JORC Code, 2012 Edition – Table 1

Toms Gully Mineral Resource Estimate – December 2021

Section 1 Sampling Techniques and Data
(Criteria in this section apply to all succeeding sections)

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Sampling techniques	• *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.* • *Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample representivity and the appropriate calibration of any measurement tools or systems used.* • *Aspects of the determination of mineralisation that are Material to the Public Report. 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.*	**2018 drilling** • Drilling consisted of HQ diamond drilling with an RC pre-collar. • RC samples are collected at 1 m intervals straight from the rig-mounted cyclone and cone splitter. The cone splitter produces a nominal 2 kg to 3 kg sub-sample which is collected in a pre-numbered calico bag. Only zones of interest were submitted to the lab. • Diamond core is geologically logged by a geologist before sample intervals are determined over prospective mineralised zones. Sampling of diamond core is generally at 1 m intervals except for the Toms Gully quartz reef where sample boundaries are defined by changes in quartz veining. The diamond core is cut in half with an automated core saw with one half submitted to the lab for analysis. • Both the RC and DD samples are analysed for gold by fire assay by Jinning Testing and Inspection (JTI), Canning Vale, WA. **Previous drilling** • Diamond Drill (DD) core, RC chips and underground rock chip sampling are the three main sample types. • Diamond core was geologically logged and sampled to lithological contacts or changes in the nature of mineralisation. Nominal sample lengths of 1.5 m with a minimum sample length of 0.2 m. Core was half core sampled. • RC chips sampled at 1 m intervals. This was riffle or cone split to produce a sample of approximately 3 kg to be sent to the laboratory for analysis. Some 2 m and 4 m composites intervals were taken outside the drill target zones. • Face chip sampling was undertaken from underground headings with vertical channel or chip sampling perpendicular to the geological domain. Sample lengths varied from 0.1 m to 5 m. • Sample boundaries were based on geological contacts and changes in nature of mineralisation. Very often 2 vertical sample lines were taken for each face to enable a check on the repeatability of the mineralised interval.
Drilling techniques	• *Drill type (eg core, reverse circulation, open-hole hammer, rotary air blast, auger, Bangka, sonic, etc) and details (eg 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).*	**2018 drilling** • Diamond holes at Toms Gully were drilled with RC pre-collars, followed by HQ3. • All diamond core was orientated were possible. **Previous drilling** • Pre-2014 drill holes, vertical RC pre-collars 10 m to 20 m above the mineralisation target, then diamond core drilling tail (NQ) with standard inner tube. Diamond tail depths varied between 20 m to 30 m. Diamond core was not oriented. • Reverse circulation (RC) with downhole hammer. Hole diameter of RC holes were not recorded in available historical documents.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		• 2014 drill holes, steep angled RC pre-collars varied in depth from 70 m to 160 m, with orientated NQ2 tails between 150 m to 250 m for maximum hole depths of approximately 330 m. • Open hole percussion drilling and open pit blast holes were logged and sampled and included in the database but not used in this resource interpretation due to uncertainty with sample quality.
Drill sample recovery	• *Method of recording and assessing core and chip sample recoveries and results assessed.* • *Measures taken to maximise sample recovery and ensure representative nature of the samples.* • *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.*	**2018 drilling** • For RC drilling sample recovery and condition are visually assessed and recorded in a sample book. • For diamond drilling drilled metres and recovered metres are recorded by the drill crew and later checked by company personnel. Zones of core loss are recorded in the geological log and are assumed to have no gold. Core recoveries for mineralised intervals are 100%. **Previous drilling** • DD core loss (in metres) was measured in the core trays and core loss and recovery (%) recorded in geotechnical records. • 6% of sample intervals measured had core loss of 5%, with 2% having core loss of more than 20%. • Core recoveries were mostly recorded in fault gouges and breccia zones and generally un-mineralised or highly sulphidic softer shales (potentially mineralised intervals). • Measures taken to maximize sample recovery and ensure representative nature of the samples are not known. • No analysis on relationship between sample core recovery and grade has been undertaken due to low percentage of data affected by poor recovery.
Logging	• *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.* • *Whether logging is qualitative or quantitative in nature. Core (or costean, channel, etc) photography.* • *The total length and percentage of the relevant intersections logged.*	**2018 drilling** • All RC chips and diamond core has been geologically logged. • Geological logging typically detailed lithology, veining, alteration, sulphides, and weathering. Alpha and beta angles of geology structures like bedding, contacts and veining are recorded when core was orientated. • Logging was to an industry standard and of sufficient detail to support the resource model. **Previous drilling** • Diamond core and RC chips have been geologically and geotechnically logged to a level of detail to support appropriate Mineral Resource estimation. • Underground face data logging and wall mapping have been used to support mineralisation interpretation and Mineral Resource estimation. • Total length of all drilled data is 82,548 m. • The total amount of relevant drill data utilised for this estimate is 57,150 m (RC, DD and underground face data), of which 66% was logged and 1,168 m was flagged as mineralised intercepts. • Many RC pre-collars (pre-2014) have no geological logging. • Logging has been conducted both qualitatively and quantitatively – full description of lithologies, alteration and comments are noted, as well as percentage estimates on alteration, veining and sulphide amount.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation	• *If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all core taken.* • *If non-core, whether riffled, tube sampled, rotary split, etc and whether sampled wet or dry.* • *For all sample types, the nature, quality, and appropriateness of the sample preparation technique.* • *Quality control procedures adopted for all sub-sampling stages to maximise representivity of samples.* • *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.* • *Whether sample sizes are appropriate to the grain size of the material being sampled.*	**2018 drilling** • RC samples are collected at 1 m intervals straight from the rig-mounted cyclone and cone splitter. • Diamond core is saw in half with one half sent off for analysis. • Quality control procedures for diamond drilling included the insertion of certified reference materials and blanks at a rate of 1 every 20 samples. **Previous drilling** • Diamond Core was half core sampled. The core was cut longitudinally along its length for sampling and assay. The minimum sample length was 0.2 m and a maximum sample length was 1.5 m • RC drillholes are typically sampled on 1.0 m intervals. Pre-collar samples were typically sampled on 2 m or 4 m intervals. The drill cuttings are riffle or cone split to produce a final sample of approximately 2-3 kg. • For all sample types, the nature, quality and appropriateness of the sample preparation technique is industry standard. • Sample size of 2-3 kg is appropriate for grain size of mineralised material.
Quality of assay data and laboratory tests	• *The nature, quality and appropriateness of the assaying and laboratory procedures used and whether the technique is considered partial or total.* • *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.* • *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.*	**2018 drilling** • All samples are submitted to JTI to be analysed for gold by 50 grams fire assay. Fire assay is a total digest. • Jinning Testing and Inspection conducted extensive QAQC procedures throughout their laboratory processes. In addition, Primary Gold conducted its own internal QAQC process which typically involved certified reference materials, blanks. • **Previous drilling** • Original laboratory records for drilling in 2009-10 were checked against database records and significant intersections. For drilling prior to 2009, original laboratory records were unavailable. • Drillholes prior to 2014 – Gold assays were determined using fire assay with 50 g charge and AAS finish. Laboratory and assay procedures described in the historical documents are appropriate for Mineral Resource estimation. Base metal analysis was either AAS or ICP-OES following perchloric acid digest. • Drillholes prior to 2014 - Descriptions of quality control procedures are based on previous resource reports and historical documents. The absence of original laboratory quality control records has meant that results of quality control analyses could not be checked and verified. • Drillholes prior to 2014 - QAQC consisted of systematic submission of field duplicates, barren flushes, standards and blanks into the sample stream. From the reported information the samples showed acceptable levels of accuracy and precision. • Drillholes prior to 2014 - An umpire laboratory in Darwin or Alice Springs was used for check the assaying. • Review of historical reports noted analysis of duplicates and check assaying information showed good

