

EIR Review 2023 - 010 Communications in relation to Bond reviews

From: Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Sent: **04 May 2022 19:21**
To: Bob Cook <bob.cook@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Subject: Cononish- Bond Review

Hi there, I recall some assurance was sought from Ironside Farrar on the current bond adequacy later last year. Can you remind me of the advice received? Mindful with the rise in costs we should monitor this closely.

Thanks

Stuart

From: Alison Williamson
Sent: **05 May 2022 09:53**
To: Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Bob Cook <bob.cook@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Cc: Vivien Emery @lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Subject: RE: Cononish- Bond Review

Hi Stuart

Amy and I discussed this with Ironside Farrar a couple of weeks ago and their advice was that they would recommend that a bond review was undertaken given increases in costs and changes on site such as more engineered settlement pond and additional structures etc. Ironside Farrar advised that they could provide an idea of costs for a bond review if we wish to proceed (to be charged to Scotgold).

Let us know your thoughts and we can progress with Ironside Farrar if you feel that would be a good way to start a conversation with Scotgold?

Thanks

Alison

From: Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Sent on: Thursday, May 5, 2022 8:56:16 AM
To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Bob Cook <bob.cook@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
CC: Vivien Emery @lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Subject: RE: Cononish- Bond Review

Thanks, yes, please do get a fee quote for this.

S

From: Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Sent: **16 May 2022 10:37**
To: Bob Cook <bob.cook@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Subject: Cononish bond review

Hi, has any progress being made with getting the fee quote for this? I can't remember if it was Amy or Alison? Can you remind if the bond review is at least partially rechargeable to Scotgold? Was thinking of putting the review in the statement of assurance which I need to complete today.

Thanks
S

From: Bob Cook <bob.cook@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Sent: **16 May 2022 10:48**
To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Subject: FW: Cononish bond review

Morning Alison
I hope you had a fine weekend

Can you assist answer these questions which Stuart has asked re the Cononish Bond review? Was your ask to XXXXXX last week our first ask for a fee quote? Re-chargeble?

Much appreciated

Bob

From: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Sent: **16 May 2022 10:58**
To: Bob Cook <bob.cook@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Subject: RE: Cononish bond review

Morning Bob

My request to XXXXXX last week was for a fee quote, he has responded but we have not had his fee quote yet- I can chase this up.

The s75 for Cononish specifically notes in section 5.4 that "any review of the bond amount would be at the expense of the operators".

Hope that helps.

Alison

From: Bob Cook <bob.cook@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Sent on: Monday, May 16, 2022 10:16:37 AM
To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Subject: RE: Cononish bond review

Hi Alison - Stuart requests that you seek a timeline - so please chase up.

Much appreciated

Bob

From: Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Sent on: Wednesday, June 8, 2022 10:42:09 AM

To: Bob Cook <bob.cook@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Vivien Emery @lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Subject: re Cononish

Hi there, I think when you check the s75 detail Alison it will have the answer but I was wondering if the bond review is actually for the applicant to undertake and submit to us for review and approval? Rather than the review being undertaken by IF on our instruction. That was how the bond was prepared and would follow that should be the approach.

Thanks

S

From: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Sent: 01 July 2022 10:53

To: Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Cc: Bob Cook <bob.cook@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Vivien Emery lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Subject: Cononish 2017/0254/MIN- Restoration and Aftercare Bond Review

Hi Stuart

Draft letter attached to Scotgold with regard to the proposed bond review.

Do you consider that we need any legal advice on this? I will also draft letters to both the land owner and Crown Estate advising of our requirement for a bond review.

Thanks

Alison

Alison Williamson

Planning Officer

Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park

From: Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Sent on: Friday, July 1, 2022 10:58:16 AM

To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

CC: Bob Cook <bob.cook@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Vivien Emery @lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Subject: RE: Cononish 2017/0254/MIN- Restoration and Aftercare Bond Review

Hi, thanks. I would clarify that the fees to review are required to be covered by the operator. Apart from that reads well.

I don't think there are any particular aspects we need legal advice on unless there is something you feel should be checked? All pretty straightforward.

Should we add in a review of the GCGMP elements?

S

From: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Sent: 06 July 2022 10:39

To: Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Cc: Bob Cook <bob.cook@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Vivien Emery @lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Subject: RE: Cononish 2017/0254/MIN- Restoration and Aftercare Bond Review

Hi Stuart

Yes I agree that we should add in a review of the GCGMP bond amount. I have asked XXXX at Ironside Farrar for a cost estimate for this. I have amended the draft letter to include review of both of the bonds.

I don't see any requirement for legal advice at this stage.

The letter includes a note that Scotgold are to cover the fees for the bond reviews.

Updated draft letter attached.

Thanks

Alison

From: Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Sent on: Wednesday, July 6, 2022 1:14:17 PM

To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

CC: Bob Cook <bob.cook@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Vivien Emery @lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Subject: RE: Cononish 2017/0254/MIN- Restoration and Aftercare Bond Review

Thanks Alison,

My only thought is should we set a timeline of our expectations? I wouldn't want it to drag on. Apart from that, happy for you to issue.

S

From: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Sent: 26 July 2022 10:56

To: Vivien Emery <@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Cc: Bob Cook <bob.cook@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Subject: Cononish Bond Reviews

Hi Vivien

There are two bonds for Cononish- a Restoration and Aftercare Bond and a bond for the Greater Cononish Glen Management Plan. Given the current financial situation and increases to costs etc. we have decided that now is a good time to review the bond amounts. Ironside Farrar will be carrying out this work on our behalf (XXXXXX) and we have agreed with XXXX that we would like a detailed review to be carried out. We had some initial discussions with XXXX about this recently and Stuart is keen that this is progressed. Scotgold have been advised verbally that we will be instructing a bond review under the terms of the s75 and I have drafted letters to be sent to Scotgold and the other parties to the s75 agreement to advise of this (land owners and Crown Estate).

I am going to send the letters today- Stuart is keen that this process does not drag on and XXXXXX has suggested 3 months as a reasonable timescale. XXXX has provided anticipated costs for the bond reviews- Scotgold are to meet these costs as detailed in the s75. We can advise Scotgold of costs at a later date. I have attached the s75 for your info. I will get these letters sent out and then we can arrange a meeting with Scotgold and XXXX from Ironside Farrar to start discussions.

Just to keep you in the loop.

Thanks

Alison

From: Vivien Emery <@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Sent: 26 July 2022 12:27

To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Cc: Bob Cook <bob.cook@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Subject: RE: Cononish Bond Reviews

Thanks Alison. I am pulling together a list of actions to be prioritised by myself and I will add arranging this meeting to the list.

Thanks

Vivien

From: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Sent: 26 July 2022 11:59

To: XXXXXX <@scotgoldresources.com>

Cc: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Subject: Cononish - Restoration and Aftercare Bond and GCGMP Bond- Reviews

Dear XXXXXX

Please find attached a letter for your attention with regard to the National Park's requirement for a review of both the Restoration and Aftercare Bond and the Greater Cononish Glen Management Plan (GCGMP) bond amounts.

Please advise of the contact at Scotgold who will represent Scotgold in discussions on the bond reviews and I will get back to you with some suggested dates for an initial meeting with Ironside Farrar.

Regards

Alison

Alison Williamson

Planning Officer

Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park

From: XXXXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com>

Sent on: Wednesday, July 27, 2022 6:34:36 AM

To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Subject: Re: Cononish - Restoration and Aftercare Bond and GCGMP Bond- Reviews

Just as an FYI Alison, I will be having a short review meeting on the Restoration and Aftercare Bond Review with XXXXXXXX on Friday and then a more detailed internal review with XXXXXXXX next week. Once we have spoken, we will be in a position to set up a suitable date for the meeting with yourself, XXXXX and Stuart, so let me revert back to you. Sorry for all of the to-ing and fro-ing. I am trying to keep things as simple as can be for you all.

Would you like this to be a face to face? We have offices in Glasgow or could meet with you all at your offices. Have a think about how it can work best for you all as we can be very flexible.

Many thanks

XXXX

From: XXXXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com>

Sent on: Wednesday, July 27, 2022 6:18:08 AM

To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
CC: Vivien Emery @lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Subject: Re: Cononish - Restoration and Aftercare Bond and GCGMP Bond- Reviews

Thanks Alison

I hope you are keeping well.

I will be forwarding this over to XXXXXX and XXXXXX as the best contacts for the bond review.

Many thanks

XXXXXX

From: XXXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com>
Sent: 27 July 2022 07:20
To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Cc: Vivien Emery @lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Subject: Re: Cononish - Restoration and Aftercare Bond and GCGMP Bond- Reviews
Contact information FYI XXXXX@scotgoldresources.com and XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.co.uk

From: XXXXXX
Sent: 27 July 2022 14:24
To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Subject: Cononish Actions

Hi Alison

I have pulled together a table with all outstanding actions:
Bond Review Meeting to be arranged with XXXXXX
Await XXX to confirm date – looking like w/b 22nd August.

