

12th June 2015

Completion of First Stage MLEM Survey Highlights Multiple Significant Conductors at Roe Hills Nickel Sulphide Project

- MPJ has completed the first stage of a regional MLEM survey at the Roe Hills Nickel Sulphide Project East of Kalgoorlie/Kambalda WA (Figure 1).
- Multiple significant conductors identified along strike from known mineralisation across the Talc Lake and Hooton Prospects.
- DDH1 Drilling engaged to commence Phase 1 drill testing of priority targets and mobilisation is underway.




Figure 1: Project Location.

For personal use only

Mining Projects Group Limited (ASX:MPJ) (“the Company”) is pleased to announce it has completed the first stage of a regional Moving Loop Electro-Magnetic (MLEM) Geophysical survey planned to ultimately evaluate the entire 40 km strike extent of prospective ultramafic stratigraphy within the Company’s Roe Hills Project tenure (Figure 1).

The survey has successfully identified multiple significant conductors within geologically favourable positions along strike from known mineralisation across the Talc Lake and Hooton Prospects.

Definitive modelling of each of the conductors is in progress combining an ongoing evaluation of historical geological and geochemical data in order to prioritise targets for follow-up drill testing (Figure 2).

DDH1 Drilling has been engaged to commence Phase 1 RC/Diamond drilling and mobilisation is underway. The program will include testing of priority targets, establishing DHEM geophysical platforms in key areas and stratigraphic traverses to test and refine the Company’s conceptual geological models (Figure 3).




Figure 2: MPJ Roe Hills Nickel Sulphide Project showing proposed and recently completed surface MLEM geophysical surveys & conductors.

For personal use only




Figure 3: MPJ Roe Hills Nickel Sulphide Project, Talc Lake and Hooton Prospects showing MLEM conductors & Phase 1 drilling areas.

For personal use only




Figure 4: MPJ Roe Hills Nickel Sulphide Project showing areas of proposed Phase 1 drilling.

ENDS

For further information please contact:

Mr Joshua Wellisch
Managing Director
Mining Projects Group Limited

For online Information visit: www.miningprojectsgroup.com.au

COMPETENT PERSON STATEMENT:

Competent Person: *The information in this report that relates to Exploration Results or Mineral Resources is based on information compiled and reviewed by Mr N Hutchison, who is a Non-Exec Director for Mining Projects Group and who is a Member of The Australian Institute of Geoscientists.*

Mr Hutchison has sufficient experience which is relevant to the style of mineralisation and type of deposits under consideration and to the activity which he is undertaking to qualify as a Competent Person as defined in the 2012 Edition of the 'Australasian Code for Reporting of Exploration Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves.' (the JORC Code 2012). Mr Hutchison has consented to the inclusion in the report of the matters based on his information in the form and context in which it appears.

The Australian Securities Exchange has not reviewed and does not accept responsibility for the accuracy or adequacy of this release.

For personal use only

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
<i>Sampling techniques</i>	<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"> Moving in-loop ground EM survey carried out at 200m line spacing using a SMARTemV system by ElectroMagnetic Imaging Technology Pty Ltd. EMIT Fluxgate sensor recording 3 orthogonal components: Bz, Bx and By. Survey done at ground level. SMARTEM standard window times used for a transmitter frequency of 0.27 to 1 Hz. 200m x 200m transmitter loop producing a loop dipole moment for ~32000000 Am². Location of stations was accomplished with Garmin handheld GPS units with an accuracy of +/- 4m.
<i>Drilling techniques</i>	<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">
<i>Drill sample recovery</i>	<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">
<i>Logging</i>	<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 metallurgical studies. Whether logging is qualitative or quantitative in nature. Core (or costean, channel, etc) photography. The total length and percentage of the relevant intersections logged. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<i>Sub-sampling techniques and</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all core taken. If non-core, whether riffled, tube sampled, rotary split, etc and whether sampled wet or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

