24 August 2026

Exploration Update: Drilling Underway at Lewis Ponds

- **Drilling underway at Lewis Ponds to advance next phase of resource expansion and exploration at the 100%-owned Lewis Ponds project, New South Wales**
- **Drilling is focused towards high-priority targets, including:**
    - **TLPD-04 offhole EM conductor, located in the footwall of the Lewis Pond's Deposit**
    - **Tom's Lode, located in the far south of the Mineral Resource Estimate**
        - **Samples will be used for future metallurgical testwork and to increase resource confidence levels**
- **Downhole EM results from the last phase of drilling, drill hole GLPRCDD003, show the new discovery, Cousin Jack mineralisation is strongly conductive, allowing effective exploration targeting with electromagnetic (EM) methods**
    - **1.6km long IP trend to be screened with a ground EM Survey in Q4**
    - **Drone magnetic contractor engaged with survey planned for next month**
- **Cousin Jack discovery is defined by multiple Zinc – Copper - Silver – Lead – Gold sulphide domains located south-east of the Lewis Ponds Deposit (refer ASX announcement: 22 June 2026)**
- **Lewis Ponds Deposit has an existing high-grade gold and silver JORC 2012 Resource of 17.52Mt (9.09Mt Indicated & 8.43Mt Inferred) @ 1.12g/t Au, 53.34g/t Ag, 2.06% Zn, 1.10% Pb, 0.14% Cu, which equates to 1.7MOz AuEq (refer ASX announcement: GRL 15 December 2025)**

Orbit Resources Limited (ASX: OBT) ("Orbit" or the "Company") is pleased to provide an update on exploration activities and results from its 100%-owned Lewis Pond's gold, silver and base metals project in the Lachlan Fold Belt in NSW. The Lewis Pond's Project covers ~148 km^2 and is located 15 km east of Orange, NSW (EL5583).

Management commentary

Managing Director Ms Jeneta Owens said: *"This latest round of drilling has delivered two highly encouraging outcomes that reinforce both the growth and exploration potential of Lewis Ponds. Firstly, a strong downhole electromagnetic response of up to 1,500 Siemens confirms that the mineralisation intersected at the new Cousin Jack discovery is highly conductive and validates our exploration model. This result provides us with a powerful tool to rapidly identify and prioritise additional sulphide accumulations across the 1.6km-long target corridor, significantly enhancing our ability to cost effectively and rapidly vector towards potentially higher-grade mineralised centres."*

"Secondly, the intersection of meaningful gold and base metal mineralisation within the Quarry Lode is particularly important given its location outside the current Mineral Resource Estimate and proposed open pit. The results demonstrate the potential for this area to contribute additional mineralisation and support future mining studies aimed at evaluating open pit expansion opportunities. Incorporating the Quarry Lode into the Mineral Resource Estimate is an exciting opportunity to further enhance the scale and value of the Lewis Ponds Project."

"With the drill rig mobilised to site over the weekend and drilling now underway to test priority EM targets and advance resource growth opportunities, these results continue to demonstrate the significant upside that exists both within and beyond the current Lewis Ponds resource footprint."

Figure 1: Drill rig arriving on site at Lewis Ponds.

A track-mounted diamond drill rig has successfully mobilised to the Lewis Ponds Project, with drilling now underway. The program is focused on testing priority exploration targets, including key electromagnetic (EM) conductors and resource infill drilling, as Orbit advances the next phase of exploration and resource expansion at Lewis Ponds Gold-Silver-Base Metals Project.



Figure 2: Location of GLPRCDD001-005 drillholes and the 1.6km long Induced Polarisation Chargeability anomaly (background image), termed the Cousin Jack Prospect, with the down hole EM result of GLPRCDD004 showing conductance building off hole, indicating a potential near-miss.

Geophysical program update

Downhole EM (DHEM) surveying and data interpretation of drillhole GLPRCDD003 (Cousin Jack discovery hole) and GLPRCDD004 is now complete. The DHEM confirms that the mineralisation is highly conductive, up to 1500 Siemens, (Figure 3) and validates our exploration model of screening the 1.6km long Cousin Jack Prospect with ground electromagnetics to identify strongly conductive zones which could be mapping enriched centres containing pyrrhotite +/- copper and gold.

Separately, a drone magnetics contractor has been engaged to collect high resolution magnetics data over Cousin Jack. The survey is scheduled to commence in September. Any magnetic anomaly over Cousin Jack will be considered a high-priority drill target.



Figure 3: Cross Section of GLPRCDD003 Cousin Jack discovery hole, showing location of EM conductor plates and that mineralisation is strongly conductive between 200 – 1500S.

Drill program summary and assay results:

Five combination Reverse Circulation (RC) and Diamond drillholes were completed earlier this year for 1663.2m, totalling 676m of RC and 987.2m of diamond. Recent heavy rainfall across Australia's east coast required the program to be temporarily placed on standby while the Company secured a suitable track-mounted drill rig to enable drilling to continue safely and efficiently under prevailing site conditions.

All assays have now been received for the previously completed five drillholes (GLPRCDD001 – 005) for 1663.2m (Figure 2).

The new drill contractor will complete the remaining holes, which includes drill testing the TLPD-04 offhole electromagnetic (EM) conductor located in the north footwall of the Lewis Ponds deposit, postulated to represent a concealed accumulation of sulphides. Drilling is also planned into Tom's Lode in the south of the deposit, with the primary purpose to collect material for metallurgical test work purposes and also to increase mineral resource confidence levels at this location.

Summary of the drilling and assay results (Tables 1 and 2) are:

GLPRCDD001 (Figure 4): targeted an offhole EM conductor TLPD-04, postulated to represent gold-silver-base metal sulphides positioned 200m west of the existing Mineral Resource Estimate. The hole was stopped prematurely at 178m due to excessive lift, meaning the targeted EM conductor would be missed if the hole continued. This hole will be re-drilled as a part of the upcoming drill program.

It is important to note that the upper part of the drillhole intersected the **Quarry Lode mineralisation returning 27m @ 0.97g/t AuEq from 83m including 10m @ 1.44g/t AuEq from 89m.** The Quarry Lode represents a zone of mineralisation located west and into the footwall of the Lewis Pond's Deposit and currently sits outside of the Mineral Resource Estimate (MRE) and the proposed open pit as defined in the Scoping Study (refer Figure 4 and ASX announcement: GRL 16 February 2026). A key outcome is incorporating the Quarry Lode into the MRE, which has the potential to increase the resource inventory and support future mining studies aimed at expanding the planned open pit.

GLPRCDD002: RC hole GLPRCDD004 was drilled to 252m to test the TLPD-72 off-hole conductor. Hole deviation resulted in the target not being fully evaluated, and a follow-up re-drill (GLPRCDD005) encountered similar drilling conditions. Despite these challenges, the program generated valuable geological data that will assist in planning future testing of the conductor. GLPRCDD002 will be surveyed with downhole electromagnetics (EM) to better constrain the location of the TLPD-72 conductor.



Figure 4: Cross Section of GLPRCDD001 showing the Quarry Lode, which lies west of the current MRE area and planned Open Pit from the 2026 Scoping Study.

