Presentation

Chris Griffith

Chief Executive Officer, Gold Fields

So thanks for that introduction, Avishkar. Hi, Peter and to all of you ladies and gents that are on the call, good day to you all. As always, we draw your attention, in this case to the most significant disclaimer pages that you've ever seen. So there's three pages of disclaimers. Please note though, given the context of this presentation today, our very important disclaimer.

So I guess the question is, so why this deal? We are extremely excited to be announcing today the acquisition of Yamana Gold and we think this is truly a transaction that delivers on our strategic importance and strategic initiatives for the future of this Company but it also delivers significant long-term value creation for shareholders.

In line with the strategy of Gold Fields, we have done extensive work building on our previous strategy. The team in Gold Fields has done a lot of work with the support of the Board, engaged in an extensive review since the end of last year and looked at a range of opportunities that deliver the strategic imperatives that we were looking for, for this Company, which is to grow. One of the strategy legs, to grow the value and quality of our portfolio.

We have followed a strict evaluation criteria and the rigorous process to come up with the opportunities that we want to pursue and thereby have identified Yamana as what we think is a unique opportunity for Gold Fields.

In Yamana, Gold Fields will acquire a high-quality portfolio of assets that'll continue to deliver and grow the business and the capital returns from the Company. We get a world-class asset portfolio, including Canadian Malartic and Jacobina.

We'll have an increased diversity of exposure across premier gold regions including an enhanced access into North America with Canadian Malartic in Canada on competitive economics. We get, as part of the portfolio of assets, a deep project pipeline providing excellent opportunities and optionality for the future.

One of the great things about the combination of these Companies is that we think there is a cultural alignment seldom seen between the combination of two companies, including shared focus on delivery, a track record of delivery on production, growth and ESG priorities.

We think that there's significant value potential within the combined business that we've identified through detailed due diligence, all the way from the initial engagements, management presentations, the data room but also including detailed site visits and complementary site visits between the Management Teams of both Companies.

This transaction certainly positions Gold Fields at the forefront of the gold sector and will result in a unique investment opportunity for our stakeholders. So what I'm going to be doing over the next number of slides is expanding a little bit on this introduction.

This slide, for those of you who follow Gold Fields, will have seen this slide before. This is the summary of the purpose, our vision, our values and our strategy that we announced to the market at the end of last year. This was building on the previous strategies that the Company has, in our view, successfully delivered.

I'm going to point to you in that circle in the middle, the bottom green component where you see strategy pillar 3, because this presentation addresses that element of the strategy. We talked to growing the value and the quality of our portfolio of assets so you can see from what comes, is that this is entirely focussed on the strategy and the delivering the next potential phase of the Company strategy.

So I mentioned that we have followed a very diligent process to look at the opportunities. First of all, taking into account what the market regularly gives us feedback for and what drives value. On the two on the right-hand side, you can see that the market regularly gives us feedback to say that unless you have the right quality of assets, life of mine and all-in sustaining cost and a number of other metrics, but also geographic or jurisdictional quality. Unless you have quality assets, it doesn't really matter what comes after that as you're never going to get premium value.

Of course, from Management, making sure that we deliver in what we say we're going to deliver and delivering on our strategy so that people believe if they put money behind us, that they'll get the returns that we've promised.

Making sure that we've got the right balance sheet. That we don't put the Company at risk. That we have the right discipline in our financial allocation of capital and that we generate shareholder return. So the market's telling us this.

What the market's also saying is, sizes and scale is of itself not a premium driver and certainly, that's not been the focus - although the outcome, which we'll speak about later, is that this is a greater scale Company, it certainly wasn't the driving force of this deal.

I think the next slide on the left-hand side shows the criteria that we have used to evaluate the external opportunity set. So we look at the - as we look at the opportunities, we look at these six points on the left-hand side and say whatever we do and whatever we're looking at, must improve the business on these metrics.

So we're saying that if these things that we're looking at do not bring improved asset quality in terms of life of mine and sustaining costs or that we're not growing cashflows, or if we're bringing assets to the table that they don't improve our jurisdictional quality. Having spent all this time over the last 10 years, I think a portfolio of assets in what we believe is very, very good jurisdiction, we don't want to go and mess that up.

Whatever we do, we said in the strategy, given that the Gold Fields portfolio, we grow production to 2024 but thereafter as we get to 2.8 million ounces, our production profile slot's dropping off as some of our mines come to the end of their life. This was this particular thing, as we think for the future of the Company, as we're thinking about the strategy of the Company, making sure that whatever we do is enhancing the pipeline of this Company.

Then having a look at what we're good at, I mean, we're good, we believe at running underground operations. We can run open pit operations. We have fixed up operations before, like the Australian assets and we can build new mines. What we're saying is, whatever we do, whatever we buy, must make sure that it can talk to our competitive advantage.

Then lastly, given all the work that Gold Fields has done over a number of years, what we don't want to do is put together a portfolio that takes us backwards in our ESG commitments.

Then what you see on the right-hand side is you see that Yamana pretty much ticks all of those boxes and ticks those boxes very comprehensively. As the work that Brett and his team and our Executive Team, as we've evaluated opportunities, and we see what are the companies or what are the single asset opportunities that help tick all those boxes? We keep coming back to say that Yamana Gold is the best opportunity that we could see.

A bit later when I talk to you about the value that we can see in this Company, we believe that it's substantially higher than the value that we are paying for these assets.

So this is what you're going to see. So when we put these two Companies together, this is just a summary of some of the metrics that you can see when we initially put these two together and as we go through the presentation, you'll see that some of the - these metrics will continue to improve.

So on the left-hand side at the top, you see we put the two Companies together, we'll have pro forma production for 2021 of 3.4 million ounces. That grows over the next number of years to 3.8 million ounces.

At the bottom left-hand side, you can see what the growth rates over the next three years is. The Gold Fields, the two Companies put together, the growth rates over the next number of years of 7.4%. A reserve life with over 3.8 million ounces of 25 years.

All-in sustaining costs like - by putting together the Yamana assets with the Gold Fields assets, actually, our all-in sustaining costs reduces and of course, as we put the two combined portfolios together, there remains opportunities to be able to continue improving that all-in sustaining cost. But it absolutely, you can see from this particular graph, that it meets one of the strategic criteria of saying that if we put things together, we must be reducing our cost.

These two Companies will produce a free cashflow yield of 5.2% and at the bottom box on the right-hand side, you can see these two Companies will have a market cap when you put them together of $16 billion.

Because of the metrics that you're seeing on the left-hand side, with the huge potential to re-rate if you compare how we feature versus the other major gold companies. When you look at the market cap, we believe that there's huge potential for our re-rate for the shares.

Importantly though, this deal has not been done on the premise that there will be a re-rate for the shares. What you can see from this slide is the inevitable conclusion that we think that that is an outcome that will be an outcome of putting these two Companies together.

This is another way of looking at that message. If you look at a number of metrics, P/NAV, EV to EBITDA and price to cashflow, you can see and compare based on the metrics I showed you, what the potential is for significant value creation in this Company.

So the transaction structure. How we've put this deal together. This is an all-share acquisition of Yamana by Gold Fields. Yamana shareholders will receive a 0.6 times Gold Fields ordinary share or an ADS for every Yamana share held. It offers on the 10-day VWAP of 33.8% premium versus the prices that you see on the slide.

This will be executed via plan of arrangement in Canada or category 1 transaction for Gold Fields in South Africa.

Gold Fields will continue to be Gold Fields Limited and headquartered in South Africa. Trading on the JSE as its primary listing and ADSs traded on the secondary listing in the New York Stock Exchange.

Gold Fields will own 61% and Yamana shareholders 39% of the combined Company. One of the things that I'll show you on the next slide is another way, although that was not how the deal was done, it was done from the bottom up on a value basis, we'll show you on a number of metrics that sort of show that that ratio feels right.

We require shareholder approvals as a part of this deal. Where it indicates, Gold Fields requires 75% and Yamana shareholders, 66% approval. We expect to do this and have this completed in Q3 with the closing of the deal early in Q4 of this year.

As you would expect, there are mutual deal protections with break fees of about 4.5% of the market caps of both Companies with the break fee for Yamana, $300 million and Gold Fields $450 million. In addition to all the other protections that you would normally expect of a deal of this nature.