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		comparisons of results for gold in lower grade ranges (< 2 g/t Au), with larger discrepancies in higher grade ranges. The differences noted as being due to nugget effect in higher grade ranges, consistent with gold mineralisation. • 2014 drill holes – Sample preparation and assaying was conducted by Quantum Analytical Services (Welshpool, WA). Samples were assayed for gold (50 g fire assay), silver, arsenic, copper, lead and zinc (ICP40Q 4 acid digest). • Quality control samples for diamond core sampling were included in the sample stream at a rate of approximately 1 in 5 and were inserted at the discretion of the site geologist to reflect samples collected through the mineralised zone. The ore zone at Toms Gully is highly visible allowing the site geologist to insert a blank sample prior to the ore zone and a grade appropriate CRM immediately following the ore zone. • No umpire analysis was undertaken on 2014 drill hole pulps.
Verification of sampling and assaying	• *The verification of significant intersections by either independent or alternative company personnel.* • *The use of twinned holes.* • *Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols.* • *Discuss any adjustment to assay data.*	• No independent sampling has been undertaken by Cube. • Drillhole assay data has not been checked against the original hardcopy laboratory assay reports. Recent drilling and face sampling assay records in digital format have been checked for significant intervals within the resource area. • No twinning of holes has been identified in the drillhole data. • Underground face data has been compared against the surface diamond drilling in close proximity and shows good correlation with the drillhole logging and the significant intersections. • Drillhole data prior to 2014 - data entry and verification was completed by the various companies which have operated Toms Gully and are described in historical documents relating to the corresponding periods of operation. • All data below detection limit (0.01 ppm Au) have been entered as 0.005 ppm Au. Other corrections dealt with negative numbers and zeros appearing in the gold assay field. These were identified as not sampled or below detection limit and had a value of 0.005 ppm Au in the database. • Samples not received or missing have had the interval left blank in the database.
Location of data points	• *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.* • *Specification of the grid system used.* • *Quality and adequacy of topographic control.*	**2018 drilling** • The coordinate reference system used for the project area is GDA94 / MGA zone 52. Drill collars and drill traces are subsequently converted to the Toms Gully local reference system prior to the interpretation of the resource model. • Drill hole locations were set out using a handheld GPS. After completion of the drillholes all collars were surveyed using a handheld GPS. • Drill rig alignment was achieved using a compass. After completion of the drillhole, all holes were down-hole surveyed using a north-seeking gyro tool.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		Previous drilling • Diamond drillhole collars were routinely surveyed for collar location and RL using a theodolite. Downhole surveys have been taken with an Eastman single shot survey tool every 30 m to 60 m for the RC pre-collar – diamond tail holes. • Underground face locations were digitally mapped from underground survey stations noted from face maps and theodolite survey pickups. • The grid system has been setup on a local mine grid co-ordinates. Grid transformation conversion data from Local Mine Grid to MGA was not located in the data set. • Topography was converted to DXF format from aerial photography with ground survey control. This topography is adequate for resource estimation. • Visual inspection in 3D graphics did not identify any inaccuracies with the spatial position of the drillholes.
Data spacing and distribution	• *Data spacing for reporting of Exploration Results.* • *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.* • *Whether sample compositing has been applied.*	• Drill Data spacing is variable ranging from 20 m x 20 m up to 80 m x 40 m for the majority of RC/DD relating to the Mineral Resource estimate. This spacing is adequate to determine the geological and grade continuity for reporting of Mineral Resources. • Underground face data was spaced at 3 m intervals along development and ore drives in specific areas within the mineralisation. • Sample compositing was over the full length of the drillhole intervals within the mineralised domains.
Orientation of data in relation to geological structure	• *Whether the orientation of sampling achieves unbiased sampling of possible structures and the extent to which this is known, considering the deposit type.* • *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.*	• Both drilling and underground face sampling is orientated normal to the dip and plunge of the mineralisation. • The orebody is known to be a flat sheeted vein structure with most of the drilling designed as vertical holes providing in most instances a representative sample across the mineralisation.
Sample security	• *The measures taken to ensure sample security.*	**2018 drilling** • Samples are collected during the day and securely locked at the core farm overnight. From the core farm samples are picked up by Toll transport and delivered to the laboratory in Perth. **Previous drilling** • Drilling prior to 2014 - Routine sampling, submission and storage procedures are described in historical reports. • 2014 drillhole data – Primary Gold staff were present at the RC drill rig whilst samples were drilled and collected. At the end of shift all samples were transferred to a central collection area for documentation and processing prior to being couriered to Perth.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		• Similarly, diamond core was collected from the rig and transferred to the central processing area for logging, sampling and documentation. Drill core was then stored in the central core shed, located in a gated compound at Toms Gully. • Once assaying was complete the results were returned in digital format to the Company geologist and independent database administrator.
Audits or reviews	• *The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.*	• Several reviews have been undertaken by previous company staff and independent consultants, detailed in historical reports. • Cube conducted a data compilation review and validation prior to resource estimation which involved checks for duplicate surveys, downhole surveys errors, assays and geological intervals beyond drillhole total depths, overlapping intervals, and gaps between intervals.

