

Certificate of Analysis

Reference Material PG04

Recommended Values and 95% Confidence Intervals

Platinum Concentration: 0.903 (\pm 0.007) $\mu\text{g/g}$

Palladium Concentration: 1.196 (\pm 0.014) $\mu\text{g/g}$

Gold Concentration: 1.004 (\pm 0.008) $\mu\text{g/g}$

The above values apply only to product in jars or sachets which have an identification number within the following range: **446249–447102**.

Prepared and Certified By:

Franz Lim, BSc
Rocklabs Reference Materials
P.O. Box 18-142
Glen Innes
Auckland 1743, **NEW ZEALAND**
Email: f.lim@rocklabs.com
Telephone: +64 9 444 3534

Date of Certification:

11 October 2017

Certificate Status:

Original

Available Packaging:

This reference material has been packed in wide-mouthed jars that contain 2.5 kg of product. The contents of some jars may be subsequently repacked into sealed polyethylene sachets.

Origin of Reference Material:

Concentrates containing platinum, palladium and gold that have been screened to ensure there is no gold nugget effect and then blended with an appropriate matrix of barren minerals.

Supplier of Reference Material:

ROCKLABS
P O Box 18 142
Glen Innes
Auckland 1743, **NEW ZEALAND**
Email: sales@rocklabs.com
Website: <https://www.scottautomation.com>

Description:

The reference material is a light grey powder that has been well mixed and a homogeneity test carried out after the entire batch was packaged into wide-mouthed jars. There is no soil component. The product contains crystalline quartz and therefore dust from it should not be inhaled.

The approximate chemical composition is:
(Uncertified Values)

SiO ₂	48.27
Al ₂ O ₃	10.52
Na ₂ O	3.07
K ₂ O	1.61
CaO	4.70
MgO	19.11
TiO ₂	1.16
MnO	0.12
P ₂ O ₅	0.26
Fe ₂ O ₃	8.26
LOI	2.41

Intended Use:

This reference material is designed to be included with every batch of samples analysed and the results plotted for quality monitoring and assessment purposes.

Stability:

The container (jar or sachet) should not be heated to temperatures higher than 50 °C. The reference material is stable, with weight changes of less than 0.5 % at extremes of naturally occurring temperature and humidity conditions.

Method of Preparation:

Pulverized basalt rock and feldspar minerals were blended with finely pulverized and screened minerals containing platinum, palladium, and gold. Once the powders were uniformly mixed the composite was placed into 854 wide-mouthed jars, each bearing a unique number. 24 jars were randomly selected from the packaging run and material from these jars was used for both homogeneity and consensus testing.

Homogeneity Assessment:

Sampling was performed by Rocklabs Reference Materials and an independent laboratory carried out gold analysis by fire assay of 30 g portions, using an ICP finish. Steps were taken to minimize laboratory method variation in order to better detect any variation in the candidate reference material.

Homogeneity: A sample was removed from the top of each of the 24 jars randomly selected from the 854 jars in the batch. The results of analysis of the 24 samples (randomly ordered then consecutively numbered before being sent to the laboratory) indicated 4 test results were anomalously low/high. Analysis of the slags and crucibles related to these samples showed laboratory error, so the results for these 4 samples were discarded. The test results for the remaining 20 samples produced a relative standard deviation of 2.1% for platinum, 2.1% for palladium, and 1.6% for gold.

Settling: The contents of 3 randomly selected jars were compacted by vibration (to simulate the effect of freighting) and 5 samples were removed successively from top to bottom from each jar. In addition, 5 samples were removed from the last jar in the series. No top to bottom gradation in the gold values was observed neither was there a significant difference between the last jar and the other jars.

Analytical Methodology:

Once homogeneity had been established, two sub-samples were submitted to a number of well-recognized laboratories in order to assign platinum, palladium, and gold values by consensus testing. The sub-samples were drawn from 24 randomly selected jars and each laboratory received samples from two different jars.

The samples were analysed for gold by all participating laboratories using fire assay followed by either gravimetric or instrument finish (AAS or ICP). Laboratories that routinely perform platinum and palladium testing analysed the samples using similar methods. Each laboratory was instructed to analyse the samples using the method they believed would give the best results. Indicative concentration ranges were provided.

The amount of sample used in the analyses varied between laboratories, (range 10 - 50g).

