For personal use only

23 November 2026

First Assays from Stage 2 Lewis Ponds Drilling Indicate Resource Growth Potential

Highlights

- **Broad polymetallic, gold-silver mineralisation intersected in drill hole *GLPDD011*, comprising three separate mineralised zones including:**
  a. **Tom's Lode:**
     - **17m @ 1.83g/t AuEq[1] from 347m,**
       - **incl. 3m @ 3.94g/t AuEq from 358m**
     - **1m @ 6.25g/t AuEq (6.16g/t Au) from 379m**
  b. **Lady Bellmore Lode:**
     - **6.56m @ 1.04g/t AuEq from 254.4m**
  c. **New Hanging-Wall Zone:**
     - **3.3m @ 0.99g/t AuEq from 163.2m**
- **The Lady Bellmore Lode and the New Hanging-Wall Zone are outside the current Lewis Ponds Mineral Resource Estimate (MRE) and provide scope for potential resource expansion**
- **Drill hole *GLPDD010* intersected polymetallic mineralisation of the Quarry Lode below previous drilling and outside the existing MRE including:**
  - **10m @ 1.49g/t AuEq from 131m (GLPDD010)**
- **The results support the continuity of polymetallic mineralisation across multiple lodes at Lewis Ponds and will inform:**
  - **Future updates to the Lewis Ponds Mineral Resource of 17.52Mt (9.09Mt Indicated and 8.43Mt Inferred) @ 1.12g/t Au, 53.34g/t Ag, 2.06% Zn, 1.10% Pb and 0.14% Cu, reported in accordance to JORC 2012. (refer ASX Announcement 15 December 2025); and**
  - **Selection of representative core for the next phase of metallurgical testwork**
- **Assay results from the remaining two Stage 2 drill holes are expected prior to the end of the December 2026 quarter**

Orbit Resources Limited (ASX: OBT) ("Orbit" or the "Company") is pleased to provide the first assay results from its recently completed Stage 2 diamond drilling program at the Company's 100%-owned Lewis Ponds gold, silver and base metals project in the Lachlan Fold Belt in NSW.

Results have been received for drill holes GLPDD010 and GLPDD011, representing two of the four diamond drill holes completed during the Stage 2 drilling program.

[1] Refer to the AuEq formula on page 7. All intervals are downhole widths; true widths are not yet known.

For personal use only

The results include a broad, high-grade gold equivalent intersection at Tom's Lode, located within the current Lewis Ponds Mineral Resource Estimate (MRE), and additional mineralised intersections at the Quarry and Lady Bellmore lodes.

Importantly, the Quarry and Lady Bellmore lodes are currently not included in the existing MRE, and these new intercepts provide further evidence of the opportunity to expand the Project's existing MRE with additional drilling.

Significant assay results from the Stage 2 drilling include:

Drill Hole GLPDD011:

- **3.3m @ 0.99g/t AuEq from 163.2m at the New Hanging-Wall Zone**
- **6.56m @ 1.04g/t AuEq from 254.4m, at the Lady Bellmore Lode**
- **17m @ 1.83g/t AuEq from 347m, at Tom's Lode including**
    - **3m @ 3.94g/t AuEq from 358m**
- **1m @ 6.25g/t AuEq (6.16g/t Au) from 379m**

Drill Hole GLPDD010

- **10m @ 1.49g/t AuEq from 131m at the Quarry Lode**

Assay results from GLPDD012 and GLPDD013 are pending and are expected to be received in the coming weeks.

Management commentary

Managing Director Ms Jeneta Owens said: *"Stage 2 drilling was designed to strengthen confidence in the existing Lewis Ponds Mineral Resource while testing the potential for mineralisation beyond its current boundaries. Encouragingly, the first two holes have delivered positive results against both objectives.*

"At Tom's Lode, GLPDD011 intersected 17 metres at 1.83g/t AuEq, including 3 metres at 3.94g/t AuEq, within an area currently classified as Inferred. Results such as this provide valuable additional data to support potential future upgrades to the Mineral Resource classification, which remains a near-term priority.

"Drilling has also intersected mineralisation at the Quarry Lode and the newly modelled Lady Bellmore Lode, both outside the current 17.52Mt Mineral Resource. These results highlight the potential to expand the mineralised footprint at Lewis Ponds and will inform future evaluation of both lodes as part of our ongoing Resource growth strategy.

"Assays from GLPDD012 and GLPDD013 are pending, while GLPDD010 has been cased in preparation for a downhole electromagnetic survey. We have also recovered fresh core to support the next phase of metallurgical testwork.

