JORC Code, 2012 Edition – Table 1 report template

Section 1 Sampling Techniques and Data

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

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Sampling techniques	• Nature and quality of sampling (eg cut channels, random chips, or specific specialised industry standard measurement tools appropriate to the minerals under investigation, such as down hole gamma sondes, or handheld XRF instruments, etc). These examples should not be taken as limiting the broad meaning of sampling. • Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample representivity and the appropriate calibration of any measurement tools or systems used. • Aspects of the determination of mineralisation that are Material to the Public Report. • In cases where 'industry standard' work has been done this would be relatively simple (eg 'reverse circulation drilling was used to obtain 1 m samples from which 3 kg was pulverised to produce a 30 g charge for fire assay'). In other cases more explanation may be required, such as where there is coarse gold that has inherent sampling problems. Unusual commodities or mineralisation types (eg submarine nodules) may warrant disclosure of detailed information.	• All samples retrieved so far are from diamond drill cores that have been cut longitudinally in half and prepared for assaying. The samples are predominantly 1-metre in length. • The samples were pulverised to produce a 50g sample for Atomic Aqua Regia digestion and Absorption Spectrometry (AAS) analysis for Au assaying and check fire assaying in the on-site lab. A portable THERMO Niton XL3t XRF was used to analyze the pulps for Cu, Zn and Ag on site, and 4% of the samples have been submitted to ALS-Loughrea, Ireland for check assaying by ICP-MS. • The half-cores are considered representative because they have been consistently sampled. • An aspect to the determination of mineralisation that is material is that the Cu, Zn and Ag values have been measured by portable XRF. An extensive review of QA/QC data including check assays conducted at ALS-OMAC, Loughrea Ireland have concluded that Cu and Zn assays are suitable for Mineral Resource estimation, but that Ag assays are not.
Drilling techniques	• Drill type (eg core, reverse circulation, open-hole hammer, rotary air blast, auger, Bangka, sonic, etc) and details (eg core diameter, triple or standard tube, depth of diamond tails, face-sampling bit or other type, whether core is oriented and if so, by what method, etc).	• All drilling was done by diamond coring, and all holes were planned as vertical. The cores started as PQ (85 mm diameter), but were reamed down to HQ (63.5 mm) and NQ (47.6 mm) as deemed necessary by the drillers. The majority of the recovered core was HQ (82% of the total) and NQ (14%). No orientation marks were made on the recovered cores.
Drill sample recovery	• Method of recording and assessing core and chip sample recoveries and results assessed. • Measures taken to maximise sample recovery and ensure representative nature of the samples. • Whether a relationship exists between sample recovery and grade and whether sample bias may have occurred due to preferential loss/gain of fine/coarse material.	• Core recovery was calculated on a per drill-run basis (maximum 3 m). Core recovery averaged 99%, ranging from 37% to 100%). Only 36 intervals did not have a recovery of 100%, the majority of which occurred in the upper few metres of some holes were thin overburden was encountered, or the surface rock is weathered. One interval was adjacent to a fault. • No relationship between recovery and grade could be found. The excellent recovery statistics indicate there is no sample bias due to

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		loss of materials to fines.
Logging	• Whether core and chip samples have been geologically and geotechnically logged to a level of detail to support appropriate Mineral Resource estimation, mining studies and metallurgical studies. • Whether logging is qualitative or quantitative in nature. Core (or costean, channel, etc) photography. • The total length and percentage of the relevant intersections logged.	• Drill core was logged in detail for lithology, alteration, mineralisation, geological structure, and oxidation state by AIMC geologists, utilising logging codes and data sheets as supervised by the senior geologist. • Logging was considered sufficient to support Mineral Resource estimation, mining studies and metallurgical studies. • Rock Quality Designation (RQD) logs were produced for all core drilling for geotechnical purposes. Fracture intensity and fragmentation proportion analysis was also gathered for geotechnical information • Logging was both quantitative and qualitative in nature. All core was photographed in the core boxes to show the core box number, core run markers and a scale.

Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation	• If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all core taken.
	• If non-core, whether riffled, tube sampled, rotary split, etc and whether sampled wet or dry.
	• For all sample types, the nature, quality and appropriateness of the sample preparation technique.
	• Quality control procedures adopted for all sub-sampling stages to maximise representivity of samples.
	• Measures taken to ensure that the sampling is representative of the in situ material collected, including for instance results for field duplicate/second-half sampling.
	• Whether sample sizes are appropriate to the grain size of the material being sampled.
		• Full core was split longitudinally using a rock diamond saw to create half-core samples that were taken at typically 1 m intervals or to rock contacts if present in the core run for both mineralisation and wall rock. The drill core was rotated prior to cutting to maximise structure to core axis of the cut core.
		• Half core was taken for sampling for assaying, and one half remains in the core box as reference material. Where field duplicates have been sampled the remaining half-core has been split, leaving quarter-core as a reference.
		• Core samples were prepared according industry best practice, with initial geological control of the half core, followed by crushing and grinding at the laboratory sample preparation facility that is routinely managed for contamination and cleanliness control. Sampling practice is considered as appropriate for Mineral Resource Estimation.
		• Sample preparation at the Azerbaijan International Mining Company (AIMC) on-site laboratory is subject to the following procedure:
		  ○ After receiving samples at the laboratory from the geology department, all samples are cross referenced with the sample order list.
		  ○ All samples are dried in an oven for 24 hours at 105° to110° centigrade temperature.
		  ○ First stage sample crushing to -25mm size.
		  ○ Second stage sample crushing to -10mm size.
		  ○ Third stage sample crushing to -2mm size.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		◦ After crushing the samples are riffle split and a 200 to 250-gram sample is taken. ◦ A 75-micron sized prepared 50 g pulp is produced that is subsequently sent for assay preparation. • Quality control procedures were used for all sub-sampling preparation. This included geological control over the core cutting, and sampling to ensure representativeness of the geological interval. • Sample sizes are considered appropriate to the grain size of the rocks and style of mineralisation being sampled
Quality of assay data and laboratory tests	• The nature, quality and appropriateness of the assaying and laboratory procedures used and whether the technique is considered partial or total. • For geophysical tools, spectrometers, handheld XRF instruments, etc, the parameters used in determining the analysis including instrument make and model, reading times, calibrations factors applied and their derivation, etc. • Nature of quality control procedures adopted (eg standards, blanks, duplicates, external laboratory checks) and whether acceptable levels of accuracy (ie lack of bias) and precision have been established.	• Gold assaying is conducted at an on-site laboratory that also supports sampling at the operational mines (Gedabek and Gadir). Here, the sample is ground to 90% passing 75 µm, from which 25 g is split. This is roasted for up to 3 hours and then decanted and mixed 3 g of NaF. 50 ml of Aqua Regia is then added and it heated for a further 2 hours before HCl is added and it is heated for 30 minutes. 50 ml of this solution is mixed with dibutyl sulphide in toluene solution. Au is determined by atomic absorption spectroscopy (AAS). Check fire assays are conducted on high-grade samples (from the first round aqua regia digestion). These are conducted by industry standard procedures for fire assay, with an AAS finish. • Assaying for Cu, Zn and Ag is done by portable XRF. The instrument is a Thermo Niton XL3t GOLD++ machine that is operated in “Ore &Soil” mode with a tube current of 200 µA and tube voltage of 45 kV. Calibration is “soil calibration”. Analysis time is 20 seconds per filter, so 60 seconds per sample in total. Samples are pre-dried to ensure <0.5% moisture content. Pulverized (90% passing 75 µm) pulps are used for analysis. A drifting correction is applied and the laboratory refers to the supplier if any analytical issues are encountered. A subset (4% of samples) are sent to ALS Loughrea, Ireland for check sampling by ICP-MS. These assays confirmed that Au assaying by AIMC is good, that Ag by pXRF is inadequate and that Cu and Zn by pXRF are reasonable, with minor concerns at low Cu and Zn values. • A wide variety of OREAS CRMs (30 in total) have been used for quality control purposes for all assaying methods. In addition, blanks, coarse reject duplicates and pulp duplicates have been assayed to assess the accuracy, repeatability, consistency of analytical methods and machines and sample contamination. • Mining Plus is of the view that assaying for Au has produced reliable results, those for Cu and Zn variable results, particularly for low-grade

