ASX ANNOUNCEMENT

17 November 2026

WOYLA MAIDEN JORC MINERAL RESOURCE
549,000 OZ GOLD EQUIVALENT
441,000 OZ GOLD AND 7.2 MOZ SILVER

Far East Gold Ltd (**FEG** or the **Company**) is pleased to announce a maiden JORC (2012) Mineral Resource Estimate (**MRE**) for its Woyla Gold–Silver Project (**Woyla** or the **Project**) in Aceh Province, Sumatra, Indonesia. The MRE covers four low-sulphidation epithermal vein deposits – Rek Rinti–Agam, Aloe Rek, Aloe Eumpeuk and Anak Perak – within a 24,260-hectare sixth-generation Contract of Work originally established by Barrick, in which FEG holds an indirect 51% interest.

The maiden MRE totals **19.4 Mt at 0.71 g/t Au and 11.6 g/t Ag (0.88 g/t AuEq) for 441,000 ounces of gold and 7.2 million ounces of silver, or 549,000 ounces of gold equivalent (AuEq)**, reported within optimised open-pit shells above a 0.15 g/t AuEq cut-off. Indicated Mineral Resources of **5.1 Mt at 0.92 g/t AuEq for 151,000 oz AuEq** (125,000 oz Au) represent 27% of the contained AuEq. The Resource contains a coherent higher-grade component: above a 1.0 g/t AuEq cut-off it contains approximately **293,000 oz AuEq at 1.75 g/t AuEq** – **53%** of the contained metal within **27%** of the tonnage. The 1.0 g/t AuEq cut-off figures are a grade-tonnage presentation of the MRE and are not a separate Mineral Resource.

The MRE has been defined from 133 diamond holes for 20,585 m drilled by FEG between September 2022 and July 2024 on four of the nine known prospects within the Contract of Work, and is effective as at 9 November 2026. Mineral Resources are not Ore Reserves and do not have demonstrated economic viability. See the key risks and Forward-Looking Statements in this announcement.

HIGHLIGHTS

- Maiden JORC (2012) Mineral Resource of **19.4 Mt at 0.71 g/t Au and 11.6 g/t Ag (0.88 g/t AuEq) for 441,000 oz Au and 7.2 Moz Ag (549,000 oz AuEq)**, reported within optimised open-pit shells above a 0.15 g/t AuEq cut-off and classified as Indicated and Inferred.
- Indicated Mineral Resources of **5.1 Mt at 0.76 g/t Au and 10.5 g/t Ag (0.92 g/t AuEq) for 125,000 oz Au and 1.7 Moz Ag (151,000 oz AuEq)**, representing 27% of contained AuEq and providing a strong confidence base for a maiden estimate.
- Rek Rinti–Agam is the cornerstone deposit with **343,000 oz Au and 5.9 Moz Ag (432,000 oz AuEq)**, hosted in at least eight vein zones of 0.7–20 m width and 600–1,500 m strike length.
- Aloe Rek contains a high-grade Indicated core of **0.3 Mt at 2.02 g/t Au (2.12 g/t AuEq)** within a total Resource of 66,000 oz Au (71,000 oz AuEq). Aloe Eumpeuk is silver-rich at **53.9 g/t Ag (2.15 g/t AuEq)**.
- Above a 1.0 g/t AuEq cut-off, the MRE contains approximately **5.2 Mt at 1.40 g/t Au and 23.3 g/t Ag (1.75 g/t AuEq) for 293,000 oz AuEq** – 53% of the contained AuEq within 27%

of the tonnage. This is a grade-tonnage presentation of the MRE and not a separate Mineral Resource.

- Metallurgical testwork on Rek Rinti & Aloe Eumpeuk drill core returned **92–93% gold and 79–81% silver recovery** by whole-ore cyanide leach at P80 75 µm, with 45–47% gravity-recoverable gold. The MRE adopts recoveries of 90% for gold and 80% for silver.
- The MRE is supported by **133 diamond holes for 20,585 m** drilled by FEG between September 2022 and July 2024. Only four of the nine known prospects within the Contract of Work have been drilled; the other five, including FEG's Kareung Reuboh discovery, are undrilled exploration targets.
- Potential future work identified in the JORC Report includes infill and extension drilling, first-pass drilling of untested prospects, and metallurgical and geotechnical studies. All four deposits lie within Protected Forest (Hutan Lindung). Open-pit mining will require the relevant areas to be reclassified from Protected Forest to Production Forest; a desktop study, confirmed by the Ministry of Forestry, identified 15,425.09 ha (63.75%) of the PT WAM CoW area as potentially eligible for reclassification.




Figure 1: *Woyla Project location, retained Contract of Work area and established prospects, Aceh Province, Indonesia.*

Chief Executive Officer, Shane Menere comments

"This is another significant milestone for Far East Gold. Delivering a maiden JORC Resource of ***549,000 ounces of gold equivalent, including 441,000 ounces of gold and 7.2 million ounces of silver****, is an outstanding result, particularly when you consider that we have only drilled four of the nine known prospects across this extensive project.*

What really excites me is the quality of what we have discovered. We already have 151,000 ounces of gold equivalent in the Indicated category, and metallurgical testwork demonstrating gold recoveries of over 90%. These are encouraging fundamentals for the next stage of Woyla's development. These results provide a strong foundation for demonstrating Woyla's value to potential development partners.

Importantly, this is only the beginning of our understanding of Woyla's potential. We have five known prospects yet to be drilled, including our own Kareung Reuboh discovery, and considerable opportunity to extend the mineralisation already identified.

With Woyla now joining Idenburg and Wonogiri as another of FEG's JORC-defined gold projects in Indonesia, FEG's combined JORC 2012-compliant gold resources across its portfolio now exceed 2.2 million ounces (Woyla 441 koz + Idenburg 780 koz + Wonogiri 996 koz = 2,217 koz Au). This further demonstrates the underlying value and scale of Far East Gold's portfolio. *Our focus at Woyla is now on consolidating the technical information and evaluating opportunities to realise value through a potential sale or joint venture."*

WOYLA MINERAL RESOURCE ESTIMATE

The Woyla MRE is presented in Table 1 by deposit and classification. It has been estimated in accordance with the JORC Code (2012) and is reported in situ, within optimised open-pit shells, above a cut-off grade of 0.15 g/t AuEq on a 100% project basis. Gold and silver grades and contained metal are reported individually alongside the gold equivalent. The geological modelling and resource estimation were undertaken by Mr Pratama Abimanyu, Senior Resource Geologist and an independent consultant to FEG. Dr. Mark Steemson Process Engineer and an independent consultant to FEG reviewed the metallurgical test results. Mr Michael Corey has reviewed the supporting data, estimation methodology and results and takes responsibility for the MRE as Competent Person. The MRE is effective as at 9 November 2026.

Deposit	Classification	Tonnes (Mt)	Au (g/t)	Ag (g/t)	AuEq (g/t)	Au (koz)	Ag (Moz)	AuEq (koz)
Rek Rinti–Agam	Indicated	4.4	0.64	9.4	0.78	90	1.33	110
	Inferred	12.2	0.64	11.7	0.82	253	4.60	322
	Total	**16.6**	**0.64**	**11.1**	**0.81**	**343**	**5.93**	**432**
Aloe Rek	Indicated	0.3	2.02	7.0	2.12	19	0.07	20
	Inferred	1.6	0.89	4.9	0.97	47	0.26	51
	Total	**1.9**	**1.06**	**5.2**	**1.14**	**66**	**0.33**	**71**
Aloe Eumpeuk	Indicated	0.2	1.05	37.6	1.62	8	0.29	12
	Inferred	0.3	1.59	68.4	2.62	14	0.59	22
	Total	**0.5**	**1.34**	**53.9**	**2.15**	**22**	**0.88**	**34**
Anak Perak	Indicated	0.2	1.25	6.9	1.36	8	0.04	8
	Inferred	0.1	0.83	7.1	0.94	3	0.03	3
	Total	**0.3**	**1.10**	**7.0**	**1.21**	**11**	**0.07**	**11**
Woyla Total	**Indicated**	**5.1**	**0.76**	**10.5**	**0.92**	**125**	**1.73**	**151**
	Inferred	**14.3**	**0.69**	**11.9**	**0.87**	**316**	**5.47**	**398**
	Total	**19.4**	**0.71**	**11.6**	**0.88**	**441**	**7.20**	**549**

Table 1: *Woyla Mineral Resource Estimate, effective 9 November 2026. Mineral Resources are reported in situ within optimised pit shells above a cut-off grade of 0.15 g/t AuEq on a 100% project basis; FEG holds an indirect 51% interest in PT Woyla Aceh Minerals. AuEq = Au + 0.015 × Ag (see Gold equivalent calculation). Tonnes, grades and contained metal are rounded and totals may not add due to rounding. Mineral Resources are not Ore Reserves and do not have demonstrated economic viability.*




Figure 2: *Woyla contained gold by deposit and classification, with contained gold equivalent shown in brackets.*

Gold equivalent calculation

Gold equivalent (AuEq) grades are calculated as AuEq (g/t) = Au (g/t) + 0.015 × Ag (g/t), and contained AuEq ounces as Au oz + 0.015 × Ag oz. The conversion factor of 0.015 reflects a recovery-adjusted Ag:Au value ratio of approximately 67:1, based on assumed prices of US$3,500/oz for gold and US$59.06/oz for silver and metallurgical recoveries of 90% for gold and 80% for silver, which are supported by the metallurgical testwork summarised in Table 3. It is the Company's opinion that both gold and silver included in the metal equivalent calculation have a reasonable potential to be recovered and sold.

WOYLA PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Woyla Project lies in the Barisan Range of Aceh Province, northern Sumatra, approximately 120 km south-east of Banda Aceh (Figure 1). Access is by sealed road from Banda Aceh via Beureunuen, Tangse and Geumpang to the base camp near Anak Perak (about 5.5 hours), then by trail bike or on foot to the prospects. Helicopter access from Banda Aceh takes about 40 minutes.

The Project is held by PT Woyla Aceh Minerals (PT WAM), formerly PT Barrick Mutiara Woyla, under a sixth-generation Contract of Work (CoW) signed on 28 April 1997 and covering 24,260 hectares in the Pidie and West Aceh Regencies. FEG holds an indirect 51% interest in PT WAM. The CoW is in the exploration stage. The exploration term ran from 14 October 2022 to 14 October 2024; PT WAM lodged a valid application to extend the exploration stage before it expired, followed by further applications in 2025 and 2026, and the extension is being processed by the Directorate General of Minerals and Coal of the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources. The CoW provides for a 30-year operation period from the start of production, extendable by two further 10-year periods, subject to approval.

Barrick explored the CoW between 1995 and 1997 using regional geochemistry, airborne geophysics, mapping and trenching, and identified the Aloe Rek, Aloe Eumpeuk, Anak Perak and Rek Rinti vein systems, but did not drill. Newcrest held an earn-in between 1999 and 2002 but completed no additional fieldwork, and the CoW was suspended during the Aceh conflict before being reactivated on 14 October 2022. FEG commenced detailed geological mapping, vein sampling and geophysical surveys in 2021 and began diamond drilling at Anak Perak in September 2022. Nine prospects are now known within the CoW, including FEG's Kareung Reuboh discovery. No historical Mineral Resource has been reported for any Woyla prospect.

SUMMARY OF MATERIAL INFORMATION (ASX LISTING RULE 5.8.1)

Geology and geological interpretation

The CoW straddles the dextral Sumatran Fault System. Basement is the Triassic to Early Cretaceous Woyla Group arc assemblage, overlain by Tertiary sediments and Quaternary volcanics and intruded by Late Cretaceous–Palaeocene and Miocene intrusions (Figure 3). Gold–silver mineralisation is of low-sulphidation epithermal type, hosted in banded quartz–adularia veins, stockworks and breccias with ginguro banding, electrum and acanthite within andesitic volcanic rocks. At Rek Rinti–Agam, drilling has delineated ten quartz veins, including the Agam, Pertama, Susi and Bohay veins, which strike north-east to east and dip about 60° south-east. At Aloe Rek (Victory Vein), Aloe Eumpeuk (Meuh and Awai veins) and Anak Perak, veins strike north–south and dip 70–80° east. Aloe Eumpeuk mineralisation is silver-rich (Ag:Au about 39:1). Mineralisation was interpreted as 13 structurally controlled domains from logged quartz veining, brecciation and assays, supported by surface mapping.




Figure 3: *Summary regional geology of the Woyla Project showing the Sumatran Fault System and prospect locations (PT Barrick Mutiara Woyla, July 1997).*

Drilling techniques

The MRE is supported by 133 diamond drill holes for 20,585 m completed by FEG between September 2022 and July 2024 (Table 2), of which 111 intersected gold-bearing veins and were used to define the mineralised domains; the remaining holes did not intersect veins (Figure 4). All drilling was by Omega Drilling using man-portable rigs with triple-tube PQ core from surface (median 45 m) and HQ thereafter, with core oriented by Reflex and Axis tools. Average core recovery is 92.7%. Collars were surveyed by RTK GNSS, except for eight holes located by tape and compass, and downhole surveys were taken at 10 m and then every 40–50 m.

Deposit	Holes	Metres	Period	Selected significant intercepts (down-hole)
Rek Rinti–Agam	63	11,618	Oct 2022 – Mar 2024	RRD004: 30.0 m @ 2.83 g/t Au from 98.0 m, incl. 8.1 m @ 7.69 g/t Au; RRD034R: 25.8 m @ 3.28 g/t Au from 66.5 m
Aloe Rek	12	1,884	Mar – Jul 2024	ARD009: 20.0 m @ 7.57 g/t Au from 67.5 m, incl. 11.0 m @ 13.45 g/t Au; ARD001: 12.4 m @ 5.59 g/t Au from 82.3 m
Aloe Eumpeuk	30	3,647	Apr – Aug 2023	AED018: 6.8 m @ 3.50 g/t Au from 65.2 m; AED002: 2.6 m @ 7.31 g/t Au from 74.4 m, incl. 1.0 m @ 18.46 g/t Au
Anak Perak	28	3,436	Sep 2022 – Mar 2023	APD011: 11.8 m @ 2.91 g/t Au from 48.6 m, incl. 2.5 m @ 10.51 g/t Au
Total	**133**	**20,585**	**Sep 2022 – Jul 2024**	

Table 2: *Summary of FEG diamond drilling by deposit, with selected significant intercepts calculated at a 0.2 g/t Au lower cut-off with a maximum of 2 m internal waste and no top cut. Intercepts are down-hole lengths; true widths are not known. These results have been previously reported (see ASX announcements dated 13 December 2022, 2 February 2023, 22 July 2024 and FEG's 2023 Financial Report - 29 Sep 2023). Totals may not add due to rounding.*




Figure 4: *Drill collar locations by deposit and topographic survey coverage (UTM Zone 47N, WGS84).*

Sampling and sub-sampling techniques

Core was logged, photographed and marked up by geologists, and half core was sampled on geological boundaries at 0.17–1.83 m intervals (median 1.0 m), for 9,715 samples over 8,293 m, and dispatched under chain-of-custody protocols. Samples were crushed to 95% passing 3 mm and pulverised to 95% passing 75 µm.

Sample analysis method

Samples were analysed by PT Geoservices, Cikarang (ISO 17025). Gold was determined by 30 g fire assay with AAS finish to January 2023 and 50 g fire assay with AAS finish thereafter, with a gravimetric finish above 50 ppm. Silver and multi-elements were determined by aqua regia digest with ICP-OES finish and ore-grade AAS above 100 ppm Ag. CRMs, blanks and field duplicates were inserted at a combined rate of 13.3%, with 70 umpire pulps checked by Intertek. Accuracy and contamination are acceptable; field-duplicate precision is moderate to poor, consistent with the variable distribution of gold in epithermal veins. Screen fire assays of five high-grade pulps by Intertek confirmed coarse gold in two samples, which led FEG to adopt the larger 50 g fire assay charge. The QA/QC results are considered adequate to support the Mineral Resource classification.

Estimation methodology

Geological modelling and resource estimation were undertaken by independent consultant Mr Pratama Abimanyu using Leapfrog Geo. Block models use parent blocks of 10 m × 10 m × 5 m, sub-blocked to 2.5 m × 2.5 m × 1.25 m. Assays were composited to 1 m within domains and top-cut at the 94th to 99th percentile. Gold and silver were estimated independently by ordinary kriging using pairwise-relative variograms, with inverse distance weighting used for three minor domains (RR_02, NRA_01 and NRA_02) that have insufficient data for variography. Bulk densities from 2,080 wax-coated immersion measurements were applied at 2.46 t/m³ (Rek Rinti–Agam and Aloe Rek), 2.40 t/m³ (Aloe Eumpeuk) and 2.42 t/m³ (Anak Perak). The model was validated using global statistics, swath plots and cross-sections, and block volumes agree with wireframe volumes to within 1% for all but two minor domains. No depletion has been applied for artisanal workings, which in the Competent Person's opinion have had no material impact on the Mineral Resource.

Cut-off grade

Pit optimisation and resource reporting are based on AuEq grade. The 0.15 g/t AuEq cut-off is a break-even grade calculated using a mining cost of US$2.00/t, processing cost of US$10.00/t, G&A cost of US$3.00/t, 90% gold recovery, 80% silver recovery, a silver price of US$59.06/oz (applied through the AuEq factor) and a gold price of US$3,500/oz, which is approximately 15% below the spot price at the time of reporting (about US$4,100/oz, September 2026). At current prices the break-even cut-off is approximately 0.13 g/t AuEq. Costs are based on typical open-pit gold operations in Indonesia. Royalty, refining charges and mining dilution are not included in the optimisation, with the discount to the spot price considered sufficient to accommodate them.

Classification criteria

Mineral Resources are classified as Indicated and Inferred using three-dimensional solids digitised around areas of consistent drill spacing and geological confidence. Indicated Resources are areas drilled at a nominal spacing of approximately 40 m with demonstrated geological and grade continuity, estimated by ordinary kriging in the first or second search pass and predominantly informed by two or more drill holes. Inferred Resources are estimated blocks outside the Indicated areas within domains supported by at least two drill holes, including all blocks estimated by inverse distance weighting. Indicated blocks have a median average sample distance of 41 m and Inferred blocks 109 m. Indicated Resources account for 26% of tonnes and 27% of contained AuEq, with 86% of Indicated tonnes at Rek Rinti–Agam. No Measured Resources have been estimated. The

Competent Person believes that the classification criteria are appropriate and the resulting resource classifications are an accurate reflection of mineral distribution.

Mining and metallurgical methods and parameters, and other modifying factors

Conventional open-pit truck-and-shovel mining is assumed. To demonstrate reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction (RPEEE), FEG generated optimised pit shells for each deposit at a gold price of US$3,500/oz with 45° overall slopes and 90% recovery, and the Mineral Resource is reported within these shells above 0.15 g/t AuEq (Figure 5). The pit shells extend to approximately 100 m below surface at Anak Perak and 150 m at Rek Rinti–Agam, Aloe Eumpeuk and Aloe Rek, while the block models extend to about 250 m. A sensitivity run at US$3,600/oz changed the contained AuEq within the shells by less than 1%, with no significant change in pit depth.




Figure 5: *Rek Rinti–Agam block model (Au g/t) with the RPEEE optimised pit shell (left), and a representative cross-section showing block grades, drill holes and the pit shell outline (right).*

Metallurgical testwork was carried out by PT Geoservices, Cikarang, in three programmes designed and supervised by FEG metallurgical consultant Dr Mark Steemson (Table 3). The Rek Rinti samples tested are amenable to conventional gravity and cyanide leach processing, with 92–93% gold and 79–81% silver extraction at a grind of P80 75 µm and 45–47% gravity-recoverable gold. Gravity concentration followed by leaching of the gravity tailings gave a similar overall gold recovery (91.4–94.5%). Cyanide consumption is high (4.7–4.9 kg/t NaCN) owing to the high silver content and cyanide-soluble copper, and cyanide recovery may be required; coarse-crush (heap leach) recoveries are low. Recoveries of 90% for gold and 80% for silver are assumed. No testwork has yet been carried out on Aloe Rek or Anak Perak material or on oxidised material, and recoveries there are assumed to be similar to Rek Rinti and Aloe Eumpeuk.

Test	Head grade (Au / Ag g/t)	Grind	Au recovery	Ag recovery
Diagnostic leach (01726)	1.24–2.58 / 91–134	P95 75 µm	90.6% avg	86.3% avg
Whole-ore cyanide leach, 72 h (01995)	HG01 3.83 / 66; LG01 0.99 / 17	P80 75 µm	93% / 92%	81% / 79%
Gravity-recoverable gold (01995)	HG01 / LG01	to P50 75 µm	47% / 45%	13% / 11%
Gravity + leach of tails (01995)	HG01 / LG01	P80 75 µm	94.5% / 91.4%	≈83% / ≈72%
Coarse bottle roll (02061)	1.52–2.00 / 71–111	P100 12.5 mm	24.5–50.1%	18.0–51.3%

Table 3: *Summary of metallurgical testwork on Woyla drill core composites from Rek Rinti and Aloe Eumpeuk (PT Geoservices, 2023–2024).*

Environmental, forestry and permitting factors

All four deposits lie within Protected Forest (Hutan Lindung, HL), which covers approximately 88% of the CoW, with the remaining 12% being non-forest area (APL). Open-pit mining within Protected Forest is not permitted without a change of forest function to Production Forest. A desktop study by Bogor Agricultural University concluded, as confirmed by the Ministry of Forestry, that 15,425 ha (63.75%) of the CoW area previously classified as Protected Forest may be proposed for reclassification as Production Forest. The forest-function status is considered a material risk to the open-pit RPEEE. Mining will also require a Forest Area Use Approval (PPKH), an AMDAL environmental approval and completion of the exploration stage of the CoW. No waste rock characterisation or tailings storage studies have been undertaken, and artisanal mining is present at Rek Rinti.

WOYLA GRADE-TONNAGE DISTRIBUTION

Table 4 and Figure 6 show the sensitivity of the Mineral Resource within the optimised pit shells to AuEq cut-off grade. The Resource contains a coherent higher-grade component, with approximately 5.2 Mt at 1.75 g/t AuEq for 293,000 oz AuEq (235,000 oz Au and 3.9 Moz Ag) above a 1.0 g/t AuEq cut-off. Figures at cut-offs other than 0.15 g/t AuEq are a grade-tonnage presentation of the MRE, are provided for information only and do not represent a separate Mineral Resource, a mineable inventory or a production target.

Cut-off (g/t AuEq)	Tonnes (Mt)	Au (g/t)	Ag (g/t)	AuEq (g/t)	Au (koz)	Ag (Moz)	AuEq (koz)	Indicated AuEq (koz)	Inferred AuEq (koz)
0.10	20.1	0.70	11.2	0.85	443	7.23	552	152	400
0.15 (reported)	**19.4**	**0.71**	**11.6**	**0.88**	**441**	**7.20**	**549**	**151**	**398**
0.20	18.6	0.73	12.0	0.91	437	7.15	544	149	395
0.30	16.8	0.79	13.0	0.98	425	7.01	530	143	387
0.40	14.7	0.86	14.3	1.07	405	6.76	506	137	370
0.50	12.9	0.92	15.6	1.16	383	6.49	481	128	353
0.60	11.3	0.99	17.0	1.24	360	6.17	453	121	332
0.70	10.1	1.04	18.0	1.31	340	5.87	428	114	314
0.80	9.0	1.10	19.0	1.39	318	5.50	400	107	294
0.90	6.5	1.26	22.2	1.59	263	4.64	332	101	231
1.00	5.2	1.40	23.3	1.75	235	3.89	293	96	197

Table 4: *Grade-tonnage sensitivity of the Woyla MRE within the optimised pit shells (Indicated + Inferred). The reported Mineral Resource is at the 0.15 g/t AuEq cut-off.*




Figure 6: *Grade-tonnage curves by deposit and classification within the optimised pit shells. The dashed line marks the 0.15 g/t AuEq reporting cut-off.*

FEG PORTFOLIO JORC GOLD MINERAL RESOURCES

With the maiden Woyla Mineral Resource, FEG's combined JORC (2012) compliant gold Mineral Resources across its portfolio total approximately 2.2 million ounces of gold (Table 5). The Idenburg and Wonogiri estimates have been previously reported, were prepared by different Competent Persons at different dates and using different parameters, and are not directly comparable with the Woyla estimate.

Project	FEG interest	Classification	Tonnes (Mt)	Au (g/t)	Au (koz) 100%	Source
Woyla	51% (indirect)	Indicated + Inferred	19.4	0.71	441	This announcement, using a 0.15 g/t AuEq cut-off grade.
Idenburg	51%	Inferred	7.8	3.1	780	ASX announcement 5 May 2026
Wonogiri (Randu Kuning)	100%	Measured + Indicated + Inferred	81.6	0.38	996	Replacement Prospectus (released 25 Mar 2022); ASX announcement 11 Jul 2022; Au-only resource first reported by Augur Resources Ltd (30 Aug & 9 Sep 2016)
Total					**2,217**	

Table 5: *FEG JORC (2012) gold Mineral Resources by project. See Previously reported information.*

NEXT STEPS

The JORC Report identifies the following potential future activities to advance the Woyla Project:

- infill drilling to convert Inferred Mineral Resources to Indicated, with priority on Rek Rinti–Agam and the Aloe Rek high-grade Indicated core;
- extension drilling along strike and down-dip of the modelled veins, including below the current pit shells, and first-pass drilling of the five undrilled prospects within the CoW;
- advanced metallurgical testwork, including on Aloe Rek, Anak Perak and oxidised material, together with geotechnical studies; and
- progressing the extension of the CoW exploration stage and the change of forest function required for open-pit mining.

FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS

This announcement contains forward-looking statements concerning FEG's plans, intentions and expectations. Forward-looking statements are subject to known and unknown risks, uncertainties and assumptions, many of which are beyond the Company's control. Actual outcomes may differ materially from those expressed or implied. Mineral Resources are not Ore Reserves and do not have demonstrated economic viability. Inferred Mineral Resources have a lower level of confidence than Indicated Mineral Resources and there is no certainty that further exploration will result in their conversion to Indicated Mineral Resources. The Company gives no assurance that the activities or outcomes described will be achieved and, except as required by law or the ASX Listing Rules, undertakes no obligation to update these statements.

COMPETENT PERSON'S STATEMENT

The information in this announcement that relates to Mineral Resources is based on, and fairly represents, information and supporting documentation reviewed by Mr Michael C Corey, a Competent Person who is a Member of Professional Geoscientists Ontario (PGO), Canada. Mr Corey is a consultant to Far East Gold Ltd, providing technical services for which he receives compensation that is not contingent on the findings of the Mineral Resource estimate. Mr Corey has over 35 years' experience in international mineral exploration, including 20 years in Southeast Asia focused on epithermal gold–silver and porphyry copper deposits, and has sufficient experience relevant to the style of mineralisation and type of deposit under consideration, and to the activity being undertaken, to qualify as a Competent Person as defined in the 2012 Edition of the JORC Code. Mr Corey consents to the inclusion in this announcement of the matters based on his information in the form and context in which it appears.

The full JORC Mineral Resource Report for the Woyla Project (November 2026), including JORC Table 1 and drill hole collar details, accompanies this announcement.

Information in this announcement relating to previously reported exploration results at Woyla, including the drill intercepts in Table 2, is extracted from the Company's ASX announcements dated (13 December 2022, 2 February 2023, 22 July 2024 and FEG's 2023 Financial Report - 29 Sep 2023). The Company confirms that it is not aware of any new information or data that materially affects the information included in the previous announcements and the Competent Person confirms that the form and context of information presented in this announcement has not been materially modified from the original announcements.

ABOUT FAR EAST GOLD

Far East Gold Ltd (ASX: FEG) is an ASX listed copper/gold exploration company with six advanced projects in Australia and Indonesia. This announcement has been authorised for release by the Board of Far East Gold Ltd.

FURTHER INFORMATION:

Sign up to the Far East Gold investor hub to receive important news and updates directly to your inbox, and to engage directly with our leadership team: https://investorhub.fareast.gold/auth/signup

COMPANY ENQUIRIES

Justin Werner
Chairman
e: justin.werner@fareast.gold

Shane Menere
Chief Executive Officer
e: shane.menere@fareast.gold
m: + 61 406 189 672
+ 62 811 860 8378

Tim Young
Investor Relations & Capital Markets
e: tim.young@fareast.gold
m: + 61 484 247 771

JORC MINERAL RESOURCE REPORT


PT WOYLA ACEH MINERALS

Woyla Gold - Silver Project

Pidie and West Aceh Regencies, Aceh Province, Indonesia

Prepared for: **Far East Gold Ltd**

November 2026



FAR EAST GOLD LTD

CONTENTS

DISCLAIMER 7
ABBREVIATIONS 7
RELEVANT REPORTS AND DOCUMENTS 8
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 9
Summary of Licence and Ownership 9
Location of Project 9
Description of Scope 9
Summary of Exploration 10
Summary of Mineral Resource Estimate 10
COMPETENT PERSON STATEMENT 12
1. INTRODUCTION 13
1.1 SCOPE OF WORK 13
1.2 LOCATION, ACCESS AND INFRASTRUCTURE 13
1.3 SITE VISIT 14
2022 Site Visit 14
2023 Site Visit 14
1.4 TENURE AND OWNERSHIP 15
1.5 RESULTS LIMITATIONS AND STANDARDS 16
1.5.1 JORC Table 1 16
2. GEOLOGY AND MINERALISATION 17
2.1 REGIONAL 17
2.2 MAIN PROSPECTS 18
2.2.1 Anak Perak 18
2.2.2 Rek Rinti 24
2.2.3 Aloe Eumpeuk 34
2.2.4 Aloe Rek 40
2.3 OTHER PROSPECTS 46
3. EXPLORATION HISTORY 46
3.1 DISCOVERY AND EXPLORATION HISTORY 46
4. EXPLORATION DATA TYPES 48
4.1 SURVEY 48
4.1.1 Collar and Downhole Surveys 48
4.1.2 Topographic Survey 49
4.2 BOREHOLE DATA AND DRILLING TECHNIQUES 51
4.3 SAMPLING TECHNIQUES 51
4.4 ASSAY ANALYSIS 51
4.5 QUALITY ASSURANCE AND QUALITY CONTROL 51
4.5.1 CRM – BLANK - DUPLICATE 51
4.5.2 Screen Fire Assay 56

5. GEOLOGICAL MODELLING 57
5.1 MODEL DIMENSION 57
5.2 GEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION 57
5.3 WIREFRAMES 57
5.4 COMPOSITING 58
5.5 BASIC STATISTICS 58
5.6 GRADE CAPPING 61
5.7 GRADE ESTIMATION 61
5.8 BLOCK MODEL DEFINITION 62
5.9 NEIGHBOURHOOD DEFINITION 63
5.10 MODEL VALIDATION 63
6. ESTIMATION OF RESOURCE 66
6.1 DATABASE INTEGRITY 66
6.2 SPECIFIC GRAVITY 66
6.3 METALLURGY 67
6.4 CUT-OFF GRADE 67
6.5 REASONABLE PROSPECTS FOR EVENTUAL ECONOMIC EXTRACTION 68
6.5.1 Environmental and Permission Issues 71
6.5.2 Social and Government Factors 71
6.5.3 Marketing Factors 72
6.6 ACCURACY AND PRECISION OF RESOURCE ESTIMATES 72
6.7 RESOURCE CLASSIFICATION 72
6.8 RESOURCE TONNAGE BY CLASSIFICATION 74
7. JORC STATEMENT 76
APPENDIX A - CONTRIBUTORS TO REPORT 77
APPENDIX B - JORC CODE, 2012 EDITION - TABLE 1 78
APPENDIX C - DRILL HOLE COLLAR DETAILS 97

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure ES-1 Woyla Project Location in Relation to Other Major Deposits 9
Figure 1-1 Access and Infrastructure Map 13
Figure 1-2 Woyla COW with Prospect Location Map 14
Figure 2-1 Regional geology map 17
Figure 2-2 Alteration and Mineralisation of Woyla Project 18
Figure 2-3 Quartz Vein exposure at Anak Perak prospect, 3m wide of Quartz-Chalcedonic, Breccia, Spotty Strong Fine-Grained Pyrite 20
Figure 2-4 Anak Perak Vein Interpretation with Rock Surface Sample Location 20
Figure 2-5 Plan View Boreholes and Mineralization Wireframes Anak Perak Prospect 21
Figure 2-6 Anak Perak Drill Hole Cross Section with Vein Interpretation 24
Figure 2-7 Outcrops of Quartz Vein in Rek Rinti, Quartz-Manganese with colloform texture. 25
Figure 2-8 Rek Rinti Vein Interpretation with Rock Surface Sample Location 25
Figure 2-9 Plan view of Rek Rinti vein system 26
Figure 2-10 Oblique View Boreholes and Mineralization Wireframes Rek Rinti Prospect 27
Figure 2-11 Rek Rinti Drill Hole Cross Section with Agam Vein Zone Interpretation 33
Figure 2-12 Core photos of high-grade Au and Ag mineralisation within the Agam vein, manifest as disseminated electrum (Top) and dark-grey Ag-bearing minerals (Center). Segregation of ginguro banded quartz containing abundant disseminated dark-grey sulphides (Bottom). 34
Figure 2-13 Aloe Eumpeuk Vein Interpretation with Rock Surface Sample Location 36
Figure 2-14 Oblique View Boreholes and Mineralization Wireframes Aloe Eumpeuk Prospect 37
Figure 2-15 Aloe Eumpeuk Drill Hole Cross Section with Core Photos 40
Figure 2-16 Core specimens from drillhole AED002 shows occurrence of dark-grey ginguro bands with fine-grain electrum and sulphide minerals. Photo A-75.7m, B-75.9m, C-78.6m. Assays of, 1m @ 18.4 g/t Au & 1,359 g/t Ag from 75.4m – 76.4m and 1m @ 12.9 g/t Au & 625 g/t Ag from 78.5m – 79.5m 40
Figure 2-17 Aloe Rek Vein Interpretation with Rock Surface Sample Location 42
Figure 2-18 Plan view of Victory Vein at Aloe Rek Prospect 43
Figure 2-19 Aloe Rek Drill Hole Cross Section with Significant Intercept Assay 45
Figure 2-20 Core photos of ARD009 Aloe Rek, Quartz-Pyrite-Arsenopyrite Vein Breccia, Strong Cavities. 46
Figure 3-1 Historical prospect and regional target locations (PT Barrick Mutiara Woyla, July 1997) 47
Figure 4-1 Coverage of topographic data related to drill collars 50
Figure 4-2 Standard Oreas 501d Performance, most of Au values were plotted within -2SD and +2SD of standard deviations 52
Figure 4-3 Standard Oreas 501b Performance, standard values are a bit lower than expected Au values but still fall within -2SD 52
Figure 4-4 Standard Oreas 601C Performance, two results failed; investigation with the Geoservices laboratory was inconclusive and the two samples are interpreted to have been swapped with routine samples 53
Figure 4-5 Standard Oreas 603C Performance, most of Au values were plotted within -2SD and +2SD of standard deviations 53
Figure 4-6 Standard Oreas 609b Performance, most of Au values were plotted within -2SD and +2SD of standard deviations 54
Figure 4-7 Standard Oreas 243 Performance, most of Au values were plotted within -2SD and +2SD of standard deviations 54
Figure 4-8 Standard 504 Performance, standard Au values are higher than expected values and mostly fall outside of the allowable tolerance. The standards are no longer used. The standard samples came from old stock back in 2010 55
Figure 4-9 Field duplicate Au Performance. Precision is moderate to poor (72% of pairs within ±20%), consistent with the variable distribution of gold in epithermal veins; two pairs show large differences attributed to sample heterogeneity 55
Figure 4-10 Blank Sample Performance. In general, the blank Au values are within the expected range and show satisfactory performance 56
Figure 5-1 Estimation Domains 58
Figure 5-2 Log Normal Histogram Au for each domain 59

Figure 5-3 Log Probability Plot Au for each domain 59
Figure 5-4 Log Normal Histogram Ag for each domain 60
Figure 5-5 Log Probability Plot Ag for each domain 60
Figure 5-6 Variogram Au for each main domain 62
Figure 5-7 Block Model Au Visual Validation 64
Figure 5-8 Block Model Ag Visual Validation 64
Figure 5-9 Swath-plot Au in Easting Direction 65
Figure 5-10 Swath-plot Au in Northing Direction 65
Figure 5-11 Swath-plot Au in Elevation Direction 66
Figure 6-1 Optimiser and section PIT Agam-Rek Rinti Prospect 69
Figure 6-2 Optimiser and section PIT Aloe-Eumpeuk Prospect 70
Figure 6-3 Optimiser and section PIT Aloe-Rek Prospect 70
Figure 6-4 Optimiser and section PIT Anak Perak Prospect 70
Figure 6-5 Forest Area Map 71
Figure 6-6 Mineral Resource classification of the block models by prospect 73
Figure 6-7 Grade–tonnage curves by prospect and classification 75

LIST OF TABLES

Table ES-1 Woyla Mineral Resource Estimate 11
Table 1-1 Tenement details 15
Table 1-2 PT Woyla Aceh Minerals CoW Coordinates 15
Table 2-1 Anak Perak trench results (PT Barrick Mutiara Woyla, 1996-1997) 19
Table 2-2 Significant Drill Hole Intercepts at Anak Perak (0.2 g/t Au Cut-Off, Maximum Internal Waste of 2m) 22
Table 2-3 Significant Drill Hole Intercepts at Rek Rinti (0.2 g/t Au Cut-Off, Maximum Internal Waste of 2m) 28
Table 2-4 Aloe Eumpeuk trench results (PT Barrick Mutiara Woyla, 1996-1997) 35
Table 2-5 Significant Drill Hole Intercepts at Aloe Eumpeuk (0.2 g/t Au Cut-Off, Maximum Internal Waste of 2m) 38
Table 2-6 Aloe Rek trench results (PT Barrick Mutiara Woyla, 1996-1997) 42
Table 2-7 Significant Drill Hole Intercepts at Aloe Rek (0.2 g/t Au Cut-Off, Maximum Internal Waste of 2m) 43
Table 3-1 Summary of historical exploration activity 47
Table 4-1 Summary of Exploration Data 48
Table 4-2 Summary of FEG Drilling 48
Table 4-3 Assay methods 51
Table 4-4 QA/QC samples 51
Table 4-5 CRM performance - gold 51
Table 5-1 Block model extents 57
Table 5-2 Mineralisation domains 57
Table 5-3 Composite statistics by domain (1 m composites) 58
Table 5-4 High-grade thresholds 61
Table 5-5 Gold variogram models (pairwise relative) 61
Table 5-6 Search neighbourhoods 63
Table 5-7 Volume and global grade comparison by domain 63
Table 6-1 Bulk density 66
Table 6-2 Summary of metallurgical test results 67
Table 6-3 Break-even cut-off grade by gold price 67
Table 6-4 Woyla Pit Optimization Parameter 68
Table 6-5 Limits of reasonable prospects 68
Table 6-6 Resources Estimation Table Limited by RPEEE PIT Optimization, cog 0.15 g/t AuEq 69
Table 6-7 Confidence for resource and reserve estimates 72
Table 6-8 Woyla Mineral Resource Estimate 74
Table 6-9 Grade–tonnage sensitivity of the Mineral Resource (Indicated + Inferred) 74

DISCLAIMER

This JORC Mineral Resource Report has been prepared to document the Mineral Resource estimate for the Woyla Gold–Silver Project held under a Contract of Work by PT Woyla Aceh Minerals (PT WAM), for Far East Gold Ltd (FEG). This document reports four main deposits within the PT WAM gold concession: Anak Perak, Rek Rinti, Aloe Eumpeuk and Aloe Rek deposits, located in the Pidie and West Aceh Regencies, Aceh Province, Indonesia.

The report must be read considering:

- Report distribution and the purposes for which it was intended.
- Its reliance upon information provided by FEG, PT WAM and third parties.
- The limitations and assumptions referred to throughout the report.
- The limited scope of the report.
- Other relevant issues which are not within the scope of the report.

This report speaks only as of its effective date and must be read in its entirety. It has been prepared for Far East Gold Ltd (FEG) under the direction of the Competent Person. Statements on tenure and permitting summarise documents provided and do not constitute legal due diligence.

This report, together with all data, interpretations and intellectual property contained within it, remains the property of FEG. Extracts and summaries may only be published in accordance with the applicable requirements of the JORC Code and ASX Listing Rules.

ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Meaning
AAS	Atomic absorption spectroscopy
Ag	Silver
APL	Non-forest area (Areal Penggunaan Lain)
Au	Gold
BLEG	Bulk leach extractable gold
CoW	Contract of Work (Kontrak Karya)
COG	Cut-off grade
CORS	Continuously operating reference station
CP	Competent Person
CRM	Certified reference material
CV	Coefficient of variation
DEMNAS	Indonesian national digital elevation model
ESDM	Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources
FA	Fire assay
FEG	Far East Gold Limited
g/t	Grams per tonne
GNSS	Global navigation satellite system
GRG	Gravity-recoverable gold
HL	Protected Forest (Hutan Lindung)
HP / HPT	Production Forest / Limited Production Forest
HQ / PQ	Diamond core sizes
ICP-OES	Inductively coupled plasma optical emission spectrometry
IDW	Inverse distance weighting
IP	Induced polarisation (geophysical survey)
IPPKH / PPKH	Forestry borrow-to-use permit

Abbreviation	Meaning
JORC Code	Australasian Code for Reporting of Exploration Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves (2012)
koz / Moz	Thousand / million troy ounces
LiDAR	Light detection and ranging survey
MRE	Mineral Resource Estimate
Mt	Million tonnes
NaCN	Sodium cyanide
OK	Ordinary kriging
PT WAM	PT Woyla Aceh Minerals
QA/QC	Quality assurance / quality control
RKAB	Annual work plan and budget
RL	Reduced level (elevation)
RPEEE	Reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction
RTK GPS	Real-time kinematic GPS
SG	Specific gravity / bulk density
SIPP	Barrick exploration permit reporting period (1996-1997)
t/m³	Tonnes per cubic metre
UKL-UPL	Environmental management and monitoring plans
UTM	Universal Transverse Mercator (Zone 47N, WGS84)

RELEVANT REPORTS AND DOCUMENTS

1. Australasian Code for Reporting of Exploration Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves (The JORC Code), 2012 Edition, Joint Ore Reserves Committee
2. Report on SIPP Activities, January 1996 - July 1997, PT Barrick Mutiara Woyla, R. Bugg and T. Rafferty, March 1998
3. Partial Relinquishment Report, PT Barrick Mutiara Woyla, 1999
4. Woyla drill database - collar, survey, assay, geology and bulk density tables, Far East Gold Ltd, September 2022 - October 2024
5. Quality assurance and quality control records, including certified reference material, blank, field duplicate and Intertek umpire laboratory results, Far East Gold Ltd, 2022 - 2024
6. Metallurgical test reports CIK.MET.01726 (2023), CIK.MET.01995 (2024) and CIK.MET.02061 (2024), PT Geoservices, Cikarang
7. Contract of Work tenure and permitting documents - CoW of 28 April 1997 (amended 12 April 2017), ESDM decrees and letters, UKL-UPL and IPPKH approvals and exploration-stage extension correspondence, PT Woyla Aceh Minerals, 1997 - 2026
8. Far East Gold Ltd ASX announcements on the Woyla Project, April 2022 - July 2024

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This JORC Mineral Resource Report describes the maiden Mineral Resource estimate for the Woyla Gold-Silver Project (Woyla), prepared at the request of Far East Gold Limited (FEG). Mineral Resources are estimated for four drilled prospects - Rek Rinti, Aloe Rek, Aloe Eumpeuk and Anak Perak - and are classified as Indicated and Inferred.

Summary of Licence and Ownership

PT Woyla Aceh Minerals (PT WAM), formerly PT Barrick Mutiara Woyla, is the holder of a sixth-generation Contract of Work (CoW) covering the 24,260 ha of Woyla Project in Aceh, Sumatra. The CoW was originally signed on 28 April 1997 by PT Barrick Mutiara Woyla, a joint venture company established to explore the Woyla Project, with Barrick acting as operator.

The Woyla Project is located within the highly prospective mineralised region and has been subject to extensive exploration through a series of joint ventures involving several major international gold producers, including Barrick, Newcrest, and Tigers. This long history of exploration and collaboration has contributed to the consolidation of the remaining landholding, providing an opportunity to develop near-surface Resources potentially amenable to open-pit mining. Despite the exploration undertaken to date, significant portions of the tenement remain under-explored, providing substantial potential for further discoveries beyond the nine (9) currently known prospect areas.

Location of Project

The project lies in the Barisan Range of Aceh, approximately 120 km south-east of Banda Aceh. Access is by sealed road from Banda Aceh via Beureunuen, Tangse and Geumpang to the base camp near Anak Perak (about 5.5 hours), then by trail bike or on foot to the prospects.



Figure ES-1 Woyla Project Location in Relation to Other Major Deposits

Description of Scope

The scope of work was to prepare a Mineral Resource report in accordance with the JORC Code (2012).

Summary of Exploration

Barrick explored the area between 1995 and 1997 by regional geochemistry, airborne geophysics, mapping and trenching, and identified the Aloe Rek, Aloe Eumpeuk, Anak Perak and Rek Rinti vein systems; no drilling was undertaken. Newcrest held an earn-in between 1999 and 2002. FEG commenced diamond drilling in September 2022 and by July 2024 had completed 133 diamond holes for 20,5

85 m at Rek Rinti (63 holes), Aloe Eumpeuk (30), Anak Perak (28) and Aloe Rek (12).

Gold-silver mineralisation is of low-sulphidation epithermal type, hosted in quartz veins and breccias within andesitic volcanic rocks along structures related to the Sumatran Fault System.

Summary of Mineral Resource Estimate

The Mineral Resource estimate covers 13 mineralisation domains at Rek Rinti, Aloe Rek, Aloe Eumpeuk and Anak Perak. Gold and silver grades were estimated by ordinary kriging, and by inverse distance for three minor domains. Mineral Resource is reported within optimised open-pit shells using a cut-off grade of 0.15 g/t AuEq. The basis for reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction (RPEEE), including the mining, processing and permitting assumptions, is discussed in Section 6.5. The Mineral Resource is reported on a 100% project basis. FEG holds an indirect 51% interest in PT Woyla Aceh Minerals (PTWAM).

Table ES-1 Woyla Mineral Resource Estimate

Prospect	Classification	Tonnes (Mt)	Au (g/t)	Ag (g/t)	AuEq (g/t)	Au (koz)	Ag (Moz)	AuEq (Koz)
Rek Rinti–Agam	Indicated	4.4	0.64	9.4	0.78	90	1.33	110
	Inferred	12.2	0.64	11.7	0.82	253	4.60	322
	Total	**16.6**	**0.64**	**11.1**	**0.81**	**343**	**5.93**	**432**
Aloe Rek	Indicated	0.3	2.02	7.0	2.12	19	0.07	20
	Inferred	1.6	0.89	4.9	0.97	47	0.26	51
	Total	**1.9**	**1.06**	**5.2**	**1.14**	**66**	**0.33**	**71**
Aloe Eumpeuk	Indicated	0.2	1.05	37.6	1.62	8	0.29	12
	Inferred	0.3	1.59	68.4	2.62	14	0.59	22
	Total	**0.5**	**1.34**	**53.9**	**2.15**	**22**	**0.88**	**34**
Anak Perak	Indicated	0.2	1.25	6.9	1.36	8	0.04	8
	Inferred	0.1	0.83	7.1	0.94	3	0.03	3
	Total	**0.3**	**1.10**	**7.0**	**1.21**	**11**	**0.07**	**11**
Total	Indicated	5.1	0.76	10.5	0.92	125	1.73	151
	Inferred	14.3	0.69	11.9	0.87	316	5.47	398
	Total	**19.4**	**0.71**	**11.6**	**0.88**	**441**	**7.20**	**549**

Mineral Resources are reported in situ, within optimised pit shells above a cut-off grade of 0.15 g/t AuEq. Gold equivalent (AuEq) values are calculated as follows: AuEq oz = Au oz + (Ag oz × 0.015). The conversion factor of 0.015 reflects an Ag:Au recovery-adjusted value ratio of approximately 67:1, based on an assumed gold price of US$3,500 per troy ounce and a silver price of US$59.06 per troy ounce, together with assumed metallurgical recoveries of 90% for gold and 80% for silver (Section 6.3). Tonnes, grades and contained metal are rounded to two significant figures; totals may not add due to rounding. Mineral Resources are not Ore Reserves and do not have demonstrated economic viability.

The JORC Mineral Resource Estimate (MRE) presented in this report is effective as 9 November 2026. The geological modelling and resource estimation were undertaken by Mr Pratama Abimanyu, Senior Resource Geologist and an independent consultant to FEG.

Mr Michael Corey has reviewed the supporting data, estimation methodology and results and takes responsibility for the Mineral Resource Estimate as the Competent Person.


Mr Corey is a Member of the Professional Geoscientists of Ontario (PGO) in Canada and has sufficient experience which is relevant to the style of mineralisation and type of deposit under consideration and to the activity which he is undertaking to qualify as a Competent Person as defined in the 2012 Edition of the ‘Australasian Code for Reporting of Exploration Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves’.

COMPETENT PERSON STATEMENT

This report has been prepared for FEG by the undersigned, with contributions from relevant subject matter specialists whose qualifications and professional experience are detailed in Appendix A. Michael Corey takes responsibility for the Mineral Resource Estimate as the Competent Person.

Michael Corey has over 35 years' experience in international mineral exploration, of which 20 years has been in Southeast Asia. His focus has been on epithermal Au-Ag and porphyry Cu deposits. Michael has designed and managed exploration programs globally on behalf of major and junior companies and supervised projects from grassroots to feasibility.

Michael is a consultant to FEG providing technical services for which he receives compensation. Such compensation is not contingent upon the findings, conclusions, or outcomes of this report.



Michael Corey, P. Geo

1. INTRODUCTION

This report presents the Mineral Resource estimate for the Woyla Gold-Silver Project, prepared in accordance with the JORC Code (2012). The estimate covers the Rek Rinti, Aloe Rek, Aloe Eumpeuk and Anak Perak prospects within the Woyla CoW.

1.1 SCOPE OF WORK

- Review and validation of drilling, sampling, assay, QA/QC, density, survey and metallurgical data provided by FEG.
- Review of the geological interpretation, mineralisation domains and the resource estimate.
- Classification of the Mineral Resource and reporting within RPEEE pit shells above a cut-off grade of 0.15 g/t AuEq.
- Reporting of the Mineral Resource calculation in accordance with the JORC Code (2012), including JORC Table 1.

