



# ASX ANNOUNCEMENT



7 JULY 2016

## AUTHIER LITHIUM PROJECT JORC RESOURCE ESTIMATE

**Sayona Mining Limited (ASX: SYA) ("Sayona" or the "Company")** is pleased to announce as part of its due diligence on the proposed Authier acquisition, an independent JORC Mineral Resource estimate, totalling 9.12 million tonnes containing 87,302 tonnes of Li<sub>2</sub>O.

On the 3 May 2016, the Company announced a proposed acquisition of the Authier lithium project in Quebec, Canada. Authier has a previously reported Measured and Indicated resource estimate totalling 74,000 tonnes of contained Li<sub>2</sub>O, and additional Inferred resources totalling 14,899 tonnes Li<sub>2</sub>O. The foreign estimate was prepared by Glen Eagle Resources Inc in a NI43-101 Technical Report, Preliminary Economic Assessment, 2013.

The Company has independently undertaken a detailed audit of all the available data to verify the previous work and convert the foreign estimate to a JORC 2012 compliant Mineral Resource estimate, tabulated below at a 0.5% Li<sub>2</sub>O cut-off grade.

Table 1 – Authier JORC Mineral Resources Estimate (0.5% Li <sub>2</sub> O cut-off grade)			
Category	Million Tonnes	Grades Li <sub>2</sub> O	Contained Li <sub>2</sub> O
<b>Measured</b>	2.08	0.95%	19,730
<b>Indicated</b>	5.16	0.97%	50,092
<b>Inferred</b>	1.88	0.93%	17,480
<b>Total</b>	<b>9.12</b>	<b>0.96%</b>	<b>87,302</b>

Cautionary Note - Mineral Resources are not Mineral Reserves and do not have demonstrated economic viability. There is no certainty that all or any part of the Mineral Resources estimated will be converted into a Mineral Reserves estimate.

The resource has been estimated and reported in accordance with the guidelines of the Australasian Code for the Reporting of Exploration Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves (JORC Code 2012). A summary of the estimation methodology and competent person statement is included in the appendix to this announcement.

The Company notes that the Canadian NI43-101 Standards of Disclosure system is broadly comparable to the JORC Code of reporting, and whilst the reporting methodologies are different, the mineral resource estimates are broadly similar.

Corey Nolan, Chief Executive Officer, commented *"The Company is pleased with the strong correlation between the two resource estimates which reflects the high quality of the exploration work completed at Authier. In addition, the resource contains a high proportion of Measured and Indicated Resources which will enable the rapid completion of a Pre-Feasibility Study following completion of the Authier acquisition"*.

**SAYONA MINING LIMITED**

Phone: +61 7 3369 7058

Email: [info@sayona.mining.com.au](mailto:info@sayona.mining.com.au)

Address: Suite 68, 283 Given Tce, Paddington QLD 4064

Post: PO Box 1357, Milton, Qld 4064, Australia

[www.sayonamining.com.au](http://www.sayonamining.com.au)

ASX Code: **SYA**

## **Authier Lithium Project Mineral Resource Estimate**

The Authier project is owned by TSX-V listed company, Glen Eagle Resources Inc ("Glen Eagle"). The Company has a binding agreement to acquire the Authier project from Glen Eagle for a total consideration of CAD\$4 million.

The Authier project area comprises 19 mineral claims totalling 653 hectares, and extends 3.4 kilometres in an east-west, and 3.1 kilometres in a north-south direction, respectively. The mineral claims are located over Crown Lands.

The Authier project is situated 45 kilometres north-west of the city of Val d'Or, a major mining service centre, situated in the Province of Quebec. Val d'Or is located approximately 466 kilometres north-east of Montreal. The project is easily accessed by a rural road network connecting to a national highway a few kilometres east of the project site.

The deposit is hosted in a spodumene-bearing pegmatite intrusion. The deposit is 825 metres long, striking east-west, with an average thickness of 25 metres, minimum 4 metres and maximum 55 metres, dipping at 40 degrees to the north.

The project has more than 15,000 metres of diamond drilling in 123 holes, and 2,143 assay samples. The project was initially drilled between 1991 and 1999, and then by Glen Eagle between 2010 and 2012. Holes were typically drilled perpendicular to the strike of the mineralised pegmatite to provide high confidence in the grade, strike and vertical extensions of the mineralisation. The NQ size diamond core was halved, 1.5 metre sections were assayed for Li<sub>2</sub>O content at an ALS laboratory in Vancouver using Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry. Glen Eagle had a rigorous "good industry practise" quality control process, including routine assaying of standards, duplicates and blanks. During the preparation of the Glen Eagle 43-101, SGS recommended that Glen Eagle twin 3 historical drill holes. The program demonstrated strong correlations with historical drill assays.

Authier has been subject to two metallurgical test work programs in 1999 and 2012. Bumigeme Inc, processing consultants, conducted metallurgical testing on a 40 tonne sample and produced Li<sub>2</sub>O concentrate grades between 5.78% and 5.89% at metallurgical recoveries between 67.52% and 70.19%, with an average head assay of 1.14%Li<sub>2</sub>O. At an average head grade of 1.35%Li<sub>2</sub>O, test work demonstrated a recovery of 75% and a concentrate grade of 5.96% Li<sub>2</sub>O. In 2012, Glen Eagle completed further metallurgical testing and designed a flow sheet based on the concept of producing a 5-6% Li<sub>2</sub>O concentrate at an 85% recovery rate using conventional processing routes.

Glen Eagle produced a NI43-101 Technical Report – Preliminary Economic Assessment – in 2013, demonstrating the technical and commercial viability of developing the deposit. The study included estimates of the capital and operating costs, and calculation of cut-off grades for the resource estimate. The estimates were conducted to a +/- 35% level of accuracy.

Authier has a previously reported Measured and Indicated resource estimate totalling 74,000 tonnes of contained Li<sub>2</sub>O, and additional Inferred resources totalling 14,899 tonnes Li<sub>2</sub>O (see Table 2). The foreign estimate was prepared by Glen Eagle Resources Inc in a NI43-101 Technical Report, Preliminary Economic Assessment, 22 January 2013.

<b>Table 2 - Authier Foreign Mineral Resources Estimate (0.5% Li<sub>2</sub>O cut-off grade)</b>			
<b>Category</b>	<b>Million Tonnes</b>	<b>Grades Li<sub>2</sub>O</b>	<b>Contained Li<sub>2</sub>O</b>
<b>Measured</b>	2.24	0.95%	21,318
<b>Indicated</b>	5.43	0.97%	52,681
<b>Total</b>	<b>7.67</b>	<b>0.96%</b>	<b>73,999</b>
<b>Inferred</b>	1.55	0.96%	14,899

Cautionary Note - National Instrument 43-101 is a national instrument for the Standards of Disclosure for Mineral Projects within Canada. The Mineral Resources stated are foreign estimates and are not reported in accordance with JORC Code.

