

## JORC Code, 2012 Edition – Table 1 Brilliant Brumby Project Gold Exploration Target and Exploration Results

### Section 1 Sampling Techniques and Data

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<b>Sampling techniques</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Nature and quality of sampling (e.g. cut channels, random chips, or specific specialised industry standard measurement tools appropriate to the minerals under investigation, such as down hole gamma sondes, or handheld XRF instruments, etc.). These examples should not be taken as limiting the broad meaning of sampling.</i></li> <li>• <i>Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample representivity and the appropriate calibration of any measurement tools or systems used.</i></li> <li>• <i>Aspects of the determination of mineralisation that are Material to the Public Report.</i></li> <li>• <i>In cases where 'industry standard' work has been done this would be relatively simple (e.g. 'reverse circulation drilling was used to obtain 1 m samples from which 3 kg was 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 (e.g. submarine nodules) may warrant disclosure of detailed information.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reverse circulation (RC) drilling was used to obtain 2 m composite and 1 m samples from which ~3 kg samples were collected for assay.</li> <li>• The ~3kg samples were collected using a systematic procedure of spear sampling through the bulk sample bags of all reverse circulation drill cuttings collected for each metre of drilling.</li> <li>• Sampling of HQ diamond core was completed after having been correctly jig-sawed and cut using a core saw to provide half core material at nominally 1m intervals for assaying. Where visible mineralisation was intersected the sampling interval was geologically controlled to best represent the respective geology and mineralisation in the analysis. Sample weights typically varied between 1 and 5 kg depending on the interval sampled.</li> <li>• Duplicate samples were usually taken at each RC sample ending in 25 and 75; some at selected intervals with potentially auriferous quartz rich samples. No duplicates of diamond core were completed due to the nature of the samples.</li> <li>• Certified Standard samples were inserted at each sample ending 50 and 00.</li> <li>• Assays by 50 g fire assay for gold and 4 acid digest with ICP-AES readings for various elements including Ag, Pb, S, Al, As, Ba, Be, Bi, Ca, Cd, Co, Cr, Cu, Fe, Ga, K, La, Mg, Mn, Mo, Na, Ni, P, Sb, Sc, Sr, Th, Ti, Tl, U, V, W, Zn.</li> </ul>
<b>Drilling techniques</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Drill type (e.g. core, reverse circulation, open-hole hammer, rotary air blast, auger, Bangka, sonic, etc.) and details (e.g. core diameter, triple or standard tube, depth of diamond tails, face-sampling bit or other type, whether core is oriented and if so, by what method, etc.).</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reverse circulation drilling with 140 mm diameter face sampling bits.</li> <li>• Diamond drilling was initially HQ3 triple tube for first 6m then standard tube HQ. All holes were diamond drilled from surface. Core was oriented using reflex tool.</li> </ul>
<b>Drill sample recovery</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Method of recording and assessing core and chip sample recoveries and results assessed.</i></li> <li>• <i>Measures taken to maximise sample recovery and ensure representative nature of the samples.</i></li> <li>• <i>Whether a relationship exists between sample recovery and grade and whether sample bias may have occurred due to preferential loss/gain of fine/coarse material.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any zones of poor chip recovery noted on logs. Core recovery was tabulated for each drilling run and averaged 99.6%.</li> <li>• Selection of known good quality drilling contractor, drillers, associated equipment, and adequate air pressure used. For core drilling selection of drilling fluids was adjusted to suit the ground being drilled. Careful sampling procedures.</li> <li>• Minor loss of ultra-fines as dust during RC drilling. Drilling equipment produced coarse chips thus minimising fines. Apart from the upper 20-40m of holes at ca. 750m RL (Surprise prospect area) where highly weathered material was encountered, most drilling was in fresh</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		rock or saprock.
