Attachment 1 Table 1 – JORC Code 2012

JORC Code, 2012 Edition – Table 1

Section 1 Sampling Techniques and Data

(Criteria in this section apply to all succeeding sections)

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 downhole gamma sondes, or handheld XRF instruments, etc.). These examples should not be taken as limiting the broad meaning of sampling. ▪ Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample representivity and the appropriate calibration of any measurement tools or systems used. ▪ Aspects of the determination of mineralisation that are Material to the Public Report. ▪ 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.	▪ 1,444 soil samples were conducted at 100 m intervals along northwest–southwest sample lines oriented across the Segele deposit. Each sample was collected manually and weight between 2–3 kg. ▪ 4.25 km of trenching was completed over the deposit. The trenches were geologically logged and sampled at 1 m intervals, with samples weighing between 2–3 kg, and the samples were then sent to the laboratory for gold analysis. An additional, approximately 10 kg, sample of material was taken from the trench floor at 1 m intervals and was then panned in the Akobo River. ▪ Artisanal pits were logged and sampled at 1 m intervals using an iron-framed escalator/pulley system, moving down to the bottom of each pit. Each pit was logged in vertical sections, which showed petrology, alteration, and mineralisation contrast down depth. 123 samples were collected from the pits weighing approximately 2 kg each and then prepared and sent for analysis. ▪ 4 Reverse Circulation (RC) holes were completed using a face sampling hammer with a hole diameter of 140 mm. Samples were collected at 1 m intervals via a rig mounted cyclone and Jones-type three-tiered riffle splitter. Samples weighed between 2–3 kg. ▪ 99 Diamond drill holes were completed for 13,810.99 m using either NQ (47.6 mm diameter core) NQTK (50.6 mm diameter core) or HQ (63.5 mm diameter core) sized drilling and using a standard tube drilling. Core loss was encountered frequently at depths less than 30 m (average 78.9%), however, all the mineralised intersections in the drill holes occurred below this depth. Core recovery from depths greater than 30 m was consistently above 97% except for 29 intervals over 95.2 m with recoveries <90% which represents <1% of the drilled metres >30 m depth. Diamond drill samples were taken over intervals ranging from 0.1 to 2.7 m although most samples were taken over 1 m intervals.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
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.).	▪ 4 RC holes were completed in 2015 using a face sampling hammer with a hole diameter of 140 mm. ▪ 99 Diamond drill holes were completed using either NQ (47.6 mm diameter core) NQTK (50.6 mm diameter core) or HQ (63.5 mm diameter core) sized drilling and using a standard tube drilling. Core was oriented using a Devicore BBT system which marks the base of the hole for each core run.
Drill sample recovery	▪ Method of recording and assessing core and chip sample recoveries and results assessed. ▪ Measures taken to maximise sample recovery and ensure representative nature of the samples. ▪ Whether a relationship exists between sample recovery and grade and whether sample bias may have occurred due to preferential loss/gain of fine/coarse material.	▪ The mass of RC sample splits and sample spoil was not recorded and therefore there has been no assessment of the relationship between recovery and grade for the RC holes. ▪ Diamond drill recoveries were calculated by measuring the core recovered against the drillers recorded depth for each diamond core run. Core loss was encountered frequently at depths less than 30 m (average 78.9%), however, all the mineralised intersections in the drill holes occurred below this depth. Core recovery from depths greater than 30 m was consistently above 97% except for 29 intervals over 95.2 m with recoveries <90% which represents <1% of the drilled meters >30 m depth. There is no apparent correlation between grade and sample mass, hence it is not believed that the drilling method could have introduced bias.
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. ▪ Whether logging is qualitative or quantitative in nature. Core (or costean, channel, etc.) photography. ▪ The total length and percentage of the relevant intersections logged.	▪ Full qualitative lithology logging has been completed for all the trench sampling intervals and the RC drilling intervals. ▪ Full qualitative lithology and structural logging have been performed for Diamond drill holes.
Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation	▪ If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all core taken. ▪ If non-core, whether riffled, tube sampled, rotary split, etc. and whether sampled wet or dry. ▪ For all sample types, the nature, quality and appropriateness of the sample preparation technique. ▪ Quality control procedures adopted for all sub-sampling stages to maximise representivity of samples. ▪ Measures taken to ensure that the sampling is representative of the in situ material collected, including for instance results for field duplicate/second-half sampling. ▪ Whether sample sizes are appropriate to the grain size of the material being sampled.	▪ Soil samples were sieved and quartered to produce a 50 g sub-sample using a -80 mesh at the exploration field camp and then sent for analysis. ▪ Trench and pit samples were collected manually as channel samples weighing approximately 2–3 kg. The samples were weighed upon receipt at the laboratory and then crushed with a jaw crusher to 70% passing 2 mm. The crushed material was split using a Jones-type riffle splitter to split off a 1000 g sub-sample. The crushed sample was then pulverised to 85% passing 75 microns. ▪ RC samples were collected at 1 m intervals via a rig mounted cyclone and Jones-type three-tiered riffle splitter weighing between 2–3 kg. The samples were then weighed upon receipt at the laboratory and subjected to crushing with a jaw crusher to 70% passing 2 mm. The crushed material