"Combined with the Cousin Jack discovery, these results provide Orbit with a strong pipeline of exploration and technical work at Lewis Ponds as we advance our priorities programs into 2027."

Drill Program Update

Orbit completed four diamond drill holes for approximately 1,500m as part of its Stage 2 drilling program at Lewis Ponds.

For personal use only

The program was designed to:

- investigate the continuation of mineralisation below current Indicated Resource boundaries;
- evaluate mineralised lodes outside the Mineral Resource Estimate;
- test selected geophysical targets; and
- recover fresh drill core for future metallurgical testwork.

Assay results have now been received for GLPDD010 and GLPDD011. Results for the remaining two holes, GLPDD012 and GLPDD013, remain pending.




Figure 1: Location of Stage 2 drilling program at Lewis Ponds plotted on IP chargeability

For personal use only

Drill Hole GLPDD011 – Tom's Lode and Lady Bellmore Lode

GLPDD011 was designed primarily to test Tom's Lode at depth within an area currently classified as Inferred Mineral Resource. Additional drilling in this area may support an upgrade in classification to the Indicated category.

The hole intersected the anticipated sequence of sedimentary and volcanic units before intersecting semi-massive polymetallic sulphide mineralisation at Tom's Lode near the southern extent of the current Lewis Ponds MRE (Figure 1).

At Tom's Lode, GLPDD011 returned:

- **17m @ 1.83g/t AuEq from 347m, including:**
    - **3m @ 3.94g/t AuEq from 358m**
- **1m @ 6.25g/t AuEq (6.16g/t Au) from 379m**

The broad intersection supports the interpreted continuity of polymetallic gold-silver mineralisation at Tom's Lode within an area of the current Inferred Resource model at Lewis Ponds.

In shallower intervals of the drillhole (Figure 2), GLPDD011 also intersected mineralisation in the hanging wall, which is now termed the Lady Bellmore Lode, returning:

- **6.56m @ 1.04g/t AuEq from 254.4m**

The Lady Bellmore Lode is a mineralised zone within the Lewis Ponds Project area that has now been 3D geologically modelled across several historic drillholes, with this new intercept intersected close to its expected position at this location. The Lady Bellmore Lode is not currently included in the Lewis Ponds MRE, with further drilling needed to assess whether it can be included within an updated MRE. This result adds another potential area for resource growth and will be assessed as part of Orbit's ongoing resource evaluation program.

In addition to the Tom's and Lady Bellmore Lodes, a new zone of shallower mineralisation has been intersected higher in the hanging wall to the Lady Bellmore Lode, which may indicate a new mineralised lode and an area for future follow-up drilling. Assay results from this zone returned:

- **3.3m @ 0.99g/t AuEq from 163.2m**

Results from GLPDD011 will be incorporated into the Lewis Ponds geological model and considered as part of future Mineral Resource estimation work.




Figure 2: Cross section of drillhole GLPDD011 with significant intercepts highlighted as well as the position of the Lady Bellmore Lode and Tom's Lode

Drill Hole GLPDD010 – Quarry Lode and Electromagnetic (EM) Target

GLPDD010 was completed in the northern sector of the Lewis Ponds deposit and had two principal objectives:

- to test a modelled offhole electromagnetic (EM) conductor located in the footwall of Quarry Lode; and
- to evaluate the Quarry Lode below the extent of previous drilling.

For personal use only

For personal use only

The hole intersected the anticipated sequence of sedimentary and volcanic units before intersecting the Quarry Lode close to the position predicted by Orbit's geological model (Figure 3).

At the Quarry Lode, GLPDD010 returned:

- **5m @ 0.92g/t AuEq from 121m**
- **10m @ 1.49g/t AuEq from 131m**

The mineralised intervals comprise disseminated to stringer sulphide mineralisation developed proximal to marble units. The Quarry Lode is not currently included in the Lewis Ponds Mineral Resource Estimate. The intersection represents an encouraging result and provides additional geological and assay information that may support its evaluation for inclusion in a future Mineral Resource update.

GLPDD010 also tested the targeted TLPD-04 offhole electromagnetic conductor, thought to represent an accumulation of mineral sulphides. The EM conductor was not explained by the drilling and the hole has been cased with PVC to facilitate future downhole EM surveying; ultimately this will refine the position and geometry of the conductor and assist in determining whether further drill testing is warranted.




Figure 3: Cross section of drillhole GLPDD010 with significant intercepts highlighted as well as the position of the Quarry Lode and the modelled TLPD-04 EM conductor.

