



**Westgold Resources Limited**

Level 6, 197 St Georges Tce

Perth WA 6000

PO Box 7068

Cloisters Square WA 6850

**ABN 60 009 260 306**

T: +61 8 9462 3400

F: +61 8 9462 3499

E: [perth.reception@westgold.com.au](mailto:perth.reception@westgold.com.au)

W: [www.westgold.com.au](http://www.westgold.com.au)

2 October 2018

ASX Limited  
Level 40  
152-158 St Georges Terrace  
PERTH WA 6000

Dear Sir

**Westgold Resources Limited – Amended Announcement**

Westgold Resources Limited (**ASX:WGX**) (**Westgold**) released an announcement to the ASX on 1 October 2018 entitled “2018 Annual Update of Mineral Resources & Ore Reserves” (the **Announcement**).

Westgold has identified that two tables on pages 6 and 7 of the Announcement contained incorrectly rounded numbers for the Meekatharra Gold Operations Mineral Resource.

An amended announcement is attached.

Yours sincerely

David Okeby  
Company Secretary  
Westgold Resources Limited



**Press Release**  
2 October 2018

## **2018 Annual Update of Mineral Resources & Ore Reserves**

### **Westgold Ore Reserve Growth Outpaces Depletion and Divestment**

Westgold Resources Limited (**ASX:WGX**) (**Westgold**) wishes to advise that it has completed its annual Mineral Resource and Ore Reserve estimates as at 30 June 2018. Westgold's consolidated Ore Reserve estimate has increased despite annual mining depletion and the divestment of its South Kalgoorlie Operations (**SKO**).

#### **Highlights**

- The consolidated Ore Reserve at Westgold's WA gold operations now stands at 39.3 million tonnes at 2.39 g/t Au containing 3.02 million ounces of gold.
- The consolidated Mineral Resource estimate at Westgold's WA gold operations is 168 million tonnes at 2.08 g/t Au containing 11.27 million ounces.

Westgold's gold production for the year was 253,210 ounces. Even after the sale of SKO, Westgold's exploration and resource development programs replaced the mining depletion of the overall Mineral Resource to maintain the overall inventory.

In addition, the Mineral Resource estimates at the the groups Tennant Creek polymetallic assets in the Northern Territory remain unchanged and contain substantial undeveloped opportunities.

Westgold's Managing Director, Peter Cook said:

"The 2018 Financial Year has been transformational for Westgold. The sale of our shortest life asset at SKO and the acquisition and integration of specialist underground contractor, Australian Contract Mining, have been key features.

Westgold made significant capital investment in all its business sectors which has established an excellent platform for the growth of our gold assets and the further creation of shareholder wealth.

Our operational and mine planning teams have focused on the longevity of our business with continued Ore Reserve definition. The Ore Reserve has grown faster than production of the past year. This is a significant achievement with the complete removal of SKO. As an organisation we look forward to bringing these high-quality ore reserves to account in Financial Year 2019 and beyond."

Details of all identified Mineral Resource and Ore Reserve estimates are detailed in the attached appendices.

#### **Enquiries**

**Peter Cook**  
Managing Director  
peter.cook@westgold.com.au

**Steve Norregaard**  
Operations Director  
steve.norregaard@westgold.com.au

**Rod Corps**  
Manager – Investor Relations  
rod.corps@westgold.com.au

**Westgold Resources Limited**  
ACN 009 260 306

t: +61 8 9462 3400 | e: reception@westgold.com.au | w: www.westgold.com.au  
PO Box 7068, Cloisters Square, Perth WA 6850 | Level 6, 197 St Georges Tce, Perth WA 6000

**WESTGOLD RESOURCES LIMITED**  
**Gold Division (WA Operating Mines)**  
**Mineral Resource Statement - Rounded for Reporting**  
**30/6/18**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Tonnes ('000s)</b>	<b>Grade</b>	<b>Ounces Au ('000s)</b>
<b>Measured</b>			
CGO	656	4.18	88
MGO	1,565	3.22	162
FGP	68	1.56	3
HGO	3,118	2.20	220
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>5,407</b>	<b>2.72</b>	<b>474</b>
<b>Indicated</b>			
CGO	35,553	2.54	2,905
MGO	28,491	1.70	1,560
FGP	15,891	1.86	949
HGO	15,991	1.99	1,022
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>95,926</b>	<b>2.09</b>	<b>6,437</b>
<b>Inferred</b>			
CGO	19,506	2.46	1,546
MGO	30,249	1.81	1,778
FGP	5,859	1.87	353
HGO	10,637	1.99	682
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>66,251</b>	<b>2.05</b>	<b>4,359</b>
<b>Total</b>			
CGO	55,714	2.53	4,539
MGO	60,305	1.81	3,500
FGP	21,819	1.86	1,305
HGO	29,746	2.01	1,924
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>167,584</b>	<b>2.09</b>	<b>11,269</b>

**WESTGOLD RESOURCES LIMITED**  
**Gold Division (WA Operating Mines)**  
**Ore Reserve Statement - Rounded for Reporting**  
**30/6/18**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Tonnes ('000s)</b>	<b>Grade</b>	<b>Ounces Au ('000s)</b>
<b>Proven</b>			
CGO	405	4.46	58
MGO	1,112	2.35	84
FGP	68	1.56	3
HGO	29	3.63	3
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1,613</b>	<b>2.87</b>	<b>149</b>
<b>Probable</b>			
CGO	21,403	2.53	1,742
MGO	4,555	2.56	375
FGP	5,822	2.07	387
HGO	5,916	1.91	363
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>37,696</b>	<b>2.37</b>	<b>2,867</b>
<b>Total</b>			
CGO	21,807	2.57	1,800
MGO	5,667	2.52	459
FGP	5,890	2.06	390
HGO	5,945	1.92	367
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>39,309</b>	<b>2.39</b>	<b>3,016</b>

**Cue Gold Operations**  
**Mineral Resource Statement - Rounded for Reporting**  
**30/6/18**

Project	Measured			Indicated			Inferred			Total		
	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)
Big Bell	-	-	-	16,472	2.79	1,478	7,505	2.66	642	23,977	2.75	2,119
Cuddingwarra	-	-	-	6,555	2.06	435	2,826	2.34	213	9,381	2.15	648
Day Dawn	188	1.73	10	4,661	3.77	565	3,389	2.47	269	8,238	3.19	844
Tuckabianna	367	5.92	70	3,810	2.72	334	5,786	2.27	422	9,963	2.58	826
Stockpiles	101	2.42	8	4,054	0.72	94	-	-	-	4,155	0.76	102
<b>Total</b>	<b>656</b>	<b>4.18</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>35,553</b>	<b>2.54</b>	<b>2,905</b>	<b>19,506</b>	<b>2.46</b>	<b>1,546</b>	<b>55,714</b>	<b>2.53</b>	<b>4,539</b>

**Cue Gold Operations**  
**Ore Reserve Statement - Rounded for Reporting**  
**30/6/18**

Project	Proven			Probable			Total		
	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)
Big Bell	-	-	-	11,829	2.89	1,098	11,829	2.89	1,098
Cuddingwarra	-	-	-	1,289	2.08	86	1,289	2.08	86
Day Dawn	-	-	-	2,112	3.93	267	2,112	3.93	267
Tuckabianna	304	5.14	50	2,119	2.90	197	2,423	3.18	248
Stockpiles	101	2.42	8	4,054	0.72	94	4,155	0.76	102
Fender Underground	-	-	-	435	2.96	41	435	2.96	41
<b>Total</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>4.46</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>21,403</b>	<b>2.53</b>	<b>1,742</b>	<b>21,807</b>	<b>2.57</b>	<b>1,800</b>

**Cue Gold Operations**  
**Mineral Resource Statement - Comparison to Previous Year**  
**30/6/18**

Project	2017 Mineral Resource			2018 Mineral Resource			Change		
	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)
Big Bell	27,993	2.77	2,491	23,977	2.75	2,119	-4,016	-0.02	-372
Cuddingwarra	9,381	2.15	648	9,381	2.15	648	0	-	0
Day Dawn	8,761	3.10	872	8,238	3.19	844	-524	0.09	-28
Tuckabianna	10,520	2.42	819	9,963	2.58	826	-557	0.16	7
Stockpiles	4,095	0.76	100	4,155	0.76	102	60	0.00	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>60,750</b>	<b>2.52</b>	<b>4,931</b>	<b>55,714</b>	<b>2.53</b>	<b>4,539</b>	<b>-5,036</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>-392</b>

**Cue Gold Operations**  
**Ore Reserve Statement - Comparison to Previous Year**  
**30/6/18**

Project	2017 Ore Reserve			2018 Ore Reserve			Change		
	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)
Big Bell	12,254	2.78	1,096	11,829	2.89	1,098	-425	0.10	2
Cuddingwarra	1,358	2.02	88	1,289	2.08	86	-70	0.06	-2
Day Dawn	2,154	4.04	280	2,112	3.93	267	-42	-0.11	-13
Tuckabianna	1,864	2.97	178	2,423	3.18	248	559	0.21	70
Stockpiles	4,077	0.73	96	4,155	0.76	102	78	0.03	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>21,707</b>	<b>2.49</b>	<b>1,738</b>	<b>21,807</b>	<b>2.57</b>	<b>1,800</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>0.08</b>	<b>62</b>

**Meekatharra Gold Operations**  
**Mineral Resource Statement - Rounded for Reporting**  
**30/6/18**

Project	Measured			Indicated			Inferred			Total		
	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)
Meekatharra North	-	-	-	956	1.74	54	723	1.38	32	1,679	1.59	86
Nannine	-	-	-	717	1.74	40	422	1.57	21	1,139	1.68	61
Paddy's Flat	844	4.78	130	15,660	1.59	802	12,301	1.50	594	28,805	1.65	1,526
Reedy's	95	1.66	5	3,240	2.27	236	9,389	2.52	762	12,725	2.45	1,003
Yaloginda	15	2.26	1	7,918	1.68	428	7,414	1.55	369	15,347	1.62	798
Stockpiles	610	1.32	26	-	-	-	-	-	-	610	1.32	26
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,565</b>	<b>3.22</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>28,491</b>	<b>1.70</b>	<b>1,560</b>	<b>30,249</b>	<b>1.83</b>	<b>1,778</b>	<b>60,305</b>	<b>1.81</b>	<b>3,500</b>

**Meekatharra Gold Operations**  
**Ore Reserve Statement - Rounded for Reporting**  
**30/6/18**

Project	Proven			Probable			Total		
	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)
Meekatharra North	-	-	-	421	1.74	24	421	1.74	24
Nannine	-	-	-	244	1.86	15	244	1.86	15
Paddy's Flat	501	3.61	58	2,613	2.66	224	3,115	2.82	282
Reedy's	-	-	-	713	2.94	67	713	2.94	67
Yaloginda	-	-	-	564	2.52	46	564	2.52	46
Stockpiles	610	1.32	26	-	-	-	610	1.32	26
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,112</b>	<b>2.35</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>4,555</b>	<b>2.56</b>	<b>375</b>	<b>5,667</b>	<b>2.52</b>	<b>459</b>

**Meekatharra Gold Operations**  
**Mineral Resource Statement - Comparison to Previous Year**  
**30/6/18**

Project	2017 Mineral Resource			2018 Mineral Resource			Change		
	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)
Meekatharra North	1,569	1.56	79	1,679	1.59	86	109	0.03	7
Nannine	830	1.67	44	1,139	1.68	61	309	0.01	17
Paddy's Flat	32,482	1.69	1,770	28,805	1.65	1,526	-3,677	-0.05	-244
Reedy's	10,527	2.41	816	12,725	2.45	1,003	2,197	0.04	187
Yaloginda	15,544	1.63	813	15,347	1.62	798	-197	-0.01	-14
Stockpiles	192	1.91	12	610	1.32	26	418	-0.59	14
<b>Total</b>	<b>61,145</b>	<b>1.80</b>	<b>3,533</b>	<b>60,305</b>	<b>1.81</b>	<b>3,500</b>	<b>-840</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>-33</b>

**Meekatharra Gold Operations**  
**Ore Reserve Statement - Comparison to Previous Year**  
**30/6/18**

Project	2017 Ore Reserve			2018 Ore Reserve			Change		
	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)
Meekatharra North	294	1.48	14	421	1.74	24	127	0.26	10
Nannine	43	1.62	2	244	1.86	15	201	0.24	12
Paddy's Flat	3,711	3.29	393	2,806	3.13	282	-905	-0.17	-111
Reedy's	580	3.11	58	713	2.94	67	133	-0.17	9
Yaloginda	1,159	2.83	105	564	2.52	46	-595	-0.31	-60
Stockpiles	192	1.91	12	610	1.32	26	418	-0.59	14
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,979</b>	<b>3.04</b>	<b>585</b>	<b>5,358</b>	<b>2.67</b>	<b>459</b>	<b>-620</b>	<b>-0.38</b>	<b>-125</b>



**Higginsville Gold Operations**  
**Mineral Resource Statement - Rounded for Reporting**  
**30/6/18**

Project	Measured			Indicated			Inferred			Total		
	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)
Trident	620	3.75	75	571	5.24	96	714	4.51	104	1,904	4.48	275
Chalice	266	4.04	35	501	3.55	57	186	4.15	25	953	3.80	116
Corona - Fairplay	2	-	0	944	2.26	69	282	2.95	27	1,228	2.42	96
Vine	-	-	-	190	2.13	13	468	2.04	31	658	2.07	44
Lake Cowan	71	1.63	4	1,191	1.53	58	528	1.34	23	1,790	1.47	85
Two Boys	-	-	-	375	2.04	25	203	2.88	19	578	2.33	43
Mount Henry	1,301	1.88	79	8,147	1.73	453	898	1.83	53	10,347	1.76	584
Paleochannels	-	-	-	1,474	2.15	102	208	2.13	14	1,682	2.15	116
Greater Eudynie	-	-	-	-	-	-	683	1.86	41	683	1.86	41
Polar Bear	-	-	-	1,160	1.90	71	5,260	1.67	282	6,420	1.71	353
Musket	107	2.26	8	376	2.33	28	601	1.60	31	1,084	1.92	67
Other	-	-	-	485	1.54	24	603	1.72	33	1,087	1.64	57
Stockpiles	751	0.86	21	258	1.00	8	-	-	-	1,009	0.89	29
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,118</b>	<b>2.20</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>15,672</b>	<b>1.99</b>	<b>1,004</b>	<b>10,634</b>	<b>1.99</b>	<b>681</b>	<b>29,424</b>	<b>2.01</b>	<b>1,906</b>

**Higginsville Gold Operations**  
**Ore Reserve Statement - Rounded for Reporting**  
**30/6/18**

Project	Proven			Probable			Total		
	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)
Trident	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chalice	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Corona - Fairplay	-	-	-	286	2.91	27	286	2.91	27
Vine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lake Cowan	-	-	-	132	1.97	8	132	1.97	8
Two Boys	-	-	-	57	2.12	4	57	2.12	4
Mount Henry	-	-	-	3,236	1.79	186	3,236	1.79	186
Paleochannels	-	-	-	924	2.06	61	924	2.06	61
Greater Eudynie	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Polar Bear	-	-	-	707	1.87	43	707	1.87	43
Musket	-	-	-	244	2.42	19	244	2.42	19
Other	-	-	-	193	1.66	10	193	1.66	10
Stockpiles	29	3.63	3	136	1.27	6	164	1.68	9
<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>3.63</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5,916</b>	<b>1.91</b>	<b>363</b>	<b>5,945</b>	<b>1.92</b>	<b>367</b>

**Higginsville Gold Operations**  
**Mineral Resource Statement - Comparison to Previous Year**  
**30/6/18**

Project	2017 Mineral Resource			2018 Mineral Resource			Change		
	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)
Trident	1,904	4.48	275	1,904	4.48	275	-	-	-
Chalice	953	3.80	116	953	3.80	116	-	-	-
Corona - Fairplay	1,708	2.00	110	1,228	2.42	96	-480	0.43	-14
Vine	658	2.07	44	658	2.07	44	-	-	-
Lake Cowan	1,790	1.47	85	1,790	1.47	85	-	-	-
Two Boys	2,000	1.64	105	900	2.14	62	-1,100	0.50	-44
Mount Henry	19,460	1.72	1,075	10,347	1.76	584	-9,114	0.04	-490
Paleochannels	2,321	1.91	142	1,682	2.15	116	-639	0.24	-26
Greater Eundynie	683	1.86	41	683	1.86	41	-	-	-
Polar Bear	0	-	0	6,420	1.71	353	6,420	1.71	353
Musket	937	1.99	60	1,084	1.92	67	147	-0.07	7
Other	194	1.64	10	1,087	1.64	57	893	0.00	47
Stockpiles	368	1.79	21	1,009	0.89	29	641	-0.90	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>32,978</b>	<b>1.97</b>	<b>2,084</b>	<b>29,746</b>	<b>2.01</b>	<b>1,924</b>	<b>-3,231</b>	<b>0.05</b>	<b>-160</b>

**Higginsville Gold Operations**  
**Ore Reserve Statement - Comparison to Previous Year**  
**30/6/18**

Project	2017 Ore Reserve			2018 Ore Reserve			Change		
	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)
Trident	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chalice	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Corona - Fairplay	481	2.34	36	286	2.91	27	-195	0.57	-9
Vine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lake Cowan	132	1.97	8	132	1.97	8	-	-	-
Two Boys	45	2.17	3	57	2.12	4	12	-0.05	1
Mount Henry	7,299	1.57	369	3,236	1.79	186	-4,063	0.22	-183
Paleochannels	550	1.90	34	924	2.06	61	374	0.16	28
Greater Eundynie	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Polar Bear	-	-	-	707	1.87	43	707	1.87	43
Musket	122	3.06	12	244	2.42	19	122	-0.64	7
Other	76	1.41	3	193	1.66	10	117	0.25	7
Stockpiles	368	1.79	21	164	1.68	9	-204	-0.11	-12
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,074</b>	<b>1.67</b>	<b>487</b>	<b>5,945</b>	<b>1.92</b>	<b>367</b>	<b>-3,129</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>-120</b>

**Fortnum Gold Project**  
**Mineral Resource Statement - Rounded for Reporting**  
**30/6/18**

Project	Measured			Indicated			Inferred			Total		
	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)
Fortnum	-	-	-	5,661	2.47	449	3,787	1.94	236	9,448	2.26	685
Horseshoe	-	-	-	1,266	2.09	85	183	1.43	8	1,449	2.01	93
Peak Hill	-	-	-	5,233	1.70	286	1,284	2.05	85	6,518	1.77	371
Stockpiles	68	1.56	3	1,423	0.86	40	24	0.99	1	1,515	0.90	44
<b>Total</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>1.56</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>13,583</b>	<b>1.97</b>	<b>860</b>	<b>5,279</b>	<b>1.95</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>19,066</b>	<b>1.96</b>	<b>1,200</b>

