

Appendix 12

Whale Tail 2025 Geomechanical Inspection Implementation Plan

AGNICO EAGLE MINES LTD
MEADOWBANK COMPLEX - AMARUQ SITE
2025 ANNUAL OPEN PIT GEOMECHANICAL INSPECTION
RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY

Knight Piesold Observations, Comments and Recommendations										AEM Implementation Action Plan				
Category	Topic	2022 Recommendations	2023 Status and Comments	2023 Recommendations	2024 Status and Comments	2024 Recommendations	2025 Status and Comments	2025 Recommendations	Priority	AEM Action Plan / Follow-up	Status	Due Date	Completion Date	AEM Comments / Update
Rock Mass Characterization		Undertake structural mapping to: a) Define the northwest dipping joint set in the lower Phase 2 Southeast Wall of the Whale Tail open pit. b) Better define the extents of Structural Domain 5 in the Whale Tail open pit. c) Validate the Brittle Structure model.	This work has not yet been completed. The original recommendations remain relevant. Key decisions are being made based on the Brittle / High Strain Structure model (e.g., Whale Tail open pit lower Northeast Wall redesign, tactical measures for the Whale Tail open pit Northwest Wall, design of the IVR V2 open pit North Wall etc.) increasing the importance of validating the model through mapping in the open pits and underground mine. While it is unrealistic to assume that all structures will agree with the model, it is expected that many of the major structures will be able to be identified consistently across the open pit slopes.	Complete the original recommendation, with a particular focus on validating the Brittle / High Strain Structure model. Key areas include Design Sector A1K, E4, D4K, and IVR V2A. If there are significant changes to the interpretation of the structures, the potential impact on the open pit slope performance and design should be assessed. Priority increased to P2.	This work has not yet been completed. The original recommendations remain relevant. Structural mapping has not been completed since 2023 inspection.	Complete regular structural mapping with the objectives of: - Confirming the general structural trends (e.g., the dip of the foliation). - Identifying prominent structures that can strongly influence slope performance, including the Brittle / High Strain Structures. - Confirming the extents of Structural Domain 5 in the South Wall of the Whale Tail Pit. - Validating the Brittle / High Strain Structure model. Key areas include Design Sector A1K, D4K, H5, G5 and IVR V2A. If there are significant changes to the interpretation of the structures, the potential impact on the open pit slope performance and design should be assessed.	The Rock Mechanics team has completed structural mapping of four general areas within the Whale Tail Pit (East Wall above and below the ramp, Southeast Wall below the ramp). The data have not yet been consolidated or reviewed for trends. No mapping is currently undertaken to validate the Brittle / High Strain Structure model.	Complete structural mapping in the IVR open pits to confirm the general trends in the orientation of the foliation and to validate the High-Strain / Brittle Structure model. This is particularly important for the V2A and the V2/V1AK design sectors. Confirm the joint sets that formed the wedge in the South Wall of the IVR V2 open pit. Consolidate and review the structural mapping for the Whale Tail Pit to confirm the general structural trends as well as the extents of Structural Domains 2, 5 and 6 in the Southeast, South and Southwest Walls. Continue to complete structural mapping in the Whale Tail Pit. Assess the potential impact on the open pit slope performance and design if there are significant changes to the interpretation of the rock mass structure.	P2	1) Systematic mapping will be completed by the team & OP support once the walls of concern in V2A start to be exposed (we're not there yet). 2) The wedge in the south wall will be mapped. 3) The OP consultants will work with the team to develop a useful format for evaluating the mapping previously completed in WHL. Domains will be validated through this process and reported in the quarterly or alternate document.	Not started	01/Aug/26	-	1) Mapping of IVR North wall is high priority for the team 3) The komatite contact along the southwall has already been adjusted by the Geology team to reflect field mapping, observations, and DDH data. We are using this to help us predict where future rockfalls could occur and scaling them out or adjusting blasting as needed before failure can occur. This has been an effective mitigation.
		Complete geomechanical mapping on a regular basis, consistent with the commitments in the GCMP. Mapping is particularly important in Q2 and Q3 when the bench faces are clear of snow. The mapping should focus on critical areas of the open pit, including Design Sectors D4K and F6 of the Whale Tail pit and V0A, V2A and V2E of the IVR pits.	The Rock Mechanics team commits to undertaking spot mapping every 150 m along each of the final benches. The mapping is not reliably completed; 18 locations were mapped in the first quarter of 2023 but none were mapped in the second quarter. The mapping to date has been focussed on critical areas in Design Sector D4 of the Whale Tail pit and Design Sector V0A of the IVR V1 pit, which is endorsed. The mapping should also include Design Sectors A1K, F6 at the Whale Tail pit and Design Sectors V2A and V2E of the IVR V2 pit.	Complete the original recommendation. The mapping should include Design Sectors A1K, D4, D4K, F6 and IVR V2A and V2E. There is a need for periodic mapping to confirm the rock mass characteristics that underpin the design recommendations or when unexpected/unusual conditions are encountered (e.g., sheared Mafic Volcanics).	Geomechanical mapping has not been completed since the 2023 inspection. The commitment for spot mapping has been reduced from "once every 150 m along each of the final benches" to on a "as needed basis".	Complete geomechanical mapping to confirm the rock mass design parameters and characterize any unusual or unexpected conditions. The mapping could be completed annually or when unusual conditions are observed. The commitment in the GCMP should be clarified accordingly.	The Rock Mechanics team has completed rock mass quality spot mapping of four general areas within the Whale Tail Pit (East Wall above and below the ramp, Southeast Wall below the ramp). The data have not yet been consolidated or reviewed for trends. No mapping has been completed in the IVR pits. The commitment in the GCMP has been clarified and now specifies that mapping is to be completed annually or when unusual conditions are observed.	Complete sufficient geomechanical mapping (e.g., GSI estimates of rock mass quality) to confirm the rock mass design parameters and characterize any unusual or unexpected conditions. Consolidate and review the collected data for trends or deviations from the design basis.	P2	1) We regular request that Geology support our structural mapping process. 2) We have completed the update to the lithology model for the Komatite in the south wall. The wall has been assessed and we are using the new litho to predict where future rockfalls could occur and are removing the hazard in advance.	Ongoing	LOM Task	-	
Review of 5-Year Mine Plan and LOM	(New Recommendation in 2024)				Recovery of the crown pillar between the underground workings and the open pit is planned for the second half of 2026. Extraction of the crown pillar is likely to adversely influence slope performance, including in areas that have performed well to date. A workshop was held on August 21, 2024 to review the risks associated with the recovery of the crown pillar and to identify potential control measures. A series of follow-up action items were identified.	Implement the actions identified during the crown pillar workshop. Assign priorities and track progress. The Underground Weekly Planning meeting minutes summarize the progress of lightfilling the stopes and development below the crown pillar. The cable bolts are being installed in the footwall drive intersections as each stope is mined. This is being tracked through the stope PSDs.	The various commitments related to the crown pillar, including from previous design studies and the 2024 workshop, are tracked in a table by the Rock Mechanics team. Progress is being made. The Underground Weekly Planning meeting minutes summarize the progress of lightfilling the stopes and development below the crown pillar. The cable bolts are being installed in the footwall drive intersections as each stope is mined. This is being tracked through the stope PSDs.	None. Continue to track this work to completion.	Complete					
	(New Recommendation in 2024)				The benches below the ramp in the Northeast Wall of the Whale Tail open pit are intended to be established during the winter months in order to take advantage of the strengthening effect of the permafrost. The benches will then be buttressed. In the current LOM, the first two benches are established by the end of September 2025. This is likely too early to ensure that the benches remain frozen. Mining in this area is planned to be completed by April 2026.	Review the timing of the development of the benches below the ramp in the Northeast Wall of the Whale Tail open pit and ensure that they will remain frozen between development and buttressing prior to freshet. Ensure the construction of the buttress is included in the LOM and Budget mine plans. Note that there may be an opportunity to recover more ore in this area if a greater number of benches can be excavated and buttressed during the winter than currently planned.	The timing of the development of the benches and the subsequent buttress below the ramp in the Northeast Wall of the Whale Tail open pit was reviewed during the inspection. The buttress has not yet been incorporated into the LOM or budget mine plans. A high-level review suggests that it will be possible to mine the benches while they are frozen and to construct the buttress prior to freshet. However, the details are important and need to be worked through.	Design the buttress in detail and include it in the LOM and Budget mine plans. Ensure that the benches will remain frozen between establishing the benches and constructing the buttress prior to freshet. If this is not possible, a revised mining strategy will be required for this area.	P2	Buttress was designed and placed in the field.	Completed	30/Mar/26	10/Mar/26	Note that the wall of concern performed much better than expected. Conditions were very favourable, even in winter.