Calculation of Certified Value:

The 51 participating laboratories each returned replicate gold results using one finish method for both samples. In addition, 20 of the 51 laboratories submitted replicate sets of platinum and palladium results from the same samples. Statistical analysis to identify outliers was carried out using the principles detailed in sections 7.3.2 – 7.3.4, ISO 5725-2: 1994. Assessment of each laboratory's performance was carried out on the basis of z-scores, partly based on the concept described in ISO/IEC Guide 43-1. Details of the criteria used in these examinations are available on request. As a result of these statistical analyses, 6 sets of results were excluded for the purpose of assigning a gold concentration value, 1 set excluded for platinum, and 2 sets excluded for palladium. A recommended value was thus calculated from the average of the remaining n = 45 sets of replicate results for gold, n = 19 sets for platinum, and n = 18 sets for palladium. The 95% confidence interval was estimated using the formula:

$$X \pm ts/\sqrt{n}$$

(where X is the estimated average, s is the estimated standard deviation of the laboratory averages, and t is the 0.025 tail-value from Student's t-distribution with n-

1 degrees of freedom). The recommended value is provided at the beginning of the certificate in $\mu\text{g/g}$ (ppm) units. A summary of the results used to calculate the recommended value is listed on page 4-5 and the names of the laboratories that submitted results are listed on page 6. The results are listed in increasing order of the individual laboratory averages.

Statistical analysis of the consensus test results has been carried out by independent statistician, Tim Ball.

Summary of Results Used to Calculate Platinum Value

(Listed in increasing order of individual laboratory averages)

Platinum (ppm)		
Sample 1	Sample 2	Set Average
0.881	0.879	0.880
0.87	0.89	0.880
0.863	0.898	0.881
0.879	0.890	0.885
0.900	0.890	0.895
0.901	0.892	0.897
0.879	0.919	0.899
0.920	0.878	0.899
0.886	0.918	0.902
0.896	0.909	0.903
0.910	0.900	0.905
0.917	0.897	0.907
0.897	0.917	0.907
0.935	0.897	0.916
0.950	0.883	0.917
0.907	0.933	0.920
0.925	0.915	0.920
0.96	0.89	0.925
0.931	0.926	0.929
Average of 19 sets	=	0.903 ppm
Standard deviation of 19 sets	=	0.015 ppm
Relative standard deviation	=	1.7 %
95% Confidence interval for average	=	+/- 0.007 ppm

Summary of Results Used to Calculate Palladium Value

(Listed in increasing order of individual laboratory averages)

Palladium (ppm)		
Sample 1	Sample 2	Set Average
1.14	1.16	1.150
1.135	1.185	1.160
1.151	1.175	1.163
1.167	1.171	1.169
1.151	1.188	1.170
1.195	1.155	1.175
1.190	1.170	1.180
1.185	1.188	1.187
1.230	1.151	1.191
1.200	1.190	1.195
1.20	1.21	1.205
1.222	1.201	1.212
1.230	1.195	1.213
1.237	1.210	1.224
1.25	1.20	1.225
1.230	1.235	1.233
1.204	1.268	1.236
1.25	1.24	1.245
Average of 18 sets	=	1.196 ppm
Standard deviation of 18 sets	=	0.029 ppm
Relative standard deviation	=	2.4 %
95% Confidence interval for average	=	+/- 0.014 ppm

Summary of Results Used to Calculate Gold Value

(Listed in increasing order of individual laboratory averages)

Gold (ppm)		
Sample 1	Sample 2	Set Average
0.935	0.935	0.935
0.991	0.933	0.962
0.949	0.979	0.964
0.969	0.967	0.968
0.96	0.98	0.970
0.962	0.985	0.974
0.986	0.963	0.975
0.993	0.964	0.979
0.986	0.976	0.981
0.981	0.981	0.981
0.983	0.984	0.984
0.985	0.985	0.985
0.991	0.985	0.988
0.99	0.99	0.990
0.988	0.993	0.991
1.027	0.957	0.992
0.980	1.004	0.992
1.005	0.995	1.000
1.00	1.00	1.000
1.00	1.01	1.005
1.00	1.01	1.005
1.002	1.012	1.007
1.010	1.005	1.008
0.987	1.032	1.010
1.01	1.01	1.010
1.010	1.010	1.010
1.010	1.010	1.010
1.000	1.020	1.010
1.021	1.007	1.014
1.010	1.019	1.015
1.02	1.01	1.015
1.020	1.010	1.015
1.037	0.996	1.017
1.050	0.989	1.020
1.025	1.020	1.023
1.020	1.030	1.025
1.03	1.02	1.025
1.031	1.022	1.027
1.042	1.021	1.032
1.025	1.040	1.033
1.050	1.025	1.038
1.040	1.040	1.040
1.034	1.048	1.041
1.030	1.062	1.046
1.046	1.070	1.058
Average of 45 sets	=	1.004 ppm
Standard deviation of 45 sets	=	0.026 ppm
Relative standard deviation	=	2.5 %
95% Confidence interval for average:	=	+/- 0.008 ppm

