ALMASANE ALKOBRA MINING COMPANY (“AMAK” or the “Company”)

AMAK Announces Maiden Mineral Resource Estimate for the Jabal Qaran Polymetallic Project, Najran Region

Independent, JORC (2012)-compliant estimate confirms 11.3 million tonnes of Indicated and Inferred Mineral Resources containing copper, zinc, gold and silver, with further unclassified mineralisation identified as upside potential.

Highlights

- Maiden Mineral Resource Estimate (“MRE”) for Jabal Qaran of 11.3 Mt classified as Indicated and Inferred Mineral Resources, containing 34,000t copper metal, 118,000t zinc metal, 281,000oz gold and 3,739,000oz silver, estimated and reported in accordance with the JORC Code (2012).
- Confirms and refines the preliminary estimate of approximately 11 Mt announced by the Company on 25 November 2025; independently estimated by Cube Consulting Pty Ltd of Perth, Australia.
- 7.1 Mt (63% of total tonnes) is classified Indicated, with the balance of 4.1 Mt Inferred; no Measured Mineral Resources are reported at this early stage.
- Polymetallic mineralisation totals **9.7 Mt at 1.38% CuEq**; gold-dominant mineralisation totals **1.5 Mt at 1.10 g/t Au**.
- A further approximately **2.7 Mt of mineralised material** within the same pit and underground optimisation shells remains ‘unclassified’, providing additional upside subject to further drilling.
- Cut-off date of the Mineral Resource Statement is 31 July 2026.

1. Introduction

Almasane Alkobra Mining Company (“AMAK” or the “Company”) has completed an independent, maiden Mineral Resource Estimate (“MRE”) for the Jabal Qaran polymetallic project (“Jabal Qaran” or the “Project”), held under Exploration License No. 1446216 in the Najran region of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The License was awarded to AMAK on 4 September 2024 under Round 5 of the Ministry of Industry and Mineral Resources' competitive licensing rounds, as previously disclosed by the Company on 5 September 2024 (where the site was referred to as “Jabal Qaran”).

The Project is located approximately 60km south-southwest of AMAK's producing Al Masane and Guyan mining complex. This MRE confirms and refines the preliminary estimate of approximately 11 Mt announced by the Company on 25 November 2025, and was independently prepared by Cube Consulting Pty Ltd (“Cube”) of Perth, Australia, incorporating all diamond drilling available up to 15 July 2026.

2. Mineral Resource Statement

The Mineral Resource Statement below is classified and reported in accordance with the JORC Code (2012), cut-off date 31 July 2026. Mineralisation is grouped as gold-dominant (processed via the existing Guyan CIP plant) or polymetallic-dominant (processed via the existing Moyeath and Al Masane flotation plants).

Table 1: Mineral Resource Statement – Combined Gold and Polymetallic Mineralisation

Classification	Tonnes (Mt)	Cu (Kt)	Zn (Kt)	Au (Koz)	Ag (Koz)
Indicated	7.1	26	77	174	2,547
Inferred	4.1	8	41	107	1,192
Total	**11.3**	**33**	**118**	**281**	**3,739**

Table 2: Mineral Resource Statement – Gold Mineralisation

Classification	Tonnes (Mt)	Au (g/t)	Ag (g/t)	Au (Koz)	Ag (Koz)
Indicated	0.9	1.09	0.76	32	22
Inferred	0.6	1.11	0.53	23	11
Total	**1.5**	**1.10**	**0.67**	**55**	**33**

Table 3: Mineral Resource Statement – Polymetallic Mineralisation

Classification	Tonnes (Mt)	CuEq (%)	Cu (%)	Zn (%)	Au (g/t)	Ag (g/t)	Cu (Kt)	Zn (Kt)	Au (Koz)	Ag (Koz)
Indicated	6.2	1.45	0.41	1.23	0.71	12.60	26	77	142	2,525
Inferred	3.5	1.25	0.22	1.19	0.75	10.52	8	41	84	1,181
Total	**9.7**	**1.38**	**0.34**	**1.21**	**0.72**	**11.85**	**33**	**118**	**226**	**3,706**

- *Mineral Resources that are not Mineral Reserves do not have demonstrated economic viability; the estimate may be materially affected by environmental, permitting, legal, title, taxation, socio-political, marketing or other issues.*
- *Reported within optimised open pit shells / underground MSO solids above cut-off grades of 0.33g/t Au (open pit gold) and 0.52g/t Au (underground gold); 0.45% CuEq (open pit polymetallic) and 0.8996% CuEq (underground polymetallic, excl. oxide material).*
- *No Mineral Resources are classified as Measured. Figures may not add up due to rounding. The open pit / underground breakdown and full JORC Table 1 assessment criteria are attached to this report.*

3. Unclassified Mineralisation – Upside Potential

Additional mineralised material occurs within the same open pit optimisation shells and underground mineable shape optimiser (MSO) at Jabal Qaran, above the same cut-off grades applied to the classified Mineral Resource, but does not currently meet the geological confidence, drill spacing and continuity criteria required for classification under the JORC Code (2012). This Unclassified material (Table 4) is not included in, and must not be aggregated with, the Mineral Resource Statement in Section 2.

Table 4: Unclassified Material Within Pit and Underground Optimisation

Mineralisation	Tonnes (Mt)	Cu (Kt)	Zn (Kt)	Au (Koz)	Ag (Koz)
Gold	0.05	–	–	1.6	0.4
Polymetallic	2.6	6	26	66	1,110
Total	**2.7**	**6**	**26**	**68**	**1,110**

This Unclassified material does not constitute, and must not be construed as, a Mineral Resource or Ore Reserve under the JORC Code (2012). AMAK regards this material as upside potential and intends to prioritise infill drilling to test its conversion in future resource updates.

