JORC 2012 TABLE 1

Section 1: Sampling Techniques and Data

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Sampling techniques	*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.*	510 mobile metal ion soil samples were collected using a hand auger and taken from 10-25cm depth. Samples were not split in the field. 579 trench samples/channels were cut with a gas-powered chop saw using diamond blades. Sample widths were approximately 2 cm, depth approximately 5 cm, with sample material chiseled out of cuts using a steel chisel/hammer into plastic sample bags. Where samples were not strongly altered or mineralized, rock chip samples were taken instead of channel samples. 1893 rock chips were taken using a 3-4 lb hammer, with samples bagged in plastic sample bags. 4294 short-wave infra-red samples were collected across the property, often at the same locations as the rock chip samples. These samples were collected in the field and brought back to site where they were analysed using an ASD TerraSpec® Halo machine. The Halo is a near infrared spectrometer and captures spectra in the visible near-infrared and near-infrared ranges. The Halo analyses the O-H bonds in minerals and is able to identify up to four minerals in a single sample. The Halo will provide a one to three star rating based on the confidence level of the reading (three stars being highest confidence).
	Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample representivity and the appropriate calibration of any measurement tools or systems used	Soil and rock samples comprise multiple chips / volume considered to be representative of the horizon or outcrop being sampled. The Halo requires an external white reference when it is first turned on and takes about a minute to calibrate. Subsequently, it has an internal white reference which it will use periodically whilst being operated.
	Aspects of the determination of mineralisation that are Material to the Public Report. In cases where 'industry standard' work has been done this would be relatively simple (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	Samples were collected whole, and submitted to accredited commercial laboratories for preparation and analysis using industry standard techniques.
Drilling techniques	*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).*	All drilling has been previously disclosed. Although hand augers have been utilised in the collection of soil samples, this has not been regarded as "drilling".
Drill sample recovery	*Method of recording and assessing core and chip sample recoveries and results assessed*	Not applicable
	Measures taken to maximise sample recovery and ensure representative nature of the samples	Not applicable
	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.	Not applicable
Logging	*Whether core and chip samples have been geologically and geotechnically logged to a level of detail to support appropriate Mineral Resource estimation, mining studies and metallurgical studies.*	Samples are described in detail in the field and captured in excel/database.
	Whether logging is qualitative or quantitative in nature. Core (or costean, channel, etc) photography.	The logging of the geological features was predominately qualitative. Parameters such as sulphide abundances are visual estimates by the logging geologist. The geological and geotechnical logging is at an appropriate level for the stage of exploration being undertaken.
	The total length and percentage of the relevant intersections	Not applicable.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	logged	
Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation	*If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all core taken.*	Not applicable.
	If non-core, whether riffled, tube sampled, rotary split, etc and whether sampled wet or dry.	Samples are not split in the field. Volumes/weights are only reduced at commercial laboratories following sample preparation procedures outlined below.
	For all sample types, the nature, quality and appropriateness of the sample preparation technique.	Samples are submitted to commercial laboratories for preparation and analysis using standard industry practice at ISO/IEC 17025 and ISO 9001 accredited laboratories. Rock chip and channel samples taken away from the Cameron deposit were prepared and analysed at ALS (accredited to ISO/IEC 17025:2005 and ISO 9001:2008). Samples received at ALS are unpacked, sorted, logged in LIMS database and dried. Samples are then crushed to 70% <2mm, then split using a riffle splitter. The ~250g split is pulverized to 85% passing 75 microns, then fused with a mixture of lead oxide, sodium carbonate, borax, silica, and other reagents as required, inquarted with 6 mg of gold-free silver then cupelled to yield a precious metal bead. The bead is digested in 0.5 mL dilute nitric acid in a microwave oven, then 0.5 mL concentrated hydrochloric acid is added and the bead is further digested in the microwave at a lower power setting. The digested solution is cooled, diluted to a total volume of 4 mL with demineralized water, and analysed by atomic absorption spectroscopy against matrix-matched standards. The ICP (48 element four acid ICP-MS lab packages Au-AA23 and ME-MS61) sample is cut to 0.25g and is digested with perchloric, nitric, and hydrofluoric acids. The residue is leached with dilute hydrochloric acid and diluted to volume. The final solution is then analysed by inductively coupled plasma-atomic emission spectrometry and inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometry. Results are corrected for spectral inter-element interferences. Relogged channels and pulps from the Cameron deposit were prepared and analysed at Actlabs (accredited to ISO/IEC 17025, including ISO 9001 and ISO 9002 with CAN-P-1579 (Mineral Analysis) for specific registered tests by the SCC). Samples were received in poly bags, packed inside of rice bags that are inside of plastic collapsible crates. Samples were sorted, loaded into the drying room at 60 degrees, logged into the LIMS database then crushed to a minimum of 80% <2mm. Samples were then split using a Jones Riffle to achieve a subsample between 250g and 300g which was pulverized to 95% -105 micron. Fine crush duplicates are taken every 50 samples. A 30g Aliquot is weighed and mixed with a PbO mixture and Ag was added as a collector. Every batch of 35 samples contains an additional 2 standards, 2 blanks and 3 duplicates to fill the furnace to a load of 42. Samples were then fused in our fire assay furnaces poured, de-slagged and then cupelled. The finishing silver doré was then picked and put into glass test tubes then transferred to porcelain crucibles and the gold was parted using nitric acid. The resulting gold flake was annealed and the remaining gold flake was weighed using a gravimetric balance. Soil samples were sent to SGS Minerals for preparation and analysis (an ISO/IEC 17025 accredited laboratory located in Don Mills, Toronto, Ontario). Soil samples analysed using the MMI™ process undergo no drying or preparation. Sub-samples of 50 g were shaken with a weak extraction solution and analysed for the MMI-M package via ICP-MS. 8 blanks and 7 field duplicates were inserted with the samples. No soil standards were used in the current program due to the lack of readily available reference materials.
	Quality control procedures adopted for all sub-sampling stages to maximise representivity of samples.	Crush duplicates, standards and blanks are inserted by the laboratory at a rate of 1/20.
	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.	All QA/QC controls and measures are routinely reviewed and reported on at the completion of the program. 7 soil sample field duplicates were included.
	Whether sample sizes are appropriate to the grain size of the	Sample sizes were decided by the infield geologist, and based on

