

## Rockface – Massive Sulphides Update

4 November 2021

- Two follow-up drillholes have both intersected **massive sulphide** mineralization.
- Visual estimates of **35% to 40% sulphide minerals**
- Downhole Electromagnetic (DHEM) Models define **highly conductive target zones**
- **Deposit remains open at depth** and down plunge to west-south-west

KGL Resources is pleased to provide an update on the discovery of visually high-grade extensions to the Rockface deposit. On 11th October 2021, it was announced that drillhole KJCD481D3 had intersected massive sulphides containing significant copper minerals (chalcopyrite and bornite) on the western side of the Rockface North lode. The drillhole was designed to determine the western edge of the mineralisation, so such a strong interval of copper was unexpected. Processing of the drill-core covering the visually high-grade zone was afforded top priority, but assays have not been received and are not expected for some weeks due to congestion at the laboratory.




Figure 1. Mineralised core from KJCD481D3

# ASX Announcement

## Rockface – Massive Sulphides

Fortuitously, the DHEM crew were on site and were able to immediately survey KJCD481D3. The DHEM modelling indicated that the hole had intersected a highly conductive (>2000 Siemens) zone which lies mostly to the east of the hole but is interpreted to have a steeply plunging component to the west.

Figure 1 above shows the mineralised core from KJCD481D3. This photograph taken of half-core retained after sampling for assaying was completed.

Based on this information a follow-up daughter hole, KJCD481D4, was drilled, which also intersected narrow copper-bearing massive sulphides amongst a wider mineralised zone 55 metres down-dip from the original intersection. This announcement is based solely on a visual inspection of the core. The core samples have yet to be assayed.

Table 1 below, reports a visual geological log of the mineralised intervals and interburden in KJCD481D4.

From m	To m	Drilled Width m	Est. True Width m	Minerals/ Lithology	Nature	*Est. % sulphide	Alteration
752.80	753.72	0.92	0.75	Chalcopyrite, Pyrite	Veined	8%	Biotite, Muscovite, Hematite
753.72	765.44	11.72	9.60	Psammopelite	Unmineralised	N/A	Biotite, Muscovite,
765.44	766.20	0.76	0.62	Chalcopyrite, Pyrite	Veined	35%	Magnetite, Chlorite
766.20	775.56	9.36	8.38	Chalcopyrite, Pyrite	Veined	1%	Massive Magnetite
775.56	785.44	9.88	8.85	Chalcopyrite, Pyrite	Disseminated	Trace	Magnetite, Chlorite, Garnet
785.44	809.90	24.46	21.91	Psammopelite	Unmineralised	N/A	Magnetite, chlorite garnet
809.90	841.00	31.10	28.23	Chalcopyrite, Pyrite	Disseminated	Trace	Magnetite, chlorite, garnet
841.00	842.00	1.00	0.91	Chalcopyrite	Veined	1%	Biotite, muscovite, chlorite, magnetite
842.00	849.07	7.07	6.45	Chalcopyrite, Pyrite	Disseminated	Trace	Magnetite, chlorite, garnet
849.07	851.14	2.07	1.88	Chalcopyrite, Pyrite	Disseminated	2%	Biotite, muscovite, chlorite, magnetite

Table 1 Summary Geological Log of KJCD481D4 sulphide mineralised zones

*\*Visual observations, Assays pending.*

DHEM surveying was then carried out on KJCD481D4, and the processing of this data further expanded the range of the high-conductivity (>2000 Siemens) models. Based on the updated models, which also show an interpreted westerly plunge, it was decided to drill KJCD481D5, which also intersected copper-bearing massive sulphide mineralisation, this time 32 metres down plunge from the original intersection in KJCD481D3.

Table 2 reports a visual log of the mineralised intervals and inter-burden in KJCD481D5. Figure 2 shows core tray containing the main massive sulphide interval between 765.44 to 766.20 metres.

