



ASX CODE: CHK

TO: COMPANY ANNOUNCEMENTS OFFICE ASX LIMITED

DATE: 3 December 2018

DESKTOP REVIEW OF IOCG TARGETS WEST OF BHP'S OAK DAM

- Continued focus to target IOCG trend from Oak Dam East, through anomaly and towards the "Horse Well" HWD1 anomaly within EL6183.
- Horse Well tenements lie within same regional geological settings as BHP's Oak Dam Project¹.

Cohiba Minerals Limited (ASX: CHK) (Cohiba or the Company) is pleased to announce its desktop review has identified the Horse Well Project lies within same geological setting as the BHP's Oak Dam Discovery.

Cohiba Executive Director Mordechai Benedikt said *"We are extremely pleased and excited to identify the similarities in the geological and structural setting for the Horse Well Project to BHP's Oak Dam discovery. The Oak Dam sits approximately 2km to the east of the Horse Well Project."*

"Furthermore Cohiba has in the past few weeks has been in preliminary discussions with various parties willing to discuss collaboration on the Horse Well Project, although the form and nature of any collaboration remains under discussion. Although these discussions are incomplete and preliminary in nature, in light of recent events, CHK has increased confidence in its ability to negotiate a favourable outcome for our shareholders. We will keep the market informed and at the moment it is business as usual with Cohiba and its joint venture partner seeking to finalise permits to enable us to commence a drilling program as soon as practical."

Horse Well IOCG Target

The Horse Well IOCG target lies within the same geological and structural setting as BHP's Oak Dam prospect (Figure 1) where a potential new iron oxide, copper, gold (IOCG) mineralised system has been identified (BHP News Release, 27 November 2018, "BHP copper exploration program update"). Both the Horse Well and Oak Dam prospects have similar regional settings to the Olympic Dam deposit and are located within the eastern margin of the Gawler Craton within the Olympic IOCG metallogenic province.

¹Cohiba hold the rights to earn up to an 80% interest in the Horse Well tenements pursuant to a farm-in agreement with Olympic Domain Pty Ltd (refer to ASX Announcement dated 7 March 2018 for further details).

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

The Horse Well target lies at the intersection of northwest, northeast and east-west trending structures with an offset magnetic anomaly to the north. The target was highlighted by the 3D alteration modelling conducted by Barrick (Barrick Australia Pacific, Technical Progress Report for Copper Range (SA) P/L, October 2009 – unpublished) as having characteristics similar to known IOCG deposits.




Figure 1: Regional geology of part of the pre-1400 Ma units of the Gawler craton, including the Cariewerloo basin, host to the Pandurra Formation (Cowley, 1993; Fairclough et al., 2003).

Source: Davidson, Paterson, Meffre and Berry, 2007, "Characteristics and Origin of the Oak Dam East Breccia-Hosted, Iron Oxide Cu-U-(Au) Deposit: Olympic Dam Region, Gawler Craton, South Australia", Economic Geology, v. 102, pp. 1471–1498.

There is additional information which the Company's technical team is reviewing and it will update the market in due course.

Project Planning and Planned expenditure

Cohiba has to date met all its obligation with a focus on Pernatty although in light of current events the company is working with its JV Partner to fast track the stage 1, 2 and 3 \$1,500,000 expenditure commitments (CHK News Release, 7 March, 2018 "Execution of Farm-in Agreement to SA Projects) with majority of funding to be directed to the Horsewell property which sits Adjacent to BHP's discovery (BHP News Release, 27 November 2018, "BHP copper exploration program") as outlined in figure 2.




Figure 2: Cohiba area of interest subject to farm-in

Ends.