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		was split using a Jones-type riffle splitter to split off a 1000 g sub-sample. The crushed sample was then pulverised to 85% passing 75 microns. ■ Diamond drill core was split using a diamond saw and half core was sampled at intervals ranging from 0.1 to 2.7 m. The samples were then weighed upon receipt at the laboratory and crushed with a jaw crusher. After crushing either 1000 g or the entire sample of the crushed material was pulverised. ■ Analysis of half and quarter core field duplicates has resulted in a coefficient of variation of 4.7 which is consistent with a highly variable, nuggety gold deposit. However, the size of samples taken from the Diamond drilling at Segele may be too small given the coarse-gold nature of the mineralisation. Akobo Minerals AB is investigating options for bulk sampling to validate the Diamond drilling results.
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. ■ For geophysical tools, spectrometers, handheld XRF instruments, etc., the parameters used in determining the analysis including instrument make and model, reading times, calibrations factors applied and their derivation, etc. ■ Nature of quality control procedures adopted (e.g. standards, blanks, duplicates, external laboratory checks) and whether acceptable levels of accuracy (i.e. lack of bias) and precision have been established.	■ Soil samples processed prior to 2015 were analysed at ALS Chemex Gauteng (South Africa) using Aqua Regia extraction with ICP-MS and ICP-AES finish analytical techniques for gold and all other elements (ALS code ME-MS41). In 2015, soil samples were sent to Ezana laboratory (Mekele, Ethiopia) and analysed using fire assay with an ASS finish. ■ Trench and pit samples were analysed at ALS (Gauteng) using a 50 g fire assay with an ICP-AES finish. A 50 g fire assay with a gravimetric finish was used where the initial fire assay was greater than 10 g/t Au. ■ RC samples were prepared at ALS (Addis Ababa) and then sent to ALS (Romania) and analysed using a 50 g fire assay with an ICP-AES finish. A 50 g fire assay with gravimetric finish was used where the initial fire assay was greater than 10 g/t Au. ■ Diamond drill samples were prepared at ALS (Addis Ababa) and then sent to ALS (Loughrea or Rosia Montana) and analysed. Samples submitted prior to September 2020 were analysed using a 30 g fire assay for samples not containing visible gold or a screen fire assay for samples that did contain visible gold. Some of the 30 g fire assays were subsequently re-assayed using a 50 g fire assay. From September 2020 onwards, samples not containing visible gold were analysed using a 50 g fire assay. ■ Quality control/quality assurance (QA/QC) sampling: – RC drilling and trench sampling – insertion of certified reference material samples (CRMs) at a rate of 1:30, pulp duplicates at a rate of 1:20.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		– Diamond Drilling - blanks at a rate 1:25, CRMs at a rate of 1:25, field duplicates at a rate of 1:20, crush duplicates at a rate of 1:20 and pulp duplicates at a rate of 1:20. ■ The analysis of the available QC data indicates acceptable accuracy and precision of the RC and Diamond drilling assay results with no major failed results recorded.
Verification of sampling and assaying	■ The verification of significant intersections by either independent or alternative company personnel. ■ The use of twinned holes. ■ Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols. ■ Discuss any adjustment to assay data.	■ The Competent Person has independently verified the database by checking drill hole collar locations, sampling and logging intervals and validating a selection of assay results against laboratory certificates. ■ There are no twin drill holes completed at Segele. ■ The company has implemented a cloud-based data management system (MX Deposit) which minimises transcription errors and allows transparent and accurate data collection. ■ No adjustments to assay data have been made.
Location of data points	■ Accuracy and quality of surveys used to locate drill holes (collar and downhole surveys), trenches, mine workings and other locations used in Mineral Resource estimation. ■ Specification of the grid system used. ■ Quality and adequacy of topographic control.	■ 840 topographic points were surveyed using a Leica Total Station survey tool. ■ RC collars were picked up using a handheld GPS unit. ■ All the Diamond drill holes were surveyed by a qualified surveyor in early April 2022 using a Leica TCR803 total station using the Adinda/ UTM Zone 36N datum ■ Downhole surveys of holed drilled prior to SEDD41 were conducted using a DeviCore BBT tool which oriented the core and recorded changes in the drill hole dip at irregular intervals. The DeviCore tool does not record changes in azimuth and the drill holes are assumed to be straight. ■ All drill holes drilled from June 2021 (SEDD42 – 99) have been surveyed using a DeviFlex Rapid instrument that measures changes both in Azimuth and Dip. ■ All work has been carried out using Adinda/UTM Zone 36N datum coordinate system ■ Topographic control is based upon 840 survey points but is complicated by the extensive artisanal mining which has occurred through the Segele deposit area. A topographic surface has been modelled.
Data spacing and distribution	■ Data spacing for reporting of Exploration Results. ■ Whether the data spacing, and distribution is sufficient to establish the degree of geological and grade continuity appropriate for the Mineral	■ The trenching, pit sampling and geological mapping we used to help guide the lithological and mineralisation modelling. ■ The four RC drill holes lie outside the Segele mineralisation and were not used in the geological modelling or Mineral Resource estimation.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	Resource and Ore Reserve estimation procedure(s) and classifications applied. ▪ Whether sample compositing has been applied.	▪ Seven Diamond drill holes were excluded from the geological modelling and Mineral Resource estimation. One drill hole had downhole surveying errors while six drill holes were drilled to the east of the deposit. ▪ 92 Diamond drill holes were used to produce the 2022 Segele geological model. ▪ 82 Diamond drill holes were used to produce the 2022 Mineral Resource estimate. 8 Diamond drill holes were not used as they were completed as either metallurgical or geotechnical holes and had no assays and two drill holes were awaiting assays to be returned from the laboratory. ▪ Diamond drilling at Segele was completed on a nominal drill spacing varying between 5–15 mE by 10–15 mN. The Diamond drilling spacing is sufficient to establish the geological and grade continuity of the Segele deposit for Mineral Resource estimation. ▪ Diamond drill samples were composited to 1 m lengths, for estimation purposes, broken by the mineralised domains, with residual composites <0.5 m added to the previous 1 m composite.
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. ▪ 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.	▪ Diamond drilling at the Segele deposit has been conducted approximately perpendicular to the trend of the mineralisation. It does not appear that the orientation of the drilling has resulted in a sampling bias.
Sample security	▪ The measures taken to ensure sample security.	▪ Diamond drill hole samples are sealed and labelled inside individual plastic bags and then 10 samples are put in bulk bags and sealed. ▪ All sampling intervals are recorded on paper logs and then entered into the Akobo geological database. ALS laboratory electronic submission forms are then completed for each sample batch and re-checked against the geological database entries. ▪ Samples are then transported by road to the ALS laboratory in Addis Ababa using a company truck. ALS performs a sample reconciliation when the samples are received. ▪ Sample pulps are then exported to Ireland or Romania for analysis at the ALS laboratory in Loughrea or Rosia Montana and a pulp split is sent back to Akobo for storage. ▪ Assay results are returned digitally and hard copy form and are checked against the sampling interval recorded in the geological database.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Audits or reviews	▪ The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.	▪ There have been no audits or reviews of the sampling techniques and data, however, the Competent Person has viewed/confirmed the conduct of the sampling to the documented procedures during a virtual site visit.