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		samples. Overall Cu may be under reported by the pXRF and Zn slightly over reported. The assaying of Ag by pXRF is unreliable and not reproducible. This is a consequence of the Ag concentration of the vast majority of the samples being close to the detection limit for Ag by this analytical method.
Verification of sampling and assaying	• The verification of significant intersections by either independent or alternative company personnel. • The use of twinned holes. • Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols. • Discuss any adjustment to assay data.	• Significant intersections were verified by a number of company personnel within the management structure of the Exploration Department. Intersections were defined by the exploration geologists, and subsequently verified by the Exploration Manager. • No independent verification has been performed by Mining Plus in 2021, due to COVID-19 travel restrictions. • Data entry is supervised by a data manager, and verification and checking procedures are in place. The format of the data is appropriate for use in resource estimation. All data is stored in electronic MS Access databases within the geology department and backed up to the secure company electronic server that has limited and restricted access. Four main files are created relating to “collar”, “survey”, “assay” and “geology”. Laboratory data is loaded electronically by the laboratory department and validated by the geology department. Any outlier assays are re-assayed. • Independent validation of the database was part of the resource model generation process, where all data was checked for errors, missing data, misspelling, interval validation, negative values, and management of zero versus absent data • All drilling and sampling and assaying databases are considered suitable for the Mineral Resource Estimate. • No adjustments were made to the assay data.
Location of data points	• Accuracy and quality of surveys used to locate drill holes (collar and down-hole surveys), trenches, mine workings and other locations used in Mineral Resource estimation. • Specification of the grid system used. • Quality and adequacy of topographic control.	• The Gedabek Contract Area was surveyed in July 2020 by high resolution drone survey. Five topographic base stations were installed and accurately surveyed using high precision GPS, that was subsequently tied into the local mine grid using ground based total station surveying (LEICA TS02) equipment. All drill holes collars were then surveyed using total station survey equipment. This equipment comprised 2x Trimble R10, Model 60 and associated equipment. • Most of the core holes have been surveyed using Reflex EZ-TRAC equipment at a downhole interval of every 12 m. • The grid system used is Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) 84 WGS zone 38T (Azerbaijan).

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		• The topographic DTM is adequate for the purposes of resource and reserve modelling (having been validated by both aerial and ground based survey techniques).
Data spacing and distribution	• Data spacing for reporting of Exploration Results. • Whether the data spacing and distribution is sufficient to establish the degree of geological and grade continuity appropriate for the Mineral Resource and Ore Reserve estimation procedure(s) and classifications applied. • Whether sample compositing has been applied.	• The drilling at Zafar has been conducted on a grid that is nominally 30 m by 30 m oriented along the direction of the geophysical anomaly that trends approximately 120°. All holes were drilled as vertical holes, and downhole surveying has confirmed that no significant deviation has occurred. • The data spacing is adequate for mineral resource estimation, especially as this is a new discovery. The 30 m by 30 m grid permits variograms to be modelled and resource classification to be based on proven continuity of mineralisation. Geological continuity is reasonable, but could be improved by orientation of the drill cores so that structural data can be measured with greater confidence. • Most of the sampling has been conducted at 1-metre intervals, and compositing at 1-metre composite intervals means only very minor adjustment to raw grade values by the composting process.
Orientation of data in relation to geological structure	• Whether the orientation of sampling achieves unbiased sampling of possible structures and the extent to which this is known, considering the deposit type. • If the relationship between the drilling orientation and the orientation of key mineralised structures is considered to have introduced a sampling bias, this should be assessed and reported if material.	• The orientation of the mineralized zones has become more apparent as a consequence of the modelling of the mineralisation from this first set of vertical drillholes. Future drillholes will be planned as angled holes that cut the anisotropy at right angles. • Since the mineralisation has considerable vertical as well as lateral continuity the bias introduced by the vertical drillholes appears minimal.
Sample security	• The measures taken to ensure sample security.	• The drilling site is supervised by a geologist, the drill core is placed into wooden or plastic core boxes that are sized specifically for the drill core diameter. A wooden/plastic lid is fixed to the box to ensure no spillage. Core box number, drill hole number and from/to metres are written on both the box and the lid. The core is then transported to the core storage area and logging facility, where it is received and logged into a data sheet. Core logging, cutting, and sampling takes place at the secure core management area. The core samples are bagged with labels both in the bag and on the bag, and data recorded on a sample sheet. The samples are transferred to the laboratory where they are registered as received, for laboratory sample preparation works and assaying. Hence, a chain of custody procedure has been followed from core collection to assaying and

