GENESIS MINERALS LIMITED

14th December 2023

Reporting on select Kin Mining gold projects

Genesis Minerals Limited (Genesis) (ASX: GMD) refers to the ASX announcement "Genesis to acquire the Bruno-Lewis and Raeside gold projects" dated 14th December 2023.

For completeness, Genesis announces further information in relation to the Mineral Resource relative to Kin Mining's Cardinia West (Bruno-Lewis and Kyte) and Raeside assets.

The Total Mineral Resource estimates for the Cardinia West and Raeside are shown on the following pages.

This announcement is approved for release by Raleigh Finlayson, Managing Director of Genesis.

For further information, visit: http://www.genesisminerals.com.au or please contact:

Geoff James
Company Secretary
Genesis Minerals Limited
T: +61 8 9323 9050

GENESIS MINERALS LIMITED

14th December 2023

Region	Project	Measured			Indicated			Inferred			Total		
		Tonnes ('000)	Grade (g/t)	Ounces ('000)	Tonnes ('000)	Grade (g/t)	Ounces ('000)	Tonnes ('000)	Grade (g/t)	Ounces ('000)	Tonnes ('000)	Grade (g/t)	Ounces ('000)
Cardinia West	Bruno-Lewis	769	1.2	31	7,699	1.0	257	3,594	0.9	100	12,063	1.0	388
	Kyte				340	1.5	17	114	0.9	3	453	1.4	20
	Subtotal	**769**	**1.2**	**31**	**8,039**	**1.1**	**274**	**3,708**	**0.9**	**103**	**12,516**	**1.0**	**408**
Raeside	Michealangelo				1,163	2.0	74	449	2.1	31	1,612	2.1	105
	Leonardo				404	2.4	31	212	1.9	13	615	2.2	44
	Forgotten Four				111	2.1	7	148	2.1	10	259	2.1	17
	Krang				383	1.6	20	57	1.8	3	440	1.7	23
	Raeside Underground				100	2.6	5	100	2.5	7	200	2.5	13
	Subtotal				**2,161**	**2.0**	**137**	**966**	**2.1**	**64**	**3,126**	**2.0**	**202**
	Total	**769**	**1.2**	**31**	**10,200**	**1.3**	**411**	**4,674**	**1.1**	**167**	**15,642**	**1.2**	**610**

Notes:

1. Reported at 30 June 2023 refer ASX:KIN 'Cardinia Project Gold Mineral Resource Passes 1.5 Moz' July 3, 2023
2. All resources excepting Raeside Underground are reported constrained by a A$2,600/oz pit optimisation shell at 0.4g/t cut-off.
3. Raeside Underground has been reported using a 2.0 g/t cut-off outside the A$2,600 optimisation shells.

RESOURCES

Bruno-Lewis and Kyte

Geology and Geological Interpretation

Deposit stratigraphy constitutes a lower felsic volcanic unit which is overlain by a much thinner unit of felsic volcaniclastics interbedded with sediments (predominantly shales and siltstones). This unit is in turn overlain by the mafic sequence comprising pillow basalts with occasional dolerite units. At the approximate location of the Lewis trial pit, the stratigraphy is offset by faulting, exhibiting sinistral strike slip movement. This offsets the northern block to the SW by approximately 350m. The stratigraphy is intruded by several NE dipping felsic porphyry units as well as later Proterozoic dolerite dykes. Mineralisation consists of the following types:

Potassic Lodes - Moderately NE-dipping, NW-striking primary mineralisation lodes, associated with and sub-parallel to the NE-dipping porphyry intrusions. Characterised by potassic alteration, quartz stockwork veining and disseminated pyrite. 6 different trends (Bruno, Liston, Cooper, Lewis, Cassius and Frazier) have so far been identified, with numerous lodes belonging to each.

Contact Lodes - Moderate to steeply W-dipping, stratigraphy-parallel primary mineralisation lodes. Located on or near the stratigraphic contacts, or within the central interbedded volcaniclastic and sediment unit. Typically, pyrite-rich with limited strike extent. They have been divided into 'Contact North' and 'Contact South', separated by the fault offset at the approximate location of the Lewis trial pit. Due to the deeper weathering in the north, and a lack of drilling into fresh rock, the Contact North lodes are much more poorly defined than the contact south lodes.

Supergene - Flat lying situated close to surface and occur in association with the primary lodes of both the potassic and contact types.

Drilling Techniques

Bruno-Lewis and Kyte mineralisation has primarily been defined by Diamond and Reverse Circulation (RC) drilling. Diamond drilling has been completed at NQ2 (47mm) and HQ3 (64mm) core sizes and oriented to facilitate the acquisition of structural data. RC drilling has typically been completed utilising 140mm downhole face-sampling hammer bits. Downhole survey has been completed using electronic multi-shot survey tools and intermittent gyroscopic surveys. Holes were surveyed 10-15m from surface and then every 30m to bottom of hole.

Sampling and sub-sampling techniques

Diamond core samples, either HQ3 or NQ2 in size diameter, were either cut in half longitudinally or a third longitudinally. Core sample intervals varied from 0.3 to 1.3m in length but were predominantly aligned to 1m intervals or with sample boundaries which respected geological contacts. RC drilling samples were collected in 1m downhole intervals by passing through a cyclone, a collection box and then dropping through a cone splitter. All RC sub-samples were collected over one metre downhole intervals and averaged 3-4kg.

Sample Analysis Method

Sample preparation included oven drying (105°C), crushing (<6mm), pulverising (P90% passing 75µm) and split to obtain a 50-gram catchweight. Analysis for gold only was carried out by Fire Assay fusion technique with AAS finish. Blanks and CRM standards were inserted in each sample batch at a ratio of 1:25. Field duplicates were typically collected at a ratio of 1:25 samples. Laboratory pulp grind and crush checks were typically requested at a ratio of 1:50 or less. Best practice QAQC methods for all drilling operations and the treatment and analysis of samples have been implemented and adhered to.

Estimation Methodology

Gold grades have been estimated using Ordinary Kriging (OK) from a resource dataset of RC and Diamond drilling only. Samples have been flagged by estimation domain wireframes, assigned a unique domain identifier, and composited to 1m. Composites have been analysed for grade outliers and topcut as appropriate to minimise the Coefficient of Variation (CV). Variograms for well supported domains were created to analyses nugget values and the spatial continuity of the data and act as inputs to the OK estimations. All estimation parameters have been derived from Kriging Neighbourhood Analysis (KNA). Parent block sizes have been set at 10x10x5m for Bruno-Lewis and 7.5x7.5x2.5m for Kyte with a nested search passes employed informed by variogram ranges. The models have been depleted for historical mining where appropriate and bulk density has been assigned by weathering profile. Estimated grades have been validated both visually and statistically to ensure conformance to input sample data.

Cut-off Grades

The in-situ resources have been reported above a 0.40 g/t Au cut-off within an A$2,600 optimisation pit shell based on Measured, Indicated and Inferred Mineral resources.

Resource Classification

Classification is based on a combination of drill spacing, geological confidence and estimation quality. For Bruno-Lewis the resource has been classified as Inferred, Indicated or Measured based on the following:

Measured - Blocks within interpreted mineralisation/estimation domains, containing more than 3 drill holes and more than 5 composite samples, at a drill spacing of 10m x 10m or tighter.

Indicated - Blocks within interpreted mineralisation/estimation domains, containing more than 3 drill holes and more than 5 composite samples, at a drill spacing of 20m x 20m or tighter.

Inferred - Blocks within interpreted mineralisation/estimation domains at a drill spacing wider than 20m x 20m.

For Kyte the resource has been classified as Inferred and Indicated based on the following:

Indicated - 15m x 15m drill spacing with > 50% Kriging Efficiency and > 75% Slope of regression.

Inferred - <40m x40m drill spacing with Positive kriging efficiency and > 50% Slope of regression.

Mining Assumptions

The open pit estimate has been undertaken on the assumption of open pit mining methods; the selection of SMU size was based on the scale of mining equipment likely to be used.

Metallurgical Assumptions

Metallurgical assumptions were based on PFS level test work completed on Lewis and Kyte samples. Processing recoveries of 95% have been assumed for all material types.

Other Modifying Factors

No modifying factors are applied to the Mineral Resource.

Raeside

Geology and Geological Interpretation

Raeside is composed of four spatially disparate deposits; Michealangelo, Leonardo, Krang and Forgotten Four.

Mineralisation at Michelangelo is hosted by a uniform metamorphosed medium grained dolerite. The deposit occurs on or above the basal sheared contact of the quartz dolerite. Four or five extensive quartz vein structures dip at 30°-40° to the northeast, extending over a strike length of 575m with a total stratigraphic thickness of approximately 90m. The position of the footwall has been roughly delineated however no other convincing geological boundaries are defined.

Mineralisation at Leonardo occurs mainly in a partly carbonaceous-graphitic shale (coded as generic metasediment) close to/adjacent to but above the quartz mafic contact. The mineralisation dips 35°-50° to the east however this ore body exhibits significant differences to the other deposits. Initially the mineralisation at Leonardo is hosted in sedimentary rocks above the quartz diorite. Secondly the mineralisation is associated with a zone of strong bleaching, sericitisation and silicification, often up to +20m wide. The strike length of the steeply plunging north main shoot is approximately 60m. Thirdly the gold mineralisation occurs within a relatively linear shear zone that is traceable over 2km of strike; the shear contains significant mineralisation in at least three other locations along strike.

Mineralised zones at Forgotten Four are mainly hosted by mafics however the uppermost (strongest) zone of mineralisation appears to be positioned just below the lower contact of overlying sediments, and one of the lower zones appear to coincide with a sporadically developed sediment wedge in the mafic rocks. The sediments are also mineralised. The strongest zone of mineralisation is just below the lower contact with the overlying carbonaceous shale and sediments. The bulk of the mineralisation is hosted by dolerite along the upper contact with the interbedded shale and the quartz diorite.

Mineralisation at Krang appears to be broadly related to the metasediments however geological boundaries are difficult to discern. Along the eastern side of the deposit mineralisation appears to be broadly associated with the contact zones between mafic and metasedimentary units. Some of the mineralisation is associated with massive quartz-pyrite-arsenopyrite lodes which display high but erratic grade. Gold mineralisation occurs internal to the quartz dolerite unit which displays varying dips ranging from 30° to 60° to the northeast. Mineralisation occurs in at least four separate pods over a continuous strike length of about 700m.

Drilling Techniques

Raeside mineralisation has primarily been defined by Diamond and Reverse Circulation (RC) drilling. Diamond drilling has been completed at NQ2 (47mm) and HQ3 (64mm) core sizes and oriented to facilitate the acquisition of structural data. RC drilling has typically been completed utilising 140mm downhole face-sampling hammer bits. Downhole survey has been completed using electronic multi-shot survey tools and intermittent gyroscopic surveys. Holes were surveyed 10-15m from surface and then every 30m to bottom of hole.

Sampling and sub-sampling techniques

Diamond core samples, either HQ3 or NQ2 in size diameter, were either cut in half longitudinally or a third longitudinally. Core sample intervals varied from 0.3 to 1.3m in length but were predominantly aligned to 1m intervals or with sample boundaries which respected geological contacts. RC drilling samples were collected in 1m downhole intervals by passing through a cyclone, a collection box and then dropping through a cone splitter. All RC sub-samples were collected over one metre downhole intervals and averaged 3-4kg.

Sample Analysis Method

Sample preparation included oven drying (105°C), crushing (<6mm), pulverising (P90% passing 75µm) and split to obtain a 50-gram catchweight. Analysis for gold only was carried out by Fire Assay fusion technique with AAS finish. Blanks and CRM standards were inserted in each sample batch at a ratio of 1:25. Field duplicates were typically collected at a ratio of 1:25 samples. Laboratory pulp grind and crush checks were typically requested at a ratio of 1:50 or less. Best practice QAQC methods for all drilling operations and the treatment and analysis of samples have been implemented and adhered to.

