*Building the pre-eminent vertically integrated **Lithium** business in Ontario, Canada*

TRANSFORMATIONAL 22.5MT MINERAL RESOURCE BASE REACHED ACROSS ONTARIO LITHIUM PROJECTS

HIGHLIGHTS

- **High grade Inferred Maiden MRE of 8.1Mt at 1.32% Li_2O over the Root Bay Deposit, part of the 20km-wide Root Lithium Project in Ontario, Canada**
- **Total of 22.5 million tonnes across GT1's 100% owned lithium deposits**
- **Further Mineral Resource growth anticipated along trend at the Root Bay Deposit, and across the larger Root project area**
- **Resource definition drilling now underway at Root Bay to test open mineralisation trends and add to spodumene resource base**
- **Field exploration has commenced over an expanded untested exploration area at Root, to identify additional priority drill targets**

Green Technology Metals Limited (**ASX: GT1**) (**GT1** or the **Company**), a Canadian-focused multi-asset lithium business, is pleased to announce an updated Inferred Mineral Resource Estimate (MRE) for its 100% owned Root Project, located approximately 200km west of the flagship Seymour Project in Ontario, Canada.

Project	Tonnes (Mt)	Li_2O (%)	Ta_2O_5 (ppm)
Root Project			
Root Bay Inferred	8.1	1.32	35
McCombe Inferred	4.5	1.01	110
Total	**12.6**	**1.21**	**62**
Seymour Project[1]			
North Aubry Indicated	5.2	1.29	161
North Aubry Inferred	2.6	0.90	120
South Aubry Inferred	2.1	0.50	90
Total	**9.9**	**1.04**	**137**
Combined Total	**22.5**	**1.14**	**95**

Table 1: Combined Lithium Mineral Resources - 0.2% Li_2O cut-off

[1] [1]For full details of the Seymour Mineral Resource estimate and Root Maiden Mineral Resource estimate, see GT1 ASX release dated 23 June 2022, Interim Seymour Mineral Resource Doubles to 9.9Mt and GT1 Mineral Resources increased to 14.4MT dated 19 April 2023.

"This is just the beginning for our Root Lithium Project and we are very pleased with ongoing drilling indicating further extension potential along the East-West trend. We still have a lot of untested ground to cover and with time we hope to continue to grow our quality hard rock spodumene lithium resource base in Ontario.

The Mineral Resource base at Root has now reached critical mass and is transformational for GT1, as it allows us to assess the potential for Root to become a stand-alone project hosting its own concentrator in line with our corporate strategy." *– GT1 Chief Executive Officer, Luke Cox*

ROOT BAY RESOURCE ESTIMATE SUMMARY

The updated Inferred Mineral Resource Estimate (**MRE**) for the Root Lithium project (McCombe + Root Bay) is **12.6 million tonnes** @ **1.21% Li_2O** and 62 ppm Ta_2O_5 incorporating an additional **8.1 million tonnes** @ **1.32% Li_2O** from the Root Bay deposit to the reported **4.5 million tonnes @ 1.01% Li_2O** from the McCombe deposit[2].

The maiden inferred MRE from the Root Bay deposit includes all drilling that commenced on 23 February 2023, comprising of 36 holes for 9,174.70m. The initial hole drilled at Root Bay testing the down dip mineralisation continuity was not used in the MRE. Drilling is revealing multiple, shallow-dipping LCT pegmatites up to 18m thick, with exceptional lithium grades up to 1.73% Li_2O. 13 stacked pegmatites have been identified and defined to over 200m depth and 1,300m along the Root Bay trend, with a northerly strike length of up to 300m.

The pegmatites are hosted within an Archean package of meta-basalts. The meta-basalts are themselves sandwiched in a 300m wide corridor flanked in the south by meta-sediments and in the north by more meta-sediments hosting Banded Iron Formation units. The contacts between the meta-basalts and the meta-sedimentary units are thought to be steeply dipping to sub-vertical.



Figure 1: Root Lithium Project exploration target area

[2]For full details of the Seymour Mineral Resource estimate and Root Maiden Mineral Resource estimate, see GT1 ASX release dated 23 June 2022, Interim Seymour Mineral Resource Doubles to 9.9Mt and GT1 Mineral Resources increased to 14.4MT dated 19 April 2023.

The MRE has been constrained within a pit shell generated through the Micromine Pit Optimiser module. Pegmatite tonnes and grade are reported above a 0.2% Li_2O cut-off within the pit shell on a dry basis.

Root Bay 2023 MRE		
Grade cut-off (% Li_2O)	Tonnes (Mt)	Li_2O (%)
0.0	8.4	1.28
0.2	8.1	1.32
0.4	7.8	1.36
0.6	7.5	1.40

Table 1: Root 2023 MRE Grade-Tonnage Data

Infill drilling will be undertaken to improve the MRE confidence for future economic assessment (i.e. Indicated Resources) as well as to increase overall resource tonnage. Studies to support necessary modifying factors, waste characterisation, metallurgical recoveries, and geotechnical assessments will be conducted in concert with the infill drilling.



Figure 2: Root Bay plan view showing block model (multi colour), Pegmatite current extents (purple) and collar locations (blue).

Resource Growth Potential

Maiden diamond drilling by GT1 commenced at the Root project only nine months ago and initially focused on the McCombe deposit which has successfully generated a 4.5Mt maiden resource. Drilling has more recently expanded to include Morrison and Root Bay which has returned high-grade intercepts and an inferred maiden resource estimate at Root Bay of **8.1Mt @ 1.32% Li_2O** and is demonstrating significant potential for ongoing resource growth.

Exploration at the Root project has so far focused on three target areas: McCombe, Morrison and Root Bay. However, a large area surrounding these targets remains underexplored and highly prospective for new LCT pegmatite target areas especially considering the recent success at Root Bay, that was a simple outcrop occurrence before GT1 began drill testing at depth.

A large-scale field exploration program over 2,993 Hectares (29.9km^2) of prime lithium real estate within the Lake St. Joseph greenstone belt within the Uchi Domain to include prospecting, mapping, and sampling is currently underway by GT1 to identify new priority drill targets at the Root Project. Focus is on the northern tenement area that has had no previous exploration to date, as well as the areas 1.5km east and 1.7km west along the trend from the current drilling at Root Bay. The trend remains open and highly prospective and can be clearly traced over the entire length of GT1's tenement through the highly magnetic BIF unit that runs along the northern boundary of the Root Bay deposit.

An accelerated phase 2 diamond drilling program at Root Bay is now underway including both infill and extension drilling followed by drill testing of new targets generated from field exploration across the Root Lithium project area.



Figure 3: Root Bay diamond drill hole locations



Figure 4: Root Bay stacked pegmatites looking north.

Indigenous Partners Acknowledgement

We would like to say Gchi Miigwech to our Indigenous partners. GT1 appreciates the opportunity to work in these territories and remains committed to the recognition and respect of those who have lived, travelled, and gathered on the lands since time immemorial. Green Technology Metals is committed to stewarding Indigenous heritage and remains committed to building, fostering, and encouraging a respectful relationship with Indigenous Peoples based upon principles of mutual trust, respect, reciprocity, and collaboration in the spirit of reconciliation.

Root Mineral Resource Estimate Detail

Regional and Local Geology

The Root Lake Lithium Project is located the boundary between the Uchi Domain and the English River sub province is defined by the Sydney Lake – Lake St. Joseph Fault, a steeply dipping brittle ductile fault zone over 450km along strike and 1 – 3km wide. It is estimated that the fault had accommodated 30km dextral, transcurrent displacement and 2.5km of south side up normal movement.

The English River Terrane is an east-west trending sub province composed of highly metamorphosed sedimentary rock, including turbiditic sediments and oxide iron formations, abundant granitoid batholiths, mafic to ultramafic plutons and rare felsic to intermediate metavolcanic rock.



Figure 5: Root and Seymour Property Locations and Geology

Bedrock Geology

McCombe, Morrison and Root Bay project areas bedrock consist primarily of metavolcanic rocks of the Lake St. Joseph greenstone belt within the Uchi Domain, while the Root Lake pegmatite is within metasedimentary rocks of the English River Terrane.

Property Geology

The Root Lake Lithium Project is covered in a veneer of patchy glacial deposits comprising shallow gravelly soils, boulder till and in places thick moraines. In low-lying areas, the bedrock is also obscured by lakes and swamps with the Roadhouse River transecting the southern portion of the McCombe deposit and western Morrison pegmatites.

The local bedrock consists primarily of Archean metavolcanics and intercalated sediments with later cross-cutting felsic intrusions to the east of the McCombe pegmatites. East-west or northeast, steep or moderately dipping lithium bearing pegmatites crosscut the meta-volcanics and sediments. The Root Bay deposit lies along an east-west trending ridge of meta-basalts hosting moderately easterly dipping pegmatites and sandwiched between meta-sediments to the south and north. The northern sediments host steeply dipping magnetite rich horizons.

Pegmatites

Four spodumene bearing pegmatite groups are found on GT1's Root Lake land holdings, McCombe, Morrison and Root Bay and Root Lake.

The **McCombe** pegmatites is a combination of several spodumene-bearing granitic pegmatites located on the northwest side of the property. The dykes are exposed over 200m along strike length and vary from east-west to northeast orientations. Dips are the south and southeast and vary from 30-40 degrees to 60-70 degrees. Pegmatite width vary from 2-15m wide.

The **Morrison** Lake pegmatite is located on the northwest side of the property, 1.7km southeast from the McCombe pegmatite. The pegmatite trends east-west, dips moderately-steeply to the south, is exposed along strike over 195m and is 6.5m wide.

The **Root Bay** pegmatite is located on the south-eastern side of the property. It is exposed approximately 60m along strike, is 10m wide (Smyk et al., 2008; Magyarosi, 2016) and follows the presumed trace of the Lake St. Joseph Fault (Smyk et al., 2008). The pegmatites are hosted in foliated, locally pillowed mafic metavolcanic rock that contain metasomatic near the contact of the pegmatite (Magyarosi, 2016).

The **Root Lake** pegmatite is located on the southwestern side of the property, south of the McCombe and Morrison pegmatites. The pegmatite is based on an occurrence from a single drill hole. The 168.55m drill hole intersected 7 spodumene-bearing and spodumene-absent granite pegmatite intervals between 0.15-1.22m thick within quartz biotite schists and metagreywackes.

Mineral Resource Estimates

Sampling and sub-sampling techniques

Green Technology Metals Ltd have drilled 187 holes within the Root Lake project area with 116 holes drilled at McCombe, a further 34 holes into the neighbouring Morrison prospect and 37 holes in Root Bay for a total of 34,959.63m as of 15 April 2023.

The bulk of the core is NQ diameter core with some BQTK Ardiden drilled at McCombe. All recent drilling is NQ diameter core. Each ½ core sample was dried, crushed to entirety to 90% -10 mesh, riffle split (up to 5 kg) and then pulverized with hardened steel (250 g sample to 95% -150 mesh) (includes cleaner sand). Blanks and Certified Reference samples were inserted in each batch submitted to the laboratory at a rate of approximately 1:20. A proportion of the mineralised pulps were re-tested by an independent laboratory, ACTLABS, Thunder Bay. The sample preparation process is considered representative of the whole core sample.

Drilling Techniques

HQ drilling was undertaken through the thin overburden prior to NQ2 diamond drilling through the primary rock. The holes were drilled used a standard barrel configuration and the core was orientated using a Reflex ACTIII tool located on the rear of the downhole barrel.

Database Integrity

Data was imported into the database directly from source geology logs and laboratory csv files. The data was then passed through a series of validation checks before final acceptance of the data for downstream use.

Site Visits

A site visit was undertaken by the Competent Person (John Winterbottom) between 14 to 15 March 2023; general site layout, drilling sites, logging practices, and diamond drilling operations were viewed. GT1 store diamond core in a dedicated facility at Thunder Bay. The storage facility was visited on 13 March and several holes reviewed and compared to logging.

Geological interpretation

At Root Bay there is uncertainty as to the exact limits of the pegmatite strike extents due to glacial cover preventing identification of the exact meta-basalt-sediment contacts at the time of the MRE. As a result, the contacts have been determined from aero-magnetic data and last known drill hole limits with the contacts placed mid-way between the last known pegmatite intercept and the next hole along strike with no pegmatite intercept. Interpretation was made directly from pegmatites noted in geological logs with confirmation through core photographs. The overburden lower contact and pegmatite units, as logged in the drilling, were digitised using Leapfrog © software and cut to the Lidar surface to create individual pegmatite and geological solids.

No high-grade envelopes were warranted at Root Bay due to the consistent high-grade nature of the main pegmatites. Pegmatite wireframes were seamlessly utilised in Seequent Leapfrog Edge© software for use in building the sub-blocked block models. Alternative geological interpretations would have a minimal effect on the resource estimate. Root Bay has two main types of pegmatites, thin low-grade pegmatites and thicker higher-grade pegmatites. The thinner low-grade units were interpreted and estimated in the MRE but were not considered as Mineral Resource inventory due to the likely low recovery and low-grade nature of these pegmatites. 2m thickness envelopes were generated for each of the pegmatites, where this was possible, for later MRE reporting purposes.

Dimensions

The Root Bay deposit has a total strike extent of approximately 200m and has been drilled to a down dip extent of over 500m downdip (250m below ground level). The pegmatites all dip to the east at approximately 35 degrees. The pegmatites are stacked and occur along a 1,200m east-west corridor.

Estimation and modelling techniques

An Ordinary Kriging (OK) grade estimation methodology has been used for Li_2O in the Mineral Resource Estimate which is considered appropriate for the style of mineralisation under review. OK was also applied to important potential bi-product or deleterious elements (Ta_2O_5, Fe, K, S). Elements other than Li_2O have not been included in the Mineral Resource figures as they have no economic value. All estimates were made to parent blocks. Leapfrog Edge version 2022.1.0 software was used for estimation, statistical and geostatistical data analysis at Root Bay.

Estimation Methodology

The Root Bay block model used 5mE x 10mN x 5mRL unrotated blocks and sub blocked to ensure they faithfully captured the pegmatite volumes. Variable Orientation searches were used for each pegmatite. Two passes were used to ensure blocks are filled in areas with sparser drilling. Root Bay also used two searches the first at 100m x 100m x 20m and a second at 150m search radii with all blocks filled after the second pass.

Moisture

All tonnages are reported on a dry basis.

Cut-off parameters

The Root Bay Mineral Resource is reported using open-pit mining constraints.

The open-pit Mineral Resource is only the portion of the resource that is constrained within a US$4,000 / t SC6 optimised shell and above a 0.2% Li2O cut-off grade. The optimised open pit shell

- $4/t mining cost
- $15.19/t processing costs
- Mining loss of 5% with no mining dilution
- 55-degree pit slope angles
- 75% Product Recovery Modifying Factors

Bulk density

1,599 bulk density measurements were made by GT1 on ½ NQ core 20cm billets using water immersion (Archimedes) techniques. 217 of the measurements were directly on pegmatite core. 2 pegmatite measurements were rejected as being anomalously low, 1.3 and 1.96.

2,993 bulk densities were tested on Root Bay ½ NQ drill core billets with 890 measurements made directly on pegmatite core. Results were similar to those measured at McCombe.

Rock Type	Length	Bulk Density
Pegmatite	143.10	2.70
BIF	5.19	2.96
Sediment	116.46	2.77
Basalt	292.85	3.05
Overburden*	0	2.20

*** Estimated**

Root Bay pegmatite bulk density measurements averaged 2.70. No bulk density data is available for the largely glacial cover over the deposit due to the difficulty in recovering this material in the drilling process. This material is volumetrically negligible ranging in depths from 0 to 19m and averaging around 6m at Root Bay. An assumed bulk density of 2.2 was used for overburden. There is a weak to moderate correlation between bulk density and Li_2O grade (Correlation Coefficient 58%) and so an assumed average pegmatite bulk density was used.

This ASX release has been approved for release by the Board.

KEY CONTACTS

Investors

Luke Cox
Chief Executive Officer

info@greentm.com.au
+61 8 6557 6825

Media

Jacinta Martino
Investor Relations and Media

ir@greentm.com.au
+61 430 147 046

Green Technology Metals (ASX:GT1)

GT1 is a North American-focussed lithium exploration and development business with a current global resource of 22.5Mt Li_2O at 1.14% Li_2O. The Company's main 100% owned Ontario Lithium Projects comprise high-grade, hard rock spodumene assets (Seymour, Root and Wisa) and lithium exploration claims (Allison and Solstice) located on highly prospective Archean Greenstone tenure in north-west Ontario, Canada.

All sites are proximate to excellent existing infrastructure (including clean hydro power generation and transmission facilities), readily accessible by road, and with nearby rail delivering transport optionality.

Seymour has an existing Mineral Resource estimate of 9.9 Mt @ 1.04% Li_2O (comprised of 5.2 Mt at 1.29% Li_2O Indicated and 4.7 Mt at 0.76% Li_2O Inferred).1 and Root has an Inferred Mineral Resource Estimate of 4.5 Mt @ 1.01% Li_2O. Accelerated, targeted exploration across all three projects delivers outstanding potential to grow resources rapidly and substantially.

[1] For full details of the Seymour Mineral Resource estimate, see GT1 ASX release dated 23 June 2022, *Interim Seymour Mineral Resource Doubles to 9.9Mt*. For full details of the Root Maiden Mineral Resource estimate, see GT1 ASX release dated 19 April 2023, *GT1 Mineral Resources Increased to 14.4MT*. The Company confirms that it is not aware of any new information or data that materially affects the information in that release and that the material assumptions and technical parameters underpinning this estimate continue to apply and have not materially changed.

APPENDIX A: IMPORTANT NOTICES

Competent Person's Statements

The information in this report that relates to Exploration Results pertaining to the Project is based on, and fairly represents, information and supporting documentation either compiled or reviewed by Mr Stephen John Winterbottom who is a member of Australian Institute of Geoscientists (Member 6112). Mr Winterbottom is the General Manager – Technical Services of Green Technology Metals. Mr Winterbottom has sufficient experience which is relevant to the style of mineralisation and type of deposit under consideration and to the activity which he is undertaking to qualify as a Competent Person (CP) 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 Winterbottom consents to the inclusion in the report of the matters based on his information in the form and context in which it appears. Mr Winterbottom holds securities in the Company.

No new information

Except where explicitly stated, this announcement contains references to prior exploration results, all of which have been cross-referenced to previous market announcements made by the Company. The Company confirms that it is not aware of any new information or data that materially affects the information included in the relevant market announcements.

The information in this report relating to the Mineral Resource estimate for the Seymour Project is extracted from the Company's ASX announcement dated 23 June 2022. GT1 confirms that it is not aware of any new information or data that materially affects the information included in the original announcement and that all material assumptions and technical parameters underpinning the Mineral Resource estimate continue to apply.

The information in this report relating to the Mineral Resource estimate for the Root Project is extracted from the Company's ASX announcement dated 19 April 2023. GT1 confirms that it is not aware of any new information or data that materially affects the information included in the original announcement and that all material assumptions and technical parameters underpinning the Mineral Resource estimate continue to apply.

Forward Looking Statements

Certain information in this document refers to the intentions of Green Technology Metals Limited (ASX: GT1), however these are not intended to be forecasts, forward looking statements or statements about the future matters for the purposes of the Corporations Act or any other applicable law. Statements regarding plans with respect to GT1's projects are forward looking statements and can generally be identified by the use of words such as 'project', 'foresee', 'plan', 'expect', 'aim', 'intend', 'anticipate', 'believe', 'estimate', 'may', 'should', 'will' or similar expressions. There can be no assurance that the GT1's plans for its projects will proceed as expected and there can be no assurance of future events which are subject to risk, uncertainties and other actions that may cause GT1's actual results, performance or achievements to differ from those referred to in this document. While the information contained in this document has been prepared in good faith, there can be given no assurance or guarantee that the occurrence of these events referred to in the document will occur as contemplated. Accordingly, to the maximum extent permitted by law, GT1 and any of its affiliates and their directors, officers, employees, agents and advisors disclaim any liability whether direct or indirect, express or limited, contractual, tortuous, statutory or otherwise, in respect of, the accuracy, reliability or completeness of the information in this document, or likelihood of fulfilment of any forward-looking statement or any event or results expressed or implied in any forward-looking statement; and do not make any representation or warranty, express or implied, as to the accuracy, reliability or completeness of the information in this document, or likelihood of fulfilment of any forward-looking statement or any event or results expressed or implied in any forward-looking statement; and disclaim all responsibility and liability for these forward-looking statements (including, without limitation, liability for negligence).

APPENDIX A: JORC CODE, 2012 EDITION – Table 1 Report

Section 1 Sampling Techniques and Data

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

<table>
<tr><th>Criteria</th><th>JORC Code explanation</th><th>Commentary</th></tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling techniques</td>
<td>

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.
Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample representivity and the appropriate calibration of any measurement tools or systems used.
Aspects of the determination of mineralisation that are Material to the Public Report.
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.

</td>
<td>
Diamond Drilling

Capital Lithium and CME drilled numerous holes in the McCombe and Morrison area. None of this earlier drilling was used to inform the current MRE as drill hole spatial location, sampling and preparation practices or assaying and QAQC protocols could not be verified to the requirements of JORC 2012.
In 2016 Ardiden drilled a total of 8 diamond NQ holes and took one channel sample to test the historic McCombe pegmatites identified by earlier historic drill programs. Ardiden confirmed the presence of the pegmatites but no further work at McCombe was undertaken.
Green Technology Metals Ltd have drilled 187 holes within the Root Lake project area with 116 holes drilled at McCombe, a further 34 holes into the neighbouring Morrison prospect and 37 holes in Root Bay for a total of 34,959.63m as of 15 April 2023.