GLPRCDD003: This 650m deep hole represents **the discovery hole into the Cousin Jack Prospect** which is defined by two major sulphides domains (see ASX announcement GRL 22 June, 2026):

Upper Domain: 79m @ 1.3% ZnEq from 311m including

- *15m @ 2.8% ZnEq from 314m*
- *5m @ 4.1% ZnEq from 363m*
- *6m @ 3.2% ZnEq from 370m*

Lower Domain: 104m @ 1.3% ZnEq from 527m *including*

- *4m @ 5.0% ZnEq from 558m*
- *6m @ 3.8% ZnEq from 564m*
- *11m @ 4.4% ZnEq from 584m*

GLPRCDD004: This 487.2m drillhole targeted the Eastern IP Chargeability Target, approximately 650m south-east and long strike of the Lewis Pond's Deposit. The drillhole intersected the targeted Induced Polarisation chargeability anomaly which coincided with an interbedded sequence of siltstone and minor sandstone and <1% disseminated pyrite +/- pyrrhotite. While no significant assays were intersected, the downhole EM shows a conductive response building to the west of the hole and at depth. **This area requires further investigation**.

Gold Equivalents have been calculated using the formula for this report:

((Au grade g/t * Au price US$/oz * Au recov / 31.1035) + (Ag grade g/t * Ag price US$/oz * Ag recov / 31.1035) + (Cu grade % * Cu price US$/t* Cu recov / 100) + (Zn grade % * Zn price US$/t* Zn recov / 100) + (Pb grade % * Pb price US$/t* Pb recov / 100)) / (Au price g/t * Au recov / 31.1035). Prices are in US$ of Au= $3200/oz, Ag = $40/oz, Cu= $9,900/t, Zn = $2,700/t, Pb = 2,015/t. These prices are long-term prices and have been sourced from a range of metals analysts who provide monthly commodity price forecasts. The long-term pricing for each commodity is based on the average real consensus price from up to 19 metals analysts surveyed. The date of the survey was November 17th, 2025.

Zinc Equivalents have been calculated using the formula for this report:

Zinc Equivalent (ZnEq) grades have been calculated to provide a single indicative value for polymetallic mineralisation. The ZnEq values incorporate zinc (Zn), lead (Pb) silver (Ag) copper (Cu) and gold (Au) grades, based on assumed long-term commodity prices and metallurgical recoveries.

Individual metal grades for Zn, Pb Ag, Cu and Au are reported alongside ZnEq values in all tables. ZnEq values are provided for illustrative purposes only and no allowance has been made for mining, dilution, processing costs, smelter terms or refining charges.

((Au grade g/t * Au price US$/oz * Au recov / 31.1035) + (Ag grade g/t * Ag price US$/oz * Ag recov / 31.1035) + (Cu grade % * Cu price US$/t* Cu recov / 100) + (Zn grade % * Zn price US$/t* Zn recov / 100) + (Pb grade % * Pb price US$/t* Pb recov / 100)) / (Zn price US$/t * Zn recov / 100). Prices are in US$ of Au= $3200/oz, Ag = $40/oz, Cu= $9,900/t, Zn = $2,700/t, Pb = 2,015/t. These prices are long-term prices and have been sourced from a range of metals analysts who provide monthly commodity price forecasts. The long-term pricing for each commodity is based on the average real consensus price from up to 19 metals analysts surveyed. The date of the survey was November 17th, 2025.

Several metallurgical studies have been initiated on the Lewis Ponds resource and the most recent work used in this report was completed by Core Resources in December 2025 (refer ASX GRL, 9 December 2025), who indicated a relatively simple flotation process producing two concentrates, a zinc dominant concentrate and a lead-gold-silver-copper concentrate. The average recoveries for the various metals were Gold = 64.7%, Silver = 71.8%, Zinc = 93.1%, Lead = 73.4% and Copper = 68.9%. These recoveries have been used in the metal equivalent calculation. It is the Company's opinion that all the elements included in the metal equivalents calculation have a reasonable potential to be recovered and sold.

Table 1: *Significant assays of remaining holes.*

Hole ID	From (m)	To (m)	Interval (m)	AuEq CutOff	AuEq_ppm	Au_ppm	Ag_ppm	Cu_%	Pb_%	Zn_%	Comments
GLPRCDD001	83.0	110.0	27.0	0.67	0.97	0.26	22.36	0.06	0.37	0.89	Quarry Lode. Includes 3m dilution
including	***89.0***	***99.0***	***10.0***	***1.00***	***1.44***	***0.43***	***31.72***	***0.08***	***0.54***	***1.31***	
including	***105.0***	***108.0***	***3.0***	***1.00***	***1.26***	***0.31***	***31.67***	***0.07***	***0.48***	***1.13***	
GLPRCDD002	No Significant Assay										Target not reached.
GLPRCDD004	No Significant Assay										Downhole EM shows conductive response west of hole
GLPRCDD005	No Significant Assay										Re-drill of GLPRCDD002. Target not reached.

Table 2: *Summary of GLPRCDD003 significant assays as previously reported.*

Hole ID	Domain	From (m)	To (m)	Interval (m)	ZnEq CutOff	ZnEq_%	Au_ppm	Ag_ppm	Cu_%	Pb_%	Zn_%
GLPRCDD003	Upper	311.0	390.0	79.0	0.1%	1.3	0.02	5.19	0.06	0.12	0.84
including	*Upper*	*314.0*	*329.0*	*15.0*	*1.0%*	*2.8*	*0.04*	*17.43*	*0.11*	*0.43*	*1.48*
including	*Upper*	***320.0***	***321.0***	***1.0***	***5.0%***	***7.0***	***0.11***	***51.60***	***0.19***	***1.23***	***3.61***
including	*Upper*	***325.0***	***326.0***	***1.0***	***5.0%***	***5.0***	***0.05***	***26.20***	***0.12***	***0.45***	***3.35***
including	*Upper*	*347.0*	*351.0*	*4.0*	*1.0%*	*1.3*	*0.01*	*7.03*	*0.02*	*0.25*	*0.81*
including	*Upper*	*355.0*	*356.0*	*1.0*	*1.0%*	*1.2*	*0.02*	*3.70*	*0.04*	*0.01*	*0.90*
including	*Upper*	***363.0***	***368.0***	***5.0***	***1.0%***	***4.1***	***0.03***	***8.67***	***0.38***	***0.02***	***2.63***
including	*Upper*	***364.0***	***366.0***	***2.0***	***5.0%***	***6.0***	***0.06***	***15.95***	***0.75***	***0.03***	***3.24***
including	*Upper*	***370.0***	***376.0***	***6.0***	***1.0%***	***3.2***	***0.01***	***3.43***	***0.09***	***0.03***	***2.84***
including	*Upper*	***375.0***	***376.0***	***1.0***	***5.0%***	***6.7***	***0.03***	***2.10***	***0.07***	***0.04***	***6.30***
including	*Upper*	*386.0*	*388.0*	*2.0*	*1.0%*	*1.3*	*0.01*	*0.95*	*0.05*	*0.02*	*1.15*
GLPRCDD003	Middle	408.0	494.0	86.0	0.1%	0.6	0.01	1.55	0.03	0.03	0.42
including	*Middle*	***427.0***	***432.7***	***5.6***	***1.0%***	***2.1***	***0.01***	***1.86***	***0.06***	***0.05***	***1.82***
including	*Middle*	*434.0*	*437.0*	*3.0*	*1.0%*	*1.6*	*0.01*	*6.10*	*0.19*	*0.08*	*0.81*
including	*Middle*	*439.0*	*440.0*	*1.0*	*1.0%*	*1.4*	*0.01*	*6.80*	*0.11*	*0.15*	*0.73*
including	*Middle*	*442.0*	*443.0*	*1.0*	*1.0%*	*1.4*	*0.01*	*5.70*	*0.04*	*0.09*	*1.05*
including	*Middle*	*447.0*	*448.0*	*1.0*	*1.0%*	*1.0*	*0.01*	*11.10*	*0.02*	*0.25*	*0.41*
including	*Middle*	*459.0*	*460.0*	*1.0*	*1.0%*	*1.2*	*0.01*	*3.20*	*0.01*	*0.08*	*0.95*
including	*Middle*	***464.0***	***468.0***	***4.0***	***1.0%***	***2.7***	***0.01***	***3.18***	***0.04***	***0.05***	***2.44***
GLPRCDD003	Lower	527.0	631.0	104.0	0.1%	1.3	0.01	2.51	0.05	0.04	0.98
including	***Lower***	***535.6***	***537.0***	***1.4***	***1.0%***	***4.8***	***0.02***	***13.77***	***0.04***	***0.24***	***4.02***
including	*Lower*	*539.0*	*540.0*	*1.0*	*1.0%*	*1.2*	*0.01*	*2.60*	*0.03*	*0.06*	*0.95*
including	***Lower***	***558.0***	***562.0***	***4.0***	***1.0%***	***5.0***	***0.01***	***8.33***	***0.09***	***0.18***	***4.38***
including	***Lower***	***559.0***	***562.0***	***3.0***	***5.0%***	***6.1***	***0.01***	***10.40***	***0.10***	***0.22***	***5.33***
including	***Lower***	***564.0***	***570.0***	***6.0***	***1.0%***	***3.8***	***0.02***	***8.68***	***0.27***	***0.05***	***2.66***
including	***Lower***	***564.0***	***567.0***	***3.0***	***5.0%***	***6.4***	***0.03***	***14.53***	***0.45***	***0.07***	***4.49***
including	***Lower***	***584.0***	***595.0***	***11.0***	***1.0%***	***4.4***	***0.01***	***6.56***	***0.15***	***0.06***	***3.67***
including	***Lower***	***585.3***	***587.0***	***1.7***	***5.0%***	***13.1***	***0.02***	***18.05***	***0.34***	***0.14***	***11.35***
including	***Lower***	***601.0***	***602.0***	***1.0***	***1.0%***	***3.1***	***0.01***	***2.90***	***0.06***	***0.06***	***2.79***
including	*Lower*	*604.0*	*606.0*	*2.0*	*1.0%*	*1.9*	*0.02*	*3.40*	*0.05*	*0.06*	*1.60*
including	*Lower*	*613.0*	*615.0*	*2.0*	*1.0%*	*1.3*	*0.01*	*3.80*	*0.03*	*0.26*	*0.89*