**Fortnum Gold Project**  
**Ore Reserve Statement - Rounded for Reporting**  
**30/6/18**

Project	Proven			Probable			Total		
	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)
Fortnum	-	-	-	3,859	2.40	298	3,859	2.40	298
Horseshoe	-	-	-	549	1.98	35	549	1.98	35
Peak Hill	-	-	-	328	1.85	20	328	1.85	20
Stockpiles	68	1.56	3	1,086	0.98	34	1,154	1.02	38
<b>Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>1.56</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5,822</b>	<b>2.07</b>	<b>387</b>	<b>5,890</b>	<b>2.06</b>	<b>390</b>

**Fortnum Gold Project**  
**Mineral Resource Statement - Comparison to Previous Year**  
**30/6/18**

Project	2017 Mineral Resource			2018 Mineral Resource			Change		
	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)
Fortnum	9,793	2.22	699	9,448	2.26	685	-345	0.03	-14
Horseshoe	1,448	2.01	93	1,449	2.01	93	1	-0.00	0
Peak Hill	11,525	1.51	561	9,407	1.60	483	-2,118	0.08	-78
Stockpiles	1,564	0.80	40	1,515	0.90	44	-49	0.09	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>24,330</b>	<b>1.78</b>	<b>1,394</b>	<b>21,819</b>	<b>1.86</b>	<b>1,305</b>	<b>-2,511</b>	<b>0.08</b>	<b>-89</b>

**Fortnum Gold Project**  
**Ore Reserve Statement - Comparison to Previous Year**  
**30/6/18**

Project	2017 Ore Reserve			2018 Ore Reserve			Change		
	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)	Tonnes ('000s)	Grade	Ounces Au ('000s)
Fortnum	4,006	1.93	249	3,859	2.40	298	-148	0.47	49
Horseshoe	565	1.96	36	549	1.98	35	-16	0.02	-1
Peak Hill	-	-	-	328	1.85	20	328	-	20
Stockpiles	1,102	0.90	32	1,154	1.02	38	52	0.11	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,674</b>	<b>1.74</b>	<b>317</b>	<b>5,890</b>	<b>2.06</b>	<b>390</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>0.32</b>	<b>73</b>

**WESTGOLD RESOURCES LIMITED**  
**Northern Territory – Undeveloped Polymetallic Deposits**  
**Mineral Resource Statement - Rounded for Reporting**

30/6/18

	Gold			Silver			Copper			Bismuth			Cobalt			Lead			Zinc			
Project	k tonnes	Grade	k oz	k tonnes	Grade	k oz	k tonnes	Grade	k t metal	k tonnes	Grade	k t metal	k tonnes	Grade	k t metal	k tonnes	Grade	k t metal	k tonnes	Grade	k t metal	
<b>Indicated</b>																						
Explorer 108	-	-	-	8,438	14.32	3,886	5,689	0.36%	20.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	8,438	2.05%	172.8	8,438	3.41%	288.1	
Explorer 142	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Rover 1	2,741	2.42	213	2,741	2.33	205	2,741	1.42%	38.9	2,741	0.18%	4.9	2,741	0.04%	1.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>2,741</b>	<b>2.42</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>11,179</b>	<b>11.38</b>	<b>4,091</b>	<b>8,430</b>	<b>0.70%</b>	<b>59.2</b>	<b>2,741</b>	<b>0.18%</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>2,741</b>	<b>0.04%</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>8,438</b>	<b>2.05%</b>	<b>172.8</b>	<b>8,438</b>	<b>3.41%</b>	<b>288.1</b>	
<b>Inferred</b>																						
Explorer 108	-	-	-	3,430	3.32	366	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,430	1.88%	64.3	3,430	2.81%	96.5	
Explorer 142	176	0.21	1	-	-	-	176	5.21%	9.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Rover 1	4,073	1.27	166	4,073	1.90	249	4,073	1.06%	43.2	4,073	0.11%	4.5	4,073	0.08%	3.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>4,249</b>	<b>1.23</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>7,503</b>	<b>2.55</b>	<b>614</b>	<b>4,249</b>	<b>1.23%</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>4,073</b>	<b>0.11%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4,073</b>	<b>0.08%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3,430</b>	<b>1.78%</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>3,430</b>	<b>2.81%</b>	<b>96</b>	
<b>Total</b>																						
Explorer 108	-	-	-	11,868	3.32	4,252	5,689	-	20.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	11,868	1.88%	237.2	11,868	2.81%	384.6	
Explorer 142	176	0.21	1	-	-	-	176	5.21%	9.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Rover 1	6,814	1.27	380	6,814	1.90	454	6,814	1.06%	82.1	6,814	0.11%	9.4	6,814	0.08%	4.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>6,990</b>	<b>1.69</b>	<b>381</b>	<b>18,682</b>	<b>7.83</b>	<b>4,706</b>	<b>12,679</b>	<b>0.88%</b>	<b>111.6</b>	<b>6,814</b>	<b>0.14%</b>	<b>9.4</b>	<b>6,814</b>	<b>0.06%</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>11,868</b>	<b>2.00%</b>	<b>237.2</b>	<b>11,868</b>	<b>3.24%</b>	<b>384.6</b>	

Note: The Mineral Resource Statement for the Northern Territory Projects remains unchanged on a year on year basis.

# JORC 2012 TABLE 1 – GOLD DIVISION

## SECTION 1 SAMPLING TECHNIQUES AND DATA

(Criteria in this section apply to all succeeding sections.)

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
<p><b>Sampling techniques</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nature and quality of sampling (eg cut channels, random chips, or specific specialised industry standard measurement tools appropriate to the minerals under investigation, such as down hole gamma sondes, or handheld XRF instruments, etc). These examples should not be taken as limiting the broad meaning of sampling.</li> <li>Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample representivity and the appropriate calibration of any measurement tools or systems used.</li> <li>Aspects of the determination of mineralisation that are Material to the Public Report.</li> <li>In cases where 'industry standard' work has been done this would be relatively simple (eg 'reverse circulation drilling was used to obtain 1 m samples from which 3 kg was pulverised to produce a 30 g charge for fire assay'). In other cases more explanation may be required, such as where there is coarse gold that has inherent sampling problems. Unusual commodities or mineralisation types (eg submarine nodules) may warrant disclosure of detailed information.</li> </ul>	<p><b>HGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Diamond Drilling</b> The bulk of the data used in resource calculations at Trident has been gathered from diamond core. Four types of diamond core sample have been historically collected. The predominant sample method is half-core NQ2 diamond with half-core LTK60 diamond, Whole core LTK48 diamond and whole core BQ also used. This core is logged and sampled to geologically relevant intervals.  The bulk of the data used in resource calculations at Chalice has been gathered from diamond core. The predominant drilling and sample type is half core NQ2 diamond. Occasionally whole core has been sampled to streamline the core handling process. Historically half and whole core LTK60 and half core HQ diamond have been used. This core is logged and sampled to geologically relevant intervals.</li> <li><b>Face Sampling</b> Each development face / round is chip sampled at both Trident and Chalice. One or two channels are taken per face perpendicular to the mineralisation. The sampling intervals are dominated by geological constraints (e.g. rock type, veining and alteration / sulphidation etc..) with an effort made to ensure each 3kg sample is representative of the interval being extracted. Samples are taken in a range from 0.1 m up to 1.2 m in waste / mullock. All exposures within the orebody are sampled.</li> <li><b>Sludge Drilling</b> Sludge drilling at Chalice and Trident is performed with an underground production drill rig. It is an open hole drilling method using water as the flushing medium, with a 64mm or 89mm hole diameter. Samples are taken twice per drill steel (1.9m steel, 0.8m sample). Holes are drilled at sufficient angles to allow flushing of the hole with water following each interval to prevent contamination.</li> <li><b>RC Drilling</b> For Fairplay, Vine, Lake Cowan, Two Boys, Mousehollow, Pioneer and Eundynie the bulk of the data used in the resource estimate is sourced from RC drilling. Minor RC drilling is also utilised at Trident, Musket, Chalice and the Palaeochannels (Wills, Pluto, Mitchell 3 and 4).  Drill cuttings are extracted from the RC return via cyclone. The underflow from each 1 m interval is transferred via bucket to a four tiered riffle splitter, delivering approximately three kilograms of the recovered material into calico bags for analysis. The residual material is retained on the ground near the hole. Samples too wet to be split through the riffle splitter are taken as grabs and are recorded as such.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Drilling techniques</b></p>		
<p><b>Drill sample recovery</b></p>		



Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1279 145 2143 277"> <p>• <b>RAB / Air Core Drilling</b></p> <p>Drill cuttings are extracted from the RAB and Aircore return via cyclone. 4m Composite samples are obtained by spear sampling from the individual 1m drill return piles; the residue material is retained on the ground near the hole. In the Palaeochannels 1m samples are riffle split for analysis.</p> <p>There is no RAB or Aircore drilling used in the estimation of Trident, Chalice, Corona, Fairplay, Vine, Lake Cowan and Two Boys.</p> <p>MGO</p> </li> <li data-bbox="1279 379 2143 512"> <p>• <b>Diamond Drilling</b></p> <p>A significant portion of the data used in resource calculations at the MGO has been gathered from diamond core. Multiple sizes have been used historically. This core is geologically logged and subsequently halved for sampling. Grade control holes may be whole-cored to streamline the core handling process if required.</p> </li> <li data-bbox="1279 523 2143 655"> <p>• <b>Face Sampling</b></p> <p>At each of the major past and current underground producers at the MGO, each development face / round is horizontally chip sampled. The sampling intervals are dominated by geological constraints (e.g. rock type, veining and alteration / sulphidation etc.). The majority of exposures within the orebody are sampled.</p> </li> <li data-bbox="1279 667 2143 847"> <p>• <b>Sludge Drilling</b></p> <p>Sludge drilling at the CMGP was / is performed with an underground production drill rig. It is an open hole drilling method using water as the flushing medium, with a 64mm (nominal) hole diameter. Sample intervals are ostensibly the length of the drill steel. Holes are drilled at sufficient angles to allow flushing of the hole with water following each interval to prevent contamination. Sludge drilling is not used to inform resource models.</p> </li> <li data-bbox="1279 858 2143 1038"> <p>• <b>RC Drilling</b></p> <p>Drill cuttings are extracted from the RC return via cyclone. The underflow from each interval is transferred via bucket to a four tiered riffle splitter, delivering approximately three kilograms of the recovered material into calico bags for analysis. The residual material is retained on the ground near the hole. Composite samples are obtained from the residue material for initial analysis, with the split samples remaining with the individual residual piles until required for re-split analysis or eventual disposal.</p> </li> <li data-bbox="1279 1050 2143 1150"> <p>• <b>RAB / Aircore Drilling</b></p> <p>Combined scoops from bucket dumps from cyclone for composite. Split samples taken from individual bucket dumps via scoop. RAB holes are not included in the resource estimate.</p> </li> <li data-bbox="1279 1161 2143 1246"> <p>• <b>Blast Hole Drilling</b></p> <p>Cuttings sampled via splitter tray per individual drill rod. Blast holes not included in the resource estimate.</p> </li> <li data-bbox="1279 1257 2143 1358"> <p>• All geology input is logged and validated by the relevant area geologists, incorporated into this is assessment of sample recovery. No defined relationship exists between sample recovery and grade. Nor has sample bias due to preferential loss or gain of fine or coarse material been noted.</p> </li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
		<p><b>CGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Diamond Drilling</b> A significant portion of the data used in resource calculations at the CGO has been gathered from diamond core. Multiple sizes have been used historically. This core is geologically logged and subsequently halved for sampling. Grade control holes may be whole-cored to streamline the core handling process if required.</li> <li>• <b>Face Sampling</b> At each of the major past and current underground producers at the CGO, each development face / round is horizontally chip sampled. The sampling intervals are dominated by geological constraints (e.g. rock type, veining and alteration / sulphidation etc.). The majority of exposures within the orebody are sampled.</li> <li>• <b>Sludge Drilling</b> Sludge drilling at the CMGP was / is performed with an underground production drill rig. It is an open hole drilling method using water as the flushing medium, with a 64mm (nominal) hole diameter. Sample intervals are ostensibly the length of the drill steel. Holes are drilled at sufficient angles to allow flushing of the hole with water following each interval to prevent contamination. Sludge drilling is not used to inform resource models.</li> <li>• <b>RC Drilling</b> Drill cuttings are extracted from the RC return via cyclone. The underflow from each interval is transferred via bucket to a four tiered riffle splitter, delivering approximately three kilograms of the recovered material into calico bags for analysis. The residual material is retained on the ground near the hole. Composite samples are obtained from the residue material for initial analysis, with the split samples remaining with the individual residual piles until required for re-split analysis or eventual disposal.</li> <li>• <b>RAB / Aircore Drilling</b> Combined scoops from bucket dumps from cyclone for composite. Split samples taken from individual bucket dumps via scoop. RAB holes are not included in the resource estimate.</li> <li>• <b>Blast Hole Drilling</b> Cuttings sampled via splitter tray per individual drill rod. Blast holes not included in the resource estimate.</li> </ul> <p>All geology input is logged and validated by the relevant area geologists, incorporated into this is assessment of sample recovery. No defined relationship exists between sample recovery and grade. Nor has sample bias due to preferential loss or gain of fine or coarse material been noted.</p>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
		<p><b>FGP</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Historic reverse circulation drilling was used to collect samples at 1m intervals with sample quality, recovery and moisture recorded on logging sheets. Bulk samples were composited to 4-5m samples by PVC spear. These composites were dried, crushed and split to produce a 30g charge for aqua regia digest at the Fortnum site laboratory.</li> <li>• For Westgold (WGX) RC Drilling drill cuttings are extracted from the RC return via cyclone. The underflow from each interval is transferred via bucket to a four tiered riffle splitter, delivering approximately three kilograms of the recovered material into calico bags for analysis. The residual material is retained on the ground near the hole. Composite samples are obtained from the residue material for initial analysis, with the split samples remaining with the individual residual piles until required for re-split analysis or eventual disposal.</li> <li>• In the case of grade control drilling, 1m intervals were split at the rig via a 3-tier splitter box below the cyclone and collected in calico bags with bulk samples collected into large plastic bags. These 1m splits were dried, pulverised and split to produce a 50g charge for fire assay at an offsite laboratory.</li> <li>• Where composite intervals returned results &gt;0.15g/t Au, the original bulk samples were split by 3-tier riffle splitter to approximately 3-4kg. The whole sample was dried, pulverised and split to produce a 50g charge for fire assay at an offsite laboratory.</li> <li>• Historic diamond drilling sampled according to mineralisation and lithology resulting in samples of 10cm to 1.5m. Half core pulverised and split to produce a 50g charge for fire assay at an offsite laboratory.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Logging</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether core and chip samples have been geologically and geotechnically logged to a level of detail to support appropriate Mineral Resource estimation, mining studies and metallurgical studies.</li> <li>• Whether logging is qualitative or quantitative in nature. Core (or costean, channel, etc) photography.</li> <li>• The total length and percentage of the relevant intersections logged</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Westgold surface drill-holes are all orientated and have been logged in detail for geology, veining, alteration, mineralisation and orientated structure. Westgold underground drill-holes are logged in detail for geology, veining, alteration, mineralisation and structure. Core has been logged in enough detail to allow for the relevant mineral resource estimation techniques to be employed.</li> <li>• Surface core is photographed both wet and dry and underground core is photographed wet. All photos are stored on the companies servers, with the photographs from each hole contained within separate folders.</li> <li>• Development faces are mapped geologically.</li> <li>• RC, RAB and Aircore chips are geologically logged.</li> <li>• Sludge drilling is logged for lithology, mineralisation and vein percentage.</li> <li>• Logging is quantitative in nature.</li> <li>• All holes are logged completely, all faces are mapped completely.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
<p><b>Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all core taken.</li> <li>If non-core, whether riffled, tube sampled, rotary split, etc and whether sampled wet or dry.</li> <li>For all sample types, the nature, quality and appropriateness of the sample preparation technique.</li> <li>Quality control procedures adopted for all sub-sampling stages to maximise representivity of samples.</li> <li>Measures taken to ensure that the sampling is representative of the in situ material collected, including for instance results for field duplicate/second-half sampling.</li> <li>Whether sample sizes are appropriate to the grain size of the material being sampled.</li> </ul>	<p><b>HGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NQ2 and LTK60 diameter core is sawn half core using a diamond-blade saw, with one half of the core consistently taken for analysis. LTK48 and BQ are whole core sampled. Sludge samples are dried then riffle split.</li> <li>The un-sampled half of diamond core is retained for check sampling if required.</li> <li>For the onsite Intertek facility the entire dried sample is jaw crushed (JC2500 or Boyd Crusher) to a nominal 85% passing 2mm with crushing equipment cleaned between samples. An analytical sub-sample of approximately 500-750 g is split out from the crushed sample using a riffle splitter, with the coarse residue being retained for any verification analysis. Sample preparation techniques are appropriate for the type of analytical process.</li> <li>Where fire assay has been used the entire half core sample (3-3.5 kg) is crushed and pulverised (single stage mix and grind using LM5 mills) to a target of 85-90% passing 75µm in size. A 200g sub-sample is then separated out for analysis.</li> <li>Core and underground face samples are taken to geologically relevant boundaries to ensure each sample is representative of a geological domain. Sludge samples are taken to nominal sample lengths.</li> <li>The sample size is considered appropriate for the grain size of the material being sampled.</li> <li>For RC, RAB and Aircore chips regular field duplicates are collected and analysed for significant variance to primary results.</li> <li>RAB and Aircore sub-samples are collected through spear sampling.</li> </ul> <p><b>MGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Blast holes -Sampled via splitter tray per individual drill rods.</li> <li>RAB / AC chips - Combined scoops from bucket dumps from cyclone for composite. Split samples taken from individual bucket dumps via scoop.</li> <li>RC - Three tier riffle splitter (approximately 5kg sample). Samples generally dry.</li> <li>Face Chips - Nominally chipped horizontally across the face from left to right, sub-set via geological features as appropriate.</li> <li>Diamond Drilling - Half-core niche samples, sub-set via geological features as appropriate. Grade control holes may be whole-cored to streamline the core handling process if required.</li> <li>Chips / core chips undergo total preparation.</li> <li>Samples undergo fine pulverisation of the entire sample by an LM5 type mill to achieve a 75µ product prior to splitting.</li> <li>QA/QC is currently ensured during the sub-sampling stages process via the use of the systems of an independent NATA / ISO accredited laboratory contractor. A significant portion of the historical informing data has been processed by in-house laboratories.</li> <li>The sample size is considered appropriate for the grain size of the material being sampled.</li> <li>The un-sampled half of diamond core is retained for check sampling if required. For RC chips regular field duplicates are collected and analysed for significant variance to primary results.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CGO</b></li> <li>• Blast holes -Sampled via splitter tray per individual drill rods.</li> <li>• RAB / AC chips - Combined scoops from bucket dumps from cyclone for composite. Split samples taken from individual bucket dumps via scoop.</li> <li>• RC - Three tier riffle splitter (approximately 5kg sample). Samples generally dry.</li> <li>• Face Chips - Nominally chipped horizontally across the face from left to right, sub-set via geological features as appropriate.</li> <li>• Diamond Drilling - Half-core niche samples, sub-set via geological features as appropriate. Grade control holes may be whole-cored to streamline the core handling process if required.</li> <li>• Chips / core chips undergo total preparation.</li> <li>• Samples undergo fine pulverisation of the entire sample by an LM5 type mill to achieve a 75µ product prior to splitting.</li> <li>• QA/QC is currently ensured during the sub-sampling stages process via the use of the systems of an independent NATA / ISO accredited laboratory contractor. A significant portion of the historical informing data has been processed by in-house laboratories.</li> <li>• The sample size is considered appropriate for the grain size of the material being sampled.</li> <li>• The un-sampled half of diamond core is retained for check sampling if required. For RC chips regular field duplicates are collected and analysed for significant variance to primary results.</li> <li>• <b>FGP</b></li> <li>• Diamond core samples to be analysed were taken as half core. Sample mark-up was controlled by geological domaining represented by alteration, mineralisation and lithology.</li> <li>• Reverse circulation samples were split from dry, 1m bulk sample via a 3-tier riffle splitter. Field duplicates were inserted at a ratio of 1:20, analysis of primary vs duplicate samples indicate sampling is representative of the insitu material.</li> <li>• Standard material was documented as being inserted at a ratio of 1:100 for both RC and diamond drilling.</li> <li>• Detailed discussion of sampling techniques and Quality Control are documented in publicly available exploration technical reports compiled by prior owners (Homestake, Perilya, Gleneagle, RNI).</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
<p><b>Quality of assay data and laboratory tests</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The nature, quality and appropriateness of the assaying and laboratory procedures used and whether the technique is considered partial or total.</li> <li>For geophysical tools, spectrometers, handheld XRF instruments, etc, the parameters used in determining the analysis including instrument make and model, reading times, calibrations factors applied and their derivation, etc.</li> <li>Nature of quality control procedures adopted (eg standards, blanks, duplicates, external laboratory checks) and whether acceptable levels of accuracy (ie lack of bias) and precision have been established.</li> </ul>	<p><b>HGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recent drilling was analysed by fire assay as outlined below; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» A 40g sample undergoes fire assay lead collection followed by flame atomic adsorption spectrometry.</li> <li>» The laboratory includes a minimum of 1 project standard with every 22 samples analysed.</li> <li>» Quality control is ensured via the use of standards, blanks and duplicates.</li> </ul> </li> <li>No significant QA/QC issues have arisen in recent drilling results.</li> <li>Historical drilling has used a combination of Fire Assay, Aqua Regia and PAL analysis.</li> <li>These assay methodologies are appropriate for the resources in question.</li> </ul> <p><b>MGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recent drilling was analysed by fire assay as outlined below; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» A 40g sample undergoes fire assay lead collection followed by flame atomic adsorption spectrometry.</li> <li>» The laboratory includes a minimum of 1 project standard with every 22 samples analysed.</li> <li>» Quality control is ensured via the use of standards, blanks and duplicates.</li> </ul> </li> <li>No significant QA/QC issues have arisen in recent drilling results.</li> <li>Historical drilling has used a combination of Fire Assay, Aqua Regia and PAL analysis.</li> <li>These assay methodologies are appropriate for the resources in question.</li> </ul> <p><b>CGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recent drilling was analysed by fire assay as outlined below; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» A 40g sample undergoes fire assay lead collection followed by flame atomic adsorption spectrometry.</li> <li>» The laboratory includes a minimum of 1 project standard with every 22 samples analysed.</li> <li>» Quality control is ensured via the use of standards, blanks and duplicates.</li> </ul> </li> <li>No significant QA/QC issues have arisen in recent drilling results.</li> <li>Historical drilling has used a combination of Fire Assay, Aqua Regia and PAL analysis.</li> <li>These assay methodologies are appropriate for the resources in question.</li> </ul> <p><b>FGP</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Historic assaying of RC and core was done by 50g charge fire assay with Atomic Absorption Spectrometry finish at Analabs. The method is standard for gold analysis and is considered appropriate in this case. No Laboratory Certificates are available for historic assay results pre 2008 however, evaluation of the database identified the following; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standards are inserted at a ratio of 1:100,</li> <li>• Assay repeats inserted at a ratio of 1 in 20.</li> <li>• QA/QC analysis of this historic data indicates the levels of accuracy and precision are acceptable.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assay of recent (post 2012) sampling was done by 40g charge fire assay with Inductively Coupled Plasma – Optical Emission Spectroscopy finish at Bureau Veritas (Ultratrace), Perth. The method is standard for gold analysis and is considered appropriate in this case. Laboratory Certificates are available for the assay results and the following QA/QC protocols used include; Laboratory Checks inserted 1 in 20 samples, CRM inserted 1 in 30 samples and Assay Repeats randomly selected 1 in 15 samples.</li> <li>QA/QC analysis of this data indicates the levels of accuracy and precision are acceptable with no significant bias observed.</li> </ul>
<b>Verification of sampling and assaying</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The verification of significant intersections by either independent or alternative company personnel.</li> <li>The use of twinned holes.</li> <li>Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols.</li> <li>Discuss any adjustment to assay data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No independent or alternative verifications are available.</li> <li>Virtual twinned holes have been drilled in several instances across all sites with no significant issues highlighted. Drillhole data is also routinely confirmed by development assay data in the operating environment.</li> <li>Primary data is collected utilising LogChief. The information is imported into a SQL database server and verified.</li> <li>All data used in the calculation of resources and reserves are compiled in databases (underground and open pit) which are overseen and validated by senior geologists.</li> <li>No adjustments have been made to any assay data.</li> </ul>
<b>Location of data points</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accuracy and quality of surveys used to locate drill holes (collar and down-hole surveys), trenches, mine workings and other locations used in Mineral Resource estimation.</li> <li>Specification of the grid system used.</li> <li>Quality and adequacy of topographic control.</li> </ul>	<p><b>HGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collar coordinates for surface drill-holes were generally determined by GPS, with underground drill-holes generally determined by survey pick-up. Downhole survey measurements for most surface diamond holes were by Gyro-compass at 5m intervals. Holes not gyro-surveyed were surveyed using Eastman single shot cameras at 20m intervals. Downhole surveys for underground diamond drill-holes were taken at 15 – 30m intervals by Reflex single-shot cameras. Routine survey pick-ups of underground and surface holes where they intersected development indicates (apart from some minor discrepancies with pre-Avoca drilling) a survey accuracy of less than 5m.</li> <li>All drilling and resource estimation is undertaken in local mine grid at the various projects.</li> <li>Topographic control is generated from Differential GPS. This methodology is adequate for the resource in question.</li> </ul> <p><b>MGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All data is spatially oriented by survey controls via direct pickups by the survey department. Drillholes are all surveyed downhole, deeper holes with a Gyro tool if required, the majority with single / multishot cameras.</li> <li>All drilling and resource estimation is preferentially undertaken in local mine grid at the various sites.</li> <li>Topographic control is generated from a combination of remote sensing methods and ground-based surveys. This methodology is adequate for the resources in question.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
		<p><b>CGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All data is spatially oriented by survey controls via direct pickups by the survey department. Drillholes are all surveyed downhole, deeper holes with a Gyro tool if required, the majority with single / multishot cameras.</li> <li>All drilling and resource estimation is preferentially undertaken in local mine grid at the various sites.</li> <li>Topographic control is generated from a combination of remote sensing methods and ground-based surveys. This methodology is adequate for the resources in question.</li> </ul>
		<p><b>FGP</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The grid system used for historic Fortnum drilling is the established Fortnum Mine Grid. Control station locations and traverses have been verified by external survey consultants (Ensurv). Collar locations of boreholes have been established by either total station or differential GPS (DGPS). The Yarlarweelor, Callie's and Eldorado open pits (currently abandoned) was picked up by DGPS at the conclusion of mining. The transformation between Mine Grid and MGA94 Zone 50 is documented and well established.</li> <li>A LIDAR survey over the project area was undertaken in 2012 and results are in agreement with survey pickups of pits, low-grade stockpiles and waste dumps.</li> <li>Historic drilling by Homestake was routinely surveyed at 25m, 50m and every 50m thereafter, using a single shot CAMTEQ survey tool. RC holes have a nominal setup azimuth applied. Perilya YLRC series holes had survey shots taken by gyro every 10m. Historic drilling in the area did not appear to have any significant problems with hole deviation.</li> <li>Drilling by RNI / WGX was picked up by DGPS on MGA94. Downhole surveys were taken by digital single shot camera every 50m or via a gyro survey tool.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Data spacing and distribution</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data spacing for reporting of Exploration Results.</li> <li>Whether the data spacing and distribution is sufficient to establish the degree of geological and grade continuity appropriate for the Mineral Resource and Ore Reserve estimation procedure(s) and classifications applied.</li> <li>Whether sample compositing has been applied.</li> </ul>	<p><b>HGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drilling in the underground environment at Trident is nominally carried-out on 20m x 30m spacing for resource definition and in filled to a 10m x 15m spacing with grade control drilling. At Trident the drill spacing below the 500RL widens to an average of 40m x 80m.</li> <li>Drilling at the Lake Cowan region is on a 20m x 10m spacing. Historical mining has shown this to be an appropriate spacing for the style of mineralisation and the classifications applied.</li> <li>Compositing is carried out based upon the modal sample length of each project.</li> </ul> <p><b>MGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data spacing is variable dependent upon the individual orebody under consideration. A lengthy history of mining has shown that this approach is appropriate for the Mineral Resource estimation process and to allow for classification of the resources as they stand.</li> <li>Compositing is carried out based upon the modal sample length of each individual do-main.</li> </ul>



Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CGO</b></li> <li>• Data spacing is variable dependent upon the individual orebody under consideration. A lengthy history of mining has shown that this approach is appropriate for the Mineral Resource estimation process and to allow for classification of the resources as they stand.</li> <li>• Compositing is carried out based upon the modal sample length of each individual domain.</li> <li>• <b>FGP</b></li> <li>• Drillhole spacing is a nominal 40m x 40m that has been in-filled to a nominal 20m x 20m in the main zone of mineralisation at Yarlarweelor, Callie's and Eldorado with 10m x10m RC grade control within the limits of the open pits.</li> <li>• The spacing is considered sufficient to establish geological and grade continuity for appropriate Mineral Resource classification.</li> <li>• During the historic exploration phase, samples were composited to 4m by spearing 1m bulk samples. Where the assays returned results greater than 0.15ppm Au, the original 1m bulk samples were split using a 3-tier riffle splitter and analysed as described above.</li> </ul>
<b>Orientation of data in relation to geological structure</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the orientation of sampling achieves unbiased sampling of possible structures and the extent to which this is known, considering the deposit type.</li> <li>• If the relationship between the drilling orientation and the orientation of key mineralised structures is considered to have introduced a sampling bias, this should be assessed and reported if material.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drilling intersections are nominally designed to be normal to the orebody as far as underground infrastructure constraints / topography allows.</li> <li>• Development sampling is nominally undertaken normal to the various orebodies.</li> <li>• Where drilling angles are sub optimal the number of samples per drill hole used in the estimation has been limited to reduce any potential bias.</li> <li>• It is not considered that drilling orientation has introduced an appreciable sampling bias.</li> </ul>
<b>Sample security</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The measures taken to ensure sample security.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For samples assayed at on-site laboratory facilities, samples are delivered to the facility by Company staff. Upon delivery the responsibility for sample security and storage falls to the independent third party operators of these facilities.</li> <li>• For samples assayed off-site, samples are delivered to a third party transport service, who in turn relay them to the independent laboratory contractor. Samples are stored securely until they leave site.</li> </ul>
<b>Audits or reviews</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site generated resources and reserves and the parent geological data is routinely reviewed by the Westgold Corporate technical team.</li> </ul>

## SECTION 2 REPORTING OF EXPLORATION RESULTS

(Criteria listed in the preceding section also apply to this section.)

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
<p><b>Mineral tenement and land tenure status</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Type, reference name/number, location and ownership including agreements or material issues with third parties such as joint ventures, partnerships, overriding royalties, native title interests, historical sites, wilderness or national park and environmental settings.</li> <li>The security of the tenure held at the time of reporting along with any known impediments to obtaining a licence to operate in the area.</li> </ul>	<p><b>HGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State Royalty of 2.5% of revenue applies to all tenements.</li> <li>The Trident Resource is located within mining leases M15/0642, M15/0351 and M15/0348. M15/0351 and M15/0642 also incur the Morgan Stanley royalty of 4% of revenue after 100,000oz of production and the Morgan Stanley price participation royalty at 10% of incremental revenue for gold prices above AUD\$600/oz. M15/0642 is also subject to the Mitchell Royalty at AUD\$32/oz.</li> <li>The Chalice Resource is located on mining lease M15/0786. There are no additional royalties.</li> <li>Lake Cowan is located on mining lease M15/1132. Lake Cowan is subject to an additional royalty (Brocks Creek) of \$1/tonne of ore.</li> </ul> <p><b>MGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Native title interests are recorded against several MGO tenements.</li> <li>The MGO tenements are held by the Big Bell Gold Operations (BBGO) of which Westgold has 100% ownership.</li> <li>Several third party royalties exist across various tenements at CMGP, over and above the state government royalty.</li> <li>BBGO operates in accordance with all environmental conditions set down as conditions for grant of the leases.</li> <li>There are no known issues regarding security of tenure.</li> <li>There are no known impediments to continued operation.</li> </ul> <p><b>CGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Native title interests are recorded against several CGO tenements.</li> <li>The CMGP tenements are held by the Big Bell Gold Operations (BBGO) of which Westgold has 100% ownership.</li> <li>Several third party royalties exist across various tenements at CGO, over and above the state government royalty.</li> <li>BBGO operates in accordance with all environmental conditions set down as conditions for grant of the leases.</li> <li>There are no known issues regarding security of tenure.</li> <li>There are no known impediments to continued operation.</li> </ul> <p><b>FGP</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Fortnum Gold Project tenure is 100% owned by Westgold through subsidiary company Aragon Resources Pty. Ltd.</li> <li>Various Royalties apply to the package. The most pertinent being;</li> <li>\$10/oz after first 50,000oz (capped at \$2M)- Perilya</li> <li>State Government – 2.5% NSR</li> <li>The tenure is currently in good standing.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
<b>Exploration done by other parties</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Higginsville region has an exploration and production history in excess of 30 years.</li> <li>The MGO tenements have an exploration and production history in excess of 100 years.</li> <li>The CGO tenements have an exploration and production history in excess of 100 years.</li> <li>The FGP tenements have an exploration and production history in excess of 30 years.</li> <li>Westgold work has generally confirmed the veracity of historic exploration data.</li> </ul>
<b>Geology</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.</li> </ul>	<p><b>HGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trident is hosted primarily within a thick, weakly differentiated gabbro with subordinate mafic and ultramafic lithologies and comprises a series of north-northeast trending, shallowly north-plunging mineralised zones. The deposit comprises two main mineralisation styles; large wallrock-hosted ore-zones comprising sigmoidal quartz tensional vein arrays and associated metasomatic wall rock alteration hosted exclusively within the gabbro, and thin, lode-style, nuggetty laminated quartz veins that formed primarily at sheared lithological contacts between the various mafic and ultramafic lithologies.</li> <li>Lake Cowan mineralisation can be separated into two types. Structurally controlled primary mineralisation in ultramafics, basalts and felsics host (e.g. Louis, Josephine and Napoleon), and saprolite / palaeochannel hosted supergene hydromorphic deposits, including Sophia, Brigitte and Atreides.</li> </ul> <p><b>MGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The MGO is located in the Achaean Murchison Province, a granite-greenstone terrane in the northwest of the Yilgarn Craton. Greenstone belts trending north-northeast are separated by granite-gneiss domes, with smaller granite plutons also present within or on the margins of the belts.</li> </ul> <p><b>CMGP</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The CGO is located in the Achaean Murchison Province, a granite-greenstone terrane in the northwest of the Yilgarn Craton. Greenstone belts trending north-northeast are separated by granite-gneiss domes, with smaller granite plutons also present within or on the margins of the belts.</li> <li>Mineralisation at Big Bell is hosted in the shear zone (Mine Sequence) and is associated with the post-peak metamorphic retrograde assemblages. Stibnite, native antimony and trace arsenopyrite are disseminated through the K-feldspar-rich lode schist. These are intergrown with pyrite and pyrrhotite and chalcopyrite. Mineralisation outside the typical Big Bell host rocks (KPSH), for example 1,600N and Shocker, also display a very strong W-As-Sb geochemical halo.</li> <li>Numerous gold deposits occur within the Cuddingwarra Project area, the majority of which are hosted within the central mafic-ultramafic ± felsic porphyry sequence. Within this broad framework, mineralisation is shown to be spatially controlled by competency contrasts across, and flexures along, layer-parallel D2 shear zones, and is maximised when transected by corridors of northeast striking D3 faults and fractures.</li> <li>The Great Fingall Dolerite hosts the majority gold mineralisation within the portion of the greenstone belt proximal to Cue (The Day Dawn Project Area). Unit AGF3 is the most brittle of all the five units and this characteristic is responsible for its role as the most favourable lithological host to gold mineralisation in the Greenstone Belt.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
		<p><b>FGP</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Fortnum deposits are Paleoproterozoic shear-hosted gold deposits within the Fortnum Wedge, a localised thrust duplex of Narracoota Formation within the overlying Ravelstone Formation. Both stratigraphic formations comprise part of the Bryah Basin in the Capricorn Orogen, Western Australia.</li> <li>The Horseshoe Cassidy deposits are hosted within the Ravelstone Formation (siltstone and argillite) and Narracoota Formation (highly-altered, moderate to strongly deformed mafic to ultramafic rocks). The main zone of mineralisation is developed within a horizon of highly altered magnesian basalt. Gold mineralisation is associated with strong vein stock works that are confined to the altered mafic. Alteration consists of two types; stockwork proximal silica-carbonate-fuchsite-haematite-pyrite and distal silica-haematite-carbonate+/- chlorite.</li> <li>The Peak Hill district represents remnants of a Proterozoic fold belt comprising highly deformed trough and shelf sediments and mafic / ultramafic volcanics, which are generally moderately metamorphosed (except for the Peak Hill Metamorphic Suite).</li> </ul>
<b>Drill hole Information</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A summary of all information material to the understanding of the exploration results including a tabulation of the following information for all Material drill holes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» easting and northing of the drill hole collar</li> <li>» elevation or RL (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in metres) of the drill hole collar</li> <li>» dip and azimuth of the hole</li> <li>» down hole length and interception depth</li> <li>» hole length.</li> </ul> </li> <li>If the exclusion of this information is justified on the basis that the information is not Material and this exclusion does not detract from the understanding of the report, the Competent Person should clearly explain why this is the case.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No drillhole information is being presented in this release.</li> </ul>
<b>Data aggregation methods</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In reporting Exploration Results, weighting averaging techniques, maximum and/or minimum grade truncations (eg cutting of high grades) and cut-off grades are usually Material and should be stated.</li> <li>Where aggregate intercepts incorporate short lengths of high grade results and longer lengths of low grade results, the procedure used for such aggregation should be stated and some typical examples of such aggregations should be shown in detail.</li> <li>The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values should be clearly stated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No drillhole information is being presented in this release.</li> </ul>
<b>Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These relationships are particularly important in the reporting of Exploration Results.</li> <li>If the geometry of the mineralisation with respect to the drill hole angle is known, its nature should be reported.</li> <li>If it is not known and only the down hole lengths are reported, there should be a clear statement to this effect (eg 'down hole length, true width not known').</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No drillhole information is being presented in this release.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
<b>Diagrams</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate maps and sections (with scales) and tabulations of intercepts should be included for any significant discovery being reported. These should include, but not be limited to a plan view of drill hole collar locations and appropriate sectional views.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No drillhole information is being presented in this release.</li> </ul>
<b>Balanced reporting</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where comprehensive reporting of all Exploration Results is not practicable, representative reporting of both low and high grades and/or widths should be practiced to avoid misleading reporting of Exploration Results.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No drillhole information is being presented in this release.</li> </ul>
<b>Other substantive exploration data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other exploration data, if meaningful and material, should be reported including (but not limited to): geological observations; geophysical survey results; geochemical survey results; bulk samples – size and method of treatment; metallurgical test results; bulk density, groundwater, geotechnical and rock characteristics; potential deleterious or contaminating substances.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no other substantive exploration data associated with this release.</li> </ul>
<b>Further work</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The nature and scale of planned further work (eg tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling).</li> <li>Diagrams clearly highlighting the areas of possible extensions, including the main geological interpretations and future drilling areas, provided this information is not commercially sensitive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ongoing surface and underground exploration activities will be undertaken to support continuing mining activities at Westgold Gold Operations.</li> </ul>

## SECTION 3 ESTIMATION AND REPORTING OF MINERAL RESOURCES

(Criteria listed in section 1, and where relevant in section 2, also apply to this section.)