I mentioned to you that although the deal - and I'm going to talk about the value that we can see and what we can see in addition to that but if you try get a sense of what does this look like and feel like and does a 61%/39% split feel right?

So if you look at a number of metrics that you see on the left-hand side, whether it's reserves, resources, production. Production in the next number of years. Consensus NAV or all-in sustaining costs. If you have a look at that and you look at that red line, that is the 61%/39% split.

You can see roughly that is where these areas of metrics between the two Companies' contributions land. So I think what this is, it's another way of saying that this deal feels right at that split for the various two Companies in the combined Company.

This is an important slide because it indicatively gives you a sense of the value that we can see. If we start on the left-hand side, you can see that the Gold Fields market cap of $10.9 billion, the current Yamana market cap of just over around $5 billion.

You can see with the dotted box just below - just above that in blue, it shows that yes, but the year's high had been as high as $6.2 billion. So if you look at that and the market - the deal that we're doing today is equivalent to $6.7 billion. What we're showing is, we can see that value.

So that little box in the top side, we can see $6.5 billion, $7 billion, for what we are paying so we think this is a very good deal for the Yamana shareholders but for Gold shareholders as well, you can see on the boxes on the right-hand side that we haven't had to push the boat out and put absolutely everything into the future.

So some of the upside is what we're paying and some of the benefit, the future benefit, both in pipeline, in future project expansions, we pay for but some of that upside and a majority of that upside, or significant upside above that, comes from value that we haven't used in our valuation.

Another way to think about that is the 12 month target price for Yamana is $7 billion so the market is seeing $7 billion and $6.7 billion is not out of line with what the market is seeing. The market is saying it will take some time to get there and so for the Yamana shareholders, our view is that's an acceleration of value but some of that value will be unlocked because of the combination of the two Companies.

So in a much bigger Company, you see the text under those gold boxes, some of that, like MARA and the execution of that, it's all happening amongst - it's more likely to happen in a larger Company, is where additional value will come from.

So this is not to say to the Gold Fields - this is to say to the Gold Fields shareholders, both because of the delivery of Wasamac, MARA, future value coming from just unlocking - the ongoing unlocking of value from existing assets.

On the really right-hand side, you see that we've got synergies that are not included in that value. This deal is not based on synergies. Yes, there is some synergy and we haven't tried to push the boat out. I'm going to share with you how some of the synergies work but actually, we see much more upside in synergy on upside production or upside efficiency by working together.

There's near-term potential at some of these - at almost all of these mines that has not been included in the value of this Company. There's development projects like larger development projects that are longer term, say for example, the second shaft fit at Canadian Malartic or the or stage 4 at Jacobina. That forms part of that bucket of absolutely value we can see that has not been included in the valuation.

Then a very significant exploration portfolio that comes with this deal. So yes, of course we're paying for that. This is like an investment in a mine. You invest the money to spec greater return later. So, because today we've had a lot of questions like, is there short-term dilution? Yeah, there is some short-term dilution. As you pay a premium for investing in a much more significant value that comes with this combination of assets.

Then the strapline at the bottom says, don't forget that if you - if we were not to do this deal, as we need to supplement our portfolio of assets in our pipeline, as we need to do that, of course we are going to invest in - and we're going to have to put money into those assets.

We had a discussion on one of the calls today where someone was saying to us, well look, the value of our Company per reserve ounce for Gold Fields is currently about $220 an ounce. The value of what we are buying at $6.7 billion for Yamana per reserve ounce is $208 an ounce. We have to go for that bottom strapline. The pipeline that we need to go and invest in.

You investing in single assets, there's quality assets, that's going to come at $350 to $400 an ounce. It's just another way of helping us see that the value that we are paying for this asset in our view, we are paying for some of the value that we see and there's still potential upside with the combination of these - well there's definitely significant value upside still to come from this Company.

So what does that look like? What does the new Company look like? Now I'll speedup a bit as we go through the presentation but this truly looks like if you think about two puzzle pieces fitting alongside each other as opposed to two puzzle pieces sitting on top of each other.

So yes, there's things that Gold Fields bring in the short term and there's things that Yamana suite of assets bring in the longer term but in the overlap with both Companies are very disciplined cash-generating assets.

So it's not like one only brings long-term benefit and one only brings short-term. These are well-established companies generating growth, generating cash returns and returning cash to shareholders but we add complementary portfolios to each other.

So I'm not going to run through those because for those who know Gold Fields, will know that this is what we're bringing. We're bringing a very substantial growth in the short-term and very substantial cash generation ability. Very strong focus on ESG and a disciplined approach to growth, capital return, shareholder returns.

On the right-hand side, we can see what Yamana brings. [A suite] of projects, near-term and medium-term pipeline, established operations. Three of those five assets, we want to go and buy tomorrow so in the individual rights, these are great assets that we are putting in our portfolio.

The geographic position of these Companies is complementary to ours. A deep pipeline. I've got a slide in a couple of slides' time that'll give you a sense of how expensive that exploration portfolio is but also, a strong track record of cost effective mining and on mining on assets that are actually quite complementary to Gold Fields.

Then, very importantly, right at the end, very similar approaches to ESG.

So this is what this looks like when you put these two Companies together. Starting from the right-hand side, you can see Australia. So that's our existing Australian footprint of about a million ounces. In - we're working our way to the left. You can see Africa with 1.1 million ounces and about 24% of the future NAV of this Company.

Having a look at the left-hand side, looking at North America. So we have long wanted to get into Canada and it's always been too expensive and we found it difficult to - on a standalone basis, to get into Canada so that it adds value to the Company.

Now we have a - one of the best mines in Canada, we - in the 50/50 JEV with Agnico, we get into one of the best mines in Canada with an exploration project in - not an exploration, a near-term project in Wasamac and a footprint to allow us to potentially grow in Canada.

The most significant put-together, which is why I left it for last is in South America. So if you look at - I mean, this will be about 40% of the Company's NAV. If you look at Chile down the left-hand side, the El Peñón assets, again one of the three assets that we would want to go and target even if it was a standalone asset.

So El Peñón, very close and with plenty of synergies with Salares, with our exploration potential and exploration potential around those assets, definitely in years to come, you're going to see that that's going to be a much bigger footprint in that area. With the Miner Florida mine, you can see what the contribution from Chile is.

In addition to that, we have one of the really [star] mines, Jacobina. Again, a mine that we want to own in its own right with enormous potential. I've already spoken about, we've visited - the Yamana team are busy executing the final stages of stage 2. There's a stage three and then a stage 4 and with plenty of opportunities along that greenstone belt in Brazil.

Then lastly in MARA in Argentina, we have - here is an operating mine, Cerro Moro, a smaller mine but with only a small footprint of that mine, that has yet been explored.

The real star of the future portfolio is the MARA project. It is a big project, one of the largest undeveloped copper/gold projects around in the world at the moment. Certainly in the combined business, this is likely to be an asset that is likely to be developed in a much bigger Company. This could be 400,000 to 600,000 ounces a year of gold equivalent.

I know a lot of folk think about MARA and that have done work around MARA think about it as a big greenfields mine. Well it's not a greenfields mine and it was an existing mine when it was Alumbrera. So it's got a plant, it's got a tailings dam, it's got licenses. It's got its pipeline to the coast. It's got the logistics in place to get the rail line down to the port.

All we've got to do is go and build the new mine. So of course it's not nearly as simple as that but it's not a - this is not a greenfields mine and in a bigger mine like ours, this is highly likely that an operation like this at the right time can and will be developed.

So if you look at it together, this is what the combined Company will look like. You can see all of this in very, very attractive gold mining jurisdictions. These are the assets, the flagship assets in Gold Fields. They're not all of our assets but certainly the assets that move the dial.

Tarkwa. St Ives in Australia. South Deep in South Africa that's now becoming - and as it's growing and has growth for the next number of years. Granny Smith in Australia and the Salares Norte mine, one of the best gold assets being developed in the world at this point in time will develop on average 450,000 ounces of gold with just over $500 an ounce all-in cost.

So that's your portfolio. Those of you who know Gold Fields will know these assets. Those who know Yamana will know these assets but for most of the Gold Fields shareholders, these will be new to them.

