

DETOUR GOLD

Since Detour Gold's Management Information Circular was issued on November 15th, we have been in active dialogue with many of the Company's shareholders and responding to the questions that they have. As many shareholders have asked similar questions, we thought it would be helpful to share our answers with you.

If you have other questions that aren't addressed below, we encourage you to let us know.

GOVERNANCE & DISCLOSURE

1. Why did the Company delay filing a National Instrument 43-101 Technical Report and when will it be issued?

- The Technical Report was filed today. You will see that it is entirely consistent with the Company's prior disclosure on the 2018 LOM Plan.
- The filing of the Technical Report was not delayed – in fact, it is not required to be filed until we file our Annual Information Form in the spring of 2019. However, we made a decision when we disclosed the 2018 LOM Plan in June that we would prepare the Technical Report as soon as we reasonably could given our shareholders' desire to have it issued.
- While we have been committed to getting the Technical Report out, we needed to decide where to focus our technical resources – we chose to focus those resources on progressing operational execution. We felt comfortable doing this because the Technical Report only confirms the 2018 LOM Plan disclosed in June in a very comprehensive news release.

2. Is there any validity to the whistleblower report regarding the disclosure of the 2018 LOM Plan?

- **No** – timely disclosure of the 2018 LOM Plan was made. In fact, we initially disclosed our "preliminary" findings to get the relevant information out into the market as early as we could. Ironically, some criticized us for disclosing these preliminary findings, saying we should have waited until the final 2018 LOM Plan was completed.
- We first heard about the purported whistleblower complaint when it was released through Paulson's announcement on November 9, 2018. The complaint (dated October 22, 2018) was allegedly sent to the Ontario Securities Commission more than six months after the incident in question occurred; a copy was only received by the Company in the mail several days after Paulson released it publicly. Notably, it was copied to Paulson and another activist shareholder attacking the Company.
- The exercise of options noted in the report was pre-cleared in accordance with our policies; this clearance was given because there was no material undisclosed information at that time.

3. Why did Michael Kenyon exercise his options and sell his shares?

- The options exercised were scheduled to expire during a trading blackout which prevented Mr. Kenyon from exercising them at that time. As per common practice, Mr. Kenyon had ten days after the end of the trading blackout to exercise the options which is what he did. It made no sense to let them expire without exercising.
- The exercise cost was nearly C\$1M and this went to Detour Gold's treasury.
- Mr. Kenyon sold only some of the shares in order to cover the exercise cost and the income tax liability.
- He was able to increase his share position by over 12,000 shares as a result of that exercise.

4. How much is Michael Kenyon being paid as Interim CEO?

- Mr. Kenyon is being paid an annual salary of C\$1.5 million. This is the **entirety** of Mr. Kenyon's compensation and he elected to receive 20% of it in deferred share units which he can redeem only after he leaves the Company.

- Mr. Kenyon's compensation does **not** include any other cash bonuses nor equity awards. Moreover, he does not have any change of control provisions or severance provisions upon termination.
- Detour Gold's independent compensation consultants advised the Board that his compensation is the median *cash* compensation within our peer group CEOs (i.e. excluding any share- or option-based compensation that those peer group CEOs receive) and that this is the appropriate basis on which to compensate Interim CEOs.
- The compensation paid to Detour Gold's previous CEO averaged C\$3M annually. The median compensation paid to the CEOs at the Company's 14-member peer group is C\$4.2M per year.

THE PROXY FIGHT

5. Why hasn't the Company used a straightforward "universal" proxy card for the shareholder meeting?

- In Canada "universal proxies" can only be used at annual general meetings where all board seats are treated as vacant and the number of nominees is greater than the number of board seats.
- This meeting was requisitioned by Paulson. We are obliged to use a form of proxy that follows the agenda items that Paulson has put forward.
- Paulson's requisition asked for three things: 1) the removal of 8 of the existing 9 directors; 2) fixing the board size at 8; and 3) the addition of 8 directors proposed by Paulson.
- We have constructed the easiest form of proxy possible: shareholders will get the opportunity to individually select the directors they want off the Board as well as the new directors they want on it. This is the easiest and most shareholder-friendly form of proxy possible while addressing Paulson's requisition, which we are obliged to do.

6. Why haven't you settled with Paulson?

- We are not able to disclose the details of our settlement discussions with Paulson but we can assure you that we have tried very hard to end this proxy fight. However, Paulson has not been willing to settle on any basis other than on terms which we believe would completely undermine the successful execution of the 2018 LOM Plan.
- Paulson rejected any reasonable settlement and our Board, including all of our new independent Board members, rejected Paulson's terms.
- As a result, we have put to shareholders what we believe is a reasonable settlement by voluntarily putting forward 2 of Paulson's nominees to replace two existing legacy directors in addition to having already added 3 new nominees and removing 2 legacy directors in August. Mr. Kenyon has also agreed to resign from the Board once a CEO is hired. This proposal is supported in writing by one of our largest shareholders.

7. Why has Detour Gold never spoken to or met with Mr. Feldman or Mr. Robison?

- Given Mr. Feldman's and Mr. Robison's track records which are well-known to the Company, we believe they will be additive to Detour Gold's Board, while meeting shareholders' desire for change.
- One of our largest shareholders has supported their addition to our Board in writing.
- Mr. Feldman and Mr. Robison have agreed to sit as directors of Detour Gold. We would be surprised to find that they would be unwilling to join the Board after putting their names forward to do just that.

8. What is “vote buying” and will Detour Gold be doing this for the meeting of shareholders?

- “Vote buying” refers to the practice of paying fees to dealers for securing favourable shareholder votes in proxy contests and other corporate transactions. Detour Gold has never entered into such arrangements and will not do so in the context of the upcoming meeting of shareholders.