For personal use only

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<i>sample preparation</i>	<p><i>dry.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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> 	
<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"> • Data acquired using SMARTemV receiver system. • Data were delivered by Merlin Geophysical Solutions Pty Ltd who performed QA/QC on a daily basis. • Data were again subject to QA/QC by consultants Newexco Services Pty Ltd on a daily basis. QA/QC was achieved using Maxwell software by ElectroMagnetic Imaging Technolgy Pty Ltd.
<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"> • Data were check and validated on a daily basis using Maxwell software by ElectroMagnetic Imaging Technolgy Pty Ltd.
<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"> • Locations were planned using a combination of GIS software packages. • Location of stations was accomplished with Garmin handheld GPS units with an accuracy of +/- 4m. • All data points were located using the Geocentric Datum of Australia 1994 and the Map Grid of Australia zone 51 projection.
<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"> • At least 3 readings were recorded per station. • Stations were spaced 100m along line. • Line spacing was 200m
<i>Orientation of data in relation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Whether the orientation of sampling achieves unbiased sampling of possible structures and</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey was oriented with E-W lines perpendicular to the main

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<i>to geological structure</i>	<p><i>the extent to which this is known, considering the deposit type.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> 	geological trend.
<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"> Data were acquired by Merlin Geophysical Solutions Pty Ltd and reported to the company director. Data were forwarded from Merlin Geophysical Solutions Pty Ltd to consultants Newexco Services Pty Ltd.
<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">

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"> Insert your commentary here...
<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">
<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">
<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 Material and this exclusion does not detract from the understanding of the report, the</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	Competent Person should clearly explain why this is the case.	
<i>Data aggregation methods</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Where aggregate intercepts incorporate short lengths of high grade results and longer lengths of low grade results, the procedure used for such aggregation should be stated and some typical examples of such aggregations should be shown in detail. The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values should be clearly stated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<i>Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These relationships are particularly important in the reporting of Exploration Results. If the geometry of the mineralisation with respect to the drill hole angle is known, its nature should be reported. If it is not known and only the down hole lengths are reported, there should be a clear statement to this effect (eg 'down hole length, true width not known'). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<i>Diagrams</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<i>Balanced reporting</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<i>Other substantive exploration data</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Survey designed and managed by Newexco Services Pty Ltd. Moving in-loop Transient Electromagnetic surveying was completed by Merlin Geophysical Solutions Pty Ltd. Geophysical surveying employed a SMARTemV receiver system, an EMIT Fluxgate magnetic field sensor, Zonge ZT-30 transmitter and 200m x 200m transmitter loops. Survey stations were spaced 100m

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> along line and lines were spaced 200m. Interpretation of the Electromagnetic data is being undertaken by Newexco Services Pty Ltd.
<i>Further work</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The nature and scale of planned further work (eg tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling). Diagrams clearly highlighting the areas of possible extensions, including the main geological interpretations and future drilling areas, provided this information is not commercially sensitive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

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"> 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. Data validation procedures used. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Newexco Services Pty Ltd backs up all data daily, weekly and monthly with data held off-site. No changes are made to primary data.
<i>Site visits</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment on any site visits undertaken by the Competent Person and the outcome of those visits. If no site visits have been undertaken indicate why this is the case. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<i>Geological interpretation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confidence in (or conversely, the uncertainty of) the geological interpretation of the mineral deposit. Nature of the data used and of any assumptions made. The effect, if any, of alternative interpretations on Mineral Resource estimation. The use of geology in guiding and controlling Mineral Resource estimation. The factors affecting continuity both of grade and geology. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<i>Dimensions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<i>Estimation and modelling techniques</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. The availability of check estimates, previous estimates and/or mine production records and whether the Mineral Resource estimate takes appropriate account of such data. The assumptions made regarding recovery of by- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<p>products.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimation of deleterious elements or other non-grade variables of economic significance (eg sulphur for acid mine drainage characterisation). • In the case of block model interpolation, the block size in relation to the average sample spacing and the search employed. • Any assumptions behind modelling of selective mining units. • Any assumptions about correlation between variables. • Description of how the geological interpretation was used to control the resource estimates. • Discussion of basis for using or not using grade cutting or capping. • 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>Moisture</i>	<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. 	•
<i>Cut-off parameters</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The basis of the adopted cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied. 	•
<i>Mining factors or assumptions</i>	<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. 	•
<i>Metallurgical factors or assumptions</i>	<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. 	•
<i>Environmental factors or assumptions</i>	<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 	•

