

19 May 2022

## **ADDENDUM TO ANNOUNCEMENT RELEASED 18 MAY 2022 “CULPEO IDENTIFIES MULTIPLE NEW REGIONAL TARGETS AT LANA CORINA”**

Culpeo Minerals Limited (**Culpeo** or the **Company**) (**ASX:CPO**) provides the attached updated JORC Table 1 (Sections 1 and 2) for more fulsome disclosure at the request of ASX, which should be read in conjunction with the Company’s announcement titled “Culpeo identifies multiple new regional targets At Lana Corina ” released on 18 May 2022.

This announcement has been authorised by the Board of Directors of Culpeo Minerals Limited.

### **COMPANY**

Max Tuesley  
Managing Director  
E: max.tuesley@culpeominerals.com.au  
P: +61 (08) 9322 1587

### **MEDIA/INVESTORS**

Peter Taylor  
NWR Communications  
E: peter@nwrcommunications.com.au  
P: +61 (0) 412 036 23

### **Competent Persons’ Statements**

The information in this announcement that relates to Exploration Results is based on information compiled by Mr Maxwell Donald Tuesley, BSc (Hons) Economic Geology, MAusIMM (No 111470). Mr Tuesley is a member of the Australian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy and is a shareholder and Director of the Company. Mr Tuesley has sufficient experience that is relevant to the style of mineralisation and type of deposit under consideration and to the activity which he is undertaking to qualify as a Competent Person as defined in the 2012 Edition of the Australasian Code for Reporting of Exploration Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves. Mr Tuesley consents to the inclusion in this report of the matters based on this information in the form and context in which it appears.

The information in this announcement that relates to Geophysical Results is based on information compiled by Nigel Cantwell. Mr Cantwell is a Member of the Australian Institute of Geoscientists (AIG) and the Australian Society of Exploration Geophysics (ASEG). Mr Cantwell is a consultant to Culpeo Minerals Limited. Mr Cantwell has sufficient experience which is relevant to the style of mineralisation and type of deposit under consideration and to the activity which he is undertaking to qualify as a Competent Person as defined in the 2012 Edition of the Australasian Code for Reporting of Exploration Results, Mineral Resources & Ore Reserves. Mr Cantwell consents to the inclusion in this report of the matters based on this information in the form and context in which it appears.

## Appendix A JORC Code Table 1 – Lana Corina Project

### SECTION 1 SAMPLING TECHNIQUES AND DATA

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<b>Sampling techniques</b>	<i>Nature and quality of sampling (e.g. cut channels, random chips, or specific specialised industry standard measurement tools appropriate to the minerals under investigation, such as down-hole gamma sondes, or handheld XRF instruments, etc.). These examples should not be taken as limiting the broad meaning of sampling.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ground Magnetic Data was collected using a GEM GSM-19W Magnetometer, data were quality checked by Quantec and geophysical consultants in Perth, Australia, and were considered to be of excellent quality.</li> <li>Geochemical sampling was undertaken in an area of 800 x 700 m for a sample spacing of 50 x 50 m and sometimes 25 x 25 m. 192 samples were extracted and 192 copper analyses and 70 molybdenum analyses were performed.</li> </ul>
	<i>Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample representivity and the appropriate calibration of any measurement tools or systems used.</i>	
	<i>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.</i>	
<b>Drilling techniques</b>	<i>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.).</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A as no new drilling results are being reported.</li> </ul>
<b>Drill sample recovery</b>	<i>Method of recording and assessing core and chip sample recoveries and results assessed.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A as no new drilling results are being reported.</li> </ul>
	<i>Measures taken to maximise sample recovery and ensure representative nature of the samples.</i>	
	<i>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.</i>	
<b>Logging</b>	<i>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.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A as no new drilling results are being reported.</li> </ul>
	<i>Whether logging is qualitative or quantitative in nature. Core (or costean, channel, etc.) photography.</i>	
	<i>The total length and percentage of the relevant intersections logged.</i>	
<b>Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation</b>	<i>If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all core taken.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A as no new drilling results are being reported.</li> </ul>
	<i>If non-core, whether riffled, tube sampled, rotary split, etc. and whether sampled wet or dry.</i>	
	<i>For all sample types, the nature, quality and appropriateness of the sample preparation technique.</i>	
	<i>Quality control procedures adopted for all sub-sampling stages to maximise representivity of samples.</i>	
	<i>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.</i>	
	<i>Whether sample sizes are appropriate to the grain size of the material being sampled.</i>	
<b>Quality of assay data and laboratory tests</b>	<i>The nature, quality and appropriateness of the assaying and laboratory procedures used and whether the technique is considered partial or total.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Magnetic surveys were ground-based surveys, measuring Total Magnetic Intensity, with a 1s recording interval. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data units were nanotesla (nT).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	<i>For geophysical tools, spectrometers, handheld XRF instruments, etc., the parameters used in determining the analysis including</i>	