For personal use only

Next Steps

Orbit's ongoing activities at Lewis Ponds include:

- Assay results from two drill holes pending (GLPDD012 and GLPDD013)
- Downhole EM surveying
- Integration of drilling and geophysical results into the Lewis Ponds geological model
- Future metallurgical testwork
- Refining priority exploration and resource-development targets for the 2027 program

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$/t* Pb recov / 100)) / (Au price US$/oz * 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.

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 OBT, 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: *Summary of significant intercepts (downhole widths; true widths not yet known)*

Hole ID	From (m)	To (m)	Interval (m)	AuEq ppm	Au ppm	Ag ppm	Cu %	Pb %	Zn %	Comments
GLPDD010	121	126	5	0.92	0.15	17.0	0.04	0.32	1.12	Quarry Lode. Outside of MRE. 0.67g/t AuEq cutoff
GLPDD010	**131**	**141**	**10**	**1.49**	**0.38**	**32.6**	**0.10**	**0.53**	**1.19**	**Quarry Lode. Outside of MRE. 0.67g/t AuEq cutoff**
GLPDD011	163.2	166.5	3.3	0.99	0.01	2.7	0.02	0.21	2.32	New Hanging-Wall Zone. Outside of MRE. 0.67g/t AuEq cutoff
and	254.44	261	6.56	1.04	0.02	4.7	0.09	0.52	1.97	Lady Bellmore Lode. Outside of MRE. 0.67g/t AuEq cutoff
and	**347**	**364**	**17**	**1.83**	**0.56**	**34.9**	**0.05**	**0.85**	**1.46**	**Tom's Lode. 0.67g/t AuEq cutoff**
incl	358	361	3	3.94	1.54	66.7	0.08	1.54	2.78	Tom's Lode - high grade footwall position
and	379	380	1	6.25	6.16	2.7	0.00	0.08	0.08	0.67g/t AuEq cutoff
and	393	397	4	0.93	0.17	21.5	0.42	0.03	0.08	0.67g/t AuEq cutoff
and	413	414	1	0.84	0.20	11.8	0.45	0.01	0.05	0.67g/t AuEq cutoff
and	422	424	2	0.69	0.05	15.2	0.38	0.02	0.08	0.67g/t AuEq cutoff

<ENDS>

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

For personal use only

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, base metals and rare earth 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 approximately 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 and a Member of the Australasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy. 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 and Mineral Resources associated with the Company's projects is extracted from the following ASX Announcements:

- *ASX Announcement Titled Additional Visible Semi-Massive Sulphide Intersected dated 4 November 2026*
- *ASX Announcement Titled "Drilling Intersects more Massive Sulphides at Lewis Ponds" dated 21 October 2026*
- *ASX Announcement Titled "Exploration Update: Lewis Ponds Gold, Silver and Base metals Project" dated 29 September 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*
- *ASX Announcement Titled Lewis Ponds Gold and Silver Project Scoping Study dated 17 February 2026*

For personal use only

- *ASX Announcement Titled Lewis Ponds Metallurgical Flotation Completed, Delivering Superior Concentrate Production" dated 9 December 2025*
- *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 Annual Report for the year ended 30 June 2025 dated 12 September 2025*
- *ASX Announcement Titled DHEM Data indicative of Resource Expansion at Lewis ponds dated 27 June 2025*
- *ASX Announcement Titled Geophysics Reveals large Exploration Targets at Lewis Ponds dated 5 May 2025*
- *ASX Announcement Titled High-grade Drill Results Continue at the Lewis Ponds Gold & Silver Project" dated 12 March 2025*

Copies of the market announcements referred to above are available on the Company's website www.orbitresources.au. The announcements were issued in accordance with the 2012 Edition of the JORC Australasian Code for Reporting of Exploration Results, Mineral 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 Orbit'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.

For personal use only

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.
• 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.
• 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="5">* DD = Diamond Drilling RC = Reverse Circulation</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>TOTAL</td><td>67496.4</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">DD_Wedge = Diamond Wedge hole RCDD = Combination RC and DD hole</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></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 Orbit (OBT) (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>

For personal use only

Criteria	• JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		• Holes were tripled tubed and oriented using the Reflex Ori system, with bottom of hole marks. Lewis Ponds Orbit Resources (2026) • Phase 1: RC and Diamond drilling using a UDR 1200 HC. Holes have been drilled with RC pre-collars and HQ3 and/ or NQ3 diamond tails. • Phase 2: Diamond drilling using a Sandvik DE712 drill rig • Holes are HQ3 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 Orbit (2024/2025) • Core recovery was completed on every drill run and logged into OBT 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 Orbit Resources (2026) • Core recovery was completed on every drill run and logged into OBT 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 OBT 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 by suitably qualified geologists
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.

