



## **PROMISING RESULTS FROM MAIDEN DRILLING PROGRAM AT LADY LILA**

### **Highlights:**

- **Maiden Forrestania Resources drilling programme defines supergene mineralisation over a 300m strike length**
- **Shallow mineralisation intercepted, starting at 8m (LLRC002 – 8m @ 1.9g/t)**
- **Mineralisation open in all directions, extended at depth, including 16m @ 1.4g/t (LLRC009), this includes an intersection above laboratory detection limits 4m @ >4g/t**
- **Mineralisation extended 50m to the south of the known resource**

Forrestania Resources (ASX:FRS) (**Forrestania** or the **Company**), is pleased to announce the results of its maiden drilling programme. The Lady Lila drilling programme was completed in early November with the aim of testing the down dip extension of the Lady Lila resource, as well as the southern extension of the mineralisation.

Lady Lila is located 17km south-west of the historic +1Moz Bounty Gold Mine and has an inferred mineral resource of 541,000 tonnes grading at 1.38g/t, for 24,000oz of gold.

The existing inferred resource at Lady Lila was constructed in 2016 in accordance with JORC 2012 guidelines, using holes drilled before 1999. Around 85% of the drilling is of low confidence, either RAB or from the pre-1999 era and averages 60m depth. The Company's programme was very much an exploration/orientation opportunity and the results have been extremely encouraging.

14 RC holes were completed in the most recent campaign for a total of 1,823m in early November<sup>1</sup>. An independent environmental survey was carried out prior to drilling in order to gain a base-line understanding of the flora species in the drilling area.


The FRS drilling programme aimed to test the sub vertical structure that has previously been drilled by a number of explorers; most recently in 2018 by Classic Resources (ASX:CLZ) who intersected strong mineralisation<sup>2</sup>, including FLLRC010 15m @ 2.1g/t.

Previous explorers had failed to adequately test the southern extent of the mineralisation; however, the Company's drilling programme has successfully demonstrated that the structure remains open, at least a further 50m along strike, to the south. The Company's first drill hole LLRC007 intersected 8m @ 1.1g/t to confirm the mineralisation to the south. Mineralisation intercepts >0.5g/t can be found in table 1.

---

<sup>1</sup> ASX:FRS announcement 10<sup>th</sup> November 2021

<sup>2</sup> ASX:CLZ announcement 8<sup>th</sup> October 2018




**Figure 1: Location of the 100% Forrestania Resources owned Lady Lila prospect**

Hole ID	Depth from	Depth to	Au g/t	Width	Gram metre
LLRC001	No significant intercepts >0.5g/t				
LLRC002	No significant intercepts >0.5g/t				
LLRC003	88	104	1.37	16	21.90
LLRC004	116	128	0.84	12	10.08
LLRC005	88	92	0.63	4	2.52
LLRC006	112	116	0.68	4	2.73
LLRC007	64	72	1.15	8	9.16
LLRC009	108	116	2.37	8	18.95
LLRC010	116	120	0.66	4	2.64
LLRC012	108	112	0.88	4	3.50
LLRC013	No significant intercepts >0.5g/t				
LLRC014	No significant intercepts >0.5g/t				

**Table 1: Significant intersection summary (>0.5g/t)**


The Company remains very optimistic that the geological formations intersected are analogous with the +1Moz Bounty Gold Mine – with the mineralisation associated with a banded iron formation and a quartz sulphide assemblage.




**Figure 2: The Lady Lila drilling programme with select results and location of cross sections**

The drilling has proved that the mineralised structure continues at depth and the Company plans to further test this structure in the new year.

The programme was designed with 4m composite sampling using aqua regia digest; the 1m samples from the mineralised intervals will be submitted for fire assay shortly, with results expected in 8-10 weeks.




**Figure 3: Cross section, looking north at the Lady Lila prospect showing recent FRS drilling along with historic RAB and RC drilling (6,429,856mN)**



**Figure 4: Cross section, looking north at the Lady Lila prospect showing recent FRS drilling along with historic RAB drilling (6,430,010mN)**

The Company has submitted several Programme of Work (POWs) applications in order to further advance the project and has already completed a spring flora survey of the wider Lady Lila tenement areas to enable these POW's to be approved. After approval has been granted for further drilling, the Company will aim to further test the southern extension of the mineralisation, the northern extension as well as the down dip mineralised structure.



