

20 August 2021

The Manager  
ASX Market Announcements  
Australian Securities Exchange Limited

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Airborne Geophysical Survey – JORC Table**

We refer to the Tempus announcement “Elizabeth Geophysical Survey Highlights Scale Potential” dated 2 August 2021, which did not include the relevant JORC Code (2012) tables. The announcement “Elizabeth Geophysical Survey – Update” dated 13 August 2021 included the incorrect JORC Code (2012) tables.

The following pages include the correct JORC Code (2012) tables relating to the airborne geophysical survey information released on 2 August 2021.

Yours faithfully,



Melanie Ross  
Director / Company Secretary

The following tables are provided to ensure compliance with the JORC Code (2012) requirements for the reporting of Exploration Results for the Elizabeth Gold Project and the Blackdome Mine

**Section 1: Sampling Techniques and Data**

(Criteria in this section apply to all succeeding sections.)

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Sampling techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nature and quality of sampling (eg 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.</li> <li>Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample representivity and the appropriate calibration of any measurement tools or systems used.</li> <li>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 (eg '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 (eg submarine nodules) may warrant disclosure of detailed information.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not applicable</li> </ul>
Drilling techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drill type (eg core, reverse circulation, open-hole hammer, rotary air blast, auger, Bangka, sonic, etc) and details (eg 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).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not applicable</li> </ul>
Drill sample recovery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Method of recording and assessing core and chip sample recoveries and results assessed.</li> <li>Measures taken to maximise sample recovery and ensure representative nature of the samples.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not applicable</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Logging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>Whether logging is qualitative or quantitative in nature. Core (or costean, channel, etc) photography.</li> <li>The total length and percentage of the relevant intersections logged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not applicable</li> </ul>
Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all core taken.</li> <li>If non-core, whether riffled, tube sampled, rotary split, etc and whether sampled wet or dry.</li> <li>For all sample types, the nature, quality and appropriateness of the sample preparation technique.</li> <li>Quality control procedures adopted for all sub-sampling stages to maximise representivity of samples.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Whether sample sizes are appropriate to the grain size of the material being sampled.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not applicable</li> </ul>
Quality of assay data and laboratory tests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The nature, quality and appropriateness of the assaying and laboratory procedures used and whether the technique is considered partial or total.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Nature of quality control procedures adopted (eg standards, blanks, duplicates, external laboratory checks) and whether acceptable levels of accuracy (ie lack of bias) and precision have been established.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The survey aircraft was equipped with a data acquisition system, GPS navigation system pilot guidance unit (PGU), laser altimeter, triple magnetic gradient boom system, fluxgate magnetometer, gamma ray spectrometer, barometer, and temperature/humidity probe. In addition, two magnetic base stations were used to record temporal magnetic variations.</li> <li>The Integrated Multi Parameter Acquisition Console (IMPAC), manufactured by Nuvia Dynamics Inc. (previously Pico Envirotec Inc.), is the main computer used in integrated data recording, data synchronizing, providing real time quality control data for the geophysical operator display, and the generation of navigation information for the pilot and operator display systems.</li> <li>The Elizabeth survey block was flown at 200 m line spacing at a heading of 090/270 °; tie lines were flown at 2,000</li> </ul>

		<p>m spacing at a heading of 000/180. An infill block covering 6.3 km by 3.5 km was flown at the east side of the main block. Survey and tie lines flown at 200 m line spacings within the infill block resulted in 100 m spacing. A total of 755 line km was flown over an area of 115.3 km<sup>2</sup>.</p>
<p>Verification of sampling and assaying</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The verification of significant intersections by either independent or alternative company personnel.</li> <li>• The use of twinned holes.</li> <li>• Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols.</li> <li>• Discuss any adjustment to assay data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<p>Location of data points</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Specification of the grid system used.</li> <li>• Quality and adequacy of topographic control.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The topographic surface was generated from Lidar airborne DTM</li> <li>• UTM grid NAD83 Zone 10N.</li> <li>• The Opti-Logic RS 800 laser altimeter used on the geophysics survey helicopter was tested and calibrated in accordance with manufacturer's instructions prior to starting the survey.</li> </ul>
<p>Data spacing and distribution</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data spacing for reporting of Exploration Results.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Whether sample compositing has been applied.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Elizabeth survey block was flown at 200 m line spacing at a heading of 090/270 °; tie lines were flown at 2,000 m spacing at a heading of 000/180. An infill block covering 6.3 km by 3.5 km was flown at the east side of the main block. Survey and tie lines flown at 200 m line spacings within the infill block resulted in 100 m spacing.</li> </ul>

