BARRICK GOLD CORPORATION
TD Canada Trust Tower
161 Bay Street, Suite 3700
Toronto, ON M5J 2S1
Canada
Tel +1 416 861 9911
Fax +1 416 861 2482

www.barrick.com

June 2019

Dear Mr Matthews and Mr Howchin

**Church of England Pensions Board and Swedish Council on Ethics for the AP Public Pension Fund**

On the 1st of January 2019 Barrick Gold Corporation and Randgold Resources Limited merged to form an industry leader with a focus on creating value for all our stakeholders. Ensuring that the restructured business maintained effective, accountable procedures to govern sustainability, was a key short-term priority post-merger and, with this in mind, we are providing information on both the former Barrick's and the former Randgold's Tailings Storage Facilities.

## Tailings Management System and Management of Risk

All Barrick-operated or controlled tailings storage facilities (TSFs) are subject to the company's Tailings and Heap Leach Management Standard (the Standard), which requires that Barrick locates, designs, constructs, operates and closes its tailings storage facilities (TSFs) and its heap leach facilities (HLFs) using a risk-based design approach with site specific data or as otherwise specified by regional regulatory requirements, whichever is more stringent.

This Standard also outlines:

- Roles and responsibilities for our Engineers of Record (EoRs) and Responsible Persons (RPs);
- Schedules for routine inspections by our operators, EoR dam safety inspections (typically annually), dam safety reviews, independent geotechnical review committee assignments and management audits to the Standard. (Barrick has maintained a fully independent geotechnical review committee since 1998);
- Geotechnical instrumentation monitoring, data reduction, assessment and reporting obligations, including the establishment of trigger action response plans (TARPs); and
- Minimum required geotechnical, hydrological, hydrogeological and environmental design and performance standards.

For existing and closed facilities, the Standard outlines six levels of safety oversight that must be undertaken, with full documentation at each stage:

1. **Monitoring technology**
   Our operating sites employ monitoring systems such as vibrating wire piezometers, inclinometers, drone surveys, satellite surveys and imagery, static prisms for movement detection, drainage monitoring and other technologies to monitor tailings storage facilities (TSF's), abutments, natural slopes and water levels.
2. **Routine Inspection**
   Conducted by suitably qualified and experienced operation site personnel, in compliance with Operation, Maintenance and Surveillance (OMS) Manual requirements. Intended to ensure that the TSF is operating within prescribed parameters.
3. **EoR / Dam Safety Inspection**
   Conducted by the Engineer of Record (EoR) responsible for the design of the current TSF phase, or by a suitably qualified and experienced geotechnical engineer outside of Barrick with a comprehensive understanding of the current TSF phase. Intended to verify that the existing or

anticipated TSF conditions follow design intent and that site-specific performance objectives are being met.

4. **Dam Safety Review**
   Conducted by a suitably qualified and experienced geotechnical engineer outside of Barrick who is neither the EoR nor a representative of the TSF operation or closure design consulting firm and who has a comprehensive understanding of the current TSF phase. Intended to provide a detailed, independent assessment of the safety and operational stewardship of the TSF.
5. **Assurance Audit**
   Conducted by our internal corporate technical specialists. Expected audit frequency of one to three years, based in part on compliance level and previous findings. Intended to ensure that the existing or anticipated TSF conditions and management procedures comply with Barrick's corporate Tailings Management Standard.
6. **Independent Tailings Review Committee**
   Conducted by one or more qualified and internationally-recognized experts outside of Barrick and not involved with preparation of the TSF design. Intended to provide an expert, independent opinion as to whether or not the TSF design and current and/or anticipated performance demonstrate an acceptable level of care, from geotechnical, hydrotechnical and environmental perspectives and with reference to accepted international practice.

## Tailings management approach in light of the recent tailings disasters

Barrick continues to improve its tailings management program, for example by increasing and/or improving geotechnical monitoring equipment and technologies, training site-based tailings staff and conducting regular technical and management reviews of its closed and operating TSFs. Barrick also maintains current, site-specific Emergency Preparedness and Response Plan (EPRP) documents and tests the EPRP protocols. Where issues are encountered, including insufficient understanding of embankment, tailings mass and/or foundation conditions, the company will develop and conduct the necessary programs to address knowledge gaps and, if required, improve estimated stability. We recently conducted a review of our upstream facilities to determine whether these posed any significant risks.

For additional information on the management of our TSFs including our Tailings Storage Facility Inventory, please visit the Barrick website at:
*https://www.barrick.com/English/sustainability/environment/default.aspx*

I/We certify that the information supplied is correct and true to the best of our knowledge.

