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Forward looking statement

These materials prepared by Evolution Mining Limited (or “the Company”) include forward looking statements. Often, but not always, forward looking statements can generally be identified by the use of forward looking words such as “may”, “will”, “expect”, “intend”, “plan”, “estimate”, “anticipate”, “continue”, and “guidance”, or other similar words and may include, without limitation, statements regarding plans, strategies and objectives of management, anticipated production or construction commencement dates and expected costs or production outputs.

Forward looking statements inherently involve known and unknown risks, uncertainties and other factors that may cause the Company’s actual results, performance and achievements to differ materially from any future results, performance or achievements. Relevant factors may include, but are not limited to, changes in commodity prices, foreign exchange fluctuations and general economic conditions, increased costs and demand for production inputs, the speculative nature of exploration and project development, including the risks of obtaining necessary licenses and permits and diminishing quantities or grades of reserves, political and social risks, changes to the regulatory framework within which the Company operates or may in the future operate, environmental conditions including extreme weather conditions, recruitment and retention of personnel, industrial relations issues and litigation.

Forward looking statements are based on the Company and its management’s good faith assumptions relating to the financial, market, regulatory and other relevant environments that will exist and affect the Company’s business and operations in the future. The Company does not give any assurance that the assumptions on which forward looking statements are based will prove to be correct, or that the Company’s business or operations will not be affected in any material manner by these or other factors not foreseen or foreseeable by the Company or management or beyond the Company’s control.

Although the Company attempts and has attempted to identify factors that would cause actual actions, events or results to differ materially from those disclosed in forward looking statements, there may be other factors that could cause actual results, performance, achievements or events not to be as anticipated, estimated or intended, and many events are beyond the reasonable control of the Company. Accordingly, readers are cautioned not to place undue reliance on forward looking statements. Forward looking statements in these materials speak only at the date of issue. Subject to any continuing obligations under applicable law or any relevant stock exchange listing rules, in providing this information the Company does not undertake any obligation to publicly update or revise any of the forward looking statements or to advise of any change in events, conditions or circumstances on which any such statement is based.
Australia’s 2\textsuperscript{nd} largest gold miner

1 \textbf{Cowal (100\%)}
- Gold Reserves 2016 (Moz)\textsuperscript{(1)}: 3.20
- Gold Resources 2016 (Moz)\textsuperscript{(1)}: 5.04
- Reserve Grade 2016 (Au g/t): 0.85
- FY17A Au Production (koz): 263
- FY17A AISC (A$/oz): 833
- FY17 Net Mine Cash flow (A$M): 166

2 \textbf{Mungari (100\%)}
- Gold Reserves 2016 (Moz)\textsuperscript{(1)}: 0.60
- Gold Resources 2016 (Moz)\textsuperscript{(1)}: 2.73
- Reserve Grade 2016 (Au g/t): 2.2
- FY17A Au Production (koz): 144
- FY17A AISC (A$/oz): 1,143
- FY17 Net Mine Cash flow (A$M): 59

3 \textbf{Mt Carlton (100\%)}
- Gold Reserves 2016 (Moz)\textsuperscript{(1)}: 0.73
- Gold Resources 2016 (Moz)\textsuperscript{(1)}: 0.98
- Reserve Grade 2016 (Au g/t): 4.7
- FY17A Au Production (koz): 105
- FY17A AISC (A$/oz): 622
- FY17 Net Mine Cash flow (A$M): 91

4 \textbf{Mt Rawdon (100\%)}
- Gold Reserves 2016 (Moz)\textsuperscript{(1)}: 0.87
- Gold Resources 2016 (Moz)\textsuperscript{(1)}: 1.19
- Reserve Grade 2016 (Au g/t): 0.8
- FY17A Au Production (koz): 101
- FY17A AISC (A$/oz): 873
- FY17 Net Mine Cash flow (A$M): 36

5 \textbf{Cracow (100\%)}
- Gold Reserves 2016 (Moz)\textsuperscript{(1)}: 0.19
- Gold Resources 2016 (Moz)\textsuperscript{(1)}: 0.52
- Reserve Grade 2016 (Au g/t): 5.7
- FY17A Au Production (koz): 89
- FY17A AISC (A$/oz): 1,123
- FY17 Net Mine Cash flow (A$M): 41

6 \textbf{Edna May (100\%)}
- Gold Reserves 2016 (Moz)\textsuperscript{(1)}: 0.43
- Gold Resources 2016 (Moz)\textsuperscript{(1)}: 0.85
- Reserve Grade 2016 (Au g/t): 1.6
- FY17A Au Production (koz): 70
- FY17A AISC (A$/oz): 1,440
- FY17 Net Mine Cash flow (A$M): 15

7 \textbf{Ernest Henry (Evolution economic interest)}
- Reserves 2016\textsuperscript{(1)}: 0.96Moz Au, 182kt Cu
- Resources 2016\textsuperscript{(1)}: 1.73Moz Au, 315kt Cu
- Reserve Grade 2016: 0.50g/t Au, 1.02% Cu
- FY17A Au Production\textsuperscript{(2)} (koz): 60
- FY17A AISC\textsuperscript{(2)} (A$/oz): (361)
- FY17 Net Mine Cash flow\textsuperscript{(2)} (A$M): 82

(1) This information is extracted from the report entitled “Annual Mineral Resources and Ore Reserve Statement” released by Evolution to ASX on 20 April 2017 and is available to view on www.asx.com.au. Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves are depleted to 31 December 2016.
(2) Ernest Henry transaction completed 1 November 2016. Production and costs reflect 8 months of economic interest. Cash flow reflects 7 months of copper sales and 5 months of gold sales. Location bubble size denotes FY17 gold production (annualised for Ernest Henry).
Developing a pipeline of Mineral Resources

- Major footprint in the world-class Kalgoorlie region
  - ~950km² across 346 tenements
  - Resource definition and Discovery programs building momentum
- Strategically located 1.7Mtpa processing plant
- Mungari Regional Resources 1.59Moz gold¹
  - Open-pit resources constrained to ensure quality
- Significant potential to expand production and extend mine life
- 150km of early stage drilling completed in FY17 – similar level planned in FY18

**Opportunities for mine life extension**

- Resource definition pipeline – advancing resources toward production
  - Potential for regional resource expansion
    - Progressing to satellite mining operations
  - Near mine reserve expansion at Frog’s Leg (Mist lode) and White Foil
- Discovering a new high-grade orebody

¹ Resource information is extracted from the report entitled “Annual Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves Statement” released by Evolution to ASX on 20 April 2017 and is available to view on www.asx.com.au. Further information and footnotes on the Mungari Mineral Resource is provided in the appendix of this presentation.
Operational overview