Section 2 Reporting of Exploration Results

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

<table>
<tr><th>Criteria</th><th>JORC Code explanation</th><th>Commentary</th></tr>
<tr><td>Mineral tenement and land tenure status</td><td>• 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.
• 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.</td><td>• The Mount Bundy Project covers an area of 1,424 km^2, comprising of 18 granted mining and exploration licenses.
• PGO has a 100% interest in all tenements.
• Leases are granted and are properly maintained.
•
<table>
<tr><th>Tenement #</th><th>Area (km^2)</th><th>Grant Date</th><th>Expiry Date</th><th>Type</th><th>Note</th></tr>
<tr><td>EL30809</td><td>508.9</td><td>3/07/2015</td><td>2/07/2021</td><td>Exploration Lease</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>EL30824</td><td>619.38</td><td>3/07/2015</td><td>2/07/2021</td><td>Exploration Lease</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>ML29781</td><td>1.4</td><td>6/02/2013</td><td>5/02/2023</td><td>Mining Lease</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>ML29782</td><td>0.8</td><td>6/02/2013</td><td>5/02/2023</td><td>Mining Lease</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>ML29783</td><td>2.85</td><td>6/02/2013</td><td>5/02/2023</td><td>Mining Lease</td><td>Quest 29 Deposits</td></tr>
<tr><td>ML29785</td><td>0.4</td><td>6/02/2013</td><td>5/02/2023</td><td>Mining Lease</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>ML29786</td><td>1.13</td><td>6/02/2013</td><td>5/02/2023</td><td>Mining Lease</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>ML29812</td><td>1.58</td><td>6/02/2013</td><td>5/02/2023</td><td>Mining Lease</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>ML29814</td><td>0.84</td><td>6/02/2013</td><td>5/02/2023</td><td>Mining Lease</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>MLN1058</td><td>6.82</td><td>3/08/1989</td><td>2/08/2039</td><td>Mining Lease Northern</td><td>Toms Gully Deposit</td></tr>
<tr><td>MLN1083</td><td>7.56</td><td>4/03/1991</td><td>31/12/2045</td><td>Mining Lease Northern</td><td>Rustlers Roost Project – Renewal Approved April 2021</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
<tr><td>Exploration done by other parties</td><td>• Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.</td><td>• The Toms Gully gold deposit was discovered in 1986 by routine geochemical sampling conducted by Carpentaria Exploration Company Pty Ltd (Carpentaria), a subsidiary of Mount Isa Mines Limited. A total of 64 stream sediment samples were collected (representing approx. 1 per sq km) and assayed using a bulk leach technique. These were paired with a second -80 mesh sample analysed for Cu, Pb, Zn, As, and Ag. Two samples returned anomalous Au values of 3.1 ppb and 13.1 ppb Au in proximity to an iron-stained, laminated, grey quartz reef mapped over a strike of approximately 200 m. Rock chipping returned values between 2.35 g/t to 30.0g/t with an average of 9.6 g/t Au.
• Exploration and resource definition drilling at Toms Gully has been completed during the management of Carpentaria, Kakadu, Sirocco and Renison, Crocodile Gold and Primary Gold Limited. The types of drilling include percussion, reverse circulation (RC) and diamond core (DD). Most DD holes were RC pre-collared with diamond core tails. Diamond core size was not recorded in the historical databases but reports and core photos indicate HQ and NQ diameter core size. All holes were drilled from surface and the maximum depth of drilling is 340m.
• Carpentaria Exploration Co. Pty Ltd (CEC) completed a total of 329 RC, percussion, and DD holes between 1986 and the cessation of mining in mid-1991.
• 1993 - Kakadu Resources Ltd. completed a further 13 DD drillholes (2,225.75 m) for geotechnical purposes and to explore the area of Inferred resource.
• 1997 - Sirocco drilled five RC drillholes (601 m) for metallurgical sampling purposes.
• 2003 to 2004 - Renison (RSN) carried out extensive drilling to delineate the Toms Gully deposit down plunge of the existing open pit limits allowing a substantial resource upgrade to be defined. This</td></tr>
</table>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		formed the basis for a feasibility study, which was carried out in 2004 to assess the viability of an underground mining operation at the deposit. • 2009 to 2010 - Crocodile Gold completed 34 infill holes from surface. • 2014 – Primary Gold limited drilled 9 holes for 1,41 6m reverse circulation (RC- pre-collars) and 1,673 m diamond core.