1.2 LOCATION, ACCESS AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The CoW lies between approximately 96°04′30″E and 96°13′E and between 4°38′30″N and 4°51′N in the Barisan Range, about 120 km south-east of Banda Aceh. Access is by road from Banda Aceh airport to Beureunuen (about 117 km, 2.5 hours) and then via Tangse and Geumpang to the base camp near Anak Perak (about 105 km, 3 hours). The prospects are reached by trail bike or on foot; helicopter access from Banda Aceh takes about 40 minutes.

The terrain ranges from about 300 m to 2,800 m elevation under tropical rainforest, with daily rainfall between October and February. The nearest communities are around Geumpang, where rice farming, rattan collection and minor logging are the main activities.




Figure 1-1 Access and Infrastructure Map




Figure 1-2 Woyla COW with Prospect Location Map

1.3 SITE VISIT

2022 Site Visit

The first visit to Woyla was undertaken between 21-25 June 2022. Access to the site is via plane from Jakarta to Banda Aceh airport in Aceh Province, Indonesia. The site's access roads and supporting infrastructure are in good condition and appear to undergo regular maintenance and improvements. The access road is predominantly asphalt-paved along its entire length.

The site visit focused on verifying access to the concession and assessing the condition of the samples stored at the Anak Perak coreshed. The core shed was identified as requiring urgent repairs; however, the remaining facilities were generally well-maintained and systematically organised. Selected drill core samples were photographed and cross-checked against the original photographs to verify their consistency. The records and database maintained in Jakarta were also found to be in good condition, with the information generally consistent with the observations and data available at the site.

The second visit was undertaken on 20-26 November 2022. Mr. Corey was accompanied by the exploration manager and geologist from FEG. The visit focused on reviewing drill core and verifying the types and styles of mineralisation observed by FEG geologists.

2023 Site Visit

The visits to Woyla in 2023 were undertaken between 12-19 January, 26-30 June, and 3-7 July 2023. During these visits, Mr Corey reviewed drill core and verifying the types and styles of mineralisation observed by FEG geologists.

1.4 TENURE AND OWNERSHIP

FEG holds an indirect 51% interest in PT Woyla Aceh Minerals (PTWAM). PTWAM lodged a valid application to extend the exploration period before it expired on 14 October 2024, and that application remains under extension process by the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources (MoEMR).

This report does not provide any express or implied warranty or representation to PT WAM or any third party regarding the legal validity, enforceability, or status of the Exploration CoW or the related documentation. This report should not be construed as, or relied upon as, a legal due diligence assessment of the concession.

The summary of the project tenure and associated rights is provided in Table 1-1, and the concession coordinates presented in Table 1-2.

Table 1-1 Tenement details

Item	Details
Licence type	Contract of Work (Kontrak Karya)
Company Name	PT Woyla Aceh Minerals
Grant	Presidential approval B-143/Pres/3/1997 (17 March 1997); CoW signed 28 April 1997; amended 12 April 2017
Area	24,260 ha
Regencies / Province	Pidie and West Aceh / Aceh
Stage	Exploration
Exploration term	14 October 2022 - 14 October 2024. PT WAM lodged further applications to extend the exploration stage in 2025 and 2026, and the extension is being processed by the Directorate General of Minerals and Coal, Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources (DGoMC).

Table 1-2 PT Woyla Aceh Minerals CoW Coordinates

No.	EAST LONGITUDE (E)			NORTH LATITUDE (N)		
	Degrees	Minutes	Seconds	Degrees	Minutes	Seconds
1	96	10	00.00	4	38	30.00
2	96	10	00.00	4	40	40.80
3	96	8	00.00	4	40	40.80
4	96	8	00.00	4	44	30.00
5	96	4	30.00	4	44	30.00
6	96	4	30.00	4	51	0.00
7	96	8	00.00	4	51	0.00
8	96	8	00.00	4	49	0.00
9	96	13	00.00	4	49	0.00
10	96	13	00.00	4	38	30.00

1.5 RESULTS LIMITATIONS AND STANDARDS

Geological evaluations inherently rely on limited statistical sampling across broad areas. Because the precise nature of a mineral deposit is only fully revealed once mining is completed, available data can support multiple valid interpretations. The statements and figures in this report reflect the best information available at publication, but they remain subject to revision as new exploration data emerges or geological concepts evolve.

This report is based on the appraisal of these dynamic datasets. All views and conclusions are strictly those of the CP, and any referenced third-party interpretations do not necessarily reflect the CP's endorsement.

Out of the nine prospect areas identified within the WAM concession, only four (Anak Perak, Rek Rinti, Aloe Rek, and Aloe Eumpeuk) have sufficient data density to support classification as Mineral Resources. The remaining five prospect areas currently lack adequate sampling and are categorized solely as exploration prospects. Consequently, the Mineral Resource Estimates in this report apply strictly to these four named prospects.

1.5.1 JORC Table 1

This Mineral Resource Report has been prepared in accordance with the 2012 edition of the JORC Code, as published by the Joint Ore Reserves Committee (JORC) of the Australasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy (AusIMM), the Australian Institute of Geoscientists (AIG), and the Minerals Council of Australia (MCA).

Under the JORC Code, a Mineral Resource is defined as a concentration or occurrence of solid material of economic interest within or on the Earth’s crust, occurring in such form, grade (or quality), and quantity that there are reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction. The location, quantity, grade, geological characteristics and continuity of a Mineral Resource are estimated or interpreted from geological evidence and knowledge. Mineral Resources are classified according to increasing levels of geological confidence as Inferred, Indicated and Measured Mineral Resources (JORC Code, 2012).

In accordance with the principles of the JORC Code, Table 1 of the Code (Appendix B) has been used as a checklist in the preparation of this Report. Relevant comments have been provided on an “if not, why not” basis to demonstrate that the applicable criteria have been considered and to identify matters that are either considered to be of low consequence or remain to be addressed or resolved.

The criteria presented in Table 1 are organised to reflect the systematic approach generally applied to exploration and mineral resource evaluation. Relevance and materiality are the overriding principles governing the information presented in a Public Report. Accordingly, Competent Person has sought to provide sufficient commentary on matters that could materially influence a reader’s understanding or interpretation of the exploration results and Mineral Resource estimates reported herein. The relative importance of individual criteria may vary depending on the nature of the project and the legal, technical and economic circumstances applicable at the time of the determination.

2. GEOLOGY AND MINERALISATION

2.1 REGIONAL

The CoW straddles the dextral Sumatran Fault System, which formed through oblique subduction beneath Sundaland and bisects the licence. Basement is the Triassic to Early Cretaceous Woyla Group arc assemblage, "detached into several blocks along the Sumatran Fault System", overlain by Tertiary basin sediments, with serpentinite slabs along the fault and Quaternary Leuping/Peut Sague volcanics in the north-east. Late Cretaceous-Palaeocene intrusions (Sikuleh, Gle Seukeun, Beurieung, Baso) and Miocene Tangse porphyries are present (SIPP, 1998).

Barrick interpreted north-south dilational fractures between the Sumatran Fault and a sub-parallel fault as the host of the epithermal veins, and recognised low-sulphidation veins (Aloe Rek, Aloe Eumpeuk, Anak Perak, Rek Rinti, Dolok), high-sulphidation alteration (Dolok, Beurieung, Geumpang East, Peut Sague), weak skarn (Aloe Vera) and porphyry indications (Lower Beurieung, Siganta). A ~10 km laharic "rim" carrying paleoplacer vein clasts complicates stream geochemistry (SIPP, 1998).

The Woyla mineralisation is classified as low-sulphidation epithermal gold-silver, characterised by banded quartz-adularia veins with ginguro banding, electrum and acanthite, hosted in andesitic volcanic rocks. Gosowong (Halmahera) and Hishikari (Japan) are regarded as analogues.




Figure 2-1 Regional geology map




Figure 2-2 Alteration and Mineralisation of Woyla Project

2.2 MAIN PROSPECTS

2.2.1 Anak Perak

The vein system at the Anak Perak prospect occupies a broad zone extending more than 1,800 m in length and 20-300 m in width, comprising quartz veins, stockwork, sheeted veining, and silicification hosted within argillic altered andesite. The type of mineralization at Anak Perak is interpreted as low-sulphidation epithermal. Individual vein widths are variable, with some veins reaching up to 9 m. Channel sampling from historical trenches returned intervals of 2m @ 7.64 g/t Au and 6 m @ 4.29 g/t Au. Soil sampling defines a relatively weak but extensive anomaly, extending over 2.2 km with a width of 300 m, and remaining open in both directions along strike as well as across strike.

Location & Geological Setting

Located along and west of the Geumpang-Tutut road, in the Upper Beutong area. Geology comprises intermediate volcanics (andesitic lavas and pyroclastics) intruded locally by strongly altered porphyritic rocks, with unaltered dacite dykes in the northeast of the area. A widespread andesitic lahar breccia unit occurs to the north of the prospect and extends eastward in a 10 km-diameter arc enclosing other

prospects in the area; clasts within this unit are often ore-grade silicified volcanic or vein material, which complicates drainage geochemistry nearby.

Vein System & Alteration

The quartz vein and breccia system is a typical low-sulphidation type, that was exposed in historical trenches with reported, with widths varying from less than 50 cm to about 9 m. The veins are generally N-S trending with individual lenses traceable for about 100 m, and dips typically steep to the east. The vein zone shows a sinuous trace, pinches and swells, and splits into veinlets and stockworks in places. Vein textures include brecciation, cockade, comb, saccharoidal, and vuggy forms, with local hydrothermal milling producing rounded, pea-sized quartz clasts; several vein generations are represented within individual lenses.

The host rock is clay-pyrite altered porphyritic andesite with variable development of sheeted or stockwork veinlets. Petrology shows phyllic alteration overprinted by a late-stage argillic assemblage, indicative of deposition from a weakly acidic fluid at 230-250°C at intermediate depths associated with porphyry intrusions. A fluid-inclusion study on one vein sample gave a homogenisation temperature of 219°C, corresponding to a formation depth of at least 256 m below the paleowater table - relatively shallow epithermal levels.

Geochemistry (Barrick 1996 – 1997)

First-pass stream sediments did not highlight the vein system well (up to 0.33 ppm Au; BLEG up to 7.4 ppb Au). Float assayed up to 5.6 g/t Au, with two exceptional vein quartz breccia samples returning 35 and 31 g/t Au (no equivalent outcrop grades were found). Outcrop rock chips reached up to 5.4 g/t Au (generally <2 g/t Au); outcrop channel samples were mostly <0.3 g/t Au per 1 m interval.

Ridge-and-spur soil sampling (0.03 ppm Au threshold) defined the vein system over a 2 km strike length and up to 300 m wide in the south of the area, open to the south (maximum 3.41 ppm Au). The lead anomaly correlates well, extending 1.7 km with narrow zones >200 ppm Pb (maximum 860 ppm Pb). The arsenic anomaly forms a broad >70 ppm As envelope with narrow zones >120 ppm As paralleling the gold and lead anomalies. The antimony anomaly is less coherent.

Trenching Results (Barrick 1996 – 1997)

Thirteen trenches were dug across vein outcrops and soil anomalies (two were abandoned due to unstable ground). The widest veins were exposed in AP13Tr (>9 m), AP11Tr (7 m), AP01Tr (6.5 m), and AP12Tr (4 m).

Table 2-1 Anak Perak trench results (PT Barrick Mutiara Woyla, 1996-1997)

Trench No.	Length (m)	Average Result
AP01Tr	18	18 m @ 1.5 g/t Au, <1 g/t Ag, incl. 6 m @ 4.29 g/t Au, 2 g/t Ag
AP06Tr	8	8 m @ 0.33 g/t Au, <1 g/t Ag, incl. 2 m @ 1.21 g/t Au (open to west)
AP13Tr	9	9 m @ 1.9 g/t Au, <1 g/t Ag, incl. 2 m @ 7.64 g/t Au, 2 g/t Ag (open to east; vein >9 m)
AP03Tr	10	10 m @ 0.39 g/t Au, 3.5 g/t Ag
Other trenches (10)	6-24	Generally < 0.3 g/t Au




Figure 2-3 Quartz Vein exposure at Anak Perak prospect, 3m wide of Quartz-Chalcedonic, Breccia, Spotty Strong Fine-Grained Pyrite




Figure 2-4 Anak Perak Vein Interpretation with Rock Surface Sample Location

Diamond Drilling (Far East Gold 2022 - 2024)

The Anak Perak Prospect was the first prospect within the Woyla Project to be drilled by FEG. The campaign was conducted from September 2022 to late February 2023 and comprised two drilling phases totaling 28 drillholes: 22 drillholes in Phase 1 and 6 drillholes in Phase 2.

Phase 1 was designed to test the interpreted Anak Perak vein over a strike length of approximately 2 km, with drill spacing of up to 100 m. Phase 2 focused on the central portion of the Anak Perak vein, with 50 m spacing, aimed at infilling and confirming the down-dip extension of the high-grade Anak Perak zone. Data

from all drillholes were used to construct a geological model of Anak Perak, which formed the basis for estimating and reporting the current Anak Perak Mineral Resource.

The Anak Perak drilling program, comprising 28 drillholes, totaled approximately 3,435.7 metres. Mineralisation was intercepted in all drillholes except APD015, which was terminated early for safety reasons. The best intercept from fresh vein material was returned in APD011: 11.8 m @ 2.91 g/t Au from 48.6 m downhole depth, including 2.50 m @ 10.51 g/t Au from 51 m downhole depth.

All holes were drilled from surface using conventional triple-tube diamond drilling techniques, with core recovery exceeding 90% across all mineralised intervals reported. Of the 28 drillholes completed, 27 intersected mineralised intervals, with apparent true widths ranging from 2 m to 12 m. All completed drillholes were incorporated into the resource model.




Figure 2-5 Plan View Boreholes and Mineralization Wireframes Anak Perak Prospect

Table 2-2 Significant Drill Hole Intercepts at Anak Perak (0.2 g/t Au Cut-Off, Maximum Internal Waste of 2m)

Hole ID	East (m)	North (m)	RL (m)	Azimuth (°)	Dip (°)	Depth (m)	From (m)	To (m)	Interval (m)	Grade (g/t Au)	Comments
APD001	178707.2	529335.5	1076.17	273.7	-46.4	90	0	3	**3**	**0.51**	
							24	25.8	**1.80**	**0.18**	
							27	28.0	**1.00**	**0.17**	
							34	42.0	**8**	**0.21**	
APD003	178718.6	529150.3	1063.47	267.7	-46.7	80.6	4	5	**1**	**0.32**	
							21.4	24.5	**3.10**	**0.87**	
APD004	178719.8	529150.4	1063.36	270	-80.8	140	37	39	**2**	**1.38**	
							41	42	**1**	**2.06**	
							95.7	96.7	**1**	**0.22**	
							106.4	107.2	**0.8**	**0.35**	
							110.5	111.4	**0.9**	**0.33**	
							119.75	120.45	**0.7**	**0.33**	
APD005	178711.1	529253.8	1074.44	271.4	-50.5	76.2	23.8	24.6	**0.8**	**0.34**	
							35.3	36.1	**0.8**	**0.40**	
							42.4	45.6	**3.2**	**0.90**	**Incl. 0.9 m @ 2.06 g/t Au from 42.40 m**
							48	48.6	**0.6**	**0.32**	
							52.3	55.3	**3**	**0.28**	
APD007	178768.4	528993.3	1019.32	268.8	-46.6	145.2	49.5	50.5	**1**	**0.28**	
							59.4	60.3	**0.9**	**0.20**	
APD007R	178769.4	528993.3	1019.28	268.8	-50	80	29.3	29.7	**0.4**	**0.19**	
							51.5	52.5	**1**	**0.32**	
APD008	178788.5	528889.9	1019.29	271.1	-51.7	142.3	79.95	82.30	**2.3**	**0.24**	
							84.4	85.4	**1**	**0.19**	
							88.4	89.8	**1.4**	**6.21**	
							91.5	93	**1.5**	**0.59**	
APD011	178741.7	528812.3	1053.4	269.2	-47.1	97.2	40.9	42.5	**1.0**	**1.08**	
							45.8	46.6	**0.8**	**0.81**	
							48.6	60.4	**11.8**	**2.91**	**Incl. 2.5 m @ 10.51 g/t Au from 51 m and 0.6 m @ 3.66 g/t Au from 56 m**
							61.8	62.2	**0.4**	**0.18**	
APD012	178731.4	528653.2	1051.73	273.7	-44.7	128.65	67.5	74.0	**6.5**	**0.26**	
							75.2	76.5	**1.3**	**0.24**	
							77.6	78.5	**0.9**	**0.02**	
							84.3	85.3	**1.0**	**0.16**	
							101	102.3	**1.3**	**0.29**	
							105	105.85	**0.8**	**0.07**	

Table 2-2 (cont'd) Significant Drill Hole Intercepts at Anak Perak (0.2 g/t Au Cut-Off, Maximum Internal Waste of 2m)

Hole ID	East (m)	North (m)	RL (m)	Azimuth (°)	Dip (°)	Depth (m)	From (m)	To (m)	Interval (m)	Grade (g/t Au)	Comments
APD013	178742.6	528812.3	1053.37	266.6	-73.6	145.5	68.2	69	**0.7**	**0.20**	
							74.2	74.5	**0.3**	**0.12**	
							81.1	81.9	**0.8**	**0.19**	
							86.7	87.35	**0.65**	**0.30**	
							89.1	90	**0.9**	**0.18**	
							98.3	100.0	**1.7**	**0.64**	
							102.3	103.7	**1.4**	**0.18**	
							105.4	105.80	**0.4**	**0.22**	
							108.6	111.6	**3.0**	**0.32**	
							117.3	119.4	**2.1**	**1.16**	**Incl. 0.7 m @ 2.63 g/t Au from 117.30 m**
APD014	178731.9	528653.2	1051.73	272	-60.2	158.9	78.5	88.4	**9.9**	**0.42**	**Incl. 1 m @ 2.42 g/t Au from 78.50 m**
							91.7	92.5	**0.8**	**0.13**	
							112.5	113.7	**1.2**	**0.34**	
							116	128.0	**12.5**	**0.09**	
							130	132.0	**2.0**	**0.08**	
							134	137.00	**3.0**	**0.42**	
APD018	178915.8	527931.1	967.2	359	-49.9	97.7	79.6	80.4	**0.8**	**0.28**	
APD019	178915.8	527930.7	967.21	46.6	-46.8	100.5	38	39.4	**1.4**	**2.42**	**Incl. 0.4 m @ 7.80 g/t Au from 38 m**
							40.5	42.5	**2.0**	**0.29**	
							75.8	76	**0.6**	**0.49**	
APD021	178748.3	528853.1	1037.96	270.8	-46.6	80	38.2	44.6	**6.40**	**2.53**	**Incl. 1 m @ 12.09 g/t Au from 42.20 m**
APD022	178744.2	528753.3	1025.92	270.9	-46.2	91.5	22	23	**1.0**	**0.14**	
							65.9	70.1	**4.2**	**0.14**	
							72.3	75	**2.7**	**0.51**	**Incl. 1 m @ 0.97 g/t Au from 74 m**
APD024	178652.7	528574.2	1053.448	87.1	-71.6	128	53.9	54.8	**0.9**	**0.12**	
							55.7	56.5	**0.8**	**0.15**	
							74.8	76.8	**2**	**0.13**	
							77.8	78.5	**0.7**	**0.22**	
							79.5	80.5	**1**	**0.20**	
							83	85.4	**2.4**	**0.28**	
							88	91.5	**3.5**	**0.23**	
APD025	178778.9	528658.4	1039.722	270.6	-62.6	240	149.2	149.8	**0.6**	**0.18**	
							217.3	219.2	**1.9**	**0.35**	
APD026	178694.7	529702.5	1125.74	269.3	-46.9	142.5	96	97.7	**1.7**	**1.04**	




Figure 2-6 Anak Perak Drill Hole Cross Section with Vein Interpretation

2.2.2 Rek Rinti

The Rek Rinti Prospect is interpreted as a low-sulphidation epithermal quartz vein and breccia system comprising at least eight separate veins. The veins have a general northeast-southwest orientation which dips to the southeast. Individual veins range from approximately 0.7 to 20 m wide and extend between 600 and 1,500 m in length.

Location & Geological Setting

The Rek Rinti Prospect is located approximately 14 km from Geumpang. Geology is dominated by andesite flows, locally porphyritic. The andesites are variably clay-pyrite altered. A circular feature interpreted as an intrusive or volcanic center with a small central magnetic high cut the low-magnetic.

Vein System and Mineralization

The Rek Rinti veins are characterized by colloform-crustiform textures and are associated with manganese mineralization. Rock-chip sampling has returned grades of up to 53 g/t Au and 752 g/t Ag.

The vein system is bounded by the Sumatra Fault to the northeast, resulting in numerous fault zones that cross-cut the vein system.

Mineralisation has been modelled in ten domains (AGM_01 to AGM_04, RR_01, RR_02, PTM_01 (Pertama), SR_01, NRA_01 and NRA_02), which strike north-east to east and dip at about 60° to southeast. Artisanal workings are present, and 269 m of cavities or voids were logged in 35 holes.

Geochemistry (Barrick 1996 – 1997)

A first-pass BLEG anomaly of 93 ppb Ag was the only anomalous sample at the reconnaissance stage. Follow-up sampling by Barrick in 1997 subsequently identified numerous sites with gold in pan concentrates and ore-grade vein quartz rocks - float of vein material assayed up to 24.2 g/t Au and follow up mapping by FEG from chip samples of outcrop quartz veins have returned grades of up to 53 g/t Au

and 752 g/t Ag; arsenic is below detection and base metals are low. No systematic channel sampling has been carried out.



Figure 2-7 Outcrops of Quartz Vein in Rek Rinti, Quartz-Manganese with colloform texture.



Figure 2-8 Rek Rinti Vein Interpretation with Rock Surface Sample Location

Diamond Drilling (Far East Gold 2022 - 2024)

Far East Gold commenced the drilling campaign at the Rek Rinti Prospect in October 2022, continuing until March 2024. The program comprised 63 drillholes for a total of 11,629 metres, which successfully delineated a complex system of 10 quartz veins, namely Bohay, Pertama, Agam, Manya, Susi, Sarsem, Nira, Rame, Acong, and Anggur.

The drilling was conducted in four phases. Phase 1 comprised 13 drillholes as scout drilling to test the surface vein interpretation. Phase 2 comprised 32 drillholes, focused on Agam Vein resource delineation and vein extension, as well as scout drilling to test geophysical anomalies. Phase 3 consisted of 12 drillholes focused on the strike and down-dip extension of the Pertama, Susi, and Bohay veins, and on the extension of the Agam Vein based on geophysical anomalies. Phase 4 focused on the extension of the Susi and Pertama veins.




Figure 2-9 Plan view of Rek Rinti vein system

Mineralisation was intercepted in all drillholes except RRD005, RRD010, and RRD013. RRD010 and RRD013 were terminated early due to safety issues and drilling problems. The best intercepts were from fresh vein material from hole RRD004 in the Agam vein which returned: 30 m @ 2.83 g/t Au from 98.00 m depth, including 8.10 m @ 7.69 g/t Au from 102.40 m depth, and including 0.5 m @ 78 g/t Au from 108.60 m depth. RRD034R: 25.80 m @ 3.28 g/t Au from 66.50 m depth, including 5.20 m @ 6.97 g/t Au from 81.20 m depth, and including 0.90 m @ 8.40 g/t Au from 88.90 m depth. Table 2-3 summarises the significant drillhole intercepts.