From: XXXXXX@wardell-armstrong.com>
Sent on: Friday, July 29, 2022 10:37:13 AM
To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
CC: Vivien Emery @lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX@wardell-armstrong.com>
Subject: Cononish - Restoration and Aftercare Bond and GCGMP Bond Reviews
Attachments: Cononish - Restoration and Aftercare Bond and GCGMP Bond Reviews .msg (130.5 KB)

Dear Alison

Thank you for your letter dated 26 July 2022 confirming the proposed review of the restoration and aftercare bond for Cononish Mine. We would welcome the opportunity to see and review the proposals before they are formally agreed and would be grateful if you would please keep us informed.

Kind regards

XXXXXX | Director and Crown Mineral Agent
Wardell Armstrong LLP

From: XXXXXX@dagleishassociates.co.uk>
Sent on: Monday, August 1, 2022 10:55:11 AM
To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Subject: bond review

Alison
XX
Just a quick note to say XXXXX mentioned an email request for a bond review and I have had a discussion with her and XXXXX on this, they'll come back to you this week I think. Should that come back to you? XXXXXX Stuart, anyone else?
Catch up soon

XXXXXX
Dagleish Associates Ltd

From: XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com>
Sent: 02 August 2022 08:17
To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Cc: Vivien Emery @lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Subject: Re: Cononish - Restoration and Aftercare Bond and GCGMP Bond- Reviews

Morning Alison
By way of an update, I have been discussing your email with XXXXX and XXXXXX and we will shortly be commencing an internal review of the Restoration and Aftercare Bond and GCGMP Bond. Once we have done this, I will get in touch and we can all then get together to review as a collective.
Happy to have this on site, or at your offices, or we could do a Teams call. But I will revert back once I have had the necessary discussions internally with XXXXXX
Many thanks
XXXXXX

From: Vivien Emery @lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Sent on: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 2:07:55 PM
To: XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com>; Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
CC: Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Subject: RE: Cononish - Restoration and Aftercare Bond and GCGMP Bond- Reviews

Hi XXXXXX
Thanks for your e-mail. XXXXXX from Ironside Farrar is XXXXXX It is hoped we can arrange a meeting as soon as possible XXXXXX and I will be in touch then with some dates.
Kind Regards
Vivien Emery
Planning Officer

Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park

From: Vivien Emery @lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Sent on: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 2:00:52 PM
To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Subject: RE: Cononish Actions

Hi Alison
XXXXXX

If you have time can you please put something in the diary for us to catch up so I can go over outstanding actions

Other points to note:

1. XXXXXX has confirmed w/b 22 Aug prob best for Bond Review Meeting. It's the XXXXXXXX so 22/24 best for me. XXXXXX

Thanks
Vivien

From: XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com>
Sent: 10 August 2022 15:00
To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Cc: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX X@dalglishassociates.co.uk>; <XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.co.uk>
Subject: Re: Cononish - Restoration and Aftercare Bond and GCGMP Bond- Reviews

Hi Alison

XXXXXXXXXX

On your email and attachment below, I would like to move on setting up an initial call/meeting to discuss next steps regarding a review of the Cononish Restoration & Aftercare Bond and the GCGMP Bond. When do you have in mind? I will work on an agenda internally that I will circulate prior to the call/meeting.

Thanks
XXXXXX

From: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Sent: 11 August 2022 10:14
To: XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com>
Cc: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; <XXXXXX@dalglishassociates.co.uk>; <XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.co.uk>
Subject: RE: Cononish - Restoration and Aftercare Bond and GCGMP Bond- Reviews

Hi XXXXX

Thanks for your email. XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX. XXXXX had suggested w/c 22nd August for a meeting so we can confirm a date with him on his return.

Regards

Alison

Alison Williamson

Planning Officer

Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park

From: XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com>
Sent on: Thursday, August 11, 2022 9:31:03 AM
To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
CC: XXXXXX@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX@dagleishassociates.co.uk>; XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.co.uk>
Subject: Re: Cononish - Restoration and Aftercare Bond and GCGMP Bond- Reviews

No problems Alison. Thanks for letting me know. That week looks like it can work for us.

Thanks

XXXXXX

From: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Sent on: Wednesday, August 17, 2022 2:36:30 PM
To: XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com>; Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
CC: Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX@dagleishassociates.co.uk>; XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.co.uk>
Subject: RE: Cononish - Restoration and Aftercare Bond and GCGMP Bond- Reviews

Hi XXXXX

XXXXXX has been in touch to advise he will be undertaking an initial review of the bond information over the next week. He will then be in touch with queries as necessary prior to arranging an initial meeting.

I will keep you updated.

Many Thanks

Vivien

Vivien Emery

Planning Officer

Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park

From: XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>
Sent on: Tuesday, August 23, 2022 4:49:29 PM
To: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
CC: XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>; XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>
Subject: Cononish Mine Bond - Initial Queries

Hi Vivian

I've reviewed the information we hold relative to the bond. Initial queries include making sure we have the right drawings and information in the right format to be able to undertake the bond checks as well as talking through the bond calculation spreadsheets with ScotGold to ensure I am clear what they represent. If the following could be passed on with the request

for a meeting I think that would be useful. I'll review the GGMP bond shortly and get back to you with any similar queries – I guess ideally you'd send both sets of queries together.

Regards

XXXXXX

Director

Ironside Farrar Ltd, 111 McDonald Road, Edinburgh, EH7 4NW

Bond Information for Use in Checking Calculations

- Please confirm that the spreadsheet *2017 Bond_ 17.05.18* is the relevant/latest calculation to check
- Please provide PDFs and CAD versions of the consented drawings used in the bond calculation. I have the ES drawings showing the mine layouts etc but am not clear whether they are the latest versions I should be using when checking the bond. CAD versions are required enable the areas/volumes to be checked. **They should include the predevelopment topo survey.** The drawings I hold in pdf are set out below so I'd be grateful if they could be confirmed as being the relevant ones to use:
 - 2017_0254_MIN-Figure_3_8_Indicative_Restoration_Plan-100315766 as the reference for the restoration?
 - 2017_0254_MIN-Figure_6_iii_Landscape_Restoration_Plan-100289522 – I assume this is not the relevant drawing and it's the one above that should be used?
 - 2017_0254_MIN-Figure_3_1_Existing_Mine_Site-100289609
 - 2017_0254_MIN-Figure_3_1i_Existing_Dalrigh_Layout-100289608
 - 2017_0254_MIN-Figure_3_2_Development_Mine_Site_Layout-100289602
 - 2017_0254_MIN-Figure_3_3_Development_Cross_Sections_A__B-100315763
 - 2017_0254_MIN-Figure_3_4_Development_Mine_Site_Layout_-_Stacks_1-2-100289605
 - 2017_0254_MIN-Figure_3_5_Development_Mine_Site_Layout_-_Stacks_1-6-100289606
 - 2017_0254_MIN-Figure_3_6_Development_Mine_Site_Layout_-_Stacks_1-10-100289604
 - 2017_0254_MIN-Figure_3_7_Development_Dalrigh_Site_Layout-100289603
 - 2017_0254_MIN-Figure_3_7i_Car_Park_Layout-100289599
 - 2017_0254_MIN-Figure_3_8_Indicative_Restoration_Plan-100315766
 - 2017_0254_MIN-Figure_3_9_Plant_Building_Layout_and_Isometric_View-100315768
 - 2017_0254_MIN-Figure_3_10_Development_Plant_Building_Area-100289607
- Please confirm that *100322143-32-DRPv.2* is the relevant Restoration Plan (it's text only?) relative to the bond calculation
- Please confirm that *100322145-A1-Toolkitv.2* is the Restoration Toolkit (it's text only?) relative to the bond calculation

Initial Queries

It would be useful to meet to run through the various items on the spreadsheets so I'm clear what they represent, the following are initial queries:

- Confirmation of inflation to be added since the 2017 assessment together with any changes since then that may not be reflected on the bond.
- It's not completely clear what the Bond A and Bond B is for each phase – Pre Deposition and Max Exposure – assume its pre and post the works on each stack?
- Why no mention of Stacks 1 and 2 as a standalone Tab?
- What actually is the amount of the bond proposed– is it the maximum figure presented - £518.9k – or does it vary over the different phases as calculated? The former is clearly more protective of the NPA for much of the time.

- There doesn't appear to be much relative to the mine itself – is that as anticipated ? It includes £4.8k for sealing but what about stripping out/removal of equipment/water levels rising?/making safe etc
- There is no mention of the offsite storage of peat – are all peat areas now permanent and fully restored or does any of the peat require relocation/additional restoration?
- Does there require to be an item for restoration of the Cononish farm buildings/ yard?
- Does there need to be consideration for the event that ground/surface water is contaminated from the tailings/rise in the mine?
- Is any consideration required to be given to works already completed other than as set out in the spreadsheet?
- 20 year aftercare requirements are included in a number of documents as being a requirement but the bond calculation doesn't look like this is included – 10 years is shown a few times in the spreadsheet.

From: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Sent on: Wednesday, August 24, 2022 10:51:08 AM
To: XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>; Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
CC: XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>; XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>
Subject: RE: Cononish Mine Bond - Initial Queries

Hi XXXXXX

Thanks very much for your e-mail. I have a few questions for Alison regarding the plans and your initial queries. Once I have had a chance to have a chat with her I will be in touch.

Many Thanks

Vivien

Vivien Emery

Planning Officer

Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park

From: XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>
Sent on: Friday, August 26, 2022 3:37:40 PM
To: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
CC: XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>; XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>
Subject: RE: Cononish Mine Bond - Initial Queries V2

Hi Vivien

I've just gone through the two bonds in outline with XXXXX – have added a few more queries to the list below (in red) for the main bond and will issue something shortly on the GGMP.