### JORC Resource Estimate

The Company has independently undertaken a detailed audit of all the available data to verify the previous work and convert the foreign estimate to a JORC 2012 compliant estimate, including:

- Site visit to the project area to inspect the surface geology, confirm locations of the drill hole collars and inspection of the diamond drill core library. The site visit was attended by Gilles Laverdiere, a senior geologist who managed the Glen Eagle drilling programs and resource estimates;
- Review of the geological and drilling database. This included a working session with consultants from SGS Canada who previously prepared the Authier mineral resource; and
- Reinterpretation of the geological model using Micromine software.

The independent resource estimate was undertaken using reported intercepts calculated using weighted averages, no top-cut, and a 0.5% Li<sub>2</sub>O cut-off grade. The estimation was based on an Inverse Distance Squared interpolation using Micromine software. The parent block dimensions used were 5m x 5m x 5m with sub-blocks of 2.5m x 2.5m x 2.5 in accordance with the drill spacing and pegmatite body geometry.

The resource has been estimated and reported in accordance with the guidelines of the Australasian Code for the Reporting of Exploration Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves (JORC Code 2012). The JORC compliant resource estimate at 0.5% Li<sub>2</sub>O cut-off grade is tabulated below.

<b>Table 3- Authier JORC Mineral Resources Estimate (0.5% Li<sub>2</sub>O cut-off grade)</b>			
<b>Category</b>	<b>Million Tonnes</b>	<b>Grades Li<sub>2</sub>O</b>	<b>Contained Li<sub>2</sub>O</b>
<b>Measured</b>	2.08	0.95%	19,730
<b>Indicated</b>	5.16	0.97%	50,092
<b>Inferred</b>	1.88	0.93%	17,480
<b>Total</b>	<b>9.12</b>	<b>0.96%</b>	<b>87,302</b>

Cautionary Note - Mineral Resources are not Mineral Reserves and do not have demonstrated economic viability. There is no certainty that all or any part of the Mineral Resources estimated will be converted into a Mineral Reserves estimate

The Measured Mineral Resource was defined within areas of close spaced diamond drilling of less than 35m by 35m, and where the continuity and predictability of the spodumene bearing pegmatite was high. The Indicated Mineral Resource was assigned to areas where drill hole spacing was less than 50m by 50m. The Inferred Mineral Resource was assigned to areas where drill hole spacing was greater than 50m by 50m generally in the edges of the known mineralisation mostly in the down-dip extensions beyond the last drill holes in each section.

The Company notes that the Canadian NI43-101 Standards of Disclosure system is broadly comparable to the JORC Code of reporting, and whilst the reporting methodologies are different, the mineral resource estimates are broadly similar.

## **Next Steps**

The Company's strategy is to develop Authier in a staged approach, including:

- Converting the inferred mineral resources to measured and indicated through further drilling;
- Converting the mineral resources to reserves;
- Exploring for extensions to the existing mineral resources and other potential mineralisation within the tenement package;
- Consolidating other potential resources in the district;
- Studying options for improving the project economics, including:
  - operating and capital cost reductions (e.g. leasing and purchasing of second hand equipment);
  - metallurgical optimisation using latest technologies available like dense medium separation;
  - downstream processing options including the production of high-value lithium carbonate;
- Completion of an Environmental Impact Statement and Bankable Feasibility Study;
- Negotiating production off-take agreements; and
- Sourcing development finance and constructing the project.

## **Finalisation of the Authier Purchase**

The Company is actively working through a due diligence program covering all the legal and technical aspects of the proposed acquisition which is nearing completion. The Company has also commenced preliminary discussions with prospective financiers in regard to funding the acquisition, and has been encouraged by the response regarding the level and types of funding that could be available. Financing will be completed once all shareholder and regulatory approvals are completed.

**For more information, please contact:**

Corey Nolan  
Chief Executive Officer  
Phone: +61 (7) 3369 7058  
Email: [info@sayonamining.com.au](mailto:info@sayonamining.com.au)

Sayona Mining Limited is an Australian, ASX-listed (SYA), company focused on sourcing and developing the raw materials required to construct lithium-ion batteries for use in the rapidly growing new and green technology sectors. Please visit us as at [www.sayonamining.com.au](http://www.sayonamining.com.au)

**COMPETENT PERSON STATEMENT**

The information in this report that relates to Exploration Results is based on information compiled by Dr Gustavo Delendatti, a member of the Australian Institute of Geoscientists. Dr Delendatti is an independent consultant, and has sufficient experience which is relevant to the style of mineralisation and type of deposit under consideration and to the activity which it is undertaking to qualify as a Competent Person as defined in the JORC Code (2012 Edition) of the "Australasian Code for Reporting of Exploration Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves." Dr Delendatti was responsible for the design and conduct of this audit and review of the exploration and drilling information, supervised the preparation of the technical information in this release and has relevant experience and competence of the subject matter. Dr Delendatti, as competent person for this announcement, has consented to the inclusion of the information in the form and context in which it appears herein.