Sincerely

Mark Bristow
President and CEO

# Tailings Storage Facility Inventory

| 1 | 2 | 1a | 1b | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18a | 18b | 19 | 20 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tailings Storage Facility Name | Site Name (Location) | TSF Centroid Latitude (Dec. Deg.) | TSF Centroid Longitude (Dec. Deg.) | Ownership [a] | TSF Status | TSF Start-up (Year) | Design Intent Compliance? [b] (Yes / No) | Raise Methodology [c] | Current Maximum Height [d] (m) | Current Tailings Volume [e] ($Mm^3$) | Planned Ultimate Tailings Volume [f] ($m^3$) | Most Recent Independent Review [g] (Month Year) | Engineering Records Complete [h] (Yes / No) | Hazard Classification | Classification Guideline [i] | Stability ever Questioned [j] (Yes / No) | Internal Oversight and/or External Support [k] (Yes / No) | Most Recent Dam Breach Study [l] (Month/Year) | Closure Plan in Place (Yes / No) | Long-term Monitoring Included (Yes / No) | Climate Change Effects Considered (Yes / No) | Note(s) |
| **Cells 1 & 2** | Cortez (Nevada, USA) | 40.262480 | -116.702689 | Barrick | Closed | 1995 | Yes | US | 65.5 | 35 | 35 | Dec 2018 | Yes | Significant | DWR NV | Yes [9] | Yes and Yes | Apr 2018 | No | Yes | Yes | |
| **Cell 4** | Cortez (Nevada, USA) | 40.266031 | -116.686047 | Barrick | Operating | 2013 | Yes | DS | 55 | 27 | 39 | Dec 2018 | Yes | Low | DWR NV | No | Yes and Yes | Apr 2018 | No | Yes | Yes | |
| **TA 1-3** | Cortez (Nevada, USA) | 40.203921 | -116.622530 | Barrick | Closed | 1969 | Unknown | Unknown | 7.5 | 5.6 | 5.6 | Unknown | No | Low | DWR NV | Unknown | Yes and No | Unknown | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **TA 4-5** | Cortez (Nevada, USA) | 40.213596 | -116.617825 | Barrick | Closed | 1974 | Unknown | Unknown | 10 | 1.8 | 1.8 | Unknown | No | Low | DWR NV | Unknown | Yes and No | Unknown | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **TA 6** | Cortez (Nevada, USA) | 40.213491 | -116.624058 | Barrick | Closed | 1984 | Unknown | Unknown | 16.8 | 5.2 | 5.2 | Unknown | No | Low | DWR NV | Unknown | Yes and No | Unknown | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **TA 7** | Cortez (Nevada, USA) | 40.208789 | -116.624296 | Barrick | Closed | 1994 | Unknown | DS | 19 | 0.8 | 4.2 | Unknown | No | Low | DWR NV | Unknown | Yes and No | Unknown | No | Yes | No | 13 |
| **TSF 2** | Golden Sunlight (Montana, USA) | 45.889132 | -111.990559 | Barrick | Operating | 1993 | Yes | US, CL | 71.5 | 34 | 34 | Mar 2012 | Yes | N/A [7] | DEQ MT | No | Yes and Yes | In progress | In progress | Yes | Yes | |
| **TSF 1** | Golden Sunlight (Montana, USA) | 45.889086 | -112.003863 | Barrick | Closed | 1983 | Yes | CL | 33 | 19 | 19 | Nov 2008 | No | N/A [7] | DEQ MT | Unknown | Yes and Yes | Unknown | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| **North Block TDF** | Goldstrike (Nevada, USA) | 41.003265 | -116.358552 | Barrick | Operating | 1994 | Yes | DS | 129.5 | 147 | 232 | May 2019 | Yes | Significant | DWR NV | No | Yes and Yes | Sep 2015 | No | Yes | Yes | |
| **TSF 3** | Goldstrike (Nevada, USA) | 40.994527 | -116.347161 | Barrick | Operating | 2014 | Yes | DS | 85.5 | 37 | 73 | May 2019 | Yes | Significant | DWR NV | No | Yes and Yes | Sep 2015 | No | Yes | Yes | |
