



ASX CODE: CHK

TO: COMPANY ANNOUNCEMENTS OFFICE ASX LIMITED

DATE: 30 August 2018

**STRONG COPPER-COBALT-GOLD GRADES FROM WEE
MACGREGOR DRILLING**

Highlights:

Hole GC5:	8-10m	1.2% Cu
	10-12m	1.38% Cu
Hole WM03:	2-4m	2.15% Cu, 0.063% Co, 1.1ppm Au
	4-6m	1.49% Cu, 0.066% Co, 1.3ppm Au

Cohiba Minerals Limited (ASX: CHK) ("Cohiba" or "Company") is pleased to advise that it has received results from the first phase of drilling. Although very early in the program, results have been encouraging and have demonstrated the presence of subsurface copper mineralisation in the previously untested Great Central area.

In addition Hole VWM03 demonstrates the presence of accessory mineralisation for gold and cobalt coincident with the copper mineralisation in the Wee MacGregor mine area, refer Figure 1 for drill hole locations. The significance of this is that the coincident cobalt and gold results in the Wee MacGregor mine area indicate the potential to substantially increase the value of the deposit when based on copper values alone (assuming current commodity prices).

Initial assays have been done on two metre composite samples in order to reduce costs. Any of the composite samples returning elevated grades will be re assayed on one metre intervals as required, refer Tables 1 and 2 for hole locations and assay results received to date.

The aim of the drilling program was to quantify the anecdotal evidence of the presence of gold and cobalt in the Wee MacGregor area indicated by surface rock chip samples and to establish the existence of and controls on untested mineralisation in the Great Central area. Any new mineralisation found in this area will not have been included in any resource estimate or exploration target previously established and may add to potentially exploitable material.

ISSUED CAPITAL

557,947,574 fully paid shares
414,635,367 CHKO listed options

DIRECTORS

Mr Mordechai Benedikt (Chairman)
Dr Bob Beeson (Director)
Mr Nachum Labkowski (Director)

**REGISTERED OFFICE AND
PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS**

Level 4
100 Albert Road
South Melbourne, Victoria 3205

CONTACT

P +61 3 9692 7222
F +61 3 9077 9233

Drilling is currently in hiatus due to technical difficulties with the drill rig but will continue as soon as the mechanical problems are fixed. The Company is eager to complete the program and determine an updated resource to reflect the true potential of the deposit.

Cohiba Executive Director Mordechai Benedikt said “This is only the first drilling program we have undertaken on the Wee Macgregor Project with tremendous results. We have established the presence of high grade copper-cobalt-gold mineralisation outside the resource area. It is evidently clear now cobalt and gold credits not included in the current JORC or exploration target areas are present. We look forward to incorporating additional results into our understanding of the system as they are received and continue our program to validate and grow the existing JORC resource with additional cobalt and gold data added to the estimate.”



Figure 1. Planned hole locations and hole names drilled to date.

Hole Name	East	North	Azi	Dip	Depth (m)
GC5	390100	7686705	90°	60°	33 eoh
GC 19	390115	7686810	76°	60°	33 eoh
GC 19b	390111	7686806	171°	60°	31 eoh
GC 20	390123	7686812	79°	60°	22 eoh
WM 03	390152	7687158	65°	60°	15

Table 1. Holes drilled.

Cohiba Minerals has access to the Wee Mac Gregor project through its wholly owned subsidiary, Cobalt X Pty Ltd (Cobalt X). Cobalt X has entered into a farm-in agreement with Mining International Pty Ltd, a wholly owned subsidiary of Cape Lambert Resources Limited (ASX: CFE), to earn up to an 80% interest in the project before 24 March 2019.

End.

Competent Persons Statement

The information in this report that relates to Exploration Results is based on information compiled by Mr Olaf Frederickson. Mr Frederickson is a Member of The Australasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy (AusIMM) and has sufficient experience relevant to the style of mineralisation and type of deposit under consideration and to the activity which they are 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 "JORC Code"). Mr Frederickson is a consultant to Cohiba Minerals Limited. Mr Frederickson consents to the inclusion in the report of the Exploration Results in the form and context in which they appear. Mr Frederickson holds shares in Cohiba Minerals Limited