	(New Recommendation in 2025)					Most recent rockfalls have occurred along High-Strain Brittle Structures #1, #4 and #2 in the Northwest Wall and along the contacts of the Komatite in the South Wall. The mine has started to anticipate these failures by projecting the contacts to the next bench and making these areas a focus of monitoring and scaling. Scaling the wedges can be ineffective if the benches are established in the winter and the rock mass remains frozen. The wedges fail during or after freshet as the rock mass thaws. These wedges are expected to continue to form as the open pit continues to depth.	Review the location and impact of potential future failures along the HSBs and contacts (particularly where they are located along the ramp) and develop a mitigation plan developed. This could include local adjustments to the bench geometry / trim blasting to mine out potential wedges, shear pins, buttresses, rockfall berms, a focussed monitoring plan, etc.	These actions are systematically being implemented: - shear pins and a rockfall barrier was installed along the southwall to protect the future ramp. - a buttress was installed in the NE corner of WHL. - a rockfall barrier will be installed in East WHL once the zone of concern is exposed. - the bottom of the pit will be designed according to the domain and lithology it is in. - Holes closest to the wall have been removed to decrease observed damage to the walls. - Edge protectors are ready to go should we see peeling back into the ramp. - rockfall berms are systematically used per our procedures. - we will have 24/7 radar monitoring during freshet	P3		Completed		16/Mar/26	

Knight Piesold Observations, Comments and Recommendations										AEM Implementation Action Plan							
Category	Topic	2022 Recommendations	2023 Status and Comments	2023 Recommendations	2024 Status and Comments	2024 Recommendations	2025 Status and Comments	2025 Recommendations	Priority	AEM Action Plan / Follow-up	Status	Due Date	Completion Date	AEM Comments / Update			
Design		(New Recommendation in 2025)					The 260-ST-206 will be exposed in the East Wall of the Whale Tail pit, below the step-in on which the ramp buttress will be constructed. The slope is partially backfilled with Unconsolidated Rockfill (URF). Once exposed in the open pit wall the URF will be a potential rockfall hazard. In addition, migration of the URF could result in a loss of confinement acting on the benches intersected by the slope, increasing the potential for a bench-scale instability (which could impact the buttress above).	Review measures for managing the slope and develop a detailed plan for incorporation into the mine plan. These measures could include: - Modifying the local bench geometry to remove or reduce the size of brows formed by the exposure of the slope in the wall. - Applying shotcrete to the URF, draping chain-link mesh over the area, and/or constructing rockfall berms to manage the rock fall hazard. - Installing ground support (e.g., cable bolts) to reinforce the brow above the slope. Note that modifying the design of the benches above the slope may be possible to reduce the hazard. However, current design scenarios result in a steepened inter-ramp angle that does not meet the slope design acceptance criteria.	P3	A plan has been developed: - In order to respect a 10m pillar height minimum, a 14m bench will be blasted in a single shot. - Once the slope is exposed, any void will be packed with material. A JHA will be conducted to do this safely. - A team will be hired to install a rockfall barrier across the open slope. Also requiring a JHA. - The final buttress is reasonably far back from the area of concern and will be evaluated for instability, but at this time it is not expected to pose a risk. - Berms will be used as needed throughout the process and with the final conditions.	Ongoing	30/Aug/26	-	Note that the inter-ramp angle does and always had respected the slope design criteria. The team had been discussing mitigation options for this zone with the auditor, however this was never included in the mine plan.			