- Residential and long term workforce
- Owner miner Workforce: ~270 employees and ~70 contractors
- Enterprise Agreement approved in June 2017
  - Mine rosters:
  - Underground and mill 7/7 – 4 panel
- Open-pit 7/3/5/6 – 3 panel
- Frog’s Leg currently a one jumbo operation
- Mungari processing plant commissioned in 2014
  - Additional optimisation opportunities
- White Foil open-pit optimised
- Improved understanding of tenement package beginning to yield results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>600km east of Perth, Western Australia, Australia or 20km West of Kalgoorlie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mining method</td>
<td>White Foil: conventional open-pit Frog’s Leg: underground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerals</td>
<td>Gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineralisation type</td>
<td>Quartz and stockwork veining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process method</td>
<td>3 stage crushing-grinding-CIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process capacity</td>
<td>1.7Mtpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery</td>
<td>93 – 94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ore Reserves¹</td>
<td>8.30Mt @ 2.25g/t for 602koz Au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Resources ¹</td>
<td>57.46Mt @ 1.51g/t for 2,783koz Au</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹. See Mungari Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves and footnotes provided in the appendices of this presentation for details on Ore Reserve and Mineral Resource estimates
Site layout
Zero harm

- LTIFR 1.2
- TRIFR 13.3
- Improved safety culture driven by quality field discussions and Safety Assurance programs
- Ongoing focus on continued improvement in performance
- FY17 focus on critical controls (93% compliance)

TRIFR: Total recordable injury frequency rate. The frequency of total recordable injuries per million hours worked. Results above are based on a 12 month moving average.

LTIFR: Lost time injury frequency rate. The frequency of injuries involving one or more lost work days per million hours worked. Results are based on a 12 month moving average.
Employee and community engagement through Shared Value Projects
- Coolgardie Primary Bush Tucker completed
- Nature Play Garden completed

Successful Site Family Fun Day attended by 220 employees (including contractors) and their families

Alignment across the entire tenement package

Annual audits ensure a high level of compliance and risk management
Mungari performance

FY17 performance

- Gold production of 143,820 ounces
- AISC\(^1\) of A$1,143 per ounce
- Operating mine cash flow A$96 million
- Net mine cash flow A$59 million
- A$18 million invested in resource definition and discovery programs
- Frog’s Leg grade under budget in high-grade laminated vein – impacted results
- Variable grade reconciliations returned from mining in southern end of White Foil
- Processing – strong finish to FY17 with lower costs and improved recovery
- Pit optimisations and designs for regional resources in progress

1. AISC (All-in sustaining cost) includes C1 cash cost plus royalty expense, sustaining capital expense, general corporate and administration. Calculated on per ounce sold
Mine geology

- **Frog’s Leg**
  - Quartz vein hosted deposit located on the lithological contact between the Victorious Basalt and the Black Flag Volcaniclastics
  - Mineralised widths range from 0.2m to 5.0m
  - Mineral Resource is being tested down-plunge in FY18

- **White Foil**
  - Mineralisation is quartz hosted fracture infill within a structurally deformed quartz gabbro
  - Vein density and higher grades are strongly influenced by early stage structures visible as high-grade shoots

Frog’s Leg underground: F7750N Face #49: weighted average face grade 21.59g/t Au
Frog’s Leg extensions

- Dedicated drill platforms exist for both the Rocket and Mist lodes
- Additional drill platforms developed in June 2017 quarter
  - Drilling into lower Mist to commence in September 2017 quarter
- ~13km of in-mine underground drilling is scheduled for FY18
Open pit optimisation resulted in less waste and >50koz added to Ore Reserves

Stage 3 cutback will result in stockpile build as excess ore mined in FY19 and FY20

Latest drill results intersected a broad mineralised zone of 80.2m (64.2m etw) grading 1.98g/t Au – widening the main zone interpretation and extending continuity of mineralisation

Further drilling planned

Resource model to be updated and scoping study to be revisited for underground potential – large, bulk low-grade deposit close to mill

The reported interval is a downhole width as true widths are not currently known. An estimated true width ("etw") is provided.
White Foil Resource Definition drilling

- Recent drilling below the north end of the pit has returned significant mineralised intervals and provided key data which has resulted in a change to the interpretation.
- The Sovereign Fault was intersected further up-hole which resulted in a material increase in volume and continuity of the mineralised Quartz Gabbro.

Original Interpretation

Revised Interpretation
FY17 underground performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>FY17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UG lateral development - capital</td>
<td>kt</td>
<td>1,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG lateral development - operating</td>
<td>kt</td>
<td>2,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total UG lateral development</td>
<td>kt</td>
<td>3,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG ore mined</td>
<td>kt</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG grade mined</td>
<td>g/t</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Frog’s Leg underground production commenced 2008
- 29% reduction in pastefill unit cost achieved in FY17
  - Tails sourced from Mungari, cement percentage reduced
- Seismicity well managed with increased support profiles
- Drill platform developed to test at depth – drilling has commenced
- Frog’s Leg reduced to one jumbo for FY18 – associated restructure is complete
- Frog’s Leg Mineral Resource 2.67Mt grading 6.54g/t Au for 560koz and Ore Reserves 1.55Mt grading 5.21g/t Au for 260koz\(^1\) at Dec 2016

1. This information is extracted from the report entitled “Annual Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves Statement” released to ASX on 20 April 2017 and is available to view at www.evolutionmining.com.au. See Mungari Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves appended to this presentation for details on Resource and Reserve estimates. Mineral Resources are inclusive of Ore Reserves.
FY17 open pit performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>FY17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OP capital waste</td>
<td>kt</td>
<td>2,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP operating waste</td>
<td>kt</td>
<td>6,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP ore mined</td>
<td>kt</td>
<td>1,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP grade mined</td>
<td>g/t</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life of mine strip ratio remaining</td>
<td>Waste:ore</td>
<td>3.9:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- White Foil open-pit located <1km east of the Mungari Process plant
- Open pit re-optimised in FY17
  - Steeper walls, 90 degree batters, 15m benches
- Grade in southern end of pit lower than plan due to coarse, nuggety gold – mining now complete
- Grade in main zone more continuous
- White Foil Mineral Resource 7.00Mt grading 1.67g/t Au for 376koz and Ore Reserves 5.71Mt grading 1.61g/t Au for 299.3koz¹ at Dec 2016

¹ This information is extracted from the report entitled “Annual Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves Statement” released to ASX on 20 April 2017 and is available to view at [www.evolutionmining.com.au](http://www.evolutionmining.com.au). See Mungari Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves appended to this presentation for details on Resource and Reserve estimates. Mineral Resources are inclusive of Ore Reserves.
White Foil material movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year (FY)</th>
<th>Waste mined (capital) (Mt)</th>
<th>Waste mined (operating) (Mt)</th>
<th>Ore mined (Mt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surface mined as at December 2016
### FY17 plant performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>FY17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total tonnes processed</td>
<td>kt</td>
<td>1,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade processed</td>
<td>g/t</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold recovery</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold produced</td>
<td>oz</td>
<td>143,820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Solid performance from Mungari processing plant
- Successful tails dam harvesting of tails for paste – increased capital utilisation and reduced pastefill costs
- Second Knelson installed to improve gravity recovery component
- Plant stream analyser installed for improved trending and met reporting
- Maintenance costs reduced significantly (A$700k) in June 2017 half year due to contractor focus
- Current throughput of 1.7Mtpa – in excess of 1.5Mtpa nameplate capacity
- Modular plant design allows for future expansions
Expanding the Mineral Resource base

