JORC Code, 2012 Edition – Table 1 report template

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.*	• All samples retrieved so far are from diamond drill cores that have been cut longitudinally in half and prepared for assaying. The mean sample length is 0.98 m from 45,744 samples. • The samples were pulverised to produce a 50 g sample for Atomic Aqua Regia digestion and Absorption Spectrometry (AAS) analysis for Au assaying and check fire assaying in the on-site lab. A portable THERMO Niton XL3t XRF was used to analyse the pulps for Cu, Zn and Ag on site, and 15.07% of the samples were submitted to ALS-Loughrea, Ireland for check assaying by ICP-MS. • The half-cores are considered representative because they have been consistently sampled.
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).*	• All drilling was done by diamond coring, both vertical and angled holes were planned and drilled. The holes were collared as PQ (85 mm diameter) and then reduced down to HQ (63.5 mm) and NQ (47.6 mm) as deemed necessary by the drillers. Of the recovered core, 4.5% was drilled in PQ, 92.1% was drilled as HQ and 3.4% was drilled as NQ. • Orientation marks were made on 4 drill holes of the most recent recovered cores that were drilled angled holes for geotechnical purpose. The azimuth of a drillhole is surveyed and rig set up accordingly. The drill machine azimuth is entered to the downhole survey equipment (Devicor BBT H) equipment, which marks a "red" line on the core and if drill hole orientation changed during drilling, the system automatically calculates variation. Exported azimuth data from equipment is used by geologists to identify exact strikes and

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		azimuth of geological structure using easy logger equipment
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 was calculated on a per drill-run basis (maximum 3 m). • Core recovery averaged 99%, ranging from 20% to 100% from 14,994 intervals. Only 684 intervals did not have a recovery of less than 100%, the majority of which occurred in the upper few metres of some holes where thin overburden was encountered, or the surface rock is weathered. Samples with less than 100% recovery often adjacent to faults, secondary quartzite (ZN_SQ, andesite (AN), quartz porphyry (QP) type rocks. • No relationship between recovery and grade could be found. The excellent recovery statistics indicate there is no sample bias due to loss of materials to fines.
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.*	• The entire drill core was logged in detail for lithology, alteration, mineralisation, geological structure, and oxidation state by AIMC geologists, utilising standardised logging codes and data sheets as supervised by the senior geologist. • Logging was considered sufficient to support Mineral Resource estimation, mining studies and metallurgical studies. • Rock Quality Designation (RQD) logs were produced for all core drilling for exploration and geotechnical purposes. Fracture intensity and fragmentation proportion analysis was also gathered for geotechnical information. • Logging was both quantitative and qualitative in nature. All core was photographed wet and dry in the core boxes to show the core box number, core run markers and a scale.
