

14 September 2017

ASX Market Announcements  
ASX Limited  
20 Bridge Street  
Sydney NSW 2000

**Revised – Table 1**

Vector Resources Limited (“**Vector**” or “**the Company**”) refers to the announcement dated 6 September 2017 titled “New Discovery at Maniema Gold Project” and attaches a revised JORC Code, 2012 Edition Table 1 report on the Eveche Gold Prospect.

Table 1 has been amended to:

1. Further expand on the Sampling techniques;
2. Note that the samples taken have not been geologically logged; and
3. Provide further detail on Sample security.

Yours faithfully



N J Bassett  
Company Secretary

## JORC Code, 2012 Edition – Table 1 report Eveche Gold Prospect

### 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"> <li>• <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></li> <li>• <i>Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample representivity and the appropriate calibration of any measurement tools or systems used.</i></li> <li>• <i>Aspects of the determination of mineralisation that are Material to the Public Report.</i></li> <li>• <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></li> </ul>	<p>The sample shown in Figure 3 was hand specimen sample provided by an artisanal miner upon request. A second sample was a rock chip sample collected by a Vector geologist from the vein being mined by artisanal miners at the excavation shown in Figure 2. One of these samples contains visible gold (Figure 3). The Rock-chip sample has been sent for analysis by ALS in South Africa. The sample will be processed by standard ALS procedures (Preparation by PREP-31), analysis by fire assay with AES finish (AU-ICP21) Results have not been received.</p> <p>Both sample locations were recorded with a Garmin handheld GPS instrument with less than 10m accuracy as per section (<i>Location of data points</i>) below.</p>
Drilling techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <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></li> </ul>	No exploration has been done
Drill sample recovery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Method of recording and assessing core and chip sample recoveries and results assessed.</i></li> <li>• <i>Measures taken to maximise sample recovery and ensure representative nature of the samples.</i></li> </ul>	No exploration has been done

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	
Logging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>Whether logging is qualitative or quantitative in nature. Core (or costean, channel, etc) photography.</li> <li>The total length and percentage of the relevant intersections logged.</li> </ul>	The samples taken have not been geologically logged.
Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all core taken.</li> <li>If non-core, whether riffled, tube sampled, rotary split, etc and whether sampled wet or dry.</li> <li>For all sample types, the nature, quality and appropriateness of the sample preparation technique.</li> <li>Quality control procedures adopted for all sub-sampling stages to maximise representivity of samples.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Whether sample sizes are appropriate to the grain size of the material being sampled.</li> </ul>	No exploration has been done. The Rock-chip sample has been sent for analysis by ALS in South Africa. The sample will be processed by standard ALS procedures (ALS Code: Preparation by PREP-31),
Quality of assay data and laboratory tests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The nature, quality and appropriateness of the assaying and laboratory procedures used and whether the technique is considered partial or total.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	No exploration has been done. Analysis will be by fire assay with AES finish (ALS code: AU-ICP21) Results have not been received.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Verification of sampling and assaying	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The verification of significant intersections by either independent or alternative company personnel.</li> <li>• The use of twinned holes.</li> <li>• Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols.</li> <li>• Discuss any adjustment to assay data.</li> </ul>	No exploration has been done on this prospect. The discovery visit was a reconnaissance visit as follow-up to reports received by Vector geologists from local miners
Location of data points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Specification of the grid system used.</li> <li>• Quality and adequacy of topographic control.</li> </ul>	<p>Sample locations were recorded with a Garmin handheld GPS instrument with less than 10m accuracy. The location of hand specimen samples were part of a site visit in August 2016 by Vector geologists. No samples results have been received.</p> <p>Coordinates are recorded in the WGS84-UTM35N Grid System</p>
Data spacing and distribution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data spacing for reporting of Exploration Results.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Whether sample compositing has been applied.</li> </ul>	No exploration has been done on this prospect
Orientation of data in relation to geological structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the orientation of sampling achieves unbiased sampling of possible structures and the extent to which this is known, considering the deposit type.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	No exploration has been done on this prospect
Sample security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The measures taken to ensure sample security.</li> </ul>	No exploration has been done on this prospect. No security protocol has been followed as the sampling was not part of a formal program and results will not be used for economic decisions but to provide an indication of gold tenor at the sampling point of the hosting vein.
Audits or reviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.</li> </ul>	No exploration has been done on this prospect

