



3 February 2014

Companies Announcements Office
Australian Securities Exchange

RMG DISCOVERS HIGH GRADE COPPER GOLD ZONE AT TUINA IN CHILE

RMG Limited (ASX: RMG) ("RMG" or "the Company") is pleased to announce that the Company has discovered three new copper and copper-gold mineralised anomalies within its Tuina project in northern Chile. The three new Cu and Cu-Au anomalies have been discovered by recently completed stream sediment and rock chip sampling programmes.

Highlights

- 🔥 Surface rock chip grades of up to 15g/t gold, 4% copper and 104g/t silver discovered at the new copper-gold mineralised zone, "La Teca Anomaly C"
- 🔥 The La Teca Anomaly C potentially represents a totally new discovery of copper-gold mineralisation with characteristics similar to Chilean IOCG deposits
- 🔥 Rock chip sampling and stream drainage sampling indicate the copper-gold anomaly extends over 5kms length and is open to the north-west
- 🔥 Rock chip and drainage sampling also discovered two new copper-silver anomalies similar to the San José and San Martín copper deposits, with rock chip grades up to 2.5% copper and 55g/t silver at La Teca Anomaly A and Anomaly B
- 🔥 A new area of copper replacement mineralisation with attendant bornite, chalcocite mineralisation at surface has been discovered within Anomaly A

RMG Executive Director, Peter Rolley said the results highlight the strong copper endowment of the Tuina project and justify the Company's commitment to regional exploration activities. To date, there have not been any gold or copper-gold discoveries in the Tuina District and these results over a 5km strike length represent a new style of mineralisation that may have characteristics similar to the northern Chilean IOCG copper-gold deposits.

“In the La Teca area, we believe the most significant discovery from this new sampling is a 5km long anomaly of copper gold mineralisation at La Teca Anomaly C with high grade gold at surface. The discovery warrants further exploration to better identify discrete mineralised targets before committing to a drilling programme to test this extensive mineralised system,” Mr Rolley said.

These three new anomalies at La Teca are located in the southwest of the Tuina Project area and are all totally separate to the existing San José, San Martin and Santa Rosa copper-silver deposits previously mined. All the new copper and copper-gold anomalies are held under exploration and mining licences by RMG in partnership with Chile Metals Ltda (see ASX release 30 December 2013). Figure one shows the location of the La Teca area and the location of the previously reported San José and San Martin mine sites.




Figure 1 Location of La Teca area

Stream sediment sampling

A total of 24 streams were sampled in the La Teca area. Figure 2 shows the location and sample numbers of the sample sites. Table 2 in Appendix One presents the locations and copper grades. The samples were collected from active sediment within the stream bed and screened to 1mm in the field and thence screened to <180um at the lab. A 0.5gram charge of the fine fraction was then sub-sampled and digested in aqua regia before analysing the solute by ICP-MS.

The stream sediment sampling identified three extensive copper anomalies with the following multi-elemental associations

- 🔥 Anomaly A – single stream sediment with highest geochemical anomalism
 - Association of Cu, Pb, Mo, Ba, Ag, Bi, Hg, Cd, Au
 - Strongest molybdenum and highest lead and barite values
 - Discovered unmapped Tuina Formation mudstones and siltstones with attendant copper replacement (manto) style mineralisation
 - Spatially associated with unmineralised dacitic and porphyry intrusives with minor pyrite and attendant K-feldspar alteration
- 🔥 Anomaly B – five anomalous drainages over an area of 2 sq. kms
 - Association of Cu, Ag, Bi, Mo, Hg, Au
 - Associated with haematitic andesite and, in the southern part of the anomaly area, associated with previously unmapped Tuina Formation sediments with attendant copper manto mineralisation
- 🔥 Anomaly C – six anomalous drainages over a strike length of 5 kilometres
 - Association of Au, Cu, Ba, weak Ag
 - Associated with pervasive silicification, quartz veining and large haematite and specular haematite veins within andesites

The stream sediment sampling has identified three anomalies with multi-element and multi-drainage support. These are all considered robust stream sediment copper anomalies and worthy of follow-up exploration.