I won't go through all of the detail but I will pick out one or two highlights. If you look at Canadian Malartic, this is a joint venture run by - or managed by Agnico but producing over 700,000 ounces a year, of which our share is 360,000 ounces.

So a very material mine of all-in cost of - all-in sustaining cost of $900 an ounce with underground potential. Half of the potential of that underground, we have not included in our valuation. The second dig on the whole new lode of deposits, that is available with the potential next shaft, all of that has not been included in the valuation that we see for the Company.

That will be developed in time. I mean, this is one of - this star mine across - gold mines across the world.

Next is El Peñón in Chile. Very close to our Salares Norte mine. Great synergies between these. A proper mine in its own right. Low cost, $930 an ounce with future potential. It has been as high as 300,000 ounces and has a potential to go back there.

We look at Jacobina in Brazil. It looks currently at 186,000 ounces, growing all the time as we speak. So this will be low CapEx in growth but comes with the various next phases.

So we have El Peñón growing to - in this phase - sorry, Jacobina growing in this phase. I think, Peter, it's to 220,000 to 230,000 ounces? It's got another phase after that. It could go to 350,000 and beyond that, we have untapped potential beyond 400,000.

So this mine in disciplined capital investment, as it has been doing over the last number of years, has got tremendous potential and you can see just what the all-in sustaining cost of this mine at under $750 an ounce. You see that that combination is why we're seeing the reduction of the contribution helps to reduce the all-in cost of Gold Fields.

Then I've already spoken a little bit about MARA and in the appendix to this presentation is a little bit more detail about MARA and something that still is very exciting for us in the future but it's again, if you choose not to invest in this project in time, there's still significant value that could be created if you were to monetise this asset.

The point I'm making is, you don't have to - we don't have to see for now the development of MARA to be able to justify the price that we are paying for these assets.

Then on this slide, just shows you what the growth looks like over the next couple of years. We grow from 3.3 million ounces combination to 3.8 million ounces. You can see beyond that, say over the next 10 years, if you want to put a timeline to that and I know the Yamana team are probably saying well no, it'll get there a lot quicker than that but you can put a realistic timeline over that and say that you could very easily, if you look at the hatched bars, you could add a million ounces over that period. Yes, some of that will replace some declining production from Gold Fields, some of - but the majority of that will be production growth.

But again, I think sometimes this alarms people because they think oh, my goodness, we're going to now just be using all the capital in growth. The great thing about this is, there is potential for good, disciplined growth and still - and subsequent slides, I'll show you our focus. We haven't lost the focus on returning cash to shareholders.

So what you have here is opportunities and in a disciplined way, you can bring these on and not undermine your ability to return cash and increasing returns to cash to shareholders.

I won't go through this but I think pictorially you can just see the - this is the pipeline of early stage exploration, development projects, near-term potential and execution. We start with execution, you can see Salares. So the blue is Gold Fields. The Salares is the project that we have in execution at the moment and there's two projects, Jacobina and Odyssey at Canadian Malartic that are under execution at the moment.

Left of that, you see the near-term potential and this is all low CapEx production, expansion at all of those operations. Again, you can see what comes from Gold Fields and what comes from Yamana. The point we're really making is, Gold Fields doesn't have a pipeline, we will need to invest in that.

Then you can see the number of exploration opportunities and number of those are advanced exploration opportunities so they're close to being able to be used in investment decisions.

The next two slides, I think are important from the point of now of thinking about the way the Company will still retain its D&A around capital discipline and shareholder returns.

On the left-hand side, you can see the combined Company has a net debt to EBITDA of 0.39. That means actually both Companies have a net debt to EBITDA of 0.39 because that's what Gold Fields is now. The point here is that we are not buying into a Company that has got substantial debt. So with both Companies have got very good balance sheet. The balance sheets are in great shape. Both of the Companies are investment grade rating.

If you look at the liquidity, this combined Company will have liquidity of $3.8 billion. So no need to go back to the market. No need to do anything different, anything strange. We're putting together two Companies with balance sheets in great shape.

It's also Companies that have been thinking about returns to shareholders in similar way. You can see over the last number of years how both Gold Fields and Yamana have increased cash returns to shareholders. You can see our dividend yield at the moment is 2.5% with a potential for that to increase.

If we look on the right-hand side, I think the important message that we want to leave with is, what we are doing is providing optionality and we are putting the Company in a strategically fantastic position to manage for the next 10, 20, 30 years but our focus will remain. The D&A of this Company will not change. It's not changing as a result of executing on our strategy but our focus remains on financial discipline and shareholder returns.

I mentioned up front that what we didn't want to do is put a Company together that took us backwards in our ESG journey. Here you can see just with a very high level snapshot on the left-hand side, Gold Fields. On the right-hand side, Yamana. There's not too dissimilar ratings although sometimes the different rating agencies and with similar commitments in the blue bars at the bottom.

A number of - by putting these assets together, we actually bring some lower cost - some lower emission assets therefore helping the combined Company to have a lower emission footprint going forward. Certainly helping the ESG journey. So very similar approaches on the ESG front between our two Companies.

I mentioned that this deal is not premised on synergies. There are synergies. There will be some synergy around corporate services. You can see that there is a portion of the corporate savings, which I think is possible and I don't think is pushing the boat out.

There will be material in our view, supply chain savings on the - when we put together the South American assets and we have a much more leveraged, a much more bulky South American business and we do think that then by supply chain and bulk purchasing, we can deliver additional synergies but I think that's on the operational fronts on the bottom left-hand side that I'm the most excited.

So here we have two sets of very strong technical teams that are able to work together and actually - you know, in an environment where technical expertise is so, so rare, what you can see that I'm much more excited about the operational improvements and the operational benefits that we can get by working together.

We've spoken about the synergies and the opportunities we can see but we don't think that that's - those opportunities apply to everyone. So we don't think oh, Joe Bloggs can come with his Company. You - the same deal as we have and they'll get the same benefits.

So I'll share with you - I mean, if you just think about the type of assets that we're putting together. So if we look at the Jacobina and Tarkwa. They - if you put the previous - those two continents together, you can see that those assets form part of the same type of mining geology and the Jacobin and the Tarkwa mines are very similar.

The expertise that Yamana has for mining underground on those assets and that we've got for the open pit mines there, there's plenty of opportunities for both - on both sides of this Company to be able to contribute.

We look at the orogenics in Australia and Canada in - and Wasamac, we think there's a huge amount of opportunity. Now, these opportunities aren't available to everyone else. They - the copper and gold [porphpry] synergies with - and the way we think about mining those at Cerro corona, we think will help hugely at delivering of MARA. Likewise, the same type of geology exists in - for El Peñón and Salares, given that they are in exactly the same region.

So here you can see that our technical teams and technical operational synergies are not available to everyone else and they certainly are available to improve the revenue line of the synergies here. So - but there are synergies but this deal is not premised on delivering synergies.

So I'm going to hand over to Peter because he's going to talk about well, why should we do our business with Gold Fields. So Peter, over to you.

Peter Marrone

Chairman, Yamana

Chris, thank you very much. I'm going to begin with a couple of comments and a question. So I founded this Company in 2003 and some of the commentary today amongst our shareholders was, is this bittersweet for you? You founded this Company and now it is effectively being sold to someone else.

The second comment is that we present an Americas portfolio that is an excellent fit into a number of different opportunities. That beggars the question, why do a deal and why this one?

The answer to that question is, this is a unique value proposition. It combines two strong platforms, creating a Company that is better than the sum of the parts and Gold Fields is the best custodian for these assets.

Let's talk a little bit about the custodianship and let's talk a bit about the - what gets created. It creates an immediate scale to become a new major gold Company with unparalleled growth and quality.

Top tier assets with leading reserve life index, amongst the senior gold producers and that's before we look at resources to further bolster longevity. It will be the third largest precious metals producer by 2024. It has brownfield growth as Chris mentioned, not greenfield growth. Where's the risk?

The risk is not on the mine. The risk is often on the plant, particularly large plants. Big scale plants in more difficult, less labour-effective parts of the world. When the plants are built, that becomes substantially easier. It's low cost growth. It will be the fourth largest Company by market capitalisation but this presents that value proposition that I referred to a moment ago. As we meet the multiples of those larger peers.