<ENDS>

This market announcement has been authorised for release to the market by the Board of Orbit Resources Limited.

For further information regarding Orbit, please visit https://orbitresources.au/ or contact:

Jeneta Owens
Managing Director
+61 417 344 658
jowens@orbitresources.au

Released through: Henry Jordan, Six Degrees Investor Relations, +61 431 271 538

About Orbit Resources

Orbit Resources Limited (formerly Godolphin Resources Limited) is an ASX-listed exploration company focused on the discovery and advancement of gold, silver, copper and base metal projects within the highly prospective Lachlan Fold Belt of New South Wales. The Company's portfolio is anchored by the advanced Lewis Ponds Gold-Silver Project and a pipeline of high-quality exploration assets spanning over 2,500km^2 of tenure immediately north and east of Orange, NSW. Orbit Resources is implementing a disciplined exploration strategy focused on unlocking value through resource growth, discovery and development. The Company is committed to responsible exploration, strong community engagement and delivering long-term value for shareholders through systematic advancement of its precious and base metal portfolio.

COMPLIANCE STATEMENT The information in this report that relates to Exploration Targets, Exploration Results, Mineral Resources or Ore Reserves is based on information compiled by Ms Jeneta Owens, a Competent Person who is a Member of the Australian Institute of Geoscientists. Ms Owens is the Managing Director, full-time employee, Shareholder and Option holder of Orbit Resources Limited. Ms Owens has sufficient experience that is relevant to the style of mineralisation and type of deposit under consideration and to the activity being undertaken to qualify as a Competent Person as defined in the 2012 edition of the Australasian Code for Reporting of Exploration Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves. Ms Owens consents to the inclusion in the report of the matters based on her information in the form and context in which it appears.

PREVIOUS DISCLOSURES

The information in this announcement that relates to Exploration Results, associated with the Company's projects is extracted from the following ASX Announcements:

- *ASX Announcement Titled "Significant Increase to the Lewis Ponds Gold, Silver and Base Metals Deposit Mineral Resource Estimate" dated 15 December 2025*
- *ASX Announcement Titled "GRL: Lewis Ponds Gold and Silver Project Scoping Study" dated 1 February 2026*
- *ASX Announcement Titled "New Massive and Semi Massive Sulphide Discovery with +100m wide Zinc Copper-Lead-Silver-Gold Mineralisation Intersected south of Lewis Ponds" dated 22 June 2026*

A copy of the market announcements referred to above are available on the Company's website www.orbitresources.com.au. The announcements were issued in accordance with the 2012 Edition of the JORC Australian Code of Reporting of Exploration Results, Minerals Resources and Ore Reserves. The Company confirms that it is not aware of any new information that materially affects the information included in the original market announcements and that all material assumptions and technical parameters underpinning the estimates in the relevant market announcements continue to apply and have not materially changed. The Company confirms that the form and context in which the Competent Persons' findings are presented have not been materially modified from the original market announcements.

FORWARD LOOKING STATEMENTS

Certain statements in this announcement constitute "forward-looking statements" or "forward-looking information" within the meaning of applicable securities laws. Such statements involve known and unknown risks, uncertainties and other factors, which may cause actual results, performance or achievements of the Company, or industry results, to be materially different from any future results, performance or achievements expressed or implied by such forward-looking statements or information. Such statements can be identified by the use of words such as "may", "would", "could", "will", "intend", "expect", "believe", "plan", "anticipate", "estimate", "scheduled", "forecast", "predict" and other similar terminology, or state that certain actions, events or results "may", "could", "would", "might" or "will" be taken, occur or be achieved. These statements reflect the Company's current expectations regarding future events, performance and results, and speak only as of the date of this announcement. All such forward-looking information and statements are based on certain assumptions and analyses made by GRL's management in light of their experience and perception of historical trends, current conditions and expected future developments, as well as other factors management believes are appropriate in the circumstances.

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

Section 1 Sampling Techniques and Data (Criteria in this section applies to all succeeding sections)