The multi-element assemblage for Anomaly A and Anomaly B is consistent with Cu-Ag manto mineralisation (copper replacement of sediments and/or tuffaceous andesites). Mapping at Anomaly A has already discovered a new area of extensive copper replacement mineralisation within sediments with attendant chalcocite and bornite mineralisation.

The multi-element assemblage evident for Anomaly C is possibly indicating IOCG copper mineralisation.

During the field work to complete the stream sediment sampling programme, a number of in-situ outcrops of altered andesites and shales were mapped and rock chip sampling was

also undertaken. The rock chip sites are located within a 5m radius of the stream sediment sample site, or were collected whilst traversing between stream sediment sites.




Figure 2 Location of stream sediment sampling sites and anomaly groups

Rock Chip Sampling

A total of 46 sites were rock chip sampled during the stream sediment sampling programme for a total of 47 rock chip samples.

- Table 3 in Appendix One has the locations and major element results.
- Figure 3 shows the location of the rock chip sample sites, the location of the three stream sediment sample anomalies, and the rock chip gold grades.
- Figures 4 and 5 show the rock chip grades for copper and silver respectively.

Rock chip samples of around 1-1.5kg each were totally crushed and pulverised to 75um and then split for 4-acid digest and multi-element assaying by ICP-MS. Gold was assayed on a 25 gram charge with an aqua regia digest and ICP-MS analysis.

Table 1 below presents the more significant results grouped by each anomaly. The rock chip sampling has clearly supported the stream sediment anomalism and in each case has significantly enhanced the tenor of the anomalism.

The rock chip results from Anomaly C are the most significant due to their high gold contents. Of the 23 rock chip samples from Anomaly C, 13 are strongly anomalous in gold including 7 samples with greater than 1g/t Au.

All three anomalies have surface outcrops of strong copper mineralisation that warrant further exploration work.

Rock Chip Samples - Significant results Only						
SampID	Grid_System	North	East	Au_ppm	Ag_ppm	Cu_%
Anomaly A						
17507	WGS84 19 S	7502788	548781	0.001	3.7	1.83
17509	WGS84 19 S	7503300	549558	0.004	6.2	1.74
17510	WGS84 19 S	7503257	549529	0.004	3.9	1.25
17511	WGS84 19 S	7503353	549437	0.004	10.4	2.13
17516	WGS84 19 S	7503462	549225	0.011	4.8	0.72
Anomaly B						
17501	WGS84 19 S	7500945	549675	0.002	48.1	1.47
17502	WGS84 19 S	7500823	549307	0.045	55.3	1.62
17503	WGS84 19 S	7501239	548990	0.012	18.9	2.47
17520	WGS84 19 S	7500679	549225	0.010	20.3	2.41
17548	WGS84 19 S	7500598	548432	0.024	2.0	0.93
Anomaly C						
17514	WGS84 19 S	7502547	551225	1.490	1.5	0.16
17515	WGS84 19 S	7502808	550889	0.014	17.0	1.76
17524	WGS84 19 S	7498551	554237	0.008	5.2	1.38
17525	WGS84 19 S	7498524	554299	0.048	6.2	2.34
17526	WGS84 19 S	7498497	554266	14.950	0.5	0.05
17530	WGS84 19 S	7500851	553058	10.550	4.6	0.86
17533	WGS84 19 S	7501436	552687	0.151	15.3	3.26
17534	WGS84 19 S	7501349	552777	0.872	104.0	4.34
17536	WGS84 19 S	7501521	552695	1.890	3.3	1.19
17542	WGS84 19 S	7501910	552403	6.860	83.7	1.47
17543	WGS84 19 S	7501870	552346	1.040	32.6	3.13
17544	WGS84 19 S	7502027	552363	7.950	2.8	0.06
17545	WGS84 19 S	7502131	552190	0.119	90.1	3.60

Table 1 Significant rock chip results – see Appendix 1 for all results

Figures 2 to 5 show the sample locations plotted onto a Fe ratio image from the WorldView2 satellite imagery. This image clearly shows two geologic features that are considered by RMG to be significant in explaining the mineralisation in this La Teca area.