| **AA TSF** | Goldstrike (Nevada, USA) | 40.985307 | -116.342606 | Barrick | Closed | 1988 | Yes | DS | 65.5 | 18 | 18 | Aug 2016 | Unknown | Significant | DWR NV | Unknown | Yes and Yes | Unknown | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| **Mill 4 TSF** | Goldstrike (Nevada, USA) | 40.989607 | -116.357059 | Barrick | Closed | 1989 | Yes | DS | 56.5 | 8.4 | 8.4 | Aug 2016 | Unknown | High | DWR NV | Unknown | Yes and Yes | Unknown | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| **Arturo TSF (TD-1)** | Goldstrike (Nevada, USA) | 41.007315 | -116.432022 | Barrick | Closed | 1984 | Yes | DS | 33.5 | 2.6 | 2.6 | Unknown | No | Unknown | DWR NV | Unknown | Yes and No | Unknown | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **David Bell / Williams Basin** | Hemlo (Ontario, Canada) | 48.668708 | -85.878245 | Barrick | Operating | 1985 | Yes | US, DS | 41 | 68 | 68 | Jul 2015 | Yes | Very High | CDA | No | Yes and Yes | Dec 2013 | No | Yes | Yes | |
| **CTSF 1** | Kibali (Democratic Republic of Congo) | 3.131053 | 29.598067 | Barrick (AngloGold, SOK IMO) | Operating | 2013 | Yes | DS | 45 | 5 | 33 | Mar 2019 | Yes | High | SANS 10286 | No | Yes and Yes | In progress | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **CTSF 2** | Kibali (Democratic Republic of Congo) | 3.127811 | 29.605878 | Barrick (AngloGold, SOK IMO) | Operating | 2016 | Yes | DS | 45 | 7 | inc. above | Mar 2019 | Yes | High | SANS 10286 | No | Yes and Yes | In progress | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **FTSF** | Kibali (Democratic Republic of Congo) | 3.119041 | 29.605928 | Barrick (AngloGold, SOK IMO) | Operating | 2014 | Yes | DS [5] | 36 | 13 | 60 | Mar 2019 | Yes | High | SANS 10286 | No | Yes and Yes | In progress | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **Loulo TSF** | Loulo (Mali) | 13.096819 | -11.343639 | Barrick (Mali) | Operating | 2005 | Yes | US | 30 | 35 | 48 | None [6] | Yes | High | SANS 10286 | No | Yes and Yes | In progress | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **Lumwana TSF** | Lumwana (Zambia) | -12.234695 | 25.862281 | Barrick | Operating | 2008 | Yes | CL | 45 | 160 | 480 | Nov 2018 | Yes | Significant | ANCOLD | No | Yes and Yes | Jan 2018 | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| **Morila TSF** | Morila (Mali) | 11.695650 | -6.840917 | Barrick (AngloGold, Mali) | Reclamation [3] | 2014 | Yes | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Yes | Low | SANS 10286 | No | Yes and Yes | N/A | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **El Llagal TSF** | Pueblo Viejo (Dominican Republic) | 18.898767 | -70.173460 | Barrick (Newmont) | Operating | 2012 | Yes | DS | 114 | 52 | 175 | Nov 2018 | Yes | Extreme | CDA | No | Yes and Yes | Feb 2018 | No | Yes | Yes | 14 |
| **Tongon TSF** | Tongon (Ivory Coast) | 9.941306 | -5.763114 | Barrick (Cote d'Ivoire) | Operating | 2011 | Yes | US | 26 | 24 | 31 | None [6] | Yes | High | SANS 10286 | No | Yes and Yes | In progress | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **Turquoise Ridge TSF** | Turquoise Ridge (Nevada, USA) | 41.235985 | -117.220018 | Barrick | Closed | 1989 | Yes | CL, DS | 52 | 8.7 | 8.7 | Unknown | Yes | Low | DWR NV | No | Yes and Yes | Unknown | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **Dry Stack TSF** | Jabal Sayid (Kingdom of Saudi Arabia) | 23.861374 | 40.942444 | Barrick (Ma'aden) | Operating | 2015 | Yes | US | 28 | 2.4 | 13.4 | None | Yes | Low Risk | ANCOLD | No | Yes and Yes | N/A | No | Yes | No | |