Note: For all 3 tables, neither the Standard deviation nor the Confidence interval should be used as a basis to set control limits when plotting individual laboratory results.
See notes under "Instructions and Recommendations for Use" (pg 7)

Participating Laboratories

Australia	ALS Minerals, Kalgoorlie ALS Minerals, Orange ALS Minerals, Perth ALS Minerals, Townsville Bureau Veritas Amdel, Adelaide Bureau Veritas Amdel, Kalgoorlie Intertek Genalysis Laboratory Services, Perth SGS Minerals Services, Perth SGS Minerals Services, Townsville
Burkina Faso	ALS Minerals, Burkina Faso SEMAFO Burkina Faso S.A.
Canada	ALS Minerals, Val-d'Or ALS Minerals, Vancouver Burlamaque Assay Laboratories, Quebec Bureau Veritas Commodities Canada Ltd, Ontario Bureau Veritas Commodities Canada Ltd, Vancouver Met-Solve Analytical Service Inc., Langley BC SGS Minerals Services, Lakefield, Ontario SGS Minerals Services, Vancouver Techni-Lab S.G.B. Abitibi Inc/Actlabs, Val d'Or Techni-Lab S.G.B. Abitibi Inc/Actlabs, Ste-Germaine-Boule TSL Laboratories Inc, Saskatoon
Côte d'Ivoire	Bureau Veritas Mineral Laboratories, Abidjan
Ghana	ALS Minerals, Kumasi
Ireland	ALS Minerals, Loughrea
Kyrgyz Republic	Stewart Assay and Environmental Laboratories LLC, Kara-Balta
Laos	ALS Geochemistry, Vientiane
Mali	ALS Minerals, Tabakoto
Mexico	Mina La India Agnico Eagle México Inspectorate de Mexico - Bureau Veritas Group
Mongolia	ALS Minerals, Ulaanbaatar
New Zealand	SGS New Zealand Ltd, Otago SGS New Zealand Ltd, Waihi
Peru	ALS Minerals, Lima Inspectorate Services Perú S.A.C., Callao Minera Yanacocha SRL – Newmont, Lima
Romania	ALS Minerals, Rosia Montana
Russia	Irgiredmet Analytical Centre, Irkutsk
South Africa	ALS Minerals, Edenvale - Johannesburg SibanyeGold, Driefontein Operations Performance Laboratories, Barberton Performance Laboratories, Randfontein
Turkey	Acme Analitik Laboratuar Hizmetleri Ltd, Sirketi ALS Minerals, Izmir
USA	ALS Minerals, Reno Barrick Goldstrike – Met Services, Nevada Inspectorate, Sparks McClelland Laboratories Inc., Sparks Newmont Mining Corporation, Carlin Newmont Mining Corporation, Lone Tree Newmont Mining Corporation, Twin Creeks
Zimbabwe	Performance Laboratories, Ruwa

Instructions and Recommendations for Use:

Weigh out quantity usually used for analysis and analyse for total gold by normal procedure. Homogeneity testing has shown that consistent results are obtainable for gold when 30g portions are taken for analysis.

We quote a 95% confidence interval for our estimate of the declared value. This confidence interval reflects our uncertainty in estimating the true value for the gold content of the reference material. The interval is chosen such that, if the same procedure as used here to estimate the declared value were used again and again, then 95% of the trials would give intervals that contained the true value. It is a reflection of how precise the trial has been in estimating the declared value. It **does not** reflect the variability any particular laboratory will experience in its own repetitive testing.

Some users have used our consensus testing statistical data to establish control limits for assessing acceptance of laboratory results. Our certification process produces precise statistical data based on the proficiency program and not on an individual laboratory. Such use inevitably leads to many apparent out-of-control points, leading to doubts about the laboratory's testing, or of the reference material itself.

Our suggested best practice would be to accumulate a history of the test results obtained, and plot them on a control chart to determine any laboratory bias and variability. The appropriate centre line and control limits for this chart should be based on the average level and variation exhibited in the laboratory's own data. This chart will provide a clear picture of the long-term stability or otherwise of the laboratory testing process, providing good clues as to the causes of any problems. To help our customers do this, we can provide a free Excel template that will produce sensible graphs, with intelligently chosen limits, from the customer's own data.

Our instructions are recommendations for appropriate use of reference materials. If our statistical data is used for control limits due to practicality and particular circumstances, please consult with us and we will be happy to assist and advise.

Legal Notice:

This certificate and the reference material described in it have been prepared with due care and attention. However ROCKLABS Ltd, Scott Technology Ltd and Tim Ball Ltd accept no liability for any decisions or actions taken following the use of the reference material.

References:

For further information on the preparation and validation of this reference material please contact Franz Lim.

Certifying Officer



Franz Lim (BSc)

Independent Statistician



Tim Ball BSc (Hons)