Section 2 Reporting of Exploration Results

(Criteria listed in section 1 also apply to this section.)

<table>
<tr><th>Criteria</th><th>JORC Code explanation</th><th>Commentary</th></tr>
<tr><td>Mineral tenement and land tenure status</td><td>

- 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.
- 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.

</td><td>

- The Segele deposit lies within the Mining Licence (MOM/LSML/1898/2021) which was granted on 30 September 2021 and is valid for 5 years. The mining licence can be renewed up to a maximum of 10 years for each renewal.
- There are no known issues relating to third parties, however, a royalty of 5% on the sale price of gold extracted from the project and payable to the Federal Government of Ethiopia applies.

</td></tr>
<tr><td>Exploration done by other parties</td><td>

- Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.

</td><td>

- All exploration work has been carried out by ETNO Mining Plc (ETNO) which is 99.97% owned by Akobo Minerals AB.

</td></tr>
<tr><td>Geology</td><td>

- Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.

</td><td>

- The Segele deposit is a high-grade orogenic gold deposit hosted within altered ultramafic and mafic rocks. The mineralisation is controlled by east–west shear movement which has created local dilatational zones oriented in a northwest–southeast direction which favoured precipitation of gold in narrow zones and pockets of intense shearing within the ultramafic and overlying mafic units. Gold appears to have been introduced during hydrothermal alteration of the ultramafic pyroxenite, where the mineral pyroxene was altered to amphibole by hydrous solutions carrying gold.
- The mineralisation has been modelled as a series of compact thin and sometimes bifurcating lenses using a cut-off 0.20–0.3 g/t Au. The lenses occurred mostly within the ultramafic units but do also extend upwards into the overlying mafic units.

</td></tr>
<tr><td>Drill hole Information</td><td>

- A summary of all information material to the understanding of the exploration results including a tabulation of the following information for all Material drillholes:
  - easting and northing of the drillhole collar
  - elevation or RL (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in metres) of the drillhole collar
  - dip and azimuth of the hole
  - downhole length and interception depth
  - hole length.
- If the exclusion of this information is justified on the basis that the information is not Material and this exclusion does not detract from the

</td><td>

- RC drill holes

<table>
<tr><th>Hole number</th><th>Easting</th><th>Northing</th><th>Elevation</th><th>Dip</th><th>Azimuth</th><th>Hole Depth</th></tr>
<tr><td>SERC001</td><td>727,581</td><td>715228</td><td>634</td><td>-60</td><td>230</td><td>145</td></tr>
<tr><td>SERC002</td><td>727362</td><td>715025</td><td>642</td><td>-50</td><td>270</td><td>150</td></tr>
<tr><td>SERC003</td><td>727511</td><td>715303</td><td>635</td><td>-50</td><td>230</td><td>150</td></tr>
<tr><td>SERC004</td><td>727622</td><td>715125</td><td>636</td><td>-50</td><td>300</td><td>150</td></tr>
</table>

</td></tr>
</table>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	understanding of the report, the Competent Person should clearly explain why this is the case.	▪ Diamond drill Holes

Hole number	Easting	Northing	Elevation	Dip	Azimuth	Hole Depth
SEDD01	727,506	715,219	628	-60	180	32.8
SEDD02	727,505	715,220	629	-75	180	59.0
SEDD03	727,530	715,221	627	-75	180	101.1
SEDD04	727,516	715,250	627	-75	180	95.5
SEDD05	727,541	715,250	626	-75	180	134.8
SEDD06	727,555	715,223	620	-75	180	104.9
SEDD07	727,564	715,252	619	-75	180	137.5
SEDD08	727,479	715,220	630	-75	180	44.6
SEDD09	727,479	715,230	630	-60	150	95.9
SEDD10	727,531	715,221	627	-80	330	99.0
SEDD11	727,518	715,222	628	-70	180	69.3
SEDD12	727,539	715,219	626	-75	180	93.4
SEDD13	727,535	715,235	627	-75	180	105.0
SEDD14	727,524	715,233	627	-75	180	91.0
SEDD15	727,510	715,232	628	-75	180	24.0
SEDD16	727,510	715,235	628	-75	180	92.4
SEDD17	727,454	715,221	632	-75	180	129.3
SEDD18	727,527	715,281	626	-75	180	138.5
SEDD19	727,504	715,282	628	-75	180	126.2
SEDD20	727,542	715,296	625	-75	180	45.2
SEDD21	727,543	715,307	625	-75	180	156.3
SEDD22	727,516	715,298	627	-75	180	131.4
SEDD23	727,529	715,248	626	-75	180	111.3
SEDD24	727,524	715,221	627	-80	180	90.3
SEDD25	727,528	715,282	626	-65	160	129.2
SEDD26	727,537	715,265	625	-72	180	117.2
SEDD27	727,533	715,224	627	-75	180	33.5
SEDD28	727,533	715,227	627	-75	180	87.2
SEDD29	727,544	715,237	626	-75	180	99.2
SEDD30	727,550	715,251	625	-75	180	114.2
SEDD31	727,528	715,300	626	-75	180	144.0