Figure 2-10 Oblique View Boreholes and Mineralization Wireframes Rek Rinti Prospect

Table 2-3 Significant Drill Hole Intercepts at Rek Rinti (0.2 g/t Au Cut-Off, Maximum Internal Waste of 2m)

Hole ID	East (m)	North (m)	RL (m)	Azimuth (°)	Dip (°)	Depth (m)	From (m)	To (m)	Interval (m)	Grade (g/t Au)	Comments
AGM003	186854.7	526833.3	740.121	317.1	-53.3	142.5	17	21.8	**4.8**	**0.48**	
							36.2	37	**0.8**	**0.21**	
							45	45.9	**0.9**	**1.56**	
							NO CORE 45.9-46.5m artisanal mining				
							46.5	47.0	**0.5**	**0.24**	
							48.0	50.8	**2.8**	**0.43**	
							56.95	60	**3.05**	**0.27**	
							61.2	66.5	**5.3**	**0.55**	**Incl. 0.4 m @ 2.52 g/t Au from 61.2 m**
							67.9	69.3	**1.4**	**2.43**	**Incl. 0.6 m @ 4.69 g/t Au from 67.9 m**
							75.35	83.3	**7.95**	**0.92**	**Incl. 0.7 m @ 5.36 g/t Au from 77 m**
							84.7	89	**4.3**	**3.50**	**Incl. 0.7 m @ 8.95 g/t Au from 85.3 m**
							92.9	93	**0.5**	**0.32**	
							98.6	101.5	**2.9**	**0.98**	
							109.5	110.5	**1**	**0.27**	
							113.1	118	**4.9**	**0.46**	
							141	141.7	**0.7**	**0.28**	
AGM007	186830.6	526802.3	756.514	315.5	-69.6	244.5	92.7	95.7	**3**	**1.94**	**Incl. 1 m @ 4.66 g/t Au from 94.7 m**
							86.7	89.8	**3.1**	**2.41**	
							100	101	**1.0**	**0.27**	
							102	102.6	**0.6**	**0.39**	
							118.9	124	**5.1**	**0.71**	
							125	129.4	**4.4**	**0.94**	**Incl. 0.6 m @ 1.78 g/t Au from 127 m**
							132	134.8	**2.8**	**0.24**	
							136.3	137	**0.7**	**0.43**	
							160	161	**1**	**0.94**	
							171	171.7	**0.7**	**0.66**	
							172.7	173.7	**1**	**0.22**	
							178	179	**1**	**0.38**	
							180.6	183.2	**2.60**	**0.23**	
							190.7	196.5	**5.80**	**0.49**	
							201.2	206.5	**5.30**	**8.43**	**Incl. 0.5 m @ 81 g/t Au from 201.2 m**

Table 2-3 (cont'd) Significant Drill Hole Intercepts at Rek Rinti (0.2 g/t Au Cut-Off, Maximum Internal Waste of 2m)

Hole ID	East (m)	North (m)	RL (m)	Azimuth (°)	Dip (°)	Depth (m)	From (m)	To (m)	Interval (m)	Grade (g/t Au)	Comments
AGM013	186858.8	526803.8	742.985	316.4	-59.3	210	45.6	47.9	**2.3**	**0.25**	
							61.30	61.85	**0.55**	**0.24**	
							71.0	73.0	**2.0**	**0.68**	
							75.0	76.0	**1.0**	**0.20**	
							79.7	83.0	**3.3**	**0.29**	
							96.2	103.0	**6.8**	**0.24**	
							104.8	113.6	**8.8**	**0.53**	**Incl. 1.3 m @ 1.07 g/t Au from 107 m**
							115.65	116.10	**0.45**	**0.32**	
							127.9	133.0	**5.1**	**0.29**	
							145.2	148.9	**3.7**	**0.58**	
							150.2	151.4	**1.2**	**0.61**	
							160.4	162.0	**1.6**	**0.91**	
							164.0	167.3	**3.3**	**3.58**	**Incl. 1.5 m @ 7.28 g/t Au from 164.00 m, and incl. 0.5 m @ 12.85 g/t Au from 164.50**
							169.0	171.0	**2.0**	**0.41**	
							193.0	194.0	**1.0**	**0.35**	
AGM017	186768.1	526784.7	781.542	331.3	-64.7	255.3	21.0	22.0	**1.0**	**0.22**	
							24.0	24.5	**0.5**	**0.28**	
							25.1	25.50	**0.4**	**0.25**	
							27.5	28.1	**0.6**	**0.28**	
							70	70.6	**0.6**	**0.23**	
							136.0	137.0	**1.0**	**0.25**	
							152.3	153.3	**1.0**	**0.30**	
							155.3	156.3	**1.0**	**0.21**	
							183.4	184.5	**1.1**	**0.21**	
							210.5	213.9	**3.4**	**1.06**	**Incl. 1 m @ 2.31 g/t Au from 211 m**
							216.4	218.8	**2.4**	**2.81**	**Incl. 0.9 m @ 6.70 g/t Au from 217.4 m**
							219.9	222.3	**2.4**	**3.02**	**Incl. 0.6 m @ 7.29 g/t Au from 219.9 m**
							225.7	226.8	**1.1**	**0.28**	

Table 2-3 (cont'd) Significant Drill Hole Intercepts at Rek Rinti (0.2 g/t Au Cut-Off, Maximum Internal Waste of 2m)

Hole ID	East (m)	North (m)	RL (m)	Azimuth (°)	Dip (°)	Depth (m)	From (m)	To (m)	Interval (m)	Grade (g/t Au)	Comments
AGM018	186768.2	526784.5	781.544	345	-71.4	275.2	18.0	18.6	**0.6**	**0.59**	
							21.6	23.0	**1.4**	**0.64**	
							26.0	27.00	**1.0**	**0.27**	
							29.8	33.7	**3.9**	**2.16**	**Incl. 1 m @ 6.27 g/t Au from 31.7 m**
							35.7	37.7	**2.0**	**4.89**	**Incl. 1 m @ 7.63 g/t Au from 36.7 m**
							40.7	41.2	**0.5**	**0.22**	
							134.0	135.0	**1.0**	**3.56**	
							139.0	145.0	**6.0**	**0.35**	
							166.0	172.0	**6.0**	**0.44**	

able 2-3 (cont'd) Significant Drill Hole Intercepts at Rek Rinti (0.2 g/t Au Cut-Off, Maximum Internal Waste of 2m)

Hole ID	East (m)	North (m)	RL (m)	Azimuth (°)	Dip (°)	Depth (m)	From (m)	To (m)	Interval (m)	Grade (g/t Au)	Comments
RRD001	186658	526864	736.51	315.5	-75.6	228	4	12.5	8.5	**0.30**	
							84.1	85.0	0.9	**0.26**	
							86	91.1	5.1	**1.66**	**Incl. 3.1 m @ 2.41 g/t Au from 86.70 m, and incl. 0.8 m @ 5.76 g/t Au from 89.0**
							93.1	94.1	1.0	**0.54**	
							95.7	103.2	7.5	**1.11**	**Incl. 0.5 m @ 7.32 g/t Au from 98.2 m**
							196.0	196.7	0.7	**4.52**	
RRD004	186895.2	526799.6	732.64	314.9	-46.5	165.3	56.5	57.5	1.0	**0.36**	
							60.0	60.5	0.5	**0.48**	
							62.1	63.6	1.5	**0.60**	
							66.5	67.5	1.0	**0.53**	
							75.2	77.6	2.4	**0.34**	
							79.5	83.2	3.7	**0.56**	
							86.4	90.0	3.6	**0.20**	
							93.0	94.0	1.0	**1.48**	
							98.0	128.0	30.0	**2.83**	**Incl. 8.1 m @ 7.69 g/t Au from 102.40 m, and incl. 2 m @ 24.74 g/t Au from 108.00**
							132.5	135.5	3.0	**0.16**	
							137.5	140.3	2.8	**0.22**	
							141.4	142.0	0.6	**0.28**	
							147.0	153.5	6.5	**0.78**	**Incl. 0.7 m @ 2.75 g/t Au from 147.90 m, 0.5 m @ 1.85 g/t Au from 149.50**
RRD020	186667	526650.6	820.422	315	-77.7	83.4	33.0	35.2	2.20	**4.84**	**Incl. 1.4 m @ 7.48 g/t Au from 33.8.40 m, and incl. 0.8 m @ 9.30 g/t Au from 33.80**
							38.0	40.9	2.90	**0.36**	**Incl. 0.5 m @ 0.79 g/t Au from 39.3 m**
							41.9	43.9	2.00	**3.41**	**Incl. 1 m @ 6.37 g/t Au from 42.9 m**
							44.9	45.9	1.00	**0.62**	
							47.4	48.9	1.50	**2.88**	**Incl. 0.5 m @ 6.08 g/t Au from 47.4 m**
							NO CORE 48.9-49.4m artisanal mining				
							49.4	49.8	0.40	**1.65**	
							NO CORE 49.8-50.3m artisanal mining				
							50.3	50.8	0.50	**5.38**	
							NO CORE 50.8-52.3m artisanal mining				

Table 2-3 (cont'd) Significant Drill Hole Intercepts at Rek Rinti (0.2 g/t Au Cut-Off, Maximum Internal Waste of 2m)

Hole ID	East (m)	North (m)	RL (m)	Azimuth (°)	Dip (°)	Depth (m)	From (m)	To (m)	Interval (m)	Grade (g/t Au)	Comments
RRD020	186667	526650.6	820.422	315	-77.7	83.4	52.3	53.00	0.70	**1.59**	
							NO CORE 53-54.3m artisanal mining				
							54.3	55.0	0.70	**1.63**	
							NO CORE 55-56.1m artisanal mining				
							56.1	57.4	1.30	**1.81**	**Incl. 0.4 m @ 2.18 g/t Au from 57 m**
							NO CORE 57.4-59.4m artisanal mining				
							59.4	64.9	5.50	**4.16**	**Incl. 2.6 m @ 5.81 g/t Au from 59.4 m**
							66.0	71.1	5.10	**0.44**	
							74.0	76.5	2.50	**1.17**	**Incl. 0.8 m @ 2.28 g/t Au from 74.0 m**
							81.3	81.9	0.60	**0.93**	
RRD028	186698	526678.9	806.813	180.3	-71.1	198	27.0	30.4	3.40	**0.66**	
							31.5	32.5	1.00	**0.28**	
							53.0	55.0	2.00	**0.27**	
							76.0	77.0	1.00	**0.36**	
							100.30	114.90	14.60	**1.87**	**Incl. 1.7 m @ 1.44 g/t Au from 100.30 m, 2.20 m @ 7.44 g/t Au from 103.2 m, 4.5 m @ 1.51 g/t Au from 106.5 m**
							116.00	117.00	1.00	**0.21**	
							127.50	130.20	2.70	**0.74**	
							131.70	143.00	11.30	**0.29**	
							144.70	145.30	0.60	**0.46**	
							146.90	148.00	1.10	**0.22**	
							157.50	158.50	1.00	**0.62**	
							159.50	161.50	2.00	**1.54**	**Incl. 1 m @ 2.26 g/t Au from 160.5 m**
							176.50	177.50	1.00	**0.33**	
RRD033	186667.4	526647.8	820.427	210.4	-61.7	108	46.0	55.1	9.1	**0.93**	**Incl. 3.6 m @ 1.71 g/t Au from 46.9 m, and incl. 0.6 m @ 4.19 g/t Au from 46.9 m**
							62.0	63.0	1.0	**0.22**	
							66.0	67.0	1.0	**0.35**	
							69.0	87.0	18.0	**1.96**	**Incl. 3.6 m @ 3.49 g/t Au from 71.0 m, 1 m @ 15.76 g/t Au from**
							96.0	98.0	2.0	**0.37**	

Table 2-3 (cont'd) Significant Drill Hole Intercepts at Rek Rinti (0.2 g/t Au Cut-Off, Maximum Internal Waste of 2m)

Hole ID	East (m)	North (m)	RL (m)	Azimuth (°)	Dip (°)	Depth (m)	From (m)	To (m)	Interval (m)	Grade (g/t Au)	Comments
RRD034R	186668.2	526647.8	820.422	190.9	-67.4	99.4	66.5	71.4	**4.90**	**2.09**	**Incl. 0.7 m @ 4.86 g/t Au from 68.6 m, 0.7 m @ 7.63 g/t Au from 70.7 m**
							NO CORE 71.4-72.0m Core Loss				
							72.0	89.8	**17.80**	**4.11**	**Incl. 0.9 m @ 2.03 g/t Au from 72.0 m, 4 m @ 5.19 g/t Au from 74.3 m, 7.2 m @ 6.97 g/t Au from 81.2 m, 0.9 m @ 8.40 g/t Au from 88.9 m**
							90.8	92.3	**1.50**	**0.88**	**Incl. 1 m @ 1.21 g/t Au from 91.3 m,**




Figure 2-11 Rek Rinti Drill Hole Cross Section with Agam Vein Zone Interpretation



Figure 2-12 Core photos of high-grade Au and Ag mineralisation within the Agam vein, manifest as disseminated electrum (Top) and dark-grey Ag-bearing minerals (Center). Segregation of ginguro banded quartz containing abundant disseminated dark-grey sulphides (Bottom).

2.2.3 Aloe Eumpeuk

The Aloe Eumpeuk Prospect is located approximately 1 km southwest of the Rek Rinti Prospect. Trenching exposed a vein system extending over approximately 100 m of strike. Aloe Eumpeuk hosts the NNE-trending Meuh and Awai veins, the mineralisation is silver-rich (Ag:Au about 39:1) and is modelled as a single domain (AE_01) dipping steeply east. The mineralization is interpreted as a low-sulphidation epithermal system.

Location & Geological Setting

Located approximately 1.8 km north along strike from the Victory Vein (Aloe Rek); the report considers this system to likely represent a northern extension of the Aloe Rek system. Gold-anomalous float rocks were traced to sub-outcrop, leading to initial mapping that outlined a north-striking epithermal vein.

Vein System & Alteration (Barrick 1996-1997)

The Aloe Eumpeuk vein was exposed in only two of seven historical hand-dug trenches (one was abandoned due to collapse; three failed to reach bedrock due to thick soil cover, although quartz fragments were noted in the soil). The vein can be traced for 100 m between a creek outcrop north of trench AE01Tr and trench AE02Tr, appearing as two separate veins - the larger vein in AE01Tr is 3 m wide (plus a 0.5 m vein), while AE02Tr exposes 3 m and 1 m wide veins. The strike is NNW with moderate to steep dips to the east.

Vein textures are variably limonitic, massive, milky, sugary, and chalky quartz with crustiform, colloform, and vuggy forms, and multiple crosscutting vein generations. The host rock is argillic-altered porphyritic andesite with variable development of quartz-limonite veinlets. The vein disappears under soil cover both

north and south of this area and may be cut off by a NE-trending fault along the creek just north of AE01Tr. Alluvial/colluvial artisanal gold workings are present on flat ground near the Aloe Rek river.

Prospecting in tributaries of the Aloe Rek north of the vein system identified kaolinite-pyrite (argillic) altered andesitic rocks and one small intrusive exposure with propylitic or weak potassic alteration - suggesting the Aloe Eumpeuk vein system may extend further north beyond the existing trenches and soil grid.

Geochemistry (Barrick 1996-1997)

Stream sediments assayed up to 0.5 ppm Au; rock float reached up to 12.4 g/t Au and 400 g/t Ag (8 samples >1 g/t Au; no outcrop chip samples were anomalous). Six outcrop exposures were channel sampled, with the best result being 5 m @ 5.54 g/t Au. North of the gridded area, silicified/stockworked float reached up to 0.09 g/t Au, 15.3 g/t Ag, and sub-outcropping crustiform-banded quartz assayed 1.66 g/t Au, 6.6 g/t Ag - indicating potential for additional vein systems to the north.

A soil grid (63 samples) defined a gold anomaly (0.02 ppm Au threshold) over 250 m of strike and up to 120 m wide, likely broadened by downhill dispersion to the east. Two samples assayed 2.2 and 2.7 ppm Au east of trench AE04Tr, with quartz chips in the soil suggesting they may sit over in-situ veining. The anomaly is closed off to the north but open to the south; silver and arsenic in soils are generally low.

Trenching Results (Barrick 1996-1997)

Hand trenching exposed the vein system over approximately 100 m of strike, with individual vein widths up to 3 m and 1 m channel samples up to 28 g/t Au. Only AE01Tr and AE02Tr intersected the main vein; AE03Tr and AE04Tr returned only weakly anomalous grades from colluvial quartz fragments. Both AE01Tr and AE02Tr stopped in mineralisation at both ends, remaining open.

Table 2-4 Aloe Eumpeuk trench results (PT Barrick Mutiara Woyla, 1996-1997)

Trench No.	Length (m)	Average Result
AE01Tr	15	15 m @ 1.50 g/t Au, 1 Ag, incl. 4 m @ 6.57 g/t Au, 2.95 Ag (open to east)
AE02Tr	16	16 m @ 2.93 g/t Au, 2 Ag, incl. 9 m @ 5.16 g/t Au, 2.41 Ag, within which 1 m @ 28.3 g/t Au, 9.9 Ag (open both ways)
AE03Tr-AE06Tr	5-9	Generally < 0.2 g/t Au (colluvium, did not intersect the main vein)




Figure 2-13 Aloe Eumpeuk Vein Interpretation with Rock Surface Sample Location

Diamond Drilling (Far East Gold 2023)

The Aloe Eumpeuk Prospect was the third prospect drilled by Far East Gold. Drilling was conducted from April to August 2023, covering an area of 750 m x 400 m, and comprised 30 drillholes for a total of 3,646.8 metres. The campaign delineated two parallel, high-angle vein systems, namely the Awai and Meuh Veins, with strike lengths of up to 500 m. Drilling was conducted at 50 m spacing on the Meuh Vein and 100 m spacing on the Awai Vein.

All holes intersected mineralised structure except AED029. The best results (Table 2-5) included: **AED002**: 2.6 m @ 7.31 g/t Au from 74.40 m depth, including 1 m @ 18.46 g/t Au from 75.40 m depth; and 3.9 m @ 5.17 g/t Au from 78.50 m depth, including 1 m @ 12.94 g/t Au from 78.50 m depth. **AED018**: 6.80 m @ 3.50 g/t Au from 65.20 m depth, including 3.70 m @ 5.88 g/t Au from 65.20 m depth, and also including 1 m @ 17.60 g/t Au from 65.20 m depth.

Mineralised intervals were intersected with apparent true widths ranging from 1 m to 8.4 m.




Figure 2-14 Oblique View Boreholes and Mineralization Wireframes Aloe Eumpeuk Prospect

Table 2-5 Significant Drill Hole Intercepts at Aloe Eumpeuk (0.2 g/t Au Cut-Off, Maximum Internal Waste of 2m)

Hole ID	East (m)	North (m)	RL (m)	Azimuth (°)	Dip (°)	Depth (m)	From (m)	To (m)	Interval (m)	Grade (g/t Au)	Comments
AED001	185780.8	525879.2	831.159	267.4	-56.1	51.7	48.70	49.10	**0.4**	**0.31**	
AED002	185781.9	525879.3	831.146	271.2	-82.6	120.5	69.00	70.00	**1.0**	**0.68**	
							74.40	77.00	**2.6**	**7.31**	**Incl. 1 m @ 18.46 g/t Au from 75.40 m (NO CORE 77-78.5m artisanal mining)**
							78.50	82.40	**3.9**	**5.17**	**Incl. 1 m @ 12.94 g/t Au from 78.50 m (NO CORE 82.4-86m artisanal mining)**
							86.00	87.00	**1**	**9.85**	
							94.00	94.70	**0.7**	**0.25**	
							96.70	97.70	**1**	**0.30**	
AED003	185906.8	525878.7	805.867	266	-75.3	192	171.10	173.40	**2.3**	**0.55**	
AED004	185917.7	525975.1	805.924	268.9	-46.6	153	84.80	85.40	**0.6**	**0.43**	
							140.70	141.20	**0.5**	**0.23**	
AED005	185846.7	526177.2	829.422	269.2	-46	112.5	61.20	68.00	**6.8**	**1.20**	**Incl. 0.9 m @ 4.00 g/t Au from 61.20 m**
AED006	185848.1	526177.3	829.446	269.3	-78.5	129	97.50	98.10	**0.60**	**0.27**	
							102.25	106.25	**4.00**	**0.40**	
AED007	185819.4	525982.3	809.45	269.9	-47.9	136.1	108.95	110.80	**1.85**	**6.39**	**Incl. 0.40 m @ 28.06 g/t Au from 108.95 m**
							113.50	115.30	**1.80**	**0.40**	
AED008	185808.5	525936.1	811.994	268.3	-61.5	131.7	101.00	102.60	**1.60**	**6.36**	**Incl. 1 m @ 9.40 g/t Au from 101.60 m**
							104.20	104.90	**0.70**	**0.26**	
							107.80	108.40	**0.60**	**0.36**	
AED009	185809.1	525936.1	811.974	269.7	-78.3	168	61.70	63.20	**1.50**	**0.28**	
							111.50	112.40	**0.90**	**0.29**	
							114.30	115.40	**1.10**	**0.90**	
							116.80	117.60	**0.80**	**0.25**	
							134.80	139.40	**4.60**	**0.47**	**Incl. 0.3 m @ 0.69 g/t Au from 136.30 m**
AED010	185906	525878.8	805.841	268.3	-47.4	183.8	106.90	107.60	**0.70**	**0.25**	
							151.90	154.50	**2.60**	**0.19**	
							156.80	162.00	**5.20**	**0.45**	

Table 2-5 (cont'd) Significant Drill Hole Intercepts at Aloe Eumpeuk (0.2 g/t Au Cut-Off, Maximum Internal Waste of 2m)

Hole ID	East (m)	North (m)	RL (m)	Azimuth (°)	Dip (°)	Depth (m)	From (m)	To (m)	Interval (m)	Grade (g/t Au)	Comments
AED011	185844.5	525825.9	811.604	269.4	-47	129	102.60	108.90	**6.30**	**2.62**	**Incl. 3.20 m @ 4.18 g/t Au from 102.60 m**
							111.50	112.50	**1.00**	**0.23**	
AED014	185781	525821.4	818.826	269.6	-72.1	79.4	56.50	59.90	**3.40**	**2.11**	**Incl. 1.40 m @ 4.26 g/t Au from 58.50 m, and incl. 0.60 m @ 6.39 g/t Au from 58.50 m**
AED015	185757.3	525937.3	831.609	269.5	-47.2	80	39.90	41.00	**1.10**	**0.30**	
							48.00	56.40	**8.40**	**0.86**	**Incl. 0.80 m @ 5.53 g/t Au from 52.40 m**
AED016	185758.3	525937.2	831.642	270.1	-71.3	90.5	77.00	83.00	**6.00**	**0.54**	**Incl. 0.50 m @ 2.67 g/t Au from 80.50 m**
AED017	185741.5	525984.6	826.823	270	-46.8	58.2	28.30	30.00	**1.70**	**0.49**	
							32.00	32.50	**0.50**	**5.69**	
AED018	185742.2	525984.9	826.734	268.5	-81.3	90.5	60.10	62.50	**2.40**	**0.40**	
							65.20	72.00	**6.80**	**3.50**	**Incl. 3.70 m @ 5.88 g/t Au from 65.20 m, and incl. 1 m @ 17.60 g/t Au from 65.20 m**
AED020	185739.8	526036.6	819.076	91.1	-62.4	54.5	9.85	12.40	**2.55**	**0.78**	**Incl. 0.55 m @ 1.98 g/t Au from 9.85 m**
AED021	185745.6	526078.1	809.678	91.1	-56.6	101	39.60	44.60	**5.00**	**1.64**	**Incl. 5 m @ 1.64 g/t Au from 40.60 m**
							45.60	48.30	**2.70**	**0.38**	
							49.30	50.30	**1.00**	**0.76**	
							51.30	52.30	**1.00**	**0.26**	
							85.30	86.00	**0.70**	**0.46**	
AED025	185822.1	526226.9	824.886	269.4	-86.4	50	29.50	35.70	**6.20**	**0.50**	**Incl. 1.60 m @ 0.89 g/t Au from 31.00 m**
AED028	185810.5	525769.3	802.438	269.7	-70.7	142	95.30	97.00	**1.70**	**1.33**	**Incl. 1 m @ 2.10 g/t Au from 96.00 m**
							121.70	122.50	**0.80**	**0.25**	




Figure 2-15 Aloe Eumpeuk Drill Hole Cross Section with Core Photos




Figure 2-16 Core specimens from drillhole AED002 shows occurrence of dark-grey ginguro bands with fine-grain electrum and sulphide minerals. Photo A-75.7m, B-75.9m, C-78.6m. Assays of, 1m @ 18.4 g/t Au & 1,359 g/t Ag from 75.4m – 76.4m and 1m @ 12.9 g/t Au & 625 g/t Ag from 78.5m – 79.5m

2.2.4 Aloe Rek

Mineralization at the Aloe Rek Prospect is hosted primarily within the Victory Vein, which comprises a complex series of quartz lenses and veinlets that can be traced for more than 1 km along strike within a broad zone of extensively argillic-altered andesite.

Individual veins commonly exhibit bladed quartz, calcite-replacement, and colloform quartz textures, together with adularia banding. These textures are characteristic of a low-sulphidation epithermal system and indicate varying levels within the boiling zone.

Twelve diamond holes (ARD001-ARD011R, 1,884 m) were drilled from March 2024. Mineralisation is modelled as a single domain (AR_01).

Location & Geological Setting

Located in the Kr. Beurieung and Aloe Rek drainages. Intensive stream sediment sampling identified two vein systems - the Aloe Eumpeuk Vein and the Victory Vein. The prospect lies near the margin of a circular feature visible on satellite imagery, in an area of numerous circular features and N-S to NNE-trending lineaments. The north-south trend of the Aloe Rek veins correlates with the dominant direction of intrusive dykes into the host andesite, confirming that this N-S trend is structurally dilational. The prospect sits within an arcuate 'rim' feature - an apron of laharic debris flows preserved in the east but breached and eroded in the west.

Vein System & Alteration

The Victory Vein comprises generally north-south trending lenses of quartz ± adularia ± carbonate with trace pyrite and rare chalcopyrite, pinching and swelling up to about 5 m from a common width of 1-2 m, within a broader zone up to 50 m wide of argillic-altered andesite with variable quartz veinlet stockworking. The larger veins are in places hard, brecciated and re-sealed, but also locally sugary and friable. Hydrothermal textures include crustiform, lacy-banded, milky, vuggy, and bladed textures (after calcite). Individual pods are traceable for up to 100 m, dipping steeply to the east (rarely west). The overall vein system is 1,100 m long, apparently closed off to the north but still open to the south, with grade and width reducing in that direction.

Petrology (Barrick 1996) on two Victory Vein samples shows that the quartz formed from a slightly less-than-neutral chloride fluid at temperatures of 220-290°C, at a depth of at least 925 m below the paleowater table - a deep epithermal to mesothermal environment. Float of siliceous sinter was observed in some nearby drainages, and chalcedonic quartz float elsewhere, suggesting that varying levels of the epithermal conduit are now exposed, with boiling-zone levels currently at surface along the Victory Vein structure. Some local vein offset may have occurred near grid 9250N.

Geochemistry (Barrick 1996-1997)

Rock float reached a high of 13.6 g/t Au from streams draining the vein system and 17 g/t Au from colluvium below old workings; 12 float samples assayed >1.0 g/t Au. Outcrop rock chips reached up to 76 g/t Au with 78 g/t Ag from quartz vein breccia with strong limonite and pyrite-arsenopyrite. The best channel sample of outcrop was 7 m @ 0.32 g/t Au. Stream sediments assayed up to 1.6 ppm Au, with one BLEG sample returning 32 ppb Au.