		Document the bench performance and key rock mass characteristics in the IVR V2 open pit and compare them to the design. In particular, it is important to verify that the north wall is being established in the Mafic Volcanics and below the Brittle Structure expected along the contact between the Mafic Volcanics and the Komatiite as the slope geometry recommendations for the V2A and V2E design sectors are based on this premise.	The bench performance of the IVR V2 open pit was reviewed as part of the Open Pit Ground Control Quarterly Reports in Q3 2022 and Q1 2021. The lithologies and high-strain/brittle structures exposed in the open pit slopes have not been reviewed relative to the design. The rock mass quality and structure encountered in the pit had not been quantitatively documented at the time of the audit.	Document the lithology, rock mass quality, and rock mass structure at regular intervals in the IVR V2 pit and compare them to the design. Continue to document and review the bench performance. KP is in the process of completing a detailed review of the design of the IVR V2 open pit, including the bench performance and rock mass characteristics.	Documentation of the lithology, rock mass quality, and rock mass structure in the IVR V2 pit has not been completed in 2024. This is because mining has focussed on the pushback of the west wall where the slope performance is less sensitive to the expected variation in rock mass characteristics. These activities should be resumed once mining restarts on the footwall (i.e., V2A design sector). The review of the design of the IVR V2 open pit was completed by KP in 2024. The review is documented in letter NB24-00250 issued in March 2024. The slope performance in the V2A design sector will be sensitive to the position and characteristics of the high-strain/brittle structures. The bench performance of the final walls is reviewed as part of the quarterly reports.	Document the lithology, rock mass quality, and rock mass structure in the V2A design sector of the IVR V2 pit, with a particular focus on the position, orientation, and characteristics of the high-strain/brittle structures. The existing benches should be mapped as soon as practical and periodic mapping should be planned for when mining resumes in this design sector.	This work remains outstanding. Mining of the North Wall of IVR V2 was limited to a couple of benches over the last twelve months.	This recommendation has been grouped with the recommendations in the Rock Mass Characterization section.	N/A	-	-	-	-	-			
Design Verification and Optimization		(New Recommendation in 2024)					The catch bench width compliance for the IVR V2 pit continues to be challenging, with only 60% of the catch benches established to date achieving a width of 8 m. Approximately 85% of the catch benches achieved a width of 6 m, which has been demonstrated to be adequate for retaining rockfall. The underperforming catch benches are not limited to any one design sector, and include walls with favourable rock mass conditions. As a result, it is likely that the cause is linked to operational factors. The on-going efforts to reduce backbreak appear to be having a positive effect but this has not been quantified.	Review the causes of the poor catch bench width compliance in the IVR V2 pit including drilling, blasting, and scaling practices resulting in crest loss and/or hard toes. Summarize the status and effectiveness of the previous initiatives to reduce the catch bench loss. Implement measures to improve the catch bench width compliance and track their progress (e.g., on a monthly or quarterly basis). The mine needs to demonstrate that the minimum catch bench width can be reliably achieved or the design catch bench width will need to be increased or a variance obtained from the WSCC. Priority based on potential for an order from the regulator.	Back break was measured for the IVR V2 pit for Q3-Q4 of 2024. The backbreak averaged 1.6 to 2 m (excluding the first bench which is influenced by surface effects). However, catch bench width compliance was not assessed. The catch bench width compliance was assessed in Q2 2025. The catch benches evaluated achieved the required width of 8 m with 79% reliability. This is consistent with the design basis. The catch bench performance needs to be more consistently compared to the design basis. Recommend continuing to complete this as part of the Quarterly Summary Reports.	P3	Consistently complete the catch bench compliance reviews as part of the Quarterly Summary Reports. Priority reduced to P3 given the progress demonstrated over the last year.	This is already included in our quarterly process and will continue.	Completed	-	-	-	-
		(New Recommendation in 2024)					Rock Mechanics has recently started to review and document the catch bench width compliance for the Whale Tail pit. Previous efforts focused solely on measuring the backbreak and this change is endorsed.	Complete systematic reviews of the catch bench width compliance for all new benches in the Whale Tail pit.	Catch bench compliance was reviewed for each of the final benches established since Q2 2024. The catch benches achieved the required 8 m with 75 to 80% reliability. This is consistent with the design basis.	Complete	-	-	-	-			
		(New Recommendation in 2023)	The redesign of the Northeast wall of the Whale Tail open pit is based in part on the results of a numerical model that have not yet been validated. There is a need to validate the numerical model results and thus the slope design.	Use the numerical model to define criteria for comparing the model results to the observed/measured performance of the Northeast Wall. Use these criteria to verify the slope design.	This work remains outstanding. The mine has installed an SAA and three GNSS beacons in the Northeast Wall since the previous annual inspection and the SSR has recently been moved to a position on the South Wall where it will have long-term coverage of the Northeast Wall. These data can be used to validate the numerical model and better predict both the long-term slope performance and the impact of crown pillar recovery on the slopes.	Periodically compile and review the data from the SSR, GNSS beacons, and SAA. The interpretation of the slope deformation developed from these data should then be compared to the slope performance predicted by the model. It is recommended that this be done quarterly or semi-annually. Priority increased to P2 based on the time available to collect and review these data before the crown pillar is recovered.	This work remains outstanding. The mine is planning to supplement the data from the GNSS beacons and SAA with InSAR and periodic LIDAR scans. While the expansion of the monitoring program is a good initiative, there is a need to start reviewing the existing monitoring data in aggregate and using it to validate the numerical modelling results. As time passes, the value that can be obtained from this process is diminishing.	Complete the 2024 recommendations. At least an initial review should be completed in Q4 2025.	P2	No major movement has been observed to date: - The GNSS beacons have not seen any movement. - The SAA has only seen 9mm of movement over several years and the rate of movement has decreased in the last year. This is not enough movement to make any deductions regarding rock slope deformation. - InSAR was trialed but due to the direction and angle of the walls in WHL and limitations of the available satellites, the data received was not usable. - We will trial LIDAR scanning this summer to look for deformation trends. - Field monitoring and observations will continue to be our main tool, along with radar monitoring.	Completed	Q4 2025	31/Dec/25	-			
		(New Recommendation in 2024)					The open pit is reaching the expected boundary between Structural Domains 5 and 6. The position of this boundary is uncertain and is based on discontinuity orientation data from a limited number of drillholes. There is a significant difference in the expected slope performance and the slope geometry recommendations for design sectors H5 and G5 in Structural Domain 5 and the overlying design sectors H6 and F6 in Structural Domain 6. It is important that the appropriate slope geometry is implemented for the encountered conditions. The observed slope performance in the Southeast Wall suggests that Design Sector F6 may extend deeper than currently planned.	Confirm the extents of Structural Domain 5 and adjust the implementation of the slope geometry recommendations for the South and Southeast walls accordingly (i.e., Design Sectors H6/H5 and F6/G5).	Structural mapping has been completed in the lower South Wall over the last year. These data can be used to refine / confirm the transition from Structural Domain 5. The data have not yet been consolidated and reviewed. Observations in the open pit suggest that the active bench has reached the transition to Structural Domain 5.	N/A	-	-	-	-	-		
		(New Recommendation in 2024)					The open pit slope geometry recommendations and expected slope performance for the future lower Northwest and North Wall of the Whale Tail open pit is sensitive to whether or not, and to what degree, the S1-S2 foliation and Brittle / High Strain Structures folds and dips to the north at depth in the pit. There is limited drillhole coverage of this area.	Review the confidence in the dip of the foliation and Brittle / High Strain Structures at the base of the final Northwest and North walls of the Whale Tail open pit. If the confidence is limited, collect additional data to confirm the orientation of the S1-S2 foliation and the orientation and position of the Brittle / High Strain Structures in this area. This could be through diamond drilling or through mapping of the cross-outs on 260L in the underground mine.	Mapping of the cross-outs on 260L in the underground mine was completed in 2024. The measured orientation of the foliation is consistent with the expectation that it folds to the north.	Complete	-	-	-	-	-		