Regards

XXXXXX

Director

Ironside Farrar Ltd, 111 McDonald Road, Edinburgh, EH7 4NW

From: XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>
Sent on: Friday, August 26, 2022 3:56:17 PM
To: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
CC: XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>; XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>
Subject: GGMP Bond - Initial Queries

Hi XXXXXX

As discussed, I've reviewed the information we hold relative to the GCGMP bond. Initial queries include making sure we have the right drawings and information in the right format to be able to undertake the bond checks as well as talking through the bond calculation spreadsheets with ScotGold to ensure I am clear what they represent. If the following could be passed on with the request for a meeting I think that would be useful.

Regards

XXXXXX

Director

Ironside Farrar Ltd, 111 McDonald Road, Edinburgh, EH7 4NW

Bond Information for Use in Checking Calculations

- Please confirm that the spreadsheet *2017 GCGMP.25.05.18* is the relevant/latest calculation to check
- Please provide PDFS and CAD versions of the consented drawings used in the bond calculation. The drawings I hold in pdf are set out below so I'd be grateful if they could be confirmed as being the relevant ones to use:

Planning Application Area with Underground Mine , Plan 1 14.03.18

S.75/GCGMP Location Plan 24.07.18

GCGMP Planting Plan 24.07.18

The above drawings are contained in the GCGMP document of 25th October 2019 by DAL (Rob Latimer) which describes the works and is also relevant to the calculation – pls confirm.

- There is a July 2021 Landscape Masterplan which I understand is the most up to date drawing for the whole area, should this be considered in the bond assessment?

Initial Queries

It would be useful to meet to run through the various items on the spreadsheets so I'm clear what they represent, the following are initial queries:

- Confirmation of inflation to be added since the 2017 assessment together with any changes since then that may not be reflected on the bond.
- I understand that a number of the works identified on the bond have been completed, do these require to be reflected in the assessment?

From: XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>

Sent: 26 August 2022 16:38

To: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Cc: XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>; XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>

Subject: RE: Cononish Mine Bond - Initial Queries V2

Hi Vivien

I've just gone through the two bonds in outline with XXXXX– have added a few more queries to the list below (in red) for the main bond and will issue something shortly on the GGMP.

Regards

XXXXXX

Director

Ironside Farrar Ltd, 111 McDonald Road, Edinburgh, EH7 4NW

- There is a July 2021 Landscape Masterplan which I understand is the most up to date drawing for the whole area, should this be used as the basis of the bond assessment by ScotGold?
- There have been a number of changes since 2017/2018 that require to be captured in the bond in some form:
 - settlement pond now larger than in 2017,
 - the mine offices were not proposed as being on the current position - removal and decommissioning of hardstanding etc
 - sewage treatment plant and explosive store on the access track

How is the sediment laden water coming from the mine addressed going forward?

From: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Sent: 29 August 2022 15:04

To: XXXXXX<@ironsidefarrar.com>; Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Cc: XXXXXX <@ironsidefarrar.com>; XXXXXX <@ironsidefarrar.com>

Subject: RE: GGMP Bond - Initial Queries

Hi XXXXXX

Thanks for sending me your queries on the two bonds. I have a Cononish meeting with Stuart and Alison tomorrow and will be in touch after that.

Many Thanks

Vivien

Vivien Emery

Planning Officer

Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park

From: XXXXXX<@ironsidefarrar.com>

Sent: 29 August 2022 17:47

To: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Cc: XXXXXX<@ironsidefarrar.com>; XXXXXX<@ironsidefarrar.com>

Subject: RE: GGMP Bond - Initial Queries

Vivien

Thanks for that – happy to chat through with you after.

Regards

XXXXX

Director

Ironside Farrar Ltd, 111 McDonald Road, Edinburgh, EH7 4NW

From: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Sent on: Tuesday, August 30, 2022 3:56:44 PM

To: XXXXXX<@ironsidefarrar.com>; Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

CC: XXXXXX<@ironsidefarrar.com>; XXXXXX<@ironsidefarrar.com>

Subject: RE: Cononish Mine Bond - Initial Queries V2

Good Afternoon XXXXX

I have had a chat with Alison and Stuart. I was not sure if the National Park could be confirming the most up to date plans/information but it was agreed that we will pass all your queries (on both bonds) directly onto Scotgold. I will also pass on a request for a meeting.

We are happy that any initial discussions regarding points of clarification take place between yourself and Scotgold (I presume it will be XXXXX). Are you happy with that? Alison and I will then attend any further meetings. Alison is working on another case at the moment and will not be available until after 26th September.

Many Thanks
Vivien

From: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Sent on: **Wednesday, August 31, 2022 12:49:58 PM**
To: XXXXXX<@dalgleishassociates.co.uk>;
XXXXXX<l@scotgoldresources.com>; XXXXXX<@scotgoldresources.co.uk>
CC: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>;
XXXXXX<@ironsidefarrar.com>
Subject: Cononish Mine Bond - Initial Queries
Attachments: Cononish Mine Bond Initial Queries.docx (16.14 KB)

Dear XXX

As you are aware we have started proceedings with regard to the Restoration and Aftercare Bond and Greater Cononish Glen Management Plan (GCGMP) Bond. XXXXXX from Ironside Farrar will review the Restoration and Aftercare Bond and GCGMP Bond amounts on behalf of the Park Authority. In order to proceed with the bond reviews XXXXX has requested clarification of a number of points along with some initial queries. I have outlined these below.

Can you please respond to XXXXXX and confirm the most up to date plans/information as requested and any of the other straightforward queries.

Alison is currently working on another project until the end of the month but will be available after that to attend a meeting along with myself to discuss any of the more detailed queries.

Kind Regards
Vivien

From: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Sent on: **Wednesday, August 31, 2022 1:29:42 PM**
To: XXXXXX <@dalgleishassociates.co.uk>;
XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com>; XXXXX@scotgoldresources.co.uk>
CC: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>;
XXXXXX<@ironsidefarrar.com>
Subject: RE: Cononish Mine Bond - Initial Queries
Attachments: GCGMP Bond Initial Queries.docx (14.57 KB), Cononish Mine Bond Initial Queries.docx (16.09 KB)

Hi XXXX

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX I am now re-sending with the queries relating to both bonds sent as attachments as originally intended. We will respond separately to your response. As you are aware we have started proceedings with regard to the Restoration and Aftercare Bond and Greater Cononish Glen Management Plan (GCGMP) Bond. XXXXXX from Ironside Farrar will review the Restoration and Aftercare Bond and GCGMP Bond amounts

on behalf of the Park Authority. In order to proceed with the bond reviews XXXXX has requested clarification of a number of points along with some initial queries. I have outlined these below.

Can you please respond to Mark and confirm the most up to date plans/information as requested and any of the other straightforward queries.

Alison is currently working on another project until the end of the month but will be available after that to attend a meeting along with myself to discuss any of the more detailed queries.

Kind Regards

Vivien

Vivien Emery

Planning Officer

Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park

From: XXXXXX<@ironsidefarrar.com>

Sent on: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 1:45:16 PM

To: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

CC: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Subject: RE: Cononish Mine Bond - Initial Queries

Afternoon

I saw XXXXX comments. My understanding is that DAL may still need to do work on the bond. IFL are doing a full independent check but that relies on the bond information being up to date/available in the first place, hence some of my queries checking I had what was considered to be the latest information. Happy to have a quick Teams call with the various parties if needed to agree the plan

Regards

XXXXX

From: XXXXXX <@dalgleishassociates.co.uk>

Sent: 31 August 2022 14:01

To: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>;

XXXXXX<@scotgoldresources.com>; XXXXXX<@scotgoldresources.co.uk>

Cc: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>;

XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>

Subject: RE: Cononish Mine Bond - Initial Queries

Hi Vivien

I had previously agreed with Alison that DAL would undertake the review as we have all the original files/cost assumptions etc. and an understanding of what was included and why. Has this approach now changed? I had assumed your reference to XXXXX involvement was to lead the review process on behalf of the PA, rather than actually undertake the review. I understood we were to have a kick off meeting to agree the approach, and that then DAL would be reviewing the quantum in the first instance, for IFL and the PA to then consider. That meeting was to be w/c 22nd but there was no update on that.

Regards

XXXXXX

Dalgleish Associates Ltd

From: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Sent: 31 August 2022 16:35

To: XXXXXX <r@dalgleshassociates.co.uk>; Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX <l@scotgoldresources.com>;

<XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.co.uk>

Cc: 'Mark Chapman' <mark.chapman@ironsidefarrar.com>

Subject: RE: Cononish Mine Bond - Initial Queries

Dear XXXX

Whilst we discussed DAL undertaking the bond review as a potential approach, we certainly did not agree this. I advised I would speak to Ironside Farrar and we would set up a meeting to discuss with all parties and agree an approach. This remains the intention.

XXXXX has undertaken an initial review of the information he has and has identified some queries on what the latest information is. We will set up a meeting shortly, however due to other workload commitments I will not be available until the end of September. In the meantime, we felt that it may be possible for you to assist XXXXX with some of the queries and points of clarification.