**Figure 5: Long section of the Lady Lila prospect (looking west), with a selection of the Company's recent drilling along with a selection of historic results. FRS drilling has successfully confirmed +300m of mineralised strike length.**

Hole ID	Prospect	North	East	Depth	Dip	Azi	RL
LLRC001	Lady Lila	6430010	755688	138	-60	270	415
LLRC002	Lady Lila	6430009	755618	60	-60	270	415
LLRC003	Lady Lila	6429858	755684	126	-60	270	415
LLRC004	Lady Lila	6429858	755704	138	-60	270	415
LLRC005	Lady Lila	6430010	755668	132	-60	270	415
LLRC006	Lady Lila	6429909	755692	150	-60	270	415
LLRC007	Lady Lila	6429758	755680	132	-60	270	415
LLRC008	Lady Lila	6429758	755700	132	-60	270	415
LLRC009	Lady Lila	6429810	755700	138	-60	270	415
LLRC010	Lady Lila	6430058	755680	124	-60	270	415
LLRC011	Lady Lila	6430057	755716	126	-60	270	415
LLRC012	Lady Lila	6429958	755682	144	-60	270	415
LLRC013	Lady Lila	6429957	755703	139	-60	270	415
LLRC014	Lady Lila	6429810	755725	144	-60	270	415

**Table 2 – Lady Lila drilling summary**

End

This announcement is authorised for release by the Board.

**For further information, please contact:**

John Hannaford  
Chairman

T: +61 (0) 419 042 769

E: [john@forrestanioresources.com.au](mailto:john@forrestanioresources.com.au)

Simon Adams

Company Secretary


T: +61 (0)439 845 435

E: [simon@forrestanioresources.com.au](mailto:simon@forrestanioresources.com.au)

**About Forrestania Resources Limited**

Forrestania Resources Limited is an exploration company searching for gold, lithium, and nickel in the Forrestania, Southern Cross and Leonora regions of Western Australia. The Forrestania Project is prospective for gold, lithium and nickel and is currently the only project, within the tenement portfolio that holds a gold Mineral Resource. The Southern Cross Project is prospective for gold and lithium and the Leonora Project is prospective for gold.

The Forrestania Project is situated in the well-endowed southern Forrestania Greenstone Belt, with a tenement footprint spanning approximately 100km, north-to-south of variously metamorphosed mafic/ultramafic/volcano-sedimentary rocks host to the historic 1Moz Bounty gold deposit, emerging Kat Gap gold deposit, the operating Flying Fox, and Spotted Quoll nickel mines, and the more recently discovered Earl Grey lithium deposit.



The Southern Cross Project tenements are scattered within proximity to the town of Southern Cross and located in and around the Southern Cross Greenstone Belt, which extends along strike for approximately 300km from Mt Jackson to Hatters Hill in the south. It is the Company’s opinion that the potential for economic gold mineralisation at the Southern Cross Project has not been fully evaluated. In addition to greenstone shear-hosted gold deposits, Forrestania is targeting granite-hosted deposits. New geological models for late Archean granite-controlled shear zone/fault hosted mineralisation theorise that gold forming fluids, formed at deep crustal levels do not discriminate between lithologies when emplaced in the upper crust. Applying this theory, Forrestania has defined seven new targets.

The Leonora Project tenements are located within the Norseman-Wiluna Greenstone Belt of the Yilgarn Craton. The Project includes one Exploration Licence and five Exploration Licence Applications, covering a total of 856.7km<sup>2</sup>. The tenements are predominately non-contiguous and scattered over 200km length of the greenstone belt. The southernmost tenement is approximately 15 km southeast of the town of Menzies, and the northernmost tenement is located approximately 70 km northeast of Leonora. Prior exploration over the project area has focussed on gold, diamonds, and uranium. Tenements in the Project have been variably subjected to soil sampling, stream sampling, drilling, mapping, rock chip sampling and geophysical surveys.

Priority drilling targets have been identified in both project areas and the Company is well funded to undertake effective exploration programs.