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<i>instrument make and model, reading times, calibrations factors applied and their derivation, etc.</i> <i>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.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Data was collected by Quantec Geoscience (Chile), covering 150 line kms at a 25m spacing. The Magnetometer was a GEM GSM-19W with a Overhauser Effect Sensor Type, mounted on a 2m staff.</li> <li>○ The control point location was 296647 E, 6555150 N (PSAD56, Zone 19S) (repeated at beginning and end of survey each day)</li> </ul>
<b>Verification of sampling and assaying</b>	<i>The verification of significant intersections by either independent or alternative company personnel.</i> <i>The use of twinned holes.</i> <i>Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols.</i> <i>Discuss any adjustment to assay data.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A as no new drilling results are being reported.</li> </ul>
<b>Location of data points</b>	<i>Accuracy and quality of surveys used to locate drill holes (collar and down-hole surveys), trenches, mine workings and other locations used in Mineral Resource estimation.</i> <i>Specification of the grid system used.</i> <i>Quality and adequacy of topographic control.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A as no new drilling results are being reported.</li> </ul>
<b>Data spacing and distribution</b>	<i>Data spacing for reporting of Exploration Results.</i> <i>Whether the data spacing and distribution is sufficient to establish the degree of geological and grade continuity appropriate for the Mineral Resource and Ore Reserve estimation procedure(s) and classifications applied</i> <i>Whether sample compositing has been applied.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The historical drilling and surface sampling are widely spaced and no systematic sampling/drilling grid has been implemented. In general, the mineralisation strikes in a north-east direction and drilling has been undertaken perpendicular to that.</li> </ul>
<b>Orientation of data in relation to geological structure</b>	<i>Whether the orientation of sampling achieves unbiased sampling of possible structures and the extent to which this is known, considering the deposit type.</i> <i>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.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A as no new drilling results are being reported.</li> </ul>
<b>Sample security</b>	<i>The measures taken to ensure sample security.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A as no new drilling results are being reported.</li> </ul>
<b>Audits or reviews</b>	<i>The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No records are available for the historic sampling, but it is assumed no audits have been completed.</li> </ul>

## SECTION 2 REPORTING OF EXPLORATION RESULTS

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<b>Mineral tenement and land tenure status</b>	<i>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.</i>  <i>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.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project area comprises nine exploitation concessions, which cover a total area of approximately 550 Hectares. Culpeo Minerals has agreements in place to earn up to 80%.</li> </ul>
<b>Exploration done by other parties</b>	<i>Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Historically three companies have undertaken exploration in the project area. These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minera Centinela (1982 to 1985)</li> <li>Antofagasta Minerals (2005)</li> <li>SCM Antares (2010 to 2018)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Geology</b>	<i>Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The prospect is associated with a structural belt orientated in a NE-SW direction, about 1,000m long and 400m wide. The near surface part of the mineralised system is associated with three breccia pipes and below this a mineralised copper / molybdenum porphyry. Around the edges of the main mineralisation are a series of gold, gold-copper and barite veins.</li> </ul>
<b>Drillhole Information</b>	<i>A summary of all information material to the understanding of the exploration results including a tabulation of the following information for all Material drillholes:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>easting and northing of the drillhole collar</i></li> <li><i>elevation or RL (elevation above sea level in metres) of the drillhole collar</i></li> <li><i>dip and azimuth of the hole</i></li> <li><i>down hole length and interception depth hole length</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A as no new drilling results are being reported.</li> </ul>
<b>Data aggregation methods</b>	<i>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.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A as no new drilling results are being reported.</li> </ul>
<b>Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths</b>	<i>If the geometry of the mineralisation with respect to the drillhole angle is known, its nature should be reported.</i>  <i>If it is not known and only the down hole lengths are reported, there should be a clear statement to this effect (e.g. 'down hole length, true width not known').</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A as no new drilling results are being reported.</li> </ul>
<b>Diagrams</b>	<i>Appropriate maps and sections (with scales) and tabulations of intercepts should be included for any significant discovery being reported. These should include, but not be limited to a plan view of drill hole collar locations and appropriate sectional views.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Diagrams are included in the main body of the report.</li> </ul>
<b>Balanced reporting</b>	<i>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.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A as no new drilling results are being reported.</li> </ul>
<b>Other substantive exploration data</b>	<i>Other exploration data, if meaningful and material, should be reported including (but not limited to): geological observations; geophysical survey results; geochemical survey results; bulk samples – size and method of treatment; metallurgical test results; bulk density, groundwater, geotechnical and rock characteristics; potential deleterious or contaminating substances.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A ground magnetic survey has recently been completed, covering 150 line kms at a 25m spacing.</li> <li>Historic geochemical survey undertaken in an area of 800 x 700 m for a sample spacing of 50 x 50 m and sometimes 25 x 25 m. 192 samples were taken (192 copper and 70 molybdenum analyses)</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two programs of geophysics have been undertaken over the project area.</li> <li>In 2015 an IP survey was undertaken by Geodatos, where data was collection over 7.6 line km. A second IP survey was carried out in 2018, also by Geodatos with data being collected over 12.2 line km.</li> </ul>
<b>Further work</b>	<i>The nature and scale of planned further work (e.g. tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling).</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A drilling program to test the near surface breccia pipe hosted mineralisation and deeper porphyry style mineralisation is currently underway.</li> <li>The recently acquired ground magnetic data is now being modelled and target ranking will be undertaken.</li> </ul>