R3D Resources Limited | ACN: 111 398 040 | ASX: R3D
169 Blues Point Road, McMahons Point NSW 2060 Australia | Tel: +61 2 9392 8032

21 July 2021

Maria Clemente
Adviser, Listings Compliance (Sydney)
ASX Compliance
20 Bridge Street,
Sydney NSW 2000

R3D Resources Limited (R3D) – Re-Admission Conditions

In regard to your letter of 8 July 2021, we respond to the matters raised concerning the Independent Geologist's Report as follows:

In satisfaction of Paragraph 1.11.12 of your letter, we provide additional context around, and clarifying the intent of the following statement made in relation to the estimated supergene copper resource on page 171 of the Prospectus (in section 2.5.4 of the Independent Geologist's Report):

> In SRK's opinion, the data provided by TNA lacks sufficient detail to fully appraise the current Mineral Resource. No geological logging information was supplied to validate the definition of the oxidised mineralisation, nor was the approach detailed in the BMS Mineral Resource report (BMS, November 2020). No topography was supplied to validate the impact and relation of the existing pit to the current Mineral Resources.
>
> Therefore, pending additional detail, for this IGR SRK provides supplementary commentary for the Tartana oxide prospect as part of the previously defined Exploration Target (refer to Section 2.6.1).

The following statement was provided by the Independent Geologist, who has consented to the release of the statement:

> The previous statement refers to the fact that SRK has not verified the supergene Resource, which has been estimated by Geoff Reed (BMS) and Tom Saunders, both of whom are Competent Persons under JORC 2012 Guidelines. SRK is not stating that the Resource is not present, merely that it has not been supplied with a level of information to perform validation and verification procedures in order to give an independent opinion on the Resource estimate. The supergene Resource is very small and occurs within a much larger, previously defined Exploration Target. Given its small size, the supergene Resource is not considered material when compared to the size of the Exploration Target, which is a focus of Tartana's initial 2-year exploration program. Tartana's exploration program and budget includes "infill drilling within the current open cut to upgrade the exposed supergene zone to mineable status" and "shallow drilling northwest and north of the current open cut to proof up additional oxide resources.

In satisfaction of Paragraph 1.11.13 of your letter, we provide the following information required by sections 1 and 2 of Table 1 of the JORC Code for the assays obtained using portable x-ray fluorescence as described in section 2.5.2 of the Independent Geologist's Report on page 167 of the Prospectus:

> In 2020 Tartana conducted a soil sampling orientation programme which involved the collection of 296 soil geochemical analyses using a portable X-ray fluorescence (pXRF) (INNOB -X Delta High Sensitivity XRF) at 20 m spacing along eight NE/SW orientated lines; each line was separated by approximately 100 m. The pXRF was held directly on the soil after removing 2 cm of organic material. The programme was designed for geochemical orientation as well as identify broad geochemical trends across the Valentino area.

This information has now been included JORC (2012) Table 1, Section 1 describing Sampling Techniques and Data and Table 2 describing the Reporting of Exploration Results which are presented below. It replaces the JORC (2012) Tables 1 & 2 in the Independent Geologist's Review Appendix A, Pages 13-42 in the Prospectus.

R3D Resources Limited

Stephen B Bartrop
Managing Director

Authorised by the Managing Director and Company Secretary.

CONSENT

SRK has consented in writing to the inclusion of these amendments to the Independent Technical (Geologist's) Report on the Tartana Projects in which R3D Resources has an interest in the form and context in which it appears and have not withdrawn that consent.

Section 1 Sampling Techniques and Data

(Criteria in this section apply to all succeeding sections.)