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*	• Full core was split longitudinally using a rock diamond saw to create half-core samples that were taken at typically 1 m intervals or to rock contacts if present in the core run for both mineralisation and wall rock. The drill core was rotated prior to cutting to maximise structure to core axis of the cut core. • Half core was taken for sampling for assaying, and one half remains in the core box as reference material. Where field duplicates have been sampled, at a frequency of 1:45, the remaining half-core has been split, leaving quarter-core as a reference.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	being sampled.	• Core samples were prepared according to industry best practice, with initial geological control of the half core, followed by crushing and grinding at the laboratory sample preparation facility that is routinely managed for contamination and cleanliness control. Sampling practice is considered as appropriate for Mineral Resource Estimation. • All samples have been prepared at the Azerbaijan International Mining Company (AIMC) on-site laboratory. • Sample preparation at the AIMC on-site laboratory is subject to the following procedure: ○ After receiving samples at the laboratory from the geology department, all samples are cross referenced with the sample order list. ○ All samples are dried in an oven for 24 hours at 105° to 110° centigrade temperature. ○ First stage sample crushing to 90% passing -25 mm size. ○ Second stage sample crushing to 90% passing -10 mm size. ○ Third stage sample crushing to 90% passing -2 mm size. ○ After crushing the samples are riffle split and a 200 to 250-gram sample is taken. ○ A 75-micron sized prepared 50 g pulp is produced that is subsequently sent for assay preparation. • Quality control procedures were used for all sub-sampling preparation. This included geological control over the core cutting, and sampling to ensure representativeness of the geological interval. • Sample sizes are considered appropriate to the grain size of the rocks and style of mineralisation being sampled.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
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.*	• Gold assaying is conducted at an on-site laboratory that also supports sampling at the operational mines (Gedabek and Gadir). Here, the sample is ground to 90% passing 75 µm, from which 25 g is split. This is roasted for up to 3 hours and then decanted and mixed 3 g of NaF. 50 ml of Aqua Regia is then added and heated for a further 2 hours before HCl is added and it is heated for 30 minutes. 50 ml of this solution is mixed with dibutyl sulphide in toluene solution. Au is determined by atomic absorption spectroscopy (AAS). Check fire assays are conducted on high-grade samples (from the first round aqua regia digestion). These are conducted by industry standard procedures for fire assay, with an AAS finish. • Assaying for Cu, Zn and Ag is done by portable XRF. The instrument is a Thermo Niton XL3t GOLD++ machine that is operated in "Ore &Soil" mode with a tube current of 200 µA and tube voltage of 45 kV. Calibration is "soil calibration". Analysis time is 20 seconds per filter, so 60 seconds per sample in total. Samples are pre-dried to ensure <0.5% moisture content. Pulverised (90% passing 75 µm) pulps are used for analysis. A drift correction is applied and the laboratory refers to the supplier if any analytical issues are encountered. A subset (15% of samples) is sent to ALS Loughrea, Ireland for check sampling by ICP-MS. These assays confirmed that Au assaying by AIMC is good, that Ag by pXRF is inadequate and that Cu and Zn by pXRF are reasonable, with minor concerns at low Cu and Zn values. • A variety of OREAS CRMs (41 in total) covering Au, Cu and Zn have been used for quality control purposes for all assaying methods, where samples have been submitted to the internal AIMC laboratory. In addition, blanks (AIMC insertion rate 1:45), coarse reject duplicates (1:45) and pulp duplicates (1:45) have been assayed to assess the accuracy, repeatability, consistency of analytical methods and machines and for sample contamination. While the QAQC samples were acceptable compared against the control values and limits, Mining Plus notes the low submission percentages compared to expected AIMC percentages.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary

	QAQC Samp type	No. QAQC Samples	% of Total Samples	Industry standard QAQC %
QAQC	Coarse duplicates	894	2%	2%
	Pulp duplicates	0	0%	2%
	Standards	41	0%	6%
	Coarse blanks	102	0%	2%
	Pulp blanks	0	0%	2%
	Check samples - ALS	5328	15%	4%
	Total QAQC Samples	6365	18%	18%
Assays	Total all samples	35839		

- 11 different OREAS CRMs were sent to ALS Loughrea, third party external laboratory; the accuracy of these supports the use of this laboratory for independent assay verification.
- External check assays performed reasonably well – Au by aqua-regia digestion and AAS had good correlation between the internal and external laboratory. Cu grades show greater deviation at lower grades as the pXRF is less reliable below 0.1% Cu. Zn grades on the pXRF are slightly biased at higher values than ALS. Overall, the results are comparable evaluating AIMC against ALS Loughrea laboratory.
- Mining Plus is of the view that assaying for Au has produced reliable results, those for Cu and Zn produced variable results, particularly for low-grade samples. Overall Cu may be under reported by the pXRF and Zn slightly over reported. The assaying of Ag by pXRF is unreliable and not reproducible. This is a consequence of the Ag concentration of the vast majority of the samples being close to the detection limit for Ag by this analytical method. Therefore, Ag has not been estimated in the MRE.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
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 were verified by a number of company personnel within the management structure of the Exploration Department. Intersections were defined by the exploration geologists, and subsequently verified by the Exploration Manager. • Data entry is supervised by a data manager, and verification and checking procedures are in place. The format of the data is appropriate for use in resource estimation. All data is stored in electronic MS Access databases within the geology department and backed up to the secure company electronic server that has limited and restricted access. Nine files are created relating to "collar", "survey", "assay", "lithology", "mineralisation", "oxide_minerals", "hole_size", "recovery_rqd" and "SG". Laboratory data is loaded electronically by the laboratory department and validated by the geology department. Any outlier assays are re-assayed. • Independent validation of the database was part of the resource model generation process, where all data was checked for errors, missing data, misspelling, interval validation, negative values, and management of zero versus absent data. • Independent validation by Mining Plus was carried out on the drilling and assaying database and it is considered suitable for the Mineral Resource Estimate. • No twin drillholes were drilled at Gilar. • No adjustments were made to the 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.*	• The Gedabek Contract Area was surveyed in July 2020 by high resolution drone survey. Five topographic base stations were installed and accurately surveyed using high precision GPS, that was subsequently tied into the local mine grid using ground based total station surveying (LEICA TS02) equipment. All drill holes collars were then surveyed using total station survey equipment. This equipment comprised 2 x Trimble R10, Model 60 and associated equipment. • 18 core holes have been surveyed using Reflex EZ- TRAC equipment at downhole intervals, between 14 and 34 m in length.87% of survey intervals are 24 m in length. Early vertical holes were 24 m intervals. Surveys were conducted retreating from drilling and outside of the barrel when surveyed.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		• Kink checking testing carried out using the in-built Leapfrog Geo system shows that the first record in 5 holes (21GLDD27, 22GLDD105, 22GLDD106 and 22GLDD122, 23GLDD139) are flagged as requiring checking if the tolerance is set at 6 m intervals. These readings have the planned dip and azimuth values at 0 m, meaning there is sufficient difference between those values and the first actual readings are sufficiently different to be flagged. Future surveys should take a reading at the collar and not assume the hole has been correctly set up. This does not have a material effect on the positioning of the samples used for Mineral Resource Estimation • The grid system used is Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) 84 WGS zone 38T (Azerbaijan). • The topographic DTM is adequate for the purposes of resource and reserve modelling (having been validated by both aerial and ground-based survey techniques).
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.*	• The drilling at Gilar has been conducted on a grid that is nominally 20 m x 20 m oriented along the direction approximately 045°. In the first phase of drilling all holes mainly were drilled as angled holes, and downhole surveying has confirmed that no significant deviation has occurred. For the second phase the 20 m grid has been preserved but most of the holes were vertical. After the ore boundary was identified, third phase drill holes were drilled with an angled to the ore from the outside to determine the morphology of the ore body. The fourth phase of drill holes drilled the southern part of the Gilar area as vertical with a 20 m x 20 m grid after identified the main massive ore body.

Year	No. of Drillholes	Meterage Drilled	Drillholes % of Total	Meters % of Total
2020	26	7,781.70	18%	17%
2021	51	13,477.80	35%	29%
2022	49	17,378.95	34%	37%
2023	19	7,770.80	13%	17%
Total	145	46,409.25	100%	100%

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		• The data spacing is adequate for Mineral Resource estimation, especially as this new discovery now consists of vertical and angled holes, the latter of which enhanced geological interpretation. The 20 m x 20 m grid permits variograms to be modelled and resource classification to be based on proven continuity of mineralisation. • Geological continuity has been improved by orientation of angled drill cores so that structural data can be measured with greater confidence. • Most of the sampling has been conducted at 1 m intervals, and compositing at 1 m composite intervals means only very minor adjustment to raw grade values by the composting process.
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 orientation of the mineralised zones has become more apparent as a consequence of the modelling of the mineralisation from the third and fourth phase sets of angled and vertical drillholes. • Since the mineralisation has considerable vertical as well as lateral continuity the bias introduced by the vertical drillholes appears minimal.
Sample security	• *The measures taken to ensure sample security.*	• The drilling site is supervised by a geologist, the drill core is placed into wooden core boxes that are sized specifically for the drill core diameter. A wooden lid is fixed to the box to ensure no spillage. Core box number, drill hole number and from/to metres are written on both the box and the lid. The core is then transported to the core storage area and logging facility, where it is received and logged into a data sheet. • Core logging, cutting, and sampling takes place at the secure core management area. The core samples are bagged with labels both in the bag and on the bag, and data recorded on a sample sheet. The samples are transferred to the laboratory where they are registered as received, for laboratory sample preparation works and assaying. Hence, a chain of custody procedure has been followed from core collection to assaying and storage of pulp/remnant sample material. • All samples received at the core facility are logged and registered on a certificate sheet. The certificate sheet is signed by the drilling team supervisor and core facility supervisor (responsible person). All core is photographed and has undergone geotechnical logging, geological

