

ASX/MEDIA ANNOUNCEMENT

10 MAY 2016

NUMEROUS NEW PEGMATITE TARGETS IDENTIFIED AT MT YORK LITHIUM PROJECT, WA

Successful radiometric and aeromagnetic surveys reveal priority target areas

HIGHLIGHTS

- **Targeting using the recently-acquired, ultra-detailed airborne geophysics completed at the Mt York Lithium-Gold Project in WA.**
- **Numerous new pegmatite targets identified from radiometric and aeromagnetic data interpretation.**
- **Targets to be field-checked, mapped and sampled over the coming weeks ahead of drilling planned for early next quarter.**
- **Results suggest significant future upside potential at Kairos' Mt York Project.**

Kairos Minerals Limited ("Kairos" or "Company" ASX: KAI) is pleased to advise that it has received the final results from a targeting exercise using recently acquired airborne geophysical data from its Mt York Lithium-Gold Project, located in the highly prospective Pilgangoora region of WA's East Pilbara (see Figure 5).

As a result of this work, multiple pegmatite targets have been identified throughout Kairos's tenement package, using ultra-detailed radiometric and aeromagnetic data.

These targets highlight the significant potential of the Mt York Project, which abuts the world-class Pilgangoora Lithium Tantalum Project being developed by Pilbara Minerals (ASX: PLS), as well as the Altura Mining (ASX: AJM) and Dakota Minerals (ASX: DKO) lithium projects.

The newly identified target areas will be subject to ground-based exploration activities including reconnaissance field evaluation and mapping/rock chip sampling in the coming weeks ahead of drilling planned for early in the September 2016 Quarter.

Geophysics Programme Results

In February 2016, Kairos commissioned Magspec Airborne Surveys Pty Ltd to conduct an ultra-detailed airborne geophysical survey across the Company's newly acquired Mt York Lithium-Gold Project tenements.

The survey was conducted on 25m line spacing, with the principal aim of utilising high quality magnetic and radiometric data to identify areas containing potential pegmatite intrusives and to assist with drill targeting. The survey was completed in February, with data processing and targeting undertaken in April. Both of these activities have now been completed by Terra Resources Pty Ltd.

The targeting identified a series of radiometric anomalies throughout the tenement package which are interpreted to represent potassium feldspar-rich zones of pegmatite intrusives, either outcropping, emplaced as non-outcropping sub-horizontal sheets or buried beneath shallow cover. The signatures of the geophysical anomalies were cross-referenced with areas of known pegmatite-bearing lithium mineralisation, such as the Pilgangoora Central Pegmatite Suite, to establish a benchmark for the targeting.

In most cases, the targets are in structures parallel to known lithium-bearing pegmatites, within favourable structural settings and host stratigraphy (Figure 1). If they are proven to be pegmatites, this suggests that they could also potentially be lithium-bearing.




Figure 1: Mt. York Lithium-Gold Project. KAIROS tenements (blue). Mapped geology used to assist finalising interpreted geology from geophysics. Interpreted pegmatite targets in red. High priority field mapping areas shown as red (1) and blue (2) priority polygons.





Figure 2: Mt York Project showing magnetic anomalies

Figure 3: Mt York Project showing radiometric anomalies

Initial testing of the geophysical targets produced from this study will include geological mapping, surface rock-chip sampling followed by drill testing.

Mt York Lithium-Gold Project

Kairos' Mt York Lithium-Gold Project is located on and in the vicinity of an extensive lithium-tantalum bearing pegmatitic dyke swarm. Peer activity in the immediate area, which is known as Pilgangoora, includes Pilbara Minerals ASX: PLS) and Altura Mining (ASX: AJM), which have both discovered significant lithium and tantalum resources in recent times.

Pilbara Minerals has identified a total Indicated and Inferred Resource of 80.2Mt @ 1.26% Li₂O and 32.9Mt @ 0.022% Ta₂O₅ and recently announced a significantly upgraded Exploration Target for its flagship Pilgangoora Project.

On the adjacent property, Altura Mining has identified an Indicated and Inferred resource of 35.7Mt @ 1.05% Li₂O. Following recent exploration activity, the Pilgangoora area has been confirmed to contain one of the world's largest hard-rock lithium deposits, mostly in the form of the mineral spodumene.