Geology	• *Deposit type, geological setting, and style of mineralisation.*	• The Toms Gully mineralisation consists of a shallow dipping quartz reef hosted in graphitic shale and siltstone of the Wildman Siltstone unit. The deposit lies entirely within an 800 m wide, planar quartz sulphide vein which strikes east-west and dips south at approximately 30° in outcropping exposures, to near horizontal at approximately 1,500 m down dip (280 m vertical depth). • Carbonaceous shales and siltstones of the Wildman Group dominate the lithology in the vicinity of the Toms Gully Gold Mine. Locally the sediment package dips to the south and the quartz reef appears to be conformable with the sediments. The sediments are generally well banded with little structural fabric, however, within 1 to 2m of the reef, a deformation fabric consisting of varying degrees of shearing and brecciation is typically present. • Gold mineralisation is associated with a single planar south-southwest plunging quartz-sulphide vein associated with possible thrust related brecciation and re-crystallisation of an early barren zone of quartz veining. When early quartz is absent from the thrust, gold mineralisation is not well developed, indicating that the secondary brittle fracturing was essential for sulphide and gold deposition. Gold also occurs in the enveloping sheared and brecciated wall rocks so that the mineralised envelope averages around 2m in thickness. The sub-vertically dipping south-southwest striking Crabb and Williams Faults bound the reef to the east and west • Sulphides may comprise 10 to 40% of the mineralisation, with the ratio of pyrite to arsenopyrite being between 2:1 and 5:1. Gold often forms as particles of electrum and is included in arsenopyrite associated with galena, with arsenopyrite on crystal faces or as fracture fillings within the arsenopyrite.
Drill hole Information	• *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:* ○ *easting and northing of the drill hole collar* ○ *elevation or RL (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in metres) of the drill hole collar* ○ *dip and azimuth of the hole* ○ *down hole length and*	• Detailed information in relation to the historic drill holes forming the basis of this Mineral Resource estimate are not included in this report. The information is not material in the context of this report and its exclusion does not detract from the understanding of this report. For the sake of completeness, the following background information is provided in relation to the drill holes. • Easting, Northing and RL of the drill hole collars are in local Mine Grid coordinates. • Dip is the inclination of the hole from the horizontal. For example a vertically down drilled hole from the surface is -90°. Azimuth is reported in magnetic degrees as the direction toward which the hole is drilled. • Down hole length of the hole is the distance from the surface to the end of the hole, as measured along the drill trace. • Interception depth is the distance down the hole as measured along the drill trace. Intersection width is the downhole distance of an intersection as measured along the drill trace.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	interception depth ○ *hole length.* • *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.*	
Data aggregation methods	• *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.* • *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.* • *The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values should be clearly stated.*	• Detailed information in relation to data aggregation methods is not relevant as no exploration results are being reported in this Mineral Resource report. The information is not material in the context of this report and its exclusion does not detract from the understanding of this report.
Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths	• *These relationships are particularly important in the reporting of Exploration Results.* • *If the geometry of the mineralisation with respect to the drill hole angle is known, its nature should be reported.*	• The holes were drilled at right angle to the mineralisation at the Toms Gully deposit. • Toms Gully ore body is a shallow dipping quartz reef. • Holes were drilled either vertically or at the angle providing 90° intersection with the mineralisation, thus the intercept length is an accurate measure of the mineralisation thickness.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	• *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').*	
Diagrams	• *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.*	• Geometry of mineralisation is well known because resources of Toms Gully were estimated including the Indicated category and mine was in production in the past. This information together with orientation of the historical drill holes that were used for resource estimation was used for planning the current brown field exploration.
Balanced reporting	• *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.*	• This report relates to release of December 2021 Mineral Resource estimates for Toms Gully, and not exploration results.
Other substantive exploration data	• *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.*	• All meaningful and material exploration data has been reported.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Further work	• *The nature and scale of planned further work (eg tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling).* • *Diagrams clearly highlighting the areas of possible extensions, including the main geological interpretations and future drilling areas, provided this information is not commercially sensitive.*	• Since taken over by Hanking in 2018, Primary Gold has conducted significant brown field exploration drilling and provided new significant intersections which have been used for updating the mineral resources.

