

## REVIEW OF HISTORIC EXPLORATION IDENTIFIES ANORTHOSITE ANALOGUE WITH ANOMALOUS TITANIUM


12 March 2026

- EL7060 is located over the only other known occurrence of an anorthosite complex within the Gawler Craton outside PTR Limited’s Muckanippie Project, which hosts the Rosewood and Duke titanium mineral sands deposits and prospects
- Petrological analysis of drillhole TA100 identified lithologies interpreted as anorthosite, a rock type recognised as a source for titanium mineralisation<sup>1</sup>
- Multiple historic drillholes returned titanium values exceeding 1% Ti (with a peak of ~1.5% Ti), suggesting the presence of a titanium-enriched intrusive system
- Historic exploration results indicate potential for anorthosite-hosted titanium mineralisation within RBX tenure
- RBX will undertake further geological and geophysical interpretation to define exploration targets

Resource Base Ltd (ASX: RBX) (**Resource Base or the Company**) is pleased to provide the results of its detailed geological review of historic exploration completed across EL7060 located approximately 15 kilometres south of Tarcoola within the northern Gawler Craton of South Australia.

The review incorporated historic drill data, geochemical datasets, petrological reports and regional geophysical interpretation sourced from the South Australian Resources Information Gateway (SARIG).

The review has identified elevated titanium concentrations in historic drilling together with petrological references to lithologies interpreted as anorthosite, a rock type recognised as a primary source of titanium-bearing minerals within the Gawler Craton.



**Figure 1:** Location map showing EL7060 relative to other major regional explorers.

<sup>1</sup> Aurelius Resources NL (1993). Exploration Licence EL1859 Annual Report. South Australian Department for Energy and Mining Report Envelope ENV09314



## Geological Review of Historic Exploration

EL7060 covers approximately 69 km<sup>2</sup> within the northern Gawler Craton, a region known for its complex Proterozoic magmatic history and association with a variety of mineral systems including intrusion-related gold, nickel sulphides and titanium-bearing heavy mineral sands.

The Company commissioned a review of historic exploration conducted by several previous explorers including Amoco Minerals Australia, CSR Ltd, Aurelius Resources and Minex Australia. The work involved the compilation of historic drilling data, geochemical results, petrology reports and regional geophysical datasets.

The review identified several geological indicators that suggest EL7060 may host titanium-bearing mafic intrusive rocks associated with anorthosite complexes.


## Historic Titanium Intersections

Exploration conducted by Aurelius Resources during the early 1990s included a drilling program targeting magnetic anomalies within the region<sup>1</sup>.

Six drillholes were completed within what is now the northern portion of EL7060 including TA71 and TA99 to TA103. Geochemical assay results from this drilling program reported elevated titanium concentrations including values up to approximately 1.5% Ti with numerous intervals reporting titanium concentrations exceeding 1% Ti.

These titanium values are considered anomalous relative to background concentrations typically observed in surrounding regional lithologies and may indicate the presence of titanium-bearing mafic or anorthositic intrusive rocks within the EL7060 tenure.

The elevated titanium responses recorded across several drillholes suggest the potential presence of a broader titanium-enriched intrusive system.



**Figure 2:** Showing the location of EL7060 with historic drill holes that returned anomalous Ti values in historic reports and basement geology as recorded on SARIG.




**Petrological Evidence for Anorthosite**

Petrological analysis undertaken on drillhole TA100 identified lithologies interpreted as weathered mafic rocks with characteristics consistent with anorthosite<sup>1</sup>.

The petrology report noted that the sampled lithology differed from other regional samples and may represent an anorthosite-related intrusive unit.

Anorthosite complexes are considered important exploration targets within the Gawler Craton as they are interpreted to represent primary source rocks for titanium-bearing minerals including ilmenite.

The presence of lithologies interpreted as anorthosite within EL7060 therefore represents a significant geological indicator that the tenement may host part of a previously unrecognised anorthositic intrusive system.