The first geologic feature of interest is the large dome of andesites with varying silica alteration (pale areas of the satellite image) where sample 29909 is located near to the centre, sample 29906 is located on the northern margin, and sample 29916 is located on the eastern margin. Anomaly B is located within this dome, Anomaly A is located along the northern margin, and part of Anomaly C is along the eastern margin of the Dome.

The second geologic feature of interest is the strong north-west structural corridor within the andesites along the eastern margin of the Dome and is the host for Anomaly C. In the field this structural zone is characterised by quartz veining, pervasive chlorite and silica

alteration, strong epidote as pervasive alteration and as large (>10m wide) veins, strong massive haematite and specular haematite zones, with local K-feldspar.

This structural corridor hosts all the gold anomalism in this area with rock chips up to 14.95g/t gold. The structural corridor has been mapped over 5 kms in length and remains open to the north-west.

The strength of alteration and deformation, and the tenor gold mineralisation along this structural corridor is unique in the entire Tuina area and warrants further systematic exploration including mapping and geophysics.

These elemental and geologic associations for Anomaly C are, in the opinion of RMG, consistent with other IOCG geochemical associations in northern Chile.




Figure 3 Location of rock chip sample sites and gold grades




Figure 4 Location of rock chip sample sites and copper grades




Figure 5 Location of rock chip sample sites and silver grades

Proposed Exploration

In general, these results highlight the strong copper endowment of the Tuina project and justify the commitment to the regional exploration activities whilst the Company continues to progress the definition of the known manto copper oxide and sulphide deposits along the San José and San Martin copper trends.

In the La Teca area, the discovery of strong copper and gold mineralisation within a 5km long structural corridor clearly warrants further exploration including IP geophysics to better identify discrete mineralised targets before committing to a drilling programme to test these extensive mineralised systems.

About RMG Limited

RMG is a gold, copper and base metals exploration and resource development company with projects located in Queensland and Chile. RMG has agreements to earn a 75% interest in over 117 sq. kms in northern Chile and is continuing to expand the copper endowment of this area.

Ends

For further information please contact:

Mr Robert Kirtlan or Mr Peter Rolley
+61 8 9387 6619

Competent Persons Statement for the Exploration Results in this Public Report

The information in this report that relates to Exploration Results is based on information compiled by Mr Peter Rolley a Competent Person who is a Member of The Australian Institute of Geoscientists (MAIG). Mr Rolley 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 (the "JORC Code 2012"). Mr Rolley is a shareholder and an Executive Director of RMG Ltd. Mr Rolley consents to the inclusion in the report of the matters based on his information in the form and context in which it appears.

Forward Looking Statements

This document may include forward looking statements. Forward looking statements include, but are not necessarily limited to, statements concerning RMG Limited's planned exploration programme and other statements that are not historic facts. When used in this document, the words such as "could", "indicates", "plan", "estimate", "expect", "intend", "may", "potential", "should" and similar expressions are forward looking statements. Such statements involve risks and uncertainties, and no assurances can be provided that actual results or work completed will be consistent with these forward looking statements.