### Appendix A – Historical Drilling Intersections (not drilled by Sayona)

Drill Hole	East	North	RL	Azimuth	Dip	Depth	Downhole Intersections (metres)			
							From	To	Thickness	Grade Li <sub>2</sub> O
AL-03	707670.66	5360235.61	330.00	181.00	-45.00	42.98	30.34	37.96	7.62	1.46
AL-04	707671.54	5360235.68	330.00	180.00	-75.00	29.87	No intersections of interest			
AL-05	707670.86	5360296.00	330.00	178.00	-50.00	93.88	69.49	74.67	5.18	1.48
AL-06	707640.77	5360253.50	330.00	178.00	-45.00	123.14	41.15	76.20	35.05	1.20
AL-07	707611.24	5360252.23	330.00	178.00	-45.00	98.76	48.77	86.87	38.10	1.41
AL-08	707705.38	5360256.14	330.00	178.00	-45.00	94.18	30.78	38.40	7.62	1.12
AL-10-01	707152.45	5360353.03	329.90	180.00	-52.00	138.00	72.00	123.25	51.25	1.35
AL-10-02	707152.02	5360315.95	329.25	180.00	-50.00	108.00	48.55	62.80	14.25	1.41
							76.45	82.55	6.10	0.94
AL-10-03	707152.20	5360283.97	329.47	180.00	-45.00	87.00	33.10	35.75	2.65	1.59
							47.45	54.70	7.25	1.09
AL-10-04	707231.11	5360318.37	329.93	180.00	-60.00	102.00	56.40	64.85	8.45	1.25
							78.10	90.95	12.85	1.22
AL-10-05	707254.57	5360326.56	329.74	180.00	-59.00	111.00	74.85	77.95	3.10	1.30
							83.70	95.85	9.30	1.43
AL-10-08	707401.89	5360320.78	331.99	180.00	-60.00	102.00	69.00	79.50	10.50	0.98
AL-10-09	707426.89	5360292.98	330.70	180.00	-55.00	102.00	42.00	68.50	26.50	0.82
AL-10-10	707426.97	5360261.58	330.58	180.00	-55.00	108.00	15.50	21.75	6.25	0.95
							43.80	54.00	10.20	0.69
AL-10-11	707458.65	5360269.59	330.88	180.00	-55.00	102.00	38.55	61.50	22.95	1.05
							65.15	78.00	12.85	0.77
AL-10-12	707557.05	5360332.34	331.86	180.00	-45.00	126.00	103.50	109.50	6.00	0.99
AL-10-13	707556.34	5360263.03	331.43	180.00	-48.00	114.00	58.50	96.45	37.95	0.91
AL-10-14	707561.59	5360216.92	330.83	180.00	-50.00	105.00	49.50	85.50	36.00	1.09
AL-10-15	707589.40	5360309.43	331.93	180.00	-55.00	132.00	69.00	96.40	27.40	0.97
AL-10-16	707592.97	5360274.62	331.68	180.00	-56.00	108.00	48.00	92.50	44.50	1.08
AL-10-17	707657.81	5360310.28	332.54	180.00	-55.00	105.00	87.00	88.50	1.50	1.09
AL-10-18	707660.79	5360273.13	331.65	180.00	-50.00	96.00	61.50	63.00	1.50	1.29
							78.00	82.50	4.50	0.84
AL-11-01	707153.45	5360419.66	331.65	180.00	-54.10	192.00	142.50	171.00	28.50	1.14
AL-11-02	707094.28	5360378.30	330.56	180.00	-55.00	175.00	124.50	133.50	9.00	0.75
AL-11-03	707089.44	5360327.08	329.57	180.00	-54.00	180.00	52.50	72.00	19.50	1.06
AL-11-04	707048.27	5360275.50	329.75	180.00	-55.00	130.00	43.50	57.00	13.50	0.77
AL-11-05	706997.43	5360274.09	330.14	180.00	-55.00	128.00	72.00	85.50	13.50	0.72
AL-11-06	707000.20	5360329.28	330.35	180.00	-55.00	180.00	97.50	100.50	3.00	0.81
AL-11-07	707051.07	5360328.19	330.09	180.00	-55.00	180.00	60.00	75.00	15.00	0.93

							90.00	102.00	12.00	0.89
AL-11-08	707054.26	5360378.00	331.42	180.00	-55.00	177.00	117.00	124.50	7.50	1.31
AL-11-09	707022.33	5360370.52	331.13	194.00	-57.00	177.00	129.00	133.50	4.50	0.57
AL-11-10	706951.84	5360376.86	331.50	180.00	-55.00	175.00	151.50	159.00	7.50	1.08
AL-11-15	707301.37	5360422.39	331.78	180.00	-52.00	195.00	150.00	184.50	34.50	1.25
AL-11-16	707304.70	5360410.16	332.29	163.00	-55.00	177.00	157.50	169.50	12.00	0.67
AL-11-17	707343.81	5360320.04	331.51	207.00	-63.00	102.00	63.00	69.00	6.00	0.58
AL-11-18	707450.57	5360358.02	332.77	180.00	-57.00	170.00	144.00	148.50	4.50	0.82
AL-11-20	707450.59	5360251.29	331.22	180.00	-45.00	85.00	21.00	40.50	19.50	0.82
							46.50	73.50	27.00	0.78
AL-11-21	707574.28	5360360.10	333.99	180.00	-56.00	156.00	133.50	147.00	13.50	1.33
AL-11-22	707574.56	5360213.64	332.17	180.00	-59.00	90.00	39.00	61.50	22.50	1.05
AL-11-23	707200.66	5360389.17	331.23	180.00	-54.00	162.00	117.00	130.50	13.50	0.90
AL-11-24	707246.90	5360386.47	331.52	180.00	-60.00	186.00	121.50	144.00	22.50	1.13
							150.00	175.50	25.50	1.32
AL-11-25	707552.17	5360172.52	329.18	180.00	-45.00	87.00	No intersections of interest			
AL-12-01	707000.13	5360227.08	328.57	180.00	-55.00	72.00	58.50	63.00	4.50	0.14
AL-12-02	707049.98	5360247.29	329.60	180.00	-55.00	58.00	31.50	34.50	3.00	0.79
							40.00	48.00	8.00	0.58
AL-12-03	707047.45	5360418.19	331.32	180.00	-55.00	177.00	138.00	166.50	28.50	0.68
AL-12-04	707099.41	5360415.09	329.94	180.00	-55.00	177.00	136.50	157.50	21.00	0.76
AL-12-05	707104.61	5360263.65	327.83	180.00	-55.00	150.00	19.50	25.30	4.50	0.71
							39.00	42.00	3.00	0.66
AL-12-07	707150.86	5360447.48	330.78	180.00	-48.00	201.00	157.50	187.50	30.00	0.92
AL-12-08	707199.49	5360411.19	331.44	180.00	-54.00	201.00	128.20	156.00	27.80	0.92
AL-12-09	707423.97	5360223.47	330.39	180.00	-55.00	48.00	6.00	33.00	27.00	0.85
AL-12-11	707475.31	5360226.91	330.50	180.00	-55.00	72.00	34.50	56.50	12.00	0.54
							58.50	64.50	6.00	0.71
AL-12-12	707476.51	5360294.74	331.98	180.00	-55.00	90.00	70.50	78.00	7.50	0.57
AL-12-14	707474.85	5360374.10	332.43	180.00	-55.00	177.00	132.00	166.50	34.50	0.77
AL-12-15	707497.69	5360201.42	330.16	180.00	-45.00	72.00	25.50	69.00	43.50	0.88
AL-12-16	707500.76	5360297.33	331.89	180.00	-45.00	126.00	79.50	94.90	15.40	0.76
AL-12-17	707501.24	5360378.82	332.49	180.00	-50.00	186.00	138.00	175.50	37.50	1.30
AL-12-18	707545.72	5360357.03	332.25	180.00	-55.00	186.00	133.50	165.00	31.50	1.10
AL-12-19	707597.77	5360224.29	330.38	180.00	-45.00	102.00	48.00	69.00	21.00	0.73
AL-12-20	707597.42	5360373.44	335.12	180.00	-55.00	177.00	142.50	168.00	25.50	1.20
AL-12-21	707622.14	5360242.83	331.40	180.00	-50.00	90.00	36.00	66.00	30.00	1.03
AL-14	707550.89	5360243.74	330.00	177.00	-45.00	121.92	49.38	99.36	49.98	1.26
AL-16	707426.03	5360225.70	330.00	177.00	-45.00	118.87	3.66	45.72	41.45	1.03
AL-17	707360.86	5360284.03	330.00	177.00	-55.00	124.05	21.34	45.72	24.38	1.01