<table>
<tr><th>Criteria</th><th>• JORC Code explanation</th><th>Commentary</th></tr>
<tr><td>Sampling techniques</td><td>• 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.</td><td>• Sawn half core samples from diamond drilling were sent for Industry standard sample preparation and analysis at a commercial laboratory. Sampling was at 1m intervals and/or based on geological control. No sample results are being reported for the current drill program.
• Chip samples from Reverse Circulation drilling were sent for Industry standard sample preparation and analysis at a commercial laboratory. Sampling was at 1m or 2m intervals.
• Measures to ensure sample representivity included triple tube drilling after 1990. Field duplicates were obtained in drill core by quartering the core. No sample results are being reported for the current drill program.
• Mineralisation is defined by the visual presence of sulphide mineralisation within the host rock accompanied by significant alteration indicative of gold mineralisation
• Historical holes drilled are listed below according to Company and drill campaign year.
.
<table>
<tr><th>Company</th><th>Year</th><th>Number of Drillholes</th><th>DD</th><th>Total_m_DD</th><th>DD_Wedge</th><th>Total_m_DD_W</th><th>RC</th><th>Total RC</th><th>RC/DD</th><th>Total_m_RCDD</th><th>Total meters drilled</th><th>Total_m/Company</th></tr>
<tr><td>AMAX</td><td>1971</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>111.3</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>111.3</td><td>874.7</td></tr>
<tr><td>AMAX</td><td>1972</td><td>3</td><td>3</td><td>763.4</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>763.4</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>AAS</td><td>1975</td><td>3</td><td>3</td><td>592.5</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>592.5</td><td>2101.8</td></tr>
<tr><td>AAS</td><td>1976</td><td>7</td><td>7</td><td>1509.3</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1509.3</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>SHELL MINERALS</td><td>1980</td><td>5</td><td>5</td><td>1710.9</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1710.9</td><td>2402.4</td></tr>
<tr><td>SHELL MINERALS</td><td>1981</td><td>3</td><td>3</td><td>691.5</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>691.5</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>SABMINCO</td><td>1987</td><td>10</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>10.0</td><td>710.0</td><td></td><td></td><td>710.0</td><td>2298.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>SABMINCO</td><td>1988</td><td>23</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>23.0</td><td>1588.0</td><td></td><td></td><td>1588.0</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>TRIORIGIN</td><td>1992</td><td>9</td><td>8</td><td>2350.8</td><td>1.0</td><td>337.5</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>2688.3</td><td>53957.4</td></tr>
<tr><td>TRIORIGIN</td><td>1993</td><td>13</td><td>13</td><td>4709.4</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>4709.4</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>TRIORIGIN</td><td>1994</td><td>33</td><td>21</td><td>9657.8</td><td>12.0</td><td>6493.8</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>16151.5</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>TRIORIGIN</td><td>1995</td><td>33</td><td>26</td><td>8172.5</td><td>7.0</td><td>3206.3</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>11378.8</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>TRIORIGIN</td><td>1996</td><td>4</td><td>1</td><td>807.4</td><td>1.0</td><td>596.4</td><td>2.0</td><td>96.0</td><td></td><td></td><td>1499.8</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>TRIORIGIN</td><td>1997</td><td>34</td><td>19</td><td>7944.5</td><td>9.0</td><td>4443.5</td><td>4.0</td><td>516.0</td><td>2.0</td><td>1328.0</td><td>14232.0</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>TRIORIGIN</td><td>2004</td><td>13</td><td>3</td><td>1451.9</td><td></td><td></td><td>5.0</td><td>657.3</td><td>5.0</td><td>612.9</td><td>2722.1</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>TRIORIGIN</td><td>2005</td><td>6</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>4.0</td><td>421.9</td><td>2.0</td><td>153.6</td><td>575.5</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>TriAus Min</td><td>2011</td><td>9</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>9.0</td><td>920.0</td><td></td><td></td><td>920.0</td><td>920.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>ARDEA</td><td>2017</td><td>4</td><td>4</td><td>780.4</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>780.4</td><td>780.4</td></tr>
<tr><td>Godolphin</td><td>2021</td><td>13</td><td>4</td><td>1882.0</td><td></td><td></td><td>9.0</td><td>1185.0</td><td></td><td></td><td>3067.0</td><td>4161.8</td></tr>
<tr><td>Godolphin</td><td>2024</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>571.2</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>571.2</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Godolphin</td><td>2025</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>523.6</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>523.6</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="10">* DD = Diamonf Drilling RC = Reverse Circulation</td><td>TOTAL</td><td>67496.4</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="12">DD_Wedge = Diamond Wedge hole RCDD = Combination RC and DD hole</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
<tr><td>Drilling techniques</td><td>• 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).</td><td><u>Lewis Ponds Historical</u>
• Two main types of drilling have been used since the first drill testing at Lewis Ponds in 1971: Reverse Circulation percussion (RC) and diamond-core drilling (DD). Open hole techniques including Tricone, Blade and Hammer have been used to pre-collar holes through overburden and barren ground to place casing to facilitate deeper RC and/or DD drilling.
• Prior to 1980, HQ sized core was drilled only to seat the casing and enable NQ sized coring to start. Most of these holes at some stage reduced to BQ sized core size when rotation became an issue with NQ sized core. In DD programs subsequent to 1980, HQ sized core was used to refusal when the core size was reduced to NQ sized core and occasionally to BQ sized core. After 1990 triple tube barrels were used to good effect minimizing core loss, and reduction to NQ sized core became the norm with no further use of BQ sized coring. As seen in the table above, the majority of the drilling supporting the MRE are post 1990.
• Diamond tails, as distinct from pre-collars, were used to extend RC holes in the 2004 and 2005 programs.
• No use of oriented core was made until 2004 when drillers marks on core assisted determination of vergence in folding adjacent to mineralization.
• DD wedge drilling has been undertaken to increase coverage at depth.

<u>Lewis Ponds Godolphin (GRL) (2024/2025)</u>
• Diamond drilling for HQ3 core using a DE-712 rig. One hole, GLPDD009 had a combination of PQ3, HQ3 and NQ3 drill core.</td></tr>
</table>

Criteria	• JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		• Holes were tripled tubed and oriented using the Reflex Ori system, with bottom of hole marks. Lewis Ponds Godolphin (GRL) (2026) • RC and Diamond drilling using a UDR 1200 HC. Holes have been drilled with RC pre-collars and HQ3 and/ or NQ3 diamond tails. • Holes were tripled tubed and oriented using the Reflex Ori system, with bottom of hole marks.
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.	Lewis Ponds Historical • Recovery of core has been measured by restoring the core and fitting individual pieces end to end where possible. Lengths of the assembled core were measured to compare with the intervals between drillers' downhole markers. The ratio between the measured length and the marker interval length was recorded as core recovery percent. • Geological logs indicate very limited core loss usually associated with the top of hole and localized shearing/faulting. Some holes terminated in pre-existing mined voids. • From historical records, core loss was minimized by maintaining a satisfactory balance between core diameter and drilling cost. For the TOA, TRO and TriAusMin programs between 1992 and 2004, also the Shell/Aquitaine 1981 program, the standard core size was HQ reducing to NQ. This was the most significant factor in minimizing core loss, to the extent that contract-controlled drilling provisions were not called for. • Percussion chip samples, at least in the more recent RC drilling, were weighed and the weight recorded. Any noticeably low weight recorded became a recovery factor in the sampling record. • The very limited amount of core loss ensured that there was no relationship between metal grades and core recovery. Lewis Ponds Godolphin (2024/2025) • Core recovery was completed on every drill run and logged into GRL spreadsheets on site. Core loss was very limited, except where underground voids were encountered. • Sample recovery was maximised by drilling to ground conditions and using drilling fluids • The very limited amount of core loss ensured that there was no relationship between metal grades and core recovery Lewis Ponds Godolphin (2026) • Core recovery was completed on every drill run and logged into GRL spreadsheets on site. Core loss was very limited. • Sample recovery is maximised by drilling to ground conditions and using drilling fluids • It is expected that with a limited amount of core loss there will be no relationship between metal grades and core recovery
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.*	• Logging of core and chips has been maintained throughout the Lewis Ponds programs • Drill core logs include datasets for Lithology, Alteration and Mineralisation with more recent drilling captured Veining, Structure and Magnetic Susceptibility. Geotechnical Logs are limited to TLPDD04001 and 04002 and the most recent GRL drilling. • The data is logged by a qualified geologist and together with the available core photography, is suitable for use in any future geological modelling, resource estimation, mining and/or metallurgical studies • The core logging is qualitative based on a series of codes for the various parameters recorded. • All relevant drill intersections were logged
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.	• During core logging, sample intervals are marked by the geologist using lithology and visual observation of sulphide mineralisation as guides. Sample lengths are not equal. The core is cut using a core saw and one half of each sample interval sent for assay analysis. Where field duplicates are required, the core is quartered. • RC sampling, generally dry, was carried out on a metre by metre basis, collected directly into a plastic bulk bag from the rig cyclone. Historically, a 3-5kg sub-sample was taken by the spear method, bagged and submitted to the laboratory and in the most recent 2026 RC drilling, samples were collected by a cone splitter off the cyclone at either 1 or 2m intervals. Historically, wet samples were mixed and quartered manually, but this was a rare necessity. The large volume of the sample and the use of the Reverse Circulation method was industry standard to achieve representivity. Normal quality control procedures were in place in the RC drilling, in particular cleaning the hole with air between each sampling run and casing through overburden to avoid up hole contamination.