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	material being sampled.	numerous factors including grain size.
Quality of assay data and laboratory tests	*The nature, quality and appropriateness of the assaying and laboratory procedures used and whether the technique is considered partial or total.*	Samples are submitted to commercial laboratories for preparation and analysis using standard industry practice at ISO/IEC 17025 and ISO 9001 accredited laboratories. Rock chip and channel samples taken away from the Cameron deposit were prepared and analysed at ALS (accredited tom ISO/IEC 17025:2005 and ISO 9001:2008). Samples received at ALS are unpacked, sorted, logged in LIMS database and dried. Samples are crushed to 70% <2mm, then split using a riffle splitter. The ~ 250g split is pulverized to 85% passing 75 microns, then fused with a mixture of lead oxide, sodium carbonate, borax, silica, and other reagents as required, inquarted with 6 mg of gold-free silver then cupelled to yield a precious metal bead. The bead is digested in 0.5 mL dilute nitric acid in a microwave oven, then 0.5 mL concentrated hydrochloric acid is added and the bead is further digested in the microwave at a lower power setting. The digested solution is cooled, diluted to a total volume of 4 mL with demineralized water, and analysed by atomic absorption spectroscopy against matrix-matched standards. The ICP (48 element four acid ICP-MS lab packages Au-AA23 and ME-MS61) sample is cut to 0.25g and is digested with perchloric, nitric, and hydrofluoric acids. The residue is leached with dilute hydrochloric acid and diluted to volume. The final solution is then analysed by inductively coupled plasma-atomic emission spectrometry and inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometry. Results are corrected for spectral inter-element interferences. Relogged channels and pulps from the Cameron deposit were prepared and analysed at Actlabs (accredited to ISO/IEC 17025, including ISO 9001 and ISO 9002 with CAN-P-1579 (Mineral Analysis) for specific registered tests by the SCC). Samples were received in poly bags packed inside of rice bags that are inside of plastic collapsible crates. Samples were sorted, loaded into the drying room at 60 degrees, logged into the LIMS database then crushed to a minimum of 80% <2mm. Samples were then split using a Jones Riffle to achieve a subsample between 250g and 300g which was pulverized to 95% -105 micron. Fine crush duplicates are taken every 50 samples. A 30g Aliquot is weighed and mixed with a PbO mixture and Ag was added as a collector. Every batch of 35 samples contains an additional 2 standards, 2 blanks and 3 duplicates to fill the furnace to a load of 42. Samples were then fused in our fire assay furnaces poured, de-slagged and then cupelled. The finishing silver doré was then picked and put into glass test tubes then transferred to porcelain crucibles and the gold was parted using nitric acid. The resulting gold flake was annealed and the remaining gold flake was weighed using a gravimetric balance. Soil samples were sent to SGS Minerals for preparation and analysis (an ISO/IEC 17025 accredited laboratory located in Don Mills, Toronto, Ontario). Soil samples analysed using the MMI™ process undergo no drying or preparation. Sub-samples of 50 g were shaken with a weak extraction solution and analysed for the MMI-M package via ICP-MS. Detection limits for each element analysed are presented below. 8 blanks and 7 field duplicates were inserted with the samples. No soil standards were used in the current program due to the lack of readily available reference materials.