Regards

Alison

Alison Williamson

Planning Officer

Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park

From: XXXXXX<@dalgleishassociates.co.uk>

Sent: 31 August 2022 16:56

To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX <@scotgoldresources.com>; XXXXXX <@scotgoldresources.co.uk>

Cc: " <@ironsidefarrar.com>

Subject: RE: Cononish Mine Bond - Initial Queries

Thanks Alison, that's absolutely fine.

I was just concerned we were all talking at cross purposes.

We both considered that it was a sensible way forward, for the reasons stated in my email.

You're quite right though, it is not yet determined as the agreed way forward – we'll certainly need to meet and get things set up for this exercise.

I will be able to compile relevant reference documents and review XXXXX queries. I just didn't want any party committing lots of time to this prior to the set-up meeting where we can actually discuss who is to do what and in what order!

Regards

XXXXX

Dalgleish Associates Ltd

From: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Sent: 20 September 2022 17:07

To: 'XXXXXX' <@dalgleishassociates.co.uk>; XXXXXX <@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX <@ironsidefarrar.com>

Cc: XXXXXX <@scotgoldresources.com>; XXXXXX <@scotgoldresources.co.uk>

Subject: RE: Cononish Mine Bond - Initial Queries

Hi XXXXXX

I am now available to attend a meeting on the bond reviews, I have listed a few potential dates and times below that suit both Vivien and myself. If you could let me know your availability for a virtual meeting, then we can get something set up.

Monday 26 September- anytime before 2pm

Wednesday 28 September- anytime before 2pm

Monday 10 October- anytime before 2pm

Thanks

Alison

Alison Williamson

Planning Officer

Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park

From: XXXXXX<@ironsidefarrar.com>

Sent: 22 September 2022 10:12

To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX <@dalgleishassociates.co.uk>; Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Cc: XXXXXX<l@scotgoldresources.com>; XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.co.uk>

Subject: RE: Cononish Mine Bond - Initial Queries

Morning

I've marked up my availability against the dates below.

Monday 26 September- anytime before 2pm – fine other than 10.00 – 11.00am

Wednesday 28 September- anytime before 2pm – fine anytime

Monday 10 October- anytime before 2pm – fine other than 9.00 – 11.00am

Regards

XXXXXX

Director

Ironside Farrar Ltd, 111 McDonald Road, Edinburgh, EH7 4NW

From: XXXXXX <@dalgleishassociates.co.uk>

Sent on: Wednesday, September 28, 2022 9:23:51 AM

To: XXXXXX <@ironsidefarrar.com>; Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

CC: XXXXXX<@scotgoldresources.com>; XXXXXX <@scotgoldresources.co.uk>

Subject: RE: Cononish Mine Bond - Initial Queries

Attachments: 2022.09.27 Cononish Mine Bond Initial Queries.docx (26.34 KB)

XXXXXX

Please see attached some feedback to your initial queries.

I look forward to discussing, and agreeing an approach to the bond review, and hope the attached is useful in the meantime.

Regards

XXXXXX

Dalgleish Associates Ltd

From: XXXXXX <@dalgleishassociates.co.uk>

Sent on: Thursday, September 22, 2022 9:57:00 AM

To: XXXXXX <XXXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>; Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

CC: XXXXXX<@scotgoldresources.com>; XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.co.uk>

Subject: RE: Cononish Mine Bond - Initial Queries

Dear all

I have checked with XXXXXX and we have availability for the 10th October, so any time that day between 11 and 2 seems to suit all parties.

XXXXXX – apologies for the delay in coming back to you on your initial queries, I shall try to review where I'd got to with that and come back to you today/tomorrow.

Regards
XXXXX
Dalglish Associates Ltd

From: XXXXXX
Sent: 28 September 2022 10:23
To: XXXXXX [Alison Williamson](#); [Vivien Emery](#)
Cc: XXXXXX
Subject: RE: Cononish Mine Bond - Initial Queries
XXXXXX

Please see attached some feedback to your initial queries.
I look forward to discussing, and agreeing an approach to the bond review, and hope the attached is useful in the meantime.

Regards
XXXXXX
Dalglish Associates Ltd

From: XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>
Sent on: Wednesday, September 28, 2022 10:03:02 AM
To: XXXXXX@dalglishassociates.co.uk>; Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
CC: XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com>; XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.co.uk>
Subject: RE: Cononish Mine Bond - Initial Queries

Thanks XXXXX
Will have a look through as a starter and we can discuss in a week or so.
Regards
XXXXX

From: XXXXXX@dalglishassociates.co.uk>
Sent on: Monday, October 17, 2022 10:07:56 AM
To: XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.co.uk>; XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>; Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXXI@scotgoldresources.com>
CC: XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com>
Subject: Bond Review initial meeting
Attachments: SCL-MOM-20221010InitialBondMeeting.pdf (143.53 KB)

Dear all
MOM attached from our bond review kick off meeting.
I can confirm we propose to circulate a proposed update bond quantum together with a full narrative by the 16th December 2022 for the PA's review.
Regards

XXXXXX
Dagleish Associates Ltd

From: XXXXXX <@dagleishassociates.co.uk>
Sent: 17 October 2022 11:08
To: XXXXXX<@scotgoldresources.co.uk>; XXXXX<@ironsidefarrar.com>; Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX <@scotgoldresources.com>
Cc: XXXXXX <@scotgoldresources.com>
Subject: Bond Review initial meeting

Dear all
MOM attached from our bond review kick off meeting.
I can confirm we propose to circulate a proposed update bond quantum together with a full narrative by the 16th December 2022 for the PA's review.
Regards
XXXXXX
Dagleish Associates Ltd

From: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Sent: 09 November 2022 14:35
To: XXXXXX<@dagleishassociates.co.uk>; XXXXXX <@scotgoldresources.co.uk>; XXXXXX <@ironsidefarrar.com>; Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com
Cc: XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com; Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Subject: RE: Bond Review initial meeting

Dear XXXX
Thanks for providing a proposed timescale. As discussed, our expectation on timescales was that reviews of both bonds would be concluded within three months. I appreciate that some of the delay to having an initial meeting on this was down to my availability, however we were anticipating that the reviews would be nearing completion by the end of the year. The proposed timescale of 16th December for having the revised bond quantum's means that with annual leave and the Christmas and new year break, things would likely be delayed further until the start of 2023. We would therefore request that you aim to have revised bond quantum information with us by the end of November.

Regards
Alison
Alison Williamson
Planning Officer
Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park

From: Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Sent on: Thursday, November 10, 2022 9:21:21 AM
To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
CC: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Bob Cook <bob.cook@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX<@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Subject: Re: Bond Review initial meeting

Thanks Alison, agree with the timeline. Feels like they have had plenty time and we need this concluded quickly now.

Keen for an update on all things Cononish over the next week or so.

XXXXX, can you find an hour for a catch up over the next two weeks please?

S

From: XXXXXX<@scotgoldresources.co.uk>
Sent: 11 November 2022 14:55
To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Cc: XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com; Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; 'XXXXX'<@dalgleishassociates.co.uk>; XXXXXX <@ironsidefarrar.com>; Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX <@scotgoldresources.com>
Subject: RE: Bond Review initial meeting

Hi Alison,
XXX is working on this as requested on behalf of Scotgold – we are happy to catch up at the end of the month but it will be tight to submit before then as he has a number of projects ongoing.

If this is going to cause a significant issue internally then please let me know.
Can you please also let us know the expected turnaround time on your side once submitted (assume via XXX) so we pull together a more detailed timetable?

Thanks
XXXXX
Financial Controller
Cononish Gold Mine

From: XXXXXX<@ironsidefarrar.com>
Sent: 11 November 2022 17:12
To: XXXXXX <@scotgoldresources.co.uk>; Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Cc: XXXXX@scotgoldresources.com; Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX <@dalgleishassociates.co.uk>; Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX<@scotgoldresources.com>
Subject: RE: Bond Review initial meeting

Afternoon All

If we get the bond by the end of November there's about 2.5 weeks until the start of our Christmas break, so my aim would be to have our review completed by then. If there are queries, and there often are with this type of thing, we could pick up/finalise when we get back in the New Year.

Regards
XXXXXX
Director
Ironsides Farrar Ltd, 111 McDonald Road, Edinburgh, EH7 4NW

From: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Sent: 24 November 2022 12:00
To: XXXXXX <@ironsidefarrar.com>; XXXXXX <@scotgoldresources.co.uk>
Cc: XXXXX@scotgoldresources.com; Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX <@dalgleishassociates.co.uk>; Vivien Emery

<vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXX <@scotgoldresources.com>

Subject: RE: Bond Review initial meeting

Dear XXXX

Thanks for your email, I am advised that XXX is working towards having the information with us by the end of November and as you will have seen from XXXX email below, he hopes to complete his review before the Christmas break.

Regards

Alison

Alison Williamson

Planning Officer

Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park

From: XXXXX<@scotgoldresources.co.uk>

Sent: 11 November 2022 14:55

To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Cc: XXXX<@scotgoldresources.com>; Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; 'XXXXXX <@dalgleishassociates.co.uk>; XXXXXX<ironsidefarrar.com>;

Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>;<@scotgoldresources.com>

Subject: RE: Bond Review initial meeting

Hi Alison,

XXXXX is working on this as requested on behalf of Scotgold – we are happy to catch up at the end of the month but it will be tight to submit before then as he has a number of projects ongoing.