- Resource test phase commenced in FY17 with nine months of regional work
  - Journey to continue in FY18 as results start to develop the resource base
- Regional Resources are being drill tested to improve the asset portfolio
- Mungari Reserves estimated at a conservative A$1,350/oz
  - Second underground drill platform developed to test for Frog’s Leg reserve extensions at depth
  - White Foil open pit and underground resources to be reviewed for potential reserves
- Regional Pipeline adding to reserves through resource definition drilling programs
  - Cutters Ridge and Burgundy reserves have potential to expand
  - Red Dam and Carbine North resources are targeted for potential upgrade to reserves
  - Regional resources Emu, Rayjax and Blue Funnel targeted for drilling and reserves additions
- Discovery to add to resource base in FY18 and FY19

Targeted drill programs starting to deliver exploration success
Discovery at Evolution Mining
What we’re looking for

- **Our exploration focus**
  - Epithermal and orogenic lode gold deposits
  - Will consider iron oxide copper-gold deposits (opportunistic)

- **Our appetite for risk**
  - Moderate (ie mine extensions) to very high (ie endowed camps) on the risk spectrum

- **Playing to our exploration and operating strengths**
  - Epithermal deposits (Cracow and Mt Carlton)
  - Lode gold deposits (Mungari and Edna May)
  - Driven by our ability to discover an orebody across a 3 – 5 year period

---

**Gold discoveries >2 Moz**

*Host rock resource inventory 1997 – 2011*

- **Porphyry** 218.5Moz
- **Orogenic** 116.2Moz
- **EpiL** 64.4Moz
- **EpiH** 62.7Moz
- **Carb-hosted** 20.4Moz
- **Palaeplacer** 13.2Moz
- **IOCG** 11.9Moz
- **Skarn** 3.0Moz

*Source: SNL Metals & Mining 2011*
Australia – our primary focus

- Yilgarn >400 Moz (Lode Au)
- Tanami >40 Moz (Lode Au)
- Telfer >30 Moz
- New England >15 Moz (IRGS, Epithermal & Porphyry)
- Charters Towers >35 Moz (Epithermal, VHMS)
- Mt Isa >17 Moz (IOCG)
- Lachlan >80 Moz (Porphyry & Epithermal)
- Gawler >100 Moz (IOCG)
- Victoria >40 Moz (Slate Belt Au)

Gold endowment:
- >5 Moz Au
- 1 Moz – 5 Moz Au
- >0.5 Moz – 1 Moz Au
- Au occurrence – no cover
- Au occurrence – cover
Challenges to opportunities

- Discovering quality deposits is becoming more challenging
  - Mature fields in Australia – low hanging fruit are rare
  - Exploring deeper under cover – requires higher quality mineralisation and a larger appetite for risk
- We are developing a pipeline of high quality exploration projects with the aim of sustaining/growing the company organically
  - M&A activity can deliver into the project pipeline at any stage
  - Improving overall quality of the portfolio – stacking the bottom end of the pipeline and being prepared to continually upgrade and substitute projects
  - Pipeline structured to reflect various stages of project maturity and degrees of risk
  - New projects to align with our desire to improve average asset quality along with our geographic and commodity preferences
Enablers

- R&D to sponsor relevant innovation
  - Target models – mineral systems versus genetic models
  - Drilling
  - Data analysis
    - Real time availability
    - 100% utilisation
    - Artificial intelligence
  - Geophysics
    - Seismic
    - Airborne acquisition of induced polarisation measurements
    - Drones
- Leverage external partnerships
  - Junior explorers, consultants and entrepreneurs
  - Adopting fit for purpose commercial structures
    - Equity, joint ventures, strategic alliances and grubstakes
Target model – Eastern Goldfields WA

- Multiple ages of mineralisation
- Late basin conglomerates
- Upper mafic stratigraphy preserved
- Major, long-lived faults
- Enriched granitoids

*Image: Bleeker, 2012; Slide: John Dobe, 2016*
Regional scale targeting Eastern Goldfields

- Major structures
- Gravity highs
- Late basins
- Low metamorphic grade
- Enriched granitoids

Legend

- Gold deposit > 1 Moz
- Major structure
- Gravity high (thick greenstone)
- Late basin sediments
- Enriched intrusive rocks
Our key exploration themes

- Sharp focus on our objectives
- Discoveries are declining in Australia – must look deeper under cover
- Innovation will enable deeper visualisation of potential targets
- Opportunities to compress discovery timelines by revolutionising drilling technologies
- Enhanced target models will guide selection of district and camp scale search spaces
- Leverage external partnerships
Mungari Discovery

**FY17 highlights**
- Spend increased by 280% to ~A$14 million
- Doubled drill volume and built up Discovery and Resource definition teams
- Consolidated and developed targets pipeline
- Commenced testing Mungari Shear along strike from Frog’s Leg
- Demonstrated potential at Ora Banda (Phoenix ground) with Lady Agnes intercept
- Blue Funnel Aircore 100 ppb anomaly defined over >600m strike and 120m width

**FY18 plan**
- Similar level of discovery expenditure to FY17
- Advance target pipeline
- Focus on priority areas at:
  - Ora Banda
  - Frog’s Leg South
  - Zuleika North (Blue Funnel)

---

**Budget history**

- CY12: 3
- CY13*: 3
- FY14: 5
- FY15: 8
- FY16: 13
- FY17: 17

**Discovery drilling history**

- FY11: 10,000
- FY12: 20,000
- FY13: 30,000
- FY14: 40,000
- FY15: 60,000
- FY16: 120,000
- FY17: 120,000

*Note: 6 month period change from calendar year (CY) to financial year (FY)
Project pipeline

- ~180 targets currently identified on lease
- 94 exploration stage targets under evaluation
- Testing top 20+ highest priority targets
Frog’s Leg South

- Commenced testing targets along strike to the south
- Poorly tested below 300m
- Drilling to the south determined extent of favourable stratigraphy
- Innis drilling targeting favourable hosts along Mungari Shear

This information is extracted from the report entitled “Quarterly Report for the period ending 31 December 2016” released to ASX on 27 January 2016 and is available to view on www.evolutionmining.com.au. The reported intervals are a downhole width as true widths are not currently known. An estimated true width (“etw”) is provided. The Company confirms that it is not aware of any new information or data that materially affects the information included in the Report.
Blue Funnel South

- 7km strike of Zuleika Shear being tested
- Zone of structural complexity has been poorly tested
- >100ppb gold anomaly defined
Ora Banda

- Priority target area for exploration FY18
- Under-explored area with significant potential
- Variable ownership history has resulted in little focussed exploration over the past 15+ years
- Multiple Enterprise-style targets apparent
- Significant gold anomalies throughout the area
- Lady Agnes – first drill program since Phoenix acquisition has returned favourable results

Schematic northeast – southwest section of recent drilling at Lady Agnes
Future opportunity

- Mt Pleasant
- Bullant
- Zuleika Shear Zone
- Frog's Leg
- White Foil
- Kundana
Focus on quality – advancing regional Mineral Resources and advanced targets towards Ore Reserves

Recent positive results from drill testing priority targets reinforce the potential to increase the resource base

Results returned along or adjacent to the Kunanalling Shear Zone – historically less focus than the Zuleika Shear Zone
New zone of high-grade mineralisation intersected in the footwall at Burgundy. Best intersections included:

- 17m (14.5m etw) grading 4.7g/t Au from 112m (BURC061)
- 21m (17.9m etw) grading 5.1g/t Au from 170m (BURC076)
Drilling at the Emu project has intersected high-grade mineralisation.

