Table 1. Gonneville Maiden Mineral Resource Estimate (JORC Code 2012), 9 November 2021.

Domain	Cut-off Grade	Category	Mass	Grade								Contained Metal							
			(Mt)	Pd (g/t)	Pt (g/t)	Au (g/t)	Ni (%)	Cu (%)	Co (%)	NiEq (%)	PdEq (g/t)	Pd (Moz)	Pt (Moz)	Au (Moz)	Ni (kt)	Cu (kt)	Co (kt)	NiEq (kt)	PdEq (Moz)
Oxide	0.9g/t Pd	Indicated																	
		Inferred	8.8	1.8		0.06					1.9	0.51		0.02					0.52
		Subtotal	**8.8**	**1.8**		**0.06**					**1.9**	**0.51**		**0.02**					**0.52**
Sulphide (Transitional)	0.4% NiEq	Indicated	7.7	0.68	0.16	0.03	0.18	0.11	0.019	0.60	1.6	0.17	0.04	0.01	14	8.1	1.5	46	0.40
		Inferred	8.0	0.97	0.25	0.03	0.17	0.14	0.029	0.79	2.1	0.25	0.06	0.01	14	11	2.3	63	0.55
		Subtotal	**16**	**0.83**	**0.20**	**0.03**	**0.18**	**0.12**	**0.024**	**0.70**	**1.9**	**0.42**	**0.10**	**0.02**	**27**	**19**	**3.8**	**110**	**0.95**
Sulphide (Fresh)	0.4% NiEq	Indicated	150	0.74	0.18	0.03	0.16	0.10	0.016	0.61	1.6	3.5	0.82	0.14	240	150	23	890	7.7
		Inferred	160	0.69	0.16	0.02	0.16	0.10	0.016	0.58	1.6	3.6	0.82	0.12	270	160	26	940	8.2
		Subtotal	**310**	**0.72**	**0.17**	**0.03**	**0.16**	**0.10**	**0.016**	**0.59**	**1.6**	**7.1**	**1.6**	**0.26**	**510**	**310**	**49**	**1,800**	**16**
All		Indicated	150	0.74	0.17	0.03	0.17	0.10	0.016	0.61	1.6	3.7	0.86	0.15	250	160	25	930	8.1
		Inferred	180	0.76	0.15	0.03	0.16	0.09	0.016	0.56	1.6	4.4	0.89	0.15	280	170	28	1,000	9.3
		Total	**330**	**0.75**	**0.16**	**0.03**	**0.16**	**0.10**	**0.016**	**0.58**	**1.6**	**8.1**	**1.7**	**0.30**	**530**	**330**	**53**	**1,900**	**17**

Note some numerical differences may occur due to rounding to 2 significant figures.
NiEq (%) = Ni (%) + 0.37 x Pd (g/t) + 0.24 x Pt (g/t) + 0.25 x Au (g/t) + 0.65 x Cu (%) + 3.24 x Co (%).
PdEq (g/t) = Pd (g/t) + 0.66 x Pt (g/t) + 0.67 x Au (g/t) + 2.71 x Ni (%) + 1.76 x Cu (%) + 8.78 x Co (%).
Includes drill holes drilled up to and including 31 July 2021.

Table 2. Higher-grade sulphide component of Gonneville Resource, 9 November 2021.

Domain	Cut-off Grade	Category	Mass	Grade								Contained Metal							
			(Mt)	Pd (g/t)	Pt (g/t)	Au (g/t)	Ni (%)	Cu (%)	Co (%)	NiEq (%)	PdEq (g/t)	Pd (Moz)	Pt (Moz)	Au (Moz)	Ni (kt)	Cu (kt)	Co (kt)	NiEq (kt)	PdEq (Moz)
High-grade Sulphide (Transitional)	0.60% NiEq	Indicated	1.8	1.2	0.28	0.05	0.27	0.19	0.030	1.0	2.8	0.07	0.02	0	4.9	3.4	0.55	18	0.16
		Inferred	3.8	1.5	0.39	0.05	0.21	0.19	0.044	1.1	3.0	0.18	0.05	0.01	7.9	7.2	1.7	42	0.37
		Subtotal	**5.6**	**1.4**	**0.35**	**0.05**	**0.23**	**0.19**	**0.040**	**1.1**	**3.0**	**0.25**	**0.06**	**0.01**	**13**	**11**	**2.2**	**61**	**0.53**
High-grade Sulphide (Fresh)	0.60% NiEq	Indicated	36	1.4	0.35	0.07	0.21	0.21	0.019	1.0	2.8	1.6	0.40	0.08	76	76	6.9	370	3.2
		Inferred	32	1.3	0.30	0.06	0.22	0.21	0.019	1.0	2.7	1.4	0.32	0.06	73	67	6.3	320	2.8
		Subtotal	**68**	**1.4**	**0.33**	**0.06**	**0.22**	**0.21**	**0.019**	1.0	2.8	**3.0**	**0.72**	**0.14**	**150**	**140**	**13**	**700**	**6.0**
All	0.60% NiEq	Indicated	38	1.4	0.35	0.07	0.22	0.21	0.020	1.0	2.8	1.7	0.42	0.08	81	80	7.4	390	3.4
		Inferred	36	1.4	0.31	0.06	0.22	0.21	0.022	1.0	2.8	1.6	0.36	0.06	80	74	8.0	370	3.2
		Total	**74**	**1.4**	**0.33**	**0.06**	**0.22**	**0.21**	**0.021**	**1.0**	**2.8**	**3.3**	**0.78**	**0.15**	**160**	**150**	**15**	**760**	**6.6**

Note some numerical differences may occur due to rounding to 2 significant figures.
This higher-grade component is contained within the reported global Mineral Resource.
NiEq (%) = Ni (%) + 0.37 x Pd (g/t) + 0.24 x Pt (g/t) + 0.25 x Au (g/t) + 0.65 x Cu (%) + 3.24 x Co (%).
PdEq (g/t) = Pd (g/t) + 0.66 x Pt (g/t) + 0.67 x Au (g/t) + 2.71 x Ni (%) + 1.76 x Cu (%) + 8.78 x Co (%).
Includes drill holes drilled up to and including 31 July 2021.

