ORE RESEARCH & EXPLORATION

ORE RESEARCH & EXPLORATION P/L ABN 28 006 859 856
37A Hosie Street · Bayswater North · VIC 3153 · AUSTRALIA
61 3 9729 0333 61 3 9761 7878
info@ore.com.au www.ore.com.au

CERTIFICATE OF ANALYSIS FOR

GOLD ORE REFERENCE MATERIAL

OREAS 62d

SUMMARY STATISTICS

Recommended Values, 95% Confidence and Tolerance Intervals

Constituent	Recommended Value	95% Confidence Interval		Tolerance Interval 1-α=0.99, ρ=0.95	
		Low	High	Low	High
Gold, Au (ppm)	10.50	10.36	10.64	10.44	10.56
Silver, Ag (ppm)	8.37	8.01	8.74	8.18	8.57

Note: intervals may appear asymmetric due to rounding

Prepared by:
Ore Research & Exploration Pty Ltd
November, 2007

REPORT 07/615-62d

INTRODUCTION

OREAS certified reference materials (CRMs) are intended to provide a low cost method of evaluating and improving the quality of precious and base metal analysis of geological samples. To the analyst they provide an effective means of calibrating analytical equipment, assessing new techniques and routinely monitoring in-house procedures. 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.

SOURCE MATERIALS

Reference material OREAS 62d was prepared from a sample of high grade ore material from Cracow, Queensland Australia. Cracow is an epithermal vein-style gold mineralisation hosted by andesitic volcanics.

The approximate major and trace element composition of gold ore standard OREAS 62d is given in Table 1. The constituents SiO_2 to Zr are the means of duplicate borate fusion X-ray fluorescence analyses, while the remaining constituents, As to Yb, are instrumental neutron activation analysis (INAA) means of twenty-three representative samples.

Table 1. Indicative and major and trace element composition of gold ore reference material OREAS 62d; SiO_2 to total and Cand S as weight percent; rest in parts per million; SiO_2 to Zr by fusion XRF except C and S by Leco furnace; As to Yb by INAA.

Constituent	wt.%	Constituent	ppm	Constituent	ppm	Constituent	ppm
SiO_2	62.48	Ag	7.5	Gd	1.4	Sb	1.9
TiO_2	0.29	As	28	Hf	1.0	Sc	7.0
Al_2O_3	6.75	Ba	210	Ho	0.24	Sm	1.7
Fe_2O_3	2.88	Be	0.5	In	0.02	Sn	<1
MnO	0.08	Bi	<0.1	La	7.6	Sr	217
MgO	0.95	Cd	<0.5	Li	39	Ta	<0.1
CaO	12.27	Ce	16.2	Lu	0.1	Tb	0.2
SO_3	1.49	Co	6.0	Mo	6.7	Te	3.5
K_2O	1.97	Cs	5.2	Nb	1.2	Th	1.5
P_2O_5	0.102	Cu	42	Nd	7.8	U	0.4
Na_2O	0.36	Dy	1.2	Ni	7.0	W	6.7
LOI	11.24	Er	0.7	Pb	15	Y	6.5
Total	100.9	Eu	0.5	Pr	1.9	Yb	0.7
C	2.61	Ga	7.1	Rb	72	Zn	29
S	0.47					Zr	34

COMMINUTION AND HOMOGENISATION PROCEDURES

The high grade Cracow material comprising OREAS 62d was prepared in the following manner:

a) jaw crushing to minus 7mm
b) drying to constant mass at 105^{0}C
c) milling of the high grade Cracow material to 100% minus 20 micron
d) bagging into 25kg sublots

Throughout the bagging stage twenty 1kg test units were taken at regular intervals, sealed in laminated plastic bags and set aside for the analytical program.