**Figure 3:** Historic petrological description for drillhole TA100 indicating weathered mafic lithologies interpreted as consistent with anorthosite-related intrusive rocks. Extract from Aurelius Resources NL exploration report, DEM ENV09314



The sample from TA-100 is quite different to the other samples, but has some similarities to plutons of the Bradman Outstation Suite in and adjacent to the Malabooma Anorthosite Complex. These rocks have:

- Generally iron-rich ferromagnesian minerals
- Common to abundant magnetite-ilmenite-apatite aggregates  $\pm$  zircon
- Particularly euhedral plagioclase with interstitial material being rather randomly either quartz or orthoclase.
- Range from quartz and orthoclase-poor to quartz and/or orthoclase-rich and are massive and undeformed.

**Figure 4:** Additional excerpt from historic petrology report for drillhole TA100 comparing the sampled lithology to other regional samples and noting characteristics consistent with anorthosite-related rock types. Extract from Aurelius Resources NL exploration report, DEM ENV09314

### Regional Geological Context

Anorthosite-bearing intrusive rocks are relatively uncommon within the Gawler Craton. The only other recognised anorthosite complex within the region occurs within tenure held by PTR Limited (ASX: PTR) at the Muckanippie Project. The Muckanippie anorthosite complex is interpreted to be the primary source of titanium-rich heavy mineral sands mineralisation and hosts the Rosewood and Duke titanium mineral sands deposits and prospects. Globally, significant titanium (plus vanadium) deposits hosted within anorthosite suites include the giant Lac Tio deposit in Quebec, Canada.

The identification of elevated titanium values together with petrological evidence for anorthosite within EL7060 indicates that the tenement may lie within a favourable geological setting for anorthosite-hosted titanium mineralisation.


### Geological Interpretation

Historic drilling within EL7060 intersected a range of intrusive lithologies including quartzo-feldspathic gneiss, monzodiorite and gabbro. These lithologies are consistent with mafic intrusive systems that occur within the Harris Domain of the Gawler Craton.

Mafic intrusive rocks of this type are commonly associated with anorthosite-bearing intrusive complexes, which are recognised source rocks for titanium-bearing minerals including ilmenite. Petrological observations from drillhole TA100 indicate lithologies interpreted as weathered mafic rock with characteristics consistent with anorthosite.

The presence of elevated titanium geochemistry together with mafic intrusive lithologies intersected in historic drilling suggests that EL7060 may lie within a previously unrecognised mafic intrusive system that could include anorthosite-related rocks.

The identification of titanium enrichment and anorthosite-related lithologies within EL7060 therefore indicates that the tenement may lie within a favourable geological setting for anorthosite-associated titanium mineralisation.



**Figure 5:** Tenement Location map over TMI RTP Magnetics showing the location of historic drill holes that returned anomalous Ti values in historic records.

### Next Steps

- Geophysical Review of regional magnetic and gravity data sets.
- Target identification for potential intrusive bodies associated with titanium mineralisation.
- Field Reconnaissance and geological mapping to confirm lithological interpretations.

### Historical Exploration References

- Aurelius Resources NL (1993). Exploration Licence EL1859 Annual Report. South Australian Department for Energy and Mining Report Envelope ENV09314.
- Amoco Minerals Australia (1982) – ENV04896
- CSR Ltd (1987) – ENV06859
- Minex Australia / BHP (2001) – ENV09886



- ENDS -

This announcement has been authorised by the Board of Resource Base Limited.

**For further information please contact:**

Brent Palmer

Executive Director

E: [bp@resourcebase.com.au](mailto:bp@resourcebase.com.au)

W: [www.resourcebase.com.au](http://www.resourcebase.com.au)

Maurice Feilich

Chairman

E: [mf@resourcebase.com.au](mailto:mf@resourcebase.com.au)

For further information please visit our website – [www.resourcesbase.com.au](http://www.resourcesbase.com.au)



Follow @ResourceBaseLtd



Follow Resource Base Ltd (ASX:RBX)

**Competent Persons Statement**

The Information in this report that relates to exploration results, mineral resources or ore reserves is based on information compiled by Mr Michael Beven, the non-executive technical director to the Company, who is a Member of the Australasian Institute of Geoscientists. Mr Beven has sufficient experience which is relevant to the style of mineralisation and type of deposits under consideration and to the activity that he is undertaking to qualify as a Competent Person as defined in the 2012 edition of the 'Australian Code for Reporting Exploration Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves' (the JORC Code). Mr Beven consents to the inclusion of this information in the form and context in which it appears in this report. Mr Beven does not hold securities in the Company.