Criteria	• JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	• 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.	• All samples were submitted to a commercial laboratory for sample preparation and analysis (generally to ALS in Orange, NSW but also Bureau Veritas in Adelaide, SA). • Historical sample preparation was considered appropriate for the time. The more recent Godolphin drill core samples were sorted, dried then weighed. Sample preparation involved crushing to a target of 70% passing 6mm and splitting the sample with a riffle splitter where necessary to obtain a sub-fraction (up to 3kg) which was pulverised in a vibrating pulveriser with a target of 85% passing 75 micron. All coarse residues have been retained • Historically, with both the RC and DD drill sampling, a field duplicate sample was taken approximately every 20-25m for quality control and submitted without special identification with other samples to the laboratory. It was rare for duplicate sample assays, when compared with the original, to fall outside normal variability within the sampling/assay process. On some occasions a triplicate sample was taken for a Check lab Au assay. • The Lewis Ponds sulphides, whether massive or disseminated, have not raised problems of representivity with the DD sampling employed. Preliminary metallurgical study indicates that gold may be refractory within some sulphide lenses. • Sample sizes are considered 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.	<u>Lewis Ponds Historical</u> • 30 or 50g charges were used for fire assay for gold, platinum and palladium depending on sulphide content with an Inductively Coupled Plasma (ICP) Optical Emission Spectrometry finish. The method is a total digest method and is an industry standard • Ag, Cu, Pb, Zn were either assayed using a 4 acid (near total digestion) or via an aqua regia digestion. • GRL routinely inserts analytical blanks and standards at regular intervals (sometimes at specific intervals based on the geologist's discretion) into the client sample batches for laboratory accuracy performance monitoring. Standards used are commercially available standards. • All the QAQC data has been statistically assessed, both Company QAQC and Lab data. GRL has undertaken its own further review of QAQC results of the BV routine standards through a database consultancy, 100% of which returned within acceptable QAQC limits. This fact combined with the fact that the data is demonstrably consistent has meant that the results are considered to be acceptable and suitable for reporting. <u>Lewis Ponds Godolphin (2024/2025)</u> • Samples were analysed for gold using a 30g fire assay technique with FA-AA finish (Au-AA25) and for a 34-element suite using a 4 acid digest with an ICP-AES finish (ME-ICP61). Both techniques are considered a near total technique. • Assays for Pb, Zn and Ag which are over detection are further reported by the laboratory using: Pb-OG62, Zn-OG62 and Ag-OG62 • GRL routinely inserts analytical blanks [coarse and pulp blanks] and standards at regular intervals (sometimes at specific intervals based on the geologist's discretion but nominally at an insertion rate of 1 in 25) into the client sample batches for laboratory accuracy performance monitoring. Standards used are commercially available standards. • No second laboratory checks were reported. • All of the QAQC data has been statistically assessed and are within designated thresholds. Contamination was detected in the coarse blank samples and is believed to have occurred from a compromised batch at site. <u>Lewis Ponds Godolphin 2026</u> • Samples were analysed for gold using a 30g fire assay technique with FA-AA finish (Au-AA25) and for a 34-element suite using a 4 acid digest with an ICP-AES finish (ME-ICP61). Both techniques are considered a near total technique. • Assays for Pb, Zn which are over detection are further reported by the laboratory using: Pb-OG62, Zn-OG62 • GRL routinely inserts analytical blanks [coarse and pulp blanks] and standards at regular intervals (sometimes at specific intervals based on the geologist's discretion but nominally at an insertion rate of 1 in 25) into the client sample batches for laboratory accuracy performance monitoring. Standards used are commercially available standards. • No second laboratory checks were reported. • All of the QAQC data has been statistically assessed and are within designated thresholds.
Verification of sampling and assaying	• The verification of significant intersections by either independent or alternative company personnel. • Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols.	<u>Lewis Ponds Historical</u> All significant intersections (TRO, TOA and prior) have been independently verified by a historical senior consultant to the extent of re-logging to become familiar with the detailed characteristics. Significant intersections have also been verified by the Measured Group Pty Ltd in 2025 The drill intercept spacing is perhaps surprisingly regular given the number of drilling campaigns that have contributed. One significant intersection twinned is:

Criteria	• JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	• Discuss any adjustment to assay data.	<table><tr><td>Drill hole</td><td>Interval</td><td>Au</td><td>Ag</td><td>Cu</td><td>Pb</td><td>Zn</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>m.</td><td>gpt</td><td>gpt</td><td>pct</td><td>pct</td><td>pct</td></tr><tr><td>SLP-2</td><td>2.1</td><td>13.5</td><td>486</td><td>2.73</td><td>3.44</td><td>5.21</td></tr><tr><td>SLP-2W</td><td>2.1</td><td>3.9</td><td>370</td><td>0.32</td><td>5.3</td><td>5.8</td></tr></table> This is indicative of Cu and Au variability between two intersections two metres apart. In 2004 an internal database verification exercise was carried out for Lewis Ponds. This was recorded on a master spreadsheet which listed all drill holes, one sample per record. The data as had been entered was checked individually against source Assay Certificates and Sample Submission information. 289 errors were identified, listed and corrected. Of these 16 were significant errors. 9 of the 16 from early drilling could not be reconstructed and had to be deleted from the database. In those cases, original Assay Certificates were not available, and checks could only be made against scanned tables of assays or in some cases scans of assay results on drill cross sections. <u>Lewis Ponds Godolphin (2024/2025/2026)</u> • Significant intersections have been reviewed and verified by internal GRL geologists reviewing historical logs. • No twinned holes were completed • All primary data is captured into digital excel logging sheets and transferred to a Microsoft Access database. This is stored on the GRL server. • Primary assay data is received by the Company from the laboratory and entered/ stored on the GRL server. GRL database geologists facilitate this process. • Assays which are below detection are entered as half their detection limit. Any assay values above detection have been re-assayed for their true value and are used in the reporting herein.
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.	<u>Lewis Ponds Historical</u> • Collar positions were set using a Trimble GPS instrument with a sub-5-meter level of accuracy. Collars of TOA and TRO holes have been picked up using a DGPS Sub-1 meter instrument since mid-1995. Prior to that, holes may have been sited relative to a pegged tape and compass grid with significant inaccuracies. However, in 1995 all previous hole collars appear to have been identified and surveyed by DGPS. No tape and compass co-ordinates are used to locate any item of drill data in the current database. In 2004 limited checks were made of surviving early hole collars (pre-1995) using DGPS with satisfactory results when compared with database. • GRL also conducted collar check prior to the 2021 Mineral Resource Estimation using a Trimble TDC150 GPS with average accuracy of 20-30cm in all three axes. When comparing the GRL collar data with the current database, the average variance was between 1.5m and 3.0m, resulting in high confidence for the current collar database. • Pre 2017 downhole surveys were taken at various intervals such as 30m, 50m or as large as 100m and measured magnetic north. Post 2017 surveys used Reflex EZ or TruShot tools with regular intervals surveyed such as 30m and 6m. • In 1992 a Lewis Ponds grid was established using a local grid north reference of 3150 magnetic. This Grid is no longer in use and the current grid is GDA94/ MGA Zone55 but for completeness the conversion is included below: The Grid north orientation of 315^0 (Mag) equates to 329^0 MGA. To convert local grid bearing to magnetic subtract 45^0. To convert local grid bearings to MGA subtract 31^0. A number of points along the local grid baseline have been surveyed using real time DGPS with sub-metre accuracy. To allow for transformation into MGA coordinates two corresponding surveyed points are: Local converting to MGA(55): Local grid — MGA(55) grid 000East 1100North — 709679.3East 6316506.4North 000East -370North — 710436.0East 6315245.4North • It is considered that all issues with the location of data points have been identified and remedied prior to the start of 2004 drilling. <u>Lewis Ponds Godolphin (2024/2025)</u> • Drill hole collars have been picked up by MPF Surveying using the DPGS method • Downhole surveys were taken using a True North seeking Devi Gyro. Surveys were taken at regular 3m intervals along the entire hole. • Grid used GDA94/ MGA Z55 • Underground mine workings exist but have not been mapped with any level of accuracy. If intersected in the drilling they are recorded. If they are evident at surface, they have been picked up with a handheld GPS with an accuracy of +/- 5m • Topographic control for the majority of drilling is constrained by recently acquired Lidar in 2025, with a resolution of 0.03m. Z or RL values for all drill collars have been updated to the Lidar Z value

