



ASX Announcement

27th October 2021

Addendum to September 2021 Quarterly Report

Duketon Mining Ltd (DKM) provides the attached amended and re-stated JORC Table 1 (Sections 1 and 2) intended to accompany the ASX Release of today, 27th October 2021 "September 2021 Quarterly Report".

This addendum includes additional technical detail following consultation with ASX.

Authorised for release by:

Stuart Fogarty

Duketon Mining Limited - Managing Director

+61 8 6315 1490



JORC Table 1

JORC Code, 2012 Edition – Table 1 report – Duketon Project

Section 1 Sampling Techniques and Data – Rosie DHEM Geophysics

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

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Sampling techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Nature and quality of sampling (eg 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.</i> <i>Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample representivity and the appropriate calibration of any measurement tools or systems used.</i> <i>Aspects of the determination of mineralisation that are Material to the Public Report.</i> <i>In cases where ‘industry standard’ work has been done this would be relatively simple (eg ‘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 (eg submarine nodules) may warrant disclosure of detailed information.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DHEM survey was conducted using the DigiAtlantis system and HP100 transmitter. The readings were recorded at 2.5 to 20m intervals. The survey used a 460m x 500m loop.
Drilling techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Drill type (eg core, reverse circulation, open-hole hammer, rotary air blast, auger, Bangka, sonic, etc) and details (eg 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).</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A – geophysical data only
Drill sample recovery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Method of recording and assessing core and chip sample recoveries and results assessed.</i> <i>Measures taken to maximise sample recovery and ensure representative nature of the samples.</i> <i>Whether a relationship exists between sample recovery and grade</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A – geophysical data only

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<i>and whether sample bias may have occurred due to preferential loss/gain of fine/coarse material.</i>	
Logging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Whether logging is qualitative or quantitative in nature. Core (or costean, channel, etc) photography. The total length and percentage of the relevant intersections logged. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A – geophysical data only
Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all core taken. If non-core, whether riffled, tube sampled, rotary split, etc and whether sampled wet or dry. For all sample types, the nature, quality and appropriateness of the sample preparation technique. Quality control procedures adopted for all sub-sampling stages to maximise representivity of samples. 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. Whether sample sizes are appropriate to the grain size of the material being sampled. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A – geophysical data only
Quality of assay data and laboratory tests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The nature, quality and appropriateness of the assaying and laboratory procedures used and whether the technique is considered partial or total. 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. Nature of quality control procedures adopted (eg standards, blanks, duplicates, external laboratory checks) and whether acceptable levels of accuracy (ie lack of bias) and precision have been established. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DHEM parameters are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tx Loop Size: 460m X 500m Transmitter: HP 100 Receiver: SmartEM Probe: DigiAtlantis Station Spacing: 2.5m to 20m Tx Current: 100A Base Frequency: 0.5 and 1Hz Readings: Min 2 repeatable readings per station

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stacks: 64
Verification of sampling and assaying	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The verification of significant intersections by either independent or alternative company personnel. The use of twinned holes. Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols. Discuss any adjustment to assay data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A – geophysical data only
Location of data points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Specification of the grid system used. Quality and adequacy of topographic control. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The grid system used is GDA94, MGA Zone 51
Data spacing and distribution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data spacing for reporting of Exploration Results. 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. Whether sample compositing has been applied. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A – geophysical data only
Orientation of data in relation to geological structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the orientation of sampling achieves unbiased sampling of possible structures and the extent to which this is known, considering the deposit type. 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The orientation of the geology and mineralization at Rosie is steeply dipping to the south to south-west and striking NNW to W.
Sample security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The measures taken to ensure sample security. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A – geophysical data only
Audits or reviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No external audits or reviews have been conducted apart from internal company review.



Section 2 Reporting of Exploration Results

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

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Mineral tenement and land tenure status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The tenement (M38/1252) is 100% owned by Duketon Mining Limited and is in good standing and there are no known impediments to obtaining a licence to operate in the area.
Exploration done by other parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Previous drilling at The Bulge Complex was completed by Independence Group (IGO) and South Boulder Mines Ltd. This work has been checked for quality as far as possible and formed the basis of the follow-up conducted as part of the drilling programme presented.
Geology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Rosie Nickel Deposit is a komatiite-hosted nickel sulphide deposit. The mineralisation is characterised by accumulations of massive, matrix, breccia and disseminated sulphides at the basal contact overlying a basalt footwall.
Drill hole Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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"> easting and northing of the drill hole collar elevation or RL (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in metres) of the drill hole collar dip and azimuth of the hole down hole length and interception depth hole length. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A – geophysical data only. All relevant drillhole information contained within Appendix 2.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Data aggregation methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>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.</i> <i>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.</i> <i>The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values should be clearly stated.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NiEq has been calculated with the following prices (US \$) and recoveries for Pentlandite (P) and Violarite (V): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ni \$8.00/lb., P = 96.9%, V = 88.7% Cu \$3.65/lb., P = 99.5%, V = 94.5% Co \$15.30/lb., P = 95.1%, V = 88.5% Pt \$1,100/oz., P = 78.2%, V = 57.6% Pd \$2,300/oz., P = 97.6%, V = 87.3% Rh \$15,500/oz., P = 83.4%, V = 64.8% The calculation for the pentlandite domain is: $NiEq = Ni\% + (Cu\% * 0.995 * (3.65/8.00)) + (Co\% * 0.951 * (15.30/8.00)) + (Pt\% * 0.782 * (1100 * 14.583/8.00)) + (Pd\% * 0.976 * (2300 * 14.583/8.00)) + (Rh\% * 0.834 * (15500 * 14.583/8.00))$ The calculation for the violarite domain is: $NiEq = Ni\% + (Cu\% * 0.945 * (3.65/8.00)) + (Co\% * 0.885 * (15.30/8.00)) + (Pt\% * 0.576 * (1100 * 14.583/8.00)) + (Pd\% * 0.873 * (2300 * 14.583/8.00)) + (Rh\% * 0.648 * (15500 * 14.583/8.00))$
Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>If the geometry of the mineralisation with respect to the drill hole angle is known, its nature should be reported.</i> <i>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').</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A – geophysical data only
Diagrams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>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.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to figures in document.
Balanced reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>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.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All drillhole locations are reported and a table of significant intervals is provided in the release text.
Other substantive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>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</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to document.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
exploration data	<i>method of treatment; metallurgical test results; bulk density, groundwater, geotechnical and rock characteristics; potential deleterious or contaminating substances.</i>	
Further work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The nature and scale of planned further work (eg tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling).</i> <i>Diagrams clearly highlighting the areas of possible extensions, including the main geological interpretations and future drilling areas, provided this information is not commercially sensitive.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A discussion of further work underway is contained within the body to this ASX release.