<b>Logging</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Whether core and chip samples have been geologically and geotechnically logged to a level of detail to support appropriate Mineral Resource estimation, mining studies and metallurgical studies.</i></li> <li>• <i>Whether logging is qualitative or quantitative in nature. Core (or costean, channel, etc.) photography.</i></li> <li>• <i>The total length and percentage of the relevant intersections logged.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed geology was logged by qualified geologists for each 1 m sample from unsieved and sieved drill chips for RC drilling.</li> <li>• Core was logged by qualified geologists and included lithology, oxidation, alteration, and estimated of vein and mineralisation percentages.</li> <li>• Photographs were taken of all chip trays following logging of samples. Drill core was photographed both wet and dry.</li> <li>• Full sample intersections were logged.</li> </ul>
<b>Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all core taken.</i></li> <li>• <i>If non-core, whether riffled, tube sampled, rotary split, etc. and whether sampled wet or dry.</i></li> <li>• <i>For all sample types, the nature, quality and appropriateness of the sample preparation technique.</i></li> <li>• <i>Quality control procedures adopted for all sub-sampling stages to maximise representivity of samples.</i></li> <li>• <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></li> <li>• <i>Whether sample sizes are appropriate to the grain size of the material being sampled.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Diamond drill holes were sampled using half core.</li> <li>• Samples were carefully spear (50 mm tube) sampled from the bulk 1m sample bags. Most samples were dry. The bulk bags were traversed through their full depth until approximately 3 kg sub-samples were collected into pre-numbered calico bags.</li> <li>• Laboratory sample preparation was undertaken by ALS-Global quality managed systems to ISO standards. Samples were weighted and barcoded on receipt at the laboratory then riffle split to 3 kg to over-weight. The 3 kg samples were pulverised to 85% passing 75 microns prior to analysis.</li> <li>• Laboratory sample preparation undertaken by ALS-Global quality managed systems.</li> <li>• Field duplicate samples were taken at the rate of 1 per 50 primary samples and the results assessed (Diamond drilling substituted duplicate for a certified standard).</li> <li>• Certified Standard samples inserted at each sample ending 50 and 00.</li> <li>• Sample sizes are considered appropriate to the material collected, following industry standards. Coarse gold was noted on rare occasions in high grade drill core intersections suggesting high nugget effects should be allowed for in resource estimation and large samples taken where possible.</li> </ul>
<b>Quality of assay data and laboratory tests</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The nature, quality and appropriateness of the assaying and laboratory procedures used and whether the technique is considered partial or total.</i></li> <li>• <i>For geophysical tools, spectrometers, handheld XRF instruments, etc., the parameters used in determining the analysis including instrument</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The assay methods (Au-AA26 &amp; ME-ICP61) used by ALS give fire assay total gold and 4 acid digestion “near-total” extraction of some other elements. The methods are considered appropriate for the deposits. Screen fire gold assaying may be required where coarse gold is possible. Note however that Ba, REE oxides, Ta, Sn and W are only partially or poorly extracted and that Fe and S are only indications of their content.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<p><i>make and model, reading times, calibrations factors applied and their derivation, etc.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Nature of quality control procedures adopted (e.g. standards, blanks, duplicates, external laboratory checks) and whether acceptable levels of accuracy (i.e. lack of bias) and precision have been established.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Magnetic susceptibility readings were collected in triplicate at 1m intervals,</li> <li>• Duplicate samples were normally taken at each sample ending in 25 and 75, except for diamond drilling which substituted the duplicate for a certified standard. Certified Standard samples were inserted at sample ending 50 and 00, however are not a CRM for the XRF analysis method. Blank samples were not used. ALS completed their own internal QAQC procedures. No external laboratory checks were undertaken due to the ISO 9001 rating of the ALS laboratory.</li> </ul>
<b>Verification of sampling and assaying</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The verification of significant intersections by either independent or alternative company personnel.</i></li> <li>• <i>The use of twinned holes.</i></li> <li>• <i>Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols.</i></li> <li>• <i>Discuss any adjustment to assay data.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No independent verifications were undertaken however routine duplicate sampling and certified standard procedures ensured that a significant proportion of high-grade samples were verified.</li> <li>• Diamond drill holes targeted gold mineralised zones near selected RC drill holes.</li> <li>• Field data was recorded on paper sheets and subsequently entered digitally onto a computer in the field. Both hard and digital copy are filed. Digital data verification is periodically undertaken. Check logging was undertaken between geologists was done when new personnel took over logging.</li> <li>• No adjustments were made to the data apart from averaging high gold assays where repeats were available</li> </ul>
