Arcadia High Grade Lithium Project – additional High Grade Li_2O Results returned

- All results from the channel chip sampling (316 samples – excluding standards) have been received
- All chip samples were collected from the weathered exposures of the historical Arcadia pit as well as from regional geological traverses
- Results from 316 samples can be summarised as:
    - **6 samples return > 4% Li_2O**
    - **28 samples return > 3% Li_2O**
    - **95 samples return > 2% Li_2O**
    - **178 samples return > 1.5% Li_2O**
    - **238 samples return > 1% Li_2O**
    - **Peak grade is 4.37% Li_2O**

The rock chip samples were collected from one to two metre intervals located along continuous traverses over the central eastern side of the exposed pegmatite within the Arcadia pit as well as from initial geological traverses of the claims area.

Assaying was done by ALSChemex using multi element ICP and over limits on lithium analysed using the LiOG63 method

For further information, please contact:

Hugh Warner
Prospect Resources
Executive Chairman
Ph: +61 413 621 652

Harry Greaves
Prospect Resources
Executive Director
Ph: +263 772 144 669

Competent Person's Statement

The information in this announcement that relates to Exploration Targets, Exploration Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves is based on information compiled by Mr Roger Tyler, a Competent Person who is a member of The Australasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy and The South African Institute of Mining and Metallurgy. Mr Tyler is the Company's Senior Geologist. Mr Tyler has sufficient experience relevant to the style of mineralisation and type of deposit under consideration and to the activity 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 Tyler consents to the inclusion in the report of the matters based on his information in the form and context in which it appears.

JORC Code, 2012 Edition – Table 1 report template

Section 1 Sampling Techniques and Data

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Sampling techniques	• *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.*	• At the Arcadia Li Project, continuous sample cuts were hand-chipped at approximately 3m intervals, with individual samples being collected every 1 metre
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).*	• N/A.
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.*	• N/A
Logging	• *Whether core and chip samples have been geologically and geotechnically logged to a level of detail to support appropriate*	• Chips were logged in detail. • Geological codes were used for detailed geological logging,

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	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.*	using different logging parameters for texture, alteration, mineralisation, lithology and weathering.
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.*	• Chip sample was coned and quartered in field. Approximately 3kgs submitted for laboratory analysis and a similar amount retained for retained for reference. • Quality control provided by insertion of standards and blanks • The laboratory undertook repeat analysis. • . • Samples were taken at 1m intervals along traverse lines through the central and eastern side of the historic Arcadia pit faces and floor
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.*	• Initial screening was by multi-element ICP at ALS Vancouver, with over limit analyses of lithium by the LiOG63 method, after four acid digestion • Laboratories reported acceptable levels of accuracy on inserted standards • Use of Certified Standard Reference material has shown relatively no bias from the results thus the analysis from

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	• *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.*	laboratory are acceptable
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.*	• Sample sites inspected by more than one staff member and external party. • Logging and assay data captured electronically on excel spreadsheet • No adjustments to assay data.
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.* • *Specification of the grid system used.* • *Quality and adequacy of topographic control.*	• No Mineral Resource estimate has been carried out. • N/A
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.*	• The entire old pit face was sampled with traverses at 3m 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.*	• The entire old pit face was sampled with traverses at 3m intervals without bias. •
Sample security	• *The measures taken to ensure sample security.*	• Samples were placed in sealed bags to prevent movement and mixing. Minimal preparation was done on site.
Audits or reviews	• *The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.*	• The reliability of the Li assay results was based on the implemented quality assurance and quality control protocol by the laboratory that entails the analysis of repeats and certified

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		reference materials. The analytical laboratory returned very good results for the certified reference materials. Similarly repeat samples returned acceptable results.

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 licencee to operate in the area.*	• (Exploration Permits) • Rural farmland
Exploration done by other parties	• *Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.*	•
Geology	• *Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.*	• Na-Li Pegmatite vein; spodumene, eucryptite, petalite.

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 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*
		• N/A

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	explain why this is the case	
Data aggregation methods	• *In reporting Exploration Results, weighting averaging techniques, maximum and/or minimum e truncations (e.g. 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.*	•
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').*	•
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.*	•
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.*	• The Company believes that all results have been reported and comply with balanced reporting.
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).*	• Infill and extension drilling is ongoing.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	• *Diagrams clearly highlighting the areas of possible extensions, including the main geological interpretations and future drilling areas, provided this information is not commercially sensitive.*	