Estimation Methodology

Gold grades have been estimated using Ordinary Kriging (OK) from a resource dataset of RC and Diamond drilling only. Samples have been flagged by estimation domain wireframes, assigned a unique domain identifier, and composited to 1m. Composites have been analysed for grade outliers and topcut as appropriate to minimise the Coefficient of Variation (CV). Variograms for well supported domains were created to analyses nugget values and the spatial continuity of the data and act as inputs to the OK estimations. All estimation parameters have been derived from Kriging Neighbourhood Analysis (KNA). Parent block sizes have been set at 5x5x5m with a nested search pass employed informed by variogram ranges. The model has been depleted for historical mining and bulk density has been assigned by weathering profile. Estimated grades have been validated both visually and statistically to ensure conformance to input sample data.

Cut-off Grades

The in-situ resources have been reported above a 0.40 g/t Au cut-off within an A$2,600 optimisation pit shell based on Indicated and Inferred Mineral resources.

Resource Classification

Classification is based on a combination of drills pacing, geological confidence and estimation quality. The classification is applied to the model on a lode-by-lode basis.

Indicated - 20m x 20m x 20m drill spacing with > 15% Kriging Efficiency.

Inferred - up to 40m x40m x 40m drill spacing with Positive Kriging Efficiency.

Mining Assumptions

The open pit estimate has been undertaken on the assumption of open pit mining methods; the selection of SMU size was based on the scale of mining equipment likely to be used.

Metallurgical Assumptions

Metallurgical assumptions were based on PFS level test work completed on Michealangelo and Leonardo samples. Processing recoveries of 95% have been assumed for all material types. Graphitic shale was encountered in Forgotten Four during mining and has been noted in logging at Leonardo.

Other Modifying Factors

No modifying factors are applied to the Mineral Resource.

Competent Persons Statement

The information contained in this report relating to Resource Estimation results for the Bruno-Lewis deposit relates to information compiled by Cube consulting (Mr Mike Millad). Mr Millad is a member of the Australian Institute of Geoscientists and a full time employee of Cube Consulting. Mr Millad has sufficient experience of relevance to the styles of mineralisation and the types of deposit under consideration, and to the activities undertaken to qualify as a Competent Person as defined in the 2012 edition of the JORC "Australasian Code for Reporting of Exploration Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves". Mike Millad consents to the inclusion in the statement of the matters based on his information in the form and context in which it appears.

The information contained in this report relating to Resource Estimation results for deposits including Kyte, Michaelangelo, Leonardo, Forgotten Four and Krang relates to information compiled by Mr Jamie Logan. Mr Logan is employed by Palaris Australia Pty Ltd consultants and is a member of the Australian Institute of Geoscientists. Mr Logan has sufficient experience of relevance to the styles of mineralisation and the types of deposit under consideration, and to the activities undertaken to qualify as a Competent Person as defined in the 2012 edition of the JORC "Australasian Code for Reporting of Exploration Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves". Jamie Logan consents to the inclusion in the statement of the matters based on his information in the form and context in which it appears.

GENESIS MINERALS LIMITED

14th December 2023

Appendix 1 - JORC TABLE 1s

JORC Table 1 Checklist of Assessment and Reporting Criteria
Section 1 Sampling Techniques and Data – Bruno-Lewis, Kyte and Raeside

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
Sampling Techniques	• *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.* • *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 (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.*	Diamond Historic (pre-2014) diamond core (DD) sampling utilised half core or quarter core sample intervals; typically varying from 0.3m to 1.4m in length. 1m sample intervals were favoured and sample boundaries principally coincided with geological contacts. Recent (2014-2018) diamond core (DD) samples, either HQ3 or NQ2 in size diameter, were either cut in half longitudinally or further cut into quarters, using a powered diamond core drop saw centred over a cradle holding core in place. Core sample intervals varied from 0.2 to 1.25m in length but were predominantly aligned to 1m intervals or with sample boundaries which respected geological contacts. 2019 diamond core samples, either HQ3 or NQ2 in size diameter, were either cut in half longitudinally or a third longitudinally, using an automated Corewise core saw Core was placed in boats, holding core in place. Core sample intervals varied from 0.3 to 1.3m in length but were predominantly aligned to 1m intervals or with sample boundaries which respected geological contacts. RC Historic reverse circulation (RC) drill samples were collected over 1m downhole intervals beneath a cyclone and typically riffle split to obtain a sub-sample (typically 3-4kg). 1m sub-samples were typically collected in pre-numbered calico bags and 1m sample rejects were commonly stored at the drill site. 3m or 4m composited interval samples were often collected by using a scoop (dry samples) or spear (wet samples). If composite samples re turned anomalous results once assayed, the single metre sub-samples of the anomalous composite intervals were retrieved and submitted for individual gold analysis. Recent reverse circulation (RC) drill samples were collected by passing through a cyclone, a sample collection box, and riffle or cone splitter. All RC sub-samples were collected over one metre downhole intervals and averaged 3-4kg. 2019-20 RC drilling samples were collected in 1m downhole intervals by passing through a cyclone, a collection box and then dropping through a cone splitter. All RC sub-samples were collected over one metre downhole intervals and averaged 3-4kg. AC/RAB Historic air core (AC) and rotary air blast (RAB) were typically collected at 1 metre intervals and placed on the ground with 3-4kg sub-samples collected using a scoop or spear. Three metre or four metre composited interval samples were often collected by using a scoop (dry samples) or spear (wet samples). If composite samples returned anomalous results once assayed, the single metre sub-samples of the anomalous composite intervals were retrieved and submitted for individual gold analysis. Assay Methodology Historic sample analysis typically included several commercial laboratories with preparation as per the following method, oven drying (90-110°C), crushing (<-2mm to <-6mm), pulverizing (<-75µm to <-105µm), and riffle split to obtain a 30, 40, or 50gram catchweight for gold analysis. Fire Assay fusion, with AAS finish was the common method of analysis however, on occasion, initial assaying may have been carried out via Aqua Regia digest and AAS/ICP finish. Anomalous samples were subsequently re-assayed by Fire Assay fusion and AAS/ICP finish. Recent sample analysis typically included oven drying (105-110°C), crushing (<-6mm & <-2mm), pulverising (P90% <-75µm) and sample splitting to a representative 50gram catchweight sample for gold only analysis using Fire Assay fusion with AAS finish.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
		Multi element analysis was also conducted on approximately 10% of samples, predominantly through ore zones. This was conducted via a 4-acid digest with ICP-MS/OES determination for a 48 element suite. Rock Chips All rock chip samples are taken using a pick. The samples are taken from outcrop where possible. Samples are also taken from in situ float material or waste rock around historic workings, where outcrop is not present. Care is taken to ensure all samples are representative of the medium being sampled. For example, if a 1m sediment unit is being sampled, a channel sample will be taken across the entire unit. All recent drilling, sample collection and sample handling procedures were conducted and/or supervised by KIN geology personnel to high level industry standards. QA/QC procedures were implemented during each drilling program to industry standards.
Drilling Techniques	• *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).*	Drilling carried out since 1986 and up to the most recent drill programs completed by KIN Mining was obtained from a combination of reverse circulation (RC), diamond core (DD), air core (AC), and rotary air blast (RAB) drilling. Data prior to 1986 is limited due to lack of exploration. Diamond Historic DD was carried out using industry standard 'Q' wireline techniques, with the core retrieved from the inner tubes and placed in core trays. Core sizes include NQ/NQ3 (Ø 45-48mm) and HQ/HQ3 (Ø 61-64mm). At the end of each core run, the driller placed core blocks in the tray, marked with hole number and depth. Core recovery was usually measured for each core run and recorded onto the geologist's drill logs. 2017 – 2018 DD was carried out by contractor Orbit Drilling Pty Ltd ("Orbit Drilling") with a Mitsubishi truck-mounted Hydco 1200H 8x4 drill rig, using industry standard 'Q' wireline techniques. 2019-20 DD was carried out by Topdrill Pty Ltd. With a Sandvick DE840 mounted on a Mercedes Benz 4144 Actros 8x8 Carrier. The rig is fitted with Sandvik DA555 hands free diamond drilling rod handler and Austex hands free hydraulic breakout. Drill core is retrieved from the inner tubes and placed in plastic core trays and each core run depth recorded onto core marker blocks and placed at the end of each run in the tray. Core sizes include NQ2 (Ø 47mm) and HQ3 (Ø 64mm). Recent DD core recovery and orientation was obtained for each core run where possible, using electronic core orientation tools (e.g. Reflex EZ-ACT) and the 'bottom of core' marked accordingly. 2017 -18 drilling was measured at regular downhole intervals, typically at 10-15m from surface and then every 30m to bottom of hole, using electronic multi-shot downhole survey tools (i.e. Reflex EZ-TRAC or Camteq Proshot). Independent programs of downhole deviation surveying were also carried out to validate previous surveys. These programs utilised either electronic continuous logging survey tool (AusLog A698 deviation tool) or gyroscopic survey equipment. 2019-20 DD was surveyed at regular downhole intervals (every 30m with an additional end-of-hole survey) using electronic gyroscopic survey equipment. RC Historic RC drilling used conventional reverse circulation drilling techniques, utilising a cross-over sub, or face-sampling hammers with bit shrouds. Drill bit sizes typically ranged between 110-140mm. 2017-18 RC drilling was carried out by Orbit Drilling's truck-mounted Hydco 350RC 8x8 Actross drill rigs with 350psi/1250cfm air compressor, with auxiliary and booster air compressors (when required). Drilling utilised mostly downhole face-sampling hammer bits (Ø 140mm), with occasional use of blade bits for highly oxidized and soft formations. The majority of drilling retrieved dry samples, with the occasional use of the auxiliary and booster air compressors beneath the water table, to maintain dry sample return as much as possible. RC drillhole deviations were surveyed downhole, typically carried out inside a non-magnetic stainless steel (s/s) rod located above the hammer, using electronic multi-shot downhole tool (e.g. Reflex EZ-TRAC). In some instances, drillholes were