| **Bulyanhulu TSF** | Bulyanhulu (Tanzania) | -3.234281 | 32.486293 | Acacia [1] | Operating | 2015 | Yes | US | 18.5 | 8 | 45 | Dec 2018 | Yes | High | SANS 10286 | No | Yes and Yes | Nil | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **Buzwagi TSF** | Buzwagi (Tanzania) | -3.857605 | 32.679994 | Acacia [1] | Operating | 2009 | Yes | DS | 43.6 | 32.3 | 33.3 | Apr 2019 | Yes | High | ANCOLD | No | Yes and Yes | Nil | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **North Mara TSF** | North Mara (Tanzania) | -1.473721 | 34.499459 | Acacia [1] | Operating | 2002 | No [4] | DS | 53 | 30 | 33 | Feb 2019 | Yes | Extreme | ANCOLD | No | Yes and Yes | 2019 | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **Fimiston I** | KCGM (Western Australia) | -30.746707 | 121.508969 | Barrick (Newmont) [2] | Active | 1988 | Yes | US | 60 | 42 | 50 | Jul 2018 | Yes | High | ANCOLD | No | Both (No and No) | Dec 2016 | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| **Fimiston II** | KCGM (Western Australia) | -30.751359 | 121.546371 | Barrick (Newmont) [2] | Active | 1991 | Yes | US | 60 | 119 | 135 | Jul 2018 | Yes | High | ANCOLD | No | Both (No and No) | Feb 2014 | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| **Kaltails** | KCGM (Western Australia) | -30.798458 | 121.563501 | Barrick (Newmont) [2] | Active | 2011 | Yes | US | 60 | 82 | 98 | Jul 2018 | Yes | High | ANCOLD | No | Both (No and No) | Sep 2018 | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| **Gidji I** | KCGM (Western Australia) | -30.583170 | 121.453803 | Barrick (Newmont) [2] | Inactive / C&M | 1989 | Yes | US | 30 | 3 | 3 | Jul 2018 | Yes | Low | ANCOLD | No | Both (No and No) | Nov 2010 | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| **Gidji II** | KCGM (Western Australia) | -30.583170 | 121.453803 | Barrick (Newmont) [2] | Active | 2012 | Yes | DS | 25 | 1 | 2 | Jul 2018 | Yes | Low | ANCOLD | No | Both (No and No) | Mar 2011 | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| **Mullingar** | KCGM (Western Australia) | -30.729694 | 121.471046 | Barrick (Newmont) [2] | Inactive / C&M | unknown | No | Unknown | 5 | 0.0816 | N/A | - | No | Unknown | Not classified | Uncertain | No | Unknown | Yes | No | No | |
| **Mt. Percy** | KCGM (Western Australia) | -30.718556 | 121.487728 | Barrick (Newmont) [2] | Inactive / C&M | 1985 | No | US | 23 | 8.4 | N/A | Jul 2018 | No | Unknown | Not classified | Uncertain | No | Unknown | Yes | No | No | 15 |
| **Paringa** | KCGM (Western Australia) | -30.757052 | 121.523793 | Barrick (Newmont) [2] | Inactive / C&M | 1982 | No | Unknown | 5 | 0.836 | N/A | - | No | Unknown | Not classified | Uncertain | No | Unknown | Yes | No | No | |
| **Croesus** | KCGM (Western Australia) | -30.752291 | 121.499765 | Barrick (Newmont) [2] | Inactive / C&M | < 1973 | No | Unknown | 20 | 4.25 | N/A | 2012 | Yes | Unknown | Not classified | Uncertain | No | Unknown | Yes | No | No | 16 |
| **Old Croesus** | KCGM (Western Australia) | -30.759984 | 121.497266 | Barrick (Newmont) [2] | Inactive / C&M | 1960s | No | Unknown | 23 | 2.12 | N/A | - | No | Unknown | Not classified | Uncertain | No | Unknown | Yes | No | No | 17 |
| **Zaldivar TSF** | Zaldivar (Chile) | -24.415046 | -69.130110 | Barrick (Antafogasta) | Operating | 1995 | Yes | DS | 39.0 | 9.3 | 17.0 | Feb 2019 | Yes | Medium | Antafogasta | No | Yes and Yes | Feb 2015 | Yes | Yes | Yes | |