Section 3 Estimation and Reporting of Mineral Resources

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

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Database integrity	• *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.* • *Data validation procedures used.*	• The drilling database for Quest 29 is maintained by Hanking. Data maintenance and verification is undertaken by Hanking staff. The CP accepts that the work was diligently undertaken and does not represent a material risk to the project. • The drilling data in MS Access format and also drill hole updates in csv format was supplied to Cube on 28 October 2021 and was relied upon as the source data for the December 2021 Mineral Resource estimate (MRE). • Cube compiled and validated the data prior to importing into a standard resource database in MS Access format. All original data was checked against the MRE database to ensure no transfer or translation errors occurred. • For a 2014 MRE completed by Cube, data compilation was sourced from electronic data rooms from previous companies that have operated at Quest 29. The drilling data records were noted as having several database versions containing varying degrees of completeness and no master database to reliably use as a basis for checking drilling records from the various sources. • In 2014 Cube undertook a complete data review by sourcing the original annual drilling reports in order to verify historical drilling locations, quality, and results for the datasets. Several missing datasets were located and added to a master database which formed the basis of the current Quest 29 database. • For the 2021 MRE, percussion or RAB holes and open pit grade control (GC) holes were not included in the grade interpolation but were used as part of the geological and mineralisation trend analyses and interpretation. Face samples and mapping were not used in the estimation but were also used to guide the interpretation of the mineralisation reef contacts.