If this is going to cause a significant issue internally then please let me know.

Can you please also let us know the expected turnaround time on your side once submitted (assume via Mark) so we pull together a more detailed timetable?

Thanks

XXXXXX

Financial Controller

Cononish Gold Mine

From: XXXXX <@dalgleishassociates.co.uk>

Sent: 07 December 2022 10:45

To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>;

'XXXXX<ironsidefarrar.com>; XXXXXX <@scotgoldresources.co.uk>

Cc: XXXXXX<@scotgoldresources.com>; Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX <@scotgoldresources.com>

<@scotgoldresources.com>

Subject: RE: Bond Review initial meeting

All

Just a quick update on this, the restoration bond is undergoing internal review and should be with you by the end of the week. I appreciate the desire to get this review finalised but once again would like to highlight that as this bond is for a worst case restoration which is still some way off, the site remains appropriately bonded in the meantime.

The GCGMP bond review is awaiting some updated costs from contractors so, as we had discussed, will be delayed.

XXXXXX

Dalgleish Associates Ltd

From: Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Sent: 07 December 2022 10:56

To: Bob Cook <bob.cook@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Vivien Emery

<vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Subject: RE: Bond Review initial meeting

Helpful update – I think this reflects the adjusted position in the committee report, Bob?

On 7 Dec 2022, at 13:44, Bob Cook <bob.cook@lochlomond-trossachs.org> wrote:

Hi Stuart – pretty much covered – I could add the line that ‘the site remains appropriately bonded meantime’ if you wish and not too late?

Bob

From: Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Sent: 07 December 2022 13:53

To: Bob Cook <bob.cook@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Cc: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Subject: Re: Bond Review initial meeting

Thanks, I think it is too late. Can cover in the presentation

From: Bob Cook <bob.cook@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Sent on: Wednesday, December 7, 2022 2:04:59 PM

To: Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

CC: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Subject: RE: Bond Review initial meeting

Will do - Alison cc'd for awareness

Bob

From: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Sent: 08 December 2022 13:41

To: XXXXXX@dalgleshassociates.co.uk; 'XXXXXX<@ironsidefarrar.com>'; XXXXXX <@scotgoldresources.co.uk>

Cc: XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com; Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>;

XXXXXX<@scotgoldresources.com>

Subject: RE: Bond Review initial meeting

Dear XXXX

Thanks for the update- look forward to receiving the restoration bond information.

Regards

Alison

Alison Williamson

Planning Officer

Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park

From: XXXXXX<dalgleshassociates.co.uk>

Sent: 11 December 2022 22:38

To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>;

XXXXXX<@ironsidefarrar.com>; XXXXXX <@scotgoldresources.co.uk>

Cc: XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com; Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>;

<XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com>

Subject: RE: Bond Review initial meeting

Alison *et al*

Please find attached the bond quantum and commentary. An updated Figure 1 - Bond 2022 Stacks 3, 4 and 5, illustrating the worst case bond scenario, will follow for completeness, but in the meantime the attached documentation allows you to consider the proposed uplift to the bond.

You will note the spreadsheet includes detail of earlier calculations, for reference; the current review is presented within columns O and P, and these are highlighted as such.

In total, the proposal is to increase the restoration bond provision to **£609,795.66**

Regards

XXXXXX

Dalglish Associates Ltd

From: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Sent: 12 December 2022 11:08

To: XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>

Cc: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Bob Cook <bob.cook@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Subject: FW: Bond Review initial meeting

Hi XXXXX

Once you have had a chance to look through this information from Scotgold, could you let us know if there are areas that you need clarification on and/or of it would be worthwhile talking through with XXXX/Scotgold. We are keen to progress this as soon as possible but appreciate that the submission of this information was delayed and this is not the best time of year given the Christmas break.

Vivien and I are going out on site tomorrow with XXX so will get an update on where things are at on site.

Regards

Alison

Alison Williamson

Planning Officer

Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park

From: XXXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>

Sent on: Tuesday, December 13, 2022 4:58:28 PM

To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

CC: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Bob Cook <bob.cook@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Subject: RE: Bond Review initial meeting

Follow up:

Hi Alison

I'll have a look at the bond information – it will be a push to undertake the full assessment before Christmas now. I'll see how it looks but I think realistically it will be January now. I should though be able have an initial review and ask queries.

Regards

XXXXXX

Director
Ironsides Farrar Ltd, 111 McDonald Road, Edinburgh, EH7 4NW

From: XXXXXX@ironsidesfarrar.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2022 5:06:11 PM
To: XXXXXX@dalglishassociates.co.uk>; Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.co.uk>
Cc: XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com <XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com>; Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com>
Subject: RE: Bond Review initial meeting

Hi Rob

Thanks for the information. Do you have Figure 1 updated yet that could be sent?

Thanks

Regards

XXXXXX

Director

Ironsides Farrar Ltd, 111 McDonald Road, Edinburgh, EH7 4NW

From: XXXXXX@wardell-armstrong.com>
Sent on: Wednesday, January 4, 2023 5:20:16 PM
To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
CC: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX<@wardell-armstrong.com>
Subject: RE: Cononish - Restoration and Aftercare Bond and GCGMP Bond Reviews
Attachments: RE Cononish - Restoration and Aftercare Bond and GCGMP Bond Reviews .msg (154.5 KB)

Follow up:

Dear Allison

I have a meeting with CES next week and I was wondering if there is any progress in respect of the bond review? It would be useful to understand the likely timescales for undertaking this exercise and when there will be a package of data for us to review and for CES to approve. Also do you anticipate any requirements to vary the S75 document or other need for any legal input?

Happy new year and best wishes for 2023.

XXXXX

| Director and Crown Mineral Agent
Wardell Armstrong LLP

From: XXXXXXXX <@ironsidesfarrar.com>
Sent: 05 January 2023 15:36
To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Cc: XXXXXX <@ironsidesfarrar.com>; XXXXXX <@ironsidesfarrar.com>
Subject: Cononish Bond Queries

Hi Alison

Happy New Year to you, hope the break was a good one?

I'm working my way through the bond and have a couple of queries you could maybe help with:

1.SGL have assumed that some broken concrete may retained on site:

"Broken concrete is inert and can be used as a drainage layer/fill material, it may therefore be retained on site, SCL proposes the removal of previous provision to remove concrete from site; there is no benefit in doing so."

I tend to agree that it is ok to leave some broken concrete on site (could be buried or reused in future) but just want to check with the NPA. There is actually a sum retained in the bond for this item anyway, but it is proposed as a contingency.

2. There are no works to the mine itself other than sealing up the opening with a metal grill, but what about stripping out/removal of equipment/water levels rising?/making safe etc

I queried XXX on this before and he noted :

"RL - n/a Nothing has changed since the bond was agreed."

Is that correct – just because the bond was agreed doesn't necessarily mean that the one item is correct – so just picking your brains.

I have some more queries forXXXXX et al which I'll pass on but these require some NPA input I think.

Thanks

Regards

XXXXX

From: XXXXXX<@wardell-armstrong.com>
Sent on: **Friday, January 6, 2023 10:57:51 AM**
To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
CC: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX <@wardell-armstrong.com>
Subject: RE: Cononish - Restoration and Aftercare Bond and GCGMP Bond Reviews
Attachments: RE Cononish - Restoration and Aftercare Bond and GCGMP Bond Reviews .msg (155 KB)

Many thanks Alison

CES would want XXXXXX to check and verify the revised bond sum and ensure that the supporting data and overall review process is robust.

Regards

XXXXXX

Director and Crown Mineral Agent
Wardell Armstrong LLP

From: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Sent: **06 January 2023 16:34**
To: XXXXX<@ironsidefarrar.com>
Cc: XXXXXX <@ironsidefarrar.com>; XXXXXX<@ironsidefarrar.com>; Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Subject: RE: Cononish Bond Queries
Hi XXXXXX

I have copied your queries and added my comments below:

1.SGL have assumed that some broken concrete may retained on site:

“Broken concrete is inert and can be used as a drainage layer/fill material, it may therefore be retained on site, SCL proposes the removal of previous provision to remove concrete from site; there is no benefit in doing so.”

I tend to agree that it is ok to leave some broken concrete on site (could be buried or reused in future) but just want to check with the NPA. There is actually a sum retained in the bond for this item anyway, but it is proposed as a contingency.

I have checked back on any documentation from the original bond calculations (I wasn't involved at the time) and also at the Decommissioning and Restoration Plan (approved under condition 32) which states that:

(ii) The plant building and all associated infrastructure shall be removed upon mine closure, the concrete hardstanding shall be broken out and bund materials landscaped over this area.

(iii) The plant bund shall be stripped of vegetation for use in restoration (of either stack 10 or the plant area, as appropriate) and re-landscaped across the plant area. Once landscaped any available turf (from the bund/cut face) shall be placed and the area hydro-seeded.

(iv) The mine platform shall be subject to the same treatment as the plant area, being rooted and a thin soil forming matrix spread. The areas shall then be subject to seeding with an acid grass mix.

My initial view is that the concrete would not necessarily need to be removed from site, but I think we would want “materials to be landscaped over” which seems to still be the intention.