Appendix A JORC Table 1

A-1 Section 1 Sampling Techniques and Data

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Sampling techniques	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.	• HQ core was quarter cored and NQ2 was half cored with samples taken over selective intervals ranging from 0.2m to 1.2m (typically 1.0m). • Reverse Circulation (RC) drilling samples were collected as 1m samples. • Aircore (AC) drilling samples were collected as 1m samples.
	Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample representivity and the appropriate calibration of any measurement tools or systems used.	• Qualitative care taken when sampling diamond drill core to sample the same half of the drill core. • For RC, two 1m assay samples were collected as a split from the rig cyclone using a cone splitter with the same split consistently sent to the laboratory for analysis. • For AC, one 1m assay sample was collected as a split from the rig cyclone using a cone splitter with the same split consistently sent to the laboratory for analysis.
	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.	• Mineralisation is easily recognised by the presence of sulphides. In diamond core sample intervals were selected on a qualitative assessment of sulphide content
Drilling techniques	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).	• Drilling has been undertaken by diamond, Reverse Circulation (RC) and Aircore (AC) techniques. • Diamond drill core is predominantly HQ size (63.5mm diameter). Limited NQ2 (47.6mm diameter) drilling has also been completed. Triple tube has been used from surface until competent bedrock and then standard tube thereafter. • Core orientation is by an ACT Reflex (ACT II RD) tool • RC Drilling uses a face-sampling hammer drill bit with a diameter of 5.5 inches (140mm).

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		• AC drilling used a bladed 100mm bit and was only used in the oxide
Drill sample recovery	Method of recording and assessing core and chip sample recoveries and results assessed.	• Individual recoveries of diamond drill core samples were assessed quantitively by comparing measured core length with expected core length from drillers mark. Generally core recovery was excellent in fresh rock and approaching 100%. Core recovery in oxide material is often poor due to sample washing out. Core recovery in the oxide zone averages 60% • Individual recoveries for RC composite samples were recorded on a qualitative basis. Sample weights were observed to be slightly lower through transported cover whereas drilling through bedrock yielded samples with more consistent weights. Two separate studies were completed where all the sample was weighed and compared with the expected weight. These indicated that as with the diamond core, sample recovery in the oxide is moderate and good in the fresh rock • Individual recoveries for AC composite samples were recorded on a qualitative basis. Bag weighing was completed on every 5th hole to verify the recovery and provide a basis on which to estimate the sample recovery in other holes.
	Measures taken to maximise sample recovery and ensure representative nature of the samples.	• With diamond drilling triple tube coring in the oxide zone is undertaken to improve sample recovery. This results in better recoveries but recovery is still only moderate to good • Diamond core samples were consistently taken from the same side of the core and RC samples were consistently taken from the same split on the cyclone • AC drilling was focused on sample recovery by using low air pressure. Bag weighing was completed on every 5th hole to verify the recovery
	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.	• There is no evidence of a sample recovery and grade relationship in unweathered material. • A program of aircore drilling which focused on sample recovery returned slightly higher grades on average than adjacent RC and diamond samples suggesting that there may be some minor loss of Pd mineralisation in the fine material when sample recovery is poor. However, overall it is unlikely to

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		have a material impact on the Resource
Logging	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.	• All drill holes were logged geologically including, but not limited to; weathering, regolith, lithology, structure, texture, alteration and mineralisation. Logging was at an appropriate quantitative standard for infill drilling and resource estimation.
	Whether logging is qualitative or quantitative in nature. Core (or costean, channel, etc) photography.	• Logging is considered qualitative in nature. • Diamond drill core is photographed wet before cutting.
	The total length and percentage of the relevant intersections logged.	• All holes were geologically logged in full.
Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation	If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all core taken.	• Diamond core was sawn in half and one-half quartered and sampled over 0.2-1.2m intervals (mostly 1m).
	If non-core, whether riffled, tube sampled, rotary split, etc and whether sampled wet or dry.	• RC assay samples were collected as two 1m splits from the rig cyclone via a cone splitter. The cone splitter was horizontal to ensure sample representivity. Wet or damp samples were noted in the sample logging sheet. A majority of samples were dry. • AC assay samples were collected as 1m splits from the rig cyclone via a cone splitter. The cone splitter was horizontal to ensure sample representivity. Wet or damp samples were noted in the sample logging sheet. There was a higher percentage of wet samples than in the RC drilling, but a review of the assay results do not indicate any downhole smearing of samples
	For all sample types, the nature, quality and appropriateness of the sample preparation technique.	• Sample preparation is industry standard and comprises oven drying, jaw crushing and pulverising to -75 microns (80% pass).
	Quality control procedures adopted for all sub-sampling stages to maximise representivity of samples.	• Field duplicates were collected from AC, RC and diamond drilling at an approximate ratio of one in twenty five. • Diamond drill core field duplicates collected as ¼ core. • RC Field duplicates were collected from selected sulphide zones as a second 1m split directly from the cone splitter. • AC field duplicates were selected randomly from the bulk sample.
	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.	• In the majority of cases the entire hole has been sampled and assayed. • Duplicate sample results were compared with the original sample