Table 1 MRE figures
<table>
<tr><th colspan="11">Drilling Used in the June 2023 Mineral Resource Estimate</th></tr>
<tr><td>Company</td><td colspan="3">Ardiden</td><td colspan="7">Green Technology Metals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Type</td><td>CH</td><td>DDH</td><td rowspan="3">Total</td><td>DDH</td><td>DDH</td><td>DDH</td><td>DDH</td><td>DDH</td><td rowspan="3">Total</td></tr>
<tr><td>Prospect</td><td>Root Bay</td><td>McCombe</td><td>McCombe</td><td>McCombe</td><td>Morrison</td><td>Morrison</td><td>Root Bay</td></tr>
<tr><td>Year</td><td>2016</td><td>2016</td><td>2022</td><td>2023</td><td>2022</td><td>2023</td><td>2023</td></tr>
<tr><td>Holes</td><td>1</td><td>8</td><td>9</td><td>83</td><td>37</td><td>7</td><td>27</td><td>37</td><td>187</td></tr>
<tr><td>Metres</td><td>15.00</td><td>468.50</td><td>483.50</td><td>13,101.93</td><td>7,079.00</td><td>1,230.00</td><td>4,170.00</td><td>9,378.70</td><td>34,443.13</td></tr>
<tr><td>Proportion</td><td></td><td></td><td>1%</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>99%</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="11">All historic holes from the 50's were excluded from the MRE due to unverifiable spatial location data and QAQC validation. 3 Ardiden holes were rejected due to spatial location or hole orientation concerns. Channel samples were not used in the grade estimation of the MRE</td></tr>
</table>
Drilling was contracted to G4 drilling using a NQ, standard configuration coring equipment producing 4.76cm diameter core.
Historic Grab Samples

Grab samples were not used in the MRE

</td>
</tr>
</table>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		Historic Channel Samples • Preparation prior to obtaining the channel samples including grid and geo-references and marking of the pegmatite structures. • Samples were cut across the pegmatite with a diamond saw perpendicular to strike. • Average 1 metre samples are obtained, logged, removed and bagged and secured in accordance with QAQC procedures. • Sampling continued past the Spodumene -Pegmatite zone, even if it is truncated by Mafic Volcanic a later intrusion. • Samples were then transported directly to the laboratory for analysis accompanied with the log and instruction forms. • Bagging of the samples was supervised by a geologist to ensure there are no numbering mix-ups. • One tag from a triple tag book was inserted in the sample bag. As recorded, procedures were consistent with normal industry practices. Channel samples were used to aid the pegmatite interpretation but were not used in the estimate.
Drilling techniques	▪ *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).*	▪ HQ drilling was undertaken through the thin overburden prior to NQ2 diamond drilling through the primary rock. 11 holes at MCombe were drilled by Ardiden using BQTK core. ▪ Holes were drilled used a standard barrel configuration. ▪ GT1 core was orientated using a Reflex ACTIII tool located on the rear of the downhole barrel.
Drill sample recovery	▪ *Method of recording and assessing core and chip sample recoveries and results assessed.* ▪ *Measures taken to maximise sample recovery and ensure representative nature of the samples.* ▪ *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.*	▪ No core was recovered through the overburden, glacial cover, HQ section of the hole, typically the top 5m of the hole. ▪ Core recovery through the primary rock and mineralised pegmatite zones was over 97% and considered satisfactory. ▪ Recovery was determined by measuring the recovered metres in the core trays against the drillers core block depths for each run. ▪ No relationship was observed between grade and core recovery. ▪ Minor preferential lower recovery was observed in where micas were thought to have been present in the original rock.
Logging	▪ *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.*	▪ Each sample was logged for lithology, minerals, grainsize and texture as well as alteration, sulphide content, and any structures. ▪ Logging is qualitative in nature. ▪ Samples are representative of an interval or length. ▪ Sampling was undertaken for the entire cross strike length of the intersected pegmatite unit at nominal 1m intervals with breaks at geological contacts. Sampling extended into the country mafic rock. ▪ Logging is qualitative in nature based on visual estimates of mineral species and geological features. ▪ All core was photographed in both a wet and dry condition after metres marks and lithology had been transcribed onto the core surface with wax crayon.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation	▪ *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.*	▪ The bulk of the core is NQ diameter core with some BQTK Ardiden at McCombe. All recent drilling is NQ diameter core. ▪ Each ½ core sample was dried, crushed to entirety to 90% -10 mesh, riffle split (up to 5 kg) and then pulverized with hardened steel (250 g sample to 95% -150 mesh) (includes cleaner sand). ▪ Blanks and Certified Reference samples were inserted in each batch submitted to the laboratory at a rate of approximately 1:20. ▪ A proportion of the mineralised pulps were re-tested by an independent laboratory, ACTLABS, ThunderBay. ▪ The sample preparation process is considered representative of the whole core sample.
Quality of assay data and laboratory tests	▪ *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.*	▪ GT1 inserted certified ORES standards and blanks at a rate of 1:20 or better into each batch of samples submitted to the laboratory. The laboratory tested the control samples in sequence and any control failures were repeated. A failure was considered as any control sample that was outside 3 standards deviations from the certified value or where 2 controls samples were outside 2 standards deviations within the same batch. OREAS control samples were lithium certified standards, OREAS 751,752 and 753. ▪ Lithium QAQC control data results were acceptable although a slight positive bias was observed in standards around 0.5-0.7% Li and a similar negative bias around 1% Li. The biases are not considered material to the MRE.  *Figure 1 QAQC OREAS 751 Control Chart* ***Table 2 QAQC OREAS 751 Statistics***

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary

Summary Statistics		Oreas 751	
No of samples	116	Min Cert	Max Cert
Certified Value	4,675	4,165	5,185
Actual Mean	4,761	4,350	5,140
Abs Difference	85		
Rel. Difference	2%		
Records Outside 2SD	2	2%	Fail Rate
Records Outside 3SD	0	0%	Fail Rate

Figure 2 QAQC OREAS 752 Control Chart

Table 3 QAQC OREAS 752 Statistics

Summary Statistics		3SD	
No of samples	74	Min Cert	Max Cert
Certified Value	7,070	6,440	7,700
Actual Mean	7,213	6,680	7,520
Abs Difference	143		
Rel. Difference	2%		
Records Outside 2SD	1	1%	Fail Rate
Records Outside 3SD	0	0%	Fail Rate



Figure 3 OREAS 753 Li Control Chart

Table 4 OREAS 753 Li Statistics

Summary Statistics		Oreas 753	
No of samples	191	Min Cert	Max Cert
Certified Value	10,179	9,489	10,869
Actual Mean	9,979	7,620	10,700
Abs Difference	199		
Rel. Difference	2%		
Records Outside 2SD	21	11%	Fail Rate
Records Outside 3SD	3	2%	Fail Rate

- Batches that failed (2 control samples outside 2 SD or 1 control outside 3SD in the same batch) were repeated by the laboratory.
- Tantalum, whilst certified by OREAS in the standards used by GT1, was not the primary element of consideration and therefore is not ideal for economic levels of tantalum but aided in detecting untoward assay batches.
- In addition to the independent controls inserted into each batch by GT1, AGAT also conducted their own internal QAQC protocols. Their results also did not indicate any significant bias.
- The bulk of the samples were dispatched to AGAT laboratories Thunder Bay, Ontario

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		• GT1 undertook 1,530 water immersion (Archimedes) bulk density tests at McCombe and a further 2,993 measurements at Root Bay on ½ NQ core billets. • The following average figures were determined for each of the major rock types found within the modelled area and applied as an average to the corresponding blocks within the model: ***Table 5 Bulk Densities*** **McCombe** **Rock Type / Length / Bulk Density** Pegmatite / 94.58 / 2.70 Felsic / 10.49 / 2.76 Sediment / 238.39 / 3.03 Basalt / 133.95 / 2.97 **Root Bay** **Rock Type / Length / Bulk Density** Pegmatite / 143.10 / 2.70 BIF / 5.19 / 2.96 Sediment / 116.46 / 2.77 Basalt / 292.85 / 3.05
Verification of sampling and assaying	▪ *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.*	▪ Significant Li_2O intersections were verified by the site geologist as well as the competent person from core photography and visits to the Thunder Bay core facility to inspect the core first hand. Spodumene, the principal lithium bearing mineral, is a good indicator of likely Li grades and is visually conspicuous at higher Li grades. High grades were generally confirmed when comparing returned assays to the corresponding pegmatite intercepts and spodumene content. ▪ Geological logs and supporting data are uploaded directly to the database using custom built importers to ensure no chance of typographical errors. ▪ Drill and surface sample data is retained in a purpose-built SQL database managed by a third-party Database Administrator based in Denmark Western Australia. ▪ All original assay certificates are retained on the companies secure OneDrive directory. ▪ No adjustment to laboratory assay data was made. Oxide conversions were calculated for Li2O and Ta2O5 using factors of 2.153 and 1.2211 respectively.
Location of data points	▪ *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.*	▪ A GPS reading was taken for each sample location using UTM NAD83 Zone15 (for Root); waypoint averaging or dGPS was performed when possible. ▪ Lidar survey of the Root area in 2021 (+/- 0.15m) which underpins the local topographic surface. All drill collars have been draped onto the LIDAR surface to ensure accurate elevation data for the drillholes. ▪ GT1 employed a calibrated Reflex SprintIQ North Seeking Gyroscopic tool on all 2022 and 2023 drill holes and surveyed the holes in

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	▪ *Specification of the grid system used.* ▪ *Quality and adequacy of topographic control.*	their entirety with readings downhole every 5m. North Seeking gyroscopes have a typical azimuth accuracy of +/-0.75 degrees and +/-0.15 degrees for dip.  ***Figure 4 McCombe prospect area***  ***Figure 5 Root Bay prospect area*** • All collars are picked up and stored in the database in North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83) Zone 15 horizontal and geometric control datum projection for the United States.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Data spacing and distribution	▪ *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.*	▪ Drill spacing at McCombe was variable ranging from 50 x 50 to 50 x 100 with some more sparsely drilled areas of the deposit. ▪ Drill spacing at Root Bay was 100 x100 to 100 x 150m. ▪ The drill spacing is sufficient to support the inferred level of Mineral Resource classification applied to the estimate. ▪ 1m compositing was applied to the Mineral Resource update based on a review of sample interval lengths.  ***Figure 6 McCombe sample intervals***

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		 ***Figure 7 Root Bay Sample Intervals***
Orientation of data in relation to geological structure	▪ *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.*	▪ GT1 drill samples were drilled close to perpendicular to the strike of the pegmatite unit and sampled the entire length of the pegmatite as well including several metres into the mafic country rock either side of the pegmatite. Hole RB-23-001 was an exception and was drilled down the pegmatite dip direction. This hole was ignored for the Root Bay MRE. ▪ Grab and trench samples were taken where outcrop was available. All attempts were made to ensure trench samples represented traverses across strike of the pegmatite.
Sample security	▪ *The measures taken to ensure sample security.*	▪ All core and samples were supervised and secured in a locked vehicle, warehouse, or container until delivery to AGAT in Thunder Bay for cutting, preparation and analysis.
Audits or reviews	▪ *The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.*	▪ No independent audits or reviews have been undertaken on this Mineral Resource estimate.

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	▪ *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.*	▪ Green Technology Metals (ASX:GT1) owns 100% interest in the Ontario Lithium Projects (Seymour, Root and Wisa). ▪ A 1.5% NSR exists over the Root project where 0.5% is held by Primero Holdings, a subsidiary of NRW Holdings Group and 1% is held by Lithium Royalty Corp. ▪ The Root Lithium Asset consists of 249 boundary Cell mining claims (Exploration Licences), 33 mining license of occupation claims (285 total claims) with a total claim area of 5,377 ha. ▪ Generally surface rights to the Root Property remain with the Crown, except for 9 Patent Claims (PAT-51965. PAT-51966. PAT-51967. PAT-51968. PAT-51970. PAT-51974. PAT-51975. PAT-51976 and PAT-51977). ▪ All Cell Claims are in good standing.
Exploration done by other parties	▪ *Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.*	▪ Regional exploration for lithium deposits commenced in the 1950's. ▪ In 1955-1956 Capital Lithium Mines Ltd. geologically mapped and sampled dikes near the McCombe Deposit with the highest recorded channel sample of 1.52m at 3.06%Li_2O. 7 drill holes (1,042.26m total) within the McCombe Deposit and Root Lake Prospect yielding low lithium assays. According to Mulligan (1965), Capital Lithium Mines Ltd. reported to Mulligan that they drilled at least 55 holes totalling 10469.88m in 1956. They delineated 4 pegmatite zones and announced a non-compliant NI 41-101 reserve calculation of 2.297 million tons at 1.3% Li_2O. However, none of that information is available on the government database. ▪ In 1956, Consolidated Morrison Explorations Ltd drilled 16 holes (1890m total) at the Morrison prospect recording 3.96m at 2.63% Li_2O. ▪ In 1956, Three Brothers Mining Exploration southwest of the McCombe Deposit that did not intersect pegmatite ▪ In 1957, Geo-Technical Development Company Limited on behalf of Continental Mining Exploration conducted a magnetometer survey and an electromagnetic check survey on the eastern claims of the Root Lithium Project to locate pyrrhotite mineralization ▪ In 1977, Northwest Geophysics Limited on behalf of Noranda Exploration Company Ltd. conducted an electromagnetic and magnetometer survey for sulphide conductors on a small package of claims east of the Morrison Prospect. Noranda also conducted a mapping and sampling program over the same area, mapped a new pegmatite dike and sampled a graphitic schist assaying 0.03% Cu and 0.15% Zn. ▪ In 1998, Harold A. Watts prospected, trenched and sampled spodumene-bearing pegmatites with the Morrison Prospect assaying up to 5.91% Li_2O. In 2002 stripped and blasted 2 more spodumene-bearing pegmatites near the Morrison prospect. ▪ In 2005, Landore Resources Canada Inc. created a reconnaissance survey, mapping and sampling project mostly within the McCombe Deposit, but also in the Morrison and Root Lake Prospects. Highest sample was 3.69% Li_2O with the McCombe Deposit. ▪ In 2008, Rockex Ltd. on behalf of Robert Allan Ross stripped and trenched 40 trenches for iron, gold and base metals associated with oxide iron formation. All Fe assays were above 25% (up to 47.5% Fe). 3 gold zones were discovered with assays up to 4.0g/t Au in Zone A (Root Bay Gold Prospect), 1.3%g/t Au over 0.5m in Trench 9, 0.19% Cu-Zn over 8m and up to 0.14% Li_2O in Zone B. Best assays of samples collected north-east area of Root Bay had up to 394ppm Zn, 389ppm Cu, 185ppm Ni, 102ppm Co and 57.0ppm Mo. ▪ In 2009, Golden Dory Resources along with Harold A. Watts conducted a due diligence sampling program to validate historic data from the Morrison Prospect. Highest grab sample was 5.10% Li_2O and a channel sample of 5m at 4.44% Li_2O. ▪ In 2011, Geo Data Solutions GDS Inc. on behalf of Rockex Ltd. flew a high-resolution helicopter borne aeromagnetic survey intersecting a small portion of the south-central claims owned by GM1. ▪ In 2012, Stares Contracting on behalf of Golden Dory Resources Corporation conducted a ground magnetic survey near the Morrison

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		Prospect to look for magnetic contrasts between pegmatites and metasedimentary units. They also conducted a prospecting (lithium) and soil sampling (gold) program at the Rook Lake Prospect and east of the Morrison Prospect. Highest Li assays within GM1 claims was 0.0037% Li_2O and a gold soil assay of 52ppb Au. ▪ In 2016, the previous owner conducted a drilled 7 diamond drill holes (469m total) within the McCombe deposit. Highest assay was 1m at 3.8% Li_2O. A hole drilled down dip intersected 70m at 1.7% Li_2O. An outcrop sampling within the Morrison and Root Bay Prospects yielded 0.04% Li_2O. Channel sample within the Morrison Prospect had 5m at 2.09% Li_2O and within the Root Bay Prospect, 14m at 1.67% Li_2O. ▪ In 2021, KBM Resources Group on behalf of Kenorland Minerals North America Ltd. conducted an 800km^2 aerial LIDAR acquisition survey over their South Uchi Property which intersects a very small portion of the patented claims held by GM1, just west of the McCombe Deposit.
Geology	▪ *Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.*	▪ **Regional Geology**: The Root Lithium Asset is located within the Uchi Domain, predominately metavolcanic units interwoven with granitoid batholiths and English River Terrane, a highly metamorphosed to migmatized, clastic and chemical metasedimentary rock with abundant granitoid batholiths. They are part of the Superior craton, interpreted to be the amalgamation of Archean aged microcontinents and accretionary events. The boundary between the Uchi Domain and the English River Terrane is defined by the Sydney Lake – Lake St. Joseph fault, an east west trending, steeply dipping brittle ductile shear zone over 450km along strike and 1 – 3m wide. Several S-Type, peraluminous granitic plutons host rare-element mineralization near the Uchi Domain and English River subprovince boundary. These pegmatites include the Root Lake Pegmatite Group, Jubilee Lake Pegmatite Group, Sandy Creek Pegmatite and East Pashkokogan Lake Lithium Pegmatite. ▪ **Local Geology:** The Root Lithium Asset contains most of the pegmatites within the Root Lake Pegmatite Group including the McCombe Pegmatite, Morrison Prospect, Root Lake Prospect and Root Bay Prospect. The McCombe Pegmatite and Morrison Prospect are hosted in predominately mafic metavolcanic rock of the Uchi Domain. The Root Lake and Root Bay Prospects are hosted in predominately metasedimentary rocks of the English River Terrane. On the eastern end of the Root Lithium Asset there is a gold showing (Root Bay Gold Prospect) hosted in or proximal to silicate, carbonate, sulphide, and oxide iron formations of the English River Terrane. ▪ **Ore Geology**: The McCombe Pegmatite is internally zoned. These zones are classified by the tourmaline discontinuous zone along the pegmatite contact, white feldspar-rich wall zone, tourmaline-bearing, equigranular to porphyritic potassium feldspar sodic apalite zone, tourmaline-being, porphyritic potassium feldspar spodumene pegmatite zone and lepidolite-rich pods and seams (Breaks et al., 2003). Both the McCombe and Morrison pegmatites have been classified as complex-type, spodumene-subtype (Černý 1991a classification) based on the abundance of spodumene, highly evolved potassium feldspar chemistry and presence of petalite, mircolite, lepidolite and lithium-calcium liddicoatite (Breaks et al., 2003).
Drill hole Information	▪ *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:* ○ *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.* ▪ *If the exclusion of this information is*	▪ In 2016 Ardiden drilled a total of 8 diamond NQ holes and took one channel sample to test the historic McCombe pegmatites identified by earlier historic drill programs. Ardiden confirmed the presence of the pegmatites but no further work at McCombe was undertaken. ▪ Green Technology Metals Ltd have drilled 116 holes within the McCombe project area, a further 34 holes into the neighbouring Morrison prospect and 37 holes at Root Bay for a total of 34,443.13m as of 15 April 2023. ▪ All historic holes from the 50's were excluded from the MRE due to unverifiable spatial location data and QAQC validation. 3 Ardiden holes were rejected due to spatial location or hole orientation concerns and the initial Root Bay hole, RB-23-001. Channel samples were not used in the grade estimation of the MRE ▪ Drilling was contracted to G4 drilling using a NQ, standard configuration coring equipment producing 4.76cm diameter core. ▪ No visual estimates have been used in the delineation of the MRE ***Table 6 Drilling Summary table***

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	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.	