Criteria	• JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		Lewis Ponds Current Drill Program (2026): • Collars reported herein are captured using a handheld GPS with an accuracy of +/- 5m. In due course these collars with be picked up using a differential GPS
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.	• The main mineralized zone of the Spicer's Lode in the north of the deposit has a drillhole spacing of 40m-60m in both dimensions for an area roughly 500m x 300m. The general data density for Tom's Lode is similar, but for smaller areas of strike and dip throughout the length of the deposit. • Historical sampling was selective likely targeting areas within the geological model. For this reason, some intercepts of historic drillholes with the current model have no assay data, and the data spacing is greater in areas such as these. Where individual samples were taken, they did not typically exceed 1m. • The data spacing is sufficient to establish both geological and grade continuity for the Mineral Resource Estimate classification. • No sample compositing was applied Lewis Ponds Current Drill Program (2026): • GLPRCDD002 -005 is of an exploratory nature and not suitable for Resource reporting due to lack of drillhole density. Drillhole data spacing around GLPRCDD001 is considered sufficient for future consideration of Mineral Resources.
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.	• As the lenses dip variably to the north-east, and the difficult topography is to the west, there has been little problem in siting holes to optimize the drilling for mineralisation intersection angles. The strongest mineralization dips about 70°-80° east. This has resulted in intersection angles effectively normal to the thicker parts of the mineralization. • No significant bias is likely as a result of the pattern of intersection angles. Lewis Ponds Current Drill Program (2026): • Drillholes have been oriented at surface so that they are generally at right angles to the strike of the rock layering. However, some of the drilling encountered rock layering at a low angle to the drillhole and this was attributed to local folding. More drilling is required to fully assess true thicknesses around Cousin Jack Prospect.
Sample security	• The measures taken to ensure sample security.	• For all programs, care has been taken to have standard procedures for sample processing, and each past drilling program has recorded its procedures. These have been simple and industry standard to avoid sample bias. • For the GRL work, all core was collected and accounted for by GRL employees/consultants during drilling. All logging was done by GRL personnel. • All samples were bagged into calico bags by GRL personnel following GRL procedures and were transported direct to the laboratory using a company vehicle. • The appropriate manifest of sample numbers and a sample submission form containing laboratory instructions were submitted to the laboratory. Any discrepancies between sample submissions and samples received were routinely followed up and accounted for.
Audits or reviews	• The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.	A total review and audit of the Lewis Ponds database was carried out following the public float of Tri Origin Minerals Limited on 9 Jan 2004. Areas were: Grids and Collars, Downhole Surveys, Assays, Geology. Apart from this review, previous resource estimates were studied for factors likely to introduce bias, up or down. It is not clear if sampling techniques were audited or not.

Section 2 Reporting of Exploration Results (Criteria listed in the preceding section 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 license to operate in the area.*	• The Lewis Ponds project is comprised of tenement EL5583 located approximately 15km east-northeast of the city of Orange, central New South Wales, Australia. • EL 5583 was granted to TriAusMin in 1999 for an area of 71 units and replaced three previously held exploration licenses (EL 1049, EL 4137 and EL 4432). In the 2006 renewal, the licence was partly relinquished to 57 units and the following year TriAusMin purchased 289 hectares of freehold land over Lewis Ponds. Upon renewal in 2011, EL 5583 was reduced to 51 units for a further term until 24th June 2014. The second renewal of EL 5583 was granted until June of 2017 with no reduction in tenement size. • On August 5th 2014, TriAusMin underwent a corporate merger with Heron Resources Limited which resulted in Heron acquiring 100% of EL 5583 and the 289 hectares of freehold land over Lewis Ponds. In 2017, Ardea Resources Ltd was "spun out" as a new company, and gained ownership of EL 5583, with TriAusmin becoming a wholly owned subsidiary of Ardea. In 2019, Godolphin Resources Ltd was spun out of Ardea as a new company, and gained ownership of EL 5583, with TriAusmin becoming a wholly owned subsidiary of Godolphin. • Local relief at the site is between 700m and 900m above sea level. • Access to the area is by sealed and gravel roads and a network of farm tracks. • The exploration rights to the project are owned 100% by Godolphin Resources through the granted exploration license EL5583.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		• Security of $93,000 is held by the NSW Department of Planning and Environment in relation to EL5583 • The project is on partly cleared private land, most of which is owned by Godolphin Resources. Access agreements are in place for the private land surrounding the main deposit area. There are no national parks, reserves or heritage sites affecting the project area. • At this stage, security can only be enhanced by continued engagement with stakeholders and maintaining profile in the City of Orange in particular.
Exploration done by other parties	• Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.	• In the 1850's gold was discovered at Ophir. At this time Lewis Ponds was already a small mining camp. Shallow underground mining took place at Spicer's, Lady Belmore, Tom's Zone and on several mines in the Icely area during the period 1887 to 1921. In 1964, a number of major companies including Aquitaine, Amax, Shell and Homestake explored the region looking for depth and strike extensions of the Lewis Ponds mineralization but failed to intersect significant mineralization. These companies had drilled approximately 8,500 meters. Not commonly noted, but of great significance is the fact that much of Lewis Ponds' early development was due to the high grades of silver in its ores. It appears that silver was the major commodity mined at different points of the mines' history. Several Mineral Resource Estimates have been completed: • 2005 & 2016 (Tri Origin): Indicated (6.35Mt) + Inferred Resource for a total of 6.62Mt at 69gpt Ag, 1.50gpt Au, 0.15% Cu, 1.38% Pb and 2.41% Zn (JORC 2012). The report for this Lewis Ponds resource estimate replaces the first April 2005 resource report for the silver-gold-copper-lead-zinc mineralisation at the Lewis Ponds Project prepared for Tri Origin Minerals Ltd (TRO). The purpose of that Resource estimate was to enable a scoping study to assess the economics of an underground mining operation. The original April 2005 Mineral Resource was prepared in compliance with guidelines published by the Joint Ore Reserves Committee (JORC) of the Aus IMM in 2004. In 2012 the Committee presented revised guidelines including the comprehensive Table 1. The 2016 report presents the 2005 Mineral Resource in the context of the 2012 JORC Code & Guidelines. The author of this report, Robert Cotton was also the author of the 2005 report. • 2021 (Godolphin): Inferred Resource 6.2Mt @ 2.0 g/t Au, 80 g/t Ag, 2.74% Zn, 1.59% Pb and 0.17% Cu (JORC 2012). This was completed by an external consultancy, GEO-Wiz, on behalf of Godolphin Resources. Please refer to ASX: GRL Announcement dated 2 February 2021. • August 2025 (Godolphin): 9.83Mt (5.01Mt Indicated, 4.82Mt Inferred) @ 1.49g/t Au, 66.15g/t Ag, 2.46% Zn, 1.38% Pb, 0.15% Cu (470Koz of gold and 21Moz of silver). This was completed by an external consultancy, Measured Group, on behalf of Godolphin Resources. Please refer to ASX: GRL Announcement dated 12 August 2025. • December 2025 (Godolphin): 17.52Mt (9.09Mt Indicated & 8.43Mt Inferred) @ 1.12g/t Au, 53.34g/t Ag, 2.06% Zn, 1.10% Pb, 0.14% Cu. This was an update to the August 2025 resource completed by an external consultancy, Measured Group, on behalf of Godolphin Resources. Please refer to ASX: GRL Announcement dated 15 December 2025. • Numerous drill campaigns have been completed over the project by various companies, the earliest of which was by Amax in 1971, using a Longyear 44 rig. Total drilling at the Lewis Ponds Project, which includes drilling along strike to the north west and south east, beyond the 2025 Era Mineral resource boundary, is 67,496.44m (refer below image). • 126 diamond holes for 44230.23 meters • 30 wedged diamond holes for 15,077.51 meters • 9 diamond tails to RC holes for 2094.5 meters • 66 RC holes for 6094.2 meters