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		results and there is no bias observed in the data.
	Whether sample sizes are appropriate to the grain size of the material being sampled.	• Drill sample sizes are considered appropriate for the style of mineralisation sought and the nature of the drilling program.
Quality of assay data and laboratory tests	The nature, quality and appropriateness of the assaying and laboratory procedures used and whether the technique is considered partial or total.	• Diamond drill core, RC and AC samples underwent sample preparation and geochemical analysis by ALS Perth. Au-Pt-Pd was analysed by 50g fire assay fusion with an ICP-AES finish (ALS Method code PGM-ICP24). A 48-element suite was analysed by ICP-MS following a four-acid digest (ALS method code ME-MS61) for holes up to and including JD023 and JRC122. Later holes including all AC holes were analysed using four-acid digest for 34 elements (ALS method code ME-ICP61) including Ag, Al, As, Ba, Be, Bi, Ca, Cd, Co, Cr, Cu, Fe, Ga, K, La, Mg, Mn, Mo, Na, Ni, P, Pb, S, Sb, Sc, Sr, Th, Ti, Tl, U, V, W, Zn, Zr. Additional ore-grade analysis was performed as required for elements reporting out of range for Ni, Cr, Cu (ALS method code ME-OG-62) and Pd, Pt (ALS method code PGM-ICP27). • These techniques are considered total digests.
	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.	• Not applicable as no such tools or instruments were used
	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.	• Certified analytical standards and blanks were inserted at appropriate intervals for diamond, RC and AC drill samples with an insertion rate of >5%. Approximately 5% of significant intercepts were sent for cross laboratory checks. All QAQC samples display results within acceptable levels of accuracy and precision.
Verification of sampling and assaying	The verification of significant intersections by either independent or alternative company personnel.	• Significant drill intersections are checked by the Project Geologist and then by the General Manager Development. Significant intersections are cross-checked with the logged geology and drill core after final assays are received.
	The use of twinned holes.	• Six sets of twinned holes (RC versus Diamond) have been drilled to provide a comparison between grade/thickness variations over a 5m separation between drill holes.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		• Only Palladium assays have been analysed as part of this twin hole comparison. Ni and Cu grades are very low level in the selected holes (~0.1 – 0.2% Ni and <0.1% Cu), so no meaningful correlation can be obtained. • Intervals correlate well between holes although in detail there is variation between them for higher grade samples in terms of both location and grade. However, there is no discernible grade bias between drill types.
	Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols.	• Primary drill data was collected digitally using OCRIS software before being transferred to the master SQL database. • All procedures including data collection, verification, uploading to the database etc are captured in detailed procedures and summarised in a single document.
	Discuss any adjustment to assay data	• No adjustments were made to the lab reported assay data.
Location of data points	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.	• Diamond, RC and AC drill hole collar locations are initially recorded by Chalice employees using a handheld GPS with a +/- 3m margin of error and then picked up with an RTK-DGPS. • RTK-DGPS collar pick-ups replace handheld GPS collar pick-ups and have +/-20 mm margin of error. • Planned and final hole coordinates are compared after pick up to ensure that the original target has been tested.
	Specification of the grid system used.	• The grid system used for the location of all drill holes is GDA94 - MGA (Zone 50).
	Quality and adequacy of topographic control.	• RLs for reported holes were derived from RTK-DGPS pick-ups.
Data spacing and distribution	Data spacing for reporting of Exploration Results.	• Drill hole spacing varies from between 40m x 40 m in the south to 160m x 80m in the north and west.
	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.	• Results from the drilling to date are considered sufficient to assume geological or grade continuity appropriate for Mineral Resource estimation procedure(s) and classifications.
	Whether sample compositing has been applied.	• No compositing undertaken for diamond drill core or RC samples.
Orientation of data in relation to	Whether the orientation of sampling achieves unbiased sampling of possible structures and the extent to which this is known, considering the deposit type.	• RC and Diamond drill holes were typically oriented within 15° of orthogonal to the interpreted dip and strike of the known zone of mineralisation. However, several holes

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
geological structure		were drilled at less optimal azimuths due to site access constraints or to test for alternative mineralisation orientations.
	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.	• The orientation of the drilling is not considered to have introduced sampling bias.
Sample security	The measures taken to ensure sample security.	• Samples were collected in polyweave bags either at the drill rig (RC and AC samples) or at the core cutting facility (diamond samples). The polyweave bags have five samples each and are cable tied. • Filled bags were collected into palletised bulk bags at the field office and delivered directly from site to ALS laboratories in Wangara, Perth by a Chalice contractor several times weekly.
Audits or reviews	The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.	• CSA Global conducting a site visit and review of the sampling techniques and data as part of the Resource. • SRK completed an independent assurance review of the Chalice and CSA Global procedures including documentation and appropriateness of methods employed.