Knight Piesold Observations, Comments and Recommendations										AEM Implementation Action Plan					
Category	Topic	2022 Recommendations	2023 Status and Comments	2023 Recommendations	2024 Status and Comments	2024 Recommendations	2025 Status and Comments	2025 Recommendations	Priority	AEM Action Plan / Follow-up	Status	Due Date	Completion Date	AEM Comments / Update	
Implementation: Inspections and Monitoring	Inspections	(New Recommendation in 2023)	IVR West 2 was barricaded upon completion of mining. This was an effective method of managing the risk associated with the identified rockfall hazards in the pit. It was identified during the 2022 annual review that access would eventually be required for dewatering purposes and that the construction of a rockfall berm along the inside of the ramp was recommended prior to re-entry. However, in late June or early July, dewatering personnel were allowed access to install a pump at the base of the ramp. The rockfall berm had not been constructed. A rock mechanics inspection was not completed prior to personnel accessing the pit. The pump was installed below a rockfall hazard and adjacent several large blocks that had fallen onto the ramp. These rockfall hazards were either not identified by the dewatering personnel or were identified and no action was taken. The hazard was identified during the 2023 annual inspection and the pump was removed and the pit barricaded the following day.	Ensure that a rock mechanics inspection is completed before work activities resume in barricaded areas. The intent is to re-assess existing hazards and to assess whether new hazards have developed over time. All hazards should be mitigated before access is allowed. A rockfall berm should be constructed along the inside of the ramp if the IVR West 2 pit is used for water management in the future. Prior to the removal of the pump and the re-establishment of the barricade, this was a P1 priority.	None	A rock mechanics inspection is now completed before work resumes in a closed area/open pit. These areas are tracked on the Hazard Maps. A rockfall berm has not been constructed along the inside of the ramp in the IVR West 2 pit. However, access to the IVR West 2 pit is prevented by a berm and access is not currently planned.		The IVR West 2 pit is periodically accessed by dewatering personnel who have to travel along the ramp, below a series of rockfall hazards. While Rock Mechanics completes an inspection of the ramp before allowing access, the hazards have not been mitigated. If access into the open pit continues to be required, these hazards need to be mitigated. As a result this recommendation has been re-opened.	Permanently close the open pit or mitigate the rockfall hazards above the IVR West 2 Ramp. Mitigation is expected to require the removal of the loose material at the crest of the slopes and/or the construction of a rockfall berm along the inside of the ramp).	P2	IVR West 2 pit is occasionally accessed by the dewatering team after the area has been inspected by Rock Mechanics personnel. Rock Mechanics evaluate for instabilities or signs of movement. A berm will be installed per the recommendations but the RM team feel this zone is under control.	Not started	01/Aug/26	-	-
		Review the use of the Hazard Maps: a) Refine the legend on the Hazard Map to clearly note the restrictions associated with the risk ratings (e.g., Yellow – Spotter Required). b) Provide more detailed guidance, including examples, on how to determine the risk ratings. c) Consider the use of physical markers (e.g., pylons) in the open pit to remind personnel of hazards that are not bermed off (e.g., Yellow Zones). d) Consider a separate method for communicating the corrective actions to Operations so that it is clear that the Hazard Map is focussed on existing hazards rather than whether or not work has been completed. This could be captured within the Bench Approval process. e) Two of the hazards noted as requiring ongoing monitoring in the Hazard Tracking Database have been removed from the hazard map. All current hazards requiring mitigation should be shown on the Hazard Map.	The use of the Hazard Maps has been reviewed. a) The legend has been revised to clearly indicate the need for a spotter in Medium Risk (Yellow) areas. b) There continues to be limited guidance on how to determine the risk ratings. The mine relies on practical training by the Rock Mechanics Coordinator. While the training is important, the ratings are a critical aspect of hazard management at the mine and more detailed formal guidance on their selection should be developed. c) The mine has considered the use of physical markers in the open pit to demarcate the Yellow hazard areas that are not bermed off but has concluded that it would be impractical to implement. d) The Hazard Map is focussed on rock mechanics hazards. While corrective actions related to the identified hazards are noted on the map, the corrective actions are primarily communicated and tracked through the Pit Wall Approval procedure and the Hazard Tracking Database. e) Not all existing hazards are shown on the map. This is discussed separately as a new recommendation under Hazard Tracking, below.	Provide more detailed guidance, including examples, on how to determine the risk ratings. Priority has been revised to P3.	This work remains outstanding.	Complete the 2023 recommendation. The objective is to promote consistency among rock mechanics personnel and to help guide less experienced personnel.	Criteria or examples have not been developed to help with the selection of risk ratings. However, only two personnel complete the hazard maps and they feel that they are on the same page. The hazard map has been updated to show the location of the Komatitite Zones (which trigger the Working With Komatitite procedure) and the position of berms. The mine has also started using Green Candles to demarcate geotechnical hazards. These are a positive developments.	This recommendation is not considered applicable given the current capabilities of the Rock Mechanics team. The recommendation would revert if the team changed. Consider developing more detailed guidance in the event of a future change in personnel.	N/A	-	-	-	-	-	
		(New Recommendation in 2025)						The hazard maps form the basis for the risk-based Work Close to Pit Wall procedure, which is a key process for managing geotechnical risk. A spotter is required in Medium Risk areas but not in Low Risk areas. Remedial measures are required in High or Very High Risk areas and these areas are demarcated with a berm or candles. The Low and Medium Risk areas are only communicated via the hazard maps and are not demarcated in the field. However, the hazard maps are not routinely carried by personnel working in the pit and are not updated outside of the regular two-week cycle. As a result, it is not clear whether personnel can reliably apply the Work Close to Pit Wall procedure. Note that the Drillers and Blasters only work on patterns cleared by Rock Mechanics through the Wall Approval procedure; as such the personnel most likely to be exposed to Medium Risk areas are Surveyors and Geologists.	Review the integration between the Work Close to Pit Wall procedure and the hazard maps to ensure that the procedure can be consistently implemented as intended.	P2	These two processes are reviewed every year. It will be reviewed this spring. However note the following: - Hazards maps have always been sent out to all supervisors working in the pit and it is their responsibility to provide copies to their teams. - Areas require scaling and a wall inspection conducted by Rock Mechanics before they may be considered low risk. All hazards are removed at this time. Through the wall approval process, the low risk zones are demarcated in the field. Since this is an open pit with 21m walls, we will never call a zone "no hazard". - Yellow zones require a spotter within 10m of the wall. Which is respected by Survey and Geology.	Ongoing	01/Jun/26	-	-
		Review the Pit Wall Approval process: a) Review the communication of bench approvals with Engineering and Operations to ensure that the process is reliably followed. b) Incorporate a checklist to improve consistency between staff and avoid hazards being missed. c) Limit approvals in key sectors (e.g. WHL F6) to experienced staff.	The list of upcoming patterns is reviewed each morning during the daily production meeting. This includes whether or not the walls adjacent the pattern have been approved. The mine is in the process of updating the Pit Wall Approval procedure so that patterns are only released to Survey once the required wall approvals are completed. This is endorsed. A checklist has not yet been implemented. The Rock Mechanics team currently relies on practical training in the field for new staff. Approvals in key sectors are now only completed by experienced staff.	Update the Pit Wall Approval procedure as planned. Continue to recommend the development of a checklist to improve consistency between staff and avoid hazards being missed. Priority has been revised to P3.	A checklist has not yet been implemented. The Rock Mechanics team currently relies on practical training in the field for new staff.	Continue to recommend the development of a checklist to improve consistency among staff and to avoid hazards being missed.	A checklist has not yet been implemented. The Pit Wall Approvals are currently only completed by three to four experienced staff and the team feels that the results are consistent. This would change if new staff join the team. The Pit Wall Approval procedure was planned to be updated this year and the team intends to address this recommendation as part of that process.	Develop a checklist to improve consistency among staff and to avoid hazards being missed.	We will complete this to ensure appropriate onboarding of NS personnel	P4	Not started	01/May/26	-	-	-