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

Section 2 Reporting of Exploration Results

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

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Mineral tenement and land tenure status	• Type, reference name/number, location and ownership including agreements or material issues with third parties such as joint ventures, partnerships, overriding royalties, native title interests, historical sites, wilderness or national park and environmental settings. • The security of the tenure held at the time of reporting along with any known impediments to obtaining a licence to operate in the area.	• The project is located within a current contract area that is managed under a production sharing agreement or “PSA”. The project is held under AGREEMENT: ON THE EXPLORATION, DEVELOPMENT AND PRODUCTION SHARING FOR THE PROSPECTIVE GOLD MINING AREAS: KEDABEK, 1997 • The PSA grants the Company a number of periods to exploit defined licence areas, known as Contract Areas, agreed on the initial signing with the Azerbaijan Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		('MENR'). The exploration period allowed for the early exploration of the Contract Areas to assess prospectivity can be extended. • A 'development and production period' commences on the date that the Company issues a notice of discovery, which runs for 15 years with two extensions of five years each at the option of the Company. Full management control of mining in the Contract Areas rests with Anglo Asian Mining. • Under the PSA, Anglo Asian is not subject to currency exchange restrictions and all imports and exports are free of tax or other restrictions. In addition, MENR is to use its best endeavours to make available all necessary land, its own facilities and equipment and to assist with infrastructure. • The deposit is not located in any national park. • At the time of reporting no known impediments to obtaining a licence to operate in the area exist and the contract (licence) area agreement is in good standing
Exploration done by other parties	• Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.	• Zafar is a new discovery made by AIMC in late 2020 and was announced via a news release in January 2021. No other parties have conducted exploration in the area.
Geology	• Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.	• The Gedabek ore district is extensive and includes numerous mineral occurrences and prospects (as well as operating mines), the majority of which fall within the designated Gedabek Contract Area. The region (with the Gedabek open pit located on the flanks of Yogundag Mountain) lies within the Shamkir uplift of the Lok-Karabakh volcanic arc (in the Lesser Caucasus Mega-Anticlinorium). This province has been deformed by several major magmatic and tectonic events, resulting in compartmentalised stratigraphic blocks. • The Zafar ore deposit is located within the large Gedabek-Garadag volcanic-plutonic system. This system is characterised by a complex internal structure indicative of repeated tectonic movement and multi-cyclic magmatic activity, leading to various stages of mineralisation emplacement. Yogundag Mountain is a porphyry-epithermal zone, with known deposits in the area (e.g. Gedabek, Gadir and Umid) believed to represent the upper portion of the system. • The Zafar ore deposit is a high sulphidation (HS) copper-gold deposit located at the contact between Bajocian (Mid-Jurassic) volcanic rocks and a later-stage Kimmeridgian intrusion (Late Jurassic). The mineralisation is dominantly hosted in the local rhyolitic porphyry

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		(known on site as the 'quartz porphyry' unit), overlain by volcanics (mainly dacites). The principal hydrothermal alteration styles found at Gedabek are propylitic alteration (encompassing the orebody) with quartz ± adularia ± pyrite alteration (forming the deposit) and argillic alteration (confined to the centre of the orebody). • Ore mineralisation is spatially associated with the quartz porphyry. Disseminated pyrite occurs pervasively through most of the deposit, with high concentrations of fine-grained pyrite found at its heart. Increased Cu and Au grades occur in the shallowest levels of Zafar, predominantly in contact with the overlying barren dacites. Brecciated zones are developed at various depths. Additionally, faulting running through the middle of the deposit has been shown to control the hydrothermal metasomatic alteration and associated Au mineralisation (causing the argillic alteration mentioned above). The deposit geology was originally considered to be a "porphyry" style, whereas the current interpretation is that the deposit is HS-epithermal in nature. • In vertical section, the higher gold grade ore is located on the top of the ore body (mainly in the contact with dacite waste on the top).
Drill hole Information	• A summary of all information material to the understanding of the exploration results including a tabulation of the following information for all Material drill holes: ○ easting and northing of the drill hole collar ○ elevation or RL (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in metres) of the drill hole collar ○ dip and azimuth of the hole ○ down hole length and interception depth ○ 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.	• A summary of all the drilling conducted at Zafar by the cut-off date for the MRE report are tabulated below • All drillholes are surveyed for collar position, azimuth and dip by the AIMC Survey Department, relative to the grid system • The database contains assay and geological sample information up to 31st May 2021. • All the drillholes tabulated below are considered material since this is the first JORC report for Zafar. • All of the holes were drilled as vertical. Downhole survey indicated a maximum deviation of 2.8°at 768.8 m in hole 20GED03. • All holes drilled, their collar co-ordinates and final depths are tabulated below

HOLE ID	EASTING	NORTHING	ELEVATION	FINAL DEPTH
20GED01	565,062.09	4,494,753.04	1790.99	389.50
20GED03	565,014.32	4,494,716.71	1807.83	768.80
20GED04	564,983.02	4,494,697.34	1820.94	500.00
20GED06	564,983.26	4,494,734.05	1821.19	522.90
20GED07	564,936.76	4,494,675.24	1835.64	498.00
20GED08	565,009.25	4,494,674.77	1808.48	498.00