4. Basis of Estimate, Next Steps and Competent Person Statement

The MRE was estimated by Ordinary Kriging of downhole composites within validated geological and mineralisation domain models. AMAK's diamond drilling database is supported by rigorous quality assurance and quality control protocols and results (blanks, duplicates, certified reference materials). Classification of the MRE is consistent with the JORC Code (2012) and based on data quality, sample spacing, geological understanding of mineralization controls and geological/mineralization continuity and quality of the final grade estimate. Indicated Resources are typically characterised by extensive surface trenching plus resource definition drilling to 50 m spacing while Inferred Resources includes material typically less than 100 m extrapolation distance from the nearest drill hole. The Mineral Resources are reported within optimised open pit shells and underground MSO shapes to satisfy the requirements of 'reasonable prospects of eventual economic extraction' (RPEEE). Metallurgical testwork completed to date has confirmed amenability of Jabal Qaran mineralisation to conventional gravity, sulphide flotation and cyanidation processing, with no fatal flaw identified. AMAK intends to prioritise infill drilling to convert Inferred and Unclassified material to higher-confidence categories, complete further metallurgical testwork to support a future feasibility study, and progress Development Concept and scoping studies for Jabal Qaran.

The information in this report relating to the Jabal Qaran MRE is based on, and fairly represents, information compiled by Mr Mark Zammit, a Director and Principal Geologist of Cube Consulting Pty Ltd and a Member of the Australian Institute of Geoscientists (AIG), who has sufficient relevant experience to qualify as a Competent Person as defined in the JORC Code (2012) and consents to the inclusion of this information in the form and context in which it appears. Mr Zammit has not visited the Jabal Qaran site but visited AMAK's adjacent Al Masane and Guyan operations from 19–25 September 2025, and has reviewed core photography for all diamond drilling completed by AMAK at Jabal Qaran.