A-2 Section 2 Reporting of Exploration Results

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Mineral tenement and land tenure status	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.	• Exploration activities are ongoing over E70/5118 and 5119 and the tenements are in good standing. The holder CGM (WA) Pty Ltd is a wholly owned subsidiary of Chalice Mining Limited with no known encumbrances.
	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.	• Current drilling is on private land all of which is owned by the Company. • E70/5119 partially overlaps ML1SA, a State Agreement covering Bauxite mineral rights only.
Exploration done by other parties	Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.	• There is no previous exploration at Gonneville and only limited exploration has been completed by other exploration parties in the vicinity of the targets identified by Chalice to date. • Chalice has compiled historical records dating back to the early 1960's which indicate only three

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		genuine explorers in the area, all primarily targeting Fe-Ti-V mineralisation. • Over 1971-1972, Garrick Agnew Pty Ltd undertook reconnaissance surface sampling over prominent aeromagnetic anomalies in a search for 'Coates deposit style' vanadium mineralisation. Surface sampling methodology is not described in detail, nor were analytical methods specified, with samples analysed for V2O5, Ni, Cu, Cr, Pb and Zn, results of which are referred to in this announcement. • Three diamond holes were completed by Bestbet Pty Ltd targeting Fe-Ti-V situated approximately 3km NE of JRC001. No elevated Ni-Cu-PGE assays were reported. • Bestbet Pty Ltd undertook 27 stream sediment samples within E70/5119. Elevated levels of palladium were noted in the coarse fraction (-5mm+2mm) are reported in this release. Finer fraction samples did not replicate the coarse fraction results. • A local AMAG survey was flown in 1996 by Alcoa using 200m line spacing which has been used by Chalice for targeting purposes.
Geology	Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.	• The target deposit type is an orthomagmatic Ni-Cu-PGE sulphide deposit, within the Yilgarn Craton. The style of sulphide mineralisation intersected consists of massive, matrix, stringer and disseminated sulphides typical of metamorphosed and structurally overprinted orthomagmatic Ni sulphide deposits.
Drill hole Information	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: 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.	• Not applicable for this report. No previously unreleased exploration results included.
	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	• No material information has been excluded.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	Competent Person should clearly explain why this is the case.	
Data aggregation methods	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.	• Significant intercepts are reported using a >0.3g/t Pd length-weighted cut off. A maximum of 4m internal dilution has been applied.
	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.	• Higher grade intervals are reported using a >1.0g/t Pd and >1.0g/t Pd & >0.5% Ni+Cu length-weighted cut off. A maximum of 2m internal dilution has been applied.
	The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values should be clearly stated.	• Metal price assumptions used in the metal equivalent calculations are: US$1,700/oz Pd, US$1,300/oz Pt, US$1,700/oz Au, US$18,500/t Ni, US$9,000/t Cu, US$60,000/t Co. • Metallurgical recovery assumptions used in the metal equivalent calculation for the oxide material are: Pd – 75%, Au – 95%. • Hence for the oxide material PdEq (g/t) = Pd (g/t) + 1.27 x Au (g/t). • Metallurgical recovery assumptions used in the metal equivalent calculation for the sulphide (fresh) material are: Pd – 75%, Pt – 65%, Au – 50%, Ni – 60%, Cu – 80%, Co - 60%. • Hence for the sulphide material NiEq = Ni % + 0.37x Pd g/t + 0.24 x Pt g/t + 0.25 x Au g/t + 0.65 x Cu % +3.24 x Co % and PdEq = Pd g/t + 0.66 x Pt g/t + 0.67 x Au g/t + 2.71 x Ni % + 1.76 x Cu % + 8.78 x Co %. • The volume of transitional material is small and considered unlikely to materially affect the overall metal equivalent calculation.
Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths	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.	• RC and Diamond drill holes were typically oriented within 15° of orthogonal to the interpreted dip and strike of the known zone of mineralisation. However, several holes were drilled at less optimal azimuths due to site access constraints or to test for alternative mineralisation orientations.
	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').	• All widths are quoted down-hole. True widths vary depending on the orientation of the hole and the orientation of the mineralisation. For low grade intercepts (> 0.3g/t Pd) true width approximates downhole width. For high grade intercepts (>1g/t Pd)

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		true width is generally between 80 and 100% of the downhole width.
Diagrams	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.	• Refer to figures in the body of text.
Balanced reporting	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.	• No new exploration intercepts reported.
Other substantive exploration data	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.	• Not applicable. All meaningful data relating to the Mineral Resource has been included
Further work	The nature and scale of planned further work (eg. tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling).	• Diamond and RC drilling will continue to test high-priority targets including EM conductors. Further drilling along strike and down dip may occur at these and other targets depending on results. • Scoping study work has commenced including additional metallurgical testwork, mining studies, tailings studies and waste rock characterisation etc.
	Diagrams clearly highlighting the areas of possible extensions, including the main geological interpretations and future drilling areas, provided this information is not commercially sensitive.	• Any potential extensions to mineralisation are shown in the figures in the body of the text.

A-3 Section 3 Estimation and Reporting of Mineral Resources

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Database integrity	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.	• OCRIS data logging software is used by Chalice for front end data collection and has in-built validation for all geological logging and sampling. • All logging, sampling and assay files are stored in a SQL Server database using DataShed (industry standard drill hole database management software).