For personal use only

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 Orbit 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. • OBT 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. OBT 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 Orbit (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 • OBT 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 / Orbit Resources 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 • OBT/ OBT 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)	<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:

For personal use only

Criteria	• JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	protocols. • 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 / Orbit Resources (2024/2025/2026)</u> • Significant intersections have been reviewed and verified by internal OBT 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 OBT server. • Primary assay data is received by the Company from the laboratory and entered/ stored on the OBT server. OBT 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. • OBT 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 OBT 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 Orbit (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. • GLPDD010, GLPDD011 , GLPDD012 and GLPDD013 targeted areas of Inferred Resource with the aim to improve drillhole density in these areas to support future consideration of Mineral Resource updates
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. • GLPDD013 has been drilled slightly oblique to the Spicer's Lode owing to accessibility constraints .
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 OBT work, all core was collected and accounted for by OBT employees/consultants during drilling. All logging was done by OBT personnel. • All samples were bagged into calico bags by OBT personnel following OBT 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, Orbit 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 Orbit. • Local relief at the site is between 700m and 900m above sea level.

For personal use only

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		• 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 Orbit Resources through the granted exploration license EL5583. • Security of $108,000 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 Orbit 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 Bellmore, 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 (Orbit): 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 Orbit Resources. Please refer to ASX: OBT Announcement dated 2 February 2021. • August 2025 (Orbit): 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 Orbit Resources. Please refer to ASX: OBT Announcement dated 12 August 2025. • December 2025 (Orbit): 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 Orbit Resources. Please refer to ASX: OBT 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

For personal use only

For personal use only

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 Orbit 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 Orbit Resources using MITRE Geophysics in 2025 (See ASX: OBT 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.

For personal use only

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		The mineralisation has been disrupted by a major 200-250m wide high strain zone, termed the Lewis 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...
Drill hole Information	• A summary of all information material to the understanding of the exploration results including a tabulation of the following information for all Material drill holes: ○ *easting and northing of the drill hole collar* ○ *elevation or RL (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in metres) of the drill hole collar* ○ *dip and azimuth of the hole* ○ *down hole length and interception depth* ○ *hole length.* • If the exclusion of this information is justified on the basis that the information is not Material and this exclusion does not detract from the understanding of the report, the Competent Person should clearly explain why this is the case.	• Hole locations are shown in the body of the announcement and historical assays are summarised in the significant assays table below • Cousin Jack discovery hole GLPRCDD003 assays are highlighted in Figure 1 and these assays have previously been reported via 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 • No drillhole information has been excluded
Data aggregation methods *And Gold Equivalent Calculation*	• 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.	• Weighted averages of mineralisation reported in the current drill program have been calculated in Microsoft excel. • Intercepts reported are typically subject to a 0.67g/tAuEq cut off supported by economic assumptions presented in MRE's presented on the ASX in December 2025 • 1m internal dilution is applied in some instances and noted in the following intercept table • If core loss falls within the mineralised envelope it is given a zero value • Significant assay values are presented within the news release and provided here