From m	To m	Drilled Width m	Est. True Width m	Minerals/ Lithology	Nature	*Est. % sulphide	Alteration
747.46	749.09	1.63	1.37	Chalcopyrite, Pyrite	Veined	40%	Magnetite
749.09	752.10	3.01	2.53	Chalcopyrite, Pyrite	Veined	Trace	Magnetite

Table 2. Summary Geological Log of KJCD481D5 sulphide mineralised zones

*\*Visual observations, Assays pending.*

Figure 3 is a longitudinal projection of Rockface North, showing the new DHEM conductor plate models along with DHEM conductors modelled by KGL in previous years. Also shown are the pierce-points for the 3 holes which have intersected massive sulphides.

Through modelling and analysis of the DHEM data, KGL's experienced consultant geophysicists, Mitre Geophysics, have reached the conclusion that the Rockface conductive bodies are open and extend to depth, with no indication of a lower limit or a reduction in conductivity. This is clearly positive for the ultimate longevity of the Rockface mine even though exploration of these deep levels will probably be best achieved by drilling from underground once the mine is established.

# ASX Announcement

## Rockface – Massive Sulphides




Figure 2 showing the mineralized zone in KJCD481D5.




Figure 3: Longitudinal Projection of the Rockface North Deposit as defined by DHEM conductors. Underground mine outline shown for reference. The new DHEM conductors are coloured magenta whilst the earlier DHEM conductors are multi-coloured. The expanded view shows the pierce-points of the holes which have intersected massive sulphides (KJCD481D3, D4 and D5)

KGL Managing Director, Simon Finnis, comments,

“The results showing massive sulphides from the two most recent holes on the western side of Rockface, indicate considerable scale of the zone of massive sulphides intersected in previously announced hole KJCD481D3. The DHEM reinforces the drilling results by modelling highly conductive zones which are interpreted to be extensions of the overall Rockface North deposit. It is very pleasing to see the geophysical techniques we are using at Jervois continue to support our drilling program, and directing us effectively to extensions of known resources, as well as generating new exploration targets.

“The drill intersections obtained so far will very likely result in an expansion of the currently envisaged mine plan. Deeper drilling however, despite the inherent high-grade potential at Rockface, will compete in priority with other shallower targets which may be more cost-effectively drilled from surface.

“Once the current phase for drilling at Rockface has been completed, KGL intends to commence drilling a 370-metre-long “gap” in the Reward structure, where recent drilling results, such as KJCD447 (4.47m at 3.81% Cu and 4.22m at 3.18% Cu) and KJCD448 (2.57m at 2.26% Cu and 5.16m @ 2.73% Cu) have indicated the potential for high-grade shoots which would be readily accessible for early exploitation from the open pit or shallow underground.

“By now, KGL had thought to be able to provide assay results for the massive sulphide intersection in KJCD481D3 but these results have been delayed due to an industry-wide congestion being experienced by mineral laboratories”

This announcement has been authorised by the KGL Board of Directors.

### Competent Person Statement

The information in this announcement that relates to Exploration Targets and Exploration Results is based on data compiled by John Levings BSc, a Competent Person who is a Fellow of The Australasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy. Mr Levings is Principal Geologist for the Company. Mr Levings has sufficient experience, which is relevant to the style of mineralisation and type of deposit under consideration and to the activity, which is being undertaken to qualify as a Competent Person as defined in the 2012 Edition of 'Australasian Code for Reporting of Exploration Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves'. Mr Levings consents to the inclusion in the announcement of the matters based on his information in the form and context in which it appears.

The following drill holes were originally reported on the date indicated and using the JORC code specified in the table. Results reported under JORC 2004 have not been updated to comply with JORC 2012 on the basis that the information has not materially changed since it was last reported.

Hole		Date originally Reported	JORC Reported Under
KJCD	447	21/09/2021	2012
KJCD	448	21/09/2021	2012
KJCD	481D3	11/10/2021	2012

### Forward Looking statements

This release includes certain forward-looking statements. The words “forecast”, “estimate”, “like”, “anticipate”, “project”, “opinion”, “should”, “could”, “may”, “target” and other similar expressions are intended to identify forward looking statements. All statements, other than statements of historical fact, included herein, including without limitation, statements regarding forecast cash flows and potential mineralisation, resources and reserves, exploration results and future expansion plans and development objectives of KGL are forward-looking statements that involve various risks and uncertainties. Although every effort has been made to verify such forward-looking statements, there can be no assurance that such statements will prove to be accurate and actual results and future events could differ materially from those anticipated in such statements. You should therefore not place undue reliance on such forward-looking statements.