The Company has an experienced Board and management team which is focused on discovery to increase value for Shareholders.

### **Competent Person's Statement**

The information in this report that relates to Exploration Results is based on and fairly represents information compiled by Mr Ashley Bennett. Mr Bennett is the Exploration Manager of Forrestania Resources Limited and is a member of the Australian Institute of Geoscientists. Mr Bennett has sufficient experience of relevance to the styles of mineralisation and types of deposits under consideration, and to the activities undertaken to qualify as a Competent Person as defined in the 2012 Edition of the Joint Ore Reserves Committee (JORC) Australasian Code for Reporting of Exploration Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves. Mr Bennett consents to the inclusion in this report of the matters based on information in the form and context in which they appear.

### **Disclosure**

The information in this announcement is based on the following publicly available ASX announcements and Forrestania Resources IPO, which is available from <https://www2.asx.com.au/>

The Company confirms that it is not aware of any new information or data that materially affects the information included in the original ASX announcements and that all material assumptions and technical parameters underpinning the relevant ASX announcements continue to apply and have not materially changed. The Company confirms that the form and context in which the Competent Person's findings are represented have not been materially modified from the original ASX announcements.



## Appendix 1 – JORC TABLE 1

### Section 1 Sampling Techniques and Data

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
<p><i>Sampling techniques</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>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.</i></li> <li><i>Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample representivity and the appropriate calibration of any measurement tools or systems used.</i></li> <li><i>Aspects of the determination of mineralisation that are Material to the Public Report.</i></li> <li><i>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.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conventional Reverse Circulation (RC) percussion drilling was used to obtain representative 1 metre samples of approximately 1.5kg, using a rig-mounted cyclone and cone splitter.</li> <li>The remaining material from each metre was collected from the cyclone as a bulk sample of approximately 15-20kg.</li> <li>Bulk samples from each metre interval were spear sampled and combined to form a 4-metre composite sample of approximately 3kg.</li> <li>In the laboratory, all samples are riffle split if required, then pulverised to an nominal 85% passing 75 microns to obtain a homogenous sub-sample for assay.</li> <li>Sampling was carried out under FRS's standard protocols and QA/QC procedures and is considered standard industry practice.</li> <li>Historic sampling: The samples for historic drilling were taken by HQ diamond drill coring, RC face hammer drill and RAB drill. All RC drill samples for assaying were generated via an RC hammer (diameter unknown), but for early holes it is not known whether this was a face-sampling or conventional hammer. The majority of RC holes were sampled as one-metre composites. There is limited information provided in the reporting of historic results on the quality of the sampling processes</li> <li>CLZ sampling: The samples were taken by a RC face sampling hammer drill. All RC holes were sampled at one-metre intervals.</li> <li>Care was taken to control metre delineation, and loss of fines.</li> <li>The determination of mineralisation was done via industry standard methods, including RC drilling, followed by splitting, crushing and fire assaying</li> </ul>
<p><i>Drilling techniques</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>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.).</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RC percussion drilling was completed using a 4.5 to 5 inch face sampling hammer bit.</li> <li>Historic drilling: The deposit has been drilled using a combination of RAB and RC drilling. All RC drill samples for assaying were generated via an RC hammer, but for early holes it is not known whether this was a face-sampling or conventional hammer. Samples are presumed to</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
		<p>have passed through a cyclone on the drill rig and a riffle splitter to provide a sample for analysis. The majority of RC holes were sampled as one-metre composites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CLZ drilling: All drilling was completed using reverse circulation method, using a Hydco 350 model rig and 6m Remet Harlsen 4 ½ inch rods. The rig mounted Airtruck has 1150 cfm 500 psi auxiliary couples with a hurricane 7t Booster 2400 cfm /1000 psi booster. The bit size was 5 5/8.</li> </ul>
<i>Drill sample recovery</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Method of recording and assessing core and chip sample recoveries and results assessed.</i></li> <li>• <i>Measures taken to maximise sample recovery and ensure representative nature of the samples.</i></li> <li>• <i>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.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RC percussion drill samples recoveries were assessed visually.</li> <li>• Recoveries remained relatively consistent throughout the program.</li> <li>• Poor (low) recovery intervals were logged and entered into the drill logs.</li> <li>• Wet samples were not composited and were sampled in 1m intervals and details of wet samples were noted on the drill logs.</li> <li>• The cone splitter was routinely cleaned and inspected during drilling.</li> <li>• Care was taken to ensure calico samples were of consistent volume.</li> <li>• No sample bias has been noted.</li> <li>• Historic: Recoveries from the historic drilling are not known.</li> <li>• CLZ: Recoveries from the drilling are not known, as sample weights were not recorded at this stage of exploration, but visual inspection of samples in the field indicate that recoveries were sufficient.</li> </ul>
<i>Logging</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>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.</i></li> <li>• <i>Whether logging is qualitative or quantitative in nature. Core (or costean, channel, etc.) photography. The total length and percentage of the relevant intersections logged.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RC percussion samples were logged geologically on a one metre interval basis, including but not limited to: recording colour, weathering, regolith, lithology, veining, structure, texture, alteration and mineralisation (type and abundance).</li> <li>• Logging was at a qualitative and quantitative standard appropriate for RC percussion drilling and suitable to support appropriate future Mineral Resource studies.</li> <li>• Representative material was collected from each RC percussion drill sample and stored in a chip tray. These chip trays were transferred to Perth.</li> <li>• All holes and all relevant intersections were geologically logged in full.</li> <li>• Historic: Core and chips were logged, but it is not clear whether this has occurred to a level of detail to support the Mineral Resource estimation at Lady Lila.</li> <li>• Logging was qualitative in nature.</li> <li>• CLZ: Logging was qualitative in nature.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
<p><i>Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>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.</i></li> <li><i>For all sample types, the nature, quality and appropriateness of the sample preparation technique.</i></li> <li><i>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.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All intersections were logged</li> <li>1m bulk samples recovered from the drill rig cyclone were spear sampled and combined to make 4m composite samples.</li> <li>&gt;95% of the samples were dry in nature.</li> <li>RC percussion samples were weighed, dried and pulverized to 85% passing 75 microns. This is considered industry standard and appropriate.</li> <li>FRS has its own internal QAQC procedure involving the use of certified reference materials (standards), blanks and field duplicates which account for approximately 8% of the total submitted samples.</li> <li>The sample sizes are considered appropriate for the style of precious metal mineralisation previously recorded for the area.</li> <li>Historic: Details of the splitter and drill rig configuration for RC drilling were not provided.</li> <li>The quality and the appropriateness of the sample preparation technique cannot be determined for the historic drilling. It is assumed that sampling practices employed during the respective drill programs followed standard industry practice in effect at the time.</li> <li>CLZ: The nature and quality of the sampling suits the purpose, being exploration. The laboratory preparation is standard practice and has not been further refined to match the ore.</li> <li>QC in the lab prep stage was limited to taking pulp duplicates (e.g. no coarse crush duplicates were submitted)</li> <li>The sample split sizes (4-5 kg) are regarded as more than adequate for the nature and type of material sampled.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Quality of assay data and laboratory tests</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The nature, quality and appropriateness of the assaying and laboratory procedures used and whether the technique is considered partial or total.</i></li> <li><i>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.</i></li> <li><i>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.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All 4m composite drilling samples have been submitted for assay to Minal analytical for their aqua regia digest AR1030 for 49 Elements ICP-OES / ICP-MS Package (includes Pt Pd)</li> <li>A small number of 1m drilling samples were also submitted to Minal analytical (only wet samples were not composited, these were sampled in 1m intervals) and assayed by aqua regia digest AR1030 for multi elements and separately for gold using FA50AAS - a 50g Fire Assay with an AAS finish.</li> <li>The assay techniques are considered appropriate and are industry best standard.</li> <li>The techniques are considered to be a near total digest, only the</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
		<p>mostresistive minerals are only partially dissolved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An internal QAQC procedure involving the use of certified reference materials (standards), blanks and duplicates accounts for approximately 10% of the totalsubmitted samples.</li> <li>• The certified reference materials used have a representative range of values typical of low, moderate and high grade gold mineralisation. Standard results for drilling demonstrated assay values are both accurate and precise. Blank results demonstrate there is negligible cross-contamination between samples. Duplicate results suggest there is reasonable repeatability between samples.</li> <li>• Historic: Assays presented consist of a range of aqua regia, fire assay and leach well analysis. Determination of the analytical procedures employed was not completed. The quality and appropriateness of the assaying and laboratory procedures used could not be determined.</li> <li>• Information on quality control procedures was not available.</li> <li>• CLZ: Standard 50g fire assays with an AAS finish were used to get assay results. This is a total technique, and considered appropriate for this level of exploration.</li> <li>• Quality control was carried out by inserting blanks and standards into the sampling chain and 5% intervals. These all showed acceptable levels of accuracy and precision.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Verification of sampling and assaying</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The verification of significant intersections by either independent or alternative company personnel.</i></li> <li>• <i>The use of twinned holes.</i></li> <li>• <i>Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols.</i></li> <li>• <i>Discuss any adjustment to assay data.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant intersections have been verified by the Company's database administrator.</li> <li>• No dedicated twin holes have yet been drilled for comparative purposes.</li> <li>• Primary data was collected via digital logging hardware and software using in- house logging methodology and codes.</li> <li>• Logging data was validated and entered into an industry standard master database maintained by the FRS database administrator.</li> <li>• Historic: No comments are available in any reports on the verification of significant intersections.</li> <li>• CLZ: Significant intersections have not been validated by independent or alternative personnel.</li> <li>• No twin holes were included in this programme, as it is not relevant</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