Drilling Used in the June 2023 Mineral Resource Estimate									
Company	**Ardiden**			**Green Technology Metals**					
Type	**CH**	**DDH**	**Total**	**DDH**	**DDH**	**DDH**	**DDH**	**DDH**	**Total**
Prospect	Root Bay	McCombe		McCombe	McCombe	Morrison	Morrison	Root Bay	
Year	2016	2016		2022	2023	2022	2023	2023	
Holes	1	8	9	83	37	7	27	36	187
Metres	15.00	468.50	483.50	13,101.93	7,079.00	1,230.00	4,170.00	9,3174.0	34,239.1
Proportion			1%						99%
All historic holes from the 50's were excluded from the MRE due to unverifiable spatial location data and QAQC validation. 3 Ardiden holes were rejected due to spatial location or hole orientation concerns. Channel samples were not used in the grade estimation of the MRE									

- Drilling used in Mineral Resource Estimates to 15 April 2023.
- McCombe MRE Drill Collars for the 89 holes used to interpolate the model grades were as follows:

Table 7 McCombe Drill Collar data

HoleID	Easting	Northing	RL	Dip	Azimuth	Depth
RL-16-01A	590,792	5,643,600	398	- 45	357	75
RL-16-03	590,725	5,643,582	394	- 45	-	72
RL-16-04	590,726	5,643,623	398	- 45	-	41
RL-16-05	590,853	5,643,552	393	- 45	-	80
RL-16-07	590,848	5,643,594	396	- 45	-	54
RL-22-001	590,698	5,643,630	398	- 59	359	60
RL-22-002	590,704	5,643,578	394	- 62	1	72
RL-22-003	590,699	5,643,517	394	- 58	359	102
RL-22-004	590,698	5,643,483	395	- 61	358	144
RL-22-005	590,699	5,643,421	394	- 60	360	147
RL-22-006	590,800	5,643,605	398	- 59	1	120
RL-22-007	590,799	5,643,549	393	- 61	360	117

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary

RL-22-008	590,802	5,643,504	392	-61	0	162
RL-22-009	590,799	5,643,441	394	-61	3	186
RL-22-010	590,792	5,643,407	392	-61	359	150
RL-22-011	590,792	5,643,406	392	-86	89	180
RL-22-013	590,903	5,643,644	397	-61	360	132
RL-22-014	590,902	5,643,596	396	-59	2	129
RL-22-015	590,952	5,643,702	392	-61	1	93
RL-22-016A	590,899	5,643,546	394	-61	3	156
RL-22-017	590,951	5,643,556	397	-59	348	120
RL-22-018	591,002	5,643,702	390	-61	2	90
RL-22-019	591,002	5,643,575	396	-60	3	120
RL-22-020	591,001	5,643,499	388	-61	359	150
RL-22-021	590,901	5,643,500	397	-60	3	150
RL-22-022	590,648	5,643,529	394	-59	1	152
RL-22-023	590,700	5,643,630	398	-61	3	189
RL-22-024	590,642	5,643,428	392	-60	3	150
RL-22-025	590,851	5,643,597	396	-60	1	141
RL-22-027	590,853	5,643,653	397	-59	359	108
RL-22-028	591,123	5,643,856	391	-60	316	150
RL-22-029	590,850	5,643,475	392	-60	1	227
RL-22-033	590,600	5,643,476	395	-58	5	162
RL-22-035	590,650	5,643,480	397	-59	1	162
RL-22-037	590,598	5,643,421	392	-60	1	180
RL-22-038	591,050	5,643,709	390	-60	1	141
RL-22-039	590,600	5,643,375	392	-60	357	201
RL-22-040	591,048	5,643,679	389	-62	0	126
RL-22-041	590,649	5,643,405	391	-59	0	210
RL-22-387	590,652	5,643,578	394	-60	356	123

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary

RL-22-461	590,951	5,643,616	394	- 60	1	107
RL-22-490	591,053	5,643,521	389	- 60	8	201
RL-22-499	591,100	5,643,725	389	- 61	1	120
RL-22-501	591,153	5,643,752	388	- 60	2	201
RL-22-505	591,198	5,643,775	388	- 59	359	210
RL-22-521	590,547	5,643,432	391	- 59	360	180
RL-22-526	590,698	5,643,373	390	- 60	1	180
RL-22-529	591,152	5,643,808	389	- 59	320	150
RL-22-530	591,197	5,643,826	390	- 59	322	150
RL-22-531	591,241	5,643,847	391	- 61	321	150
RL-22-532	591,199	5,643,775	388	- 85	320	231
RL-22-533	591,153	5,643,752	388	- 86	313	204
RL-22-534	591,251	5,643,797	388	- 61	320	201
RL-22-535	591,300	5,643,864	391	- 60	322	150
RL-22-536	591,304	5,643,808	390	- 60	320	180
RL-22-537	591,299	5,643,763	388	- 58	322	201
RL-22-538	590,619	5,643,435	392	- 45	302	102
RL-22-539	590,619	5,643,435	392	- 70	300	117
RL-22-540	591,357	5,643,875	392	- 59	322	150
RL-22-541	591,353	5,643,831	389	- 59	322	180
RL-22-542	591,351	5,643,776	388	- 59	318	252
RL-22-543	591,351	5,643,776	388	- 74	323	252
RL-22-548	591,394	5,643,851	389	- 60	321	192
RL-22-549	591,394	5,643,800	388	- 59	319	249
RL-22-550	591,441	5,643,838	389	- 59	313	150
RL-22-571	591,735	5,643,768	391	- 49	1	273
RL-23-044	591,054	5,643,576	397	- 60	1	381
RL-23-353	591,939	5,643,553	393	- 61	359	221

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary

RL-23-442	590,908	5,643,457	388	-74	3	168
RL-23-452	590,905	5,643,706	392	-60	1	201
RL-23-454	590,898	5,643,750	391	-60	320	180
RL-23-480	591,002	5,643,748	390	-59	1	201
RL-23-544A	591,021	5,643,340	393	-61	319	225
RL-23-545	591,099	5,643,364	395	-60	321	225
RL-23-546	590,957	5,643,327	388	-59	321	210
RL-23-553	591,441	5,643,838	389	-46	318	120
RL-23-554	591,057	5,643,750	389	-45	1	150
RL-23-556	591,103	5,643,360	395	-60	12	222
RL-23-558	591,099	5,643,365	395	-82	314	210
RL-23-560	591,257	5,643,589	388	-57	335	351
RL-23-561	591,103	5,643,360	395	-45	354	225
RL-23-567	591,557	5,643,890	388	-44	350	129
RL-23-568C	591,499	5,643,851	388	-75	348	132
RL-23-569	591,499	5,643,855	388	-45	353	120
RL-23-570	591,557	5,643,886	388	-83	350	120
RL-23-572	591,705	5,643,654	390	-60	2	240
RL-23-573	591,153	5,643,326	394	-80	13	201
RL-23-575	591,492	5,643,858	388	-88	131	324
RL-23-576	591,595	5,643,696	388	-55	4	270

- Root Bay Collars

Table 8 Root Bay Collar data

Prospect	HoleID	Easting	Northing	RL	Dip	Azi	Depth
Root Bay	RB-23-001*	600,403	5,642,412	434	-45	91	204

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary

Root Bay	RB-23-003	600,493	5,642,405	439	-60	271	201
Root Bay	RB-23-005	600,601	5,642,407	438	-60	266	210
Root Bay	RB-23-007	600,686	5,642,401	435	-60	272	231
Root Bay	RB-23-009	600,795	5,642,399	430	-61	271	288
Root Bay	RB-23-011	600,901	5,642,392	432	-60	283	353
Root Bay	RB-23-013	600,997	5,642,397	443	-60	272	402
Root Bay	RB-23-014	600,397	5,642,445	434	-61	273	321
Root Bay	RB-23-016	600,496	5,642,451	437	-61	274	162
Root Bay	RB-23-029	600,496	5,642,345	428	-60	274	171
Root Bay	RB-23-040	600,393	5,642,498	432	-60	273	324
Root Bay	RB-23-042	600,487	5,642,504	431	-60	272	168
Root Bay	RB-23-044	600,597	5,642,495	435	-60	272	189
Root Bay	RB-23-046	600,693	5,642,499	438	-61	272	252
Root Bay	RB-23-048	600,794	5,642,499	435	-60	272	291
Root Bay	RB-23-050	600,897	5,642,499	434	-60	272	354
Root Bay	RB-23-053	600,401	5,642,302	394	-46	71	219
Root Bay	RB-23-057	600,600	5,642,300	418	-61	272	192
Root Bay	RB-23-081	600,243	5,642,448	435	-60	269	351
Root Bay	RB-23-083	600,153	5,642,444	433	-60	268	324
Root Bay	RB-23-085	600,045	5,642,458	428	-45	270	228
Root Bay	RB-23-088	599,897	5,642,452	429	-45	271	201
Root Bay	RB-23-091	599,785	5,642,444	425	-45	271	207
Root Bay	RB-23-098	600,042	5,642,352	422	-60	271	273
Root Bay	RB-23-102	599,851	5,642,349	420	-59	272	162

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		(continued – drill hole table below)

Root Bay	RB-23-132	600,403	5,642,304	391	- 60	271	120
Root Bay	RB-23-148	600,240	5,642,550	431	- 60	271	369
Root Bay	RB-23-152	600,040	5,642,544	435	- 60	271	300
Root Bay	RB-23-156	599,846	5,642,545	422	- 60	271	120
Root Bay	RB-23-161	600,492	5,642,650	432	- 60	272	201
Root Bay	RB-23-165	600,693	5,642,648	434	- 60	272	231
Root Bay	RB-23-169	600,892	5,642,653	432	- 61	273	411
Root Bay	RB-23-174	600,244	5,642,650	433	- 60	271	347
Root Bay	RB-23-178	600,043	5,642,652	432	- 60	273	222
Root Bay	RB-23-182	599,851	5,642,646	427	- 60	271	126
Root Bay	RB-23-195	600,896	5,642,753	431	- 60	278	312
Root Bay	RB-23-200	600,310	5,642,747	434	- 60	272	342

* **Hole RB-23-001 was not drilled tangential to strike and the intervals quoted are not representative of, or similar to, the pegmatite true widths intercepts. The hole was not used in the Root Bay MRE.**

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Data aggregation methods	▪ *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.* ▪ *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.* ▪ *The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values should be clearly stated.*	▪ length weighted averages and all resource estimates are tonnage weighted averages ▪ Grade cut-offs have not been incorporated. ▪ No metal equivalent values are quoted.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths	▪ *These relationships are particularly important in the reporting of Exploration Results.* ▪ *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 (eg 'down hole length, true width not known').*	▪ McCombe holes drilled by GT1 attempt to pierce the mineralised pegmatite approximately perpendicular to strike, and therefore, most of the downhole intercepts reported are approximately equivalent to the true width of the mineralisation. ▪ Root Bay intercepts are reported as downhole depths and are generally drilled tangential to pegmatite strike and dip except for hole RB-23-001 which was drilled downdip of the initial pegmatite to confirm downdip mineralisation continuity. ▪ Trenches are representative widths of the exposed pegmatite outcrop. Some exposure may not be a complete representation of the total pegmatite width due to recent glacial deposit cover limiting the available material to be sampled.
Diagrams	▪ *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.*	▪ The appropriate maps are included in the announcement for the Root deposit.

Balanced reporting	▪ *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.*	▪ Downhole interval summary with associated assay results is listed in Appendix B

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Other substantive exploration data	▪ *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.*	
Further work	▪ *The nature and scale of planned further work (eg tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling).* ▪ *Diagrams clearly highlighting the areas of possible extensions, including the main geological interpretations and future drilling areas, provided this information is not commercially sensitive.*	▪ Further geological field mapping of anomalies and associated pegmatites at Root and regional claims ▪ Sampling country rock to assist in LCT pegmatite vector analysis and target generation. ▪ Infill drilling at the McCombe deposit to improve the deposits resource confidence. ▪ Commencement of detailed mining studies ▪ Further exploration and extension of the Root Bay pegmatites discovered to date.

Section 3 Estimation and Reporting of Mineral Resources – (McCombe and Root deposit)

(Criteria listed in section 1, and where relevant in section 2, also apply to this section.)

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Database integrity	▪ *Measures taken to ensure that data has not been corrupted by, for example, transcription or keying errors, between its initial collection and its use for Mineral Resource estimation purposes.* ▪ *Data validation procedures used.*	▪ Data was imported into the database directly from source geology logs and laboratory csv files. Was then passed through a series of validation checks before final acceptance of the data for downstream use.
Site visits	▪ *Comment on any site visits undertaken by the Competent Person and the outcome of those visits.* ▪ *If no site visits have been undertaken indicate why this is the case.*	▪ A site visit to the Root area was undertaken by the Competent Person (John Winterbottom) between 14th and 15th March 2023; general site layout, drilling sites, diamond drilling operations were viewed, plus diamond core in the storage facility Thunder Bay.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Geological interpretation	▪ *Confidence in (or conversely, the uncertainty of) the geological interpretation of the mineral deposit.* ▪ *Nature of the data used and of any assumptions made.* ▪ *The effect, if any, of alternative interpretations on Mineral Resource estimation.* ▪ *The use of geology in guiding and controlling Mineral Resource estimation.* ▪ *The factors affecting continuity both of grade and geology.*	▪ There is sufficient confidence in the geological interpretation of the McCombe and Root Bay deposits in most areas; there are some areas of uncertainty at the outer limits of the deposits where drill spacing is sparse. ▪ Interpretation was made directly from pegmatites noted in geological logs and confirmation through core photographs. ▪ Alternative geological interpretation would have a minimal effect on the resource estimate. ▪ Pegmatite intrusions were used to constrain the mineral resource estimation.
Dimensions	▪ *The extent and variability of the Mineral Resource expressed as length (along strike or otherwise), plan width, and depth below surface to the upper and lower limits of the Mineral Resource.*	**McCombe** • The deposit consists of 6 LCT pegmatite units of varying thicknesses and attitudes. • The McCombe deposit has a total strike extent of approximately 1,500m and has been drilled to a down dip depth of over 250m. McCombes pegmatites varying in strike direction from east-west to southwest-northeast and all dip towards the south or southeast at varying degrees of inclination ranging from 40 to 70 degrees.  ***Figure 8 McCombe pegmatites – Plan view*** **Root Bay** • The deposit consists of 13 LCT pegmatite units of varying thicknesses and attitudes.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		• The Root Bay deposit has a total strike extent of approximately 200m along a 1300m trend and has been drilled to a down dip depth of over 500m (250m from surface) • .Root Bays pegmatites strike direction from north-south and moderately dip towards the east.  ***Figure 9 Root Bay Pegmatites - Looking North***
Estimation and modelling techniques	▪ *The nature and appropriateness of the estimation technique(s) applied and key assumptions, including treatment of extreme grade values, domaining, interpolation parameters and maximum distance of extrapolation from data points. If a computer assisted estimation method was chosen include a description of computer software and parameters used.* ▪ *The availability of check estimates, previous estimates and/or mine production records and whether the Mineral Resource estimate takes*	▪ An Ordinary Kriging (OK) grade estimation methodology has been used for Li_2O in the Mineral Resource Estimate which is considered appropriate for the style of mineralisation under review. OK was also applied to important potential bi-product or deleterious elements (Ta2O5, K, Fe, S). ▪ Geological units were first interpreted in Leapfrog 2022.1.1 software from geological logs and core photography references. ▪ Each pegmatite was assigned its own domain and drill intercepts flagged with the corresponding domain name. ▪ Wireframes were also generated for the enclosing country rock including, the glacial overburden, felsic intrusives and the greenstone sediments and basalt units. ▪ Data was composited to 1m length to geological contacts and exploratory data analysis was performed each of the pegmatite units.

<table>
<tr><th>Criteria</th><th>JORC Code explanation</th><th>Commentary</th></tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>

appropriate account of such data.

- *The assumptions made regarding recovery of by-products.*
- *Estimation of deleterious elements or other non-grade variables of economic significance (eg sulphur for acid mine drainage characterisation).*
- *In the case of block model interpolation, the block size in relation to the average sample spacing and the search employed.*
- *Any assumptions behind modelling of selective mining units.*
- *Any assumptions about correlation between variables.*
- *Description of how the geological interpretation was used to control the resource estimates.*
- *Discussion of basis for using or not using grade cutting or capping.*
- *The process of validation, the checking process used, the comparison of model data to drill hole data, and use of reconciliation data if available.*

</td>
<td>



Figure 10 MCombe Intervals



Figure 11 Root Bay Intervals

- Li2O showed poor correlation with the other elements of interest.

</td>
</tr>
</table>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		Table 9 McCombe Element Correlation

Field Name	Li20 ppm	Ta205 ppm	Rb20 ppm	Cs20 ppm	Ca ppm	Fe ppm	Mg ppm	K ppm	S ppm
Correlation Matrix									
Li20 ppm	100%								
Ta205 ppm	7%	100%							
Rb20 ppm	19%	-7%	100%						
Cs20 ppm	9%	1%	58%	100%					
Ca ppm	-26%	-45%	-29%	-4%	100%				
Fe ppm	-18%	-47%	-27%	4%	91%	100%			
Mg ppm	-22%	-48%	-25%	9%	89%	91%	100%		
K ppm	5%	-16%	86%	44%	-31%	-29%	-28%	100%	
S ppm	-12%	-21%	-15%	-7%	48%	54%	35%	-14%	100%

Table 10 Root Bay Element Correlation

Field Name	Li2O ppm	Ta2O5 ppm	Rb2O ppm	Cs2O ppm	Ca ppm	Fe ppm	Mg ppm	K ppm	S ppm
Correlation Matrix									
Li2O ppm	100%								
Ta2O5 ppm	-22%	100%							
Rb2O ppm	14%	17%	100%						
Cs2O ppm	20%	36%	72%	100%					
Ca ppm	-38%	-9%	-31%	-21%	100%				
Fe ppm	-26%	-12%	-33%	-19%	83%	100%			
Mg ppm	-34%	-6%	-35%	-19%	88%	94%	100%		
K ppm	7%	-21%	75%	29%	-33%	-34%	-36%	100%	
S ppm	-16%	-6%	-15%	-11%	35%	52%	40%	-14%	100%

- Data statistics was evaluated for each element within each domain including mean, coefficient of variation and grade distribution.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		• Most domains showed a log normal distribution. John Pegmatite, the thickest unit, showed a bimodal distribution of Li_2O. A high-grade sub-domain was generated in an attempt to better confine the two populations. A 0.5% Li_2O envelope was created within the John Pegmatite using Leapfrog numerical modelling to better sub-domain the higher-grade zones within the pegmatite. • Histograms below demonstrate that the sub-domaining was reasonably effective in achieving this objective.  ***Figure 12 McCombe Pegmatite John Li2O Histogram***

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		 ***Figure 13 McCombe Pegmatite John sub-domained comparison histograms*** • Most pegmatites within the Root Bay deposit showed low lithium variability and did not require further sub-domaining.



Figure 14 Root Bay – Pegmatite RB006 Li_2O ppm histogram

Sample data was composited to 1m down-hole composites, while honouring geological contacts at both deposits. Residual lengths were distributed evenly across the interval.

- Variography was carried out to define the variogram models for the Ordinary Kriging (OK) interpolation.

Top cut

Top cut analysis was carried out to identify extreme outliers, using a combination of plots, and histograms and coefficient of variation. No top cuts have been applied to estimated elements. Instead, outlier values were clamped at 50% of the variogram range above the identified outlier cut-off for each element within each domain.

- Top cuts were applied to some Root Bay pegmatites, Table 4

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		

			***Figure 15 John High Grade (HG) Statistics***

![Green Technology Metals logo]



Figure 16 Root Bay Pegmatite RB006 Composite Statistics

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary



Figure 17 Root Bay Pegmatite RB006 Composite Statistics

Summary Statistics McCombe Pegmatites

Table 11 McCombe SummaryStatistics

Parameter	Li2O_ppm Pegmatite - Amy	Li2O_ppm Pegmatite - Andrea	Li2O_ppm Pegmatite - John	Li2O_ppm Pegmatite - John HG	Li2O_ppm Pegmatite - Luke	Li2O_ppm Pegmatite-Breanne
Vertices:	481	2,167	2,822	2,539	408	3,403
Triangles:	958	4,330	5,640	5,078	816	6,802
Volume:	39,585	480,490	914,020	628,260	13,515	1,157,000

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary

Area:	54,543	273,680	356,080	230,020	14,268	669,830
Parts:	1	2	1	1	1	1
Closed:	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
Consistent:	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
Manifold:	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
Number of points:	23	162	64	268	18	150
Number of Values:	23	162	64	268	18	150
Min Value:	257	160	69	299	415	77
Lower Quartile:	483	1,270	483	7,000	2,613	258
Median:	4,284	7,319	749	13,756	7,313	1,938
Upper Quartile:	10,753	18,592	2,725	17,836	15,551	13,849
Max Value:	25,422	40,556	20,924	36,165	21,528	32,721
Clamped	N/A	35000	18000	30000	N/A	25000
Mean:	6,297	10,778	3,155	12,835	8,848	6,891
Cut: Mean	6,297	10,778	3,155	12,835	8,848	6,891
Declustered Mean	5,960	8,965	2,480	11,607	7,518	6,545
Std Deviation:	7,199	10,122	5,092	7,406	7,094	8,521
Variance:	51,821,300	102,444,000	25,932,000	54,855,800	50,320,800	72,608,700

Table 12 – Summary Statistics Root Bay Pegmatites

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary

Statistics weighting: Length-weighted

Name	Count	Length	Mean	Standard deviation	CoV	Variance	Min	Lower quartile	Median	Upper quartile	Max
Pegmatite_RB001	84	79.85									
Li2O_ppm	84	79.85	12,702	5,467	0.43	29,888,759	159	10,354	13,239	16,662	21,354
Cut_Li2O_ppm	84	79.85	12,702	5,467	0.43	29,888,759	159	10,354	13,239	16,662	21,354
Interval Length	84	n/a	1	0	0.16	0.02	0.45	0.90	1.00	1.00	1.30
Pegmatite_RB002	29	26.73									
Li2O_ppm	29	26.73	11,038	5,351	0.48	28,636,157	301	7,254	11,495	14,746	24,971
Cut_Li2O_ppm	29	26.73	11,038	5,351	0.48	28,636,157	301	7,254	11,495	14,746	24,971
Interval Length	29	n/a	1	0	0.21	0.04	0.40	0.80	1.00	1.00	1.20
Pegmatite_RB003	50	42.72									
Li2O_ppm	50	42.72	7,233	7,153	0.99	51,159,880	75	506	5,037	13,347	22,388
Cut_Li2O_ppm	50	42.72	7,233	7,153	0.99	51,159,880	75	506	5,037	13,347	22,388
Interval Length	50	n/a	1	0	0.24	0.04	0.45	0.70	0.92	1.00	1.25
Pegmatite_RB004	20	16.88									
Li2O_ppm	20	16.88	3,351	4,942	1.47	24,421,936	110	319	760	5,188	17,221
Cut_Li2O_ppm	20	16.88	2,621	3,089	1.18	9,543,299	110	319	760	5,188	9,000
Interval Length	20	n/a	1	0	0.17	0.02	0.48	0.76	0.85	1.00	1.00
Pegmatite_RB005	10	8.84									
Li2O_ppm	10	8.84	12,591	5,456	0.43	29,764,553	6,824	8,266	9,709	17,953	21,268
Cut_Li2O_ppm	10	8.84	12,591	5,456	0.43	29,764,553	6,824	8,266	9,709	17,953	21,268
Interval Length	10	n/a	1	0	0.16	0.02	0.60	0.83	0.84	1.04	1.07
Pegmatite_RB006	124	119.28									
Li2O_ppm	124	119.28	15,835	4,413	0.28	19,470,881	2,583	12,959	16,274	18,943	26,047
Cut_Li2O_ppm	124	119.28	15,835	4,413	0.28	19,470,881	2,583	12,959	16,274	18,943	26,047

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary

Interval Length	124	n/a	1	0	0.14	0.02	0.49	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.38
Pegmatite_RB007	36	32.60									
Li2O_ppm	36	32.60	14,731	4,967	0.34	24,667,576	2,540	12,270	15,564	18,104	24,110
Cut_Li2O_ppm	36	32.60	14,731	4,967	0.34	24,667,576	2,540	12,270	15,564	18,104	24,110
Interval Length	36	n/a	1	0	0.20	0.03	0.57	0.75	1.00	1.00	1.35
Pegmatite_RB008	5	4.51									
Li2O_ppm	5	4.51	9,012	6,748	0.75	45,529,229	344	385	11,000	12,507	15,714
Cut_Li2O_ppm	5	4.51	9,012	6,748	0.75	45,529,229	344	385	11,000	12,507	15,714
Interval Length	5	n/a	1	0	0.33	0.09	0.43	0.90	0.95	0.98	1.25
Pegmatite_RB009	7	6.71									
Li2O_ppm	7	6.71	7,588	4,703	0.62	22,114,139	1,638	4,973	5,597	11,129	16,102
Cut_Li2O_ppm	7	6.71	7,588	4,703	0.62	22,114,139	1,638	4,973	5,597	11,129	16,102
Interval Length	7	n/a	1	0	0.19	0.03	0.67	0.80	1.00	1.00	1.24
Pegmatite_RB010	6	4.36									
Li2O_ppm	6	4.36	1,748	2,767	1.58	7,654,740	125	159	721	1,666	7,362
Cut_Li2O_ppm	6	4.36	1,369	1,836	1.34	3,371,601	125	159	721	1,666	5,000
Interval Length	6	n/a	1	0	0.33	0.06	0.30	0.70	0.70	0.85	1.00
Pegmatite_RB011	7	5.37									
Li2O_ppm	7	5.37	2,915	5,702	1.96	32,513,328	41	359	424	5,296	19,073
Cut_Li2O_ppm	7	5.37	2,915	5,702	1.96	32,513,328	41	359	424	5,296	19,073
Interval Length	7	n/a	1	0	0.34	0.07	0.45	0.50	0.76	1.00	1.15
Pegmatite_RB012	6	3.73									
Li2O_ppm	6	3.73	4,532	3,277	0.72	10,736,402	161	198	5,662	7,341	7,341
Cut_Li2O_ppm	6	3.73	4,532	3,277	0.72	10,736,402	161	198	5,662	7,341	7,341
Interval Length	6	n/a	1	0	0.33	0.04	0.43	0.50	0.53	0.67	1.01
Pegmatite_RB013	19	16.87									
Li2O_ppm	19	16.87	7,267	7,893	1.09	62,301,113	125	908	3,552	10,074	24,971
Cut_Li2O_ppm	19	16.87	7,267	7,893	1.09	62,301,113	125	908	3,552	10,074	24,971

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary

Interval Length	19	n/a	1	0	0.28	0.06	0.44	0.65	1.00	1.00	1.25

- *Variography*

Variograms models were constructed for each element estimated for each pegmatite domain. Variogram model parameters have been summarised in Table 5 for McCombe and Table 6 for Root Bay. Domains that had poorer data support used variograms from the better supported pegmatites orientated to each pegmatite's orientation. Estimation searches were aligned to variogram directions.