AL-18	707577.87	5360334.11	330.00	177.00	-45.00	172.52	96.62	105.77	9.14	0.97
AL-19	707487.34	5360385.04	330.00	177.00	-60.00	180.75	135.64	173.74	38.10	1.12
AL-20	707732.91	5360298.68	330.00	178.00	-45.00	153.16	60.96	65.53	4.57	1.23
AL-24	707297.25	5360329.23	330.00	177.50	-71.00	106.68	79.34	99.97	20.63	0.97
AL-25	707238.73	5360291.92	330.00	177.00	-60.00	83.82	37.10	42.67	4.57	0.98
AL-26	707487.95	5360320.23	330.00	178.00	-50.00	135.94	82.30	83.80	1.52	0.71
AL-27	707552.24	5360174.93	330.00	177.00	-45.00	81.99	15.85	21.34	5.49	1.20
							27.43	74.68	47.24	1.06
AL-28	707611.95	5360194.75	330.00	178.00	-45.00	90.46	45.72	57.91	11.22	0.81
							68.21	74.68	6.46	0.60
AL-29	707421.61	5360320.92	330.00	177.00	-50.00	106.07	59.44	74.68	15.24	0.60
							82.30	85.35	3.05	1.04
AL-30	707610.46	5360322.10	330.00	178.00	-55.00	129.54	96.01	106.68	10.57	0.96
AL-31	707642.04	5360183.37	330.00	177.00	-45.00	87.45	21.34	36.58	13.35	0.81
R-93-01	707454.70	5360268.28	330.67	175.00	-55.00	133.50	39.01	79.25	40.23	0.95
R-93-02	707429.13	5360322.04	330.00	178.00	-55.00	99.67	76.20	88.40	12.20	0.79
R-93-03	707403.78	5360293.79	330.64	176.00	-51.00	81.69	27.43	72.85	75.42	0.90
R-93-04	707408.87	5360237.91	330.00	178.00	-49.00	93.88	11.58	42.06	30.48	0.81
R-93-05	707383.76	5360237.20	330.00	175.00	-45.00	71.32	9.14	18.44	9.30	0.91
							22.04	34.75	12.71	1.03
R-93-06	707376.44	5360297.00	330.00	180.00	-46.00	84.73	36.58	70.10	33.53	1.12
R-93-08	707352.82	5360347.56	332.62	182.00	-49.00	139.90	78.64	87.78	9.14	0.90
R-93-09	707358.38	5360237.57	330.00	174.00	-48.00	78.64	13.87	24.69	9.14	0.90
R-93-10	707350.43	5360297.80	330.00	174.00	-51.00	69.49	30.48	54.86	24.38	0.95
R-93-12	707297.44	5360367.22	330.83	174.00	-49.00	139.60	99.97	109.12	9.14	0.95
R-93-14	707302.97	5360333.93	330.00	183.00	-50.00	93.88	No intersections of interest			
R-93-15	707276.85	5360335.80	330.00	180.00	-53.00	125.88	No intersections of interest			
R-93-16	707280.30	5360284.18	328.23	179.00	-51.00	69.49	20.42	23.16	2.74	0.96
							46.63	55.32	8.69	1.33
R-93-18	707257.28	5360299.33	330.00	177.00	-54.00	96.93	59.74	62.48	2.74	0.83
R-93-19	707255.46	5360354.55	330.30	179.00	-59.00	136.55	88.39	112.93	24.54	1.12
R-93-20	707234.76	5360278.91	330.00	185.00	-52.00	81.69	20.73	40.23	6.71	0.77
R-93-21	707231.64	5360370.09	330.00	172.00	-65.00	136.55	100.28	126.03	25.76	1.10
R-93-22	707193.43	5360273.92	328.36	180.00	-56.00	63.40	16.46	22.55	6.10	0.84
							24.99	27.13	2.13	1.37
							38.40	43.43	5.03	0.65
R-93-23	707193.93	5360332.88	330.00	180.00	-52.00	106.07	76.20	97.54	21.34	1.18
R-93-24	707194.98	5360394.56	330.00	180.00	-48.00	121.92	No intersections of interest			
R-93-25	707151.13	5360352.47	329.76	181.00	-52.00	133.50	79.25	125.58	45.75	1.31
R-93-27	707128.12	5360290.92	330.00	178.00	-60.00	87.17	33.53	49.07	8.08	0.78

							60.81	70.41	9.60	0.95
R-93-28	707132.80	5360347.41	330.00	180.00	-55.00	130.45	73.15	99.36	26.21	1.29
							100.88	102.11	1.22	1.36
							109.42	117.81	8.38	1.39
R-93-30	707104.78	5360265.05	327.82	181.00	-73.00	83.82	54.25	67.67	13.41	1.17
R-93-33	707372.92	5360326.23	330.00	180.00	-57.00	109.12	60.96	73.15	12.19	0.60