2. There are no works to the mine itself other than sealing up the opening with a metal grill, but what about stripping out/removal of equipment/water levels rising?/making safe etc

I queried XXXX on this before and he noted :

“RL - n/a Nothing has changed since the bond was agreed.”

Is that correct – just because the bond was agreed doesn't necessarily mean that the one item is correct – so just picking your brains.

The Decommissioning and Restoration Plan states:

(i) The mine adit shall remain gated with bat access maintained. The access gate shall be retained for monitoring/maintenance purposes. Two existing upper adits/shafts shall be retained. There are no other openings (existing or proposed).

Maybe we could ask for some more information on this from Scotgold- I have limited knowledge of underground infrastructure but I am aware that there is ventilation, lighting, power supply etc as well as some drainage infrastructure and it would be useful to know if these elements will/should just be left “as is” on decommissioning?

Hope the above is helpful. Let me know if you have any further queries.

As a slight aside, I have been keeping Crown Estate Scotland's representatives (Wardell Armstrong) up to date on progress with the review of the Restoration and Aftercare bond and I am advised that Crown Estate Scotland would want Wardell Armstrong to check and verify the revised bond sum and ensure that the supporting data and overall review process is robust. I'm planning to discuss process further with Wardell Armstrong and I am also taking some advice from our legal advisers on procedures and whether the s75 legal agreement will need to be altered assuming the bond values will change (the s75 specifies the bond amounts). It may be easiest to involve Wardell Armstrong in our discussions with Scotgold, however I am conscious of the number of parties involved, so it is worth considering process before proceeding.

I will keep you posted on this and let me know once you are in a position to go back to XXXXXX/Scotgold with initial queries.

Thanks

Alison

Alison Williamson

Planning Officer

Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park

From: XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>
Sent on: Tuesday, January 10, 2023 5:33:09 PM
To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
CC: XXXXXX <XXXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>; XXXXXX<@ironsidefarrar.com>; Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>
Subject: RE: Cononish Bond
Attachments: Cononish Mine Bond Review No. 1, Jan 2023.doc (72 KB), 2022.12.09 Bond Quantification 2022 - with IFL check Comments Jan 2022.xlsx (140.53 KB), Bond Commentary with IFL Comments.pdf (8.65 MB), 63032-99-001-P01 Area Measurements.pdf (921.03 KB)

Afternoon Alison

I'm through it all to a draft review stage now – have put in most of the legwork. I think they have done a pretty good job, better/more thorough than many I've seen for quarries and opencasts which is my more normal fair.

The way I do the reviews is:

- Review and markup of the bond commentary
- Check areas/volumes on a marked up copy of the restoration plan
- Check rates/quantities/arithmetic on a marked-up version of the spreadsheet
- Prepare short bond review which includes queries at this draft stage

I'll copy the specific queries and send to SCL for their response

I attach a copy of the above to give you an idea of approach. That should be enough for Wardell Armstrong to see it's been checked thoroughly – we can discuss though.

Is it best if we have a quick chat about the CE/WA input when you've looked through the above (in outline) before I go back to SCL with queries so we can involve them now if we think it would be best?

Regards

XXXXXX

Director

Ironside Farrar Ltd, 111 McDonald Road, Edinburgh, EH7 4NW

From: XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>
Sent on: Thursday, January 26, 2023 9:26:39 AM
To: XXXXXX@dagleishassociates.co.uk>
CC: XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com; Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXX X@scotgoldresources.com>; Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.co.uk>
Subject: 63032 Cononish Bond Review

Morning XXXX

I've been through the bond and produced an initial report/check sheets etc which I've been through with Alison. In general, I think it's been well done and thought through thoroughly. I do have some specific queries below which I'd be grateful if you could provide a response to, in order to complete the checks.

If you have any queries please let me know.

Regards
XXXXX
Director
Ironsides Farrar Ltd, 111 McDonald Road, Edinburgh, EH7 4NW

Item 2.1 – Can substantiation be provided for the removal of the processing plant and buildings @ £46,932.48? It's a significant item and could be on the low side on inspection. Demolition costs can be difficult to estimate and vary significantly between contractors, especially given location. Please also confirm the thinking behind the processing equipment itself. This would be anticipated to have a value but may have been stripped at the point of a distressed closure of the mine. Noted that offices/labs are on hire and would probably be removed by hire company at nil cost and may provide an element of contingency.

Item 3.1.5 – Can the actual quantity of material in the screening bund be quantified, does it vary significantly from the 19,602m³ originally assumed?

Item 3.1.5 - A rate of £0.62/m³ to regrade (doze) materials is considered to be low even, though it appears to be a dozing operation. Can this be reviewed pls. as its not a commercial rate.

Item 9.4 - Geotechnical Visits - Commentary notes 12 visits but only 8 priced in Spreadsheet Tab Geotech Revised for 2017?

Item 5.1 - This was touched on in the initial queries of late 2022. Could SCL provide further information - I have limited knowledge of the underground infrastructure but are aware that there is ventilation, lighting, power supply etc in the mine as well as some drainage infrastructure. Regardless of the original bond approval, it would be useful to know if these elements will/should just be left "as is" on decommissioning?

Items 2.5, 2.5.2, 2.6, 2.8, 3.2.B, 3.4, 3.5, 4.1, 4.2.B, 4.3. To aid checking and for the avoidance of doubt, could the extent of these items be highlighted on a plan.

From: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Sent: 27 January 2023 16:58

To: XXXXXX@ironsidesfarrar.com>

Cc: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Subject: RE: 63032 Cononish Bond Review

Hi XXXXXX

Could you let me know your availability next week for a quick chat on the restoration bond? (It would only need about 15 mins)

Alison

Alison Williamson

Planning Officer

Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park

From: XXXXXX@ironsidesfarrar.com>

Sent on: Friday, January 27, 2023 5:17:44 PM

To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

CC: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Subject: RE: 63032 Cononish Bond Review

Hi Alison

Tuesday anytime would suit me if you want to put something in the diary on Teams. Friday anytime after 11.30am would also suit

Regards

XXXXXX

On **1 Feb 2023, at 12:13**, Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org> wrote:

Hi Stuart

Just to let you know that following our discussion last week, Vivien and I met with XXXXX from Ironside Farrar yesterday re the restoration bond review. XXXX is going to review the current position and the current bond value to advise on current risk and will feedback. Will update you once we hear back from XXXX.

Alison

Alison Williamson

Planning Officer

Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park

From: XXXXXX@dagleishassociates.co.uk>

Sent on: Wednesday, February 1, 2023 2:35:26 PM

To: XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>

CC: XXXXX@scotgoldresources.com; Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXX@scotgoldresources.com>; Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.co.uk>

Subject: RE: 63032 Cononish Bond Review

XXXXXX

Just a quick update to let you know I've looked at through your queries and should be able to come back to you by the end of the week with clarification, including an additional Figure to highlight the various items/areas you've mentioned.

XXXXXX

Dagleish Associates Ltd

From: XXXXX <X@dagleishassociates.co.uk>

Sent: 09 February 2023 10:11

To: XXXXXX <XX@ironsidefarrar.com>

Cc: XXXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com; Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX <@scotgoldresources.com>; Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXX <@scotgoldresources.co.uk>

Subject: RE: 63032 Cononish Bond Review

Hi XXXX

I hope the following now allows you to complete your review of the restoration bond. I have copied your queries for ease of reference with my responses below each in ***bold italic***.

Item 2.1 – Can substantiation be provided for the removal of the processing plant and buildings @ £46,932.48? It's a significant item and could be on the low side on inspection. Demolition costs can be difficult to estimate and vary significantly between contractors, especially given location. Please also confirm the thinking behind the processing equipment itself. This would be anticipated to have a value but may have been stripped at the point of a distressed closure of the mine. Noted that offices/labs are on hire and would probably be removed by hire company at nil cost and may provide an element of contingency.

The principle of the bond review is to allow for an uplift on the previously agreed quantum, this being to accommodate the inflationary rise since agreement. It was agreed that unless subject to significant changes in the interim, no baseline review would be undertaken. We have not reconsidered the original quantum for the building but on the basis that there is either a value in the plant and building materials, or that items will have been stripped prior to a distressed closure, thus reducing costs for their removal, we believe the figure to be adequate.

As you say, it is difficult to estimate. I return to the fact that the original bond figure for this item was agreed on the basis of advice to the operator and the planning authority at the time, and an appropriate RPI uplift has now been applied.

My own remit from the NPA is to check that the bond quantum represents a reasonable allowance to undertake the restoration works according to the agreed restoration scheme - and not simply to apply an RPI increase to the previous figures (even though that is fact fine for many of the items.)

In this case I don't have a good feel for what the costs would be, so was hoping to understand the basis of the (original) assessment - the advice to the operator and the planning authority at the time – as you term it. If there was a quote from a contractor/a QS's breakdown etc I could use this to help verify the number?

Item 3.1.5 – Can the actual quantity of material in the screening bund be quantified, does it vary significantly from the 19,602m³ originally assumed?

As-built bund volume, for the record – 23,182m³

Total volume is not directly relevant to the quantum as the aim of restoration is to produce a naturalistic landform, not to necessarily remove all of the bund or retain any predetermined volume in a retained bund form. Provision to regrade 19,602m³ remains appropriate.

Noted – agreed at this volume figure.