	ME-ICP61	ME-ICP61 / Cu-OG62	Au-AA25
SAMPLE	Co	Cu	Au
UNIT	%	%	ppm
WM03 0-2	0.011	0.58	0.06
WM03 2-4	0.063	2.15	1.1
WM03 4-6	0.066	1.49	1.32
WM03 6-8	0.042	0.73	0.14
WM03 8-10	0.040	0.94	0.14
WM03 10-12	0.042	0.89	0.06
WM03 12-14	0.016	0.20	0.01
WM03 14-15	0.016	0.58	0.2
GC5 0-2	0.004	0.12	0.1
GC5 2-4	0.005	0.21	0.09
GC5 4-6	0.010	0.32	0.12
GC5 6-8	0.010	0.72	0.04
GC5 8-10	0.032	1.2	0.17
GC5 10-12	0.042	1.38	0.02
GC5 12-14	0.025	0.32	<0.01
GC5 14-16	0.013	0.14	<0.01
GC5 16-18	0.010	0.06	<0.01
GC5 18-20	0.009	0.01	<0.01
GC5 20-22	0.008	0.02	<0.01
GC5 22-24	0.010	0.04	<0.01
GC5 24-26	0.008	0.03	<0.01
GC5 26-28	0.007	0.02	<0.01

GC5 28-30	0.006	0.01	<0.01
GC5 30-32	0.005	0.01	<0.01
GC5 32-33	0.003	0.01	<0.01
GC19 0-2	0.013	0.04	<0.01
GC19 2-4	0.016	0.06	0.02
GC19 4-6	0.008	0.03	<0.01
GC19 6-8	0.026	0.03	<0.01
GC19 8-10	0.026	0.01	<0.01
GC19 10-12	0.023	0.01	<0.01
GC19 12-14	0.022	0.01	<0.01
GC19 14-16	0.010	0.01	<0.01
GC19 16-18	0.010	0.01	<0.01
GC19 18-20	0.010	0.03	<0.01
GC19 20-22	0.009	0.03	<0.01
GC19 22-24	0.008	0.01	<0.01
GC19 24-26	0.007	0.01	<0.01
GC19 26-28	0.004	0.00	<0.01
GC19 28-30	0.005	0.03	0.07
GC19 30-32	0.004	0.05	0.03
GC19 32-33	0.004	0.05	0.03
GC20 0-2	0.009	0.01	0.02
GC20 2-4	0.006	0.01	0.01
GC20 4-6	0.006	0.02	0.02
GC20 6-8	0.005	0.01	0.01
GC20 8-10	0.006	0.01	0.01
GC20 10-12	0.014	0.02	0.03
GC20 12-14	0.007	0.01	0.03
GC20 14-16	0.008	0.05	0.01
GC20 16-18	0.006	0.08	0.02
GC20 18-20	0.004	0.04	0.02
GC20 20-22	0.003	0.05	0.03
GC19b 0-2	0.022	0.19	0.03
GC19b 2-4	0.059	0.12	0.03
GC19b 4-6	0.044	0.03	0.01
GC19b 6-8	0.019	0.01	0.02
GC19b 8-10	0.014	0.04	0.01
GC19b 10-12	0.009	0.02	0.03
GC19b 12-14	0.006	0.02	0.03
GC19b 14-16	0.005	0.03	0.04
GC19b 16-18	0.002	0.01	0.02
GC19b 18-20	0.002	0.03	0.01
GC19b 20-22	0.004	0.02	0.02
GC19b 22-24	0.004	0.01	0.01
GC19b 24-26	0.004	0.02	0.02
GC19b 26-28	0.004	0.02	0.01
GC19b 28-30	0.004	0.01	0.01
GC19b 30-31	0.004	0.02	0.03

Table 2. List of assays received.

JORC Code, 2012 Edition – Table 1

Section 1 Sampling Techniques and Data

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<i>Sampling techniques</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> <i>Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample representivity and the appropriate calibration of any measurement tools or systems used.</i> <i>Aspects of the determination of mineralisation that are Material to the Public Report.</i> <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> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Samples were taken as 1m intervals from RC drill chips. Complete samples from the RC drill rig were fed through a 50:50 splitter as many times as was required to retain approximately a 2kg sample for submission to the lab.
<i>Drilling techniques</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drilling was undertaken by a track mounted QMP80 Reverse Circulation rig using a 3 inch face sampling RC hammer.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<i>so, by what method, etc).</i>	
<i>Drill sample recovery</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Method of recording and assessing core and chip sample recoveries and results assessed.</i> • <i>Measures taken to maximise sample recovery and ensure representative nature of the samples.</i> • <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> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Samples were recovered directly from the cyclone on the rig and split through a 50:50 splitter as many times as was required to retain approximately a 2kg sample for submission to the lab.
<i>Logging</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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> • <i>Whether logging is qualitative or quantitative in nature. Core (or costean, channel, etc) photography.</i> • <i>The total length and percentage of the relevant intersections logged.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic geological logging was undertaken to record primary and secondary lithologies, major alteration and major mineralisation. • Samples were logged on 1m intervals.
<i>Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all core taken.</i> • <i>If non-core, whether riffled, tube sampled, rotary 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</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No sub sampling undertaken.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<i>appropriate to the grain size of the material being sampled.</i>	
<i>Quality of assay data and laboratory tests</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Samples sent to ALS in Mount Isa for analysis. • Samples were prepared with standard sample preparation consisting of crushing, pulverizing, splitting and weighing. • Analysis consisted of multi element assay using four acid digestion ICP-AES and fire assay for gold.
<i>Verification of sampling and assaying</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No verification work done other than by in house lab procedures. • Data was received from the lab in the form of a standard lab report and an excel spreadsheet.
<i>Location of data points</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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> • <i>Specification of the grid system used.</i> • <i>Quality and adequacy of topographic control.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data points recorded with hand held GPS. • Drill hole orientation and angle was measured on site with a compass and clinometer.
<i>Data spacing and distribution</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Data spacing for reporting of Exploration Results.</i> • <i>Whether the data spacing and distribution is sufficient to establish the degree of</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Holes are located on a nominal 20 x 25 diamond pattern grid. • Samples were composited in the lab into 2m intervals for initial assaying to save cost.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<p><i>geological and grade continuity appropriate for the Mineral Resource and Ore Reserve estimation procedure(s) and classifications applied.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Whether sample compositing has been applied.</i> 	
<i>Orientation of data in relation to geological structure</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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> • <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> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No orientation data. • Samples taken by hand at surface.
<i>Sample security</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The measures taken to ensure sample security.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Samples delivered to ALS in Mount Isa by geologist and CP managing the program.
<i>Audits or reviews</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No audit or review conducted.