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary

Hole number	Easting	Northing	Elevation	Dip	Azimuth	Hole Depth
SEDD32	727,516	715,282	627	-75	180	125.7
SEDD33	727,521	715,289	626	-75	180	123.2
SEDD34	727,533	715,291	626	-75	180	135.2
SEDD35	727,542	715,300	625	-65	160	150.2
SEDD36	727,552	715,307	624	-75	180	168.0
SEDD37	727,539	715,286	626	-75	180	150.2
SEDD38	727,536	715,330	624	-75	180	165.2
SEDD39	727,547	715,331	624	-75	180	180.1
SEDD40	727,523	715,321	625	-75	180	141.2
SEDD41	727,557	715,331	623	-75	180	183.2
SEDD42	727,517	715,222	628	-70	180	51.4
SEDD43	727,528	715,248	626	-75	180	99.0
SEDD44	727,543	715,237	626	-75	180	100.0
SEDD45	727,556	715,359	622	-75	180	220.5
SEDD46	727,543	715,359	623	75	180	220.5
SEDD47	727,605	715,289	622	-45	225	200.0
SEDD48	727,606	715,290	622	-55	225	200.2
SEDD49	727,607	715,291	622	-65	261	200.2
SEDD50	727,607	715,291	622	-57	261	200.0
SEDD51	727,530	715,359	624	-75	180	249.3
SEDD52	727,517	715,360	624	-75	180	222.3
SEDD53	727,542	715,360	623	75	180	225.0
SEDD54	727,556	715,387	621	-75	180	225.0
SEDD55	727,544	715,387	622	-75	180	222.0
SEDD56	727,532	715,387	623	75	180	225.0
SEDD57	727,557	715,226	620	-60	230	85.0
SEDD58	727,569	715,387	620	75	180	250.0
SEDD59	727,557	715,226	620	70	230	99.1
SEDD60	727,521	715,310	625	-75	180	180.0
SEDD61	727,557	715,225	620	65	220	93.4
SEDD62	727,499	715,226	629	-50	180	96.0
SEDD63	727,558	715,225	620	-75	240	96.1
SEDD64	727,499	715,227	628	-60	180	74.9
SEDD65	727,557	715,236	620	75	225	93.1

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary

Hole number	Easting	Northing	Elevation	Dip	Azimuth	Hole Depth
SEDD66	727,506	715,226	628	-50	180	85.0
SEDD67	727,506	715,227	628	-60	180	75.0
SEDD68	727,514	715,226	628	-50	180	85.0
SEDD69	727,514	715,227	628	-60	180	75.0
SEDD70	727,521	715,226	627	-50	180	85.0
SEDD71	727,565	715,243	619	75	225	111.1
SEDD72	727,521	715,226	627	-60	180	75.0
SEDD73	727,529	715,225	627	-50	180	85.4
SEDD74	727,529	715,226	627	-60	180	75.2
SEDD75	727,567	715,216	620	-50	225	83.3
SEDD76	727,537	715,224	627	-50	180	85.3
SEDD77	727,537	715,225	627	-60	180	75.0
SEDD78	727,534	715,414	622	-75	180	250.0
SEDD79	727,567	715,216	620	60	215	84.0
SEDD80	727,545	715,413	622	75	180	252.0
SEDD81	727,570	715,224	620	-50	225	89.8
SEDD82	727,570	715,224	620	-60	215	97.1
SEDD83	727,559	715,413	620	-75	180	260.0
SEDD84	727,754	715,032	630	-55	245	102.0
SEDD85	727,570	715,412	619	-75	180	261.0
SEDD86	727,760	715,019	630	55	245	117.1
SEDD87	727,535	715,438	621	-75	180	276.0
SEDD88	727,754	715,046	630	-55	245	115.0
SEDD89	727,776	715,054	630	-55	245	127.4
SEDD90	727,547	715,438	620	-75	180	276.9
SEDD91	727,766	715,064	630	-55	245	104.7
SEDD92	727,559	715,438	619	-75	180	285.0
SEDD93	727,754	715,057	629	-55	245	104.7
SEDD94	727,572	715,440	619	-75	180	300.0
SEDD95	727,610	715,252	624	-50	230	131.9
SEDD96	727,521	715,414	623	-75	180	150.0
SEDD97	727,533	715,324	625	-50	180	300.0
SEDD98	727,523	715,438	622	-75	180	276.0
SEDD99	727,672	715,552	653	-60	230	372.0