Best intersections included:

- 23.7m (14.2m etw) grading 13.7g/t Au from 90m including 5.4m (3.2m etw) grading 50.2g/t Au (EMUD004)
Mungari process plant – a strategic asset in the West Kalgoorlie area

Excellent ground holding in world-class terrane
- ~950km²
- ~48km of the Zuleika Shear Zone
- ~70km of the Kunanalling Shear Zone

Large inventory of early to mid-stage targets

New, energised team in place

Long future assured through blending higher grade underground deposits with base load open pits

Strategy focussed on:
- Developing the Regional Resource base
- Discovering a high-grade orebody

Accelerated drilling programs are building momentum – returning encouraging results
Appendices
Mungari’s Evolution

- **1996**: White Foil discovery
- **1999**: Frog’s Leg discovery
- **2008**: First gold pour from Frog’s Leg underground mine
- **2011**: Processing via toll treatment
- **2013**: Frog’s Leg Ore Reserve grows to 786koz
- **2014**: Mungari plant construction commenced
- **2015**: Mungari plant completed
- **2016**: Evolution acquires Phoenix Gold
- **2017**: Evolution acquires 100% of La Mancha’s Australian operations

**Calendar Year production**
- 239koz
- 66koz

**Financial Year production**
- 2002: 60koz
- 2008: 60koz
- 2011: 120koz
- 2013: 140koz
- 2014: 154koz
- 2015: 166koz
- 2016: 166koz
- 2017: 144koz

1Calendar Year production
2Financial Year production
Source: company reports
Process plant circuit
Process equipment

- **Power**
  - Western Power – grid supply

- **Crushing**
  - Three stage crushing
    - Primary: Metso 40” Single Toggle Jaw Crusher
    - Secondary: Metso Cone HP 4 – Coarse liners
    - Tertiary: Metso Cone HP 4 – Coarse liners

- **Grinding**
  - Polysius overflow Ball mill – 5.5m (dia) 8.74m (l)
  - 4.5 MW power, Hoffman gearbox, VSD, Dual direction
  - Maggotaux 78mm and 94mm balls (50/50)
  - Polymet composite liners
  - Grind size 75% - 106µm

- **Gravity Circuit**
  - 2 * Knelson concentrator – 30”
  - 40-60% of gold recovered via gravity

- **Leaching**
  - CIL circuit
  - 2 x 1,140m³ leaching tank
  - 6 x 750m³ adsorption tanks
  - Cyanide supply – CSBP
  - Lime supply – Chememan
## Underground mining equipment

- Development drills
  - 1 x development jumbo – Sandvik DD421
- Production drills
  - 2 x longhole drills – Sandvik DL421
- Underground mine trucks
  - 4 x Caterpillar AD55B
- Underground loaders
  - 2 x Caterpillar R2900 (loading)
  - 2 x Caterpillar R1700 (remoting)
- Ancillary Equipment
  - 2 x Charge-up Atlas Copco
  - 3 x Integrated Tool Carrier
  - 1 x Dry tailings pastefill plant
  - 1 x Shotcrete batching plant, agitator truck and sprayer

## Open-pit mining equipment

- Loading
  - 1 x 250t Hitachi EX2600
  - 1 x 200t PC2000 (backup)
  - 1 x 110t Komatsu PC1250 (batters)
- Hauling
  - 6 x 135t Caterpillar 785 dump trucks
  - 3 x 90t Caterpillar 777D dump trucks
- Dozers
  - 2 x Caterpillar D10T
- Haul road maintenance
  - 1 x Caterpillar 773D 40,000L Water cart
  - 1 x Caterpillar 16M Grader
- Drilling
  - 5 x Sandvik Pantera drills, (115, 102mm, 5m bench blasting)
Competent Persons

Competent Persons Statement

The information in this report that relates to Exploration Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves listed in the table below is based on work compiled by the person whose name appears in the same row, who is employed on a full-time basis by Evolution Mining Limited and is a member of the institute named in that row. Each person named in the table below has sufficient experience which is relevant to the style of mineralisation and types of deposits under consideration and to the activity which he has undertaken to qualify as a Competent Person as defined in the JORC Code 2012. Each person named in the table consents to the inclusion in this report of the matters based on his information in the form and context in which it appears including sampling, analytical and test data underlying the results.

The Company confirms that it is not aware of any new information or data that materially affects the information included in this presentation. The Company confirms that the form and context in which the Competent Persons' findings are presented have not been materially modified from the Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Competent person</th>
<th>Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mungari Exploration Results – Resource Definition</td>
<td>Andrew Engelbrecht</td>
<td>Australasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mungari Exploration Results</td>
<td>Julian Woodcock</td>
<td>Australasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mungari Combined Ore Reserves - December 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ore Reserve</th>
<th>cut-off (Mt)</th>
<th>Tonnage (Mt)</th>
<th>Grade Au (g/t)</th>
<th>Cont. Metal Au (koz)</th>
<th>Tonnage (Mt)</th>
<th>Grade Au (g/t)</th>
<th>Cont. Metal Au (koz)</th>
<th>Tonnage (Mt)</th>
<th>Grade Au (g/t)</th>
<th>Cont. Metal Au (koz)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Pit</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>281.8</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>299.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>172.8</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>260.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>104.7</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>497.2</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>601.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Data is reported to significant figures to reflect appropriate precision and may not sum precisely due to rounding.

Ore Reserves are reported above variable cut-off grades (as indicated), depending on the haulage cost and applicable third-party royalties applicable for each project.

This information is extracted from the report entitled “Annual Mineral Resources and Ore Reserve Statement” released to ASX on 20 April 2017 and available to view at www.asx.com.au.

