

# Mining Due Diligence Report

## Executive Summary

### Project: Cassiar Gold Property (Test 3)

Report Generated: 2025-11-24 17:37:55

## Dual Scoring System

### Investment Score

**67.5 / 100**

**Risk Band: MODERATE RISK**

Probability of Success: 67.50%

## Score Breakdown by Category

### Geology / Prospectivity

Raw Score: 8.0/10 | Weight: 35.0% | Contribution: 28.0

*Rationale:* The NI 43101 report devotes significant content to geology, mineralization, and deposit types, and identifies multiple mineralized centers (Taurus, Table Mountain, etc.) with long exploration histories and prior production, which collectively support strong geological prospectivity. However, the excerpt provided lacks quantitative grade/continuity data and a fully articulated deposit model, so the score is high but not maximal.

Evidence Found:

- [+] Property name: Cassiar Gold Property, Liard Mining Division, Northern British Columbia, Canada (NTS 104 P/3,4,5,6).
- [+] Regional and local geology, property geology, and detailed mineralization are covered in dedicated sections (Section 7 - Regional and Local Geology, Property Geology, Mineralization).
- [+] Multiple mineralized zones are identified and individually described: Taurus (Sable, 88 Hill, Plaza, Highway, Taurus mine, Taurus West, 88 West), Table Mountain veins, Lucky, Wings Canyon, Newcoast, Hopeful, and other zones.
- [+] Deposit types are explicitly discussed in Section 8, implying a welldefined genetic and structural model for mineralization.
- [+] Extensive historical and recent exploration (geochemistry, geophysics, and drilling from 1979 through 2024) indicates a large, wellexplored gold system.

### Missing Information:

- [x] Specific grades (g/t Au) and thickness/continuity parameters for the main mineralized zones (Taurus, Table Mountain, etc.).
- [x] Explicit description of deposit type(s) (e.g., orogenic, intrusionrelated, epithermal) and their typical sizes/grades within the camp.
- [x] Quantitative details on scale and continuity of mineralized structures (strike length, downdip continuity, typical width).
- [x] Exploration upside discussion (untested targets, depth potential, regional potential) from the Interpretation and Recommendations sections.
- [x] Any known deleterious elements or metallurgical constraints that could alter effective prospectivity.

### Resource Potential / Model Confidence

# Mining Due Diligence Report

Raw Score: 7.0/10 | Weight: 20.0% | Contribution: 14.0

*Rationale:* The report clearly contains a modern NI 43101 resource estimate with standard components (domains, QA/QC, block modeling, validation, cutoff and pit optimization, comparison to earlier work). This supports a strong level of technical rigor and reasonable confidence in the resource model. However, the excerpt does not provide the actual resource quantities or classification detail, preventing a higher score and requiring some conservatism.

Evidence Found:

[+] A full Mineral Resource Estimates section (Section 14) is included, covering data, interpretation, wireframing, contact profiles, EDA, compositing, outlier management, density, interpolation plan, block model parameters, validation, and resource tabulation.

[+] Resources are modeled with distinct geological domains including 'Vein and Shear' and 'Pyrite Halo' domains, indicating geologically constrained resource modeling.

[+] Density, previously extracted material, and pit optimization for cutoff selection are explicitly addressed (Sections 14.6, 14.7, 14.12.1).

[+] Resource block model configuration and categorization (Inferred/Indicated/Measured) are discussed in Section 14.10.3.

[+] Model validation is specifically covered with statistics, distribution analysis, sections/plans, and trend analysis (Section 14.11), indicating a methodical and NI 43101 compliant approach.

## Missing Information:

[x] Actual resource statement tables: tonnage, grade, contained ounces by category, deposit, and perhaps by cutoff.

[x] Details on the classification criteria: drill spacing thresholds, search ellipsoid parameters, and confidence rationale for Measured/Indicated vs Inferred.

[x] Sensitivity analyses (gradetonnage curves are present, but numerical details are not visible in the excerpt) and economic pit shell parameters used in pit optimization.

[x] Extent to which historic data (preQA/QC era) were included or excluded from the resource model and any factors of risk applied.

[x] Explicit confirmation if there are any Mineral Reserves (Section 15 exists but likely blank or states none; the excerpt does not confirm).

## Economics / Unit-Cost & Upside

Raw Score: 3.0/10 | Weight: 15.0% | Contribution: 4.5

*Rationale:* While the structure of the report includes sections for mining, processing, costs, and economic analysis, the information made available here does not provide any numerical economics or unitcost detail. Without CAPEX/OPEX and financial metrics, economic attractiveness and cost competitiveness cannot be reliably assessed. A low but nonzero score is given because the presence of sections suggests at least preliminary consideration of economic factors, but the lack of visible data for...