	• *Data validation procedures used*	• Cube carried out a database validation review of the supplied drilling data, supplied digital terrain models (DTM) and historical pit surveys prior to undertaking the resource estimation update.
		• Validation checks completed included the following work:
		  • Maximum hole depths check between sample/logging tables and the collar records
		  • Checking for sample overlaps
		  • Reporting missing assay intervals
		  • 3D visual validation in Leapfrog Geo v2021.1 and Surpac v2021 of co-ordinates of collar drill holes to topography and open pit workings GC drilling locations.
		  • 3D visual validation of downhole survey data to identify if any inconsistencies of drill hole traces.
		• A validated assay field was included into the Assay table (au_use) to convert any intercepts that have negative values or blanks in the primary Au field (au1_ppm).
		• No significant issues were found with the data, although there are minor discrepancies of 1 m to 3 m between the 2021 drilling hole collar surveys and the current topographic surface DTM.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		• Any validation issues were reported back to Hanking for review and amended in the MRE database where relevant
Site visits	• *Comment on any site visits undertaken by the Competent Person and the outcome of those visits.*	• Brian Fitzpatrick (Principal Geologist at Cube Consulting) who is the Competent Person (CP) for the December 2021 MRE did not undertake a site visit during the most recent drilling periods (2021) but has previously visited the deposit area for the 2014 MRE. • The CP previously completed a site visit to the Quest 29 open pit workings and the Toms Gully Mine core storage area in 2014 for the previous owners, Primary Gold (PGO). During the 2014 site visit the Quest 29 open pit workings were inspected and local outcrop reconnaissance mapping was undertaken. Limited access was available to the open pit workings due to flooding of the pit, although pit wall mapping in several locations was able to be undertaken.
	• *If no site visits have been undertaken indicate why this is the case*	• Not applicable.
Geological interpretation	• *Confidence in (or conversely, the uncertainty of) the geological interpretation of the mineral deposit.*	• The confidence in the interpretation is high as a result of a previous open pit and underground mining activities at Toms Gully that mined a single continuous main quartz reef. • The predominant drilling data is DD core so there is detailed core logging, core photos and in addition to open pit and underground mapping information from mining activities prior to 2014. For the 2021 MRE new infill DD core drilling was completed by Hanking in 2018 and mostly confirmed the previous interpretation of the mineralised main reef and sub-reef.
	• *Nature of the data used and of any assumptions made.*	• The current geological interpretation is based on the DD core logged quartz reef/shear zone within the host sequence. • Geological and structural information gathered from wall mapping of the open pits assisted in interpretation and projections along strike and below the pits based on fact geology. • Significant veining and +/- sulphide percentage was also used in the criteria to identify mineralisation and where little or no geological data was logged; a 1.0 g/t Au lower cut-off was used.
	• *The effect, if any, of alternative interpretations on Mineral Resource estimation.*	• Previous interpretations have separated vein structures and domains into thin mineralised envelopes or interpreted variable thickness waste or dilution haloes around the in-situ mineralisation. Grade estimations from these models had not reconciled well with actual underground mining in specific areas of the operation. • The 2014 and updated 2021 interpretation by Cube have modelled the mineralisation predominantly to the in-situ main reef structure and locally combined the main reef and sub-reef where there is significant mineralisation (>1.0g/t Au) of less than 2m true thicknesses.
	• *The use of geology in guiding and controlling Mineral Resource estimation.*	• Both open pit mining and underground development and wall mapping of the mineralisation confirm drill hole logging of a shallow dipping main quartz reef/sub-reef gold mineralisation zone. • Geological and mineralisation interpretations have been followed up with 3D wireframe models in 3D software

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		(Surpac) to act as hard boundaries in controlling the mineralisation envelope.
	• *The factors affecting continuity both of grade and geology.*	• Two major NNE trending faults are interpreted to cut-off or offset the mineralisation and limit the east-west extent of the mineralisation being estimated. • For the 2021 interpretations the main quartz reef structure has been extended west of the interpreted Williams Fault. The fault was previously mapped from surface and was used to bound the western limit of the main reef mineralisation for the 2014 model. The evidence for the projection of the Williams Fault on the limits or potential offset of the mineralisation continuity remains unclear and will need further analysis for future model work as more data becomes available.
Dimensions	• *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.*	• The 2021 MRE contains one major shallow dipping to flat mineralised structure (main quartz reef. • The mineralised quartz reef has a thickness of 0.5 m – 5 m (average ~2 m) and a down dip extent to the SSW of 1.65 km. The across strike width from grid west to east varies from 390 m (upper zone), 310 m (central zone, to 160 m (deeps zone). • Mineralisation pre-surface mining, extended from surface to approximately 320m vertical depth below surface. • Mineralisation is open at depth. • The quartz reef was extrapolated out to the contact with major fault to the (Crabb Fault). The northern end of the quartz reef was terminated at the base of the pit. • The 2021 interpretation of the quartz reef has been projected in the upper and central area of the main reef past the interpreted William Fault, following evidence of the main reef continuity from recent and previous drilling.

Estimation and modelling techniques	• *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.*	• A single block model was constructed to enable efficient gold estimation of the main reef gold mineralisation to the current known extents.
		• The estimation methodology used was Ordinary Kriging. Surpac version 2021.1 was used for estimation.
		• Due to the narrow width of the mineralisation, interval composites were generated for the mineralisation domain, using an intercept table in the database to control compositing.
		• The interval composites were then weighted by their respective vertical lengths to result in an '*accumulation variable*'.
		• The accumulation variable for gold was then used for variogram analysis and 2D interpolation of gold grades. The estimated 2D block values were then exported back into 3D space.
		• Variogram ranges and search distances were defined in the horizontal plane, i.e. Omni-directional spherical structure.
		• A search radius of 200 m was used with a minimum and maximum number of samples of 4 and 28 respectively.
		Software Used:
		  • Surpac v2021.1 – Drillhole validation, weathering surface DTMs, final mineralisation interpretation and wireframe modelling and minor zones OK estimation
		  • Supervisor v8.13 – geostatistics, variography, KNA analysis