## 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
Sampling techniques	<p><i>Nature and quality of sampling (eg cut channels, random chips, or specific specialised industry standard measurement tools appropriate to the minerals under investigation, such as down hole gamma sondes, or handheld XRF instruments, etc). These examples should not be taken as limiting the broad meaning of sampling.</i></p> <p><i>Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample representivity and the appropriate calibration of any measurement tools or systems used.</i></p> <p><i>Aspects of the determination of mineralisation that are Material to the Public Report.</i></p> <p><i>In cases where 'industry standard' work has been done this would be relatively simple (eg 'reverse circulation drilling was used to obtain 1 m samples from which 3 kg was pulverised to produce a 30 g charge for fire assay'). In other cases more explanation may be required, such as where there is coarse gold that has inherent sampling problems. Unusual commodities or mineralisation types (eg submarine nodules) may warrant disclosure of detailed information.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All holes reported in this program have been Diamond Core Drill holes (DDH).</li> <li>• Diamond core typical sample length is 1.5 metre but can vary according to lithological contact between the mineralised pegmatite and the host rock.</li> <li>• High grade graphite mineralisation is visible during geological logging and sampling.</li> <li>• The sample preparation and assaying techniques are within industry standard and appropriate for this type of mineralisation.</li> </ul>
Drilling techniques	<p><i>Drill type (eg core, reverse circulation, open-hole hammer, rotary air blast, auger, Bangka, sonic, etc) and details (eg core diameter, triple or standard tube, depth of diamond tails, face-sampling bit or other type, whether core is oriented and if so, by what method, etc).</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core drilling, core diameter size NQ. Standard tube and bit.</li> </ul>
Drill sample recovery	<p><i>Method of recording and assessing core and chip sample recoveries and results assessed.</i></p> <p><i>Measures taken to maximise sample recovery and ensure representative nature of the samples.</i></p> <p><i>Whether a relationship exists between sample recovery and grade and whether sample bias may have occurred due to preferential loss/gain of fine/coarse material.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core recovery has been above 99%.</li> <li>• There has been no identified relationship or sample bias between sample recovery and grade.</li> </ul>
Logging	<p><i>Whether core and chip samples have been geologically and geotechnically logged to a level of detail to support appropriate Mineral Resource estimation, mining studies and metallurgical studies.</i></p> <p><i>Whether logging is qualitative or quantitative in nature. Core (or costean, channel, etc) photography.</i></p> <p><i>The total length and percentage of the relevant intersections logged.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geological logging and RQD measurements completed for all holes done by Glen Eagle.</li> <li>• Before sampling, the core was photographed using a digital camera and the core boxes were identified with Box Number, Hole ID, From and To using aluminum tags.</li> <li>• All the core logged and all the target mineralisation type core (spodumene pegmatite) been sampled and analysed.</li> </ul>
Sub-sampling techniques	<p><i>If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all core taken.</i></p> <p><i>If non-core, whether riffled, tube sampled, rotary</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drill core NQ diameter samples cut to two halves with one half placed in a new plastic bag along with the sample tag sent for analysis; the other</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<p>and sample preparation</p>	<p><i>split, etc and whether sampled wet or dry.</i>  <i>For all sample types, the nature, quality and appropriateness of the sample preparation technique.</i>  <i>Quality control procedures adopted for all sub-sampling stages to maximise representivity of samples.</i>  <i>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.</i>  <i>Whether sample sizes are appropriate to the grain size of the material being sampled.</i></p>	<p>half was replaced in the core box with the second sample tag for reference.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sampling boundaries are based in both, mineralogical and textural homogeneity as well as geological contacts with host rock.</li> <li>• In general at least one host rock sample was collected each side from the contacts with the mineralised pegmatite.</li> <li>• Sample preparation of drill core samples collected during the 2010 exploration programs at the ALS laboratory (“ALS”) facilities in Val d’Or, Quebec follows industry best practice, involving oven drying, crushing and pulverizing there to respect the specifications of the analytical protocol and then shipped to ALS laboratories in North Vancouver, BC, for analysis.</li> <li>• Sample preparation of drill core samples collected during the 2011-2012 exploration programs at the AGAT Laboratories (“AGAT”) facilities in Val d’Or office and transported directly to the AGAT preparation laboratory facilities in Sudbury, Ontario for sample preparation. The submitted samples are pulverized there to respect the specifications of the analytical protocol and then shipped to AGAT laboratories in Mississauga, Ontario, for analysis.</li> <li>• Sample sizes are considered appropriate with regard to the grain size of the sampled material.</li> </ul>
<p>Quality of assay data and laboratory tests</p>	<p><i>The nature, quality and appropriateness of the assaying and laboratory procedures used and whether the technique is considered partial or total.</i>  <i>For geophysical tools, spectrometers, handheld XRF instruments, etc, the parameters used in determining the analysis including instrument make and model, reading times, calibrations factors applied and their derivation, etc.</i>  <i>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.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assaying of all 2010 samples was carried out at the ALS laboratory in North Vancouver, BC which is a certified laboratory in compliance with ISO/IEC 17025 standards. Two analytical methods have been used for the samples from Authier Lithium deposit. The first analytical method used by ALS is the 38 elements analysis (not including lithium) using lithium metaborate fusion followed by Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry (“ICP-MS”) (ALS code ME-MS81). This method uses 0.2 g of the pulverized material and returns different detection limit for each element. The second analytical protocol used at ALS is the ore grade lithium four-acid digestion with Inductively Coupled Plasma-Atomic Emission Spectrometry (“ICP-AES”) (ALS code Li-OG63). The LI-OG63 analytical method uses approximately 0.4 g of pulp material and returns lower detection limit of 0.01 % Li.</li> <li>• Assaying of all 2011-2012 received at AGAT were</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		<p>processed according to the following procedure sat the AGAT preparation facilities in Sudbury, Ontario. All samples are inspected and compared to the chain of custody (COC) and logged into the AGAT laboratory management system (AGAT LIMS) then weighted. Drying is done at 60°C on all samples. Sample material is crushed in a Rocklabs Boyd or a TM Terminator Jaw Crusher to 75% passing 10 mesh (2mm). The crushed material is split with a rifle splitter (or a rotary splitter) to obtain a 250 g sub-sample which is then pulverised to 85% passing 200 mesh (75 µm) using TM, TM-2 pulverisers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The analyses were conducted at the AGAT laboratory located in Mississauga, Ontario, which is an accredited laboratory under ISO/IEC 17025 standards. The analytical protocol used at AGAT is the ore grade lithium four-acid digestion with Inductively Coupled Plasma – Optical Emission Spectrometry (“ICP-OES”) (AGAT code 201079) - Li. The analytical method uses approximately 0.5 g of pulp material and uses a lower detection limit of 0.0001% Li.