(New Recommendation in 2024)					The Rock Mechanics team completes drone surveys of the open pit slopes each month during the summer. While the photos and videos are saved on the network, the results of the surveys are not reported.	Document the drone surveys in brief reports. The reports should present the conditions in key areas as well as any observations of slope instability or unusual conditions.	The drone surveys are summarized in reports that present a side-by-side comparison of the current and prior conditions of the catch benches. These are nice summaries. The reports currently focus on overall slope performance. There is value in periodically including close-ups of specific areas of interest (e.g., area with Edge Protectors along ramp) where the drone is best-suited to identifying potential instabilities.	Periodically include close-up photos of specific areas of interest in the drone survey reports. This should include the bench and bench crest with the Edge Protectors above the South Wall failure.	P3	Ok to include	Completed	-	-	-	

Knight Piesold Observations, Comments and Recommendations										AEM Implementation Action Plan					
Category	Topic	2022 Recommendations	2023 Status and Comments	2023 Recommendations	2024 Status and Comments	2024 Recommendations	2025 Status and Comments	2025 Recommendations	Priority	AEM Action Plan / Follow-up	Status	Due Date	Completion Date	AEM Comments / Update	
Instrumentation and Monitoring		(New Recommendation in 2024)			The SSRs for the Whale Tail pit have been moved to semi-permanent locations. This will result in a much longer-term set of monitoring data to assess the slope performance than has been available to date. The Komatite in the Northeast and Northwest slopes is likely to experience more deformation over time than the other lithologies. It is possible that this deformation could be a precursor to a large-scale instability. The current SSR alarms are focussed on relatively brittle small-scale failures and the mine would benefit from defining additional alarms that consider longer-term trends over a larger area of the slope.	Define additional SSR alarms that consider the potential for large-scale slope instability that manifest over an extended period. The length of the period is likely to be limited by noise in the data (e.g., atmospheric effects).	The potential for monitoring longer-term deformation using the radar is limited based on discussions with GroundProbe. The practical limit is in the order of 3 months.	None. Continue to periodically monitor longer-term deformation trends. Changes in slope behaviour should trigger a review.	Complete						
		(New Recommendation in 2024)			The SSR alarm parameters are currently reviewed infrequently and on an ad-hoc basis. The SSR is a key tool for managing the risk associated with slope failures at the mine and there is a need to periodically review the effectiveness of the alarm parameters.	Define a commitment to review the effectiveness of the SSR alarm parameters on an annual basis, if the observed/anticipated slope performance changes, or if a significant instability did not trigger an alarm. The alarms should be updated as necessary based on the results of the review. GroundProbe's GSS can assist with the review process if needed.	The SSR alarm parameters were reviewed by AEM and GroundProbe in July 2024 and the impact of different thresholds considered. The velocity threshold was reduced from 1.3 mm/hr to 1 mm/hr over 2 hours, 2 scans and 3 contiguous pixels. In certain areas, the alarm is sometimes relaxed to 1mm/hr over 80 minutes and 3 pixels over 2 scans.	Define a commitment (e.g., in the GCMP) to review and reconcile the alarm parameters annually as well as after major failures or failures where the SSR alarms were ineffective to ensure that they remain effective.	P3	Commitment will be included in next GCMP iteration. The quarterly is already capturing the effectiveness of the radars.	Not started	01/Jul/26			
		Define a red trigger for the SSR TARP to provide a backstop for unprecedented or unexpected conditions.	A global Red Alarm trigger has not been defined. The intent is to define these on a case by case basis for high risk activities requiring constant monitoring.	Continue to recommend the development of a Red Alarm for at least the areas of the open pit where SSR is a critical control. The intent is to capture unprecedented or unexpected conditions.	A Red Alarm has not been developed and the mine's preference is to always have Rock Mechanics in the loop before a decision is made to evacuate personnel from a particular area. The mine has retained GroundProbe's Geotechnical Support Services (GSS) to provide 24/7 remote monitoring of the SSR. Alarms and unusual trends are communicated to the Rock Mechanics team, including a member on call during the night shift. As a result, someone from the Rock Mechanics team reviews all alarms promptly. The use of GSS reduces the likelihood that an unprecedented / unexpected instability is missed.	This recommendation is being closed. However, the development of a Red Alarm would provide a backstop to the current SSR monitoring process and may still be needed in the future depending on the slope performance or mining activities. If a Red Alarm will not be defined, it should be removed from the TARP.			N/A						
		Explain in the GCMP or radar monitoring procedure why the SSR alarms have been set at their current values and provide guidance on how they can be adjusted based on different circumstances.	The Ground Control Monitoring Using Radar System Procedure sets out the current alarm triggers and when they can be adjusted. However, no guidance is provided on how to adjust them based on different circumstances.	Complete the original recommendation. While it is recognized that it is not practical to cover all eventualities, recommend providing additional guidance on how to define alarm criteria.	This work remains outstanding.	Complete the original recommendation.	The Ground Control Monitoring Using Radar System Procedure was updated in July and is awaiting approvals. The updated procedure now explains the common alarm triggers used and provides guidance on how they can be adjusted based on different circumstances.	None. Finalize the procedure once it is approved.		Complete					
		(New Recommendation in 2024)				The existing GNSS/GPS beacons are installed in areas identified as having an increased potential or consequence of slope deformation. This is reasonable. However, there is value in having one or more beacons installed in areas expected to be stable in order to define a baseline.	Develop a comprehensive monitoring plan for the LOM. As part of the plan, install GNSS/GPS beacons on the North Wall of the Whale Tail pit in the Greywacke. Installing the beacons in the lower North Wall will also allow them to be used to assess whether the Greywacke starts to deform during recovery of the crown pillar as predicted by the numerical model.	One additional GNSS beacon was installed in the North Wall of the Whale Tail Pit in the Greywacke in April 2025. A further four, potentially five, GNSS beacons are planned to be installed in the lower North and Northeast walls as they are established in 2026 and 2027.	Finalize the instrumentation locations and complete the planned instrumentation.	P3	Ongoing	Ongoing	01/Nov/26		
		(New Recommendation in 2024)				The GNSS/GPS beacons have been installed but are not yet fully integrated into the mine's monitoring system. As a result, the data are not consistently available or reviewed for trends. Trigger thresholds, alarms, and a TARP have not yet been developed.	Fully integrate the GNSS/GPS beacons into the mine's monitoring system, including MonitorIQ. Define a TARP and alarms for the beacons. Review the scatter in the data with the service provider. One option to better understand the accuracy of the instruments is to compare the data with the deformation reported by the SSR.	The GNSS beacons are now fully integrated into MonitorIQ. The beacons are relatively imprecise and are better suited to long-term monitoring and trend identification rather than real-time critical safety applications. An alarm has been specified for 10 mm/hr. The ability to set more restrictive alarms is constrained by the precision of the beacons. The available data suggest that this alarm may be triggered by spurious readings. There is speculation that the base station may be moving and introducing a displacement error into the data set (e.g., the drift of the beacons towards the southwest). The battery in the beacon installed along the ramp in the Northwest Wall of the Whale Tail pit is currently dead.	Investigate whether the base station is moving and whether it needs to be relocated to a stable area. Redefine the existing alarm or define a new alarm over a longer reporting period that is better suited to the beacons. Develop a TARP to manage the response to the alarms. Suggest adjusting the displacement plots to only show the trendline (i.e., not the individual data) when they will be shared outside of the Rock Mechanics team. Replace the dead battery in the beacon installed along the ramp in the Northwest Wall of the Whale Tail pit. Priority reduced to P3 based on the progress made to date.	P3	There is no evidence of movement in the base station to date. The alarm has been set to 15mm/hr. Battery of the dead beacon has been replaced. A TARP will be created in the next iteration of the GCMP.	Closed			