We have a complementary regional approach in the Company. We believe in regional significance, even dominance in the regions in which we operate and we think we certainly see this on our diligence, that Gold Fields takes a similar approach.

The amount of shareholders who retain 39% of the combined Company and that's reflective of the inherent fair value. It's consistent with comparative net asset value contributions and that's why these discussions were constructive.

Gold Fields came to the conclusion that we were looking to come to, which is that the market is not reflecting our inherent fair value and we can justify an inherent fair value that is higher. That 39% is reflective of that conclusion. It enables Yamana shareholders to capture more of that inherent value in assets, as you mentioned Chris, such as Jacobina and MARA where the geological experience, together with size and scale, will make a difference for the advancement and development of those projects.

With a larger Company, the value in the assets such as MARA can be unearthed. We also came to the conclusion in our diligence that Management competency is required to develop world-class assets. MARA is a world-class asset and it requires Management competency to get to that point.

This globally diversified Company will have 14 operating mines across four - across premiere, rules-based mining jurisdictions. Once again, it was consistent with our philosophy.

We want to be in mining-friendly jurisdictions and we want to be in rules-based jurisdictions. No one can argue that's true of where you are in Australia. That is very true of South Africa. It's true of Ghana, where Tarkwa is. You have an asset in Chile which is where we are and already have a platform.

Rules-based mining friendly jurisdictions where there's mining pedigree and where we don't have to worry about where the labour force is coming from because it's already there in the jurisdictions in which we operate.

This will have an expanded global footprint in those rules-based jurisdictions to complement our Americas portfolio. We have a shared Management belief in building regional dominance, anchored by flagship assets.

In addition to all of that, it creates an industry-leading Management bench strength. I appreciate that there are many who say, well where are the synergies? Fortunately, we have some synergies here but these deals should not be done based on the synergies. We're in an industry that is suffering in many respects from a shortage of high quality, competent and capable managers.

If we can bring two Companies together an improve that Management bench strength, that's critical for success. I describe it as more oars in the water and more hands on the oars. That's critical and important to a combination and the success of our combination.

We have a shared common vision and a commitment, as you mentioned, to ESG and the care of the host communities in which we operate. We have a joint track record of successfully delivering on projects and extensive - with extensive technical capabilities. The combined Management provides significant experience in certain geologies comparable in our Company to your Company.

We can complement the skills of deep underground bulk mining and open pit competencies. South Deep is one of the deepest mines in the world and we have a mine in Canada that is a deep mine that requires a shaft. Maybe a second shaft.

We firmly believe in our Management and in our Board of Directors that this is not a mine that will be producing 500,000 to 600,000 ounces per year. There's plant capacity of 560,000 tonnes per day. Why would you ever limit yourself to one shaft at 20,000 tonnes per day? You would always try to optimise that and with the experience in South Africa, we think that can parley well into looking at how can we fast track? How can the new Company fast track the development of another shaft and getting more ore to surface to go through that additional capacity?

We have a complementary experience in Latin America to deliver value from exploration and to development and operational excellence.

You talked a little bit about the shared knowledge. Salares Norte, El Peñón and Minera Florida, there's a Chilean platform and that platform can be used for optimisations, risk mitigation and value creation. It's always easier when there's a platform rather than just a standalone sole [asset] in a particular jurisdiction. That platform delivers more than 330,000 ounces per year so it's a robust, strong platform in the country.

Odyssey and South Deep as underground bulk mining, as I mentioned, these are two quality assets in quality jurisdictions where the experience in deep underground mining in one will parley well in the other.

You've mentioned Jacobina and Tarkwa and the shared experiences and knowledge that can be translated between the two and while you talked about MARA and Cerro Corona, I think it's also relevant and important to talk about what happens with MARA.

Here is an asset that should be developed. It's an asset that certainly should go through the process of consideration for development. In a Company that produces a million ounces per year, that's a more difficult decision to make. One that we would likely make but a more difficult decision in a Company that produces up to four million ounces per year or more.

We believe, steadfastly and wholeheartedly that while you're cautiously and conservatively talking about going this Company to four million ounces per year, we think that that number is likely higher than that.

So we have the scale to execute on these organic growth projects and we can crystalise that inherent value immediately but for those shareholders who choose to remain, and I hope that there are many of those shareholders, there is significant value upside in maintaining a shareholding in this Company. That's it.

Chris Griffith

Chief Executive Officer, Gold Fields

Thanks, Peter. I've only got one landing slide and that is what we think will be the outcome of putting these two Companies together. I started the presentation by talking about why we started looking at the assets that we were looking at and what we were trying to achieve and why we landed on Yamana.

The outcome is, when we do put these two together, whilst some of those may not have been the driving forces behind the deal, the outcome is what we think a true combination for long-term value. This will be a super impressive Company when this deal goes through.

We'll be creating a new gold major with a compelling value proposition. It's a long-life, low cost, leading growth mine and few companies can boast of those - all three of those components at the same time.

We'll have a portfolio diversified across the premier gold regions. Almost all of the big mining gold mining companies have got some parts or some component of their business that is in less attractive jurisdictions. That won't be the case for Gold Fields.

This is complementary high quality portfolios with strong cashflows and a deep project and exploration pipeline.

We have, as Peter mentioned, a robust platform to build off. We're not starting from afresh. We're not putting together a very early stage development company. These are two well-established Companies that we're putting together and awesome platform to deliver a disciplined organic growth strategy.

We have, as Gold Fields, project development track record. We can build mines, we can fix mines and we can run mines. We have a strong balance sheet to be able to execute our projects in a disciplined way without going back to shareholders and without putting the balance sheet under pressure.

Our vision that we highlighted up front when we last year were thinking about, well actually, where could we take Gold Fields to? We were thinking that this is possible and I know most people put up visions like this that are aspirational.

When we say that how do we become the preferred gold mining Company? Where actually, people go to. So investors go to. Governments go to. Communities go to. Employees go to. We think that this combination is fast-tracking our Company to be able to deliver on being the preferred gold mining company that delivers superior value but sustainably.

We've mentioned that we haven't lost focus on our ESG and actually, this complementary portfolio actually accelerates some of the delivery that we have on ESG. With both of us committed to zero emissions by 2050, zero fatalities and increasing gender diversity amongst a whole range of ESG metrics that we measure, have targets for and that we update the market on regularly.

Then at the same time, that bottom strapline, I think says that whilst we are doing that, we will continue doing that remaining focussed on quality growth. So not growth for the sake of growth and not scale for the sake of scale. Financial discipline and increasing shareholder returns.

So ladies and gents, thanks very much for your time. Thanks very much, Peter, for the two of us together and I think we are now going to go to Q&A.

Q&A Session

Anita Soni - (CIBC Gold Markets)

First question from me is, in terms of - I noticed in the presentation there wasn't any indication on what the key Management roles would be. Are - is there anyone in the CC - in Yamana staying on in the new Company is my first question.

Chris Griffith

So we haven't - thanks, Anita, for the question. So we haven't landed on all that and I think post our conversation - post this announcement today and as we engage with the Management teams, we will then have conversations with the Management team. I mean, it is a takeover and it is an acquisition and Gold Fields Management and the Board will run the Company but as Peter said, number one, firstly on the operational front, we absolutely need to lock, stock and barrel everyone that's running those assets to run those assets because they're not competing in any role.

There can't be two combined Managements and Boards but there absolutely is space for senior leadership roles. There's absolutely space. There's still plenty of work to be done with integration and the answer to your question, Anita, is that we will be engaging with Yamana Management, our Management and we will be seeing on what basis, on a merit basis, which staff we integrate into the future Company.

But we haven't spent that time yet. We haven't agreed for - and we haven't spoken to any of the senior leadership in Yamana yet.

Anita Soni - (CIBC Gold Markets)

Okay and then second question. In terms of the project pipeline for Yamana, I mean Jacobina's not expensive capital but I'm just sort of thinking about the Malartic expansion at Odyssey Underground. There's supposed to be a mine tour for that tomorrow. Then Wasamac.

Should we assume that the capital spending programs and the start-up timelines are unchanged with this deal? Or should we think that you might re-evaluate and consider and talk with our partners on that - on Malartic at least?