</li> <li>• SGS Geostat conducted independent check sampling of selected drill core from the Project. The analyses of the check samples were conducted at the SGS Canada Inc. – Minerals Services laboratory located in Toronto, Ontario (“SGS Minerals”), which is an accredited ISO/IEC 17025 laboratory. The analytical method used by SGS Minerals is the ore grade analysis using sodium peroxide fusion with Induced Coupled Plasma Optical Emission Spectrometry (“ICP-OES”) finish methodology with a lower detection limit of 0.01% Li (SGS code ICP90Q). This method uses 20 g of pulp material</li> <li>• No geophysical or handheld tools were used.</li> <li>• Above the laboratory quality assurance quality control protocol (“QA/QC”) routinely conducted by ALS using pulp duplicate analysis, Glen Eagle implemented an internal QA/QC protocol consisting in the insertion of reference material, analytical standards and blanks, on a systematic basis with the samples shipped to ALS. The company also sent pulps from selected mineralised intersection to SGS Minerals for re-analysis. SGS Geostat did not visit the ALS or SGS Minerals facilities, or conduct an audit of the</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<p>Verification of sampling and assaying</p>	<p><i>The verification of significant intersections by either independent or alternative company personnel.</i>  <i>The use of twinned holes.</i>  <i>Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols.</i>  <i>Discuss any adjustment to assay data.</i></p>	<p>laboratories.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The results are considered acceptable and have been reviewed by multiple geologists</li> <li>• The entire drilling program conducted by Glean Eagle since 2010 are logged by contractor geologist and technicians from the Company contracted Services Forestiers et d'Exploration GFE ("Services GFE") and verified by Glen Eagle's geologists. Services GFE provided the office, core logging and storage facilities to the Company which are located less than 4 km southeast from the Authier project near the town of La Motte.</li> <li>• The core boxes were photographed and are available for verification at Services GFE storage facilities less than 4 km southeast from the Authier project.</li> <li>• Following SGS recommendations, Glen Eagle completed 3 twin drill holes to verify the historical R-93-XX drill holes series. Holes R-93-01, R-93-13, and R-93-25 were twinned with holes AL-10-11, AL-10-06, and AL-10-01 respectively. Due to localisation difficulties encountered in the field by the Company, the twin drill holes planned for the AL-XX drill hole series were collared too far (more than 15-20 m) from the historical holes to be considered valid for data verification. After reviewing all the drill data, two holes, one by the recent Glen Eagle drilling (AL-10-15) and one from the R93-XX series (R93-12), intersected mineral intervals near enough holes from the AL-XX series to be considered valid for data verification. Considering the significant grade and geometry variability observed in the Authier pegmatite intrusive body, the results of the twin drill hole program showed a fair to good correlation between the recent and historical drill holes except between historical R-93-13 and AL-10-06 as well as historical AL-19 and AL-12-14 lower mineralised intercepts of which returned Li<sub>2</sub>O grade differences in excess of 30% and 40% differences respectively. No systematic analytical bias was outlined. Based on the results of the twin hole drill program, SGS Geostat considers the historical drill data to be of acceptable quality to be included in the final drill hole database of the Project.</li> <li>• Primary data are captured on paper in the drilling</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		<p>site and then re-entered into spreadsheet format by the supervising geologist, to then be input into the company's database.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No adjustments to assay data have been undertaken.</li> </ul>
Location of data points	<p><i>Accuracy and quality of surveys used to locate drill holes (collar and down-hole surveys), trenches, mine workings and other locations used in Mineral Resource estimation.</i></p> <p><i>Specification of the grid system used.</i></p> <p><i>Quality and adequacy of topographic control.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collar positions have been surveyed and the survey values are recorded as the final coordinates and hole orientation in the database by an independent and qualified land surveyor.</li> <li>• The Drill hole deviation (dip and azimuth) was measured by a Flexit tool. Measurements are made at the beginning (25 m below surface) and at the end of the hole length. An intermediate measure was done when drill hole length exceeded 150 m.</li> <li>• The grid system used is 1983 North American Datum (NAD83)</li> <li>• The level of topographic control offered by the collar survey is considered sufficient for the work undertaken at its current stage.</li> </ul>
Data spacing and distribution	<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>Whether sample compositing has been applied.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drill holes were drilled perpendicular to the lithium mineralised pegmatite as shown on the attached plan.</li> <li>• Drill collars were sited to provide the best geological information possible to test the grade, strike and vertical extensions of mineralisation.</li> <li>• The data spacing is sufficient to estimate geological and grade continuity of observed mineralisation and therefore to produce a JORC compliant mineral resource estimate.</li> <li>• Sample compositing has not been applied.</li> </ul>
Orientation of data in relation to geological structure	<p><i>Whether the orientation of sampling achieves unbiased sampling of possible structures and the extent to which this is known, considering the deposit type.</i></p> <p><i>If the relationship between the drilling orientation and the orientation of key mineralised structures is considered to have introduced a sampling bias, this should be assessed and reported if material.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drilling grid orientation is perpendicular to the strike of the mineralisation determined by previous mapping and historical drilling.</li> <li>• No bias attributable to orientation of sampling upgrading of results has been identified.</li> </ul>
Sample security	<p><i>The measures taken to ensure sample security.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All reasonable measures have been taken to ensure sample security along the value chain. These measures include the sample collection by company's field personnel, recording of sample dispatch and receipt reports, secure delivering of samples to ALS laboratory facilities in 2010 and to AGAT Laboratories facilities in 2011 and 2012.</li> </ul>
Audits or reviews	<p><i>The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SGS Geostat completed independent analytical checks of drill core duplicate samples taken from</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		<p>Glen Eagle's 2010, 2011 and 2012 diamond drilling programs. The validation did not return any significant issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SGS Geostat also conducted analysis of twin holes completed by the Company to validate the historical analytical data. The validation did not return any significant issues.</li> </ul> <p>Internal laboratory QAQC data (standards, blanks and duplicates) have been reviewed and no significant problems were identified regarding the quality of the assaying.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finally validation of the project digital database supplied by Glen Eagle were verified for errors or discrepancies. The validation did not return any significant issues.</li> <li>• The quality control protocols implemented at Authier Lithium deposit are considered to represent good industry practice and allow some assessment of analytical precision and accuracy. The assay data is considered to display acceptable precision.</li> </ul>