**Proximate Statements**

*This announcement contains references to mineral exploration results derived by other parties either nearby or proximate to EL7060 and includes references to topographical or geological similarities to that of the target anorthosite complex at EL7060. It is important to note that such discoveries or geological similarities do not in any way guarantee that the Company will have similar exploration successes if at all.*



| Hole ID | Exploration Company | Easting (MGA94) | Northing (MGA94) | Dip | End of Hole Depth (m) |
|---------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----|-----------------------|
| TA71    | Pima Mining         | 459618          | 6589073          | -90 | 39                    |
| TA99    | Pima Mining         | 478412          | 6591024          | -90 | 77                    |
| TA100   | Pima Mining         | 477972          | 6591272          | -90 | 55                    |
| TA101   | Pima Mining         | 477890          | 6591322          | -90 | 31                    |
| TA102   | Pima Mining         | 477767          | 6591409          | -90 | 40                    |
| TA103   | Pima Mining         | 477703          | 6591512          | -90 | 32                    |

Table 1: Table of historic drillholes reported with relevant historic exploration results

| Hole ID | From (m) | To (m) | Interval (m) | Ti (%) |
|---------|----------|--------|--------------|--------|
| TA99    | 18       | 21     | 3            | 1.05   |
| TA100   | 14       | 17     | 3            | 1.23   |
| TA100   | 21       | 24     | 3            | 1.5    |
| TA101   | 10       | 13     | 3            | 1.08   |
| TA102   | 16       | 19     | 3            | 1.11   |
| TA103   | 12       | 15     | 3            | 1.07   |

Table 2: Significant Ti % intervals found in historic drill intercepts



## Appendix B, JORC Code, 2012 Edition – Table 1 report

### Section 1 Sampling Techniques and Data

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

| Criteria                     | JORC Code explanation   | Commentary   |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Sampling techniques</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>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 down hole gamma sondes, or handheld XRF instruments, etc). These examples should not be taken as limiting the broad meaning of sampling.</i></li> <li><i>Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample representivity and the appropriate calibration of any measurement tools or systems used.</i></li> <li><i>Aspects of the determination of mineralisation that are Material to the Public Report.</i></li> <li><i>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 pulverized 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.</i></li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The results reported in this announcement are historical exploration results derived principally from Aurelius Resources / Pima Mining drilling reported in open file report ENV09314, supplemented by later regional compilation in Vale Australia's EL5673 annual report. Drillholes of relevance within EL7060 include TA71 and TA99–TA103, with assay samples reported for TA99–TA103 and no assay samples reported for TA71.</li> <li>Later Vale compilation identifies these holes as aircore holes drilled by Pima Mining in 1997. Detailed primary sample collection procedures from ENV09314 are not fully reproduced in the currently available review material and have not been independently verified by RBX.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Drilling techniques</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>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).</i></li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Later compilation of historic drilling records within EL5673 records TA71 and TA99–TA103 as aircore holes drilled by Pima Mining in 1997 and TUN71–93 as reverse circulation holes drilled by CSR Minerals in 1987</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Drill sample recovery</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Method of recording and assessing core and chip sample recoveries and results assessed.</i></li> <li><i>Measures taken to maximise sample recovery and ensure representative nature of the samples.</i></li> <li><i>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.</i></li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed recovery data for the historic TA and TUN programs is not available in the presently reviewed source material. RBX has not independently verified sample recoveries nor whether any relationship exists between recovery and grade</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Logging</b>               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>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.</i></li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Historic drill logs and petrological observations were generated by the original explorers. Drill logs indicate the presence of weathered mafic lithologies within the drilling area. Later reviews indicate shallow drilling within the Malbooma Ring area intersected</li> </ul>  |



