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.*	• RC 1m splits were submitted to Inspectorate (Richmond, Canada), ACME (Vancouver, Canada), SGS-Malaysia (Port Klang and Bau) and SGS-Mengapur (onsite near Sri Jaya, Malaysia), and Fortress-Mengapur. • RC samples were passed from in-line cyclone connected to the sample hose, samples were collected in 1m intervals into bulk plastic bags and to produce smaller sample splits the RC sample was split with a riffle splitter into four ports: 50%, 25% and two times 12.5% portions. • DD core was cut in half and half core sampled were submitted to Inspectorate (Richmond, Canada), ACME (Vancouver, Canada), SGS-Malaysia (Port Klang and Bau) and SGS-Mengapur (onsite near Sri Jaya, Malaysia), and Fortress-Mengapur. • Diamond core sampling on HQ/NQ diamond drill core at mostly 1m intervals. Closer spaced sampling around specific mineralized zones or structures. • Diamond cores were marked on the core by the geologist according to geological intervals. The core was cut in half by field technicians, with half being placed in a pre-numbered bag and the other half returned to the core tray. For duplicate samples the core to be submitted for analysis is quartered. • The resource estimates use geochemical, metallurgical and magnetic susceptibility results with geological logging information from diamond drill core, RC chip samples and a small amount of grade control chip samples. • Monument Mengapur Sdn Bhd (Monument): Had a detailed methodology including QAQC procedures for collecting magnetic susceptibility (MagSus) readings from sample pulps returned from the laboratories. • Fortress: Collected an additional 5000 MagSus readings on sample pulps retained at Mengapur. Readings included validation data to calibrate between the Monument and Fortress readings.
Drilling techniques	• *Drill type (eg core, reverse circulation, open-hole hammer, rotary air blast, auger, Bangka, sonic, etc) and details (eg core diameter, triple*	• Monument: RC drilling was mainly used for pre-collaring of diamond core holes and comprised 15% of the drilled meters by Monument. A face-

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	or standard tube, depth of diamond tails, face-sampling bit or other type, whether core is oriented and if so, by what method, etc).	sampling 133 mm diameter drill bit was used with several different air compressors, but generally with a capacity of 350 psi at 900 cfm. The RC drilling was typically done under dry conditions, with water injection conducted if necessary. • Fortress: Fortress drilled 105 holes for 10785.2m completed by internal Fortress contractor including 40 grade control drillholes • RC drilling program used a drill rig with a 550psi compressor. • The RC sampling was undertaken through 3 m long drill rods with 4.5" diameter face sampling hammer bit. • Diamond core was drilled using a Sandvik DE710 drill rig. Diamond holes were drilled from surface, HQ3 diameter, triple tubed and reduction to NQ2 core where required. The core sample was collected in 3 m long HQ diameter drill rods to produce a core with a diameter of 63.5 mm recovered via a double tube. • The holes were regularly surveyed using gyro REFLEX.
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 loss or low sample recovery was recorded at zone where there is localized faulting. • Sample recovery was low for diamond drill and RC drill when intersecting brecciated zone. • Recovery was estimated as a percentage and recorded on field sheets prior to entry into the database. • Diamond core sample recovery was measured and calculated during logging using RQD logging procedures. • Monument: Average core recovery is 83% across all rock types and oxidation zones. Within the fresh skarn, the core recovery averages approximately 96%, while within the oxide zone, the core recovery averages 63%. • Monument: The RC sample recovery was poor, with between 15% and 50% commonly reported. This is based on a density of 2.2 g/cm3 and calculated using the weights of 167 unsplit RC chip samples. Sampling bias is expected from sample recoveries this low. • Fortress: The RC sample recovery was measured to have an average recovery of 73.4%. RC chip recovery within fresh 84% and 62.7% for weathered rock. It is calculated using an average density of 3.2g/cm3 of 6892 samples. RC chip samples weight of less than 5kg are marked as core loss to avoid bias.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		• Fortress: Average core recovery is 73% across all rock types and oxidation zone. The average recovery is low due to diamond drilling in weathered brecciated zone. The core recovery is found to be 98.34% for fresh rock and within oxide zone, the recovery is 69%. • Fortress: Core recovery was measured directly. Most of the drilling was in the oxide and transitional zones with the recovery being poor to good. Qualitative estimates of the rock chip recovery are mostly reasonable.
