

# ASX Announcement

26 March 2024

## COLINA DELIVERS FURTHER HIGH- GRADE RESULTS

*High- grade infill results confirm top tier quality of Salinas Lithium Project*

### HIGHLIGHTS

- Multiple high- grade assay results received from the ongoing resource drilling program (“Resource Drilling Program”) in the central zone of the Colina Deposit, affirm the continuity of thickness, consistency, and quality of the mineralisation of the Salinas Lithium Project (“Salinas”).
- One of the largest intersections encountered at the Salinas Project ever recorded in SADD246 with 32.92m @ 1.62% Li<sub>2</sub>O from 325.19m (incl. 27.81m @ 1.80% Li<sub>2</sub>O from 325.19m).
- Significant mineralised intercepts returned from a further 29 completed diamond drill holes from the Resource Drilling Program. Highlights include:
  - SADD233: 24.81m @ 1.53% Li<sub>2</sub>O from 355.19m
  - SADD234: 20.79m @ 1.49% Li<sub>2</sub>O from 299.03m
  - SADD236: 14.20m @ 1.38% Li<sub>2</sub>O from 188.00m
  - SADD238: 25.32m @ 1.61% Li<sub>2</sub>O from 321.00m
  - SADD239: 21.66m @ 1.47% Li<sub>2</sub>O from 294.74m
  - SADD239: 16.82m @ 1.26% Li<sub>2</sub>O from 330.24m
  - SADD240: 11.41m @ 1.94% Li<sub>2</sub>O from 181.59m
  - SADD240: 17.11m @ 1.59% Li<sub>2</sub>O from 317.59m
  - SADD241: 20.24m @ 1.41% Li<sub>2</sub>O from 332.12m
  - SADD243: 10.12m @ 1.30% Li<sub>2</sub>O from 327.88m
  - SADD244: 12.92m @ 1.55% Li<sub>2</sub>O from 268.58m
  - SADD245: 18.65m @ 1.60% Li<sub>2</sub>O from 298.24m
  - SADD259: 15.25m @ 1.51% Li<sub>2</sub>O from 217.60m
  - SADD259: 10.65m @ 1.57% Li<sub>2</sub>O from 293.35m
  - SADD262: 17.75m @ 1.78% Li<sub>2</sub>O from 339.57m
- True thickness analysis of all current pegmatite intersections has shown that 75% or 48.3Mt of the December ‘23 MRE is derived from pegmatites greater than 5m true thickness, including 39% or 24.8Mt of the December ‘23 MRE derived from pegmatites greater than 15m true thickness.
- Fourth updated Colina Mineral Resource Estimate (“Colina MRE”) planned for Q2 2024.
- DFS planned for a Q3 2024 release.

Latin Resources Limited (ASX: LRS) (“Latin” or “the Company”) is pleased to announce continued drilling success on the Colina Deposit resource definition program at the Company’s 100% owned Salinas Lithium Project (“Salinas Project”) in Brazil.

Latin Resources’ Vice President of Operations - Americas, Tony Greenaway, commented:

“With the Colina deposit infill drilling almost complete we are gearing up to run our next Mineral Resource Estimate. This update will be focused on increasing the JORC mineral classification of the existing 63.5Mt resource to enable the declaration of Mineral Reserves as part of the DFS which is currently underway. Results from our infill drilling have closely match our existing data, confirming the robustness of our early interpretations for the Colina Pegmatites. Once the infill drilling is completed, we will refocus some of our drilling fleet back onto our high priority exploration target at Planalto, where our first drill hole intersected thick high-grade mineralisation.”




Figure 1: Plan view of the resource drilling program at the Colina Deposit, indicating new assays and section locations.

## COLINA DEPOSIT- ASSAY RESULTS

The latest round of assay results has been received from the Colina Deposit resource definition drilling and Fog's Block drilling programs. The resource definition drilling program at Colina, which started in December 2023, is set to be completed on time at the end of March 2024. The program is primarily aimed at infill and extensional drilling, with the goal of improving the confidence of the JORC resource categories and extending the spodumene mineralisation at the existing Colina MRE down dip. Assay results from the Colina resource drilling program continue to deliver consistent high-grade and thick spodumene-bearing intercepts, improving the mineralised footprint of the Colina Deposit. Additionally, the program will deliver upgraded confidence level in the current Colina MRE.

16 rigs are currently on site undertaking the 2024 drilling program encompassing resource definition, metallurgical, and geotechnical. These programs will continue throughout the 2024 drilling season, aimed at increasing tonnage and upgrade the confidence level in the current Colina MRE model and to further identify and validate new priority drill targets at Colina, Planalto, Salinas South and Fog's Block.

As it stands, the Colina Deposit contains a MRE of 63.5Mt @ 1.3% Li<sub>2</sub>O, based on 198 drill holes for 64,769m. The Colina Deposit is a SW- NE striking ore body, with approximate dimensions of ~2.70km long and ~0.90km at the widest (**Figure 1**).

To date, 323 diamond core holes have been completed for approximately 104,662m at the Salinas Project with 306 diamond holes for 98,454m at the Colina Deposit alone.

Complete assay results have been received for a further 29 holes, which have collectively intercepted approximately 900m of cumulative lithium mineralisation. A technical discussion is included below, and significant drill intercepts included in **Appendix B**.

### **Technical Discussion**

Assay results within this release refer to 29-diamond drill holes which have been completed as part of the infill resource definition drilling program. The results confirm lithium mineralisation extends from near surface as well as demonstrating thicker than anticipated pegmatite intercepts with continued high-grade results at depth for the Colina Deposit.


The latest results from the will be critical in expanding the current Colina MRE along strike and at depth. These results will be used in the fourth MRE update of the Colina Deposit, which will commence in mid-April and is expected to be completed at the end of April or early May 2024.

The reported drillholes are located toward the central part of the MRE area (**Figure 1**) that have predominately been drilled on a 100m spacing. The drillholes have successfully intersected significant lithium mineralisation, supporting the continuity of the known high-grade mineralisation within the stacked pegmatites along strike and down dip, which remain open at depth. Two section lines '**A – A**' and '**B- B**', drilled approximately 100m apart illustrate the continuity of the intersected mineralisation (refer to **Figure 3** and **Figure 4**).

Notably **SADD246** has intersected 32.92m @ 1.62% Li<sub>2</sub>O from 325.19m (incl. 27.81m @ 1.80% Li<sub>2</sub>O from 325.19m), **one of the largest continuous intersections encountered at the Salinas Project**.

The importance of these new assay results and their location further enhances the geological understanding of the Colina lithium mineralised system and provides significant confidence toward the upgrade into measured category for the upcoming MRE and converting into reserves category as part of the DFS.

Analysis of the true thickness of all current pegmatite intersections (**Figure 2**), has shown that **75% or 48.3Mt** of the December '23 MRE is derived from pegmatites **greater than 5m true thickness**, including **39% or 24.8Mt** of the December '23 MRE derived from pegmatites **greater than 15m true thickness**. This weighting of the MRE tonnage toward thicker pegmatites is evidence that the Colina deposit is amenable to simple open cut mining.




**Figure 2: Colina Pegmatite true-thickness – December MRE tonnage distribution.**

For the complete collar and assay details from the latest round of drilling at Colina, refer to **Appendix A** and **B**.


Two representative sections and a long section are shown in **Figure 3**, **Figure 4** and **Figure 5** respectively.

Representative core photographs and associated grades are shown in **Figure 6** and **Figure 7**.





**Figure 3: Sectional view ('A - A') through the Colina Deposit with Colina Infill Drilling collars indicating multiple stacked pegmatites and grade.**



**Figure 4: Sectional view ('B - B') through the Colina Deposit with Colina Infill Drilling collars indicating multiple stacked pegmatites and grade (new collars in bold).**





Figure 5: Long Sectional view ('C-C') through the Colina Deposit with Colina Infill Drilling collars indicating multiple stacked pegmatites and grade (new collars in bold).