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
		surveyed later in open hole. Independent programs of downhole deviation surveying were also carried out to validate previous surveys. These programs utilised either electronic continuous logging survey tool (AusLog A698 deviation tool) or gyroscopic survey equipment. 2019-20 RC drilling was carried out by Swick Mining Services truck-mounted Swick version Schramm 685 RC Drill Rig (Rod Handler & Rotary Cone Splitter) with support air truck and dust suppression equipment. Drilling utilised downhole face-sampling hammer bits (Ø 140mm). The majority of drilling retrieved dry samples, with the occasional use of the auxiliary and booster air compressors beneath the water table, to maintain dry sample return as much as possible. 2019-20 RC was surveyed at regular downhole intervals (every 30m with an additional end-of-hole survey) using electronic gyroscopic survey equipment. <u>AC/RAB</u> Historic AC drilling was conducted utilising suitable rigs with appropriate compressors (eg 250psi/600cfm). AC holes were drilled using 'blade' or 'wing' bits, until the bit was unable to penetrate ('blade refusal'), often near the fresh rock interface. Hammer bits were used only when it was deemed necessary to penetrate further into the fresh rock profile or through notable "hard boundaries" in the regolith profile. No downhole surveying is noted to have been undertaken on AC drillholes. Historic RAB drilling was carried out using small air compressors (eg 250psi/600cfm) and drill rods fitted with a percussion hammer or blade bit, with the sample return collected at the drillhole collar using a stuffing box and cyclone collection techniques. Drillhole sizes generally range between 75-110mm. No downhole surveying is noted to have been undertaken on RAB drillholes.
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.*	<u>Diamond</u> Historic core recovery was recorded in drill logs for most of the diamond drilling programs since 1985. A review of historical reports indicates that core recovery was generally good (>80%) with lesser recoveries recorded in zones of broken ground and/or areas of mineralisation. Overall recoveries are considered acceptable for resource estimation. Recent core recovery data was recorded for each run by measuring total length of core retrieved against the downhole interval drilled and stored in the database. KIN representatives continuously monitored core recovery and core presentation quality as drilling is conducted and issues or discrepancies are rectified promptly to maintain industry best standards. Core recoveries averaged >95%, even when difficult ground conditions were being encountered. When poor ground conditions were anticipated, a triple tube drilling configuration was utilised to maximize core recovery. <u>RC/AC/RAB</u> Historic sample recovery information for RC, AC, and RAB drilling is limited. Recent RC drilling samples are preserved as best as possible during the drilling process. At the end of each 1 metre downhole interval, the driller stops advancing, retracts from the bottom of hole, and waits for the sample to clear from the bottom of the hole through to the sample collector box fitted beneath the cyclone. The sample is then released from the sample collector box and passed through either a 3-tiered riffle splitter or cone splitter fitted beneath the sample box. Drilling prior to 2018 utilised riffle split collection whereas sample collection via a cone splitter was conducted for drilling undertaken since March 2018; cyclone cleaning processes remained the same. Sample reject was collected in plastic bags, and a 3-4kg sub-sample is collected in pre-marked calico bags for analysis. Once the samples have been collected, the cyclone, sample collector box and riffle splitter are flushed with compressed air, and the splitter cleaned by the off-sider using a compressed air hose at both the end of each 6 metre drill rod and then extensively cleaned at the completion of each hole. This process is

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
		maintained throughout the entire drilling program to maximise drill sample recovery and to maintain a high level of representivity of the material being drilled. From 2020 sample rejects were placed on the ground. RC drill sample recoveries are not recorded in the database however a review by Carras Mining Pty Ltd (CM) in 2017, of RC drill samples stored in the field, and ongoing observations of RC drill rigs in operation by KIN representatives, suggested that RC sample recoveries were mostly consistent and typically very good (>90%). Collected samples are deemed reliable and representative of drilled material and no material discrepancy, that would impede a mineral resource estimate, exists between collected RC primary and sub-samples.
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.*	Logging data coded in the database, prior to 2014, illustrates at least four different lithological code systems, a legacy of numerous past operators (Hunter, MPI, Metana, CIM, MEGM, Pacmin, SOG, and Navigator). Correlation between codes is difficult to establish however, based on historical reports, drill hole logging procedures appear consistent with normal industry practices of the time. KIN attempted to validate historical logging data and to standardize the logging code system by incorporating the SOG and Navigator logging codes into one. <u>Diamond</u> Historical diamond core logging was recorded into drill logs for most of the diamond drilling programs since 1985. A review of historical reports indicates that logging noted core recovery, fractures per metre and RQD, lithology, alteration, texture, mineralisation, weathering, and other features. Core was then marked up for cutting and sampling. Navigator's procedure for logging of diamond core included firstly marking of the bottom of the core (for successful core orientations), then recording of core recovery, fractures per metre and RQD, lithology, alteration, texture, mineralisation, weathering, and other features. Core was then marked up for cutting and sampling. Navigator DD logging is predominantly to geological contacts. Navigator logging information was entered directly into handheld digital data loggers and transferred directly to the database, after validation, to minimize data entry errors. Drill core photographs, for drilling prior to 2014, are available only for diamond drillholes completed by Navigator. KIN core logging was carried out on site once geology personnel retrieve core trays from the drill rig site. Core was collected from the rig daily. The entire length of every hole is logged. Recorded data includes lithology, alteration, structure, texture, mineralisation, sulphide content, weathering, and other features. Drillhole collar coordinates, azimuth, dip, depth and sampling intervals are also recorded. KIN core logging was to geological contacts. Qualitative logging includes classification and description of lithology, weathering, oxidation, colour, texture, and grain size. Quantitative logging includes percentages of identified minerals, veining, and structural measurements (using a kenometer tool). In addition, logging of diamond drilling includes geotechnical data, RQD and core recoveries. Drill core was photographed at the Cardinia site, prior to any cutting and/or sampling, and then stored at Cardinia. Photographs are available for every diamond drillhole completed by KIN and a selection of various RC chip trays. SG data is also collected. All information collected was entered directly into laptop computers or tablets, validated in the field, and then transferred to the database. The level of logging detail is considered appropriate for exploration and to support appropriate mineral resource estimation, mining studies, and metallurgical studies.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
		Diamond drillholes completed for geotechnical purposes were independently logged for structural data by geotechnical consultants. RC/AC/RAB Historical RC, AC, and RAB logging (including Navigator) was entered on a metre by metre basis. Logging consisted of lithology, alteration, texture, mineralisation, weathering, and other features. For the majority of historical drilling (pre-2004) the entire length of each drillhole have been logged from surface to end of hole. KIN RC logging of was carried out in the field and logging has predominantly been undertaken on a metre by metre basis. KIN logging is inclusive of the entire length of each RC drillhole from surface to end of hole. Recorded data includes lithology, alteration, structure, texture, mineralisation, sulphide content, weathering and other features. Drillhole collar coordinates, azimuth, dip, depth and sampling intervals are also recorded. Qualitative logging includes classification and description of lithology, weathering, oxidation, colour, texture and grain size. Quantitative logging includes identification and percentages of mineralogy, sulphides, mineralisation, and veining. Photographs are available for a selection of recent KIN RC drillholes. All information collected is entered directly into laptop computers or tablets, validated in the field, and then transferred to the database. The level of logging detail is considered appropriate for exploration and to support appropriate mineral resource estimation, mining studies, and metallurgical studies.
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.*	Diamond Historic diamond drill core (NQ/NQ3 or HQ/HQ3) samples collected for analysis were longitudinally cut in half, and occasionally in quarters for the larger (HQ/HQ3) diameter holes, using a powered diamond core drop saw centred over a cradle holding the core in place. Half core or quarter core sample intervals typically varied from 0.3m to 1.4m in length. 1m sample intervals were favoured and are the most common method of sampling, however sample boundaries do principally coincide with geological contacts. The remaining core was retained in core trays. 2017-18 diamond drill core samples collected for analysis were longitudinally cut in half, with some samples cut into quarters, using a powered diamond core drop saw blade centred over a cradle holding the core in place. Core sample intervals varied from 0.2 to 1.25m in length but were predominantly aligned to 1m intervals or with sample boundaries which respected geological contacts. The remaining core was retained in their respective core trays and stored in the Cardinia core yard for future reference. 2019-20 diamond drill core samples collected for analysis were longitudinally cut in half, with some samples cut into thirds, using an automated Corewise powered diamond core saw with the blade centred over a boat holding the core in place. Core sample intervals varied from 0.2 to 1.25m in length but were predominantly aligned to 1m intervals or with sample boundaries which respected geological contacts. The remaining core was retained in their respective core trays and stored in KIN's yard for future reference. All KIN diamond drill core is securely stored at the Cardinia core yard. All sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation procedures conducted and/or supervised by KIN geology personnel were to standard industry practice. Sub-sampling and sample preparation techniques used are considered to maximise representivity of drilled material. QA/QC procedures implemented during each drilling program are to industry standard practice. Samples sizes are considered appropriate for this style of gold mineralisation and as an industry accepted method for evaluation of gold deposits in the Eastern Goldfields of Western Australia.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
		RC/AC/RAB Historic sampling was predominantly conducted by collecting 1m samples from beneath a cyclone and either retaining these primary samples or passing through a riffle splitter to obtain a 3-4kg subsample for analysis. First pass sampling often involved collecting composite samples by using a scoop (dry samples) or spear/tube (wet samples) to obtain 3m or 4m composited intervals, with the single metre split samples being retained at the drill site as spoil or in sample bags. If composite sample assays returned anomalous results, the single metre samples for this composite were retrieved and submitted for analysis. RC/AC/RAB sampling procedures are believed to be consistent with the normal industry practices at the time. Samples obtained from conventional RC drilling techniques with cross-over subs often suffered from down hole contamination, especially beneath the water table. Samples obtained from RC drilling techniques using the face sampling hammer suffered less from down hole contamination and were more likely to be kept dry beneath the water table, particularly if auxiliary and booster air compressors were used. These samples are considered to be representative. Most of the Reverse Circulation (RC) drill samples were collected at 1m downhole intervals from beneath a cyclone and then riffle split to obtain a sub-sample (typically 3-4kg). After splitting, 1m sub-samples were typically collected in pre-numbered calico bags, and the 1m sample rejects were commonly stored at the drill site in marked plastic bags, for future reference. First pass sampling often involved collecting composite samples by using a scoop (dry samples) or spear/tube (wet samples) to obtain 3m or 4m composited intervals, with the single metre split sub-samples being retained at the drill site. If the composite sample assays returned anomalous results, single metre sub-samples for the anomalous composite intervals were retrieved and submitted for analysis. Navigator included standards, fields duplicate splits (since 2009), and blanks within each drill sample batch, at a ratio of 1 for every 20 samples, with the number of standards being inserted at a ratio of 1 for every 50 samples. Recent RC sub-samples were collected over 1 metre downhole intervals and retained in pre-marked calico bags, after passing through a cyclone and either a riffle splitter, prior to March 2018, or cone splitter, after March 2018. The majority of RC sub-samples consistently averaged 3-4kg. Sample reject from the riffle splitter were retained and stored in plastic bags and located near each drillhole site. When drilling beneath the water table, the majority of sample returns were kept dry by the use of the auxiliary and booster air compressors. Very few wet samples were collected through the splitter, and the small number of wet or damp samples is not considered material for resource estimation work. KIN RC drill programs utilised field duplicates, at regular intervals at a ratio of 1:25, and assay results indicate that there is reasonable analytical repeatability considering the presence of nuggety gold. All sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation procedures conducted and/or supervised by KIN geology personnel are to standard industry practice. Sub-sampling and sample preparation techniques used are considered to maximise representivity of drilled material. QA/QC procedures implemented during each drilling program are to industry standard practice. Samples sizes are considered appropriate for this style of gold mineralisation and as an industry accepted method for evaluation of gold deposits in the Eastern Goldfields of Western Australia. No duplicates are taken for rock chip sampling. Sample sizes are approximately 3kg, this is considered appropriate for the material being sampled.
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.*	Numerous assay laboratories and various sample preparation and assay techniques have been used since 1981. Historical reporting and descriptions of laboratory sample preparation, assaying procedures, and