Peter Marrone

Well, Anita, certainly in terms of how the - we compared models and in valuing the Company, the conclusion that was reached was that the steady as she goes on the project development for the underground at Malartic and also for Wasamac. So Chris, perhaps you can comment on this but my impression, certainly our Management's impression as part of the diligence, is that we're not changing the timelines on those projects. They're progressing according to the timeline that we'd set for them.

Chris Griffith

Yes, Peter, I would agree with that. Look, we don't have a desire to say stop all things and we want the businesses to continue running. So yes, in a combined business, of course we will evaluate project and capital allocation. Of course we'll do that but that doesn't mean that we want anything to stop.

We don't want teams - the Gold Fields business to get distracted. They've got to continue delivering on all the things that they know they need to deliver and the same message - and Peter, I'm sure you've been saying that to your team and we'll be saying that to the team.

There's - this is a business that's running and running well. Just carry on and we will around that be talking to each other about exactly what that'll look like but there's no intention to put things on hold and to stop value that [inaudible] but at [inaudible].

Anita Soni - (CIBC Gold Markets)

Apparently my daughter doesn't like this [deal].

Chris Griffith

[Inaudible] but it was none of these things that had a big red light next to it saying oh my goodness, if we have a look at this, we've got to stop A, B and C. We didn't have any of that because we can see some of those value. We buy into that value and how we integrate that, it'll be a function of the future. But at this point in time, Peter, absolutely right because we want the businesses to carry on performing.

Anita Soni - (CIBC Gold Markets)

Okay and then my last question was just with regard to the TSX listing. You mentioned that you would de-list that one for Yamana. I'm just curious why focus just in Johannesburg and not retain that listing in Canada, given the large ownership base up here?

Chris Griffith

So look, at the moment, the offer is, Anita, for either Gold Fields shares or for ABSs. So that's the offer. That's the construct of the deal. Therefore the shareholders in Yamana will be offered either of those two options and under those two options, we don't need to retain the listing on the TSX.

Peter Marrone

Anita, the volume - the overwhelming majority of the volume in our stock is on the New York Stock Exchange and the two are interchangeable. That's true of the ADRs as well. So this was not a sticking point for our Board of Directors. While you're right that there's a Canadian base, equally the overwhelming majority of volume is in New York and certainly our Board's experience is that investors go to where the volume is. So that's why we came to this conclusion.

Anita Soni - (CIBC Gold Markets)

Okay, thank you very much for taking my questions.

Peter Marrone

Thank you.

Chris Griffith

Thanks, Anita.

Josh Wolfson - (RBC Capital Markets)

Thank you very much. Just a question on the regulatory side. What approvals are required? Is there any complexity associated with the domicile of each respective Company?

Peter Marrone

We're not seeing any regulatory hurdles other than ordinary course than normally when one has multipole jurisdictions. So from the timing point of view, the only issue on timing is the delivery of pro forma financial statements or an information circular.

Gold Fields publishes results semi-annually and we publish results quarterly. So we will have a discussion on how we can expedite our financial results for the second quarter and Gold Fields' financial results for the half year so that we can provide that - those information circulars into our shareholders hands sooner rather than later.

But from a regulatory point of view that goes strictly to your question, we're not seeing anything that is an impediment or hurdle to timing and while we said in our announcement that we expect to be completing in the fourth quarter, certainly we're aiming for the third quarter. The end of the third quarter.

Josh Wolfson - (RBC Capital Markets)

Okay.

Chris Griffith

I've got nothing further to add so, Peter, thanks very much. We don't see any regulatory hurdles that are not part of the normal process of doing a deal of this magnitude.

Josh Wolfson - (RBC Capital Markets)

Okay and on the Gold Fields side, I think for Gold Fields shareholders, there's certainly looks to be high dilution associated with this transaction for near-term operating metrics and even when you look at what Gold Fields would have looked like with Salares Norte coming online and there being high cashflow there. You know, the deal still looks quite dilutive.

I understand there are some merits here to scale but there does seem to be a larger sacrifice of what that upside is and diluting that growth. Is there anything that we're not seeing here in terms of maybe risk on the project or other upside for Yamana within Gold Fields that we should be thinking about?

Chris Griffith

No, I don't think so. I mean, I think we spent quite a bit of time on the presentation talking about the value that we can see. Sure, the Yamana share price is under-valued but it - that value is not only seen by us, it's also seen by the market and so the market is anticipating that in the not too distant future, as delivery of certain things happens, the add value will come through.

Yes, there's - you pay for control. You pay for a take-out and you pay for some of the upside value, you will pay to the existing owners but I've made it - I've hopefully made it clear and hopefully I've emphasised enough that we still see plenty of upside and we avoid very material injections of - or investments in cash more likely, of what we still have to do for the future of our Company.

I think that's not been felt or it's not been valued and that's not being seen but that still has to happen in Gold Fields going forward. So I'd like to think of this rather by the Gold Fields investors, like we would invest in a mine. You would invest in some of the value that we can see and that's, I think, what we are doing.

We are investing our shareholders, we're saying we can see that value and a lot more and we're asking you to invest and trust Management because we can do this. We can see that. What we're asking you to do is invest in this future value and the future of this Company at what we think is a very, very attractive premium to get in there.

So this premium that we're paying is not wild compared to what the market sees. They're not valuing that now, we will get there. Some of that value unlock will come in our hands and we don't see any material downside.

I mean, there's normal mining things in - we've got in our own assets that you know, that we've got to manage on a day-to-day basis. There's none of those - in particular, three big assets that make up 85% to 90% of the value of Yamana. These are well-run assets, they've got low costs, they're contributing to a reduction in our all-in cost. We're excited to be able to leverage off the synergies between our two companies and we are not seeing any material downside, even in the big project MARA where traditionally I think most people have said we don't know if this will ever be developed.

In our hands, we - in this combined company's hands because we will have the scale to develop that, and actually in the risk of where big projects are, they're in the plant, they're in the pipeline, they're in the logistics, and they're in the tailings dams. That's where the risk is. So, yes, there will still be risks and we've got to go through them, evaluate, but I don't see insurmountable risks to be able to develop a project like that. Over time, at the right time, and at the right pace we think that we can develop that. We don't see - otherwise we wouldn't be sitting here today if we believed there was material risk to the delivery of the value that we can see.

Peter Marrone

Josh, I'm going to supplement that answer a little bit by providing a bit of a challenge. You refer to high dilution but look, when one looks at dilution, we have to look at short term, long term, what are the assumptions, what is the methodology that's being looked at. Is it net asset value, cash flow, free cash flow? My experience over three-and-a-half decades of transactions is that the best transactions are the ones that don't check every box, but they check some of the boxes for one side and some of the boxes for the other.

We have to be very cautious when we talk about high dilution or any dilution because it is all based on the assumptions and what is it that one is looking at. If we looked at net asset value, for example, this transaction is very close to neutral for net asset value. There will be accretion to one company on short-term cash flow and accretion to the other company on longer-term cash flow and all of that has to be looked at in the context of the assumptions as MARA gets developed or not developed. If MARA gets developed then longer term it would be dilutive to our cash flow, but equally it would be more of a challenge, as I mentioned, for Yamana to develop MARA than it would be for this combined company.

Josh Wolfson - (RBC Capital Markets)

Great. Thank you very much.

Adrian Hammond - SBG Securities

Hi, Chris. Thanks for the clear rationale presented today. I would just like to perhaps ask a question on the [soft-edge] deals around cultural fit between the two companies and whether some thought was taken into account regarding that. I'll draw your attention to deals of the past such as that between Barrick and Randgold and versus Newmont and Gold Corp where clearly very different companies merged or combined and both had very different outcomes if you looked at their share prices relative to performance. Could you give us some colour as to what thinking was considered regarding whether this is a risk or not?

Chris Burgess

Yes, thanks for an interesting question, Adrian. It's something that - because of course we have to operate these assets going forward. We have to manage a combined company. I think Gold Fields has got sufficient history to be able to acknowledge that we all come from different parts of the world, and we all bring some cultural complexity, and we bring some cultural advantage. You just look at Gold Fields as it stands today is that we have Australians, South Africans, Ghanaians, Peruvians, Chileans, and even - you just look at Peruvians and Chileans and although they're next-door neighbours they can be quite different.