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		• User access to the database is regulated by specific user permissions. Only the Database Manager can overwrite data. • All data has passed a validation process; any discrepancies have been checked by Chalice personnel before being updated in the database.
	Data validation procedures used.	• CSA Global completed numerous validations on the drill hole data extraction provided by Chalice for use in the Mineral Resource Estimate. • Absent collar data, multiple collar entries, suspect, downhole survey results, absent survey data, overlapping, intervals, negative sample lengths and sample intervals which extended beyond the hole depth defined in the collar table were reviewed. • Only minor validation errors were detected which were communicated to Chalice and corrected prior to the preparation of the Mineral Resource estimate.
Site visits	Comment on any site visits undertaken by the Competent Person and the outcome of those visits.	• A site visit to the Julimar Project was completed by Phil Jankowski (Principal Consultant, Resource Geology at CSA Global) and Aaron Green (Business Unit Managing Partner at CSA Global), on 15 September 2021, and an inspection of the ALS sample preparation and analytical laboratories on 6 September 2021. Phil Jankowski assumes Competent Person status for the Mineral Resource estimate. • During the Julimar site visit, the drilling, sampling, geological logging, density measurement and sample storage facilities, equipment and procedures were witnessed, and discussions held with Chalice representatives. The facilities and equipment were appropriate, and the procedures were well-designed and being implemented consistently. The sample preparation and analytical laboratories were well equipped and were operated to a very high standard. In the Competent Person's opinion, the geological and analytical data being produced is appropriate for use in a Mineral Resource Estimate.
	If no site visits have been undertaken indicate why this is the case.	• Not applicable (see above)
Geological interpretation	Confidence in (or conversely, the uncertainty of) the geological interpretation of the mineral deposit.	• location and orientation of the primary Ni-Cu-PGE mineralisation within the Ultramafic host unit are reasonably well understood and have been developed over the course of the drill-out phase of the project.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		• Information regarding the in-situ mineral chemistry and spatial distribution of the various mineral species within the primary Ni-Cu-PGE mineralisation is currently not available and has therefore not been incorporated into the geological interpretation for the deposit. • Geological controls on the supergene/dispersion zone material are reasonably simple and well understood. • Confidence in the orientations of the barren Dolerite dyke lithology is variable over the footprint of the deposit, due to the geological complexity shown by this lithology unit. However, volumetrically the unit is considered as having been appropriately captured in the geological interpretation. Work on improving definition of, and confidence in, the Dolerite lithology by Chalice is ongoing.
	Nature of the data used and of any assumptions made.	• Sample intercept logging and assay results from drill core form the basis for the geological interpretations. • A criterion of > 0.9ppm Pd and < 0.3% S have been used by Chalice to construct the supergene/dispersion zone mineralised zone wireframe. The logged oxide-transition boundary in the weathering profile was taken into account when developing the interpretation. A minimum intersection width of 2m was applied.
	The effect, if any, of alternative interpretations on Mineral Resource estimation.	• Alternative interpretations are likely to materially impact on the Mineral Resource estimate on a local, but not global, basis.
	The use of geology in guiding and controlling Mineral Resource estimation.	• The litho- chronological domains within the host Ultramafic unit are known to have an association with the orientation of the primary mineralisation zones. Geological interpretations for these features, along with logged sulphide content from drill hole intersections, have been incorporated into the resource estimation approach via the development of trend surfaces informing a variable search ellipse orientation strategy (Dynamic Anisotropy).
	The factors affecting continuity both of grade and geology.	• The deposit represents part of a large layered intrusion. Sulphide content and metal grade are well correlated, with higher sulphide concentration corresponding to higher metal content. • On a global scale the mineralisation displays good geological and grade continuity, which is largely governed by magmatic fractionation processes within the host intrusion. On a local scale

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		geological and grade continuity is disrupted by the presence of variably oriented barren dolerite dykes, which overprint the mineralisation.
Dimensions	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.	• The main part of the Mineral Resource extends for a strike length of approximately 1.8km. Plan width of the sub-parallel sulphide rich zones varies from 5 to 40m. Plan width of the encompassing sulphide poor zones varies from 100 to 150m. The reported Indicated Mineral Resource is within approximately 280m below surface. The reported Inferred Mineral Resource is within approximately 580m below surface.
Estimation and modelling techniques	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.	• All geological wireframe interpretations used in the Resource were constructed by Chalice using a combination of Leapfrog and Micromine software. Geological wireframes provided by Chalice include weathering, lithological, litho-chronological and supergene/dispersion zone interpretations. Block modelling and grade estimation was carried out by CSA Global using Datamine software. Statistical analysis was carried out by CSA Global using a combination of Phinar Software's X10-GEO software (version 1.4.18.19) and Snowden's Supervisor software (version 8.14.3.0). • Prior to estimation of variables below detection limit assays were assigned a positive value equal to half of the detection limit for the relevant grade variable. Intentionally unsampled intervals were retained as absent grade values. The vast majority of the intentionally unsampled intervals occur outside of the host intrusion lithology, and therefore have no bearing on the grade estimates. Absent density values have been retained as absent values, as density determinations were not taken for these intervals • All drillhole samples were flagged according to the geological domain interpretations provided by Chalice. Sample populations were statistically analysed to derive geostatistical domain groupings for Pd, Pt, Ni, Co, Cu, Au, S and density. Statistical analysis included comparison of global grade distributions, derivation of statistical correlations between grade variables and contact analysis of grade variables across the various geological domains. From analysis domains were determined for Pd/Pt, Ni/Co, Cu/Au, S and density variable groupings. Information

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		regarding the in-situ mineral chemistry of the various mineral species for the deposit is currently not available. Mineral speciation was therefore not incorporated into the definition of the geostatistical domains. • For primary Pd, Pt, Ni, Co, Cu, Au mineralisation, located within the Ultramafic intrusion, geostatistical domains for estimation were defined via a Categorical Indicator Kriging (CIK) process. In the CIK process, assays were composited to the nominal sample length of 1m, and appropriate mineralised grade threshold values selected to create indicator variables in the composited drillhole file. For the Pd/Pt variable grouping a 0.9ppm Pd threshold was determined. For the Ni/Co variable grouping a 2,500ppm Ni threshold was determined. For the Cu/Au variable grouping a 1,500ppm Cu threshold was determined. Variograms were modelled for each of the grade-based indicator variables to facilitate indicator estimation into a small-cell block model (2.5m (E) x 2.5m (N) x 2.5m (RL)) using Ordinary Kriging (OK). No transformation other than the indicator transform was applied to the data for variogram modelling. A variable search ellipse orientation strategy was implemented via Datamine Studio's Dynamic Anisotropy (DA) functionality during estimation to honour the local undulations in the mineralisation orientation. Application of DA involved creating "structural trend surfaces" in Datamine software by creating 2D DTM's from interpretation points snapped to drill hole intercepts. The DTM's were based on the litho-chronological domain wireframe interpretations, logged sulphide content, and palladium grade trends in drillhole data to inform the block search orientations. After estimation of the indicator variables a block probability limit, based on optimisation of sample misclassification, as determined from sample misclassification plots for the Pd/Pt Ni/Co and Cu/Au variable groupings, was selected to define the sulphide rich (high grade) zones and the sulphide poor (low grade) zones in the model cells. The sulphide rich (high grade) and sulphide poor (low grade) model cells were then used to select and code the composited drillhole data to create matching domaining in blocks and samples for the Pd/Pt, Ni/Co and Cu/Au variable groupings. Resolution of the

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		small-cell block model was then reset to a larger parent cell size (20m(E) x 20m(N) x 10m(RL)) suitable for subsequent grade estimation, with the final model being sub-blocked (2.5m(E) x 2.5m(N) x 2.5m(RL)) to honour the respective sulphide rich (high grade) and the sulphide poor (low grade) coding created during the CIK process. • For secondary mineralisation, located within the weathering profile, geostatistical domains for estimation were defined based on the geological wireframes represented by the supergene/dispersion zone and base of transported and base of oxidation wireframe interpretations. Pd, Pt, Ni, Co, Cu, Au and S have all been estimated based on the geological wireframes represented by the lithological and weathering interpretations, and no further sub-domaining, i.e,. CIK, has taken place in the weathering profile. • Once geostatistical domains for grade estimation were defined, composited drill hole sample populations were statistically analysed to derive grade capping values. Contact analysis of grade variable distributions across the sulphide rich (high grade) and the sulphide poor (low grade) domain codes indicates that sample sharing across the respective domain boundaries is not warranted, and all geostatistical domains have "hard" boundaries for data analysis and estimation. After application of capping values were applied variograms were modelled from the capped composite data for each of the grade variables. A normal scores transform was applied for variogram modelling, with a back-transform to real space applied before using the variogram models in grade estimation. Quantitative kriging neighbourhood analysis (KNA) was undertaken to assess the effect of changing key kriging neighbourhood parameters on block grade estimates in order to develop the estimation search plan. Kriging efficiency and slope of regression were determined for a range of block sizes, minimum/maximum samples, search ellipse dimensions and block discretisation grids. • Estimation of Pd, Pt, Ni, Co, Cu, Au and S was subsequently undertaken by OK for the primary and secondary mineralisation. Estimation of density was restricted to the primary mineralisation within the host Ultramafic intrusion. A variable search ellipse orientation

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		strategy was implemented via Datamine Studio's DA functionality during grade estimation to honour the local undulations in the mineralisation orientation. The variable search ellipse orientations used for grade estimation correspond to the orientations applied in the CIK domaining process. A three-pass search ellipse strategy was adopted whereby search ellipses were progressively increased if search criteria could not select sufficient data for the block estimate. Initial search ellipse dimensions were set to honour the maximum variogram ranges determined in the three principal directions for each grade variable. Search ellipse expansion for second and third pass interpolations were set to two times and four times the initial search ellipse ranges respectively. Maximum samples per drillhole restrictions have been applied to limit across strike smearing of estimated grades as search volume pass increases. • QKNA estimation search plans determined: • Primary mineralisation Pd/Pt, Ni/Co, Cu/Au and S- A minimum of 12 and maximum of 24 samples per estimate into a parent block size 20m(E) x 20m(N) x 10m(RL). Maximum number of samples per drillhole of 8. Search pass ellipse size equal to the variogram ranges. Block discretisation scheme 4pts(E) x 4pts(N) x 2pts(RL). • Primary mineralisation density - A minimum of 8 and maximum of 16 samples per estimate into a parent block size 20m(E) x 20m(N) x 10m(RL). Maximum number of samples per drillhole of 6. Search pass ellipse size equal to the variogram ranges. Block discretisation scheme 4pts(E) x 4pts(N) x 2pts(RL). • Secondary mineralisation Pd, Pt, Ni, Co, Cu, Au - A minimum of 12 and maximum of 24 samples per estimate into a parent block size 20m(E) x 20m(N) x 10m(RL). Maximum number of samples per drillhole of 8. Search pass ellipse size equal to the variogram range. Block discretisation scheme 4pts(E) x 4pts(N) x 2pts(RL). • Secondary mineralisation S - A minimum of 12 and maximum of 16 samples per estimate into a parent block size 20m(E) x 20m(N) x 10m(RL). Maximum number of samples per drillhole of 8. Search pass ellipse size equal to the variogram range. Block discretisation scheme 4pts(E) x 4pts(N) x 2pts(RL).