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary

20GED09	564,999.47	4,494,646.32	1808.91	495.00
20GED10	565,021.67	4,494,571.32	1827.78	749.50
20GED11	565,097.78	4,494,685.53	1774.34	501.00
20GED12	565,138.97	4,494,649.71	1772.30	750.00
20GED13	564,930.06	4,494,639.16	1834.13	750.00
21GED14	564,805.65	4,494,563.68	1872.79	622.40
21GED15	565,530.77	4,494,332.26	1772.71	510.60
21GED16	565,034.83	4,494,664.22	1795.10	527.50
21GED17	565,060.64	4,494,650.60	1784.93	510.00
21GED18	565,099.43	4,494,642.86	1784.32	515.00
21GED19	565,066.12	4,494,682.38	1784.80	511.00
21GED20	565,102.48	4,494,570.48	1813.55	471.00
21GED21	564,977.73	4,494,615.33	1817.67	562.50
21GED22	565,039.29	4,494,698.18	1798.67	551.00
21GED23	564,977.30	4,494,666.01	1816.59	500.00
21GED24	565504.039	4494462	1763.812	517.00
21GED25	565167.942	4494640.778	1773.212	500.00
21GED26	565033.462	4494628.778	1796.345	500.00
21GED27	565014.73	4494606.219	1811.598	500.00
21GED28	564957.791	4494643.277	1823.132	500.00
21GED29	565075.504	4494616.882	1796.398	445.50
21GED30	565156.486	4494613.271	1783.183	434.00
21GED31	565200.595	4494628.478	1777.457	401.50
21GED32	565062.611	4494703.917	1788.437	460.00
21GED33	565122.282	4494626.706	1782.649	460.00
21GED34	565111.319	4494728.811	1773.687	458.80
21GED35	565097.438	4494607.513	1796.311	445.00
21GED36	565038.846	4494734.841	1797.248	438.00
21GED37	565045.738	4494597.721	1810.288	460.00
21GED38	565423.358	4494533.554	1780.726	500.00
21GED39	565131.535	4494592.465	1795.921	405.00
21GED40	565073.595	4494576.399	1815.415	415.00
21GED41	565192.862	4494654.85	1766.16	410.00
21GED42	565120.389	4494702.689	1766.269	500.00
21GED43	564988.434	4494587.08	1823.231	438.70
21GED44	565221.253	4494647.128	1767.696	401.50

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Data aggregation methods	• In reporting Exploration Results, weighting averaging techniques, maximum and/or minimum grade truncations (eg cutting of high grades) and cut-off grades are usually Material and should be stated. • Where aggregate intercepts incorporate short lengths of high grade results and longer lengths of low grade results, the procedure used for such aggregation should be stated and some typical examples of such aggregations should be shown in detail. • The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values should be clearly stated.	• No exploration results are reported in this MRE. • Aggregation is only done by compositing to 1-metre composite intervals as described above • A Cu-equivalent grade is defined as Cu-eqv = Cu% + (Auppm*0.83) + (Zn%*0.33). This equation has been determined by AIMC and is based on recovered grades at the nearby Gedabek and Gadir Mines
Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths	• These relationships are particularly important in the reporting of Exploration Results. • If the geometry of the mineralisation with respect to the drill hole angle is known, its nature should be reported. • If it is not known and only the down hole lengths are reported, there should be a clear statement to this effect (eg 'down hole length, true width not known').	• The relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths in the case of the Zafar deposit is less critical as the mineralisation dominantly forms a broad scale sulphide that has varying types of mineral structures of varying orientations. • All intercepts are reported as down-hole lengths
Diagrams	• Appropriate maps and sections (with scales) and tabulations of intercepts should be included for any significant discovery being reported These should include, but not be limited to a plan view of drill hole collar locations and appropriate sectional views.	• These are included in the accompanying report
Balanced reporting	• Where comprehensive reporting of all Exploration Results is not practicable, representative reporting of both low and high grades and/or widths should be practiced to avoid misleading reporting of Exploration Results.	• Representative reporting of mineral intervals has been previously reported by Anglo Asian Mining via regulated news service (RNS) announcements of the London Stock Exchange (AIM) or on the Company website. • Reporting of exploration results does not form part of this 2021 Mining Plus Mineral Resource estimate for Zafar
Other substantive exploration data	• Other exploration data, if meaningful and material, should be reported including (but not limited to): geological observations; geophysical survey results; geochemical survey results; bulk samples – size and method of treatment; metallurgical test results; bulk density, groundwater, geotechnical and rock characteristics; potential deleterious or contaminating substances.	• A considerable amount of aerial and ground geophysical data has been collected. The initial interpretation of ZTEM data was used to define the anomalies that ultimately led to the discovery of Zafar. • No other data relating specifically to geotechnical, hydrogeological and metallurgical information has been made available at the reporting date
Further work	• The nature and scale of planned further work (eg tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling). • Diagrams clearly highlighting the areas of possible extensions, including the main geological interpretations and future drilling areas, provided this information is not commercially sensitive.	• Planned future work includes a multifaceted drilling programme for further Mineral Resource definition, geotechnical and hydrogeological data collection