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
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. ▪ 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. ▪ The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values should be clearly stated.	▪ All trench and drilling data is provided as weighted average intervals. The weighting is applied according to intersection length. No high- or low-grade cut-off was used. ▪ The minimum sampling width used was 1 m for RC and 0.1 m for Diamond drill holes. ▪ No Exploration Results are presented in this report. Mineral Resources are reported and are based upon 3D geological modelling and Mineral Resource estimates. The geological modelling has been based primarily on Diamond drill sampling with the trenching, pit sampling and geological mapping only used to help guide the lithological and mineralisation modelling up dip from the drill holes. The Mineral Resource estimate only uses information from the Diamond drill hole sampling.
Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths	▪ These relationships are particularly important in the reporting of Exploration Results. ▪ If the geometry of the mineralisation with respect to the drillhole angle is known, its nature should be reported. ▪ If it is not known and only the downhole lengths are reported, there should be a clear statement to this effect (e.g. 'down hole length, true width not known').	▪ No Exploration Results are presented in this report. Mineral Resources are reported and are based upon 3D geological modelling and Mineral Resource estimates. The geological modelling has been based primarily on diamond drill sampling with the trenching, pit sampling and geological mapping only used to help guide the lithological and mineralisation modelling up dip from the drill holes. The Mineral Resource estimate only uses information from the Diamond drill hole sampling.
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 drillhole collar locations and appropriate sectional views.	▪ No Exploration Results are presented in this report. Mineral Resources are reported and are based upon 3D geological modelling and Mineral Resource estimates. The geological modelling has been based primarily on Diamond drill sampling with the trenching, pit sampling and geological mapping only used to help guide the lithological and mineralisation modelling up dip from the drill holes. The Mineral Resource estimate only uses information from the Diamond drill hole sampling.
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.	▪ No Exploration Results are presented in this report. Mineral Resources are reported and are based upon 3D geological modelling and Mineral Resource estimates. The geological modelling has been based primarily on diamond drill sampling with the trenching, pit sampling and geological mapping only used to help guide the lithological and mineralisation modelling up dip from the drill holes. The Mineral Resource estimate only uses information from the Diamond drill hole sampling.
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	▪ Geological mapping has been conducted over the Segele deposit at various scales; 1:2000, 1:10,000 and 1:25,000.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	treatment; metallurgical test results; bulk density, groundwater, geotechnical and rock characteristics; potential deleterious or contaminating substances.	▪ A ground magnetic geophysical survey has been completed over a 15.6 km^2 section of the deposit area.
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.	▪ No Exploration Results are presented in this report. Mineral Resources are reported and are based upon 3D geological modelling and Mineral Resource estimates. The geological modelling has been based primarily on diamond drill sampling with the trenching, pit sampling and geological mapping only used to help guide the lithological and mineralisation modelling up dip from the drill holes. The Mineral Resource estimate only uses information from the Diamond drill hole sampling. ▪ Future exploration work testing for lateral extensions of the Segele mineralisation is ongoing.

Section 3 Estimation and Reporting of Mineral Resources

(Criteria listed in section 1, and where relevant in section 2, also apply to this section.)