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 holes were geologically and structurally logged by Fortress geologists using Fortress standard operating procedures. Logging was transferred into the company database once complete. • All core was delivered to the core shed where it was geologically logged, photographed and sampled. • Geological logging of drillhole intervals was carried out with sufficient detail to meet the requirements of resource estimation. • Geological drilling logging includes definition of intervals of lithology varieties based on petrography, mineralization, alterations, based on structural and textural features. • Core was photographed wet and dry. • RC washed drill chips of interval 1 m were stored in chip trays, sieved from each 1m bulk sample, geologically logged and retained for reference. • It is understood that all material drilled has been logged, totaling approximately 122,841m in a qualitative manner.

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 maximize representivity of samples.*
	• *Measures taken to ensure that the sampling is representative of the in situ material collected, including for instance results for field duplicate/second-half sampling.*
	• *Whether sample sizes are appropriate to the grain size of the material being sampled.*
		• Diamond drill (DD) core samples were analysed at the internal Fortress site Laboratory at Mengapur by XRF with AAS finish for gold. The technique is appropriate for the material and style of mineralisation.
		• Sample preparation methods were similar at all laboratories and involved:
		  ◦ Drying of sample for less than 24 hours at generally <105°C;
		  ◦ Crushing with jaw crushers to >70% passing 2mm;
		  ◦ Pulverising a 250g to 2kg (average 1kg) riffle split subsample to greater than 85% passing 75µm; and
		  ◦ Multiple pulp samples for; assaying, metallurgical test work and storage.
		• Total RC samples of less than 5kg (<15% recovery) are not sampled as deemed unrepresentative.
		• Field duplicate samples were taken for both core and RC, results of which

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		showed appropriate levels of precision for the duplicate sampling. • Industry standard procedures were followed to minimize sample error during sample preparation and sub-sampling.
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.*	• Monument: In general base metal analysis was by a mixture of ICP-MS and ICP-OES using 4-acid digest and with over-limits reassayed using ore grade processes. Most laboratories analysed for Leco S and fire assay gold with AAS finish. • Monument completed standard QAQC checks at the end of their drilling programs. The QAQC analysis indicated possible sample numbering errors that are still in the database. The use of multiple laboratories and different analytical methods has resulted in data 'artifacts' near the lower detection limits for each laboratory/analytical method in the combined database. • Fortress: A field duplicates are inserted for every 20 samples. In the case of drill core duplicates, the core is quartered, and quarter core is sampled. Industry purchased Standards are inserted at a rate of 4 per 20 samples. • 2 Geostats Fe standards and 2 Cu standards are inserted per 20 samples. • Laboratory Certified Reference Materials and/or in-house controls, blanks, splits and replicates are analysed with each batch of samples by the laboratory. These quality control results are reported along with the sample values in the final report. Selected samples are also re-analysed to confirm anomalous results. • Fortress: Magnetic susceptibility measurements were carried out using a Terraplus (Georadis) KT-10 v2 magnetic susceptibility meter. Three measurements were recorded and averaged for all sample pulps by Fortress laboratory staff. • Monument: The magnetic susceptibility meter used is the "magROCK Magnetic Susceptibility Meter manufactured by Alpha Geoscience. Monument geotechnical staff followed rigorous procedures to ensure the readings were not affected by contamination or nearby magnetic objects. Monument had specific magnetic susceptibility standards made for QAQC.
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.*	• All Lower Detection Limit (LDL) values in the assay datasets were converted to their positive equivalents. Upper Detection Limit (UDL) were converted to their positive equivalents. • No specific twinning of holes has been undertaken, however comparison of Monument drilling with the historic pre-Monument drilling suggests similar

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	• *Discuss any adjustment to assay data.*	grade distribution for copper mineralisation • Laboratory data is received electronically and uploaded, verified and stored in Expedio OCRIS. • Monument: The dataset was provided as a Microsoft Access export from SQL • No adjustment of the assay data has been done. • database using a DataShed management model containing 116 separate tables and 12 queries to Expedio OCRIS. Lab job files were also supplied to OCRIS. The data are then returned to Fortress in the form of CSV files. • Fortress: The dataset was provided in the form of CSV files. All data is validated by the supervising geologist before finalizing 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.*	• Monument: Drill collars were surveyed using total station on the Malaysian Rectified Skewed Orthomorphic (MRSO) grid using the Kertau 48 datum. • Monument: Between 2011 and April 2012, downhole surveys were conducted with Camteq single or multi-shot survey instrument at 20 to 60m intervals, with at least two surveys completed for each hole. 16% of the Monument drill dataset is from this time, and these surveys may be affected by the presence of magnetic minerals. Since May 2012, a gyroscopic tool took readings at 5m intervals. This survey tool was not affected by the presence of magnetic minerals. • Fortress: Licensed surveyor carries out collar surveys with DGPS with accuracy of +/-0.05m to accurately record the easting, northing and RL prior to drill holes being used for resource estimation. Drill hole collars were located by DGPS in WGS84 Zone 48N UTM format. • Downhole surveys are undertaken by the geofield technician at 10m intervals using a digital Reflex survey tool. • The topography is produced by combination of existing lidar and photogrammetry data using 23 controlled GCP in which data are collected twice every month by drone.