## Section 2 - Reporting of Exploration Results

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

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Mineral tenement and land tenure status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>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.</i></li> <li>• <i>The security of the tenure held at the time of reporting along with any known impediments to obtaining a license to operate in the area.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Authier Lithium Property consists in one block of map designated claim cells located at the border between the La Motte Township and the Preissac Township, totalling 19 claims covering 653.57 ha. The Property extends 3.4 km in the east-west direction and 3.1 km north-south.</li> <li>• From the 19 claims composing the Property, 3 claims were acquired by staking on November 27, 2009 (CDC 21955725) and July 9, 2010 (CDC 2240226 and 2240227), 15 claims were acquired through two separate purchasing agreements and one claim is held under an option agreement. Glen Eagle is conducting exploration work under valid intervention permits delivered by the Quebec Government, and there is no known environmental liabilities pertaining to the Property. Some of the claims containing mineral resources are subject to mining royalties.</li> <li>• Approximately more than 75% of the mineral resources are present inside the 3 claims (CDC 2183454-2183455 and 2194819). About less than</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		<p>25% of the estimated mineral resources are present inside the claim (CDC2116146).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The spodumene-bearing pegmatite intrusion is located on claims number CDC 2183455, 2194819 and 2116146, and extends at surface between approximately 707,050mE and 707,775mE in the East-West direction, and between 5,359,975 mN and 5,360,275 mN in the North-South direction.</li> <li>The Property is adjacent to a protected area reserved for groundwater catchment supply located just the north of the Property, which has been excluded for exploration and mining activities.</li> <li>Glen Eagle is conducting exploration work under valid forest intervention permit delivered by the provincial Ministère des Ressources Naturelles et de la Faune ("MRNF"). As of the date of this report, the Company confirmed having valid work permits.</li> <li>Sayona has signed a binding term sheet, subject to completion of a 60-day due diligence, to acquire 100 % of the Authier Lithium deposit for CAD\$4 million before 30 June 2016. The agreement was extended until 21st July 2016.</li> </ul>
<p>Exploration done by other parties</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Property has been explored in the 1950's and 1960's for volcanic nickel-copper sulfides mineralisation, and later for lithium mineralisation since the late 1960's with the discovery of a significant spodumene-bearing pegmatite intrusion. The Property saw significant amount of exploration work between 1966 and 1980 with delineation drilling programs from 1991 until 1999 with bulk sampling and metallurgical testing programs.</li> <li>The project has more than 15,000 metres of drilling in 123 diamond holes, and 2,143 assay samples. The project was initially drilled between 1991 and 1999, and then by Glen Eagle between 2010 and 2012.</li> <li>In 2010, Glen Eagle secured the mining rights and completed exploration work as well as 1,905 m of diamond drilling totalling 18 holes targeting the deposit. During 2011, Glen Eagle drilled a total of 4,051 m mainly on the Authier pegmatite deposit and other areas. In 2012, Glen Eagle drilled a total of 3,034 m mainly on the Authier Pegmatite deposit and other areas.</li> </ul>
<p>Geology</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The deposit is hosted in a spodumene-bearing pegmatite intrusion. The deposit is 825 metres</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		long, striking east-west, with an average thickness of 25 metres, minimum 4 metres and maximum 55 metres, dipping at 40 degrees to the north.
Drill hole Information	<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>• Drill hole details are reported in the body of this announcement as Appendix A.</li> </ul>
Data aggregation methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In reporting Exploration Results, weighting averaging techniques, maximum and/or minimum grade truncations (eg cutting of high grades) and cut-off grades are usually Material and should be stated.</li> <li>• Where aggregate intercepts incorporate short lengths of high grade results and longer lengths of low grade results, the procedure used for such aggregation should be stated and some typical examples of such aggregations should be shown in detail.</li> <li>• The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values should be clearly stated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No weight averaging or high-grade cut has been applied to any of the sample assay results.</li> <li>• Reported intercepts have been calculated as arithmetic averages using a 0.5 % lower cutoff grade, as described in the body text of this release.</li> <li>• The majority of the lithium assay results show a simple normal population and it is not believed the reporting of intercepts is skewed by the inclusion of high and low grade results.</li> <li>• Metal equivalent values have not been reported.</li> </ul>
Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These relationships are particularly important in the reporting of Exploration Results.</li> <li>• If the geometry of the mineralisation with respect to the drill hole angle is known, its nature should be reported.</li> <li>• 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').</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drilling has been sited to intersect the lithium mineralisation orthogonally.</li> <li>• Drilling widths reported are downhole intercept widths and true width is approximately 85 % of drilling width.</li> </ul>
Diagrams	<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>• A Collar Plan and typical cross-sections will be presented in a separate presentation on the Authier JORC resource following this release. Drill hole details are reported in the body of this announcement as Appendix A.</li> </ul>
Balanced reporting	<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 to avoid misleading reporting of Exploration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reporting is considered to be balanced.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<i>Results.</i>	
Other substantive exploration data	<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>The Glen Eagle 2010-2012 diamond drilling campaign was preceded by prospecting, geochemical sampling and geophysical surveys that covered the Property targeted areas. This work confirmed the presence of several pegmatite occurrences across the Property having a similar geochemical signature to the main Authier pegmatite.</li> </ul>
Further work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The nature and scale of planned further work (eg 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>Sayona’s Project Development strategy is detailed as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Converting the inferred mineral resources to measured and indicated through further drilling;</li> <li>Converting the mineral resources to reserves;</li> <li>Exploring for extensions to the existing mineral resources and other potential mineralisation within the tenement package;</li> <li>Consolidating other potential resources / mineralisation in the district;</li> <li>Studying options for improving the project economics, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Operating and capital cost reductions (e.g. leasing and purchasing of second hand equipment);</li> <li>Metallurgical optimization using latest technologies available like Dense Media Separation.</li> <li>Downstream processing options including the production of high-value lithium carbonate;</li> </ul> </li> <li>Completion of an Environmental Impact Statement and Bankable Feasibility Study;</li> <li>Negotiating production off-take agreements; and</li> <li>Sourcing development finance and constructing the project.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