<b>Location of data points</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Accuracy and quality of surveys used to locate drillholes (collar and downhole surveys), trenches, mine workings and other locations used in Mineral Resource estimation.</i></li> <li>• <i>Specification of the grid system used.</i></li> <li>• <i>Quality and adequacy of topographic control.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standard GPS survey used with accuracy of 3 m – 5 m. Following the program, a DGPS (Trimble Catalyst DA1) collected drill hole collar locations to approximately 30 cm accuracy. The Catalyst has GNSS and an RTK correction applied. No downhole surveys were completed as all holes were vertical.</li> <li>• All surveys were MGA Zone 55 (GDA94).</li> <li>• Regional 1:25,000 topographic contours were used. Other topographic data has been collected from a ground magnetic survey completed in 2013 and a Drone photogrammetry survey completed over the Surprise prospect in 2021.</li> </ul>
<b>Data spacing and distribution</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Data spacing for reporting of Exploration Results.</i></li> <li>• <i>Whether the data spacing and distribution is sufficient to establish the degree of geological and grade continuity appropriate for the Mineral Resource and Ore Reserve estimation procedure(s) and classifications applied.</i></li> <li>• <i>Whether sample compositing has been applied.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drill intercept spacing is variable typically ranging from less than 10 m to 50 m in the upper 80 m to 40 to 80 m below 80 m beneath the surface.</li> <li>• The data spacing is reasonable for the reporting of Exploration Targets however the continuity of the higher-grade gold population is yet to be evaluated. Four of the six DDHs which were drilled in proximity to high grade intersections in RC holes also returned high grade results. 3D evaluation of the distances between the core and RC intersections is yet to be undertaken.</li> <li>• Composite 2 m RC samples were used in visually unmineralised lithologies. Follow-up 1 m samples were assayed where any 2 m composites showed gold &gt;0.25 g/t Au.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<b>Orientation of data in relation to geological structure</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Whether the orientation of sampling achieves unbiased sampling of possible structures and the extent to which this is known, considering the deposit type.</i></li> <li>• <i>If the relationship between the drilling orientation and the orientation of key mineralised structures is considered to have introduced a sampling bias, this should be assessed and reported if material.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The orientation of the sampling was generally unbiased being nominally at right angles to the strike where the topography permitted. Where possible, the drilling was across strike at nominal 20 to 40 m intervals. The mineralised quartz reefs typically lie longitudinally along the strike of the sericitic alteration lodes. At Brumby North and parts of Brilliant Brumby and Silica Ridge some quartz veins run almost at right angles to the lode orientation. There some of the drilling was towards the SW to sample both the longitudinal and cross-lode veins.</li> <li>• Due to the difficult topography, fans of holes were drilled where necessary, e.g. at Victory (Brandy Creek) for both RC and diamond drill holes, These gave rise to closely spaced high grade intersections at Victory. The obliquely drilled holes resulted in some intersections being much longer than the true width. The latter intersections provide a larger volume of potentially mineralised sample to reduce sampling errors.</li> <li>• Sampling bias due to the orientation of the drilling versus the geological structure has been established in some holes at Victory, Brilliant Brumby, Brumby North and Golden Spur (see above). All drilling results have been reported as down-hole lengths.</li> <li>• Where possible the orientation of the quartz veins and mineralisation was measured in diamond drill core based on Reflex orientation marks where continuity could be obtained between core runs.</li> </ul>
<b>Sample security</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The measures taken to ensure sample security.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standard sample security protocols were observed. Only site and ALS staff had access to the samples which were promptly despatched from site to the ALS Laboratory in Townsville in company vehicles.</li> </ul>
<b>Audits or reviews</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data have been undertaken.</li> </ul>

## Section 2 Reporting of Exploration Results

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary																																																															
<b>Mineral tenement and land tenure status</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jodo Gold Pty Ltd, a subsidiary of InterGroup Mining Ltd owns 100% of EPM18419 and ML 100008. InterGroup Mining Ltd owns 100% of EPM 25299 and MLa10282 on which the Brandy Creek mineralisation lies.</li> <li>The cultural heritage is claimed by the Gudjula People of Charters Towers.</li> <li>The mineral tenure lies on Mt Stewart (1GF189 Lands Lease) Station.</li> <li>The tenements are in good standing and no known impediments exist on the drilled areas.</li> </ul>																																																															
<b>Exploration done by other parties</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most exploration was completed by Map to Mine personnel following on from previous work by or on behalf of InterGroup Mining Ltd. Recent surface structural geological mapping was undertaken by Brett Davis (Olinda Gold Pty Ltd) and quartz textural work was completed by Gregg Morrison (Klondike Exploration Services). The work by the numerous historic explorers is acknowledged in Company reports.</li> </ul>																																																															