**SADD246: ~326.50m (3.23%  $\text{Li}_2\text{O}$ ). Green spodumene associated to quartz, feldspar and mica.**



**SADD246: ~329.30m (1.78%  $\text{Li}_2\text{O}$ ). Green spodumene associated to quartz, feldspar and mica**



**SADD246: 325.19 – 358.11m (32.92m @ 1.62%  $\text{Li}_2\text{O}$ )**

**Figure 6: Colina Deposit diamond drill core demonstrating the new assay grades for the pegmatites with coarse grained spodumene mineralisation at the indicated intervals. Refer to Appendix D for full assay details.**



SADD238: 321.17 – 322.00m (0.83m @ 1.86% Li<sub>2</sub>O)



SADD238: 325.89 – 326.77m (0.88m @ 2.23% Li<sub>2</sub>O)



SADD238: 321.00 – 346.32 (25.32m @ 1.61% Li<sub>2</sub>O)

*Figure 7: Colina Deposit diamond drill core demonstrating the new assay grades for the pegmatites with coarse grained spodumene mineralisation at the indicated intervals. Refer to Appendix D for full assay details.*

## Ends

This Announcement has been authorised for release to ASX by the Board of Latin Resources

For further information please contact:

Chris Gale  
**Managing Director**  
 Latin Resources Limited  
 +61 8 6117 4798

Fiona Marshall  
**Senior Communications Advisor**  
 White Noise Communications  
 +61 400 512 109

[fiona@whitenoisecomms.com](mailto:fiona@whitenoisecomms.com)

Jane Morgan  
**Director**  
 Jane Morgan Management  
 + 61 405 555 618

[jm@janemorganmanagement.com.au](mailto:jm@janemorganmanagement.com.au)

[info@latinresources.com.au](mailto:info@latinresources.com.au)  
[www.latinresources.com.au](http://www.latinresources.com.au)



## About Latin Resources

Latin Resources Limited (ASX: LRS) is an Australian-based mineral exploration company, with projects in South America and Australia, that is developing mineral projects in commodities that progress global efforts towards Net Zero emissions.

The Company is focused on its flagship Salinas Lithium Project in the pro-mining district of Minas Gerais Brazil, where the Company has defined a Global Mineral Resource Estimate at its Colina Lithium Deposit\* of 70.3Mt @ 1.3% Li<sub>2</sub>O, reported above a cut-off of 0.5% Li<sub>2</sub>O.

The classification of this JORC MRE includes:

- Colina MRE- **63.5Mt @ 1.3% Li<sub>2</sub>O** (1.73Mt @ 1.47% Li<sub>2</sub>O Measured + 39.29Mt @ 1.36% Li<sub>2</sub>O Indicated) + 22.47Mt @ 1.21% Li<sub>2</sub>O Inferred.
- Fog's Block MRE- **6.8Mt @ 0.9% Li<sub>2</sub>O** Inferred.

The Company recently defined a Preliminary Economic Assessment (PEA)\*\* which contemplates a proposed 3.6Mtpa standalone mining and processing operation over two phases. where the economics show after-tax NPV8% of A\$3.6 billion (US\$2.5 billion) and combined after-tax IRR of 132%.

Latin also holds the Catamarca Lithium Project in Argentina and through developing these assets, aims to become one of the key lithium players to feed the world's insatiable appetite for battery metals.

\*For full details of the Colina Lithium Deposit MRE, please refer to ASX Announcement dated 6 December 2023.

\*\*For full details of the Colina Lithium Project PEA, please refer to ASX Announcement dated 28 September 2023.

## Salinas Project- Mineral Resources

**Table 1: Global MRE for the Salinas Lithium Project (reported above a 0.50% Li<sub>2</sub>O cut-off grade).**

Deposit	Resource Category	Tonnes (Mt)	Grade (Li <sub>2</sub> O %)	Li <sub>2</sub> O (Kt)	Contained LCE (Kt)
Colina	Measured	1.73	1.47	25.8	62.8
	Indicated	39.29	1.36	534.0	1,320.6
	Measured + Indicated	41.02	1.36	559.4	1,383.4
	Inferred	22.47	1.21	271.8	672.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>63.49</b>	<b>1.31</b>	<b>831.2</b>	<b>2,055.6</b>
Fog's Block	Inferred	6.79	0.87	57.3	141.7
	<b>Total</b>	<b>6.79</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>57.3</b>	<b>141.7</b>
<b>GLOBAL MRE TOTAL</b>		<b>70.28</b>	<b>1.27</b>		

**Table 2: Fog's Block independent Exploration Target Range.**

Deposit	Lower Range (Mt)	Upper Range (Mt)	Grade Range (Li <sub>2</sub> O %)
Fog's Block	7.0	18.0	0.8 – 1.1

\*The potential quantity and grade of the Fog's Block Exploration Target is conceptual in nature, that there has been insufficient exploration to estimate a Mineral Resource and that it is uncertain if further exploration will result in the estimation of a Mineral Resource.

## Competent Person Statements – Salinas Lithium Project

The information in this report that relates to Geological Data and Exploration Results for the Salinas Lithium Project is based on information compiled by Mr Anthony Greenaway, who is a Member of the Australian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy. Mr Greenaway 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 as defined in the 2012 Edition of the 'Australasian Code for Reporting of Exploration

*Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves’. Mr Greenaway consents to the inclusion in this report of the matters based on his information, and information presented to him, in the form and context in which it appears.*

*The information in this report that relates to the Mineral Resource Estimate for the Salinas Lithium Project is based on the information compiled by Mr Marc-Antoine Laporte M.Sc., P.Geol., who is an employee of SGS Canada Ltd and a member of the L’Ordre des Géologues du Québec. He is a Senior Geologist for the SGS Geological Services Group and as more than 15 years of experience in industrial mineral, base and precious metals exploration as well as Mineral Resource evaluation and reporting. Mr Laporte 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 as defined in the 2012 Edition of the ‘Australasian Code for Reporting of Exploration Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves’.*

*The information in this report that relates to the Exploration Target for the Salinas Lithium Project is based on the information compiled by Mr Marc-Antoine Laporte M.Sc., P.Geol., who is an employee of SGS Canada Ltd and a member of the L’Ordre des Géologues du Québec. He is a Senior Geologist for the SGS Geological Services Group and as more than 15 years of experience in industrial mineral, base and precious metals exploration as well as Mineral Resource evaluation and reporting. Mr Laporte 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 as defined in the 2012 Edition of the ‘Australasian Code for Reporting of Exploration Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves’.*

#### **Confirmation Statement – Colina Project Preliminary Economic Assessment**

*The production targets and forecast financial information disclosed in this Announcement is extracted from the Company’s ASX announcement entitled “Robust Results for Colina Lithium Project Preliminary Economic Assessment (PEA)”, dated 28 September 2023. The Company confirms all material assumptions underpinning the production targets and forecast financial information derived from the production targets in the initial announcement continue to apply and have not materially changed.*

#### **Forward-Looking Statement**

*This ASX announcement may include forward-looking statements. These forward-looking statements are not historical facts but rather are based on Latin Resources Ltd.’s current expectations, estimates and assumptions about the industry in which Latin Resources Ltd operates, and beliefs and assumptions regarding Latin Resources Ltd.’s future performance. Words such as “anticipates”, “expects”, “intends”, “plans”, “believes”, “seeks”, “estimates”, “potential” and similar expressions are intended to identify forward-looking statements. Forward-looking statements are only predictions and are not guaranteed, and they are subject to known and unknown risks, uncertainties and assumptions, some of which are outside the control of Latin Resources Ltd. Past performance is not necessarily a guide to future performance and no representation or warranty is made as to the likelihood of achievement or reasonableness of any forward-looking statements or other forecast. Actual values, results or events may be materially different to those expressed or implied in this ASX announcement. Given these uncertainties, recipients are cautioned not to place reliance on forward looking statements. Any forward-looking statements in this announcement speak only at the date of issue of this announcement. Subject to any continuing obligations under applicable law and the ASX Listing Rules, Latin Resources Ltd does not undertake any obligation to update or revise any information or any of the forward-looking statements in this announcement or any changes in events, conditions or circumstances on which any such forward looking statement is based.*

#### **Exploration Announcements – Referenced**

*The information in this announcement that relates to previously reported results has been extracted from the following ASX announcements:*

- *“241% Increase for the Colina Mineral Resource”, 20 June 2023; and*


- *“Positive DMS Test Work Demonstrates Success at Pilot Plant Scale”, 10 August 2023.*
- *“Robust Results for Colina Lithium Project Preliminary Economic Assessment (PEA)”, 28 September 2023.*
- *“Another significant Spodumene Discovery at Salinas”, 22 November 2023.*
- *“High Grade Assays Continue to Impress at Colina Deposit”, 30 November 2023.*
- *“56% Increase in Global Resource Salinas Lithium Project JORC MRE Now - 70.3mt @ 1.27% Li<sub>2</sub>O”, 6 December 2023.*

*These above-mentioned announcements are available on the Company’s website.*

*The Company confirms that it is not aware of any new information or data that materially affects the information included in the above market announcements, and that the form and context in which the Competent Persons findings are presented have not been materially modified from the original market announcement.*