Appendix One

Table One - Table of Stream sediment Locations and copper results

Stream Sediment Samples							
SampId	Grid_System	North	East	Elev	Samp_Wt_kg	Cu_ppm	Anomaly #
29901B	WGS84 19 S	7503387	549814	2887	0.96	480	A
29902B	WGS84 19 S	7502873	550536	2959	1.32	457	
29903B	WGS84 19 S	7498522	552750	3122	1.24	1010	
29904B	WGS84 19 S	7498356	553455	3135	1.16	792	
29905B	WGS84 19 S	7499090	552349	3115	1.27	599	
29906B	WGS84 19 S	7503396	549327	2875	0.81	1200	A
29907B	WGS84 19 S	7501570	550123	2972	1.35	1120	B
29908B	WGS84 19 S	7501428	549246	2940	1.37	1720	B
29909B	WGS84 19 S	7501275	549354	2957	1.51	1580	B
29910B	WGS84 19 S	7500614	549466	2966	1.26	1790	B
29911B	WGS84 19 S	7502037	551888	3033	1.07	949	
29912B	WGS84 19 S	7502034	551863	3018	1.22	973	
29913B	WGS84 19 S	7502034	551863	3018	1.24	947	
29916B	WGS84 19 S	7500983	552493	3044	1.18	707	
29917B	WGS84 19 S	7498453	554266	3149	1.35	976	C
29918B	WGS84 19 S	7498407	555348	3146	1.22	484	
29919B	WGS84 19 S	7499543	553255	3105	1.41	939	C
29920B	WGS84 19 S	7500621	553348	3075	1.16	691	
29921B	WGS84 19 S	7501173	552650	3048	1.48	481	C
29922B	WGS84 19 S	7501378	552572	3049	1.48	320	C
29923B	WGS84 19 S	7501378	552572	3049	1.46	305	C
29926B	WGS84 19 S	7501959	552168	3036	1.23	481	
29927B	WGS84 19 S	7502235	551996	3033	1.04	712	C
29928B	WGS84 19 S	7500737	548569	2906	1.51	1360	B
29929B	WGS84 19 S	7500365	549980	2991	1.47	1460	B
29930B	WGS84 19 S	7501077	548981	2950	1.28	1320	B

Table Two - Table of Rock Chip Locations and copper, silver, gold results

Rock Chip Samples - all results						
SampID	Grid_System	North	East	Au_ppm	Ag_ppm	Cu_%
Anomaly A						
17507	WGS84 19 S	7502788	548781	0.001	3.7	1.83
17508	WGS84 19 S	7502480	549100	0.003	0.2	0.02
17509	WGS84 19 S	7503300	549558	0.004	6.2	1.74
17510	WGS84 19 S	7503257	549529	0.004	3.9	1.25
17511	WGS84 19 S	7503353	549437	0.004	10.4	2.13
17512	WGS84 19 S	7503202	550129	0.001	0.3	0.02
17516	WGS84 19 S	7503462	549225	0.011	4.8	0.72
Anomaly B						
17501	WGS84 19 S	7500945	549675	0.002	48.1	1.47
17502	WGS84 19 S	7500823	549307	0.045	55.3	1.62
17503	WGS84 19 S	7501239	548990	0.012	18.9	2.47
17517	WGS84 19 S	7501884	549764	0.116	0.4	0.03
17518	WGS84 19 S	7502077	549563	0.001	0.2	0.00
17519	WGS84 19 S	7501462	549446	0.001	0.2	0.00
17520	WGS84 19 S	7500679	549225	0.010	20.3	2.41
17521	WGS84 19 S	7500617	549438	0.010	0.3	0.03
17548	WGS84 19 S	7500598	548432	0.024	2.0	0.93
17549	WGS84 19 S	7500664	549593	0.002	0.1	0.01
17550	WGS84 19 S	7500671	549541	0.017	0.1	0.00
Anomaly C						
17514	WGS84 19 S	7502547	551225	1.490	1.5	0.16
17515	WGS84 19 S	7502808	550889	0.014	17.0	1.76
17522	WGS84 19 S	7502035	551885	0.001	0.1	0.00
17523	WGS84 19 S	7500938	552472	0.001	1.2	0.04
17524	WGS84 19 S	7498551	554237	0.008	5.2	1.38
17525	WGS84 19 S	7498524	554299	0.048	6.2	2.34
17526	WGS84 19 S	7498497	554266	14.950	0.5	0.05
17527	WGS84 19 S	7499239	553304	0.080	0.4	0.01
17530	WGS84 19 S	7500851	553058	10.550	4.6	0.86
17531	WGS84 19 S	7500713	553263	0.107	0.5	0.01
17532	WGS84 19 S	7501420	552627	0.007	0.1	0.01
17533	WGS84 19 S	7501436	552687	0.151	15.3	3.26
17534	WGS84 19 S	7501349	552777	0.872	104.0	4.34
17535	WGS84 19 S	7501610	552674	0.119	10.9	0.58
17536	WGS84 19 S	7501521	552695	1.890	3.3	1.19
17537	WGS84 19 S	7501404	552743	0.006	1.5	0.03
17539	WGS84 19 S	7501397	552706	0.067	0.3	0.02
17540	WGS84 19 S	7500633	553333	0.003	0.0	0.00
17541	WGS84 19 S	7501979	552258	0.122	0.5	0.01
17542	WGS84 19 S	7501910	552403	6.860	83.7	1.47
17543	WGS84 19 S	7501870	552346	1.040	32.6	3.13
17544	WGS84 19 S	7502027	552363	7.950	2.8	0.06
17545	WGS84 19 S	7502131	552190	0.119	90.1	3.60