**Ore Reserve Competent Person:** Matt Varvari

The Company confirms that it is not aware of any new information or data that materially affects the information included in the Report and that all material assumptions and technical parameters underpinning the estimates in the Report continue to apply and have not materially changed. The Company confirms that the form and context in which the Competent Persons’ findings are presented have not been materially modified from the Report.
## Notes:
Data is reported to significant figures to reflect appropriate precision and may not sum precisely due to rounding
Mineral Resources are reported inclusive of Ore Reserves
Open Pit Mineral Resource reported above 0.5g/t Au cut-off within optimised pit shell
Frog’s Leg Underground Mineral resource reported above 2.5g/t Au cut-off and White Foil Underground Mineral Resource reported above 1.5g/t Au cut-off using MSO shapes
This information is extracted from the report entitled “Annual Mineral Resources and Ore Reserve Statement” released to ASX on 20 April 2017 and available to view at www.asx.com.au
Mineral Resources Competent Person: Andrew Engelbrecht
The Company confirms that it is not aware of any new information or data that materially affects the information included in the Report and that all material assumptions and technical parameters underpinning the estimates in the Report continue to apply and have not materially changed. The Company confirms that the form and context in which the Competent Persons’ findings are presented have not been materially modified from the Report.

## Mungari Mineral Resources - December 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mineral Resource</th>
<th>Measured</th>
<th>Indicated</th>
<th>Inferred</th>
<th>Total Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tonnes (Mt)</td>
<td>Grade Au (g/t)</td>
<td>Cont. Metal Au (koz)</td>
<td>Tonnes (Mt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-Pit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Foil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockpiles</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frog’s Leg</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Foil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockpiles</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>10.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Data is reported to significant figures to reflect appropriate precision and may not sum precisely due to rounding.
- Mineral Resources are reported inclusive of Ore Reserves.
- Open Pit Mineral Resource reported above 0.5g/t Au cut-off within optimised pit shell.
- Frog’s Leg Underground Mineral resource reported above 2.5g/t Au cut-off and White Foil Underground Mineral Resource reported above 1.5g/t Au cut-off using MSO shapes.
- This information is extracted from the report entitled “Annual Mineral Resources and Ore Reserve Statement” released to ASX on 20 April 2017 and available to view at www.asx.com.au.

The Company confirms that it is not aware of any new information or data that materially affects the information included in the Report and that all material assumptions and technical parameters underpinning the estimates in the Report continue to apply and have not materially changed. The Company confirms that the form and context in which the Competent Persons’ findings are presented have not been materially modified from the Report.
### Mungari Regional Mineral Resources – December 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Prospect</th>
<th>Cut-Off</th>
<th>Measured</th>
<th>Indicated</th>
<th>Inferred</th>
<th>Total Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tonnes (Mt)</td>
<td>Gold Grade (g/t)</td>
<td>Gold Metal (koz)</td>
<td>Tonnes (Mt)</td>
<td>Gold Grade (g/t)</td>
<td>Gold Metal (koz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuleika</td>
<td>Blue Funnel</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red Dam</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carbine North</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lady Jane</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuleika Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ora Banda</td>
<td>Nazzaris</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whitehaven</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ora Banda Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunanalling</td>
<td>Castle Hill</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Picante</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kintore</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ridgeback</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burgundy</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telegraph</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catherwood</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emu</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rayjax</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunanalling Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.27</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockpiles</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32.47</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>11.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data is reported to significant figures to reflect appropriate precision and may not sum precisely due to rounding. Mineral Resources are reported inclusive of Ore Reserves. Open pit Mineral Resource reported above a 0.5g/t cut-off within optimised pit shell. Castle Hill Mineral resource includes Wadi, Mick Adam, Kiora and Outridge. Picante Mineral Resource includes Picante, Wookie and Lady Alice. This information is extracted from the report entitled “Annual Mineral Resources and Ore Reserve Statement” released to ASX on 20 April 2017 and available to view at www.asx.com.au

Mineral Resources Competent Person: Andrew Engelbrecht

The Company confirms that it is not aware of any new information or data that materially affects the information included in the Report and that all material assumptions and technical parameters underpinning the estimates in the Report continue to apply and have not materially changed. The Company confirms that the form and context in which the Competent Persons’ findings are presented have not been materially modified from the Report.
Evolution Gold Ore Reserves Dec 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cut-Off</th>
<th>Gold Grade (g/t)</th>
<th>Gold Metal (koz)</th>
<th>Gold Grade (g/t)</th>
<th>Gold Metal (koz)</th>
<th>Gold Grade (g/t)</th>
<th>Gold Metal (koz)</th>
<th>Total Reserve (Mt)</th>
<th>Gold Grade (g/t)</th>
<th>Gold Metal (koz)</th>
<th>Competent Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cowal¹</td>
<td>Open pit</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>43.70</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>73.02</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2,207</td>
<td>116.71</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cracow¹</td>
<td>Underground</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edna May¹</td>
<td>Open pit</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edna May¹</td>
<td>Underground</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edna May¹</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Carlton¹</td>
<td>Open pit</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Carlton¹</td>
<td>Underground</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Carlton¹</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Rawdon¹</td>
<td>Open pit</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30.99</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>32.69</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mungari¹</td>
<td>Underground</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mungari¹</td>
<td>Open pit</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mungari¹</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mungari¹</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest Henry²</td>
<td>Underground</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>52.30</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>59.45</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.92</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1,366</td>
<td>177.35</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>5,624</td>
<td>231.27</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>6,990</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data is reported to significant figures to reflect appropriate precision and may not sum precisely due to rounding.
1. Includes stockpiles
2. This information is extracted from the report entitled "Annual Mineral Resources and Ore Reserve Statement" released to ASX on 20 April 2017 and available to view at www.asx.com.au
3. This information is extracted from the report entitled "Glencore Resources and Reserves as at 31 December 2016" released February 2017 and available to view at www.glencore.com. Ernest Henry is reported at 0.9 % CuEq

The Company confirms that it is not aware of any new information or data that materially affects the information included in the Report and that all material assumptions and technical parameters underpinning the estimates in the Report continue to apply and have not materially changed. The Company confirms that the form and context in which the Competent Persons’ findings are presented have not been materially modified from the Report.
### Evolution Gold Mineral Resources Dec 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cut-off</th>
<th>Gold Measured (Mt)</th>
<th>Gold Indicated (Mt)</th>
<th>Gold Inferred (Mt)</th>
<th>Total Resource (Mt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tonnes (Mt)</td>
<td>Gold Grade (g/t)</td>
<td>Gold Metal (koz)</td>
<td>Gold Grade (g/t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowal²</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>43.70</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>129.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cracow²</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>10.89</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edna May¹</td>
<td>Open pit</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>15.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edna May</td>
<td>Underground</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edna May</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>17.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Carlton²</td>
<td>Open pit</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Carlton</td>
<td>Underground</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Carlton</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Rawdon¹</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mungari¹</td>
<td>Open pit</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mungari¹</td>
<td>Underground</td>
<td>2.5/1.5</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mungari²</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mungari Regional</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>32.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest Henry²</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>68.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsden</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>59.81</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1,673</td>
<td>474.24</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data is reported to significant figures to reflect appropriate precision and may not sum precisely due to rounding. Mineral Resources are reported inclusive of Ore Reserves.