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		• For Pd, Pt, Ni, Co, Cu, Au and S un-estimated blocks have been assigned default grades of half detection limit for each grade variable. For bulk density, un-estimated blocks within the Ultramafic intrusion have been assigned a default value equal to the average value of the capped composite sample data for the relevant domain. For domains other than the Ultramafic intrusion, where density was not estimated, a default density value equal to the average density of the capped composite sample data for the relevant domain has been applied. • Final block values for Pd, Pt, Ni, Co, Cu, Au, S and density were validated by way of visual review of plans and cross sections (block model and drill samples presented with same colour legend), swath plots, and comparison of estimation domain mean grades with the input grade distribution data.
	The availability of check estimates, previous estimates and/or mine production records and whether the Mineral Resource estimate takes appropriate account of such data.	• No previous Mineral Resource estimates reported in accordance with the JORC Code were available for comparison. • No previous mining has taken place at the project, and production data is not available to reconcile against the block model estimates. • In addition to CSA Global internal QAQC process, a check estimate was completed by Cube Consulting on a previous grade-tonnage estimate (not prepared for reporting under the JORC Code) but not the current MRE.
	The assumptions made regarding recovery of by-products.	• Gonneville is a polymetallic deposit, and the assumption based on metallurgical testwork to date has been made that all reported constituents are recovered and are able to be sold.
	Estimation of deleterious elements or other non-grade variables of economic significance (eg. sulphur for acid mine drainage characterisation).	• Sulphur has been estimated as part of the Mineral Resource estimate • No deleterious variables have been estimated but to date there are no indications of any deleterious elements in concentrate samples.
	In the case of block model interpolation, the block size in relation to the average sample spacing and the search employed.	• A 20m E x 20m N x 10m RL parent cell size was used for grade estimation. Infill drilling has been undertaken to approximately 40m spacing in the upper section of the deposit. The block size therefore represents approximately half the drillhole spacing.
	Any assumptions behind modelling of selective mining units.	• No assumptions have been made regarding selective mining units.
	Any assumptions about correlation between variables.	• No assumptions were made regarding correlation between variables.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	Description of how the geological interpretation was used to control the resource estimates.	• The litho- chronological domains within the host Ultramafic unit are known to have an association with the orientation of the primary mineralisation zones. Geological interpretations for these features, along with logged sulphide content from drill hole intersections, have been incorporated into the resource estimation approach via the development of trend surfaces informing a variable search ellipse orientation strategy (Dynamic Anisotropy). • The geological interpretation for the supergene/dispersion zone has been used to constrain the resource estimate for the reported weathering zone material. a variable search ellipse orientation strategy (Dynamic Anisotropy) was employed to capture local undulations in the supergene/dispersion zone during grade estimation.
	Discussion of basis for using or not using grade cutting or capping.	• The need for grade capping was assessed for all estimated variables on a per geostatistical domain basis prior to estimation. • Histograms and log-probability plots were used to review composited sample grade distributions graphically. Additionally, a visual inspection was carried out in Datamine for potential clustering of very high-grade sample data prior to selecting a capping value. • Capping values, where deemed necessary, were applied to the composited sample grades.
	The process of validation, the checking process used, the comparison of model data to drill hole data, and use of reconciliation data if available.	• Final block values for Pd, Pt, Ni, Co, Cu, Au, S and density were validated by way of visual review of plans and cross sections (block model and drill samples presented with same colour legend), swath plots, and comparison of estimation domain mean grades with the input grade distribution data. The block model reflected the tenor of the grades in the drillhole samples both globally and locally. • No previous mining has taken place at the project, and production data is not available to reconcile against the block model estimates.
Moisture	Whether the tonnages are estimated on a dry basis or with natural moisture, and the method of determination of the moisture content.	• Tonnages are estimated on a dry basis. No moisture data is available.
Cut-off parameters	The basis of the adopted cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied.	• Any oxide block within the optimisation pit shell above a palladium cut-off of 0.9 g/t is considered as Mineral Resource.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		• Any transitional or fresh block within the optimised pit shell above a nickel equivalent cut-off of 0.4% is considered as Mineral Resource.
Mining factors or assumptions	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.	• This Mineral Resource estimate is based on conventional drill, blast, load, and haul mining methods. • The pit optimisations prepared to support reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction had appropriate mining dilution and ore loss applied. • The Mineral Resource estimate is reported without mining dilution or ore loss.
Metallurgical factors or assumptions	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.	• Metallurgical test work on oxide material conducted includes: • Detailed QEMSCAN and XRD mineralogy on composites. • Approximately 60 laboratory batch leach tests using a variety of reagent suites to assess potential extraction. • Metallurgical test work on sulphide material conducted includes: • Detailed QEMSCAN and XRD mineralogy on 12 composites and a further 4 sets of mineralogy of flotation test products. • Comminution testing includes 12 SMC SAG milling tests plus 48 Ball Mill Work Indices. • Flotation testwork on a suite of six ore type composites and four mining composites comprising over 130 individual tests, including 9 locked cycle tests (LCT). • These composite samples are focussed on the higher grade zones of the deposit and only limited work has been undertaken on lower grade, especially disseminated, ore types. • LCT results were used as a basis for estimating metallurgical recovery. • Recovery of intermediate products (enriched Cu/PGE concentrate and Ni/Co MHP) from concentrate enrichment of low grade nickel concentrates has been estimated using pilot plant data from similar projects; scouting test work is currently underway. • The base case assumption is for sequential flotation to produce copper and nickel concentrates. A saleable copper concentrate is readily achievable even from very low Cu head grades. A saleable nickel concentrate