<b>Geology</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The mineralisation identified to date is Palaeozoic mesothermal quartz vein style hosted in Palaeozoic granites. The gold mineralisation is a late stage event related fault deformation of the pre-existing quartz veins.</li> </ul>																																																															
<b>Drillhole information</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A summary of all information material to the understanding of the exploration results including a tabulation of the following information for all Material drillholes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>easting and northing of the drillhole collar</li> <li>elevation or RL (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in metres) of the drill hole collar</li> <li>dip and azimuth of the hole</li> <li>downhole length and interception depth</li> <li>hole length.</li> </ul> </li> <li>If the exclusion of this information is justified on the basis that the information is not Material and this exclusion does not detract from the understanding of the report, the Competent Person should clearly explain why this is the case.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Diamond drill hole collar information is tabulated in the following table. All other drill holes are incorporated into the Exploration Target.</li> <li>The Exploration Target includes all drilling data, except for the sample assays for the diamond drill holes. Geological logs from the diamond holes were used to interpret the Exploration Target.</li> <li>Grid is GDA94 Zone 55</li> </ul> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Hole_ID</th> <th>Depth</th> <th>East</th> <th>North</th> <th>RL</th> <th>Prospect</th> <th>Tenement</th> <th>Dip</th> <th>Azi_Mag</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>BBDD012</td> <td>60.8</td> <td>331597</td> <td>7758966</td> <td>747</td> <td>Surprise</td> <td>ML 100008</td> <td>-60</td> <td>220</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BBDD013</td> <td>54.8</td> <td>331331</td> <td>7758336</td> <td>708</td> <td>Silica Ridge</td> <td>ML 100008</td> <td>-60</td> <td>246</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BBDD014</td> <td>99.8</td> <td>331287</td> <td>7757548</td> <td>685</td> <td>Brumby North</td> <td>ML 100008</td> <td>-60</td> <td>276</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BBDD015</td> <td>108.7</td> <td>331286</td> <td>7757451</td> <td>680</td> <td>Brilliant Brumby</td> <td>ML 100008</td> <td>-65</td> <td>205</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BBDD016</td> <td>179</td> <td>327397</td> <td>7761823</td> <td>685</td> <td>Victory</td> <td>EPM 25299</td> <td>-60</td> <td>202</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BBDD017</td> <td>138.9</td> <td>327401</td> <td>7761710</td> <td>676</td> <td>Victory</td> <td>EPM 25299</td> <td>-60</td> <td>286</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Hole_ID	Depth	East	North	RL	Prospect	Tenement	Dip	Azi_Mag	BBDD012	60.8	331597	7758966	747	Surprise	ML 100008	-60	220	BBDD013	54.8	331331	7758336	708	Silica Ridge	ML 100008	-60	246	BBDD014	99.8	331287	7757548	685	Brumby North	ML 100008	-60	276	BBDD015	108.7	331286	7757451	680	Brilliant Brumby	ML 100008	-65	205	BBDD016	179	327397	7761823	685	Victory	EPM 25299	-60	202	BBDD017	138.9	327401	7761710	676	Victory	EPM 25299	-60	286
Hole_ID	Depth	East	North	RL	Prospect	Tenement	Dip	Azi_Mag																																																									
BBDD012	60.8	331597	7758966	747	Surprise	ML 100008	-60	220																																																									
BBDD013	54.8	331331	7758336	708	Silica Ridge	ML 100008	-60	246																																																									
BBDD014	99.8	331287	7757548	685	Brumby North	ML 100008	-60	276																																																									
BBDD015	108.7	331286	7757451	680	Brilliant Brumby	ML 100008	-65	205																																																									
BBDD016	179	327397	7761823	685	Victory	EPM 25299	-60	202																																																									
BBDD017	138.9	327401	7761710	676	Victory	EPM 25299	-60	286																																																									

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary								
		BBDD018	140.8	327420	7761720	678	Victory	EPM 25299	-60	270
<b>Data aggregation methods</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>In reporting Exploration Results, weighting averaging techniques, maximum and/or minimum grade truncations (e.g. cutting of high grades) and cut-off grades are usually Material and should be stated.</i></li> <li><i>Where aggregate intercepts incorporate short lengths of high grade results and longer lengths of low grade results, the procedure used for such aggregation should be stated and some typical examples of such aggregations should be shown in detail.</i></li> <li><i>The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values should be clearly stated.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Diamond drill hole results are reported as selected anomalous intervals.</li> <li>No weighting was used.</li> <li>A statistical analysis of the Au sample populations from drill samples constrained within the wireframe models was carried out which demonstrated the need to apply top cuts to extreme high-grade assays.</li> <li>Samples were also composited to 1 m lengths which represents the predominant sample length across all prospects.</li> <li>Metal equivalent values were not used.</li> </ul>								