ANALYSIS OF OREAS 62d

Seventeen laboratories participated in the certification program and are listed in the section headed 'Participating Laboratories'. To maintain anonymity they have been randomly designated the letter codes A through R (Tables 2 and 3). With the exception of Laboratory A, each received five 100g samples with instructions to carry out one 25 to 50g fire assay determination for gold and one aqua regia digest determination for silver using their preferred finish. Apart from Labs I, M and N (gravimetric) and Labs B and G (ICP-OES), the laboratories employed a flame AAS finish. Silver was determined by a range of methods at Labs B to R including aqua regia with ICP-OES, ICP-MS or AAS (12 labs), fire assay with ICP-OES (1 lab), 3 acid (HNO_3-HCl-$HClO_4$) digest with AAS (1 lab) and 4 acid (HF-HNO_3-HCl-$HClO_4$) digest with AAS (1 lab). Lab P did not report results for Ag.

For each laboratory two 100g subsamples were scoop-split from each of two separate 1kg test units taken during the bagging stage. This two-stage nested design for the interlaboratory programme was amenable to analysis of variance (ANOVA) treatment and enabled a comparative assessment of within- and between-unit homogeneity (see 'ANOVA study' section). For the determination of a statistical tolerance interval for gold, a 10g scoop split was taken from each of the twenty-four random test units and submitted to Lab A for determination via instrumental neutron activation analysis on a reduced analytical subsample weight of 0.5 gram.

Individual gold results for the fire assay and INAA methods are presented in Table 2 together with the mean, median, standard deviation (absolute and relative) and bias (PDM^3) for each data set. Interlaboratory agreement of the data set means is good with the exception of two laboratories relegated to outlying status (Labs A and L with biases of 8.10% and -13.4% respectively), lying within 6% of the recommended value of 10.50 ppm Au. Individual silver results together with summary statistics for each data set are presented in Table 3. Interlaboratory agreement of the means of all but one data set (Lab F with a bias of -46.3%) is fair, lying within 15.0% of the recommended value of 8.37 ppm Ag.

Table 2. Analytical results for gold in OREAS 62d (INAA - instrumental neutron activation analysis; FA-AAS - fire assay / atomic absorption spectrometry; FA-OES - fire assay / inductively coupled optical emission spectrometry; FA-GRAV - fire assay / gravimetric finish; Std.Dev. and Rel.Std.Dev. are one sigma values; PDM^3 - percent deviation of lab mean from corrected mean of means; outliers in bold; values in parts per million).

Replicate No.	Lab A INAA 0.5g	Lab B FA*OES 40g	Lab C FA*AAS 50g	Lab D FA*AAS 50g	Lab E FA*AAS 50g	Lab F FA*AAS 50g	Lab G FA*OES 25g	Lab H FA*AAS 50g	Lab I FA*GRAV 30g	Lab J FA*AAS 50g	Lab K FA*AAS 50g	Lab L FA*AAS 50g	Lab M FA*GRAV 50g	Lab N FA*GRAV 50g	Lab O FA*AAS 50g	Lab P FA*AAS 25g	Lab Q FA*AAS 40g	Lab R FA*AAS 50g
1	11.60	10.90	9.98	10.59	10.60	10.50	11.19	10.69	10.60	9.87	10.86	9.94	10.50	10.35	10.30	10.85	10.51	10.50
2	11.70	10.70	10.00	10.61	10.40	10.80	10.58	10.79	10.50	9.82	10.79	8.81	10.55	10.30	10.30	10.70	10.68	10.50
3	11.60	10.80	10.25	10.57	10.10	9.86	11.08	10.84	10.60	10.00	10.81	9.43	10.50	10.20	10.20	10.90	10.40	10.50
4	11.20	10.80	10.10	**10.35**	10.40	10.40	10.68	10.69	10.50	10.00	10.84	8.61	10.70	10.40	10.40	10.65	10.21	10.50
5	11.60	10.90	9.82	10.59	10.20	11.20	10.19	10.77	10.60	9.92	10.82	8.65	10.70	10.05	10.40	10.75	10.65	10.40
6	11.50	10.90	10.20	**10.44**	10.40	11.30	9.94	10.81	**10.20**	9.76	10.83	9.09	10.55	10.30	10.10	10.65	10.46	10.40
7	11.40																	
8	11.50																	
9	11.20																	
10	11.20																	
11	11.30																	
12	11.40																	
13	11.40																	
14	11.20																	
15	11.20																	
16	11.40																	
17	11.20																	
18	11.10																	
19	10.90																	
20	11.40																	
Mean	**11.35**	10.83	10.06	10.53	10.35	10.68	10.61	10.76	10.50	9.90	10.83	**9.09**	10.58	10.27	10.28	10.75	10.49	10.47
Median	11.40	10.85	10.05	10.58	10.40	10.65	10.63	10.78	10.55	9.90	10.83	8.95	10.55	10.30	10.30	10.73	10.49	10.50
Std.Dev.	0.20	0.08	0.16	0.11	0.18	0.54	0.49	0.06	0.15	0.10	0.03	0.52	0.09	0.13	0.12	0.10	0.17	0.05
Rel.Std.Dev.	1.77%	0.75%	1.57%	1.00%	1.70%	5.05%	4.60%	0.57%	1.48%	0.98%	0.24%	5.70%	0.88%	1.22%	1.14%	0.98%	1.65%	0.49%
PDM^3	8.10%	3.18%	-4.20%	0.24%	-1.43%	1.68%	1.05%	2.52%	0.00%	-5.76%	3.10%	-13.4%	0.80%	-2.22%	-2.06%	2.38%	-0.14%	-0.32%

Table 3. Analytical results for silver in OREAS 62d (INAA – instrumental neutron activation analysis; AR-AAS - aqua regia digest / atomic absorption spectrometry; AR-OES - aqua regia digest / inductively coupled plasma optical emission spectrometry; AR-MS - aqua regia digest / inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry; other abbreviations as in Table 2; values in parts per million).

Replicate No.	Lab B AR*MS	Lab C AR*OES	Lab D AR*AAS	Lab E AR*OES	Lab F AR*OES	Lab G FA*OES	Lab H AR*AAS	Lab I AR*OES	Lab J 3A*AAS	Lab K AR*AAS	Lab L 4A*AAS	Lab M AR*AAS	Lab N AR*AAS	Lab O AR*AAS	Lab P -	Lab Q AR*OES	Lab R 4A*AAS
1	8.80	9.00	8.40	7.50	5.00	8.29	8.93	9.10	8.00	7.20	8.30	7.70	8.20	8.40	NR	9.02	8.00
2	8.80	8.70	8.60	7.90	5.00	7.84	8.82	9.10	8.00	7.10	8.10	7.50	8.20	8.40	NR	9.03	9.00
3	9.10	9.00	8.60	7.40	3.00	8.21	8.82	9.20	7.00	7.20	**7.80**	7.50	8.30	8.60	NR	9.64	8.00
4	9.40	9.30	8.50	7.90	4.00	7.84	8.80	9.00	8.00	7.20	8.20	7.60	8.30	8.80	NR	9.66	9.00
5	8.80	9.20	8.40	7.80	6.00	8.39	8.82	9.10	8.00	7.10	8.20	7.60	8.30	8.70	NR	9.67	8.00
6	8.80	9.40	8.90	7.80	4.00	8.32	8.82	**9.40**	7.00	7.10	8.30	7.60	8.10	8.50	NR	9.67	8.00
Mean	8.95	9.10	8.57	7.72	**4.50**	8.15	8.83	9.15	7.67	7.15	8.15	7.58	8.23	8.57		9.45	8.33
Median	8.80	9.10	8.55	7.80	4.50	8.25	8.82	9.10	8.00	7.15	8.20	7.60	8.25	8.55		9.65	8.00
Std.Dev.	0.25	0.25	0.19	0.21	1.05	0.25	0.05	0.14	0.52	0.05	0.19	0.08	0.08	0.16		0.33	0.52
Rel.Std.Dev.	2.80%	2.78%	2.17%	2.77%	23.3%	3.03%	0.51%	1.51%	6.74%	0.77%	2.30%	0.99%	0.99%	1.91%		3.48%	6.20%
PDM[3]	6.88%	8.67%	2.30%	-7.85%	-46.3%	-2.73%	5.49%	9.26%	-8.45%	-14.6%	-2.68%	-9.44%	-1.68%	2.30%		12.8%	-0.49%

STATISTICAL EVALUATION OF ANALYTICAL DATA FOR OREAS 62d

Recommended Value and Confidence Limits

The recommended value is the mean of means of accepted replicate values of accepted participating laboratories computed according to the formulae

$$\bar{x}_i = \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} x_{ij}$$

$$\ddot{x} = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^{p} \bar{x}_i$$

where

x_{ij} *is the jth result reported by laboratory i;*

p *is the number of participating laboratories;*

n_i *is the number of results reported by laboratory i;*

$\bar{x}_i$ *is the mean for laboratory i;*

$\ddot{x}$ *is the mean of means.*

The test for rejection of individual outliers from each laboratory data set was based on z scores (rejected if $|z_i| > 2.5$) computed from the robust estimators of location and scale, T and S, respectively, according to the formulae

$$S = 1.483 \underset{j=1.....n}{median} / x_j - \underset{i=1.....n}{median} (x_i) /$$

$$z_i = \frac{x_i - T}{S}$$

where

T is the median value in a data set;
S is the median of all absolute deviations from the sample median multiplied by 1.483, a correction factor to make the estimator consistent with the usual parameter of a normal distribution.

In certain instances statistician's prerogative has been employed in discriminating outliers. Individual outliers and, more rarely, laboratory means deemed to be outlying are shown in bold and have been omitted in the determination of recommended values.

Table 4. Recommended Values and 95% Confidence Intervals

Constituent	Recommended Value	95% Confidence Interval	
		Low	High
Gold, Au (ppm)	10.50	10.36	10.64
Silver, Ag (ppm)	8.37	8.01	8.74

Note: intervals may appear asymmetric due to rounding

Statement of Homogeneity

The standard deviation of each laboratory data set includes error due to both the imprecision of the analytical method employed and to possible inhomogeneity of the material analysed. The standard deviation of the pooled individual analyses of all participating laboratories includes error due to the imprecision of each analytical method, to possible inhomogeneity of the material analysed and, in particular, to deficiencies in accuracy of each analytical method. In determining tolerance intervals for silver that component of error attributable to measurement inaccuracy was eliminated by transformation of the individual results of each data set to a common mean (the uncorrected grand mean) according to the formula

$$x'_{ij} = x_{ij} - \bar{x}_i + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{p}\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} x_{ij}}{\sum_{i=1}^{p} n_i}$$

where

x_{ij} *is the jth raw result reported by laboratory i*;

x'_{ij} *is the jth transformed result reported by laboratory i*;

n_i *is the number of results reported by laboratory i*;

p *is the number of participating laboratories*;

$\bar{x}_i$ *is the raw mean for laboratory i*.

The homogeneity of each constituent was determined from tables of factors for two-sided tolerance limits for normal distributions (ISO 3207) in which

$$\text{Lower limit is } \ddot{x} - k'_2(n,p,1-\alpha)s''_g$$
$$\text{Upper limit is } \ddot{x} + k'_2(n,p,1-\alpha)s''_g$$

where

n *the number of results*
$1-\alpha$ *is the confidence level;*
p *is the proportion of results expected within tolerance limits;*
k'_2 *is the factor for two-sided tolerance limits (m,* α *unknown);*
s_g *is the corrected grand standard deviation.*

The meaning of these tolerance limits may be illustrated for silver, where 99% of the time at least 95% of subsamples will have concentrations lying between 8.18 and 8.57 ppm. 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 (IS0 Guide 35).

The corrected grand standard deviation, s_g'', used to compute the tolerance intervals is the weighted means of standard deviations of all data sets for a particular constituent according to the formula

$$s''_g = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{p} (s_i (1 - \frac{s_i}{s'_g}))}{\sum_{i=1}^{p} (1 - \frac{s_i}{s'_g})}$$

where

$$1 - (\frac{s_i}{2s'_g}) \text{ is the weighting factor for laboratory } i ;$$

$$s'_g \text{ is the grand standard deviation computed from the transformed (i.e. means - adjusted) results}$$

according to the formula

$$s'_g = \left[\frac{\sum_{i=j}^{p} \sum_{j=i}^{n_i} (x'_{ij} - \bar{x}'_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{p} n_i - 1} \right]^{1/2}$$

$$\text{where } \bar{x}'_i \text{ is the transformed mean for laboratorty } i$$

The weighting factors were applied to compensate for the considerable variation in analytical precision amongst participating laboratories. Hence, weighting factors for each data set have been constructed so as to be inversely proportional to the standard deviation of that data set. Outliers (shown in bold in Tables 3 and 4) were removed prior to the calculation of tolerance intervals and a weighting factor of zero was applied to those data sets where $s_I / 2s_g' > 1$ (i.e. where the weighting factor $1 - s_I / 2s_g' < 0$). It should be noted that estimates of tolerance by this method are considered conservative as a significant proportion of the observed variance, even in those laboratories exhibiting the best analytical precision, can presumably be attributed to measurement error.

Table 5. Recommended Values and Tolerance Intervals.

Constituent	Recommended Value	Tolerance Interval 1-α=0.99, ρ=0.95	
		Low	High
Gold, Au (ppm)	10.50	10.44	10.56
Silver, Ag (ppm)	8.37	8.18	8.57

Note: intervals may appear asymmetric due to rounding

For gold a more simplified procedure was used in the determination of homogeneity. This entailed using the high precision INAA data alone, obtained on an analytical subsample weight of 0.5 gram (compared to 25-50 gram for the fire assay method). By employing a sufficiently reduced subsample weight in a series of determinations by the same method, analytical error becomes negligible in comparison to subsampling error. The corresponding standard deviation at a 50 gram subsample weight can then be determined from the

observed standard deviation of the 0.5 gram data using the known relationship between the two parameters (Ingamells and Switzer, 1973). The homogeneity of gold was then determined from tables of factors for two-sided tolerance limits for normal distributions. The high level of repeatability indicated by the low coefficients of variation in Table 2 (particularly the INAA data) is consistent with the very narrow calculated tolerance interval and is confirmation of the excellent homogeneity of gold in OREAS 62d.

ANOVA Study

The sampling format for OREAS 62d was structured to enable nested ANOVA treatment of the round robin results. During the bagging stage immediately following final homogenization, samples were taken at 20 intervals representative of the entire batch of OREAS 62d. Seventeen labs participated in the ANOVA study (Labs B to R) where each received paired samples of three different, non-adjacent, sampling units. For example, the six samples that any one of the sixteen participating labs could have received is:

- Sample 1 (from sampling interval 1)
- Sample 2 (from sampling interval 6)
- Sample 3 (from sampling interval 11)
- Sample 4 (from sampling interval 1)
- Sample 5 (from sampling interval 6)
- Sample 6 (from sampling interval 11)

The purpose of the ANOVA investigation was to compare the within-unit variance with that of the between-unit variance. This approach permitted an assessment of homogeneity across the entire batch of OREAS 62d. The test was performed using the following parameters:

- Significance Level α = P (type I error) = 0.05
- 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 whereby 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 outliers prior to calculation of the p-value. This derived a p-value of 0.996 and indicates no evidence that between-unit variance is greater than within-unit variance. Conclusion: do not reject H_0. Note that ANOVA is not an absolute measure of homogeneity. Rather, it establishes that gold is uniformly distributed throughout OREAS 62d and that the variance between two subsamples from the same unit is identical to the variance from two subsamples taken from any two separate units.

Performance Gates

Performance gates 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. They take into account errors attributable to measurement (analytical bias and precision) and CRM variability. For an effective CRM the contribution of the latter should be negligible in comparison to measurement errors. Two methods have been employed to calculate performance gates.