Figure 18 John HG Li2O Variogram and fitted model



Figure 19 John HG Ta2O5 Variogram and fitted model



Figure 20 – Root Bay Pegmatite RB006 Li_2O Variogram and fitted model

Variogram model parameters

Table 13 McCombe Variogram models

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary

General	Direction				Structure 1					Structure 2				
Variogram Name	**Dip**	**Dip Azimuth**	**Pitch**	**Normalised Nugget**	**Normalised sill**	**Structure**	**Major**	**Semi-major**	**Minor**	**Normalised sill**	**Structure**	**Major**	**Semi-major**	**Minor**
Fe_ppm Pegmatite - Amy	41	216	17	0.14	0.44	Spherical	50	46	2	0.42	Spherical	150	100	4
Fe_ppm Pegmatite - Andrea	67	157	17	0.14	0.44	Spherical	50	46	2	0.42	Spherical	150	100	4
Fe_ppm Pegmatite - John HG	26	176	59	0.10	0.66	Spherical	55	112	5	0.24	Spherical	129	116	7
Fe_ppm Pegmatite - John	26	176	59	0.10	0.60	Spherical	64	42	5	0.30	Spherical	137	115	7
Fe_ppm Pegmatite - Luke	67	157	17	0.14	0.44	Spherical	50	46	2	0.42	Spherical	150	100	4
Fe_ppm Pegmatite - Nathan	27	170	22	0.14	0.44	Spherical	50	46	2	0.42	Spherical	150	100	4
Fe_ppm Pegmatite-Breanne	69	169	8	0.10	0.03	Spherical	64	80	2	0.87	Spherical	104	102	5
K_ppm Pegmatite - Amy	49	217	16	0.10	0.38	Spherical	9	39	5	0.52	Spherical	67	67	7
K_ppm Pegmatite - Andrea	67	157	17	0.14	0.44	Spherical	50	46	2	0.42	Spherical	150	100	4
K_ppm Pegmatite - John HG	26	176	59	0.10	0.60	Spherical	64	42	5	0.30	Spherical	137	115	7
K_ppm Pegmatite - John	26	176	59	0.10	0.60	Spherical	64	42	5	0.30	Spherical	137	115	7
K_ppm Pegmatite - Luke	67	157	17	0.14	0.44	Spherical	50	46	2	0.42	Spherical	150	100	4
K_ppm Pegmatite - Nathan	27	170	22	0.14	0.44	Spherical	50	46	2	0.42	Spherical	150	100	4
K_ppm Pegmatite-Breanne	69	169	8	0.10	0.03	Spherical	64	80	2	0.87	Spherical	104	102	5
Li2O_ppm Pegmatite - Amy	49	217	16	0.10	0.44	Spherical	37	42	5	0.46	Spherical	87	51	7
Li2O_ppm Pegmatite - Andrea	67	157	17	0.14	0.44	Spherical	50	46	2	0.42	Spherical	150	100	4

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary													
		Li2O_ppm Pegmatite - John HG	26	176	59	0.10	0.79	Spherical	35	43	5	0.11	Spherical	111	82	7
		Li2O_ppm Pegmatite - John	26	176	66	0.19	0.29	Spherical	34	27	7	0.52	Spherical	120	138	10
		Li2O_ppm Pegmatite - Luke	67	157	17	0.14	0.44	Spherical	50	46	2	0.42	Spherical	150	100	4
		Li2O_ppm Pegmatite - Nathan	27	170	22	0.14	0.44	Spherical	50	46	2	0.42	Spherical	150	100	4
		Li2O_ppm Pegmatite- Breanne	69	169	8	0.10	0.03	Spherical	64	80	2	0.87	Spherical	104	102	5
		Mg_ppm Pegmatite - Nathan	27	170	22	0.14	0.44	Spherical	50	46	2	0.42	Spherical	150	100	4
		S_ppm Pegmatite - Amy	49	217	16	0.10	0.44	Spherical	37	42	5	0.46	Spherical	87	51	7
		S_ppm Pegmatite - Andrea	67	157	17	0.14	0.44	Spherical	50	46	2	0.42	Spherical	150	100	4
		S_ppm Pegmatite - John HG	26	176	59	0.10	0.60	Spherical	64	42	5	0.30	Spherical	137	115	7
		S_ppm Pegmatite - John	26	176	59	0.10	0.60	Spherical	64	42	5	0.30	Spherical	137	115	7
		S_ppm Pegmatite - Luke	67	157	17	0.14	0.44	Spherical	50	46	2	0.42	Spherical	150	100	4
		S_ppm Pegmatite - Nathan	27	170	22	0.14	0.44	Spherical	50	46	2	0.42	Spherical	150	100	4
		S_ppm Pegmatite- Breanne	69	169	8	0.10	0.03	Spherical	64	80	2	0.87	Spherical	104	102	5
		Ta2O5_ppm Pegmatite - Amy	49	217	16	0.10	0.44	Spherical	37	42	5	0.46	Spherical	67	51	7
		Ta2O5_ppm Pegmatite - Andrea	67	157	17	0.14	0.44	Spherical	50	46	2	0.42	Spherical	150	100	4
		Ta2O5_ppm Pegmatite - John HG	26	176	59	0.10	0.59	Spherical	64	46	6	0.31	Spherical	137	115	11
		Ta2O5_ppm Pegmatite - John	26	176	66	0.19	0.29	Spherical	34	27	7	0.52	Spherical	120	138	10
		Ta2O5_ppm Pegmatite - Luke	67	157	17	0.14	0.44	Spherical	50	46	2	0.42	Spherical	150	100	4

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary

Ta2O5_ppm Pegmatite - Nathan	27	170	22	0.14	0.44	Spherical	50	46	2	0.42	Spherical	150	100	4
Ta2O5_ppm Pegmatite-Breanne	69	169	8	0.10	0.03	Spherical	64	80	2	0.87	Spherical	104	102	5

Table 14 Root Bay Variogram model parameters

General	Direction				Structure 1					Structure 1				
Variogram Name	**Dip**	**Dip Azi.**	**Pitch**	**Norm. Nugget**	**Norm. sill**	**Str**	**Major**	**Semi-major**	**Minor**	**Norm. sill**	**Str**	**Major**	**Semi-major**	**Minor**
Ca_ppm Pegmatite_RB001	33	115	67	0.11	0.37	Sph	102	61	5	0.52	Sph	221	130	9
Ca_ppm Pegmatite_RB002	38	113	79	0.11	0.32	Sph	72	94	3	0.57	Sph	120	120	6
Ca_ppm Pegmatite_RB003	34	120	72	0.08	0.43	Sph	72	61	5	0.49	Sph	104	97	6
Ca_ppm Pegmatite_RB004	30	108	82	0.11	0.30	Sph	38	13	1	0.59	Sph	122	67	6
Ca_ppm Pegmatite_RB005	39	117	71	0.11	0.30	Sph	38	13	1	0.59	Sph	122	67	6
Ca_ppm Pegmatite_RB006	39	117	65	0.11	0.37	Sph	58	32	3	0.52	Sph	145	108	5
Ca_ppm Pegmatite_RB007	52	119	71	0.11	0.29	Sph	58	13	1	0.60	Sph	113	103	1
Ca_ppm Pegmatite_RB008	32	128	59	0.11	0.56	Sph	58	13	0	0.33	Sph	71	50	1
Ca_ppm Pegmatite_RB009	39	117	65	0.11	0.20	Sph	58	13	2	0.69	Sph	120	103	6
Ca_ppm Pegmatite_RB010	39	117	65	0.11	0.20	Sph	58	13	2	0.69	Sph	120	103	6
Ca_ppm Pegmatite_RB011	36	127	57	0.11	0.31	Sph	58	38	2	0.58	Sph	143	103	4
Ca_ppm Pegmatite_RB012	39	121	69	0.11	0.30	Sph	58	33	1	0.59	Sph	113	103	3
Ca_ppm Pegmatite_RB013	19	96	79	0.11	0.29	Sph	58	36	1	0.60	Sph	113	103	2
Cs2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB001	33	115	67	0.11	0.37	Sph	102	61	5	0.52	Sph	221	130	9

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary

Cs2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB002	38	113	79	0.11	0.32	Sph	72	94	3	0.57	Sph	120	120	6
Cs2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB003	34	120	72	0.08	0.43	Sph	72	61	5	0.49	Sph	104	97	6
Cs2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB004	30	108	82	0.11	0.30	Sph	38	13	1	0.59	Sph	122	67	6
Cs2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB005	39	117	71	0.11	0.30	Sph	38	13	1	0.59	Sph	122	67	6
Cs2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB006	39	117	65	0.11	0.37	Sph	58	32	3	0.52	Sph	145	108	5
Cs2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB007	52	119	71	0.11	0.29	Sph	58	13	1	0.60	Sph	113	103	1
Cs2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB008	32	128	59	0.11	0.56	Sph	58	13	0	0.33	Sph	71	50	1
Cs2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB009	39	117	65	0.11	0.20	Sph	58	13	2	0.69	Sph	120	103	6
Cs2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB010	39	117	65	0.11	0.20	Sph	58	13	2	0.69	Sph	120	103	6
Cs2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB011	36	127	57	0.11	0.31	Sph	58	38	2	0.58	Sph	143	103	4
Cs2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB012	39	121	69	0.11	0.30	Sph	58	33	1	0.59	Sph	113	103	3
Cs2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB013	19	96	79	0.11	0.29	Sph	58	36	1	0.60	Sph	113	103	2
Fe_ppm Pegmatite_RB001	33	115	67	0.11	0.37	Sph	102	61	5	0.52	Sph	221	130	9
Fe_ppm Pegmatite_RB002	38	113	79	0.11	0.32	Sph	72	94	3	0.57	Sph	120	120	6
Fe_ppm Pegmatite_RB003	34	120	72	0.08	0.43	Sph	72	61	5	0.49	Sph	104	97	6
Fe_ppm Pegmatite_RB004	30	108	82	0.11	0.30	Sph	38	13	1	0.59	Sph	122	67	6
Fe_ppm Pegmatite_RB005	39	117	71	0.11	0.30	Sph	38	13	1	0.59	Sph	122	67	6
Fe_ppm Pegmatite_RB006	39	117	65	0.11	0.37	Sph	58	32	3	0.52	Sph	145	108	5
Fe_ppm Pegmatite_RB007	52	119	71	0.11	0.29	Sph	58	13	1	0.60	Sph	113	103	1
Fe_ppm Pegmatite_RB008	32	128	59	0.11	0.56	Sph	58	13	0	0.33	Sph	71	50	1
Fe_ppm Pegmatite_RB009	39	117	65	0.11	0.20	Sph	58	13	2	0.69	Sph	120	103	6
Fe_ppm Pegmatite_RB010	39	117	65	0.11	0.20	Sph	58	13	2	0.69	Sph	120	103	6
Fe_ppm Pegmatite_RB011	36	127	57	0.11	0.31	Sph	58	38	2	0.58	Sph	143	103	4
Fe_ppm Pegmatite_RB012	39	121	69	0.11	0.30	Sph	58	33	1	0.59	Sph	113	103	3

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary

Fe_ppm Pegmatite_RB013	19	96	79	0.11	0.29	Sph	58	36	1	0.60	Sph	113	103	2
K_ppm Pegmatite_RB001	33	115	67	0.11	0.37	Sph	102	61	5	0.52	Sph	221	130	9
K_ppm Pegmatite_RB002	38	113	79	0.11	0.32	Sph	72	94	3	0.57	Sph	120	120	6
K_ppm Pegmatite_RB003	34	120	72	0.08	0.43	Sph	72	61	5	0.49	Sph	104	97	6
K_ppm Pegmatite_RB004	30	108	82	0.11	0.30	Sph	38	13	1	0.59	Sph	122	67	6
K_ppm Pegmatite_RB005	39	117	71	0.11	0.30	Sph	38	13	1	0.59	Sph	122	67	6
K_ppm Pegmatite_RB006	39	117	65	0.11	0.37	Sph	58	32	3	0.52	Sph	145	108	5
K_ppm Pegmatite_RB007	52	119	71	0.11	0.29	Sph	58	13	1	0.60	Sph	113	103	1
K_ppm Pegmatite_RB008	32	128	59	0.11	0.56	Sph	58	13	0	0.33	Sph	71	50	1
K_ppm Pegmatite_RB009	39	117	65	0.11	0.20	Sph	58	13	2	0.69	Sph	120	103	6
K_ppm Pegmatite_RB010	39	117	65	0.11	0.20	Sph	58	13	2	0.69	Sph	120	103	6
K_ppm Pegmatite_RB011	36	127	57	0.11	0.31	Sph	58	38	2	0.58	Sph	143	103	4
K_ppm Pegmatite_RB012	39	121	69	0.11	0.30	Sph	58	33	1	0.59	Sph	113	103	3
K_ppm Pegmatite_RB013	19	96	79	0.11	0.29	Sph	58	36	1	0.60	Sph	113	103	2
Li2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB001	33	115	67	0.11	0.37	Sph	102	61	5	0.52	Sph	221	130	9
Li2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB002	38	113	79	0.11	0.32	Sph	72	94	3	0.57	Sph	120	120	6
Li2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB003	34	120	72	0.08	0.43	Sph	72	61	5	0.49	Sph	104	97	6
Li2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB004	30	108	82	0.11	0.30	Sph	38	13	1	0.59	Sph	122	67	6
Li2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB005	39	117	71	0.11	0.30	Sph	38	13	1	0.59	Sph	122	67	6
Li2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB006	39	117	65	0.11	0.37	Sph	58	32	3	0.52	Sph	145	108	5
Li2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB007	52	119	71	0.11	0.29	Sph	58	13	1	0.60	Sph	113	103	1
Li2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB008	32	128	59	0.11	0.56	Sph	58	13	0	0.33	Sph	71	50	1
Li2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB009	39	117	65	0.11	0.20	Sph	58	13	2	0.69	Sph	120	103	6
Li2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB010	39	117	65	0.11	0.20	Sph	58	13	2	0.69	Sph	120	103	6

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		(table continued below)

Li2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB011	36	127	57	0.11	0.31	Sph	58	38	2	0.58	Sph	143	103	4
Li2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB012	39	121	69	0.11	0.30	Sph	58	33	1	0.59	Sph	113	103	3
Li2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB013	19	96	79	0.11	0.29	Sph	58	36	1	0.60	Sph	113	103	2
Mg_ppm Pegmatite_RB001	33	115	67	0.11	0.37	Sph	102	61	5	0.52	Sph	221	130	9
Mg_ppm Pegmatite_RB002	38	113	79	0.11	0.32	Sph	72	94	3	0.57	Sph	120	120	6
Mg_ppm Pegmatite_RB003	34	120	72	0.08	0.43	Sph	72	61	5	0.49	Sph	104	97	6
Mg_ppm Pegmatite_RB004	30	108	82	0.11	0.30	Sph	38	13	1	0.59	Sph	122	67	6
Mg_ppm Pegmatite_RB005	39	117	71	0.11	0.30	Sph	38	13	1	0.59	Sph	122	67	6
Mg_ppm Pegmatite_RB006	39	117	65	0.11	0.37	Sph	58	32	3	0.52	Sph	145	108	5
Mg_ppm Pegmatite_RB007	52	119	71	0.11	0.29	Sph	58	13	1	0.60	Sph	113	103	1
Mg_ppm Pegmatite_RB008	32	128	59	0.11	0.56	Sph	58	13	0	0.33	Sph	71	50	1
Mg_ppm Pegmatite_RB009	39	117	65	0.11	0.20	Sph	58	13	2	0.69	Sph	120	103	6
Mg_ppm Pegmatite_RB010	39	117	65	0.11	0.20	Sph	58	13	2	0.69	Sph	120	103	6
Mg_ppm Pegmatite_RB011	36	127	57	0.11	0.31	Sph	58	38	2	0.58	Sph	143	103	4
Mg_ppm Pegmatite_RB012	39	121	69	0.11	0.30	Sph	58	33	1	0.59	Sph	113	103	3
Mg_ppm Pegmatite_RB013	19	96	79	0.11	0.29	Sph	58	36	1	0.60	Sph	113	103	2
Rb2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB001	33	115	67	0.11	0.37	Sph	102	61	5	0.52	Sph	221	130	9
Rb2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB002	38	113	79	0.11	0.32	Sph	72	94	3	0.57	Sph	120	120	6
Rb2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB003	34	120	72	0.08	0.43	Sph	72	61	5	0.49	Sph	104	97	6
Rb2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB004	30	108	82	0.11	0.30	Sph	38	13	1	0.59	Sph	122	67	6
Rb2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB005	39	117	71	0.11	0.30	Sph	38	13	1	0.59	Sph	122	67	6
Rb2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB006	39	117	65	0.11	0.37	Sph	58	32	3	0.52	Sph	145	108	5
Rb2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB007	52	119	71	0.11	0.29	Sph	58	13	1	0.60	Sph	113	103	1
Rb2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB008	32	128	59	0.11	0.56	Sph	58	13	0	0.33	Sph	71	50	1

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary

Rb2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB009	39	117	65	0.11	0.20	Sph	58	13	2	0.69	Sph	120	103	6
Rb2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB010	39	117	65	0.11	0.20	Sph	58	13	2	0.69	Sph	120	103	6
Rb2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB011	36	127	57	0.11	0.31	Sph	58	38	2	0.58	Sph	143	103	4
Rb2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB012	39	121	69	0.11	0.30	Sph	58	33	1	0.59	Sph	113	103	3
Rb2O_ppm Pegmatite_RB013	19	96	79	0.11	0.29	Sph	58	36	1	0.60	Sph	113	103	2
S_ppm Pegmatite_RB001	33	115	67	0.11	0.37	Sph	102	61	5	0.52	Sph	221	130	9
S_ppm Pegmatite_RB002	38	113	79	0.11	0.32	Sph	72	94	3	0.57	Sph	120	120	6
S_ppm Pegmatite_RB003	34	120	72	0.08	0.43	Sph	72	61	5	0.49	Sph	104	97	6
S_ppm Pegmatite_RB004	30	108	82	0.11	0.30	Sph	38	13	1	0.59	Sph	122	67	6
S_ppm Pegmatite_RB005	39	117	71	0.11	0.30	Sph	38	13	1	0.59	Sph	122	67	6
S_ppm Pegmatite_RB006	39	117	65	0.11	0.37	Sph	58	32	3	0.52	Sph	145	108	5
S_ppm Pegmatite_RB007	52	119	71	0.11	0.29	Sph	58	13	1	0.60	Sph	113	103	1
S_ppm Pegmatite_RB008	32	128	59	0.11	0.56	Sph	58	13	0	0.33	Sph	71	50	1
S_ppm Pegmatite_RB009	39	117	65	0.11	0.20	Sph	58	13	2	0.69	Sph	120	103	6
S_ppm Pegmatite_RB010	39	117	65	0.11	0.20	Sph	58	13	2	0.69	Sph	120	103	6
S_ppm Pegmatite_RB011	36	127	57	0.11	0.31	Sph	58	38	2	0.58	Sph	143	103	4
S_ppm Pegmatite_RB012	39	121	69	0.11	0.30	Sph	58	33	1	0.59	Sph	113	103	3
S_ppm Pegmatite_RB013	19	96	79	0.11	0.29	Sph	58	36	1	0.60	Sph	113	103	2
Ta2O5_ppm Pegmatite_RB001	33	115	67	0.11	0.37	Sph	102	61	5	0.52	Sph	221	130	9
Ta2O5_ppm Pegmatite_RB002	38	113	79	0.11	0.32	Sph	72	94	3	0.57	Sph	120	120	6
Ta2O5_ppm Pegmatite_RB003	34	120	72	0.08	0.43	Sph	72	61	5	0.49	Sph	104	97	6
Ta2O5_ppm Pegmatite_RB004	30	108	82	0.11	0.30	Sph	38	13	1	0.59	Sph	122	67	6
Ta2O5_ppm Pegmatite_RB005	39	117	71	0.11	0.30	Sph	38	13	1	0.59	Sph	122	67	6
Ta2O5_ppm Pegmatite_RB006	39	117	65	0.11	0.37	Sph	58	32	3	0.52	Sph	145	108	5

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary

Ta2O5_ppm Pegmatite_RB007	52	119	71	0.11	0.29	Sph	58	13	1	0.60	Sph	113	103	1
Ta2O5_ppm Pegmatite_RB008	32	128	59	0.11	0.56	Sph	58	13	0	0.33	Sph	71	50	1
Ta2O5_ppm Pegmatite_RB009	39	117	65	0.11	0.20	Sph	58	13	2	0.69	Sph	120	103	6
Ta2O5_ppm Pegmatite_RB010	39	117	65	0.11	0.20	Sph	58	13	2	0.69	Sph	120	103	6
Ta2O5_ppm Pegmatite_RB011	36	127	57	0.11	0.31	Sph	58	38	2	0.58	Sph	143	103	4
Ta2O5_ppm Pegmatite_RB012	39	121	69	0.11	0.30	Sph	58	33	1	0.59	Sph	113	103	3
Ta2O5_ppm Pegmatite_RB013	19	96	79	0.11	0.29	Sph	58	36	1	0.60	Sph	113	103	2

- The McCombe block model used block sizes 10mE x 10mN x 5.0mRL unrotated. Due to the variability of the spatial orientation of the McCombe pegmatites an optimal block size that suited each pegmatite was not possible.
- The Root Bay block model used 5mE x 10mN x 5mRL unrotated.
- Blocks were sub blocked to ensure they faithfully captured the pegmatite volumes.



Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary

Figure 21 Block Model Extents and Run Criteria – McCombe



Figure 22 Block Model Extents and Run Criteria – Root Bay

- Variable Orientation searches were used for each pegmatite.
- Two passes were used to ensure blocks are filled in areas with sparser drilling.
- At McCombe searches of 150m x 150m and 20m with applied anisotropy and orientation to the search ellipsoid based on the trend model were made. A final 250m search radii was applied to all the pegmatite blocks. Blocks outside the limits of the second search were not

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		estimated. This final estimation run only accounted for 2% of the tonnes at McCombe within the pit optimisation shell. 98% of blocks within the constraining pit shell were estimated within the first estimation run. • Root Bay also used two searches the first at 100m x 100m x 20m and a second at 150m search radii with all blocks filled after the second pass. Root Bay used a smaller search radius due to its more predictable geometry.

Table 0-15 – Proportion of MRE by Estimation Run

Estimation Run	% of Reported McCombe Total Tonnes
Run 1	98%
Run 2	2%
Total	**100%**

- Recovery of by-products will be determined following detailed metallurgical testwork.
- Estimated averages for bi product and deleterious elements for McCombe are tabulated below.

Table 0-16 – McCombe Approximate figures for biproduct and deleterious elements

Bi-product and deleterious elements
Reported within $US4000 pit design
above 0.2% Li_2O cut-off

Deleterious elements reported to 2 significant figures

Tonnes (Mt)	4.5
Li_2O %	1.01
Ta_2O_5 ppm	106
Fe ppm	8,500
K ppm	18,000
S ppm	160

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		Table 0-17 – Root Bay - Approximate figures for biproduct and deleterious elements

Bi-product and deleterious elements
Reported within $US4000 pit design
above 0.2% Li_2O cut-off

Deleterious elements reported to 2 significant figures

Tonnes (Mt)	8.1
Li_2O %	1.32
Ta_2O_5 ppm	35
Fe ppm	8,600
K ppm	21,000
S ppm	190

Validation

- Validation was carried out in several ways, including visual inspection in plan and cross-section comparing block estimates to composite values, Swath plots and model and composite statistical comparison.

		 ***Figure 23 McCombe plan showing block model, Pegmatite interpretations, collar locations and section lines***  ***Figure 24 McCombe Section through 590925mE***

Figure 25 McCombe Section through 591025mE

Figure 26 McCombe Section through 591075mE

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		 ***Figure 27 McCombe Swath Plot (Easting) John HG***  ***McCombe Model vs Composite Statistics, respectively, John HG***

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		 *Figure 28 Root Bay Block Model and Drill Collars*  *Figure 29 Root Bay Cross Section +/-50m 5642475mN*

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		 ***Figure 30 Root Bay Li2O Block Model vs Composite histogram comparison***  ***Figure 31 Root Bay Eastings Swath plot***

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		▪ No reconciliation data is available.
Moisture	▪ *Whether the tonnages are estimated on a dry basis or with natural moisture, and the method of determination of the moisture content.*	▪ Tonnages are estimated on a dry basis
Cut-off parameters	▪ *The basis of the adopted cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied.*	The Mineral Resources are reported using open-pit mining constraints. The open-pit Mineral Resource is only the portion of the resource that is constrained within a US$4,000 / t SC6 optimised shell and above a 0.2% Li_2O cut-off grade. The optimised open pit shell was generated using: ○ $4/t mining cost ○ $15.19/t processing costs ○ Mining loss of 5% with no mining dilution ○ 55 degree pit slope angles ○ 75% Product Recovery
Mining factors or assumptions	▪ *Assumptions made regarding possible mining methods, minimum mining dimensions and internal (or, if applicable, external) mining dilution. It is always necessary as part of the process of determining reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction to consider potential mining methods, but the assumptions made regarding mining methods and parameters when estimating Mineral Resources may not always be rigorous. Where this is the case, this should be reported with an explanation of the basis of the mining assumptions made.*	▪ The June 2023 Mineral Resource Estimate is reported above 0.2% Li_2O cut-off. The cut-off is based on lowest potential grade at which a saleable product might be extracted using a conventional DMS and / or flotation plant and employing a TOMRA Xray sorter (or equivalent) on the plant feed. ▪ A number of pegmatites outcrop at surface thus the mineral resource is likely to be extracted using a conventional drill and blast, haul and dump mining fleet.
Metallurgical factors or assumptions	▪ *The basis for assumptions or predictions regarding metallurgical amenability. It is always necessary as part of the process of determining reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction to consider potential metallurgical methods, but the assumptions regarding metallurgical treatment*	▪ No metallurgical work has been carried on the Root Lake project mineralised pegmatites to date.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	processes and parameters made when reporting Mineral Resources may not always be rigorous. Where this is the case, this should be reported with an explanation of the basis of the metallurgical assumptions made.	
Environmental factors or assumptions	▪ *Assumptions made regarding possible waste and process residue disposal options. It is always necessary as part of the process of determining reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction to consider the potential environmental impacts of the mining and processing operation. While at this stage the determination of potential environmental impacts, particularly for a greenfields project, may not always be well advanced, the status of early consideration of these potential environmental impacts should be reported. Where these aspects have not been considered this should be reported with an explanation of the environmental assumptions made.*	▪ Waste rock characterization work has not begun at the Root Lake project to date.
Bulk density	▪ *Whether assumed or determined. If assumed, the basis for the assumptions. If determined, the method used, whether wet or dry, the frequency of the measurements, the nature, size and representativeness of the samples.* ▪ *The bulk density for bulk material must have been measured by methods that adequately account for void spaces (vugs, porosity, etc), moisture and differences between rock and alteration zones within the deposit.* ▪ *Discuss assumptions for bulk density estimates used in the evaluation process of the different*	▪ At McCombe 1,599 bulk density measurements were made by GT1 on ½ NQ core 20cm billets using water immersion (Archimedes) techniques. 217 of the measurements were directly on pegmatite core. 2 pegmatite measurements were rejected as being anomalously low, 1.3 and 1.96. ▪ GT1 also tested 2,993 bulk densities on Root Bay ½ NQ drill core with 890 measurements made directly on pegmatite core. Results were similar to those measured at McCombe.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	materials.	 ***GT1's Bulk Density Apparatus***

McCombe Bulk Density results

Rock Type	Length	Bulk Density
Pegmatite	94.58	2.70
Felsic	10.49	2.76
Sediment	238.39	3.03
Basalt	133.95	2.97
Overburden*	0	2.20

* Estimated

Table 18Root Bay Bulk Density results

Rock Type	Length	Bulk Density
Pegmatite	143.10	2.70
BIF	5.19	2.96
Sediment	116.46	2.77
Basalt	292.85	3.05

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary

Overburden*	0	2.20

* Estimated

- McCombe and Root Bay pegmatites bulk density measurements averaged 2.70.
- No bulk density data is available for the largely glacial cover over the deposit due to the difficulty in recovering this material in the drilling process. This material is volumetrically negligible ranging in depths from 0 to24m and averaging around 5m. An assumed bulk density of 2.2 was used for overburden.
- There is a weak to moderate correlation between bulk density and Li2O grade (Correlation Coefficient 58%) and so an assumed average pegmatite bulk density was used.



McCombe Bulk Density Breakdown

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		 ***Figure 32 Root Bay Bulk Density Breakdown***
Classification	▪ *The basis for the classification of the Mineral Resources into varying confidence categories.* ▪ *Whether appropriate account has been taken of all relevant factors (ie relative confidence in tonnage/grade estimations, reliability of input data, confidence in continuity of geology and metal values, quality, quantity and distribution of the data).* ▪ *Whether the result appropriately reflects the Competent Person's view of the deposit.*	▪ The Mineral Resources have been classified Inferred based on drill spacing and geological continuity and modifying factor confidence levels. ▪ The Resource models uses a classification scheme based upon drill hole spacing plus block estimation parameters, including kriging variance, number of composites in search ellipsoid informing the block cell and average distance of data to block centroid. ▪ The results of the Mineral Resource Estimation reflect the views of the Competent Person.

Table 19 June 2023 Mineral Resource Estimate Figures

	Indicated			Inferred			Total		
Deposit	**Tonnes (Mt)**	**Li_2O (%)**	**Ta_2O_5 (ppm)**	**Tonnes (Mt)**	**Li_2O (%)**	**Ta_2O_5 (ppm)**	**Tonnes (Mt)**	**Li_2O (%)**	**Ta_2O_5 (ppm)**
McCombe	0	0	0	4.5	1.01	110	4.5	1.01	110
Root Bay	0	0	0	8.1	1.32	35	8.1	1.32	35
Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**12.6**	**1.21**	**62**	**12.6**	**1.21**	**62**

1. Mineral Resource produced in accordance with the 2012 Edition of the Australian Code for Reporting of Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves (JORC 2012)
2. Figures constrained to US$4,000 open pit shell and reported above a 0.2% cut-off grade.
3. Numbers in the mineral resource table have been rounded.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		Table 20 McCombe Grade Tonnage Table

Cut Off Grade (% Li_2O	McCombe	
	Tonnes (Mt)	Grade (% Li_2O)
0%	4.6	1.01
0.2%	4.5	1.01
0.4%	4.2	1.07
0.6%	3.6	1.15

Table 21 Root Bay Grade Tonnage Table

Cut Off Grade (% Li_2O	Root Bay	
	Tonnes (Mt)	Grade (% Li_2O)
0%	8.4	1.28
0.2%	8.1	1.32
0.4%	7.8	1.36
0.6%	7.5	1.40

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Audits or reviews	▪ *The results of any audits or reviews of Mineral Resource estimates.*	▪ No audits or reviews have been undertaken by GT1
Discussion of relative accuracy/ confidence	▪ *Where appropriate a statement of the relative accuracy and confidence level in the Mineral Resource estimate using an approach or procedure deemed appropriate by the Competent Person. For example, the application of statistical or geostatistical procedures to quantify the relative accuracy of the resource within stated confidence limits, or, if such an approach is not deemed*	▪ The relative accuracy of the Mineral Resource is reflected in the reporting of the Mineral Resource as being in line with the guidelines of the 2012 JORC Code. ▪ The statement relates to local estimates of tonnes and grade, with reference made to resources above a certain cut-off that are intended to assist mining studies but are lack sufficient confidence to be suitable for determination of economic extraction.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	appropriate, a qualitative discussion of the factors that could affect the relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate. ▪ *The statement should specify whether it relates to global or local estimates, and, if local, state the relevant tonnages, which should be relevant to technical and economic evaluation. Documentation should include assumptions made and the procedures used.* ▪ *These statements of relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate should be compared with production data, where available.*	

Appendix B

Interpreted Downhole Intercepts

McCombe Geology Summary

HoleId	From	To	Interval	Lithology	Li2O ppm
RL-16-01A	0.0	5.0	5.0	Overburden	-
RL-16-01A	5.0	25.2	18.3	Extrusive	329
RL-16-01A	25.2	33.9	1.0	Pegmatite	12,515
RL-16-01A	33.9	75.0	37.2	Extrusive	125
RL-16-02	0.0	6.0	6.0	Overburden	-
RL-16-02	6.0	10.0	2.5	Extrusive	2,287
RL-16-02	10.0	21.4	0.9	Pegmatite	10,640
RL-16-02	21.4	26.5	3.5	Extrusive	1,693
RL-16-03	0.0	6.0	6.0	Overburden	-
RL-16-03	6.0	52.5	22.3	Extrusive	113
RL-16-03	52.5	61.5	1.0	Pegmatite	12,485
RL-16-03	61.5	72.0	8.7	Extrusive	215
RL-16-04	0.0	2.0	2.0	Overburden	-
RL-16-04	2.0	18.0	14.1	Extrusive	147
RL-16-04	18.0	32.0	0.9	Pegmatite	10,533
RL-16-04	32.0	41.0	7.2	Extrusive	121
RL-16-05	0.0	6.0	6.0	Overburden	-
RL-16-05	6.0	68.4	30.4	Extrusive	45
RL-16-05	68.4	76.1	0.9	Pegmatite	10,346
RL-16-05	76.1	80.0	2.5	Extrusive	596
RL-16-07	0.0	4.0	4.0	Overburden	-
RL-16-07	4.0	28.0	22.1	Extrusive	525
RL-16-07	28.0	35.3	1.1	Pegmatite	2,049
RL-16-07	35.3	41.0	5.7	Extrusive	-
RL-16-07	41.0	46.1	1.0	Pegmatite	11,391
RL-16-07	46.1	54.0	6.3	Extrusive	112
RL-22-001	0.0	2.3	2.1	Overburden	-
RL-22-001	2.3	11.8	2.8	Sediment	811
RL-22-001	11.8	24.2	0.9	Pegmatite	17,687
RL-22-001	24.2	60.0	2.9	Sediment	106
RL-22-002	0.0	11.3	11.3	Overburden	-
RL-22-002	11.3	42.2	0.7	Sediment	111
RL-22-002	42.2	57.5	0.7	Pegmatite	12,022
RL-22-002	57.5	72.0	0.6	Mafic	62
RL-22-003	0.0	5.7	5.7	Overburden	-
RL-22-003	5.7	72.0	2.9	Sediment	41
RL-22-003	72.0	83.5	1.0	Pegmatite	20,350
RL-22-003	83.5	102.0	2.6	Sediment	27
RL-22-004	0.0	3.0	3.0	Overburden	-
RL-22-004	3.0	12.3	0.6	Sediment	-
RL-22-004	12.3	17.8	0.9	Mafic	-
RL-22-004	17.8	80.3	0.7	Sediment	44
RL-22-004	80.3	80.5	0.2	Mafic	3,444
RL-22-004	80.5	87.4	0.7	Pegmatite	14,139
RL-22-004	87.4	144.0	0.6	Sediment	21
RL-22-005	0.0	3.5	1.8	Overburden	-
RL-22-005	3.5	90.8	2.9	Sediment	58
RL-22-005	90.8	100.7	0.8	Pegmatite	2,462
RL-22-005	100.7	106.5	1.6	Sediment	91
RL-22-005	106.5	135.8	2.7	Mafic	8
RL-22-005	135.8	136.7	0.8	Pegmatite	279
RL-22-005	136.7	147.0	2.4	Mafic	16
RL-22-006	0.0	5.0	4.6	Overburden	-

HoleId	From	To	Interval	Lithology	Li2O ppm
RL-22-006	5.0	21.7	0.6	Sediment	504
RL-22-006	21.7	31.2	0.8	Pegmatite	15,360
RL-22-006	31.2	72.8	0.7	Sediment	261
RL-22-006	72.8	75.5	0.8	Pegmatite	1,545
RL-22-006	75.5	120.0	0.7	Sediment	94
RL-22-007	0.0	5.0	5.0	Overburden	-
RL-22-007	5.0	64.9	2.9	Sediment	61
RL-22-007	64.9	74.7	0.9	Pegmatite	15,122
RL-22-007	74.7	117.0	2.8	Sediment	72
RL-22-008	0.0	15.8	12.5	Overburden	-
RL-22-008	15.8	71.5	0.7	Sediment	108
RL-22-008	71.5	80.3	0.8	Pegmatite	18,050
RL-22-008	80.3	87.3	0.7	Sediment	306
RL-22-008	87.3	87.3	0.1	Pegmatite	-
RL-22-008	87.3	91.3	0.6	Sediment	389
RL-22-008	91.3	92.1	0.3	Pegmatite	2,504
RL-22-008	92.1	162.0	0.6	Sediment	9
RL-22-009	0.0	1.2	1.2	Overburden	-
RL-22-009	1.2	33.0	2.9	Sediment	-
RL-22-009	33.0	84.4	3.0	Mafic	-
RL-22-009	84.4	91.7	2.2	Sediment	1,175
RL-22-009	91.7	99.4	0.9	Pegmatite	5,346
RL-22-009	99.4	123.0	2.8	Sediment	200
RL-22-009	123.0	130.5	2.7	Mafic	-
RL-22-009	130.5	186.0	3.0	Sediment	-
RL-22-010	0.0	9.0	3.2	Overburden	-
RL-22-010	9.0	107.8	0.6	Mafic	33
RL-22-010	107.8	114.7	0.8	Pegmatite	7,947
RL-22-010	114.7	135.1	0.7	Mafic	171
RL-22-010	135.1	135.7	0.6	Pegmatite	254
RL-22-010	135.7	150.0	0.6	Mafic	41
RL-22-011	0.0	9.0	7.5	Overburden	-
RL-22-011	9.0	97.1	2.9	Mafic	-
RL-22-011	97.1	130.6	2.8	Sediment	47
RL-22-011	130.6	132.4	0.7	Pegmatite	417
RL-22-011	132.4	180.0	2.9	Sediment	27
RL-22-012	0.0	0.3	0.3	Overburden	-
RL-22-012	0.3	111.0	2.9	Mafic	-
RL-22-013	0.0	5.2	5.2	Overburden	-
RL-22-013	5.2	64.0	2.8	Sediment	58
RL-22-013	64.0	72.0	0.7	Pegmatite	17,213
RL-22-013	72.0	132.0	2.8	Sediment	43
RL-22-014	0.0	3.9	1.7	Overburden	-
RL-22-014	3.9	36.2	0.7	Sediment	143
RL-22-014	36.2	38.9	0.6	Pegmatite	11,297
RL-22-014	38.9	55.5	0.7	Sediment	309
RL-22-014	55.5	75.0	0.7	Mafic	-
RL-22-014	75.0	102.0	1.3	Sediment	150
RL-22-014	102.0	110.4	0.7	Pegmatite	13,181
RL-22-014	110.4	129.0	2.5	Sediment	322
RL-22-015	0.0	10.9	10.8	Overburden	-
RL-22-015	10.9	28.9	2.3	Sediment	283
RL-22-015	28.9	42.3	0.8	Pegmatite	12,233
RL-22-015	42.3	92.0	2.8	Sediment	62
RL-22-015	92.0	93.0	1.0		-
RL-22-016A	0.0	8.1	8.1	Overburden	-
RL-22-016A	8.1	67.3	2.8	Sediment	224
RL-22-016A	67.3	73.6	0.9	Pegmatite	15,696
RL-22-016A	73.6	130.2	2.7	Sediment	326
RL-22-016A	130.2	133.8	0.6	Pegmatite	14,624
RL-22-016A	133.8	156.0	2.6	Mafic	284
RL-22-017	0.0	2.7	2.7	Overburden	-
RL-22-017	2.7	53.9	2.8	Mafic	253
RL-22-017	53.9	60.0	0.8	Pegmatite	12,856
RL-22-017	60.0	91.8	2.6	Mafic	215

HoleId	From	To	Interval	Lithology	Li2O ppm
RL-22-017	91.8	120.0	2.9	Sediment	-
RL-22-018	0.0	17.3	17.3	Overburden	-
RL-22-018	17.3	51.8	0.7	Mafic	144
RL-22-018	51.8	64.5	0.9	Pegmatite	11,320
RL-22-018	64.5	90.0	0.8	Sediment	127
RL-22-019	0.0	23.1	2.6	Mafic	264
RL-22-019	23.1	26.7	0.9	Pegmatite	10,749
RL-22-019	26.7	120.0	2.9	Sediment	82
RL-22-020	0.0	5.1	4.9	Overburden	-
RL-22-020	5.1	78.0	0.7	Sediment	69
RL-22-020	78.0	82.8	0.8	Pegmatite	11,786
RL-22-020	82.8	150.0	0.7	Sediment	35
RL-22-021	0.0	4.0	4.0	Overburden	-
RL-22-021	4.0	111.3	0.7	Mafic	26
RL-22-021	111.3	118.7	0.9	Pegmatite	8,362
RL-22-021	118.7	150.0	0.7	Mafic	240
RL-22-022	0.0	3.5	3.5	Overburden	-
RL-22-022	3.5	47.4	2.7	Mafic	67
RL-22-022	47.4	61.4	0.8	Pegmatite	13,478
RL-22-022	61.4	150.0	2.9	Mafic	34
RL-22-022	150.0	152.3	2.3		-
RL-22-023	0.0	3.3	3.3	Overburden	-
RL-22-023	3.3	12.4	1.8	Sediment	648
RL-22-023	12.4	25.5	0.8	Pegmatite	13,873
RL-22-023	25.5	76.6	2.7	Sediment	142
RL-22-023	76.6	78.3	1.2	Felsic	-
RL-22-023	78.3	108.4	2.9	Sediment	-
RL-22-023	108.4	111.5	2.2	Felsic	-
RL-22-023	111.5	120.0	2.8	Sediment	-
RL-22-023	120.0	189.0	69.0		-
RL-22-025	0.0	3.0	3.0	Overburden	-
RL-22-025	3.0	29.8	2.4	Mafic	44
RL-22-025	29.8	30.1	0.2	Amphibolite	4,779
RL-22-025	30.1	37.8	0.9	Pegmatite	10,533
RL-22-025	37.8	47.8	0.9	Mafic	2,569
RL-22-025	47.8	49.7	0.8	Pegmatite	4,787
RL-22-025	49.7	71.0	2.5	Mafic	243
RL-22-025	71.0	103.0	2.9	Sediment	-
RL-22-025	103.0	104.0	1.0	Felsic	-
RL-22-025	104.0	137.8	2.9	Mafic	-
RL-22-025	137.8	141.0	2.8	Felsic	-
RL-22-027	0.0	3.4	3.4	Overburden	-
RL-22-027	3.4	4.2	0.8	Pegmatite	2,777
RL-22-027	4.2	4.7	0.5	Sediment	5,339
RL-22-027	4.7	15.6	0.9	Pegmatite	15,314
RL-22-027	15.6	26.0	0.8	Mafic	878
RL-22-027	26.0	27.0	1.0	Felsic	932
RL-22-027	27.0	64.5	2.8	Mafic	8
RL-22-027	64.5	66.0	1.5	Felsic	-
RL-22-027	66.0	78.4	2.9	Mafic	-
RL-22-027	78.4	80.2	1.8	Felsic	-
RL-22-027	80.2	88.2	2.5	Mafic	-
RL-22-027	88.2	89.0	0.9	Felsic	-
RL-22-027	89.0	90.9	1.0	Mafic	-
RL-22-027	90.9	93.6	1.8	Felsic	-
RL-22-027	93.6	108.0	2.9	Mafic	-
RL-22-029	0.0	6.4	6.4	Overburden	-
RL-22-029	6.4	9.1	2.5	Mafic	-
RL-22-029	9.1	19.7	2.8	Felsic	-
RL-22-029	19.7	30.9	2.4	Mafic	-
RL-22-029	30.9	32.1	1.2	Felsic	-
RL-22-029	32.1	75.0	3.0	Mafic	-
RL-22-029	75.0	80.1	2.6	Felsic	-
RL-22-029	80.1	91.6	2.0	Mafic	365
RL-22-029	91.6	92.9	0.6	Pegmatite	456