Grid soil sampling (0.02 ppm Au threshold) defined a north-south, sinuous zone 900 m long correlating well with the distribution of the veins (maximum 8.97 ppm Au); the strongest part of the anomaly is 200 m long and up to 70 m wide, open in the southeast corner and to the north. The arsenic anomaly correlates well with gold, with five zones >300 ppm As (maximum 1,757 ppm As). Silver in the soils was mostly below detection.

Trenching Results (Barrick 1996-1997)

Seventeen hand-dug trenches were excavated along 1,100 m of strike length.

Table 2-6 Aloe Rek trench results (PT Barrick Mutiara Woyla, 1996-1997)

Trench No.	Length (m)	Average Result
AR06Tr	14	14 m @ 2.47 g/t Au, 12.5 g/t Ag, incl. 7 m @ 4.95 g/t Au, 23.5 g/t Ag (best single sample 1 m @ 13.43 g/t Au, 78 g/t Ag)
AR05Tr	10	5 m @ 3.67 g/t Au, 2 Ag & 5 m @ 2.48 g/t Au, 1 Ag (open to NE)
AR17Tr	14	14 m @ 2.14 g/t Au, incl. 7 m @ 4.02 g/t Au (open both ways)
AR08Tr	64	63.6 m @ 0.20 g/t Au, incl. 2 m @ 1.88 g/t Au
Other trenches (13)	4-52	Generally < 1 g/t Au



Figure 2-17 Aloe Rek Vein Interpretation with Rock Surface Sample Location

Diamond Drilling (Far East Gold 2024)

FEG conducted a 12-hole (1,883.8 metre) diamond drilling program at the Aloe Rek Prospect from March to July 2024, focused on an area measuring 200 m by 600 m. The program was conducted in two drilling phases: 8 drillholes in Phase 1 and 4 drillholes in Phase 2. All drillholes intersected a steep quartz vein, namely the Victory Vein, which has a strike length of up to 500 m. The most significant intercepts are: ARD001: 12.4 m @ 5.59 g/t Au from 82.30 m depth, including 9.70 m @ 7.06 g/t Au from 85.00 m depth, and including 4 m @ 11.83 g/t Au from 85.50 m depth. ARD009: 20 m @ 7.57 g/t Au from 67.50 m depth, including 11 m @ 13.45 g/t Au from 70.50 m depth, and including 3.25 m @ 31.64 g/t Au from 75.75 m depth.

Mineralised intervals were intersected with apparent true widths ranging from 0.4 m to 20 m. Table 2-7 summarises the significant drill hole intercepts.




Figure 2-18 Plan view of Victory Vein at Aloe Rek Prospect

Table 2-7 Significant Drill Hole Intercepts at Aloe Rek (0.2 g/t Au Cut-Off, Maximum Internal Waste of 2m)

Hole ID	East (m)	North (m)	RL (m)	Azimuth (°)	Dip (°)	Depth (m)	From (m)	To (m)	Interval (m)	Grade (g/t Au)	Comments
ARD001	185370.9	523447.	847.805	271.1	-53	170.9	15.0	16.0	**1.0**	**0.27**	
							46.0	51.0	**5.0**	**2.36**	**Incl. 0.5 m @ 15.91 g/t Au from 47.00 m**
							54.0	54.5	**0.5**	**0.34**	
							82.3	94.7	**12.4**	**5.59**	**Incl. 9.7 m @ 7.06 g/t Au from 85.00 m, and incl. 4 m @ 11.83 g/t Au from 85.50**
							98.5	102.8	**4.3**	**0.61**	
							123.0	123.8	**0.8**	**3.58**	**Incl. 0.4 m @ 6.79 g/t Au from 123.00 m**
							130.1	130.6	**0.5**	**1.077**	
							132.7	134.5	**1.8**	**0.69**	
							139.4	139.8	**0.5**	**0.71**	
							141.8	142.8	**1.0**	**0.55**	
ARD002	185371.3	523447.1	847.819	270.9	-76.7	258.5	18.5	18.9	**0.4**	**0.44**	
							191.0	203.0	**12.0**	**0.75**	**Incl. 1 m @ 4.22 g/t Au from 194.00 m**
							207.0	220.0	**13.0**	**0.54**	**Incl. 1 m @ 3.77 g/t Au from 215.00 m**

Hole ID	East (m)	North (m)	RL (m)	Azimuth (°)	Dip (°)	Depth (m)	From (m)	To (m)	Interval (m)	Grade (g/t Au)	Comments
							227.9	228.7	**0.8**	**0.39**	
							243.1	244.0	**0.9**	**0.21**	
ARD003	185340.9	523556	866.009	270.1	-75.3	151.8	55.8	60.4	**4.6**	**0.89**	
							62.1	63.3	**1.2**	**0.71**	
							68.5	71.9	**3.4**	**6.68**	**Incl. 0.70 m @ 30.05 g/t Au from 70.20 m**
							74.5	75.6	**1.1**	**1.33**	
							80	85	**5.0**	**1.44**	**Incl. 1.60 m @ 2.23 g/t Au from 83.40 m**
							86.3	89.7	**3.4**	**1.11**	**Incl. 1.30 m @ 2.07 g/t Au from 87.50 m**
							96.5	97.5	**1.0**	**0.71**	
							130.8	131.7	**0.9**	**0.29**	
							135.8	136.4	**0.6**	**0.25**	
ARD006	185271.9	523259	822.566	92.1	-55.7	113.8	21.3	41	**19.7**	**0.65**	**Incl. 2.50 m @ 2.26 g/t Au from 31.00 m**
							49.85	54	**4.15**	**1.35**	
							63.2	64.5	**1.3**	**0.59**	
							68.4	69	**0.6**	**0.42**	
ARD007	185271.5	523259	822.546	93.7	-72.7	150.5	7.2	8	**0.8**	**0.54**	
							17.9	36.35	**18.45**	**1.38**	**Incl. 2.35 m @ 3.41 g/t Au from 18.90 m, 1.35 m @ 4.89 g/t Au from 35.00**
							38.35	41.6	**3.25**	**0.32**	
							55.2	55.6	**0.4**	**0.44**	
							56.8	57.2	**0.4**	**0.34**	
							68.75	73.4	**4.65**	**0.85**	
							83.3	84.3	**1**	**0.58**	
							86.6	92.2	**5.6**	**1.14**	
							87.6	*88.9*	***1.3***	***3.12***	
							108.5	110	**1.5**	**0.22**	
ARD009	185269.1	523495.2	843.4011	89.4	-45.9	118.5	3.2	3.6	**0.4**	**1.63**	
							4.8	5.2	**0.4**	**0.54**	
							31.6	32.4	**0.8**	**0.28**	
							55.1	59	**3.9**	**0.99**	
							62	62.4	**0.4**	**0.61**	
							67.5	87.5	**20.0**	**7.57**	**Incl. 11 m @ 13.45 g/t Au from 70.50 m, and incl. 3.25 m @ 31.64 g/t Au from 75.75**
ARD010	185268.5	523495.3	843.3385	88.7	-61.4	177.3	4.6	5.2	**0.6**	**0.30**	
							7.2	12.4	**5.2**	**1.00**	**Incl. 1.45 m @ 2.04 g/t Au from 10.95 m**
							20	26.7	**6.7**	**0.61**	**Incl. 1.35 m @ 1.76 g/t Au from 21.95 m**
							65	66	**1**	**0.21**	
							105	108.9	**3.9**	**0.43**	**Incl. 0.40 m @ 1.10 g/t Au from 106.00 m**

Hole ID	East (m)	North (m)	RL (m)	Azimuth (°)	Dip (°)	Depth (m)	From (m)	To (m)	Interval (m)	Grade (g/t Au)	Comments
							116.15	120.2	**4.05**	**0.62**	**Incl. 0.50 m @ 1.48 g/t Au from 119.7 m**
ARD011	185270.2	523396	817.4803	91	-45	111	0.8	1.8	**1**	**1.37**	
							4	6	**2**	**4.95**	**Incl. 0.70 m @ 13.61 g/t Au from 5.3 m**
							52.5	69	**16.5**	**1.99**	
							53	*64.8*	***11.8***	***2.69***	**Incl. 4.2 m @ 4.11 g/t Au from 58.40 m, and incl. 0.5 m @ 0.26 g/t Au from 71.7**




Figure 2-19 Aloe Rek Drill Hole Cross Section with Significant Intercept Assay




Figure 2-20 Core photos of ARD009 Aloe Rek, Quartz-Pyrite-Arsenopyrite Vein Breccia, Strong Cavities.

2.3 OTHER PROSPECTS

Barrick identified additional regional targets within the original CoW, including Dolok, Beurieung, Aloe Vera and Siganta. Far East Gold discovered one prospect Kareung Reuboh. These prospects have not been adequately defined and no drilling has been completed.

3. EXPLORATION HISTORY

3.1 DISCOVERY AND EXPLORATION HISTORY

PT Barrick Mutiara Woyla (1995-1998)**.** Barrick (80%, with Quralon 15% and PT Mutiara Mitramin 5%) explored under SIPP permits from 1 Nov 1995 and a sixth-generation CoW signed 28 Apr 1997 over 143,600 ha. Work comprised photogeological interpretation (Landsat, SPOT, radar, air photos), a 1996 helicopter magnetic/radiometric survey (N-S lines 400 m apart), BLEG, −80# silt, pan-concentrate and rock sampling, auger soils, hand trenches, and 1:25,000-1:1,000 mapping. (SIPP report, Bugg & Rafferty, March 1998, pp.11-16).

Barrick (1996) reported trench results (surface channel samples, not used in the resource estimate) from: Aloe Rek (Victory Vein, 1,100 m strike, 17 trenches) AR06Tr 14 m @ 2.47 g/t Au and 12.5 g/t Ag, including 7 m @ 4.95 g/t Au; Aloe Eumpeuk AE02Tr 16 m @ 2.93 g/t Au, including 9 m @ 5.16 g/t Au; and Anak Perak AP01Tr 18 m @ 1.5 g/t Au, including 6 m @ 4.29 g/t Au, within a soil anomaly about 2 km by 300 m; (SIPP pp.17-36).

Barrick stopped fieldwork in July 1997 because no target showed potential for a deposit of more than 2 Moz open-pittable gold, while noting potential for "smaller, moderate-grade deposits within the vein systems, suitable for a smaller company", and recommended scout drilling at Anak Perak and Aloe Eumpeuk-Aloe Rek (SIPP p.44). The 1999 Partial Relinquishment Report retained 107,700 ha; the named prospects lie in the retained block. No historical resource estimate exists for any Woyla prospect.

Newcrest (1999-2002) earned into the project (75% for US$7.5M) and withdrew in 2003. The CoW was reduced to 109,800 ha (1999) and 24,260 ha (2002), suspended from 1999 during the Aceh conflict, and reactivated on 14 Oct 2022. No additional field work was completed by Newcrest. FEG (2021-present) completed detailed geological mapping and vein sampling, and geophysical surveys and began diamond drilling at Anak Perak in Sep 2022.




Figure 3-1 Historical prospect and regional target locations (PT Barrick Mutiara Woyla, July 1997)

Table 3-1 Summary of historical exploration activity

Period	Company	Work
1995-1998	PT Barrick Mutiara Woyla	Photogeology, airborne magnetics/radiometrics, stream, soil, rock and trench sampling
1999-2002	Newcrest	Earn-in; target ranking; withdrew 2003
1999-2022	-	Suspension during the Aceh conflict; area reduced to 24,260 ha (2002)
2021-2022	FEG	Mapping, rock sampling, IP survey
Sep 2022 - Jul 2024	FEG	133 diamond holes for 20,585 m
2023-2024	FEG	Metallurgical test work
Sep 2026	FEG	Resource review and RPEEE pit optimisation

4. EXPLORATION DATA TYPES

The data compilation includes drilling, surface sampling, and geochemical datasets, each accompanied by relevant spatial and analytical information.

1. Borehole
2. Rock Sample
3. Geochemical Stream Sediment
4. Geophysical Survey
5. Soil Sampling

Collectively, these datasets form the basis for geological interpretation and resource estimation within the Woyla project area. A summary of the available exploration data is presented in Table 4-1.

Table 4-1 Summary of Exploration Data

PROSPECT		LAND SATELLITE STUDY		SURFACE MAPPING		GEOCHEMICAL STUDY		GEOPHYSICAL STUDY		TRENCH		DRILLING			SAMPLE ASSAY		
Name	Area (Ha)	Type	Area (Ha)	Type	Area (Ha)	Type	Area (Ha)	Type	Area (Ha)	Depth (m)	Area (Ha)	Spacing (m)	Holes (titik)	Depth (m)	Analysis Type	Sample Type	Total
Anak Perak	1,130	Citra Satelit	715	Topografi	3	Tanah	83	IP	462	0.5 - 2	18	100-50	28	3,436		Tanah	611
				Geologi Lokal	1,130	Endapan Sungai	1,130	Airborne Mag	1,130							Endapan Sungai	24
						Batuan	685								50g Fire Assay	Batuan	892
						Paritan	18								50g Fire Assay	Inti Bor	1,651
Rek Rinti	662	Drone Photogrammetry	662	Topografi Lidar	662	Endapan Sungai	662	UAV Mag	662			100-50	63	11,618		Endapan Sungai	23
		Citra Satelit	662	Geologi Lokal	156	Batuan	217	IP	252						50g Fire Assay	Batuan	155
								Airborne Mag	662						50g Fire Assay	Inti Bor	6,104
Aloe Rek	250	Drone Photogrammetry	250	Topografi Lidar	250	Tanah	20	UAV Mag	250	0.5 - 2	6	100-50	12	1,884		Tanah	243
				Geologi Lokal	250	Endapan Sungai	250	Airborne Mag	250							Endapan Sungai	6
						Batuan	89								50g Fire Assay	Batuan	568
															50g Fire Assay	Inti Bor	981
Aloe Bumpeuk	400	Drone Photogrammetry	400	Topografi Lidar	400	Tanah	7	UAV Mag	400	0.5 - 2	1	100-50	30	3,647		Tanah	88
		Citra Satelit	400	Geologi Lokal	400	Endapan Sungai	400	IP	144							Endapan Sungai	25
						Batuan	162	Airborne Mag	400						50g Fire Assay	Batuan	276
															50g Fire Assay	Inti Bor	863
Kareung Reuboh	214	Drone Photogrammetry	214	Topografi Lidar	214	Endapan Sungai	214	UAV Mag	214							Endapan Sungai	16
		Citra Satelit	214	Geologi Lokal	214	Batuan	85	Airborne Mag	214						50g Fire Assay	Batuan	36
Beurieung	2,604	Drone Photogrammetry	1,074	Geologi Lokal	1,665	Endapan Sungai	2,604	UAV Mag	750							Endapan Sungai	43
		Citra Satelit	384			Batuan	1,246	Airborne Mag	2,604						50g Fire Assay	Batuan	680
Aloe Kamara	1,236	Citra Satelit	800	Geologi Lokal	182	Endapan Sungai	1,236	Airborne Mag	1,236							Endapan Sungai	15
						Batuan	182								50g Fire Assay	Batuan	42
Anak Perak Utara	824	Citra Satelit	520	Geologi Lokal	450	Endapan Sungai	824	Airborne Mag	824							Endapan Sungai	5
						Batuan	50								50g Fire Assay	Batuan	22
Dolok	870	Drone Photogrammetry	989	Geologi Lokal	685	Endapan Sungai	870	Airborne Mag	870							Endapan Sungai	26
						Batuan	450								50g Fire Assay	Batuan	275
Sigenta	870	Citra Satelit	366	Geologi Lokal	423	Endapan Sungai	870	Airborne Mag	870							Endapan Sungai	65
						Batuan	163								50g Fire Assay	Batuan	88
Aloe Vera	905			Geologi Lokal	332	Endapan Sungai	905	Airborne Mag	905							Endapan Sungai	34
						Batuan	87								50g Fire Assay	Batuan	74
Regional WKK	14,295	Drone Photogrammetry	835	Geologi Lokal	1,341	Endapan Sungai	14,295	Airborne Mag	14,295							Endapan Sungai	87
		Citra Satelit	2,259			Batuan	1,341								50g Fire Assay	Batuan	236
Total	24,260												133	20,585			14,254

Table 4-2 Summary of FEG Drilling

Prospect (hole prefix)	Holes	Metres	Period
Rek Rinti (RRD, AGM)	63	11,618	Oct 2022 - Mar 2024
Aloe Eumpeuk (AED)	30	3,647	Apr - Aug 2023
Anak Perak (APD)	28	3,436	Sep 2022 - Mar 2023
Aloe Rek (ARD)	12	1,884	Mar - Jul 2024
Total	**133**	**20,585**	**Sep 2022 - Jul 2024**

The 1 m composites used in this MRE come from 111 drill holes that intersected the gold-bearing veins and which were used to define the mineralized domains at each prospect. The remaining holes did not intersect veins and were not included in the domaining.

4.1 SURVEY

4.1.1 Collar and Downhole Surveys

Drill-hole collars were surveyed by RTK GNSS (radio-linked base-rover), quoted accuracy 1-5 cm, with real-time coordinates (no post-processing required). Coordinate system: UTM Zone 47N, WGS84 / national datum DGN'95 (parameters equivalent to WGS84). Primary control was tied to the national geodetic reference network (Badan Informasi Geospasial / BIG) via CORS station CLAN at Telkom

Calang, using static differential GNSS (dual-frequency receivers, minimum 3-hour sessions, ≥6 satellites, GDOP <7). Baseline processing and network adjustment were carried out in Trimble Business Center (TBC v3.5); the results are stated to meet the software's standard parameters.

Downhole surveys were recorded at 10 m, and thereafter at 40-50 m intervals to the end of hole, yielding 2-9 stations per hole (median 5). Surveys were acquired using a Reflex instrument in 2022 and an Axis instrument in 2023.

4.1.2 Topographic Survey

Topographic data for the Rek Rinti - Aloe Eumpeuk to Aloe Rek prospects were derived from a LiDAR survey conducted by Enmintech in September 2023. Topography for the Anak Perak prospect, on the other hand, was derived from a Tape and Compass survey tied to drill-hole collar points established by the RTK survey. All other areas were sourced from regional DEMNAS contour data. The topographic data is considered of sufficient accuracy to reliably use for resource estimation.




Figure 4-1 Coverage of topographic data related to drill collars

4.2 BOREHOLE DATA AND DRILLING TECHNIQUES

All drilling services were provided by Omega Drilling using man-portable Jacro 350 rigs, with PQ core from surface to a median depth of 45 m (range 20-101 m) and HQ thereafter (6,235 m PQ and 14,030 m HQ). Triple-tube core barrels were used and core was oriented (Reflex tool in 2022, Axis tool in 2023). Hole dips range from −45° to −86°.

Core recovery averages 92.7% overall (Aloe Eumpeuk 96.8%, Aloe Rek 94.1%, Anak Perak 90.8%, Rek Rinti 91.8%) and 92.2% in samples grading ≥0.3 g/t Au. Lower recovery is associated with higher grades in broken vein zones, and cavities from near-surface artisanal workings are recorded at Rek Rinti. It is the opinion of the Competent Person that artisanal mining has had no material impact for the mineral resources reported here-in for the 4 prospect areas.

4.3 SAMPLING TECHNIQUES

Core was logged, photographed and marked up by geologists, and half core was sampled at intervals of 0.17-1.83 m (median 1.0 m), guided by geology. A total of 9,715 samples were collected over 8,293 m. Samples were bagged and dispatched to PT Geoservices, Cikarang, under strict chain of custody protocols and using dispatch ledgers and sample submission forms.

4.4 ASSAY ANALYSIS

Table 4-3 Assay methods

Item	Details
Laboratory	PT Geoservices, Cikarang, West Java (ISO 17025)
Preparation	Dry, crush to 95% passing 3 mm, pulverise to 95% passing 75 µm
Gold (to January 2023)	30 g fire assay with AAS finish; detection limit 0.01 ppm
Gold (from January 2023)	50 g fire assay with AAS finish; detection limit 0.005 ppm; gravimetric finish above 50 ppm
Silver and multi-element	Aqua regia digest, ICP-OES (Ag detection limit 0.5 ppm); ore-grade AAS above 100 ppm Ag; Cu, Pb, Zn, As, Sb, Mo, Bi, Ba
Reported gold value	Average of primary, replicate and laboratory duplicate assays

4.5 QUALITY ASSURANCE AND QUALITY CONTROL

4.5.1 CRM – BLANK - DUPLICATE

Certified reference materials (CRMs), blanks and field duplicates were inserted with the primary samples at a combined rate of 13.3%, and pulp duplicates were submitted to Intertek as an umpire laboratory.

Table 4-4 QA/QC samples

QC type	Count	Insertion rate
CRMs (OREAS 243, 501b, 501d, 504, 601c, 603c, 609b)	433	4.5%
Blanks	428	4.4%
Field duplicates	430	4.4%
Umpire pulps (Intertek, Dec 2022 and Feb 2024)	70	-

Table 4-5 CRM performance - gold

CRM	n	Certified Au (g/t)	Mean bias	Within ±2SD
OREAS 501d	179	0.232	+1.0%	100%
OREAS 601c	133	0.996	+2.3%	99%
OREAS 603c	34	4.96	+2.3%	100%
OREAS 243	22	12.39	+0.6%	100%

CRM	n	Certified Au (g/t)	Mean bias	Within ±2SD
OREAS 609b	28	5.15	−2.6%	100%
OREAS 501b	19	0.248	−5.5%	94%
OREAS 504	12	1.48	+7.7%	8%

CRM results show acceptable accuracy, with mean bias within ±3% for the principal standards. OREAS 504 returned high results in May-June 2023 and was withdrawn. Blanks show no significant contamination (one result above five times the detection limit in 423). Field duplicates show moderate to poor precision (72% of pairs within ±20%; mean absolute relative difference 49% for pairs above 0.3 g/t Au), consistent with the variable distribution of gold in epithermal veins; laboratory repeats show good precision. Umpire checks at Intertek show gold bias within ±5%.

The QA/QC results are considered adequate to support the Mineral Resource classification.




Figure 4-2 Standard Oreas 501d Performance, most of Au values were plotted within -2SD and +2SD of standard deviations




Figure 4-3 Standard Oreas 501b Performance, standard values are a bit lower than expected Au values but still fall within -2SD




Figure 4-4 Standard Oreas 601C Performance, two results failed; investigation with the Geoservices laboratory was inconclusive and the two samples are interpreted to have been swapped with routine samples




Figure 4-5 Standard Oreas 603C Performance, most of Au values were plotted within -2SD and +2SD of standard deviations




Figure 4-6 Standard Oreas 609b Performance, most of Au values were plotted within -2SD and +2SD of standard deviations




Figure 4-7 Standard Oreas 243 Performance, most of Au values were plotted within -2SD and +2SD of standard deviations




Figure 4-8 Standard 504 Performance, standard Au values are higher than expected values and mostly fall outside of the allowable tolerance. The standards are no longer used. The standard samples came from old stock back in 2010




Figure 4-9 Field duplicate Au Performance. Precision is moderate to poor (72% of pairs within ±20%), consistent with the variable distribution of gold in epithermal veins; two pairs show large differences attributed to sample heterogeneity




Figure 4-10 Blank Sample Performance. In general, the blank Au values are within the expected range and show satisfactory performance

4.5.2 Screen Fire Assay

To assess the potential influence of coarse ("nuggety") gold on assay results, five pulp samples (000352, 000357, 000365, 000368 and 000382) were submitted for screen fire assay to PT Intertek Utama Services.

Each sample was screened at 200 mesh. The undersize (-200#) fraction was assayed in duplicate by fire assay with an AAS finish (scheme SF75/AA), while the entire oversize (+200#) fraction was fire-assayed in full using a gravimetric finish (scheme FA50/GR200), so that any coarse or nuggety gold retained on the screen would be fully captured rather than under-represented by sub-sampling. A mass-weighted total gold grade was then calculated from the two fractions.

Total gold grades for the five samples ranged from 4.21 g/t Au to 51.7 g/t Au:

Table 4-5 Screen Fire Assay Result

Sample	-200# fraction avg (g/t Au)	+200# fraction (g/t Au)	Total (g/t Au)
000352	8.34	3.00	8.29
000357	4.24	1.42	4.21
000365	8.55	4.17	8.37
000368	9.29	15.65	9.58
000382	51.14	315.35	51.70

Duplicate assays of the -200# fraction showed good reproducibility, with relative percent differences of 0.9-4.1% across all five samples. Samples 000368 and, more markedly, 000382 returned significantly higher grades in the +200# (coarse) fraction than in the -200# (fine) fraction (15.65 g/t vs 9.29 g/t, and 315 g/t vs 51 g/t, respectively), indicating the presence of coarse, nuggety gold. Although the +200# fraction made up only 2-4% of the total sample mass, its contribution to contained gold in sample 000382 was still substantial given the very high coarse-fraction grade, highlighting the value of the screen fire assay protocol in capturing coarse gold that a standard single-sub-sample fire assay could otherwise misrepresent. As a result, FEG changed its analytical protocol to assay of a 50 gram fire assay from the previous 30 gram charge.

5. GEOLOGICAL MODELLING

5.1 MODEL DIMENSION

Block models were constructed for the Rek Rinti, Aloe Rek, Aloe Eumpeuk and Anak Perak prospects, covering 13 mineralisation domains with a combined volume of about 11.7 Mm³.