| Criteria  | JORC Code explanation  | Commentary   |
|---|--|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whether logging is qualitative or quantitative in nature. Core (or costean, channel, etc) photography.</li> <li>The total length and percentage of the relevant intersections logged.</li> </ul>  | <p>quartzo-feldspathic gneiss, monzo-diorite and gabbroic lithologies. Detailed geotechnical logging procedures are not known.</p>   |
| <b>Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all core taken.</li> <li>If non-core, whether riffled, tube sampled, rotary split, etc and whether sampled wet or dry.</li> <li>For all sample types, the nature, quality and appropriateness of the sample preparation technique.</li> <li>Quality control procedures adopted for all sub-sampling stages to maximise representivity of samples.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Whether sample sizes are appropriate to the grain size of the material being sampled.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The historic TA holes are interpreted to be non-core aircore holes. Detailed sub-sampling and preparation procedures are not fully available in the reviewed excerpts. Historic sample numbering associated with the drilling includes sample ranges TA99 (53110–53112), TA100 (53113–53121), TA101 (53124–53126), TA102 (53131–53136) and TA103 (53140–53144).</li> <li>These records confirm downhole samples were collected and assayed but the original splitting and preparation protocols should be confirmed from ENV09314 where available.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Quality of assay data and laboratory tests</b>     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The nature, quality and appropriateness of the assaying and laboratory procedures used and whether the technique is considered partial or total.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Nature of quality control procedures adopted (eg standards, blanks, duplicates, external laboratory checks) and whether acceptable levels of accuracy (i.e. lack of bias) and precision have been established.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Historic geochemical assays reported from TA99–TA103 returned elevated titanium values up to approximately 1.5% Ti with numerous values exceeding 1% Ti.</li> <li>The laboratory, digestion and analytical finish used in the historic program are not stated in the excerpts currently available to RBX and therefore the analytical procedures have not been independently verified.</li> <li>No QAQC records for the historic drilling programs were identified in the reviewed excerpts. The existence and results of standards, blanks or duplicate samples are unknown to RBX at this stage.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Verification of sampling and assaying</b>          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The verification of significant intersections by either independent or alternative company personnel.</li> <li>The use of twinned holes.</li> <li>Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols.</li> <li>Discuss any adjustment to assay data.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RBX has compiled the historic data from SARIG open file reports and later company exploration reports. Drillhole information relevant to EL7060 has been sourced from these archived records. No twinned holes have been drilled by RBX and no adjustments to historical assay data have been made.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Location of data points</b>                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>Specification of the grid system used.</li> <li>Quality and adequacy of topographic control.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drillhole coordinates have been sourced from historic collar tables and SARIG archived reports. Coordinates are interpreted to be reported in GDA94 MGA Zone 53. The original survey methods used by the historic explorers are not described in the reviewed excerpts and therefore positional accuracy cannot be independently verified.</li> </ul>   |



| Criteria   | JORC Code explanation  | Commentary   |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Data spacing and distribution</b>                           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Data spacing for reporting of Exploration Results.</i></li> <li>• <i>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.</i></li> <li>• <i>Whether sample compositing has been applied.</i></li> </ul>                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The historic drilling programs were reconnaissance in nature and targeted magnetic anomalies rather than systematic resource delineation. The data spacing is insufficient to establish geological continuity appropriate for Mineral Resource estimation.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Orientation of data in relation to geological structure</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Whether the orientation of sampling achieves unbiased sampling of possible structures and the extent to which this is known, considering the deposit type.</i></li> <li>• <i>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.</i></li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The orientation of the historic drillholes relative to the interpreted intrusive bodies or potential mineralised structures is not known. True widths of mineralisation cannot be determined from the currently available information.</li> </ul>                     |
| <b>Sample security</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The measures taken to ensure sample security.</i></li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Historic sample security procedures are not described in the available reports.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Audits or reviews</b>                                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.</i></li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RBX has undertaken a compilation and geological review of historic exploration reports archived in SARIG. No independent audits of the historic data have been undertaken</li> </ul>  |

## Section 2 Reporting of Exploration Results

(Criteria listed in the preceding section also apply to this section.)