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
	• *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 (e.g. standards, blanks, duplicates, external laboratory checks) and whether acceptable levels of accuracy (i.e. lack of bias) and precision have been established.*	quality control protocols for the samples from the various drilling programs are variable in their descriptions and completeness. Assay data obtained prior to 2001 is incomplete and the nature of results could not be accurately quantified due to the combinations of various laboratories and analytical methodologies utilised. Since 1993, the majority of samples submitted to the various laboratories were typically prepared for analysis firstly by oven drying, crushing and pulverizing to a nominal 85% passing 75µm. In the initial exploration stages, Aqua Regia digest with AAS/ICP finish, was generally used as a first pass detection method, with follow up analysis by Fire Assay fusion and AAS/ICP finish. This was a common practice at the time. Mineralised intervals were subsequently Fire Assayed (using 30, 40 or 50 gram catchweights) with AAS/ICP finish. Approximately 15-20% of the sampled AC holes may have been subject to Aqua Regia digest methods only, however AC samples were predominantly within the oxide profile, where aqua regia results would not be significantly different to results from fire assay methods. Limited information is available regarding check assays for drilling programs prior to 2004. During 2004-2014, Navigator utilised six different commercial laboratories during their drilling programs, however Kalgoorlie Assay Laboratories conducted the majority of assaying for diamond, RC, and AC samples using Fire Assay fusion on 40 gram catchweights with AAS/ICP finish. Since 2009 Navigator regularly included field duplicates and Certified Reference Material (CRM), standards and blanks, with their sample batch submissions to laboratories at average ratio of 1 in 20 samples. Sample assay repeatability and blank and CRM standard assay results were typically within acceptable limits. ▪ KIN sample analysis from 2014 to 2018 was conducted by SGS Australia Pty Ltd's ("SGS") Kalgoorlie and Perth laboratories. Sample preparation included oven drying (105°C), crushing (<6mm), pulverising (P90% passing 75µm) and riffle split to obtain a 50 gram catchweight. Analysis for gold only was carried out by Fire Assay fusion technique with AAS finish (SGS Lab Code FAA505). ▪ KIN regularly inserted blanks and CRM standards in each sample batch at a ratio of 1:50. This allowed for at least one blank and one CRM standard to be included in each of the laboratory's fire assay batch of 50 samples. Field duplicates are typically collected at a ratio of 1:50 samples and test sample assay repeatability. Blanks and CRM standards assay result performance is predominantly within acceptable limits for this style of gold mineralisation. ▪ KIN requested laboratory pulp grind and crush checks at a ratio of 1:50 or less since May 2018 in order to better qualify sample preparation and evaluate laboratory performance. Samples have generally illustrated appropriate crush and grind size percentages since the addition of this component to the sample analysis procedure. ▪ SGS include laboratory blanks and CRM standards as part of their internal QA/QC for sample preparation and analysis, as well as regular assay repeats. Sample pulp assay repeatability, and internal blank and CRM standards assay results are typically within acceptable limits. From late 2018 samples have been analysed by Intertek Genalysis, with sample preparation either at their Kalgoorlie prep laboratory or the Perth Laboratory located in Maddington. Sample preparation included oven drying (105°C), crushing (<6mm), pulverising (P90% passing 75µm) and split to obtain a 50 gram catchweight. Analysis for gold only was carried out by Fire Assay fusion technique with AAS finish. ▪ KIN regularly inserted blanks and CRM standards in each sample batch at a ratio of 1:25. Field duplicates were typically collected at a ratio of 1:25 samples to test sample assay repeatability. Blanks and CRM standards assay result

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
		performance is predominantly within acceptable limits for this style of gold mineralisation. ▪ KIN requested laboratory pulp grind and crush checks at a ratio of 1:50 or less since May 2018 in order to better qualify sample preparation and evaluate laboratory performance. Samples have generally illustrated appropriate crush and grind size percentages since the addition of this component to the sample analysis procedure. ▪ Genalysis included laboratory blanks and CRM standards as part of their internal QA/QC for sample preparation and analysis, as well as regular assay repeats. Sample pulp assay repeatability, and internal blank and CRM standards assay results are typically within acceptable limits. The nature and quality of the assaying and laboratory procedures used are satisfactory and appropriate for use in mineral resource estimations. Fire Assay fusion is a total extraction technique. Most assay data used for the mineral resource estimations were obtained by the Fire Assay technique with AAS or ICP finish. AAS and ICP methods of detection are both considered to be suitable and appropriate methods of detection for this style of mineralisation. Aqua Regia is considered a partial extraction technique, where gold encapsulated in refractory sulphides or some silicate minerals may not be fully dissolved, resulting in partial reporting of gold. No other analysis techniques have been used to determine gold assays. Best practice QAQC methods for all drilling operations and the treatment and analysis of samples have been adhered to. Regular laboratory site visits and audits have been conducted since April 2018 on an annual basis.
Verification of sampling and assay	• *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.*	Verification of sampling, assay techniques, and results prior to 2004 is limited due to the legacy of the involvement of various companies, personnel, drilling equipment, sampling protocols and analytical techniques at different laboratories. During 2009, a selection of significant intersections had been verified by Navigator's company geologists and an independent consultant McDonald Speijers ("MS"). MS were able to validate 92% of the assay records in 50 randomly selected check holes, and only 6 assay discrepancies were detected (< 0.2%), only 2 of those were considered significant. MS concluded that the very small proportion of discrepancies indicated that the assay database was probably reliable at that time. In 2009, Runge Ltd ("Runge") completed a mineral resource estimate report for the Cardinia Project area, including Kyte and Bruno-Lewis deposits. Runge's database verification included basic visual validation in Surpac and field verification of drillhole positions in February 2009. Runge did not report any significant issues with the database. Since 2014, significant drill intersections have been verified by KIN company geologists during the drilling programs. During 2017, Carras Mining Pty Ltd ("CM") carried out an independent data verification. 38,098 assay records for KIN 2014-2017 drilling programs were verified by comparing laboratory assay reports against the database. 6 errors were found, which are not considered material and which represented only 0.03% of all database records verified for KIN 2014-2017 drilling programs. No adjustments, averaging or calibrations are made to any of the assay data recorded in the database. QA/QC protocol is considered industry standard with standard reference material submitted on a routine basis. There is no significant material difference between historical drilling information and KIN drilling information. Areas without twinned holes illustrate a drill density that is considered sufficient to enable comparison with surrounding historic information. No material difference of a negative nature exists between historical drilling information and KIN drilling information.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
		KIN diamond holes drilled for metallurgical and geotechnical test work illustrate assay results with adequate correlation to both nearby historical and recent drilling results. No adjustment or calibration has been made to assay data.
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.*	Several local grids were established and used by previous project owners. During the 1990s, SOG transformed the surface survey data firstly to AMG and subsequently to MGA (GDA94 zone51). Navigator recognised errors in the collar co-ordinates resulting from transformations and as a result, a significant number of holes were resurveyed and a new MGA grid transformation generated. Historical collars have been validated against the original local grid co-ordinates and independently transformed to MGA co-ordinates and checked against the database. Navigator's MGA co-ordinates were checked against the surveyor's reports. Recent KIN drill hole collars are located and recorded in the field by a contract surveyor using RTK-DGPS (with a horizontal and vertical accuracy of ±50mm). Location data was collected in the GDA94 Zone51 grid coordinate system. A small selection of drillhole collars, which do not have DGPS collar surveys, were picked up with a handheld GPS and individually appraised in regards to their location prior to modelling; the position of these collars is deemed appropriate for the resource estimation work.
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 hole spacing within the resource areas is sufficient to establish an acceptable degree of geological and grade continuity and is appropriate for both the mineral resource estimation and the resource classifications applied.
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.*	The Cardinia greenstone sequence displays a NNW to NW trend. Drilling and sampling programs were carried out to obtain unbiased locations of drill sample data, generally orthogonal to the strike of mineralisation. At Bruno-Lewis and Kyte, mineralisation is either stratigraphy parallel (trending NNW, steep to moderately W-dipping) or cross-cutting and dipping shallowly to the NE (striking NW). Most of the drilling is therefore predominantly orientated at -60°/225-250° or -60°/090°. Grade Control drillholes were drilled vertically. Since late 2018, Kin's drilling has been largely oriented to 070° to target contact lodes and 225-250° to target the NE-dipping potassic lodes. The chance of sample bias introduced by sample orientation is considered minimal. No orientation sampling bias has been identified in data thus far.
Sample security	• *The measures taken to ensure sample security.*	KIN employees or contractors were utilised to transport samples to the laboratory. No perceived opportunity for samples to be compromised from collection of samples at the drill site, to delivery to the laboratory, where they were stored in their secure compound, and made ready for processing is deemed likely to have occurred. On receipt of the samples, the laboratory independently checked the sample submission form to verify samples received and readied the samples for sample preparation. Intertek sample security protocols are of industry standard and deemed acceptable for resource estimation work.
Audits or reviews	• *The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.*	Historic drilling and sampling methods and QA/QC are regarded as not being as thoroughly documented compared to current standards. In house reviews of various available historical company reports of drilling and sampling techniques indicates that these were most likely conducted to industry best practice and standards of the day. Independent geological consultants Runge Ltd completed a review of the Cardinia Project database, drilling and sampling protocols, and so forth in 2009. The Runge report highlighted issues with bulk density and QA/QC

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
		analysis within the supplied database. Identified issues were subsequently addressed by Navigator and KIN. Carras Mining Pty Ltd (CM), an independent geological consultant, reviewed and carried out an audit on the field operations and database in 2017. Drilling and sampling methodologies observed during the site visits were to industry standard. No issues were identified for the supplied databases which could be considered material to a mineral resource estimation. During the review, Carras Mining logged the oxidation profiles (base of complete oxidation and top of fresh rock) for each of the deposit areas, based on visual inspection of selected RC drill chips from KIN's recent drilling programs, and a combination of historical and KIN drillhole logging. Final adjustments were made with input from KIN geologists. The oxidation profiles were used to assign bulk densities and metallurgical recoveries to the 2017 resource models. Past bulk density test work has been inconsistent with incorrect methods employed, to derive specific gravity or in-situ bulk density, rather than dry bulk density. Navigator (2009) and recent KIN (2017) bulk density test work was carried out using the water immersion method on oven dried, coated samples to derive dry bulk densities for different rock types and oxidation profiles. This information has been incorporated into the database for resource estimation work. CM conducted site visits during 2017 to the laboratory to validate the methodology. Drilling, sampling methodologies, and assay techniques used in these drilling programs are appropriate to mineral exploration industry standards of the day. Laboratory site visits and audits were introduced in April 2018 and are conducted on an annual basis. This measure ensures that all aspects of KIN QAQC practices are adhered to and align with industry best practice.

Section 2 Reporting of Exploration Results – Bruno-Lewis and Kyte

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
Mineral Tenement and Land Tenure Status	• *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.*	The Bruno-Lewis Project is located 25-30km NE of Leonora within the Shire of Leonora in the Mt Margaret Mineral Field of the Northeastern Goldfields. The Bruno-Lewis and Kyte deposits include granted mining tenements M37/86 (expiry 21/12/2028), M37/227 (expiry 17/07/2031), M37/277 (expiry 10/04/2032), M37/300 (expiry 21/10/2032), M37/428 (expiry 03/02/2036) and M37/646 (expiry 27/06/2027). All tenements are renewable for further periods of 21 years. Genesis purchased the tenements from Navigator Mining Pty Ltd on in 2023 under an Asset Sale Agreement. The following royalty payment may be applicable to the Bruno and Kyte deposit: 1. Vox Royalty in respect of M37/86 (purchased off Gloucester Coal Ltd in November 2022) - 1% of the quarterly gross value of sales for gold ounces produced, in excess of 10,000 ounces. There are no known native title interests, historical sites, wilderness areas, national park or environmental impediments over the outlined current resource areas, and there are no current impediments to obtaining a licence to operate in the area.
Exploration Done by Other Parties	• *Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.*	Companies involved in the collection of the majority of the gold exploration data since 1985 and prior to 2014 include: Thames Mining NL ("Thames") 1985; Mt Eden Gold Mines (Aust) NL (also Tarmoola Aust Pty Ltd "MEGM") 1986-2003; Centenary International Mining Ltd ("CIM") 1986-1988, 1991-1992; Metana Minerals NL ("Metana") 1986-1989; Sons of Gwalia Ltd ("SOG") 1989, 1992-2004; Pacmin Mining Corporation ("Pacmin") 1998-2001, and Navigator Resources Ltd ("Navigator") 2004-2014. In 2009 Navigator commissioned Runge Limited ("Runge") to complete a Mineral Resource estimate for the Bruno, Lewis, and Kyte deposits. Runge reported a JORC 2004 compliant Mineral Resource estimate, at a