1. Includes stockpiles
2. This information is extracted from the report entitled “Annual Mineral Resources and Ore Reserve Statement” released to ASX on 20 April 2017 available to view at www.glencore.com
3. This information is extracted from the report entitled “Glencore Resources and Reserves as at 31 December 2016” released February 2017 and available to view at www.glencore.com. Ernest Henry is reported at 0.9 % CuEq.


Full details of the Ernest Henry Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves are provided in the report entitled “Glencore Resources and Reserves as at 31 December 2016” released February 2017 and available to view at www.glencore.com.

The Company confirms that it is not aware of any new information or data that materially affects the information included in the Report and that all material assumptions and technical parameters underpinning the estimates in the Report continue to apply and have not materially changed. The Company confirms that the form and context in which the Competent Persons’ findings are presented have not been materially modified from the Report.

48
### Group Copper Ore Reserves Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cut-Off</th>
<th>Tonnes (Mt)</th>
<th>Copper Grade (%)</th>
<th>Copper Metal (kt)</th>
<th>Tonnes (Mt)</th>
<th>Copper Grade (%)</th>
<th>Copper Metal (kt)</th>
<th>Total Reserve</th>
<th>Copper Grade (%)</th>
<th>Copper Metal (kt)</th>
<th>Competent Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ernest Henry</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.69</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>17.82</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Carlton</td>
<td>Open pit</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Carlton</td>
<td>Underground</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Carlton</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.53</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>22.66</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Group Copper Mineral Resources Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cut-Off</th>
<th>Tonnes (Mt)</th>
<th>Copper Grade (%)</th>
<th>Copper Metal (kt)</th>
<th>Tonnes (Mt)</th>
<th>Copper Grade (%)</th>
<th>Copper Metal (kt)</th>
<th>Total Resource</th>
<th>Copper Grade (%)</th>
<th>Copper Metal (kt)</th>
<th>Competent Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marsden</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>160.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest Henry</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20.61</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Carlton</td>
<td>Open pit</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Carlton</td>
<td>Underground</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Carlton</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>189.71</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>18.49</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>217.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data is reported to significant figures to reflect appropriate precision and may not sum precisely due to rounding. Mineral Resources are reported inclusive of Ore Reserves. 1 Includes stockpiles 2 Ernest Henry Operation cut-off 0.9% CuEq

1. This information is extracted from the report entitled “Glencore Resources and Reserves as at 31 December 2016” released February 2017 available to view at glencore.com”. EHO is reported at 0.9 % CuEq.

**Group Ore Reserves Competent Person Notes** refer to: 4. Tony Wallace; 7. Ian Patterson; 8. Alexander Campbell (Glencore)

**Group Mineral Resources Competent Person Notes** refer to: 5. Matthew Obiri-Yeboah; 7. Colin Stelzer (Glencore); 8. Michael Andrew

Full details of the Ernest Henry Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves are provided in the report entitled “Glencore Resources and Reserves as at 31 December 2016” released February 2017 and available to view at www.glencore.com.

The Company confirms that it is not aware of any new information or data that materially affects the information included in the Report and that all material assumptions and technical parameters underpinning the estimates in the Report continue to apply and have not materially changed. The Company confirms that the form and context in which the Competent Persons’ findings are presented have not been materially modified from the Report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hole</th>
<th>Hole Type</th>
<th>Northing MGA (m)</th>
<th>Easting MGA (m)</th>
<th>RL AHD (m)</th>
<th>Hole Length (m)</th>
<th>Dip MGA</th>
<th>Azi MGA</th>
<th>From (m)</th>
<th>Interval1 (m)</th>
<th>ETW (m)</th>
<th>Au(g/t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WFRD027</td>
<td>RCD</td>
<td>6,594,444</td>
<td>332,348</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>462.5</td>
<td>-58</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>271.55</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>32.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>286.5</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Includes</td>
<td>286.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; 326.75</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>413.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFRD028</td>
<td>RCD</td>
<td>6,594,495</td>
<td>332,373</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>450.6</td>
<td>-66</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>269.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Includes</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; 221</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFRD029W1</td>
<td>RCD</td>
<td>6,594,494</td>
<td>332,375</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>306.3</td>
<td>-59</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>221</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>237</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>254.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reported intervals are downhole widths as true widths are not currently known and an estimated true width (etw) is provided where available.
Section 1 Sampling Techniques and Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sampling techniques</strong></td>
<td>Sampling of gold mineralisation at Mungari was undertaken using diamond core (surface and underground) and reverse circulation (RC) drill chips. All drill samples were logged prior to sampling. Diamond drill core was sampled to lithological, alteration and mineralisation related contacts, whilst RC samples were collected at 1m downhole intervals. Sampling was carried out according to Evolution protocols and QAQC procedures which comply with industry best practice. All drill-hole collars were surveyed using a total station theodolite or total GPS. The sampling and assaying methods are appropriate for the orogenic mineralised system and are representative for the mineralisation style. The sampling and assaying suitability was validated using Evolution’s QAQC protocol and no instruments or tools requiring calibration were used as part of the sampling process. RC drilling was sampled to obtain 1m samples from which 3 to 5 kg was crushed and pulverised to produce a 30g to 50g subsample for fire assay. Diamond drillcore sample intervals were based on geology to ensure a representative sample, with lengths ranging from 0.2 to 1.0m. Surface diamond drilling was half core sampled. All diamond core samples were dried, crushed and pulverised (total preparation) to produce a 30g to 50g charge for fire assay of Au. A suite of multi elements are determined using four-acid digest with ICP/MS and/or an ICP/AES finish for some sample intervals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drilling techniques</strong></td>
<td>RC sampling was completed using a 4.5” to 5.5” diameter face sampling hammer. Diamond holes from both surface and underground were predominantly wireline NQ2 (50.5mm) or HQ (63.5mm) holes. All diamond core from surface and underground was orientated using the reflex (act II or ezi-or) tool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drill sample recovery</strong></td>
<td>RC drilling sample weights were recorded for selected sample intervals and monitored for fluctuations against the expected sample weight. If samples were below the expected weight, feedback was given promptly to the RC driller to modify drilling practices to achieve the expected weights. All diamond core was orientated and measured during processing and the recovery recorded into the drill-hole database. The core was reconstructed into continuous runs on a cradle for orientation marking. Holes depths were checked against the driller’s core blocks. Inconsistencies between the logging and the driller’s core depth measurement blocks were investigated. Core recovery has been excellent as all holes are drilled into fresh competent rock. Surface drilling recoveries were generally excellent with the exception of oxide zones however these rarely fell below 90%. Measures taken to maximise sample recovery include instructions to drillers to slow down drilling rates or reduce the coring run length in less competent ground. Analysis of drill sample bias and loss/gain was undertaken with the Overall Mine Reconciliation performance where available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Logging</strong></td>
<td>RC drill chips and diamond core has been geologically logged to the level of detail required for the Mineral Resource estimation, mining studies and metallurgical studies. All logging was both qualitative and quantitative in nature recording features such as structural data, RQD, sample recovery, lithology, mineralogy, alteration, mineralisation types, vein density, oxidation state, weathering, colour etc. All holes are photographed wet. All RC and diamond holes were logged in entirety from collar to end of hole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation</strong></td>
<td>Most diamond core drilled from surface was half cored sampled and the remaining half was retained. In the oxide zone, where cutting can wash away samples, some surface holes were full core sampled. A proportion of underground diamond core holes were half core sampled and the remaining core retained for further geological or metallurgical analysis. All RC samples were split by a cone or a riffle splitter and collected into a sequenced calico bag. Any wet samples that could not be riffle split were dried then riffle split. Sample preparation of RC and diamond samples was undertaken by external laboratories according to the sample preparation and assaying protocol established to maximise the representation of the Mungari mineralisation. Laboratories performance was monitored as part of Evolution’s QAQC procedure. Laboratory inspections were undertaken to monitor the laboratories compliance to the Mungari sampling and sample preparation protocol. The sample and size (2.5kg to 4kg) relative to the particle size (&gt;85% passing 75um) of the material sampled is a commonly utilised practice for effective sample representation for gold deposits within the Eastern Goldfields of Western Australia. Quality control procedures adopted to maximise sample representation for all sub-sampling stages include the collection of field and laboratory duplicates and the insertion of certified reference material as assay standards (1 in 20) and the insertion of blank samples (1 in 20) or at the geologist’s discretion. Coarse blank material is routinely submitted for assay and is inserted into each mineralised zone where possible. The quality control performance was monitored as part of Evolution’s QAQC procedure. The sample preparation has been conducted by commercial laboratories. All samples are oven dried (between 85°C and 105°C), jaw crushed to nominal &lt;3mm and if required split by a rotary splitter device to a maximum sample weight of 3.5kg as required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