**APPENDIX A: SALINAS LITHIUM PROJECT TENURE**



## APPENDIX B: COLINA DEPOSIT- DIAMOND DRILL COLLAR DETAILS

Hole ID	Easting (m)	Northing (m)	RL (m)	Azi (deg)	Dip (deg)	Depth (m)	Target
SADD233	807588.83	8214595.22	799.29	265	-63	450.29	Colina
SADD234	807569.8	8214340.48	820.62	260	-61	401.52	Colina
SADD236	808010.47	8214765.9	780.57	260	-70	330.26	Colina
SADD237	807972.78	8215109.72	711.94	275	-70	250.16	Colina
SADD238	807585.28	8214386.21	815.95	263	-59	404.67	Colina
SADD239	807691.26	8214611.75	763.48	260	-72	424.35	Colina
SADD240	807664.32	8214501.96	783.74	260	-70	415.75	Colina
SADD241	807570.18	8214691.68	801.89	260	-64	450.25	Colina
SADD242	807476.44	8214676.14	799.08	260	-65	450.13	Colina
SADD243	807470.88	8214573.41	781.56	260	-60	379.6	Colina
SADD244	807476.71	8214372.52	806.99	260	-60	381.2	Colina
SADD245	807472.59	8214471.48	791.39	258	-67	390.28	Colina
SADD246	807664.03	8214609.63	776.35	265	-65	430.8	Colina
SADD247	807354.34	8214549.05	767.98	260	-60	165.17	Colina
SADD248	807358.83	8214657.35	758.46	260	-63	154.83	Colina
SADD252	807364.95	8214450.85	779.00	260	-61	297.39	Colina
SADD253	807550.59	8214796.3	799.27	260	-70	252.4	Colina
SADD254	806653.81	8213721.13	819.78	260	-67	205.74	Colina
SADD255	806731.44	8213837.41	819.72	260	-70	264.04	Colina
SADD256	806826.58	8213954.69	821.59	260	-70	133.11	Colina
SADD257	807263.19	8214629.45	751.66	260	-63	127.85	Colina
SADD258	807253.3	8214534.57	761.43	260	60	22.64	Colina
SADD259	807276.84	8214331.45	794.49	260	-60	75.29	Colina
SADD260	806753.15	8213739.16	822.14	260	-67	98.8	Colina
SADD261	807254.77	8214432.93	779.31	260	-61	121.7	Colina
SADD262	807699.15	8214714.86	764.77	260	69	23.99	Colina
SADD263	807644.18	8214813.79	779.55	260	72	235.73	Colina
SADD264	807613.06	8214295.11	825.54	260	67	193.85	Colina
SADD265	807154.62	8214517.16	783.38	260	60	207.28	Colina

## APPENDIX C: COLINA DEPOSIT- SIGNIFICANT INTERSECTIONS

Hole ID	From (m)	To (m)	Interval (m)	Li <sub>2</sub> O (%)	Target
SADD233	147.27	148.54	1.27	0.73	Colina
SADD233	148.94	152.79	3.85	1.70	Colina
SADD233	155.14	159.80	4.66	1.18	Colina
Including:	156.00	158.00	2.00	1.41	Colina
SADD233	172.00	175.71	3.71	1.36	Colina
Including:	174.00	175.71	1.71	1.74	Colina
SADD233	197.37	198.85	1.48	1.24	Colina
SADD233	201.73	210.76	9.03	1.75	Colina
Including:	201.73	208.77	7.04	2.02	Colina
SADD233	267.20	268.91	1.71	1.27	Colina
SADD233	269.99	270.98	0.99	1.29	Colina
SADD233	271.55	273.60	2.05	1.34	Colina
SADD233	348.35	350.25	1.90	0.88	Colina
SADD233	355.19	380.00	24.81	1.53	Colina
Including:	356.00	374.00	18.00	1.75	Colina
And:	356.00	363.00	7.00	1.97	Colina
SADD234	122.00	123.00	1.00	1.18	Colina
SADD234	129.27	130.08	0.81	1.62	Colina
SADD234	164.29	165.32	1.03	0.78	Colina
SADD234	180.65	182.63	1.98	1.49	Colina
SADD234	183.08	186.00	2.92	1.50	Colina
SADD234	254.46	255.27	0.81	1.07	Colina
SADD234	284.75	288.08	3.33	2.17	Colina
SADD234	299.03	319.82	20.79	1.49	Colina
Including:	311.00	316.00	5.00	2.01	Colina
SADD234	348.53	364.00	15.47	1.20	Colina
Including:	349.30	353.00	3.70	2.23	Colina
And:	355.00	359.00	4.00	1.48	Colina
SADD236	144.00	150.75	6.75	1.64	Colina
Including:	145.00	147.00	2.00	2.54	Colina
And:	148.00	150.00	2.00	1.82	Colina
SADD236	188.00	202.20	14.20	1.38	Colina
Including:	189.00	193.00	4.00	2.02	Colina
And:	199.00	202.20	3.20	1.78	Colina
SADD237	230.00	232.18	2.18	0.83	Colina
SADD238	129.88	133.00	3.12	1.13	Colina
Including:	131.00	132.00	1.00	2.33	Colina
SADD238	135.00	136.17	1.17	0.97	Colina
SADD238	137.07	137.97	0.90	1.36	Colina
SADD238	148.13	149.50	1.37	0.92	Colina
SADD238	169.23	170.56	1.33	3.23	Colina
SADD238	177.53	181.37	3.84	1.19	Colina
Including:	177.53	179.45	1.92	1.56	Colina
SADD238	195.40	198.67	3.27	0.65	Colina
SADD238	240.32	242.76	2.44	1.06	Colina
SADD238	256.15	257.78	1.63	2.27	Colina
SADD238	278.41	279.11	0.70	0.72	Colina
SADD238	282.37	283.58	1.21	1.62	Colina
SADD238	285.43	287.00	1.57	2.39	Colina
SADD238	315.45	316.05	0.60	1.22	Colina
SADD238	321.00	346.32	25.32	1.61	Colina
Including:	326.00	331.00	5.00	2.11	Colina



And:	336.00	341.00	5.00	3.03	Colina
SADD238	363.27	364.12	0.85	1.21	Colina
SADD238	364.91	372.50	7.59	1.19	Colina
Including:	366.00	369.00	3.00	1.52	Colina
SADD238	386.36	388.86	2.50	1.28	Colina
SADD239	136.30	138.33	2.03	1.31	Colina
SADD239	184.89	186.76	1.87	1.72	Colina
SADD239	188.92	190.10	1.18	0.74	Colina
SADD239	196.00	209.00	13.00	1.23	Colina
Including:	199.00	203.00	4.00	1.59	Colina
SADD239	217.00	226.42	9.42	1.38	Colina
Including:	221.00	226.42	5.42	1.69	Colina
SADD239	242.00	243.15	1.15	0.44	Colina
SADD239	257.43	258.30	0.87	0.68	Colina
SADD239	294.74	316.40	21.66	1.47	Colina
Including:	294.74	305.00	10.26	1.60	Colina
And:	309.00	315.20	6.20	1.71	Colina
SADD239	330.24	347.06	16.82	1.26	Colina
Including:	330.24	334.00	3.76	1.61	Colina
SADD239	386.08	388.73	2.65	1.16	Colina
SADD239	390.33	395.84	5.51	1.14	Colina
SADD239	397.60	400.61	3.01	1.30	Colina
SADD239	401.66	402.28	0.62	1.25	Colina
SADD239	404.12	405.13	1.01	1.01	Colina
SADD240	106.00	107.49	1.49	0.66	Colina
SADD240	171.24	178.78	7.54	1.86	Colina
SADD240	181.59	193.00	11.41	1.94	Colina
SADD240	262.20	264.15	1.95	1.56	Colina
SADD240	272.69	281.85	9.16	1.29	Colina
Including:	273.69	279.00	5.31	1.59	Colina
SADD240	317.59	334.70	17.11	1.59	Colina
Including:	318.30	325.00	6.70	2.07	Colina
And:	329.00	332.00	3.00	2.27	Colina
SADD240	337.51	345.66	8.15	1.37	Colina
Including:	337.51	342.50	4.99	1.72	Colina
SADD240	347.49	348.33	0.84	1.97	Colina
SADD240	353.01	358.74	5.73	0.73	Colina
SADD240	371.47	378.53	7.06	1.09	Colina
Including:	371.47	374.50	3.03	1.74	Colina
SADD240	387.33	395.04	7.71	1.32	Colina
Including:	388.15	391.00	2.85	1.86	Colina
SADD241	150.70	151.10	0.40	1.05	Colina
SADD241	152.83	153.20	0.37	1.58	Colina
SADD241	155.03	155.93	0.90	0.70	Colina
SADD241	165.92	166.41	0.49	0.76	Colina
SADD241	171.27	173.30	2.03	1.74	Colina
SADD241	175.90	176.33	0.43	1.49	Colina
SADD241	182.81	185.06	2.25	1.50	Colina
SADD241	203.65	206.00	2.35	0.84	Colina
SADD241	213.94	217.40	3.46	1.26	Colina
SADD241	220.49	222.27	1.78	1.07	Colina
SADD241	237.00	239.38	2.38	1.29	Colina
SADD241	290.17	293.46	3.29	1.38	Colina
SADD241	332.12	352.36	20.24	1.41	Colina
Including:	333.00	339.00	6.00	1.73	Colina
And:	343.00	345.00	2.00	1.86	Colina