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Sampling techniques	▪ Nature and quality of sampling (e.g. cut channels, random chips, or specific specialised industry standard measurement tools appropriate to the minerals under investigation, such as downhole 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 (e.g. '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 (e.g. submarine nodules) may warrant disclosure of detailed information.	**Tartana Project:** Sampling of historical 1960s and 1970s reverse circulation (RC) holes was generally in 3 feet increments and sampling of drill core was generally in 10 feet or 30 feet increments. No duplicates, standards or blanks are known to have been used. Sampling of historical 1990s drill core was generally done at 1 m intervals. No duplicates, standards or blanks are known. Details of the sampling of 1990s RC drilling is generally not known. The use of duplicates, standards or blanks is not known. Sample weight of historical sampling is unknown. Sampling of 2006 RC holes was generally in 1 m intervals. The use of duplicates, standards or blanks is not known. Sampling of 2009–2012 drill core was generally in 1 m intervals; the use of duplicates, standards or blanks is not known. In 2020 Tartana conducted a soil sampling orientation programme which involved the collection of 296 soil geochemical analyses using a portable X-ray fluorescence (pXRF) (INNOB -X Delta High Sensitivity XRF) at 20 m spacing along eight NE/SW orientated lines; each line was separated by approximately 100 m. The pXRF was held directly on the soil after removing 2 cm of organic material. The programme was designed for geochemical orientation as well as identify broad geochemical trends across the Valentino area. **Tasmanian Zinc Project:** Pyrosmelt NL completed 36 vertical air core (AC) drillholes in 1991. Samples were collected at 1 m intervals downhole and analysed for zinc. No details on sampling techniques used are provided. In 2019 TNA completed a drilling program of 7 vertical AC drillholes. Samples were collected at 1 m intervals downhole. Samples were logged and sent to ALS (Burnie) for assay and weighing to check core recovery and representivity of samples. The TNA program supplemented as well as provided verification of the earlier drilling program conducted by Pyrosmelt. **Mount Hess Project:** Drill samples were logged and sampled generally in 1 m increments. Multi-element assay used ICO41 aqua regia digest and gold assay was by 50 g fire

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		assay. QA/QC supports ALS laboratory values. Core was lithologically logged, geotechnically logged, structural measurements taken, photographed wet and dry, with magnetic susceptibility and specific gravity measurements recorded. **Amber Creek Project:** No exploration drilling completed. **Dimbulah Copper Project:** Sampling of historical 1972 drill core was generally in 1-3 m increments using geological control. No duplicates, standards or blanks are known to have been used. Sampling of historical 1983 RC drilling was consistently done at 2 m intervals. No duplicates, standards or blanks are known. Sampling of historical 1990s RC drilling was consistently done at 3m intervals. The use of duplicates, standards or blanks is not known. Sample weight of historical sampling is unknown. **Bellevue Copper Project:** Sampling of historical 1972 RC and drill core holes was generally in 5 feet increments. No duplicates, standards or blanks are known to have been used. Sampling and logging of historical 1989 RC drilling was consistently done at 1 m intervals. No duplicates, standards or blanks are known. Sampling of historical 1995 RC drilling was consistently done at 2 m intervals. The use of duplicates, standards or blanks is not known. Sampling of historical mid 2000s core drilling was consistently done at 1m intervals. The use of duplicates, standards or blanks is not known. Sample weight of historical sampling is unknown.
Drilling techniques	▪ Drill type (e.g. core, reverse circulation, open-hole hammer, rotary air blast, auger, Bangka, sonic, etc.) and details (e.g. 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.).	Details of the drilling techniques used are shown in the table preceding this section. Details of the core and drillhole diameters are yet to be determined. **Tartana Project:** Historical drilling: Surface drilling involved diamond drilling (DD), RC and rotary air blast (RAB). The average depth of diamond holes was 200 m, average depth of RC holes was 50 m and average depth of RAB holes was 20 m. No core orientation was carried out. **Zeehan Project:** 36 vertical AC drillholes were completed by Pyrosmelt (1992) and 7 vertical AC drillholes were completed by TNA (2019).