Knight Piesold Observations, Comments and Recommendations										AEM Implementation Action Plan				
Category	Topic	2022 Recommendations	2023 Status and Comments	2023 Recommendations	2024 Status and Comments	2024 Recommendations	2025 Status and Comments	2025 Recommendations	Priority	AEM Action Plan / Follow-up	Status	Due Date	Completion Date	AEM Comments / Update
Implementation: Inspections and Monitoring		(New Recommendation in 2024)			The ramp above the South Wall failure in the Whale Tail pit is currently restricted to single lane traffic. The failure was reviewed in detail as part of the annual inspection. Further progression of the failure towards the ramp was identified as unlikely but possible. Re-opening the ramp to two-way traffic will require the implementation of monitoring and mitigation measures to manage the risk associated with this possibility.	Develop a monitoring and mitigation plan for the failure in the South Wall of the Whale Tail pit, below the ramp. One option discussed during the annual inspection would be to re-position the berm at the crest of the failure, to prevent access to the area affected by the plausible progression of the failure. The failure could then be monitored using a combination of the SSR and visual inspections. A location-specific alarm should be defined for the failure (e.g., using the criteria suggested by GroundProbe).	The area has been re-opened to two-lane traffic after Edge Protectors were installed. A localized SSR alarm has been defined for the bench below this area and visual inspections are completed every two weeks. The overhanging slab adjacent the initial failure ultimately failed but did not affect the ramp. The area is difficult to inspect visually and can be more effectively monitored using a drone.	Supplement the visual inspections of the bench with the Edge Protectors with close-up photos of the bench and bench crest using the drone. This recommendation has been grouped with the recommendation for periodically including close-up photos of specific areas of interest in the drone survey reports.	N/A					
		(New Recommendation in 2025)					The SAA installed in the upper Northeast Wall of the WHL open pit is reporting displacement into the open pit, as expected. The data vary over time, likely due to whether or not mining is occurring at the toe of the slope.	Plot the SAA data relative to significant changes in mining activities below the Northeast Wall. Determine whether the slope deformation can be linked to mining activities or other potential controls (e.g., seasonal trends). If the deformation accelerates these relationships can be valuable for managing slope performance.	P3	This task cannot be completed. There is not enough displacement (9mm over 3 years) to be able to identify jumps in data from OP blasting. We will continue to monitor the SAA for increased movement, however the movement has decreased from 1mm/m to 0.28mm/m over the last year.	Closed			
		(New Recommendation in 2023)	The design of the IVR V2 open pit North Wall is sensitive to the position and orientation of the High Strain / Brittle Structures, as well as the presence of Komatite. This is one of very few design sectors at Amaruq where the potential for inter-ramp scale failures limited the slope design. As a result, increased monitoring is recommended.	Plan for full-time SSR coverage of the North Wall of the IVR V2 open pit once mining extends further to depth in 2024.	The purchase of a third SSR unit to allow for full time coverage of the IVR V2 open pit is being considered for the 2025 budget. Mining of the North Wall is currently paused as mining activities are focussed on the pushback to the west.	Plan for full-time SSR coverage of the North Wall of the IVR V2 open pit once mining of the North Wall resumes. The SSR should be supplemented with other monitoring systems (e.g., GNSS/GPS beacons, SAAs, etc.). Develop an overall monitoring plan for the IVR V2 North Wall.	A third SSR has been purchased for use at IVR and is expected to arrive in Q3 of 2025. A replacement SSR was purchased and has been set up for the oldest SSR (#253). SSR 253 has been kept on site with the intent to use it for tactical monitoring in-pit. An overall monitoring plan has not yet been developed for the IVR V2 North Wall.	Set-up and incorporate the third SSR into the monitoring program as planned. The SSR should be supplemented with other monitoring systems (e.g., GNSS/GPS beacons, SAAs, etc.). Develop an overall monitoring plan for the IVR V2 North Wall.	P3	The third radar has been commissioned and is in use since October. A monitoring plan for North IVR is already developed. We will closely monitor for implementation of instruments.	Closed	01/Nov/25	01/Nov/25	
Hazard Tracking		Implement a mechanism within the Hazard Tracking Database to flag overdue corrective actions. If an action has been superseded or the hazard mitigated through other means the action should be closed out.	Hazards with overdue corrective actions or that have been unmitigated for extended durations are not flagged. In some cases, corrective actions that have been superseded are noted as such and the action closed out, but this is not consistently done. This aspect of this recommendation is discussed as part of the new recommendation below.	Complete the original recommendation.	A mechanism within the Hazard Tracking Database to flag overdue corrective actions remains outstanding. There is a need to clean up the database so that it is an effective tool.	Complete the original recommendation.	The database has been cleaned up. There are still a few overdue / outstanding items, some of which can no longer be addressed (e.g., access has been lost). These are usually highlighted in red.	None. Continue to periodically review and clean-up the database.	Complete					
		(New Recommendation in 2023)	There are multiple hazards documented in the Hazard Tracking Database that have not been closed out but are being managed through exclusion zones (or other means of limiting exposure). The intent is to ensure they are identified, communicated to personnel and mitigated prior to resuming work in the area. For example, this could be accomplished using a new status in the database and/or with a separate layer on the Hazard Maps.	Develop a process to track hazards that have not been eliminated but are being managed through exclusion zones (or other means of limiting exposure). The intent is to ensure they are identified, communicated to personnel and mitigated prior to resuming work in the area. For example, this could be accomplished using a new status in the database and/or with a separate layer on the Hazard Maps.	This work remains outstanding.	Complete the original recommendation.	This work remains outstanding.	Develop a process to track hazards that have not been eliminated but are being managed through exclusion zones (or other means of limiting exposure). The intent is to ensure they are identified, communicated to personnel and mitigated prior to resuming work in the area. For example, adding a layer on the Hazard Map that remains internal to the Rock Mechanics team that tracks long-term hazards and areas that are a focus of monitoring (e.g., the wedge above the ramp on the West Wall of the Whale Tail pit). Alternatively, these could be tracked in the Hazard Tracking Database with a specific identifier.	P2	A long-term hazard map will be created for all pits and incorporated into the next iteration of the GCMP.	Not started	01/Jul/26		
		(New Recommendation in 2023)	Not all rockfalls have been documented in the Rockfall Database. This is a key tool for understanding failures and for refining/validating the slope design and other control measures.	Document all rockfalls (at least to the extent practical) in the rockfall database. Define criteria for what type of events are recorded in the rockfall database. Events that resulted in injury or damage to equipment, or could plausibly have done so under different circumstances, should always be recorded in the database.	All rockfalls since the last annual inspection have been documented in the database, regardless of whether or not they are reportable to the mine inspector (> 50 l). However, the criteria for which rockfalls are to be documented is still limited to reportable rockfalls in the GCMP.	Define criteria for what type of events are recorded in the rockfall database. Events that could have plausibly resulted in injury or damage to equipment under different circumstances, should always be recorded in the database. Priority decreased to P4.	This work remains outstanding. The criteria for which rockfalls are to be documented is still limited to reportable rockfalls (i.e. > 50 l) in the GCMP. In practice, the Rock Mechanics team documents all rockfalls that they are aware of. Large failures are reliably captured but smaller rockfalls likely are not.	Redefine the criteria in the GCMP for what type of events are recorded in the rockfall database. Events that could have plausibly resulted in injury or damage under different circumstances, as well as unusual occurrences, should also be recorded in the database.	P4	This will be included in the next iteration of the GCMP.				Note that all rockfalls, no matter the size, are captured and reported in an intelx.