<table>
<tr><th>Criteria</th><th>JORC Code explanation</th><th>Commentary</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>
<table>
<tr><th>Element</th><th>Unit</th><th>Detection limit</th><th>Element</th><th>Unit</th><th>Detection limit</th></tr>
<tr><td>Ag</td><td>ppb</td><td>1</td><td>Nb</td><td>ppb</td><td>0.5</td></tr>
<tr><td>Al</td><td>ppm</td><td>1</td><td>Nd</td><td>ppb</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>As</td><td>ppb</td><td>10</td><td>Ni</td><td>ppb</td><td>5</td></tr>
<tr><td>Au</td><td>ppb</td><td>0.1</td><td>P</td><td>ppm</td><td>0.1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Ba</td><td>ppb</td><td>10</td><td>Pb</td><td>ppb</td><td>10</td></tr>
<tr><td>Bi</td><td>ppb</td><td>1</td><td>Pd</td><td>ppb</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Ca</td><td>ppm</td><td>10</td><td>Pr</td><td>ppb</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Cd</td><td>ppb</td><td>1</td><td>Pt</td><td>ppb</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Ce</td><td>ppb</td><td>5</td><td>Rb</td><td>ppb</td><td>5</td></tr>
<tr><td>Co</td><td>ppb</td><td>5</td><td>Sb</td><td>ppb</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Cr</td><td>ppb</td><td>100</td><td>Sc</td><td>ppb</td><td>5</td></tr>
<tr><td>Cs</td><td>ppb</td><td>0.5</td><td>Sm</td><td>ppb</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Cu</td><td>ppb</td><td>10</td><td>Sn</td><td>ppb</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Dy</td><td>ppb</td><td>1</td><td>Sr</td><td>ppb</td><td>10</td></tr>
<tr><td>Er</td><td>ppb</td><td>0.5</td><td>Ta</td><td>ppb</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Eu</td><td>ppb</td><td>0.5</td><td>Tb</td><td>ppb</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Fe</td><td>ppm</td><td>1</td><td>Te</td><td>ppb</td><td>10</td></tr>
<tr><td>Ga</td><td>ppb</td><td>1</td><td>Th</td><td>ppb</td><td>0.5</td></tr>
<tr><td>Gd</td><td>ppb</td><td>1</td><td>Ti</td><td>ppb</td><td>3</td></tr>
<tr><td>Hg</td><td>ppb</td><td>1</td><td>Tl</td><td>ppb</td><td>0.5</td></tr>
<tr><td>In</td><td>ppb</td><td>0.5</td><td>U</td><td>ppb</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>K</td><td>ppm</td><td>0.1</td><td>V</td><td>NA</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>La</td><td>ppb</td><td>1</td><td>W</td><td>ppb</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Li</td><td>ppb</td><td>5</td><td>Y</td><td>ppb</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Mg</td><td>ppm</td><td>1</td><td>Yb</td><td>ppb</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Mn</td><td>ppb</td><td>10</td><td>Zn</td><td>ppb</td><td>20</td></tr>
<tr><td>Mo</td><td>ppb</td><td>5</td><td>Zr</td><td>ppb</td><td>5</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>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.</td><td>The Halo requires an external white reference when it is first turned on and takes about a minute to calibrate. Subsequently, it has an internal white reference which it will use periodically while in use, which takes about 30 seconds.</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>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.</td><td>Standards and blanks were inserted every 20 samples by Chalice, in addition to laboratory inserted standards/blanks or crush duplicates which are inserted every 20 samples. 7 field duplicate soil samples were included.