JORC Code 2012 Table 1 - Mungari

Commentary

- **Sampling techniques**: Sampling of gold mineralisation at Mungari was undertaken using diamond core (surface and underground) and reverse circulation (RC) drill chips. All drill samples were logged prior to sampling. Diamond drill core was sampled to lithological, alteration and mineralisation related contacts, whilst RC samples were collected at 1m downhole intervals. Sampling was carried out according to Evolution protocols and QAQC procedures which comply with industry best practice. All drill-hole collars were surveyed using a total station theodolite or total GPS. The sampling and assaying methods are appropriate for the orogenic mineralised system and are representative for the mineralisation style. The sampling and assaying suitability was validated using Evolution’s QAQC protocol and no instruments or tools requiring calibration were used as part of the sampling process. RC drilling was sampled to obtain 1m samples from which 3 to 5 kg was crushed and pulverised to produce a 30g to 50g subsample for fire assay. Diamond drillcore sample intervals were based on geology to ensure a representative sample, with lengths ranging from 0.2 to 1.0m. Surface diamond drilling was half core sampled. All diamond core samples were dried, crushed and pulverised (total preparation) to produce a 30g to 50g charge for fire assay of Au. A suite of multi elements are determined using four-acid digest with ICP/MS and/or an ICP/AES finish for some sample intervals.

- **Drilling techniques**: RC sampling was completed using a 4.5” to 5.5” diameter face sampling hammer. Diamond holes from both surface and underground were predominantly wireline NQ2 (50.5mm) or HQ (63.5mm) holes. All diamond core from surface and underground was orientated using the reflex (act II or ezi-or) tool.

- **Drill sample recovery**: RC drilling sample weights were recorded for selected sample intervals and monitored for fluctuations against the expected sample weight. If samples were below the expected weight, feedback was given promptly to the RC driller to modify drilling practices to achieve the expected weights. All diamond core was orientated and measured during processing and the recovery recorded into the drill-hole database. The core was reconstructed into continuous runs on a cradle for orientation marking. Holes depths were checked against the driller’s core blocks. Inconsistencies between the logging and the driller’s core depth measurement blocks were investigated. Core recovery has been excellent as all holes are drilled into fresh competent rock. Surface drilling recoveries were generally excellent with the exception of oxide zones however these rarely fell below 90%. Measures taken to maximise sample recovery include instructions to drillers to slow down drilling rates or reduce the coring run length in less competent ground. Analysis of drill sample bias and loss/gain was undertaken with the Overall Mine Reconciliation performance where available.

- **Logging**: RC drill chips and diamond core has been geologically logged to the level of detail required for the Mineral Resource estimation, mining studies and metallurgical studies. All logging was both qualitative and quantitative in nature recording features such as structural data, RQD, sample recovery, lithology, mineralogy, alteration, mineralisation types, vein density, oxidation state, weathering, colour etc. All holes are photographed wet. All RC and diamond holes were logged in entirety from collar to end of hole.

