

JORC Code, 2012 Edition – Table 1

Section 1 Sampling Techniques and Data

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

| Criteria | JORC Code explanation | Commentary |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Sampling techniques | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Systematic soil samples were taken on a 400mx100m grid; Samples were taken from the upper saprolite zone, at 30-40 cm (maximum 80 cm) below surface. Each 3kg sample was collected in a labeled plastic bag; Rock-chips samples were collected from outcrop showing mineralisation, with alteration and/or quartz veining, where sheared and/or deformed and plus or minus boxworks of sulphides. Approximately 3 kg of rock chips were collected in labeled plastic bags; Samples were shipped to an internal preparation laboratory in Yaoundé. |
| Drilling techniques | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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). | |
| Drill sample recovery | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. | |
| Logging | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 | |

| Criteria | JORC Code explanation | Commentary |
|--|--|---|
| | <p><i>studies.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Whether logging is qualitative or quantitative in nature. Core (or costean, channel, etc) photography.</i> • <i>The total length and percentage of the relevant intersections logged.</i> | |
| <p><i>Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all core taken.</i> • <i>If non-core, whether riffled, tube sampled, rotary split, etc and whether sampled wet or dry.</i> • <i>For all sample types, the nature, quality and appropriateness of the sample preparation technique.</i> • <i>Quality control procedures adopted for all sub-sampling stages to maximise representivity of samples.</i> • <i>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.</i> • <i>Whether sample sizes are appropriate to the grain size of the material being sampled.</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Samples were dried in an oven at 60°C for 6 to 8 hours and were entirely crushed to at least 70% passing a 2mm sieve and then quartered to split to 500g sub-samples; • The 500g crushed samples are pulverised to 85% of material passing a 75 microns sieve. 50-60g from that pulverised sample was collected, bagged in craft paper and labelled ready for dispatch to an internationally-accredited analytical lab. A coarse reject from the remaining crushed material and the 440g pulp reject (from the pulverised sample) are retained and secured for future use or need; • A sieve test at every 10th sample crushed is performed to ascertain the 70% of material are passing 2mm sieving. And another sieve test is performed at every 10 samples pulverized to ensure pulverization is done well and that 85% of material are passing 75 microns sieves. Records are kept in a log book. • After every sample is crushed, a barren gneiss is used to flush the crusher and remove any form of cross-sample contamination; • Pulverisers are cleaned after each sample pulverisation using compressed air and dry cloth; • Certified Reference Material (CRM) (from GEOSTATS Australia), blanks, and field duplicates are inserted among pulps before submission to lab on 1:40 ratio. |
| <p><i>Quality of assay data and laboratory tests</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The nature, quality and appropriateness of the assaying and laboratory procedures used and whether the technique is considered partial or total.</i> • <i>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.</i> • <i>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.</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fire assay gold analysis was conducted on a 50 g charge, using an AAS finish; • Lower detection limits for soil and rocks were 0.002 ppm and 0.01 ppm respectively; • QC procedures for the programme included the insertion of blanks and commercial CRM (from Geostats and the lab uses CRM from Rocklabs) to monitor the accuracy and precision of laboratory data; • The overall quality of QA/QC is good. |

| Criteria | JORC Code explanation | Commentary |
|---|--|---|
| Verification of sampling and assaying | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The verification of significant intersections by either independent or alternative company personnel. • The use of twinned holes. • Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols. • Discuss any adjustment to assay data. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All samples were submitted to Bureau Veritas in Cote d'Ivoire which is an internationally accredited laboratory (ISO 9001:2008 accredited). |
| Location of data points | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accuracy and quality of surveys used to locate drill holes (collar and down-hole surveys), trenches, mine workings and other locations used in Mineral Resource estimation. • Specification of the grid system used. • Quality and adequacy of topographic control. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All sample locations were surveyed with a hand-held GPS; • Coordinates were recorded in UTM WGS84 Zone 33N coordinate reference system. |
| Data spacing and distribution | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil samples were taken on a pre-defined 400mx100m grid; |
| Orientation of data in relation to geological structure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the orientation of sampling achieves unbiased sampling of possible structures and the extent to which this is known, considering the deposit type. • If the relationship between the drilling orientation and the orientation of key mineralised structures is considered to have introduced a sampling bias, this should be assessed and reported if material. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil sampling lines with 100m sample spacing were oriented towards 134 degrees, and perpendicular to the main observed NE- trending structural corridor, which is denoted by a main foliation trend and key geological contact. |
| Sample security | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The measures taken to ensure sample security. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to their dispatch, samples were stored in a locked storeroom, within a fenced and guarded office; • The rock-chip samples by Oriole were analysed at Bureau Veritas in Cote d'Ivoire, the samples were sent by DHL in secured metal boxes to the laboratory; • At arrival, batch logging and official check-in (bar-coding, for tracking purposes) of samples was carried out before sample preparation and analysis. |
| Audits or reviews | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal reviews on sampling and assaying results were conducted for all data. |