And:	346.00	350.68	4.68	1.78	Colina
SADD242	124.10	127.08	2.98	1.73	Colina
SADD242	148.85	151.43	2.58	1.33	Colina
SADD242	155.01	155.83	0.82	0.66	Colina
SADD242	164.13	166.31	2.18	1.18	Colina
SADD242	218.83	219.89	1.06	0.67	Colina
SADD242	220.75	221.00	0.25	0.60	Colina
SADD242	236.93	239.37	2.44	1.24	Colina
SADD242	287.42	293.28	5.86	0.85	Colina
SADD242	297.82	305.00	7.18	0.82	Colina
Including	297.82	302.00	4.18	1.12	Colina
SADD243	65.00	66.00	1.00	1.22	Colina
SADD243	86.46	91.06	4.60	1.58	Colina
SADD243	96.41	97.57	1.16	0.46	Colina
SADD243	106.27	110.65	4.38	0.89	Colina
SADD243	182.30	184.10	1.80	1.94	Colina
SADD243	240.40	241.41	1.01	1.26	Colina
SADD243	242.25	246.10	3.85	1.17	Colina
SADD243	254.00	258.10	4.10	1.36	Colina
SADD243	291.36	294.00	2.64	1.58	Colina
SADD243	327.88	338.00	10.12	1.30	Colina
Including	330.00	336.00	6.00	1.54	Colina
SADD244	127.43	132.17	4.74	1.15	Colina
SADD244	158.29	159.56	1.27	1.64	Colina
SADD244	243.54	250.48	6.94	1.49	Colina
SADD244	268.58	281.50	12.92	1.55	Colina
Including	275.50	280.50	5.00	1.88	Colina
SADD244	298.09	299.53	1.44	1.07	Colina
SADD244	317.86	324.15	6.29	1.81	Colina
Including	320.00	323.00	3.00	2.49	Colina
SADD244	346.89	353.00	6.11	1.78	Colina
Including	348.00	351.00	3.00	2.88	Colina
SADD245	113.67	116.64	2.97	0.91	Colina
SADD245	123.70	127.31	3.61	1.11	Colina
SADD245	180.34	182.13	1.79	1.30	Colina
SADD245	231.03	237.53	6.50	1.32	Colina
Including	234.00	237.00	3.00	1.66	Colina
SADD245	246.35	253.18	6.83	0.85	Colina
Including	250.30	252.30	2.00	1.65	Colina
SADD245	298.24	316.89	18.65	1.60	Colina
Including	301.00	305.00	4.00	2.13	Colina
And:	307.00	310.00	3.00	1.94	Colina
SADD245	329.66	332.85	3.19	1.21	Colina
SADD246	140.78	145.67	4.89	1.79	Colina
SADD246	172.75	175.78	3.03	1.30	Colina
SADD246	177.65	177.92	0.27	1.63	Colina
SADD246	179.40	180.59	1.19	0.70	Colina
SADD246	188.37	197.26	8.89	1.43	Colina
SADD246	201.87	209.00	7.13	1.12	Colina
Including	201.87	204.57	2.70	1.51	Colina
SADD246	218.27	226.53	8.26	1.52	Colina
SADD246	231.26	235.24	3.98	1.03	Colina
SADD246	292.68	297.34	4.66	1.42	Colina
SADD246	325.19	358.11	32.92	1.62	Colina
Including	325.19	353.00	27.81	1.80	Colina
And:	335.00	349.00	14.00	2.05	Colina

SADD246	363.12	365.80	2.68	1.26	Colina
SADD246	371.38	374.22	2.84	1.40	Colina
SADD246	437.00	440.20	3.20	1.18	Colina
SADD247	92.73	93.88	1.15	1.02	Colina
SADD247	161.04	163.00	1.96	1.70	Colina
SADD247	205.48	207.45	1.97	1.78	Colina
SADD247	307.00	311.71	4.71	1.48	Colina
Including	307.00	310.00	3.00	2.05	Colina
SADD248	51.40	53.38	1.98	0.47	Colina
SADD248	117.03	118.05	1.02	0.68	Colina
SADD248	124.59	127.63	3.04	1.62	Colina
SADD248	202.00	209.61	7.61	1.35	Colina
SADD252	69.08	71.05	1.97	1.15	Colina
SADD252	148.58	149.26	0.68	1.14	Colina
SADD252	174.73	178.44	3.71	1.40	Colina
SADD252	204.34	205.62	1.28	0.80	Colina
SADD252	225.81	233.78	7.97	1.27	Colina
SADD252	295.00	302.00	7.00	1.31	Colina
SADD253	157.35	159.51	2.16	1.11	Colina
SADD253	221.48	224.83	3.35	1.51	Colina
SADD253	232.60	237.08	4.48	1.18	Colina
SADD253	240.80	244.16	3.36	1.48	Colina
SADD253	323.56	329.00	5.44	1.83	Colina
Including	326.00	329.00	3.00	2.27	Colina
SADD254	174.53	177.49	2.96	0.70	Colina
SADD255	136.65	137.64	0.99	0.60	Colina
SADD255	247.00	249.79	2.79	1.88	Colina
SADD256	129.80	134.65	4.85	1.20	Colina
SADD256	223.86	226.09	2.23	0.70	Colina
SADD256	326.23	329.82	3.59	1.40	Colina
SADD257	62.78	63.94	1.16	1.78	Colina
SADD257	180.38	180.95	0.57	0.55	Colina
SADD258	29.80	33.42	3.62	0.78	Colina
SADD258	106.76	110.20	3.44	1.57	Colina
SADD258	195.22	201.00	5.78	1.61	Colina
Including	197.00	200.00	3.00	2.22	Colina
SADD259	99.77	100.73	0.96	1.78	Colina
SADD259	124.82	127.41	2.59	1.10	Colina
SADD259	182.33	183.12	0.79	0.46	Colina
SADD259	217.60	232.85	15.25	1.51	Colina
Including	217.60	220.00	2.40	2.77	Colina
SADD259	293.35	304.00	10.65	1.57	Colina
Including	294.20	299.00	4.80	1.92	Colina
SADD259	329.00	329.90	0.90	0.43	Colina
SADD259	382.77	383.84	1.07	0.58	Colina
SADD259	394.43	396.10	1.67	0.60	Colina
SADD259	402.76	411.00	8.24	1.66	Colina
Including	403.80	409.00	5.20	1.83	Colina
SADD260	224.90	225.97	1.07	0.46	Colina
SADD261	100.30	102.19	1.89	1.20	Colina
SADD261	105.48	106.34	0.86	1.62	Colina
SADD261	120.97	121.77	0.80	0.85	Colina
SADD261	172.90	175.76	2.86	0.88	Colina
SADD261	207.81	215.00	7.19	2.71	Colina
SADD261	299.63	306.62	6.99	1.28	Colina
SADD262	54.79	58.71	3.92	1.12	Colina