For Further information, please contact:

Mr Mordechai Benedikt
Executive Chairman

Important Notice

This ASX Announcement does not constitute an offer to acquire or sell or a solicitation of an offer to sell or purchase any securities in any jurisdiction. In particular, this ASX Announcement does not constitute an offer, solicitation or sale to any U.S. person or in the United States or any state or jurisdiction in which such an offer, tender offer, solicitation or sale would be unlawful. The securities referred to herein have not been and will not be registered under the United States Securities Act of 1933, as amended (the "Securities Act"), and neither such securities nor any interest or participation therein may not be offered, or sold, pledged or otherwise transferred, directly or indirectly, in the United States or to any U.S. person absent registration or an available exemption from, or a transaction not subject to, registration under the United States Securities Act of 1933.

Forward Looking Statements

Statements and material contained in this document, particularly those regarding possible or assumed future performance, resources or potential growth of Cohiba Minerals Limited, industry growth or other trend projections are, or may be, forward looking statements. Such statements relate to future events and expectations and, as such, involve known and unknown risks and uncertainties. Such forecasts and information are not a guarantee of future performance and involve unknown risk and uncertainties, as well as other factors, many of which are beyond the control of Cohiba Minerals Limited. Information in this presentation has already been reported to the ASX.

Competent persons Statement

The information in this report / ASX release that relates to Exploration Targets and Exploration Results is based on information either compiled or reviewed by Mr Andrew Graham, who is an employee of Mineral Strategies Pty Ltd. Mr Graham is a Member of the Australasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy and has sufficient experience of relevance to the styles of mineralisation and the types of deposits under consideration, and to the activities undertaken, to qualify as a Competent Person as defined in the 2012 Edition of the Joint Ore Reserves Committee (JORC) Australasian Code for Reporting of Exploration Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves. Mr Graham consents to the inclusion in this report /ASX release of the matters based on 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 in this section apply to all succeeding sections.)

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Sampling techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barrick conducted a review of previous work including the ground gravity survey work and drilling conducted by Copper Range (SA) in 2006-2007. No sampling was undertaken by Barrick.
Drilling techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No drilling was undertaken.
Drill sample recovery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No drilling was undertaken.
Logging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No drilling was undertaken - logging was not required.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<p><i>metallurgical studies.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> 	
<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 appropriate to the grain size of the material being sampled.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no sub-sampling undertaken.
<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"> Barrick conducted a review of historical geochemical work to identify geochemical methods that could be used in conjunction with the geological and geophysical datasets to assist in target generation. Barrick reviewed the geochemical methods to determine if they could be effectively used to address the challenges of deep anomaly detection through up to 1,000m of lithified cover sequences.
<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"> All information utilised by Barrick was from pre-existing sources such as PIRSA, Western Mining Corporation, Copper Range (SA) and open source files. No assay data was used or reported.
<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"> All the historical work referenced by Barrick was conducted by industry-recognised service providers.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<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 geological and grade continuity appropriate for the Mineral Resource and Ore Reserve estimation procedure(s) and classifications applied.</i> <i>Whether sample compositing has been applied.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No resource estimation was undertaken. Data spacing was dictated to by the resolution of the historical geophysics and geochemical survey work. There was not attempt to define a resource and no drilling was undertaken.
<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"> There were no samples for orientation. There was no drilling conducted.
<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"> No sampling was conducted by Barrick.
<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"> Barrick reviewed and compiled data from historic reports, PIRSA and open files and collated and validated the historic exploration data.

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"> Cohiba Minerals currently has a Farm-In Agreement with Olympic Domain Pty Ltd in relation to Olympic Domain's tenements which include the Horse Well area (EL6183, EL5970 and EL 6122)
<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"> Copper Range conducted a ground gravity survey in 2006-07. Barrick visited the PIRSA Core Library and reviewed a total of 12 drill holes to understand the stratigraphy and mineralisation styles. The work conducted by Davidson et. Al, 2007 was based on a compilation of multiple research and academic papers and information which was supplied by Western Mining Corporation.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open file drilling data was compiled by Barrick to better understand the stratigraphy, depth to basement, nature of the basement-cover unconformity and density ranges. • Barrick completed geological cross sections to depict this improved understanding. • Barrick's exploration activities included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • data compilation and review of previous work, • geological data review, • geochemical data review, • geophysical data processing and review including gravity modelling and seismic processing, • target identification and ranking, • ground access negotiations.
Geology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Iron oxide, copper gold (IOCG) style deposit with very similar characteristics to the Olympic Dam deposit
Drill hole Information	<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 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> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No additional drilling was conducted.
Data aggregation methods	<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</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exploration data