The block models were built in Leapfrog Geo in UTM Zone 47N (WGS84), with no rotation. The extents of the combined sub-blocked model are shown below.

Table 5-1 Block model extents

Prospect	Easting (m)	Northing (m)	RL (m)
Rek Rinti	186,260.0 - 187,005.0	526,275.0 - 527,360.0	437.50 - 888.75
Aloe Rek	185,270.0 - 185,347.5	523,157.5 - 523,620.0	527.50 - 870.00
Aloe Eumpeuk	185,702.5 - 185,927.5	525,695.0 - 526,352.5	551.25 - 857.50
Anak Perak	178,662.5 - 178,765.0	528,520.0 - 529,400.0	838.75 - 1,086.25

5.2 GEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION

Mineralisation is interpreted as structurally controlled, elongate quartz veins and lodes. Domains were interpreted from drill core logging (quartz veining, brecciation) and assays, supported by surface mapping. At Rek Rinti the veins strike mainly north-east and minor to the east and dip at about 60° south-east and south; at Aloe Rek, Aloe Eumpeuk and Anak Perak the veins strike north-south and dip at 70-80° to the east.

5.3 WIREFRAMES

Table 5-2 Mineralisation domains

Prospect	Domain	Volume (Mm³)
Rek Rinti - Agam	AGM_01	3.72
	AGM_02	1.24
	AGM_03	0.64
	AGM_04	2.02
	NRA_01	0.45
	NRA_02	0.13
	PTM_01	0.25
	RR_02	0.36
	RR_01	0.71
	SR_01	0.03
Aloe Eumpeuk	AE_01	0.52
Anak Perak	AP_01	0.34
Aloe Rek	AR_01	1.34
Total		**11.75**




Figure 5-1 Estimation Domains

5.4 COMPOSITING

More than half of the samples were 1 m long and 94% were 0.5–1.5 m; assays were therefore composited to 1 m within domains.

5.5 BASIC STATISTICS

Statistics of the 1 m composites within each domain are summarised below (length-weighted, not declustered; composites without assays excluded). Grade capping removes 12-24% of the gold metal in most capped domains, but 64% in RR_01, where the maximum composite of 56.1 g/t Au is capped at 4.16 g/t Au. Capping also removes 38% of the silver metal in AE_01 and 54% in RR_01.

Table 5-3 Composite statistics by domain (1 m composites)

Domain	Holes	n	Au mean (g/t)	Au CV	Au max (g/t)	Au capped mean (g/t)	Au metal cut (%)	Ag mean (g/t)	Ag CV	Ag metal cut (%)
AGM_01	30	540	1.00	2.23	29.43	0.88	12	12.1	1.84	2
AGM_02	21	474	0.71	3.93	40.57	0.54	24	13.0	2.55	16
AGM_03	20	219	0.32	1.96	5.67	0.27	14	1.6	2.11	18
AGM_04	5	129	0.79	1.31	5.83	0.68	14	9.1	1.07	8
NRA_01	4	27	0.20	0.83	0.71	0.20	0	2.2	1.06	0
NRA_02	2	6	0.90	1.38	3.64	0.90	0	6.2	1.45	0
PTM_01	12	48	0.51	2.48	7.85	0.41	20	1.8	1.50	16
RR_01	7	83	1.07	5.83	56.06	0.38	64	4.9	3.35	54
RR_02	3	42	0.61	1.09	3.44	0.54	12	4.4	1.03	9

Domain	Holes	n	Au mean (g/t)	Au CV	Au max (g/t)	Au capped mean (g/t)	Au metal cut (%)	Ag mean (g/t)	Ag CV	Ag metal cut (%)
SR_01	3	23	0.46	0.83	1.96	0.46	0	8.3	1.37	0
AE_01	25	131	1.37	1.97	18.84	1.19	14	77.3	2.10	38
AP_01	20	119	0.81	2.29	11.83	0.67	17	6.0	1.41	4
AR_01	8	304	1.24	3.11	36.17	1.04	16	6.0	2.73	16




Figure 5-2 Log Normal Histogram Au for each domain




Figure 5-3 Log Probability Plot Au for each domain




Figure 5-4 Log Normal Histogram Ag for each domain




Figure 5-5 Log Probability Plot Ag for each domain

5.6 GRADE CAPPING

Table 5-4 High-grade thresholds

Domain	Au threshold (g/t)	Au percentile	Ag threshold (g/t)	Ag percentile
AGM_01	7.6	98.25	118.6	98.75
AGM_02	7.3	99.2	144.6	98.7
AGM_03	1.95	97.5	5.5	97.5
AGM_04	2.7	95.5	27	94.2
PTM_01	3.4	97	9.9	95.8
SR_01	-	-	-	-
RR_01	4.16	98.5	14	95.8
RR_02	2.18	96.2	13.45	94.15
NRA_01	-	-	-	-
NRA_02	-	-	-	-
AE_01	9.8	96.75	195.8	94.4
AP_01	6.3	97	33.1	96.8
AR_01	16.7	98.6	40.8	98.75

Grade thresholds were selected from log-probability plots at the 94th to 99th percentiles to limit the influence of high-grade outliers. No thresholds were applied to SR_01, NRA_01 and NRA_02. The metal removed by capping is shown in Section 5.5; the 64% reduction in gold metal in RR_01.

5.7 GRADE ESTIMATION

Gold and silver were estimated by ordinary kriging using pairwise relative variogram models for AGM_01, AGM_02, AE_01, AP_01 and AR_01. The AGM_01 model (rotated to local orientations) was applied to AGM_04, PTM_01, SR_01 and RR_01, and the AGM_02 model to AGM_03. RR_02, NRA_01 and NRA_02 were estimated by inverse distance as there was not sufficient data to model a meaningful variogram.

Table 5-5 Gold variogram models (pairwise relative)

Domain (Au)	Nugget	C1 / range (m)	C2 / range (m)	Ranges major × semi × minor (m)
AGM_01 (also AGM_04, PTM_01, SR_01, RR_01)	0.25	0.78 / 50	1.20 / 100	100 × 65 × 10
AGM_02 (also AGM_03)	0.204	0.403 / 60	0.339 / 115	115 × 105 × 20
AE_01	0.18	0.45 / 50	0.42 / 175	175 × 65 × 9
AP_01	0.185	0.325 / 105	0.325 / 360	360 × 70 × 3.5
AR_01	0.24	0.64 / 65	0.61 / 105	105 × 80 × 12




Figure 5-6 Variogram Au for each main domain

5.8 BLOCK MODEL DEFINITION

Block models were constructed in Leapfrog Geo with parent blocks of 10 m (east) × 10 m (north) × 5 m (RL), sub-blocked to a minimum of 2.5 m × 2.5 m × 1.25 m at domain boundaries, with no rotation. Regularised models of 2.5 m × 2.5 m × 1.25 m blocks were also exported for each prospect. Block attributes include domain (WFNAME), capped Au and Ag grades, kriging variance, kriging efficiency, slope of regression, search pass, number of composites and drill holes, average sample distance, prospect, density and resource category. Of the 183,138 blocks, 137 (about 2,812 m³ in AGM_01, PTM_01 and SR_01) were not estimated and are excluded from the Mineral Resource.

5.9 NEIGHBOURHOOD DEFINITION

Table 5-6 Search neighbourhoods

Domain	Search radius, pass 1 / 2 (/ 3) (m)
AGM_01, SR_01	100 / 350
AGM_04, RR_01	100 / 350 / 400
AGM_02, AGM_03	115 / 230
PTM_01	- / 350 (pass 2 only recorded)
RR_02, NRA_01, NRA_02	165 / 330
AE_01	175 / 875
AP_01	360 / 720
AR_01	105 / 210

Pass 1 required 4-16 composites from at least two drill holes and pass 2 required 2-16 composites from at least one drill hole, with a maximum of four composites per drill hole. Pass 3 (AGM_04 and RR_01) required 1-16 composites with a maximum of eight per drill hole. A maximum of four composites per sector (four sectors) was applied. Semi-major and minor search ratios follow the variogram anisotropy of each domain.

5.10 MODEL VALIDATION

Block volumes agree with wireframe volumes to within 1% for all domains except NRA_01 (−11%) and NRA_02 (−15%), which should be checked. Global block grades differ from the naive (not declustered) composite means by up to about ±30%. The larger negative differences (AE_01, AGM_01, AR_01 and RR_02) are consistent with drilling being concentrated in higher-grade parts of the veins, but this has not been confirmed by declustering.

Table 5-7 Volume and global grade comparison by domain

Domain	Wireframe volume (Mm³)	Block volume (Mm³)	Volume diff. (%)	Composite Au, capped (g/t)	Block Au (g/t)	Grade diff. (%)
AGM_01	3.721	3.722	+0.0	0.88	0.61	-31
AGM_02	1.245	1.245	+0.0	0.54	0.51	-6
AGM_03	0.639	0.637	-0.2	0.27	0.23	-15
AGM_04	2.019	2.019	+0.0	0.68	0.63	-7
NRA_01	0.449	0.398	-11.4	0.20	0.24	+18
NRA_02	0.132	0.112	-15.6	0.90	0.83	-8
PTM_01	0.247	0.247	-0.1	0.41	0.52	+27
RR_01	0.712	0.712	+0.0	0.38	0.47	+22
RR_02	0.356	0.356	+0.1	0.54	0.38	-29
SR_01	0.033	0.033	-0.2	0.46	0.46	-2
AE_01	0.521	0.518	-0.5	1.19	0.82	-31
AP_01	0.336	0.335	-0.3	0.67	0.74	+11
AR_01	1.337	1.337	+0.0	1.04	0.73	-30




Figure 5-7 Block Model Au Visual Validation




Figure 5-8 Block Model Ag Visual Validation




Figure 5-9 Swath-plot Au in Easting Direction




Figure 5-10 Swath-plot Au in Northing Direction




Figure 5-11 Swath-plot Au in Elevation Direction

6. ESTIMATION OF RESOURCE

6.1 DATABASE INTEGRITY

Collar, survey, assay, geology and density tables were validated for duplicate records, overlapping or missing intervals, intervals beyond hole depth and missing surveys. Holes APD015, RRD005, RRD010 and RRD013 have no assays, and gold results are missing for parts of APD006 and APD007; these intervals are treated as unsampled. Collars were surveyed by RTK GPS, except for eight holes located by tape and compass.

6.2 SPECIFIC GRAVITY

Bulk density was measured on 2,080 wax-coated core billets by water immersion (February 2023 - July 2024; 107 holes), giving a mean of 2.43 t/m³ after exclusion of outliers. Density decreases with oxidation (fresh 2.44 t/m³; strongly oxidised 2.22 t/m³).

Table 6-1 Bulk density

Prospect	Measurements	Mean (t/m³)	Mineralised mean (t/m³)	Value applied (t/m³)
Rek Rinti	1,584	2.44	2.42	2.46
Aloe Eumpeuk	224	2.43	2.33	2.40
Anak Perak	67	2.36	-	2.42
Aloe Rek	200	2.34	2.22	2.46

The applied densities are the means of the density measurements selected for each prospect (Rek Rinti 502, Aloe Eumpeuk 82 and Anak Perak 24 measurements) and are within 1-3% of the measured means for mineralised material at Rek Rinti and Aloe Eumpeuk. Aloe Rek was assigned the Rek Rinti value, which is 5% above the mean of the Aloe Rek measurements and 11% above the mean of mineralised Aloe Rek samples; a prospect-specific value should be considered. Measurements at Anak Perak are limited to five holes.

6.3 METALLURGY

Metallurgical test work was carried out by PT Geoservices, Cikarang, in three programmes: diagnostic and cyanide leach tests on three composites from Aloe Eumpeuk and Rek Rinti; gravity and cyanide leach tests on high-grade and low-grade composites; and coarse bottle-roll tests on RRD004 material. The testwork was designed and supervised by FEG metallurgical consultant Dr. Mark Steemson.

Table 6-2 Summary of metallurgical test results

Test	Composites (head Au / Ag g/t)	Size	Au recovery (%)	Ag recovery (%)	NaCN (kg/t)
Diagnostic leach	Woyla_1-3: 1.24-2.58 / 91-134	P95 75 µm	87.2-93.1 (avg 90.6)	85.0-87.9 (avg 86.3)	-
Whole-ore cyanide leach, 72 h	HG01 3.83 / 66; LG01 0.99 / 17	P80 75 µm	93 / 92	81 / 79	4.9 / 4.7
Gravity-recoverable gold	HG01 / LG01	to P50 75 µm	47 / 45	13 / 11	-
Gravity + leach of tails	HG01 / LG01	P80 75 µm	94.5 / 91.4	≈83 / ≈72 (calc.)	4.9 / 4.6
Coarse bottle roll	MET_01-03: 1.52-2.00 / 71-111	P100 12.5 mm	24.5-50.1	18.0-51.3	1.0-1.8

Based on current metallurgical samples tested from Rek Rinti, the mineralization is amenable to conventional gravity and cyanide leach processing, with 92-93% gold and 79-81% silver extraction at a grind of P80 75 µm and 45-47% gravity-recoverable gold. Gravity concentration followed by leaching of the gravity tailings gave a similar overall gold recovery (91.4-94.5%) to direct leaching, and no visible gold or electrum was observed in the gravity concentrates. Cyanide consumption is high (4.7-4.9 kg/t NaCN) due to the high silver content and cyanide-soluble copper, and cyanide recovery may be required. Coarse-crush (heap leach) recoveries are low.

A gold recovery of 90% and silver recovery of 80% are used in the cut-off grade calculation. Recoveries for Aloe Rek and Anak Perak are assumed to be similar to Rek Rinti & Aloe Eumpeuk. No metallurgical test work has been carried out on Aloe Rek or Anak Perak material or on oxidised material.

6.4 CUT-OFF GRADE

Pit optimisation and resource reporting are based on the gold equivalent (AuEq) grade, calculated as AuEq = Au + 0.015 × Ag. The conversion factor of 0.015 reflects an Ag:Au recovery-adjusted value ratio of approximately 67:1, based on an assumed gold price of US$3,500 per troy ounce and a silver price of US$59.06 per troy ounce, together with assumed metallurgical recoveries of 90% for gold and 80% for silver (Section 6.3). Accordingly, silver revenue is incorporated into the pit optimisation and cut-off grade through the AuEq calculation.

A break-even cut-off grade was calculated as:

Cut-off grade (g/t AuEq) = [mining cost + processing cost + G&A cost] ÷ [gold price × recovery ÷ 31.1035]

Table 6-3 Break-even cut-off grade by gold price

Gold price	Break-even cut-off (g/t AuEq)
US$2,600/oz	0.20
US$3,000/oz	0.17
US$3,500/oz	0.15
US$3,900/oz	0.13

Using a mining cost of US$2.00/t, processing cost of US$10.00/t, G&A cost of US$3.00/t and recovery of 90%, a gold price of US$3,500/oz gives a break-even cut-off grade of 0.15 g/t AuEq. This cut-off has been adopted for pit optimisation and resource reporting.

Table 6-4 Woyla Pit Optimization Parameter

Items	Value	Unit
Commodity Price	3,500	$/oz
Recovery Au	90.0	%
Mining Cost	2.0	$/t
Processing Cost	10.0	$/t
GA Cost	3.0	$/t
Break Even COG	0.15	g/t

Costs are based on typical open-pit gold operations in Indonesia (FEG, 2026) and are considered reasonable for resource-stage assumptions. The gold price of US$3,500/oz is approximately 15% below the spot price at the time of reporting (about US$4,100/oz, September 2026) and is considered reasonable for the demonstration of RPEEE. Royalty, refining charges and mining dilution are not included in the optimisation; the discount to spot price is considered sufficient to accommodate these costs.

6.5 REASONABLE PROSPECTS FOR EVENTUAL ECONOMIC EXTRACTION

All reports of Mineral Resources must satisfy the requirement that there are reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction (RPEEE), regardless of classification. The limits considered are summarised below.

Table 6-5 Limits of reasonable prospects

Category	Limit	Discussion
Hard limit	CoW boundary	All Mineral Resources lie within the CoW.
Hard limit	Geological model	Grades are estimated and reported only within interpreted mineralisation domains.
Economic limit	Cut-off grade	Mineral Resources are reported above a break-even cut-off grade of 0.15 g/t AuEq (Section 6.4).
Technical limit	Mining method and depth	Open-pit mining has been assumed due to the absence of sufficient geotechnical data to support an alternative mining method assessment.

Open-pit extraction is assumed for Mineral Resources. At current gold prices (about US$4,100/oz, September 2026), the break-even cut-off grade is approximately 0.13 g/t AuEq, so the adopted reporting cut-off of 0.15 g/t AuEq is above break-even. The block models extend to approximately 250 m below surface, whereas the RPEEE pit shells extend to depths of approximately 100 m at Anak Perak, and 150 m at Rek Rinti, Aloe Eumpeuk, and Aloe Rek. Sensitivity runs at a higher gold price (US$3,600/oz) changed the contained AuEq ounces within the pit shells by less than 1%, with no significant change in pit shell depth. Mineralisation below the RPEEE pit shells is therefore considered to have potential for future extraction.

Table 6-6 Resources Estimation Table Limited by RPEEE PIT Optimization, cog 0.15 g/t AuEq

Prospect	Classification	Tonnes (Mt)	Au (g/t)	Ag (g/t)	AuEq (g/t)	Au (koz)	Ag (Moz)	AuEq (Koz)
Rek Rinti–Agam	Indicated	4.4	0.64	9.4	0.78	90	1.33	110
	Inferred	12.2	0.64	11.7	0.82	253	4.60	322
	Total	**16.6**	**0.64**	**11.1**	**0.81**	**343**	**5.93**	**432**
Aloe Rek	Indicated	0.3	2.02	7.0	2.12	19	0.07	20
	Inferred	1.6	0.89	4.9	0.97	47	0.26	51
	Total	**1.9**	**1.06**	**5.2**	**1.14**	**66**	**0.33**	**71**
Aloe Eumpeuk	Indicated	0.2	1.05	37.6	1.62	8	0.29	12
	Inferred	0.3	1.59	68.4	2.62	14	0.59	22
	Total	**0.5**	**1.34**	**53.9**	**2.15**	**22**	**0.88**	**34**
Anak Perak	Indicated	0.2	1.25	6.9	1.36	8	0.04	8
	Inferred	0.1	0.83	7.1	0.94	3	0.03	3
	Total	**0.3**	**1.10**	**7.0**	**1.21**	**11**	**0.07**	**11**
Total	Indicated	5.1	0.76	10.5	0.92	125	1.73	151
	Inferred	14.3	0.69	11.9	0.87	316	5.47	398
	Total	**19.4**	**0.71**	**11.6**	**0.88**	**441**	**7.20**	**549**

FEG generated optimised pit shells on the block models for Rek Rinti–Agam, Aloe Rek, Aloe Eumpeuk and Anak Perak at a gold price of US$3,500/oz, with 45° overall slopes and 90% recovery. Blocks above 0.15 g/t AuEq within these shells total approximately 19.4 Mt at 0.88 g/t AuEq for 549 koz AuEq.




Figure 6-1 Optimiser and section PIT Agam-Rek Rinti Prospect




Figure 6-2 Optimiser and section PIT Aloe-Eumpeuk Prospect




Figure 6-3 Optimiser and section PIT Aloe-Rek Prospect




Figure 6-4 Optimiser and section PIT Anak Perak Prospect

6.5.1 Environmental and Permission Issues

Indonesia divides forests into strictly regulated Protected Forests (HL) and commercially driven Production Forests (HP). Mining is allowed within HP or Limited Production (HPT) zones, provided operators engage relevant stakeholders and secure an IPPKH permit for temporary land use.

As shown in the figure below, the WAM Exploration CoW area comprises approximately 88% protected forest (HL) and 12% non-forest area (APL). All Woyla prospect blocks are located within HL zones. Open-pit extraction of the Mineral Resource will therefore require a change of forest function of the relevant areas to Production Forest. A desktop study was completed by Bogor Agricultural University. The conclusion confirmed by the Ministry of Forestry that 15,425.09 ha (63.75%) of the PT WAM Contract of Work area previously classified as Protected Forest (HL) may be proposed for reclassification as Production Forest (HP).

The requirement to reclassify the relevant areas of Protected Forest has been considered in assessing reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction (RPEEE). The desktop study undertaken by Bogor Agricultural University and the Ministry of Forestry's confirmation that areas within the CoW may be proposed for reclassification provide a basis for considering that the required reclassification could be achieved. Approval remains uncertain and represents a material permitting risk.




Figure 6-5 Forest Area Map

6.5.2 Social and Government Factors

CoW provides for a production (operation) period of 30 years from the start of production, extendable by two further 10-year periods, subject to approval. Conversion to the operation stage will require the exploration stage to be extended and completed. The nearest communities are around Geumpang, and artisanal mining is present at Rek Rinti.

All 9 prospect blocks within the Woyla Project are situated within protected forest areas and would be downgraded to production forest. Consequently, the project will require the issuance of PPKH (Forest

Area Use Approval) prior to the commencement of any mining operations, in accordance with prevailing regulatory requirements.

6.5.3 Marketing Factors

No marketing factors were identified that would affect the Resource estimate, as market parameters were already accounted for in determining the gold cut-off grade.

6.6 ACCURACY AND PRECISION OF RESOURCE ESTIMATES

Accuracy refers to how close an estimate is to the true value, and precision to the repeatability of the estimate. As exploration advances from early stage through Inferred, Indicated and Measured Resources, confidence in the tonnage and grade increases. The ranges in Table 6-7 are indicative only.

Table 6-7 Confidence for resource and reserve estimates

Classification	Indicative estimate range (90% confidence)
Proved / Probable Ore Reserves	±5 to 10%
Measured Resources	±10 to 20%
Indicated Resources	±30 to 50%
Inferred Resources	±50 to 100%
Exploration Targets	+100%

The Woyla Mineral Resource is a global estimate with confidence consistent with the Indicated and Inferred classifications. No production data is available for reconciliation.

It is the opinion of the Competent Person that artisanal mining has not had a material resource depreciation impact at the 4 prospect for which mineral resources have been estimated in this report.

6.7 RESOURCE CLASSIFICATION

Mineral Resources have been classified as Indicated and Inferred in accordance with the JORC Code (2012), considering drill-hole spacing, confidence in the geological interpretation and continuity of mineralisation, the quality and quantity of sample data, and the quality of the block estimates. No Measured Mineral Resources have been estimated.

Classification was applied using three-dimensional solids digitized around areas of consistent drill spacing and geological confidence, which were then used to assign the classification to the block model. This approach avoids the "spotted dog" effect of isolated blocks of differing classification that can result from automated block-by-block assignment. The criteria applied are:

- Indicated: areas drilled at a nominal spacing of approximately 40 m, with demonstrated geological and grade continuity, estimated by ordinary kriging in the first or second search pass, and predominantly informed by two or more drill holes.
- Inferred: estimated blocks outside the Indicated areas within domains supported by at least two drill holes, including all blocks estimated by inverse distance weighting.

Indicated blocks have a median average sample distance of 41 m and a median slope of regression of 0.49, and 74% were estimated in the first search pass. Inferred blocks have a median average sample distance of 109 m, and 72% were estimated in the second search pass.

Within the RPEEE pit shells and above 0.15 g/t AuEq, Indicated Mineral Resources account for 26% of tonnes and 27% of contained AuEq, with 86% of Indicated tonnes at Rek Rinti–Agam. The remaining Mineral Resources are classified as Inferred.

The Competent Person considers that the classification appropriately reflects the confidence in the Mineral Resource estimate.




Figure 6-6 Mineral Resource classification of the block models by prospect

6.8 RESOURCE TONNAGE BY CLASSIFICATION

The Mineral Resource totals **19.4 Mt at 0.71 g/t Au and 11.6 g/t Ag (0.88 g/t AuEq) for 441 koz Au and 7.2 Moz Ag (549 koz AuEq)**, comprising Indicated Mineral Resources of 5.1 Mt at 0.76 g/t Au and 10.5 g/t Ag (0.92 g/t AuEq) for 125 koz Au and 1.7 Moz Ag (151 koz AuEq), and Inferred Mineral Resources of 14.3 Mt at 0.69 g/t Au and 11.9 g/t Ag (0.87 g/t AuEq) for 316 koz Au and 5.5 Moz Ag (398 koz AuEq).

Table 6-8 Woyla Mineral Resource Estimate

Prospect	Classification	Tonnes (Mt)	Au (g/t)	Ag (g/t)	AuEq (g/t)	Au (koz)	Ag (Moz)	AuEq (Koz)
Rek Rinti–Agam	Indicated	4.4	0.64	9.4	0.78	90	1.33	110
	Inferred	12.2	0.64	11.7	0.82	253	4.60	322
	Total	**16.6**	**0.64**	**11.1**	**0.81**	**343**	**5.93**	**432**
Aloe Rek	Indicated	0.3	2.02	7.0	2.12	19	0.07	20
	Inferred	1.6	0.89	4.9	0.97	47	0.26	51
	Total	**1.9**	**1.06**	**5.2**	**1.14**	**66**	**0.33**	**71**
Aloe Eumpeuk	Indicated	0.2	1.05	37.6	1.62	8	0.29	12
	Inferred	0.3	1.59	68.4	2.62	14	0.59	22
	Total	**0.5**	**1.34**	**53.9**	**2.15**	**22**	**0.88**	**34**
Anak Perak	Indicated	0.2	1.25	6.9	1.36	8	0.04	8
	Inferred	0.1	0.83	7.1	0.94	3	0.03	3
	Total	**0.3**	**1.10**	**7.0**	**1.21**	**11**	**0.07**	**11**
Total	Indicated	5.1	0.76	10.5	0.92	125	1.73	151
	Inferred	14.3	0.69	11.9	0.87	316	5.47	398
	Total	**19.4**	**0.71**	**11.6**	**0.88**	**441**	**7.20**	**549**

Mineral Resources are reported in situ, within optimised pit shells above a cut-off grade of 0.15 g/t AuEq. Gold equivalent (AuEq) values are calculated as follows: AuEq oz = Au oz + (Ag oz × 0.015). The conversion factor of 0.015 reflects an Ag:Au recovery-adjusted value ratio of approximately 67:1, based on an assumed gold price of US$3,500 per troy ounce and a silver price of US$59.06 per troy ounce, together with assumed metallurgical recoveries of 90% for gold and 80% for silver (Section 6.3). Tonnes, grades and contained metal are rounded to two significant figures; totals may not add due to rounding. Mineral Resources are not Ore Reserves and do not have demonstrated economic viability.