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		logging, sample interval determination, bulk density testing, core cutting, and sample preparation. • All samples are weighed daily, and a Laboratory order prepared which is signed by the core facility supervisor prior to release to the laboratory. On receipt at the laboratory, the responsible person countersigns the order. • After assaying all reject duplicate pulp samples are sent back from the laboratory to the core facility (recorded on a signed certificate). All reject samples are placed into boxes referencing the sample identities and stored in the core facility. • For external assaying, Anglo Asian Mining utilised ALS-OMAC in Ireland. Samples selected for external assay are recorded on a data sheet and sealed in appropriate boxes for shipping by air freight. Communications between the geological department of the Company and ALS monitor the shipment, customs clearance, and receipt of samples. Results are sent electronically by ALS and loaded into the Company database.
Audits or reviews	• *The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.*	• No audits or reviews have yet been undertaken on this new discovery.

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 located within a current contract area that is managed under a production sharing agreement or "PSA". The project is held under agreement: On the exploration, development and production sharing for the prospective gold mining areas: Kedabek, 1997. • The PSA grants the Company a number of periods to exploit defined licence areas, known as Contract Areas, agreed on the initial signing with the Azerbaijan Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources ('MENR'). The exploration period allowed for the early exploration of the Contract Areas to assess prospectivity. • A development and production period commences on the date that the Company issues a notice of discovery, which runs for 17 years with two extensions of five years each at the option of the Company. Full management control of mining in the Contract Areas rests with Anglo Asian Mining. • Under the PSA, Anglo Asian is not subject to currency exchange restrictions and all imports and exports are free of tax or other restrictions. In addition, MENR is to use its best endeavours to make available all necessary land, its own facilities and equipment and to assist with infrastructure. • The deposit is not located in any national park. • At the time of reporting no known impediments to obtaining a licence to operate in the area exist and the contract (licence) area agreement is in good standing
Exploration done by otherparties	• *Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.*	• Gilar is a new discovery made by AIMC in 2019 and was announced via a news release in November 2019. No other parties have conducted exploration in the area.
Geology	• *Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.*	• The Gedabek ore district is extensive and includes numerous mineral occurrences and prospects (as well as operating mines), the majority of which fall within the designated Gedabek contract area. The region (with the Gedabek open pit located on the flanks of Yogundag Mountain) lies within the Shamkir uplift of the Lok-Karabakh volcanic

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		arc (in the Lesser Caucasus Mega-Anticlinorium). This province has been deformed by several major magmatic and tectonic events, resulting in compartmentalised stratigraphic blocks. • The Gilar ore deposit is located within the large Gedabek- Garadag volcanic-plutonic system. This system is characterised by a complex internal structure indicative of repeated tectonic movement and multi-cyclic magmatic activity, leading to various stages of mineralisation emplacement. Boyuk Qalacha-Chenlibel ore belt is a porphyry-epithermal zone, with known deposits in the area (e.g. Maarif, Xarxar and Garadag) believed to represent the upper portion of the system. • The Gilar ore deposit is an intermediate sulphidation (IS) gold-copper deposit located at the contact between Bajocian (Mid-Jurassic) volcanic rocks and a later-stage Kimmeridgian intrusion (Late Jurassic). The mineralisation is dominantly hosted in the local rhyolitic porphyry (known on site as the 'quartz porphyry' unit), overlain by volcanics (mainly andesite). The principal hydrothermal alteration styles found at Gilar are silicified alteration with quartz ± adularia ± pyrite alteration and argillic alteration (confined to the centre of the orebody). • Ore mineralisation is spatially associated with metasomatically altered quartz porphyry. Disseminated pyrite occurs pervasively through most of the deposit, with high concentrations of fine- grained pyrite found at its heart. Increased Au and Cu grades occur in the shallowest levels of Gilar, predominantly in contact with the overlying barren andesites. Brecciated zones are developed at various depths and faults. Additionally, faulting running through the orebody has been shown to strike-slip ore mass. • The deposit geology was originally considered to be a "porphyry" style, whereas the current interpretation is that the deposit is VMS in nature. • In vertical section, elevated gold grades are located in the deeper portions of the main orebody.
Drill hole Information	• *A summary of all information material to the understanding of the exploration results including a tabulation of the following information for all Material drill holes:* • *easting and northing of the drill hole collar* • *elevation or RL (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in*	• A summary of all the drilling conducted at Gilar by the cut-off date for the MRE report are tabulated below. • All drillholes are surveyed for collar position, azimuth and dip by the AIMC Survey Department, relative to the grid system.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	metres) of the drill hole collar • *dip and azimuth of the hole* • *down hole length and interception depth* • *hole length.* • *If the exclusion of this information is justified on the basis that the information is not Material and this exclusion does not detract from the understanding of the report, the Competent Person should clearly explain why this is the case.*	• The database contains assay and geological sample information up to 11th June 2023. • The full drillhole data used in the Gilar MRE report is tabulated in the associated JORC MRE Report below are considered material of a JORC report for Gilar. A summary table of drill meters used in the MRE is tabulated below.