Number 1, from the portfolio [inaudible] putting together, we're putting more Chileans, some Brazilians; this is not different from what we're doing today. We get additional - we get Canadians, I'm not sure about Canadians, but other than those - this is not something that we manage, that's not different for us to be able to manage different cultural groups of people together. That's not a problem for us and we're absolutely excited about bringing different thinking and different people into our business because we just believe that diversity creates strength.

In the culture that we've been looking at is to say is this - do we think the same way about business? It's not the cultural from different parts of the world, we talk about are we going to find a company that are just a bunch of cowboys and that they hurt people and they don't care about communities, and they don't care about the impact that they have on society and how they're thinking about the future and the contribution they make and the purpose that they have. That's important for us: is this just a company that only wants to grow and not return cash to shareholders because those are things that are quite difficult to change.

Then what you've got to do if you find that this is insurmountable then you've got to say well, we've got to do something fundamentally different, or we don't do the business together. Our view is that that's not what we found. We found very similar cultural approaches to safety, to the environment, to health, to engaging with governments, to engaging with local governments, to engaging with communities, to thinking about the impact and the future and the contribution we want to make to net zero and that sort of thing.

We think - of course, we're going to have - we'll be different companies and we'll be different. I guess a smaller company can be more nimble than a bigger company. A bigger company can have other benefits. I think we're going to put together some pretty interesting positive cultural fits, the contributions that we make because of the places we come from across the world I think will be positive.

All round I think, Adrian, when we've looked at culture from that point of view how do we run the business? We've found that actually our businesses are run very, very similarly. We are different sizes, sure; we operate a little bit differently in different parts of the world, and we'll bring strengths to that discussion from both sides. I don't know if you want to add anything to that, Peter.

Peter Marrone

No, I think that's excellent [report].

Chris Burgess

One of the things - when we were doing - when [Brett] and his team were going through this, it is absolutely one of the questions we ask is around the cultural fit, and we can't say that for every company that we looked at. We don't think that there are companies - there's some companies where we had a big cross next to some of those things. So, it's not just because how you get a big tick under any circumstances, we have - for a number of companies we said we don't want to work with these guys.

Peter Marrone

Perhaps I will add something to this. Do you know - and I'm sure, Adrian, we've not met so I will look forward to meeting at some point, but there is certainly a willingness today to talk about climate action but the way we do climate action is effectively it's an extension of - if you're protecting the global environment, you're also caring about the local environment.

We as a Company have been very sensitive to ensuring that we're taking care of health and safety issues, that we are responsive to local environmental issues, that we are responsive to community issues, that we engage effectively with communities. We would not do a deal with a company that did not have that similar level of engagement. Part of our diligence - and this was something that was critically important to our Board of Directors - part of our diligence was that we wanted to make sure that from a health, safety, environment, and community point of view there was a similarity, a simpatico between the two cultures, and we certainly came to the conclusion that there is.

Adrian Hammond - SBG Securities

Thanks very much. Perhaps if I have a follow-up, Chris, you've now secured the future effectively and haven't used the balance sheet. Are you willing to enhance dividends for shareholders?

Chris Burgess

Yes. I hope I've said it at least 10 times today, Adrian, that the discipline in returning cash to shareholders and increasing cash to shareholders is as strong as it ever was, and that's - we're not changing the way we think about that. That's always been our intention, Adrian, as we deliver Solaris the intention was, and the expectation was that we would be able to increase returns to shareholders.

I think the one thing that [Paul] always says is absolutely as we increase the size of the pie, the slice - even if the percentage slice is the same, the absolute amount - and I know you know that well, but we will be returning increased cash to shareholders. There are different ways of course, as you know, for shareholders returns, but hopefully I've stressed at least 10 times today that that is not changing. Thanks, Adrian.

John Tumazos - Very Independent Research

Thank you very much and congratulations on this enormous work to get the transaction this far. I have two questions. First, the Agnico-Kirkland transaction announced within the last year had a tremendous rationale that the merged firm has not outperformed Barrick or Newmont. So, what will be your posture if the market doesn't appreciate this Rembrandt as much as we do. We all thought the Agnico-Kirkland would trade up.

Second question. South Deeps is half of the resources and GFI and it's been a problematic mine for two or three decades. Could you just review the fatality record and the risks of regulators coming down on it? Secondly, a sixth of the resources of GFI are undeveloped and I've been reading about chinchillas and rare species of foxes and heaven forbid the mine is half built and not completed like Pascua. Sorry, but I had those concerns.

Chris Burgess

No, I think they're fine, John, and hopefully we can address them now. John, what happens if shareholders don't appreciate our story? We've been working on this story collectively between our two companies for I don't know, like eight months or something, so we don't expect the market to have instantaneously the same level of appreciation for this deal as we do.

We have been working deeply on these things during - and as Brett and his team are saying, and the same for Gerardo and your team, Peter is our teams have been working as various layers of increasing depth, all the way from initial discussions, desktop reviews, management presentation, data rooms, site visits. Our teams have got a very good understanding of the assets both ways, reciprocally, of what we're dealing with. So, when we say to the market we can see A, B, and C, it's not because we woke up one day or we read a report, it's because of detailed work over an extensive period of time that has led us to this position that we believe, and we can see, and we can justify it to our shareholders.

Now, for many shareholders they would have seen this for the first time because of course we've been working behind closed doors to make sure that we want to get to this position and that we can motivate the shareholders. We're not asking shareholders to vote today and by the time that we do ask shareholders to vote, we plan to engage both Peter's team - Peter's got as much work to do as I have and my team have got to do, because Peter's got to say to his shareholders we think that Gold Fields are the right custodians for these assets and that we want to be in bed with them.

We've got to go to our shareholders and say we think you're paying for the same reasons and look at it as what we are buying and what we are creating. We expect to busy for the next couple of months. We expect that we've got work to do and we don't begrudge that work. It's our obligation to show our shareholders what we can see and so we'll be doing that, and we do that gladly and we actually are very excited to be able to share this message and to share this vision and to share this work that our teams have done. At this point in time, I don't think if the - if somebody doesn't see it yet that we say that we can't help them see it over time. Peter, do you want to add to that?

Peter Marrone

John, I would add it's never clear why one transaction may be in favour and another in disfavour, but it's very difficult for us to be able to say why would the Agnico-Kirkland deal - and I don't know if it did or didn't underperform but why would that deal have underperformed? I think the starting point should always be let's ask the question why did the two companies do a deal, and is it consistent with their philosophy, is it consistent with what they have said and whether or not they've said it, what does it create?

In this case, we're not trying to create something, as Chris said, that is bigger. Bigger seems to be better today than it has been in the past but better is always better. So, what we're trying to do here is we're trying to say we're creating a company that demonstrably is better across all of the measures and if we're successful at communicating that, then we should be able to capture that value in our shares, in the shares of Gold Fields. I think we'll be successful at being able to do that.

The starting point is we ask the question why, and why are we doing it? We're doing it because we're creating a better company. I know you asked questions and Chris will answer this on Solaris and chinchillas and foxes and I don't know if the plural is fox or foxes, and South Deeps but our diligence, we visited those sites. The conclusion that we reached, I can put hand on heart, pound the table and say that an excellent job is being done at South Deeps to promote what the Company has been saying which is that we can get a better production at better cost and there doesn't appear to be any issue that leads to a delay in the start-up of operations at Solaris. We can give that endorsement because we've been there and conducted that diligence.

Chris Burgess

Thanks, Peter. I'll quickly talk about Solaris and South Deep. We got asked a few times today so why now, but potentially this deal, when South Deep wasn't yet in the position it is today, so two years ago this would have been a difficult deal to sell to shareholders. We were much further away for delivering of Solaris and we certainly hadn't yet got

South Deep to a position that it was generating sustainable cash flow and had a proper trajectory that people could buy into.

Over the last number of years, and I claim no credits for this, it's work that's been underway for many years, and certainly [Nick] has been telling the market that guys, the work that we're doing is going to deliver and some of the tough work that that team took in 2017 and '18 to restructure the mine, sort out the labour relations, take on the unions, have a much more constructive [post new staff], a much more constructive relationship with unions under the leadership of Martin Preece and [Ben Siddon] and his team.