Item 3.1.5 - A rate of £0.62/m³ to regrade (doze) materials is considered to be low even, though it appears to be a dozing operation. Can this be reviewed pls. as its not a commercial rate.

Whilst the principle of the review is as noted above, an uplift in line with RPI, we do agree 0.62 is lower than current rates. We propose a rate of 0.65 be applied, this has been agreed recently in bond review undertaken by JPB and IFL. This represents an uplift to the bond of £475. New total - £610,402.29

Thanks for reviewing although this still appears low, would suggest a figure of £1.50 (we are commonly getting rates on earthworks schemes of £4.0 or more for cut and fill requiring use of dump trucks) would be more reasonable unless you have any further substantiation you could provide?

Item 9.4 - Geotechnical Visits - Commentary notes 12 visits but only 8 priced in Spreadsheet Tab Geotech Revised for 2017?

This seems to be an error which we had carried forward, the sheet shows 8 visits, the commentary has always shown 12. There is a note on the bond quantification spreadsheet which clarifies this apparent discrepancy – cell L115 “6-monthly for 2 years, 4 further visits (every two years)”, a total of 8 visits over a 10 year period.

Noted – agreed.

Item 5.1 - This was touched on in the initial queries of late 2022. Could SCL provide further information - I have limited knowledge of the underground infrastructure but are aware that there is ventilation, lighting, power supply etc in the mine as well as some drainage infrastructure. Regardless of the original bond approval, it would be useful to know if these elements will/should just be left “as is” on decommissioning?

Any electrical equipment, cabling, pumps etc. and mobile plant would be removed (likely prior to any distressed closure, hence no allowance for this). Agreed provision is for sealing/gating of the mine which remains appropriate.

As above, my remit is not necessarily just to take the previously agreed figure forward – so to be clear what you are confirming is that there are no works required in the mine that would require expenditure in the event of a distressed closure (other than

sealing the entrance and stripping out materials which you are confirming have a net positive value)? For example drainage/support/H+S measures/cleaning and removing pipework/removal of any waste materials etc . Seems unlikely that SCL's plan when the mine is eventually decommissioned is just to seal the door and walk away? What I'm trying to get at is what works actually would be required on closure. It would then be for NPA/SCL to discuss what is appropriate to be in the bond.

Items 2.5, 2.5.2, 2.6, 2.8, 3.2.B, 3.4, 3.5, 4.1, 4.2.B, 4.3. To aid checking and for the avoidance of doubt, could the extent of these items be highlighted on a plan.

Please refer to Figure 2 attached.

2.5 as shown on Figure 2.

2.5.2 berms are shown on Figure 1, now also labelled for clarity on Figure 2.

2.6 Removal of powerlines – as noted, none established to date, therefore none shown.

2.8 Track scarifying – extent shown on Figure 2. Cf. 3.5.1

3.2.B TSF Area, clarified on Figure 2, half of Stack 3 and 5 and the whole of Stack 4.

N.B. separate provision is made for other operational areas including HEAs. Cf. 4.2.B

3.4 Western ponds are not included in the bond, the area is question is highlighted on Figure 2 for your reference.

3.5 Storage & circulation areas to be reinstated (inc. reduction of access track, show on Figure 2). Cf 2.8.

4.1 Western Process Plant Area now highlighted on Figure 2

4.2.B same area as 3.2.B.

4.3 Settlement Pond Area (periphery of pond, highlighted on Figure 2).

Thanks for the plan – that's useful and clarifies the query – I'll go through and check the item coverage.

As always, happy to discuss.

Regards

XXXXXXX

Dalglish Associates Ltd

From: XXXXXXXX@wardell-armstrong.com>

Sent on: Thursday, February 9, 2023 11:50:39 AM

To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

CC: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXXXX@wardell-armstrong.com>

Subject: RE: Cononish - Restoration and Aftercare Bond and GCGMP Bond Reviews

Attachments: RE Cononish - Restoration and Aftercare Bond and GCGMP Bond Reviews .msg (154.5 KB)

Hi Alison

Apologies but it will likely be next week before I'll get back to you on this.

Regards

XXXXXX

| Director and Crown Mineral Agent

Wardell Armstrong LLP

From: XXXXXX<@ironsidefarrar.com>

Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2023 5:01 PM

To: XXXXXX <@dalgleishassociates.co.uk>

Cc: XXXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com; Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX

<XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com>; Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; <@scotgoldresources.co.uk>

Subject: RE: 63032 Cononish Bond Review

Afternoon XXXXX

Thanks for your email. It does resolve some of the issues and the plan was helpful. I have some further comments/queries below in red.

Thanks

Regards

XXXXXX

Director

Ironside Farrar Ltd, 111 McDonald Road, Edinburgh, EH7 4NW

From: XXXXXX@wardell-armstrong.com>

Sent on: Monday, February 20, 2023 3:07:43 PM

To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

CC: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX@wardell-armstrong.com>; XXXXXXXX@wardell-armstrong.com>

Subject: NL01712: Cononish - Restoration and Aftercare Bond and GCGMP Bond Reviews

Attachments: 2023 02 20 Initial comments on bond review ji.pdf (144.32 KB)

Hi Alison

Our initial comments on the bond review attached. Please do give me a call if you have any queries or if we have misunderstood any aspect of the proposals.

Regards

XXXXXX

| Director and Crown Mineral Agent

From: XXXXXX <X@ironsidefarrar.com>

Sent on: Wednesday, February 22, 2023 12:48:32 PM

To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

CC: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Subject: 63032 - Cononish Bond

Hi Alison

I've had a quick look at the figures in the event that the bond was to be called in now, ahead of getting the additional funding in place to cover the anticipated increase in the bond quantum.

The current Dec 2022 Bond is sitting at £610k – there are some items yet to agree as you'll have seen from my last email – so let's assume its agreed somewhere between £610k - £650k

The 2018 bond was £537k.

The only "slack" in the 2018 bond is because it covered a worst-case scenario of the bond being called in when Stacks 3,4 and 5 were all being worked on. We are now approaching the end of Stack 1 and starting on Stack 2 – and there may be order of £65k not required to be spent.

All other items will be required if the bond were to be called in now. I checked whether there was any spare money in Restoration and Aftercare but inflation has negated the savings on works already completed.

This would mean that the current restoration costs would be order of £545k - £585k total leaving a shortfall of up to say £50k based on the current bond at £537k.

Figures are only approximate but give a feel for where things sit currently.

Hope this is of use.

Regards

XXXXXX

Director

Ironside Farrar Ltd, 111 McDonald Road, Edinburgh, EH7 4NW

From: XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>

Sent on: Wednesday, February 22, 2023 12:48:32 PM

To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

CC: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Subject: 63032 - Cononish Bond

Hi Alison

I've had a quick look at the figures in the event that the bond was to be called in now, ahead of getting the additional funding in place to cover the anticipated increase in the bond quantum.

The current Dec 2022 Bond is sitting at £610k – there are some items yet to agree as you'll have seen from my last email – so let's assume its agreed somewhere between £610k - £650k

The 2018 bond was £537k.

The only "slack" in the 2018 bond is because it covered a worst-case scenario of the bond being called in when Stacks 3,4 and 5 were all being worked on. We are now approaching the end of Stack 1 and starting on Stack 2 – and there may be order of £65k not required to be spent.

All other items will be required if the bond were to be called in now. I checked whether there was any spare money in Restoration and Aftercare but inflation has negated the savings on works already completed.

This would mean that the current restoration costs would be order of £545k - £585k total leaving a shortfall of up to say £50k based on the current bond at £537k.

Figures are only approximate but give a feel for where things sit currently.

Hope this is of use.

Regards

XXXXXX

Director

Ironside Farrar Ltd, 111 McDonald Road, Edinburgh, EH7 4NW

From: Alison Williamson

Sent: Wednesday, March 8, 2023 4:05 PM

To: 'XXXXXX<@ironsidefarrar.com>'; XXXXXX <@dalgleishassociates.co.uk>

Cc: XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com; Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX <XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com>; XXXXXX <@scotgoldresources.co.uk>

Subject: RE: 63032 Cononish Bond Review

Hi XXXXX

Can you advise when you expect to be able to provide a response to XXXXX additional queries?

Can you also advise on timescales for providing the GCGMP bond review figures? In December 2022 you advised this was delayed due to waiting for updated costs from contractors- have you received these now?

Regards

Alison

Alison Williamson

Planning Officer

Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park

From: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Sent: 15 March 2023 13:50

To: XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>

Cc: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Subject: FW: 63032 Cononish Bond Review

Hi XXXXX

Hope you are well. I haven't received a response from XXXXX on the restoration bond review queries as yet, but he did advise verbally that he had some comments ready to come back to you on. Hopefully we will get these soon.

The Crown Estate have come back with some queries on the review, after I shared your initial review document with them. Would you be able to have a look through their comments (attached). I think it would just be points 4 and 5 that require a response from you and other points are for the NPA to consider.

Happy to discuss as ever.

Thanks

Alison

Alison Williamson

Planning Officer

Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park

From: XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>

Sent on: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 2:47:49 PM

To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

CC: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Subject: RE: 63032 Cononish Bond Review

Hi Alison

Thanks for chasing re the bond review queries, will review when they come in.

Yes, will take a look at the queries and let you know what I think in the first place.

