Appendix 2: Pyramid Hill Gold 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.*	• Aircore (AC) drilling samples were collected via 2-4m composite samples from 1m bulk samples using a pvc spear with each combined composite sample weighing approximately 3kg. 1m samples were taken within some mineralised zones using a spear • All composite and 1m samples were pulverised to nominal 85% passing 75 microns before being analysed . • Qualitative care was taken to ensure representative sample weights were consistent when sampling on a metre by metre basis.
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).*	• The drilling was completed via an aircore (AC) drilling technique using both blade and/or face sampling hammer drill bit with a diameter of 102-104mm.
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.*	• Individual recoveries of 1m samples were recorded on a qualitative basis. Generally the sample weights were comparable and any bias considered negligible. • No relationships have been noticed between sample grade and recoveries.
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.*	• 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 to support future geological, engineering and metallurgical studies. • Logging is considered quantitative in nature. • All holes were geologically logged in full.
Sub-sampling techniques	• *If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all core taken.*	• 1 metre AC samples were collected in bulk form from the rig cyclone. 2-4m

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
and sample preparation	• *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.*	composite samples of the 1m samples were collected using a spear method. Where 1m samples were collected a spear method was also used. The majority of the samples were dry in nature. • Field duplicate samples were sent every 20th sample to check for assay repeatability. Results of duplicate samples were considered acceptable and within precision and accuracy limits for the style of mineralisation. • Sample sizes are considered appropriate for the style mineralisation sought and the reconnaissance nature of the drilling programme.
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.*	• All samples were sent to ALS prep facility in Adelaide for sample preparation then sent to ALS Perth for chemical analysis. • 40 elements (including gold) were analysed using up to a 25g aqua regia method with an ICPAES and ICPMS finish depending on the elements (ALS method code – TL43-MEPKG). Aqua Regia techniques are not considered total in nature. Should refractory mineralisation be encountered this can affect the nature of the final results. • Chalice has its own internal QAQC procedure involving the use of certified reference materials. Standards - 4 per 100 samples, blanks – 1 per 100 samples and duplicates 4 per 100 samples which accounts for ~9% of the total submitted samples.
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 Project Senior Geologist and then by the General Manager of Exploration. Significant intersections are cross-checked with the geology logged and drill chips collected 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 hard copy logging sheets using in house logging codes. The data is sent to Perth where the data is validated and entered into the master database. • No adjustments have been made to the assay data received
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.*	• Hole collar locations have been picked up by Chalice employees using a handheld GPS with a +/- 5m error. • The grid system used for the location of

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	• *Specification of the grid system used.* • *Quality and adequacy of topographic control.*	all drill holes is either MGA_GDA94 (Zone 54) or MGA_GDA94 (Zone 55) . A grid zone boundary transects the project area • RL data is considered unreliable although topography around the drill area is relatively flat and hence should not have any significant effect on the interpretation of data. All drill collar RLs have been normalised to 1 sec (30m) satellite 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 100-400m between aircore holes. • The current spacing is not considered sufficient to assume any geological or grade continuity of the mineralisation intersected. • 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.* • *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.*	• Sampling has been routinely completed beneath transported cover with no selective bias to any particular primary geological domain. • Intersected mineralisation to date is flat in nature and the drilling perpendicular to the mineralisation indicating little to no sampling bias..
Sample security	• *The measures taken to ensure sample security.*	• Chain of custody is managed by Chalice. Samples are being 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.*	• Drilling was carried out within EL6737, EL6661 and EL6901. All licences are wholly owned by CGM (WA) Pty Ltd, a full subsidiary of Chalice Gold Mines Limited with no known encumbrances.
Exploration done by other parties	• *Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.*	• There has been little effective exploration completed by other parties in the immediate vicinity of the targets identified by Chalice to date. • Chalice has compiled historic records dating back to the early 1980's which

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		indicate only sporadic reconnaissance drilling has been completed by various parties over the project area. All effective drill holes that reached the basement and were assayed for gold have been compiled. • Homestake Mining completed initial surface sampling which has been evaluated and used by Chalice for some targeting purposes.
Geology	• *Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.*	• The mineralisation being explored for is orogenic style similar to that seen within the Bendigo and Fosterville gold deposits of the Bendigo Zone. Gold mineralisation is typically hosted by quartz veins within in the Ordovician age Castlemaine Group sediments.
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:* o *easting and northing of the drill hole collar* o *elevation or RL (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in metres) of the drill hole collar* o *dip and azimuth of the hole* o *down hole length and interception depth* o *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 Appendix 1 and Appendix 3
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.*	• A weighted average technique has been applied where necessary to produce all displayed drill intersections. A maximum internal dilution of 4m has been used in the calculation of some drill intersections. • Grade intercepts are reported in full. • No metal equivalent results are reported.
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.* • *If it is not known and only the down hole*	• The drill intersections reported are considered close to true widths as interpreted (refer to geological cross sections).

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	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.*	• Only significant results above 0.1g/t Au and 1000ppm As have been tabulated.
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 is being planned to better define the mineralised envelopes and to improve the understanding of potential geological controls to mineralisation. • Target Zones as defined on the cross sections highlight the areas of most interest for initial further follow-up exploration.