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<i>environmental assumptions made.</i>	
<i>Bulk density</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • Discuss assumptions for bulk density estimates used in the evaluation process of the different materials. 	•
<i>Classification</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The basis for the classification of the Mineral Resources into varying confidence categories. • 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). • Whether the result appropriately reflects the Competent Person's view of the deposit. 	•
<i>Audits or reviews</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The results of any audits or reviews of Mineral Resource estimates. 	•
<i>Discussion of relative accuracy/confidence</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • These statements of relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate should be compared with production data, where available. 	•

Section 4 Estimation and Reporting of Ore Reserves

(Criteria listed in section 1, and where relevant in sections 2 and 3, also apply to this section.)

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<i>Mineral Resource estimate for conversion to Ore Reserves</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of the Mineral Resource estimate used as a basis for the conversion to an Ore Reserve. • Clear statement as to whether the Mineral Resources are reported additional to, or inclusive of, the Ore Reserves. 	•
<i>Site visits</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment on any site visits undertaken by the Competent Person and the outcome of those visits. • If no site visits have been undertaken indicate why this is the 	•

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	case.	
<i>Study status</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The type and level of study undertaken to enable Mineral Resources to be converted to Ore Reserves. The Code requires that a study to at least Pre-Feasibility Study level has been undertaken to convert Mineral Resources to Ore Reserves. Such studies will have been carried out and will have determined a mine plan that is technically achievable and economically viable, and that material Modifying Factors have been considered. 	•
<i>Cut-off parameters</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The basis of the cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied. 	•
<i>Mining factors or assumptions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The method and assumptions used as reported in the Pre-Feasibility or Feasibility Study to convert the Mineral Resource to an Ore Reserve (i.e. either by application of appropriate factors by optimisation or by preliminary or detailed design). The choice, nature and appropriateness of the selected mining method(s) and other mining parameters including associated design issues such as pre-strip, access, etc. The assumptions made regarding geotechnical parameters (eg pit slopes, stope sizes, etc), grade control and pre-production drilling. The major assumptions made and Mineral Resource model used for pit and stope optimisation (if appropriate). The mining dilution factors used. The mining recovery factors used. Any minimum mining widths used. The manner in which Inferred Mineral Resources are utilised in mining studies and the sensitivity of the outcome to their inclusion. The infrastructure requirements of the selected mining methods. 	•
<i>Metallurgical factors or assumptions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The metallurgical process proposed and the appropriateness of that process to the style of mineralisation. Whether the metallurgical process is well-tested technology or novel in nature. The nature, amount and representativeness of metallurgical test work undertaken, the nature of the metallurgical domaining applied and the corresponding metallurgical recovery factors applied. Any assumptions or allowances made for deleterious elements. The existence of any bulk sample or pilot scale test work and the degree to which such samples are considered representative of the orebody as a whole. For minerals that are defined by a specification, has the ore reserve estimation been based on the appropriate mineralogy to meet the specifications? 	•
<i>Environmental</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The status of studies of potential environmental impacts of the mining and processing operation. Details of waste rock characterisation and the consideration of potential sites, status of design options considered and, where applicable, the status of approvals for process residue storage and waste dumps should be reported. 	•
<i>Infrastructure</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existence of appropriate infrastructure: availability of land for plant development, power, water, transportation (particularly for bulk commodities), labour, accommodation; or the ease with which the infrastructure can be provided, or accessed. 	•