Rock chip samples collected by Fladgate did not include QaQc samples in the sample stream, and rely solely on laboratory inserted standards, blanks and crush duplicates.

Internal reviews of QaQc results are regularly completed, and reported at the completion of the program. No serious issues were identified, however one blank from trench sampling returned above detection limit results and was assumed to be due to a switch with the previous sample number. Only one standard sample failed (>3 std dev) from rock chip sampling (1.67g/t rather than 1.16g/t Au).</td></tr>
<tr><td>Verification of sampling and assaying</td><td>The verification of significant intersections by either independent or alternative company personnel.</td><td>Channel intercepts were reviewed by G Snow (Chalice Gold Ltd)</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>The use of twinned holes.</td><td>Not applicable.</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols.</td><td>Sample location data is input either manually or transferred from the GPS and descriptions input each evening following a sampling event into excel. Lab assay certificates (excel versions) are merged with location/descriptions. Lab QAQC and internal standard/blank QAQC is reviewed and a report generated. An audit of the merged data consisting of randomly checking at least 2% all of the assays from each certificate is completed by another geologist.</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Discuss any adjustment to assay data.</td><td>Not applicable.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Location of data points</td><td>Accuracy and quality of surveys used to locate drillholes (collar and down-hole surveys), trenches, mine workings and other locations used in Mineral Resource estimation.</td><td>Sample locations are recorded using handheld GPS. Location accuracy is within 10m X-Y and 15m in the Z direction, however is generally in the order of 1-3m accuracy.</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Specification of the grid system used.</td><td>All sample information has been referenced to the NAD83, Zone 15 datum.</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Quality and adequacy of topographic control.</td><td>Topographic control is taken from an aerial survey flown by ATLIS Geomatics of
Winnipeg, Manitoba in 2010. The survey provided a Digital Elevation Model (DEM)
contoured at one metre intervals.</td></tr>
</table>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Data spacing and distribution	*Data spacing for reporting of Exploration Results.*	A total of 510 MMI soil samples were collected from three reconnaissance sampling grids in the Nova showing area, the South Cedartree area adjacent to the historic Wicks showing, and from the Brooks Lake/Pipestone areas to the south. Detailed MMI sampling in 2014 around the Cameron deposit had already proven the usefulness of this method Nova was poorly defined by historic geological mapping and so was completed on 400 x 400m centres to provide maximum coverage, Sampling near the historic Wicks showing was completed on 400 x 200m centres because the prospective contact was better defined. Sampling from the Brooks Lake/Pipestone areas was conducted on approximately 100m x 250m centres. Rock chips were collected on approximately 400m centres, plus additional outcrops of interest, however as sampling requires availability of outcrop, it was not always possible to obtain samples on planned locations.
	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.	Not applicable.
	Whether sample compositing has been applied.	Not applicable.
Orientation of data in relation to geological structure	*Whether the orientation of sampling achieves unbiased sampling of possible structures and the extent to which this is known, considering the deposit type.*	The MMI surveys were oriented with lines perpendicular to prospective structures. Rock samples were collected based on field observations and the availability of outcrop, and were not collected on regular, even spaced grid, although in general samples were collected on ~400m centres..
	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.	No drilling reported.
Sample security	*The measures taken to ensure sample security.*	Samples were packed in plastic sample bags, then placed inside rice sacks. Each rice bag was sealed with a numbered security tag, which was recorded with the associated sample numbers. The rice bags were placed in plastic crates which were picked up by Gardewine once a week. The crates were loaded directly into the truck by Chalice staff. Paper work was sent with the Gardewine driver as well as an electronic copy being emailed directly to the lab. When the lab received the samples they would ensure the security tags had not been broken, and once they opened the rice bags, confirm that the samples on the paperwork were physically there. A tracking system in the form of an excel spreadsheet tracked when every sample left site, when it was received by the lab, and when results were received. Each shipment had a number associated with it, which would then have the security tag numbers attached, which then had the samples numbers attached.
Audits or reviews	*The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.*	An internal audit of the data merging was completed, checking at least 2% of assays against certificates.