We have got at South Deep in our view now a mine that is - it's like any other mine now. It's just generating free cash flow, it's got an upward trajectory, it's doing some fantastic work on thinking about the future with their people on safety and the improvements in safety at that mine over the last number of years have been tremendous. We've got faith in the team, and they've demonstrated that and over the last number of years we have seen very substantial increases in cash flow and our view is that that will continue.

Whilst we had a 21% or 29% increase in production '21 over '20, over the next number of years we've said that we will continue to deliver growth and that we'll see 20% to 30% increases in the growth, and commensurate to it, we will be able - or aligned with that we'll be able to manage inflation and you will see a real reduction in unit costs from that operation. That's become like any mine now. Yes, it's had a troublesome history but over the last three years you can see there's been a track record of delivery and improving delivery and that will continue.

For Solaris, we've been very clear about what our challenges around Chinchilla are. There's like 15 or 20 Chinchilla on the project site but in one specific area, in a rocky outcrop area that we need to start mining in 2025. We don't think that we need to - because it's the stripping at Agua Amarga where we only need - this is the second pit that we need to start stripping much later one. We don't think - we could move those 15 or 20 chinchillas in one morning; we just need to take the environmental authorities along with us and we understand that this is a difficult period as they're changing the Constitution and they're putting in place more environmental rights.

We are working alongside the government; we're working alongside as many experts as we can find. We've got universities, we've got people that are studying and doing PhDs on chinchillas, and we've got the best minds around thinking about how we do this. We're not gung-ho, we're not mowing down chinchilla habitat or anything like that; we've got enough time to solve this and to move the chinchilla to a different relocation. We are not worried around chinchilla.

The foxes were something that we - now this is a new thing for us so we've got to - because they move around, foxes, and we've just got to make sure we've got protocols on the mines that can make these foxes, which incidentally hunt these chinchillas. We are not worried about the environmental impacts. They absolutely need to be managed and that's absolutely something we want to do. We don't want to harm any of the natural fauna and flora, and we will do whatever is necessary to look after it. We are not worried about it, and it poses in our view very, very low risk to our project.

John Tumazos - Very Independent Research

Could you just refresh us, how long has it been since there's been a fatality at South Deeps? I know there were many 10, 20, 30 years ago; I've been watching it since [Placer] bought it in '98. Maybe it would give us comfort to understand the diminution in improvement in safety.

Chris Burgess

We had one fatality in April of last year, and it was quite a strange fatality. We had a very long drill steel that was stuck in an ore pass chute and it had bent and was under tension and the shaft timberman who was cutting this because he wanted to clear the drill steel out of the chute, hadn't realised the tension that was in the drill steel. When he cut the drill steel, it sprung back like a steel and unfortunately struck [inaudible] on - it struck him, and he was fatally injured.

This was not for example a fall-of-ground injury, the kind of risk that you would anticipate at a deep site [inaudible] active mine. I think the team have done a great job in terms of mine design, in terms of support for being able to look after the safety of people at South Deep. Thanks, John.

John Tumazos - Very Independent Research

Thank you.

Grant Sporre - Bloomberg Intelligence

Good afternoon, everyone. Chris, thanks for taking our questions. A lot of the questions have been answered but I've just got a follow-up one in terms of the MARA project. From my assessment it is quite a large part of the value equation for the acquisition. Have you in your due diligence discussed plans with the minority partners Glencore or Newmont in terms of developing the mine and their thoughts around that?

Chris Burgess

No. You could imagine, we can't yet go to the other partners to tell them hey, we're sniffing around these things that are in discussion so no, we'll only be able to have these conversations afterwards. Perhaps one other thing, the thing about South America I guess, it's like other mining jurisdictions, the people move around. We have got people in our business, probably to Peter's irritation at some point in the past, that used to work on some of these projects that work for us now.

We've got our head of our new Chilean operations used to work at MARA. We've got folk that used to work at Jacobina. We've got our head of our South American operations [Luco] who used to be and run [Alambrera]. When we send some of these people back to say well, tell us what it looks like compared to when you were there, and some of this was fairly recently but Luco used to work a long time ago at the Alambrera, which is now the MARA plant. Their feedback to us was the plant is in good shape, it needs very little capital, these assets are being looked after well, they're running well.

Some of the guys, who used to for example work at Jacobina, say this is like 100 times better than it was when it was way back when they used to work there. We've got a number of - other than our people and we took these very experienced mining engineers, geologists, exploration geologists, formed very substantial teams that went to visit these operations. We've got thumbs up from people that not only visited those operations but some of them used to work there, including some people at MARA.

Some of our guys are saying yes, this is a big project and we've got - any JV's got an additional layer of complexity, but none of our guys are saying - we manage mines and things, we manage big projects, we manage mines, we manage regions on a daily basis and none of our guys are saying we can't manage this.

One of the things Brett said to Luco when he actually went there, he said you're going to have to run these things, can you run them, do you want to run them? When he went there, it's different to say no, this looks lovely then I'll give it to somebody else; someone says to you you're going to run this thing then all of a sudden, you've got a very different perspective of whether these are good assets to own. Our team have come back and are saying these are great assets, we should own them.

The team, when they left Jacobina they texted Brett and said we've got to own this mine. Of course, there's risk in anything. Our view is that this is about the lowest-risk combination that we can see, and the assets are the lowest-risk asset combinations that we can see. Yes, we've got work. We are not approving MARA today; we will have to work with the team - and neither is Yamana approving the project today. We are not concerned that we won't in the fullness of time be able to do justice to some of those assets.

It looks like we're running out of questions, so I think perhaps at this time - are there more questions coming in [somewhere else]? There are? Okay.

René Hochreiter - Noah Capital

Hello, Chris and Peter. Well done on the deal. I think it's going to be a good one, this one, and getting up the mining production log to third place. Well done. Peter said something about the market not reflecting the inherent value of Yamana. Why do you think that is?

Peter Marrone

What a good question, René, and I wish I could give you the categorical and unequivocal answer. Sometimes there could be many reasons but take an asset like MARA just as an example. We think MARA should be developed. Clearly, there's still work in front of us as Chris said. It has to go through completion of feasibility study and going through the permitting process but it's advancing well.

It's a low capital intensity project and all of the engineers in our Company, and I would surmise that in Chris's company he would say the challenge of an asset like that is a 115-tonne-per-day plant. It's not the mine, it's the plant but if the plant's already built then a lot of the risk is significantly, if not completely, removed so it should be developed. Having said all of that, Yamana is a substantive company but we're a substantive company with a million ounces of gold production - between gold and silver, gold equivalent production per year.

I think if I were an investor, I would have a natural scepticism to say how much value will I place in it because I don't know if a company that size would want to develop an asset, even of that quality but an asset of that size. Part of what we've been dealing with is what are the strategic alternatives that we should consider, and I think you would agree with me, René, that markets prefer certainty rather than strategic alternatives without a decision on one or another.

What is interesting about this combination is that with a production platform of call it roughly 3.5 million ounces per year, it's an entirely different paradigm should the decision be made to develop it. It seems to me that it will unearth more value in a larger company than it would in a smaller company, even one as substantive as Yamana.

René Hochreiter - Noah Capital

Okay, good. That's a good answer. Just following on from Adrian's question, what sort of dividend yield could we expect? You said you're sitting on about 2.5 at the moment, I think you want some 3.2 in terms of Agnico Eagle. What sort of dividend yield - obviously, it depends on the gold price but what sort of dividend yield are you looking at to maintain going into the future?

Chris Burgess

René, we've said that we've got a dividend policy of 25% to 35% of normalised earnings. I think for now until we see how things pan out, we would leave it at that. I think we absolutely would expect to be - we've been paying 30%, as you know, for a number of years now and I think we would have an expectation of moving to the top end of that range as we start delivering Solaris. I think that should still be our plan. We would plan as we put the two companies together to retain that.

We don't have a plan to all of a sudden chase massive projects. There may be a period before other [inaudible] material capital allocation kicks in that there's - you're at the top end of that range, but I think we've - both myself and Paul and our Board have said look, for now we think that's an appropriate range, let's leave it like that and hopefully get to the top end of that range in the next while. So yes, we believe that.