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<i>Costs</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The derivation of, or assumptions made, regarding projected capital costs in the study. • The methodology used to estimate operating costs. • Allowances made for the content of deleterious elements. • The source of exchange rates used in the study. • Derivation of transportation charges. • The basis for forecasting or source of treatment and refining charges, penalties for failure to meet specification, etc. • The allowances made for royalties payable, both Government and private. 	•
<i>Revenue factors</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The derivation of, or assumptions made regarding revenue factors including head grade, metal or commodity price(s) exchange rates, transportation and treatment charges, penalties, net smelter returns, etc. • The derivation of assumptions made of metal or commodity price(s), for the principal metals, minerals and co-products. 	•
<i>Market assessment</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The demand, supply and stock situation for the particular commodity, consumption trends and factors likely to affect supply and demand into the future. • A customer and competitor analysis along with the identification of likely market windows for the product. • Price and volume forecasts and the basis for these forecasts. • For industrial minerals the customer specification, testing and acceptance requirements prior to a supply contract. 	•
<i>Economic</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inputs to the economic analysis to produce the net present value (NPV) in the study, the source and confidence of these economic inputs including estimated inflation, discount rate, etc. • NPV ranges and sensitivity to variations in the significant assumptions and inputs. 	•
<i>Social</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The status of agreements with key stakeholders and matters leading to social licence to operate. 	•
<i>Other</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To the extent relevant, the impact of the following on the project and/or on the estimation and classification of the Ore Reserves: • Any identified material naturally occurring risks. • The status of material legal agreements and marketing arrangements. • The status of governmental agreements and approvals critical to the viability of the project, such as mineral tenement status, and government and statutory approvals. There must be reasonable grounds to expect that all necessary Government approvals will be received within the timeframes anticipated in the Pre-Feasibility or Feasibility study. Highlight and discuss the materiality of any unresolved matter that is dependent on a third party on which extraction of the reserve is contingent. 	•
<i>Classification</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The basis for the classification of the Ore Reserves into varying confidence categories. • Whether the result appropriately reflects the Competent Person's view of the deposit. • The proportion of Probable Ore Reserves that have been derived from Measured Mineral Resources (if any). 	•
<i>Audits or reviews</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The results of any audits or reviews of Ore Reserve estimates. 	•
<i>Discussion of relative accuracy/ confidence</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where appropriate a statement of the relative accuracy and confidence level in the Ore Reserve estimate using an approach or procedure deemed appropriate by the Competent Person. For example, the application of statistical 	•

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<p>or geostatistical procedures to quantify the relative accuracy of the reserve within stated confidence limits, or, if such an approach is not deemed appropriate, a qualitative discussion of the factors which could affect the relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Accuracy and confidence discussions should extend to specific discussions of any applied Modifying Factors that may have a material impact on Ore Reserve viability, or for which there are remaining areas of uncertainty at the current study stage. • It is recognised that this may not be possible or appropriate in all circumstances. These statements of relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate should be compared with production data, where available. 	

Section 5 Estimation and Reporting of Diamonds and Other Gemstones

(Criteria listed in other relevant sections also apply to this section. Additional guidelines are available in the ‘Guidelines for the Reporting of Diamond Exploration Results’ issued by the Diamond Exploration Best Practices Committee established by the Canadian Institute of Mining, Metallurgy and Petroleum.)