<p><i>Location of data points</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>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.</i></li> <li>• <i>Specification of the grid system used.</i></li> <li>• <i>Quality and adequacy of topographic control.</i></li> </ul>	<p>to the stage of exploration and purpose of this drilling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All primary data was collected on spread sheets which have been validated for errors and included into an Access database.</li> <li>• Assay data has not been adjusted</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hole collar locations will be surveyed prior to rehabilitation with handheld GPS instruments with accuracy <math>\pm 3\text{m}</math>. Table 2 summarises the FRS drilling.</li> <li>• Hole locations reported are the planned hole designs, any RLs reported are approximated, based on previous drilling.</li> <li>• Downhole surveys were completed on all drill holes using a north seeking gyro downhole survey tool at downhole intervals of approximately every 30m, but planned downhole orientation is used in the cross sections.</li> <li>• The grid system used for location of all drill holes as shown in tables and on figures is MGA Zone 50, GDA94.</li> <li>• Topographic control is based on published topographic maps.</li> <li>• Historic: All recent and historical drillhole collar positions were surveyed during a campaign undertaken at Wattle Rocks in December 1998. Other holes were left with their previously surveyed or nominally designed coordinates. The default RL - 415 mRL, to reflect an average of the topographic heights encountered across the broadly flat prospect area.</li> <li>• Most holes drilled prior to 1996 were not downhole surveyed.</li> <li>• CLZ: Drill hole locations were determined by GPS in the field in UTM zone 50.</li> <li>• Topographic control is available through a detailed satellite-derived DTM.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Data spacing and distribution</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Data spacing for reporting of Exploration Results.</i></li> <li>• <i>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.</i></li> <li>• <i>Whether sample compositing has been applied.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drill hole spacing is variable, as shown in diagrams in the body of the announcement. Drill hole locations can be found in table 2.</li> <li>• Drill hole spacing and distribution is not considered sufficient as to make geological and grade continuity assumptions appropriate for Mineral Resource estimation.</li> <li>• 4 metre sample compositing of the RC percussion drilling samples was routinely used.</li> <li>• Historic: The data spacing and distribution is sufficient to establish the degree of geological and grade continuity appropriate for the Mineral Resource estimation procedure and classifications applied.</li> <li>• CLZ: Holes were not drilled on a pattern and there was no specific drill hole spacing. In general holes are drilled within 50m from previous</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
<p><i>Orientation of data in relation to geological structure</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Whether the orientation of sampling achieves unbiased sampling of possible structures and the extent to which this is known, considering the deposit type.</i></li> <li><i>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.</i></li> </ul>	<p>intersections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The data spacing is considered sufficient to demonstrate geological and grade continuity for estimation procedures.</li> <li>The orientation of drilling and sampling is not anticipated to have any significant biasing effects.</li> <li>The drill holes reported in this announcement are generally angled to the west and are interpreted to have intersected the mineralised structures approximately perpendicular to their dip.</li> <li>Historic: The relationship between the drilling orientation and the orientation of key mineralised structures is not considered to have introduced a sampling bias.</li> <li>CLZ: The orientation of sampling has achieved unbiased sampling of structures, with drilling perpendicular to the dip and strike of the mineralised zones</li> <li>The relationship between the drilling orientation and the orientation of key mineralised structures is not considered to have introduced a sampling bias.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Sample security</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The measures taken to ensure sample security.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sample chain of custody is managed by FRS</li> <li>Sampling was carried out by FRS field staff.</li> <li>Samples were transported to a laboratory in Perth by FRS contractors or employees.</li> <li>Historic: The orientation of sampling has mostly achieved unbiased sampling of structures</li> <li>The relationship between the drilling orientation and the orientation of key mineralised structures is not considered to have introduced a sampling bias.</li> <li>CLZ: Samples were immediately dispatched to the laboratory and have at all times been in possession of CLM or its designated contractors. Chain of custody was maintained throughout.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Audits or reviews</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The sampling methods being used are industry standard practice.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No audit or review has been completed.</li> </ul>