## 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"> <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 licence to operate in the area.</i></li> </ul>	<p>The relevant concession for this project is PR4801. All concession are held in good standing under a joint venture agreement between Vector Resources and WB Kasai Investments Congo SARL (WBK). Under the terms of the Agreement, the Company has agreed to acquire the option that African Royalty has secured to purchase a 70% interest in the Project from WBK.</p>
<i>Exploration done by other parties</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Extensive soil geochemistry was conducted by Afrimines Resources in late 2011 on all concessions. Roughly 6700 samples were collected from prospective areas surrounding artisanal workings and stream sediment anomalies including the nearby Mitunda prospect. However no exploration has been conducted over the Eveche prospect.</p>
<i>Geology</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.</i></li> </ul>	<p>The Project is situated in the Twangiza-Namoya Belt, in the northern part of the Kibara Belt. The Kibara belt is the result of an extensive orogeny, taking place between 1400 and 950 Ma, and contains a wide variety of deposits, comprising typically shear-related granophile elements including tin, tungsten, lithium, beryllium, tantalum, and gold. Gold occurs in brittle-ductile zones, and seems to have formed at a relatively high lithostratigraphic level. The source of the gold-bearing fluids is thought to be either from deeply buried Archean greenstone belts, or alternatively Lower Proterozoic mafic rocks buried beneath the Kibaran sedimentary sequence. Gold deposits are generally situated some distance from the Sn-W “tin granites”.</p> <p>The gold appears mostly in quartz veins, either as single, high-grade veins, or as iron-rich gold-bearing breccias. Most of these veins occur typically in clastic Kibaran metasediments, while breccias are restricted to basic metavolcanic rocks. Auriferous quartz veins appear to be associated with shear zones. Sulphide association varies, but the most abundant sulphides associated with the mineralisation are arsenopyrite and pyrite, with secondary pyrrhotite, chalcopyrite and galena.</p> <p>The geology in the Maniema prospects consists mostly of</p>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		<p>metasediments and lightly metamorphosed mafic rocks, both volcanic and intrusive, from the Kibaran and Rusizian, with large granitic intrusions, generally situated on the edge of the tenement. The Kabotshome Prospect is situated in the Lower Burundian series which consists of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> massive and interbedded quartzite and sandstones in the host metapelite;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> metasediments: metapelite, often associated with disseminated sulphide agglomerations, mainly pyrite;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> metavolcanic and intrusive mafic rocks;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> minor dolerite dykes;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> felsic porphyry;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> granites and pegmatites, on the periphery of the property</li> </ul> <p>Metamorphism is of lower greenschist facies. Carbonate is often associated with metavolcanic and mafic intrusive rocks.</p>
<p><i>Drill hole Information</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <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"> <li>○ <i>easting and northing of the drill hole collar</i></li> <li>○ <i>elevation or RL (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in metres) of the drill hole collar</i></li> <li>○ <i>dip and azimuth of the hole</i></li> <li>○ <i>down hole length and interception depth</i></li> <li>○ <i>hole length.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <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></li> </ul>	<p>No drilling has been done.</p>
<p><i>Data aggregation methods</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <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></li> <li>• <i>Where aggregate intercepts incorporate short lengths of high grade results and longer lengths of low grade results,</i></li> </ul>	<p>No exploration has been done on this prospect.</p>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<p><i>the procedure used for such aggregation should be stated and some typical examples of such aggregations should be shown in detail.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values should be clearly stated.</i></li> </ul>	
<i>Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>These relationships are particularly important in the reporting of Exploration Results.</i></li> <li><i>If the geometry of the mineralisation with respect to the drill hole angle is known, its nature should be reported.</i></li> <li><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></li> </ul>	No drilling has been done.
<i>Diagrams</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><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></li> </ul>	The map figure shows the artisanal workings as recorded by Garmin GPS.
<i>Balanced reporting</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><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></li> </ul>	No exploration has been done
<i>Other substantive exploration data</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><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></li> </ul>	No exploration has been done
<i>Further work</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The nature and scale of planned further work (eg tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling).</i></li> <li><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></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mapping and further sampling once hand specimen results have been received.</li> <li>Potentially drilling once results analysed.</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>	No Data exists as no exploration has been done
Site visits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment on any site visits undertaken by the Competent Person and the outcome of those visits.</li> <li>If no site visits have been undertaken indicate why this is the case.</li> </ul>	N/a
Geological interpretation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confidence in (or conversely, the uncertainty of) the geological interpretation of the mineral deposit.</li> <li>Nature of the data used and of any assumptions made.</li> <li>The effect, if any, of alternative interpretations on Mineral Resource estimation.</li> <li>The use of geology in guiding and controlling Mineral Resource estimation.</li> <li>The factors affecting continuity both of grade and geology.</li> </ul>	There is insufficient information given the project stage to allow develop of a geological interpretation.
Dimensions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	N/a
Estimation and modelling techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>The availability of check estimates, previous estimates and/or mine production records and whether the Mineral Resource estimate takes</li> </ul>	N/a

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<p><i>appropriate account of such data.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 mining units.</i></li> <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>	
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>	N/a
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>	N/a
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>	N/a
Metallurgical factors or	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The basis for assumptions or predictions regarding</i></li> </ul>	No samples have been collected for metallurgical investigations at this

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
assumptions	<i>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>	stage of the project
<i>Environmental factors or assumptions</i>	<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>	It has been assumed that there are no significant environmental factors evident. Environmental surveys and assessments will form a part of future pre-feasibility.
<i>Bulk density</i>	<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>	N/a
<i>Classification</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The basis for the classification of the Mineral Resources into varying confidence categories.</i></li> </ul>	No exploration has been done.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	
<i>Audits or reviews</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The results of any audits or reviews of Mineral Resource estimates.</i></li> </ul>	No exploration has been done
<i>Discussion of relative accuracy/ confidence</i>	<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>	n/a

For personal use only