SADD262	60.37	63.20	2.83	1.38	Colina
SADD262	160.30	162.96	2.66	1.49	Colina
SADD262	216.19	225.00	8.81	1.39	Colina
Including	221.00	225.00	4.00	1.76	Colina
SADD262	244.80	247.00	2.20	1.15	Colina
SADD262	255.83	262.27	6.44	1.65	Colina
Including	257.00	261.52	4.52	1.80	Colina
SADD262	266.75	269.68	2.93	1.42	Colina
SADD262	279.09	280.00	0.91	1.20	Colina
SADD262	280.54	283.12	2.58	1.22	Colina
SADD262	302.26	302.94	0.68	1.14	Colina
SADD262	310.82	317.96	7.14	1.34	Colina
Including	310.82	314.00	3.18	2.09	Colina
SADD262	339.57	357.32	17.75	1.78	Colina
Including	339.57	350.00	10.43	2.19	Colina
SADD262	398.03	401.53	3.50	1.95	Colina
SADD262	412.46	414.82	2.36	1.13	Colina
SADD262	417.84	424.72	6.88	1.67	Colina
Including	421.00	424.72	3.72	2.32	Colina
SADD263	66.41	67.62	1.21	1.25	Colina
SADD263	194.24	195.29	1.05	0.84	Colina
SADD263	210.53	212.55	2.02	1.10	Colina
SADD263	249.86	254.41	4.55	1.92	Colina
SADD263	287.36	293.00	5.64	1.29	Colina
SADD263	357.44	367.25	9.81	1.35	Colina
SADD263	400.00	405.14	5.14	1.68	Colina
Including	401.00	404.00	3.00	2.43	Colina
SADD264	203.54	212.15	8.61	1.26	Colina
Including	203.54	209.00	5.46	1.46	Colina
SADD264	348.00	361.40	13.40	1.03	Colina
Including	348.00	351.00	3.00	1.61	Colina
SADD265	82.20	84.93	2.73	1.11	Colina
SADD265	233.13	233.78	0.65	0.46	Colina

**Note:**

1. A nominal minimum Li<sub>2</sub>O grade of 0.5% Li<sub>2</sub>O has been used to define a 'significant intersection' over a nominal minimum intersection of 1.0m with a maximum internal dilution of 2.0m.

## APPENDIX D: JORC CODE, 2012 EDITION – TABLE 1

### SECTION 1 SAMPLING TECHNIQUES AND DATA (CRITERIA IN THIS SECTION APPLY TO ALL SUCCEEDING SECTIONS)

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<b>Sampling techniques</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nature and quality of sampling (e.g. cut channels, random chips, or specific specialised industry standard measurement tools appropriate to the minerals under investigation, such as down hole gamma sondes, or handheld XRF instruments, etc). These examples should not be taken as limiting the broad meaning of sampling.</li> <li>Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample representivity and the appropriate calibration of any measurement tools or systems used.</li> <li>Aspects of the determination of mineralisation that are Material to the Public Report.</li> <li>In cases where 'industry standard' work has been done this would be relatively simple (e.g. 'reverse circulation drilling was used to obtain 1 m samples from which 3 kg was pulverised to produce a 30 g charge for fire assay'). In other cases, more explanation may be required, such as where there is coarse gold that has inherent sampling problems. Unusual commodities or mineralisation types (e.g. submarine nodules) may warrant disclosure of detailed information.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The July 2021 stream sediment sampling program was completed by Latin Resources.</li> <li>Latin Resources stream sediment sampling: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stream sediment samples were taken in the field by Latin's geologists during field campaign using pre-set locations and procedures.</li> <li>All surface organic matter and soil were removed from the sampling point, then the active stream sediment was collected from five holes spaced 2.5 m using a post digger.</li> <li>Five subsamples were collected along 25 cm depth, homogenised in a plastic tarp and split into four parts.</li> <li>The chosen part (1/4) was screened using a 2 mm stainless steel sieve.</li> <li>A composite sample weighting 350-400g of the &lt;2 mm fraction was poured in a labelled zip lock bag for assaying.</li> <li>Oversize material retained in the sieve was analyzed with hand lens and discarded.</li> <li>The other three quartiles were discarded, sample holes were filled back, and sieve and canvas were thoroughly cleaned.</li> <li>Photographs of the sampling location were taken for all the samples.</li> <li>Sample books were filled in with sample information and coordinates.</li> <li>Stream sediment sample locations were collected in the field using a hand-held GPS with +/-5m accuracy using Datum SIRGAS 2000, Zone 23 South) coordinate system.</li> <li>No duplicate samples were taken at this stage.</li> <li>No certified reference standards samples were submitted at this stage.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Latin Resources Diamond Drilling: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Diamond core has been sampled in intervals of ~ 1 m (up to 1.18 m) where possible, otherwise intervals less than 1 m have been selected based on geological boundaries. Geological boundaries have not been crossed by sample intervals.</li> <li>½ core samples have been collected and submitted for analysis, with regular field duplicate samples collected and submitted for QA/QC analysis.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Metallurgical Drilling <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Latin conducted a metallurgical program on material sourced from diamond drilling in 2022 and 2023.</li> <li>Drillhole diameter was HQ for metallurgical drill holes.</li> <li>Spodumene concentrate testwork was completed on two composite samples of Colina ore.</li> <li>The samples comprising the composites were taken from ½ HQ core from selected mineralized and unmineralized zones as part of the 65,000m drilling program.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<b>Drilling techniques</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drill type (e.g. core, reverse circulation, open-hole hammer, rotary air blast, auger, Bangka, sonic, etc.) and details (e.g. core diameter, triple or standard tube, depth of diamond tails, face-sampling bit or other type, whether core is oriented and if so, by what method, etc.).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Latin Resources drilling is completed using industry standard practices. Diamond drilling is completed using HQ size coring equipment.</li> <li>Drilling techniques used at Salinas Project comprise: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NTW Diamond Core (64.2mm diameter), standard tube to a depth of ~200- 250 m.</li> <li>BTW diamond core utilized for hole SADD031 from a depth of 309.10 m.</li> <li>Diamond core holes drilled directly from surface.</li> <li>Initial drill rig alignment is carried out using Reflex TN14 alignment tool.</li> <li>Down hole survey was carried out by Reflex EZ-TRAC tool (SADD001 to SADD020).</li> <li>Down hole survey was carried out by Reflex EZ-TRAC tool (SADD001 to SADD020) and Reflex GYRO SPRINT-IQ (SADD021 to date).</li> <li>Core orientation was provided by an ACT Reflex (ACT III) tool.</li> </ul> </li> <li>All drill collars are surveyed using RTK DGPS.</li> </ul>
<b>Drill sample recovery</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Method of recording and assessing core and chip sample recoveries and results assessed.</li> <li>Measures taken to maximise sample recovery and ensure representative nature of the samples.</li> <li>Whether a relationship exists between sample recovery and grade and whether sample bias may have occurred due to preferential loss/gain of fine/coarse material.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Latin Resources core is depth marked and orientated to check against the driller's blocks, ensuring that all core loss is taken into account. Diamond core recovery is logged and captured into the database.</li> <li>Zones of significant core loss may have resulted in grade dilution due to the loss of fine material.</li> </ul>
<b>Logging</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whether core and chip samples have been geologically and geotechnically logged to a level of detail to support appropriate Mineral Resource estimation, mining studies and metallurgical studies.</li> <li>Whether logging is qualitative or quantitative in nature. Core (or costean, channel, etc.) photography.</li> <li>The total length and percentage of the relevant intersections logged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All drill cores have been geologically logged.</li> <li>Sampling is by sawing core in half and then sampling core on nominal 1m intervals.</li> <li>All core sample intervals have been photographed before and after sawing.</li> <li>Latin's geological logging is completed for all holes, and it is representative. The lithology, alteration, and structural characteristics of drill samples are logged following standard procedures and using standardised geological codes.</li> <li>Logging is both qualitative and quantitative depending on the field being logged.</li> <li>All drill-holes are logged in full.</li> <li>Geological structures are collected using Reflex IQ Logger.</li> <li>All cores are digitally photographed and stored.</li> </ul>
<b>Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all core taken.</li> <li>If non-core, whether riffled, tube sampled, rotary split, etc and whether sampled wet or dry.</li> <li>For all sample types, the nature, quality and appropriateness of the sample preparation technique.</li> <li>Quality control procedures adopted for all sub-sampling stages to maximise representivity of samples.</li> <li>Measures taken to ensure that the sampling is representative of the in-situ material collected, including for instance results for field duplicate/second-half sampling.</li> <li>Whether sample sizes are appropriate to the grain size of the material being sampled.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the 2021 stream sediment sampling program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All samples collected from the field were dry due to the dry season.</li> <li>To maximise representiveness, samples were taken from five holes weighing around 3 Kg each for a total of 15 Kg to be reduced to 350-400 g.</li> <li>Samples were dried, crushed and pulverized 250g to 95% at 150#. Any samples requiring splitting were split using a Jones splitter.</li> </ul> </li> <li>For the 2023 diamond drilling program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Samples were crushed in a hammer mill to 75% passing -3mm followed by splitting off 250g using a Jones splitter and pulverizing to better than 95% passing 75 microns.</li> <li>Duplicate sampling is carried out routinely throughout the drilling campaign. The laboratory will</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		<p>carry out routine internal repeat assays on crushed samples.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The selected sample mass is considered appropriate for the grain size of the material being sampled.</li> </ul>
<b>Quality of assay data and laboratory tests</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The nature, quality and appropriateness of the assaying and laboratory procedures used and whether the technique is considered partial or total.</li> <li>• For geophysical tools, spectrometers, handheld XRF instruments, etc, the parameters used in determining the analysis including instrument make and model, reading times, calibrations factors applied and their derivation, etc.</li> <li>• Nature of quality control procedures adopted (e.g. standards, blanks, duplicates, external laboratory checks) and whether acceptable levels of accuracy (i.e. lack of bias) and precision have been established.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the 2021 stream sediment sampling program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The stream sediment samples were assayed via ICM90A (fusion by sodium peroxide and finish with ICP-MS/ICP-OES) for a 56-element suite at the SGS Geosol Laboratorios located at Vespasiano/Minas Gerais, Brazil.</li> <li>○ No control samples have been used at this stage. The internal laboratory controls (blanks, duplicates and standards) are considered suitable.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• For the 2023 diamond drilling program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Core samples are assayed via ICM90A (fusion by sodium peroxide and finish with ICP-MS/ICP-OES) for a 56-element suite at the SGS Geosol Laboratorios located at Vespasiano/Minas Gerais, Brazil.</li> <li>○ If lithium results are above 15,000ppm, the Lab analyze the pulp samples just for lithium through ICP90Q (fusion by sodium peroxide and finish with ICP/OES).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• For metallurgical testwork: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ All test work analysis has been undertaken by SGS Canada Natural Resources Lakefield, which conforms to the requirements of ISO/IEC 17025 and is accredited by the Standards Council of Canada. Representative subsamples were submitted for Li assay and whole rock analysis (XRF/ICP), for suite which includes SiO<sub>2</sub>, Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, MgO, CaO, Na<sub>2</sub>O, K<sub>2</sub>O, TiO<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>, MnO, Cr<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, V<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>, and loss on ignition (LOI), as well as semi-quantitative XRD analysis.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Verification of sampling and assaying</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The verification of significant intersections by either independent or alternative company personnel.</li> <li>• The use of twinned holes.</li> <li>• Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols.</li> <li>• Discuss any adjustment to assay data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selected sample results which are considered to be significant will be subjected to resampling by the Company. This can be achieved by either reassaying of sample pulps, resplitting of coarse reject samples, or resplitting of core and reassaying.</li> <li>• All Latin Resources data is verified by the Competent person. All data is stored in an electronic Access Database. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Assay data and results are reported, unadjusted.</li> <li>○ Li<sub>2</sub>O results used in the market are converted from Li results multiplying it by the industry factor 2.153.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Location of data points</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accuracy and quality of surveys used to locate drill holes (collar and down-hole surveys), trenches, mine workings and other locations used in Mineral Resource estimation.</li> <li>• Specification of the grid system used.</li> <li>• Quality and adequacy of topographic control.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stream sediment sample locations and drill collars are captured using a handheld GPS.</li> <li>• Drill collars are located using a handheld GPS.</li> <li>• All GPS data points were later visualized using ESRI ArcGIS Software to ensure they were recorded in the correct position.</li> <li>• The grid system used was UTM SIRGAS 2000 zone 23 South.</li> </ul>
<b>Data spacing and distribution</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data spacing for reporting of Exploration Results.</li> <li>• Whether the data spacing and distribution is sufficient to establish the degree of geological and grade continuity appropriate for the Mineral Resource and Ore Reserve estimation procedure(s) and classifications applied.</li> <li>• Whether sample compositing has been applied.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stream sediment samples were taken every 200m between sampling points along the drainages which is considered appropriate for a first stage, regional work.</li> <li>• Every sampling spot had a composite sample made of five subsamples spaced 2.5 m each along a channel for a 10 m length zone or a cross pattern with the same spacing of 2.5 m for the open valleys and braided channels.</li> </ul>



Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Due to the preliminary nature of the initial drilling campaign, drill holes are designed to test specific targets, with not set drill spacing.</li> </ul>
<b>Orientation of data in relation to geological structure</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whether the orientation of sampling achieves unbiased sampling of possible structures and the extent to which this is known, considering the deposit type.</li> <li>If the relationship between the drilling orientation and the orientation of key mineralised structures is considered to have introduced a sampling bias, this should be assessed and reported if material.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sampling is preferentially across the strike or trend of mineralised outcrops.</li> <li>Drilling has been designed to intersect the mapped stratigraphy as close to normal as possible.</li> </ul>
<b>Sample security</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The measures taken to ensure sample security.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At all times samples were in the custody and control of the Company's representatives until delivery to the laboratory where samples were held in a secure enclosure pending processing.</li> </ul>
<b>Audits or reviews</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Competent Person for Exploration Results reported here has reviewed the field procedures used for sampling program at field and has compiled results from the original sampling and laboratory data.</li> <li>No External audit has been undertaken at this stage.</li> </ul>

**SECTION 2 REPORTING OF EXPLORATION RESULTS**  
**(CRITERIA LISTED IN THE PRECEDING SECTION ALSO APPLY TO THIS SECTION.)**

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<b>Mineral tenement and land tenure status</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Type, reference name/number, location and ownership including agreements or material issues with third parties such as joint ventures, partnerships, overriding royalties, native title interests, historical sites, wilderness or national park and environmental settings.</li> <li>The security of the tenure held at the time of reporting along with any known impediments to obtaining a licence to operate in the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exploration Licences: 830.578/2019, 830.579/2019, 830.580/2019, 30.581/2019, 830.582/2019, 830.691/2017, 832.515/2021 and the western portion of 831.799/2005 are 100% fully owned by Latin Resources Limited.</li> <li>Latin has lodged new applications for the following areas: 832.601/2022, 832.602/2022, 832.604/2022, 832.605/2022, 832.606/2022, 832.607/2022, 832.608/2022, 832.609/2022, 832.611/2022, 832.612/2022, 832.613/2022, 832.614/2022, 832.616/2022, 832.801/2022, 832.802/2022 &amp; 832.804/2022.</li> <li>Latin has entered in separate exclusive option agreement to acquire 100% interest in the areas: 830.080/2022, 830.581/2019, 831.118/2008, 831.219/2017, 831.798/2015, 831.799/2005 (Second Part &amp; Third Part), 833.881/2010 &amp; 834.282/2007.</li> <li>The Company is not aware of any impediments to obtaining a licence to operate, subject to carrying out appropriate environmental and clearance surveys.</li> </ul>
<b>Exploration done by other parties</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Historic exploration was carried out on the area 830.080/2022 (Monte Alto) with extraction of gems (tourmaline and lepidolite), amblygonite, columbite and feldspar.</li> </ul>
<b>Geology</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Salinas Lithium Project geology comprises Neoproterozoic age sedimentary rocks of Araçuaí Orogen intruded by fertile Li-bearing pegmatites originated by fractionation of magmatic fluids from the peraluminous S-type post-tectonic granitoids of Araçuaí Orogen. Lithium mineralisation is related to discordant swarms of spodumene-bearing tabular pegmatites hosted by biotite-quartz schists.</li> </ul>
<b>Drill hole Information</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A summary of all information material to the understanding of the exploration results including a tabulation of the following information for all Material drill holes:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>easting and northing of the drill hole collar</li> <li>elevation or RL (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in metres) of the drill hole collar</li> <li>dip and azimuth of the hole</li> <li>down hole length and interception depth</li> <li>hole length</li> </ul> </li> <li>If the exclusion of this information is justified on the basis that the information is not Material and this exclusion does not detract from the understanding of the report, the Competent Person should clearly explain why this is the case.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All drill hole summary location data is provided in Appendix 1 to this report and is accurately represented in appropriate location maps and drill sections where required.</li> </ul>
<b>Data aggregation methods</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In reporting Exploration Results, weighting averaging techniques, maximum and/or minimum grade truncations (e.g. cutting of high-grades) and cut-off grades are usually Material and should be stated.</li> <li>Where aggregate intercepts incorporate short lengths of high-grade results and longer lengths of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sample length weighted averaging techniques have been applied to the sample assay results.</li> <li>Where duplicate core samples have been collected in the field, results for duplicate pairs have been averaged.</li> <li>A nominal minimum Li<sub>2</sub>O grade of 0.3% Li<sub>2</sub>O has been used to define a 'significant intersection'.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<p>low-grade results, the procedure used for such aggregation should be stated and some typical examples of such aggregations should be shown in detail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values should be clearly stated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A 3.5 % grade top cut has been applied to high grade composites having an influence of over 25 metres during resource estimation."</li> </ul>
<b>Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These relationships are particularly important in the reporting of Exploration Results.</li> <li>If the geometry of the mineralisation with respect to the drill hole angle is known, its nature should be reported.</li> <li>If it is not known and only the down hole lengths are reported, there should be a clear statement to this effect (e.g. 'down hole length, true width not known').</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drilling is carried out at right angles to targeted structures and mineralised zones where possible.</li> <li>Drill core orientation is of a high quality, with clear contact of pegmatite bodies, enabling the calculation of true width intersections.</li> </ul>
<b>Diagrams</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate maps and sections (with scales) and tabulations of intercepts should be included for any significant discovery being reported These should include, but not be limited to a plan view of drill hole collar locations and appropriate sectional views.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Company has released various maps and figures showing the sample results in the geological context.</li> </ul>
<b>Balanced reporting</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where comprehensive reporting of all Exploration Results is not practicable, representative reporting of both low and high-grades and/or widths should be practiced avoiding misleading reporting of Exploration Results.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All analytical results for lithium have been reported.</li> </ul>
<b>Other substantive exploration data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other exploration data, if meaningful and material, should be reported including (but not limited to): geological observations; geophysical survey results; geochemical survey results; bulk samples – size and method of treatment; metallurgical test results; bulk density, groundwater, geotechnical and rock characteristics; potential deleterious or contaminating substances.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All information that is considered material has been reported, including stream sediment sampling results, Drilling results geological context, etc.</li> <li>Sighter metallurgical test work was undertaken on approximately 44kg of drill core sourced from drill hole SADD023 (26.99m: 94.00-120.88m) and submitted to independent laboratories SGS GEOSOL Laboratories in Belo Horizonte Brazil.</li> <li>Test work included crushing, size fraction analysis and HLS separation to ascertain the amenability of the Colina Project spodumene pegmatite material to DMS treatment routes.</li> </ul>
<b>Further work</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The nature and scale of planned further work (e.g. tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling).</li> <li>Diagrams clearly highlighting the areas of possible extensions, including the main geological interpretations and future drilling areas, provided this information is not commercially sensitive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Latin plans to undertake additional reconnaissance mapping, infill stream sediment and soil sampling at Salinas South Prospect.</li> <li>Follow-up infill and step-out drilling will be undertaken based on results.</li> <li>Additional metallurgical processing test work on drill core form the Colina Prospect.</li> </ul>

**SECTION 3 ESTIMATION AND REPORTING OF MINERAL RESOURCES  
(CRITERIA LISTED IN THE PRECEDING SECTION ALSO APPLY TO THIS SECTION.)**

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<b>Database integrity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>Data validation procedures used.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Colina database is stored in MS Excel and DataShed software. A dedicated database manager has been assigned by the project who checks the data entry against the laboratory report and survey data.</li> <li>Geological data is entered by a geologist to ensure no confusion over terminology, while laboratory assay data is entered by the data entry staff.</li> <li>A variety of manual and data checks are in place to check against human error of data entry.</li> <li>All original geological logs, survey data and laboratory results sheets are retained in a secure location on site.</li> <li>All data requested was made available to SGS by Latin Resources. Relevant data were imported to Genesis and Leapfrog software and further validation processes completed. At this stage, any errors found were corrected. The validation procedures used included checking of data as compared to the original data sheets, validation of position of drillholes in 3D models and reviewing areas appearing anomalous following statistical analysis: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drillhole depths for the geology, survey and assay logs do not exceed the recorded drilled depth.</li> <li>Dates are in the correct format and are correct</li> <li>Set limits (e.g. for northing, easting, assay values) are not exceeded</li> <li>Valid geology codes (e.g. lithology, alteration etc.) have been used. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sampling intervals are checked for gaps and overlaps.</li> </ul> </li> <li>SGS reviewed the provided database as part of the resource model generation process, where all data was checked for errors, missing data, misspelling, interval validation, negative values, and management of zero versus absent data:</li> <li>Visual checks that collar locations are correct and compared with existing information.</li> </ul> </li> <li>All drilling and sampling/assaying databases are considered suitable for the Mineral Resource Estimate. No adjustments were made to the assay data prior to import into Genesis software.</li> </ul>
<b>Site Visits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment on any site visits undertaken by the Competent Person and the outcome of those visits.</li> <li>If no site visits have been undertaken indicate why this is the case.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Competent Person Marc-Antoine Laporte M.Sc., P. Geo visit the site between 3-6 of October 2022 and 14-16 of March 2023. During the visit, CP reviewed the drilling, sampling, chain of custody, facilities, and data management process.</li> <li>All requested information requested by SGS was provided by Latin Resource employees.</li> </ul>
<b>Geological interpretation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confidence in (or conversely, the uncertainty of) the geological interpretation of the mineral deposit.</li> <li>Nature of the data used and of any assumptions made.</li> <li>The effect, if any, of alternative interpretations on Mineral Resource estimation.</li> <li>The use of geology in guiding and controlling Mineral Resource estimation.</li> <li>The factors affecting continuity both of grade and geology.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SGS considers the geological interpretation to be robust.</li> <li>The confidence in the geological interpretation is reflected by the assigned Mineral Resource classification.</li> <li>The geology has guided the resource estimation, particularly the lithological and structural control.</li> <li>Grade and geological continuity are conceptual at the moment and will be confirmed with infilled drilling.</li> <li>Lithium mineralisation is mostly composed of spodumene and no significant other lithium bearing minerals are visually present in the deposit.</li> <li>A geological and mineralisation interpretation of the deposit was made using Leapfrog software.</li> </ul>



Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<b>Dimensions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The footprint of the whole mineralisation zone is about 2,000 metres NE-SW by 1,000 metres NW-SE, with about 400 m overall thickness.</li> <li>The average surface elevation around Colinas 700 m RL. The maximum local RL of the mineralisation is 800.2 m and the minimum local RL is 563.2 m.</li> </ul>
<b>Estimation and modelling techniques</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>The availability of check estimates, previous estimates and/or mine production records and whether the Mineral Resource estimate takes appropriate account of such data.</li> <li>The assumptions made regarding recovery of by-products.</li> <li>Estimation of deleterious elements or other non-grade variables of economic significance (e.g. sulphur for acid mine drainage characterisation).</li> <li>In the case of block model interpolation, the block size in relation to the average sample spacing and the search employed.</li> <li>Any assumptions behind modelling of selective mining units.</li> <li>Any assumptions about correlation between variables.</li> <li>Description of how the geological interpretation was used to control the resource estimates.</li> <li>Discussion of basis for using or not using grade cutting or capping.</li> <li>The process of validation, the checking process used, the comparison of model data to drill hole data, and use of reconciliation data if available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The geological and mineralisation interpretation of the deposit as well as the block modelling and resource estimation were made using Genesis and Leapfrog software.</li> <li>Latin Resources provided SGS with a list of simplified codes for use in creating the 3D geological model. The major lithological units are as follows:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pegmatite:</li> <li>Spodumene Pegmatite:</li> <li>Tuff:</li> <li>Quartz Veins</li> <li>Schist</li> </ul> </li> <li>The most volumetrically significant mineralised units are the spodumene bearing pegmatites. They were generated automatically following grouping of similar mineralisation trends. A maximum extrapolation of mineralisation of 50 m was used.</li> <li>Domaining was used to construct mineralised wireframe models. The domains are defined by lithology and structure within the orebody. A total of 30 mineralized 3D wireframe models were generated for the estimation process equivalent of the individual pegmatite features (dykes) at Colina. Unmineralized wireframe models were considered for geological purposes only. The same was done for Fogs containing 5 mineralised 3D wireframe models. All pegmatites are surrounded by schist.</li> <li>The 30 Colina mineralised 3D geologically controlled wireframe models representing the selected mineralised structures were constructed using Genesis modelling software. Mineralised intervals were created from the drill hole data generally using minimum cut-off grades and or geological features, with each zone of mineralisation having its own unique identifier or tag. The Genesis software was then used to create a planar envelope (wireframe) for each zone by interpolating the mineralised intervals. The overall dimensions of the planar envelopes were constrained based on the properties set, including smoothing, resolution, margins and overall thickness front and back. The same was done for the 5 Fogs mineralised 3D geologically controlled wireframe models.</li> <li>The use of a minimal cut-off grade was applied corresponding to 0.3% Li<sub>2</sub>O but mineralised intervals of interest were considered based on Li<sub>2</sub>O content, lithological units and continuity of mineralisation. Mineralised intervals do not contain host rock material from hanging or footwall. Internal waste less than 2m were included into the solids when no waste solids were possible to create Statistics in the following table indicate the average Li<sub>2</sub>O content and downhole length:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only Li<sub>2</sub>O was estimated.</li> </ul> </li> <li>A block model was created using the mineralised models as hard boundaries. A block size of 5 m x 5 m x 5 m was selected considering the shape and spatial orientation of the mineralised models. Block fraction was applied to the block model. Block discretization of 4 x 4 x 4 was assigned to each block.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each block was attributed an average direction of mineralisation (Azimuth, Dip, Spin) according to the local direction of mineralisation. This is called variable ellipse search.</li> <li>• ID2 interpolation was used for the grade estimation of the individual pegmatites.</li> <li>• 3 estimation passes with its respective search ellipsoid. An average search orientation was applied to each block according to its local dip direction and plunge.</li> <li>• Pass 1 consisted of a minimum 5, a maximum of 15 and a maximum of 3 composites per drill hole (minimum of 2 drill holes to consider) within a search ellipsoid of 100 m x 100 m x 30 m. Pass 2 consisted of a minimum 5, a maximum of 15 and no maximum composites per drill hole within a search ellipsoid of 200 m x 200 m x 60 m. Pass 3 consisted of a minimum 2, a maximum of 15 and no maximum composites per drill hole within a search ellipsoid of 400 m x 400 m x 120 m.</li> <li>• Based on a grade capping study following the relative influence of high-grade values to the rest of the data, a capping of 3.5 % Li<sub>2</sub>O was applied during all 3 estimation passes for search distances above 25 m.</li> <li>• Block model validation was done. Swath plots, block model vs composite scattergrams and histograms were created to evaluate the estimation methods. Ordinary kriging was also done as an estimation check. Sensitivity analysis based on cut-off grade was also done on the selected resources. Validations provided sufficient confidence in the estimation procedures for resource disclosure.</li> <li>• 75% of the Fogs blocks within the mineralised 3D geologically controlled wireframe models were estimated during the first pass. 24% of the blocks within the mineralised 3D geologically controlled wireframe models were estimated during the second pass. Less than 0.5 % of the blocks within the mineralised 3D geologically controlled wireframe models were estimated during third pass.</li> <li>• 93% of the Fogs blocks within the mineralised 3D geologically controlled wireframe models were estimated during first pass. 7% of the blocks within the mineralised 3D geologically controlled wireframe models were estimated during second pass. No blocks within the mineralised 3D geologically controlled wireframe models were estimated during third pass.</li> <li>• Validation checks were undertaken at all stages of modelling and estimation process. Final grade estimates and models have been validated using:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Wireframe vs block volume</li> <li>○ Spatial Visual comparison of block grades vs input drill hole data</li> <li>○ Spatial comparison of block grades vs composite grades</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Comparison of estimation techniques</li> </ul>
<b>Moisture</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the tonnages are estimated on a dry basis or with natural moisture, and the method of determination of the moisture content</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The tonnages are estimated on a dry basis.</li> </ul>
<b>Cut-off parameters</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The basis of the adopted cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A cut-off grade of 0.5% Li<sub>2</sub>O was used for resource estimation statement.</li> <li>• The basis for the cut-off grade chosen for reporting resources at Colina is:</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<b>Mining factors or assumptions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reflective of the style of mineralization and' anticipated mining and processing development routes,</li> <li>Based on Reasonable Prospects of Eventual Economic Extraction (RPEEE).</li> <li>Below the cut-off grade of 0.5% the Li<sub>2</sub>O resources are not reported, as they are not considered to have RPEEE.</li> <li>Mineralisation at the Colina deposit extends to the surface and is expected to be suitable for open cut mining. The open pit mining method was selected. Mineralisation is relatively at a shallow depth and the average plunge of mineralisation is also moderate.</li> <li>The Colina Salinas Lithium Project is located in a well-established mining region and in close proximity to existing transport, energy and camp infrastructure.</li> <li>No minimum mining width was selected. The block model includes block fraction of the mineralised pegmatite portion. It is assumed that an adequate mining selectivity will be applied during extraction.</li> <li>Internal mining dilution is limited to internal barren pegmatite and/or host rock intervals within the mineralised pegmatite intervals. No host rock material was included from the hanging wall or the footwall of the mineralised pegmatites models nor included into the block model.</li> <li>Based on these assumptions, it is considered that there are no mining factors which are likely to affect the assumption that the deposit has reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction</li> </ul>
<b>Metallurgical factors or assumptions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Metallurgical tests were not made available at this stage of project advancement.</li> <li>An assumed concentrate (DMS) recovery of 60% has been applied in determining reasonable prospects of eventual economic extraction.</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental factors or assumptions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are no studies available on the environmental impacts of the mining and processing operation.</li> <li>SGS is not aware of any studies being started on the Project.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<b>Bulk density</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Discuss assumptions for bulk density estimates used in the evaluation process of the different materials.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The specific gravity (“SG”) of spodumene pegmatite samples surrounding the mineralisation ranged between 2.47 to 3.27 for an average of 2.67. The specific gravity of the schist material hosting the mineralisation ranged from 1.57 to 3.56 with an average of 2.76 although, only 1 sample was lower than 2.27 and only 4 samples were greater than 3.0. A SG of 2.67 was selected for the mineralised pegmatite models. Average Sample size of pegmatite material is 0.16m.</li> <li>SG measurements were completed on core by the Weight in Air/Weight in Water method.</li> <li>The SG measurements provide sufficient data for a SG determination within the mineralised pegmatite models.</li> </ul>
<b>Classification</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The basis for the classification of the Mineral Resources into varying confidence categories.</li> <li>Whether appropriate account has been taken of all relevant factors (i.e. 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).</li> <li>Whether the result appropriately reflects the Competent Person’s view of the deposit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Classification of the block model at Colina has been completed in accordance with the Australasian Code for Reporting of Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves (the JORC Code as prepared by the Joint Ore Reserve Committee of the AusIMM, AIG and MCA and updated in December 2012.</li> <li>The resource classification at Colina has been applied based on the following criteria;             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Search volume</li> <li>Internal structure of the mineralized zone (whether traceable between drillholes)</li> <li>Distance to samples (proxy for drill hole spacing)</li> <li>Number of samples</li> <li>Extrapolation of mineralization</li> </ul> </li> <li>Automatic classification was used. Classification focused on composite spatial relation was used. For the measured resources, a minimum of 7composites to consider (maximum of 3 composites per drill hole) within a search ellipsoid of 50 m x 50 m x 15 m. A 67% ellipsoid filling factor was also applied. For the indicated resources, a minimum of 7composites to consider (maximum of 3 composites per drill hole) within a search ellipsoid of 100 m x 100 m x 30 m. A 67% ellipsoid filling factor was also applied. The remaining unclassified blocks were set as inferred category.</li> <li>The entire Fogs blocks were defined as inferred.</li> <li>“Spotted dog effect” was reduced to a minimum.</li> <li>It is the competent’ s opinion that the current classification used is adequate and reliable for this type of mineralization and resource estimate.</li> </ul>
<b>Audits or reviews</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The results of any audits or reviews of Mineral Resource estimates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A peer review of the block modelling parameters and resource estimation methods has been done by fellow colleagues and competent persons.</li> </ul>
<b>Discussion of relative accuracy/ confidence</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 appropriate, a qualitative discussion of the factors that could affect the relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Validation has proven that the block model fairly reflects the underlying data inputs. Variability over distance is relatively moderate too low for the Colina deposit type therefore 50% of the classification level is Indicated, 48% is inferred and only 2% is measured.. The Fogs deposit is set as inferred. The MRE reported is a global estimate with reasonable prospects of eventual economic extraction.</li> <li>An Inferred Mineral Resource is that part of a Mineral Resource for which quantity and grade or quality are estimated on the basis of limited geological evidence and sampling. Geological evidence is sufficient to imply but not verify geological and grade or quality continuity.</li> </ul>



Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>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.</i></li> <li><i>These statements of relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate should be compared with production data, where available.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>An Inferred Mineral Resource has a lower level of confidence than that applying to an Indicated Mineral Resource and must not be converted to a Mineral Reserve. It is reasonably expected that the majority of Inferred Mineral Resources could be upgraded to Indicated Mineral Resources with continued exploration.</i></li> <li><i>There has been no production at the Salinas Colina Project.</i></li> </ul>