The first method uses the standard deviation of the pooled individual analyses generated from the certification program. All individual and lab dataset (batch) outliers are removed prior to determination of the standard deviation. The outliers can only be removed if they can be confidently deemed to be analytical rather than arising from inhomogeneity of the

CRM. Standard deviations and performance gates at 2SD and 3SD have been calculated from the accepted pool of certification data and are presented in Table 6.
As a guide these intervals may be regarded as warning or rejection for multiple outliers (2SD), or rejection for individual outliers (3SD) in QC monitoring, although their precise application should be at the discretion of the QC manager concerned.
For the second method a ±5% error bar on the recommended value is used as the window of acceptability (refer Table 6).
Both methods should be used with caution 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 6. Performance Gates for OREAS 62d

Constituent	Recommended Value	1SD	Performance Gates					
			2SD Interval		3SD Interval		5% Interval	
			Low	High	Low	High	Low	High
Gold, Au (ppm)	10.50	0.33	9.84	11.16	9.51	11.49	9.97	11.02
Silver, Ag (ppm)	8.37	0.68	7.02	9.73	6.34	10.41	7.96	8.79

Note: intervals may appear asymmetric due to rounding

PARTICIPATING LABORATORIES

Acme Analytical Laboratories, Vancouver, BC, Canada
Activation Laboratories, Ancaster, Ontario, Canada
ALS Chemex, Garbutt, QLD, Austalia
ALS Chemex, La Serena, Chile
ALS Chemex, Sparks, Nevada, USA
ALS Chemex, Val d'Or, Quebec, Canada
ALS Chemex, North Vancouver, BC, Canada
Amdel Laboratories Ltd, Perth, WA, Australia
Amdel Laboratories Ltd, Adelaide, SA, Australia
Genalysis Laboratory Services Pty Ltd, Maddington, WA, Australia
Intertek Testing Services, Jakarta, Indonesia
McPhar Geoservices (Phil.) Inc., Makati, Philippines
OMAC Laboratories, Loughrea. Co. Galway, Ireland
SGS Lakefield Research Ltd, Ontario, Canada
SGS, Perth, WA, Australia
SGS, Townsville, QLD, Australia
Ultra Trace, Canning Vale, WA, Australia

PREPARER AND SUPPLIER OF THE REFERENCE MATERIAL

Gold ore reference material OREAS 62d has been prepared and certified and is supplied by:

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

Telephone	(03) 9729 0333	International	+613-9729 0333
Facsimile	(03) 9761 7878	International	+613-9761 7878
Email	info@ore.com.au	Web	www.ore.com.au

It is available in unit sizes of 60g laminated foil packets.

INTENDED USE

OREAS 62d is a reference material intended for the following:

i) for the calibration of instruments used in the determination of the concentration of gold and silver;
ii) for the verification of analytical methods for gold and silver;
iii) for the preparation of secondary reference materials of similar composition;
iv) as an arbitration sample for commercial transactions.

STABILITY AND STORAGE INSTRUCTIONS

OREAS 62d has been prepared from sulphide-poor epithermal Au-Ag ore. The robust foil laminate film used to package it is an effective barrier to oxygen and moisture and the sealed CRM is considered to have long-term stability under normal storage conditions.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE CORRECT USE OF THE REFERENCE MATERIAL

The recommended values for OREAS 62d refer to the concentration levels of gold and silver in packaged form. Drying in air to constant mass at 105^0C has established a hygroscopic moisture content of 1.11%. If the reference material is dried by the user prior to analysis, the recommended value stated herein should be corrected to the moisture-free basis.

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

Craig Hamlyn (B.Sc. Hons.), Geology

REFERENCES

Ingamells, C. O. and Switzer, P. (1973), Talanta 20, 547-568.
ISO Guide 35 (1985), Certification of reference materials - General and statistical principals.
ISO Guide 3207 (1975), Statistical interpretation of data - Determination of a statistical tolerance interval.