**Section 2 Reporting of Exploration Results**  
(Criteria in this section apply to all succeeding sections)

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
Mineral tenement and land tenure status	<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 results relate to drilling completed on prospecting licences P77/4325.</li> <li>The tenements are held 100% by Forrestania Resources Ltd.</li> <li>The tenements are held securely and no impediments to obtaining a licence to operate have been identified.</li> </ul>
Exploration by other parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Lady Lila prospect was initially discovered by Sons of Gwalia in the late 1980's. During this period a number of non-JORC resource estimates were produced by a variety of operators including Aztec Mining, Forrestania Gold NL and Viceroy Australia.</li> <li>Between 1997 and 2004, a total of 14 soil samples were taken at P77/4325 by Forrestania Gold NL/Sons of Gwalia with no significant gold mineralisation. (Forrestania Gold NL/Sons of Gwalia also drilled 37 RAB holes for 2920m across the adjoining tenement P77/4326 – no anomalous values were returned). During the same period, 127 auger samples were also taken with encouraging anomalous Au at P77/4325.</li> <li>Forrestania Gold NL/Sons of Gwalia reported a total of 35 RC holes for 2780m and 56 RAB holes for 3017.5m between 1997 and 2004 at the Lady Lila prospect.</li> <li>A JORC compliant resource estimate was produced in 2016, when Fortuna SL Mining (then tenement holders) engaged Cadre Geology to complete one. This resource currently stands at 541,000 tonnes @ 1.38g/t Au for 24,000oz Au.</li> <li>Classic Minerals drilled 10 holes for 732m in 2018, these drill holes are the most recent drilling activity at Lady Lila.</li> </ul>
Geology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Lady Lila prospect is prospective for gold mineralisation associated with structures in Archaean greenstone units.</li> <li>P77/4325 is part of the Archaean Southern Cross - Forrestania Greenstone Belt. The greenstone belt trends north to northwest and has a strike length of over 300 kilometres.</li> <li>Regional mapping has identified two distinct lithostratigraphic units</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
		<p>within the Forrestania Greenstone Belt, a mafic — ultramafic metavolcanic suite and a sequence of immature clastic sediments, which overlie the older mafic - ultramafic sequence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These units are folded into a regional northerly plunging syncline, with the sedimentary rocks forming the core of the structure (Central Domain).</li> <li>• The mafic — ultramafic rocks to the east (Eastern Domain) of the sediments are steeply west dipping while those to the west of the sediments (Western Domain) are shallowly east dipping. The basal rocks of the Eastern domain comprise a thick sequence of tholeiitic basalts with minor intrusive exhalative interflow sedimentary horizons, all upon a younger intrusive granitoid basement.</li> <li>• The greenstones are predominantly altered mafic and ultramafic flows with intercalated fine banded iron formations, cherts, and at stratigraphically higher levels, fine grained clastic sediments.</li> <li>• The Forrestania Greenstone Belt (FGB) is enclosed by granitoids and folded along anticlinal and synclinal axes that trend north — south and northwest — southeast. Numerous Proterozoic dolerite dykes cut the stratigraphy in an east —west and northeast — southwest direction.</li> <li>• Lady Lila is part of a linear, discontinuous, 1,400 metre long, north south trending zone.</li> <li>• The mineralised zone dips steeply (60-70°) to the east and is hosted in narrow quartz stringers enveloped by garnetiferous, graphitic, pelitic sediments.</li> <li>• The sediments bifurcate in places and accompany discontinuous chert beds that do not appear to be related to mineralisation.</li> <li>• The lithology strongly correlates with a magnetic high and a coincident north-south trending geochemical Au anomaly.</li> <li>• The gold mineralisation at Lady Lila is associated with a strongly weathered, steeply sequence of weathered meta-pelites and BIFs.</li> <li>• Importantly, this mineralisation is analogous with the Bounty Gold Mine which is also hosted by a BIF.</li> </ul>
Drill hole Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>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:</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All material information is summarised in the Tables and Figures included in the body of the announcement.</li> </ul>



Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
	<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, down hole length and interception depth</li> <li>• hole length</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>	
Data aggregation methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In reporting Exploration Results, weighting averaging techniques, maximum and/or minimum grade truncations (e.g. 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>• FRS: All significant intersections are reported based on a 0.5g/t Au cut-off grade, with LLRC004 allowing for internal dilution by one sub-grade 4m composite sample (with a value of 0.32g/t). Refer to Table I for detail.</li> <li>• Significant intersections are 4m composite samples, with the exception of LLRC013 which also includes a 1m sample 132-133m sample (this interval was fire assayed).</li> <li>• No metal equivalent values have been reported.</li> <li>• Historic data: Summary drill hole results (pre CLZ drilling) as reported, are reported on a 2m internal dilution and 0.5 g/t Au cut-off.</li> <li>• Historic aggregate results (pre CLZ drilling) calculated from results in the historic Violet Haze database. (data available, Hannans Reward Ltd, Final Surrender Report-Forrestania Project, P77/4012 &amp; P77/4013, 29/10/12-17/12/14</li> <li>• CLZ data: High grades were not cut in the reporting of weighted averages in this Report.</li> <li>• Summary drill hole results as reported in figures and in the report are reported on a 2m internal dilution and 0.5 g/t Au cut-off.</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. If it is not known and only the down hole lengths are reported, there should be a clear statement to this effect (e.g. 'down hole length, true width not known').</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Down hole lengths are reported, true width is not known.</li> <li>• The relationship between mineralisation width and intercept length is not known.</li> <li>• Further drilling is required to determine the geometry of the mineralisation with respect to the drill hole angle.</li> <li>• Historic: In almost all cases, the drill holes are perpendicular to the mineralisation. The true width is not expected to deviate much from intersection width</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CLZ: In almost all cases, the drill holes are perpendicular to the mineralisation. The true width is not expected to deviate much from intersection width.</li> </ul>
Diagrams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <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></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refer to Figures included in the body of the announcement.</li> </ul>
Balanced reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <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></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comprehensive reporting of assay results is not practicable.</li> <li>• Representative reporting of significant intersections is included in the body of the announcement.</li> <li>• Historic: Figures represent specific selected drill intervals to demonstrate the general trend of high grade trends. Cross sections show all relevant result in a balanced way.</li> <li>• CLZ: Figures represent specific selected drill intervals to demonstrate the general trend of high grade trends. Cross sections show all relevant result in a balanced way.</li> </ul>
Other substantive exploration data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <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 method of treatment; metallurgical test results; bulk density, groundwater, geotechnical and rock characteristics; potential deleterious or contaminating substances.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None.</li> </ul>
Further work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The nature and scale of planned further work (e.g. tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale stepout drilling).</i></li> <li>• <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></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further RC percussion drilling may be undertaken for infill and extension of the known mineralisation at the Lady Lila deposit and surrounding exploration prospects.</li> <li>• Diamond tails may be drilled using the recent FRS drilling as pre collars where mineralisation is anticipated.</li> <li>• The 1m split samples currently on site will be retrieved and submitted to Minanalytical for fire assay analysis.</li> </ul>