		(New Recommendation in 2024)				A rockfall report is completed for all rockfalls and slope failures. The content of the reports varies but typically focuses on a factual description of the event (conditions and chronology), the consequences of the event, and the immediate corrective actions to be taken. While the reports are typically well done, they consider the events in isolation. Often the preliminary report issued within 24 hours of the event is not updated or elaborated on. Intelx reports are completed for rockfalls deemed to be Near Misses. There is a need to complete a more detailed review and back-analysis of some of these failures, both to identify root causes / lessons learned and to better anticipate similar failures in the future. Examples include: - Trends, such as the repeated failures along the Brittle / High Strain Structure in the Northwest Wall of the Whale Tail pit. - Failures with an increased consequence, such as the failure below the ramp on the Southwest Wall of the Whale Tail pit. - Unusual occurrences (e.g. larger failures) or cases where the existing procedures did not function as intended or desired.	Complete a detailed review and back-analysis of clusters of slope failures, unusual failures, or failures with an increased consequence. The review should consider: - The primary and contributing causal factors, including lithology, structure, water, temperature, blasting, etc. - The effectiveness of the applied controls. - Lessons learned. - The potential for other similar failures. - Action or follow-up items. Define a commitment for these reviews in the GCMP.	The contents of the reports varies but has improved significantly since the last annual inspection. The reports now typically include: - A factual description of the event (conditions and chronology) and the consequences of the event. - The primary and contributing causal factors, including lithology, structure, water, temperature, blasting, etc. - Whether the failure is part of a larger trend. - Action or follow-up items. In cases where multiple similar events have occurred, a more detailed discussion is typically included in the Quarterly Summary reports along with lessons learned. The reports typically do not consider the effectiveness of the existing controls. This is discussed as part of a separate recommendation.	None. Continue to complete reviews as appropriate.	Complete				

Knight Piesold Observations, Comments and Recommendations										AEM Implementation Action Plan					
Category	Topic	2022 Recommendations	2023 Status and Comments	2023 Recommendations	2024 Status and Comments	2024 Recommendations	2025 Status and Comments	2025 Recommendations	Priority	AEM Action Plan / Follow-up	Status	Due Date	Completion Date	AEM Comments / Update	
Implementation: Other Controls	Managing Exposure / Barricades	(New Recommendation in 2024)			Mining in the IVR V1 open pit and Whale Tail Extension is complete, but both are still accessed as part of the long-term water management strategy for the mine. As a result, personnel will be travelling on the ramps in these pits on an on-going basis. The mine currently manages geotechnical risks along the ramps, including rockfall hazards, through regular inspections by the Rock Mechanics team.	Evaluate the use of a rockfall berm along the inside of the IVR V1 open pit and Whale Tail Extension ramps instead of relying on regular inspections to manage the rockfall hazard.	This work remains outstanding.	Establish a rockfall berm along the inside of the IVR V1 open pit and Whale Tail Extension ramps. Priority increased to P2 based on the rockfall hazard.	P2	Berms were installed and inspections were completed during the interaction between mining and dewatering activities. At this stage, there is no longer access to IVR-1.	Closed	-	01/Sep/25	-	
		(New Recommendation in 2024)			The partial or complete loss of catch benches in the lower Southeast Wall of the Whale Tail pit directly above the ramp increases the rockfall hazard for the ramp in this area. While rockfalls have not been reported or observed in this area, the potential for rockfall has been identified.	Evaluate and implement measures for mitigating the rockfall hazard. For example, installing a rockfall barrier on the crest of the bench above the ramp.	The mine designed and installed a Geobrugg rockfall fence along approximately 30 m of the crest above the ramp in the Southeast Wall.	None	Complete	-	-	-	-	-	
		(New Recommendation in 2025)						The Diorite forms a greater portion of the benches below the ramp in the Southeast Wall of the Whale Tail pit than expected. Increased crest loss along Joint Set C within the Diorite has reduced the capacity of the catch benches. In addition, the blocky nature of the Diorite creates a rockfall hazard.	Review the need for rockfall mitigation measures in this area, such as a rockfall berm or a rockfall barrier. Confirm the extents of the Diorite. If the Diorite extends further to depth than currently anticipated, the catch bench width may need to be increased.	P3	This was reviewed and mitigation is not required as the catch benches below have performed well and are expected to catch any loose material.	Closed	01/Sep/26	01/Sep/26	-
		(New Recommendation in 2024)			The loss of catch benches as a result of the failures in the Northwest Wall of the Whale Tail pit increases the hazard associated with rockfall in this area.	Construct a rockfall berm on the catch bench below the Northwest Wall failure.	A step-in with a rockfall berm was constructed on the 5025 bench to address the rockfall hazard below the failure.	None	Complete	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Blasting	(New Recommendation in 2025)						The mine has continued to iterate and improve on the blasting practices used to establish the final walls. Additional improvements were discussed during the annual inspection, including: - Developing dedicated blasting practices for all bench configurations in the Komatitite. - Setting up periodic meetings between Blasting and Rock Mechanics to review progress and discuss additional opportunities. - Incorporating Rock Mechanics in the design and sign-off process for blast patterns to ensure that geotechnical considerations are taken into account.	Complete the planned activities.	P3	The D&B design is an ongoing review for each area. This will continue to be implemented.	Ongoing	Ongoing	-	-
Ground Control Program	Training	Develop a skills matrix to help identify training needs.	A skills matrix has not been developed. The Rock Mechanics team has experienced significant turnover, with only three staff remaining from a year ago. This puts an increased demand on training and knowledge sharing.	Complete the original recommendation.	This work remains outstanding.	Complete the original recommendation. The recently developed Roles and Responsibilities document for the Rock Mechanics team is a good starting point.	An initial skills matrix has been developed. It is well thought out but currently focuses on monitoring and instrumentation. This is a good start but should be expanded to include other key skills such as pit wall inspections and approvals.	Revise the skills matrix to include all key skills needed for Rock Mechanics personnel to effectively manage the geomechanical hazards in the open pits.	P4	-	-	-	-	Not a H&S concern	