HoleId	From	To	Interval	Lithology	Li2O ppm
RL-22-029	92.9	94.4	0.7	Mafic	2,711
RL-22-029	94.4	95.6	0.6	Felsic	3,863
RL-22-029	95.6	106.4	1.7	Mafic	443
RL-22-029	106.4	112.3	0.8	Pegmatite	10,858
RL-22-029	112.3	141.5	2.6	Felsic	241
RL-22-029	141.5	151.8	2.7	Mafic	-
RL-22-029	151.8	156.1	2.4	Felsic	-
RL-22-029	156.1	210.0	3.0	Mafic	-
RL-22-029	210.0	226.7	16.7		-
RL-22-032	0.0	6.0	6.0	Overburden	-
RL-22-032	6.0	141.0	3.0	Mafic	-
RL-22-033	0.0	2.9	2.9	Overburden	-
RL-22-033	2.9	8.0	0.8	Pegmatite	14,141
RL-22-033	8.0	162.0	2.9	Mafic	7
RL-22-035	0.0	3.2	3.2	Overburden	-
RL-22-035	3.2	66.5	2.8	Mafic	32
RL-22-035	66.5	79.2	1.0	Pegmatite	12,758
RL-22-035	79.2	162.0	2.9	Mafic	23
RL-22-037	0.0	2.0	2.0	Overburden	-
RL-22-037	2.0	40.1	2.7	Sediment	193
RL-22-037	40.1	43.9	0.9	Pegmatite	8,210
RL-22-037	43.9	97.8	2.8	Sediment	196
RL-22-037	97.8	138.0	2.9	Mafic	-
RL-22-037	138.0	153.4	2.9	Sediment	-
RL-22-037	153.4	180.0	3.0	Mafic	-
RL-22-038	0.0	15.0	15.0	Overburden	-
RL-22-038	15.0	69.9	0.7	Sediment	-
RL-22-038	69.9	73.4	0.6	Felsic	-
RL-22-038	73.4	81.5	0.8	Sediment	986
RL-22-038	81.5	90.0	0.8	Pegmatite	11,820
RL-22-038	90.0	141.0	0.7	Mafic	149
RL-22-039	0.0	6.0	6.0	Overburden	-
RL-22-039	6.0	16.1	2.8	Sediment	-
RL-22-039	16.1	34.8	2.8	Mafic	-
RL-22-039	34.8	60.6	2.9	Sediment	-
RL-22-039	60.6	71.2	2.7	Mafic	-
RL-22-039	71.2	80.2	2.6	Sediment	-
RL-22-039	80.2	111.6	2.6	Mafic	93
RL-22-039	111.6	112.8	0.6	Pegmatite	69
RL-22-039	112.8	127.0	2.3	Mafic	182
RL-22-039	127.0	136.5	2.6	Sediment	-
RL-22-039	136.5	137.8	1.2	Mafic	-
RL-22-039	137.8	200.0	3.0	Sediment	-
RL-22-039	200.0	201.0	1.0	Mafic	-
RL-22-040	0.0	15.0	15.0	Overburden	-
RL-22-040	15.0	99.5	2.9	Mafic	20
RL-22-040	99.5	107.8	1.1	Pegmatite	4,917
RL-22-040	107.8	117.5	1.8	Sediment	2,899
RL-22-040	117.5	126.0	2.9	Mafic	-
RL-22-041	0.0	8.4	8.4	Overburden	-
RL-22-041	8.4	87.6	3.0	Sediment	-
RL-22-041	87.6	98.1	1.9	Mafic	1,077
RL-22-041	98.1	114.0	1.0	Pegmatite	10,714
RL-22-041	114.0	138.6	2.5	Sediment	145
RL-22-041	138.6	201.0	3.0	Mafic	-
RL-22-041	201.0	210.0	9.0		-
RL-22-042	0.0	7.9	7.9	Overburden	-
RL-22-042	7.9	41.5	2.9	Sediment	-
RL-22-042	41.5	156.0	3.0	Mafic	-
RL-22-043	0.0	2.4	2.4	Overburden	-
RL-22-043	2.4	141.0	3.0	Mafic	-
RL-22-045	0.0	3.0	3.0	Overburden	-
RL-22-045	3.0	5.5	2.5	Mafic	-
RL-22-045	5.5	31.6	2.9	Sediment	-
RL-22-045	31.6	162.0	3.0	Mafic	-

HoleId	From	To	Interval	Lithology	Li2O ppm
RL-22-047	0.0	5.9	5.9	Overburden	-
RL-22-047	5.9	148.4	3.0	Sediment	-
RL-22-047	148.4	178.5	2.9	Mafic	-
RL-22-047	178.5	204.0	2.2	Sediment	86
RL-22-387	0.0	11.4	11.4	Overburden	-
RL-22-387	11.4	31.8	2.4	Mafic	307
RL-22-387	31.8	41.5	0.9	Pegmatite	11,540
RL-22-387	41.5	123.0	2.9	Mafic	23
RL-22-461	0.0	4.8	4.8	Overburden	-
RL-22-461	4.8	5.5	0.7	Mafic	-
RL-22-461	5.5	8.4	0.8	Pegmatite	7,725
RL-22-461	8.4	107.0	2.9	Mafic	81
RL-22-475	0.0	5.5	5.5	Overburden	-
RL-22-475	5.5	28.3	2.9	sediment	-
RL-22-475	28.3	43.0	2.7	mafic	-
RL-22-475	43.0	53.2	2.6	Sediment	-
RL-22-475	53.2	99.1	2.9	Mafic	-
RL-22-475	99.1	109.7	2.8	Sediment	-
RL-22-475	109.7	120.0	2.8	Mafic	-
RL-22-490	0.0	3.0	3.0	Overburden	-
RL-22-490	3.0	61.7	2.8	Mafic	105
RL-22-490	61.7	66.0	0.8	Pegmatite	11,799
RL-22-490	66.0	122.3	2.8	Mafic	123
RL-22-490	122.3	124.5	1.2	Felsic	-
RL-22-490	124.5	162.0	2.9	Mafic	-
RL-22-490	162.0	176.5	2.9	Shear	-
RL-22-490	176.5	191.2	2.8	Mafic	-
RL-22-490	191.2	195.0	2.5	Felsic	-
RL-22-490	195.0	198.5	2.6	Shear	-
RL-22-490	198.5	201.0	2.5	Felsic	-
RL-22-497	0.0	12.4	11.6	Overburden	-
RL-22-497	12.4	19.6	2.5	Mafic	-
RL-22-497	19.6	25.5	2.2	Felsic	-
RL-22-497	25.5	124.0	3.0	Mafic	-
RL-22-499	0.0	14.8	14.8	Overburden	-
RL-22-499	14.8	90.6	2.9	Mafic	20
RL-22-499	90.6	97.7	1.0	Pegmatite	13,050
RL-22-499	97.7	114.0	2.5	Sediment	416
RL-22-499	114.0	120.0	6.0		-
RL-22-501	0.0	9.0	9.0	Overburden	-
RL-22-501	9.0	53.7	2.8	Sediment	59
RL-22-501	53.7	53.9	0.2	Pegmatite	1,386
RL-22-501	53.9	56.3	0.9	Sediment	1,709
RL-22-501	56.3	62.1	0.7	Pegmatite	12,339
RL-22-501	62.1	150.4	2.6	Sediment	72
RL-22-501	150.4	155.0	0.9	Pegmatite	5,143
RL-22-501	155.0	171.2	2.5	Sediment	229
RL-22-501	171.2	181.2	2.7	Felsic	-
RL-22-501	181.2	201.0	2.9	Mafic	-
RL-22-505	0.0	5.9	5.9	Overburden	-
RL-22-505	5.9	12.0	3.0	Felsic	-
RL-22-505	12.0	118.8	2.9	Mafic	79
RL-22-505	118.8	123.2	0.8	Pegmatite	11,294
RL-22-505	123.2	169.3	2.7	Mafic	122
RL-22-505	169.3	170.4	1.1	Felsic	-
RL-22-505	170.4	210.0	3.0	Mafic	-
RL-22-521	0.0	7.4	7.4	Overburden	-
RL-22-521	7.4	15.2	1.4	Sediment	263
RL-22-521	15.2	16.3	0.6	Pegmatite	415
RL-22-521	16.3	58.1	2.7	Mafic	42
RL-22-521	58.1	59.0	0.9	Felsic	-
RL-22-521	59.0	66.1	2.7	Mafic	-
RL-22-521	66.1	131.2	2.9	Sediment	-
RL-22-521	131.2	131.8	0.6	Mafic	-
RL-22-521	131.8	136.7	2.4	Sediment	-

HoleId	From	To	Interval	Lithology	Li2O ppm
RL-22-521	136.7	147.8	2.6	Felsic	-
RL-22-521	147.8	151.1	1.9	Mafic	-
RL-22-521	151.1	160.9	2.6	Felsic	-
RL-22-521	160.9	180.0	2.9	Mafic	-
RL-22-522	0.0	10.5	10.5	Overburden	-
RL-22-522	10.5	44.2	2.7	Sediment	7
RL-22-522	44.2	44.3	0.1	Pegmatite	243
RL-22-522	44.3	50.1	1.7	Sediment	54
RL-22-522	50.1	53.4	1.1	Felsic	108
RL-22-522	53.4	53.6	0.2	Pegmatite	327
RL-22-522	53.6	56.8	1.6	Felsic	120
RL-22-522	56.8	67.7	2.6	Sediment	11
RL-22-522	67.7	67.8	0.1	Pegmatite	157
RL-22-522	67.8	69.8	1.0	Sediment	180
RL-22-522	69.8	131.6	3.0	Felsic	-
RL-22-522	131.6	140.9	2.8	Sediment	-
RL-22-522	140.9	147.4	2.3	Felsic	-
RL-22-522	147.4	153.4	2.7	Sediment	-
RL-22-522	153.4	154.7	1.3	Felsic	-
RL-22-522	154.7	175.6	2.8	Sediment	-
RL-22-522	175.6	177.1	1.3	Felsic	-
RL-22-522	177.1	192.5	2.9	Sediment	-
RL-22-522	192.5	193.1	0.6	Felsic	-
RL-22-522	193.1	201.0	2.7	Sediment	-
RL-22-524	0.0	6.0	6.0	Overburden	-
RL-22-524	6.0	105.0	3.0	Sediment	-
RL-22-524	105.0	180.0	2.8	Felsic	51
RL-22-524	180.0	201.0	3.0	Sediment	-
RL-22-525	0.0	4.5	4.5	Overburden	-
RL-22-525	4.5	56.7	2.9	sediment	-
RL-22-525	56.7	58.9	1.6	Felsic	-
RL-22-525	58.9	94.6	2.8	Sediment	-
RL-22-525	94.6	97.5	1.4	Felsic	-
RL-22-525	97.5	102.5	1.5	Sediment	-
RL-22-525	102.5	108.5	2.6	Felsic	-
RL-22-525	108.5	112.9	2.3	Sediment	-
RL-22-525	112.9	114.6	1.0	Felsic	-
RL-22-525	114.6	116.4	1.8	sediment	-
RL-22-525	116.4	119.4	2.1	Felsic	-
RL-22-525	119.4	136.2	2.8	sediment	-
RL-22-525	136.2	137.0	0.7	Felsic	-
RL-22-525	137.0	138.6	0.9	sediment	-
RL-22-525	138.6	139.5	0.9	Felsic	-
RL-22-525	139.5	198.6	2.9	sediment	-
RL-22-525	198.6	200.1	1.5	Felsic	-
RL-22-525	200.1	208.3	2.5	sediment	-
RL-22-525	208.3	211.4	1.6	Felsic	-
RL-22-525	211.4	225.0	2.6	sediment	-
RL-22-526	0.0	8.9	8.9	Overburden	-
RL-22-526	8.9	12.3	2.9	Sediment	-
RL-22-526	12.3	18.2	2.8	Felsic	-
RL-22-526	18.2	21.1	2.7	Sediment	-
RL-22-526	21.1	21.8	0.7	Felsic	-
RL-22-526	21.8	39.7	2.8	Sediment	-
RL-22-526	39.7	42.8	1.9	Felsic	-
RL-22-526	42.8	58.0	2.8	Sediment	-
RL-22-526	58.0	61.6	1.8	Felsic	-
RL-22-526	61.6	82.3	2.8	Sediment	-
RL-22-526	82.3	86.3	2.0	Felsic	-
RL-22-526	86.3	120.4	2.7	Sediment	356
RL-22-526	120.4	122.5	0.8	Pegmatite	736
RL-22-526	122.5	171.8	2.8	Sediment	84
RL-22-526	171.8	172.0	0.2	Pegmatite	159
RL-22-526	172.0	180.0	2.5	Sediment	5
RL-22-527	0.0	3.0	3.0	Overburden	-

HoleId	From	To	Interval	Lithology	Li2O ppm
RL-22-527	3.0	9.5	2.8	Sediment	-
RL-22-527	9.5	10.4	0.8	Felsic	-
RL-22-527	10.4	18.9	2.5	Sediment	-
RL-22-527	18.9	20.8	1.9	Felsic	-
RL-22-527	20.8	22.8	1.6	Sediment	-
RL-22-527	22.8	24.1	1.1	Felsic	-
RL-22-527	24.1	32.2	2.7	Sediment	-
RL-22-527	32.2	33.0	0.8	Lost Core	-
RL-22-527	33.0	42.4	2.9	Sediment	-
RL-22-527	42.4	50.5	2.7	Felsic	-
RL-22-527	50.5	58.8	2.6	Sediment	-
RL-22-527	58.8	68.3	2.6	Felsic	-
RL-22-527	68.3	83.5	2.8	Sediment	-
RL-22-527	83.5	83.8	0.3	Lost Core	-
RL-22-527	83.8	87.4	2.6	Sediment	-
RL-22-527	87.4	88.2	0.8	Lost Core	-
RL-22-527	88.2	130.1	2.9	Sediment	-
RL-22-527	130.1	151.8	2.8	Mafic	-
RL-22-527	151.8	153.0	1.2	Lost Core	-
RL-22-527	153.0	165.1	3.0	Mafic	-
RL-22-527	165.1	169.9	2.5	Sediment	-
RL-22-527	169.9	170.4	0.5	Mafic	-
RL-22-527	170.4	174.8	2.3	Sediment	-
RL-22-527	174.8	192.6	2.7	Felsic	21
RL-22-527	192.6	193.3	0.7	Pegmatite	114
RL-22-527	193.3	200.1	1.8	Felsic	94
RL-22-527	200.1	200.2	0.1	Pegmatite	267
RL-22-527	200.2	230.9	2.9	Felsic	11
RL-22-527	230.9	236.8	2.9	Sediment	-
RL-22-527	236.8	241.0	2.4	Mafic	-
RL-22-527	241.0	249.0	2.8	Sediment	-
RL-22-528	0.0	3.0	3.0	Overburden	-
RL-22-528	3.0	125.0	3.0	Sediment	-
RL-22-528	125.0	201.0	3.0	Mafic	-
RL-22-529	0.0	3.9	3.9	Overburden	-
RL-22-529	3.9	73.9	2.8	Mafic	106
RL-22-529	73.9	80.4	0.9	Pegmatite	2,304
RL-22-529	80.4	142.5	2.7	Mafic	65
RL-22-529	142.5	144.0	1.5	Lost Core	-
RL-22-529	144.0	150.0	3.0	Mafic	-
RL-22-530	0.0	9.0	9.0	Overburden	-
RL-22-530	9.0	46.7	2.9	Mafic	18
RL-22-530	46.7	47.0	0.2	Pegmatite	618
RL-22-530	47.0	51.7	2.2	Mafic	316
RL-22-530	51.7	52.2	0.5	Pegmatite	263
RL-22-530	52.2	56.7	1.2	Mafic	399
RL-22-530	56.7	57.0	0.3	Pegmatite	553
RL-22-530	57.0	62.2	1.3	Mafic	673
RL-22-530	62.2	64.0	0.5	Felsic	1,759
RL-22-530	64.0	64.5	0.5	Mafic	3,853
RL-22-530	64.5	67.7	0.8	Pegmatite	223
RL-22-530	67.7	106.2	2.7	Mafic	287
RL-22-530	106.2	111.4	2.4	Felsic	-
RL-22-530	111.4	150.0	3.0	Mafic	-
RL-22-531	0.0	6.1	6.1	Overburden	-
RL-22-531	6.1	9.2	2.7	Mafic	-
RL-22-531	9.2	22.6	2.2	Felsic	194
RL-22-531	22.6	28.8	0.8	Pegmatite	13,215
RL-22-531	28.8	104.5	2.9	Felsic	62
RL-22-531	104.5	131.9	2.9	Mafic	-
RL-22-531	131.9	150.0	3.0	Felsic	-
RL-22-532	0.0	90.1	3.0	Mafic	40
RL-22-532	90.1	101.8	0.3	Pegmatite	9,120
RL-22-532	101.8	113.0	0.3	Sediment	5,477
RL-22-532	113.0	133.7	0.3	Pegmatite	10,842

HoleId	From	To	Interval	Lithology	Li2O ppm
RL-22-532	133.7	156.0	1.7	Sediment	3,270
RL-22-532	156.0	176.8	0.4	Pegmatite	8,344
RL-22-532	176.8	231.0	2.8	Mafic	121
RL-22-533	0.0	5.6	5.6	Overburden	-
RL-22-533	5.6	63.0	3.0	Sediment	-
RL-22-533	63.0	87.3	3.0	Felsic	-
RL-22-533	87.3	111.8	2.9	Mafic	-
RL-22-533	111.8	118.2	2.4	Felsic	-
RL-22-533	118.2	153.0	2.7	Mafic	182
RL-22-533	153.0	162.6	1.0	Pegmatite	6,046
RL-22-533	162.6	201.0	2.8	Mafic	297
RL-22-533	201.0	204.0	3.0		-
RL-22-534	0.0	6.0	6.0	Overburden	-
RL-22-534	6.0	117.0	2.8	Mafic	178
RL-22-534	117.0	120.5	0.8	Pegmatite	9,279
RL-22-534	120.5	136.8	2.2	Felsic	252
RL-22-534	136.8	201.0	3.0	Mafic	-
RL-22-535	0.0	3.2	3.2	Overburden	-
RL-22-535	3.2	3.7	0.5	Mafic	-
RL-22-535	3.7	4.5	0.9	Felsic	-
RL-22-535	4.5	15.3	2.7	Mafic	-
RL-22-535	15.3	16.8	1.5	Felsic	-
RL-22-535	16.8	30.8	2.1	Mafic	292
RL-22-535	30.8	36.3	0.3	Pegmatite	10,055
RL-22-535	36.3	142.8	2.8	Mafic	38
RL-22-535	142.8	144.0	1.2	Felsic	37
RL-22-535	144.0	150.0	2.0	Mafic	57
RL-22-536	0.0	6.3	6.3	Overburden	-
RL-22-536	6.3	91.9	2.9	Felsic	301
RL-22-536	91.9	96.1	0.9	Pegmatite	2,267
RL-22-536	96.1	127.6	2.6	Felsic	123
RL-22-536	127.6	138.8	2.6	Mafic	-
RL-22-536	138.8	162.2	2.9	Felsic	-
RL-22-536	162.2	176.7	2.9	Mafic	-
RL-22-536	176.7	180.0	2.8	Felsic	-
RL-22-537	0.0	6.3	6.3	Overburden	-
RL-22-537	6.3	172.4	2.9	Mafic	91
RL-22-537	172.4	175.9	0.9	Pegmatite	11,330
RL-22-537	175.9	201.0	2.7	Mafic	158
RL-22-538	0.0	7.2	7.2	Overburden	-
RL-22-538	7.2	28.2	2.8	Sediment	-
RL-22-538	28.2	38.2	1.8	Felsic	1,193
RL-22-538	38.2	42.8	0.7	Pegmatite	9,192
RL-22-538	42.8	102.0	2.8	Sediment	48
RL-22-539	0.0	6.0	6.0	Overburden	-
RL-22-539	6.0	53.2	2.8	Sediment	258
RL-22-539	53.2	55.4	0.7	Pegmatite	2,947
RL-22-539	55.4	59.2	0.9	Sediment	1,446
RL-22-539	59.2	75.1	2.9	Felsic	37
RL-22-539	75.1	117.0	3.0	Sediment	-
RL-22-540	0.0	3.0	3.0	Overburden	-
RL-22-540	3.0	32.6	2.7	Felsic	51
RL-22-540	32.6	39.1	0.9	Pegmatite	6,719
RL-22-540	39.1	150.0	2.7	Felsic	35
RL-22-541	0.0	10.0	9.2	Overburden	-
RL-22-541	10.0	79.5	2.8	Felsic	66
RL-22-541	79.5	83.8	0.9	Pegmatite	10,195
RL-22-541	83.8	180.0	2.9	Felsic	47
RL-22-542	0.0	7.9	7.9	Overburden	-
RL-22-542	7.9	51.5	2.9	Sediment	-
RL-22-542	51.5	114.9	2.9	Mafic	8
RL-22-542	114.9	115.9	1.0	Pegmatite	194
RL-22-542	115.9	146.9	2.4	Mafic	159
RL-22-542	146.9	151.1	0.9	Pegmatite	1,907
RL-22-542	151.1	210.7	2.8	Sediment	112