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		Mount Hess Project: A total of 20 angled drillholes; 2,439 m RC drilling and 468 m of DD holes. No core orientation was carried out. **Dimbulah Copper Project:** A total of 50 drillholes; 2,137 m RC drilling in 45 holes and 654 m of the 5 DD holes. No core orientation was carried out. **Bellevue Copper Project:** A total of 48 drillholes; 816m RC drilling in 22 holes and 6,142m of the 26 DD holes. No core orientation was carried out.
Drill sample recovery	▪ 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.	**Tartana Project:** Historical core recovery rate has not been recorded. Techniques used to maximise sample recovery are not known. The relationship between sample recovery and grade has not yet been determined. The 2006 RC drilling delivered >87.5% recoveries; the 2009–2012 DD holes produced >85% recovery. **Zeehan Project (low grade matte):** 9 vertical AC drillholes completed in the North Dump and 27 vertical AC drillholes completed in the South Dump. Sample recovery reported as high, but not quantified. No sample bias has been recorded. Drillhole sample recovery for the 7 AC holes by TNA was visually assessed, samples weighed, and weights recorded. No sample assay bias with recovered sample weights. **Mt Hess Project:** 2012 RC and DD holes produced >85% recovery. **Dimbulah Copper Project:** Historical core recovery rate has not been recorded. Techniques used to maximise sample recovery are not known. The relationship between sample recovery and grade has not yet been determined.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		Bellevue Copper Project: Historical core recovery rate has not been recorded. Techniques used to maximise sample recovery are not known. The relationship between sample recovery and grade has not yet been determined.
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. ▪ Whether logging is qualitative or quantitative in nature. Core (or costean, channel, etc.) photography. ▪ The total length and percentage of the relevant intersections logged.	**Tartana Project:** Some historical drillholes have geological logs, although the records are incomplete. Individual samples are not specifically described geologically. Geotechnical logging is absent. Logging is qualitative in nature. 2009–2012 DD holes were logged with emphasis on rock types, amount and percentage of veining and identification of minerals present. Core was photographed. **Zeehan Project:** Logging not necessarily applicable to low grade matte dump material. Limited variation in material as the dumps are relatively homogeneous. Basic descriptive logs have been made to differentiate dump stockpile from base rock/ soil. **Mount Hess Project:** Core was lithologically logged, geotechnically logged, structural measurements taken, photographed wet and dry, with magnetic susceptibility and specific gravity measurements recorded. **Dimbulah Copper Project:** Some historical drillholes have geological logs, although the records are incomplete. Individual samples are not specifically described geologically. Geotechnical logging is absent. Logging is qualitative in nature. **Bellevue Copper Project:** Some historical drillholes have geological logs, although the records are incomplete. Individual samples are not specifically described geologically. Geotechnical logging is absent. Logging is qualitative in nature.
Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation	▪ If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all core taken.	**Tartana Project:** Historical core preparation has generally not been documented for RC or RAB drilling.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	▪ 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. ▪ Whether sample sizes are appropriate to the grain size of the material being sampled.	Historical sample nature, quality and appropriateness is generally unknown. Majority of historic sampling does not include reported quality control procedures. Measures to ensure that sampling is representative of in situ material are yet to be determined or may not have been carried out for much of the historical drilling. **Zeehan Project:** No sub-sampling undertaken. **Mt Hess Project:** Core was half sawn longitudinally for sampling. Samples and blanks were sent to ALS laboratories in batches. QA/QC supports ALS's own QA/QC values. **Dimbulah Copper Project:** Historical core preparation has generally not been documented for RC or core drilling. Historical sample nature, quality and appropriateness is generally unknown. Majority of historical sampling does not include reported quality control procedures. Measures to ensure that sampling is representative of in situ material are yet to be determined or may not have been carried out for much of the historical drilling. **Bellevue Copper Project:** Historical core preparation has generally not been documented for RC or core drilling. Historical sample nature, quality and appropriateness is generally unknown. Majority of historic sampling does not include reported quality control procedures. Measures to ensure that sampling is representative of in situ material are yet to be determined or may not have been carried out for much of the historical drilling.
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. ▪ 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.	**Tartana Project:** Nature, quality and appropriateness of assaying and laboratory procedures are unknown for the historical sampling. 2009–2012 DD hole samples were assayed by SGS Laboratories in Townsville. The use of standards and blanks have not been documented for historical sampling from the drilling and no information is available on their accuracy or precision.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	▪ Nature of quality control procedures adopted (e.g. standards, blanks, duplicates, external laboratory checks) and whether acceptable levels of accuracy (i.e. lack of bias) and precision have been established.	**Zeehan Project:** Pyrosmelt samples were analysed for zinc, lead and silver by Analabs in Tasmania by peroxide fusion digest and an AAS finish. 10% of the samples were duplicated in the field to check assay precision. A further 40 sample duplicates were analysed by the same technique at Australian Assay Laboratories to check for assay accuracy, but the results are not available to date. TNA samples were submitted to ALS laboratory in Burnie for sample preparation and ALS Brisbane for analysis. Samples were weighed, dried, split, pulverised and analysed by four-acid digest, ICP-MS and XRF. Field QA/QC incorporating 8 standard reference analyses and 7 blanks were inserted into the 100-sample batch. Standard analyses results are satisfactory to +/- 2SD and demonstrate an acceptable level of accuracy and precision. Laboratory QA/QC involves the use of internal certified reference standards, blanks, splits and replicates. Analysis of these results also demonstrate an acceptable level of precision and accuracy. **Mount Hess Project:** Nature, quality and appropriateness of assaying and laboratory procedures are of good quality and to ALS standard. Standards, blanks and duplicates were applied to the 2012 drilling. There is a high degree of confidence attached to the reported values of elements that are generally associated with the primary rock – Cu, Pb, Zn, Ag, As and Mo. **Dimbulah Copper Project:** Nature, quality and appropriateness of assaying and laboratory procedures are unknown for the historical sampling. 1990s RC samples were assayed by Amdel Laboratories in Townsville. The use of standards and blanks have not been documented for historical sampling from the drilling and no information is available on their accuracy or precision. **Bellevue Copper Project:** Nature, quality and appropriateness of assaying and laboratory procedures are unknown for the historical sampling. The 1990s RC samples were assayed by Analabs Laboratories in Townsville. The use of standards and blanks have not been documented for historical sampling from the drilling and no information is available on their accuracy or precision. Selected intervals from mid-2000s core drilling were cut (halved with diamond saw) for assay by ALS Townsville.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Verification of sampling and assaying	▪ 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.	**Tartana Project:** Verification of significant intersections by independently undertaken for historical drilling completed in 2006. Original assay sheets as received from the designated SGS laboratory and are available for 2009 to 2012 drilling programs. Depths in historical drillholes are stated in feet and were converted into metric units. **Zeehan Project:** TNA drilling intersections were visually verified by the geologist supervising the drilling. No twinned holes have been drilled, but TNA holes were drilled between four of the Pyrosmelt drill collars. Drillhole data is verified in MS Excel before importing into MS Access. Maptek Vulcan software has also been used for internal validation checks before importing. For all drilling, assay values that were below detection limit were adjusted to one tenth of the detection limit value. No other adjustments to the assay data have been made. **Mount Hess Project:** Mount Hess drilling was verified by both independent Terra Search personnel and company personnel. **Dimbulah Copper Project:** Depths in historical drillholes are stated in feet and were converted into metric units. There has been no independent verification of these historic drilling programs with all data gleaned from statutory annual reports submitted to Queensland government authorities **Bellevue Copper Project:** Depths in historical drillholes are stated in feet and were converted into metric units. There has been no independent verification of these historic drilling programs with all data gleaned from statutory annual reports submitted to Queensland government authorities
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.	**Tartana Project:** Drillhole positions have been recorded using handheld GPS units, which were regularly checked against several base station survey points established by