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.*	• RC and DD drill collar spacing is sufficient to establish the degree of geological and grade continuity appropriate for a mineral resource estimation. • Monument: The nominal drill spacing is 80 m along section. The section spacing is nominally 80 m. The majority of samples were collected over 2 m intervals. The drill pattern is ‘pants-leg’ with two to four drill holes collared off each drill pad. This results in significant data clustering at the surface.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		• Fortress: The exploration drill holes were irregularly spaced over a 250m length. The 40 RC drilling for grade control has a regular spacing of 10m. The recent 29 holes consist of diamond drillhole with spacing of 60m infilled by RC drillholes to intersect with interpreted breccia magnetite. Both the core and chips samples were collected at 1 m intervals. • No compositing of samples has been undertaken.
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.*	• Drill inclination is typically 60° to 90° which is designed to intersect perpendicular to the interpreted mineralised zones. • Monument: The massive vein mineralisation at Mengapur strikes northeast and dips steeply to the southeast. Predominantly the MONUMENT drill holes are drilled to the east or to the west. There is insufficient overlap of the drilling to assess if this has caused any sampling bias. • Fortress: Predominantly most drill holes are drilled to the northeast and southeast across the dip of the interpreted massive magnetite veins. For the 29 holes drilled for breccia magnetite veins, the drillholes strikes northeast.
Sample security	• *The measures taken to ensure sample security.*	• Monument: Core and RC samples from the 2011 to 2014 Monument drilling programs were stored in enclosed, locked and patrolled facilities throughout the logging and sampling process, up until being shipped for analysis. • Fortress: RC 1m composite and 1m original RC drill samples comprised approximately 3-5 kg of material within a label and then tied. • Individual sample bags were placed in a bulka bag that was tied and dispatched to the laboratory. • Whole core marked up and stored in plastic core boxes on pallets secured with pvc strapping belt transported and stored in core shed onsite. • Sampling data was recorded on field sheets and entered into a database. • Samples were dispatched per hole. On each occasion, a sample submission form was completed which lists the sample IDs, the total number of samples and analyses to be conducted. • Upon receipt of the samples, the lab checked the sample IDs and total number of samples and notified geologist of any differences from the sample submission form. • After the analysis of the samples had been completed, results were sent to the database geologist in digital format.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Audits or reviews	• *The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.*	• Early in the Monument drill program in 2011 Mr. Roderick Carlson of Snowden conducted site inspections of the Mengapur project The site visit was general in nature and he undertook the following activities: ○ review of geologic model ○ inspection of on-going drilling and core ○ review of on-going drill sampling and logging ○ inspection of current core security procedures ○ site geology review at site outcrops ○ review of mill facilities (grinding and flotation). ○ • Chief Geologist attended the RC and DD drilling programs and ensured that sampling and logging practices adhered to Fortress prescribed standards. • Chief Geologist has reviewed the laboratory assay results against field logging sheets and drill chip trays and confirmed the reported assays occur with logged mineralised intervals and checked that assays of standards and blanks inserted by the Company were appropriately reported. • Fortress have compiled and reviewed Monument drilling and assay data. • Fortress are not aware of any other independent reviews of the drilling, sampling and assaying protocols, or the assay database.

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 Mengapur Project covers 9.35 square kilometres (935 hectares)across two licences held by Monument's wholly owned subsidiaries Cermat Aman Sdn Bhd (CASB) and Star Destiny Sdn Bhd (SDSB). • CASB owns mining lease ML8/2011 (application for renewal granted in October 2020), and SDSB owns prospecting licence SKC(H)1/2008 • Snowden Optiro understands from Fortress that the tenement is in good standing and have not advised of any impediments to being able to operate on the lease.