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. ▪ Data validation procedures used.	▪ Akobo utilise a MX Deposit geological database which has built-in validations for logging and sampling data entry. ▪ The database is managed by an Akobo employee who performs regular validations including sample interval checks, geological logging checks and assay value checks against returned laboratory certificates. ▪ In addition to this, Akobo is implementing a Micromine Nexus data management system to further improve the data management.
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.	▪ The Competent Person has not been able to undertake a physical site visit due to COVID-19 travel restrictions, although a site visit is planned for either May or June 2022. ▪ The Competent Person has completed a virtual site visit with the Akobo Minerals Chief Operating Officer and Geological staff using Microsoft Teams in 2021. During the virtual site visit the Competent Person inspected Diamond drill core processing (depth mark ups, geological logging, core sampling and sample bagging prior to dispatch) as well as a virtual field visit to the Segele deposit to inspect drill hole collars, artisanal pits and the general geomorphology.
Geological interpretation	▪ Confidence in (or conversely, the uncertainty of) the geological interpretation of the mineral deposit. ▪ Nature of the data used and of any assumptions made. ▪ The effect, if any, of alternative interpretations on Mineral Resource estimation. ▪ The use of geology in guiding and controlling Mineral Resource estimation. ▪ The factors affecting continuity both of grade and geology.	▪ Geological logging data from Diamond drill holes, trenches, artisanal pits and surface mapping and structural logging from Diamond drill holes was used to generate the Segele geological model. ▪ 18 different lithologies have been logged at Segele, these were condensed down to 5 main lithologies for the lithological model: mafic, meta-pyroxenite, ultramafic, mafic schist and a late-stage vulcanite dyke which crosscuts the other lithologies and the gold mineralisation. ▪ Gold mineralisation was modelled as a series of compact, thin, and sometimes bifurcating lenses, using a cut-off 0.2–0.3 g/t Au. The lenses occurred mostly within the ultramafic and meta-pyroxenite units but do also extend upwards into the overlying mafic units. Six mineralised lenses were modelled, a main lens which extends to surface, three footwall lenses, two of which extend at depth, and two minor isolated lenses occurring at the periphery of the other lenses. ▪ The Mineral Resource estimate used each of the mineralised lenses as hard boundaries for gold estimation, and the lithological domains as hard boundaries for density estimation.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		▪ The geological modelling demonstrates good continuity of the mineralised lenses, particularly down plunge, however, uncertainly still exists about the structural controls on the mineralisation.
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.	▪ The Segele mineralisation is approximately 40 m wide (east–west) and extends approximately 400 m down plunge to depths of up to 280 m below the topographic surface. The mineralised lenses are typically between 2–5 m thick but can vary from 1 m to 15 m thick.
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. ▪ The assumptions made regarding recovery of by-products. ▪ Estimation of deleterious elements or other non-grade variables of economic significance (e.g. sulphur for acid mine drainage characterisation). ▪ In the case of block model interpolation, the block size in relation to the average sample spacing and the search employed. ▪ Any assumptions behind modelling of selective mining units. ▪ Any assumptions about correlation between variables. ▪ Description of how the geological interpretation was used to control the resource estimates. ▪ Discussion of basis for using or not using grade cutting or capping. ▪ The process of validation, the checking process used, the comparison of model data to drillhole data, and use of reconciliation data if available.	