

## Acquisition of Strategic Zambian Cobalt Project to Proceed Following Successful Due Diligence

### HIGHLIGHTS:

- **Legal and technical due diligence on the acquisition of a 70% interest in the Kitwe Cobalt-Copper Tailings Project in Zambia completed**
- **Due diligence completed following site visit, review of extensive historical data, sampling and assaying of tailings material and meetings with key government officials**
- **Preparation of share sale agreement underway by the Company's lawyers to allow settlement of the acquisition to proceed**
- **Board consider the acquisition will further strengthen the Company's strategic position in the Central African Copperbelt, one of the world's largest producing regions of high grade cobalt and copper concentrates and LME grade copper metal**
- **Acquisition further enhances Cape Lambert's position in the cobalt sector with record high cobalt demand and prices at 8 year highs**
- **This will be the Company's second significant acquisition after finalising the Joint Venture with Paragon Mining (SARL) to develop the Kipushi Cobalt Tailings and Kasombo Cobalt Projects in the Democratic Republic of Congo**

Australian resource and investment company, Cape Lambert Resources Limited (**ASX: CFE**) (**Cape Lambert** or the **Company**) is pleased to announce that it has successfully completed its legal and technical due diligence to acquire 70% of the shares in Zambian entity Australian Mining Company Zambia Limited (**AMCZL**), which is the holder of exploration licence No 21853-HQ-SEL (**Project**) (**Acquisition**). The Licence covers a historic cobalt-copper rich tailings dump located near Kitwe in Zambia.

Commenting on the completion of the due diligence review and acquisition, Cape Lambert Executive Chairman, Mr Tony Sage, said, "We have moved very quickly to secure this strategic and significant cobalt and copper asset for the Company in one of the world's largest cobalt producing regions. The acquisition, follows the completion of our cobalt production Joint Venture in the DRC last month. These acquisitions will see the Company be a significant player in the cobalt market in the years to come."

"Our management and consultants completed a thorough legal and technical due diligence review and we are obviously pleased that the outcome was positive and now allows us to finalise the Share Purchase Agreement with our lawyers. We are committed to establish ourselves firmly in the cobalt sector and to utilize our resource experience in Africa to advance this project." Mr Sage added.

Cape Lambert Resources Limited (ASX: CFE) is a fully funded mineral development company with exposure to iron ore, copper, gold, uranium, manganese, lithium and lead-silver-zinc assets in Australia, Europe, Africa and South America.

### Australian Securities Exchange

Code: CFE

Ordinary shares  
720,686,586

Unlisted Options  
23,500,000 (\$0.05 exp 31 Dec 2018)

### Board of Directors

Tony Sage  
Executive Chairman

Tim Turner  
Non-executive Director

Jason Brewer  
Non-executive Director

Melissa Chapman  
Company Secretary

### Cape Lambert Contact

Investor Relations  
Phone: +61 8 9380 9555  
Email: [info@capelam.com.au](mailto:info@capelam.com.au)

### Australian Enquiries

Professional Public Relations  
David Tasker  
Phone: +61 8 9388 0944  
Mobile: +61 433 112 936  
Email: [david.tasker@ppr.com.au](mailto:david.tasker@ppr.com.au)

[www.capelam.com.au](http://www.capelam.com.au)



The Kitwe Cobalt-Copper Tailings Project, is located approximately 3km from the city of Kitwe, in the Copperbelt region of Zambia and approximately 170km from the Company's Kipushi Cobalt Tailings and Kasombo Cobalt Projects located near the town of Kipushi in the Democratic Republic of Congo.



Figure 1: Location of the Kitwe Cobalt-Copper Tailings Project

The Company announced on 22 May 2017 that it had executed a Binding Terms Sheet to conditionally acquire a 70% interest in the Project. The Binding Terms Sheet was subject to completion of due diligence on AMCZL and the Project and the execution of a Share Sale Agreement.

During May 2017, the Company's management team and technical consultants completed a site visit to the tailings dam, reviewed the extensive historical data and collected 7 samples from the tailings dam, which were assayed for cobalt and copper at the Kalalushi laboratory of SGS Inspection Services Ltd in Zambia. The site visit which was completed with a representative of the Zambian Ministry of Mines and Minerals Development, Geological Survey Department confirmed the extent and size of the tailings dam with a survey completed by them on 9 May 2017 estimating the license to contain 17.72 million tonnes of tailings. The assay results from the samples (refer Table 1 and included in ASX Announcement dated 22 May 2017) further confirmed the historical grade data of the tailings that was reviewed.

