



JORC Tables related to Purchase and Sales Agreement for Gold Mining Lease

JORC Code, 2012 Edition – Table 1 Report Template

Section 1 Sampling Techniques and Data

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"> • The nature, quality and accuracy of sampling techniques used is unclear as the data reported has been extracted from an Independent Expert Report compiled in 1997. • The Independent Expert Report refers to sampling results from 1980, 1981 and 1984. • The original sampling data is not available. • The sample results are historic estimates prepared pre 1989 which is when the JORC Code was introduced as Appendix 5A of the ASX Listing Rules.
<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"> • No drilling results
<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"> • No drilling results
<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"> • No details available on logging techniques used for surface chip samples
<i>Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation</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 dry. • For all sample types, the nature, quality and appropriateness of the sample preparation technique. • Quality control procedures adopted for all sub-sampling stages to maximise representivity of samples. • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No details available



Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Whether sample sizes are appropriate to the grain size of the material being sampled.	
<i>Quality of assay data and laboratory tests</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The nature, quality and appropriateness of the assaying and laboratory procedures used and whether the technique is considered partial or total.• 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.• 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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No details available
<i>Verification of sampling and assaying</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The verification of significant intersections by either independent or alternative company personnel.• The use of twinned holes.• Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols.• Discuss any adjustment to assay data.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No details available
<i>Location of data points</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.• Specification of the grid system used.• Quality and adequacy of topographic control.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Location of data points is known to be generally within the areas of historic workings on the Great Caesar Leases.• No details available
<i>Data spacing and distribution</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Data spacing for reporting of Exploration Results.• 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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No details available
<i>Orientation of data in relation to geological structure</i>	<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">• No details available
<i>Sample security</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The measures taken to ensure sample security.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No details available
<i>Audits or reviews</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No details available



Section 2 Reporting of Exploration Results

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"> • Mining Leases ML 1352 (Caesar No 2), ML 1353 (Caesar No 1) and ML 1439 (Great Fanning No 3) collectively referred to as the Great Caesar Mining Leases, located in Queensland, Australia. • Currently owned by RPD TSV Pty Ltd (Seller), with an executed Asset Sale and Purchase Agreement with Emperor Energy Ltd (Buyer) • 100% owned by RPD TSV Pty Ltd
<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"> • Exploration carried out by Marathon Petroleum 1980, Aberfoyle Exploration Pty Ltd 1981 and Pegmin Ltd 1984.
<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"> • The Leases cover gold bearing siliceous and tectonically brecciated sandstones and fractured siltstones. Within these are gossanous quartz zones and stringer veins, striking at about 80 degrees and dipping 35 degrees north and which extend for some 550m with widths commonly around 3-5m. The sequence includes a set of repetitive mineralized beds which, in surface exposure, are quartz veined, variably gossanous, clayey and brecciated.” • “The gold is associated with minor silver, lead and copper sulphides and with abundant pyrite and arsenopyrite. A broad zone of potash alteration surrounds the main mineralization
<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</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No details available



Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<i>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>	
<i>Data aggregation methods</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>In reporting Exploration Results, weighting averaging techniques, maximum and/or minimum grade truncations (eg cutting of high grades) and cut-off grades are usually Material and should be stated.</i>• <i>Where aggregate intercepts incorporate short lengths of high grade results and longer lengths of low grade results, the procedure used for such aggregation should be stated and some typical examples of such aggregations should be shown in detail.</i>• <i>The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values should be clearly stated.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No details available
<i>Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>These relationships are particularly important in the reporting of Exploration Results.</i>• <i>If the geometry of the mineralisation with respect to the drill hole angle is known, its nature should be reported.</i>• <i>If it is not known and only the down hole lengths are reported, there should be a clear statement to this effect (eg 'down hole length, true width not known').</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No details available
<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">• No details available
<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">• Rock chip sampling from Heart Stop Hill satellite deposit returned values up to 119.5 g/t gold, averaging 1 g/t gold
<i>Other substantive exploration data</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Other exploration data, if meaningful and material, should be reported including (but not limited to): geological observations; geophysical survey results; geochemical survey results; bulk samples – size and method of treatment; metallurgical test results; bulk density, groundwater, geotechnical and rock characteristics; potential deleterious or contaminating substances.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No details available
<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">• It is intended that an Exploration Program will then be progressed throughout 2024 with a complete soil geochemistry survey followed by a series of drilling programs aimed at establishing a JORC compliant Resource Statement.