Year	No. of Drillholes	Meterage Drilled	Drillholes % of Total	Meters % of Total
2020	16	6,275.1	12%	15%
2021	50	13,167.2	37%	31%
2022	52	16,550.95	39%	39%
2023	17	6,827.8	13%	16%
Total	135	42,821.05	100%	100%

• 10 Drillholes excluded from exploration drillhole database. See table below for collar ID and reason for exclusion.

Drillhole Collar ID	Reason for exclusion
20GLD01	Extensional drilling outside of project area
20GLD02	Extensional drilling outside of project area
20GLD03	Extensional drilling outside of project area
20GLD19	Extensional drilling outside of project area
20GLD21	Extensional drilling outside of project area
21GLD46	Extensional drilling outside of project area
21GLD56	Extensional drilling outside of project area
22GLD96	Extensional drilling outside of project area
22GLD119	Extensional drilling outside of project area
23GLD144	Extensional drilling outside of project area

• All relevant drillhole information relevant to the reporting of the mineral resource is outlined in Section 1 of this table and within the Competent

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		Person's report.

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.*
		• No exploration results are reported in this MRE.
		• Aggregation is only done by compositing to 2 m composite intervals as described above.
		  ○ A gold equivalent was used, details belowAu Equivalent calculation = Au g/t + (Cu%*1.49)+(Zn*0.46).
		  ○ Au $1,675/Oz, Cu $8,000/tonne and Zn $2,500/tonne.

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 relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths in the case of the Gilar deposit is less critical as the mineralisation dominantly forms a broad scale sulphide zone that has varying types of mineral structures of varying orientations. • All intercepts are reported as down-hole lengths.
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.*	• These are included in the accompanying 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.*	• Representative reporting of mineral intervals has been previously reported by Anglo Asian Mining via regulated news service (RNS) announcements of the London Stock Exchange (AIM) or on the Company website. • There is no reporting of exploration results in the resource estimation statement or Competent Person's report.
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.*	• A considerable amount of aerial and ground geophysical data has been collected. • Data relating specifically to geotechnical attributes were collected during the fourth phase of drilling. Hydrogeological drill holes have not yet been drilled. This data is still to be analysed by relevant experts and does not form part of this report. • Metallurgical information has been made available and included in the accompanying report.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Further work	• *The nature and scale of planned further work (eg tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling).* • *Diagrams clearly highlighting the areas of possible extensions, including the main geological interpretations and future drilling areas, provided this information is not commercially sensitive.*	• Planned future work includes a multifaceted drilling programme for further geotechnical and hydrogeological data collection, as well as a more detailed mining study at a Pre-Feasibility level.