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	▪ Specification of the grid system used. ▪ Quality and adequacy of topographic control.	Kagara Zinc Ltd. The results confirm that the handheld GPS units are accurate to within 3 m for east and north co-ordinates and within 4 m for the elevation. Drillholes that could not be located due to collar destruction were estimated by reconstructing the Majestic grid in relation to GDA94 and measured graphically. These are generally considered to be within 10 m of their true position. Data were captured in Map Grid of Australia GDA 94, Zone 55. No downhole surveys were carried out except for drilling of two Outokumpu diamond drillholes. Most of the DD holes are dipping at -60°; most of the RC holes are dipping at -45° and most of the RAB holes are at -90°. **Zeehan Project:** Drilling completed on a nominal 20 m × 20 m spacing through the dumps. Coffey Geosciences Pty Ltd and Pyrosmelt NL both modelled the surface of the dumps using the drillhole data. An aerial photogrammetry topographic survey was flown in March 2019, using a 10 cm resolution, which is considered appropriate for the style of mineralisation. **Mount Hess Project:** Drillhole positions have been recorded using handheld GPS units with a 5 m accuracy for east, north and elevation co-ordinates. Downhole surveys carried out using a single-shot Eastman camera at a nominal 50 m spacing. **Dimbulah Copper Project:** Almost all historic drillhole positions have been relocated and recorded using handheld GPS units. Drillholes that could not be located due to collar destruction were estimated from historical detailed plan maps. These are generally considered to be within 10 m of their true position. Data was captured in Map Grid of Australia GDA 94, Zone 55. No downhole surveys were carried out. **Bellevue Copper Project:** Almost all historical drillhole positions have been relocated and recorded using handheld GPS units. Drillholes that could not be located due to collar destruction were estimated from historic detailed plan maps. These are generally considered to be within 10 m of their true position. Data were