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		 Other key bodies of work include: • 1992-1993: Tri Origin engaged Crone Geophysics to complete a dipole-dipole IP Survey over the deposit. This data was reprocessed by Godolphin Resources using MITRE Geophysics in 2025 (see ASX Announcement 5 May 2025). This data shows the disseminated mineralisation of the deposit is mapped as an IP chargeability anomaly. • 1991-1993: Tri Origin engaged Crone Geophysics to complete DHEM on numerous holes across the deposit. This data was reprocessed by Godolphin Resources using MITRE Geophysics in 2025 (See ASX: GRL Announcement 27 June 2025). The Lewis Ponds mineralisation is mapped by conductance's between 16 – 150S. Several off hole conductor plates were detected. • 1990s: Surface geological map compilation by Tri Origin. Rock type, mineralised lodes and mine workings were mapped. This mapping continues to be used today to help guide exploration. • 2004-2005: Geological logging and core photography carried out by external consultant Dr Peter Gregory (Gregory, P., February 2004 and Gregory P., January 2005). This work influenced the 2005 resource estimate. • 2010: VTEM survey completed by Geotech Airborne Limited. As part of this survey magnetics were collected. This showed Lewis Ponds is mapped as a weak conductor. The magnetics is used on an ongoing basis to help interpret structure and rock type. • 2018: Metallurgical studies reported by Ardea Resources described results of metallurgical test work show excellent recovery of base and precious metals into two concentrate streams (See ASX: ARL Announcement 26 November 2018).
Geology	• Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralization.	The Lewis Ponds project is located on the western margin of the Hill End Trough, which forms part of the Lachlan Fold Belt (LFB). The Lewis Ponds deposit is positioned on the eastern limb of the regional Mullion's Range Anticline and is hosted within the Late Silurian Mumbil Group. The primary volcanogenic mineralisation, as it has been defined to date, extends over a 1200m long zone and dips steeply to the northeast. The deposit is mapped by multiple mineralised lodes, namely (from east to west) Tom's, Spicer's and Torphy's. Spicer's includes the historical Main Zone mineralisation which features in the north of the deposit. These lodes are wireframed as discrete entities, however, they may reflect the same primary volcanogenic sulphide horizon, which has subsequently been folded. The mineralisation has been disrupted by a major 200-250m wide high strain zone, termed the Lewis

<table>
<tr><th>Criteria</th><th>JORC Code explanation</th><th>Commentary</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>Ponds Fault Zone with apparent east-block-up movement. The mineralised lodes are hosted in a volcaniclastic-sediment package overlying a quartz eye-feldspar rhyolite porphyry (footwall sequence). The hanging wall of the deposit is dominated by siltstones. The metamorphic grade of these Late Silurian volcanics and sedimentary rocks is greenschist facies.

The Lewis Ponds mineralisation is genetically classified as a volcanic-hosted sulphide system, comprising massive, semi-massive and disseminated sulphides. The dominant sulphide phases occur in decreasing abundance as pyrite > sphalerite > galena > chalcopyrite > pyrrhotite, with trace quantities of arsenopyrite. Trace amounts of magnetite are locally present within the massive sulphide zones. Mineralisation reports as stratiform lenses as well as vein networks and replacement textures affecting the host volcaniclastic sequence...</td></tr>
<tr><td>Drill hole Information</td><td>• 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.</td><td>• Hole locations are shown in the body of the announcement and assays are summarised in the significant assays Table 1 and 2
• No drillhole information has been excluded

<table>
<tr><th>HOLE_ID</th><th>Company</th><th>Status</th><th>East_GDA94_55S</th><th>North_GDA94_55S</th><th>Elevation</th><th>Depth (m)</th><th>Azimuth</th><th>Dip</th><th colspan="2">Drilling type</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>RC (m)</td><td>Diamond (m)</td></tr>
<tr><td>GLPRCDD001</td><td>Godolphin</td><td>Complete</td><td>709566</td><td>6316613</td><td>849</td><td>178</td><td>277</td><td>-70</td><td>178</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>GLPRCDD002</td><td>Godolphin</td><td>Complete</td><td>710452</td><td>6315779</td><td>784</td><td>252</td><td>237</td><td>-57</td><td>252</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>GLPRCDD003</td><td>Godolphin</td><td>Complete</td><td>710713</td><td>6315553</td><td>767</td><td>650</td><td>222</td><td>-74</td><td>60</td><td>590</td></tr>
<tr><td>GLPRCDD004</td><td>Godolphin</td><td>Complete</td><td>710897</td><td>6315301</td><td>765</td><td>487.2</td><td>235</td><td>-73</td><td>90</td><td>397.2</td></tr>
<tr><td>GLPRCDD005</td><td>Godolphin</td><td>Complete</td><td>710453</td><td>6315781</td><td>784</td><td>96</td><td>221</td><td>-75</td><td>96</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Total</td><td>676</td><td>987.2</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>TLP078</td><td>Historical</td><td>Complete</td><td>709553</td><td>6316615</td><td>849</td><td>150</td><td>239</td><td>-50</td><td>150</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>GLPRC002</td><td>Godolphin</td><td>Complete</td><td>709619</td><td>6316639</td><td>835</td><td>163</td><td>227</td><td>-50</td><td>163</td><td></td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
<tr><td>Data aggregation methods

And Gold Equivalent Calculation</td><td>• 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.</td><td>• Weighted averages of mineralisation reported by the current drill program have been calculated in Microsoft excel. If core loss falls within the mineralized envelope it is given a zero value.
• The Significant assay table is provided in the body of the announcement and is shown below.
• GLPRCDD002 assays have been reported on Gold Equivalent (AuEq) cutoffs of 0.67AuEq, which is the open pit cutoff grade used in the Scoping Study