Section 2: Reporting of Exploration Results

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Mineral tenement and land tenure status	Type, reference name/number, location and ownership including agreements or material issues with third parties such as joint ventures, partnerships, overriding royalties, native title interests, historical sites, wilderness or national park and environmental settings.	**Cameron Gold Project:** The Cameron Gold Project is an advanced exploration project located in the southern part of western Ontario approximately 80kms south-east of the town of Kenora. The project area is accessible all year round by sealed and unsealed road. The Cameron Gold Project currently consists of two project areas namely Cameron, which includes the Cameron Deposit and West Cedartree which includes the Dubenski and Dogpaw deposits. The Cameron Gold Project contains a total of 154 unpatented claims, 24 patented claims (mineral rights only) and seven mining licences of occupation (MLO) plus four mining leases. All of the claims are located within unsurveyed crown lands, mainly in the Rowan Lake area, though some claims are situated in the Tadpole Lake, Brooks Lake and Lawrence Lake areas.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		The total area of the project is approximately 316.73km^2. **Current Ownership:** The Project is owned by Cameron Gold Operations (CGO) Limited, a wholly owned subsidiary of Chalice Gold Mines Limited Ownership is pursuant to either a 100% direct interest in the underlying licences or option agreements whereby Chalice may acquire a 100% interest upon making certain payments to the vendor. The Cameron deposit specifically, is subject to 1% NSR plus a $0.30 per ton royalty on all ore mined and milled. In March 2015, Chalice exercised its right to buy back two thirds, or 2% of the existing 3% NSR relating to the Cameron deposit for $2 million. The greater Project area is also subject to certain underlying net smelter royalties ranging between 1.5% and 3% with the majority having rights to buy back part of the royalty. In July 2014, Chalice acquired 100% of the Dubenski Gold Deposit for C$700,000, which was previously under an option agreement. In addition, there is an additional payment on all gold production mined in excess of 70,000 ounces (being US$13 per ounce where the gold price is less than or equal to US$1,500 per ounce and US$16 per ounce where the gold price is greater than US$1,500 per ounce). **Recent Ownership History:** **Cameron Gold Project** On February 5th 2014 Chalice and Coventry Resources Inc (Coventry), the former owner of CGO, successfully completed a Plan of Arrangement under which Chalice acquired a 100% interest in the Cameron Gold Project. Under this arrangement Coventry shareholders received 46M Chalice shares.
	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.	**Cameron Lake, Dubenski & Dogpaw:** According to the Mining Act (Ontario), except where otherwise provided, the holder of a prospector's licence may prospect for minerals and stake a mining claim on any Crown land (surveyed or unsurveyed). Unpatented lands are lands in which the surface and mining rights have been reserved by the Crown. Individual unpatented mining claims are comprised of a multiple of 16 Ha (40 Acre) blocks. In order to maintain the title to an unpatented mining claim indefinitely, the recorded holder of the claim is required to undertake approved work expenditure in excess of $400 per claim within two years of the granting of the claim. Work programs and expenditure commitments can be grouped across a contiguous series of unpatented mining claims. To maintain the unpatented claims comprising the Cameron Project in good standing, Chalice is required to incur an aggregate expenditure of $274,400 per year and to file annual assessment reports of the work that has been undertaken. The recorded holder of an unpatented mining claim does not own the land and has no title permitting mineral extraction unless it converts the said mining claim to a mining lease under Section 81 of the Mining Act. Prior to the grant of a mining lease, certain conditions must be fulfilled including a survey of boundaries of the claims. Once granted the duration of a mining lease is 21 years. This can be renewed on application. The mining leases within the Cameron Project were initially granted in 1988 and were subsequently renewed for a further 21 years in July, 2009, except CLM 289 which was renewed in May 2006. The annual fee for all mining leases held by Cameron Gold Operations is $2,078.61. Patented lands are private property in which the surface and mining rights are not held by the Crown. No assessment work is required on these claims, although land taxes are levied against the claim holder if the patented claim includes the surface rights associated with the claim. As the surface rights for all patented claims within the Cameron Project are held by other parties, Chalice is not required to pay any such fees. Mining Licences of Occupation (MLO's) are a type of claim that was once commonly issued to permit the mining of minerals under the beds of water bodies. On rare occasions the licence may include portions of dry land. Issued in perpetuity, there is no requirement to renew a MLO. All MLO's are subject to an annual flat rental fee of $5.00 per hectare. The holder of a patented mining claim covering predominately dry land may also hold a MLO within the patented claim, for the water portion of the same mining claim. All patented and unpatented mining claims, licences of occupation and mining leases are held in the name of Cameron Gold Operations Limited, except those claims and leases currently under option. As of the effective date of this Technical Report, all are in good standing. The author is not aware of any outstanding aboriginal land rights or land claims over the project area. Chalice enjoys full and unfettered legal access to all claims comprising the Cameron Project.
Exploration done by other parties	Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.	The Cameron deposit in particular, has received considerable exploration over the last 80 years. All historical exploration, including the results of Chalice' relogging, resampling and