<i>Orientation of data in relation to geological structure</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the orientation of sampling achieves unbiased sampling of possible structures and the extent to which this is known, considering the deposit type.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable</li> </ul>
<i>Sample security</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The measures taken to ensure sample security.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable</li> </ul>
<i>Audits or reviews</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable</li> </ul>

## Section 2: Reporting of Exploration Results

(Criteria listed in the preceding section also apply to this section.)

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>JORC Code explanation</b>	<b>Commentary</b>
<i>Mineral tenement and land tenure status</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Blackdome-Elizabeth Project is comprised of 73 contiguous mineral claims underlain by 14 Crown granted mineral claims and two mining leases.</li> <li>• The Property is located in the Clinton and Lillooet Mining Divisions approximately 230 km NNE of Vancouver</li> <li>• Tempus has exercised the option to acquire the Elizabeth Gold Project and has completed an addendum to the original Elizabeth Option Agreement (refer to ASX announcement 15 December 2020)</li> <li>• A net smelter royalty of 3% NSR (1% purchasable) applies to several claims on the Elizabeth Property.</li> <li>• No royalties apply to the Blackdome Property or Elizabeth Regional Properties.</li> <li>• There are currently no known impediments to developing a project in this area, and all tenure is in good standing.</li> </ul>

<p><i>Exploration done by other parties</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the 1940s, placer gold was discovered in Fairless Creek west of Blackdome Summit. Prospecting by Lawrence Frenier shortly afterward led to the discovery of gold-bearing quartz veins on the southwest slope of the mountain that resulted in the staking of mining claims in 1947. Empire Valley Gold Mines Ltd and Silver Standard Resources drove two adits and completed basic surface work during the 1950s.</li> <li>The Blackdome area was not worked again until 1977 when Barrier Reef Resources Ltd. re-staked the area and performed surface work in addition to underground development. The Blackdome Mining Corp. was formed in 1978 and performed extensive surface and underground work with various joint venture partners that resulted in a positive feasibility study. A 200 ton/day mill, camp facilities and tailings pond were constructed and mining operations officially commenced in 1986. The mine ceased operations in 1991, having produced 225,000 oz of Au and 547,000 oz of Ag from 338,000 tons of ore (Godard et al., 2010)</li> <li>After a period of inactivity, Claimstaker Resources Ltd. took over the project, reopening the mine in late 1998.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Geology</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Blackdome property is situated in a region underlain by rocks of Triassic to Tertiary age. Sedimentary and igneous rocks of the Triassic Pavilion Group occurring along the Fraser River represent the oldest rocks in the region. A large, Triassic age, ultramafic complex (Shulaps Complex) was emplaced along the Yalakom fault; a regional scale structure located some 30 kilometres south of the property. Sediments and volcanics of the Cretaceous Jackass Mountain Group and Spences Bridge/Kingsvale Formations overlie the Triassic assemblages. Some of these rocks occur several kilometres south of Blackdome.</li> <li>Overlying the Cretaceous rocks are volcanics and minor sediments of Eocene age. These rocks underlie much of Blackdome and are correlated with the Kamloops Group</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		<p>seen in the Ashcroft and Nicola regions. Geochemical studies (Vivian, 1988) have shown these rocks to be derived from a “calc-alkaline” magma in a volcanic arc type tectonic setting. Eocene age granitic intrusions at Poison Mountain some 22 kilometres southwest of Blackdome are host to a gold bearing porphyry copper/molybdenum deposit. It is speculated that this or related intrusions could reflect the source magmas of the volcanic rocks seen at Blackdome. There is some documented evidence of young granitic rocks several kilometres south of the mine near Lone Cabin Creek. The youngest rocks present are Oligocene to Miocene basalts of the Chilcotin Group. These are exposed on the uppermost slopes of Blackdome Mountain and Red Mountain to the south.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transecting the property in a NE-SW strike direction are a series of faults that range from vertical to moderately westerly dipping. These faults are the principal host structures for Au- Ag mineralisation. The faults anastomose, and form sygmoidal loops.</li> <li>• The area in which the Elizabeth Gold Project is situated is underlain by Late Paleozoic to Mesozoic rock assemblages that are juxtaposed across a complex system of faults mainly of Cretaceous and Tertiary age. These Paleozoic to Mesozoic-age rocks are intruded by Cretaceous and Tertiary-age stocks and dykes of mainly felsic to intermediate composition, and are locally overlain by Paleogene volcanic and sedimentary rocks. The Elizabeth Gold Project is partly underlain by ultramafic rocks of the Shulaps Ultramafic Complex, which include harzburgite, serpentinite and their alteration product listwanite.</li> <li>• The gold mineralisation found on the Elizabeth Gold Project present characteristics typical of epigenetic mesothermal gold deposits. The auriferous quartz vein mineralisation is analogous to that found in the Bralorne-Pioneer deposits. Gold mineralisation is hosted by a series of northeast trending, steeply northwest dipping veins that crosscut the Blue Creek porphyry intrusion. The Main and West vein systems display mesothermal textures, including ribboned-laminated veins and comprehensive wall rock breccias. Vein formation and gold mineralisation were associated with extensional-brittle faulting believed to be contemporaneous with mid-Eocene extensional faulting along the Marshall Creek, Mission Ridge and Quartz Mountain faults.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Drill hole Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A summary of all information material to the understanding of the exploration results including a tabulation of the following information for all Material drill holes:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ easting and northing of the drill hole collar</li> <li>○ elevation or RL (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in metres) of the drill hole collar</li> <li>○ dip and azimuth of the hole</li> <li>○ down hole length and interception depth</li> <li>○ hole length.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 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 understanding of the report, the Competent Person should clearly explain why this is the case.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refer to Appendix 1 for drill hole collar information</li> </ul>
Data aggregation methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In reporting Exploration Results, weighting averaging techniques, maximum and/or minimum grade truncations (eg cutting of high grades) and cut-off grades are usually Material and should be stated.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values should be clearly stated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable</li> </ul>
Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These relationships are particularly important in the reporting of Exploration Results.</li> <li>• If the geometry of the mineralisation with respect to the drill hole angle is known, its nature should be reported.</li> <li>• If it is not known and only the down hole lengths are reported, there should be a clear statement to this effect (eg 'down hole length, true width not known').</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable</li> </ul>
Diagrams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable Refer to maps within announcement for detailed survey line-spacing, plan view of magnetic data and cross-section.</li> </ul>



Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Balanced reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not applicable</li> </ul>
Other substantive exploration data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tempus recently completed an airborne magnetic and radiometric survey over the Elizabeth Gold Project (refer to ASX announcement 02 August 2021) by completing 97 lines for a total of 735 line-kilometres. Flight lines are oriented east-west with north-south tie lines and spaced 200 metres across the entire 115km<sup>2</sup> Elizabeth property. Line spacing of 100 metres was flown over the Elizabeth Main and Elizabeth East Zones.</li> <li>The airborne magnetic survey data was reviewed and interpreted by Insight Geophysics Inc. using 3D magnetization vector inversion (MVI) modelling.</li> <li>The geophysical surveys identified the Blue Creek Porphyry, which is the known host of the high-grade Elizabeth gold-quartz veins, as a relative magnetic low anomaly within the Shulaps Ultramafic Complex. From this correlation of geology and geophysics it was determined that the Blue Creek Porphyry, originally explored / mapped to approximately 1.1km<sup>2</sup> in size, is likely much larger. The airborne magnetic survey and MVI 3D modelling interpret the Blue Creek Porphyry to be at least four-times the size at approximately 4.5km<sup>2</sup>.</li> <li>This interpretation of the Blue Creek Porphyry is also extensive at depth extending to at least 2km deep</li> </ul>
Further work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The nature and scale of planned further work (eg tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling).</li> <li>Diagrams clearly highlighting the areas of possible extensions, including the main geological interpretations and future drilling areas, provided this information is not commercially sensitive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tempus plans to update historical NI43-101 foreign resource estimates to current NI43-101 and JORC 2012 standards</li> <li>Tempus is also seeking to expand the scale of the mineralisation at the project through further exploration.</li> </ul>