



Certificate of Analysis

Reference Material OxQ132

Recommended Values and 95% Confidence Intervals

Gold Concentration: 34.69 (+/- 0.22) µg/g
Silver Concentration: 128.5 (+/- 1.9) µg/g

The above values apply only to product in jars or sachets which have an identification number within the following range: **406 886– 407 685**.

Prepared and Certified By:

Brett Coombridge, M.Phil. Chemistry
Rocklabs Reference Materials
P.O. Box 316056, Wairau Valley Post Centre
Auckland 0760
NEW ZEALAND
Email: b.coombridge@scott.co.nz
Telephone: +64 9 444 3534

Date of Certification:

18 December 2014

Certificate Status:

Original

Available Packaging:

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

Origin of Reference Material:

Basalt and feldspar minerals with minor quantities of finely divided gold and silver-containing minerals that have been screened to ensure there is no gold nugget effect.

Supplier of Reference Material:

ROCKLABS
P O Box 18 142
Glen Innes
Auckland 1743
NEW ZEALAND
Email: reference-materials@rocklabs.com
Website: www.rocklabs.com

Description:

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

The approximate chemical composition is:
(Uncertified Values)

SiO ₂	58.03
Al ₂ O ₃	16.77
Na ₂ O	4.65
K ₂ O	5.33
CaO	3.80
MgO	3.55
TiO ₂	1.03
MnO	0.07
P ₂ O ₅	0.26
Fe ₂ O ₃	5.40
L O I	0.28

Intended Use:

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

Stability:

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

Method of Preparation:

Pulverized basalt rock and feldspar minerals were blended with finely pulverized and screened gold and silver-containing minerals. Once the powders were uniformly mixed the composite was placed into 800 wide-mouthed jars, each bearing a unique number. 23 jars were randomly selected from the packaging run and material from these jars was used for both homogeneity and consensus testing.

Homogeneity Assessment:

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

Homogeneity: A sample was removed from the top of each of the 23 jars randomly selected from the 800 jars in the batch. The results of analysis of the 23 samples (randomly ordered then consecutively numbered before being sent to the laboratory) indicated two test results were anomalously low. Analysis of the slags AND crucibles related to these samples showed excessive gold had been retained, so the results for these two samples were discarded from the set. The test results for the remaining 21 samples produced a relative standard deviation of 2.2%

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

Analytical Methodology:

Once homogeneity had been established, two sub-samples were submitted to a number of well-recognized laboratories in order to assign gold and silver values by consensus testing. The sub-samples were drawn from the 24 randomly selected jars and each laboratory received samples from two different jars. Each laboratory was instructed to analyse the samples for gold and silver using the method they believed would give the best results. Indicative concentration ranges were provided.

The samples were analysed for gold by all participating laboratories using fire assay followed by either gravimetric or instrument finish (AAS or ICP).

Only laboratories that routinely perform silver analysis were requested to analyse the samples for silver. A range of methods were used between labs, ranging from variations on acid digest/instrument finish, to fire assay/gravimetric finish.

The amount of sample used in the analyses varied between laboratories for both gold (range 10 - 50g) and silver (range 0.1 - 2.0g digest/instrument; and 30g fire assay/gravimetric).

Calculation of Certified Value:

The 53 participating laboratories each returned replicate gold results using one finish method for both samples. In addition, 29 of the 53 laboratories returned replicate sets of silver results for the same samples. Statistical analysis to identify outliers was carried out using the principles detailed in sections 7.3.2 – 7.3.4, ISO 5725-2: 1994. Assessment of each laboratory's performance was carried out on the basis of z-scores, partly based on the concept described in ISO/IEC Guide 43-1. Details of the criteria used in these examinations are available on request. As a result of these statistical analyses, 6 sets of results were excluded for the purpose of assigning a gold concentration value and 2 sets were excluded for silver. Recommended values were thus calculated from the average of the remaining $n = 47$ sets of replicate results for gold and $n = 27$ for silver.

The 95% confidence interval was estimated using the formula:

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

(where \bar{X} is the estimated average, s is the estimated standard deviation of the laboratory averages, and t is the 0.025 tail-value from Student's t -distribution with $n-1$ degrees of freedom). The recommended values are provided at the beginning of the certificate in $\mu\text{g/g}$ (ppm) units.

A summary of the results used to calculate the recommended value for silver and gold are listed on page 4 and page 5 respectively. The names of the laboratories that submitted results are listed on page 6. The results are listed in increasing order of the individual laboratory averages.

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

Summary of Results Used to Calculate Silver Value

(Listed in increasing order of individual laboratory averages)

Silver (ppm)		
Sample 1	Sample 2	Set Average
119.7	120.4	120.05
122	119	120.5
122.0	122.0	122.00
123.9	123.2	123.55
124.30	124.55	124.425
123	126	124.5
126.171	125.623	125.897
126	126	126.0
127	127	127.0
127	127	127.0
128	126	127.0
128.00	127.00	127.500
128	128	128.0
128.680	128.135	128.408
128	129	128.5
129	130	129.5
129.8	129.6	129.70
132	128	130.0
130	130	130.0
	130	130
131	129	130.0
131	131	131.0
134.7	131.2	132.95
135	132	133.5
135.411	133.925	134.668
139.2	139.0	139.10
140	139	139.5
Average of 27 sets	=	128.5 ppm
Standard deviation of 27 sets	=	4.8 ppm
Relative standard deviation	=	3.7 %
95% Confidence interval for average	=	+/- 1.9 ppm

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

Summary of Results Used to Calculate Gold Value

(Listed in increasing order of individual laboratory averages)

Gold (ppm)		
Sample 1	Sample 2	Set Average
33.4	32.7	33.05
32.55	33.90	33.225
33.365	33.250	33.308
33.5	33.3	33.40
33.7	33.5	33.60
33.85	33.75	33.800
33.6	34.3	33.95
34.552	33.363	33.958
33.984	33.999	33.992
34.0	34.0	34.00
34.178	33.851	34.015
33.8	34.5	34.15
34.64	33.70	34.170
34.2	34.2	34.20
34.6	34.1	34.35
34.4	34.4	34.40
34.663	34.245	34.454
34.7	34.4	34.55
34.6	34.5	34.55
34.67	34.48	34.575
34.6	34.7	34.65
34.564	34.800	34.682
35.00	34.50	34.750
34.9	34.6	34.75
34.8	34.9	34.85
35.1	34.6	34.85
34.290	35.552	34.921
34.980	34.880	34.930
35.021	34.842	34.932
34.7	35.3	35.00
35.37	34.65	35.010
34.9	35.2	35.05
35.1	35.0	35.05
35.232	34.968	35.100
35.259	35.020	35.140
35.1	35.2	35.15
35.075	35.415	35.245
35.10	35.50	35.300
34.99	35.63	35.310
35.772	34.893	35.333
35.3	35.5	35.40
35.440	35.395	35.418
35.580	35.510	35.545
36.0	35.3	35.65
35.586	35.949	35.768
36.043	35.717	35.880
36.90	36.85	36.875
Average of 47 sets	=	34.686 ppm
Standard deviation of 47 sets	=	0.763 ppm
Relative standard deviation	=	2.2 %
95% Confidence interval for average:	=	+/- 0.224 ppm

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

Participating Laboratories

Australia	ALS Minerals, Burnie ALS Minerals, Kalgoorlie † ALS Minerals, Orange † ALS Minerals, Perth † ALS Minerals, Townsville Bureau Veritas Amdel, Adelaide Bureau Veritas Amdel, Kalgoorlie † Intertek Genalysis Laboratory Services, Perth
Burkina Faso	ALS Minerals, Burkina Faso SEMAFO Burkina Faso S.A.
Canada	† Acme Analytical Laboratories, Vancouver † ALS Minerals, Val-d'Or † ALS Minerals, Vancouver † Bourlamaque, Quebec † Loring Laboratories (Alberta) Ltd, Calgary † SGS Minerals Services, Lakefield, Ontario † SGS Minerals Services, Vancouver Techni-Lab S.G.B. Abitibi Inc/Actlabs, Val d'Or † Techni-Lab S.G.B. Abitibi Inc/Actlabs, Ste-Germaine-Boule † TSL Laboratories Inc, Saskatoon
Chile	† Acme Analytical Laboratories, Santiago
Côte d'Ivoire	Bureau Veritas Mineral Laboratories, Abidjan
Ghana	ALS Minerals, Kumasi Performance Laboratories, Obuasi AngloGold
Ireland	ALS Minerals, Loughrea
Kyrgyz Republic	† Stewart Assay and Environmental Laboratories LLC, Kara-Balta
Laos	ALS Geochemistry, Vientiane
Mali	ALS Minerals, Bamako
Mongolia	† ALS Minerals, Ulaanbaatar
Namibia	† Bureau Veritas- Mineral Laboratories, Swakopmund
New Zealand	SGS New Zealand Ltd, Otago SGS New Zealand Ltd, Reefton † SGS New Zealand Ltd, Waihi
Peru	† ALS Minerals, Lima † Inspectorate Services Perú S.A.C., Callao † Minera Yanacocha SRL – Newmont, Lima
Romania	† ALS Minerals, Rosia Montana
Russia	† Irgiredmet Analytical Centre, Irkutsk
South Africa	† Acme, Inspectorate M & M, Rustenburg † ALS Minerals, Edenvale SibanyeGold, Driefontein Operations Performance Laboratories, Allanridge Performance Laboratories, Barberton Performance Laboratories, Randfontein
Turkey	† Acme Analitik Laboratuar Hizmetleri Ltd, Sirketi ALS Minerals, Izmir
USA	† ALS Minerals, Reno † Barrick Goldstrike – Met Services, Nevada † Inspectorate, Sparks Newmont Mining Corporation, Carlin Newmont Mining Corporation, Lone Tree Newmont Mining Corporation, Twin Creeks
Zimbabwe	Performance Laboratories, Ruwa

Note: The symbol † identifies laboratories that analysed the samples for both gold and silver.
All laboratories listed analysed the samples for gold.

Instructions and Recommendations for Use:

Weigh out quantity usually used for analysis and analyse by normal procedure. Do not dry before weighting.

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

Some users in the past have misinterpreted this confidence interval as a guide as to how different an individual test result should be from the declared value. Some mistakenly use this interval, or the standard deviation from the consensus test, to set limits for control charts on their own routine test results using the reference material. Such use inevitably leads to many apparent out-of-control points, leading to doubts about the laboratory's testing, or of the reference material itself.

A much better way of determining the laboratory performance when analysing the reference material is to accumulate a history of the test results obtained, and plot them on a control chart. The appropriate centre line and control limits for this chart should be based on the average level and variability exhibited in the laboratory's **own** data. This chart will provide a clear picture of the long-term stability or otherwise of the laboratory testing process, providing good clues as to the causes of any problems. To help our customers do this, we can provide a free Excel template that will produce sensible graphs, with intelligently chosen limits, from the customer's own data.

Legal Notice:

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

References:

For further information on the preparation and validation of this reference material please contact Malcolm Smith.

Certifying Officer

Brett Coombridge (M.Phil. Chemistry)

Independent Statistician

Tim Ball BSc (Hons)