▪ Estimates for gold and density were completed using Ordinary Kriging interpolation using Maptek Vulcan mining software. The Mineral Resource estimate used each of the mineralised lenses as hard boundaries for gold estimation and the lithological domains as hard boundaries for density estimation. No deleterious elements or additional grade variables of economic significance have been estimated. ▪ Drill hole samples were composited to 1 m lengths, broken by the mineralised domains, with residual composites <0.5 m added to the previous 1 m composite. ▪ A top cut of 850 g/t Au was applied to remove two high grade outliers and distance restrictions were applied to composite samples >150 g/t to control high grade smearing within the estimate. ▪ The estimation block size used was 5 mX x 5 mY x 1 mRL or approximately half the drill hole spacing. The estimation was completed over four passes with searches ranging from 5 mX x 5 mY x 1 mRL to 240 mX x 120 mY x 60 mRL and sample ranges of a minimum number of 6 samples and a maximum number of 22 samples, with a maximum of 3 samples per drill hole. ▪ Dynamic anisotropy searches were used during the estimates to account for localised changes in the dip and plunge of the mineralised lenses. ▪ Due to low sample numbers, the average composite gold grades were assigned to the two minor lenses which represent <1% of the Mineral Resources. ▪ Inverse distance squared and uncut Ordinary Kriging check estimates were also completed. ▪ The 2022 Segele Mineral Resource estimate has undergone several validation checks including visual validation against the Diamond drill hole sampling, a global statistical comparison between the composite samples and the estimated blocks and swath plot validations comparing averaged panel composite and estimated blocks grades along strike, along the dip direction and vertically.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Moisture	▪ Whether the tonnages are estimated on a dry basis or with natural moisture, and the method of determination of the moisture content.	▪ Tonnages have been estimated on a dry basis. ▪ There has been no assessment of the moisture content.
Cut-off parameters	▪ The basis of the adopted cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied.	▪ A cut-off grade of 2.65 g/t Au has been used for Mineral Resource reporting. ▪ The cut-off grade assumes the deposit will be mined using a cut and fill underground mining technique which was studied by Akobo Minerals in a 2021 scoping study. The scoping study outlined that ore would be hoisted from the mine from an inclined shaft to a vertical depth of approximately 225 m, although it is expected that this depth could be extended pending further study. ▪ The cut-off grade was calculated using updated costs for mining, processing, administration, environment, social and governance (ESG) and royalty costs, a gold recovery of 90% and a gold price of USD1,600 per ounce.
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.	▪ A Scoping study was completed for the Segele Deposit in September 2021 by Akobo Minerals, their subsidiary Etno Mining, Goshawk Network Technologies CC (Metallurgy), Sazani Resource and Development Ltd (ESG), Borrego Sun Pty Ltd (Mining Engineering) and SRK Consulting (Australia) Pty Ltd (Mineral Resource Estimation). ▪ The Scoping study concluded that the deposit would be accessed using an inclined shaft from the surface and the ore be mined using shrinkage stoping, post room and pillar, narrow vein stull mining, or cut and fill depending on the dip and orientation of the orebody.
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.	▪ A 258 kg sample of drill core has been processed by Peacocke & Simpson in Harare, Zimbabwe. The ore sample was subjected to Extended Gravity Recoverable Gold (EGRG) testing, an industry-standard test to determine the proportion, liberation properties and particle sizes of gravity recoverable gold (GRG) in an ore, and thus to allow process design. The sample had a very high GRG value of 76.0% at a final grind of 70.4% passing 75 microns (µm). 55.0% of head gold was liberated as GRG at coarse grind of nominal 80% passing 850 µm, and a further 13.1% at nominal 96.2% passing 212 µm. ▪ Cyanide leaching on the final gravity tailings realised a recovery of 83.9% of the test feed (20.2% of the test head) in 25 hours of leaching, overall recovery via gravity concentration and cyanide leaching on gravity tailings was 96.1 % of the test head. ▪ Mineralogical investigations suggest that the mineralisation at the Segele Deposit occurs as unevenly distributed, coarse to fine gold grains. The gold