<b>Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>These relationships are particularly important in the reporting of Exploration Results.</i></li> <li><i>If the geometry of the mineralisation with respect to the drill hole angle is known, its nature should be reported.</i></li> <li><i>If it is not known and only the down hole lengths are reported, there should be a clear statement to this effect (e.g. 'downhole length, true width not known').</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All reported results are down hole intercepts and no considered true width.</li> <li>The dip of the mineralised quartz reefs and lodes is mostly sub-vertical. Drilling angles varied based on the availability of drilling sites. At Surprise much of the drilling was undertaken from the western side, slightly down dip to the sub-vertical east dipping lode due to the infrastructure situation on the eastern side. Most other drilling was undertaken into the dip where possible however in other places fans of holes had to be drilled due to site conditions. (see previous comments). Due to the terrain constraints at Brandy Creek, most of the diamond drill holes had to be drilled at oblique angles to the interpreted strike of the quartz vein systems.</li> <li>All drilling in this report is recorded as down-hole lengths.</li> </ul>								
<b>Diagrams</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Appropriate maps and sections (with scales) and tabulations of intercepts should be included for any significant discovery being reported These should include, but not be limited to a plan view of drill hole collar locations and appropriate sectional views.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate maps are included in public announcements by InterGroup Mining.</li> <li>No significant discoveries of previously unknown mineralisation were made during the drilling.</li> </ul>								
<b>Balanced reporting</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Where comprehensive reporting of all Exploration Results is not practicable, representative reporting of both low and high grades and/or widths should be practiced to avoid misleading reporting of Exploration Results.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only high-grade diamond drill hole results have been reported here. There is no mineralisation within the host granite. Grades within the quartz veins range from -0.01g/t Au to 148g/t Au.</li> </ul>								
<b>Other substantive exploration data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Other exploration data, if meaningful and material, should be reported including (but not limited to): geological observations; geophysical survey results; geochemical survey results; bulk samples – size and method of treatment; metallurgical test results; bulk density, groundwater, geotechnical and rock characteristics; potential deleterious or contaminating substances.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Various exploration programs including geological mapping, reconnaissance and research, as well as some soil geochemical sampling and the reverse circulation drilling. Two areas were covered by detailed ground magnetic survey, while trial ground penetrating radar (GPR) traverses were surveyed at numerous prospects.</li> <li>Mapping has so far outlined 60 quartz vein deposits (grouped in 6 areas) within a 20 km long and up to 5 km wide NW trending envelope. These groups contain at least 500 individual quartz veins</li> </ul>								

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		<p>where 25% of these sampled veins returned gold grades of more than 1g/t. So far only 7% of the project area has been mapped in detail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited diamond drilling was undertaken in September – October 2021 (7 HQ diameter core holes / 783 m), mostly twining high grade reverse circulation drill intersections at Brilliant Brumby, Brumby North, Silica Ridge, Surprise and Brandy Creek. Visible gold was observed at Surprise, Brandy Creek, Brilliant Brumby and Brumby North. At the time of writing the Exploration Target report, the samples were still being assayed.</li> <li>Geotechnical work on the drill core included systematic density and Rock Quality Designation measurements.</li> <li>Several programmes of metallurgical test work have been completed including advanced gravity testing, flotation and laser ore sorting.</li> <li>Surface bulk sampling programs were undertaken between 2017 and 2019 from Brumby North, Silica Ridge, Mystery and Surprise lodes. The mean grade from run-of-mine (ROM) samples was 1.1 g/t Au.</li> <li>A 20 tpd treatment plant was established at Surprise in 2018 (two small ball mills with trommels, sluices and a Gemeni table). This has processed 2,055t of the bulk sampled produced.</li> <li>Groundwater is not normally abundant however an adequate supply for the treatment plant was obtained from a drill hole near the plant.</li> <li>No potentially deleterious assays or materials have been found. Very minor quantities of lead and zinc sulphides and pyrite are associated with primary gold mineralisation.</li> </ul>
<b>Further work</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The nature and scale of planned further work (e.g. tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling).</i></li> <li><i>Diagrams clearly highlighting the areas of possible extensions, including the main geological interpretations and future drilling areas, provided this information is not commercially sensitive.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed programs for the exploration and delineation of high-grade gold include a processing facility upgrade with further test mining/processing, excavations at Brandy Creek to establish the continuity of the resource when MLa 100282 is granted, resource drilling/sampling at ML 100008, Brandy Creek and High Ridge and exploration of the Mundic Breccia (EPM 26366).</li> <li>Diagrams of the main areas of future interest may be found on the InterGroup Mining website.</li> </ul>