Evidence Found:

[+] The contents list includes sections for Mining Methods (16), Recovery Methods (17), Property Infrastructure (18), Market Studies and Contracts (19), Capital and Operating Costs (21), and Economic Analysis (22).

[+] Historic tailings and historic development/production (Section 6.6 and 6.7) indicate that there is at least some existing infrastructure and prior operating experience at the site.

[+] Mineral Processing and Metallurgical Testing is covered in Section 13, indicating that preliminary information on processing performance exists.

## Missing Information:

[x] No CAPEX or OPEX values, unit mining/processing costs, or sustaining capital are visible in the excerpt.

[x] No NPV, IRR, payback, or price/cost assumptions from the Economic Analysis section.

[x] No description of selected mining method, pit/underground tradeoffs, production rate, or life of mine plan.

[x] No details on metallurgical recoveries, process flowsheet, or deleterious elements that might impact operating costs and cutoff grades.

[x] No discussion of market studies, concentrate/offtake contracts, or product pricing specifics.

## Legal & Title Risk

# Mining Due Diligence Report

Raw Score: 7.0/10 | Weight: 10.0% | Contribution: 7.0

*Rationale:* The report contains all standard NI 43101 sections on property description, title, agreements, and royalties, and includes maps that appear to precisely delineate mineral and surface tenures. This suggests that title has been properly documented and evaluated. However, the excerpt lacks detailed legal and commercial terms and does not reveal any potential encumbrances or disputes, so a moderatehigh score is assigned with some caution.

Evidence Found:

[+] The property is clearly defined as the 'Cassiar Gold Property' located in the Liard Mining Division, Northern British Columbia, Canada.

[+] Property Description and Location is covered in Section 4, including Mineral, Placer, and Surface Tenures (4.3), Property Agreement (4.4), Royalties and Other Agreements (4.5), Environmental Considerations (4.6), Permits (4.7), and Risks and Other Factors (4.8).

[+] Maps show mineral tenure, placer tenure, Crown grants, surface tenures, and permit areas for both the Taurus mine and Table Mountain mine, indicating specific and mapped concessions.

[+] The report is prepared for Cassiar Gold Corp., suggesting that Cassiar Gold Corp. is the registered holder or beneficial owner of the mineral rights and is the NI 43101 'issuer'.

[+] A 'Property Agreement' section implies that the chain of title, option/earnin terms, and ownership percentages are documented.

## Missing Information:

[x] Exact tenure IDs, expiration dates, and work requirements for each claim/lease, and whether all are in good standing.

[x] Detailed terms of the Property Agreement: ownership splits, earnin conditions, potential reversion clauses, and any payments outstanding.

[x] Details and magnitudes of royalties (e.g., NSR %), buyback options, or streaming/royalty deals.

[x] Any title disputes, overlapping claims, First Nations assertions, or land use conflicts noted in Section 4.8 (Risks and Other Factors).

[x] Confirmation of freehold vs Crown land status for key infrastructure areas, especially processing sites and TSFs.

## Permitting & ESG / Community

Raw Score: 6.0/10 | Weight: 10.0% | Contribution: 6.0

*Rationale:* The presence of specific sections on environmental considerations, permits, and social/community impact, plus mapped permit boundaries, indicates that permitting and ESG issues have been recognized and at least preliminarily addressed. However, without details on permit conditions, liabilities, and stakeholder relations, it is not possible to fully gauge permitting risk or ESG performance. The score is therefore midrange, reflecting known attention to permitting but incomplete visi...

Evidence Found:

[+] Permits are specifically addressed in Section 4.7, and a 'Cassiar Gold Property Permit Map' is provided (Figure 48), indicating that there are defined permitted areas, including Taurus mine and Table Mountain mine permit areas.

[+] Environmental Considerations are separately discussed in Section 4.6, implying that environmental baseline conditions, liabilities, or constraints have been reviewed.

[+] There is a full section: 'Environmental Studies, Permitting and Social or Community Impact' (Section 20), indicating that ESG and community issues have been considered at some level.

[+] Historic tailings (Section 6.6) and historic development and production (Section 6.7) indicate that environmental legacy issues and closure obligations may exist and have likely been commented upon in the environmental/permitting sections.

[+] Surface rights are addressed in Section 5.6, suggesting explicit consideration of land access for infrastructure and potential community/landowner interactions.

## Missing Information:

[x] Specific list of current permits (exploration permits, mine permits, water licenses, waste discharge permits), their status, expiry, and key conditions.

[x] Any known environmental liabilities related to historic mines and tailings (contamination, acid rock drainage, reclamation obligations, bonding status).

[x] Details of baseline studies (water quality, wildlife, cultural/heritage), and whether they meet PFS/FSlevel requirements.

# Mining Due Diligence Report

[x] Nature of relationships and consultation with Indigenous communities and local stakeholders; any Impact Benefit Agreements (IBAs) or MOUs.

[x] Regulatory pathway and timeline for future project phases (e.g., environmental assessment requirements, BC/Canadian federal triggers).

## Data Quality & QAQC

Raw Score: 8.0/10 | Weight: 10.0% | Contribution: 8.0

*Rationale: The report clearly presents a modern multiyear dataset with detailed sampling, preparation, and QA/QC descriptions, use of reputable labs, and formal data verification, including QP site visits and a statement of confidence. This is consistent with good industry practice and supports a high dataquality score. However, the absence of visible quantitative QA/QC performance data in the excerpt leaves a residual uncertainty, so the score is strong but not perfect.*

Evidence Found:

[+] The report includes comprehensive sections on 'Sample Preparation, Analyses, and Security' (Section 11) and 'Data Verification' (Section 12), which is standard for a modern NI 43101 resource report.

[+] Historical, 2008-2012, and Cassiar Gold 2020-2024 sampling and QA/QC procedures are individually described, including separate subsections for different drill programs and labs.

[+] Use of accredited laboratories is indicated: SGS Canada Inc. (2020-2022) and ALS Global Inc. (2022-2024), both recognized commercial labs with ISO/IEC 17025 accreditation for many methods.

[+] QA/QC procedures for 2008, 2009, 2012, and 2020-2024 include insertion of standards, blanks, and duplicates, and explicit 'QA/QC Procedures' subsections for each drilling campaign.

[+] Data verification includes database review and verification for pre2009 data, 2009-2012 data, and Cassiar drilling 2020-2024, plus an 'Authors Statement of Confidence' (Section 12.1.4).

### Missing Information:

[x] Quantitative QA/QC outcomes: failure rates of standards, bias/precision plots, specific corrective actions taken where issues were identified.

[x] Details on how problematic historical data (if any) were treated - excluded, downweighted, or reassayed.

[x] Exact security procedures for sample chainofcustody, storage, and transport, and any audits performed.

[x] Crosschecks between different labs (e.g., umpire assays) and their results.

[x] Level of downhole survey quality and corrections (e.g., magnetically corrected, gyro vs singleshot) and impact on spatial accuracy.

# Mining Due Diligence Report

## Technical Recommendations & Next Steps

- -> Moderate potential - proceed to deeper due diligence
- -> Recommend drill program or PEA to strengthen confidence
- -> Focus on filling critical data gaps identified below
- [!] Critical gap in Economics / Unit-Cost & Upside Case - score 3/10

## Documents Analyzed

1. CGC\_Cassiar\_NI43101\_20250728\_signed.pdf

## Overall Observations

This is a full NI 43101 Technical Report (effective June 8, 2025) for the Cassiar Gold Property, prepared by qualified persons (P.Geo.) with a typical structure covering geology, exploration history, drilling, sampling and QA/QC, metallurgical testing, mineral resource estimation, and highlevel mine/economic considerations. The document appears comprehensive and professionally prepared, with particular strengths in: (1) geological description and multiple mineralized zones with long explorati...

# Mining Due Diligence Report

## Assessment Methodology

This report uses a weighted scoring methodology with the following categories:

- Geology / Prospectivity (35% weight) - Geological favorability and ore body characteristics
- Resource Potential / Model Confidence (20% weight) - Resource estimates and modeling quality
- Economics / Unit-Cost & Upside (15% weight) - Financial projections and unit costs
- Legal & Title Risk (10% weight) - Ownership clarity and concession validity
- Permitting & ESG / Community (10% weight) - Permits status and community relations
- Data Quality & QAQC (10% weight) - Sampling protocols and data integrity

Formula: Investment Score =  $\text{Sum}(\text{Score}_i / 10 \times \text{Weight}_i)$

Probability of Success = Investment Score / 100

### Score Interpretation:

- > 70: Favourable - Fast-track or term sheet
- 50-70: Moderate - Proceed to deeper due diligence
- < 50: High Risk - Reject or restructure