Section 3 Estimation and Reporting of Mineral Resources

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

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Database integrity	• Measures taken to ensure that data has not been corrupted by, for example, transcription or keying errors, between its initial collection and its use for Mineral Resource estimation purposes. • Data validation procedures used.	• The Gedabek database (including data from the Zafar deposit) is stored in MS Excel and MS Access software. A dedicated database manager has been assigned by AIMC who checks the data entry against the laboratory reports and survey data. • Geological data is entered by a geologist to ensure no confusion over terminology, while laboratory assay data is entered by the data entry staff. • A variety of manual data checks are in place to check against human error of data entry. • All original geological logs, survey data and laboratory results sheets are retained in a secure location. • All data requested were made available to Mining Plus by AAM and AIMC. Relevant data were imported to Datamine Studio RM software and further validation processes completed. At this stage, any errors found were corrected. The validation procedures used included checking of data as compared to the original data sheets, validation of position of drillholes in 3D models and reviewing areas appearing anomalous following statistical analysis. • Mining Plus reviewed the provided database as part of the resource model generation process, where all data was checked for errors, missing data, misspelling, interval validation, negative values, and management of zero versus absent data • All drilling and sampling and assaying databases are considered suitable for the Mineral Resource Estimate. No adjustments were made to the assay data prior to import into Datamine software
Site visits	• Comment on any site visits undertaken by the Competent Person and the outcome of those visits. • If no site visits have been undertaken indicate why this is the case.	• No site visit was possible during early 2021 due to the COVID-19 travel restrictions between the United Kingdom and Azerbaijan. Mining Plus has relied on the information and reports provided by the client AAM and on a due diligence performed on site at Gedabek by a Mining Plus geologist in 2019
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	• The geological interpretation at Zafar shows similarities to nearby Gedabek Mine, where mineralisation is associated with quartz-porphyry rocks. Details of the local Zafar geology are still being interpreted, particularly the influence of controlling structures on the

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	estimation. • The use of geology in guiding and controlling Mineral Resource estimation. • The factors affecting continuity both of grade and geology.	location and continuity of the geology and mineralisation. At this stage the geology is modelled as barren hanging-wall lithologies dominated by dacite that overly quartz-porphyry that hosts the mineralisation. Grade shells for Cu, Au and Zn have been defined using numeric RBF interpolants in Leapfrog Geo software. Within the grade shells grade continuity has been demonstrated by variography, and this anisotropy conforms with other NW-SE trending structures such as regional faults, mapped diorite dykes and the interpretation of the ZTEM geophysics response measured over the deposit.
Dimensions	• The extent and variability of the Mineral Resource expressed as length (along strike or otherwise), plan width, and depth below surface to the upper and lower limits of the Mineral Resource.	• Maximum along strike (120°) is 270 m, across strike about 150 m, and vertical extent is 280 m based on the grade shells constructed using data with a 31 May 2021 cut-off date.
Estimation and modelling techniques	• The nature and appropriateness of the estimation technique(s) applied and key assumptions, including treatment of extreme grade values, domaining, interpolation parameters and maximum distance of extrapolation from data points. If a computer assisted estimation method was chosen include a description of computer software and parameters used. • The availability of check estimates, previous estimates and/or mine production records and whether the Mineral Resource estimate takes appropriate account of such data. • The assumptions made regarding recovery of by-products. • Estimation of deleterious elements or other non-grade variables of economic significance (eg sulphur for acid mine drainage characterisation). • In the case of block model interpolation, the block size in relation to the average sample spacing and the search employed. • Any assumptions behind modelling of selective mining units. • Any assumptions about correlation between variables. • Description of how the geological interpretation was used to control the resource estimates. • Discussion of basis for using or not using grade cutting or capping. • The process of validation, the checking process used, the comparison of model data to drill hole data, and use of reconciliation data if available.	• Leapfrog Geo version 6.0.4 was used for the construction of the grade shells for Cu, Au and Zn using RBF numerical interpolation methods. • The main contiguous parts of grade shells were exported for use in Datamine Studio RM software (version 1.8.37.0), where drillhole compositing was performed, and samples within and outside the three individual grade shells were coded as being in the mineralized domains, or outside. • The coded drillholes were then imported into Snowden Supervisor software (version 8.14.1.1) where exploratory data analysis (EDA), contact analysis, declustering, top-cutting, variography, kriging neighborhood analysis (KNA) and cross-validation were conducted. • The modelled variograms and KNA results were used to define estimation parameters for use in the resource estimates conducted in Datamine Studio RM. • The estimation used half the variogram range as the primary search criteria, the variogram ranges as the secondary search criteria and double the variogram ranges as the third search criteria. • Block models were constructed in Datamine Studio RM, and block sizes of 10 m (easting, X) by 10 m (northing, Y) by 5 m (elevation, Z), with sub-blocking to 1 m by 1m by 1 m (X, Y, Z). These block sizes were chosen following KNA. Minimum and maximum numbers of samples and numbers of samples per drillhole, and the arrangement of discretization points were also determined from the KNA. • Three methods of estimation, ordinary kriging (OK), inverse distance squared (ID) and nearest neighbour (NN) were used as cross checks