Statements regarding plans with respect to the Company’s mineral properties may contain forward looking statements. Statements in relation to future matters can only be made where the Company has a reasonable basis for making those statements.

### JORC Code, 2012 Edition – Table 1

## 1.1 Section 1 Sampling Techniques and Data

(Criteria in this section apply to all succeeding sections.)

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Sampling techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nature and quality of sampling (e.g. cut channels, random chips, or specific specialised industry standard measurement tools appropriate to the minerals under investigation, such as down hole gamma sondes, or handheld XRF instruments, etc). These examples should not be taken as limiting the broad meaning of sampling.</li> <li>Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample representivity and the appropriate calibration of any measurement tools or systems used.</li> <li>Aspects of the determination of mineralisation that are Material to the Public Report.</li> <li>In cases where 'industry standard' work has been done this would be relatively simple (e.g. 'reverse circulation drilling was used to obtain 1 m samples from which 3 kg was pulverised to produce a 30 g charge for fire assay'). In other cases more explanation may be required, such as where there is coarse gold that has inherent sampling problems. Unusual commodities or mineralisation types (e.g. submarine nodules) may warrant disclosure of detailed information.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At Reward diamond drilling and reverse circulation (RC) drilling were used to obtain samples for geological logging and assaying. The core samples comprised a mixture of sawn HQ quarter core, sawn NQ half core and possibly BQ half core (historical drilling only). Sample lengths are generally 1m, but at times length were adjusted to take into account geological variations. RC sample intervals are predominantly 1m intervals with some 2 and 4m compositing (historical holes only)..</li> <li>RC samples are routinely scanned by KGL Resources with a Niton XRF. Samples assaying greater than 0.1% Cu, Pb or Zn are submitted for analysis at a commercial laboratory.</li> <li>Mineralisation at all deposits is characterized by disseminations, veinlets and large masses of chalcopyrite, associated with magnetite-rich alteration within a psammite. The mineralisation has textures indicative of structural emplacement within specific strata i.e. the mineral appears stratabound.</li> <li>Documentation of the historical drilling (pre-2011) for Reward is variable.</li> </ul>
Drilling techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drill type (e.g. core, reverse circulation, open-hole hammer, rotary air blast, auger, Bangka, sonic, etc) and details (e.g. core diameter, triple or standard tube, depth of diamond tails, face-sampling bit or other type, whether core is oriented and if so, by what method, etc).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The KGL and previous Jinka-Minerals RC drilling was conducted using a reverse circulation rig with a 5.25-inch face-sampling bit. Diamond drilling was either in NQ2 or HQ3 drill diameters. Metallurgical diamond drilling (JMET holes) were PQ</li> <li>There is no documentation for the historic drilling techniques.</li> <li>Diamond drilling was generally cored from surface with some of the deeper holes at Rockface and Reward utilizing RC pre-collars.</li> <li>Oriented core has been measured for the recent KGL drilling.</li> </ul>
Drill sample recovery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Method of recording and assessing core and chip sample recoveries and results assessed.</li> <li>Measures taken to maximise sample recovery and ensure representative nature of the samples.</li> <li>Whether a relationship exists between sample recovery and grade and whether sample bias may have occurred due to preferential loss/gain of fine/coarse material.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The KGL RC samples were not weighed on a regular basis but when completed no sample recovery issues were encountered during the drilling program.</li> <li>Jinka Minerals and KGL split the rare overweight samples (&gt;3kg) for assay. Since overweight samples were rarely reported no sample bias was established</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		<p>between sample recovery and grade.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core recovery for recent drilling is &gt;95% with the mineral zones having virtually 100% recovery.</li> <li>No evidence has been found for any relationship between sample recovery and copper grade and there are no biases in the sampling with respect to copper grade and recovery.</li> </ul>
Logging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whether core and chip samples have been geologically and geotechnically logged to a level of detail to support appropriate Mineral Resource estimation, mining studies and metallurgical studies.</li> <li>Whether logging is qualitative or quantitative in nature. Core (or costean, channel, etc) photography.</li> <li>The total length and percentage of the relevant intersections logged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All KGL RC and diamond core samples are geologically logged. Logging in conjunction with multi-element assays is appropriate for mineral resource estimation.</li> <li>Core samples are also orientated and logged for geotechnical information.</li> <li>All logging has been converted to quantitative and qualitative codes in the KGL Access database.</li> <li>All relevant intersections were logged.</li> <li>Paper logs existed for the historical drilling. There is very little historical core available for inspection.</li> </ul>
Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all core taken.</li> <li>If non-core, whether riffled, tube sampled, rotary split, etc and whether sampled wet or dry.</li> <li>For all sample types, the nature, quality and appropriateness of the sample preparation technique.</li> <li>Quality control procedures adopted for all sub-sampling stages to maximise representivity of samples.</li> <li>Measures taken to ensure that the sampling is representative of the in-situ material collected, including for instance results for field duplicate/second-half sampling.</li> <li>Whether sample sizes are appropriate to the grain size of the material being sampled.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The following describes the recent KGL sampling and assaying process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RC drill holes are sampled at 1m intervals and split using a cone splitter attached to the cyclone to generate a split of ~3kg;</li> <li>RC sample splits (~3kg) are pulverized to 85% passing 75 microns.</li> <li>Diamond core was quartered with a diamond saw and generally sampled at 1m intervals with samples lengths adjusted at geological contacts;</li> <li>Diamond core samples are crushed to 70% passing 2mm and then pulverized to 85% passing 75 microns.</li> <li>Two quarter core field duplicates were taken for every 20m samples by Jinka Minerals and KGL Resources.</li> <li>All sampling methods and sample sizes are deemed appropriate for mineral resource estimation</li> </ul> </li> <li>Details for the historical sampling are not available.</li> </ul>
Quality of assay data and laboratory tests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The nature, quality and appropriateness of the assaying and laboratory procedures used and whether the technique is considered partial or total.</li> <li>For geophysical tools, spectrometers, handheld XRF instruments, etc, the parameters used in determining the analysis including instrument make and model, reading times, calibrations factors applied and their derivation, etc.</li> <li>Nature of quality control procedures adopted (e.g. standards, blanks, duplicates, external laboratory checks) and whether acceptable levels of accuracy (i.e. lack of bias) and precision have been established.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The KGL drilling has QAQC data that includes standards, duplicates and laboratory checks. In ore zones standards are added at a ratio of 1:10 and duplicates and blanks 1:20.</li> <li>Base metal samples are assayed using a four-acid digest with an ICP AES finish. Gold samples are assayed by Aqua Regia with an ICP MS finish. Samples over 1ppm Au are re-assayed by Fire Assay with an AAS finish.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are no details of the historic drill sample assaying or any QAQC.</li> <li>All assay methods were deemed appropriate at the time of undertaking.</li> </ul>
Verification of sampling and assaying	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The verification of significant intersections by either independent or alternative company personnel.</li> <li>The use of twinned holes.</li> <li>Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols.</li> <li>Discuss any adjustment to assay data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data is validated on entry into the MS Access database, using Database check queries and Maxwell's DataShed.</li> <li>Further validation is conducted when data is imported into Micromine and Leapfrog Geo software</li> <li>Hole twinning was occasionally conducted at Reward with mixed results. This may be due to inaccuracies with historic hole locations rather than mineral continuity issues.</li> <li>For the resource estimation below detection values were converted to half the lower detection limit.</li> </ul>
Location of data points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accuracy and quality of surveys used to locate drill holes (collar and down-hole surveys), trenches, mine workings and other locations used in Mineral Resource estimation.</li> <li>Specification of the grid system used.</li> <li>Quality and adequacy of topographic control.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the KGL drilling surface collar surveys were picked up using a Trimble DGPS, with accuracy to 1 cm or better.</li> <li>Downhole surveys were taken during drilling with a Ranger or Reflex survey tool at 30m intervals</li> <li>All drilling by Jinka Minerals and KGL is referenced on the MGA 94 Zone 53 grid. All downhole magnetic surveys were converted to MGA 94 grid.</li> <li>For Reward there are concerns about the accuracy of some of the historic drillhole collars. There are virtually no preserved historic collars for checking.</li> <li>There is no documentation for the downhole survey method for the historic drilling.</li> <li>Topography was mapped using Trimble DGPS and LIDAR</li> </ul>
Data spacing and distribution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data spacing for reporting of Exploration Results.</li> <li>Whether the data spacing and distribution is sufficient to establish the degree of geological and grade continuity appropriate for the Mineral Resource and Ore Reserve estimation procedure(s) and classifications applied.</li> <li>Whether sample compositing has been applied.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drilling at Rockface was on nominal 50m centres with downhole sampling on 1m intervals.</li> <li>Drilling at Reward was on 25m spaced sections in the upper part of the mineralisation extending to 50m centres with depth and ultimately reaching 100m spacing on the periphery of mineralisation.</li> <li>For Reward shallow oxide RC drilling was conducted on 80m spaced traverses with holes 10m apart.</li> <li>The drill spacing for all areas is appropriate for resource estimation and the relevant classifications applied.</li> <li>A small amount of sample compositing has been applied to some of the near surface historic drilling.</li> </ul>



Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<i>Orientation of data in relation to geological structure</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whether the orientation of sampling achieves unbiased sampling of possible structures and the extent to which this is known, considering the deposit type.</li> <li>If the relationship between the drilling orientation and the orientation of key mineralised structures is considered to have introduced a sampling bias, this should be assessed and reported if material.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Holes were drilled perpendicular to the strike of the mineralization; the default angle is -60 degrees, but holes vary from -45 to -80.</li> <li>Drilling orientations are considered appropriate and no obvious sampling bias was detected.</li> </ul>
<i>Sample security</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The measures taken to ensure sample security.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Samples were stored in sealed polyweave bags on site and transported to the laboratory at regular intervals by KGL staff or a transport contractor.</li> </ul>
<i>Audits or reviews</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sampling techniques are regularly reviewed internally and by external consultants.</li> </ul>

## 1.2 Section 2 Reporting of Exploration Results

(Criteria listed in the preceding section also apply to this section.)

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<i>Mineral tenement and land tenure status</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Type, reference name/number, location and ownership including agreements or material issues with third parties such as joint ventures, partnerships, overriding royalties, native title interests, historical sites, wilderness or national park and environmental settings.</li> <li>The security of the tenure held at the time of reporting along with any known impediments to obtaining a licence to operate in the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Jervois Project is within EL25429 and EL28082 100% owned by Jinka Minerals and operated by Kentor Minerals (NT), both wholly owned subsidiaries of KGL Resources.</li> <li>The Jervois Project is covered by Mineral Claims and an Exploration licence owned by KGL Resources subsidiary Jinka Minerals.</li> </ul>
<i>Exploration done by other parties</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Previous exploration has primarily been conducted by Reward Minerals, MIM and Plenty River.</li> </ul>
<i>Geology</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EL25429 and EL28082 lie on the Huckitta 1: 250 000 map sheet (SF 53-11). The tenement is located mainly within the Palaeo-Proterozoic Bonya Schist on the northeastern boundary of the Arunta Orogenic Domain. The Arunta Orogenic Domain in the north western part of the tenement is overlain unconformably by Neo-Proterozoic sediments of the Georgina Basin.</li> <li>The stratabound mineralisation for the project consists of a series of complex, narrow, structurally controlled, sub-vertical sulphide/magnetite-rich deposits hosted by Proterozoic-aged, amphibolite grade metamorphosed sediments of the Arunta Inlier.</li> <li>Mineralisation is characterised by veinlets and disseminations of chalcopyrite in association with magnetite. In the oxide zone which is vertically limited malachite, azurite, chalcocite are the main Cu-minerals.</li> <li>Massive to semi-massive galena in association with sphalerite occur locally in high grade lenses of limited extent with oxide equivalents including cerussite and anglesite in the oxide zone. Generally,</li> </ul>