| Criteria                                       | JORC Code explanation  | Commentary  |
|--|--|---|
| <b>Mineral tenement and land tenure status</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>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.</i></li> <li>• <i>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.</i></li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All Exploration Licenses are recently granted by the South Australian Department of Energy and Mining (DEM). Resource Base Limited (RBX) has 100% ownership of the tenements.</li> <li>• A portion of EL 7060 is covered by the Yellabinna Regional Reserve.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Exploration done by other parties</b>       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.</i></li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Gawler Craton has an extensive exploration history with multiple companies having previously held historic Exploration Licenses that have covered the newly acquired licences.</li> <li>• Historic exploration that was done on and in the vicinity of the Exploration Licenses by the following companies and associated historic reports are listed below.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><a href="#">EL7060</a></p> |



| Criteria                      | JORC Code explanation   | Commentary  |
|-------------------------------|---|---|
|                               |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EL439 – Aberfoyle Exploration. ENV05234</li> <li>• EL580 – Afmeco 1980. ENV03778</li> <li>• EL1017 – Amoco Minerals Australia 1982. ENV04896</li> <li>• EL1390 – CSR Ltd 1987. ENV06859</li> <li>• EL1859 – Aurelius Resources 1993. ENV09314</li> <li>• EL2842 – Minex Australia / BHP 2001. ENV09886</li> <li>• EL3817 – Minex Australia 2007. ENV09886</li> <li>• EL5673 – Vale Australia 2015. (No report on SARIG)</li> <li>• EL2558 – Aurelius Resources 1998. ENV09314</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Deposit type</b>           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• geological setting and style of mineralisation.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Gawler Craton is the oldest and largest geological province in South Australia, preserving a complex tectonic history spanning from ~3250 Ma to 1450 Ma. The craton comprises a Mesoarchean-Paleoproterozoic core that is intruded and overlain by Paleoproterozoic to Mesoproterozoic rocks. The Mesoarchean history of the Gawler Craton is dominated by felsic magmatism, the Neoarchean to Paleoproterozoic history by sedimentation and bimodal magmatism, and the Mesoproterozoic history by bimodal magmatism.</li> <li>• Demonstrated mineralisation styles include.</li> <li>• Intrusion-related Au (Central Gawler Gold Province, e.g. Tarcoola, Tunkilla Prospect, Barns Prospect, Weednanna Prospect)</li> <li>• Orogenic Au (e.g. Challenger)</li> <li>• Heavy Mineral Sands – PTR Muckanippie Project</li> </ul> |
| <b>Drill hole Information</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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:                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ easting and northing of the drill hole collar</li> <li>○ elevation or RL (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in metres) of the drill hole collar</li> <li>○ dip and azimuth of the hole</li> <li>○ down hole length and interception depth</li> <li>○ hole length.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Historic drilling referenced includes TA71 and TA99–TA103 completed by Aurelius Resources NL. These holes reported elevated titanium concentrations including values up to approximately 1.5% Ti.</li> <li>• See attached appendix A.</li> </ul>   |



| Criteria  | JORC Code explanation  | Commentary   |
|---|--|--|
| <b>Data aggregation methods</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>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.</i></li> <li><i>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.</i></li> <li><i>The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values should be clearly stated.</i></li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The announcement references individual historical assay values rather than RBX calculated composite intervals. Weighted averages or cut-off grades have not been applied.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>These relationships are particularly important in the reporting of Exploration Results.</i></li> <li><i>If the geometry of the mineralisation with respect to the drill hole angle is known, its nature should be reported.</i></li> <li><i>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').</i></li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All reported intervals represent downhole lengths. The geometry of the mineralised system is not sufficiently constrained to estimate true widths.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Diagrams</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>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.</i></li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please see maps and diagrams included in the announcement text, that provide locations for the claims and their location relative to other projects in the area, with known geology from the Geological Survey of South Australia as presented on SARIG.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Balanced reporting</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>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.</i></li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results reported are derived from historic exploration reports and are presented in a balanced manner.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Other substantive exploration data</b>                               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>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.</i></li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Historic petrological observations from drillhole TA100 indicate lithologies interpreted as anorthosite. Elevated titanium geochemistry recorded in the historic drilling further supports the presence of mafic intrusive rocks within EL7060.</li> </ul>          |
| <b>Further work</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The nature and scale of planned further work (e.g. tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling).</i></li> <li><i>Diagrams clearly highlighting the areas of possible extensions, including the main geological interpretations and future drilling areas, provided this information is not commercially sensitive.</i></li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RBX plans to complete further geological interpretation, verify historic drilling locations and undertake field reconnaissance and geophysical reinterpretation to generate targets for future exploration drilling.</li> </ul>                                     |