Exploration done by other parties	• *Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.*	• In 1962, Asia Mining Company and Jaya Sepakat Mining Company found three area of skarn mineralization in Mengapur by several drillholes and trenches. • Between 1983 and 1989, Malaysia Mining Corporation Berhad (MMC)

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		completed five phases of drilling at Mengapur: totalling 210 drillholes for 59,318 m of core. • During the period from 2011 to 2014, MONUMENT drilled 275 holes, comprising a combination of diamond core (DD) and reverse circulation (RC) drilling for 52,738m.
Geology	• *Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.*	• The Project is centered around the Middle-Triassic Lepar Granodiorite intrusive complex locally known as Bukit Botak. • The deposit is a skarn-type developed within sedimentary host rocks at the contact zone with the Bukit Botak intrusion complex and other associated intrusive bodies. • North-south and northwest-southeast trending high-angled faults and folding are the main structural trends. • Bukit Botak comprises of at least 300 m of rhyolitic tuff at the upper part and adamellite intrusive at the lower portion. • The pyroxene-rich and lesser garnet-rich exoskarn alteration of the surrounding carbonaceous limestone and interbedded calcareous shales are host to the Fe-Cu-Au±Ag±S sulphide and magnetite mineralisation. • The interpreted mineralization domains for skarn magnetite are based on a value of MagSus of more than 50 x10-3 SI and 15% Fe which appears to be a natural break in the grade distribution. • Magnetite is common, especially in the skarn occurring interstitial to the skarn and associated with pyrrhotite. • Chalcopyrite is the major copper mineral at Mengapur that occurs in both the skarn and veins as solid masses, veinlets, disseminated grains associated with other sulphides. It is paragenetically later than pyrrhotite and arsenopyrite. • Fortress drilling found potential overprinting of deposit skarn with low epithermal sulphidation.
Drill hole Information	• A summary of all information material to the understanding of the exploration results including a tabulation of the following information for all Material drill holes: ○ easting and northing of the drill hole collar ○ elevation or RL (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in metres) of the drill hole collar ○ dip and azimuth of the hole ○ down hole length and interception depth	• Not applicable as exploration results are not reported.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	○ hole length. • If the exclusion of this information is justified on the basis that the information is not Material and this exclusion does not detract from the understanding of the report, the Competent Person should clearly explain why this is the case.	
Data aggregation methods	• In reporting Exploration Results, weighting averaging techniques, maximum and/or minimum grade truncations (eg cutting of high grades) and cut-off grades are usually Material and should be stated. • Where aggregate intercepts incorporate short lengths of high grade results and longer lengths of low grade results, the procedure used for such aggregation should be stated and some typical examples of such aggregations should be shown in detail. • The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values should be clearly stated.	• Not applicable as exploration results are not reported.
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').	• DD drill holes were angled at -60° and designed to intersect perpendicular to the mineralisation. • RC drill holes were angled at -60° and designed to intersect perpendicular to the mineralisation. • Downhole intercepts are not reported as true widths however are considered to be close to true widths based on the drill orientation and current understanding of the mineralisation.
Diagrams	• Appropriate maps and sections (with scales) and tabulations of intercepts should be included for any significant discovery being reported These should include, but not be limited to a plan view of drill hole collar locations and appropriate sectional views.	• Relevant sections and plans have been included in the main report and in previous reports.
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.	• All drill hole information and significant mineralised intercepts and widths have been reported in previous reports
Other substantive exploration data	• Other exploration data, if meaningful and material, should be reported including (but not limited to): geological observations; geophysical survey results; geochemical survey results; bulk samples – size and method of treatment; metallurgical test results; bulk density, groundwater, geotechnical and rock characteristics; potential deleterious or contaminating substances.	• All material information has been included in the report. • Bulk densities have been measured from drill core by Fortress Mineral. • There are no known deleterious elements.
Further work	• The nature and scale of planned further work (eg tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling).	• Fortress has planned further RC infill and extension diamond drilling as well as addition metallurgical test work to increase the MRE classification.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	• Diagrams clearly highlighting the areas of possible extensions, including the main geological interpretations and future drilling areas, provided this information is not commercially sensitive.	• There are potential prospect area which are not yet drilled. • Exploration drilling for overprint epithermal low sulphidation.