Table 6-9 Grade–tonnage sensitivity of the Mineral Resource (Indicated + Inferred)

Cut-off (g/t AuEq)	Tonnes (Mt)	Au (g/t)	Ag (g/t)	AuEq (g/t)	Au (koz)	Ag (Moz)	AuEq (koz)	Indicated AuEq (koz)	Inferred AuEq (koz)
0.10	20.1	0.70	11.2	0.85	443	7.23	552	152	400
0.15	19.4	0.71	11.6	0.88	441	7.2	549	151	398
0.20	18.6	0.73	12.0	0.91	437	7.15	544	149	395
0.25	17.6	0.76	12.5	0.95	431	7.08	537	146	391
0.30	16.8	0.79	13.0	0.98	425	7.01	530	143	387
0.35	15.7	0.82	13.6	1.03	416	6.9	519	140	379
0.40	14.7	0.86	14.3	1.07	405	6.76	506	137	370
0.45	13.7	0.89	15.0	1.12	394	6.63	493	132	361
0.50	12.9	0.92	15.6	1.16	383	6.49	481	128	353
0.55	12.0	0.96	16.3	1.20	371	6.32	466	125	342
0.60	11.3	0.99	17.0	1.24	360	6.17	453	121	332
0.65	10.7	1.02	17.5	1.28	350	6.01	440	117	323
0.70	10.1	1.04	18.0	1.31	340	5.87	428	114	314
0.75	9.6	1.07	18.5	1.35	330	5.71	416	110	305
0.80	9.0	1.10	19.0	1.39	318	5.5	400	107	294

Cut-off (g/t AuEq)	Tonnes (Mt)	Au (g/t)	Ag (g/t)	AuEq (g/t)	Au (koz)	Ag (Moz)	AuEq (koz)	Indicated AuEq (koz)	Inferred AuEq (koz)
0.85	8.3	1.13	19.7	1.43	304	5.29	383	104	279
0.90	6.5	1.26	22.2	1.59	263	4.64	332	101	231
0.95	5.9	1.32	22.7	1.66	249	4.28	313	99	215
1.00	5.2	1.40	23.3	1.75	235	3.89	293	96	197
1.05	4.9	1.44	23.8	1.80	227	3.74	283	94	189
1.10	4.6	1.48	24.3	1.84	219	3.61	273	91	182
1.15	4.1	1.54	25.4	1.92	205	3.39	256	88	168
1.20	3.8	1.59	26.3	1.98	195	3.23	244	86	158




Figure 6-7 Grade–tonnage curves by prospect and classification

7. JORC STATEMENT

This Mineral Resource for the Woyla Project has been, reviewed and reported by Michael Corey, a Competent Person according to the requirements of the 2012 JORC Code. The estimate complies with the requirements of the JORC Code, including the following:

- The Mineral Resource Estimate is current as of 9 November 2026.
- The acquisition of geological data from exploration activities has been conducted professionally and accurately in accordance with the principles and definitions of the 2012 JORC Code. The sampling and logging procedures during the drilling program have been conducted under supervision.


Michael Corey is a member of the Professional Geoscientists of Ontario, Canada and has sufficient experience relevant to the style of mineralisation and type of deposit under consideration to qualify as a Competent Person as defined in the 2012 JORC Code. Michael Corey consents to the inclusion of this Mineral Resource Report in documents disclosed by the Company in the form and context in which it appears.

The Woyla Resource Estimate was prepared by Pratama Abimanyu (BE, Geology). Pratama has over 15 years of experience in mineral exploration and mining, specializing in 3D geological modelling, mineral resource estimation, geophysical surveys, and integrated geoscience data analysis. Experienced across porphyry, epithermal, sediment-hosted and nickel laterite deposits, from early-stage exploration to resource definition and mine-site geology.

The metallurgical text was checked as part of peer review process. Peer review was undertaken by Dr Mark Steemson who is a Member of the Australasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy. He has sufficient experience, which is relevant to the mineral processing under consideration.

Mr Michael Corey consents to the inclusion of this Mineral Resource Report in documents disclosed by the Company to third parties in the form in which it appears. This Mineral Resource Report may only be presented in its entirety. Extraction of selected text from this report is only permitted with the written consent of PT Woyla Aceh Minerals and Far East Gold.

Yours sincerely,



Michael Corey

APPENDIX A - CONTRIBUTORS TO REPORT

Michael Corey – Professional Geoscientist

Qualifications:	BE (Geology), P.Geo, APGO
Contribution:	Peer review, Competent Person
Experience:	Michael has over 35 years' experience in international mineral exploration, of which 20 years has been in Southeast Asia. His focus has been on epithermal Au-Ag and porphyry Cu deposits. Michael has designed and managed exploration programs globally on behalf of major and junior companies and supervised projects from grassroots to feasibility.

Pratama Abimanyu – Senior Resource Geologist

Qualifications:	BE (Geology)
Contribution:	Resource calculation, Geological Modelling
Experience:	Pratama has over 15 years of experience in mineral exploration and mining, specializing in 3D geological modelling, mineral resource estimation, geophysical surveys, and integrated geoscience data analysis. Experienced across porphyry, epithermal, sediment-hosted and nickel laterite deposits, from early-stage exploration to resource definition and mine-site geology.

Mark Steemson – Principal Mineral Processing Engineer

Qualifications:	BE (Chemical Engineering), MBA, PhD, RPE, MAusIMM
Contribution:	Peer review
Experience:	Mark has 34 years of experience in process development and engineering, holding senior roles with Solway Group, J Resources, SNC-Lavalin, Ausenco, Aker Kvaerner, Weda Bay Minerals and MIM Holdings. His expertise spans nickel, copper, lead-zinc, magnesium and gold, including the development of processing routes for four nickel laterite projects, several gold mines and patented bioleaching processes. He has extensive experience in feasibility studies, plant design, engineering, commissioning and technical due diligence across multiple commodities.

APPENDIX B - 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 completed 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 drill core was digitally photographed and logged by project geologists. Core with any potential for mineralisation was marked up for sampling and dispatched to an analytical laboratory for geochemical analysis. Only obvious non-mineralised core was not sampled. • Half core was selected for geochemical analysis. • Half diamond core sampled at 0.17-1.83 m (median 1.0 m) intervals selected on geological boundaries; 9,715 samples over 8,293 m. • All half-core samples were packed into woven polysacks by experienced site personnel and air freighted to the PT Geoservices, Cikarang, West Java, Indonesia. • All sample preparation and assays were undertaken by the independent PT Geoservices Laboratory, Cikarang, West Java, Indonesia. • Gold analyses of all drill core samples were by fire assay with atomic absorption spectrometry (AAS) finish of a 50 g charge (30 g until January 2023), with a detection limit of 0.005 g/t Au (0.01 g/t Au for the 30 g charge). • For the determination of silver and other elements with Aqua regia digest, ICP-OES (Ag detection limit 0.5 ppm); ore-grade AAS above 100 ppm Ag; Cu, Pb, Zn, As, Sb, Mo, Bi, Ba.
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).	• Triple tube diamond core drilling - fully drilled with a diamond bit without RC pre-collar. • Diamond core (PQ from surface to a median 45 m, then HQ). • Downhole surveys were recorded at 10 m, and thereafter at 40-50 m intervals to the end of hole, yielding 2-9 stations per hole (median 5). Surveys were acquired using a Reflex instrument in 2022 and an Axis instrument in 2023. • Core orientation was measured using a digital down-hole orientation tool (Reflex 2022, Axis 2023) to assist in orienting structures. • Core was fitted together and marked up for sampling by a geologist, and where loose fragments were seen core was wrapped in masking tape before

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		the core was sawn in half.
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.	• All core sample recovery was recorded in logging sheets and recovery results were assessed by project geologists. • Core recovery averages 92.7% overall and 92.2% in samples grading ≥0.3 g/t Au. • Lower recovery is associated with higher grades in broken vein zones, and cavities from artisanal workings are recorded at Rek Rinti; a bias in grade in these zones cannot be excluded.
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.	• All drill holes were logged by geologists. • All logging data recorded intervals from and to, including lithology, mineralisation, alteration, sulphides cited, detailed structure, and geotechnical characteristics. • All core was photographed. • All samples that were identified as having any potential mineralisation were assayed.
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.	• Core samples were logged and all intervals for analysis were marked up by WAM geologists, mostly at 1 metre intervals. • Core samples for analyses were cut in half and collected by experienced WAM personnel, preparation at PT Geoservices: crush 95% passing 3 mm, pulverise 95% passing 75 µm. • Half core was sampled at intervals of 0.17-1.83 m (median 1.0 m), guided by geology. A total of 9,715 samples were collected over 8,293 m. • Selected quarter core samples were assayed for quality assurance and quality control analysis. Field duplicates at 4.4%. • Sample sizes are considered appropriate for the style of mineralization.
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.	• All samples were dispatched to an independent laboratory - PT Geoservices, Cikarang, West Java, Indonesia. • Au by 30 g (to January 2023) and 50 g fire assay with AAS finish; Ag and multi-elements by aqua regia ICP-OES/AAS. CRMs (4.5%), blanks (4.4%), field duplicates (4.4%) and Intertek umpire checks. Accuracy and contamination acceptable; field-duplicate precision moderate to poor. • Analysis by Geoservices of replicate assays and duplicate pulp check assays indicate acceptable levels of accuracy and precision.
	• The verification of significant intersections by either independent or	• Umpire checks at Intertek (70 pulps).

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Verification of sampling and assaying	alternative company personnel. • The use of twinned holes. • Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols. • Discuss any adjustment to assay data.	• No twin holes. • Reported Au is the average of primary, replicate and laboratory duplicate assays.
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.	• Collars surveyed by RTK GPS (125 drill holes) and tape and compass (8 drill holes); • Downhole surveys were recorded at 10 m, and thereafter at 40-50 m intervals to the end of hole using a Reflex and an Axis instrument. • Topographic data for the Rek Rinti - Aloe Eumpeuk to Aloe Rek prospects were derived from a LiDAR while the Anak Perak prospect was derived from a Tape and Compass survey tied to drill-hole collar points established by the RTK survey. • The grid system used is Universal Transverse Mercator (WGS 84) UTM Zone 47, Northern Hemisphere.
Data spacing and distribution	• Data spacing for reporting of Exploration Results. • Whether the data spacing and distribution is sufficient to establish the degree of geological and grade continuity appropriate for the Mineral Resource and Ore Reserve estimation procedure(s) and classifications applied. • Whether sample compositing has been applied.	• Drill intercepts typically 25-55 m apart on the main veins, wider on the margins. • Sufficient to establish geological and grade continuity for Indicated Mineral Resources in the more closely drilled parts of the main veins and for Inferred Mineral Resources elsewhere. • Samples are not composited for analysis. Down-hole compositing is applied for Mineral Resource estimation.
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 sections are oriented perpendicular to the main strike of steep dipping vein structures. • Drill azimuths of about 135° and 315° at Rek Rinti, with dips of −45° to −86°. For Anak Perak, Aloe Rek and Aloe Eumpeuk drill azimuth about 270° and 90° with dips of −45° to −86°. • Most holes were drilled on section. • The orientation of the drilling is considered adequate for an unbiased assessment of the deposit with respect to interpreted structures and control on mineralisation.
Sample security	• The measures taken to ensure sample security.	• All drill core samples were packed on-site into polysacks by experienced WAM personnel and air freighted to the PT Geoservices, Cikarang, West Java, Indonesia. • Samples bagged and dispatched to the laboratory under dispatch ledgers and submission forms. • All sample preparation and assaying were undertaken at the independent, internationally recognised, PT Geoservices, Cikarang, West Java, Indonesia. • Pulps and coarse rejects were stored at the PT Geoservices, Cikarang, West

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		Java.
Audits or reviews	• The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.	• Sampling procedures and data collection were frequently reviewed particularly during regular site visits and Woyla operating committee meetings. • External high-level review and RPEEE pit optimisation (October 2026) of the preceding estimate; key findings are summarised in Section 6.9.

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 license to operate in the area.	• PT Woyla Aceh Minerals (formerly PT Barrick Mutiara Woyla) holds an Exploration Contract of Work (Kontrak Karya), 6th generation; area code 99PK0019. • Project Area covers 24,260 ha (reduced from 143,600 ha in 1999 and 2002) in Pidie and Aceh Barat Regencies. • FEG holds an indirect 51% interest in PT WAM. • The exploration stage term was 14 October 2022 - 14 October 2024 (ESDM letter B-222/MB.04/DJB.M/2023). PT WAM lodged further applications to extend the exploration stage in 2025 and 2026, and the extension is being processed by the Directorate General of Minerals and Coal, Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources. • All prospects lie within Protected Forest (Hutan Lindung), where open-pit mining is not permitted without a change of forest function; this is a known impediment to obtaining a licence to operate (Section 6.5.1).
Exploration done by other parties	• Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.	• Barrick (1995-1998): regional geochemistry; stream, soil, rock, airborne magnetics/radiometrics geophysics, mapping and trenching. • Newcrest (1999-2002): Earn-in; target ranking; withdrew 2003. • No drilling before FEG.
Geology	• Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.	• Woyla project straddles the dextral Sumatran Fault System, which formed through oblique subduction beneath Sundaland and bisects the licence. Basement is the Triassic to Early Cretaceous Woyla Group arc assemblage, "detached into several blocks along the Sumatran Fault System". • The north-south dilational fractures between the Sumatran Fault and a sub-parallel fault as the host of the epithermal veins, and recognised low-sulphidation veins (Aloe Rek, Aloe Eumpeuk, Anak Perak, Rek-Rinti), high-sulphidation alteration (Dolok, Beurieung), weak skarn (Aloe Vera) and porphyry indications (Lower Beurieung, Siganta). • The Woyla mineralisation is classified as low-sulphidation epithermal gold-silver, characterised by banded quartz-adularia veins with ginguro banding, electrum and acanthite, hosted in andesitic volcanic rocks.
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:	• 133 diamond holes (total 20,585m); collar coordinates, RL, azimuth, dip and hole length of all holes are listed in Appendix C. • Significant intercepts for selected holes are tabulated in Section 2.2.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	- 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 - 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.	• Significant intercepts were calculated using a 0.2 g/t Au lower cut-off without top cut, with a maximum of 2 m consecutive internal waste. • No metal equivalent values are reported. • Significant intercepts are tabulated in Section 2.2.
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').	• Holes are generally inclined to intersect the veins at moderate to high angles. • Intercepts in Section 2.2 are reported as down-hole lengths; true widths are not reported (down-hole length, true width not known). Vein true widths are represented in the domain wireframes.
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.	• Maps, sections and tables are listed in the List of Figures and List of Tables of the accompanying JORC Report. Drill collar locations for each deposit are shown in Figure 4 of this announcement, with plan views and cross-sections for each prospect in Section 2.2 of the JORC Report and collar details in Appendix C of the JORC 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.	• Significant intercepts for selected holes are reported in Section 2.2, and collar details of all holes in Appendix C. All drill results within the domains are used in the estimate.
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	• A helicopter-borne magnetic and radiometric survey was conducted across the entire CoW license area, with N-S flight lines spaced 400 m apart. • Photogeological interpretation (Landsat, SPOT, radar, air photos).

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	method of treatment; metallurgical test results; bulk density, groundwater, geotechnical and rock characteristics; potential deleterious or contaminating substances.	• Regional drainage sampling has been completed over the entire remaining Project Area, BLEG, −80# silt, pan-concentrate and rock sampling, auger soils, hand trenches. • IP surveys covered the Anak Perak Prospect with east-west-oriented lines and the area from Rek Rinti to Aloe Rek with NW-SE-oriented lines, both at 200 m line spacing. • Bulk density was measured on 2,080 wax-coated core billets by water immersion (107 holes). • Preliminary Metallurgical test work was carried out by PT Geoservices, Cikarang, in three programmes: diagnostic and cyanide leach tests on three composites from Aloe Eumpeuk and Rek Rinti; gravity and cyanide leach tests on high-grade and low-grade composites; and coarse bottle-roll tests on RRD004 material (Section 6.3).
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.	• Potential future infill and extension drilling could extend and infill known mineralised zones and delineate additional mineralised zones within the Woyla Exploration CoW Project Area. • Potential future work could also include advanced metallurgical testing and geotechnical studies.

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.	• A complete review of the geological database was conducted to assess if the data was suitable to support the estimating and reporting of Gold Resources by a Competent Person according to the 2012 JORC Code. • Database validated for duplicates, overlaps, missing intervals and survey errors; unsampled intervals treated as unsampled.
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.	• Site inspection focused on concession access, infrastructure, and the Anak Perak coreshed. Access roads and infrastructure were generally in good condition. The coreshed required urgent repairs, while other facilities were generally well maintained. Selected drill cores and records were cross-checked against historical photographs and databases, with generally consistent results (June 2022) • Drill core review and verification of the mineralisation types and styles identified by FEG geologists (November 2022, January 2023, June 2023, July 2023).
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.	• Thirteen domains based on logged quartz veining and assays, supported by mapping. Confidence is sufficient for the Indicated and Inferred classifications. • Mineralization at Anak Perak is classified as a low-sulphidation epithermal system. Individual vein widths are variable, with some veins reaching up to 9 m on surface and up to 20 m from drill hole data. • The Rek Rinti Prospect is a low-sulphidation epithermal vein complex comprising at least eight vein zones. Mineralisation has been modelled in ten domains (AGM_01 to AGM_04, RR_01, RR_02, PTM_01 (Pertama), SR_01, NRA_01 and NRA_02), which strike north-east to east and dip at about 60° to southeast. • Aloe Eumpeuk hosts the NNE-trending Mueh and Awai veins, the mineralisation is silver-rich (Ag:Au about 39:1) and is modelled as a single domain (AE_01) dipping steeply east. The mineralization is interpreted as a low-sulphidation epithermal system.Mineralization at the Aloe Rek Prospect is hosted within the Victory Vein, which comprises a complex series of quartz lenses and veinlets that can be traced for more than 1 km along strike within a broad zone of extensively argillic-altered andesite. Mineralisation is modelled as a single domain (AR_01).

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary

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.	• Model Dimensions
		  • Anak Perak: ~ 900 m x 200 m;
		  • Rek Rinti: ~ 1,050 m x 450 m; and
		  • Aloe Eumpeuk: ~ 650 m x 300 m.
		  • Aloe Rek: ~ 450 m x 330 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.
	• 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.
		• FEG interpreted the estimation domains for Woyla based on structural controls, vein type and lithology. This produced 13 domain wireframes across four prospects: Rek Rinti–Agam, Aloe Eumpeuk, Anak Perak and Aloe Rek. The wireframes, together with the drillhole database, were loaded into Leapfrog software for geological modelling, grade estimation and reporting.
		• Checks and validation of the borehole databases against the wireframes have been undertaken to ensure that the wireframes intersected the valuable gold grade. These checks included:
		  • A visual cross-sectional check of borehole sample Au assays against the ore domain.
		  • Conduct a visual inspection of the wireframe extrapolations.
		  • Reporting of the gold grade within the ore domain.
		• Grade estimates used search radii of up to 350-875 m (Section 5.9); Inferred blocks in the Mineral Resource have an average sample distance of about 109 m.
		• The parent block size selected 10m x 10m x 5m (minimum block size 2.5m x 2.5m x 1.25m) were considered appropriate for this style of mineralisation. The assumption of the block size was designed to match the drill spacing.
		• To estimate Au and Ag grades for Woyla, kriging was used for most domains, with the variograms modelled as pair-wise relative variograms. Domains with enough data had their own variograms modelled (AGM_01, AGM_02, AE_01, AP_01 and AR_01). Domains with too little data borrowed a rotated version of a neighbouring model: AGM_04, PTM_01, SR_01 and RR_01 used the AGM_01 model, and AGM_03 used the AGM_02 model.
		• The Inverse Distance Weighting (IDW) method was applied to RR_02, NRA_01 and NRA_02, where the data were not sufficient to model a meaningful variogram.
		• Estimation was constrained by domain wireframes built from the geological interpretation. Each domain was estimated only using composites within it.
		• Estimation used 1 m composites within a four-sector search. Each search allowed a maximum of 16 composites, with no more than 4 per drillhole and 4 per sector.
		• Most domains were estimated using two search passes, with the second

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary

		pass using a larger radius and fewer minimum samples. A third search pass was applied to AGM_04 and RR_01, while PTM_01 was estimated using a single search pass.
		• Au and Ag were estimated independently. No correlation between variables was assumed.
		• No deleterious elements were estimated, as there is insufficient data to support their estimation.
		• No depletion has been applied for artisanal workings.
		• Validation to the model was carried out using three main techniques:
		  • Global statistic of sample assays and model grades.
		  • Swath Plots of sample assays and model grades.
		  • Cross sections depicting boreholes in relation

Moisture	• Whether the tonnages are estimated on a dry basis or with natural moisture, and the method of determination of the moisture content.	Tonnages are estimated on a dry basis (density measured on dried, wax-coated core).
Cut-off parameters	• The basis of the adopted cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied.	To satisfy the requirement for RPEEE, a cut-off grade of 0.15 g/t AuEq is applied within US$3,500/oz optimised pit shells, using a silver price of US$59.06/oz and metallurgical recoveries of 90% for gold and 80% for silver
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.	Open-pit Mineral Resources are reported within US$3,500/oz optimised pit shells, assuming conventional open-pit truck-and-shovel mining with 45° overall pit slopes. No minimum mining width, mining dilution or ore loss has been applied (Sections 6.4 and 6.5).
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.	92-93% Au and 79-81% Ag by gravity and cyanide leach at P80 75 µm on Rek Rinti material; 90% Au and 80% Ag were used in the cut-off grade calculation. Recoveries for Aloe Rek, Anak Perak and oxidised material are assumed to be similar to Rek Rinti and Aloe Eumpeuk.
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	All prospects lie within Protected Forest (Hutan Lindung); open-pit mining requires a change of forest function to Production Forest (Section 6.5.1). This is considered a material risk to the open-pit RPEEE. No waste rock characterisation or tailings storage studies have been

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	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.	undertaken.
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.	Water immersion on wax-coated core (2,080 measurements); 2.46 t/m³ (Rek Rinti–Agam, Aloe Rek), 2.40 t/m³ (Aloe Eumpeuk) and 2.42 t/m³ (Anak Perak) applied. Aloe Rek was assigned the Rek Rinti value, which is 11% above the mean of mineralised Aloe Rek samples; oxidised material is not assigned a separate density, and voids from artisanal workings are not accounted for.
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.	Indicated and Inferred, resource classifications were based on drill spacing, geological continuity, data quality and estimation quality, using manually defined areas (Section 6.7). Appropriate account has been taken of all relevant factors, including the relative confidence in the tonnage and grade estimates, the reliability of the input data (QA/QC results are considered adequate to support the classification), confidence in the continuity of geology and metal values, and the quality, quantity and distribution of the data. Indicated blocks have a median average sample distance of 41 m and Inferred blocks 109 m. No Measured Mineral Resources have been estimated. It is the view of the Competent Person that the resource modeling methodology applied accurately and appropriately reflects the geological characteristics of the deposits and the nature of the mineralisation that occurs therein. The classification appropriately reflects the Competent Person's view of the deposits.
Audits or reviews	• The results of any audits or reviews of Mineral Resource estimates.	An external high-level review and RPEEE pit optimisation (October 2026) of the Woyla resource estimate raised concerns about the mineralisation envelope, grade capping, QA/QC audit and the RR_02 domain; key findings are summarised in Section 4, 5, and 6. These concerns were addressed in the final MRE report.
Discussion of relative accuracy/	• 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	Global estimate with confidence appropriate to the Indicated and Inferred classifications; no production data for reconciliation.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
confidence	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.	

Section 4 Estimation and Reporting of Ore Reserves

(Criteria listed in section 1, and where relevant in sections 2 and 3, also apply to this section.)

