Annexure 1. Warrego North Project - JORC Table 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.* • *Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample representivity and the appropriate calibration of any measurement tools or systems used.* • *Aspects of the determination of mineralisation that are Material to the Public Report.* • *In cases where 'industry standard' work has been done this would be relatively simple (eg 'reverse circulation drilling was used to obtain 1 m samples from which 3 kg was pulverised to produce a 30 g charge for fire assay'). In other cases more explanation may be required, such as where there is coarse gold that has inherent sampling problems. Unusual commodities or mineralisation types (eg submarine nodules) may warrant disclosure of detailed information.*	• Drill holes are sampled via NQ2 diamond drilling [1/2 core) or Reverse Circulation drilling. • Sampling was carried out under Chalice's standard protocols and QAQC procedures which are industry standard practice and involve the insertion of standards (including blank standards) and the collection of duplicate samples. QAQC has been checked with no apparent issues. • RC samples were collected via either 1m (split sample) or 5m composite samples using a spear from which 3kg was pulverised to produce enough sample for 50g fire assay and 4 acid ICP-AES analyses. Diamond samples were collected between 0.3m and 1.3m sample lengths, crushed and pulverised to produce enough sample for 50g fire assay and 4 acid ICP-AES analyses.
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).*	• NQ2 diamond drilling (holes WND17-001 – 002) and RC (reverse circulation) drilling were undertaken RC drilling used a 5 1/2 inch face sampling hammer. The core is was oriented using a Core Map.
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.*	• Diamond core recoveries are being measured and recorded. Recoveries in excess of 95% have been achieved for the diamond core drilled to date. RC sample recoveries remained consistent throughout the program. Any poor (low) recovery intervals were logged and entered into the database. • Diamond core is being reconstructed into continuous runs for structural orientation and depth marking. Depths were checked against driller core blocks. The cyclone and cone splitter were routinely cleaned and inspected during drilling ensuring no excessive material build up. Care was taken to ensure the split calico samples were of consistent volume. • There is no bias noted between sample recovery and grade. Excellent recoveries were obtained from both RC and Diamond drilling.
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.*	• Diamond drill holes were logged geologically including but not limited to weathering, regolith, lithology, structure, texture, alteration and mineralisation and also geotechnically for recovery and RQD. RC holes were logged geologically including but not limited to weathering, regolith, lithology, structure, texture, alteration and mineralisation. Logging was at an appropriate quantitative standard to support future geological, engineering and metallurgical studies. • Logging is considered quantitative in nature. • All holes are being geologically logged in full. •
Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation	• *If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all core taken.* • *If non-core, whether riffled, tube sampled, rotary split, etc and whether sampled wet or dry.* • *For all sample types, the nature, quality and appropriateness of the sample preparation technique.* • *Quality control procedures adopted for all sub-*	• Diamond core was sawn in half. Duplicate samples were quarter core. • 1 meter RC samples were split off the drill rig into calico bags using a riffle splitter. Selective 1m and 5m composite samples were collected and sent for assay. >95% of the samples were dry in nature. • Diamond core was cut with the same half of core sent

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	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.*	for assay. • Chalice has its own internal QAQC procedure involving the use of certified reference materials (standards), blanks and duplicates which accounts for approximately 6% of the total submitted samples. • Field duplicate samples were sent every 20th sample to check for repeatability. There are no apparent repeatability issues observed in the results. • The sample sizes are considered to be appropriate for the style of sulphide mineralisation observed which is typically coarse grained disseminated and interstitially replaced chalcopyrite.
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.* • *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.*	• The assay procedures used are considered best practice and total in nature. Samples were sent for 50g fire assay (Au-AA26) and 4 acid ICP-AES (ME-ICP61) suite. • Not Applicable • Chalice has its own internal QAQC procedure involving the use of certified reference materials (standards), blanks and duplicates which accounts for ~6% of the total submitted samples. All QAQC has been checked with no apparent issues.
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.*	• Significant intersections are checked by the Exploration Manager and Senior Geologist. Significant intersections are also verified/cross-checked by portable XRF data collected whilst in the field and cross checked after final assays are received. • No twin holes have been drilled for comparative purposes. The prospect is still considered to be in an early exploration stage. • Primary data was collected via excel through a Toughbook laptop computer using in house logging codes. The data will be sent to the Perth based office where the data is validated and entered into the master database. • No adjustments to assay results have been made.
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.* • *Specification of the grid system used.* • *Quality and adequacy of topographic control.*	• Hole collar locations have been picked up by Chalice employees using a handheld GPS with a +/- 3m error. Downhole surveys on angled holes (WND17-001 and 002) were performed by a reflex multi-shot tool at every ~30m downhole intervals. • The grid system used for location of all drill holes and as shown on all figures is MGA_GDA94, Zone 53. • RL data is considered unreliable at present although topography around the drill area is relatively flat and hence should not have any significant effect on the current interpretation of data.
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.*	• Nominal drill hole spacing is generally 600m between diamond holes. • The current spacing is not considered sufficient to assume any geological or grade continuity of the mineralised system. • For core sampling, in areas deemed void of significant mineralisation, 2 metre composite core samples were collected. When in mineralisation 0.3-1.3 m samples were collected dependant on geological boundaries. For RC sampling, in areas deemed void of significant mineralisation, 5 metre composite samples were collected via with a spear. When in mineralisation 1 m samples were collected.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
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.* • *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.*	• Considering the lack of systematic drilling at the prospect, it is unclear whether the sampling will or won't achieve unbiased results. • As above
Sample security	• *The measures taken to ensure sample security.*	• Chain of custody is managed by Chalice. Samples were stored on site before being transported by third parties to the laboratory.
Audits or reviews	• *The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.*	• No review has been carried out to date.

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.* • *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.*	• Parakeet is located wholly within Exploration Licence EL/23764. The licence is wholly owned by Meteoric Resources Limited with no known encumbrances.
Exploration done by other parties	• *Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.*	• Previous RC and RAB drilling has been completed by Normandy Gold. Additional RC drilling has been completed by Meteoric Resources Limited. These results were not released to the market.
Geology	• *Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.*	• The mineralisation has an analogy to Tennant Creek (IOCG) style Proterozoic Cu-Au-Bi 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.*
	• *If the exclusion of this information is justified on the basis that the information is not Material and this exclusion does not detract from the understanding of the report, the Competent Person should clearly explain why this is the case.*
		• See Annexure 1
		• Not Applicable

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.* • *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.*	• All results reported are weighted averages with a minimum 0.1% copper grade applied. • Not Applicable • Not Applicable
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.*	• The drill intersections reported are not considered true widths. Further detailed geological analysis and drilling is required to determine the geometry of the intersected mineralisation.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	• *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').*	
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.*	• Refer to Table 1 which shows both representative low and high grades downhole
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
Further work	• *The nature and scale of planned further work (eg 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*	• Follow up drilling will be planned to better define the geological controls of mineralisation once further ground IP geophysical surveys have been carried out.

Annexure 2

HOLE ID	MGA EAST	MGA NORTH	RL	AZI	DIP	Planned EOH (m)	RC Pre-Collar Depth (m)
WND17001	365282	7862872	340	315	-69	401	138
WND17002	364960	7862332	340	290	-74	354.8	138