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	• *The availability of check estimates, previous estimates and/or mine production records and whether the Mineral Resource estimate takes appropriate account of such data*	• This estimate used ID2 estimation as a check estimate against the OK estimation, with no significant variations in global estimate results for the single mineralisation domain representing the main quartz reef. • The 2021 model used the same parameters as the previous estimate carried out by Cube in 2014 as there were only a small amount of new data (6 DD holes) which did not impact materially on the estimation parameters for the December 2021 MRE update. • Mine production data from the open pit mine production was reviewed but is considered not wholly representative of the underground Mineral Resource. Underground mining by Renison from 2005 up to March 2007, consisted of room and pillar mining methods. Total production was 63,300t grading 3.7 g/t Au (Gillman, 2009). Site reports reviewed from this period indicated mining methods resulted in significant dilution due to poor mining methods. The UG mining data in 2 upper areas was reviewed, Underground face data information, i.e. face assays and face/wall mapping into the 3D model of the main reef mineralisation.
	• *The assumptions made regarding recovery of by-products*	• No by-product recoveries were considered.
	• *Estimation of deleterious elements or other non-grade variables of economic significance (eg sulphur for acid mine drainage characterisation).*	• Estimations of any deleterious elements were not completed for the Mineral Resource. Arsenic is known to be associated with gold mineralisation but was not estimated for this model.
	• *In the case of block model interpolation, the block size in relation to the average sample spacing and the search employed*	• Block size used is 20mN, 20m E and 1.0m RL and sub-blocked to 2.5mN x 2.5mE x 0.125mRL. The bulk of the drilling data was on 20m x 20m and 40m x 20m spaced sections.
	• *Any assumptions behind modelling of selective mining units*	• The block model definition parameters included a primary block size and sub-blocking deemed appropriate for the mineralisation and to provide adequate volume definition where there are narrow or undulating zones modelled within the single main reef mineralisation. These dimensions are deemed suitable for block estimation and modelling the selectivity for an underground room and pillar mining method.
	• *Any assumptions about correlation between variables*	• There is a moderate correlation between arsenic and gold (correlation co-efficient of 0.71) and between silver and lead. There is no correlation between any of the other elements analysed (Cu, Zn).
	• *Description of how the geological interpretation was used to control the resource estimates*	• The mineralisation domain interpretation acted as a hard boundary to control the estimation. Overall, the mineralisation was constrained by one wireframe constructed using a nominal 1.0 g x m accumulation cut-off, along with logging evidence of main reef/ sub-reef mineralisation structure.
	• *Discussion of basis for using or not using grade cutting or capping.*	• To limit the effects of extreme grades a top cut of 30 g/t Au was applied to the composite gold variable and a top cut of 45 g x m was applied to the accumulation variable.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	• *The process of validation, the checking process used, the comparison of model data to drill hole data, and use of reconciliation data if available,*	• Block model validation was undertaken using the comparison of block model estimate to drill hole data composites. Validation also comprised visual checking in 3D, global statistical comparisons of input and block grades, and local grade (by northing) relationship plots.
Moisture	• *Whether the tonnages are estimated on a dry basis or with natural moisture, and the method of determination of the moisture content.*	• Moisture was not considered in the density assignment. The mineralisation modelled in this resource estimate occurs entirely within the fresh or sulphide zone and is estimated as dry tonnes.
Cut-off parameters	• *The basis of the adopted cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied.*	• Cut-off grade for reporting is 3.0g/t Au, in line with recommendations from Hanking based on preliminary economic considerations, used for preliminary open pit optimisation study.
Mining factors or assumptions	• *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.*	• No mining factors were considered during the interpretation and 3D modelling of the mineralisation however mining factors have been accounted for in the reporting cut-off criteria. • Minimum mining widths were not considered during the interpretation and 3D modelling of the mineralisation. A minimum width of 2 m was used in interpretation of the mineralisation in order to preserve 3D wireframe integrity and continuity. • Mining methods for a sheeted, narrow-vein, are expected to be room & pillar underground mining utilizing split-face firing where appropriate and a 1.5 m minimum ore width. This method was previously used for UG mining at Toms Gully.
Metallurgical factors or assumptions	• *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*	• No metallurgical factors were considered during the interpretation and 3D modelling of the mineralisation however metallurgical factors have been accounted for in the reporting cut-off criteria. • The relationship between gold and arsenic has been examined in metallurgical studies for the deposit. Based on historical mill production, arsenic was noted as the cause of the refractory nature of some of the Toms Gully mineralisation. The sulphides at Toms Gully are commonly pyrite and arsenopyrite. • At Tom's Gully the metallurgical knowledge is more detailed as the mine has previously treated about 350,000 tonnes of ore using conventional carbon in pulp (CIP) technology (CRG, 2009). • A review of the historical testwork data has demonstrated the ability to achieve an overall metallurgical recovery of ~85 % on the Toms Gully ore.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	assumptions made.	
Environmental factors or assumptions	• *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.*	• No assumptions were made regarding environmental restrictions for the December 2021 MRE. • The project areas have previously been the subject of mining and processing, hence environmental issues are well understood. • However, future key considerations include encapsulation of sulphidic waste rock, integrity of tails facility to ensure against leakages, both of which have engineering solutions.
Bulk density	• *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.*	• Bulk densities (BD) were determined and are summarised as follows: • 222 dry BD sample measurements (using the immersion method) were undertaken from 64 drill holes (27% of available diamond holes). Intervals where the complete assay interval could not be sampled or measured were excluded. •
	• *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*	• There were no considerations made for BD based on weathering profiles as the mineralised reef domain interpreted for this resource estimate lies entirely within the primary or fresh sulphide zone. • BD determination previously utilised the water displacement method on wax encapsulated drill core to calculate the BD. Wax coating allowed for any vugs or natural cavities contained within quartz veins. • BD measurements used the following formula: BD = WAD / WAS-WWS Where WAD = weight of dry sample in air; WAS = weight of wet sample in air; WWS = weight of wet sample immersed in water.
	• *Discuss assumptions for bulk density estimates used in the evaluation process of the different materials*	• For intervals without a density determination a value has been calculated based on a formula using a density of 2.65t/m3 for country rock adjusted for the percentage of pyrite and arsenopyrite (as visually estimated in the drill core logs) using densities of 5.02g/cm^3 for pyrite, 6.2