Figure 4: East Pilbara mineral province showing the main Pegmatite Target Corridor




Figure 5: Kairos Minerals – Project Locations

ENDS

For further information, please contact:

Investors:

Mr Joshua Wellisch
Managing Director
Mining Projects Group Limited

Media:

Nicholas Read/Paul Armstrong
Read Corporate
Ph: 08 9388 1474

COMPETENT PERSON STATEMENT:

Competent Person: *The geophysical information in this report is based on information compiled by Mr Barry Bourne, who is employed as a Consultant to the Company through geophysical consultancy Terra Resources Pty Ltd. Mr Bourne is a fellow of the Australian Institute of Geoscientists and a member of the Australian Society of Exploration Geophysicists and has sufficient experience of relevance to the styles of mineralisation and the types of deposits under consideration, and 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. Mt Bourne consents to the inclusion in the report of 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"> Not applicable for geophysics survey program reporting. Not applicable for geophysics survey program reporting. Not applicable for geophysics survey program reporting. Not applicable for geophysics survey program reporting.
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"> Not applicable for geophysics survey program reporting.
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"> Not applicable for geophysics survey program reporting.
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 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"> Not applicable for geophysics survey program reporting.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<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"> • Not applicable for geophysics survey program reporting. •
<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"> • Not applicable for geophysics survey program reporting • • • Details of the geophysical survey are as follows: Flight Height: 25m. Line Spacing: 25m. Flight Line Direction: 090-270 deg. Tie Line Spacing: 250m. Tie Line Flight Direction: 0-180 deg. Magnetometer: CS-2(x3). Magnetometer Sensitivity: 0.001nT. Magnetometer Resolution: 0.001nT. Magnetometer Sampling Rate: 0.1sec (4-5m). Magnetometer Compensator: RMS-AADC 11. Radar Altimeter: King KRA405. Radiometric System: Exploranium GR-820
<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"> • Not applicable for geophysics survey program reporting. •
<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"> • Location of airborne geophysical data is via GPS units with an accuracy of +/- 5m which is considered sufficient accuracy for the purpose of interpreting results. • The grid system used is GDA 1994 MGA Zone 50.
<i>Data spacing and distribution</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Data spacing for reporting of Exploration Results.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Airborne data was captured along flight lines spaced 25m apart flown at a height of 25m. Sample spacing along each line was

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Whether sample compositing has been applied. 	approximately 4-5m.
Orientation of data in relation to geological structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the orientation of sampling achieves unbiased sampling of possible structures and the extent to which this is known, considering the deposit type. 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Orientation of the airborne geophysical survey was 090-270, ie E-W, orthogonal to the dominant strike direction of the sequences being evaluated. Not applicable for geophysics survey program reporting. .
Sample security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The measures taken to ensure sample security. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not applicable for geophysics survey program reporting. .
Audits or reviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Survey specifications and data was reviewed by Mr Barry Bourne, Terra Resources Pty Ltd Geophysical Consultancy.

Section 2 Reporting of Exploration Results

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

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Mineral tenement and land tenure status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Mt. York Project tenements comprise 12 Prospecting Licences: P45/2987 - P45/2998 inclusive. . . . All tenements are in good standing-
Exploration done by other parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historical exploration for gold has been conducted by several parties including MIM Exploration Pty Ltd and Lynas Gold NL. Historical gold mining was undertaken by Lynas Gold NL at Iron Stirrup, Zakanaka, Main Hill and Brechia Hill Deposits. No historical exploration for lithium or tantalum is known to have been undertaken.
Geology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Mt. York Project secures a significant portion of the Pilgangoora syncline which comprises a sequence of highly metamorphosed greenstone rocks of the Archaean aged

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		<p>Warrawoona group close to the contact with the Carlindi Granitoid Complex. The sequence hosts an extensive area of lithium-tantalum bearing (LCT) pegmatite intrusives which have preferentially exploited N-S and E-W trending dilational faults. The primary lithium bearing mineral is the pyroxene mineral, spodumene, a lithium aluminium inosilicate, $\text{LiAl}(\text{SiO}_3)_2$.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recent drilling in the area has shown the pegmatites to occur both as shallow E dipping, outcropping sequences and as non-outcropping sub-horizontal sheets with extensive strike and dip continuity.
Drill hole Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A summary of all information material to the understanding of the exploration results including a tabulation of the following information for all Material drill holes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> easting and northing of the drill hole collar elevation or RL (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in metres) of the drill hole collar dip and azimuth of the hole down hole length and interception depth hole length. 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not applicable for geophysics survey program reporting.
Data aggregation methods	<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"> Not applicable for geophysics survey program reporting.
Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths	<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"> Not applicable for geophysics survey program reporting.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<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"> • Supporting figures have been included within the body of the report.
<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"> • Data acquisition, interpretation of results and subsequent reporting is considered to reflect industry best practice.
<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"> •
<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"> • Detailed mapping and rock chip sampling of geophysical targets produced from this study. • Interrogation of historical drilling if present to identify non-outcropping pegmatite occurrences. • RC drill testing of priority targets