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		resource estimate update completed in 2015 have been disclosed to the market, and as such this announcement solely relates to regional reconnaissance rock chip, trenching, channel and soil sampling completed in 2015. Many of the trenching sites were selected based on MMI soil and rock chip sampling completed in 2014 over the Cameron deposit and nearby areas, as well as inversion of existing induced polarisation survey results. Soil sampling areas were selected based on historical information and field observations/rock chip sampling. Many of the targets have received limited historical exploration drilling. Since 2012 Coventry and/or Chalice have drilled 40 RC holes for 219.5m and 15 diamond holes for 2559.5m. Outside of the Cameron Lake, Dubenski and Dogpaw deposits, none have JORC compliant resources. As previously reported, the Cameron deposit has received extensive historical work. Modern exploration commenced in the 1940's and numerous companies have carried out prospecting, line cutting, geological mapping, trenching, soil and outcrop sampling and ground magnetic, electromagnetic (EM) and induced polarisation (IP) geophysical surveys. Drilling was first undertaken in July 1960 and now totals 981 holes for 120,813 m. In 1987 at the Cameron deposit, underground development for an extensive sampling program was undertaken. Some 65,000m^3 of material was excavated with some bulk sampling, diamond drilling and rock chip sampling completed. Between 2010 and 2012 Coventry drilled 242 surface diamond holes totalling 36,000m with the majority on the Cameron deposit. Exploration at the West Cedartree Gold Project commenced in 1936 (Dubenski) and 1944 (DogPaw), and has been conducted intermittently until the present day. The most significant exploration directed at the Dubenski deposit has been undertaken during the late 1990's by Avalon Ventures Inc. and from 2007 onwards by Houston Lake Mining. The total drilled for each deposit is: • Dubenski 272 diamond drill holes (30,674.3m) • Dogpaw 235 diamond drill holes (19,597m). • Three other prospects have been drilled, namely McLennans, Angel Hill and Robertson and an historical non-compliant mineral resource has been quoted for the Angel Hill prospect. There has been numerous underground workings (mainly shafts) excavated, and in 1995 an open pit excavation was undertaken at the Dogpaw deposit to generate a bulk sample.
Geology	Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.	The Cameron Gold Project setting is an Archaean granite-greenstone terrane. It is situated in the western end of the Late Archaean Savant Lake- Crow Lake Belt in the Western Wabigoon Subprovince of the Superior Province in north-western Ontario. The Savant Lake-Crow Lake Belt comprises a number of individual greenstone belts that are most commonly separated by large scale faults and shear zones. Gold mineralization is being sought, with no deposit style being exclusively targeted
Drill hole Information	A summary of all information material to the understanding of the exploration results including a tabulation of the following information for all Material drill holes: • easting and northing of the drill hole collar • elevation or RL (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in metres) of the drill hole collar • dip and azimuth of the hole • down hole length and interception depth • hole length.	Not applicable.
Data aggregation methods	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.	No grade capping has been applied.
	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.	Trench samples are reported using a minimum cut-off grade of 1 g/t Au, and no minimum width or dilution.
	The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values should be clearly stated.	No metal equivalents used.
Relationship between	These relationships are particularly important in the reporting of Exploration	Channel samples have been taken from trenches/excavated sites and where possible have been taken as close to perpendicular to mineralisation as possible, however samples are