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<i>should be clearly stated.</i>	
<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"> • No drilling was conducted so there is no information on the relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths
<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"> • The diagram included in the ASX release from the work by Davidson et. al. shows the proximity of the Horse Well prospect to the Oak Dam prospect including the similar geological and structural environments.
<i>Balanced reporting</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>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.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The information provided in the release is from reputable research / academic sources. Some of this work is primary research and as such does not have a reference point to previous / historical work and is taken on face value.
<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"> • Much of the historical work was based on geophysical (gravity and seismic) and geochemical surveys.
<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 desktop studies on the geology, structure and stratigraphy will be undertaken. • Additional geophysics work will be undertaken (aeromagnetic, gravity and resonance frequency geo-technology). • Follow-up drilling (diamond drilling).

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
<i>Database integrity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>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.</i> • <i>Data validation procedures used.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mineral Resource estimation was not undertaken

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Site visits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Comment on any site visits undertaken by the Competent Person and the outcome of those visits.</i> • <i>If no site visits have been undertaken indicate why this is the case.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mineral Resource estimation was not undertaken
Geological interpretation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Confidence in (or conversely, the uncertainty of) the geological interpretation of the mineral deposit.</i> • <i>Nature of the data used and of any assumptions made.</i> • <i>The effect, if any, of alternative interpretations on Mineral Resource estimation.</i> • <i>The use of geology in guiding and controlling Mineral Resource estimation.</i> • <i>The factors affecting continuity both of grade and geology.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mineral Resource estimation was not undertaken
Dimensions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mineral Resource estimation was not undertaken
Estimation and modelling techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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> • <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> • <i>The assumptions made regarding recovery of by-products.</i> • <i>Estimation of deleterious elements or other non-grade variables of economic significance (eg sulphur for acid mine drainage characterisation).</i> • <i>In the case of block model interpolation, the block size in relation to the average sample spacing and the search employed.</i> • <i>Any assumptions behind modelling of selective mining units.</i> • <i>Any assumptions about correlation between variables.</i> • <i>Description of how the geological interpretation was used to control the resource estimates.</i> • <i>Discussion of basis for using or not using grade cutting or capping.</i> • <i>The process of validation, the checking process used, the comparison of</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mineral Resource estimation was not undertaken

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<i>model data to drill hole data, and use of reconciliation data if available.</i>	
Moisture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the tonnages are estimated on a dry basis or with natural moisture, and the method of determination of the moisture content. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mineral Resource estimation was not undertaken
Cut-off parameters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The basis of the adopted cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mineral Resource estimation was not undertaken
Mining factors or assumptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mineral Resource estimation was not undertaken
Metallurgical factors or assumptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mineral Resource estimation was not undertaken
Environmental factors or assumptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mineral Resource estimation was not undertaken
Bulk density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether assumed or determined. If assumed, the basis for the assumptions. If determined, the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mineral Resource estimation was not undertaken

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<p><i>method used, whether wet or dry, the frequency of the measurements, the nature, size and representativeness of the samples.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> <i>Discuss assumptions for bulk density estimates used in the evaluation process of the different materials.</i> 	
Classification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The basis for the classification of the Mineral Resources into varying confidence categories.</i> <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> <i>Whether the result appropriately reflects the Competent Person's view of the deposit.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mineral Resource estimation was not undertaken
Audits or reviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The results of any audits or reviews of Mineral Resource estimates.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mineral Resource estimation was not undertaken
Discussion of relative accuracy/confidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> <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> <i>These statements of relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate should be compared with production data, where available.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mineral Resource estimation was not undertaken