HoleId	From	To	Interval	Lithology	Li2O ppm
RL-22-542	210.7	212.0	1.3	Mafic	-
RL-22-542	212.0	219.0	2.7	Sediment	-
RL-22-542	219.0	252.0	3.0	Mafic	-
RL-22-543	0.0	7.7	7.7	Overburden	-
RL-22-543	7.7	57.4	2.9	Sediment	-
RL-22-543	57.4	61.4	2.2	Felsic	-
RL-22-543	61.4	137.6	2.9	Sediment	8
RL-22-543	137.6	139.3	0.4	Pegmatite	281
RL-22-543	139.3	187.5	2.7	Mafic	528
RL-22-543	187.5	195.5	1.0	Pegmatite	8,387
RL-22-543	195.5	249.0	2.8	Mafic	149
RL-22-543	249.0	252.0	3.0		-
RL-22-547	0.0	4.5	4.5	Overburden	-
RL-22-547	4.5	45.5	2.9	Sediment	-
RL-22-547	45.5	57.3	2.8	Felsic	-
RL-22-547	57.3	67.0	2.7	Sediment	-
RL-22-547	67.0	79.9	2.7	Felsic	-
RL-22-547	79.9	92.3	2.7	Sediment	-
RL-22-547	92.3	126.0	3.0	Felsic	-
RL-22-548	0.0	3.0	3.0	Overburden	-
RL-22-548	3.0	6.7	2.6	Mafic	-
RL-22-548	6.7	14.0	2.5	Felsic	-
RL-22-548	14.0	64.8	2.9	Mafic	-
RL-22-548	64.8	70.0	1.1	Felsic	481
RL-22-548	70.0	74.0	0.7	Pegmatite	4,352
RL-22-548	74.0	96.8	2.6	Felsic	99
RL-22-548	96.8	131.1	2.8	Mafic	4
RL-22-548	131.1	132.5	0.8	Pegmatite	38
RL-22-548	132.5	163.3	2.5	Mafic	25
RL-22-548	163.3	167.3	0.8	Pegmatite	30
RL-22-548	167.3	192.0	2.7	Mafic	9
RL-22-549	0.0	9.0	9.0	Overburden	-
RL-22-549	9.0	124.3	2.9	Felsic	63
RL-22-549	124.3	128.6	0.9	Pegmatite	9,380
RL-22-549	128.6	220.9	2.9	Felsic	47
RL-22-549	220.9	249.0	2.9		-
RL-22-550	0.0	3.6	3.6	Overburden	-
RL-22-550	3.6	97.5	2.9	Felsic	25
RL-22-550	97.5	101.7	0.7	Pegmatite	9,272
RL-22-550	101.7	150.0	2.7	Felsic	59
RL-22-551	0.0	7.7	7.7	Overburden	-
RL-22-551	7.7	35.6	2.9	Sediment	-
RL-22-551	35.6	39.5	2.4	Felsic	-
RL-22-551	39.5	99.7	3.0	Sediment	-
RL-22-551	99.7	102.2	2.1	Felsic	-
RL-22-551	102.2	126.0	3.0	Sediment	-
RL-23-452	0.0	6.0	6.0	Overburden	-
RL-23-452	6.0	10.2	1.1	Mafic	2,321
RL-23-452	10.2	22.8	1.0	Pegmatite	16,087
RL-23-452	22.8	90.3	2.7	Mafic	137
RL-23-452	90.3	104.1	2.8	Sediment	-
RL-23-452	104.1	137.7	2.7	Mafic	279
RL-23-452	137.7	149.1	0.8	Pegmatite	13,205
RL-23-452	149.1	201.0	2.8	Sediment	51
RL-23-454	0.0	24.0	24.0	Overburden	-
RL-23-454	24.0	71.3	2.8	Mafic	167
RL-23-454	71.3	77.7	0.9	Pegmatite	15,329
RL-23-454	77.7	180.0	2.9	Mafic	57
RL-23-480	0.0	16.1	14.0	Overburden	44
RL-23-480	16.1	27.3	0.3	Pegmatite	8,424
RL-23-480	27.3	92.1	2.8	Mafic	41
RL-23-480	92.1	100.8	2.5	Felsic	-
RL-23-480	100.8	159.9	2.9	Mafic	-
RL-23-480	159.9	172.9	1.9	Felsic	342
RL-23-480	172.9	178.0	0.3	Pegmatite	12,019

HoleId	From	To	Interval	Lithology	Li2O ppm
RL-23-480	178.0	185.9	1.3	Felsic	1,177
RL-23-480	185.9	201.0	3.0	Sediment	-
RL-23-544	0.0	2.0	2.0	Overburden	-
RL-23-544	2.0	12.0	2.8	Mafic	-
RL-23-544A	0.0	2.0	2.0	overburden	-
RL-23-544A	2.0	159.4	2.9	mafic	21
RL-23-544A	159.4	162.8	0.9	Pegmatite	15,467
RL-23-544A	162.8	225.0	2.7	Mafic	54
RL-23-545	0.0	1.9	1.9	Overburden	-
RL-23-545	1.9	70.3	2.9	Mafic	-
RL-23-545	70.3	83.3	1.0	Pegmatite	6,739
RL-23-545	83.3	159.0	2.8	Mafic	90
RL-23-545	159.0	160.1	0.9	Pegmatite	145
RL-23-545	160.1	225.0	2.8	Mafic	14
RL-23-546	0.0	3.0	3.0	Overburden	-
RL-23-546	3.0	62.6	3.0	Mafic	-
RL-23-546	62.6	67.8	2.4	Felsic	-
RL-23-546	67.8	149.4	2.8	Mafic	26
RL-23-546	149.4	152.3	0.8	Pegmatite	17,202
RL-23-546	152.3	210.0	2.7	Mafic	89
RL-23-553	0.0	3.6	3.6	Overburden	-
RL-23-553	3.6	31.5	2.9	Felsic	-
RL-23-553	31.5	37.1	2.2	Mafic	-
RL-23-553	37.1	80.0	2.5	Felsic	52
RL-23-553	80.0	85.0	1.0	Pegmatite	170
RL-23-553	85.0	87.7	0.9	Sediment	819
RL-23-553	87.7	89.6	1.0	Pegmatite	183
RL-23-553	89.6	120.0	2.7	Felsic	66
RL-23-554	0.0	18.5	18.5	Overburden	-
RL-23-554	18.5	20.9	2.5	Mafic	-
RL-23-554	20.9	31.6	2.1	Felsic	402
RL-23-554	31.6	39.9	0.9	Pegmatite	18,168
RL-23-554	39.9	126.8	2.8	Sediment	51
RL-23-554	126.8	130.1	0.8	Pegmatite	5,615
RL-23-554	130.1	150.0	2.5	Sediment	86
RL-23-555	0.0	4.5	4.5	Overburden	-
RL-23-555	4.5	68.8	2.9	Mafic	-
RL-23-555	68.8	171.9	3.0	Sediment	-
RL-23-555	171.9	182.1	2.6	Mafic	-
RL-23-555	182.1	210.0	2.9	Sediment	-
RL-23-556	0.0	3.3	2.8	Overburden	-
RL-23-556	3.3	55.0	2.8	Mafic	142
RL-23-556	55.0	58.0	1.0	Pegmatite	13,970
RL-23-556	58.0	127.9	2.7	Mafic	111
RL-23-556	127.9	129.1	0.5	Pegmatite	410
RL-23-556	129.1	222.0	2.9	Mafic	25
RL-23-557	0.0	3.0	3.0	Overburden	-
RL-23-557	3.0	210.0	3.0	Mafic	-
RL-23-558	0.0	1.5	1.5	Overburden	-
RL-23-558	1.5	85.8	2.7	Mafic	51
RL-23-558	85.8	89.0	0.9	Pegmatite	302
RL-23-558	89.0	135.3	2.6	Mafic	97
RL-23-558	135.3	136.6	0.6	Pegmatite	316
RL-23-558	136.6	150.1	1.1	Mafic	2,023
RL-23-558	150.1	152.4	0.8	Pegmatite	5,672
RL-23-558	152.4	210.0	2.8	mafic	103
RL-23-561	0.0	1.5	1.5	Overburden	-
RL-23-561	1.5	65.7	2.8	Mafic	154
RL-23-561	65.7	69.5	0.7	Pegmatite	1,378
RL-23-561	69.5	114.6	2.7	Mafic	82
RL-23-561	114.6	155.9	2.7	Sediment	138
RL-23-561	155.9	157.9	0.9	Pegmatite	1,336
RL-23-561	157.9	172.1	1.0	Sediment	719
RL-23-561	172.1	174.0	0.9	Pegmatite	576
RL-23-561	174.0	225.0	2.8	Mafic	242

HoleId	From	To	Interval	Lithology	Li2O ppm
RL-23-560	0.0	13.5	13.5	Overburden	-
RL-23-560	13.5	275.5	2.9	Mafic	17
RL-23-560	275.5	279.8	0.6	Pegmatite	10,631
RL-23-560	279.8	351.0	2.9	Mafic	41
RL-22-571	0.0	5.4	5.4	Overburden	-
RL-22-571	5.4	69.2	2.7	Sediment	136
RL-22-571	69.2	71.5	0.8	Pegmatite	6,093
RL-22-571	71.5	95.6	2.0	Sediment	286
RL-22-571	95.6	100.7	0.7	Felsic	246
RL-22-571	100.7	157.7	2.8	Sediment	17
RL-22-571	157.7	158.4	0.6	Pegmatite	75
RL-22-571	158.4	198.5	2.6	Sediment	30
RL-22-571	198.5	207.0	2.8	felsic	-
RL-22-571	207.0	216.5	2.9	Sediment	-
RL-22-571	216.5	222.7	2.5	Felsic	-
RL-22-571	222.7	235.4	2.7	Sediment	-
RL-22-571	235.4	273.0	2.9	Felsic	-
RL-23-559	0.0	6.0	6.0	Overburden	-
RL-23-559	6.0	37.1	2.9	Mafic	-
RL-23-559	37.1	44.2	2.5	Felsic	-
RL-23-559	44.2	64.5	2.8	Mafic	-
RL-23-559	64.5	72.0	2.7	Felsic	-
RL-23-559	72.0	120.0	3.0	Mafic	-
RL-23-567	0.0	8.2	8.2	Overburden	-
RL-23-567	8.2	10.6	0.9	Sediment	881
RL-23-567	10.6	13.5	0.8	Pegmatite	7,833
RL-23-567	13.5	129.0	2.8	Sediment	77
RL-23-568	0.0	5.4	5.4	Overburden	-
RL-23-568	5.4	30.0	2.9	Sediment	-
RL-23-568C	0.0	7.7	7.7	Overburden	-
RL-23-568C	7.7	50.2	2.7	Sediment	82
RL-23-568C	50.2	56.0	1.0	pegmatite	881
RL-23-568C	56.0	108.7	2.8	Sediment	33
RL-23-568C	108.7	120.8	2.7	felsic	-
RL-23-568C	120.8	132.0	2.9	Sediment	-
RL-23-569	0.0	8.0	8.0	Overburden	-
RL-23-569	8.0	14.0	2.3	felsic	-
RL-23-569	14.0	33.0	2.4	Sediment	-
RL-23-569	33.0	36.8	1.0	Pegmatite	-
RL-23-569	36.8	68.3	2.1	sediment	-
RL-23-569	68.3	72.5	2.3	felsic	-
RL-23-569	72.5	94.3	2.8	Sediment	-
RL-23-569	94.3	107.5	2.7	felsic	-
RL-23-569	107.5	120.0	2.9	Sediment	-
RL-23-570	0.0	5.8	5.8	Overburden	-
RL-23-570	5.8	15.2	1.8	Sediment	237
RL-23-570	15.2	17.9	0.9	Pegmatite	18,177
RL-23-570	17.9	28.0	1.0	Sediment	930
RL-23-570	28.0	30.8	0.8	Pegmatite	300
RL-23-570	30.8	60.6	2.6	Sediment	108
RL-23-570	60.6	66.8	2.5	Mafic	-
RL-23-570	66.8	77.9	2.5	Sediment	7
RL-23-570	77.9	81.6	0.9	Felsic	27
RL-23-570	81.6	90.6	2.4	Sediment	5
RL-23-570	90.6	92.4	1.8	Felsic	-
RL-23-570	92.4	100.2	2.5	Sediment	7
RL-23-570	100.2	102.0	0.9	Felsic	27
RL-23-570	102.0	107.5	0.9	Sediment	75
RL-23-570	107.5	108.5	0.5	Felsic	32
RL-23-570	108.5	114.3	2.1	Sediment	7
RL-23-570	114.3	120.0	2.8	Felsic	-
RL-23-572	0.0	6.5	5.6	Overburden	-
RL-23-572	6.5	112.5	2.8	Felsic	1
RL-23-572	112.5	129.4	2.2	Pegmatite	175
RL-23-572	129.4	183.0	2.6	Felsic	858

HoleId	From	To	Interval	Lithology	Li2O ppm
RL-23-572	183.0	209.7	1.6	Sediment	256
RL-23-572	209.7	211.9	0.6	Pegmatite	90
RL-23-572	211.9	240.0	2.6	Sediment	34
RL-23-575	0.0	6.3	6.3	Overburden	-
RL-23-575	6.3	29.1	2.9	Sediment	-
RL-23-575	29.1	32.8	2.4	Felsic	-
RL-23-575	32.8	43.7	2.8	Sediment	-
RL-23-575	43.7	44.7	1.0	Felsic	-
RL-23-575	44.7	62.1	2.4	Sediment	164
RL-23-575	62.1	73.0	0.9	Pegmatite	4,739
RL-23-575	73.0	77.3	1.1	Sediment	316
RL-23-575	77.3	79.2	0.7	Pegmatite	182
RL-23-575	79.2	95.2	2.3	Sediment	60
RL-23-575	95.2	118.3	2.4	Felsic	52
RL-23-575	118.3	119.3	1.0	Pegmatite	157
RL-23-575	119.3	140.5	2.1	Felsic	85
RL-23-575	140.5	142.3	1.1	Sediment	-
RL-23-575	142.3	151.8	1.7	Felsic	64
RL-23-575	151.8	155.3	1.9	Mafic	-
RL-23-575	155.3	165.1	2.8	Felsic	-
RL-23-575	165.1	257.7	3.0	Mafic	-
RL-23-575	257.7	280.0	2.9	Felsic	-
RL-23-575	280.0	297.5	2.4	Mafic	7
RL-23-575	297.5	297.9	0.4	Pegmatite	28
RL-23-575	297.9	324.0	2.8	Mafic	1
RL-23-576	0.0	4.4	4.4	Overburden	-
RL-23-576	4.4	105.2	2.7	Felsic	55
RL-23-576	105.2	106.0	0.3	Pegmatite	271
RL-23-576	106.0	129.0	1.9	Felsic	325
RL-23-576	129.0	129.6	0.2	Pegmatite	213
RL-23-576	129.6	170.2	2.2	Felsic	147
RL-23-576	170.2	173.5	0.3	Pegmatite	12,498
RL-23-576	173.5	214.3	2.6	Felsic	54
RL-23-576	214.3	270.0	2.8	Sediment	-
RL-23-044	0.0	0.6	0.6	Overburden	-
RL-23-044	0.6	18.9	2.5	Mafic	232
RL-23-044	18.9	22.5	0.8	Pegmatite	13,594
RL-23-044	22.5	189.2	2.9	Mafic	29
RL-23-044	189.2	198.7	2.8	sediment	-
RL-23-044	198.7	215.9	2.3	mafic	121
RL-23-044	215.9	223.0	0.9	Pegmatite	5,437
RL-23-044	223.0	381.0	2.9	Mafic	13
RL-23-403	0.0	3.0	3.0	Overburden	-
RL-23-403	3.0	13.6	2.8	Sediment	-
RL-23-403	13.6	30.8	2.7	Mafic	-
RL-23-403	30.8	120.0	2.9	Sediment	-
RL-23-566	0.0	3.0	3.0	Overburden	-
RL-23-566	3.0	21.5	2.8	Sediment	-
RL-23-566	21.5	210.0	2.8	Mafic	-
RL-23-574	0.0	0.6	0.6	Overburden	-
RL-23-574	0.6	198.0	2.8	Mafic	62
RL-23-562	0.0	3.0	3.0	Overburden	-
RL-23-562	3.0	251.0	2.8	Sediment	-
RL-23-563	0.0	3.0	3.0	Overburden	-
RL-23-563	3.0	31.8	3.1	Mafic	-
RL-23-563	31.8	145.5	2.8	Sediment	-
RL-23-563	145.5	198.0	2.7	Mafic	-
RL-23-573	0.0	3.5	2.6	Overburden	-
RL-23-573	3.5	51.2	2.8	Mafic	81
RL-23-573	51.2	52.8	0.8	Pegmatite	4,478
RL-23-573	52.8	142.7	2.8	Mafic	68
RL-23-573	142.7	143.8	0.6	Pegmatite	220
RL-23-573	143.8	201.0	2.9	Mafic	202
RL-23-442	0.0	6.0	6.0	Overburden	-
RL-23-442	6.0	81.7	2.8	Mafic	-

HoleId	From	To	Interval	Lithology	Li2O ppm
RL-23-442	81.7	83.7	1.1	Pegmatite	-
RL-23-442	83.7	94.5	1.1	Mafic	-
RL-23-442	94.5	95.0	0.5	Pegmatite	-
RL-23-442	95.0	98.2	1.1	Mafic	-
RL-23-442	98.2	98.9	0.8	Pegmatite	-
RL-23-442	98.9	100.5	1.4	Mafic	-
RL-23-442	100.5	102.0	0.8	Pegmatite	-
RL-23-442	102.0	128.3	2.5	Mafic	-
RL-23-442	128.3	129.7	0.7	Pegmatite	-
RL-23-442	129.7	168.0	2.7	Mafic	-
RL-23-564	0.0	4.5	4.5	Overburden	-
RL-23-564	4.5	204.0	3.0	Mafic	-
RL-23-565	0.0	3.6	3.6	Overburden	-
RL-23-565	3.6	26.0	2.8	Mafic	-
RL-23-565	26.0	93.1	2.9	Sediment	-
RL-23-565	93.1	98.1	2.4	Mafic	-
RL-23-565	98.1	201.0	3.0	Sediment	-

Root Bay Geology Summary

HoleID	From	to	Interval	Lithology	Li2O ppm
RB-23-001	0.0	3.0	3.0	Overburden	-
RB-23-001	3.0	60.9	57.9	Mafic	-
RB-23-001	60.9	128.0	67.1	Pegmatite	11,280
RB-23-001	128.0	162.0	34.0	Mafic	-
RB-23-001	162.0	169.3	7.3	Pegmatite	14,350
RB-23-001	169.3	174.3	5.0	Mafic	-
RB-23-001	174.3	179.6	5.3	Pegmatite	13,420
RB-23-001	179.6	204.0	24.4	Mafic	-
RB-23-003	0.0	2.9	2.9	Overburden	-
RB-23-003	2.9	67.4	2.8	Mafic	19
RB-23-003	67.4	79.5	0.4	Pegmatite	12,667
RB-23-003	79.5	83.5	0.8	Mafic	535
RB-23-003	83.5	85.0	0.3	Pegmatite	3,813
RB-23-003	85.0	139.2	2.5	Mafic	79
RB-23-003	139.2	140.0	0.2	Pegmatite	125
RB-23-003	140.0	201.0	2.7	Mafic	23
RB-23-005	0.0	3.0	3.0	Overburden	-
RB-23-005	3.0	15.0	1.9	Mafic	107
RB-23-005	15.0	15.5	0.4	Pegmatite	385
RB-23-005	15.5	45.4	2.1	Mafic	220
RB-23-005	45.4	49.0	0.2	Pegmatite	646
RB-23-005	49.0	108.6	2.5	Mafic	101
RB-23-005	108.6	109.9	0.2	Pegmatite	12,585
RB-23-005	109.9	129.2	0.3	Mafic	602
RB-23-005	129.2	135.8	0.3	Pegmatite	14,678
RB-23-005	135.8	140.5	0.3	Mafic	907
RB-23-005	140.5	145.0	0.2	Pegmatite	13,394
RB-23-005	145.0	149.0	0.2	Mafic	893

HoleID	From	to	Interval	Lithology	Li2O ppm
RB-23-005	149.0	151.1	0.3	Pegmatite	10,936
RB-23-005	151.1	210.0	2.8	Mafic	39
RB-23-007	0.0	0.5	0.5	Overburden	-
RB-23-007	0.5	32.9	2.6	Mafic	94
RB-23-007	32.9	34.8	0.2	Pegmatite	6,520
RB-23-007	34.8	50.6	0.3	Mafic	510
RB-23-007	50.6	51.8	0.2	Felsic	255
RB-23-007	51.8	141.6	2.8	Mafic	31
RB-23-007	141.6	142.1	0.2	Felsic	73
RB-23-007	142.1	147.3	0.3	Mafic	454
RB-23-007	147.3	150.3	0.3	Pegmatite	16,109
RB-23-007	150.3	153.2	0.2	Mafic	595
RB-23-007	153.2	156.7	0.2	Pegmatite	4,884
RB-23-007	156.7	170.9	0.3	Mafic	745
RB-23-007	170.9	177.4	0.2	Pegmatite	15,722
RB-23-007	177.4	187.4	0.3	Mafic	760
RB-23-007	187.4	190.4	0.2	Pegmatite	15,227
RB-23-007	190.4	199.5	0.3	Mafic	680
RB-23-007	199.5	202.1	0.2	Pegmatite	11,771
RB-23-007	202.1	231.0	2.6	Mafic	77
RB-23-009	0.0	6.0	6.0	Overburden	-
RB-23-009	6.0	124.6	2.8	Mafic	18
RB-23-009	124.6	127.2	0.2	Pegmatite	10,052
RB-23-009	127.2	195.5	2.2	Mafic	111
RB-23-009	195.5	198.9	0.3	Pegmatite	16,140
RB-23-009	198.9	222.9	0.3	Mafic	475
RB-23-009	222.9	228.1	0.3	Pegmatite	14,363
RB-23-009	228.1	239.5	0.3	Mafic	685
RB-23-009	239.5	240.7	0.2	Pegmatite	11,786
RB-23-009	240.7	250.6	0.2	Mafic	777
RB-23-009	250.6	253.4	0.2	Pegmatite	13,215
RB-23-009	253.4	256.0	0.2	Mafic	959
RB-23-009	256.0	258.5	0.2	Pegmatite	15,754
RB-23-009	258.5	288.0	1.9	Mafic	253
RB-23-011	0.0	6.8	6.8	Overburden	-
RB-23-011	6.8	12.8	1.0	Mafic	272
RB-23-011	12.8	17.0	0.3	Pegmatite	8,133
RB-23-011	17.0	21.9	0.4	Mafic	932
RB-23-011	21.9	23.1	0.1	Pegmatite	193
RB-23-011	23.1	176.7	2.7	Mafic	22
RB-23-011	176.7	179.3	0.2	Pegmatite	6,396
RB-23-011	179.3	249.1	2.3	Mafic	60
RB-23-011	249.1	250.7	0.2	Pegmatite	2,282