### Section 3 Estimation and Reporting of Mineral Resources

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

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Database integrity	<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 digital drill hole database supplied by Glen Eagle and originally validated by SGS Geostats was audited by the author using Micromine validation tools for: collar location, azimuth, dip, hole length, survey data and analytical values. There were no relevant errors or discrepancies</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		noted during the validation.
Site visits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Comment on any site visits undertaken by the Competent Person and the outcome of those visits.</i></li> <li>• <i>If no site visits have been undertaken indicate why this is the case.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The author visited Authier Lithium deposit during 28 and 29 May 2016. Drill hole collars, surface geology and mineralised diamond core intervals stored at project field facilities were audited and it was concluded that these were being conducted to best industry practice.</li> </ul>
Geological interpretation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Confidence in (or conversely, the uncertainty of) the geological interpretation of the mineral deposit.</i></li> <li>• <i>Nature of the data used and of any assumptions made.</i></li> <li>• <i>The effect, if any, of alternative interpretations on Mineral Resource estimation.</i></li> <li>• <i>The use of geology in guiding and controlling Mineral Resource estimation.</i></li> <li>• <i>The factors affecting continuity both of grade and geology.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The confidence in the geological interpretation at Authier Lithium deposit is considered to be good and is based on the drilling density and well known geological features.</li> <li>• Drill hole logging by Glen Eagle geologists, through direct observation of drill core samples have been used to interpret the geological setting.</li> <li>• The continuity of the main mineralised body is clearly observed by Li<sub>2</sub>O grades correlated with spodumene rich pegmatite within the drill holes. The nature and continuity along strike of the lithium mineralisation would indicate that alternate interpretations would have little impact on the overall Mineral Resource estimation.</li> <li>• The mineralization is related to a pegmatite intrusive</li> </ul>
Dimensions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>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.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Authier Lithium Mineral Resource area extends over a strike length of 825 m, has an average width of 25 m and dips 40 degrees to the south.</li> </ul>
Estimation and modelling techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>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.</i></li> <li>• <i>The availability of check estimates, previous estimates and/or mine production records and whether the Mineral Resource estimate takes appropriate account of such data.</i></li> <li>• <i>The assumptions made regarding recovery of by-products.</i></li> <li>• <i>Estimation of deleterious elements or other non-grade variables of economic significance (eg sulphur for acid mine drainage characterisation).</i></li> <li>• <i>In the case of block model interpolation, the block size in relation to the average sample spacing and the search employed.</i></li> <li>• <i>Any assumptions behind modelling of selective</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inverse Distance Power (IDP) interpolation with an orientated 'ellipsoid' search was used for the estimates. Micromine software was used for the estimations.</li> <li>• Three dimensional mineralized wireframes were used to domain the Li<sub>2</sub>O data. Sample data was composited to 3.0m down hole lengths. The Li<sub>2</sub>O values in intervals with assays below detection limit were set to half of detection limit.</li> <li>• Based on the statistical analysis there is no need for grade capping.</li> <li>• An orientated 'ellipsoid' search was used to select data and was based on the observed lens geometry. The search ellipsoid was orientated to the average strike, plunge, and dip of pegmatite body.</li> <li>• Three passes were used. The first pass had a range of 30 m, with a minimum of 5 samples. For</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<p><i>mining units.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Any assumptions about correlation between variables.</i></li> <li>• <i>Description of how the geological interpretation was used to control the resource estimates.</i></li> <li>• <i>Discussion of basis for using or not using grade cutting or capping.</i></li> <li>• <i>The process of validation, the checking process used, the comparison of model data to drill hole data, and use of reconciliation data if available.</i></li> </ul>	<p>the second pass, the range was 50m, with a minimum of 4 samples. For the third pass, the range was extended to 90 m, with a minimum of 2 samples. A maximum of 20 samples was used for all three passes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The parent block dimensions used were 5 m x 5 m x 5 m with sub-blocks of 2.5 m x 2.5 m x 2.5 m. The parent block size was selected on the basis of being approximately 25% of the average drill hole spacing.</li> <li>• The block model size used in the Mineral Resource estimate was based on drill sample spacing and pegmatite body geometry. Selective mining units were not modelled.</li> </ul>
Moisture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Whether the tonnages are estimated on a dry basis or with natural moisture, and the method of determination of the moisture content.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tonnages and grades were estimated on a dry in situ basis.</li> </ul>
Cut-off parameters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The basis of the adopted cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Mineral Resource has been reported at a 0.5% Li<sub>2</sub>O cut-off.</li> </ul>
Mining factors or assumptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>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.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taking into account the geometry and the depth of the mineralized zone, the Authier Lithium deposit will be mined using open-pit mining methods.</li> </ul>
Metallurgical factors or assumptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>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.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metallurgical testing at Authier Lithium deposit was conducted in two stages; 1999 and 2012.</li> <li>• During 1999 COREM conducted metallurgical testing of approximately 40 tonnes of spodumene-bearing pegmatite material sampled from the main mineralised pegmatite intrusion as part of a pre-feasibility study of the Project during that period under the supervision of Bumigeme.</li> <li>• The complete metallurgical study conducted in laboratory consisted in a total of 48 tests but only 16 tests returning satisfactory results were reported. The most significant results from the process flowsheet returned a Li<sub>2</sub>O concentrate grade ranging from 5.78% to 5.89% with a recovery between 67.52% and 70.19% (tests 33 and 47). The average Li<sub>2</sub>O grades of the pegmatitic material from tests 33 and 47 were 1.15% and 1.13% Li<sub>2</sub>O respectively. Test number</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		<p>12, with an average grade of 1.35% Li<sub>2</sub>O, produced a Li<sub>2</sub>O concentrate grade of 5.96% with a recovery of 75.02%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In early fall of 2012, the Company has ordered some mineral processing and metallurgical tests to the SGS Lakefield Laboratory:</li> <li>• The results of these tests are the base of the study prepared by Bumigeme to develop the metallurgical process involved in this PEA Technical Report. Glen Eagle Resources Inc had mandated Bumigeme Inc a Canadian Engineering consulting firm based in Montreal, working mainly in the mining and metallurgical sector, to develop the metallurgical aspect of his Authier Lithium Project. This mandate is part of the Preliminary Economic Assessment (PEA) compliant with NI 43-101 regulations.</li> <li>• The mandate mainly consists of developing a conventional lithium flotation process plant with a capacity of 2,200 TPD (run of mine), and estimating the capital investment (CAPEX) and operating cost (OPEX) of the concentrator.</li> <li>• The main parameters retained by Bumigeme in their metallurgical section are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ concentrate grade of 6.0% Li<sub>2</sub>O, and;</li> <li>○ overall mill recovery of 85%;</li> <li>○ no mica pre-flotation is considered necessary in the processing.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><i>Environmental factors or assumptions</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>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.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The actual preliminary environmental report, prepared by DESSAU and GFE Forestry &amp; Exploration Services, for Authier Project didn't return environmental issues. Activities by DESSAU and GFE were performed to determine constraints linked to water and sediments quality and to environmental (physical, biological, human) impact.</li> <li>• According to public databases and from field inventories lead during this study by Dessau and GFE, no endangered species or habitats were found. However it is recommended to produce exhaustive inventories to validate or invalidate the presence of specific fauna, flora or habitat. At the end of the drilling program, the revegetation appears to be in a good state.</li> <li>• At this time, there is no detailed plan regarding possible waste and process residue disposal options and closure plan for the future mine</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		operation in Authier Property.
Bulk density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>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.</i></li> <li>• <i>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.</i></li> <li>• <i>Discuss assumptions for bulk density estimates used in the evaluation process of the different materials.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As part of the 2010 independent data verification program, SGS Geostat conducted specific gravity (“SG”) measurements on 38 mineralised core samples collected from drill holes AL-10-01 and AL-10-11. The measurements were performed using the water displacement method (weight in air/volume of water displaced) on representative half core pieces weighting between 0.67 kg and 1.33 kg with an average of 1.15 kg, results average SG value of 2.71 t/m<sup>3</sup></li> </ul>
Classification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The basis for the classification of the Mineral Resources into varying confidence categories.</i></li> <li>• <i>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).</i></li> <li>• <i>Whether the result appropriately reflects the Competent Person’s view of the deposit.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mineral Resource have been classified in accordance with the Australasian Code for the Reporting of Exploration Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves (JORC, 2012).</li> <li>• The Authier Lithium Mineral Resource was classified as Measured, Indicated and Inferred Mineral resource based on drilling density, sample spacing and geological / mineralisation continuity.</li> <li>• The Measured Mineral Resource was defined within areas of close spaced diamond drilling of less than 35m by 35m, and where the continuity and predictability of the spodumene bearing pegmatite was good. The Indicated Mineral Resource was assigned to areas where drill hole spacing was less than 50m by 50m. The Inferred mineral resource was assigned to areas where drill hole spacing was greater than 50m by 50m generally in the edges of the known mineralisation mostly in down-dip extensions beyond the last drill holes in each section.</li> <li>• The input data is comprehensive in its coverage of the mineralisation and does not favour or misrepresent in-situ mineralisation. The definition of mineralised zones is based on high level geological understanding producing a robust model of mineralised domains. This model has been confirmed by infill drilling which supported the interpretation. Validation of the block model shows good correlation of the input data to the estimated grades.</li> <li>• The Mineral Resource estimates appropriately reflect the view of the Competent Person.</li> </ul>
Audits and reviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The results of any audits or reviews of Mineral Resource estimates</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internal audits have been completed by SGS Geostats at the request of Glen Eagle Resource Inc in a NI43-101 Technical Report, Preliminary</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		Economic Assessment, 22 January 2013
Discussion of relative accuracy/confidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>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.</i></li> <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>• The pegmatite geometry and continuity has been adequately interpreted to reflect the applied level of Measured, Indicated and Inferred Mineral Resource. The data quality is good and the drill holes have detailed logs produced by qualified geologists. All diamond core obtained by Glen Eagle drilling campaigns are properly stored and mineralised intervals can be reviewed when required. Recognized laboratories have been used for all analyses.</li> <li>• The Mineral Resource statement relates to global estimates of tonnes and grade.</li> </ul>