Section 3 Estimation and Reporting of Mineral Resources

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

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
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 Gedabek database (including data from the Gilar deposit) is stored in “MX Deposit” software. A dedicated database manager has been assigned by AIMC who checks the data entry against the laboratory reports and survey data. • Geological data is entered by a geologist to ensure no confusion over terminology, while laboratory assay data is entered by the data entry staff. • A variety of manual data checks are in place to check against human error of data entry. • All original geological logs, survey data and laboratory results sheets are retained in a secure location. • All data requested were made available to Mining Plus by AAM and AIMC. Relevant data were imported to Datamine Studio RM software and further validation processes completed. At this stage, any errors found were corrected. The validation procedures used included checking of data as compared to the original data sheets, validation of position of drillholes in 3D models and reviewing areas appearing anomalous following statistical analysis. • Mining Plus reviewed the provided database as part of the resource model generation process, where all data was checked for errors, missing data, misspelling, interval validation, negative values, and management of zero versus absent data. • All drilling and sampling and assaying databases are considered suitable for the Mineral Resource Estimate. No adjustments were made to the assay data prior to import into Datamine software.
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.*	• Mining Plus site visit to Gilar project and wider Gedabek license area in 2023 carried out by Competent Person, Sean Lapham in September 2023.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
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 at Gilar shows similarities to nearby Gedabek Mine, where mineralisation is associated with quartz-porphyry rocks. • The latest interpretations demonstrate that mineralisation is strongly associated with metasomatic alteration of the host quartz porphyry, and the greatest accumulations occur close to and just below the contact with overlying dacite volcanics. • Grade shells for Cu, Au and Zn have been defined using numeric RBF interpolants in Leapfrog Geo software. Within the grade shells grade continuity has been demonstrated by variography, and this anisotropy conforms with other NW-SE trending structures such as regional faults, mapped diorite dykes and the interpretation of the ZTEM geophysics response measured over the deposit.
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 known maximum extent of the mineral resource along strike (230°) is 480 m, across strike is about 140 m, and vertical extent is 280 m based on the grade shells constructed using data with a 30th November 2023 cut-off date.
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 (eg sulphur for acid mine drainage characterisation).* • *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.*	• Initial mineralised domains were created using a 0.1 g/t Au cut-off, Cu (0.1%) and Zn (0.1%) grade shells. The Au 0.1 g/t was selected for the base mineralised unit. • The 0.1 g/t Au grade shell was split into 4 domains (1, 2, 3 and 4) based on mineralisation trends and geometry. • The coded drillholes were then imported into Snowden Supervisor software (version 8.15) where exploratory data analysis (EDA), contact analysis, declustering, top-cutting, variography, kriging neighborhood analysis (KNA) and cross-validation were conducted. • The modelled variograms and KNA results were used to define estimation parameters for use in the resource estimates conducted in Datamine Studio RM. • The estimation used half the variogram range as the primary search criteria, the variogram ranges as the secondary search criteria and double the variogram ranges as the third search criteria. • Block models were constructed in Datamine Studio RM, and block sizes of 5 m (easting, X) by 5 m (northing, Y) by 2.5 m (elevation, Z),

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	• *The process of validation, the checking process used, the comparison of model data to drill hole data, and use of reconciliation data if available.*	with sub-blocking to 1 m by 1 m by 0.5 m (X, Y, Z). These block sizes were chosen following KNA. Minimum and maximum numbers of samples and numbers of samples per drillhole, and the arrangement of discretization points were also determined from the KNA. • Three methods of estimation, ordinary kriging (OK), inverse distance squared (ID) and nearest neighbour (NN) were used as cross checks of the estimation results. • No correlation was noted between variables, and no assumptions regarding correlation were used. Each of the metals was estimated separately in each of the four domains to produce four block models. • Grade cutting was applied to Au, Cu and Zn values in all four domains based on statistical distributions. • The OK method was used to estimate the Au, Cu and Zn grades for the MRE. • Validation was conducted by visual checks on cross sections and plans between estimated values (OK, ID and NN) and sample composites, by statistical comparisons between the same sets of data and by using swath plots across the orebody in easting, northing, elevation, along strike and across strike directions.
Moisture	• *Whether the tonnages are estimated on a dry basis or with natural moisture, and the method of determination of the moisture content.*	• The densities were measured as dry bulk densities and estimated into the four domains. Moisture content was determined from masses measured in the as-retrieved state versus masses measured after drying in an oven at 105 °C for 24 hours.

Cut-off parameters	• *The basis of the adopted cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied.*	• Cut-off grades applied at nearby Gedabek Mine were applied to define mineralisation at Gilar.
		• It is assumed that processing of ores from Gilar will be conducted at the centralised ore processing facility and therefore that similar cut-off grades will apply for Gilar.
		• As the project progresses metallurgical test work will be conducted to confirm the cut-off grades
		• A Au Equivalent COG was applied at Gilar.
		  ○ AuEQ calculation = Au g/t + (Cu%*1.49)+(Zn*0.46)
		  ○ Au $1,675/Oz, Cu $8,000/tonne and Zn $2,500/tonne