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
		cut-off grade of 0.7g/t Au, totalling 4.34Mt @ 1.2 g/t au (169,700 oz Au) for Bruno, Lewis and Kyte. A trial pit (Bruno) was mined by Navigator in 2010, and a 'test parcel' of ore was extracted and transported firstly to Sons of Gwalia's processing plant in Leonora, and finally to Navigator's processing plant located at Bronzewing, where approximately 100,000 tonnes were processed at an average head grade of 2.33 g/t au (7,493 oz Au).
Geology	• *Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.*	The Cardinia Project area is located in the central part of the Norseman-Wiluna Greenstone Belt, which extends for some 600km on a NNW trend across the Archean Yilgarn Craton of Western Australia. The regional geology comprises a suite of NNE-North trending greenstones positioned within the Mertondale Shear Zone (MSZ) a splay limb of the Kilkenny Lineament. The MSZ denotes the contact between Archaean felsic volcanoclastics and sediment sequences in the west and Archaean mafic volcanics in the east. Proterozoic dolerite dykes and Archaean felsic porphyries have intruded the sheared mafic/felsic volcanoclastic/sedimentary sequence. Mineralisation at Bruno-Lewis is largely controlled by the stratigraphic contact between basalt and felsic volcanics. Gold is associated with significant sulphide mineralisation in the sediments and volcaniclastics between the 2 volcanic units. Gold Is also hosted within shallowly NE-dipping lodes, associated with increased potassic-sericite alteration and quartz stockwork veining. These lodes also host the mineralisation at Kyte. Substantial supergene mineralisation sits above both styles of mineralisation.
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:* o *easting and northing of the drill hole collar* o *elevation or RL (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in metres) of the drill hole collar* o *dip and azimuth of the hole* o *down hole length and interception depth* o *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.*	Material drilling information for exploration results has previously been publicly reported in numerous announcements to the ASX by Navigator (2004-2014) and KIN since 2014.
Data Aggregation Methods	• *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.* • *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.*	When exploration results have been reported for the resource areas, the intercepts are reported as weighted average grades over intercept lengths defined by geology or lower cut-off grades, without high grade cuts applied. Where aggregate intercepts incorporated short lengths of high-grade results, these results were included in the reports. Since 2014, KIN have reported RC drilling intersections with low cut off grades of >= 0.4 g/t Au and a maximum of 2m of internal dilution at a grade of <0.4g/t Au. There is no reporting of metal equivalent values.
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.* • *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').*	The orientation, true width, and geometry of mineralised zones have been primarily determined by interpretation of historical drilling and continued investigation and verification of KIN drilling. Drill intercepts are reported as downhole widths not true widths. Accompanying dialogue to reported intersections normally describes the attitude of mineralisation.
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.*	Appropriate maps and sections are included in the main body of this report.
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.*	Public reporting of exploration results by KIN and past tenement holders and explorers for the resource areas are considered balanced.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
		Representative widths typically included a combination of both low-grade and high-grade assay results. All meaningful and material information relating to this mineral resource estimate is or has been previously reported.
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.*	Since 2018, a campaign of determining Bulk Densities has been undertaken. The water displacement method was used on drill samples selected by the logging geologist. These measurements are entered into the logging software interface and loaded to the Datashed database.
Further Work	• *The nature and scale of planned further work (e.g. 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.*	Further work at the deposit will include extensional and infill drilling in portions of the deposit that have RPEEE. Down dip lode extensions are likely targets for further exploration.

Section 2 Reporting of Exploration Results – Raeside

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
Mineral Tenement and Land Tenure Status	• *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.*	The Raeside Project area is centred ~10km ESE of Leonora within the Shire of Leonora in the Mt Margaret Mineral Field of the Northeastern Goldfields. Raeside includes granted mining tenement M37/1298 (expiry 23/09/2035), which is renewable for further periods of 21 years. Genesis purchased the tenement from Navigator Mining Pty Ltd in 2023 under an Asset Sale Agreement. The following royalty payment may be applicable to areas within the Raeside Project that comprise the deposits being reported on: • Halloran & Prugnoli, in respect of dead mineral tenements M37/256, M37/369, M37/377, M37/379, P37/4046 and MLA37/563, which are partly or wholly overlain by M37/1298 - $1.00 per tonne of ore mined and milled for the extraction of gold or other saleable mineral. There are no known native title interests, historical sites, wilderness areas, national park or environmental impediments over the resource areas, and there are no current impediments to obtaining a licence to operate in the area.
Exploration Done by Other Parties	• *Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.*	Gold was first discovered in the Leonora district about 1896 and it is likely that the first prospecting activity in and around the Raeside Project area would have occurred at about that time. Initial production from Raeside was a small underground operation in the early 1970's when 60t @ 6.0 g/t Au was produced. In 1989, Triton Resources Limited (Triton) entered into an arrangement with local prospectors (Halloran and Prugnoli) to acquire some tenements in what is known as the Forgotten Four area. The Triton Raeside Joint Venture mined the Forgotten Four (1990-1992) to 45m depth. Production statistics include: 1990: Mined and processed 6,280t @ 5.18 g/t Au (959oz) at the Tower Hill plant in Leonora with 91.7% recovery. 1992: Mined and processed 40,537t @ 4.14 g/t Au (4,993oz) at the Harbour Lights plant in Leonora with 92.57% recovery. Finally a 2,822t parcel of ore (4.47 g/t Au) (389oz) was sold to Harbour Lights. In 1992 remnant ore from low grade stockpiles totaling 6,200t @ 1.0 g/t Au (199oz) was processed. Thus total production from the nearby Forgotten Four open cut yielded 55,839t @ 3.92 g/t Au (7,030oz) with an estimated recovery of approximately 92%. None of the reported production figures have been confirmed from official Mines Department records. The larger Raeside Project originated in 1992, when Triton (70%) formed a joint venture with Sabre Resources N.L. (Sabre) (20%) and Copperwell Pty Ltd (Copperwell), a subsidiary of Cityview Energy Corporation (10%). The three companies amalgamated their tenement holdings in the area and the joint venture applied for additional tenements.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
		Until sometime in 1994 the project was managed on behalf of the joint venture by Westchester Pty Ltd. Incomplete drilling records indicate that Westchester had been involved to some extent in managing exploration in the area for Triton prior to 1992. After mid-1994 Triton appears to have taken over as project manager. Before 1995, drilling programs were apparently dominated by first-pass rotary air blast (RAB) drilling, with local reverse circulation (RC) rotary or percussion drilling to follow up in places where mineralisation was detected. Because of RAB drilling difficulties (clays and water) air core (AC) drilling was subsequently adopted as the first-pass method. Triton's drilling programs were suspended in June 1995 while a major review of results was undertaken, and a pre-feasibility study was conducted. Drilling resumed in about April 1995. Another economic evaluation of the project was undertaken by Triton in 1998-1999 which indicated that a stand-alone operation was not possible, but that the project could be viable as a supplementary feed source for an existing, nearby process plant. SOG farmed into the project in January 2000 and subsequently acquired full ownership. They carried out limited amounts of predominantly RC drilling, aimed mainly at confirming previous results from the Michelangelo deposit. Navigator Resources Ltd (Navigator) acquired the Raeside project from SOG in September 2004. Subsequent work by Navigator has focused mainly on other projects in the Leonora district, with only very small amounts of additional drilling having been completed in the Raeside area. In 2009, Navigator commissioned MS to complete a Mineral Resource estimate for the Raeside deposits. MS reported a JORC 2004 compliant Indicated Mineral Resource estimate, at a low cutoff grade of 0.7g/t Au, totaling 1.28Mt @ 2.68 g/t Au (111,000oz). KIN acquired the Raeside Project from Navigator's administrator in 2014.
Geology	• *Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.*	The Raeside Project area is located 10km ESE of Leonora in the central part of the Norseman- Wiluna Greenstone Belt, which extends for some 600km on a NNW trend across the Archean Yilgarn Craton of Western Australia. The regional geology comprises a sequence of Archaean greenstone lithologies. The area is underlain by very poorly exposed rocks units. The gold deposits at Raeside occur within or close to the margins of a large NW (320º) trendy body of dolerite within a sequence of sediments and volcanoclastic rocks near the southern margin of porphyry intrusive. Most of the gold recovered from mining the nearby Forgotten Four mine was from shear bound quartz vein stockworks or sheeted veins and/or quartz carbonate veins within a narrow carbonaceous shale (dipping 40º-60º East) lying within a granophyric quartz dolerite and carbonate / sericite / sulphide altered wall rocks. Gold mineralisation at Michelangelo is hosted by a uniform metamorphosed medium grained dolerite. The deposit occurs on or above the basal sheared contact of the quartz dolerite. Four or five extensive quartz vein structures dip at 30°-40° to the northeast, extending over a strike length of 575m with a total stratigraphic thickness of approximately 90m. The position of the footwall has been roughly delineated however no other convincing geological boundaries are defined. Gold mineralisation at Leonardo occurs mainly in a partly carbonaceous-graphitic shale (coded as generic metasediment) close to/adjacent to but above the quartz mafic contact. The mineralisation dips 35°-50° to the east however this ore body exhibits significant differences to the other deposits. Initially the mineralisation at Leonardo is hosted in sedimentary rocks above the quartz diorite. Secondly the mineralisation is associated with a zone of strong bleaching, sericitisation and silicification, often up to

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
		+20m wide. The strike length of the steeply plunging north main shoot is approximately 60m. Thirdly the gold mineralisation occurs within a relatively linear shear zone that is traceable over 2km of strike; the shear contains significant mineralisation in at least three other locations along strike. Mineralised zones at Forgotten Four are mainly hosted by mafics however the uppermost (strongest) zone of mineralisation appears to be positioned just below the lower contact of overlying sediments, and one of the lower zones appear to coincide with a sporadically developed sediment wedge in the mafic rocks. The sediments are also mineralised. At the Forgotten Four the strongest zone of mineralisation is just below the lower contact with the overlying carbonaceous shale and sediments. The bulk of the mineralisation is hosted by dolerite along the upper contact with the interbedded shale and the quartz diorite. There are at least two lodes at Forgotten Four, one of which was partly mined by Triton (55,839t @ 3.92 g/t Au for 7,030oz Au) the second lode occurs in the hanging wall to the south. Mineralisation at Krang appears to be broadly related to the metasediments however, once again, no convincing geological boundaries are defined. Along the eastern side of the deposit mineralisation appears to be broadly associated with the contact zones between mafic and metasedimentary units. Some of the mineralisation is associated with massive quartz-pyrite-arsenopyrite lodes which display high but erratic grade. Gold mineralisation occurs internal to the quartz dolerite unit which displays varying dips ranging from 30° to 60° to the northeast; interpretation suggests two different structural styles. Mineralisation occurs in at least four separate pods over a continuous strike length of about 700m.
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:* o *easting and northing of the drill hole collar* o *elevation or RL (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in metres) of the drill hole collar* o *dip and azimuth of the hole* o *down hole length and interception depth* o *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.*	Material drilling information for exploration results has previously been publicly reported in numerous announcements to the ASX by Navigator (2004-2014) and KIN since 2014.
Data Aggregation Methods	• *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.* • *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.*	When exploration results have been reported for the resource areas, the intercepts are reported as weighted average grades over intercept lengths defined by geology or lower cut-off grades, without high grade cuts applied. Where aggregate intercepts incorporated short lengths of high grade results, these results were included in the reports. Since 2014, KIN have reported RC drilling intersections with low cut off grades of >= 0.5 g/t Au and a maximum of 2m of internal dilution at a grade of <0.5g/t Au. There is no reporting of metal equivalent values.
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.* • *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').*	The orientation, true width and geometry of the mineralised zones have been determined by interpretation of historical drilling and verified by KIN's drilling. The majority of historic drill holes within the pit area are inclined at -60° towards 280° (west). Later drilling was undertaken on the Raeside local grid, with a base line orientated to 330º (northwest). The KIN RC drilling is orientated towards 225º (SW), which is regarded as the optimum orientation to intersect the target mineralisation. Since the mineralisation is moderately dipping (-40º to -60º easterly), drill intercepts are reported as downhole widths, not true widths. Accompanying dialogue to reported intersections normally describe the attitude of the mineralisation.
Diagrams	• *Appropriate maps and sections (with scales) and tabulations of intercepts should be included for any significant discovery being*	Appropriate maps and sections are included in the main body of this report.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
	reported These should include, but not be limited to a plan view of drill hole collar locations and appropriate sectional views.	
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.*	Public reporting of exploration results by KIN and past tenement holders and explorers for the resource areas are considered balanced. Representative widths typically included a combination of both low-grade and high-grade assay results. All meaningful and material information relating to this mineral resource estimate is or has been previously reported.
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.*	Since 2018, a campaign of determining Bulk Densities has been undertaken. The water displacement method is used on drill samples selected by the logging geologist. These measurements are entered into the logging software interface and loaded to the Datashed database.
Further Work	• *The nature and scale of planned further work (e.g. 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.*	Further work at the deposit will include extensional and infill drilling in portions of the deposit that have RPEEE. Down dip lode extensions are likely targets for further exploration.