HOLE_ID	Company	Campaign	Year	Status	Type	East_GDA94_55S	North_GDA94_55S	Elevation	Depth (m)	Azimuth	Dip	Drilling type		Comments
												RC (m)	DD (m)	
GLPRCDD001	Godolphin	Phase 1	2026	Complete	RC/DD	709566	6316613	849	178.0	277	-70	178		
GLPRCDD002	Godolphin	Phase 1	2026	Complete	RC/DD	710452	6315779	784	252.0	237	-57	252		
GLPRCDD003	Godolphin	Phase 1	2026	Complete	RC/DD	710713	6315553	767	650.0	222	-74	60	590	
GLPRCDD004	Godolphin	Phase 1	2026	Complete	RC/DD	710897	6315301	765	487.2	235	-73	90	397.2	
GLPRCDD005	Godolphin	Phase 1	2026	Complete	RC/DD	710453	6315781	784	96.0	221	-75	96		Re-drill of Hole2. Hole deviated and was stopped.
GLPDD010	Orbit	Phase 2	2026	Complete	DD	709580	6316619	849	400.2	275	-65		400.2	Assay received
GLPDD011	Orbit	Phase 2	2026	Complete	DD	710290	6316133	792	434.5	241	-63		434.5	Assay received
GLPDD012	Orbit	Phase 2	2026	Complete	DD	710281	6316196	785	334.1	237	-55		334.1	Awaiting assay
GLPDD013	Orbit	Phase 2	2026	Complete	DD	709627	6316840	814	294.1	202	-60		434.5	Awaiting assay
GLPDD008	Godolphin	Historical	2025	Complete	DD	709641.8	6316734	830	195.8	244	-63			
TLPDD04002	Tri Origin	Historical	2004	Complete	DD	709692.7	6316827	802	404.0	229	-60			
TLPD-51AW3	Historical		1995	Complete	DD Wedge	710272	6316186	783	409	238	-70		409	Wedge hole
TLPD-52	Historical		1995	Complete	DD	710213	6316198	781	232.2	213	-55		232.2	
TLPD-53	Historical		1995	Complete	DD	710211	6316198	781	369.9	222	-68		369.9	
TLPD-51AW2	Historical		1995	Complete	DD_Wedge	710273	6316186	784	501	238	-70		501	
TLPD-54	Historical		1995	Complete	DD	710302	6316122	795	241	240	-47		241	
TOD-1	Historical			Complete		710829	6315363	753	151.1	238	-45			
TOD-10	Historical			Complete		7111446	6314682	764	410.7	238	-70			

Hole ID	From (m)	To (m)	Interval (m)	AuEq_ppm	Au_ppm	Ag_ppm	Cu_ppm	Pb_ppm	Zn_ppm	Cu_%	Pb_%	Zn_%	Comments
GLPDD010	121	126	5	0.92	0.15	17.0	396.2	3157	11220	0.04	0.32	1.12	0.67g/t AuEq cutoff
GLPDD010	131	141	10	1.49	0.38	32.6	999	5285	11855	0.10	0.53	1.19	Quarry Lode. Outside of MRE. 0.67g/t AuEq cutoff
GLPDD011	163.2	166.5	3.3	0.99	0.01	2.7	220	2148	23150	0.02	0.21	2.32	New hanging wall lode. 0.67g/t AuEq cutoff
and	254.4	261	6.56	1.04	0.02	4.7	934	5224	19655	0.09	0.52	1.97	Lady Bellmore Lode. 0.67g/t AuEq cutoff
and	**347**	**364**	**17**	**1.83**	**0.56**	**34.9**	**495**	**8469**	**14558**	**0.05**	**0.85**	**1.46**	**Tom's Lode. 0.67g/t AuEq cutoff**
incl	**358**	**361**	**3**	**3.94**	**1.54**	**66.7**	**843**	**15367**	**27767**	**0.08**	**1.54**	**2.78**	**Tom's Lode - high grade footwall position**
and	**379**	**380**	**1**	**6.25**	**6.16**	**2.7**	**13**	**753**	**797**	**0.00**	**0.08**	**0.08**	0.67g/t AuEq cutoff
and	393	397	4	0.93	0.17	21.5	4203	349	797	0.42	0.03	0.08	0.67g/t AuEq cutoff
and	413	414	1	0.84	0.20	11.8	4450	62	492	0.45	0.01	0.05	0.67g/t AuEq cutoff
and	422	424	2	0.69	0.05	15.2	3815	237	762	0.38	0.02	0.08	0.67g/t AuEq cutoff

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$/t* Pb recov / 100)) / (Au price US$/oz * 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 Equivalent (ZnEq) grades have been calculated to provide a single indicative value for polymetallic mineralisation as shown in Figures 1 and 2.. The ZnEq values incorporate zinc (Zn), lead (Pb) silver (Ag) copper (Cu) and gold (Au) grades, based on assumed longterm 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=

For personal use only

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		$9,900/t, Zn = $2,700/t, Pb = $2,015/t. 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 OBT, 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.	• Drillholes have been oriented at surface so that they are generally perpendicular to the strike of the rock layering • Drillhole intercepts are presented as downhole intervals and relationships to interpreted Mineralised lodes are presented in Figure 2 and Figure 3 • GLPRCDD003 results have been previously reported via 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
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.
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 intercepts are reported in the body of announcement. • GLPRCDD003 results reported in this announcement have associated "from" depths to highlight their location down hole. These results have been previously reported via 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
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 OBT 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

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		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 Orbit Resources using MITRE Geophysics in 2025 (see ASX: OBT 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.
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 2027. • Ground EM survey over Cousin Jack

For personal use only