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		captured in Map Grid of Australia GDA 94, Zone 55. Downhole surveys were carried out for mid-2000s core drilling.
Data spacing and distribution	▪ 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.	**Tartana Project:** Data spacing varies depending on the drill program. Drilling has been conducted on 100 m × 100 m spacing, then depending on results, the follow-up drilling was typically on a 50 m × 50 m spacing or 20 m × 20 m spacing. Where spacing is 20 m × 20 m, it may be possible to determine the geological and grade continuity. This is certainly apparent in the oxide zone where more than half of the orebody has been mined by open pit mining methods. No Mineral Resource has been estimated from the historical drilling data. No sample compositing has been applied. **Zeehan Project:** Drilling was completed on a nominal 20 m × 20 m spacing through the dumps by Pyrosmelt and infilled in some areas by TNA. Coffey Geosciences Pty Ltd and Pyrosmelt both modelled the surface of the dumps using drillhole data. No sample compositing was applied. **Mount Hess Project:** Data spacing varies but, where possible, drilling was completed on a 150 m × 150 m spacing. No Mineral Resource has been estimated and no mining has occurred. No sample compositing has been applied. **Dimbulah Copper Project:** Drilling was generally of a scout nature with occasional sectional drilling along 50 m and 100 m centres. No Mineral Resource has been estimated and no mining has occurred. No sample compositing has been applied. **Bellevue Copper Project:** Historical drilling is generally of a scout nature targeting IP anomalies, old workings or distinct gossan lens zones. No Mineral Resource has been estimated and no mining has occurred from drilling results. No sample compositing has been applied.
Orientation of data in relation to geological structure	▪ Whether the orientation of sampling achieves unbiased sampling of possible structures and the extent to which this is known, considering the deposit type.	**Tartana Project:** Geological information is not considered sufficiently comprehensive to develop a complete structural geological model for the deposit. Mineralisation is

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	▪ 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.	defined on the limits of geochemical data primarily from surface DD, RC and RAB drilling over a strike length >600 m. It is considered that there is no sampling bias in any of the historical data. **Zeehan Project:** Not applicable to low grade matte dumps. **Mount Hess Project:** Geological information is not considered comprehensive enough to develop a structural geological model. Mineralisation is defined on the limits of geochemical data primarily from surface DD, RC holes. It is considered that there is no sampling bias. **Dimbulah Copper Project:** Geological information is not considered sufficiently comprehensive to develop a complete structural geological model for the deposit. Mineralisation is defined on the limits of geochemical data primarily from surface DD and RC drilling. It is considered that there is no sampling bias in any of the historical data. **Bellevue Copper Project:** Geological information is not considered sufficiently comprehensive to develop a complete structural geological model for the deposit. Mineralisation is defined on the limits of geochemical data primarily from surface DD and RC drilling and around workings. It is considered that there is no sampling bias in any of the historical data.
Sample security	▪ The measures taken to ensure sample security.	**Tartana Project:** The various companies that drilled at the Tartana project maintained their own sample security measures. All sampled core from 2009–2012 drilling was transmitted to Townsville SGS laboratories. The remaining core from other drill programs is stored securely under cover on site. **Zeehan Project:** The Tasmanian Zinc dump sample security is of a high standard. The Pyrosmelt samples were transported between site and Analabs Tasmania and Australian Assay Laboratories. The TNA samples were transported by road directly to ALS laboratories in Burnie. **Mount Hess Project:** Sample security is of a high standard. All sampled core from 2012 drilling was

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		sent to Townsville ALS laboratories. All remaining core is stored at the Terra Search premises in Charters Towers. **Dimbulah Copper Project:** The various companies that drilled at the Dimbulah project maintained their own sample security measures. **Bellevue Copper Project:** The various companies that drilled at the Bellevue project maintained their own sample security measures.
Audits or reviews	▪ The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.	**Tartana Project:** A review of drilling prior to 2006 was carried out by Stevens and Associates (2006). **Zeehan Project.** No audit or review of low-grade matte dump drilling has been undertaken. **Mount Hess Project:** No review of drilling outside of Terra Search and Company personnel has been undertaken. **Dimbulah Copper Project:** No audit or review of historical drilling has been undertaken. **Bellevue Copper Project:** No audit or review of historical drilling has been undertaken.