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		g/cm³ for arsenopyrite. If no logging was present, then the BD calculation was based purely upon assayed arsenic value. • Density was estimated into the model using the same parameters as the gold interpolation. A density value of 3.04 g/cm³ was assigned where gold was interpolated.
Classification	• *The basis for the classification of the Mineral Resources into varying confidence categories.*	• Resource blocks have been classified as Indicated or Inferred on the basis on a range of criteria. • Indicated resources are defined generally on 40m x 40m or better spaced drilling which corresponds with a kriging slope of regression greater than 0.80. • Inferred resources are defined by 80m x 80m spaced drilling and confidence that the continuity of geology and mineralisation can be extended to the east and west fault boundaries. .
	• *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).*	• The resource classification for Toms Gully is mostly based on the quality of recent drilling (modern RC precollar and DD tail), systematic drill spacing, quality of estimation parameters and composites data informing the block grade estimation. • Confidence is also well established in light of the information provided by previous open pit and UG mining at Toms Gully.
	• *Whether the result appropriately reflects the Competent Person's view of the deposit.*	• Based on the historical production information and recent infill and step out drilling, the December 2021 MRE appropriately reflects the Competent Person's view of the deposit.
Audits or reviews	• *The results of any audits or reviews of Mineral Resource estimates.*	• Several reviews have been undertaken on previous Mineral Resource estimations, including an external review completed by a third party consultant, and an internal peer review of the 2D estimation methodology (in January 2014). • For the 2021 update internal peer review was undertaken by Cube.
Discussion of relative accuracy/ confidence	• *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.*	• Due to wide spaced drilling in areas, local variations can be expected within the narrow undulating main quartz reef, footwall sub-reef and mylonitic zones above and below the main reef structure. The orientation of the quartz reef may be affected by regular structural offsets and bifurcations. • Given the reef/vein system is known to host the gold, the use of an isotropic search has been adequate in providing an unbiased representation of the mineralisation. • The use of OK has assisted in reducing the risk associated with the relatively high nugget observed in the gold distribution. The additional benefit of OK is it inherently assists in declustering the data during the estimate.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	• *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.*	• The December 2021 MRE constitutes a global resource estimate. All Indicated Mineral Resources would be available for economic evaluation. • The December 2021 MRE estimate has not been constrained by other modifying factors including mining, metallurgical factors and environmental factors
	• *These statements of relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate should be compared with production data, where available*	• Historic production data from the underground mining confirms the presence of gold mineralisation as intersected by the original discovery drilling. Subsequent mining and close spaced sampling has shown the local variability of the gold mineralisation in between drill holes. The recent drilling by Hanking in 2020 has also intersected the main reef mineralisation both with infill and down dip targets. Overall, this implies a medium to high level of confidence in the estimate. **Previous Production:** • Toms Gully open pit production records were recorded from previous technical reports to be 329,000 t at 9.35 g/t Au for 9,900 oz Au (Tippen, 1991), • The total production, including the Crab Fault zone and Main reef outcrop (27,700 t at 7.8 g/t Au – Goulevitch, 1994) was reported to be 357 kt at 9.2 g/t Au for 10,600 oz Au (Gillman, 2009). • Underground mining by Renison from 2005 up to March 2007, consisted of room and pillar mining methods. Total production was 63,300 t grading 3.7 g/t Au (Gillman, 2009).