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
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 depth of the deposit almost certainly makes underground mining the only practical mining method. Datamine Mining Shape Optimizer (MSO) has generated viable mineable shapes. Costs and revenues are based on the underground mining parameters from the nearby operating Gadir mine and the feasibility studies for mining portions of the Gedabek Mine from underground operations. The study conducted for Gilar confirms that there are reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction of the Gilar deposit.
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.*	• Currently the metallurgical factors are based upon the assumption that the mineralisation at Gilar is similar to that of nearby Gedabek based on the similarity of the deposits, both being high-sulphidation epithermal deposits. Metallurgical testwork on samples from Gilar is planned, but these results have not been received by the cut-off date for this MRE
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.*	• Again, the assumption at this early stage of the project is that Gilar ore will be similar to that at Gedabek, and therefore that environmental impacts will be similar. Test work is being conducted to provide definitive answers to these issues. • From the previous Gedabek JORC Table 1 submissions the following points have been made and are assumed to pertain to potential future mining of Gilar: o As part of the initial start-up, environmental studies and impacts were assessed and reported for Gedabek. This included the nature of process waste as managed in the tailings management facility ("TMF"). Other waste products are fully managed under the AIMC HSEC team, including disposal of mine equipment waste such as lubricants and oils. o There is ongoing adherence to international environmental regulations, and continuing monitoring of their baseline environmental systems. o No environmental factors or assumptions were used during this estimation.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
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.*	• Bulk density has been measured on 5,339 core samples from 46 drillholes using the hydrostatic method (weight-in-air and weight-in-water). These measurements were made on all defined lithological codes that include waste and mineralised rocks. • Density values were estimated into the four domains by the ID3 method and combined for use in the MRE. • Validation was conducted by visual checks on cross sections and plans between estimated value and sample composites, by statistical comparisons between the same sets of data and by using swath plots across the orebody in easting, northing, elevation, along strike and across strike directions.
Classification	• *The basis for the classification of the Mineral Resources into varying confidence categories.* • *Whether appropriate account has been taken of all relevant factors (ie relative confidence in tonnage/grade estimations, reliability of input data, confidence in continuity of geology and metal values, quality, quantity and distribution of the data).* • *Whether the result appropriately reflects the Competent Person's view of the deposit.*	• On the basis of the variography and resource estimation method applied, all blocks that were estimated using a search ellipse that is half the variogram range (primary search pass) with a minimum of 4 composite samples from at least two drillholes were classified as a Measured Resource. Blocks within the secondary search ellipse (the variogram range) with a minimum of 4 composite samples from at least two drillholes were classified as an Indicated Mineral Resource. The remainder of the blocks were estimated in the third search ellipse (double the variogram range) with a minimum of 1 composite sample, were classified as Inferred Mineral Resource. • A Datamine Mining Shape Optimizer (MSO) study was undertaken using a cut-off grade of 0.5% Au-equivalent and a Cu price of US$1,675 per troy oz to define economic stope to determine RPEEE. • The relatively tight drilling grid of 30 m by 30 m in the horizontal plane provide sufficient grade continuity. • The distribution of Mineral Resource Classification applied at Gilar reflects the competent person's view of the deposit.
Audits or reviews	• *The results of any audits or reviews of Mineral Resource estimates.*	• No audits or reviews have been conducted on the newly discovered (2020) Gilar deposit to date.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
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 reliance on pXRF assaying methods for Cu, Zn and Ag, has required more QAQC samples to be sent to ALS for confirmation. These have demonstrated that pXRF is inadequate for the assaying of Ag, and so this data has not been used in the Mineral Resource Estimate. Results for Cu and Zn are considerably better, although limitations at low concentrations are probably the consequence of analytical settings. Overall, however the results are considered adequate for Mineral Resource estimation, and this is confirmed by check assays conducted by ALS. Recommendations have been made regarding improved calibration of the pXRF is this method is to be used in the future. • On the basis of the data received the Mineral Resource Estimate is considered to be reasonably accurate at a local (block size) level. This assessment of reasonable accuracy is based on low coefficient of variation, low kriging variance, high kriging efficiencies and high slope of regressions. A SMU investigation still needs to be undertaken to assess whether the sample support matches SMU support. As more detailed mining studies are undertaken at the pre- feasibility these will become more evident.