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
mineralisation widths and intercept lengths	Results. If the geometry of the mineralisation with respect to the drill hole angle is known, its nature should be reported. If it is not known and only the down hole lengths are reported, there should be a clear statement to this effect (e.g. 'down hole length, true width not known').	taken from exposed surfaces, not drilling.
Diagrams	Appropriate maps and sections (with scales) and tabulations of intercepts should be included for any significant discovery being reported These should include, but not be limited to a plan view of drill hole collar locations and appropriate sectional views.	Refer to figures and tabulations in the main text and Appendices.
Balanced reporting	Where comprehensive reporting of all Exploration Results is not practicable, representative reporting of both low and high grades and/or widths should be practiced to avoid misleading reporting of Exploration Results.	Refer to figures and tabulations in the main text and Appendices.
Other substantive exploration data	Other exploration data, if meaningful and material, should be reported including (but not limited to): geological observations; geophysical survey results; geochemical survey results; bulk samples – size and method of treatment; metallurgical test results; bulk density, groundwater, geotechnical and rock characteristics; potential deleterious or contaminating substances.	For detailed data relating to the Cameron, Dubenski or Dogpaw deposits please see previous disclosures. Other work completed by Chalice in 2015 that is still being analysed includes the collection of 4294 short wave infra-red spectra using a Terraspec Halo and the initiation of a lake sediment survey, however after 43 samples were collected this had to be postponed due to weather.
Further work	The nature and scale of planned further work (e.g. tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling). Diagrams clearly highlighting the areas of possible extensions, including the main geological interpretations and future drilling areas, provided this information is not commercially sensitive	Future work programs are being assessed with a view to highlight and prioritise targets for further exploration and/or drilling.

Section 3: Estimation and Reporting of Mineral Resources

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Database integrity	Measures taken to ensure that data has not been corrupted by, for example, transcription or keying errors, between its initial collection and its use for Mineral Resource estimation purposes.	Not applicable
	Data validation procedures used.	Not applicable
Site visits	*Comment on any site visits undertaken by the Competent Person and the outcome of those visits.* *If no site visits have been undertaken indicate why this is the case.*	Not applicable
Geological interpretation	*Confidence in (or conversely, the uncertainty of) the geological interpretation of the mineral deposit.*	Not applicable
	Nature of the data used and of any assumptions made.	Not applicable
	The effect, if any, of alternative interpretations on Mineral Resource estimation.	Not applicable
	The use of geology in guiding and controlling Mineral Resource estimation.	Not applicable
	The factors affecting continuity both of grade and geology.	Not applicable
Dimensions	*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*	Not applicable

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Estimation and modelling techniques	*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.* *The availability of check estimates, previous estimates and/or mine production records and whether the Mineral Resource estimate takes appropriate account of such data.*	Not applicable
	The assumptions made regarding recovery of by-products.	Not applicable
	Estimation of deleterious elements or other non-grade variables of economic significance (e.g. sulphur for acid mine drainage characterisation).	Not applicable
	In the case of block model interpolation, the block size in relation to the average sample spacing and the search employed.	Not applicable
	Any assumptions behind modelling of selective mining units.	Not applicable
	Any assumptions about correlation between variables.	Not applicable
	Description of how the geological interpretation was used to control the resource estimates.	Not applicable
	Discussion of basis for using or not using grade cutting or capping.	Not applicable
	The process of validation, the checking process used, the comparison of model data to drillhole data, and use of reconciliation data if available.	Not applicable
Moisture	*Whether the tonnages are estimated on a dry basis or with natural moisture, and the method of determination of the moisture content.*	Not applicable
Cut-off parameters	*The basis of the adopted cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied*	Not applicable
Mining factors or assumptions	*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.*	Not applicable
Metallurgical factors or assumptions	*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.*	Not applicable
Environmental factors or assumptions	*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*	Not applicable
Bulk density	*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.*	Not applicable

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	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,	Not applicable
	Discuss assumptions for bulk density estimates used in the evaluation process of the different materials.	Not applicable
Classification	*The basis for the classification of the Mineral Resources into varying confidence categories*	Not applicable
	Whether appropriate account has been taken of all relevant factors (i.e. 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).	Not applicable
	Whether the result appropriately reflects the Competent Person's view of the deposit.	Not applicable
Audits or reviews	*The results of any audits or reviews of Mineral Resource estimates.*	Not applicable
	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	Not applicable
	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	Not applicable
	These statements of relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate should be compared with production data, where available	Not applicable