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		of the estimation results. • This is the first estimate performed on Zafar. • No correlation was noted between variables, and no assumptions regarding correlation were used. Each of the metals was estimated separately in each metal's grade shell to produce three block models. • Grade cutting was applied to Au, Cu and Zn values of 4 ppm Au, 6.55% Cu and 11% Zn based on statistical distributions. Ag was cut at 90 ppm, although this data was not used for estimation purposes. • Validation was conducted by visual checks on cross sections and plans between estimated values (OK, ID and NN) and sample composites, by statistical comparisons between the same sets of data and by using swath plots across the orebody in easting, northing, elevation, along strike and across strike directions
Moisture	• Whether the tonnages are estimated on a dry basis or with natural moisture, and the method of determination of the moisture content.	• The densities were measured as dry bulk densities, and averaged values for ore (3.4 g/cm^3),hangingwall (2.7 g/cm^3) and footwall (3.0 g/cm$^{3)}$ were used for the estimate. Moisture content was determined from masses measured in the as-retrieved state versus masses measured after drying in an oven at 105°C for 24 hours.
Cut-off parameters	• The basis of the adopted cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied.	• Cut-off grades applied at nearby Gedabek Mine were applied to define mineralisation at Zafar. It is assumed that processing of ores from Zafar will be conducted at the centralized ore processing facility and therefore that similar cut-off grades will apply for Zafar. As the project progresses metallurgical testwork will be conducted to confirm the cut-off grades
Mining factors or assumptions	• Assumptions made regarding possible mining methods, minimum mining dimensions and internal (or, if applicable, external) mining dilution. It is always necessary as part of the process of determining reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction to consider potential mining methods, but the assumptions made regarding mining methods and parameters when estimating Mineral Resources may not always be rigorous. Where this is the case, this should be reported with an explanation of the basis of the mining assumptions made.	• The depth of the deposit almost certainly makes underground mining the only practical mining method. Mining Plus has conducted a mining trade-off study, and has concluded that sub-level caving would be the most optimal method based on the currently defined Mineral Resource. Datamine Mineable Shape Optimizer (MSO) has generated viable mineable shapes. Costs and revenues are based on the underground mining parameters from the nearby operating Gadir mine and the feasibility studies for mining portions of the Gedabek Mine from underground operations. The study conducted for Zafar confirms that there are reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction of the Zafar deposit.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Metallurgical factors or assumptions	• The basis for assumptions or predictions regarding metallurgical amenability. It is always necessary as part of the process of determining reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction to consider potential metallurgical methods, but the assumptions regarding metallurgical treatment processes and parameters made when reporting Mineral Resources may not always be rigorous. Where this is the case, this should be reported with an explanation of the basis of the metallurgical assumptions made.	• Currently the metallurgical factors are based upon the assumption that the mineralisation at Zafar is similar to that of nearby Gedabek based on the similarity of the deposits, both being high-sulphidation epithermal deposits. Metallurgical testwork on samples from Zafar is planned, but these results have not been received by the cut-off date for this MRE
Environmental factors or assumptions	• Assumptions made regarding possible waste and process residue disposal options. It is always necessary as part of the process of determining reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction to consider the potential environmental impacts of the mining and processing operation. While at this stage the determination of potential environmental impacts, particularly for a greenfields project, may not always be well advanced, the status of early consideration of these potential environmental impacts should be reported. Where these aspects have not been considered this should be reported with an explanation of the environmental assumptions made.	• Again, the assumption at this early stage of the project is that Zafar ore will be similar to that at Gedabek, and therefore that environmental impacts will be similar. Testwork is being conducted to provide definitive answers to these issues. • From the previous Gedabek JORC Table 1 submissions the following points have been made and are assumed to pertain to potential future mining of Zafar: • As part of the initial start-up, environmental studies and impacts were assessed and reported for Gedabek. This included the nature of process waste as managed in the tailings management facility ("TMF"). Other waste products are fully managed under the AIMC HSEC team, including disposal of mine equipment waste such as lubricants and oils. • There is ongoing adherence to international environmental regulations, and continuing monitoring of their baseline environmental systems. • No environmental factors or assumptions were used during this estimation.
Bulk density	• Whether assumed or determined. If assumed, the basis for the assumptions. If determined, the method used, whether wet or dry, the frequency of the measurements, the nature, size and representativeness of the samples. • The bulk density for bulk material must have been measured by methods that adequately account for void spaces (vugs, porosity, etc), moisture and differences between rock and alteration zones within the deposit. • Discuss assumptions for bulk density estimates used in the evaluation process of the different materials.	• Bulk density has been measured on 436 core samples from 4 drillholes using the hydrostatic method (weight-in-air and weight-in-water). These measurements were made on all defined lithological codes that include waste and mineralized rocks. • On the basis of these measurements average values have been calculated for the hanging-wall sequence (2.7 g/cm^3), the non-mineralized quartz-porphyry (3.0 g/cm^3) and the mineralized domains (3.4 g/cm^3). These averaged values have been applied to all blocks in the block models based on the domain classification.
Classification	• The basis for the classification of the Mineral Resources into varying confidence categories.	• On the basis of the variography and resource estimation method applied, all blocks that were estimated using a search ellipse that is