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		has been produced in tests at low head grades. Palladium recovery was predominantly into the copper concentrate. Cobalt is mineralogically associated with nickel and can be assumed to behave in a similar manner. • Metallurgical recoveries used in the pit optimisation are based on testwork completed to date. Recovery algorithms calculated for each element were used as inputs into the pit optimisation. • For the purposes of metal equivalent calculations, metallurgical recovery assumptions for the oxide material are: Pd – 75%, Au – 95% and for sulphide are: Pd – 75%, Pt – 65%, Au – 50%, Ni – 60%, Cu – 80%, Co - 60%.
Environmental factors or assumptions	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.	• This is the maiden Resource for the Julimar Project and the project is at a very early stage. Hence environmental considerations for potential mining have not yet been evaluated in detail. At this stage Chalice is unaware of any specific environmental issues that would preclude potential eventual economic extraction, subject to government approvals.
Bulk density	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.	• Sample density determinations were carried out using the water displacement method. • Incompetent oxide core samples from the weathering profile are wax-coated prior to density determination. • Density standards are employed in the density determination process. • Sample density determinations were carried out on all fresh rock core samples, and representative oxide samples resulting in ~80% of total drilled diamond core intervals having had density determinations completed.
	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.	• Incompetent oxide core samples are wax-coated prior to density determination.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	Discuss assumptions for bulk density estimates used in the evaluation process of the different materials.	• Sample density determinations were used to assign a bulk density value to the block model using a combination of assignment by geostatistical domain, and spatial estimation from density determinations from de-surveyed drillholes. • Model tonnages are subsequently estimated on a dry basis.
Classification	The basis for the classification of the Mineral Resources into varying confidence categories.	• The Resource has been classified following due consideration of all criteria contained in Section 1, Section 2 and Section 3 of JORC Code 2012 Table 1. The Resource has been classified as either Indicated or Inferred based on data quality, sample spacing, mineralisation continuity, confidence in the geological interpretations, quality of the grade estimations and metallurgical processing knowledge. No Measured material has been defined for the maiden Resource. • Primary mineralisation within the host Ultramafic intrusion has been classified as a combination of Indicated and Inferred. Indicated and Inferred wireframe volumes were developed from sectional interpretation strings, and model cells then coded with Resource Classification codes directly from the wireframe volumes. • All fresh and transitional material within the Ultramafic intrusion informed by a reasonably consistent drill spacing of 80 m has been classified as Inferred. The selection of an 80 m drill spacing distance for Inferred was based on: • The drill spacing corresponds to the nominal exploration drill hole spacing used for the deposit. • An 80m drill spacing is considered by the Competent Person as being sufficient to imply, but not verify, geological and grade continuity for the deposit style. • All fresh and transitional material within the Ultramafic intrusion informed by a consistent drill spacing of 40 m has been classified as Indicated. The selection of a 40 m drill spacing distance for Indicated was based on: • Results from a simulation-based drill hole spacing study carried out for the deposit indicating that the resource definition drill-out be conducted on a 40 m x 40 m drill spacing. • Variogram ranges of the main economic grade variable, Pd, indicating that grade continuity does not exceed 55m within the sulphide-rich zones.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		• Estimation quality metrics, such as slope of regression and kriging efficiency, decrease rapidly in the sulphide-rich zones towards drill spacings approaching the nominal 80m exploration drill hole spacing. • A 40m drill spacing is considered by the Competent Person as being sufficient to allow estimation of the deposit physical characteristics with sufficient confidence to allow the application of Modifying Factors in sufficient detail to support mine planning and evaluation of the economic viability of the deposit. • Secondary mineralisation constrained within the supergene/dispersion zone domain in the weathering profile has been classified as Inferred. The Inferred classification has been assigned directly to the model cells based on the supergene/dispersion zone domain code in the block model. While the supergene/dispersion zone material is reasonably well drilled, approaching a regular 40m drill spacing, details regarding processing requirements and metallurgy performance for this material are still to be finalised. In the opinion of the competent person, this material should remain classified as Inferred until such time as the metallurgical processing knowledge is more complete.
	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).	• Appropriate account has been taken of all relevant criteria including data quality, sample spacing, mineralisation continuity, confidence in the geological interpretations, quality of the grade estimations and metallurgical processing knowledge.
	Whether the result appropriately reflects the Competent Person's view of the deposit.	• The Mineral Resource appropriately reflects the Competent Person's views of the deposit.
Audits or reviews	The results of any audits or reviews of Mineral Resource estimates.	• In addition to CSA Global internal checks, a check estimate was completed by Cube Consulting on a previous grade-tonnage estimate (not prepared for reporting under the JORC Code) but not the current Resource. A review of inputs, assumptions and estimation methodology was completed by SRK prior to completion and reporting of the Resource.
Discussion of relative accuracy/ confidence	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	• The Mineral Resource accuracy is communicated through the classification assigned to this Mineral Resource. The Resource has been classified in accordance with the JORC

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	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.	Code (2012 Edition) using a qualitative approach. • All factors that have been considered have been adequately communicated in Section 1 and Section 3 of this table.
	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.	• The Mineral Resource statement relates to a global tonnage and grade estimate. Grade estimates have been made for each block in the block model.
	These statements of relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate should be compared with production data, where available.	• No previous mining has taken place at the project, and production data is not available to reconcile against the block model estimates.