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
<b>Database integrity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measures taken to ensure that data has not been corrupted by, for example, transcription or keying errors, between its initial collection and its use for Mineral Resource estimation purposes.</li> <li>Data validation procedures used.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The database used for the estimation was extracted from the Westgold's DataShed database management system stored on a secure SQL server.</li> <li>As new data is acquired it passes through a validation approval system designed to pick up any significant errors before the information is loaded into the master database.</li> </ul>
<b>Site visits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment on any site visits undertaken by the Competent Person and the outcome of those visits.</li> <li>If no site visits have been undertaken indicate why this is the case.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr. Russell visits Westgold Gold Operations regularly.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
<b>Geological interpretation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confidence in (or conversely, the uncertainty of) the geological interpretation of the mineral deposit.</li> <li>• Nature of the data used and of any assumptions made.</li> <li>• The effect, if any, of alternative interpretations on Mineral Resource estimation.</li> <li>• The use of geology in guiding and controlling Mineral Resource estimation.</li> <li>• The factors affecting continuity both of grade and geology.</li> </ul>	<p><b>HGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current and historical mining activities across the Higginsville region provide significant confidence in the geological interpretation of all projects.</li> <li>• No alternative interpretations are currently considered viable.</li> <li>• In all cases the local lithological and structural geology has been used to inform the interpretive process. All available information from drilling, underground mapping and pit mapping has been considered during interpretation.</li> <li>• The Trident, Corona, Fairplay, Vine and Two boys deposits are all hosted within a suite of east over west thrust repeated mafic, ultramafic and sedimentary rocks. In all cases the most favourable host is of mafic composition, generally gabbro and to a lesser extent basalt. Together the deposits form what is locally referred to as the Higginsville Line of Lode, a 5km long, north-northeast striking mineralised corridor of historic and current mining operations. Steep west and shallow east have been identified as the most favourable structural orientations for mineralisation.</li> <li>• At Chalice, multiple generations of unmineralised felsic intrusive cross cut the host amphibolite and influence both the volume and the grade, through contact remobilisation, of the mineralisation. The Resource Estimate is sensitive to the volume of unmineralised felsics within the mineralised horizon.</li> <li>• At both Chalice and Lake Cowan there is a lack of consistent visual proxies for mineralisation, making accurate ore delineation difficult.</li> <li>• High-grade zones within the palaeochannels are the result of a more preferential depositional environment due to changes in strike of the palaeochannel.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
		<p><b>SKO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HBJ: The mineralisation has been modelled focussing on the structural (shear zone) and lithological (porphyry mainly) controls. The large scale (1.9km long and ~40m wide) provides significant confidence in the geological and grade continuity within the deposit. The interpretation has used predominantly RC drilling with some DD used for the deeper parts of the resource. There is an alternative interpretation that could be applied to this deposit, which focuses on defining and sub-domaining higher grade mineralisation that is evident at lithological contacts.</li> <li>• Mount Marion: The lithological and structural model for the Mount Marion deposit is well understood as it is supported by the knowledge gained from open-pit and underground operations. The mineralisation is hosted along a dilational flexure within the lode gneiss with clearly defined contact mineralisation with the surrounding ultramafic lithologies. The lithological model is used as the basis for the mineralisation interpretation and has been derived from predominantly RC and Diamond drill-holes. The confidence of the geological controls on mineralisation is consistent with the resource classification applied to the deposit. No alternative interpretations have been devised for this deposit.</li> <li>• Mount Martin: Gold mineralisation at Mount Martin is associated with chlorite schists (shear zones) hosted within talc-carbonate ultramafic lithologies. Within these controlling shear zones are a series of stacked, westerly-dipping, sulphide and quartz carbonate bearing lodes which host the majority of the gold mineralisation. The geological and mineralisation interpretation used in this resource is consistent with that mined historically in the open pit. Although other interpretations have been proposed they tend to be variations on the steep westerly-dipping lodes theme adopted for this resource and as such would not represent a significant change in the contained metal.</li> <li>• Pernatty: Mineralisation at Pernatty is controlled by a complex arrangement of very well-defined shear zones with the highest grade mineralisation associated with structural intersections and flexures along the three main shears. Given the consistency in orientation of the three main controlling shears, the confidence in the geological and mineralisation interpretation is deemed adequate.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
		<p><b>CMGP</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mining has occurred since 1800's providing significant confidence in the currently geological interpretation across all projects.</li> <li>• No alternative interpretations are currently considered viable.</li> <li>• Geological interpretation of the deposit was carried out using a systematic approach to ensure that the resultant estimated Mineral Resource figure was both sufficiently constrained, and representative of the expected sub-surface conditions. In all aspects of resource estimation the factual and interpreted geology was used to guide the development of the interpretation.</li> <li>• The structural regime is the dominant control on geological and grade continuity at the CMGP. Lithological factors such as rheology contrast are secondary controls on grade distribution.</li> </ul> <p><b>FGP</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low-grade stockpiles are derived from previous mining of the mineralisation styles outlined above.</li> <li>• Geological matrixes were established to assist with interpretation and construction of the estimation domains.</li> <li>• Confidence in the interpretation is high as the geometry, geology, alteration and tenor of the mineralised zones was observed to be consistent along strike and down dip</li> <li>• The interpretations was based on 10m and 20m north-south spaced sections.</li> <li>• The information used in the construction and estimation of the respective resources mineralisation is based on Air Core (AC), Reverse Circulation (RC) and Diamond Drill (DDH) hole information. The AC was included in the poorly information estimation domains and this was considered during the classification of these domains.</li> <li>• Oxidation surfaces were constructed from the logged information on 20m north south sections.</li> </ul>



Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
<p><b>Dimensions</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The extent and variability of the Mineral Resource expressed as length (along strike or otherwise), plan width, and depth below surface to the upper and lower limits of the Mineral Resource.</li> </ul>	<p><b>HGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Trident mineral resource extends over 680m in strike length, 350m in lateral extent and 940m in depth.</li> <li>Chalice mineralisation has been defined over a strike length of 700m, a lateral extent of 200m and a depth of 650m.</li> <li>The Lake Cowan resource has been defined over a strike length of &gt;1.5Km, a lateral extent of &gt;500m and to a depth of &gt;150m.</li> </ul> <p><b>SKO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The HBJ deposit extends over 5km of strike (includes the Golden Hope and Mutooroo lodes) and up to 650m below surface with the individual lodes being up to 40m wide.</li> <li>Mount Marion mineralisation extends to just under 1km in strike length, 800m in depth with the lodes varying in width from 3 – 15m. The mineralisation is steeply plunging resulting in a very small surface expression of the lodes.</li> <li>The Mount Martin deposit has a strike length of 1km, a vertical extent of 350m, with the individual, shallow west-south-westerly dipping lodes varying between 2 – 10m true thickness. These lodes make up a mineralised package of ~300m true thickness (hangingwall to footwall).</li> <li>The Pernatty deposit has a strike extent of 500m, 400m dip extent and up to 300m in lateral extent. The individual lodes are of varying orientations and are generally between 2 – 15m wide.</li> </ul> <p><b>CMGP</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individual deposit scales vary across the CMGP.</li> <li>The Big Bell Trend is mineralised a strike length of &gt;3,900m, a lateral extent of up +50m and a depth of over 1,500m.</li> <li>Great Fingall is mineralised a strike length of &gt;500m, a lateral extent of &gt;600m and a depth of over 800m.</li> <li>Black Swan South is mineralised a strike length of &gt;1,700m, a lateral extent of up +75m and a depth of over 300m.</li> </ul> <p><b>CMGP</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Yarlalweelor mineral resource extends over 1,400m in strike length, 570m in lateral extent and 190m in depth.</li> <li>The Tom's and Sam's mineral resource extends over 650m in strike length, 400m in lateral extent and 130m in depth.</li> <li>The Eldorado mineral resource extends over 240m in strike length, 100m in lateral extent and 100m in depth.</li> <li>Low-grade stockpiles are of various dimensions.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
<b>Estimation and modelling techniques</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The nature and appropriateness of the estimation technique(s) applied and key assumptions, including treatment of extreme grade values, domaining, interpolation parameters and maximum distance of extrapolation from data points. If a computer assisted estimation method was chosen include a description of computer software and parameters used.</li> <li>The availability of check estimates, previous estimates and/or mine production records and whether the Mineral Resource estimate takes appropriate account of such data.</li> <li>The assumptions made regarding recovery of by-products.</li> <li>Estimation of deleterious elements or other non-grade variables of economic significance (eg sulphur for acid mine drainage characterisation).</li> <li>In the case of block model interpolation, the block size in relation to the average sample spacing and the search employed.</li> <li>Any assumptions behind modelling of selective mining units.</li> <li>Any assumptions about correlation between variables.</li> <li>Description of how the geological interpretation was used to control the resource estimates.</li> <li>Discussion of basis for using or not using grade cutting or capping.</li> <li>The process of validation, the checking process used, the comparison of model data to drill hole data, and use of reconciliation data if available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>HGO</b></li> <li>For Trident, Chalice, Two Boys, Vine and Lake Cowan the modelling and estimation work was undertaken by Alacer Gold and carried out in Vulcan 3D mining software. For Alacer Gold estimates the drill hole data to be used in the process was first validated.</li> <li>The initial interpretation was then completed on 1:250 scale hardcopy cross sections, long sections and level plans, this interpretation was then validated by either the senior geologists or the Chief Geologist before then being digitised into the Vulcan 3D modelling package. The digitised polygons form the basis of the three dimensional orebody wireframe. Wireframing is then carried out using a combination of automated stitching algorithms and manual triangulation to create an accurate three dimensional representation of the sub-surface mineralised body.</li> <li>Drillhole intersections within the mineralised body are defined, these intersections are then used to flag the appropriate sections of the drillhole database tables for compositing purposes. Drillholes are subsequently composited to allow for grade estimation. In all aspects of resource estimation the factual and interpreted geology was used to guide the development of the interpretation.</li> <li>Once the sample data has been composited, a statistical analysis is undertaken to assist with determining estimation search parameters, top-cuts etc., this is carried out using Supervisor. Top cut analysis was carried out by assessing normal and log-histograms for extreme values and using a combination of mean variance plots and population disintegration techniques. Variographic analysis of individual domains is undertaken to assist with determining appropriate search parameters. In all cases knowledge of the geology was used to guide the analysis of the variogram fans in determining the orientation of maximum continuity.</li> <li>An empty block model is then created for the area of interest; with each ore wireframe used to assign block domain codes which match the flag used for the composites. This model contains attributes set at background values for gold as well as density, and various estimation parameters that are subsequently used to assist in resource categorisation. The block sizes used in the model will vary depending on orebody geometry, minimum mining units, estimation parameters and levels of informing data available.</li> <li>Grade estimation is then undertaken, with ordinary kriging estimation as standard, although in some circumstances where sample populations are small, or domains are unable to be accurately defined, inverse distance weighting estimation techniques will be used. At Trident a grade assignment method has been employed for the Athena orebody. This uses face sampling/mapping on each level to identify runs of vein with similar width and grade profiles. For each run, the length of the run and average vein width is calculated as well as a width weighted average vein grade. Two or more grade runs are then joined up across levels to form a grade block, a long section is used to validate the plunge of each grade block against the diamond drilling. The length and width of each run is used to calculate a length weighted average grade and an average vein width for the block. A wireframe for each grade block is created at the specified average vein width for the block. This wireframe is then assigned the previously calculated block grade using a post process script.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No by-products or deleterious elements are estimated.</li> <li>• No assumptions have been made about the correlation between variables.</li> <li>• The estimation is validated using the following: a visual interrogation, a comparison of the mean composite grade to the mean block grade for each domain, a comparison of the <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• wireframe volume to the block volume for each domain, Grade trend plots (moving window statistics), comparison to the previous resource estimate.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The resource is then depleted for mining voids and subsequently classified in line with JORC guidelines utilising a combination of various estimation derived parameters and geological / mining knowledge.</li> <li>• Production reconciliation data is regularly used to check the performance of the estimate and to adjust parameters is necessary. Good reconciliation between mine claimed figures and milled figures is routinely achieved.</li> </ul> <p><b>SKO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The HBJ mineral resource estimate was undertaken in December 2011 by Widenbar and Associates Pty Ltd. The grade interpolation method used was Ordinary Kriging (OK) in the Datamine ESTIMA process – a method that is appropriate for the style of mineralisation being estimated. A simple unfolding process has been applied to the data and model blocks in order to simplify the setup of search ellipses and allow searches to follow the varying dip and strike of the various domains.</li> <li>• Geological, mining as-built and mineralisation domains and a valid drillhole database were supplied by SKO personnel. The geological and mineralisation domains were used to control the interpolation as hard boundaries (mineralisation domains) and for the application of bulk density data (geological boundaries).</li> <li>• The Mineral Resource estimates for Mount Marion, Mount Martin and Pernatty were undertaken by Alacer Gold in September 2011. The geological and mineralisation wireframes as well as the grade interpolation was undertaken in Vulcan 8.04 3-D modelling software with statistical analysis undertaken using Snowden Supervisor software. The interpolation method used was Ordinary Kriging (OK) – a method that is appropriate for the styles of mineralisation being estimated.</li> <li>• Statistical analysis was undertaken to determine the composite length (1m) and for the application of top-cuts.</li> <li>• The search ellipses applied were based on a combination of drillhole spacing and variographic analysis. Various minimum and maximum samples were used in the first search with a maximum of four samples per drill-hole allowed. Several passes were used each with increasing search ellipse sizes, all the blocks in the mineralised domains were informed in the first pass.</li> <li>• The block model was depleted using surfaces / domains generated by the SKO Survey. Validation of the models was completed by visual inspection, statistical comparisons and comparison with reconciliation data, with the final model achieving a satisfactory validation.</li> <li>• No deleterious elements were estimated as they are considered not material.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
		<p><b>CMGP</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All modelling and estimation work undertaken by Westgold is carried out in three dimensions via Surpac Vision.</li> <li>• After validating the drillhole data to be used in the estimation, interpretation of the orebody is undertaken in sectional and / or plan view to create the outline strings which form the basis of the three dimensional orebody wireframe. Wireframing is then carried out using a combination of automated stitching algorithms and manual triangulation to create an accurate three dimensional representation of the sub-surface mineralised body.</li> <li>• Drillhole intersections within the mineralised body are defined, these intersections are then used to flag the appropriate sections of the drillhole database tables for compositing purposes. Drillholes are subsequently composited to allow for grade estimation. In all aspects of resource estimation the factual and interpreted geology was used to guide the development of the interpretation.</li> <li>• Once the sample data has been composited, a statistical analysis is undertaken to assist with determining estimation search parameters, top-cuts etc. Variographic analysis of individual domains is undertaken to assist with determining appropriate search parameters. Which are then incorporated with observed geological and geometrical features to determine the most appropriate search parameters.</li> <li>• An empty block model is then created for the area of interest. This model contains attributes set at background values for the various elements of interest as well as density, and various estimation parameters that are subsequently used to assist in resource categorisation. The block sizes used in the model will vary depending on orebody geometry, minimum mining units, estimation parameters and levels of informing data available.</li> <li>• Grade estimation is then undertaken, with ordinary kriging estimation method is considered as standard, although in some circumstances where sample populations are small, or domains are unable to be accurately defined, inverse distance weighting estimation techniques will be used. Both by-product and deleterious elements are estimated at the time of primary grade estimation if required. It is assumed that by-products correlate well with gold. There are no assumptions made about the recovery of by-products.</li> <li>• The resource is then depleted for mining voids and subsequently classified in line with JORC guidelines utilising a combination of various estimation derived parameters and geological / mining knowledge.</li> <li>• This approach has proven to be applicable to Westgold's gold assets.</li> <li>• Estimation results are routinely validated against primary input data, previous estimates and mining output.</li> <li>• Good reconciliation between mine claimed figures and milled figures was routinely achieved during past production history.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
		<p><b>FGP</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All modelling and estimation work undertaken by Westgold is carried out in three dimensions with Surpac Vision, Snowden's Supervisor v8.3 and or Isatis 2015.</li> <li>• Ordinary kriging (OK) and Localised Indicator Kriging (LIK) has been used. LIK was used for the estimation of all Jasperoid related estimation domains due to mosaic mineralisation style. Length weighting of assay values related to surveyed volumes was undertaken for low-grade stockpiles.</li> <li>• All estimates were validated where possible against historical production records and previous estimates.</li> <li>• After validating the drillhole data to be used in the estimation, interpretation of the orebody is undertaken in sectional and / or plan view to create the outline strings which form the basis of the three dimensional orebody wireframe. Wireframing was carried out using a combination of automated stitching algorithms and manual triangulation to create an accurate three dimensional representation of the sub-surface mineralised body. Domaining was constructed on 20m and 10m spaced sections and was based on logged lithologies, quartz percentage and gold value.</li> <li>• Drillhole intersections within the mineralised body are defined; these intersections are then used to flag the appropriate sections of the drillhole database tables for compositing purposes. Assay data was composited to 1m downhole using Surpac "best fit" algorithm. The "best fit" algorithm eliminates residual composites and the estimation domains boundaries defined the start and end position of the compositing routine. In all aspects of resource estimation; the factual and interpreted geology was used to guide the development of the interpretation.</li> <li>• Support analysis of the difference drill types (Air Core (AC), Reverse Circulation (RC) and Diamond Drill holes (DDH)) was performed and the mixing these deemed acceptable. The AC drill holes were used in the estimation of the poorly informed estimation domains.</li> <li>• Statistical analysis was carried out on the composited data to assist with determining estimation search parameters, top-cuts and spatial continuity. Data for some of the domains exhibit an increased degree of skewness and top-cuts were applied to reduce the skewness of distribution. The appropriateness of the top-cuts was assessed for each domain utilising log-probability plots, mean and variance plots, histograms and univariate statistics for the composite Au variable.</li> <li>• Variogram modelling was undertaken using Isatis™ software and defined the spatial continuity of gold within all domains and these parameters were used for the interpolation process. Indicator variograms were generated within the Jasperoid related estimation domains to the used in the LIK estimation process.</li> <li>• Volume models were generated in Surpac using topographic surfaces, oxidation surfaces and mineralised zone wireframes as constraints.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quantitative Kriging Neighbourhood Analysis was used to optimise the search parameters.</li> <li>Search ellipses were aligned parallel to the maximum continuity defined during the variographic analysis. The search dimensions, generally, approximated the ranges of the interpreted variograms and ranged from 50 to 100m. The minimum and maximum number of samples range from 7 to 11 and 18 to 30, respectively. Second and third pass searches were implemented to fill the un-estimated cells / blocks if they were not estimated during the first search pass and these search parameters involved increasing in the search distances and reducing in the minimum number of samples used in the estimation process.</li> <li>The extrapolation was controlled through the interpreted estimation domains, which was limited to half the drill hole spacing within section and half the section spacing between sections.</li> <li>Block estimation for gold was undertaken using Isatis™ and hard boundaries were used between domains for estimation of gold grade.</li> <li>No assumptions were made about recovery during the OK and LIK estimation processes.</li> <li>Grade estimation was undertaken, with the ordinary kriging (OK) estimation method for all non-jasperoid related estimation domains.</li> <li>Check estimates were run using Localised Uniform Conditioning (LUC) for the LIK estimation domains, which produces a similar form of result to LIK. The LIK and LUC models were compared, with reasonable agreement at lower cut-offs and differences at higher cut-offs reflecting higher estimated gold variability in the LIK model. The LIK is believed to be better suited to the style of mineralisation for the Jasperoid related estimation domains.</li> <li>The estimation is validated using the following: a visual interrogation, a comparison of the mean composite grade to the mean block grade for each domain, a comparison of the wireframe volume to the block volume for each domain, grade trend plots (moving window statistics), comparison to the previous resource estimate.</li> <li>The only element of economic interest modelled is gold.</li> <li>The Isatis™ block models were transferred and imported to Surpac Mining Software. The transfer and importing process was validated against the Isatis™ block model. The resource was then depleted for mining voids and subsequently classified in line with JORC guidelines utilising a combination of various estimation derived parameters and geological / mining knowledge.</li> </ul>
<b>Moisture</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whether the tonnages are estimated on a dry basis or with natural moisture, and the method of determination of the moisture content.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tonnage estimates are dry tonnes.</li> </ul>
<b>Cut-off parameters</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The basis of the adopted cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The cut off grades used for the reporting of the Mineral Resources have been selected based on the style of mineralisation, depth from surface of the mineralisation and the most probable extraction technique.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
<p><b>Mining factors or assumptions</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assumptions made regarding possible mining methods, minimum mining dimensions and internal (or, if applicable, external) mining dilution. It is always necessary as part of the process of determining reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction to consider potential mining methods, but the assumptions made regarding mining methods and parameters when estimating Mineral Resources may not always be rigorous. Where this is the case, this should be reported with an explanation of the basis of the mining assumptions made.</li> </ul>	<p><b>HGO</b></p> <p>The principle extraction method at Trident is. For the narrow vein systems at Trident bench stoping is employed.</p> <p><b>SKO</b></p> <p>The Pernatty, Mount Martin and upper portions of the HBJ deposits are assumed to be amenable to open pit mining processes. A minimum mining width of 2.5m (horizontal) is applied to the lodes.</p> <p>The lower parts of the HBJ deposit are assumed to be mineable via sub-level open stoping or sub-level caving. The Mount Marion deposit is assumed to be amenable to underground mining via open stoping means which is consistent with the mining practices adopted for the Mount Marion deposit.</p> <p><b>CMGP</b></p> <p>Variable by deposit.</p> <p><b>FGP</b></p> <p>Conventional open cut mining with 120t class hydraulic backhoe excavators and 90t rigid dump trucks.</p> <p>2m minimum mining width has been assumed.</p> <p>No mining dilution or ore loss has been modelled in the resource model or applied to the reported Mineral Resource.</p>
<p><b>Metallurgical factors or assumptions</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The basis for assumptions or predictions regarding metallurgical amenability. It is always necessary as part of the process of determining reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction to consider potential metallurgical methods, but the assumptions regarding metallurgical treatment processes and parameters made when reporting Mineral Resources may not always be rigorous. Where this is the case, this should be reported with an explanation of the basis of the metallurgical assumptions made.</li> </ul>	<p><b>HGO</b></p> <p>Metallurgical test work is carried out on a project by project basis. The Higginsville plant is approximately 5.5 years old and routinely averages over 96% recovery when being fed with Trident material.</p> <p><b>SKO</b></p> <p>The majority of the SKO resource base comprises deposits that have some level of mining history and hence established metallurgical properties.</p> <p><b>CMGP</b></p> <p>Not considered for Mineral Resource. Applied during the Reserve generation process.</p> <p><b>FGP</b></p> <p>Horizons were modelled based on oxidation state of the host rocks, taken from the drilling information. These were: transported and lateritic residuum, oxidised, transitional and fresh.</p> <p>Jasperoid was flagged in the model due to its hardness and differing heap leach characteristics as identified in recent metallurgical scoping studies.</p>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
<b>Environmental factors or assumptions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assumptions made regarding possible waste and process residue disposal options. It is always necessary as part of the process of determining reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction to consider the potential environmental impacts of the mining and processing operation. While at this stage the determination of potential environmental impacts, particularly for a greenfields project, may not always be well advanced, the status of early consideration of these potential environmental impacts should be reported. Where these aspects have not been considered this should be reported with an explanation of the environmental assumptions made.</li> </ul>	<p><b>HGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tailings are discharged to the nearby tailings storage facility and also used to form cemented backfill for underground operations.</li> <li>Process water is pumped 30 km from the Chalice open pit to the Aphrodites pit from which it is stored prior to pumping to the process mill</li> <li>Potable water is pumped from the Coolgardie–Norseman water pipe line and is provided by the state water provider.</li> <li>Water used in the Trident mine for mining operations is recycled from underground and stored in the nearby Poseidon North Pit before being returned for underground use.</li> </ul> <p><b>SKO</b></p> <p>The significant operational history at SKO has allowed for a consistent set of environmental assumptions to be applied to the mineral resource deposits in the region.</p> <p><b>CMGP</b></p> <p>BBGO operates in accordance with all environmental conditions set down as conditions for grant of the respective leases.</p> <p><b>FGP</b></p> <p>Aragon operates in accordance with all environmental conditions set down as conditions for grant of the respective leases.</p>
<b>Bulk density</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whether assumed or determined. If assumed, the basis for the assumptions. If determined, the method used, whether wet or dry, the frequency of the measurements, the nature, size and representativeness of the samples.</li> <li>The bulk density for bulk material must have been measured by methods that adequately account for void spaces (vugs, porosity, etc), moisture and differences between rock and alteration zones within the deposit.</li> <li>Discuss assumptions for bulk density estimates used in the evaluation process of the different materials.</li> </ul>	<p><b>HGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For Trident bulk densities were assessed via test work and assigned to the model. Samples were selected to cover the full range of lithology types and ore types across the deposit. Individual unbroken half core samples of approximately 30cm length were randomly selected from within specified metre intervals. Samples were sent to the Genalysis Laboratory in Kalgoorlie, where mass and volumes (by water immersion) were measured and bulk density calculated.</li> <li>Where no drill core or other direct measurements are available, SG factors have been assumed based on similarities to other zones of mineralisation / lithologies or from historic production records.</li> </ul> <p><b>SKO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the HBJ, Mount Marion, Pernatty and Mount Martin deposits, density values were based on historic mining reconciliations combined with bulk density check test work.</li> <li>Bulk densities were assigned based on the host rock, mineralisation style and oxidation state, all of which were coded into the block models.</li> </ul>



Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
		<p><b>CMGP</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bulk density of the mineralisation at the CMGP is variable and is for the most part lithology rather than mineralisation dependent. Bulk density sampling is undertaken via assessments of drill core and grab samples.</li> <li>A significant past mining history has validated the assumptions made surrounding bulk density at the CMGP.</li> </ul> <p><b>FGP</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A large suite of bulk density determinations have been carried out across the project area. The bulk densities were separated into different weathering domains and lithological domains (i.e. jasperoid domains). Density determinations were made on diamond drill core representing mineralisation utilised the water immersion method (Archimedes Principle).</li> </ul>
<b>Classification</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The basis for the classification of the Mineral Resources into varying confidence categories.</li> <li>Whether appropriate account has been taken of all relevant factors (ie relative confidence in tonnage/grade estimations, reliability of input data, confidence in continuity of geology and metal values, quality, quantity and distribution of the data).</li> <li>Whether the result appropriately reflects the Competent Person's view of the deposit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resources are classified in line with JORC guidelines utilising a combination of various estimation derived parameters, input data and geological / mining knowledge.</li> <li>This approach considers all relevant factors and reflects the Competent Person's view of the deposit</li> </ul>
<b>Audits or reviews</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The results of any audits or reviews of Mineral Resource estimates.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resource estimates are peer reviewed by the Corporate technical team.</li> <li>No external reviews have been undertaken.</li> </ul>
<b>Discussion of relative accuracy/ confidence</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where appropriate a statement of the relative accuracy and confidence level in the Mineral Resource estimate using an approach or procedure deemed appropriate by the Competent Person. For example, the application of statistical or geostatistical procedures to quantify the relative accuracy of the resource within stated confidence limits, or, if such an approach is not deemed appropriate, a qualitative discussion of the factors that could affect the relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate.</li> <li>The statement should specify whether it relates to global or local estimates, and, if local, state the relevant tonnages, which should be relevant to technical and economic evaluation. Documentation should include assumptions made and the procedures used.</li> <li>These statements of relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate should be compared with production data, where available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All currently reported resources estimates are considered robust, and representative on both a global and local scale.</li> <li>A continuing history of mining with good reconciliation of mine claimed to mill recovered provides confidence in the accuracy of the estimates.</li> </ul>

## SECTION 4 ESTIMATION AND REPORTING OF ORE RESERVES

(Criteria listed in section 1, and where relevant in sections 2 and 3, also apply to this section.)

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
<b>Mineral Resource estimate for conversion to Ore Reserves</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description of the Mineral Resource estimate used as a basis for the conversion to an Ore Reserve.</li> <li>Clear statement as to whether the Mineral Resources are reported additional to, or inclusive of, the Ore Reserves.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At all Operations the Ore Reserve is based on the corresponding reported Mineral Resource estimate.</li> <li>Mineral Resources reported are inclusive of those Mineral Resources modified to produce the Ore Reserve estimate.</li> <li>At all projects, all Mineral Resources that have been converted to Ore Reserve are classified as either an Indicated or Measured material.</li> </ul>
<b>Site visits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment on any site visits undertaken by the Competent Person and the outcome of those visits.</li> <li>If no site visits have been undertaken indicate why this is the case.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Anthony Buckingham has been an employee of WGX (and its subsidiaries) for the past 9 years and has over 15 years' experience specifically in the Western Australian mining industry. Mr Buckingham visits the mine sites on a regular fortnightly basis and is one of the primary engineers involved in mine planning, site infrastructure and project management.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
<p><b>Study status</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The type and level of study undertaken to enable Mineral Resources to be converted to Ore Reserves.</li> <li>The Code requires that a study to at least Pre-Feasibility Study level has been undertaken to convert Mineral Resources to Ore Reserves. Such studies will have been carried out and will have determined a mine plan that is technically achievable and economically viable, and that material Modifying Factors have been considered</li> </ul>	<p><b>HGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Processing at the current Higginsville Gold Operations has occurred continuously since 2008, with historical production occurring initially in the 1990's.</li> <li>Various mineralisation styles and host domains have been mined since discovery. Mining during this time has ranged from open pit cut backs, insitu surface excavations to extensional underground developments.</li> <li>Budget level, 24 month projected, forecasts are completed on a biannual basis, validating cost and physical inventory assumptions and modelling. These updated parameters are subsequently used for the basis of the Ore Reserve modification and financial factors.</li> <li>Following exploration and infill drilling activity, Resource models are updated on both the estimation of grade and classification. These updated Resource Models then form the foundation for Ore Reserve calculation.</li> </ul> <p><b>MGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Processing at the Murchison Gold Operations has occurred continuously since 2015, with previous production occurring throughout 1980's, 1990's and 2000's.</li> <li>Various mineralisation styles and host domains have been mined since discovery. Mining during this time has ranged from open pit cut backs, insitu surface excavations to extensional underground developments.</li> <li>Budget level, 24 month projected, forecasts are completed on a biannual basis, validating cost and physical inventory assumptions and modelling. These updated parameters are subsequently used for the basis of the Ore Reserve modification and financial factors.</li> <li>Following exploration and infill drilling activity, Resource models are updated on both the estimation of grade and classification. These updated Resource Models then form the foundation for Ore Reserve calculation.</li> </ul> <p><b>CGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Processing at the Cue Gold Operations has occurred continuously since early 2018, with previous production occurring in 2012/13.</li> <li>Various mineralisation styles and host domains have been mined since discovery. Mining during this time has ranged from open pit cut backs, insitu surface excavations to extensional underground developments.</li> <li>Budget level, 24 month projected, forecasts are completed on a biannual basis, validating cost and physical inventory assumptions and modelling. These updated parameters are subsequently used for the basis of the Ore Reserve modification and financial factors.</li> <li>Following exploration and infill drilling activity, Resource models are updated on both the estimation of grade and classification. These updated Resource Models then form the foundation for Ore Reserve calculation.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
		<p><b>FGP</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Processing at the Fortnum Gold Operations has occurred continuously since early 2017, with previous production occurring in 2007/08.</li> <li>Various mineralisation styles and host domains have been mined since discovery. Mining during this time has ranged from open pit cut backs, insitu surface excavations to extensional underground developments.</li> <li>Budget level, 24 month projected, forecasts are completed on a biannual basis, validating cost and physical inventory assumptions and modelling. These updated parameters are subsequently used for the basis of the Ore Reserve modification and financial factors.</li> <li>Following exploration and infill drilling activity, Resource models are updated on both the estimation of grade and classification. These updated Resource Models then form the foundation for Ore Reserve calculation.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Cut-off parameters</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The basis of the cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Underground Mines - Cut off grades are used to determine the economic viability of the convertible Resource. COG for underground mines incorporate OPEX development and production costs, grade control, haulage, milling, administration, along with state and private royalty conditions, Where an individual mine has different mining methods and or various orebody style, COG calculations are determined for each division. These cuts are applied to production shapes (stopes) as well as high grade development. Additionally an incremental COG is applied to low grade development, whereby access to a high grade area is required.</li> <li>On the basis of above process, COG's for the underground mines range from 1.8g/t (sub level caving), 2.4g/t for bulk style open stopes, 2.8g/t for narrow vein style / discrete mechanised production fronts and 5.2g/t for man entry stoping.</li> <li>Open Pit Mines - The pit rim cut-off grade (COG) was determined as part of the Ore Reserve estimation. The pit rim COG accounts for grade control, haulage, milling, administration, along with state and private royalty conditions. This cost profile is equated against the value of the mining block in terms of recovered metal and the expected selling price. The COG is then used to determine whether or not a mining block should be delivered to the treatment plant for processing, stockpiled as low-grade or taken to the waste dump.</li> <li>On the basis of above process, COG's for the open pit mines range from 0.8g/t (whereby the Mill is local to Resources and Mill recoveries are greater than 90%) to 1.4g/t (regional pits with low Mill recoveries).</li> <li>Stockpile COG – A marginal grade was determined for each stockpile inventory to ensure it was economically viable. The COG accounts for haulage, milling, administration, along with state and private royalty conditions. Each pile honoured its Mill recovery percentage.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
<p><b>Mining factors or assumptions</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The method and assumptions used as reported in the Pre-Feasibility or Feasibility Study to convert the Mineral Resource to an Ore Reserve (i.e. either by application of appropriate factors by optimisation or by preliminary or detailed design).</li> <li>The choice, nature and appropriateness of the selected mining method(s) and other mining parameters including associated design issues such as pre-strip, access, etc.</li> <li>The assumptions made regarding geotechnical parameters (eg pit slopes, stope sizes, etc), grade control and pre-production drilling.</li> <li>The major assumptions made and Mineral Resource model used for pit and stope optimisation (if appropriate).</li> <li>The mining dilution factors used.</li> <li>The mining recovery factors used.</li> <li>Any minimum mining widths used.</li> <li>The manner in which Inferred Mineral Resources are utilised in mining studies and the sensitivity of the outcome to their inclusion.</li> <li>The infrastructure requirements of the selected mining methods.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All Ore Reserve inventories are based upon detailed 3dimensional designs to ensure practical mining conditions are met. Additionally all Ore Reserve inventories are above the mine specific COG(s) as well as containing only Measured and Indicated material. Depending upon the mining method – modifying factors are used to address hydrological, geotechnical, minimum width and blasting conditions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Open Pit Methodology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Following consideration of the various modifying factors the following rules were applied to the reserve estimation process for the conversion of measured and indicated resource to reserve for suitable evaluation.</li> <li>The mining shape in the reserve estimation is generated by a wireframe (geology interpretation of the ore zone) which overlays the block model. Where the wire frame cuts the primary block, sub blocks fill out the remaining space to the wire frame boundary (effectively the mining shape). It is reasonable to assume that the mining method can selectively mine to the wire frame boundary with the additional dilution provision stated below.</li> <li>Ore Reserves are based on Pit shape designs – with appropriate modifications to the original Whittle Shell outlines to ensure compliance with practical mining parameters.</li> <li>Geotechnical parameters aligned to the Open Pit Ore Reserves are either based on observed existing pit shape specifics or domain specific expectations / assumptions. Various geotechnical reports and retrospective reconciliations were considered in the design parameters. A majority of the open pits have a final design wall angle of 39-46 degrees, which is seen as conservative.</li> <li>Dilution of the ore through the mining process has been accounted for within the Ore Reserve quoted inventory. Various dilution ratios are used to represent the style of mineralization. Where continuous, consistent ore boundaries and grade represent the mineralised system the following factors are applied: oxide 15%, transitional 17% and fresh 19%. In circumstances where the orebody is less homogenous above the COG then the following dilution factors are applied in order to model correctly the inherent variability of extracting discrete sections of the pit floor: oxide 17%, transitional 19% and fresh 21%. To ensure clarity, the following percentages are additional ore mined in relation to excavating the wire frame boundary as identified in point 1 above, albeit at a grade of 0.0 g/t. The amount of dilution is considered appropriate based on orebody geometry, historical mining performance and the size of mining equipment to be used to extract ore.</li> <li>Expected mining recovery of the ore has been set at 93%.</li> <li>Minimum mining widths have been accounted for in the designs, with the utilization of 40T or 90T trucking parameters depending upon the size of the pit excavation.</li> <li>No specific ground support requirements are needed outside of suitable pit slope design criteria based on specific geotechnical domains.</li> <li>Mining sequence is included in the mine scheduling process for determining the economic evaluation and takes into account available operating time and mining equipment size and performance.</li> <li>No Inferred material is included within the open pit statement, though in various pit shapes inferred material is present. In these situations this inferred material is classified as waste.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
		<p><b>Underground Methodology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All Underground Reserves are based on 3D design strings and polygon derived stope shapes following the Measured and Indicated Resource (in areas above the COG). A complete mine schedule is then derived from this design to create a LOM plan and financial analysis.</li> <li>• Mining methodology is based on previous mining experience. All mining systems within the Reserve statement are standardized, mechanized Western Australian methods.</li> <li>• In large disseminated orebodies sub level caving, sub level open stoping or single level bench stoping production methodologies are used.</li> <li>• In narrow vein laminated quartz hosted domains a conservative narrow bench style mining method is used.</li> <li>• In narrow flat dipping deposits a Flat Long Hole process is adopted (with fillets in the footwall for rill angle) and or Jumbo stoping.</li> <li>• Stope shape parameters have been based on historical data (where possible) or expected stable hydraulic radius dimensions.</li> <li>• Stope inventories have been determined by cutting the geological wireframe at above the area specific COG and applying mining dilution and ore loss factors. The ore loss ratio accounts for pillar locations between the stopes (not operational ore loss) whilst dilution allows for conversion of the geological wireframe into a minable shape (Planned dilution) as well as hangingwall relaxation and blasting overbreak (unplanned dilution).</li> <li>• Depending upon the style of mineralisation, sub level interval, blasthole diameters used and if secondary support is installed, total dilution ranges from 15 to 35%.</li> <li>• Minimum mining widths have been applied in the various mining methods. The only production style relevant to this constraint is 'narrow stoping' – where the minimum width is set at 1.5m in a 17.0m sub level interval.</li> <li>• Mining operational recovery for the underground mines is set at 100% due to the use of remote loading units as well as paste filling activities. Mining recovery is not inclusive of pillar loss – insitu mineralised material between adjacent stope panels.</li> <li>• Stope shape dimensions vary between the various methods. Default hydraulic radii are applied to each method, and are derived either from historical production or geotechnical reports / recommendations. Where no data or exposure is available conservative HR values are used based on the contact domain type.</li> <li>• Mining sequence is included in the mine scheduling process for determining the economic evaluation and takes into account available operating time and mining equipment size and performance.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
<b>Metallurgical factors or assumptions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The metallurgical process proposed and the appropriateness of that process to the style of mineralisation.</li> <li>Whether the metallurgical process is well-tested technology or novel in nature.</li> <li>The nature, amount and representativeness of metallurgical test work undertaken, the nature of the metallurgical domaining applied and the corresponding metallurgical recovery factors applied.</li> <li>Any assumptions or allowances made for deleterious elements.</li> <li>The existence of any bulk sample or pilot scale test work and the degree to which such samples are considered representative of the orebody as a whole.</li> <li>For minerals that are defined by a specification, has the ore reserve estimation been based on the appropriate mineralogy to meet the specifications?</li> </ul>	<p><b>HGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gold extraction is achieved using four staged crushing, ball milling with gravity concentration and Carbon in Leach. The Higginsville plant has operated since 2008.</li> <li>The plant has a nameplate capacity of 1.2Mtpa though this can be varied between 1.0-1.4Mtpa pending rosters and material type.</li> <li>Treatment of ore is via conventional gravity recovery / intensive cyanidation and CIL is applied as industry standard technology.</li> <li>Additional test-work is instigated where notable changes to geology and mineralogy are identified. Small scale batch leach tests on primary Louis ore have indicated lower recoveries (80%) associated with finer gold and sulphide mineralisation.</li> <li>There have been no major examples of deleterious elements affecting gold extraction levels or bullion quality. Some minor variations in sulphide mineralogy have had short-term impacts on reagent consumptions.</li> <li>No bulk sample testing is required whilst geology/mineralogy is consistent based on treatment plant performance.</li> <li>For the 2018 Reserve, Plant recoveries of 83-94% have been utilised</li> </ul> <p><b>CGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CGO has an existing conventional CIL processing plant.</li> <li>The plant has a nameplate capacity of 1.4Mtpa though this can be varied between 1.2-1.6Mtpa pending rosters and material type.</li> <li>Gold extraction is achieved using two staged crushing, ball milling with gravity concentration and Carbon in Leach.</li> <li>Despite CGO having a newly commissioned processing plant (2012/13 and subsequently restarted in 2018) a high portion of the Reserve mill feed have extensive data when processed at other plants in the past 2-3 decades. This long history of processing demonstrates the appropriateness of the process to the styles of mineralisation considered.</li> <li>No deleterious elements are considered, as a long history of processing has shown this to be not a material concern.</li> <li>For the 2018 Reserve, Plant recoveries of 80-93% have been utilised</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>MGO</b></li> <li>• MGO has an existing conventional CIL processing plant – which has been operational in various periods since the late 1980’s.</li> <li>• The plant has a nameplate capacity of 1.6Mtpa though this can be varied between 1.2-1.8Mtpa pending rosters and material type.</li> <li>• Gold extraction is achieved using single stage crushing, SAG &amp; ball milling with gravity concentration and Carbon in Leach.</li> <li>• A long history of processing through the existing facility demonstrates the appropriateness of the process to the styles of mineralisation considered.</li> <li>• No deleterious elements are considered, as a long history of processing has shown this to be not a material concern.</li> <li>• For the 2018 Reserve, Plant recoveries of 85-92% have been utilised.</li> <li>• <b>FGM</b></li> <li>• FGM has an existing conventional CIL processing plant – which has been operational in various periods since the late 1980’s. The plant has a nameplate capacity of 1.0Mtpa though this can be varied between 0.8-1.2Mtpa pending rosters and material type.</li> <li>• An extensive database of historical CIL recoveries as well as detailed metallurgical test work is available for the various deposits and these have been incorporated into the COG analysis and financial models.</li> <li>• For the 2018 Reserve, Plant recoveries of 93-95% have been utilised.</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The status of studies of potential environmental impacts of the mining and processing operation. Details of waste rock characterisation and the consideration of potential sites, status of design options considered and, where applicable, the status of approvals for process residue storage and waste dumps should be reported.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>HGO</b></li> <li>• HGO operates under and in compliance with a number of operating environmental plans, which cover its environmental impacts and outputs as well as reporting guidelines / frequencies.</li> <li>• Various Reserve inventories do not have current DMP / DWER licenses – though there are no abnormal conditions / factors associated with these assets which the competent person sees as potentially threatening to the particular project.</li> <li>• The operation is frequently inspected by the regulatory authorities of DMP and DWER with continual feedback on environmental best practice and reporting results.</li> <li>• Flood Management, Inclement Weather and Traffic Management Plans existing for the operation to minimise the risks of environmental impacts.</li> <li>• Standard Operating Procedures for the transfer of hazardous materials and restocking of Dangerous Goods existing on site to mitigate the risk of these materials entering the environment.</li> </ul>



Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
		<p><b>MGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MGO operates under and in compliance with a number of operating environmental plans, which cover its environmental impacts and outputs as well as reporting guidelines / frequencies.</li> <li>• Various Reserve inventories do not have current DMP / DWER licenses – though there are no abnormal conditions / factors associated with these assets which the competent person sees as potentially threatening to the particular project.</li> <li>• The operation is frequently inspected by the regulatory authorities of DMP and DWER with continual feedback on environmental best practice and reporting results.</li> <li>• Flood Management, Inclement Weather and Traffic Management Plans existing for the operation to minimise the risks of environmental impacts.</li> <li>• Standard Operating Procedures for the transfer of hazardous materials and restocking of Dangerous Goods existing on site to mitigate the risk of these materials entering the environment.</li> </ul> <p><b>CGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CGO operates under and in compliance with a number of operating environmental plans, which cover its environmental impacts and outputs as well as reporting guidelines / frequencies.</li> <li>• Various Reserve inventories do not have current DMP / DWER licenses – though there are no abnormal conditions / factors associated with these assets which the competent person sees as potentially threatening to the particular project.</li> <li>• The operation is frequently inspected by the regulatory authorities of DMP and DWER with continual feedback on environmental best practice and reporting results.</li> <li>• Flood Management, Inclement Weather and Traffic Management Plans existing for the operation to minimise the risks of environmental impacts.</li> <li>• Standard Operating Procedures for the transfer of hazardous materials and restocking of Dangerous Goods existing on site to mitigate the risk of these materials entering the environment.</li> </ul> <p><b>FGP</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FGP operates under and in compliance with a number of operating environmental plans, which cover its environmental impacts and outputs as well as reporting guidelines / frequencies.</li> <li>• Various Reserve inventories do not have current DMP / DWER licenses – though there are no abnormal conditions / factors associated with these assets which the competent person sees as potentially threatening to the particular project.</li> <li>• The operation is frequently inspected by the regulatory authorities of DMP and DWER with continual feedback on environmental best practice and reporting results.</li> <li>• Flood Management, Inclement Weather and Traffic Management Plans existing for the operation to minimise the risks of environmental impacts.</li> <li>• Standard Operating Procedures for the transfer of hazardous materials and restocking of Dangerous Goods existing on site to mitigate the risk of these materials entering the environment.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
<b>Infrastructure</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The existence of appropriate infrastructure: availability of land for plant development, power, water, transportation (particularly for bulk commodities), labour, accommodation; or the ease with which the infrastructure can be provided, or accessed.</li> </ul>	<p><b>HGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HGO has an operating plant and tailings storage facility, along with extensive mechanical and electrical maintenance facilities.</li> <li>The site also includes existing administration buildings as well as a 150 man accommodation camp facility.</li> <li>Power is provided by onsite diesel generation, with potable water sourced from the nearby water mains pipeline.</li> <li>Communications and roadways are existing.</li> <li>Airstrip facilities are available at Kalgoorlie (150km).</li> </ul> <p><b>MGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MGO has an operating plant and tailings storage facility, along with extensive mechanical and electrical maintenance facilities.</li> <li>The site also includes existing administration buildings as well as a 300 man accommodation camp facility.</li> <li>Power is provided by onsite diesel generation, with potable water sourced from nearby bore water (post treatment).</li> <li>Communications and roadways are existing.</li> <li>Airstrip facilities are available at the local Meekatharra airstrip (30km).</li> </ul> <p><b>CGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CGO has an operating plant and tailings storage facility, along with extensive mechanical and electrical maintenance facilities.</li> <li>The site also includes existing administration buildings as well as a 250 man accommodation camp facility.</li> <li>Power is provided by onsite diesel generation, with potable water sourced from nearby bore water (post treatment).</li> <li>Communications and roadways are existing.</li> <li>Airstrip facilities are available at the local Cue airstrip (20km).</li> </ul> <p><b>FGM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FGM has an operating plant and tailings storage facility, along with extensive mechanical and electrical maintenance facilities.</li> <li>The site also includes existing administration buildings as well as a 200 man accommodation camp facility.</li> <li>Power is provided by onsite diesel generation, with potable water sourced from nearby bore water (post treatment).</li> <li>Communications and roadways are existing.</li> <li>Airstrip facilities are available on site – though a majority of the workforce are transported via the local Meekatharra airstrip.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
<p><b>Costs</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The derivation of, or assumptions made, regarding projected capital costs in the study.</li> <li>• The methodology used to estimate operating costs.</li> <li>• Allowances made for the content of deleterious elements.</li> <li>• The source of exchange rates used in the study.</li> <li>• Derivation of transportation charges.</li> <li>• The basis for forecasting or source of treatment and refining charges, penalties for failure to meet specification, etc.</li> <li>• The allowances made for royalties payable, both Government and private.</li> </ul>	<p><b>HGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Processing costs are based on actual cost profiles with variations existing between the various oxide states.</li> <li>• Site G&amp;A and portioned corporate overheads are included within the analysis (based upon previous Budget years actuals).</li> <li>• Mining costs are derived primarily from the current contractor cost profiles in both the open pit and underground environment.</li> <li>• For Open Pits where no current mining cost profiles are available for a forecasted Reserve, a historically 'validated' pit cost matrix is used – with variation allowances for density, fuel price and gear size.</li> <li>• For the underground environment, if not site specific mining rates are available, an appropriately selected operating mine is used for the basis of cost profiling.</li> <li>• Geology and Grade Control costs are incorporated in the overall cost profile and are based upon previously reconciled Budgetary forecasts.</li> <li>• Haulage costs used are either contractual rates or if in the case where a mine has none, a generic cost per tkm unit rate is utilised.</li> <li>• Both state government and private royalties are incorporated into costings as appropriate.</li> </ul> <p><b>MGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Processing costs are based on actual cost profiles with variations existing between the various oxide states.</li> <li>• Site G&amp;A and portioned corporate overheads are included within the analysis (based upon previous Budget years actuals).</li> <li>• Mining costs are derived primarily from the current contractor cost profiles in both the open pit and underground environment.</li> <li>• For Open Pits where no current mining cost profiles are available for a forecasted Reserve, a historically 'validated' pit cost matrix is used – with variation allowances for density, fuel price and gear size.</li> <li>• For the underground environment, if not site specific mining rates are available, an appropriately selected operating mine is used for the basis of cost profiling.</li> <li>• Geology and Grade Control costs are incorporated in the overall cost profile and are based upon previously reconciled Budgetary forecasts.</li> <li>• Haulage costs used are either contractual rates or if in the case where a mine has none, a generic cost per tkm unit rate is utilised.</li> <li>• Both state government and private royalties are incorporated into costings as appropriate.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
		<p><b>CGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Processing costs are based on actual cost profiles with variations existing between the various oxide states.</li> <li>Site G&amp;A and portioned corporate overheads are included within the analysis (based upon previous Budget years actuals).</li> <li>Mining costs are derived primarily from the current contractor cost profiles in both the open pit and underground environment.</li> <li>For Open Pits where no current mining cost profiles are available for a forecasted Reserve, a historically 'validated' pit cost matrix is used – with variation allowances for density, fuel price and gear size.</li> <li>For the underground environment, if not site specific mining rates are available, an appropriately selected operating mine is used for the basis of cost profiling.</li> <li>Geology and Grade Control costs are incorporated in the overall cost profile and are based upon previously reconciled Budgetary forecasts.</li> <li>Haulage costs used are either contractual rates or if in the case where a mine has none, a generic cost per tkm unit rate is utilised.</li> <li>Both state government and private royalties are incorporated into costings as appropriate.</li> </ul> <p><b>FGP</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Processing costs are based on actual cost profiles with variations existing between the various oxide states.</li> <li>Site G&amp;A and portioned corporate overheads are included within the analysis (based upon previous Budget years actuals).</li> <li>Mining costs are derived primarily from the current contractor cost profiles in both the open pit and underground environment.</li> <li>For Open Pits where no current mining cost profiles are available for a forecasted Reserve, a historically 'validated' pit cost matrix is used – with variation allowances for density, fuel price and gear size.</li> <li>For the underground environment, if not site specific mining rates are available, an appropriately selected operating mine is used for the basis of cost profiling.</li> <li>Geology and Grade Control costs are incorporated in the overall cost profile and are based upon previously reconciled Budgetary forecasts.</li> <li>Haulage costs used are either contractual rates or if in the case where a mine has none, a generic cost per tkm unit rate is utilised.</li> <li>Both state government and private royalties are incorporated into costings as appropriate.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Revenue factors</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The derivation of, or assumptions made regarding revenue factors including head grade, metal or commodity price(s) exchange rates, transportation and treatment charges, penalties, net smelter returns, etc.</li> <li>The derivation of assumptions made of metal or commodity price(s), for the principal metals, minerals and co-products.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mine Revenue, COG's, open pit optimisation and royalty costs are based on the long term forecast of A\$1,650/oz.</li> <li>No allowance is made for silver by-products.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
<b>Market assessment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The demand, supply and stock situation for the particular commodity, consumption trends and factors likely to affect supply and demand into the future.</li> <li>A customer and competitor analysis along with the identification of likely market windows for the product.</li> <li>Price and volume forecasts and the basis for these forecasts.</li> <li>For industrial minerals the customer specification, testing and acceptance requirements prior to a supply contract.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed economic studies of the gold market and future price estimates are considered by Westgold and applied in the estimation of revenue, cut-off grade analysis and future mine planning decisions.</li> <li>There remains strong demand and no apparent risk to the long term demand for the gold.</li> </ul>
<b>Economic</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The inputs to the economic analysis to produce the net present value (NPV) in the study, the source and confidence of these economic inputs including estimated inflation, discount rate, etc.</li> <li>NPV ranges and sensitivity to variations in the significant assumptions and inputs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Higginsville NPV assumes a 10% discount rate with no inflation. Mining costs derived from contract rates, Paste Plant costs as per cubes required at a historical A\$/m<sup>3</sup>, G&amp;A costs on a cost per tonne basis and processing cost based on actual cost profiles.</li> <li>Each separate mine (open pit, underground or stockpile) has been assessed on a standard operating cash generating model. Capital costs have been included thereafter to determine an economic outcome.</li> <li>Subsequently each Operating centre (MGO, CGO, FGM and HGO) has had a Discounted Cash Flow model constructed to further demonstrate the Reserve has a positive economic outcome.</li> <li>A discount rate of 8% is allied in DCF modelling.</li> <li>No escalation of costs and gold price is included.</li> <li>Sensitivity analysis of key financial and physical parameters is applied to future development projects.</li> </ul>
<b>Social</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The status of agreements with key stakeholders and matters leading to social licence to operate.</li> </ul>	<p><b>HGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HGO is fully permitted and a major contributor to the local and regional economy. It has no external pressures that impact its operation or which could potentially jeopardise its continuous operation.</li> <li>As new open pits or underground operations develop the site will require separate environmental approvals from the different regulating bodies.</li> <li>Where required, the operation has a Native Title and Pastoral Agreement.</li> </ul> <p><b>MGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MGO is fully permitted and a major contributor to the local and regional economy. It has no external pressures that impact its operation or which could potentially jeopardise its continuous operation.</li> <li>As new open pits or underground operations develop the site will require separate environmental approvals from the different regulating bodies.</li> <li>Where required, the operation has a Native Title and Pastoral Agreement.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
		<p><b>CGO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CGO is fully permitted and a major contributor to the local and regional economy. It has no external pressures that impact its operation or which could potentially jeopardise its continuous operation.</li> <li>As new open pits or underground operations develop the site will require separate environmental approvals from the different regulating bodies.</li> <li>Where required, the operation has a Native Title and Pastoral Agreement.</li> </ul> <p><b>FGP</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FGP is fully permitted and a major contributor to the local and regional economy. It has no external pressures that impact its operation or which could potentially jeopardise its continuous operation.</li> <li>As new open pits or underground operations develop the site will require separate environmental approvals from the different regulating bodies.</li> <li>Where required, the operation has a Native Title and Pastoral Agreement.</li> </ul>
<b>Other</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To the extent relevant, the impact of the following on the project and/or on the estimation and classification of the Ore Reserves: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any identified material naturally occurring risks.</li> <li>The status of material legal agreements and marketing arrangements.</li> <li>The status of governmental agreements and approvals critical to the viability of the project, such as mineral tenement status, and government and statutory approvals. There must be reasonable grounds to expect that all necessary Government approvals will be received within the timeframes anticipated in the Pre-Feasibility or Feasibility study. Highlight and discuss the materiality of any unresolved matter that is dependent on a third party on which extraction of the reserve is contingent.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HGO is an active mining project.</li> <li>MGO is an active mining project.</li> <li>CGO is an active mining project.</li> <li>FGP is an active mining project.</li> </ul>
<b>Classification</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The basis for the classification of the Ore Reserves into varying confidence categories.</li> <li>Whether the result appropriately reflects the Competent Person's view of the deposit.</li> <li>The proportion of Probable Ore Reserves that have been derived from Measured Mineral Resources (if any).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The basis for classification of the Resource into different categories is made in accordance with the recommendations of the JORC Code 2012. Measured Resources have a high level of confidence and are generally defined in three dimensions with accurately defined or normally mineralised developed exposure. Indicated resources have a slightly lower level of confidence but contain substantial drilling and are in most instances capitally developed or well defined from a mining perspective. Inferred resources always contain significant geological evidence of existence and are drilled, but not to the same density. There is no classification of any resource that isn't drilled or defined by substantial physical sampling works.</li> <li>Some Measured Resources have been classified as Proven and some are defined as Probable Reserves based on internal judgement of the mining, geotechnical, processing and or cost profile estimates.</li> <li>No Indicated Resource material has been converted into Proven Reserve.</li> <li>The resultant Reserve classification appropriately reflects the view of the Competent Person.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
<b>Audits or reviews</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The results of any audits or reviews of Ore Reserve estimates.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reserves inventories and the use of appropriate modifying factors are reviewed internally on an annual basis.</li> <li>Additionally, mine design and cost profiles are regularly reviewed by WGX operational quarterly reviews.</li> <li>Financial auditing processes, Dataroom reviews for asset sales / purchases and stockbroker analysis regularly 'truth test' the assumptions made on Reserve designs and assumptions.</li> </ul>
<b>Discussion of relative accuracy/ confidence</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where appropriate a statement of the relative accuracy and confidence level in the Ore Reserve estimate using an approach or procedure deemed appropriate by the Competent Person. For example, the application of statistical or geostatistical procedures to quantify the relative accuracy of the reserve within stated confidence limits, or, if such an approach is not deemed appropriate, a qualitative discussion of the factors which could affect the relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate.</li> <li>The statement should specify whether it relates to global or local estimates, and, if local, state the relevant tonnages, which should be relevant to technical and economic evaluation. Documentation should include assumptions made and the procedures used.</li> <li>Accuracy and confidence discussions should extend to specific discussions of any applied Modifying Factors that may have a material impact on Ore Reserve viability, or for which there are remaining areas of uncertainty at the current study stage.</li> <li>It is recognised that this may not be possible or appropriate in all circumstances. These statements of relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate should be compared with production data, where available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst it should be acknowledged that all Ore Reserves are based primarily upon an estimate of contained insitu gold (Resource), it is the competent person's view that the consolidated Reserve inventory is highly achievable in entirety.</li> <li>Given the entire Ore Reserves inventory is within existing operations, with Budgetary style cost models and current contractual mining / processing consumable rates, coupled with an extensive historical knowledge / dataset of the Resources, it is the competent person's view that the significant mining modifying factors (COG's, geotechnical parameters and dilution ratio's) applied are achievable and or within the limits of 10% sensitivity analysis.</li> </ul>

# JORC 2012 TABLE 1 – NORTHERN TERRITORY SECTION 1 SAMPLING TECHNIQUES AND DATA

(Criteria in this section apply to all succeeding sections.)

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<p><i>Sampling techniques</i></p> <p><i>Drilling techniques</i></p> <p><i>Drill sample recovery</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nature and quality of sampling (e.g. cut channels, random chips, or specific specialised industry standard measurement tools appropriate to the minerals under investigation, such as down hole gamma sondes, or handheld XRF instruments, etc.). These examples should not be taken as limiting the broad meaning of sampling.</li> <li>Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample representivity and the appropriate calibration of any measurement tools or systems used.</li> <li>Aspects of the determination of mineralisation that are Material to the Public Report.</li> <li>In cases where 'industry standard' work has been done this would be relatively simple (e.g. 'reverse circulation drilling was used to obtain 1 m samples from which 3 kg was pulverised to produce a 30 g charge for fire assay'). In other cases more explanation may be required, such as where there is coarse gold that has inherent sampling problems. Unusual commodities or mineralisation types (e.g. submarine nodules) may warrant disclosure of detailed information.</li> <li>Drill type (e.g. core, reverse circulation, open-hole hammer, rotary air blast, auger, Bangka, sonic, etc.) and details (e.g. core diameter, triple or standard tube, depth of diamond tails, face-sampling bit or other type, whether core is oriented and if so, by what method, etc.).</li> <li>Method of recording and assessing core and chip sample recoveries and results assessed.</li> <li>Measures taken to maximise sample recovery and ensure representative nature of the samples.</li> <li>Whether a relationship exists between sample recovery and grade and whether sample bias may have occurred due to preferential loss/gain of fine/coarse material.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Diamond Drilling</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All data used in resource calculations at the Tennant Creek Project has been gathered from diamond core. Multiple core sizes have been used historically. This core is geologically logged and subsequently halved for sampling.</li> <li>All geology input is logged and validated by the relevant area geologists, incorporated into this assessment of sample recovery.</li> <li>No defined relationship exists between sample recovery and grade. Nor has sample bias due to preferential loss or gain of fine or coarse material been noted.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Logging</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whether core and chip samples have been geologically and geotechnically logged to a level of detail to support appropriate Mineral Resource estimation, mining studies and metallurgical studies.</li> <li>Whether logging is qualitative or quantitative in nature. Core (or costean, channel, etc.) photography.</li> <li>The total length and percentage of the relevant intersections logged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Diamond core is logged geologically and geotechnically.</li> <li>Logging is qualitative in nature.</li> <li>All holes are logged completely.</li> </ul>



Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<i>Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all core taken.</li> <li>If non-core, whether riffled, tube sampled, rotary split, etc. and whether sampled wet or dry.</li> <li>For all sample types, the nature, quality and appropriateness of the sample preparation technique.</li> <li>Quality control procedures adopted for all sub-sampling stages to maximise representivity of samples.</li> <li>Measures taken to ensure that the sampling is representative of the in situ material collected, including for instance results for field duplicate/second-half sampling.</li> <li>Whether sample sizes are appropriate to the grain size of the material being sampled.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Diamond Drilling - Half-core niche samples, sub-set via geological features as appropriate.</li> <li>Core undergoes total preparation.</li> <li>The sample preparation process consists of;</li> <li>Crushing using a vibrating jaw crusher to achieve a maximum sample size of 4mm.</li> <li>The sample is then weighed, and if the sample weight is greater than 3.2kg, the sample is split into two using a Jones-type Riffle splitter.</li> <li>The crushed sample is then pulverised in a Labtech LM5 Ring Mill for 6 minutes. For samples weighing greater than 3.2kg the first portion is removed and second portion is homogenised in the same machine. Once complete the first portion is put back in the LM5 and both portions are homogenised.</li> <li>From the pulverised sample, approximately 200g is taken as a master sample which stays in Alice Springs, while a second sample of approximately 150g taken and sent to for assaying. These samples are collected via a scoop inserted to the bottom of the bowl. The remaining sample is transferred to a calico bag for storage.</li> <li>For every 20th sample, an approximately 25g sample is screened to 75 microns to check that homogenising has achieved 80% passing 75 microns.</li> <li>QA/QC is ensured during sampling via the use of sample ledgers, blanks, standards and repeats.</li> <li>QA/QC is ensured during the assays process via the use of blanks, standards and repeats at a NATA / ISO accredited laboratory.</li> <li>The sample sizes are considered appropriate to the grainsize of the material being sampled.</li> <li>The un-sampled half of diamond core is retained for check sampling if required.</li> </ul>
<i>Quality of assay data and laboratory tests</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The nature, quality and appropriateness of the assaying and laboratory procedures used and whether the technique is considered partial or total.</li> <li>For geophysical tools, spectrometers, handheld XRF instruments, etc., the parameters used in determining the analysis including instrument make and model, reading times, calibrations factors applied and their derivation, etc.</li> <li>Nature of quality control procedures adopted (e.g. standards, blanks, duplicates, external laboratory checks) and whether acceptable levels of accuracy (i.e. lack of bias) and precision have been established.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analysis of drill core for Au, Ag, Cu, Pb, Zn was carried out in Perth in the following manner;</li> <li>Gold (Au-AA25 scheme – lower detection limit = 0.01ppm, upper detection limit = 100ppm). A 30g charge of prepared sample is fused with a mixture of lead oxide, sodium carbonate, borax, silica and other reagents and then cupelled to yield a precious metal bead.</li> <li>The bead is then dissolved in acid and analysed by atomic absorption spectroscopy against matrix-matched standards.</li> <li>Samples returning assay values in excess of 100g/t Au were repeated using the Au- AA26 method.</li> <li>Ag, Cu, Pb, Zn (ME-OG62) - A prepared sample is digested using a 4 acid digest.</li> <li>The subsequent solution is analysed by inductively coupled plasma - atomic emission spectroscopy or by atomic absorption spectrometry.</li> <li>No significant QA/QC issues have arisen in recent drilling results.</li> <li>These assay methodologies are appropriate for the resource in question.</li> </ul>
<i>Verification of sampling and assaying</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The verification of significant intersections by either independent or alternative company personnel.</li> <li>The use of twinned holes.</li> <li>Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols.</li> <li>Discuss any adjustment to assay data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Anomalous intervals as well as random intervals are routinely checked assayed as part of the internal QA/QC process.</li> <li>Virtual twinned holes have been drilled in several instances with no significant issues highlighted.</li> <li>Primary data is loaded into the drillhole database system and then archived for reference.</li> <li>All data used in the calculation of resources are compiled in databases which are overseen and validated by senior geologists.</li> <li>No primary assays data is modified in any way.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<i>Location of data points</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accuracy and quality of surveys used to locate drill holes (collar and down-hole surveys), trenches, mine workings and other locations used in Mineral Resource estimation.</li> <li>Specification of the grid system used.</li> <li>Quality and adequacy of topographic control.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All data is spatially oriented by survey controls via direct pickups by the survey department. Drillholes are all surveyed downhole, deeper holes with a Gyro tool if required.</li> <li>All drilling and resource estimation is undertaken in MGA grid.</li> <li>Topographic control is generated from a combination of remote sensing methods and ground-based surveys. This methodology is adequate for the resource in question.</li> </ul>
<i>Data spacing and distribution</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data spacing for reporting of Exploration Results.</li> <li>Whether the data spacing and distribution is sufficient to establish the degree of geological and grade continuity appropriate for the Mineral Resource and Ore Reserve estimation procedure(s) and classifications applied.</li> <li>Whether sample compositing has been applied.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data spacing is variable dependent upon the individual orebody under consideration. This approach is appropriate for the Mineral Resource estimation process and to allow for classification of the resource as it stands.</li> <li>Compositing is carried out based upon the modal sample length of each individual domain.</li> </ul>
<i>Orientation of data in relation to geological structure</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whether the orientation of sampling achieves unbiased sampling of possible structures and the extent to which this is known, considering the deposit type.</li> <li>If the relationship between the drilling orientation and the orientation of key mineralised structures is considered to have introduced a sampling bias, this should be assessed and reported if material.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drilling intersections are nominally designed to be normal to the orebody as far topography / economics allows.</li> <li>It is not considered that drilling orientation has introduced an appreciable sampling bias.</li> </ul>
<i>Sample security</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The measures taken to ensure sample security.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Samples are delivered to a third party transport service, who in turn relay them to the independent laboratory contractor. Samples are stored securely until they leave site.</li> </ul>
<i>Audits or reviews</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site generated resources and reserves and the parent geological data is routinely reviewed by the Westgold Corporate technical team.</li> </ul>

## SECTION 2 REPORTING OF EXPLORATION RESULTS

(Criteria listed in the preceding section also apply to this section.)

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<i>Mineral tenement and land tenure status</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Type, reference name/number, location and ownership including agreements or material issues with third parties such as joint ventures, partnerships, overriding royalties, native title interests, historical sites, wilderness or national park and environmental settings.</li> <li>The security of the tenure held at the time of reporting along with any known impediments to obtaining a licence to operate in the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Tennant Creek Project comprises 5 granted exploration leases.</li> <li>Native title interests are recorded against the Tennant Creek tenements.</li> <li>The Tennant Creek tenements are held by Castile with is 100% Westgold owned.</li> <li>Several third party royalties exist across various tenements at Tennant Creek, over and above the Northern Territory government royalty.</li> <li>Castile operates in accordance with all environmental conditions set down as conditions for grant of the leases.</li> <li>There are no known issues regarding security of tenure.</li> <li>There are no known impediments to continued operation.</li> </ul>
<i>Exploration done by other parties</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Tennant Creek area has an exploration and production history in excess of 100 years. The WGX area in particular has an intensive exploration history stretching from the 1970's.</li> <li>On balance, Castile work has generally confirmed the veracity of historic exploration data.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<i>Geology</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Tennant Creek Project is located in the 1,860-1,850Ma Warramunga Province is approximately centred on the township of Tennant Creek, and contains the Palaeoproterozoic Warramunga Formation. This is a weakly metamorphosed turbiditic succession of partly tuffaceous sandstones and siltstones which includes argillaceous banded ironstones locally referred to as 'haematite shale'.</li> <li>Copper in the form of chalcopyrite occurs around the upper margins of the quartz magnetite ironstones and in the silicified BIF or haematitic shales that often form an alteration transition to the adjacent chlorite alteration envelope. Although copper levels in the upper quartz magnetite portion of the ironstones is usually very low, pervasive sub-economic copper levels can persist throughout this zone. Economic levels of copper are dominantly contained in the lower massive magnetite portion or in massive magnetite "veins" identified in the magnetite quartz zones. The massive magnetite zones grade laterally and at depth into magnetite chlorite stringer zones. Gold content increases where the content of magnetite veining and chlorite alteration decreases and there is an increase in early haematite dusted quartz veins and indurated sediments and fine chlorite veining related to the mineralisation phase. The transition from massive magnetite copper mineralisation to magnetite quartz chlorite stringer gold mineralisation is also the zone of increased bismuthinite mineralisation.</li> <li>Lead and zinc mineralisation at Explorer 108 is associated with a brecciated dolomitised sediment unit, consisting of irregular, generally narrow, domains or veins of semi-massive sulphides (sphalerite and galena). A basal "high-grade" zone is present at the contact of the dolomite and lower felsic units.</li> </ul>
<i>Drill hole Information</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A summary of all information material to the understanding of the exploration results including a tabulation of the following information for all Material drill holes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>easting and northing of the drill hole collar</li> <li>elevation or RL (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in metres) of the drill hole collar</li> <li>dip and azimuth of the hole</li> <li>down hole length and interception depth</li> <li>hole length.</li> </ul> </li> <li><i>If the exclusion of this information is justified on the basis that the information is not Material and this exclusion does not detract from the understanding of the report, the Competent Person should clearly explain why this is the case.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No drillhole information is being reported.</li> </ul>
<i>Data aggregation methods</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>In reporting Exploration Results, weighting averaging techniques, maximum and/or minimum grade truncations (e.g. cutting of high grades) and cut-off grades are usually Material and should be stated.</i></li> <li><i>Where aggregate intercepts incorporate short lengths of high grade results and longer lengths of low grade results, the procedure used for such aggregation should be stated and some typical examples of such aggregations should be shown in detail.</i></li> <li><i>The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values should be clearly stated.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No drillhole information is being reported.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<i>Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>These relationships are particularly important in the reporting of Exploration Results.</i></li> <li>• <i>If the geometry of the mineralisation with respect to the drill hole angle is known, its nature should be reported.</i></li> <li>• <i>If it is not known and only the down hole lengths are reported, there should be a clear statement to this effect (e.g. 'down hole length, true width not known').</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No drillhole information is being reported.</li> </ul>
<i>Diagrams</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Appropriate maps and sections (with scales) and tabulations of intercepts should be included for any significant discovery being reported These should include, but not be limited to a plan view of drill hole collar locations and appropriate sectional views.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No drillhole information is being reported.</li> </ul>
<i>Balanced reporting</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Where comprehensive reporting of all Exploration Results is not practicable, representative reporting of both low and high grades and/or widths should be practiced to avoid misleading reporting of Exploration Results.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No drillhole information is being reported.</li> </ul>
<i>Other substantive exploration data</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other exploration data, if meaningful and material, should be reported including (but not limited to): geological observations; geophysical survey results; geochemical survey results; bulk samples – size and method of treatment; metallurgical test results; bulk density, groundwater, geotechnical and rock characteristics; potential deleterious or contaminating substances.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No relevant information to be presented.</li> </ul>
<i>Further work</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The nature and scale of planned further work (e.g. tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling).</li> <li>• Diagrams clearly highlighting the areas of possible extensions, including the main geological interpretations and future drilling areas, provided this information is not commercially sensitive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exploration and mine planning assessment continues to take place at the Tennant Creek Project.</li> </ul>

## SECTION 3 ESTIMATION AND REPORTING OF MINERAL RESOURCES

[Criteria listed in section 1, and where relevant in section 2, also apply to this section.]

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<i>Database integrity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measures taken to ensure that data has not been corrupted by, for example, transcription or keying errors, between its initial collection and its use for Mineral Resource estimation purposes.</li> <li>Data validation procedures used.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drillhole data is stored in a Maxwell's DataShed system based on the Microsoft SQL Server platform which is currently considered "industry standard".</li> <li>As new data is acquired it passes through a validation approval system designed to pick-up any significant errors before the information is loaded into the master database. The information is uploaded by a series of Sequel routines and is performed as required. The database contains diamond drilling (including geotechnical and specific gravity data) and some associated metadata. By its nature this database is large in size, and therefore exports from the main database are undertaken (with or without the application of spatial and various other filters) to create a database of workable size, preserve a snapshot of the database at the time of orebody modelling and interpretation and preserve the integrity of the master database.</li> </ul>
<i>Site visits</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment on any site visits undertaken by the Competent Person and the outcome of those visits.</li> <li>If no site visits have been undertaken indicate why this is the case.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Russell visits site on a regular basis.</li> </ul>
<i>Geological interpretation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confidence in (or conversely, the uncertainty of) the geological interpretation of the mineral deposit.</li> <li>Nature of the data used and of any assumptions made.</li> <li>The effect, if any, of alternative interpretations on Mineral Resource estimation.</li> <li>The use of geology in guiding and controlling Mineral Resource estimation.</li> <li>The factors affecting continuity both of grade and geology.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mining of similar deposits in the region provides confidence in the current geological interpretation.</li> <li>No alternative interpretations are currently considered viable.</li> <li>Geological interpretation of the deposit was carried out using a systematic approach to ensure that the resultant estimated Mineral Resource figure was both sufficiently constrained, and representative of the expected sub-surface conditions. In all aspects of resource estimation the factual and interpreted geology was used to guide the development of the interpretation.</li> <li>The structural regime and the presence of intrusive source bodies are the dominant controls on geological and grade continuity at the Tennant Creek Project.</li> </ul>
<i>Dimensions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The extent and variability of the Mineral Resource expressed as length (along strike or otherwise), plan width, and depth below surface to the upper and lower limits of the Mineral Resource.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individual deposit scales vary across the Tennant Creek Project.</li> <li>The WGX 1 deposit is mineralised over a strike length of &gt;540m, a lateral extent of up to +70m and a depth of over 650m.</li> <li>The Explorer 108 deposit is mineralised over a strike length of &gt;400m, with a thickness of up to 60m.</li> <li>The Explorer 142 deposit is mineralised over a strike length of &gt;200m, with a thickness of up to 8m.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<i>Estimation and modelling techniques</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The nature and appropriateness of the estimation technique(s) applied and key assumptions, including treatment of extreme grade values, domaining, interpolation parameters and maximum distance of extrapolation from data points. If a computer assisted estimation method was chosen include a description of computer software and parameters used.</li> <li>The availability of check estimates, previous estimates and/or mine production records and whether the Mineral Resource estimate takes appropriate account of such data.</li> <li>The assumptions made regarding recovery of by-products.</li> <li>Estimation of deleterious elements or other non-grade variables of economic significance (e.g. sulphur for acid mine drainage characterisation).</li> <li>In the case of block model interpolation, the block size in relation to the average sample spacing and the search employed.</li> <li>Any assumptions behind modelling of selective mining units.</li> <li>Any assumptions about correlation between variables.</li> <li>Description of how the geological interpretation was used to control the resource estimates.</li> <li>Discussion of basis for using or not using grade cutting or capping.</li> <li>The process of validation, the checking process used, the comparison of model data to drill hole data, and use of reconciliation data if available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All modelling and estimation work undertaken by Westgold is carried out in three dimensions via Surpac Vision.</li> <li>After validating the drillhole data to be used in the estimation, interpretation of the orebody is undertaken in sectional and / or plan view to create the outline strings which form the basis of the three dimensional orebody wireframe. Wireframing is then carried out using a combination of automated stitching algorithms and manual triangulation to create an accurate three dimensional representation of the sub- surface mineralised body.</li> <li>Drillhole intersections within the mineralised body are defined, these intersections are then used to flag the appropriate sections of the drillhole database tables for compositing purposes. Drillholes are subsequently composited to allow for grade estimation. In all aspects of resource estimation the factual and interpreted geology was used to guide the development of the interpretation.</li> <li>Once the sample data has been composited, a statistical analysis is undertaken to assist with determining estimation search parameters, top-cuts etc.. Variographic analysis of individual domains is undertaken to assist with determining appropriate search parameters. Which are then incorporated with observed geological and geometrical features to determine the most appropriate search parameters.</li> <li>An empty block model is then created for the area of interest. This model contains attributes set at background values for the various elements of interest as well as density, and various estimation parameters that are subsequently used to assist in resource categorisation. The block sizes used in the model will vary depending on orebody geometry, minimum mining units, estimation parameters and levels of informing data available.</li> <li>Grade estimation is then undertaken, with ordinary kriging estimation method is considered as standard, although in some circumstances where sample populations are small, or domains are unable to be accurately defined, inverse distance weighting estimation techniques will be used. Both by-product and deleterious elements are estimated at the time of primary grade estimation if required. It is assumed that by-products correlate well with gold. There are no assumptions made about the recovery of by-products.</li> <li>The resource is then depleted for mining voids and subsequently classified in line with JORC guidelines utilising a combination of various estimation derived parameters and geological / mining knowledge.</li> <li>This approach has proven to be applicable to Westgold's gold assets.</li> <li>Estimation results are routinely validated against primary input data, previous estimates and mining output.</li> <li>Good reconciliation between mine claimed figures and milled figures was routinely achieved during past production history.</li> </ul>
<i>Moisture</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whether the tonnages are estimated on a dry basis or with natural moisture, and the method of determination of the moisture content.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tonnage estimates are dry tonnes.</li> </ul>
<i>Cut-off parameters</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The basis of the adopted cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The WGX 1 reporting cut-off grade is 2.5g/t Au.</li> <li>The Explorer 108 reporting cut-off grade is 2.5% Pb + Zn.</li> <li>The Explorer 142 reporting cut-off grade is 2.5g% Cu.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<i>Mining factors or assumptions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assumptions made regarding possible mining methods, minimum mining dimensions and internal (or, if applicable, external) mining dilution. It is always necessary as part of the process of determining reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction to consider potential mining methods, but the assumptions made regarding mining methods and parameters when estimating Mineral Resources may not always be rigorous. Where this is the case, this should be reported with an explanation of the basis of the mining assumptions made.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not considered for Mineral Resource. Applied during the Reserve generation process.</li> </ul>
<i>Metallurgical factors or assumptions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The basis for assumptions or predictions regarding metallurgical amenability. It is always necessary as part of the process of determining reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction to consider potential metallurgical methods, but the assumptions regarding metallurgical treatment processes and parameters made when reporting Mineral Resources may not always be rigorous. Where this is the case, this should be reported with an explanation of the basis of the metallurgical assumptions made.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not considered for Mineral Resource. Applied during the Reserve generation process.</li> </ul>
<i>Environmental factors or assumptions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assumptions made regarding possible waste and process residue disposal options. It is always necessary as part of the process of determining reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction to consider the potential environmental impacts of the mining and processing operation. While at this stage the determination of potential environmental impacts, particularly for a greenfields project, may not always be well advanced, the status of early consideration of these potential environmental impacts should be reported. Where these aspects have not been considered this should be reported with an explanation of the environmental assumptions made.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Castile operates in accordance with all environmental conditions set down as conditions for grant of the respective leases.</li> </ul>
<i>Bulk density</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whether assumed or determined. If assumed, the basis for the assumptions. If determined, the method used, whether wet or dry, the frequency of the measurements, the nature, size and representativeness of the samples.</li> <li>The bulk density for bulk material must have been measured by methods that adequately account for void spaces (vugs, porosity, etc.), moisture and differences between rock and alteration zones within the deposit.</li> <li>Discuss assumptions for bulk density estimates used in the evaluation process of the different materials.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bulk density of the mineralisation at the Tennant Creek Project is variable and is for the both lithology and alteration / mineralisation dependent.</li> <li>For modern drilling, field technicians perform density test-work on core samples on a campaign basis every three months. All density measurements have been determined using the simple water immersion technique. The samples from all holes were well below the base of oxidation and were in generally competent, non- porous rock.</li> </ul>
<i>Classification</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The basis for the classification of the Mineral Resources into varying confidence categories.</li> <li>Whether appropriate account has been taken of all relevant factors (i.e. relative confidence in tonnage/grade estimations, reliability of input data, confidence in continuity of geology and metal values, quality, quantity and distribution of the data).</li> <li>Whether the result appropriately reflects the Competent Person's view of the deposit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resources are classified in line with JORC guidelines utilising a combination of various estimation derived parameters, the input data and geological / mining knowledge.</li> <li>This approach considers all relevant factors and reflects the Competent Person's view of the deposit.</li> </ul>
<i>Audits or reviews</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The results of any audits or reviews of Mineral Resource estimates.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resource estimates are peer reviewed by the site technical team as well as Westgold's Corporate technical team.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<i>Discussion of relative accuracy/confidence</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where appropriate a statement of the relative accuracy and confidence level in the Mineral Resource estimate using an approach or procedure deemed appropriate by the Competent Person. For example, the application of statistical or geostatistical procedures to quantify the relative accuracy of the resource within stated confidence limits, or, if such an approach is not deemed appropriate, a qualitative discussion of the factors that could affect the relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate.</li> <li>The statement should specify whether it relates to global or local estimates, and, if local, state the relevant tonnages, which should be relevant to technical and economic evaluation. Documentation should include assumptions made and the procedures used.</li> <li>These statements of relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate should be compared with production data, where available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All currently reported resources estimates are considered robust, and representative on both a global and local scale.</li> <li>No production data exists to compare the resource estimate against.</li> </ul>

## SECTION 4 ESTIMATION AND REPORTING OF ORE RESERVES

[Criteria listed in section 1, and where relevant in sections 2 and 3, also apply to this section.]

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<i>Mineral Resource estimate for conversion to Ore Reserves</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description of the Mineral Resource estimate used as a basis for the conversion to an Ore Reserve.</li> <li>Clear statement as to whether the Mineral Resources are reported additional to, or inclusive of, the Ore Reserves.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reserve has been stated for the Northern Territory Project.</li> </ul>
<i>Site visits</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Comment on any site visits undertaken by the Competent Person and the outcome of those visits.</i></li> <li><i>If no site visits have been undertaken indicate why this is the case.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reserve has been stated for the Northern Territory Project.</li> </ul>
<i>Study status</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The type and level of study undertaken to enable Mineral Resources to be converted to Ore Reserves.</i></li> <li><i>The Code requires that a study to at least Pre-Feasibility Study level has been undertaken to convert Mineral Resources to Ore Reserves. Such studies will have been carried out and will have determined a mine plan that is technically achievable and economically viable, and that material Modifying Factors have been considered.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reserve has been stated for the Northern Territory Project.</li> </ul>
<i>Cut-off parameters</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The basis of the cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reserve has been stated for the Northern Territory Project.</li> </ul>



Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<i>Mining factors or assumptions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The method and assumptions used as reported in the Pre-Feasibility or Feasibility Study to convert the Mineral Resource to an Ore Reserve (i.e. either by application of appropriate factors by optimisation or by preliminary or detailed design).</li> <li>The choice, nature and appropriateness of the selected mining method(s) and other mining parameters including associated design issues such as pre-strip, access, etc.</li> <li><i>The assumptions made regarding geotechnical parameters (e.g. pit slopes, stope sizes, etc.), grade control and pre-production drilling.</i></li> <li><i>The major assumptions made and Mineral Resource model used for pit and stope optimisation (if appropriate).</i></li> <li><i>The mining dilution factors used.</i></li> <li><i>The mining recovery factors used.</i></li> <li><i>Any minimum mining widths used.</i></li> <li><i>The manner in which Inferred Mineral Resources are utilised in mining studies and the sensitivity of the outcome to their inclusion.</i></li> <li><i>The infrastructure requirements of the selected mining methods.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reserve has been stated for the Northern Territory Project.</li> </ul>
<i>Metallurgical factors or assumptions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The metallurgical process proposed and the appropriateness of that process to the style of mineralisation.</i></li> <li><i>Whether the metallurgical process is well-tested technology or novel in nature.</i></li> <li><i>The nature, amount and representativeness of metallurgical test work undertaken, the nature of the metallurgical domaining applied and the corresponding metallurgical recovery factors applied.</i></li> <li><i>Any assumptions or allowances made for deleterious elements.</i></li> <li><i>The existence of any bulk sample or pilot scale test work and the degree to which such samples are considered representative of the orebody as a whole.</i></li> <li><i>For minerals that are defined by a specification, has the ore reserve estimation been based on the appropriate mineralogy to meet the specifications?</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reserve has been stated for the Northern Territory Project.</li> </ul>
<i>Environmental</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The status of studies of potential environmental impacts of the mining and processing operation. Details of waste rock characterisation and the consideration of potential sites, status of design options considered and, where applicable, the status of approvals for process residue storage and waste dumps should be reported.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reserve has been stated for the Northern Territory Project.</li> </ul>
<i>Infrastructure</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The existence of appropriate infrastructure: availability of land for plant development, power, water, transportation (particularly for bulk commodities), labour, accommodation; or the ease with which the infrastructure can be provided, or accessed.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reserve has been stated for the Northern Territory Project.</li> </ul>
<i>Costs</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The derivation of, or assumptions made, regarding projected capital costs in the study.</i></li> <li><i>The methodology used to estimate operating costs.</i></li> <li><i>Allowances made for the content of deleterious elements.</i></li> <li><i>The source of exchange rates used in the study.</i></li> <li><i>Derivation of transportation charges.</i></li> <li><i>The basis for forecasting or source of treatment and refining charges, penalties for failure to meet specification, etc.</i></li> <li><i>The allowances made for royalties payable, both Government and private.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reserve has been stated for the Northern Territory Project.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<i>Revenue factors</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The derivation of, or assumptions made regarding revenue factors including head grade, metal or commodity price(s) exchange rates, transportation and treatment charges, penalties, net smelter returns, etc.</i></li> <li><i>The derivation of assumptions made of metal or commodity price(s), for the principal metals, minerals and co-products.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reserve has been stated for the Northern Territory Project.</li> </ul>
<i>Market assessment</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The demand, supply and stock situation for the particular commodity, consumption trends and factors likely to affect supply and demand into the future.</i></li> <li><i>A customer and competitor analysis along with the identification of likely market windows for the product.</i></li> <li><i>Price and volume forecasts and the basis for these forecasts.</i></li> <li><i>For industrial minerals the customer specification, testing and acceptance requirements prior to a supply contract.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reserve has been stated for the Northern Territory Project.</li> </ul>
<i>Economic</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The inputs to the economic analysis to produce the net present value (NPV) in the study, the source and confidence of these economic inputs including estimated inflation, discount rate, etc.</i></li> <li><i>NPV ranges and sensitivity to variations in the significant assumptions and inputs.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reserve has been stated for the Northern Territory Project.</li> </ul>
<i>Social</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The status of agreements with key stakeholders and matters leading to social licence to operate.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reserve has been stated for the Northern Territory Project.</li> </ul>
<i>Other</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>To the extent relevant, the impact of the following on the project and/or on the estimation and classification of the Ore Reserves:</i></li> <li><i>Any identified material naturally occurring risks.</i></li> <li><i>The status of material legal agreements and marketing arrangements.</i></li> <li><i>The status of governmental agreements and approvals critical to the viability of the project, such as mineral tenement status, and government and statutory approvals. There must be reasonable grounds to expect that all necessary Government approvals will be received within the timeframes anticipated in the Pre-Feasibility or Feasibility study. Highlight and discuss the materiality of any unresolved matter that is dependent on a third party on which extraction of the reserve is contingent.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reserve has been stated for the Northern Territory Project.</li> </ul>
<i>Classification</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The basis for the classification of the Ore Reserves into varying confidence categories.</i></li> <li><i>Whether the result appropriately reflects the Competent Person's view of the deposit.</i></li> <li><i>The proportion of Probable Ore Reserves that have been derived from Measured Mineral Resources (if any).</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reserve has been stated for the Northern Territory Project.</li> </ul>
<i>Audits or reviews</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The results of any audits or reviews of Ore Reserve estimates.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reserve has been stated for the Northern Territory Project.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<i>Discussion of relative accuracy / confidence</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Where appropriate a statement of the relative accuracy and confidence level in the Ore Reserve estimate using an approach or procedure deemed appropriate by the Competent Person. For example, the application of statistical or geostatistical procedures to quantify the relative accuracy of the reserve within stated confidence limits, or, if such an approach is not deemed appropriate, a qualitative discussion of the factors which could affect the relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate.</i></li> <li>• <i>The statement should specify whether it relates to global or local estimates, and, if local, state the relevant tonnages, which should be relevant to technical and economic evaluation. Documentation should include assumptions made and the procedures used.</i></li> <li>• <i>Accuracy and confidence discussions should extend to specific discussions of any applied Modifying Factors that may have a material impact on Ore Reserve viability, or for which there are remaining areas of uncertainty at the current study stage.</i></li> <li>• <i>It is recognised that this may not be possible or appropriate in all circumstances. These statements of relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate should be compared with production data, where available.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reserve has been stated for the Northern Territory Project.</li> </ul>

### **JORC Compliance Statements**

The information in this report that relates to Exploration Targets, Exploration Results and Mineral Resources is based on information compiled Mr Jake Russell B.Sc. (Hons) MAIG. Mr Russell has sufficient experience which is relevant to the styles of mineralisation and types of deposit under consideration and to the activities which they are undertaking to qualify as a Competent Person as defined in the 2012 Editions of the “Australasian Code for Reporting of Exploration Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves (JORC 2012)”. Mr Russell consents to the inclusion in this report of the matters based on his information in the form and context in which it appears. Mr Russell is a full time senior executive of the Company and is eligible to, and may participate in short-term and long-term incentive plans of the Company as disclosed in its annual reports and disclosure documents.

The information in this report that relates to Ore Reserves is based on information compiled by Mr Anthony Buckingham B.Eng (Mining Engineering) MAusIMM. Mr Buckingham has sufficient experience which is relevant to the styles of mineralisation and types of deposit under consideration and to the activities which they are undertaking to qualify as a Competent Person as defined in the 2012 Editions of the “Australasian Code for Reporting of Exploration Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves (JORC 2012)”. Mr Buckingham consents to the inclusion in this report of the matters based on his information in the form and context in which it appears. Mr Buckingham is a full time senior executive of the Company and is eligible to, and may participate in short-term and long-term incentive plans of the Company as disclosed in its annual reports and disclosure documents.