#### Brilliant Brumby Diamond Drill Hole Collar details

Hole_ID	Depth	East	North	RL	Prospect	Tenement	Dip	Azi_Mag
BBDD012	60.8	331597	7758966	747	Surprise	ML 100008	-60	220
BBDD013	54.8	331331	7758336	708	Silica Ridge	ML 100008	-60	246
BBDD014	99.8	331287	7757548	685	Brumby North	ML 100008	-60	276

BBDD015	108.7	331286	7757451	680	Brilliant Brumby	ML 100008	-65	205
BBDD016	179	327397	7761823	685	Victory	EPM 25299	-60	202
BBDD017	138.9	327401	7761710	676	Victory	EPM 25299	-60	286
BBDD018	140.8	327420	7761720	678	Victory	EPM 25299	-60	270

### Section 3 Estimation and Reporting of Mineral Resources and Exploration Target

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<b>Database integrity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measures taken to ensure that data has not been corrupted by, e.g. transcription or keying errors, between its initial collection and its use for Mineral Resource estimation purposes.</li> <li>Data validation procedures used.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All data is hosted in an SQL database on a secured server, this server is backed up daily to a cloud facility. A manual backup of the database is completed when additional data is added.</li> <li>Data validation occurs in multiple phases. Spatial and visual validation is completed by the database manager in QGIS and excel tables before uploading to the database. Forms have been setup in MS Access to load the data and these have various validation functions relating back to library codes and data type columns to ensure data is correct. Finally, MS Access queries are run once data is uploaded to validate data between tables to ensure high quality and accurate data. Assay data is loaded directly from the Lab assay sheets to ensure correct results.</li> </ul>
<b>Site visits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment on any site visits undertaken by the Competent Person and the outcome of those visits.</li> <li>If no site visits have been undertaken indicate why this is the case.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Competent Person (Mineral Resources) visited the Project on the 14th December 2021. The Competent Person checked drill collar coordinates against surveyed records and formed an understanding of the geological and geographical setting of the deposit. Drill core and RC sample chips were inspected at the Brumby exploration camp and compared with drill logs. Selected billets of DD core were compared to AC samples from equivalent down hole depths, in cases where the two holes were twinned.</li> <li>The Competent Person has not visited any of the analytical or mineralogical laboratories used by IGM.</li> <li>The outcome of the site visit was that data has been collected in a manner that supports reporting an Exploration Target in accordance with the guidelines of the JORC Code, and controls on the mineralisation are well-understood.</li> </ul>
<b>Geological interpretation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confidence in (or conversely, the uncertainty of) the geological interpretation of the mineral deposit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is insufficient confidence in the geological interpretation of the deposit to allow for a Mineral Resource to be reported.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Nature of the data used and of any assumptions made.</i></li> <li>• <i>The effect, if any, of alternative interpretations on Mineral Resource estimation.</i></li> <li>• <i>The use of geology in guiding and controlling Mineral Resource estimation.</i></li> <li>• <i>The factors affecting continuity both of grade and geology.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drill samples from RC drilling were used to assist with the geological interpretation.</li> <li>• Mineralised veins were interpreted based upon drill sample assays where Au&gt;0.3 g/t and vein intensity was logged. Geological interpretations were carried out on cross sections aligned along a NW-NNW strike, spaced between 10 m and 20 m apart, using Datamine software. Sectional interpretations of the mineralised veins were linked to form wireframe solids. Domains were extrapolated to the typical drill spacing beyond the last fence of drill holes supporting the interpretations.</li> <li>• No alternative interpretations were considered.</li> </ul>
<b>Dimensions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The extent and variability of the Mineral Resource expressed as length (along strike or otherwise), plan width, and depth below surface to the upper and lower limits of the Mineral Resource.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Surprise prospect is 150 m in strike, with vein models 1-3 m in width for a total plan width of 25 m, and extend to a depth of between 60 m and 100m below surface.</li> <li>• The Mystery prospect is 120 m in strike, with vein models 1-3 m in width for a cumulative plan width of 20 m, and extend to a depth of between 60 m and 75 m below surface.</li> <li>• The Silica Ridge prospect is 80 m in strike, with vein models 1-3 m in width for a cumulative plan width of 25 m, and extend to a depth of between 50 m and 90 m below surface.</li> <li>• The Brilliant Brumby North prospect is 130 m in strike, with vein models 1-3 m in width for a plan width of 45 m, and extend to a depth of between 70 m and 170 m below surface.</li> <li>• The Brilliant Brumby prospect is 190 m in strike, with vein models 1-3 m in width for a plan width of 50 m, and extend to a depth of between 90 m and 200 m below surface.</li> <li>• The Brandy Creek prospect has a cumulative strike extent of 140 m, with vein models 1-3 m in width for a plan width of 70 m, and extend to a depth of between 80 m and 160 m below surface.</li> </ul>