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<i>Indicator minerals</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports of indicator minerals, such as chemically/physically distinctive garnet, ilmenite, chrome spinel and chrome diopside, should be prepared by a suitably qualified laboratory. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insert your commentary here...
<i>Source of diamonds</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of the form, shape, size and colour of the diamonds and the nature of the source of diamonds (primary or secondary) including the rock type and geological environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<i>Sample collection</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Type of sample, whether outcrop, boulders, drill core, reverse circulation drill cuttings, gravel, stream sediment or soil, and purpose (eg large diameter drilling to establish stones per unit of volume or bulk samples to establish stone size distribution). • Sample size, distribution and representivity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<i>Sample treatment</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Type of facility, treatment rate, and accreditation. • Sample size reduction. Bottom screen size, top screen size and re-crush. • Processes (dense media separation, grease, X-ray, hand-sorting, etc). • Process efficiency, tailings auditing and granulometry. • Laboratory used, type of process for micro diamonds and accreditation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<i>Carat</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One fifth (0.2) of a gram (often defined as a metric carat or MC). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<i>Sample grade</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sample grade in this section of Table 1 is used in the context of carats per units of mass, area or volume. • The sample grade above the specified lower cut-off sieve size should be reported as carats per dry metric tonne and/or carats per 100 dry metric tonnes. For alluvial deposits, sample grades quoted in carats per square metre or carats per cubic metre are acceptable if 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<p><i>accompanied by a volume to weight basis for calculation.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>In addition to general requirements to assess volume and density there is a need to relate stone frequency (stones per cubic metre or tonne) to stone size (carats per stone) to derive sample grade (carats per tonne).</i> 	
<p><i>Reporting of Exploration Results</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Complete set of sieve data using a standard progression of sieve sizes per facies. Bulk sampling results, global sample grade per facies. Spatial structure analysis and grade distribution. Stone size and number distribution. Sample head feed and tailings particle granulometry.</i> <i>Sample density determination.</i> <i>Per cent concentrate and undersize per sample.</i> <i>Sample grade with change in bottom cut-off screen size.</i> <i>Adjustments made to size distribution for sample plant performance and performance on a commercial scale.</i> <i>If appropriate or employed, geostatistical techniques applied to model stone size, distribution or frequency from size distribution of exploration diamond samples.</i> <i>The weight of diamonds may only be omitted from the report when the diamonds are considered too small to be of commercial significance. This lower cut-off size should be stated.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<p><i>Grade estimation for reporting Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Description of the sample type and the spatial arrangement of drilling or sampling designed for grade estimation.</i> <i>The sample crush size and its relationship to that achievable in a commercial treatment plant.</i> <i>Total number of diamonds greater than the specified and reported lower cut-off sieve size.</i> <i>Total weight of diamonds greater than the specified and reported lower cut-off sieve size.</i> <i>The sample grade above the specified lower cut-off sieve size.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<p><i>Value estimation</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Valuations should not be reported for samples of diamonds processed using total liberation method, which is commonly used for processing exploration samples.</i> <i>To the extent that such information is not deemed commercially sensitive, Public Reports should include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>diamonds quantities by appropriate screen size per facies or depth.</i> <i>details of parcel valued.</i> <i>number of stones, carats, lower size cut-off per facies or depth.</i> <i>The average \$/carat and \$/tonne value at the selected bottom cut-off should be reported in US Dollars. The value per carat is of critical importance in demonstrating project value.</i> <i>The basis for the price (eg dealer buying price, dealer selling price, etc).</i> <i>An assessment of diamond breakage.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<p><i>Security and integrity</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Accredited process audit.</i> <i>Whether samples were sealed after excavation.</i> <i>Valuer location, escort, delivery, cleaning losses, reconciliation with recorded sample carats and number of stones.</i> <i>Core samples washed prior to treatment for micro diamonds.</i> <i>Audit samples treated at alternative facility.</i> <i>Results of tailings checks.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Recovery of tracer monitors used in sampling and treatment.</i> • <i>Geophysical (logged) density and particle density.</i> • <i>Cross validation of sample weights, wet and dry, with hole volume and density, moisture factor.</i> 	
<i>Classification</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>In addition to general requirements to assess volume and density there is a need to relate stone frequency (stones per cubic metre or tonne) to stone size (carats per stone) to derive grade (carats per tonne). The elements of uncertainty in these estimates should be considered, and classification developed accordingly.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •