

**CERTIFICATE OF ANALYSIS FOR**  
**GOLD OXIDE**  
**CERTIFIED REFERENCE MATERIAL**  
**OREAS 261**

**Table 1. Certified Values, SD's, 95% Confidence and Tolerance Limits for OREAS 261.**

Constituent	Certified Value	1SD	95% Confidence Limits		95% Tolerance Limits	
			Low	High	Low	High
<b>Fire Assay</b>						
Au, Gold (ppb)	48.6	2.3	47.8	49.3	48.1*	49.1*
<b>Aqua Regia Digestion (sample weights 10-50g)</b>						
Au, Gold (ppb)	41.3	6.2	38.9	43.7	40.9 <sup>†</sup>	41.8 <sup>†</sup>
<b>Aqua Regia Digestion (full suite, sample weights 0.15-50g)</b>						
Ag, Silver (ppm)	0.204	0.025	0.191	0.217	0.192	0.217
Al, Aluminium (wt.%)	1.33	0.15	1.26	1.39	1.29	1.36
As, Arsenic (ppm)	17.8	1.8	17.1	18.4	17.1	18.4
Ba, Barium (ppm)	171	17	163	178	166	175
Be, Beryllium (ppm)	1.23	0.085	1.19	1.26	1.18	1.27
Bi, Bismuth (ppm)	0.59	0.048	0.57	0.61	0.57	0.61
Ca, Calcium (wt.%)	1.15	0.060	1.12	1.17	1.12	1.17
Cd, Cadmium (ppm)	0.27	0.023	0.26	0.28	0.25	0.28
Co, Cobalt (ppm)	31.5	1.41	31.0	32.1	30.8	32.3
Cr, Chromium (ppm)	48.5	4.81	46.6	50.4	46.9	50.1
Cu, Copper (ppm)	64	2.3	63	65	63	66
Dy, Dysprosium (ppm)	2.63	0.33	2.35	2.90	2.51	2.74
Er, Erbium (ppm)	1.24	0.12	1.15	1.34	1.19	1.29
Eu, Europium (ppm)	0.85	0.10	0.77	0.94	0.79	0.91
Fe, Iron (wt.%)	3.74	0.135	3.69	3.79	3.68	3.81
Ga, Gallium (ppm)	4.98	0.69	4.63	5.32	4.80	5.15
Gd, Gadolinium (ppm)	3.94	0.59	3.44	4.44	3.78	4.10
Hg, Mercury (ppm)	0.071	0.009	0.066	0.076	0.060	0.083

\*Gold Tolerance Limits for typical 30g fire assay charge weight determined from 20 x 80mg INAA results and the Sampling Constant (Ingamells & Switzer, 1973); <sup>†</sup>Gold Tolerance Limits for typical 25g aqua regia sample weight determined as above; Note: intervals may appear asymmetric due to rounding.

Table 1 continued.

Constituent	Certified Value	1SD	95% Confidence Limits		95% Tolerance Limits	
			Low	High	Low	High
<b>Aqua Regia Digestion continued</b>						
Ho, Holmium (ppm)	0.44	0.05	0.40	0.48	0.42	0.46
In, Indium (ppm)	0.028	0.003	0.027	0.030	0.026	0.030
K, Potassium (wt.%)	0.281	0.049	0.259	0.303	0.269	0.293
Li, Lithium (ppm)	21.1	1.18	20.7	21.6	20.5	21.8
Lu, Lutetium (ppm)	0.14	0.008	0.14	0.15	IND	IND
Mg, Magnesium (wt.%)	0.658	0.025	0.647	0.668	0.646	0.670
Mn, Manganese (wt.%)	0.046	0.003	0.045	0.047	0.045	0.047
Mo, Molybdenum (ppm)	0.48	0.026	0.46	0.49	0.44	0.51
Na, Sodium (wt.%)	0.082	0.006	0.079	0.084	0.080	0.084
Ni, Nickel (ppm)	74	3.5	72	75	72	75
P, Phosphorus (wt.%)	0.041	0.002	0.040	0.042	0.040	0.042
Pb, Lead (ppm)	34.2	1.95	33.5	34.9	33.0	35.3
S, Sulphur (wt.%)	0.110	0.005	0.108	0.112	0.107	0.113
Sb, Antimony (ppm)	2.43	0.35	2.27	2.59	2.32	2.54
Sc, Scandium (ppm)	3.42	0.48	3.20	3.64	3.28	3.55
Sm, Samarium (ppm)	4.58	0.81	3.87	5.29	4.35	4.81
Sr, Strontium (ppm)	17.5	1.47	16.9	18.1	17.0	18.1
Tb, Terbium (ppm)	0.51	0.07	0.46	0.56	0.49	0.53
Te, Tellurium (ppm)	0.11	0.02	0.10	0.12	IND	IND
Th, Thorium (ppm)	10.9	0.95	10.5	11.4	10.6	11.2
Tl, Thallium (ppm)	0.28	0.04	0.27	0.30	0.27	0.30
Tm, Thulium (ppm)	0.16	0.03	0.13	0.20	IND	IND
U, Uranium (ppm)	1.29	0.17	1.21	1.36	1.25	1.33
V, Vanadium (ppm)	22.6	2.9	21.4	23.8	21.6	23.6
W, Tungsten (ppm)	0.092	0.013	0.081	0.103	IND	IND
Y, Yttrium (ppm)	11.7	1.2	11.2	12.3	11.4	12.0
Yb, Ytterbium (ppm)	0.98	0.097	0.93	1.04	0.94	1.02
Zn, Zinc (ppm)	128	6	126	130	125	131

Note: intervals may appear asymmetric due to rounding.

Table 2. Indicative Values for OREAS 261.

Constituent	Unit	Value	Constituent	Unit	Value	Constituent	Unit	Value
<b>Pb Fire Assay</b>								
Pd	ppb	1.18	Pt	ppb	0.767			
<b>Aqua Regia Digestion</b>								
B	ppm	9.56	Nb	ppm	< 0.05	Se	ppm	0.45
Ce	ppm	52	Nd	ppm	24.6	Si	wt.%	0.024
Cs	ppm	3.11	Pd	ppm	< 0.01	Sn	ppm	0.62
Ge	ppm	0.095	Pr	ppm	6.23	Ta	ppm	< 0.05
Hf	ppm	0.31	Pt	ppm	< 0.005	Ti	wt.%	0.005
Ir	ppm	< 0.1	Rb	ppm	21.4	Zr	ppm	12.3
La	ppm	25.6	Re	ppm	< 0.001			

Note: the number of significant figures reported is not a reflection of the level of certainty of stated values. They are instead an artefact of ORE's in-house CRM-specific LIMS.

Table 2 continued.

Constituent	Unit	Value	Constituent	Unit	Value	Constituent	Unit	Value
<b>Borate Fusion XRF</b>								
Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	wt.%	14.90	K <sub>2</sub> O	wt.%	3.55	SiO <sub>2</sub>	wt.%	64.37
BaO	ppm	900	MgO	wt.%	1.82	Sr	ppm	< 80
CaO	wt.%	1.73	MnO	wt.%	0.060	TiO <sub>2</sub>	wt.%	0.745
Cl	ppm	460	Na <sub>2</sub> O	wt.%	0.580	V <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub>	ppm	195
Cr <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	ppm	200	P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub>	wt.%	0.109	Zr	ppm	222
Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	wt.%	6.17	S	wt.%	0.116			
<b>Thermogravimetry</b>								
LOI <sup>1000</sup>	wt.%	5.70						
<b>Laser Ablation ICP-MS</b>								
Ag	ppm	0.300	Hf	ppm	6.27	Sm	ppm	7.26
As	ppm	17.6	Ho	ppm	1.23	Sn	ppm	4.20
Ba	ppm	799	In	ppm	0.050	Sr	ppm	45.7
Be	ppm	2.80	La	ppm	43.8	Ta	ppm	1.20
Bi	ppm	0.58	Lu	ppm	0.53	Tb	ppm	0.98
Cd	ppm	< 0.1	Mn	wt.%	0.048	Te	ppm	< 0.2
Ce	ppm	83	Mo	ppm	0.80	Th	ppm	16.8
Co	ppm	32.1	Nb	ppm	15.4	Ti	wt.%	0.446
Cr	ppm	138	Nd	ppm	37.1	Tl	ppm	1.00
Cs	ppm	10.8	Ni	ppm	82	Tm	ppm	0.52
Cu	ppm	62	Pb	ppm	37.0	U	ppm	3.65
Dy	ppm	5.75	Pr	ppm	10.5	V	ppm	109
Er	ppm	3.43	Rb	ppm	177	W	ppm	3.00
Eu	ppm	1.32	Re	ppm	< 0.01	Y	ppm	31.7
Ga	ppm	20.3	Sb	ppm	4.10	Yb	ppm	3.34
Gd	ppm	6.15	Sc	ppm	15.6	Zn	ppm	115
Ge	ppm	1.58	Se	ppm	< 5	Zr	ppm	221

Note: the number of significant figures reported is not a reflection of the level of certainty of stated values. They are instead an artefact of ORE's in-house CRM-specific LIMS.

## INTRODUCTION

OREAS reference materials are intended to provide a low cost method of evaluating and improving the quality of analysis of geological samples. To the geologist they provide a means of implementing quality control in analytical data sets generated in exploration from the grass roots level through to prospect evaluation, and in grade control at mining operations. To the analyst they provide an effective means of calibrating analytical equipment, assessing new techniques and routinely monitoring in-house procedures.

## SOURCE MATERIALS

Certified Reference Material (CRM) OREAS 261 was prepared from a blend of gold-bearing oxide ore from one of the Sepon gold deposits and barren mudstone sourced from a quarry east of Melbourne, Australia. The Sepon Mineral District stratigraphy comprises Devonian to Carboniferous aged continental fluvial and shallow to deep marine

sediments deposited in a half graben basin. Gold mineralisation is localised in structural and stratigraphic fluid traps similar in style to the sediment-hosted gold deposits of the Carlin Trend, Nevada, USA. Mineralisation is finely disseminated and closely associated with decalcification and variable silica replacement of calcareous rocks along structures and at lithological contacts.

The Sepon deposit is located approximately 40 kilometres north of the town of Sepon, in Savannakhet province of south-central Laos. OREAS 261 is one of a suite of four oxide gold CRMs ranging in gold content from 16 to 214ppb.

## **COMMINUTION AND HOMOGENISATION PROCEDURES**

The material constituting OREAS 261 was prepared in the following manner:

- drying to constant mass at 105°C;
- crushing and milling of the barren material to >99% minus 75 microns;
- crushing and milling of the ore material to 100% minus 30 microns;
- blending in appropriate proportions to achieve the desired grade;
- packaging in 60g units sealed in laminated foil pouches and 500g units in plastic jars.

## **ANALYTICAL PROGRAM**

Thirty six commercial analytical laboratories participated in the program to certify the 48 elements reported in Table 1. The following methods were employed:

- Gold via 25-50g fire assay with ICP-OES (14 labs), AAS (11 labs) or ICP-MS (8 labs) finish;
- Instrumental neutron activation analysis for Au on 80mg subsamples to confirm homogeneity (1 laboratory);
- Gold via 15-50g aqua regia digestion with ICP-MS (17 labs), AAS (8 labs) or graphite furnace AAS (1 lab) finish;
- Aqua regia digestion (see note below) for full elemental suite ICP-OES and ICP-MS (up to 26 laboratories depending on the element).

It is important to note that in the analytical industry there is no standardisation of the aqua regia digestion process. Aqua regia is a partial empirical digest and differences in recoveries for various analytes are commonplace. These are caused by variations in the digest conditions which can include the ratio of nitric to hydrochloric acids, acid strength, temperatures, leach times and secondary digestions. Recoveries for sulphide-hosted base metal sulphides approach total values, however, other analytes, in particular the lithophile elements, show greater sensitivity to method parameters. This can result in lack of consensus in an inter-laboratory certification program for these elements. The approach applied here is to report certified values in those instances where reasonable agreement exists amongst a majority of participating laboratories. The results of specific laboratories may differ significantly from the certified values, but will, nonetheless, be valid and reproducible in the context of the specifics of the aqua regia method in use. Users of this reference material should, therefore, be mindful of this limitation when applying the certified values in a quality control program.

For the round robin program twenty 1.5kg lot samples were taken at predetermined intervals during the bagging stage, immediately following final blending and are considered representative of the entire batch. The six samples received by each laboratory were obtained by taking two 120g scoop splits from each of three separate 1.5kg lots. This format enabled nested ANOVA treatment of the results to evaluate homogeneity, i.e. to ascertain whether between-unit variance is greater than within-unit variance. Table 1 presents the 48 certified values together with their associated 1SD's, 95% confidence and tolerance limits and Table 2 shows indicative values (uncertified) for 91 additional analytes including major and trace element composition.

Gold homogeneity has been evaluated and confirmed by instrumental neutron activation analysis (INAA) on twenty ~80 milligram sample portions (see Table 3) and by a nested ANOVA program for both fire assay and aqua regia digestion (see '**nested ANOVA**' section). Table 4 provides performance gate intervals for the certified values of each method group based on their pooled 1SD's. Tabulated results of all elements (including Au INAA analyses) together with uncorrected means, medians, standard deviations, relative standard deviations and percent deviation of lab means from the corrected mean of means (PDM<sup>3</sup>) are presented in the detailed certification data for this CRM (**OREAS 261 DataPack.xlsx**).

## STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

**Certified Values, Confidence Limits, Standard Deviations and Tolerance Limits** (Table 1) have been determined for each analyte following removal of individual, laboratory dataset (batch) and 3SD outliers (single iteration). For individual outliers within a laboratory batch the z-score test is used in combination with a second method that determines the per cent deviation of the individual value from the batch median. Outliers in general are selected on the basis of z-scores > 2.5 and with per cent deviations (i) > 3 and (ii) more than three times the average absolute per cent deviation for the batch. In certain instances statistician's prerogative has been employed in discriminating outliers. Each laboratory data set mean is tested for outlying status based on z-score discrimination and rejected if > 2.5. After individual and laboratory data set (batch) outliers have been eliminated a non-iterative 3 standard deviation filter is applied, with those values lying outside this window also relegated to outlying status.

**Certified Values** are the means of accepted laboratory means after outlier filtering. The INAA data (see Table 3) is omitted from determination of the certified value for Au and is used solely for the calculation of Tolerance Limits and homogeneity evaluation of OREAS 261.

**95% Confidence Limits** are inversely proportional to the number of participating laboratories and inter-laboratory agreement. It is a measure of the reliability of the certified value. A 95% confidence interval indicates a 95% probability that the true value of the analyte under consideration lies between the upper and lower limits. *95% Confidence Limits should not be used as control limits for laboratory performance.*

**Indicative (uncertified) values** (Table 2) are provided for the major and trace elements determined by borate fusion XRF (Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> to Zn and including LOI at 1000°C by thermogravimetry) and laser ablation with ICP-MS (Ag to Zr) and are the means of duplicate assays from Bureau Veritas, Perth. Additional indicative values by other analytical methods

are present where the number of laboratories reporting a particular analyte is insufficient (< 5) to support certification or where inter-laboratory consensus is poor.

**Table 3. Neutron Activation Analysis of Au on 20 x 80mg subsamples.**

Replicate No	Au ppb
1	55.1
2	51.7
3	45.8
4	56.3
5	48.7
6	48.2
7	51.0
8	43.1
9	48.3
10	47.8
11	48.9
12	49.3
13	50.9
14	52.9
15	46.9
16	48.4
17	49.5
18	50.4
19	48.3
20	48.4
Mean	49.5
Median	48.8
Std Dev.	3.0
Rel.Std.Dev.	6.08%
PDM <sup>3</sup>	1.94%

**Standard Deviation** values (1SDs) are reported in Table 1 and provide an indication of a level of performance that might reasonably be expected from a laboratory being monitored by this CRM in a QA/QC program. The SD values include all sources of measurement uncertainty: between-lab variance, within-run variance (precision errors) and CRM variability. For an effective CRM the contribution of the latter should be negligible in comparison to measurement errors. OREAS reference materials have a level of homogeneity such that the observed variance from repeated analysis has its origin almost exclusively in the analytical process rather than the reference material itself.

The SD for each analyte's certified value is calculated from the same filtered data set used to determine the certified value, i.e. after removal of any individual, lab dataset (batch) and 3SD outliers (single iteration). These outliers can only be removed after the absolute homogeneity of the CRM has been independently established, i.e. the outliers must be confidently deemed to be analytical rather than arising from inhomogeneity of the CRM. **The standard deviation is then calculated for each analyte from the pooled accepted analyses generated from the certification program.**

In the application of SD's in monitoring performance it is important to note that not all laboratories function at the same level of proficiency and that different methods in use at a particular laboratory have differing levels of precision. Each laboratory has its own inherent SD (for a specific concentration level and analyte-method pair) based on the analytical process and this SD is not directly related to the round robin program.

The majority of data generated in the round robin program was produced by a selection of world class laboratories. The SD's thus generated are more constrained than those that would be produced across a randomly selected group of laboratories. To produce more generally achievable SD's the 'pooled' SD's provided in this report include inter-lab bias. This 'one size fits all' approach may require revision at the discretion of the QC manager concerned following careful scrutiny of QC control charts.

Table 4 shows **Performance Gates** calculated for two and three standard deviations. As a guide these intervals may be regarded as warning or rejection for multiple 2SD outliers, or rejection for individual 3SD outliers in QC monitoring, although their precise application should be at the discretion of the QC manager concerned. A second method utilises a 5% window calculated directly from the certified value. Standard deviation is also shown in relative percent for one, two and three relative standard deviations (1RSD, 2RSD and 3RSD) to facilitate an appreciation of the magnitude of these numbers and a comparison with the 5% window. Caution should be exercised when concentration levels approach lower limits of detection of the analytical methods employed as performance gates calculated from standard deviations tend to be excessively wide whereas those determined by the 5% method are too narrow.

**Table 4. Performance Gates for OREAS 261.**

Constituent	Certified Value	Absolute Standard Deviations					Relative Standard Deviations			5% window	
		1SD	2SD Low	2SD High	3SD Low	3SD High	1RSD	2RSD	3RSD	Low	High
<b>Fire Assay</b>											
Au, ppb	48.6	2.3	43.9	53.2	41.6	55.5	4.77%	9.55%	14.32%	46.1	51.0
<b>Aqua Regia Digestion (sample weights 10-50g)</b>											
Au, ppb	41.3	6.2	29.0	53.7	22.8	59.8	14.92%	29.84%	44.76%	39.3	43.4
<b>Aqua Regia Digestion (full suite, sample weights 0.15-50g)</b>											
Ag, ppm	0.204	0.025	0.153	0.255	0.128	0.280	12.47%	24.94%	37.41%	0.194	0.214
Al, wt. %	1.33	0.15	1.03	1.62	0.88	1.77	11.13%	22.26%	33.40%	1.26	1.39
As, ppm	17.8	1.8	14.2	21.3	12.4	23.1	10.11%	20.22%	30.34%	16.9	18.6
Ba, ppm	171	17	136	205	118	223	10.19%	20.37%	30.56%	162	179
Be, ppm	1.23	0.085	1.06	1.40	0.97	1.48	6.96%	13.92%	20.89%	1.17	1.29
Bi, ppm	0.59	0.048	0.49	0.68	0.45	0.73	8.08%	16.16%	24.24%	0.56	0.62
Ca, wt. %	1.15	0.060	1.03	1.27	0.97	1.33	5.25%	10.50%	15.74%	1.09	1.20
Cd, ppm	0.27	0.023	0.22	0.31	0.20	0.34	8.49%	16.98%	25.47%	0.26	0.28
Co, ppm	31.5	1.41	28.7	34.4	27.3	35.8	4.48%	8.97%	13.45%	30.0	33.1
Cr, ppm	48.5	4.81	38.9	58.1	34.1	62.9	9.91%	19.83%	29.74%	46.1	50.9
Cu, ppm	64	2.3	60	69	57	71	3.53%	7.07%	10.60%	61	67
Dy, ppm	2.63	0.33	1.97	3.28	1.64	3.61	12.51%	25.01%	37.52%	2.49	2.76
Er, ppm	1.24	0.12	0.99	1.49	0.87	1.62	10.04%	20.09%	30.13%	1.18	1.30

Note: intervals may appear asymmetric due to rounding

**Table 4 continued.**

Constituent	Certified Value	Absolute Standard Deviations					Relative Standard Deviations			5% window	
		1SD	2SD Low	2SD High	3SD Low	3SD High	1RSD	2RSD	3RSD	Low	High
<b>Aqua Regia Digestion continued</b>											
Eu, ppm	0.85	0.10	0.64	1.06	0.54	1.16	12.16%	24.32%	36.49%	0.81	0.89
Fe, wt.%	3.74	0.135	3.47	4.01	3.34	4.15	3.61%	7.21%	10.82%	3.56	3.93
Ga, ppm	4.98	0.69	3.59	6.37	2.89	7.06	13.95%	27.90%	41.85%	4.73	5.23
Gd, ppm	3.94	0.59	2.76	5.11	2.17	5.70	14.93%	29.86%	44.80%	3.74	4.13
Hg, ppm	0.071	0.009	0.053	0.089	0.044	0.098	12.77%	25.54%	38.31%	0.068	0.075
Ho, ppm	0.44	0.05	0.34	0.54	0.29	0.59	11.53%	23.07%	34.60%	0.42	0.46
In, ppm	0.028	0.003	0.021	0.035	0.018	0.038	11.89%	23.77%	35.66%	0.027	0.030
K, wt.%	0.281	0.049	0.184	0.378	0.135	0.426	17.28%	34.55%	51.83%	0.267	0.295
Li, ppm	21.1	1.18	18.8	23.5	17.6	24.7	5.60%	11.20%	16.80%	20.1	22.2
Lu, ppm	0.14	0.008	0.13	0.16	0.12	0.17	5.85%	11.70%	17.55%	0.14	0.15
Mg, wt.%	0.658	0.025	0.607	0.708	0.582	0.733	3.84%	7.68%	11.52%	0.625	0.691
Mn, wt.%	0.046	0.003	0.041	0.051	0.038	0.054	5.49%	10.99%	16.48%	0.044	0.048
Mo, ppm	0.48	0.026	0.42	0.53	0.40	0.55	5.50%	11.01%	16.51%	0.45	0.50
Na, wt.%	0.082	0.006	0.070	0.094	0.064	0.100	7.30%	14.61%	21.91%	0.078	0.086
Ni, ppm	74	3.5	66	81	63	84	4.81%	9.63%	14.44%	70	77
P, wt.%	0.041	0.002	0.037	0.046	0.035	0.048	5.11%	10.23%	15.34%	0.039	0.043
Pb, ppm	34.2	1.95	30.3	38.0	28.3	40.0	5.70%	11.40%	17.09%	32.4	35.9
S, wt.%	0.110	0.005	0.100	0.120	0.094	0.125	4.69%	9.37%	14.06%	0.104	0.115
Sb, ppm	2.43	0.35	1.72	3.14	1.37	3.49	14.52%	29.05%	43.57%	2.31	2.55
Sc, ppm	3.42	0.48	2.45	4.39	1.96	4.87	14.18%	28.36%	42.54%	3.25	3.59
Sm, ppm	4.58	0.81	2.96	6.19	2.16	7.00	17.63%	35.26%	52.90%	4.35	4.81
Sr, ppm	17.5	1.47	14.6	20.5	13.1	21.9	8.41%	16.83%	25.24%	16.6	18.4
Tb, ppm	0.51	0.07	0.37	0.64	0.31	0.71	13.32%	26.63%	39.95%	0.48	0.53
Te, ppm	0.11	0.02	0.07	0.15	0.06	0.16	16.53%	33.05%	49.58%	0.10	0.11
Th, ppm	10.9	0.95	9.0	12.8	8.1	13.7	8.67%	17.33%	26.00%	10.4	11.5
Tl, ppm	0.28	0.04	0.20	0.37	0.16	0.41	14.76%	29.51%	44.27%	0.27	0.30
Tm, ppm	0.16	0.03	0.10	0.22	0.07	0.25	19.23%	38.46%	57.69%	0.15	0.17
U, ppm	1.29	0.17	0.95	1.62	0.78	1.79	13.14%	26.27%	39.41%	1.22	1.35
V, ppm	22.6	2.9	16.9	28.3	14.0	31.2	12.62%	25.24%	37.86%	21.5	23.7
W, ppm	0.092	0.013	0.066	0.117	0.054	0.130	13.82%	27.65%	41.47%	0.087	0.096
Y, ppm	11.7	1.2	9.2	14.2	8.0	15.4	10.60%	21.21%	31.81%	11.1	12.3
Yb, ppm	0.98	0.097	0.79	1.18	0.69	1.27	9.84%	19.68%	29.52%	0.93	1.03
Zn, ppm	128	6	117	140	111	145	4.49%	8.98%	13.47%	122	134

Note: intervals may appear asymmetric due to rounding

**Tolerance Limits** (ISO Guide 3207) were determined using an analysis of precision errors method and are considered a conservative estimate of true homogeneity. The meaning of tolerance limits may be illustrated for copper by aqua regia digestion, where 99% of the

time ( $1-\alpha=0.99$ ) at least 95% of subsamples ( $p=0.95$ ) will have concentrations lying between 63 and 66ppm. Put more precisely, this means that if the same number of subsamples were taken and analysed in the same manner repeatedly, 99% of the tolerance intervals so constructed would cover at least 95% of the total population, and 1% of the tolerance intervals would cover less than 95% of the total population (ISO Guide 35).

For gold the tolerance has been determined by INAA using the reduced analytical subsample method which utilises the known relationship between standard deviation and analytical subsample weight (Ingamells and Switzer, 1973). In this approach the sample aliquot is substantially reduced to a point where most of the variability in replicate assays should be due to inhomogeneity of the reference material and measurement error becomes negligible. In this instance a subsample weight of 80 milligrams was employed and the 1RSD of 0.32% calculated for a 30g fire assay or aqua regia sample (6.08% at 80mg weights) confirms the high level of gold homogeneity in OREAS 261. The homogeneity is of a level such that **sampling error is almost negligible** for a conventional fire assay or aqua regia determination.

*Please note that these RSD's and tolerance limits pertain to the homogeneity of the CRM only and should not be used as control limits for laboratory performance.*

The gold homogeneity of OREAS 261 has also been evaluated in a **nested ANOVA** of the round robin program. Each of the twenty-four round robin laboratories received six samples per CRM and these samples were made up of paired samples from three different, non-adjacent sampling intervals. The purpose of the ANOVA evaluation is to test that no statistically significant difference exists in the variance between-units to that of the variance within-units. This allows an assessment of homogeneity across the entire prepared batch of OREAS 261. The test was performed using the following parameters:

- Gold fire assay – 198 samples (33 laboratories each providing analyses on 3 pairs of samples);
- Gold aqua regia digestion – 156 samples (26 laboratories each providing analyses on 3 pairs of samples);
- Null Hypothesis,  $H_0$ : Between-unit variance is no greater than within-unit variance (reject  $H_0$  if  $p$ -value < 0.05);
- Alternative Hypothesis,  $H_1$ : Between-unit variance is greater than within-unit variance.

$P$ -values are a measure of probability where values less than 0.05 indicate a greater than 95% probability that the observed differences in within-unit and between-unit variances are real. The dataset was filtered for both individual and laboratory data set (batch) outliers prior to the calculation of the  $p$ -value. This process derived  $p$ -values of 0.06 for Au by fire assay and 0.88 for Au by aqua regia digestion. Both  $p$ -values are insignificant and the Null Hypothesis is retained. Additionally, only one other certified value (Hg) shows a significant  $p$ -value and this element is very low in concentration close to its lower level of detection (LLD) where reading resolution errors can lead to 'false negatives' (a 'significant'  $p$ -value that is in fact immaterial). Usually data becomes more reliable and meaningful when the concentration levels are at least twenty times the LLD.

It is important to note that ANOVA is not an absolute measure of homogeneity. Rather, it establishes whether or not the analytes are distributed in a similar manner throughout the packaging run of OREAS 261 and whether the variance between two subsamples from the

same unit is statistically distinguishable to the variance from two subsamples taken from any two separate units. A reference material therefore, can possess poor absolute homogeneity yet still pass a relative homogeneity test if the within-unit heterogeneity is large and similar across all units.

Based on the statistical analysis of the results of the inter-laboratory certification program it can be concluded that OREAS 261 is fit-for-purpose as a certified reference material (see 'Intended Use' below).

## **PARTICIPATING LABORATORIES**

1. Actlabs, Ancaster, Ontario, Canada
2. Actlabs, Kamloops, BC, Canada
3. ALS, Brisbane, QLD, Australia
4. ALS, Johannesburg, South Africa
5. ALS, Loughrea, Galway, Ireland
6. ALS, Perth, WA, Australia
7. ALS, Reno, Nevada, USA
8. ALS, Vancouver, BC, Canada
9. ANSTO, Lucas Heights, NSW, Australia
10. Bureau Veritas, Abidjan, Cote D'ivoire
11. Bureau Veritas Commodities Canada Ltd, Vancouver, BC, Canada
12. Bureau Veritas Geoanalytical, Adelaide, SA, Australia
13. Bureau Veritas Geoanalytical, Perth, WA, Australia
14. Inspectorate (BV), Lima, Peru
15. Inspectorate America Corporation (BV), Sparks, Nevada, USA
16. Intertek Genalysis, Adelaide, SA, Australia
17. Intertek Genalysis, Perth, WA, Australia
18. Intertek Tarkwa, Tarkwa, Ghana
19. Intertek Testing Services Philippines, Cupang, Muntinlupa, Philippines
20. Labtium Oy, Saarenkylä, Rovaniemi, Finland
21. MinAnalytical Services, Perth, WA, Australia
22. Nagrom, Perth, WA, Australia
23. PT Geoservices Ltd, Cikarang, Jakarta Raya, Indonesia
24. PT Intertek Utama Services, Jakarta Timur, DKI Jakarta, Indonesia
25. PT SGS Indo Assay Laboratories, Jakarta, Indonesia
26. SGS, Randfontein, Gauteng, South Africa
27. SGS Ahafo Newmont Project, Ahafo, Western Region, Ghana
28. SGS Akyem Newmont Project, Akyem, Western Region, Ghana
29. SGS Australia Mineral Services, Kalgoorlie, WA, Australia
30. SGS Australia Mineral Services, Perth, WA, Australia
31. SGS Canada Inc., Vancouver, BC, Canada
32. SGS del Peru, Lima, Peru
33. SGS Geosol Laboratorios Ltda, Vespasiano, Minas Gerais, Brazil
34. SGS Mineral Services, Townsville, QLD, Australia
35. SGS Tarkwa, Tarkwa, Western Region, Ghana
36. UIS Analytical Services, Centurion, South Africa
37. Zarazma Mineral Studies Company, Tehran, Iran

## PREPARER AND SUPPLIER

Reference material OREAS 261 has been prepared, certified and supplied by:

ORE Research & Exploration Pty Ltd  
37A Hosie Street  
Bayswater North VIC 3153  
AUSTRALIA

Tel: +613-9729 0333  
Fax: +613-9729 8338  
Web: [www.ore.com.au](http://www.ore.com.au)  
Email: [info@ore.com.au](mailto:info@ore.com.au)

It is available in unit sizes of 60g (single-use laminated foil pouches) and 500g (plastic jars).

## INTENDED USE

OREAS 261 is intended for the following uses:

- for the monitoring of laboratory performance in the analysis of analytes reported in Table 1 in geological samples;
- for the verification of analytical methods for analytes reported in Table 1;
- for the calibration of instruments used in the determination of the concentration of analytes reported in Table 1.

## STABILITY AND STORAGE INSTRUCTIONS

OREAS 261 has been prepared from a blend gold-bearing oxide ore barren mudstone. It is low in reactive sulphide (0.11% S) and in its unopened state and under normal conditions of storage has a shelf life beyond ten years. Its stability will be monitored at regular intervals and purchasers notified if any changes are observed.

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR CORRECT USE

The certified values for OREAS 261 refer to the concentration level in its packaged state. It should not be dried prior to weighing and analysis.

## HANDLING INSTRUCTIONS

Fine powders pose a risk to eyes and lungs and therefore standard precautions such as the use of safety glasses and dust masks are advised.

## TRACEABILITY

The analytical samples were selected in a manner to represent the entire batch of prepared CRM. This 'representivity' was maintained in each submitted laboratory sample batch and ensures the user that the data is traceable from sample selection through to the analytical results that underlie the consensus values. Each analytical data set has been validated by its assayer through the inclusion of internal reference materials and QC

checks during analysis. The laboratories were chosen on the basis of their competence (from past performance in inter-laboratory programs) for a particular analytical method, analyte or analyte suite, and sample matrix. Most of these laboratories have and maintain ISO 17025 accreditation. The certified values presented in this report are calculated from the means of accepted data following robust statistical treatment as detailed in this report.

## LEGAL NOTICE

Ore Research & Exploration Pty Ltd has prepared and statistically evaluated the property values of this reference material to the best of its ability. The Purchaser by receipt hereof releases and indemnifies Ore Research & Exploration Pty Ltd from and against all liability and costs arising from the use of this material and information.

## CERTIFYING OFFICER



21<sup>st</sup> February, 2018

---

Craig Hamlyn (B.Sc. Hons - Geology), Technical Manager - ORE P/L

## QMS ACCREDITED

ORE Pty Ltd is accredited to ISO 9001:2015 by Lloyd's Register Quality Assurance Ltd for its quality management system including development, manufacturing, certification and supply of CRMs.



## REFERENCES

Ingamells, C. O. and Switzer, P. (1973), *Talanta* 20, 547-568.

ISO Guide 30 (2015), Terms and definitions used in connection with reference materials.

ISO Guide 31 (2015), Reference materials – Contents of certificates and labels.

ISO Guide 3207 (1975), Statistical interpretation of data - Determination of a statistical tolerance interval.

ISO Guide 35 (2017), Certification of reference materials - General and statistical principals.