Rock Chip Samples (continued)							
SampID	Grid_System	North	East	Elev	Au_ppm	Ag_ppm	Cu_%
Other							
17513	WGS84 19 S	7502784	551051	3010	0.001	0.2	0.00
17528	WGS84 19 S	7499111	553164	3172	0.003	0.0	0.00
17529	WGS84 19 S	7499239	553161	3177	0.009	0.2	0.00
17538	WGS84 19 S	7501382	552718	3054	0.058	1.5	0.33
17546	WGS84 19 S	7502189	553726	3132	0.013	2.6	0.64
17547	WGS84 19 S	7502189	553726	3132	0.008	3.3	1.09

JORC Code, 2012 Edition – Table 1 report

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

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Sampling techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nature and quality 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rock chips sampled over 2-3 sq. metres over in situ rock outcrops. Samples are specimen samples, cracked with a hammer from in-situ rock outcrops. Stream sediment samples are collected in active stream sediment from dry drainages that are tributaries to the major streams (Rio Seco and Rio La Teca) in the area. All sampling undertaken by geologist with over 30 years' experience All field sampling procedures and sampling tools are industry standard and are considered appropriate At the stage of field sampling there are no aspects of the mineralisation that are Material to the Report
Drilling techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drill type and details 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No drilling reported
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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No drilling reported
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 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No drilling reported Rock chips geological characteristics that are visible to the naked eye are described in hand specimen and therefore qualitative Stream sediment sites also geologically and geographically described
Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If core, whether cut or sawn and whether 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. Quality control procedures adopted for all sub-sampling stages to maximise representivity of samples. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No drilling is reported Entire rock chip of around 1kg is despatched to ALS-Chemex in Antofagasta Entire 1kg rock chip sample is crushed and then pulverised to 75um This is entirely appropriate for a rock chip sample Stream sediment is sieved in field to <1mm and approx 1kg retained. 1kg Stream sediment sample is despatched to ALS-Chemex in La