Section 2 Reporting of Exploration Results

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

| Criteria | JORC Code explanation | Commentary |
|--|--|--|
| <i>Mineral tenement and land tenure status</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Type, reference name/number, location and ownership including agreements or material issues with third parties such as joint ventures, partnerships, overriding royalties, native title interests, historical sites, wilderness or national park and environmental settings.</i> • <i>The security of the tenure held at the time of reporting along with any known impediments to obtaining a licence to operate in the area.</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oriole Resources is earning to 90% beneficial interest in the Bibemi and Wapouzé licences. • The Wapouzé licence is valid until July 2019. There are no known environmental liabilities associated with the Project at this time. There are no known impediments to obtaining a licence to operate in the area. |
| <i>Exploration done by other parties</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project was formerly owned and operated by Reservoir Minerals Corporation during the period 2011-2015. RMC completed initial stream sediment sampling but no drilling. |
| <i>Geology</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Orogenic gold mineralisation hosted by quartz veins within schists along the sheared contact between mafic and felsic units. |
| <i>Drill hole Information</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>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:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>easting and northing of the drill hole collar</i> ○ <i>elevation or RL (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in metres) of the drill hole collar</i> ○ <i>dip and azimuth of the hole</i> ○ <i>down hole length and interception depth</i> ○ <i>hole length.</i> • <i>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.</i> | |
| <i>Data aggregation methods</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>In reporting Exploration Results, weighting averaging techniques, maximum and/or minimum grade truncations (eg cutting of high grades) and cut-off grades are usually Material and should be stated.</i> • <i>Where aggregate intercepts incorporate short lengths of high grade results and longer lengths of low grade results, the procedure used for such aggregation should be stated and some typical examples of such aggregations should be shown in detail.</i> • <i>The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values</i> | |

| Criteria | JORC Code explanation | Commentary |
|---|--|---|
| | <i>should be clearly stated.</i> | |
| <i>Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>These relationships are particularly important in the reporting of Exploration Results.</i> • <i>If the geometry of the mineralisation with respect to the drill hole angle is known, its nature should be reported.</i> • <i>If it is not known and only the down hole lengths are reported, there should be a clear statement to this effect (eg 'down hole length, true width not known').</i> | |
| <i>Diagrams</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Appropriate maps and sections (with scales) and tabulations of intercepts should be included for any significant discovery being reported. These should include, but not be limited to a plan view of drill hole collar locations and appropriate sectional views.</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A table of results and a plan view map of sample locations and outlined surface anomalies is included in Appendix 1.</i> |
| <i>Balanced reporting</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Where comprehensive reporting of all Exploration Results is not practicable, representative reporting of both low and high grades and/or widths should be practiced to avoid misleading reporting of Exploration Results.</i> | |
| <i>Other substantive exploration data</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Other exploration data, if meaningful and material, should be reported including (but not limited to): geological observations; geophysical survey results; geochemical survey results; bulk samples – size and method of treatment; metallurgical test results; bulk density, groundwater, geotechnical and rock characteristics; potential deleterious or contaminating substances.</i> | |
| <i>Further work</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The nature and scale of planned further work (eg tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling).</i> • <i>Diagrams clearly highlighting the areas of possible extensions, including the main geological interpretations and future drilling areas, provided this information is not commercially sensitive.</i> | |

Appendix 1




Figure 1. Results from Phase 1 soil and rock-chip sampling at Wapouzé




Figure 2. Results from Phase 1 and Phase 2 soil sampling at Bataol Zone, Wapouzé