HoleID	From	to	Interval	Lithology	Li2O ppm
RB-23-011	250.7	274.1	0.4	Mafic	485
RB-23-011	274.1	278.1	0.3	Pegmatite	16,412
RB-23-011	278.1	296.2	0.5	Mafic	598
RB-23-011	296.2	297.2	0.2	Pegmatite	5,683
RB-23-011	297.2	310.0	0.5	Mafic	603
RB-23-011	310.0	314.1	0.3	Pegmatite	12,335
RB-23-011	314.1	320.9	0.4	Mafic	980
RB-23-011	320.9	322.6	0.3	Pegmatite	11,120
RB-23-011	322.6	353.0	2.6	Mafic	118
RB-23-013	0.0	3.2	2.8	Overburden	-
RB-23-013	3.2	50.1	2.7	Mafic	130
RB-23-013	50.1	56.2	0.3	Pegmatite	13,706
RB-23-013	56.2	196.8	2.8	Mafic	56
RB-23-013	196.8	198.1	0.3	Pegmatite	635
RB-23-013	198.1	245.0	2.3	Mafic	515
RB-23-013	245.0	297.0	2.9	Sediment	16
RB-23-013	297.0	324.6	2.7	Mafic	71
RB-23-013	324.6	329.7	0.4	Pegmatite	4,657
RB-23-013	329.7	374.9	1.9	Mafic	337
RB-23-013	374.9	377.1	0.4	Pegmatite	14,864
RB-23-013	377.1	402.0	1.5	Mafic	1,876
RB-23-014	0.0	3.5	3.5	Overburden	-
RB-23-014	3.5	8.5	0.9	Mafic	439
RB-23-014	8.5	21.8	0.4	Pegmatite	13,523
RB-23-014	21.8	227.8	2.9	Mafic	18
RB-23-014	227.8	236.1	0.4	Pegmatite	14,302
RB-23-014	236.1	247.6	0.7	Mafic	769
RB-23-014	247.6	249.4	0.3	Pegmatite	13,339
RB-23-014	249.4	320.7	2.1	Mafic	223
RB-23-016	0.0	3.2	3.2	Overburden	-
RB-23-016	3.2	42.4	2.7	Mafic	90
RB-23-016	42.4	44.3	0.4	Pegmatite	12,399
RB-23-016	44.3	57.8	0.6	Mafic	1,099
RB-23-016	57.8	69.0	0.4	Pegmatite	15,169
RB-23-016	69.0	75.6	0.8	Mafic	519
RB-23-016	75.6	78.8	0.9	Pegmatite	9,457
RB-23-016	78.8	131.5	2.7	Mafic	39
RB-23-016	131.5	138.3	1.5	Pegmatite	1,101
RB-23-016	138.3	162.0	3.0	Mafic	-
RB-23-029	0.0	7.7	5.6	Overburden	-
RB-23-029	7.7	73.7	2.1	Sediment	85
RB-23-029	73.7	74.5	0.2	Pegmatite	1,421
RB-23-029	74.5	171.0	2.9	Sediment	32

HoleID	From	to	Interval	Lithology	Li2O ppm
RB-23-040	0.0	3.0	3.0	Overburden	-
RB-23-040	3.0	216.9	2.9	Mafic	7
RB-23-040	216.9	218.8	0.4	Pegmatite	13,822
RB-23-040	218.8	219.7	0.5	Mafic	6,716
RB-23-040	219.7	224.7	0.4	Pegmatite	18,622
RB-23-040	224.7	256.2	2.3	Mafic	218
RB-23-040	256.2	257.4	0.6	Pegmatite	856
RB-23-040	257.4	324.0	2.4	Mafic	251
RB-23-042	0.0	5.6	5.6	Overburden	-
RB-23-042	5.6	11.5	0.4	Pegmatite	15,396
RB-23-042	11.5	168.0	2.9	Mafic	31
RB-23-044	0.0	3.0	3.0	Overburden	-
RB-23-044	3.0	18.4	2.2	Mafic	97
RB-23-044	18.4	23.5	0.2	Pegmatite	2,193
RB-23-044	23.5	36.4	0.5	Mafic	369
RB-23-044	36.4	36.8	0.2	Pegmatite	45
RB-23-044	36.8	73.4	2.4	Mafic	88
RB-23-044	73.4	77.3	0.2	Pegmatite	292
RB-23-044	77.3	78.6	0.2	Mafic	762
RB-23-044	78.6	81.2	0.3	Pegmatite	1,381
RB-23-044	81.2	189.0	2.7	Mafic	94
RB-23-046	0.0	1.8	1.8	Overburden	-
RB-23-046	1.8	9.1	0.7	Mafic	214
RB-23-046	9.1	11.3	0.4	Pegmatite	12,974
RB-23-046	11.3	128.0	2.8	Mafic	42
RB-23-046	128.0	132.6	1.0	Pegmatite	6,374
RB-23-046	132.6	252.0	2.7	Mafic	52
RB-23-048	0.0	3.8	3.8	Overburden	-
RB-23-048	3.8	90.5	2.7	Mafic	26
RB-23-048	90.5	91.5	0.3	Pegmatite	58
RB-23-048	91.5	99.4	0.9	Mafic	597
RB-23-048	99.4	100.1	0.2	Pegmatite	2,992
RB-23-048	100.1	118.7	2.2	Mafic	93
RB-23-048	118.7	119.4	0.1	Pegmatite	200
RB-23-048	119.4	165.4	2.6	Mafic	73
RB-23-048	165.4	170.9	0.3	Pegmatite	3,733
RB-23-048	170.9	176.8	0.5	Mafic	395
RB-23-048	176.8	178.4	0.3	Pegmatite	318
RB-23-048	178.4	187.1	0.5	Mafic	456
RB-23-048	187.1	188.3	0.2	Pegmatite	8,157
RB-23-048	188.3	197.9	0.7	Mafic	696
RB-23-048	197.9	204.9	0.3	Pegmatite	10,463
RB-23-048	204.9	278.0	2.8	Mafic	39

HoleID	From	to	Interval	Lithology	Li2O ppm
RB-23-048	278.0	278.7	0.2	Pegmatite	1,137
RB-23-048	278.7	291.0	1.7	Mafic	299
RB-23-050	0.0	12.0	12.0	Overburden	-
RB-23-050	12.0	46.3	2.7	Mafic	18
RB-23-050	46.3	46.7	0.4	Pegmatite	125
RB-23-050	46.7	157.6	2.8	Mafic	35
RB-23-050	157.6	159.5	0.3	Pegmatite	208
RB-23-050	159.5	168.3	0.6	Mafic	321
RB-23-050	168.3	170.5	0.2	Pegmatite	273
RB-23-050	170.5	213.4	2.6	Mafic	57
RB-23-050	213.4	218.5	0.3	Pegmatite	327
RB-23-050	218.5	222.1	0.6	Mafic	772
RB-23-050	222.1	224.2	0.4	Pegmatite	2,051
RB-23-050	224.2	244.4	2.3	Mafic	130
RB-23-050	244.4	245.6	0.4	Pegmatite	5,391
RB-23-050	245.6	255.5	0.7	Mafic	606
RB-23-050	255.5	261.7	0.3	Pegmatite	10,917
RB-23-050	261.7	288.6	2.3	Mafic	165
RB-23-050	288.6	294.2	0.4	Pegmatite	5,966
RB-23-050	294.2	354.0	2.6	Mafic	62
RB-23-053	0.0	5.0	5.0	Overburden	-
RB-23-053	5.0	219.0	2.9	Sediment	-
RB-23-057	0.0	7.2	7.2	Overburden	-
RB-23-057	7.2	192.0	3.0	Sediment	-
RB-23-081	0.0	1.9	1.9	Overburden	-
RB-23-081	1.9	65.7	2.6	Mafic	33
RB-23-081	65.7	67.3	0.2	Pegmatite	5,978
RB-23-081	67.3	112.8	2.3	Mafic	118
RB-23-081	112.8	113.4	0.2	Pegmatite	1,447
RB-23-081	113.4	115.1	0.2	Mafic	3,003
RB-23-081	115.1	117.3	0.2	Pegmatite	13,932
RB-23-081	117.3	119.7	0.2	Mafic	921
RB-23-081	119.7	123.8	0.2	Pegmatite	13,827
RB-23-081	123.8	176.8	2.5	Mafic	167
RB-23-081	176.8	181.7	0.3	Pegmatite	5,480
RB-23-081	181.7	208.5	2.3	Mafic	548
RB-23-081	208.5	208.9	0.2	Pegmatite	19,073
RB-23-081	208.9	222.8	0.5	Mafic	690
RB-23-081	222.8	223.2	0.1	Pegmatite	4,176
RB-23-081	223.2	234.8	0.6	Mafic	543
RB-23-081	234.8	235.5	0.1	Pegmatite	8,675
RB-23-081	235.5	298.5	2.6	Mafic	153
RB-23-081	298.5	315.0	0.3	Pegmatite	15,236

HoleID	From	to	Interval	Lithology	Li2O ppm
RB-23-081	315.0	320.3	0.4	Sediment	2,182
RB-23-081	320.3	321.6	0.2	Pegmatite	7,642
RB-23-081	321.6	351.0	2.5	Mafic	138
RB-23-083	0.0	1.7	1.7	Overburden	-
RB-23-083	1.7	54.8	2.7	Mafic	33
RB-23-083	54.8	61.4	0.2	Pegmatite	15,397
RB-23-083	61.4	179.0	2.8	Mafic	59
RB-23-083	179.0	181.4	0.2	Pegmatite	2,390
RB-23-083	181.4	191.9	0.6	Mafic	623
RB-23-083	191.9	192.5	0.1	Pegmatite	161
RB-23-083	192.5	254.6	2.5	Mafic	101
RB-23-083	254.6	271.2	0.3	Pegmatite	15,491
RB-23-083	271.2	324.0	2.7	Mafic	48
RB-23-085	0.0	3.7	3.7	Overburden	-
RB-23-085	3.7	87.4	2.9	Mafic	5
RB-23-085	87.4	88.0	0.2	Pegmatite	215
RB-23-085	88.0	108.9	2.4	Mafic	77
RB-23-085	108.9	109.6	0.2	Pegmatite	5,662
RB-23-085	109.6	181.4	2.7	Mafic	124
RB-23-085	181.4	197.4	0.3	Pegmatite	15,783
RB-23-085	197.4	223.5	2.0	Mafic	274
RB-23-085	223.5	224.6	0.2	Pegmatite	6,569
RB-23-085	224.6	228.0	0.9	Mafic	470
RB-23-088	0.0	3.8	3.8	Overburden	-
RB-23-088	3.8	23.8	2.6	Mafic	27
RB-23-088	23.8	24.3	0.1	Pegmatite	198
RB-23-088	24.3	99.4	2.6	Mafic	82
RB-23-088	99.4	117.2	0.3	Pegmatite	17,321
RB-23-088	117.2	148.7	2.4	Mafic	148
RB-23-088	148.7	149.8	0.2	Pegmatite	211
RB-23-088	149.8	201.0	2.8	Mafic	20
RB-23-091	0.0	3.0	3.0	Overburden	-
RB-23-091	3.0	33.1	2.5	Mafic	95
RB-23-091	33.1	47.4	0.3	Pegmatite	15,149
RB-23-091	47.4	128.7	2.8	Mafic	207
RB-23-091	128.7	129.1	0.1	Pegmatite	153
RB-23-091	129.1	135.9	0.5	Mafic	346
RB-23-091	135.9	136.1	0.2	Pegmatite	207
RB-23-091	136.1	191.7	2.6	Mafic	46
RB-23-091	191.7	192.8	0.2	Pegmatite	7,814
RB-23-091	192.8	207.0	2.6	Mafic	86
RB-23-098	0.0	8.2	8.2	Overburden	-
RB-23-098	8.2	273.0	2.6	Sediment	20

HoleID	From	to	Interval	Lithology	Li2O ppm
RB-23-102	0.0	9.3	9.3	Overburden	-
RB-23-102	9.3	162.0	2.9	Sediment	-
RB-23-132	0.0	3.0	3.0	Overburden	-
RB-23-132	3.0	120.0	2.8	Sediment	-
RB-23-148	0.0	1.5	1.5	Overburden	-
RB-23-148	1.5	62.9	2.7	Pyroxenite	26
RB-23-148	62.9	68.8	0.2	Pegmatite	13,247
RB-23-148	68.8	69.4	0.2	Mafic	3,100
RB-23-148	69.4	69.7	0.2	Pegmatite	372
RB-23-148	69.7	166.3	2.6	Mafic	209
RB-23-148	166.3	167.1	0.3	Pegmatite	359
RB-23-148	167.1	182.3	0.3	Mafic	619
RB-23-148	182.3	183.3	0.2	Pegmatite	7,341
RB-23-148	183.3	189.5	0.2	Mafic	525
RB-23-148	189.5	189.8	0.2	Pegmatite	319
RB-23-148	189.8	221.7	2.2	Mafic	146
RB-23-148	221.7	222.7	0.3	Pegmatite	364
RB-23-148	222.7	225.3	0.2	Mafic	1,673
RB-23-148	225.3	227.2	0.2	Pegmatite	10,014
RB-23-148	227.2	238.4	0.3	Mafic	5,762
RB-23-148	238.4	238.9	0.2	Pegmatite	196
RB-23-148	238.9	239.3	0.2	Mafic	11,194
RB-23-148	239.3	240.4	0.2	Pegmatite	614
RB-23-148	240.4	242.0	0.2	Mafic	5,070
RB-23-148	242.0	242.8	0.3	Pegmatite	764
RB-23-148	242.8	250.9	0.2	Mafic	2,526
RB-23-148	250.9	251.0	0.1	Pegmatite	1,199
RB-23-148	251.0	251.3	0.2	Mafic	2,260
RB-23-148	251.3	253.5	0.2	Pegmatite	10,878
RB-23-148	253.5	257.7	0.2	Mafic	5,136
RB-23-148	257.7	263.7	0.2	Pegmatite	14,566
RB-23-148	263.7	268.2	0.2	Mafic	2,442
RB-23-148	268.2	270.1	0.2	Pegmatite	9,145
RB-23-148	270.1	275.2	0.2	Mafic	3,661
RB-23-148	275.2	275.4	0.2	Pegmatite	2,519
RB-23-148	275.4	276.8	0.2	Mafic	13,674
RB-23-148	276.8	278.6	0.2	Pegmatite	6,713
RB-23-148	278.6	281.8	0.2	Mafic	4,455
RB-23-148	281.8	282.0	0.2	Pegmatite	1,150
RB-23-148	282.0	284.8	0.2	Mafic	6,405
RB-23-148	284.8	285.1	0.2	Pegmatite	2,519
RB-23-148	285.1	291.8	0.3	Mafic	2,099
RB-23-148	291.8	292.4	0.2	Pegmatite	3,057

HoleID	From	to	Interval	Lithology	Li2O ppm
RB-23-148	292.4	310.7	0.3	Mafic	1,068
RB-23-148	310.7	310.9	0.1	Pegmatite	506
RB-23-148	310.9	313.8	0.2	Mafic	588
RB-23-148	313.8	314.0	0.1	Pegmatite	366
RB-23-148	314.0	342.0	2.4	Mafic	69
RB-23-148	342.0	342.8	0.2	Felsic	1,348
RB-23-148	342.8	354.4	0.3	Mafic	928
RB-23-148	354.4	356.6	0.2	Pegmatite	14,278
RB-23-148	356.6	358.4	0.2	Mafic	10,126
RB-23-148	358.4	359.2	0.2	Sediment	1,010
RB-23-148	359.2	360.3	0.2	Mafic	676
RB-23-148	360.3	360.7	0.2	Pegmatite	153
RB-23-148	360.7	369.0	0.3	Mafic	984
RB-23-152	0.0	4.4	4.4	Overburden	-
RB-23-152	4.4	29.2	2.5	Mafic	140
RB-23-152	29.2	30.8	0.2	Pegmatite	879
RB-23-152	30.8	48.6	2.4	Mafic	80
RB-23-152	48.6	76.6	2.1	Pyroxenite	213
RB-23-152	76.6	77.1	0.1	Pegmatite	6,996
RB-23-152	77.1	96.9	2.1	Pyroxenite	282
RB-23-152	96.9	97.3	0.2	pegmatite	329
RB-23-152	97.3	101.0	0.4	Pyroxenite	389
RB-23-152	101.0	101.3	0.1	Pegmatite	265
RB-23-152	101.3	102.2	0.2	Pyroxenite	389
RB-23-152	102.2	152.4	3.0	Mafic	102
RB-23-152	152.4	169.2	0.3	Pegmatite	15,656
RB-23-152	169.2	210.7	2.2	Mafic	800
RB-23-152	210.7	212.1	0.3	Pegmatite	1,982
RB-23-152	212.1	261.0	2.1	Mafic	242
RB-23-156	0.0	7.0	3.8	Overburden	-
RB-23-156	7.0	29.5	2.6	Mafic	81
RB-23-156	29.5	31.0	0.3	Pegmatite	14,989
RB-23-156	31.0	37.1	0.6	Mafic	1,846
RB-23-156	37.1	52.5	0.3	Pegmatite	16,506
RB-23-156	52.5	82.9	1.5	Mafic	407
RB-23-156	82.9	83.8	0.2	Pegmatite	159
RB-23-156	83.8	120.0	2.8	Mafic	37
RB-23-161	0.0	14.5	14.5	Overburden	-
RB-23-161	14.5	150.5	2.8	Sediment	32
RB-23-161	150.5	152.2	0.2	Pegmatite	4,332
RB-23-161	152.2	201.0	2.8	BIF	25
RB-23-165	0.0	12.2	11.8	Overburden	-
RB-23-165	12.2	134.4	2.8	Sediment	14

HoleID	From	to	Interval	Lithology	Li2O ppm
RB-23-165	134.4	134.4	0.1	Pegmatite	428
RB-23-165	134.4	231.0	2.8	Sediment	13
RB-23-169	0.0	15.0	15.0	Overburden	-
RB-23-169	15.0	95.0	2.7	BIF	5
RB-23-169	95.0	95.9	0.2	Pegmatite	30
RB-23-169	95.9	146.0	2.4	BIF	18
RB-23-169	146.0	317.8	2.6	Sediment	36
RB-23-169	317.8	319.5	0.2	Pegmatite	187
RB-23-169	319.5	322.5	0.3	BIF	2,219
RB-23-169	322.5	326.4	0.3	Pegmatite	227
RB-23-169	326.4	379.7	1.8	Sediment	305
RB-23-169	379.7	380.7	0.2	Pegmatite	97
RB-23-169	380.7	411.0	2.6	Sediment	125
RB-23-174	0.0	16.2	16.2	Overburden	-
RB-23-174	16.2	89.1	2.7	Sediment	20
RB-23-174	89.1	89.9	0.2	Pegmatite	73
RB-23-174	89.9	198.2	2.6	Sediment	40
RB-23-174	198.2	199.1	0.3	Pegmatite	144
RB-23-174	199.1	200.9	0.2	Sediment	470
RB-23-174	200.9	201.0	0.1	Pegmatite	407
RB-23-174	201.0	203.8	0.2	Sediment	496
RB-23-174	203.8	204.0	0.2	Pegmatite	278
RB-23-174	204.0	218.3	0.3	Sediment	588
RB-23-174	218.3	218.6	0.2	Pegmatite	155
RB-23-174	218.6	347.0	2.8	Sediment	16
RB-23-178	0.0	18.0	18.0	Overburden	-
RB-23-178	18.0	103.5	2.7	Sediment	18
RB-23-178	103.5	103.9	0.3	Pegmatite	77
RB-23-178	103.9	222.0	2.7	Sediment	12
RB-23-182	0.0	10.5	10.5	Overburden	-
RB-23-182	10.5	126.0	2.9	Sediment	-
RB-23-195	0.0	12.3	12.3	Overburden	-
RB-23-195	12.3	106.0	2.7	Sediment	11
RB-23-195	106.0	106.3	0.1	Pegmatite	131
RB-23-195	106.3	127.0	1.9	Sediment	128
RB-23-195	127.0	128.2	0.2	Pegmatite	43
RB-23-195	128.2	145.3	0.3	Sediment	275
RB-23-195	145.3	145.8	0.2	Pegmatite	45
RB-23-195	145.8	145.9	0.1	Sediment	185
RB-23-195	145.9	146.5	0.2	Pegmatite	38
RB-23-195	146.5	266.6	2.4	Sediment	56
RB-23-195	266.6	267.5	0.2	Pegmatite	41
RB-23-195	267.5	312.0	2.0	Sediment	77

HoleID	From	to	Interval	Lithology	Li2O ppm
RB-23-200	0.0	18.9	18.9	Overburden	-
RB-23-200	18.9	68.7	2.7	Sediment	19
RB-23-200	68.7	69.2	0.2	Pegmatite	60
RB-23-200	69.2	342.0	2.5	Sediment	24