# Tailings Storage Facility Inventory continued…

| 1 | 2 | 1a | 1b | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18a | 18b | 19 | 20 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tailings Storage Facility Name | Site Name (Location) | TSF Centroid Latitude | TSF Centroid Longitude | Ownership [a] | TSF Status | TSF Start-up | Design Intent Compliance? [b] | Raise Methodology [c] | Current Maximum Height [d] | Curren Tailings Volume [e] | Planned Ultimate Tailings Volume [f] | Most Recent Independent Review [g] | Engineering Records Complete [h] | Hazard Classification | Classification Guideline [i] | Stability ever Questioned [j] | Internal Oversight and/or External Support [k] | Most Recent Dam Breach Study [l] | Closure Plan in Place | Long-term Monitoring Included | Climate Change Effects Considered | Note(s) |
| | | (Dec. Deg.) | (Dec. Deg.) | | | (Year) | (Yes / No) | | (m) | ($Mm^3$) | ($m^3$) | (Month Year) | (Yes / No) | | | (Yes / No) | (Yes / No) | (Month/Year) | (Yes / No) | (Yes / No) | (Yes / No) | |
| **North Tailings Basin** | Bicroft (Ontario, Canada) | 44.995564 | -78.044357 | Barrick | Closed | 1956 | Yes | US | 8.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | Jun 2018 | Yes | High | CDA | Yes [10] | Yes and Yes | Unknown | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **South Tailings Basin** | Bicroft (Ontario, Canada) | 44.987684 | -78.038638 | Barrick | Closed | 1956 | Yes | US | 7.5 | 0.2 | 0.2 | Jun 2018 | Yes | Significant | CDA | No | Yes and Yes | Unknown | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **Bousquet LTA** | Bousquet - LTA (Quebec, Canada) | 48.106408 | -78.000949 | Barrick | Closed | 1938 | Unknown | US | 15 | 14 | 14 | May 2002 | No | Significant | CDA | No | Yes and No | Unknown | Yes | No | No | |
| **Tailings Stack** | Cadillac Molybdenite (Quebec, Canada) | 48.315221 | -78.382253 | Barrick | Closed | 1965 | Unknown | US | 20 | 1.3 | 1.3 | Sep 1998 | No | Significant | CDA | No | Yes and Yes | Unknown | Yes | No | No | |
| **Tailings Pond 1** | Cullaton Lake (Nunuvat, Canada) | 61.265859 | -98.492138 | Barrick | Closed | 1981 | Yes | DS | 5 | 0.3 | 0.3 | Sep 2015 | No | Low | CDA | No | Yes and Yes | Unknown | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| **Tailings Pond 2** | Cullaton Lake (Nunuvat, Canada) | 61.264636 | -98.479900 | Barrick | Closed | 1981 | Yes | DS | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Sep 2015 | No | Not rated | Not defined | No | Yes and Yes | N/A | Yes | Yes | Yes | 18 |
| **Albino Lake TSF** | Eskay (British Columbia, Canada) | 56.650496 | -130.496457 | Barrick | Closed | 1997 | Yes | N/A | N/A | 0.2 | 0.2 | Jun 2018 | Yes | Not rated | Not defined | No | Yes and Yes | N/A | Yes | N/A | N/A | 19 |
| **Tom McKay TSF** | Eskay (British Columbia, Canada) | 56.619746 | -130.520252 | Barrick | Closed | 2001 | Yes | N/A | N/A | 0.5 | 0.5 | Jun 2018 | Yes | Not rated | Not defined | No | Yes and Yes | N/A | Yes | N/A | N/A | 19 |
| **Upper TSF** | Giant Nickel (British Columbia, Canada) | 49.482295 | -121.461631 | Barrick | Closed | 1958 | Yes | US | 17 | 3.6 | 3.6 | Sep 2017 | No | Not rated | Not defined | No | Yes and Yes | Unknown | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **Lower TSF** | Giant Nickel (British Columbia, Canada) | 49.483430 | -121.457824 | Barrick | Closed | 1971 | Yes | DS | 22 | inc. above | inc. above | Sep 2017 | Yes | Very High | CDA | No | Yes and Yes | Nov 2014 | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **Golden Patricia TSF** | Golden Patricia (Ontario, Canada) | 51.369843 | -91.131883 | Barrick | Closed | 1988 | Unknown | US, CL | 5 | 0.8 | 0.8 | Unknown | No | Low | CDA | Unknown | Yes and No | Unknown | Yes | No | No | 20 |
| **Nickel Plate TSF** | Nickel Plate (British Columbia, Canada) | 49.355330 | -120.024094 | Barrick | Closed | 1987 | Yes | US, CL | 49 | 7.6 | 8.2 | Sep 2018 | Yes | Very High | CDA | Yes [11] | Yes and Yes | Dec 2013 | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **Parc A Residus** | Powell Rouyn (Quebec, Canada) | 48.258235 | -79.050362 | Barrick | Closed | 1937 | Unknown | US | 6 | 0.3 | 0.3 | Jun 2001 | No | Significant | CDA | Unknown | Yes and No | Unknown | Yes | No | No | |