- **Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation**: Most diamond core drilled from surface was half cored sampled and the remaining half was retained. In the oxide zone, where cutting can wash away samples, some surface holes were full core sampled. A proportion of underground diamond core holes were half core sampled and the remaining core retained for further geological or metallurgical analysis. All RC samples were split by a cone or a riffle splitter and collected into a sequenced calico bag. Any wet samples that could not be riffle split were dried then riffle split. Sample preparation of RC and diamond samples was undertaken by external laboratories according to the sample preparation and assaying protocol established to maximise the representation of the Mungari mineralisation. Laboratories performance was monitored as part of Evolution’s QAQC procedure. Laboratory inspections were undertaken to monitor the laboratories compliance to the Mungari sampling and sample preparation protocol. The sample and size (2.5kg to 4kg) relative to the particle size (>85% passing 75um) of the material sampled is a commonly utilised practice for effective sample representation for gold deposits within the Eastern Goldfields of Western Australia. Quality control procedures adopted to maximise sample representation for all sub-sampling stages include the collection of field and laboratory duplicates and the insertion of certified reference material as assay standards (1 in 20) and the insertion of blank samples (1 in 20) or at the geologist’s discretion. Coarse blank material is routinely submitted for assay and is inserted into each mineralised zone where possible. The quality control performance was monitored as part of Evolution’s QAQC procedure. The sample preparation has been conducted by commercial laboratories. All samples are oven dried (between 85°C and 105°C), jaw crushed to nominal <3mm and if required split by a rotary splitter device to a maximum sample weight of 3.5kg as required.
## Section 1 Sampling Techniques and Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of assay data and laboratory tests</strong></td>
<td>The primary sample is then pulverised in a one stage process, using a LM5 pulveriser, to a particle size of &gt;85% passing 75µm. Approximately 200g of the primary sample is extracted by spatula to a numbered paper pulp bag that is used for a 50g fire assay charge. The pulp is retained and the bulk residue is disposed of after two months. Measurements taken to ensure sample representation include the collection of field duplicates during RC drilling at a frequency rate of 5%. Duplicate samples for both RC chips and diamond core are collected during the sample preparation pulverisation stage. A comparison of the duplicate sample vs. the primary sample assay result was undertaken as part of Evolution’s QAQC protocol. It is considered that all sub-sampling and lab preparations are consistent with other laboratories in Australia and are satisfactory for the intended purpose. The sample sizes are considered appropriate and in line with industry standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verification of sampling and assaying</strong></td>
<td>Independent internal or external verification of significant intercepts is not routinely completed. The quality control / quality assurance (QAQC) process ensures the intercepts are representative for the orogenic gold systems. Half core and sample pulps are retained at Mungari if further verification is required. The twinning of holes is not a common practice undertaken at Mungari. The face sample and drill hole data with the mill reconciliation data is of sufficient density to validate neighbouring samples. Data which is inconsistent with the known geology undergoes further verification to ensure its quality. All sample and assay information is stored utilising the aQuire database software system. Data undergoes QAQC validation prior to being accepted and loaded into the database. Assay results are merged when received electronically from the laboratory. The geologist reviews the database checking for the correct merging of results and that all data has been received and entered. Any adjustments to this data are recorded permanently in the database. Historical paper records (where available) are retained in the exploration and mining offices. No adjustments or calibrations have been made to the final assay data reported by the laboratory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location of data points</strong></td>
<td>All surface drill holes at Mungari have been surveyed for easting, northing and reduced level. Recent data is collected and stored in MGA 94 Zone 51 and AHD. Resource drill hole collar positions are surveyed by the site-based survey department or contract surveyors (utilising a differential GPS or conventional surveying techniques, with reference to a known base station) with a precision of less than 0.2m variability. Underground downhole surveys consist of regular spaced digital single-shot borehole camera shots (generally 30m apart down hole), and digital electronic multi-shot surveys (generally 3m apart down hole). In instances where strong ground magnetics affect the accuracy of the measured azimuth reading, these results are removed. The RC and surface drill hole survey data consists of surveys taken utilising north seeking gyro instruments. Gyro survey measurements are obtained every 5 to 10m down hole. A proportion of these holes are downhole surveyed using a digital single shot survey technique similar to that of the underground holes, except the down-hole survey measurement is at a spacing typically 25-50m apart. Topographic control was generated from aerial surveys and detailed Lidar surveys to 0.2m accuracy. Underground void measurements are computed using Cavity Monitoring System (CMS) of the stopes and detailed survey pickup of the development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Section 1 Sampling Techniques and Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data spacing and distribution</strong></td>
<td>The nominal drill spacing for Resource Definition is 40m x 40m or in some areas 20m x 20m. This spacing includes data that has been verified from previous exploration activities on the project. Data spacing and distribution is considered sufficient for establishing geological continuity and grade variability appropriate for classifying a Mineral Resource. Sample compositing was not applied due to the often narrow mineralised zones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orientation of data in relation to geological structure</strong></td>
<td>Mineralisation at White Foil is hosted within a brittle quartz gabbro unit. The gold is associated with quartz stockworks. Structural studies confirm the presence of two main vein sets at White Foil with a dominant moderately NWW dipping set (51°/346° dip and dip direction) and a secondary SSE dipping set (56°/174° dip and dip direction). An identifiable systematic bias associated with drilling direction has not been established. The main strike to the gabbro unit is NWW-SSE and it plunges steeply towards the NNE. The predominant drill direction was to the SE. Surface holes and underground resource holes typically intersect at an angle to the mineralisation and there is no observed bias associated with drilling orientation. The relationship between the drilling orientation and the orientation of key mineralised structures at Mungari is not considered to have introduced a sampling bias and is not considered to be material. Resource Definition drilling is typically planned to intersect ore domains in an orientation that does not introduce sample bias. A small number of holes are drilled at sub-optimal orientations to test for alternate geological interpretations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample security</strong></td>
<td>Chain of custody protocols to ensure the security of samples were followed. Prior to submission samples were retained on site and access to the samples were restricted. Collected samples are dropped off at the respective commercial laboratories in Kalgoorlie. The laboratories are contained within a secured/fenced compound. Access into the laboratory is restricted and movements of personnel and the samples are tracked under supervision of the laboratory staff. During some drill campaigns some samples are collected directly from site by the commercial laboratory. While various laboratories have been used, the chain of custody and sample security protocols have remained similar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audits or reviews</strong></td>
<td>The primary assay lab was audited in July 2017. No material issues were identified. The geology logging and sampling protocols were reviewed by a 3rd party in December 2016. No material issues were identified. The Mungari geology and drilling database was reviewed by acQuire in December 2015 and no material issues were identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Section 2 Reporting of Exploration Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mineral tenement and land tenure status</td>
<td>Resource Definition drilling was undertaken on the following tenements: M15/830. All tenements are in good standing and no known impediments exist. Prospecting leases with imminent expiries will have mining lease applications submitted in due course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration done by other parties</td>
<td>The initial discovery of Frog’s Leg was made by Mines and Resources Australia Ltd who was a precursor company to La Mancha Resources Australia Pty Ltd. The deposit was discovered in 2000 as a result of following up on regional anomalism identified through rotary air blast (RAB) and aircore drilling. La Mancha was acquired by Evolution in August 2015. At White Foil the initial anomaly was identified by Almeco who found the Kopai trend which eventually included White Foil. The discovery was made in 1996 by Mines and Resources Australia who was a precursor company to La Mancha Resources Australia Pty Ltd. Placer Dome Ltd was a 49% joint venture partner during the first mining campaign in 2002 - 2003. Significant historical work has been performed across the Regional Tenement package by numerous parties since the original discovery of gold in the region c.1890. Recent exploration commenced during the 1970’s onwards and has included exploration for base metal and gold mineralisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>The White Foil gold deposit is a quartz stockwork hosted in a gabbro. The gabbro is differentiated broadly into a quartz-rich phase in the west. This quartz gabbro unit is the most hydrothermally altered unit and contains the bulk of the gold mineralisation. The White Foil deposit is bounded to the west by hangingwall volcaniclastic rocks. To the east mineralisation becomes irregular and uneconomic in the more melanocratic phase of gabbro. Mineralisation is controlled by sheeted systems of stockwork veining, which has imparted strong alteration and sulphidation to the quartz gabbro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drill hole Information</td>
<td>See Drill Hole Information table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data aggregation methods</td>
<td>Intercept length weighted average techniques, minimum grade truncations and cut-off grades have been used in this report. At White Foil composite grades &gt;1 g/t have been reported. Composite lengths and grade as well as internal significant values are reported in the Drill Hole Information summary table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths</td>
<td>There is a direct relationship between the mineralisation widths and intercept widths at Mungari. The assay results are reported as down hole intervals however an estimate of true width is provided in the Drill Hole Information Summary in this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagrams</td>
<td>White Foil sections and drill hole location plan are provided in the presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced Reporting</td>
<td>Resource Definition results have been reported in the Drill Hole Information Summary to ensure balanced reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Substantive exploration data</td>
<td>A substantial Exploration and Resource Definition program is on-going at the Mungari site. Other works include field mapping and geophysical surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further work</td>
<td>Further Resource Definition work at White Foil is planned in 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>