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.*	• Since the acquisition of the project Fortress has spent time validating and loading the data into an OCRIS Expedio relational database. Logging data is captured on a OCRIS tablet to avoid transcription errors. • Snowden Optiro undertook a basic check of the data for potential errors as a preliminary step to compiling the resource estimate. No significant flaws were identified
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.*	• The CP visited the site in February 2023 and reviewed drill core, and exposures with the site geology team. The site geology team took the CP through the current geological interpretation while on site.
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.*	• Fortress staff were involved in all aspects of the geological interpretation used for the MRE and provided guidance to the modelling, undertaken by Snowden Optiro. Snowden Optiro believes further work is required to understand the local geology and controls on the magnetite and pyrrhotite mineralization. • Only Fortress and Monument data was used for the estimation of the magnetite and pyrrhotite mineralization. Pre-Monument drilling was used to inform the skarn mineralisation in the northern part of the deposit where there is no Monument or Fortress drilling. Any part of the estimate informed by the pre-Monumnet drilling was classified as Inferred. • The skarn, magnetite and pyrrhotite mineralized domains estimated, were based on lithological models derived from logging, assay and mapping data acquired and interpreted by Fortress geology staff. • Copper mineralization is hosted primarily by the skarn aureole surrounding the adamellite intrusive. Pyrrhotite and magnetite mineralization is more discreet compared to skarn and is interpreted

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		to postdate the skarn mineralizing event.
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.*	• Hydrothermal alteration at Mengapur is centred on the Bukit Botak intrusive complex with some hornfels and mostly mineralised skarn occurring in the adjacent sedimentary rocks at the intrusive-sedimentary rock contact zone. The skarn alteration extends outward into the sedimentary rocks approximately 300 m to 650 m laterally from the contact and has been intercepted in drillholes up to 750 m below the surface. The intrusive complex is approximately 800m in diameter at the surface.
Estimation and modelling techniques	• *The nature and appropriateness of the estimation technique(s) applied and key assumptions, including treatment of extreme grade values, domaining, interpolation parameters and maximum distance of extrapolation from data points. If a computer assisted estimation method was chosen include a description of computer software and parameters used.* • *The availability of check estimates, previous estimates and/or mine production records and whether the Mineral Resource estimate takes appropriate account of such data.* • *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.* • *The process of validation, the checking process used, the comparison of model data to drill hole data, and use of reconciliation data if available.*	• Snowden Optiro estimated Cu, Fe, Au, Ag As and S grades using ordinary block kriging (parent cell estimates) using Datamine Studio RM software. Snowden Optiro considers this to be an appropriate technique to estimate grade into this type of deposit. • Grade capping was applied on a domain by domain basis where coefficient of variation exceeded 1, grade caps were applied to the following elements Cu, Au, Ag and As. Grade caps have been determined using a combination of histograms, log probability and mean variance plots. • Previous estimates by VRM 2021 and Snowden 2018 are in line in terms of grade with February 2023 estimate being reported. • No assumptions have been made with respect to by-products • Both S and As have been estimated. • A block model was constructed using a parent block size of 20 m(E) by 20 m(N) by 10 m(RL) based on the nominal drillhole spacing along with an assessment of the grade continuity using a kriging neighbourhood analysis. • No assumptions have been made with respect to selective mining units • No assumptions have been made about correlation between variables except for density where a regression between density and Fe has been used. • The supplied lithology wireframes were used to constrain the resource estimate. For the skarn mineralisation a 0.15% Cu

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		indicator was used to sub-domain the skarn mineralization. • Grade estimates were validated against the input drillhole composites (globally and using grade trend plots) and show a good comparison. Visual comparison between estimated blocks and composites on sections through the deposit have been undertaken.