Section 2 Reporting of Exploration Results

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

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<i>Mineral tenement and land tenure status</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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> • <i>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.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Wee MacGregor project is contained within two granted Mining Licences; ML2504 and ML90098 held by Mining International Pty Ltd. • Cohiba Minerals Limited have a farm in agreement with Mining International whereby they will earn an 80% interest in the tenements by meeting the tenement maintenance expenditure for 4 years. • There are existing Environmental Authorities over both licences. • The tenure is in good standing.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<i>Exploration done by other parties</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As the project is a historical mine, exploration and mining works have been conducted at different times since 1904. Mining was originally undertaken by MacGregor Cloncurry Copper Mines Pty Ltd and continued until 1920. Intermittent small scale production occurred by Edna May Mines between 1962 and 1971 after which Eastern Copper Mines attempted in situ leaching from 1974 to 1975. In 1977, leaching was re-established until 1979 when all operations ceased. Brancote completed an RC exploration program in 1991 which is the data being used today for this estimate. No further drilling has been carried out in the project although several reconnaissance visits have occurred in recent years with instances of soil sampling and rock chip collection being undertaken.
<i>Geology</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shear hosted Cu, Au, Ag, Co mineralisation within amphibolite schist and quartz feldspar porphyry / quartzite host rocks. Cross cutting quartz filled joints, shears and fractures.
<i>Drill hole Information</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>A summary of all information material to the understanding of the exploration results including a tabulation of the following information for all Material drill holes:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>easting and northing of the drill hole collar</i> <i>elevation or RL (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in metres) of the drill hole collar</i> <i>dip and azimuth of the hole</i> <i>down hole length and interception depth</i> <i>hole length.</i> <i>If the exclusion of this information is justified on the basis that the information is not</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Five drill holes have been completed to date. See tables for sample locations and assay results.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<i>Material and this exclusion does not detract from the understanding of the report, the Competent Person should clearly explain why this is the case.</i>	
<i>Data aggregation methods</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>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.</i> <i>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.</i> <i>The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values should be clearly stated.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Samples were composited in the lab into two metre intervals.
<i>Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>These relationships are particularly important in the reporting of Exploration Results.</i> <i>If the geometry of the mineralisation with respect to the drill hole angle is known, its nature should be reported.</i> <i>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').</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drill holes are targeted to intercept the mineralisation perpendicular to its dip however the results will still be apparent thicknesses to some degree.
<i>Diagrams</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Appropriate maps and sections (with scales) and tabulations of intercepts should be included for any significant discovery being reported These should include, but not be limited to a plan view of drill hole collar locations and appropriate sectional views.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See attached Figures.
<i>Balanced reporting</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Where comprehensive reporting of all Exploration Results is not practicable, representative</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See table of assay data.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<i>reporting of both low and high grades and/or widths should be practiced to avoid misleading reporting of Exploration Results.</i>	
<i>Other substantive exploration data</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Other exploration data, if meaningful and material, should be reported including (but not limited to): geological observations; geophysical survey results; geochemical survey results; bulk samples – size and method of treatment; metallurgical test results; bulk density, groundwater, geotechnical and rock characteristics; potential deleterious or contaminating substances.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No other substantive data to report.
<i>Further work</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The nature and scale of planned further work (eg tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling).</i> • <i>Diagrams clearly highlighting the areas of possible extensions, including the main geological interpretations and future drilling areas, provided this information is not commercially sensitive.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further work will consist of drilling to establish the depth and tenor of the observed mineralisation at surface.