Regards

XXXXX

From: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2023 4:52 PM

To: XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>; XXXXXX@dalgleshassociates.co.uk>

Cc: XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com' <XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com>; Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com>; XXXX @scotgoldresources.co.uk>

Subject: RE: 63032 Cononish Bond Review

Hi XXXXX

Please can you respond on the outstanding queries raised by XXXX on 16 February. Timescales have slipped and we are keen to bring this to a conclusion.

Regards

Alison

Alison Williamson

Planning Officer

Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park

From: XXXXXXX@dalgleishassociates.co.uk>

Sent on: Monday, March 20, 2023 11:16:55 AM

To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXXX<XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>

CC: XXXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com; Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXXX @scotgoldresources.com>; XXXXXXX@scotgoldresources.co.uk>

Subject: RE: 63032 Cononish Bond Review

Hi XXXXXXX/Alison

Apologies for the delay, I had been waiting for costs from a demolition contractor.

Subsequently, we have also undertaken a further review of item 5.1.

Mark, your instruction from the PA for this review wasn't perhaps entirely clear to me. We had discussed uplifting the bond in line with RPI where there were no changes known in relation to the proposals/line item; I assumed that was accepted. It seems unreasonable to do a wholesale review when this RPI uplift is the basis of what we discussed at the set up meeting.

Having said that, I have found no clear written justification for the original costs (likely based on a discussion with a demolition contractor). I have therefore followed up on the costs for the plant building and Central Demolition Ltd has confirmed that the building removal would be circa £29k. They state that the plant, even for scrap, would cover its costs, for re-use may offer a more sustainable approach as well as potentially recovering some additional value. This cannot be quantified with any certainty and for the purposes of the bond no adjustment is made.

The dozing costs are in line with what has been applied recently by IFL. I understand from my colleague XXXXXXX that this has been agreed by IFL within the last few months, albeit in a role representing a developer, where as it happens DAL was acting for the local authority. I would question the application of different rates depending on who you are acting for; unless you are able to justify the application of £1.50 for dozing here versus £0.65 elsewhere? The transfer distance from bund to platform is within dozing parameters, it is not anticipated that truck and shovel would be required. Reviewing this provision from first principles and considering costs of plant on time rather than a per cube figure, we anticipate 2 dozers for 2 or 3 weeks would be able to complete this landscaping, we have contract staff on site currently from Duncan Plant Ltd and have costs readily available. £1200 per machine per week, £1750 per operator per week = £8,200 (2 dozers for 2 weeks) or £11,700 (for 3 weeks), proposed provision for this line item is £12,700.

In terms of the mine, drainage would not be changed, the roadway has a trackside 'gutter' which would be retained. The only access retained would be for monitoring bats, there is no continuing H&S requirement, as I said previously my understanding is that plant (pumps) pipework and cabling and minor ancillary items, would all be removed prior to site abandonment, even in a distressed closure. We have however reviewed this provision and suggest that on the basis of cabling and pipework removal, this may require a team of two for a week (2 x £1,000), dropping this infrastructure from the mine wall, hauling out and

cutting for removal via skips (3 x £535, worst case general waste and not taking any value of e.g. metal into account), so we propose an additional allowance of £3,605.
I hope we can now move to agreeing the bond uplift.

Regards
XXXXXX

Dalglish Associates Ltd

From: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Sent: Monday, March 27, 2023 11:17 AM

To: XXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>

Subject: RE: 63032 Cononish Bond Review

Hi XXXXX

Hope you are well, are you around this afternoon or tomorrow morning for a quick catch up on this?

Thanks

Alison

From: XXXXXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>

Sent on: Monday, March 27, 2023 11:07:10 AM

To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Subject: RE: 63032 Cononish Bond Review

Hi Alison

This afternoon would be good. There are a few things that we do require to chat through and I was going to get in touch shortly with you re the same. I have been mulling over the possibility of another discussion with SG too – we can chat about that later.

I'm good anytime between 2.30 and 5.30 this afternoon so send a diary invite to suit you

Thanks

XXXXXX

From: XXXXXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>

Sent on: Wednesday, March 29, 2023 9:26:57 AM

To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Subject: RE: 63032 Cononish Bond Review

Morning

XXXXXX and I discussed the bond yesterday so should be in a position to conclude shortly. We agreed on the compromise rate for the dozing but XXXXX was just taking it back to SG first.

Regards

XXXXXX

From: XXXXXX <X@dalglishassociates.co.uk>

Sent on: Wednesday, March 29, 2023 10:31:37 AM

To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>;

XXXXXX <XXXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>

CC: XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com; Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX <XXXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com>; XXXXXX <XXXXXXX@scotgoldresources.co.uk>; XXXXXX <XXXXXXX@scotgoldresources.co.uk>

Subject: RE: 63032 Cononish Bond Review

Alison

XXXXX and I had a call yesterday and have now found common ground on the remaining line items.

Also attached is the latest draft bond quantification, XXXXX will now be able to run a check on this and hopefully advise you of his agreement.

Our provisionally agreed position is an uplift of £85,849.

The total restoration bond now proposed by the operator is £623,767.

I understand from XXXX that XXXXX had raised some queries on behalf of CESIM; should you require any input from SCL/myself, do not hesitate to ask.

Regards

XXXXXXX

Dagleish Associates Ltd

From: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

Sent: Wednesday, March 29, 2023 9:58 AM

To: XXXXXXX@dalgleishassociates.co.uk>; XXXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>

Cc: XXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com' <XXXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com>; Stuart Mearns <stuart.mearns@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXXX@scotgoldresources.com>; XXXXXX <XXX@scotgoldresources.co.uk>

Subject: RE: 63032 Cononish Bond Review

Hi XXXXX

Thanks for your comments. XXXXX and I have discussed this and he will follow up with you.

Regards

Alison

Alison Williamson

Planning Officer

Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park

From: XXXXXX <X@ironsidefarrar.com>

Sent on: Friday, March 31, 2023 1:33:19 PM

To: Alison Williamson <alison.williamson@lochlomond-trossachs.org>

CC: Vivien Emery <vivien.emery@lochlomond-trossachs.org>; XXXXXX<X@ironsidefarrar.com>; <XXXXXXXX@ironsidefarrar.com>; XXXXXX<X@ironsidefarrar.com>

Subject: 63032 Cononish Mine Bond

Attachments: Bond Quantification - with IFL check Comments Final March 2022.xlsx (140.8 KB), Cononish Mine Bond Review No. 1, Final March 2023.pdf (228.77 KB), 63032-99-001-P01 Area Measurements.pdf (921.03 KB)

Follow up: Follow up

Good Afternoon Alison

Please find attached a copy of our Final Bond Review Report. I have also included a copy of the marked-up bond spreadsheet with checks and a quick figure we produced with area checks against the restoration plan. These latter two are for info only and will not mean that much to you but have been included to demonstrate the check procedure.

As you and I discussed, in order to finalise the final bond figure quickly, I discussed the dozing figure with XXXX and agreed a compromise mid-ground rate of £1.00/m³.

Following the changes made during the bond review process, I have checked and agree with the figure recently revised/presented by XXX on behalf of SGL at **£623,767 plus VAT**.

Relative to the comments by Wardell Armstrong (points 4 and 5) on behalf of the Crown Estate, I'd note the following:

We agree that some high rates are being returned in the industry at the moment. Our view is that some of these reflect the amount of work available and lack of resources, rather than actual cost. Relative to this and comments re inflation rates used, we would note that we have considered the bond as a whole and have tried to agree a number that is also fair on the operator. As discussed, and as a balance, there are a number of items in the bond that include potential contingency sums which are on the protective for the NPA:

- Worst case restoration assumed (Stacks 3,4,5 being worked together), which won't be the case for the majority of the lifespan of the works and even at the critical point, it is unlikely that all three stacks will be worked together based on current experience and proposals. Its difficult to be accurate but a quick check at the current point of operation, with Stack 1 being partially restored/nearly complete and Stack 2 being commenced, this could mean that there is order of £65k of additional saving should restoration be required at this point.
- There is a sum of £19,644 allowed for restoration of HEAs 3,4,5 although these may be completed/part completed anyway so the sum may be a contingency.
- The rate for item 3.15 has been increased to £1.00/m³ since the draft review (expedited agreement as discussed)
- There is a General Contingency of 10% as well as an additional uplift of 3.5% each year for two years on the assumption that the bond is checked every two years and prices could rise in the interim. This adds a total of £89,466 to the known works.
- Whilst inflation is currently well documented to be higher than the 3.5%,(at just over 10%) it is at least useful that an allowance for this item has been included as it often isn't. We would also note that the Bank of England's February Monetary Report predicts significant drops in inflation over the coming years (CPI = 3.0% @ Q1 2024, 1.0% @ Q1 2025, 0.4% @ Q1 2026)
- It has been recommended that a quick check on inflation/rates is made yearly (ie including and between the proposed 2 yearly full bond reviews) to keep this item under review.

XXX has said he's working on the GGMP bond at the moment and will present that in due course. He noted there are a number of items that require a level of explanation and agreement so it's likely there will require to be a meeting on that to run through assumptions made.

I'm happy to review with you next week if it would help, the above is a lot to take in on a Friday afternoon.

Have a good weekend.

Regards

XXXXXX

Director