| **Renabie TSFs** | Renabie (Ontario, Canada) | 48.372015 | -83.863747 | Barrick | Closed | 1947 | Unknown | US | 13 | 3.9 | 3.9 | Unknown | No | Low | CDA | Unknown | Yes and Yes | Unknown | Yes | No | No | |
| **Uchi TSFs** | Uchi (Ontario, Canada) | 51.070900 | -92.593600 | Barrick | Closed | 1938 | Yes | N/A | N/A | 0.5 | 0.5 | Unknown | No | Low | CDA | No | Yes and No | N/A | Yes | N/A | N/A | 21 |
| **Impoundment 1** | Bullfrog (Nevada, USA) | 36.870915 | -116.814836 | Barrick | Closed | 1989 | Yes | US | 14 | 12 | 12 | Mar 1998 | Yes | Low | DWR NV | No | Yes and Yes | Unknown | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **Impoundment 2** | Bullfrog (Nevada, USA) | 36.874481 | -116.810404 | Barrick | Closed | 1991 | Yes | DS | 21 | inc. above | inc. above | Mar 1998 | Yes | Low | DWR NV | No | Yes and Yes | Unknown | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **Impoundment 3** | Bullfrog (Nevada, USA) | 36.878424 | -116.814814 | Barrick | Closed | 1995 | Yes | US, CL | 16 | 10 | 10 | Mar 1998 | Yes | Low | DWR NV | No | Yes and Yes | Unknown | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **Impoundment 4** | Bullfrog (Nevada, USA) | 36.874791 | -116.819066 | Barrick | Closed | 1997 | Yes | DS | 22.5 | inc. above | inc. above | Mar 1998 | Yes | Low | DWR NV | No | Yes and Yes | Unknown | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **Colosseum TSF** | Colosseum (California, USA) | 35.557803 | -115.570102 | Barrick | Closed | 1988 | Yes | DS | 41 | 4.2 | 4.2 | Unknown | No | Low | DSOD CA | No | Yes and No | Unknown | Yes | No | No | |
| **Large TSF** | Grants (New Mexico, USA) | 35.243592 | -107.863400 | Barrick | Closed | 1958 | Yes | US | 30.5 | 15 | 15 | Unknown | Yes | Low | OSE NM | No | Yes and Yes | None | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **Small TSF** | Grants (New Mexico, USA) | 35.237594 | -107.862084 | Barrick | Closed | 1958 | Yes | US | 7.5 | 0.9 | 0.9 | Unknown | Yes | Significant | OSE NM | No | Yes and Yes | Jan 2019 | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **Grizzly Gulch TSF** | Homestake (South Dakota, USA) | 44.329214 | -103.737900 | Barrick | Closed | 1977 | Yes | US, DS | 122 | 29 | 29 | Jul 2010 | Yes | Category 1 | DENR SD | No | Yes and Yes | In progress | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| **McDermitt TSFs** | McDermitt (Nevada, USA) | 41.931197 | -117.799907 | Barrick | Closed | 1975 | Unknown | US | 5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | Unknown | No | Low | DWR NV | Unknown | Yes and No | Unknown | Yes | No | No | |
| **McLaughlin TSF** | McLaughlin (California, USA) | 38.866172 | -122.438928 | Barrick | Closed | 1985 | Yes | DS | 50.5 | 27 | 27 | Mar 2010 | Yes | High | DSOD CA | No | Yes and Yes | May 2019 | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **Reservation Canyon TSF** | Mercur (Utah, USA) | 40.331531 | -112.196932 | Barrick | Closed | 1983 | Yes | US, DS | 113 | 15.6 | 15.6 | Mar 1998 | Yes | Low | DNR UT | Yes [12] | Yes and Yes | In progress | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **Dry Stack TSFs 1, 2 and 3** | El Indio (Region IV, Chile) | -29.766708 | -69.976503 | Barrick | Closed | 1992 | Yes | US | 215 | 2.8 | 5.1 | Nov 2004 | Yes | Not rated | Not defined | No | Yes and Yes | N/A | Yes | Yes | No | 22, 23 |
| **El Indio TSF** | El Indio (Region IV, Chile) | -29.783744 | -69.986455 | Barrick | Closed | 1981 | Yes | US, DS | 78 | 4 | 4 | Nov 2004 | Yes | Significant [8] | CDA | No | Yes and Yes | Unknown | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **Pastos Largos SP** | El Indio (Region IV, Chile) | -29.794565 | -70.000524 | Barrick | Closed | 1997 | Yes | DS | 49.0 | 0.7 | 3.2 | Nov 2004 | Yes | Significant | CDA | No | Yes and Yes | Dec 2016 | Yes | Yes | Yes | 24 |
| **Upstream TSF** | Tambo (Region IV, Chile) | -29.800932 | -69.939912 | Barrick | Closed | 1995 | Yes | DS | 68.0 | 3.8 | 3.8 | Nov 2004 | Yes | Low [8] | CDA | No | Yes and Yes | Unknown | Yes | Yes | No | |
| **Downstream TSF** | Tambo (Region IV, Chile) | -29.807611 | -69.940018 | Barrick | Closed | 1998 | Yes | DS | 85.0 | 5.5 | 5.5 | Nov 2004 | Yes | Low [8] | CDA | No | Yes and Yes | Unknown | Yes | Yes | No | |