Section 2 Reporting of Exploration Results

(Criteria listed in section 1 also apply to this section.)

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. ▪ 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.	▪ Four granted Mining Leases

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Exploration done by other parties	▪ Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.	▪ CEC – diamond drilling results used in the deeper majestic primary resource calculations ▪ Outukumpu – Deep diamond drilling Tartana Flats and partly Tartana Hill ▪ Dominion – limited to Queen Grade zinc – not in the Majestic Resource Statement ▪ Adam – Drilling at Queen Grade only ▪ Aztec – resampling and relogging at Queen Grade only ▪ Solomon Copper – RC and diamond drilling completed on Tartana Hill. Postdates Majestic drilling. Shallow RC results match the Majestic shallow RC results; however, survey control and check assays were not completed ▪ Thompson - a soil sampling orientation programme which involved the collection of 296 soil geochemical analyses using a portable X-ray fluorescence (pXRF) (INNOB -X Delta High Sensitivity XRF) at 20 m spacing along eight NE/SW orientated lines; each line was separated by approximately 100 m. The programme was designed only for geochemical orientation as well as identify broad geochemical trends across the Valentino area.
Geology	▪ Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.	▪ Porphyry copper intruded into structurally deformed sediment ▪ Within the Tartana Hill resource area, structural complexity was low ▪ Mineralising intrusive currently exposed in the southern pit area
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 drillholes: – easting and northing of the drillhole collar – elevation or RL (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in metres) of the drillhole collar – dip and azimuth of the hole – downhole 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	▪ 5.5 in RC completed by Majestic and Solomon Copper ▪ All samples were collected ex cyclone and riffle split on site ▪ Later metallurgical samples were re-split before larger samples were collected for check assay and testwork ▪ Majestic RC drilling completed by Drilltorque Townsville is one campaign with no issues ▪ NQ4 completed by Outokumpu ▪ BQ to NQ by CEC ▪ Downhole surveys only completed by Outokumpu that demonstrated a consistent lift down hole. Corrections were applied to all CEC diamond hole traces but not to the Majestic RC holes due to their shallow depths. Application of the lift correction fixed major issues in

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	the understanding of the report, the Competent Person should clearly explain why this is the case.	the older non JORC CEC Ore Reserves and brought all Tartana Hill intersections into the one zone
Data aggregation methods	■ In reporting Exploration Results, weighting averaging techniques, maximum and/or minimum grade truncations (e.g. 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.	■ Completed on a range of cut-off grades ■ Minimum intersection taken as 4 metres ■ Intersections in the collar of each hole were individually evaluated to exclude soil, dump and scree contamination or pad fill
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 drillhole angle is known, its nature should be reported. ■ If it is not known and only the downhole lengths are reported, there should be a clear statement to this effect (e.g. 'down hole length, true width not known').	■ Average 60% of true 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 drillhole collar locations and appropriate sectional views.	■ Full maps, plans, cross sections
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.	■ Yes. Multiple reports by multiple companies and independent geologists
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.	■ Past mine data ■ All above companies completed additional exploration and development including geological mapping, geochemistry, surveying, geophysics and shallow to deep open hole percussion drilling. This drilling is excluded from any calculations due to poor recoveries

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		▪ Tartana Hill and Tartana Flats mineralisation (extensions to the north of the Hills open cut) are also well defined by detailed IP geophysics ▪ Clutha also completed early drill and exploration – drill collars were unable to be located so have been excluded from the database
Further work	▪ The nature and scale of planned further work (e.g. tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling). ▪ Diagrams clearly highlighting the areas of possible extensions, including the main geological interpretations and future drilling areas, provided this information is not commercially sensitive.	▪ Shallow infill required before returning to production

R3D Resources Limited | ACN: 111 398 040 | ASX: R3D
169 Blues Point Road, McMahons Point NSW 2060 Australia | Tel: +61 2 9392 8032