Moisture	• *Whether the tonnages are estimated on a dry basis or with natural moisture, and the method of determination of the moisture content.*	• All tonnages have been estimated as dry tonnage
Cut-off parameters	• *The basis of the adopted cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied.*	• For the reporting of the Mineral Resource Estimate, a 0.3 % Cu cut-off grade inside an optimised pit shell has been used for potential open cut resources
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.*	• It is assumed the deposit will be mined using conventional open cut mining methods. • The Mineral Resource is limited to within the CASB and SDSB mining lease boundaries and is also constrained within an optimised pit shell based on the recovery of copper only, no value was attributed to iron hosted by the magnetite units or the gold and silver or any other materials present on the mining leases. The parameters used in the pit optimisation were high level assumptions provided by Fortress based on the limited metallurgical test work to date. The parameters used are presented below; • Costs ○ Mining cost – US$1.15/t rock ○ Process cost US$10.27/t ore ○ Selling cost – US$23.82/t Cu conc • Recoveries ○ Cu – 85% • Price ○ US$10,000/t Cu ○ Cu Payability – 83% • Slopes

<table>
<tr><th>Criteria</th><th>JORC Code explanation</th><th>Commentary</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>45 degrees
Min grade – 0.3% Cu</td></tr>
<tr><td>Metallurgical factors or assumptions</td><td>The basis for assumptions or predictions regarding metallurgical amenability. It is always necessary as part of the process of determining reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction to consider potential metallurgical methods, but the assumptions regarding metallurgical treatment processes and parameters made when reporting Mineral Resources may not always be rigorous. Where this is the case, this should be reported with an explanation of the basis of the metallurgical assumptions made.</td><td>See above</td></tr>
<tr><td>Environmen-tal factors or assumptions</td><td>Assumptions made regarding possible waste and process residue disposal options. It is always necessary as part of the process of determining reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction to consider the potential environmental impacts of the mining and processing operation. While at this stage the determination of potential environmental impacts, particularly for a greenfields project, may not always be well advanced, the status of early consideration of these potential environmental impacts should be reported. Where these aspects have not been considered this should be reported with an explanation of the environmental assumptions made.</td><td>It is assumed that no environmental factors exist that could prohibit any potential mining development at the Mengapur deposit. The area has a history of mining and several leases are currently being worked.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Bulk density</td><td>Whether assumed or determined. If assumed, the basis for the assumptions. If determined, the method used, whether wet or dry, the frequency of the measurements, the nature, size and representativeness of the samples.
The bulk density for bulk material must have been measured by methods that adequately account for void spaces (vugs, porosity, etc), moisture and differences between rock and alteration zones within the deposit.
Discuss assumptions for bulk density estimates used in the evaluation process of the different materials.</td><td>At Mengapur, bulk density values have been assigned as follows
<table>
<tr><th>Lithology</th><th>Oxidation</th><th>Bulk Density (t/m3)</th></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Adamellite</td><td>Oxide</td><td>1.85</td></tr>
<tr><td>Trans</td><td>2.2</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sulph</td><td>2.8</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Gossan</td><td>Oxide</td><td>3.4</td></tr>
<tr><td>Oxide</td><td>2.1</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Limestone</td><td>Oxide</td><td>1.85</td></tr>
<tr><td>Trans</td><td>2.4</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sulph</td><td>2.75</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Shale</td><td>Oxide</td><td>2.2</td></tr>
<tr><td>Trans</td><td>2.65</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
</table>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		<table><tr><td></td><td>Sulph</td><td>2.75</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Trans</td><td>2.8</td></tr><tr><td>Skarn</td><td>Sulph</td><td>BD = 0.023*Fe% + 3.004 3.5 as a default</td></tr></table>
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.*	• The classification has been applied to the Mineral Resource estimate based on the drilling data spacing, grade and geological continuity and data integrity. • No areas of the in situ Mineral Resource satisfied the requirement to be classified as Measured Resources. Indicated Resources are based on a nominal 40m*40m spaced drill density • The MRE classification appropriately reflects the view of the CP.
Audits or reviews	• *The results of any audits or reviews of Mineral Resource estimates.*	• Snowden Optiro is not aware of any external reviews of the Mengapur MRE
Discussion of relative accuracy/ confidence	• *Where appropriate a statement of the relative accuracy and confidence level in the Mineral Resource estimate using an approach or procedure deemed appropriate by the Competent Person. For example, the application of statistical or geostatistical procedures to quantify the relative accuracy of the resource within stated confidence limits, or, if such an approach is not deemed appropriate, a qualitative discussion 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 relative accuracy of the Mineral Resource estimate is reflected in the reporting of the Mineral Resource as per the guidelines of the 2012 JORC Code. • The Mineral Resource has been validated against the input composite data. • The statement relates to a global estimate of tonnes and grade with an open pit cut-off of 0.3 % Cu.