Of course, remember that - the other point I mentioned is as we create more value the size of the pie that we take 25% to 35% of is much greater. I think we would seek to get the benefit of both of those, René. That's how we keep our dividend policy for now.

René Hochreiter - Noah Capital

Okay. One last question. Of the 14 mines that you have, how many of them are going to be working at less than $1000 an ounce AISC?

Chris Burgess

Certainly, the three big - I see Brett's counting quickly, helping me count - five, I think, René. We'll come back to you if that number is different.

René Hochreiter - Noah Capital

Okay. No problem. Thanks very much. Good, yes.

Chris Burgess

Okay, cool. Thanks, René.

René Hochreiter - Noah Capital

Thanks very much. Good answers. Thank you.

Mike Parkin - National Bank

Thanks, guys. Most of my questions have been answered but just wondering if you're considering your minimum scale of assets on a go-forward basis on deal conclusion in terms of a threshold between core and non-core? Given your scale, one would seem to think that there might be a couple of assets that are moving into the non-core bucket. Just any colour there would be appreciated. Thanks very much.

Chris Burgess

Mike, thanks for the question. It's something that we absolutely are always focused on and again, I mentioned if three of the assets in Yamana are delivering 85%, 90% of the NAV then that is absolutely a logical question. Likewise, we have got a number of assets in - [Da Nang] is one of those, for example, that we're thinking about, so we are doing study work to see if we are able to do the next value-accretive investment at Daman. There are some questions, even in our own portfolio, that fit that.

We don't have a problem with 14 to 15 assets given the regionalised way we run our business. Australia, that's a million ounces; with those four mines that's very easy for one team to manage. We would like to have more than one asset per country because one asset is an inefficient way to leverage sufficient scale. None of what we see worries us that we've got too many assets or too many regions.

The good thing about what we're doing is we're not adding significant amounts of regions. We are adding Canada; we wanted to get into Canada. We think that Canada can provide a springboard in time to be a much more substantive region. We're not worried about that, but we absolutely will look at a number of the smaller assets that are generating less cash flow to say they're not better housed in other companies. So, we'll do that.

I think what we want to do is upfront not commit to that because for example, I mentioned earlier in the presentation, we're quite intrigued with Cerro Moro for example in Argentina, so yes, there are certain challenges in Argentina that you want to make sure you've covered, but also, we have touched a small - or Yamana have touched such a small part of the total potential of that asset. You want to make sure that you don't give away an asset just because it's small now, an asset that could be massively different in the future. You don't want to give up that optionality.

We just want to make sure that we have crossed and ticked those boxes, but over time asset rationalisation is absolutely part of the way that we think about that third leg of our strategy around improving the value and the quality of our portfolio of assets. Even the way we think about - if you look at the three mines, those flagship mines that we spoke about in Yamana, those are $900 and below. If you exit two of the smaller mines that are $1200, $1300 all of a sudden you have a massive improvement in the quality of your portfolio. In a bigger portfolio that becomes much easier to do. So yes, there may be some of those assets that are better held in other's hands, but we don't believe that we're qualified yet to make those calls.

Peter Marrone

Mike, you are familiar with the history of Jacobina, and I know that there are people on this call that are thinking that perhaps none of them will acknowledge, but if we go back to 2014-2015 when it was struggling at 75,000, 78,000 ounces per year, there were many who said why don't you sell it because it's not core and look at it today. I think that a strategy, Chris, as you mentioned of take your time and evaluate the geological potential exploration, potential of what can be done to improve the cash flows of an asset is always critical.

Imagine if we had sold Jacobina in 2015 thinking it was not core. We would not be doing this deal. Jacobina has become a world-class asset that in many ways, even with 230,000 ounces of production per year punches well above its weight class in terms of its cash flows with an all-in cost of below $750 per ounce. There are mines that are producing 250,000 ounces per year that generate less cash flow. I would encourage Chris and his Board and management and everyone who is on this call to just say take a very sanguine view and take your time because one never knows where the future is.

Chris Burgess

It seems like we've got one more question on the line.

Leroy Mnguni - HSBC

Hi. Thanks for squeezing me in. I appreciate it. Chris, my questions are related to the life, reserve life of mine of the Canadian Malartic asset and the El Peñón mine in Chile. It seems like if you're looking at the reserves, they've got pretty short lives, their risk of maybe an exploration or maybe CapEx catch-up that is required there. Then related to that, is the risk here not that you're going to end up having the same challenge that you have now of needing convince shareholders of the life potential of these assets like you do in Australia, and that puts a lid on your ability to re-rate?

Peter Marrone

Let me - Chris and I were passing the baton on who should start answering the question. El Peñón mine is - if we go back to its history going back to 1999, it has never had in any one year more than six to eight years of proven and probable reserves. We acquired it in 2007 with 7.5 years of proven and probable reserves and here we are in 2022, almost 2023, and we still have 7.5 years of proven and probable reserves.

We keep finding new ounces, except that it is more cost effective to find those ounces year-over-year rather than spend a fortune. We spent $16 million in exploration; we could be spending more but we would be wasting money because as we explore, we make new discoveries, year-over-year improvement in proven and probable reserves, replacement of what is mined, and then we're also into development on those ounces. It's more effective from a cost point of view and from the generation of cash flows.

Interestingly, and this was entirely coincidental, gentlemen who are here on the Gold Fields side, but we've made a new discovery at El Peñón - this is literally over the course of the last year - we've called it South Deep. That was entirely coincidental. It's clearly in Spanish but translated, but South Deep appears to be the extension of historical veins that were much richer and wider.

We're not yet at the point of saying that this completely redefines the mine, but we are comfortable in saying that that discovery alone will extend mine life. It's yet another area for exploration year-over-year to extend mine life. We're very reluctant on an asset like El Peñón to ever refer only to reserve life index because reserve life index completely underestimates the value of that asset. Imagine if in 1999 or 2000 one had said because the reserve life index then being about 5.5 years, that's how we will value it, except El Peñón mine has been one of the more prolific mines, in my view a top tier mine, in the world.

Chris Burgess

Leroy, this is something actually we were puzzling about when we had a look at Canada in the last six - so it's one asset that we couldn't get to physically, but we talked to plenty of people with lots of work and even talked to some advisors that had done some work there. If you look at the resource though, if you look at 19 million ounces of resource, this is a monster mine.

I think this is a point that we have got experience in the Australian [orogenics] and we understand how to think about some of these mines. This thing is so massive that you could spend an incredible amount of money trying to convert resource to reserve, and actually what we've come to realise is they just think about this differently, and once they have delineated the ore body and have sufficient knowledge and sufficient confidence in the - this is the way I'm led to understand - sufficient confidence in the continuity of that ore body.

They say well, why plug away spending a whole lot of extra capital that you could rather put into developing the mine into converting the resource to reserve. Once they are clear they've got a certain amount of reserve, they are very clear about the resource they sell; it's rather put that money into developing a mine. If you look at the resource, there's 19 million ounces and that is not valuing for huge portions of that asset.

This is not an asset that you're going to be saying after five years' time that we've run out of reserve, or resource. This is an incredible asset and if you listen to the management presentations, they talk and they see this asset developing from a 700,000 to a million-ounce mine. Now, we're not valuing this like that. I'm reflecting on what I hear and what I see but they do think about this in a different way. Like you think about Australian assets, Leroy, you need to think about this - these orogenics, that's their nature that you don't ever only focus on the reserve.

Peter Marrone

Chris Burgess, I'll supplement that by saying that with the Odyssey project and Malartic, there is more than 15.5 million ounces in resources. That number increased by a full million-and-a-half ounces last year alone, but this year and next year will be two really important years because these will be the two years. Remember, we're already in development on this ore body and that shaft to access the ores. This year we'll be converting a big part of the mineable ounces into proven and probable reserves, this year and next year. It will be an explosive increase in proven and probable reserves across the board in Yamana but certainly in respect of that asset.

Chris Burgess

Thanks for the questions. Abby, is that correct? Yes. I think just from our team, thanks very much to everyone on the line. It's been a great pleasure to be able to present to you and thanks very much for the questions. With that, we'll bring the presentation to a close. Thanks.

[End]