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>Serena</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stream sample is totally sieved in lab to 0.18mm and fine fraction retained. Total Fine fraction pulverised to 75um. For stream sediments and for rock chip samples, 0.5gram split for a suite of multi-element assays and 25gm split for Au assay These procedures are considered to be industry standard and appropriate The sample sizes are considered appropriate for the style of mineralisation and for the exploration purpose
<p>Quality of assay data and laboratory tests</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stream sediment samples were sent to ALS-Vancouver and digested by Aqua Regia and analysed by ICP-MS for a suite of multi-elements and for gold to a low level detection. This is considered a partial digest and is appropriate for the purpose of the exploration sampling Within the stream sediment samples two sites were duplicate sampled in the field Within the stream sediment samples, 2 blanks and 2 low level certified standards from Geostats P/L were inserted Rock Chips sent to ALS-Lima and the multi-element analyses digested by 4-acid digest which is a total digest All rock chips for gold analyses are digested by Aqua Regia. All elements analysed by ICP-MS which is considered a total assay of the solute. Assay lab also inserted blanks and standards as per Industry Standard practice All standards and blanks and duplicates assays were as “expected” and did not exhibit any sample number errors, contamination or assay drift All geological tables, locations, assay reports checked and plotted by Exploration Manager and Exploration Director for appropriateness for purpose and reliability for decision to proceed to next phase of exploration
<p>Verification of sampling and assaying</p>	<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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No drilling is reported All field data recorded in English in field books and transcribed to excel spreadsheets and then entered into an Access database for storage

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<p>verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss any adjustment to assay data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No adjustment to any assay data
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"> No drilling is reported All sample sites recorded by hand held GPS to a field accuracy of +/- 5m in X and Y. Elevation is not considered reliable. Grid system is WGS84 Zone 19S WorldView2 satellite imagery to an accuracy of 0.7m in X and Y used as field base map
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 Whether sample compositing has been applied. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No drilling is reported Data spacing is “ad hoc”, and all sample sites are selected on the wisdom of the mapping geologist No sample compositing has been applied in the reporting of the sample results
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"> No drilling is reported All samples are grab samples with no orientation implied
Sample security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The measures taken to ensure sample security. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All samples were stored in secure tied plastic bags in the possession of the senior geologist at all times until delivery by hand to the assay lab representative
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"> No audit is appropriate as data is not used for estimation

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rock chip and stream sediment samples were collected in Region II, Chile, locality of Tuina on concessions “Explora 1 to 7, La Teca 1 to 7, Rio Seco 1 to 4, Tuina 1 to 2” held by Minera Tuina Ltda, under an Earn-In agreement with RMG Ltd (ASX Release 30 December 2013). All concessions are current. There are no landowners, no

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> 	<p>indigenous claims, no historical sites, no past mining activities, no environmental claims, no proclaimed or proposed wilderness areas, no royalties to third parties</p>
Exploration done by other parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No known previous exploration by any other parties
Geology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on rock chips and mapping, the La Teca area has characteristics of manto Cu-Ag, and IOCG Cu-Au mineralisation
Drill hole Information	<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> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No drilling is reported See Tables 1 and 2 in Appendix One for sample locations
Data aggregation methods	<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 should be clearly stated.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No drilling is reported No grade cutting has been applied to samples No cut-off grade has been applied to samples No aggregating has been applied to samples No metal equivalents have been reported to samples
Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept	<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</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No drilling is reported Rock chips and Stream sediment samples have no length Rock chips and Stream Sediment samples have no declination True width of the mineralisation sampled by rock chip is unknown

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
lengths	<i>should be a clear statement to this effect (eg 'down hole length, true width not known').</i>	
Diagrams	<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"> • No drilling is reported • See Figures 2 to 5 in the body of the text for plans of the areas and the locations of the sample sites • There are no sectional views as rock chips are 2D only and mapping is incomplete
Balanced reporting	<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> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All rock chips have been reported
Other substantive exploration data	<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> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No other substantive data is known
Further work	<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> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full assessment of the rock chip and stream sediment assay results is current and further mapping, geologic sampling and geological assessment by experienced geologists, perhaps one or more IP geophysical surveys, are planned before countenancing a drilling programme • See Figures 2 to 5 in the body of the text for plans of the areas that are possibly mineralised and their possible extensions

Sections 3, 4 and 5 do not apply to this report as there are no mineral resources, no ore reserves and no gemstones reported in this report.