<b>Estimation and modelling techniques</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The nature and appropriateness of the estimation technique(s) applied and key assumptions, including treatment of extreme grade values, domaining, interpolation parameters and maximum distance of extrapolation from data points. If a computer assisted estimation method was chosen include a description of computer software and parameters used.</i></li> <li>• <i>The availability of check estimates, previous estimates and/or mine production records and whether the Mineral Resource estimate takes appropriate account of such data.</i></li> <li>• <i>The assumptions made regarding recovery of by-products.</i></li> <li>• <i>Estimation of deleterious elements or other non-grade variables of economic significance (e.g. sulphur for acid mine drainage)</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A block model with block sizes of 2 m(X) x 5 m(Y) x 2 m(Z) was constructed. The block sizes are approximately half the drill spacing. Blocks and drill sample data were flagged according to their spatial locations with respect to the mineralisation (vein) domains. Drill holes were sampled at 1 m intervals and the drill samples were accordingly composited to 1 m lengths. Composited sample data were statistically reviewed to determine what top-cuts should be applied.</li> <li>• Top cut and composited gold grades were interpolated using ordinary kriging, using a sample search ellipse with radii 30 m by 15 m by 10 m, orientated according to the local dip and strike of the local wireframe model facets, using Datamine's 'Dynamic Anisotropy' method. A minimum of 2 samples and maximum of 12 samples were used per block estimate. Search radii were increased, and the minimum number of samples reduced in subsequent sample searches if cells were not interpolated in the first two passes. Cell discretization of 3 x 3 x 1 (X,</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<p><i>characterisation).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>In the case of block model interpolation, the block size in relation to the average sample spacing and the search employed.</i></li> <li>• <i>Any assumptions behind modelling of selective mining units.</i></li> <li>• <i>Any assumptions about correlation between variables.</i></li> <li>• <i>Description of how the geological interpretation was used to control the resource estimates.</i></li> <li>• <i>Discussion of basis for using or not using grade cutting or capping.</i></li> <li>• <i>The process of validation, the checking process used, the comparison of model data to drillhole data, and use of reconciliation data if available.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Y, Z) was employed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The block model was validated by visually comparing the sample Au grades with the local block grades.</li> <li>• The Competent Person believes there are insufficient drill holes intersecting the mineralised domains to justify the reporting of a Mineral Resource.</li> </ul>
<b>Moisture</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Whether the tonnages are estimated on a dry basis or with natural moisture, and the method of determination of the moisture content.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tonnages are estimated on a dry basis.</li> </ul>
<b>Cut-off parameters</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The basis of the adopted cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade envelopes were used for geological domaining, using a lower cut-off of 0.3 g/t Au. This figure was subjectively selected but is supported by logged quartz intensity within the drill samples.</li> </ul>
<b>Mining factors or assumptions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Assumptions made regarding possible mining methods, minimum mining dimensions and internal (or, if applicable, external) mining dilution. It is always necessary as part of the process of determining reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction to consider potential mining methods, but the assumptions made regarding mining methods and parameters when estimating Mineral Resources may not always be rigorous. Where this is the case, this should be reported with an explanation of the basis of the mining assumptions made.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No assumptions have been made regarding future mining methods.</li> </ul>
<b>Metallurgical factors or assumptions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The basis for assumptions or predictions regarding metallurgical amenability. It is always necessary as part of the process of determining reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction to consider potential metallurgical methods, but the assumptions regarding metallurgical treatment processes and parameters made when reporting Mineral Resources may not always be rigorous. Where this is the case, this should be reported with an explanation of the basis of the metallurgical assumptions made.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No metallurgical studies have been carried out for the Au deposits.</li> <li>• Gold has been observed to be either free, or associated with sulfide minerals such as pyrite and galena.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<b>Environmental factors or assumptions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assumptions made regarding possible waste and process residue disposal options. It is always necessary as part of the process of determining reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction to consider the potential environmental impacts of the mining and processing operation. While at this stage the determination of potential environmental impacts, particularly for a greenfields project, may not always be well advanced, the status of early consideration of these potential environmental impacts should be reported. Where these aspects have not been considered this should be reported with an explanation of the environmental assumptions made.