Section 3 Estimation and Reporting of Mineral Resources – Bruno-Lewis

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
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 data used for the MRE were collected drill data collected before 2022. These data have been uploaded into Maxwell's Datashed application by the Database Administrator (DBA). This application includes quality protocols which must be met for uploading to occur (examples: data duplication, validation of geological field). Finally, the data are reviewed upon upload to Micromine before final use. (Examples: DH surveys present, overlapping intervals, 'From' and 'To's concurrent). Data used in the Mineral Resource Estimate ("MRE") were exported as a series of .csv files, which were imported into an Access database where further database validation was carried out, including the following: ▪ Checks for mismatched maximum hole depths between drill hole tables: collar, survey, assay, lithology ▪ Sample depth overlaps ▪ Duplicate collar ID ▪ 3D visual validation of holes in plan and section view to check for obvious drillhole trace and hole collar errors. ▪ Replacing negative values to half detection values
Site visits	• *Comment on any site visits undertaken by the Competent Person and the outcome of those visits.* • *If no site visits have been undertaken indicate why this is the case.*	Mr. Andrew Grieve of Cube Consulting conducted a formal site visit during November 2020, visiting Cardinia.
Geological interpretation	• *Confidence in (or conversely, the uncertainty of) the geological interpretation of the mineral deposit.* • *Nature of the data used and of any assumptions made.* • *The effect, if any, of alternative interpretations on Mineral Resource estimation.* • *The use of geology in guiding and controlling Mineral Resource estimation.* • *The factors affecting continuity both of grade and geology.*	The geological interpretation for Bruno-Lewis was carried out by Kin Mining on predominantly 20m by 20m drill hole spacing, with some areas of tighter 10m x 10m grade control drilling and wider 20m+ spaced drilling. 7,602 drill holes were used in the mineralisation interpretation which consist of 4,318 RC, 46 DD, 1,546 RAB and 1,692 AC drill holes. The increased geological understanding of the project by Kin Mining though the 2020/2021 drilling program has guided the geological interpretation of Bruno-Lewis. The confidence in the interpretation is directly reflected in the classification of the MRE. A nominal bottom cut-off of 0.4g/t Au was used in the interpretation of the mineralised lodes, with a 'minimum mining width' allowance for inclusion of internal waste. The Bruno-Lewis prospect stratigraphy constitutes a lower felsic volcanic unit which is overlain by a much thinner unit of felsic volcaniclastics interbedded with sediments (predominantly shales and siltstones). This unit is in turn overlain by the mafic sequence comprising pillow basalts with occasional dolerite units. At the approximate location of the Lewis

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
		trial pit, the stratigraphy is offset by faulting, exhibiting sinistral strike slip movement. This offsets the northern block to the SW by approximately 350m. The stratigraphy is intruded by several NE dipping felsic porphyry units as well as later Proterozoic dolerite dykes. The mineralisation model consists of the following: Potassic Lodes (99 domains): Moderately NE-dipping, NW-striking primary mineralisation lodes, associated with and sub-parallel to the NE-dipping porphyry intrusions. Characterised by potassic alteration, quartz stockwork veining and disseminated pyrite. 6 different trends (Bruno, Liston, Cooper, Lewis, Cassius and Frazier) have so far been identified, with numerous lodes belonging to each. Contact Lodes (41 domains): Moderate to steeply W-dipping, stratigraphy-parallel primary mineralisation lodes. Located on or near the stratigraphic contacts, or within the central interbedded volcaniclastic and sediment unit. Typically, pyrite-rich with limited strike extent. They have been divided into 'Contact North' and 'Contact South', separated by the fault offset at the approximate location of the Lewis trial pit. Due to the deeper weathering in the north, and a lack of drilling into fresh rock, the Contact North lodes are much more poorly defined than the contact south lodes. Criteria for definition of continuity in the contact lodes are not considered to be as reliable as those for the potassic lodes. Supergene (37 domains): Flat-lying, near-surface supergene lodes. These lie above both the potassic and contact-related primary mineralisation. The supergene lodes have been defined and grouped based on the primary mineralisation they are interpreted to be associated with. Topographic surface and weathering surfaces were provided by Kin Mining which were used to code the block model for oxidation and for assigning density to the blocks. No alternative interpretations were carried out. Geological observations, particular the presence of lithologies (contacts) and structural features (faults), support this interpretation. The gold mineralisation is interpreted to be structurally and stratigraphically controlled.
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 three types of mineralised lodes interpreted at Bruno-Lewis occur as follows: Potassic Lodes - occur between 6812700mN and 6814900mN, for a total strike length of 2,200m and range between elevations of 230mRL and 420mRL. Contact Lodes - occur between 6812400mN and 6814500mN, for a total strike length of 2,100m and have been delineated between elevations of 260mRL and 420mRL. Supergene Lodes - occur between 6812800mN and 6814900mN, for a total strike length of 2,100m and have been delineated between elevations of 360mRL and 420mRL.
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.* • *The availability of check estimates, previous estimates and/or mine production records and whether the Mineral Resource estimate takes appropriate account of such data.* • *The assumptions made regarding recovery of by-products.* • *Estimation of deleterious elements or other non-grade variables of economic significance (e.g. sulphur for acid mine drainage characterization).*	The Mineral Resource Estimate (MRE) was completed in May-21 by Cube Consulting. Although most drill types were used to undertake the mineralisation interpretations, only hole types deemed to have collected assay samples of sufficiently high quality were used to interpolate gold grade. Some 4,362 RC and DD drill holes, for a total of 185,404m of drilling were used in the interpolation of gold for the MRE – all other hole types were excluded. The mineralised lodes and weathering surfaces were modelled in Micromine. These wireframes were re-imported to Surpac and validated. Each object of the interpreted mineralised lodes were given a unique object number, which were used to flag the drill hole database. Samples

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
	• *In the case of block model interpolation, the block size in relation to the average sample spacing and the search employed.* • *Any assumptions behind modelling of selective mining units.* • *Any assumptions about correlation between variables.* • *Description of how the geological interpretation was used to control the resource estimates.* • *Discussion of basis for using or not using grade cutting or capping.* • *The process of validation, the checking process used, the comparison of model data to drill hole data, and use of reconciliation data if available.*	were composited to 1m downhole within the flagged domains, using "best fit" methodology in Surpac with a 25% or 0.25m threshold for flagging "short" samples. These short composite samples were compared to the longer ones and were found to not be biased in terms of gold grade, and so were incorporated in the gold grade interpolation. Basic statistics for gold grade were calculated for all estimation domains to statistically characterise each domain as well as identify statistical outliers. Most of the domains have low-to-moderate CV following top capping for gold grade. The selection of the top cut value was aided using the histogram, log probability plots and the spatial location of the outlier. Distance limiting of high-grade composites was also applied to the estimate for the second pass interpolation run, in order to mitigate the spatial influence of elevated Au grade and control grade smearing in areas of wider spaced drilling. A distance limit grade threshold of 2g/t Au was applied and composites with a grade higher than this were ignored at distances greater than 21m from the sample. Cube used Isatis software to carry out the analysis of the spatial continuity of the data through variography. The analysis was carried out on the top cut 1m composites for the more well-informed domains. As the gold grade population is positively skewed, a Gaussian transformation was applied to the data to convert the data to a standard normal distribution. The Gaussian transformation reduces the effect of outliers and helps to identify the underlying structure of the variable. The variogram models were then back-transformed to real space for use in the estimation process. The nugget effect was defined using downhole variograms for the domain to be assessed. Omnidirectional variogram models in the plane of the mineralised lodes (i.e. the major/semi-major plane) were modelled for the experimental variograms for the main shear and porphyry lodes. A high degree of anisotropy between the major/semi-major plane and the minor (lode-perpendicular) direction was observed and modelled. The modelled nugget values vary between 15% and 34% of the total sill and the modelled ranges vary between 11 and 42m. Essentially, the various domain types were observed to have relatively similar spatial structure for gold grade, resulting in the choice of relatively uniform search neighbourhood parameters for interpolation across all the lodes. Kriging Neighbourhood Analysis ("KNA") was used to assist with assessing the most appropriate search parameters especially with respect to minimum and maximum allowable samples (set at min=6 to max=16 throughout). A search radius ratio of 3:3:1 was used for the major:semi:minor axis, respectively, based on the observed anisotropy ratios in the variography. The search was divided into four sectors, with a maximum of four samples per sector allowed, in order to ensure that block estimates were informed from a range of directions. First pass interpolation runs used search radii of 21m:21m:7m (major:semi:minor) with just the top cuts implemented while Pass 2 search radii were inflated until all remaining blocks were estimated. The distance limiting previously described was only implemented in Pass 2. Dynamic local rotations, set using digitised trend surfaces for each group of lodes, were used to locally vary both the variogram and search orientation during estimation. Ordinary Kriging ("OK") and Nearest Neighbour ("NN") were used to estimate the gold grade. The NN served as a check estimate only, and it is the OK model which has been reported. No assumptions were made regarding recovery of by-products No potential by products noted in drill logs. No estimates of deleterious elements or other non-grade variables were undertaken. Some sulphide rich lodes are noted at Bruno-Lewis. No other deleterious elements noted in drill logs. Drill spacing at Cardinia Hill is at 20m x 20m spacing or tighter in most of the well mineralised areas. The parent and estimation block size of the block model was chosen to be 10mE x 10mN x 5mRL, which is half the

<table>
<tr><th>Criteria</th><th>JORC Code explanation</th><th>Comments</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>drillhole nominal spacing and within industry standard practice. The parent cells were sub-blocked to 2.5mE x 2.5mN x 1.25mRL, for accurate representation of the volume of the modelled lodes.

Gold was estimated in two passes, using a search distance between 21m and 150m.

Very poorly informed domains (no. of composites of 5 or less) were not estimated using OK but were instead assigned the mean cut composite grade of the samples within the domain, or of a closely spatially associated domain.

No assumptions were made with respect to selective mining units. The model cannot be a local recoverable estimate, and the estimation block size is slightly larger than what would reasonably be expected from an eventual grade control and mining selection.

No assumptions were made on the correlation between variables.
Lodes are modelled to represent material mineralised by fluid flow through planar structural and/or stratigraphic features. The mineralised domains act as hard boundaries to control the gold interpolation.