# ASX Announcement

## Rockface – Massive Sulphides



Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary																					
		these lenses are associated with more carbonate-rich host rocks occurring at Green Parrot, Reward and Bellbird North.																					
Drill hole Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A summary of all information material to the understanding of the exploration results including a tabulation of the following information for all Material drill holes:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>easting and northing of the drill hole collar</li> <li>elevation or RL (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in metres) of the drill hole collar</li> <li>dip and azimuth of the hole</li> <li>down hole length and interception depth</li> <li>hole length.</li> </ul> </li> <li>If the exclusion of this information is justified on the basis that the information is not Material and this exclusion does not detract from the understanding of the report, the Competent Person should clearly explain why this is the case.</li> </ul>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Hold ID</th> <th>Easting</th> <th>Northing</th> <th>RL</th> <th>Azimuth</th> <th>Dip</th> <th>Depth m</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>KJCD481D4</td> <td>628185.0</td> <td>7490804.0</td> <td>357.04</td> <td>145.14</td> <td>-75.50</td> <td>871.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>KJCD481D5</td> <td>628185.0</td> <td>7490804.0</td> <td>357.04</td> <td>145.14</td> <td>-75.50</td> <td>803.8</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>For intercept depths please see Table 1 in the body of the report</p>	Hold ID	Easting	Northing	RL	Azimuth	Dip	Depth m	KJCD481D4	628185.0	7490804.0	357.04	145.14	-75.50	871.0	KJCD481D5	628185.0	7490804.0	357.04	145.14	-75.50	803.8
Hold ID	Easting	Northing	RL	Azimuth	Dip	Depth m																	
KJCD481D4	628185.0	7490804.0	357.04	145.14	-75.50	871.0																	
KJCD481D5	628185.0	7490804.0	357.04	145.14	-75.50	803.8																	
Data aggregation methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In reporting Exploration Results, weighting averaging techniques, maximum and/or minimum grade truncations (eg cutting of high grades) and cut-off grades are usually Material and should be stated.</li> <li>Where aggregate intercepts incorporate short lengths of high grade results and longer lengths of low grade results, the procedure used for such aggregation should be stated and some typical examples of such aggregations should be shown in detail.</li> <li>The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values should be clearly stated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimum grade truncation 0.5%Cu for intercepts above 200m RL</li> <li>Minimum grade truncation 1.0%Cu for intercepts below 200m RL</li> <li>Aggregate intercepts use length-weighting</li> <li>No top-cuts are applied nor considered necessary</li> <li>No metal equivalents are used</li> </ul>																					
Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These relationships are particularly important in the reporting of Exploration Results.</li> <li>If the geometry of the mineralisation with respect to the drill hole angle is known, its nature should be reported.</li> <li>If it is not known and only the down hole lengths are reported, there should be a clear statement to this effect (eg 'down hole length, true width not known').</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the main deposit areas, the geometry of the lodes is well known and is used to estimate true widths, which are quoted in the report</li> </ul>																					
Diagrams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate maps and sections (with scales) and tabulations of intercepts should be included for any significant discovery being reported. These should include, but not be limited to a plan view of drill hole collar locations and appropriate sectional views.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer Figures 1 and 2 in the report</li> </ul>																					
Balanced reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where comprehensive reporting of all Exploration Results is not practicable, representative reporting of both low and high grades and/or widths should be practiced to avoid misleading reporting of Exploration Results.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results for all holes are reported according to the Data Aggregation Methods stated above</li> </ul>																					
Other substantive exploration data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other exploration data, if meaningful and material, should be reported including (but not limited to): geological observations; geophysical survey results; geochemical survey results; bulk samples – size and method of treatment; metallurgical test results; bulk density, groundwater, geotechnical and rock characteristics; potential deleterious or contaminating substances.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outcrop mapping of exploration targets using Real time DGPS.</li> <li>IP, Magnetics, Gravity, Downhole EM are all used for targeting</li> <li>Metallurgical studies are well advanced including recovery of the payable metals including Cu, Ag and Au.</li> <li>Deleterious elements such as Pb Zn Bi and F are modelled</li> </ul>																					
Further work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The nature and scale of planned further work (eg tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling).</li> <li>Diagrams clearly highlighting the areas of possible extensions, including the main geological interpretations and future drilling areas, provided this information is not commercially sensitive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current report relates to infill and mineral resource confirmatory drilling and is ongoing</li> <li>Brownfields and greenfield drilling has also commenced</li> <li>Additional IP and DHEM surveys are planned</li> </ul>																					