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The property is located on Grazing Homestead Perpetual Leases.</li> <li>The native title rights of the Gudjala People are respected by the Project. All the tenements excluding a small area of EPM 25299 lie on freehold land exclusive of Native Title. All fees and conditions of agreements with the Gudjala People have been complied with.</li> <li>Cultural heritage clearances were undertaken prior to IGM commencing advanced activities. All required surveys to commence activities at ML 100008 and MLa10282 in disturbed mining areas are completed.</li> <li>The majority of the area is Category A or B remnant vegetation and is of least concern.</li> <li>Potential waste from the processing of material is expected to be minimal. The on-site process under consideration is a simple crush and screen plant, with the concentrate then moved off-site for further processing. The waste material from this process will contain no contaminants is expected to aid the rehabilitation of the mined and disturbed ground.</li> </ul>
<b>Bulk density</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whether assumed or determined. If assumed, the basis for the assumptions. If determined, the method used, whether wet or dry, the frequency of the measurements, the nature, size and representativeness of the samples.</li> <li>The bulk density for bulk material must have been measured by methods that adequately account for void spaces (vugs, porosity, etc.), moisture and differences between rock and alteration zones within the deposit.</li> <li>Discuss assumptions for bulk density estimates used in the evaluation process of the different materials.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A dry bulk density of 2.6 t/m<sup>3</sup> was applied to all blocks in the block model, which is the average density value from 89 density measurements from 7 diamond holes, using the Archimedes method for density measurements.</li> <li>This value is considered appropriate by the Competent Person for the host lithologies present.</li> </ul>
<b>Classification</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The basis for the classification of the Mineral Resources into varying confidence categories.</li> <li>Whether appropriate account has been taken of all relevant factors (relative confidence in tonnage/grade estimations, reliability of input data, confidence in continuity of geology and metal values, quality, quantity and distribution of the data).</li> <li>Whether the result appropriately reflects the Competent Person's view of the deposit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The grade tonnage block model has not been classified in accordance with the JORC Code. It is currently considered by the Competent Person to be an Exploration Target.</li> <li>It is noted that the potential quantity and grade is conceptual in nature, that there has been insufficient exploration to estimate a Mineral Resource and that it is uncertain if further exploration will result in the estimation of a Mineral Resource. The Exploration Target is based upon actual exploration results.</li> <li>The Competent Person is of the opinion that the sampling methods and sample analyses have not been adequately tested by quality assurance and quality control (QAQC) procedures, which would be required for a Mineral Resource to be reported. The lack of test work for density also prevents a Mineral Resource classification at present, although the Competent Person is confident the applied density of 2.6 t/m<sup>3</sup> will be supported (within a tolerance) by future test work of drill samples.</li> <li></li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<b>Audits or reviews</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The results of any audits or reviews of Mineral Resource estimates.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The grade – tonnage block model was peer reviewed by CSA Global as part of their internal procedures, with no flaws noted.</li> <li>No external review has been conducted.</li> </ul>
<b>Discussion of relative accuracy/ confidence</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Where appropriate a statement of the relative accuracy and confidence level in the Mineral Resource estimate using an approach or procedure deemed appropriate by the Competent Person. For example, the application of statistical or geostatistical procedures to quantify the relative accuracy of the resource within stated confidence limits, or, if such an approach is not deemed appropriate, a qualitative discussion of the factors that could affect the relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate.</i></li> <li><i>The statement should specify whether it relates to global or local estimates, and, if local, state the relevant tonnages, which should be relevant to technical and economic evaluation. Documentation should include assumptions made and the procedures used.</i></li> <li><i>These statements of relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate should be compared with production data, where available.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant tonnages and grade are reported from geological domains and are provided in this report. Tonnages were calculated by selecting all blocks coded as Inferred, which within the mineralisation domain. The volumes of all the collated blocks were multiplied by the dry density value to derive the tonnages.</li> <li>Exploration Target tonnage and grade ranges were implied based upon potential for extending strike extents of currently modelled domains, based upon future additional drilling; upon the likelihood of interpreting mineralisation domains around drill hole intercepts not currently included in the domains; upon extending the depth of the mineralisation domains by testing with deeper drilling.</li> </ul>