Block model validation was undertaken by the following means:
▪ Visual validation of blocks values vs drill hole data.
▪ Comparison of global estimated block means by domain vs declustered cut composite means and the NN check estimate.
▪ Swath plots showing estimated block means vs composite means and the NN check estimates in several directions.
▪ No reconciliation data are available.
▪</td></tr>
<tr><td>Moisture</td><td>• Whether the tonnages are estimated on a dry basis or with natural moisture, and the method of determination of the moisture content.</td><td>Tonnages estimated on a dry basis only. Moisture was not considered in the density assignment.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Cut-off parameters</td><td>• The basis of the adopted cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied.</td><td>The lower cut-off gold grade for reporting mineral resources was 0.4 g/t Au. This was determined by KIN to be appropriate with a gold price of $2600 AUD per ounce and based on reasonable operating costs.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Mining factors or assumptions</td><td>• 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.</td><td>No mining method assumptions were made for the estimation of this model.

Assumptions were made for open pit mine design and pit optimisation used to constrain the Mineral Resource for reporting:
<table>
<tr><td>Revenue Assumptions</td><td>Gold Price</td><td></td><td>$/t ore</td><td>$2,600</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Revenue</td><td></td><td>$/g</td><td>$83.59</td></tr>
<tr><td>Mining Cost Assumptions</td><td>Mining Dilution</td><td></td><td>%</td><td>0%</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Mining Recovery</td><td></td><td>%</td><td>100%</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Mining Cost</td><td></td><td>$/bcm</td><td>Calculated</td></tr>
<tr><td>Processing Recovery and Cost Assumptions</td><td>Recovery</td><td>Oxide</td><td>%</td><td>95%</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>Trans</td><td></td><td>95%</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>Fresh</td><td></td><td>95%</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Processing Cost</td><td>Oxide</td><td>$/t ore</td><td>$14.00</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>Trans</td><td></td><td>$16.50</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>Fresh</td><td></td><td>$20.00</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Haulage</td><td></td><td>$/t ore</td><td>Not Calculated</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>G & A Cost</td><td></td><td>$/t ore</td><td>$2.09</td></tr>
<tr><td>Geotechnical Assumptions</td><td></td><td>Oxide</td><td>deg</td><td>50</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>Transitional</td><td>deg</td><td>60</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>Fresh</td><td>deg</td><td>65</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
<tr><td>Metallurgical factors or assumptions</td><td>• 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.</td><td>PFS level metallurgical test work has been completed for the deposit.

Processing recoveries of 95% assumed for all material types.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Environmental factors or assumptions</td><td>• 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,</td><td>No environmental assumptions have been made for the estimation of this model.</td></tr>
</table>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
	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.	
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.* • *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.* • *Discuss assumptions for bulk density estimates used in the evaluation process of the different materials.*	Dry bulk density measurements were collected primarily from diamond drill core. The data collected were mainly in the transitional and fresh zone. Density assignment was based on weathering status on a dry basis. A minor amount of dump material was assigned a density value based on Cube's experience. The weight in air versus weight in water method was used to measure dry density. Bulk density work considered void spaces and were sealed prior to the wet measurement. The average bulk density assigned for the May 2021 MRE is as follows: ▪ Dump = 1.80t/m3 ▪ Oxide = 2.00t/m3 ▪ Transition = 2.34t/m3 ▪ Fresh Porphyry = 2.77t/m3
Classification	• *The basis for the classification of the Mineral Resources into varying confidence categories.* • *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).* • *Whether the result appropriately reflects the Competent Person's view of the deposit.*	Blocks have been classified as Inferred, Indicated or Measured based on the following: Measured: ▪ Blocks within interpreted mineralisation/estimation domains. ▪ Only within domains containing more than 3 drill holes and more than 5 composite samples. ▪ Drill spacing of 10m x 10m or tighter. Indicated: ▪ Blocks within interpreted mineralisation/estimation domains. ▪ Only within domains containing more than 3 drill holes and more than 5 composite samples. ▪ Drill spacing of 20m x 20m or tighter. Inferred: ▪ Blocks within interpreted mineralisation/estimation domains. ▪ Drill spacing wider than 20m x 20m. This process was also visually and qualitatively guided by: ▪ The current understanding of geological and mineralisation continuity. ▪ Data quality. ▪ Estimation quality: by means of assessing OK quality parameters such as slope of regression. ▪ Validation results by comparing global statistics between composited data and the estimated block, and locally through trend plots. DTM wireframes for the Indicated and Measured boundaries were constructed using the above criteria, so as to smoothly vary the shape of the volume being classified (i.e. to avoid the 'spotted dog' phenomenon. For the sake of continuity, small volumes within the Mineral Resource may not conform exactly to the criteria listed above. The entire volume outside of the interpreted mineralisation/estimation domains was not classified as Mineral Resource. All relevant factors affecting classification have been considered. The MRE appropriately reflects the view of the Competent Persons.
Audits or reviews	• *The results of any audits or reviews of Mineral Resource estimates.*	No audits and reviews have been completed on this MRE.
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*	The relative accuracy of the Mineral Resource Estimate is reflected in the reporting of the MRE in accordance with the guidelines of the 2012 JORC Code. The classification of the Mineral Resources as Inferred, Indicated and Measured is deemed appropriate by the CP as noted within the criteria used for the classification.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
	of the factors that could affect the relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate. • *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.* • *These statements of relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate should be compared with production data, where available.*	The MRE constitutes a global resource estimate. Production data was not available.

Section 3 Estimation and Reporting of Mineral Resources – Kyte

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
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.*	Data is uploaded into Maxwell's Datashed application by the Database Administrator (DBA). This application includes quality protocols which must be met for uploading to occur (examples: data duplication, validation of geological fields). Returned assay results are loaded electronically in CSV format into Datashed, by either the DBA, or Senior Geologists. This includes a review of QC results. Finally, the data is reviewed upon upload to Datamine Studio RM before final use. (Examples: DH surveys present, overlapping intervals, 'From' and 'To's concurrent). Historic data does not contain sufficient metadata for thorough validation protocols however it does compare well with recent QAQC controlled data.
Site visits	• *Comment on any site visits undertaken by the Competent Person and the outcome of those visits.* • *If no site visits have been undertaken indicate why this is the case.*	Mr. Jamie Logan conducted a formal site visit during July of 2018 and again in February 2019 where all steps within the sample collection process were reviewed. Drilling, sample handling, logging and sampling, QAQC and dispatch procedures were validated.
Geological interpretation	• *Confidence in (or conversely, the uncertainty of) the geological interpretation of the mineral deposit.* • *Nature of the data used and of any assumptions made.* • *The effect, if any, of alternative interpretations on Mineral Resource estimation.* • *The use of geology in guiding and controlling Mineral Resource estimation.* • *The factors affecting continuity both of grade and geology.*	Confidence in the interpretation is directly reflected in the classification. Most of the mineralisation within this model is contained within the supergene zone and is modelled accordingly. Alteration, weathering, and grade information were used to determine this interpretation. Lithological and structural information lacking due to the predominate use of RC drilling and the strongly weathered host (supergene). Alternate interpretations have been considered; however, the current interpretation is considered robust, and conforms to the observed controls. The interpretation is largely based on gold grades, as well as its presence and association with the weathering horizons. Continuity is typical of secondary supergene mineralisation. The primary mineralisation is poorly understood, however shares similarities in orientation to mineralisation seen locally at the Lewis and Bruno deposits.
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 Kyte MRE covers part of the Bruno-Lewis system. It strikes for approximately 550m, to a depth of 35m, with an average thickness of 12m. The Mineral Resource estimate extends from surface to a maximum depth of 40m below surface.
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.* • *The availability of check estimates, previous estimates and/or mine production records and whether the Mineral Resource estimate takes appropriate account of such data.*	Mineral Resource Estimate (MRE) completed by Palaris Australia. Diamond, RC and Aircore drilling included in the MRE. Domain wireframes created in Datamine RM using a Categorical Indicator approach and Dynamic Anisotropy (DA) with directions derived from weathering surfaces and apparent primary mineralisation orientation.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
	• *The assumptions made regarding recovery of by-products.* • *Estimation of deleterious elements or other non-grade variables of economic significance (e.g. sulphur for acid mine drainage characterization).* • *In the case of block model interpolation, the block size in relation to the average sample spacing and the search employed.* • *Any assumptions behind modelling of selective mining units.* • *Any assumptions about correlation between variables.* • *Description of how the geological interpretation was used to control the resource estimates.* • *Discussion of basis for using or not using grade cutting or capping.* • *The process of validation, the checking process used, the comparison of model data to drill hole data, and use of reconciliation data if available.*	Drillholes composited to 1m, which is based on most samples being 1m or below. All lengths retained. Domains assessed for capping, using multiple methods including reviewing population gaps and Coefficient of Variation (CV). Capping effect is not believed to be material. The outer domain has a cap of 10g/t, while the inner domain has a cap of 14g/t. The previously reported MRE had a cap of 15g/t. Variography undertaken on both domain's as well as the 'waste' material. Kriging neighbourhood analysis (KNA) reviewed to determine optimal block sizes and estimation parameters. Parent cells of 7.5mE x 7.5mN x 2.5mRL estimated using Ordinary Kriging. Search distances and directions aligned with maximum variogram ranges and rotations. The estimate was compared to the previous estimate, to understand changes. Several internal iterations of this model have been created during the past year, to review sensitivities to the statistical parameters. No assumptions were made regarding recovery of by-products. No potential by products noted in drill logs. No estimates of deleterious elements or other non-grade variables were completed. No deleterious elements noted in drill logs. Nominal Drill spacing of 10m x7m in well informed areas led to parent cells of 7.5mE x 7.55mN x 2.5mRL used. Search distances and directions aligned with maximum variogram ranges and rotations. No assumptions were made on selective mining units. No assumptions were made on the correlation between variables. Domains are modelled to represent material mineralised by supergene enrichment processes from an inferred primary structure. Estimates constrained by domain wireframes however a soft boundary was used between the inner and outer mineralised domains. Model validation is a combined review including: ▪ Visual review of blocks values vs composite values, by section and plan. ▪ Visual review of Kriging efficiencies and Slope of regression outputs. ▪ Review of global means by domain vs declustered cut composite means. ▪ Swath plots showing block means vs composite means in space. Review of Change of Support plots against idealised scenario. No reconciliation data available.
Moisture	• *Whether the tonnages are estimated on a dry basis or with natural moisture, and the method of determination of the moisture content.*	Tonnages estimated on a dry basis only.
Cut-off parameters	• *The basis of the adopted cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied.*	The lower Cut-off gold grade for reporting mineral resources was of 0.4 g/t Au. This was determined by KIN to be appropriate with a gold price of $2600 AUD and based on reasonable operating costs.
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*	No mining method assumptions were made for the estimation of this model. Assumptions were made for the pit optimisation used to constrain the Mineral Resource for reporting.

<table>
<tr><th>Criteria</th><th>JORC Code explanation</th><th>Comments</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>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.</td><td>
<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Revenue Assumptions</td><td>Gold Price</td><td></td><td>$/t ore</td><td>$2,600</td></tr>
<tr><td>Revenue</td><td></td><td>$/g</td><td>$83.59</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Mining Cost Assumptions</td><td>Mining Dilution</td><td></td><td>%</td><td>0%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Mining Recovery</td><td></td><td>%</td><td>100%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Mining Cost</td><td></td><td>$/bcm</td><td>Calculated</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="8">Processing Recovery and Cost Assumptions</td><td>Recovery</td><td>Oxide</td><td>%</td><td>95%</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Trans</td><td></td><td>95%</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Fresh</td><td></td><td>95%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Processing Cost</td><td>Oxide</td><td>$/t ore</td><td>$14.00</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Trans</td><td></td><td>$16.50</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Fresh</td><td></td><td>$20.00</td></tr>
<tr><td>Haulage</td><td></td><td>$/t ore</td><td>Not Calculated</td></tr>
<tr><td>G & A Cost</td><td></td><td>$/t ore</td><td>$2.09</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Geotechnical Assumptions</td><td></td><td>Oxide</td><td>deg</td><td>50</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Transitional</td><td>deg</td><td>60</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Fresh</td><td>deg</td><td>65</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
<tr><td>Metallurgical factors or assumptions</td><td>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.</td><td>PFS level metallurgical test work has been completed for the deposit. Processing recoveries of 95% assumed for all material types.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Environmental factors or assumptions</td><td>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.</td><td>No environmental assumptions have been made for the estimation of this model.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Bulk density</td><td>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.
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.
Discuss assumptions for bulk density estimates used in the evaluation process of the different materials.</td><td>During 2017 a campaign of determining Bulk Densities was undertaken for use in the 2017 DFS. These values were maintained in this model due to no new drilling being undertaken in this area since.

