Appendix 1: King Leopold Nickel 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 sounders, 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.*	• No drilling data to be reported • Khumsup Geophysics was contracted to complete the Moving Loop Electromagnetic (MLEM) survey. • SkyTEM Australia was contracted to complete the Airborne Electromagnetic (AEM) survey. • MLEM survey data was collected with 200x200m loops and 50 to 100m stations spacing using a Smartem 24 system and FluxGate 3 component receiver in a 200m offset Slingram configuration. Z, X and Y component data were collected at a base frequency of 1Hz. • AEM survey was heli-borne, with 150m line spacing using a high current and low base frequency (12.5Hz) system • Maxwell software was utilised to process and model the MLEM data. • Modelling and interpretation of the EM survey geophysical data was undertaken by Armada Exploration Services
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).*	• No drilling reported
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.*	• Not applicable
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.*	• Not applicable
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.*	• Not applicable

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	• *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.*	
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.*	• No analytical data reported
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.*	• Not applicable
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.*	• MGA grid 94 zone 51 datum for location map • MLEM data locations are surveyed with a handheld GPS with an accuracy of +/-5m which is considered sufficient for MLEM data location accuracy.
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.*	• Not applicable
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*	• Not applicable

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	bias, this should be assessed and reported if material.	
Sample security	• *The measures taken to ensure sample security.*	• Not applicable • Chain of Custody is managed by the Company's geophysical field contractor and geophysical consultants. The data is transferred daily and is QA/QC checked by a qualified (i.e. Member of ASEG) geophysicist.
Audits or reviews	• *The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.*	• Not applicable

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.*	• The Ruins area of the King Leopold Nickel Project comprises 6 tenements (E04/1169, 2299, 2325, 2405, 2562 & 2563) which cover a total area of ~612km^2 located ~110km ENE of Derby, Western Australia. • The Ruins tenements are owned 100% by Waterford Bay Pty Ltd, Strategic Metals Pty Ltd, Kimberley Alluvials Pty Ltd and North West Nickel Pty Ltd (a wholly owned subsidiary of Chalice). • All licences are granted except for application E04/2563. • Chalice owns 100% of the hard rock mineral rights of E04/1169, 2405 and 2563. • Chalice has an earn-in agreement with Strategic Metals Ptd Ltd whereby Chalice can earn an 85% JV interest in E04/2299 & 2325. • There are no known land access impediments. • Stakeholders have been successfully engaged by North West Nickel and Chalice including but not limited to the Napier Downs Pastoralists, Wanjina-Wunggurr Aboriginal corporation, Dambimnangari Aboriginal Corporation and Warrwa Combined Native Title Claimant Group.
Exploration done by other parties	• *Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.*	• There has been little modern exploration completed by other parties on the Ruins Project. There are a number of historic shallow prospects for Tin and Tungsten known collectively as the King Sound workings. An Xcite airborne electro-magnetic (AEM) survey was completed by North West Nickel over a portion of E04/1169. The survey was helicopter supported, and consisted of 284 line km at 150m line spacing. Results were

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		processed and interpreted by Southern Geoscience and identified several late-time anomalies (channel 35). These AEM anomalies were subsequently followed-up by a field reconnaissance/mapping and surface sampling programme. • Work completed by previous explorers on the Ruins Project was reviewed by Chalice and include third party geophysical reviews. • Historic exploration data has also been reviewed; however, Chalice has not yet completed digital capture and compilation of data collected by previous explorers.
Geology	• *Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.*	• The Ruins Project is located in the King Leopold region of Western Australia which represents the western mobile belt of the North Australia Craton (NAC), the eastern belt being defined by the Halls Creek Orogen. The King Leopold province is a Paleoproterozoic terrain that contains the Ruins Dolerite which comprise a wide suite of mafic intrusives, considered prospective for nickel, copper, cobalt and PGE mineralisation. Known deposits and occurrences in the region include the Savannah mine (Ni-Cu-Co), Merlin (Ni-Cu-Co) as well as small tin-tungsten workings.
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.*	• No drilling reported
Data aggregation methods	• *In reporting Exploration Results, weighting averaging*	• Not applicable

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	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.*	
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 lengths are reported, there should be a clear statement to this effect (eg 'down hole length, true width not known').*	• Not applicable
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.*	• Figure 1-3 are included in the text of the release
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.*	• All available results are 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,*	• Previous exploration programs on the project include: aeromagnetic, radiometric and gravity surveys, an airborne Xcite EM survey, surface sampling (auger, soil and rock-chip) and field mapping.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	geotechnical and rock characteristics; potential deleterious or contaminating substances.	
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*	• Additional Moving-Loop EM (MLEM) surveys will be undertaken in order to refine the AEM (SkyTEM) targets, as well as refining anomalies generated by previously flown AEM (Xcite). A heritage survey (over new uncleared areas) and a field reconnaissance trip are also planned in the coming weeks. Reverse Circulation drilling is planned to test priority targets.