## Footnotes:

1. Tailings Dam" Name/identifier
2. Location
   1a, 1b. Latitude and Longitude in decimal degrees of the approximate TSF centroid, as obtained from Google Earth Pro
3. Ownership (a) As of March 2019; JV Partner(s) indicated in parentheses
   [1] Barrick Gold Corporation is the majority owner of Acacia Mining plc and periodically audits Acacia's TSFs and engages with Acacia on the management of its TSFs
   [2] KCGM is a 50:50 JV of Barrick Gold Corporation and Newmont Goldcorp Corporation; as Newmont Goldcorp is the operating partner, and Barrick will continue to engage with Newmont on their facilities. The information provided for the KCGM TSFs reflects that presented on the Newmont Goldcorp website
4. Status
   [3] Tailings from the Morila operation are in the final stages of being relocated to a completed (mined-out) open pit for permanent disposal; hence, the new permanent (former open pit) TSF is considered to be in Reclamation status
5. Date of initial operation
6. Is the Dam currently operated or closed as per currently approved design?
   (b) Unknown is indicated for legacy closed TSFs that were acquired by Barrick and for which Engineering Records are not complete and the original design, operation and/or closure intent is not fully known
   [4] The North Mara TSF current operation does not satisfy design minimum tailings beach width requirements
7. Raise Methodology
   (c) Upstream (US), centreline (CL) and/or downstream (DS) methodologies may have been used at any given facility; modified centreline raises considered to be upstream;
   Unknown is indicated for legacy closed TSFs that were acquired by Barrick and for which the crest raise methodology is not fully known
   [5] A trial on CL self-raise is in process as per the approved revised design
8. Current Maximum Height
   (d) Maximum height around Q4 2018 to Q1 2019 for tallest embankment structure within the TSF, reported to nearest 0.5 m.
9. Current Tailings Storage Impoundment Volume
   (e) Estimated volume of stored tailings around Q4 2018 to Q1 2019; converted (as required) from stored tailings mass using representative mean bulk density of 1.3 $Mg/m^3$
10. Planned Tailings Storage Impoundment Volume in 5 years time
    (f) Corresponding to the current (around February 2019) Life of Mine Plan for the TSF
11. Most recent Independent Expert Review
    (g) Most recent Dam Safety Review (DSR) or Independent Geotechnical Review Board (IGRB) assignment; Unknown indicates that no records were found to confirm that an independent review has been conducted
    [6] Until Q4 2019, quarterly inspections have been / will be performed by the external design and construction-supervision consultant; independent reviews will be scheduled for completion in 2020
12. Do you have full and complete relevant engineering records including design, construction, operation, maintenance and/or closure
    (h) Unknown and No indicated for legacy closed TSFs that were acquired by Barrick and for which full Engineering Records may not have been provided during acquisition, or were transferred to off-site storage; Barrick intends to continue searching for the information
13. What is your hazard categorisation of this facility, based on consequence of failure?
    [7] Tailings dams are exempt from hazard classification under DEQ MT
    [8] Provisional hazard classification under CDA framework
14. What guideline do you follow for the classification system?
    (i) ANCOLD = Australian National Committee on Large Dams  CDA = Canadian Dam Association  DENR SD = South Dakota Department of Energy and Natural Resources  DEQ MT = Montana Department of Environmental Quality  DNR UT = Utah Department of Natural Resources
    DSOD CA = California Department of Safety of Dams  DWR NV = Nevada Department of Water Resources  OSE NM = New Mexico Office of the State Engineer  SANS 10286 = South Africa Code of Practice for Mine Residue Deposits
15. Has this facility, at any point in its history, failed to be confirmed or certified as stable, or experienced notable stability concerns, as identified by an independent engineer (even if later certified as stable by the same or a different firm).
    (j) Not being certified/confirmed as stable is assumed to be where a noted deficiency is deemed sufficiently significant to trigger a catastrophic failure – the term deficiency is used in that context herein; for operating facilities, this refers to any identified deficiency for the current life/stage and for a previous life/stage, any deficiency that was not addressed as vetted by independent review; for closed/legacy facilities, this refers to any deficiency identified that reflects the current state of the facility versus a previous issue that has been addressed through confirmed changed condition via the closure process
    Unknown indicates that no records were found to confirm that an independent review has highlighted any stability risk with the facility