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"> • Insert your commentary here...
<i>Site visits</i>	<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"> •
<i>Geological interpretation</i>	<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"> •
<i>Dimensions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The extent and variability of the Mineral Resource expressed as length (along strike or otherwise),</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<i>plan width, and depth below surface to the upper and lower limits of the Mineral Resource.</i>	
<i>Estimation and modelling techniques</i>	<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 model data to drill hole data, and use of reconciliation data if available.</i> 	•
<i>Moisture</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Whether the tonnages are estimated on a dry basis or with natural moisture, and the method of determination of the moisture content.</i> 	•
<i>Cut-off parameters</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The basis of the adopted cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied.</i> 	•
<i>Mining factors or assumptions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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> 	•
<i>Metallurgical factors or assumptions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The basis for assumptions or predictions regarding metallurgical amenability. It is always necessary as part of the process of determining reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction to consider potential metallurgical methods, but the assumptions regarding metallurgical treatment</i> 	•

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<i>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>	
<i>Environmental factors or assumptions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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> 	•
<i>Bulk density</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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> • <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> 	•
<i>Classification</i>	<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> 	•
<i>Audits or reviews</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The results of any audits or reviews of Mineral Resource estimates.</i> 	•
<i>Discussion of relative accuracy/ confidence</i>	<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> 	•

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<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. 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
Mineral Resource estimate for conversion to Ore Reserves	<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. 	•
Site visits	<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. 	•
Study status	<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. 	•
Cut-off parameters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The basis of the cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied. 	•
Mining factors or assumptions	<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 	•

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<p>are utilised in mining studies and the sensitivity of the outcome to their inclusion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The infrastructure requirements of the selected mining methods. 	
Metallurgical factors or assumptions	<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? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Environmental	<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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Infrastructure	<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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Costs	<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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Revenue factors	<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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Market assessment	<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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Economic	<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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Social	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The status of agreements with key stakeholders and matters leading to social licence to operate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Other	<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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Classification	<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). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Audits or reviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The results of any audits or reviews of Ore Reserve estimates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Discussion of relative accuracy/confidence	<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 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. The statement should specify whether it relates to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<p><i>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></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>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.</i> • <i>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.</i> 	

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"> • <i>Reports of indicator minerals, such as chemically/physically distinctive garnet, ilmenite, chrome spinel and chrome diopside, should be prepared by a suitably qualified laboratory.</i> 	•
<i>Source of diamonds</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>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.</i> 	•
<i>Sample collection</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>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).</i> • <i>Sample size, distribution and representivity.</i> 	•
<i>Sample treatment</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Type of facility, treatment rate, and accreditation.</i> • <i>Sample size reduction. Bottom screen size, top screen size and re-crush.</i> • <i>Processes (dense media separation, grease, X-ray, hand-sorting, etc).</i> • <i>Process efficiency, tailings auditing and granulometry.</i> • <i>Laboratory used, type of process for micro diamonds and accreditation.</i> 	•
<i>Carat</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>One fifth (0.2) of a gram (often defined as a metric carat or MC).</i> 	•
<i>Sample grade</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Sample grade in this section of Table 1 is used in the context of carats per units of mass, area or volume.</i> • <i>The sample grade above the specified lower cut-</i> 	•

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<p><i>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 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> 	
Reporting of Exploration Results	<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"> •
Grade estimation for reporting Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves	<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"> •
Value estimation	<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</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<p><i>selected bottom cut-off should be reported in US Dollars. The value per carat is of critical importance in demonstrating project value.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The basis for the price (eg dealer buying price, dealer selling price, etc).</i> • <i>An assessment of diamond breakage.</i> 	
Security and integrity	<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> • <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> 	•
Classification	<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> 	•