JORC Code, 2012 Edition – Table 1

Section 1 Sampling Techniques and Data

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

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Sampling techniques	• *Nature and quality of sampling (eg cut channels, random chips, or specific specialised industry standard measurement tools appropriate to the minerals under investigation, such as down hole gamma sondes, or handheld XRF instruments, etc). These examples should not be taken as limiting the broad meaning of sampling.* • *Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample representivity and the appropriate calibration of any measurement tools or systems used.* • *Aspects of the determination of mineralisation that are Material to the Public Report.* • *In cases where 'industry standard' work has been done this would be relatively simple (eg 'reverse circulation drilling was used to obtain 1 m samples from which 3 kg was pulverised to produce a 30 g charge for fire assay'). In other cases more explanation may be required, such as where there is coarse gold that has inherent sampling problems. Unusual commodities or mineralisation types (eg submarine nodules) may warrant disclosure of detailed information.*	• Mineralisation is sampled by half-core from diamond drilling, the primary and only sample type used in the Mineral Resource dataset. Core is systematically logged and photographed, then split longitudinally with a diamond saw; the cut is oriented perpendicular to the main foliation to maximise representativity. One half is submitted for analysis and one half retained as reference. • Sample intervals generally honour geological boundaries and avoid mixing lithologies. Although the nominal sample length within mineralised zones was 0.30–1.50 m. • Representivity and calibration are controlled by a formal AMAK QAQC programme with ~16% control-sample insertion (field/coarse/pulp duplicates, coarse/fine blanks, and CRMs at three grade levels). • Historical rock-chip, channel and wadi-sediment sampling by USGS/Riofinex/BRGM exists but is used for context only and is excluded from the estimate.
Drilling techniques	• *Drill type (eg core, reverse circulation, open-hole hammer, rotary air blast, auger, Bangka, sonic, etc) and details (eg core diameter, triple or standard tube, depth of diamond tails, face-sampling bit or other type, whether core is oriented and if so, by what method, etc).*	• All drilling in the resource dataset is diamond core. The Mineral Resource is informed by 163 AMAK diamond drillholes for 54,397.5 m (JAQD series with assay data that intersect mineralisation). A further 21 historical FG-series holes (5,175 m) and un-assayed, cancelled, and metallurgical holes are held in the database but excluded from the estimate. Rigs: four Epiroc Boyles C6C (AMAK Drilling) and two Boretech BT-2500 (Drilling & Exploration Co.). First hole 3 February 2025; latest holes to end June 2026. Hole depths range 70–600.2 m; holes are inclined to intersect the steeply dipping mineralisation as close to perpendicular as practicable. Core diameter is HQ. Holes were drilled using double-tube core-barrel methods. No core-orientation method was used.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
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.*	• Core recovery is recorded per drill run (typically 0.5–1 m runs in weathered ground and up to 3 m in fresh rock) and assessed as part of logging; recovery in the mineralised zones is generally good. Overall core recovery is 98%, and 97% within the mineralised portions. • Sample representivity is maximised by perpendicular-to-foliation sawing and geologically bounded sampling. • There is no preferential loss/gain of fine or coarse material that could bias 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.*	• Diamond drill core was logged with the following information being recorded: lithology, structure, mineralization, alteration and density. All core is geologically logged prior to sampling — lithology (an 11-unit model), alteration (type and intensity), oxidation, mineralisation and structure — and all core is photographed, giving a permanent visual record. The Competent Person has reviewed core photography for all AMAK drilling. • Logging is primarily qualitative for geology with quantitative recovery and density measurement; it supports Mineral Resource estimation, and lithogeochemistry (ioGAS, immobile elements) is used to discriminate visually similar units. • All 163 resource drillholes have been geologically logged, with drilling, logging, sampling and assaying procedures undertaken in accordance with industry best practice.
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.*	• The core is sawn in half along the centre-marked cut line. The core was again cut perpendicular to the cut line at each sample marker. Once cut, all core was returned to the trays for sampling. • The core is sawn rather than dry cut. For field duplicates, one quarter of the core is retained as the original sample for analysis, while an adjacent quarter is collected as the field duplicate. Both quarter-core samples are processed independently through the full analytical chain. The remaining half of the core is retained in the core box for storage. • Sample preparation (drying, crushing, pulverising) is performed mainly at the AMAK Laboratory (Pathway A) with some batches prepared directly at ALS Jeddah (Pathway B). Pulverisation is verified by wet-screen tests at a minimum of 1 per 30 samples against >=85% passing 75 um; the failure rate is 2.08% (n=144), confirming adequate, homogeneous preparation. • QC at all sub-sampling stages: coarse duplicates (post-crush) and pulp duplicates (post-pulverise) at 2% each, plus coarse and fine blanks, monitor contamination and precision. Sample sizes (half HQ core) are appropriate to the grain size of the mineralisation.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		• For trench samples, the sample intervals are marked out on the exposed rock. The sample intervals consider lithological and mineralisation boundaries. A continuous chip sample is taken using a geological hammer in order to obtain the sample, no sawing of the rock is undertaken. • The samples are put in a calico bag and the bag is labelled. The sample bags were tied after the sample tags have been inserted. The bags are transported to the laboratory with the sample submission forms, chain of custody, and sample manifest. • Little to no information as to the historical rock-chip sample preparation is available.
Quality of assay data and laboratory tests	• *The nature, quality and appropriateness of the assaying and laboratory procedures used and whether the technique is considered partial or total.* • *For geophysical tools, spectrometers, handheld XRF instruments, etc, the parameters used in determining the analysis including instrument make and model, reading times, calibrations factors applied and their derivation, etc.* • *Nature of quality control procedures adopted (eg standards, blanks, duplicates, external laboratory checks) and whether acceptable levels of accuracy (ie lack of bias) and precision have been established.*	• Primary laboratory: ALS Jeddah, ISO 17025-accredited Tier 1 (majority of resource assays). Secondary: Bureau Veritas Minerals (BVMS) Jeddah for early-programme batches (QAQC-passed, included). The AMAK Laboratory provides rapid preliminary assays only and is EXCLUDED from the resource. Methods (ALS): gold by fire assay with AAS finish, using a 50 g charge for all drillhole samples (ALS Au-AA26); base metals and multi-element data by four-acid (near-total) digestion with ICP-MS/ICP-OES, ore-grade Cu/Zn/Pb/Ag by four-acid ICP-OES, Zn by AAS, and ultra-trace Hg. BVMS used aqua regia (partial) and multi-acid (near-total) ICP/AAS plus fire-assay Au. Methods are industry-standard and appropriate to the polymetallic mineralisation. • QC procedures per the AMAK QAQC Report (July 2026): CRMs (OREAS and GBM/Geostats, grade-matched, three grade levels, ~6% per batch), coarse and fine blanks (felsic-intrusive material below detection), and field/coarse/pulp duplicates, inserted per SOP (~16% of samples). Accuracy: submission-weighted Global Bias within ±2.42% at all laboratories (threshold 5%). Precision: duplicate failure rates ≤3.57% (threshold 10%). Contamination: no blank exceeded its upper control limit at any laboratory (CBLK ≤5×PDL, FBLK ≤3×PDL), i.e. a 0% contamination-failure rate; individual coarse-blank maxima for Cu and Zn at ALS (max 271 and 439 ppm) and BVMS (179 and 495 ppm) remained well within the 5×PDL control limits, while AMAK coarse-blank maxima sat below the PDL. Acceptable accuracy and precision are established, and the QAQC programme was independently reviewed and endorsed by Cube Consulting.
Verification of sampling and assaying	• *The verification of significant intersections by either independent or alternative company personnel.* • *The use of twinned holes.* • *Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols.* • *Discuss any adjustment to assay data.*	• Significant intersections are verified by alternative company personnel: core is logged and sampled by the site geological team, and the AMAK Laboratory provides rapid preliminary assays during active drilling that give an independent first check on tenor before the definitive commercial-laboratory results are returned. The geological interpretation, drillhole database and QAQC were subsequently reviewed independently by Cube Consulting as part of the maiden Mineral Resource estimate; the Competent Person also reviewed core photography for all AMAK drilling.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		• No twinned-hole programme has been undertaken. Verification instead relies on the ~16% blind QC insertion (field, coarse and pulp duplicates, coarse and fine blanks, and CRMs at three grade levels) submitted with routine samples to the accredited commercial laboratories, and on parallel AMAK Laboratory preliminary assays. • Primary data are captured digitally at the core shed and laboratory and stored in a DataShed SQL-based relational database, validated on receipt of every batch against the four-pillar framework (contamination, accuracy, precision, screen test) with defined fail-actions (investigation, sample-switch test, re-assay, re-preparation); only QAQC-passing data are loaded for estimation. Physical samples (retained half-core, coarse rejects and pulps) are stored on site as a permanent record, and the Leapfrog project is maintained as the working geological model. • Adjustments to assay data are automated by the database at import: results below the laboratory lower detection limit are substituted with half that limit (e.g. Au <0.05 g/t stored as 0.025 g/t), and over-range results above the upper detection limit take the corresponding high-range assay value. This substitution uses the laboratory detection limit, a separate and lower threshold than the empirical PDL used for QC assessment.
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.*	• Handheld GPS units, with an accuracy of +/- 3 m, were used for the positioning of drill holes on the surface, however more accurate total station DGPS surveys were taken later by the AMAK surveyors. Trenches were located with a mix of DGPS and GPS. • Collars are surveyed by Leica GNSS RTK (GS16 receiver) with real-time corrections and cement-monument markers. Coordinates are stored in WGS 84 UTM Zone 38N; downhole surveys are taken at ~3 m intervals with EZ-Trac (BT-2500) and Devigyro (AMAK) instruments. • Downhole-survey QAQC includes range checks, dogleg-severity analysis and flagging/re-survey of abrupt deviations; only validated surveys enter the database. Topographic control is provided by the RTK collar survey and project DTMs used for surfaces.
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.*	• Resource drilling is on nominal 50-100 m surface spacing, supported by surface trenches (only used for interpretation, excluded from grade estimation). • Data spacing is sufficient to establish geological and grade continuity for the classifications applied; areas beyond ~100 m extrapolation are Inferred or left unclassified. Cube considers that the drillhole spacing is sufficient to identify and model the mineralization and report Mineral Resources. • Compositing to 2 m or 3 m (selected per domain from sample-length statistics) was applied for grade estimation.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
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.*	• Holes are inclined and oriented to intersect the interpreted NNE-trending, steeply dipping mineralised lenses as close to perpendicular as practicable, so sampling captures true-thickness intervals as far as possible, and no orientation-based sampling bias is introduced. • Where intersection angles depart from perpendicular, downhole lengths are reported; true widths are addressed in the geological model and Section 2.
Sample security	• *The measures taken to ensure sample security.*	• Chain-of-custody and sample-security procedures included documented custody records, sealed sample dispatches, secure transport and storage between the site, the AMAK Laboratory and commercial laboratories, and a sample manifest accompanying each shipment. Blank samples inserted after high-grade samples containing up to 7.09 g/t Au, 23,793 ppm Cu and 38,906 ppm Zn returned values below detection limits, indicating no evidence of cross-contamination during sample handling. All remaining drill core is securely stored at the Jabal Qaran site.
Audits or reviews	• *The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.*	• The sampling and QAQC programme is documented in the standalone AMAK QAQC Report (July 2026), which consolidates workflow, protocols and laboratory performance across all three laboratories and was independently reviewed and endorsed by Cube Consulting as part of the maiden Mineral Resource estimate. The Competent Person inspected AMAK's core logging, sampling, storage and laboratory facilities at the adjacent Al Masane/Guyan operations (19–25 September 2025) and reviewed core photography for all AMAK drilling at Jabal Qaran. • A comprehensive QAQC review was completed covering sampling, sample preparation and analytical data from the AMAK Laboratory, ALS Jeddah and BVMS Jeddah. The review assessed contamination, analytical precision, CRM accuracy and pulverisation performance and concluded that all four components of the database-validation framework passed, with no material corrective actions required. No blanks exceeded the applicable upper control limits, and duplicate precision and CRM bias were within the established acceptance criteria. A small number of coarse-blank Cu and Zn results exceeded the practical detection limit but remained below the 5×PDL control limit, indicating adequate cleaning with a reduced safety margin. AMAK pulverisation generally met the requirement of ≥85% passing 75 µm; three of 144 screen tests failed initially and were subsequently re-pulverised and re-tested. No material deficiencies affecting the integrity of the Mineral Resource dataset were identified, and the ALS and BVMS analytical datasets were endorsed for use in Mineral Resource estimation for their respective drilling campaigns.

Section 2 Reporting of Exploration Results

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

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
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 project is held under AMAK Exploration Licence No. 1446216, issued 4 September 2024 and expiring 3 September 2029, covering 57.7 km2 within the Mayza quadrangle (1:100,000 sheet 17/43B), extreme southwest Saudi Arabia (~13-15 km ENE of Dhahran Al Janub). The licence was awarded under Round 5 of the Saudi Ministry of Industry and Mineral Resources competitive licensing rounds (Mining Investment Law).
Exploration done by other parties	• *Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.*	• Extensive prior work: ancient mining (oxidised Cu-Au; ~5,000 t of slag; petroglyphs to ~2,000 years). Modern: USGS rediscovery (Anderson, 1974), 1:2,000 mapping, ~1,100 rock chips, Turam EM and SP (1975-76); Riofinex regional wadi-sediment sampling (6,477 samples, 1978-1985) defining the Farah Garan anomalies; USGS Crone EM (1987) defining conductive Zones A/B/C; BRGM airborne magnetics and ground EM/SP (1980s). • Historical drilling: USGS Phase 1 (1978-79) FG-1 to FG-3 (809.4 m), FG-3 = 8.55 m @ 8.67 g/t Au, 18.51 g/t Ag, 0.29% Cu, 0.18% Pb, 3.18% Zn from 80.5 m; USGS Phase 2 (1988) FG-4 to FG-10 (1,202.9 m), FG-5 = 5.25 m @ 14.6 g/t Au, 99.0 g/t Ag, 1.21% Cu, 3.68% Zn. The database holds 21 FG-series holes (5,175 m). All historical data are excluded from the estimate.
Geology	• *Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.*	• The deposit is a structurally complex, deformed volcano-sedimentary sequence hosting stratabound polymetallic mineralization. It lies in the Farah Garan-Kutam (FGK) belt, the SW part of the ~8,000 km2 Kutam-Al Masane VMS system, within the Neoproterozoic Asir Terrane of the Arabian Shield. Host rocks: metabasalts, felsic/intermediate volcaniclastic schists (quartz-eye phyllites), graphitic phyllites and exhalites (dolomite-talc-chert), cut by barren mafic/gabbro/aplite dykes. Alteration grades from a carbonate-silicic-talc core outward to sericitic and chloritic zones.
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*	• The estimate is informed by 163 AMAK diamond holes for 54,397.5 m; collars are in WGS 84 / UTM Zone 38N, RTK-surveyed, with downhole surveys at approximately 3 m intervals recording dip and azimuth. Historical FG-series holes are excluded from the estimate. • A full tabulation of collar easting, northing, RL, dip, azimuth, downhole length and mineralised interception depths for all material holes is held in the project database and

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	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.*	will be presented as a drillhole appendix to the Public Report. Collar positions and hole traces are also shown on the plans and cross-sections accompanying the report. • Given the number of drillholes completed (163), the full collar table has not been reproduced in this Table 1. The summary information provided above—including the number of holes, total metres drilled, coordinate system, survey method and drill spacing—captures the information material to understanding the reported results, while the complete collar tabulation is provided separately. No material drillholes have been omitted from the reported results, other than the stated exclusions of historical and metallurgical drillholes and holes that were cancelled or remained unassayed.
Data aggregation methods	• *In reporting Exploration Results, weighting averaging techniques, maximum and/or minimum grade truncations (eg cutting of high grades) and cut-off grades are usually Material and should be stated.* • *Where aggregate intercepts incorporate short lengths of high grade results and longer lengths of low grade results, the procedure used for such aggregation should be stated and some typical examples of such aggregations should be shown in detail.* • *The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values should be clearly stated.*	• For the Mineral Resource, grades are length-weighted downhole composites (2 m or 3 m per domain, selected from sample-length statistics) estimated by Ordinary Kriging (see Section 3). Top-cutting (high-grade capping) procedure: composite grade populations were examined per domain using histograms, log-probability plots and disintegration (decile) analysis to identify the grade above which a small number of samples exert disproportionate influence on the domain mean. Two complementary controls were then applied. First, global top-caps were set per domain and element (for example, Au capped in the order of 6–10 g/t in the higher-variance gold domains, Ag in the 14–100 g/t range, and Zn where isolated very-high values occurred), removing the influence of extreme outliers on the whole-domain estimate. Second, distance-restricted top-cuts were applied, in which grades above a lower threshold retain their full value only within a limited radius of influence (typically 25 m) and are down-weighted beyond that distance, so a single high assay cannot be projected across sparsely drilled ground. Before-and-after-capping statistics (mean, coefficient of variation, contained metal) were recorded for each domain, and the effect of capping on the naive domain means was shown to be immaterial, confirming the caps control outlier leverage without materially depleting the estimate. • Where reported, intercepts are simple length-weighted averages over geologically continuous mineralised intervals; short high-grade sample lengths are not aggregated with long low-grade lengths to manufacture composite widths. Representative significant intercepts (length-weighted, downhole; capped where the cap applies): JAQD071 17.4 m @ 8.55 g/t Au, 35.4 g/t Ag, 0.38% Cu, 1.97% Zn (West_Unit_1); JAQD001 32.4 m @ 1.33 g/t Au, 30.2 g/t Ag, 0.74% Cu, 2.35% Zn (South_Unit_2) and 21.5 m @ 2.49 g/t Au, 0.62% Cu, 1.85% Zn (South_Unit_3); JAQD057 19.3 m @ 1.41 g/t Au, 50.7 g/t Ag, 1.58% Cu, 4.54% Zn (South_Unit_2); JAQD069 1.0 m @ 3.67 g/t Au, 182 g/t Ag, 3.76% Cu, 9.85% Zn (East_Unit_2). • Geological and visual logging, supported by assay grades, was used to define both the polymetallic and gold only mineralisation wireframes in areas of elevated Cu, Zn, Au and Ag values.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
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 (eg 'down hole length, true width not known').*	• The geometry of the mineralisation relative to the drillholes is known and has been used to guide drilling. The mineralised bodies are stratabound, lenticular lenses that strike broadly NNE and dip steeply, and holes were deliberately inclined and oriented to intersect them as close to perpendicular as practicable. Downhole intersection lengths therefore approximate true width in well-oriented holes, with a modest over-estimate of true width where the intersection angle departs from perpendicular; true widths are resolved in the 3D geological model, which honours the surveyed hole traces and the modelled domain orientations. • Reported intersection lengths vary systematically by domain in a way consistent with lens geometry rather than sampling artefact. The thickest and most continuous intersections occur in the South and West zones — for example South_Unit_1 (mean ~12.1 m, up to 49.8 m downhole), South_Unit_2 (mean ~12.2 m, up to 32.4 m) and West_Unit_1 (mean ~13.4 m, up to 50.0 m) — while the East-zone lenses are thinner and more numerous — for example East_Unit_1 (mean ~6.9 m, up to 28.2 m) with the higher-numbered East and West sub-domains typically 3–4 m. These figures are downhole lengths; corresponding true thicknesses are slightly less where holes are not exactly perpendicular. • All grade-width figures quoted in this report are downhole lengths unless explicitly stated as true width. Because the mineralisation geometry is known and holes are drilled close to perpendicular, no blanket 'true width not known' qualification is required; where specific true widths are needed, they are taken from the geological model rather than from the downhole length.
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.*	• The supporting reports include location and licence maps, geological maps, 1:500 surface mapping, structural-architecture figures, drill-collar plans, cross-sections (e.g. north-facing South Zone at 50 m spacing), 3D geological-model images, mineralisation and dyke wireframes, and the oxidation model. Appropriate plans and sections will accompany the Public 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.*	• Reporting is balanced: both low- and high-grade domains are represented, grade capping is documented (Section 3), and mineralised domains are shown in spatial context on plans, sections and long-sections. • Domain maximum sample grades from the assay database span base-metal-poor gold domains (West_Unit_1 up to 76.0 g/t Au; West_Unit_3 up to 11.2 g/t Au) and polymetallic Cu–Zn–Au–Ag domains (South_Unit_2 up to 16.70% Cu, 27.50% Zn, 20.4 g/t Au, 482 g/t Ag; South_Unit_1 up to 9.80% Cu, 20.20% Zn, 565 g/t Ag; South_Unit_3 up to 5.67% Cu, 21.37% Zn, 24.1 g/t Au, 298 g/t Ag).
Other substantive	• *Other exploration data, if meaningful and material, should be reported including (but not limited to):*	• Additional substantive data: multivariate PCA/UMAP lithogeochemistry (immobile-element protolith discrimination; ioGAS), and ore-type domaining, surface trenching

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
exploration data	*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.*	and channel sampling (2,492 trench and 189 channel assay records from 77 trenches and 8 channel samples), 22,064 bulk-density determinations, and historical geophysics (EM/SP/magnetics). Metallurgical testwork has been undertaken to assess whether Jabal Qaran ore can be processed using AMAK's existing facilities.
Further work	• *The nature and scale of planned further work (eg tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling).* • *Diagrams clearly highlighting the areas of possible extensions, including the main geological interpretations and future drilling areas, provided this information is not commercially sensitive.*	• The project has advanced to the Pre-Feasibility Stage, and no material additional exploration drilling is currently planned within the defined Mineral Resource areas. • Several other prospects in the surrounding area have been tested by trenching and may warrant further exploration.

Section 3 Estimation and Reporting of Mineral Resource

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

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Database integrity	• *Measures taken to ensure that data has not been corrupted by, for example, transcription or keying errors, between its initial collection and its use for Mineral Resource estimation purposes.* • *Data validation procedures used.*	• Drillhole data was extracted and supplied to Cube directly from AMAK's database. • AMAK has a thorough validation workflow beginning at the sample collection, receipt of electronic laboratory reports and final database storage. Data was further validated by Cube upon receipt, and prior to use in the estimation with no material errors identified. • Data is validated onsite by the supervising geologist and database administrator. The data is loaded into Leapfrog software and validated for logging codes, missing intervals, overlapping intervals, hole location and downhole surveying. The validated data is finally loaded into a relational database for storage. • Validation checks completed by Cube included but not limited to erroneous collar, survey and assay data based on visual inspection and database interrogation.
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.*	• Mark Zammit (Cube Consulting) acting as the Competent Person has not been to the Jabal Qaran project however has undertaken a site visit to the adjacent Al Masane and Guyan projects from 19th to 25th September 2025. During that time, Mr Zammit inspected: o On-site AMAK laboratory o Moyeath, Al Masane and Guyan processing plants • Mr Zammit has reviewed all core photography for all diamond drilling completed by AMAK at the Jabal Qaran project.
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 confidence in the geological interpretation is reflected by the assigned resource classification. There is reasonable level of confidence in the geological interpretation due to the consistent drilling results and the mapped outcropping geology. • Interpretation volume models were constructed for lithology, oxidation and mineralisation. Both assay and geological data were used for the mineralisation interpretation. • The mineralisation is defined by an approximate cut-off range of 0.1% to 0.5% CuEq. The modelling was further constrained by geological mapping and trenching data, as well as the presence of logged sulphides and key lithologies, including HBX, MS, SMS, and dolomite units (DCH, DLT), supported by elevated assay values for Cu, Zn, Au, and Ag • No alternative interpretations were considered.

		• Any alternative interpretations are unlikely to significantly affect the Mineral Resource estimate.
	• *The use of geology in guiding and controlling Mineral Resource estimation.*	• Geological logging of all drilling in addition to surface outcrop and trench mapping has been used for the lithology and mineralisation interpretations. A total of 19 individual domains have been interpreted.
	• *The factors affecting continuity both of grade and geology.*	• Narrow late-stage aplite and gabbro dykes cross-cut the mineralisation. These dykes are barren however their impact on the mineralisation does not represent a material volume to the Mineral Resource. • It is Cube's opinion the interpretation models underpinning the Mineral Resource are a good representation of the lithology and mineralisation and is reflected by the assigned resource classification.
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.*	• Nineteen anastomosing domains have been interpreted at the Jabal Qaran deposit. Overall, the mineralisation currently extends for approximately 1,300m along strike (NNE to SSW) and dips steeply (65 to 70) to the west and extending approximately 850m down dip. • The individual mineralised domains vary in width but are typically between 5 – 15 m thick and but can extend up to 50 m.
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.*	• Data analysis and estimation was undertaken using Snowden Supervisor and Surpac software. Interpretation wireframing was undertaken using Leapfrog Geo 3D software resulting in a total 19 mineralisation domains for the Jabal Qaran MRE. • Sample lengths vary from 0.25 to 3.10m including larger populations at 1, 1.5, 2 and 3m. The largest domains (by volume) have sample interval lengths typically equal to or less than 2 m and therefore supporting the selection of a 2 m composite length. For the smaller domains, the raw samples typically include a large portion of 2 to 3 m sample lengths and therefore a composite length of 3m was selected. Downhole compositing included Copper (Cu) %, Zinc (Zn) %, Gold (Au) ppm and Silver (Ag) ppm. • Exploratory data analysis was undertaken for all domains and top cuts determined on domain by domains basis. • Variogram modelling was completed on normal score transformed capped composites and then back-transformed to complete the estimation. Variograms were modelled where possible for the largest populated domains and these models were adopted for the less populus domains. • Contact analysis across weathering boundaries was reviewed and indicated that for the majority of domains, sub-populations based on oxidation type were approximately the same and/or exhibited soft boundaries and therefore did not require hard boundary application during grade estimation. For a small number of domains, the

	population statistics that were sufficiently different by oxidation type to warrant hard boundaries during grade estimation. • Copper (Cu) %, Zinc (Zn) %, Gold (Au) ppm and Silver (Ag) ppm block grades were estimated using Ordinary Kriging (OK). Cube considers OK to be an appropriate estimation technique for this type of mineralisation Kriging neighbourhood analysis was performed to assist determining the estimation parameters. A two-pass search strategy was used in order to estimate the poorly sampled distal areas with the second pass using a search factor range three times the first pass search distance with the same minimum and maximum number of samples. The minimum number of samples was set as 4 and the maximum as either 12 (Cu and Zn) or 14 (Au and Ag). A maximum of 4 samples per drillhole was specified targeting the inclusion of 3 drillholes per block estimate when the maximum number of samples was achieved. The search distances were typically based on the variogram ranges and varied from 100 m to 230 m.
• *Description of how the geological interpretation was used to control the resource estimates.*	• The lithological interpretation was used to guide the mineralisation interpretation. • Local rotations were implemented allowing dynamic anisotropy to be applied to both the variogram model and search ellipsoid to account for changes in orientation of the mineralised domains. The orientation of this local rotation was controlled by trend plane DTM surfaces created to honour the variable orientations for each domain. The dip and dip-direction data from the trend planes were used to interpolate the dip and dip-direction into each domain volume.
• *Discussion of basis for using or not using grade cutting or capping.*	• Cube identify a relatively small number of composites described as grade outliers within the context of the resource and background domains. A comparison of the naïve and grade capped data statistics showed that the effect of the caps as typically not material.
• *The availability of check estimates, previous estimates and/or mine production records and whether the Mineral Resource estimate takes appropriate account of such data.*	• This is the maiden Mineral Resource for Jabal Qaran. • There has been no historical production.
• *The assumptions made regarding recovery of by-products*	• No assumptions have been applied regarding the recovery of by-products.
• *Estimation of deleterious elements or other non-grade variables of economic significance (e.g. sulphur for acid mine drainage characterisation).*	• Other than the elements list above, no potentially deleterious elements have been included in the model estimation process.
• *In the case of block model interpolation, the block size in relation to the average sample spacing and the search employed.*	• Based on criteria such as data spacing and relative to the mineralised zones, a suitable parent block size of 20 mN × 2.5 mE × 20 mRL was selected for grade estimation and

		a sub-block size of 1.25 mN × 0.3125 mE × 1.25 mRL for volume representation of the narrower mineralised zones. • Block dimensions were selected following kriging neighbourhood analysis and reflect the variability of the deposit as defined by the current drill spacing.
	• *Any assumptions behind modelling of selective mining units.*	• Selective mining units were not modelled.
	• *Any assumptions about correlation between variables.*	• Cu and Zn generally exhibit a moderate correlation as do Au and Ag. The correlation between Cu and Zn with Au and Ag is typically poor.
	• *The process of validation, the checking process used, the comparison of model data to drill hole data, and use of reconciliation data if available.*	• The block model validation was undertaken by the following means: o Visual inspection of block model estimation in relation to raw drill data and composite grades o Volumetric comparison of the wireframe/solid volume to that of the block model volume o A global statistical comparison of input (composite mean grades) and block mean grades for each mineralisation domain o Compilation of grade and volume relationship plots (swath plots) for the Northing/Easting and RL directions comparing composite data with the estimate • No production has taken place and thus no reconciliation data is 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 have been estimated on a dry basis.
Cut-off parameters	• *The basis of the adopted cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied.*	• The Mineral Resource estimate for the Jabal Qaran deposit has been reported based on a combination of potential open pit and underground mining scenarios and a combination of grade cutoffs based on the material type, either gold or polymetallic. • For the open pit portion, the Mineral Resource has been reported within a pit shell optimisation based on a combination of cutoffs for the gold or polymetallic mineralization domains. Mineralisation within the optimisation has been reported by oxidation type and cutoff according to: o Gold Domains: Above a 0.33 g/t Au cutoff o Polymetallic Domains: Above a 0.45 % CuEq cutoff • The CuEq formula is: Cu Eq = Cu + (Zn*0.2322) + (Au*0.8718) + (Ag*0.0105) • For the underground portion, the Mineral Resource has been reported within mine shape optimisations (MSO) based on a combination of grade cutoffs for the different mineralization types. All classified gold domain mineralization inside the MSO solids

		and below the open pit optimisation has been included. For the polymetallic mineralisation, oxide material has been excluded from the underground portion of Mineral Resource reporting. • All mineralisation within the MSO solids has been reported according to: o Gold Domains: Above a 0.52 g/t Au cutoff o Polymetallic Domains: Above a 0.8996 % CuEq cutoff • The MSO solids and cutoff grades were provided by and based on assumptions from AMAK.
Mining factors or assumptions	• *Assumptions made regarding possible mining methods, minimum mining dimensions and internal (or, if applicable, external) mining dilution. It is always necessary as part of the process of determining reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction to consider potential mining methods, but the assumptions made regarding mining methods and parameters when estimating Mineral Resources may not always be rigorous. Where this is the case, this should be reported with an explanation of the basis of the mining assumptions made.*	• The mineralisation at Jabal Qaran extends from surface and is considered to be suitable for both open pit and underground mining. Both mining types are currently active at AMAK's nearby Al Masane, Guyan, Khutianah, Al Aqiq and Sukari project areas. • It is considered that there are no mining factors which are likely to affect the current assumption that the deposit has reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction.
Metallurgical factors or assumptions	• *The basis for assumptions or predictions regarding metallurgical amenability. It is always necessary as part of the process of determining reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction to consider potential metallurgical methods, but the assumptions regarding metallurgical treatment processes and parameters made when reporting Mineral Resources may not always be rigorous. Where this is the case, this should be reported with an explanation of the basis of the metallurgical assumptions made.*	• Metallurgical testwork was completed by SLR Consulting on 20 variability and composite samples representing the principal domains and ore types, comprising head assay and mineralogy on all samples, benchmark comminution, flotation and cyanidation testing on six samples, and gravity concentration on two gold composites. Testwork confirmed amenability to conventional gravity, sulphide flotation and cyanidation treatment, with no fatal flaw identified. SLR concluded that high overall recoveries are achievable across both base and precious metals, with saleable-grade copper concentrates produced. Comminution indices fall within the operating range of AMAK's existing circuits, and SLR assessed the deposit as having a processing profile broadly compatible with AMAK's existing assets. • The estimate assumes treatment at AMAK's existing operating plants, approximately 100 km from site by road. Metallurgical testwork by SLR is ongoing and not yet comprehensive. For the purposes of pit and stope optimisation and cut-off derivation, baseline recoveries of 80% for copper and 85% for zinc have been adopted, consistent with the AMAK district operations and preliminary testwork. These figures are interim and will be updated on completion of the SLR metallurgical programme. Testwork is currently at benchmark level; targeted optimisation, including locked-cycle flotation testing, is required to confirm final metal grades and recoveries under closed-circuit

		conditions, and to produce consistent saleable concentrates at commercial recoveries. This is being undertaken as part of the current pre-feasibility study.
Environmental factors or assumptions	• *Assumptions made regarding possible waste and process residue disposal options. It is always necessary as part of the process of determining reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction to consider the potential environmental impacts of the mining and processing operation. While at this stage the determination of potential environmental impacts, particularly for a greenfields project, may not always be well advanced, the status of early consideration of these potential environmental impacts should be reported. Where these aspects have not been considered this should be reported with an explanation of the environmental assumptions made.*	• Ore would be transported approximately 100 km by road for treatment at AMAK's existing operating and permitted processing facilities, rather than at a new plant on site. Accordingly, no new tailings storage facility is considered at Jabal Qaran, and process residues would be sent to existing tailings infrastructure. A surface waste dump has been located within the conceptual site infrastructure layout. • Environmental consideration is at an early stage appropriate to a Greenfields project. Environmental and social impact assessment, baseline studies or permitting applications have been undertaken as part of the environmental permit application, which is in progress. No endangered or protected species of flora or fauna were identified, and no community members live in the project area. Waste rock geochemistry and management strategy, conceptual closure planning, hydrology and flood studies, and social baseline and stakeholder engagement are identified in the forward works programme. No environmental fatal flaw has been identified, and AMAK operates comparable mining and processing activities within the same region and regulatory jurisdiction.
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.* • *Discuss assumptions for bulk density estimates used in the evaluation process of the different materials.*	• AMAK has undertaken regular density determination measurements for all recent drilling from JAQD001 to JAQD155. The determinations were measured on pieces of core typically 10cm in length at a frequency of approximately every 2.4m for a total of 22,064 measurements. • Density data was extracted from the database and flagged by mineralisation domain and weathering type. The final in situ density was estimated by Ordinary Kriging into the block model in a similar manner to the grade attributes described earlier.
Classification	• *The basis for the classification of the Mineral Resources into varying confidence categories.*	• The Mineral Resource has been classified as a combination of Indicated and Inferred on the basis of confidence in geological, mineralogical and grade continuity and by taking into account the quality of the sampling and assay data and confidence in the grade estimation. • At this stage no material has been classified as Measured given the lack of close spaced resource definition such as 20 m or less and/or open grade control or underground face sample data. • Indicated resources include areas of mineralisation with a moderate level of confidence in both the interpreted volume and estimated grade. There is currently no exposure from mining however, extensive surface trenching plus resource definition drilling to 50 m spacing has been considered sufficient for Indicated. The estimation characteristics for Indicated material is typically included in the first pass, informed by maximum number of samples (12) and 3 drillholes, slope of regression greater than 0.5 and an average sample distance less than 80m.

		• Inferred resources include areas where there is limited confidence due to the sparse drilling. It can include material typically less than 100 m extrapolation distance from the nearest drillhole and can include material estimated in both the first and second estimation pass. • Areas which have been included in the mineralisation interpretation but with a large extrapolation distance and insufficient confidence to be included as Inferred are not classified.
	• *Whether appropriate account has been taken of all relevant factors (i.e., relative confidence in tonnage/grade estimations, reliability of input data, confidence in continuity of geology and metal values, quality, quantity, and distribution of the data).*	• The assigned classification of Indicated and Inferred reflects the Competent Person's assessment of the accuracy and confidence levels in the Mineral Resource estimate taking into account all relevant factors.
	• *Whether the result appropriately reflects the Competent Person's view of the deposit.*	• The assigned classification of Indicated and Inferred reflects the Competent Person's assessment of the accuracy and confidence levels in the Mineral Resource estimate. The Mineral Resource has been reported within an open pit optimisation shell and underground MSO solids to satisfy the requirements for RPEEE.
Audits or reviews	• *The results of any audits or reviews of Mineral Resource estimates.*	• The Mineral Resource has been reviewed internally as part of normal validation processes by Cube and also by AMAK staff and no flaws or errors were identified and the Mineral Resource is considered fit for purpose. • No external audit or review of the current Mineral Resource has been conducted.
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.*	• The assigned classification of Indicated and Inferred reflects the Competent Person's assessment of the accuracy and confidence levels in the Mineral Resource 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.*	• The Mineral Resource statement relates to global estimates of in situ tonnes and grade.
	• *These statements of relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate should be compared with production data, where available.*	• No production has occurred from the deposit.