<table>
<tr><th>Hole ID</th><th>From (m)</th><th>To (m)</th><th>Interval (m)</th><th>AuEq CutOff</th><th>AuEq_ppm</th><th>Au_ppm</th><th>Ag_ppm</th><th>Cu_%</th><th>Pb_%</th><th>Zn_%</th><th>Comments</th></tr>
<tr><td>GLPRCDD001</td><td>83.0</td><td>110.0</td><td>27.0</td><td>0.67</td><td>0.97</td><td>0.26</td><td>22.36</td><td>0.06</td><td>0.37</td><td>0.89</td><td>Quarry Lode. Includes 3m dilution</td></tr>
<tr><td>including</td><td>89.0</td><td>99.0</td><td>10.0</td><td>1.00</td><td>1.44</td><td>0.43</td><td>31.72</td><td>0.08</td><td>0.54</td><td>1.31</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>including</td><td>105.0</td><td>108.0</td><td>3.0</td><td>1.00</td><td>1.26</td><td>0.31</td><td>31.67</td><td>0.07</td><td>0.48</td><td>1.13</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>GLPRCDD002</td><td colspan="10">No Significant Assay</td><td>Target not reached.</td></tr>
<tr><td>GLPRCDD004</td><td colspan="10">No Significant Assay</td><td>ownhole EM shows conductive response west of hol</td></tr>
<tr><td>GLPRCDD005</td><td colspan="10">No Significant Assay</td><td>Re-drill of GLPRCDD002. Target not reached.</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>TLP078</td><td>52</td><td>66</td><td>14</td><td>0.67</td><td>1.26</td><td>0.22</td><td>26.1</td><td>0.06</td><td>0.38</td><td>0.8</td><td>Historical</td></tr>
<tr><td>GLPRC002</td><td>114</td><td>136</td><td>22</td><td>0.67</td><td>2.35</td><td>1.26</td><td>23.96</td><td>0.05</td><td>0.48</td><td>0.95</td><td>Historical</td></tr>
</table>
• GPRCDD003 assays have been reported based on Zinc Equivalent (ZnEq) cutoffs of 0.1%, 1.0% and 5.0%. The quoted intercepts may contain certain intervals below the cutoff grade (dilution) and where this has occurred it has been referenced in the table below i.e:</td></tr>
</table>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		 Gold Equivalents have been calculated using the formula for this report: ((Au grade g/t * Au price US$/oz * Au recov / 31.1035) + (Ag grade g/t * Ag price US$/oz * Ag recov / 31.1035) + (Cu grade % * Cu price US$/t* Cu recov / 100) + (Zn grade % * Zn price US$/t* Zn recov / 100) + (Pb grade % * Pb price US$/t* Pb recov / 100)) / (Au price g/t * Au recov / 31.1035). Prices are in US$ of Au= $3200/oz, Ag = $40/oz, Cu= $9,900/t, Zn = $2,700/t, Pb = 2,015/t. These prices are long-term prices and have been sourced from a range of metals analysts who provide monthly commodity price forecasts. The long-term pricing for each commodity is based on the average real consensus price from up to 19 metals analysts surveyed. The date of the survey was November 17th, 2025. Zinc Equivalents have been calculated using the formula for this report: • ((Au grade g/t * Au price US$/oz * Au recov / 31.1035) + (Ag grade g/t * Ag price US$/oz * Ag recov / 31.1035) + (Cu grade % * Cu price US$/t* Cu recov / 100) + (Zn grade % * Zn price US$/t* Zn recov / 100) + (Pb grade % * Pb price US$/t* Pb recov / 100)) / (Zn price US$/t * Zn recov / 100). Prices are in US$ of Au= $3200/oz, Ag = $40/oz, Cu= $9,900/t, Zn = $2,700/t, Pb = 2,015/t. These prices are long-term prices and have been sourced from a range of metals analysts who provide monthly commodity price forecasts. The long-term pricing for each commodity is based on the average real consensus price from up to 19 metals analysts surveyed. The date of the survey was November 17th, 2025. • Several metallurgical studies have been initiated on the Lewis Ponds resource and the most recent work used in this report was completed by Core Resources in December, 2025 (refer ASX GRL, 9 December 2025), who indicated a relatively simple flotation process producing two concentrates, a zinc dominant concentrate and a lead-gold-silver-copper concentrate. The average recoveries for the various metals were Gold = 64.7%, Silver = 71.8%, Zinc = 93.1%, Lead = 73.4% and Copper = 68.9%. These recoveries have been used in the metal equivalent calculation. It is the Company's opinion that all the elements included in the metal equivalents calculation have a reasonable potential to be recovered and sold.
Relationship between mineralization 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.	• Some of the mineralisation in GLPRCDD003 is at a low angle to the core axis, meaning the length of sulphide mineralisation may be exaggerated. Further drilling is required to properly quantify the true thickness of the reported sulphide zone. • GLPRCDD002 drillhole was drilled oblique to mineralisation and the downhole intercept is somewhat exaggerated
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.	• Diagrams can be found in the body of the announcement.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
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 Results.*	Results reported in this announcement have associated "from" and "to" depths to highlight their location down hole. A summary of significant assays in reported in the body of announcement
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.	• Metallurgical test work has historically been completed on the Lewis Ponds deposit. In 2018 SGS completed the most comprehensive flotation test work and demonstrated that the deposit is amenable to a relatively simple flotation flowsheet producing two concentrates: (1) a zinc concentrate, and (2) a lead–copper- precious metals concentrate containing the majority of the gold and silver. Recoveries reported from the SGS program averaged: Gold 60%, Silver 79%, Zinc 92%, Lead 75%, and Copper 69%. In December 2025, further metallurgical flotation test work was completed by the Brisbane based laboratory Core Resources [refer ASX GRL 9 December 2025]. This study separated the mineralisation into two discrete metallurgical domains: - Semi – Massive (SEM) and was selected based on >15% total sulphide content with a combined Lead-Zinc grade > 6%. - Disseminated (DIS) and was selected based on 5 – 15% total sulphide content and a combined lead-zinc grade between 2 – 6%. This domain represents the bulk of the deposit As previously identified by SGS in 2018, the 2025 study has produced two concentrates: (1) a zinc dominant concentrate, and (2) a lead–gold-silver-copper concentrate The 2025 concentrate produced better gold and zinc recoveries, reflecting a more optimised flowsheet and processing knowledge. These revised recoveries were used to update the AuEq calculation. The updated metallurgical recoveries (based on the Disseminated Ore Domain) applied in the 2025 MRE revision are summarised below: Metal Recovery (%) Gold (Au) 64.7% Silver (Ag) 71.8% Copper (Cu) 68.9% Zinc (Zn) 93.1% Lead (Pb) 73.4% • 1970s – 1990s: Various historical soil campaigns completed to provide coverage over a 3km strike along the deposit trend, at nominal 150m x 25m centres. This data is publicly available on MINVIEW. The Deposit is mapped by a coherent Pb-Zn soil anomaly with a copper in soil anomaly developed to the south and west of the 2021 era MRE. • 1992-1993: Tri Origin engaged Crone Geophysics to complete a dipole-dipole IP Survey over the deposit. This data was reprocessed by Godolphin Resources using MITRE Geophysics in 2025 (see ASX: GRL Announcement 5 May 2025). This data shows the disseminated mineralisation of the deposit is mapped as an IP chargeability anomaly. • 1990s: Surface geological map compilation by Tri Origin. Rock type, mineralised lodes and mine workings were mapped. This mapping continues to be used today to help guide exploration. • 2026 DHEM (as reported in this announcement) Contractor: Australian Geophysical Services Date: 24 June – 3 July 2026 Tx current: 110A Component: AUV Frequency: 50mx Transmitter: Geonics Receiver: DigiAtlantic Data was reviewed by Mitre Geophysics and plate modelling completed using Maxwell

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Further Work	• The nature and scale of planned further work (eg tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling).	• A Pre Feasibility study may commence in 2026. • Re-drill of GLPRCDD001 and drill at Tom's Lode • Drone Magnetics Survey • Ground EM survey over Cousin Jack