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		appears to be unusually pure with very little associated sulphide and no associated silver or metals.
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.	▪ An Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) has been prepared in accordance with Ethiopian requirements. ▪ A gap analysis is currently being undertaken to determine what is required for the ESIA to meet Good International Industry Standards (GIIP). ▪ Key impacts identified so far are the potential economic displacement of artisanal miners and the impact of the proposed mine on surface and ground water availability. ▪ An Environmental and Social Action Plan will be prepared to mitigate any negative impacts resulting from the ESIA and gap analysis. ▪ A water study comprising hydrogeological and hydrological components is planned to better understand and address potential water impacts. ▪ Once completed, an Environmental Monitoring Plan (EMP) will be implemented. ▪ A stakeholder engagement plan, with grievance mechanism, has been prepared to guide ongoing relationships with the community local and regional governments and transient artisanal miners. All engagements are recorded, and grievances tracked until resolved. ▪ In parallel, a review of Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) risks has been undertaken and a program initiated to support sustainable livelihoods and environmental rehabilitation of degraded and damaged areas in the communities that host Akobo Minerals. Within this program are a series of innovative measures to extend shared value across the project area, facilitate resource stewardship and foster effective relationships without a culture of dependency.
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. ▪ 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. ▪ Discuss assumptions for bulk density estimates used in the evaluation process of the different materials.	▪ 614 Diamond drill samples over intervals ranging from 0.25 m to 1.8 m were selected from a range of stratigraphys; and grade ranges and were analysed for specific gravity at ALS (Loughrea) with a multipycnometer analytical method which uses an automated gas displacement pycnometer to determine density by measuring the pressure change of helium within a calibrated volume. ▪ The gas pycnometer measures the volume of solid particles using gas (helium) displacement which will penetrate the finest pores. ▪ Exploratory data analysis showed that lithological domains should be used as hard boundaries for density estimation.
Classification	▪ The basis for the classification of the Mineral Resources into varying confidence categories.	▪ Mineralisation within the 2022 Segele Mineral Resource estimate has been classified as either Indicated or Inferred Mineral Resources.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	▪ 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). ▪ Whether the result appropriately reflects the Competent Person's view of the deposit.	▪ The Competent Person is of the opinion that the deposit has reasonable prospects of eventual economic extraction using either shrinkage stoping, post room and pillar, narrow vein stull mining, or cut and fill underground mining methods. ▪ Artisanal mining, survey data, sampling and assaying methodology and quality, drill hole spacing, confidence in the geological model, estimation performance and ESG factors were all taken into consideration when classifying the Segele deposit Mineral Resources.
Audits or reviews	▪ The results of any audits or reviews of Mineral Resource estimates.	▪ There have not been any audits or reviews of the 2022 Segele Mineral Resource estimate other than internal peer review by SRK Consulting (Australasia) Pty Ltd.
Discussion of relative accuracy/confidence	▪ 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. ▪ 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. ▪ These statements of relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate should be compared with production data, where available.	▪ The Competent Person considers that the unknown depth of artisanal shaft mining, surveying methodologies, low sample counts in some domains, low amounts of density sampling, confidence in the geological modelling and the high gold grade variability present the most significant impacts on the confidence of the Mineral Resource estimate. ▪ The Competent Person is of the opinion that the 2022 Segele Mineral Resource estimate represents an appropriate global estimate that reproduces the overall grade trends and tenor seen in the Diamond drill hole samples. Due to the geological complexity and the high gold grade variability; the estimate should not be considered as an accurate local estimate.