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	• 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.	half the variogram range (primary search pass) or the secondary search ellipse (the variogram range) are considered to have a proven grade continuity and are therefore classified as Indicated Mineral Resources. • All other blocks in the defined mineralized domains have been estimated using the tertiary search ellipse that are double the variogram ranges, these blocks are classified as Inferred Mineral Resources • The relatively tight drilling grid of 30 m by 30 m in the horizontal plane provide excellent grade continuity • Most of the mineralized samples are confined to the quartz-porphyry, and the boundary between the quartz-porphyry and overlying hanging wall sequence dominated by dacite is sharp. However, the understanding of geological continuity within the quartz-porphyry and particularly the influence of structures such as faults and fractures on geological continuity limited at this early stage of project development. In this respect the overall confidence in the resource estimate should be ameliorated at this stage of the project
Audits or reviews	• The results of any audits or reviews of Mineral Resource estimates.	• No audits or reviews have been conducted on the newly discovered (2020) Zafar deposit to date.
Discussion of relative accuracy/ confidence	• Where appropriate a statement of the relative accuracy and confidence level in the Mineral Resource estimate using an approach or procedure deemed appropriate by the Competent Person. For example, the application of statistical or geostatistical procedures to quantify the relative accuracy of the resource within stated confidence limits, or, if such an approach is not deemed appropriate, a qualitative discussion of the factors that could affect the relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate. • The statement should specify whether it relates to global or local estimates, and, if local, state the relevant tonnages, which should be relevant to technical and economic evaluation. Documentation should include assumptions made and the procedures used. • These statements of relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate should be compared with production data, where available.	• The reliance on pXRF assaying methods for Ag, Cu and Zn, has meant that a lot of attention has been paid to the QA/QC programme and results. These have demonstrated that pXRF is inadequate for the assaying of Ag, and so these data have not been used in the Mineral Resource Estimate. Results for Cu and Zn are considerably better, although limitations at low concentrations are probably the consequence of analytical settings. Overall, however the results are considered adequate for Mineral Resource estimation, and this is confirmed by check assays conducted by ALS. Recommendations have been made regarding improved calibration of the pXRF if this method is to be used in the future. • On the basis of the data received the Mineral Resource Estimate is considered to be reasonably accurate at a local (block size) level. This assessment of reasonable accuracy is based on low coefficient of variation, low kriging variance, high kriging efficiencies and high slope of regressions. A SMU investigation still needs to be undertaken to assess whether the sample support matches SMU

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		support. As more detailed mining studies are undertaken at the pre-feasibility these will become more evident.

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.	•
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.	•
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.	•
Cut-off parameters	• The basis of the cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied.	•
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).	•

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	• 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 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?	•
Environmen-tal	• 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.	•
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.	•
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 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	•

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	private.	
Revenue factors	• The derivation of, or assumptions made regarding 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.	•
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.	•
Social	• The status of agreements with key stakeholders and matters leading to social licence to operate.	•
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.	•
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.	•

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	• The proportion of Probable Ore Reserves that have been derived from Measured Mineral Resources (if any).	
Audits or reviews	• The results of any audits or reviews of Ore Reserve estimates.	•
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.	•

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.	•
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.	•

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
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.	•
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.	•
Carat	• One fifth (0.2) of a gram (often defined as a metric carat or MC).	•
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).	•
Reporting of Exploration Results	• 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 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.	•

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	• 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.	•

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.
		•

Security and integrity	• Accredited process audit. • Whether samples were sealed after excavation. • Valuer location, escort, delivery, cleaning losses, reconciliation with 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	•

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	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.	•