CEO SEARCH

9. Why don't you start the CEO Search now?

- In May, the Board determined to immediately commence a CEO search and had planned to engage an independent firm to conduct this search globally. However, before a firm could be engaged, Paulson initiated its campaign against Detour Gold, which made the CEO search infeasible.
- This is due to the uncertainty that Paulson has created regarding the Board's composition and the Company's future strategy. It would be extremely challenging to source a candidate who would agree to assume the role of Detour Gold's CEO without knowing the composition of the board of directors to which they would report or what the Company's strategic direction will be going forward.
- In addition, a CEO search normally includes considering individuals who are currently CEOs at other companies. No good candidate would consider leaving an existing position to take one where the future is so uncertain.
- Detour Gold's Board is committed to commencing a CEO search immediately after this proxy fight. The Corporate Governance & Nominating Committee will lead the search, but a short list of candidates will be interviewed by the full Board.

2018 LOM PLAN

10. Why do you have confidence in Detour Gold's COO, Frazer Bouchier?

- Frazer, who started with the Company in January 2018, has the full support of the Board because it is abundantly clear to all Board members that he has taken the right approach at the Detour Lake operation – he has rigorously drilled down in all key operational areas, taken a root cause analysis approach to all problems, identified appropriate targets, put in place meaningful action plans to achieve those targets, ensured there is effective communication and alignment between the mine, mill and maintenance groups and addressed the need for significant cultural change by augmenting experienced personnel at site. It is also clear that he and the Mine General Manager are strongly supported by the entire operations leadership team.
- Our Technical Committee (which includes new directors Jim Gowans and Alan Edwards) recently visited the Detour Lake site and met with members of the operations leadership team. The Technical Committee members believe that what is being done at the Detour Lake operation is exactly what they would do, having done it before and having seen it done at other successful operations over their combined 90+ years of experience.
- The Board's endorsement is well-founded - there is ample evidence that the plan is working, as reflected by our year to date results and the continued progress on operational improvement initiatives, which puts the Company on track to meet its 2018 guidance on both gold production and all-in sustaining costs.

11. Do you have the full operations leadership team in place now?

- The operations leadership team has been significantly augmented. The changes and additions made by Mr. Bouchier include the following:

- Mining General Manager
- Mining Lead
- Maintenance Lead
- Processing Lead
- Human Resources Lead
- Business Improvement Lead
- Procurement Lead
- Site Finance Lead
- A few more appointments are expected in Q1 2019 (projects oversight, finance, processing and indigenous relations support).

12. Did Detour Gold skew its third quarter results by “high grade stockpiling”?

- **No.**
 - We mined extra ore in H1 2018 and stockpiled that ore for processing in Q3 and Q4. **The building and processing of stockpiles is normal practice for all open pit mining operations around the world.**
 - Stockpiling ore (i) allows for optimal ore blending to the process plant to maximize gold metallurgical recovery based on mineralogy and grade; and (ii) assists in smoothing process plant throughput tonnes per operating hour. Some months and quarters will be higher grade, and some months and quarters will be lower grade processing – this is normal.
 - Our stockpiles represent no more than 5% of our annual mined ex-pit tonnes. These stockpiles vary by, among other things, grade. From a financial valuation discounted cashflow basis, it is very important to process higher grade stockpiles ahead of lower grade stockpiles in order to bring forward revenue.
 - The mining costs incurred and paid in H1 2018 to build up stockpiles were booked to ore inventories. When the stockpiles were processed in Q3, these costs were then transferred off our balance sheet and booked in the Income Statement and TCC/oz as per appropriate accounting practice. This did not lower our unit mining cost; in fact, it inflated it in Q3, even though this is a “non” cash accounting principle.
 - The cost (\$/t) to mine (drill, blast and load) is the same for ore tonnes as it is for waste tonnes. In Q3, we made good progress on both maintenance and operating practices. These are the factors that drove our costs to be lower.
 - As we said on the Q3 call, we are in line with the 2018 mine plan, including the use of stockpiles (by grade and tonnes). These practices are part of any life of mine plan and reflect industry practice in large open pit operations.

13. You’ve modified your mine plan numerous times now. How do we know you have it right this time?

- In **January 2016**, we added, for the first time, new gold reserves for West Detour. This was a positive change in our LOM Plan.
- In **November 2016**, we announced that we did not yet have the support of the new MCFN Chief who was elected a few months before, and the Company would modify its LOM Plan to accommodate expected permitting delays, which Detour Gold did **in March 2017**. This Technical Report had to be filed prior to March 31, 2017 with our Annual Information Form.
- **During 2017**, despite making progress with the MCFN on a number of issues, the Chief would not provide support for the West Detour project. This meant that the small North pit would not be able to be developed in 2019 and the West Detour pit development would remain unchanged until 2025.
- As a result, in the **2018 LOM Plan**, the Company added permitting flexibility and longer timelines to obtain the necessary permits for the West Detour project which also meant changing the pit sequencing. In addition, the thorough review conducted by Frazer Bouchier

and his team, resulted in adjusting some of the underlying assumptions which impacted the time for the mine to achieve cost and production maturity.

14. How is Paulson able to cut corporate G&A by C\$337 million (NPV 5%) through a 75% cut over the 23 year mine life?

- Paulson's predicted G&A savings have grown from C\$223 million (50% cut) two months ago, to C\$300 million (67% cut) when filing its circular and then to C\$337 million (75% cut) shortly after without any deliverable plan.
- A factual analysis of G&A comparables shows that we have the lowest G&A cost per ounce of gold produced in our peer group by some margin. This will only improve as we continue to execute on the 2018 LOM Plan.