The mean of these measurements are then assigned to a weathering profile (Oxide, Transition, Fresh rock).
Oxide = 2.1t/m3
Transition = 2.2t/m3
Fresh Porphyry = 2.6t/m3
Previous work considered void spaces and were sealed prior to the wet measurement.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Classification</td><td>The basis for the classification of the Mineral Resources into varying confidence categories.
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).
Whether the result appropriately reflects the Competent Person's view of the deposit.</td><td>Classification is based on a combination of drill spacing, geological confidence and estimation quality. The classification is applied to the model on a domain by domain basis.
Indicated: 15m x 15m x 15m drill spacing with > 50% Kriging Efficiency and > 75% Slope of regression.
Inferred: up to 40m x40m x 40m drill spacing with Positive kriging efficiency and > 50% Slope of regression.
Discussed with interpreting Geologists to ensure classification represents geological confidence as well as statistical confidence.

All relevant factors effecting classification have been considered.

The Mineral Resource estimate appropriately reflects the view of the Competent Person.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Audits or reviews</td><td>The results of any audits or reviews of Mineral Resource estimates.</td><td>A previous iteration of the Kyte MRE (1810) was formally reviewed by external consultant Optiro. The estimate was endorsed by Optiro. Several improvements were recommended, none of which were deemed material. These recommendations have been reviewed, largely accepted, and implemented for this update.</td></tr>
</table>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
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.* • *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.* • *These statements of relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate should be compared with production data, where available.*	The Mineral Resource Estimate is validated both visually and statistically, and the accuracy is reflected in the reporting as per the guidelines of the 2012 JORC code. The reported Mineral Resource Estimate refers to the global estimate for the Kyte area. Production Data is not available.

Section 3 Estimation and Reporting of Mineral Resources – Raeside

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
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.*	Data for these models are largely historic, drilled between 1989 and 2006, with the majority been drilled between 1990 and 1997. This data has been uploaded into Maxwell's Datashed application by the Database Administrator (DBA). This application includes quality protocols which must be met in order for uploading to occur (examples: data duplication, validation of geological field). Considerable effort has been made to audit data, going back through previous models, report and original log/assay sheets. Finally, the data is reviewed upon upload to Datamine Studio RM before final use. (Examples: DH surveys present, overlapping intervals, 'From' and 'To's concurrent). Historic data does not contain sufficient metadata for thorough validation protocols, however, compares well with recent QAQC controlled data.
Site visits	• *Comment on any site visits undertaken by the Competent Person and the outcome of those visits.* • *If no site visits have been undertaken indicate why this is the case.*	Mr. Jamie Logan conducted a formal site visit during July of 2018 and again in February of 2019, including a visit to Raeside and the Forgotten Four pit.
Geological interpretation	• *Confidence in (or conversely, the uncertainty of) the geological interpretation of the mineral deposit.* • *Nature of the data used and of any assumptions made.* • *The effect, if any, of alternative interpretations on Mineral Resource estimation.* • *The use of geology in guiding and controlling Mineral Resource estimation.* • *The factors affecting continuity both of grade and geology.*	Confidence in the interpretation is directly reflected in the classification. Overall interpretations have not changed over time and are considered robust. Lithological, structural, alteration and grade information were used to determine this interpretation. Alternate interpretations (including previous interpretations) have been considered and have not changed conceptually for this update. The current Interpretation is considered robust, and conforms to the current thinking, and observed controls. The interpretation is directly based on the presence of, or absence of mineralisation. These deposits are fortunate in that this distinction is clear. Geological observations, particular the presence of lithologies (contacts) and structural features (faults), support this interpretation. Continuity is structurally and/or stratigraphically controlled.
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 Raeside Mineral Resource estimate (MRE) strikes for approximately 2,200m towards to North-east, to a depth of 200m, with an average width of 120m. The Mineral Resource estimate extends from surface to a maximum depth of 240m below surface.
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*	Only Diamond and RC drilling included in Estimate.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
	method was chosen include a description of computer software and parameters used. • *The availability of check estimates, previous estimates and/or mine production records and whether the Mineral Resource estimate takes appropriate account of such data.* • *The assumptions made regarding recovery of by-products.* • *Estimation of deleterious elements or other non-grade variables of economic significance (e.g. sulphur for acid mine drainage characterization).* • *In the case of block model interpolation, the block size in relation to the average sample spacing and the search employed.* • *Any assumptions behind modelling of selective mining units.* • *Any assumptions about correlation between variables.* • *Description of how the geological interpretation was used to control the resource estimates.* • *Discussion of basis for using or not using grade cutting or capping.* • *The process of validation, the checking process used, the comparison of model data to drill hole data, and use of reconciliation data if available.*	Lodes assigned and wireframes created in Datamine RM. Weathering surfaces constructed in Leapfrog Geo. These wireframes re-imported to Datamine RM and validated. All other work takes place in Datamine RM. Drillholes composited to 1m, which is based on most samples being 1m or below. Comparison of Diamond and RC lengths conducted to support this decision. All lengths retained. Individual lodes assessed for capping, using multiple methods including reviewing population gaps and Coefficient of Variation (CV). Capping effect is not believed to be material. Caps range between 2g/t to 25g/t. No sub-domaining undertaken, however searches kept as small as practical to mitigate any potential conditional bias. Variography undertaken on lodes with sufficient samples. Kriging neighbourhood analysis (KNA) reviewed to determine guidance on optimal block sizes and estimation parameters. Parent cells of 5m x 5m x 5m estimated using Ordinary Kriging. Search distances set to 80% of variogram ranges for the first 'pass' and doubled for subsequent 'passes'. Search directions generally aligned with variogram rotations, however Dynamic Anisotropy also used for local search directions. The estimate was compared to the previous estimates, to understand changes. No assumptions were made regarding recovery of by-products. No potential by products noted in drill logs. No estimates of deleterious elements or other non-grade variables were completed. Some sulphide rich shales noted at Leonardo and Forgotten Four. No other deleterious elements noted in drill logs. Drill spacing varies from 10m x 10m, to 20m x 20m. A nominal drill spacing of 15m x15m was deemed most appropriate when assessing the entire project. This led to parent cells of 5mE x 5mN x 5mRL used. Search distances and directions generally aligned with maximum variogram ranges and rotations. No assumptions were made on selective mining units. No assumptions were made on the correlation between variables. Lodes are modelled to represent material mineralised by fluid flow through planar structural and/or stratigraphic features. Estimates constrained by lode wireframes. Model validation is a combined review including: ▪ Visual review of blocks values vs composite values, by section and plan. ▪ Visual review of Kriging efficiencies and Slope of regression outputs. ▪ Review of global block means by domain vs declustered cut composite means. ▪ Swath plots showing block means vs composite means in space. ▪ Review of Change of Support plots against idealised scenario. No reliable reconciliation data available.
Moisture	• *Whether the tonnages are estimated on a dry basis or with natural moisture, and the method of determination of the moisture content.*	Tonnages estimated on a dry basis only.
Cut-off parameters	• *The basis of the adopted cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied.*	The lower Cut-off gold grade for reporting mineral resources was of 0.4 g/t Au. This was determined by KIN to be appropriate with a gold price of $2600 AUD and based on reasonable operating costs.

<table>
<tr><th>Criteria</th><th>JORC Code explanation</th><th>Comments</th></tr>
<tr><td>Mining factors or assumptions</td><td>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.</td><td>No mining method assumptions were made for the estimation of this model.

Assumptions were made for the pit optimisation used to constrain the Mineral Resource for reporting.

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Revenue Assumptions</td><td>Gold Price</td><td></td><td>$/t ore</td><td>$2,600</td></tr>
<tr><td>Revenue</td><td></td><td>$/g</td><td>$83.59</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Mining Cost Assumptions</td><td>Mining Dilution</td><td></td><td>%</td><td>0%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Mining Recovery</td><td></td><td>%</td><td>100%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Mining Cost</td><td></td><td>$/bcm</td><td>Calculated</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="8">Processing Recovery and Cost Assumptions</td><td>Recovery</td><td>Oxide</td><td>%</td><td>95%</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Trans</td><td></td><td>95%</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Fresh</td><td></td><td>95%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Processing Cost</td><td>Oxide</td><td>$/t ore</td><td>$14.00</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Trans</td><td></td><td>$16.50</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Fresh</td><td></td><td>$20.00</td></tr>
<tr><td>Haulage</td><td></td><td>$/t ore</td><td>Not Calculated</td></tr>
<tr><td>G & A Cost</td><td></td><td>$/t ore</td><td>$2.09</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Geotechnical Assumptions</td><td></td><td>Oxide</td><td>deg</td><td>50</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Transitional</td><td>deg</td><td>60</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Fresh</td><td>deg</td><td>65</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
<tr><td>Metallurgical factors or assumptions</td><td>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.</td><td>PFS level metallurgical test work has been completed for the deposit.
Processing recoveries of 95% assumed for all material types.
Graphitic shale was encountered in Forgotten Four mining, and has been noted in logging at Leonardo.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Environmental factors or assumptions</td><td>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.</td><td>No environmental assumptions have been made for the estimation of this model.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Bulk density</td><td>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.
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.
Discuss assumptions for bulk density estimates used in the evaluation process of the different materials.</td><td>During 2017 a campaign of determining Bulk Densities was undertaken for use in the 2017 DFS. These values were maintained in this model due to no new drilling being undertaken in this area since.

The mean of these measurements are then assigned to a weathering profile (Oxide, Transition, Fresh rock):
Oxide = 2.0t/m3
Transition = 2.3t/m3
Fresh Porphyry = 2.65t/m3
Previous work considered void spaces and were sealed prior to the wet measurement.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Classification</td><td>The basis for the classification of the Mineral Resources into varying confidence categories.
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).
Whether the result appropriately reflects the Competent Person's view of the deposit.</td><td>Classification is based on a combination of drills pacing, geological confidence and estimation quality. Kriging Efficiency relatively low due to small searches and low sample minimums and maximums. The classification is applied to the model on a lode by lode basis.
Measured: No material classified as Measured due to dominance of historic data used in the estimate.
Indicated: 20m x 20m x 20m drill spacing with > 15% Kriging Efficiency.
Inferred: up to 40m x40m x 40m drill spacing with Positive kriging efficiency.
Classification discussed with interpreting Geologists to ensure classification represents geological confidence as well as statistical confidence.

All relevant factors effecting classification have been considered.
The Mineral Resource estimate appropriately reflects the view of the Competent Person.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Audits or reviews</td><td>The results of any audits or reviews of Mineral Resource estimates.</td><td>No audits and reviews have completed on this Mineral Resource estimate.</td></tr>
</table>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Comments
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.* • *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.* • *These statements of relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate should be compared with production data, where available.*	The Mineral Resource Estimate is validated both visually and statistically, and the accuracy is reflected in the reporting as per the guidelines of the 2012 JORC code. The reported Mineral Resource Estimate refers to the global estimate for the Raeside area. Production Data is not available.