	Resources	(New Recommendation in 2025)					The program resources and staff are considered adequate for the current demands on the Ground Control Program. However, additional demands will be placed on the program in the future due to the extension of the underground mine life and the expected expansion of the IVR open pits. As a result, the team will need to manage the recovery of the crown pillar below the WHL open pit at the same time as the mining of the north wall of the IVR open pit. Both of these areas are considered higher risk and will require greater attention. The adequacy of the team's resources in the coming years should be reviewed.	Review the resources and staff available to the Rock Mechanics team relative to the expected demands on the team over the next few years. Adjust the resources and/or plan accordingly.	P4	We have hired contractors on NS to support the team through mining of the crown pillar and the freshet period. In addition, we have remote monitoring services in place for the radars.	Closed	-	-	-	-
		Add the following to the Quarterly Summary Reports to improve the communication of the completed rock mechanics activities and their effectiveness: a) The reports include a dashboard summary of the activities complete, but there is no reference to the commitments in the GOMP. Recommend including a column in the dashboard indicating the target frequency for the tracked items. b) Consider including a slide commenting on the effectiveness of the mine's controls (e.g. radar alarms, prior identification of rockfalls, etc.).	The recommended changes have not been implemented. While the reviews of the bench performance summarized in the reports are well done, the results are not consistently compared to expectations / the design basis.	Complete the original recommendation. Directly compare the results of the bench performance reviews to the bench design. For example, does the backbreak exceed the amount that was designed for?	The Quarterly Summary reports are comprehensive and well done. However, while they summarize the various activities of the Rock Mechanics team, they do not compare them to the relevant commitments. The effectiveness of the controls (e.g., radar alarms, visual inspections, etc.) have not been quantified. The reviews of the catch bench performance now compare the measured catch bench width to the 8 m minimum.	Complete the original recommendation.	The Quarterly Reports now include a dashboard indicating the team's commitments and their compliance with them. The effectiveness of the controls (e.g., radar alarms, visual inspections, etc.) have not been quantified.	This recommendation is considered closed. The portion of the recommendation relating to control effectiveness has been broken out as a new recommendation.	Complete	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(New Recommendation in 2025)						The effectiveness of the controls (e.g., radar alarms, visual inspections, etc.) have not been quantified.	Evaluate the effectiveness of the controls used to mitigate geotechnical risk at the mine on an annual basis. The intent is both to confirm that the risk is being mitigated as intended and to communicate the value of the controls to other stakeholders. This could be completed as part of one of the quarterly reports.	P4	This has been integrated into the quarterly reports.	Closed	01/Jan/26	01/Jan/26	-	

Knight Piesold Observations, Comments and Recommendations										AEM Implementation Action Plan				
Category	Topic	2022 Recommendations	2023 Status and Comments	2023 Recommendations	2024 Status and Comments	2024 Recommendations	2025 Status and Comments	2025 Recommendations	Priority	AEM Action Plan / Follow-up	Status	Due Date	Completion Date	AEM Comments / Update
	Documentation	<p>The following comments are provided for the GCMP:</p> <p>a) Consider adding a one-page overview of the deposit geology and mine plan, including key information such as the ultimate pit dimensions, approximate mine life, major lithologies, etc.</p> <p>b) (5.2.1.3) - Review and revise the commitments for drone monitoring so that they are focussed and achievable.</p> <p>c) (5.3.2) Clarify that the collected data should be compared to the design basis for the open pit in addition to looking for trends.</p> <p>d) (5.4.1) Note that crack meters and extensometers have not been installed and clarify that vibrating wire piezometers and thermistors are not currently being monitored. A plan with the location of the instrumentation should be included or referenced.</p> <p>e) (5.5) Reference a register that tracks who has received what geomechanical training.</p> <p>f) (8) Provide greater clarity and detail on the input the team provides to the mine planning and approval process. For example, the input to the Bench Master and 3MR.</p> <p>g) Describe and include a commitment to the bench approval process.</p>	<p>The updates to the GCMP incorporated changes b), c), d), f) and g).</p> <p>While the GCMP now includes a plan showing the location of the instrumentation, the plan is out of date.</p>	<p>a) Consider adding a one-page overview of the deposit geology and mine plan, including key information such as the ultimate pit dimensions, approximate mine life, major lithologies, etc. Focus on the major lithologies/domains and how they perform in the open pits.</p> <p>b) Reference a register that tracks who has received what geomechanical training.</p> <p>c) Update the plan showing the position of the instrumentation.</p>	<p>The GCMP was comprehensively updated in June 2024. As part of this, the plan showing the position of the instrumentation was updated.</p> <p>The GCMP now includes a brief discussion of Geotechnical Areas of Concern in each pit. This is a good practice. However, the discussion often does not include an overview of the slope instabilities and rockfalls that have occurred to date in those areas.</p> <p>The other recommendations remain outstanding.</p>	<p>Additional comments on GCMP content include the following:</p> <p>a) Consider adding a one-page overview of the deposit geology and mine plan, including key information such as the ultimate pit dimensions, approximate mine life, major lithologies, etc. Focus on the major lithologies/domains and how they perform in the open pits.</p> <p>b) Include a discussion of expected failure modes. For example, kinematic wedge or planar failures on the S1/S2 foliation are the dominant control on bench performance.</p> <p>c) Reference a register that tracks who has received what geomechanical training.</p> <p>d) Briefly describe the rockfalls that have occurred in the geotechnical areas of concern (Sec 3.1.2).</p>	<p>The GCMP was comprehensively updated in June 2025. Key changes include:</p> <p>- A summary of key design changes.</p> <p>- An overview of the geotechnical risks and failure modes.</p> <p>- An overview of the expected interaction between the open pit and the underground mine.</p> <p>- Updates to the overview of the instrumentation and monitoring program.</p> <p>The discussion of key design changes since the previous version of the GCMP is very useful but it will become difficult to understand the progression of the changes over time. Recommend summarizing previous changes and the applicable design documents in a brief table.</p>	<p>Additional comments on GCMP content include the following:</p> <p>a) Consider adding a one-page overview of the deposit geology and mine plan, including key information such as the ultimate pit dimensions, approximate mine life, major lithologies, etc. Focus on the major lithologies/domains and how they perform in the open pits.</p> <p>b) Reference a register that tracks who has received what geomechanical training.</p> <p>c) Briefly summarize previous design changes and the applicable design documents in a brief table to supplement the current discussion of key changes since the last GCMP update.</p> <p>d) Clarify that the TDR is not currently monitored (Sec 5.4.1.5)</p>	P4	We will update the GCMP accordingly.	Not started	01/Jul/26	01/Jun/26	-