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Mineral Resource estimate for conversion to Ore Reserves	• Description of the Mineral Resource estimate used as a basis for the conversion to an Ore Reserve. • Clear statement as to whether the Mineral Resources are reported additional to, or inclusive of, the Ore Reserves.	• Not Applicable
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.	• Not Applicable
Study status	• The type and level of study undertaken to enable Mineral Resources to be converted to Ore • Reserves. • The Code requires that a study to at least Pre-Feasibility Study level has been undertaken to convert Mineral Resources to Ore Reserves. Such studies will have been carried out and will have determined a mine plan that is technically achievable and economically viable, and that material Modifying Factors have been considered.	• Not Applicable
Cut-off parameters	• The basis of the cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied.	• Not Applicable
Mining factors or assumptions	• The method and assumptions used as reported in the Pre-Feasibility or Feasibility Study to convert the Mineral Resource to an Ore Reserve (i.e. either by application of appropriate factors by optimisation or by preliminary or detailed design). • The choice, nature and appropriateness of the selected mining method(s) and other mining parameters including associated design issues such as pre-strip, access, etc. • The assumptions made regarding geotechnical parameters (eg pit slopes, stope sizes, etc), grade control and pre-production drilling. • The major assumptions made and Mineral Resource model used for pit and stope optimisation (if appropriate). • The mining dilution factors used. • The mining recovery factors used. • Any minimum mining widths used. • The manner in which Inferred Mineral Resources are utilised in mining	• Not Applicable

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	studies and the sensitivity of the outcome to their inclusion. • The infrastructure requirements of the selected mining methods.	
Metallurgical factors or assumptions	• The metallurgical process proposed and the appropriateness of that process to the style of mineralisation. • Whether the metallurgical process is well-tested technology or novel in nature. • The nature, amount and representativeness of metallurgical test work undertaken, the nature of the metallurgical domaining applied and the corresponding metallurgical recovery factors applied. • Any assumptions or allowances made for deleterious elements. • The existence of any bulk sample or pilot scale test work and the degree to which such samples are considered representative of the orebody as a whole. • For minerals that are defined by a specification, has the ore Reserve estimation been based on the appropriate mineralogy to meet the specifications?	• Not Applicable
Environmental	• The status of studies of potential environmental impacts of the mining and processing operation. Details of waste rock characterisation and the consideration of potential sites, status of design options considered and, where applicable, the status of approvals for process residue storage and waste dumps should be reported.	• Not Applicable
Infrastructure	• The existence of appropriate infrastructure: availability of land for plant development, power, water, transportation (particularly for bulk commodities), labour, accommodation; or the ease with which the infrastructure can be provided, or accessed.	• Not Applicable
Costs	• The derivation of, or assumptions made, regarding projected capital costs in the study. • The methodology used to estimate operating costs. • Allowances made for the content of deleterious elements. • The derivation of assumptions made of metal or commodity price(s), for the principal minerals and co- products. • The source of exchange rates used in the study. • Derivation of transportation charges. • The basis for forecasting or source of treatment and refining charges, penalties for failure to meet specification, etc. • The allowances made for royalties payable, both Government and private.	• Not Applicable
	• The derivation of, or assumptions made regarding revenue factors	• Not Applicable

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Revenue factors	including head grade, metal or commodity price(s) exchange rates, transportation and treatment charges, penalties, net smelter returns, etc. • The derivation of assumptions made of metal or commodity price(s), for the principal metals, minerals and co-products.	
Market assessment	• The demand, supply and stock situation for the particular commodity, consumption trends and factors likely to affect supply and demand into the future. • A customer and competitor analysis along with the identification of likely market windows for the product. • Price and volume forecasts and the basis for these forecasts. • For industrial minerals the customer specification, testing and acceptance requirements prior to a supply contract.	• Not Applicable
Economic	• The inputs to the economic analysis to produce the net present value (NPV) in the study, the source and confidence of these economic inputs including estimated inflation, discount rate, etc. • NPV ranges and sensitivity to variations in the significant assumptions and inputs.	• Not Applicable
Social	• The status of agreements with key stakeholders and matters leading to social license to operate.	• Not Applicable
Other	• To the extent relevant, the impact of the following on the project and/or on the estimation and classification of the Ore Reserves: • Any identified material naturally occurring risks. • The status of material legal agreements and marketing arrangements. • The status of governmental agreements and approvals critical to the viability of the project, such as mineral tenement status, and government and statutory approvals. There must be reasonable grounds to expect that all necessary Government approvals will be received within the timeframes anticipated in the Pre-Feasibility or Feasibility study. Highlight and discuss the materiality of any unresolved matter that is dependent on a third party on which extraction of the Reserve is contingent.	• Not Applicable
Classification	• The basis for the classification of the Ore Reserves into varying confidence categories. • Whether the result appropriately reflects the Competent Person's view of the deposit. • The proportion of Probable Ore Reserves that have been derived from Measured Mineral Resources (if any).	• Not Applicable
Audits or	• The results of any audits or reviews of Ore Reserve estimates.	• Not Applicable

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
reviews		
Discussion of relative accuracy/ confidence	• Where appropriate a statement of the relative accuracy and confidence level in the Ore Reserve 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 Reserve within stated confidence limits, or, if such an approach is not deemed appropriate, a qualitative discussion of the factors which 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. • Accuracy and confidence discussions should extend to specific discussions of any applied Modifying Factors that may have a material impact on Ore Reserve viability, or for which there are remaining areas of uncertainty at the current study stage. • It is recognised that this may not be possible or appropriate in all circumstances. These statements of relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate should be compared with production data, where available.	• Not Applicable

Section 5 Estimation and Reporting of Diamonds and Other Gemstones

(Criteria listed in other relevant sections also apply to this section. Additional guidelines are available in the 'Guidelines for the Reporting of Diamond Exploration Results' issued by the Diamond Exploration Best Practices Committee established by the Canadian Institute of Mining, Metallurgy and Petroleum.)

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Indicator minerals	• Reports of indicator minerals, such as chemically/physically distinctive garnet, ilmenite, chrome spinel and chrome diopside, should be prepared by a suitably qualified laboratory.	• Not Applicable
Source of diamonds	• Details of the form, shape, size and colour of the diamonds and the nature of the source of diamonds (primary or secondary) including the rock type and geological environment.	• Not Applicable
Sample collection	• Type of sample, whether outcrop, boulders, drill core, reverse circulation drill cuttings, gravel, stream sediment or soil, and purpose (eg large diameter drilling to establish stones per unit of volume or bulk samples to establish stone size distribution). • Sample size, distribution and representivity.	• Not Applicable
Sample treatment	• Type of facility, treatment rate, and accreditation. • Sample size reduction. Bottom screen size, top screen size and re-crush. • Processes (dense media separation, grease, X-ray, hand-sorting, etc). • Process efficiency, tailings auditing and granulometry. • Laboratory used, type of process for micro diamonds and accreditation.	• Not Applicable
Carat	• One fifth (0.2) of a gram (often defined as a metric carat or MC).	• Not Applicable
Sample grade	• Sample grade in this section of Table 1 is used in the context of carats per units of mass, area or volume. • The sample grade above the specified lower cut-off sieve size should be reported as carats per dry metric tonne and/or carats per 100 dry metric tonnes. For alluvial deposits, sample grades quoted in carats per square metre or carats per cubic metre are acceptable if accompanied by a volume to weight basis for calculation. • In addition to general requirements to assess volume and density there is a need to relate stone frequency (stones per cubic metre or tonne) to stone size (carats per stone) to derive sample grade (carats per tonne).	• Not Applicable
	• Complete set of sieve data using a standard progression of sieve sizes per facies. Bulk sampling results, global sample grade per facies. Spatial structure analysis and grade distribution. Stone size and number	• Not Applicable

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Reporting of Exploration Results	distribution. Sample head feed and tailings particle granulometry. • Sample density determination. • Per cent concentrate and undersize per sample. • Sample grade with change in bottom cut-off screen size. • Adjustments made to size distribution for sample plant performance and performance on a commercial scale. • If appropriate or employed, geostatistical techniques applied to model stone size, distribution or frequency from size distribution of exploration diamond samples. • The weight of diamonds may only be omitted from the report when the diamonds are considered too small to be of commercial significance. This lower cut-off size should be stated.	
Grade estimation for reporting Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves	• Description of the sample type and the spatial arrangement of drilling or sampling designed for grade estimation. • The sample crush size and its relationship to that achievable in a commercial treatment plant. • Total number of diamonds greater than the specified and reported lower cut-off sieve size. • Total weight of diamonds greater than the specified and reported lower cut-off sieve size. • The sample grade above the specified lower cut-off sieve size.	• Not Applicable
Value estimation	• Valuations should not be reported for samples of diamonds processed using total liberation method, which is commonly used for processing exploration samples. • To the extent that such information is not deemed commercially sensitive, Public Reports should include: • diamonds quantities by appropriate screen size per facies or depth. • details of parcel valued. • number of stones, carats, lower size cut-off per facies or depth. • The average $/carat and $/tonne value at the selected bottom cut-off should be reported in US Dollars. The value per carat is of critical importance in demonstrating project value. • The basis for the price (eg dealer buying price, dealer selling price, etc). • An assessment of diamond breakage.	• Not Applicable
	• Accredited process audit. • Whether samples were sealed after excavation. • Valuer location, escort, delivery, cleaning losses, reconciliation with	• Not Applicable

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Security and integrity	recorded sample carats and number of stones. • Core samples washed prior to treatment for micro diamonds. • Audit samples treated at alternative facility. • Results of tailings checks. • Recovery of tracer monitors used in sampling and treatment. • Geophysical (logged) density and particle density. • Cross validation of sample weights, wet and dry, with hole volume and density, moisture factor.	
Classification	• In addition to general requirements to assess volume and density there is a need to relate stone frequency (stones per cubic metre or tonne) to stone size (carats per stone) to derive grade (carats per tonne). The elements of uncertainty in these estimates should be considered, and classification developed accordingly.	• Not Applicable

APPENDIX C - DRILL HOLE COLLAR DETAILS

Collar coordinates are in UTM Zone 47N (WGS84). Azimuth and dip are from the collar survey station. Source: FEG drill database (WOY Drill Collar and WOY Drill Survey, September 2024).

Hole ID	Prospect	Easting (m)	Northing (m)	RL (m)	Azimuth (°)	Dip (°)	Depth (m)	Collar survey
AED001	Aloe Eumpeuk	185780.8	525879.2	831.2	267.4	-56.1	51.7	RTK GPS
AED002	Aloe Eumpeuk	185781.9	525879.3	831.1	271.2	-82.6	120.5	RTK GPS
AED003	Aloe Eumpeuk	185906.8	525878.7	805.9	266.0	-75.3	192.0	RTK GPS
AED004	Aloe Eumpeuk	185917.7	525975.1	805.9	268.9	-46.6	153.0	RTK GPS
AED005	Aloe Eumpeuk	185846.7	526177.2	829.4	269.2	-46.0	112.5	RTK GPS
AED006	Aloe Eumpeuk	185848.1	526177.3	829.4	269.3	-78.5	129.0	RTK GPS
AED007	Aloe Eumpeuk	185819.4	525982.3	809.5	269.9	-47.9	136.1	RTK GPS
AED008	Aloe Eumpeuk	185808.5	525936.1	812.0	268.3	-61.5	131.7	RTK GPS
AED009	Aloe Eumpeuk	185809.1	525936.1	812.0	269.7	-78.3	168.0	RTK GPS
AED010	Aloe Eumpeuk	185906.0	525878.8	805.8	268.3	-47.4	183.8	RTK GPS
AED011	Aloe Eumpeuk	185844.5	525825.9	811.6	269.4	-47.0	129.0	RTK GPS
AED012	Aloe Eumpeuk	185845.5	525825.9	811.7	270.0	-69.9	159.1	RTK GPS
AED013	Aloe Eumpeuk	185779.8	525821.4	818.8	268.4	-46.9	69.0	RTK GPS
AED014	Aloe Eumpeuk	185781.0	525821.4	818.8	269.6	-72.1	79.4	RTK GPS
AED015	Aloe Eumpeuk	185757.3	525937.3	831.6	269.5	-47.2	80.0	RTK GPS
AED016	Aloe Eumpeuk	185758.3	525937.2	831.6	270.1	-71.3	90.5	RTK GPS
AED017	Aloe Eumpeuk	185741.5	525984.6	826.8	270.0	-46.8	58.2	RTK GPS
AED018	Aloe Eumpeuk	185742.2	525984.9	826.7	268.5	-81.3	90.5	RTK GPS
AED019	Aloe Eumpeuk	185735.0	526036.5	819.2	270.0	-79.7	145.5	RTK GPS
AED020	Aloe Eumpeuk	185739.8	526036.6	819.1	91.1	-62.4	54.5	RTK GPS
AED021	Aloe Eumpeuk	185745.6	526078.1	809.7	91.1	-56.6	101.0	RTK GPS
AED022	Aloe Eumpeuk	185745.1	526078.2	809.7	91.3	-66.3	149.0	RTK GPS
AED023	Aloe Eumpeuk	185855.1	526135.0	818.6	271.9	-56.1	175.1	RTK GPS
AED024	Aloe Eumpeuk	185821.0	526226.8	824.9	271.7	-52.2	168.2	RTK GPS
AED025	Aloe Eumpeuk	185822.1	526226.9	824.9	269.4	-86.4	50.0	RTK GPS

Hole ID	Prospect	Easting (m)	Northing (m)	RL (m)	Azimuth (°)	Dip (°)	Depth (m)	Collar survey
AED026	Aloe Eumpeuk	185786.1	526026.3	809.6	270.8	-57.4	81.0	RTK GPS
AED027	Aloe Eumpeuk	185809.8	525769.3	802.4	270.5	-51.7	120.0	RTK GPS
AED028	Aloe Eumpeuk	185810.5	525769.3	802.4	269.7	-70.7	142.0	RTK GPS
AED029	Aloe Eumpeuk	185809.6	525717.4	801.9	270.4	-46.4	146.0	RTK GPS
AED030	Aloe Eumpeuk	185820.3	525982.5	809.4	271.4	-72.1	180.5	RTK GPS
ARD001	Aloe Rek	185370.9	523447.3	847.8	271.1	-53.0	170.9	RTK GPS
ARD002	Aloe Rek	185371.3	523447.1	847.8	270.9	-76.7	258.5	RTK GPS
ARD003	Aloe Rek	185340.9	523556.0	866.0	270.1	-75.3	151.8	RTK GPS
ARD004	Aloe Rek	185367.8	523648.1	881.3	270.4	-65.9	191.0	RTK GPS
ARD005	Aloe Rek	185342.8	523349.6	818.4	269.8	-45.3	96.0	RTK GPS
ARD006	Aloe Rek	185271.9	523259.0	822.6	92.1	-55.7	113.8	RTK GPS
ARD007	Aloe Rek	185271.5	523259.0	822.5	93.7	-72.7	150.5	RTK GPS
ARD008	Aloe Rek	185217.9	523504.2	822.2	90.0	-63.1	279.2	RTK GPS
ARD009	Aloe Rek	185269.1	523495.2	843.4	89.4	-45.9	118.5	Tape & Compass
ARD010	Aloe Rek	185268.5	523495.3	843.3	88.7	-61.4	177.3	Tape & Compass
ARD011	Aloe Rek	185270.2	523396.0	817.5	91.0	-45.0	111.0	Tape & Compass
ARD011R	Aloe Rek	185270.1	523396.1	817.5	90.7	-45.7	65.3	Tape & Compass
APD001	Anak Perak	178707.2	529335.5	1076.2	273.7	-46.4	90.0	RTK GPS
APD002	Anak Perak	178707.7	529335.3	1076.1	276.4	-81.7	124.1	RTK GPS
APD003	Anak Perak	178718.6	529150.3	1063.5	267.7	-46.7	80.6	RTK GPS
APD003R	Anak Perak	178719.2	529150.3	1063.4	267.7	-60.0	25.0	RTK GPS
APD004	Anak Perak	178719.8	529150.4	1063.4	270.0	-80.8	140.0	RTK GPS
APD005	Anak Perak	178711.1	529253.8	1074.4	271.4	-50.5	76.2	RTK GPS
APD006	Anak Perak	178712.2	529253.7	1074.5	270.0	-80.0	140.0	RTK GPS
APD007	Anak Perak	178768.4	528993.2	1019.3	268.8	-46.6	145.2	RTK GPS
APD007R	Anak Perak	178769.4	528993.3	1019.3	268.8	-50.0	80.0	RTK GPS
APD008	Anak Perak	178788.5	528889.9	1019.3	271.1	-51.7	142.3	RTK GPS
APD009	Anak Perak	178769.8	528993.3	1019.2	267.9	-81.4	177.4	RTK GPS
APD010	Anak Perak	178789.2	528890.0	1019.4	268.7	-71.1	200.1	RTK GPS
APD011	Anak Perak	178741.7	528812.2	1053.4	269.2	-47.1	97.2	RTK GPS

Hole ID	Prospect	Easting (m)	Northing (m)	RL (m)	Azimuth (°)	Dip (°)	Depth (m)	Collar survey
APD012	Anak Perak	178731.4	528653.2	1051.7	273.7	-44.7	128.7	RTK GPS
APD013	Anak Perak	178742.6	528812.3	1053.4	266.6	-73.6	145.5	RTK GPS
APD014	Anak Perak	178731.9	528653.2	1051.7	272.0	-60.2	158.9	RTK GPS
APD015	Anak Perak	178750.9	528545.8	1012.9	270.0	-45.0	21.8	RTK GPS
APD016	Anak Perak	178856.8	527932.4	955.0	48.0	-45.6	136.1	RTK GPS
APD017	Anak Perak	178779.5	528051.4	996.3	89.8	-52.0	150.0	RTK GPS
APD018	Anak Perak	178915.8	527931.1	967.2	359.0	-49.9	97.7	RTK GPS
APD019	Anak Perak	178915.8	527930.7	967.2	46.6	-46.8	100.5	RTK GPS
APD020	Anak Perak	178811.0	528811.6	1046.9	268.8	-64.4	190.0	RTK GPS
APD021	Anak Perak	178748.3	528853.1	1038.0	270.8	-46.6	80.0	RTK GPS
APD022	Anak Perak	178744.2	528753.3	1025.9	270.9	-46.2	91.5	RTK GPS
APD023	Anak Perak	178650.5	528574.0	1053.7	271.8	-73.4	106.5	RTK GPS
APD024	Anak Perak	178652.7	528574.2	1053.4	87.1	-71.6	128.0	RTK GPS
APD025	Anak Perak	178778.9	528658.4	1039.7	270.6	-62.6	240.0	RTK GPS
APD026	Anak Perak	178694.7	529702.5	1125.7	269.3	-46.9	142.5	RTK GPS
AGM001	Rek Rinti	186895.6	526798.4	732.6	315.2	-61.4	226.5	RTK GPS
AGM002	Rek Rinti	186951.7	526755.6	730.8	314.8	-66.3	285.0	RTK GPS
AGM003	Rek Rinti	186854.7	526833.3	740.1	317.1	-53.3	142.5	RTK GPS
AGM004	Rek Rinti	186829.7	526803.2	756.5	315.8	-46.8	216.2	RTK GPS
AGM005	Rek Rinti	186951.9	526755.2	730.8	314.8	-81.6	303.5	RTK GPS
AGM006	Rek Rinti	186899.6	526868.4	724.5	315.2	-46.1	137.5	RTK GPS
AGM007	Rek Rinti	186830.6	526802.3	756.5	315.5	-69.6	244.5	RTK GPS
AGM008	Rek Rinti	186900.6	526867.6	724.5	312.2	-75.8	159.5	RTK GPS
AGM009	Rek Rinti	186943.5	526825.8	721.0	317.9	-71.2	190.6	RTK GPS
AGM010	Rek Rinti	186838.7	526775.6	756.6	316.6	-80.1	251.0	RTK GPS
AGM011	Rek Rinti	186771.6	526751.5	784.7	316.3	-47.3	205.4	RTK GPS
AGM012	Rek Rinti	186694.8	526682.5	806.8	316.9	-45.7	143.8	RTK GPS
AGM013	Rek Rinti	186858.8	526803.8	743.0	316.4	-59.3	210.0	RTK GPS
AGM014	Rek Rinti	186860.5	526798.9	742.9	10.0	-60.0	160.3	RTK GPS
AGM014R	Rek Rinti	186860.5	526798.7	742.9	7.2	-65.6	125.0	RTK GPS

Hole ID	Prospect	Easting (m)	Northing (m)	RL (m)	Azimuth (°)	Dip (°)	Depth (m)	Collar survey
AGM015	Rek Rinti	186861.4	526797.2	743.0	32.3	-61.8	161.4	RTK GPS
AGM016	Rek Rinti	186860.2	526797.9	742.9	12.0	-70.2	181.9	RTK GPS
AGM017	Rek Rinti	186768.1	526784.7	781.5	331.3	-64.7	255.3	RTK GPS
AGM018	Rek Rinti	186768.2	526784.5	781.5	345.0	-71.4	275.2	RTK GPS
AGM019	Rek Rinti	186768.8	526784.7	781.6	327.8	-72.6	307.6	RTK GPS
RRD001	Rek Rinti	186658.0	526864.0	736.5	315.5	-75.6	228.0	RTK GPS
RRD002	Rek Rinti	186657.7	526864.3	736.5	315.6	-61.0	101.9	RTK GPS
RRD003	Rek Rinti	186656.2	526862.2	736.5	259.9	-46.0	200.6	RTK GPS
RRD004	Rek Rinti	186895.2	526799.6	732.6	314.9	-46.5	165.3	RTK GPS
RRD005	Rek Rinti	186403.2	527425.3	783.2	135.0	-46.2	120.6	RTK GPS
RRD006	Rek Rinti	186386.4	527342.6	777.4	135.7	-45.6	143.5	RTK GPS
RRD006R	Rek Rinti	186386.8	527342.3	777.4	135.1	-50.3	125.0	Tape & Compass
RRD007	Rek Rinti	186896.1	526798.8	732.7	315.3	-71.4	208.7	RTK GPS
RRD008	Rek Rinti	186580.9	527326.6	752.7	316.2	-60.5	117.0	RTK GPS
RRD009	Rek Rinti	186813.6	526704.7	755.2	316.5	-52.2	148.8	RTK GPS
RRD010	Rek Rinti	186582.6	526791.5	755.1	315.0	-45.4	21.5	RTK GPS
RRD011	Rek Rinti	186819.1	526699.4	755.2	134.4	-47.5	172.3	RTK GPS
RRD012	Rek Rinti	186780.9	527009.4	711.3	315.5	-46.8	210.0	RTK GPS
RRD013	Rek Rinti	186945.2	527135.3	695.6	314.2	-46.0	21.0	RTK GPS
RRD014	Rek Rinti	186556.4	526870.4	778.6	271.9	-47.2	151.7	RTK GPS
RRD015	Rek Rinti	186557.3	526869.7	778.6	236.3	-60.9	188.0	RTK GPS
RRD016	Rek Rinti	186558.8	526867.9	778.7	315.2	-61.7	137.0	RTK GPS
RRD017	Rek Rinti	186695.5	526680.3	806.7	314.7	-79.8	156.4	RTK GPS
RRD018	Rek Rinti	186699.4	526676.6	806.8	141.4	-84.3	195.5	RTK GPS
RRD019	Rek Rinti	186665.8	526651.6	820.5	312.2	-46.3	86.2	RTK GPS
RRD020	Rek Rinti	186667.0	526650.6	820.4	315.0	-77.7	83.4	RTK GPS
RRD021	Rek Rinti	186987.7	527097.6	691.8	315.8	-49.5	192.7	RTK GPS
RRD022	Rek Rinti	186913.9	527019.1	694.7	315.4	-46.4	300.6	RTK GPS
RRD023	Rek Rinti	186780.9	527009.0	711.0	313.7	-67.1	342.0	RTK GPS
RRD024	Rek Rinti	186058.1	527158.8	891.7	315.2	-46.1	198.0	RTK GPS

Hole ID	Prospect	Easting (m)	Northing (m)	RL (m)	Azimuth (°)	Dip (°)	Depth (m)	Collar survey
RRD025	Rek Rinti	186152.7	527364.5	851.8	316.5	-45.9	151.0	RTK GPS
RRD026	Rek Rinti	186946.4	526824.8	720.9	46.0	-55.5	190.5	RTK GPS
RRD027	Rek Rinti	186697.3	526678.5	806.8	204.2	-64.2	92.0	RTK GPS
RRD028	Rek Rinti	186698.0	526678.9	806.8	180.3	-71.1	198.0	RTK GPS
RRD029	Rek Rinti	187219.6	526787.5	743.8	358.8	-63.5	210.5	RTK GPS
RRD030	Rek Rinti	186574.8	526773.6	762.1	265.5	-46.7	294.0	RTK GPS
RRD031	Rek Rinti	186574.8	526772.6	762.1	332.1	-80.6	296.0	Tape & Compass
RRD031R	Rek Rinti	186575.0	526772.2	762.1	332.4	-84.8	80.2	Tape & Compass
RRD032	Rek Rinti	186577.0	526773.1	762.1	206.0	-46.7	246.0	Tape & Compass
RRD033	Rek Rinti	186667.4	526647.8	820.4	210.4	-61.7	108.0	RTK GPS
RRD034	Rek Rinti	186668.2	526647.6	820.4	189.6	-65.8	120.3	RTK GPS
RRD034R	Rek Rinti	186668.2	526647.8	820.4	190.9	-67.4	99.4	RTK GPS
RRD035	Rek Rinti	186478.0	526434.5	863.9	1.4	-65.7	220.5	RTK GPS
RRD036	Rek Rinti	186478.9	526435.2	863.8	30.6	-47.4	200.1	RTK GPS
RRD037	Rek Rinti	186425.3	526451.6	861.3	0.3	-46.5	209.8	RTK GPS
RRD038	Rek Rinti	186608.2	526419.1	863.8	0.2	-47.3	199.3	RTK GPS
RRD039	Rek Rinti	186608.3	526417.7	863.9	0.1	-68.2	214.8	RTK GPS
RRD040	Rek Rinti	186849.7	526521.4	815.6	314.8	-60.7	300.2	RTK GPS