    [9] Questions regarding the estimated geotechnical stability of the Cortez Cells 1/2 TSF after design earthquake loading were raised during a recent independent review; geotechnical site investigation and laboratory testing programs are underway to support a revised stability evaluation, expected to be completed shortly; remedial options will be designed and completed as required thereafter
    [10] An inadequate factor of safety against liquefaction was recognized during recent independent review of the Bicroft North Tailings Basin Dam H; a stability buttress will be constructed after the detailed buttress design (currently in progress) has been completed and an earthworks contractor identified
    [11] The controlling strength and porewater pressure parameters, and thus estimated factors of safety, were questioned during a recent independent review of the Nickel Plate TSF dam; geotechnical site investigation, additional instrumentation installations and advanced laboratory testing has been completed and revised slope stability and deformation evaluations are in progress; remedial options will be identified, designed and completed as required thereafter
    [12] Questions regarding the estimated geotechnical stability of the Mercur Reservation Canyon TSF after design earthquake loading were raised during a recent geotechnical review by the newly-appointed Engineer of Record for the closed facility; site investigation, additional instrumentation installations and advanced laboratory testing programs have been completed and revised slope stability and deformation evaluations are in progress; remedial options will be identified, designed and completed as required thereafter
16. Do you have internal/in house engineering specialist oversight of this facility? Or do you have external engineering support for this purpose?
    (k) Where No indicated for external support, long-term closed facility considered to be provided with adequate corporate geotechnical oversight and external engineering support not required
17. Has a formal analysis of the downstream impact on communities, ecosystems and critical infrastructure in the event of catastrophic failure been undertaken and to reflect final conditions? If so, when did this assessment take place?
    (l) Unknown and No indicated for legacy closed TSFs, for which dam breach studies may not have been or were not completed, based on Barrick's understanding of the available Engineering Records
    N/A indicated for in-pit, dry stack and lacustrine TSFs and for breached embankments in closure for which no plausible mechanism for uncontrolled, off-site tailings release exists
18. Is there a) a closure plan in place for this dam, and b) does it include long term monitoring?
19. Have you, or do you plan to assess your tailings facilities against the impact of more regular extreme weather events as a result of climate change, e.g. over the next two years?
    The former (pre merger) operational Barrick sites considered the effects of Climate Change particularly with regard to extreme precipitation events. Climate change effects for the remaining sites will be considered in the next two years
20. Any other relevant information and supporting documentation. Please state if you have omitted any other exposure to tailings facilities through any joint ventures you may have.
    [13] Two phases of the Cortez TA 7 TSF were built and operated; three additional expansion phases remain permitted but were never constructed
    [14] For the Llagal TSF at the Pueblo Viejo Mine, the estimated current and planned ultimate tailings volume do not include waste rock that is also stored within the facility; the planned ultimate capacity of tailings plus waste rock plus operating pond is 225 $Mm^3$
    [15] As reported by Newmont Goldcorp: Q9. 42 ha and 20 to 23 m high; Q11. Informal; Q16 Informal only
    [16] As reported by Newmont Goldcorp: Q9. Estimate of portion no associated with Fim I TSF, partially encapsulated with waste rock; Q12. Fimiston I is built on top of a portion of the facility
    [17] As reported by Newmont Goldcorp: Q9. Located in pit
    [18] The Cullaton Lake Tailings Pond 2 served as a polishing pond for Tailings Pond 1; as part of the site closure plan, the Tailings Pond 2 dam was completely removed and the pond eliminated
    [19] At the closed Eskay Creek site, the Albino Lake and Tom MacKay Lake TSFs are lacustrine facilities and have no perimeter embankments
    [20] The Golden Patricia tailings dams were partially breached as part of site closure works
    [21] The Uchi tailings were deposited in two low-lying areas and have no perimeter embankments
    [22] The 215 m maximum height is the difference in elevation between El Indio Dry Stack TSF 1 and Dry Stack TSF 2, with an average slope of 10.9° in the filtered and stacked tailings surface between the two modules
    [23] The design ultimate tailings storage capacities of the El Indio Dry Stack TSF 1 and 2 sites had not been fully utilized and the Dry Stack TSF 3 site was not used, when the filtration plant was closed in 1997
    [24] The Pastos Largos TSF was converted to a sedimentation pond (SP) as part of the El Indio mine closure, prior to its design ultimate tailings storage capacity being reached