Sample ID	Co-Ordinates		Estimated thickness	Co Grade (%)	Cu Grade (%)
	Easting	Northing			
Pit 1	28°10'12" E	12°50'32" S	1.0m	0.30	0.43
Pit 2	28°10'21" E	12°50'42" S	1.0m	0.43	0.56
Pit 3	28°10'10" E	12°50'51" S	1.0m	0.25	0.53
Pit 4	28°09'56" E	12°50'50" S	1.0m	0.20	0.50
Pit 5	28°10'03" E	12°50'41" S	1.0m	0.41	0.75
Pit 6	28°10'05" E	12°50'37" S	1.0m	0.20	0.84
Pit7	28°09'57" E	12°50'34" S	1.0m	0.22	0.93

Table 1: Assay results from the Kitwe Cobalt-Copper Tailings Project

The Company's lawyers are now preparing the Share Sale Agreement under which it will complete the acquisition of the 70% interest in the Project. Under the terms of the Share Sale Agreement, the Company has a 6 month option to secure its interest in the Project by spending US\$500,000 within 6 months from the date of exercising the option.

If Cape Lambert does not exercise the option, or fails to spend the US\$500,000 within the 6 months option period, then the 70% shareholding will be returned to AMCZL. Once the Company has exercised the option and met its minimum expenditure requirements, it will further pay AMCZL the following cash payments:

- a) US\$50,000 upon AMCZL receiving environmental approvals in the respect of the Project;
- b) US\$50,000 upon AMCZL being granted a mining licence in respect of the Project; and
- c) US\$50,000 upon AMCZL receiving an export licence.

Yours faithfully  
Cape Lambert Resources Limited

Tony Sage  
**Executive Chairman**

### **Competent Persons Statement**

The information in this report that relates to Exploration Results is based on information compiled by Mr Olaf Frederickson. Mr Frederickson is a Member of The Australasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy (AusIMM) and has sufficient experience relevant to the style of mineralisation and type of deposit under consideration and to the activity which they are 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 (the "JORC Code"). Mr Frederickson is a consultant to Cape Lambert Resources. Mr Frederickson consents to the inclusion in the report of the Exploration Results in the form and context in which they appear.

## JORC Code, 2012 Edition – Table 1 Kitwe Tailings

### Section 1 Sampling Techniques and Data

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

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<b>Sampling techniques</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>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.</i></li> <li><i>Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample representivity and the appropriate calibration of any measurement tools or systems used.</i></li> <li><i>Aspects of the determination of mineralisation that are Material to the Public Report.</i></li> <li><i>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.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small pit was manually dug to 1m depth</li> <li>Manual channel samples were taken vertically through the excavated pit wall.</li> <li>Samples were collected in zip lock plastics and placed into calico bags.</li> <li>Samples were despatched to an SGS laboratory and assayed.</li> </ul>
<b>Drilling techniques</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>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).</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No drilling conducted.</li> </ul>
<b>Drill sample recovery</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Method of recording and assessing core and chip sample recoveries and results assessed.</i></li> <li><i>Measures taken to maximise sample recovery and ensure representative nature of the samples.</i></li> <li><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></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No drilling conducted.</li> </ul>
<b>Logging</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><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</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Samples were not logged.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<p>studies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	
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>• All samples were partially wet but were competent to the touch. The material was in the form of stratigraphically layered non saturated tailings of fairly uniform consistency.</li> <li>• The samples have been sorted &amp; dried. The whole sample has been pulverised in a vibrating disc pulveriser.</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>• Samples were submitted to the SGS Kalulushi lab in Zambia and analysed using the following method <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 or 4 acid digest and refluxed with a mixture of Acids including HydrofluoricNitric Hydrochloric and Perchloric Acids. This extended digest approaches a Total digest for many elements however some refractory minerals are not completely attacked.</li> <li>• Co, Cu determined by Atomic Absorbtion Spectrometry (AAS) after acid digest.</li> <li>•</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Verification of sampling and assaying	<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>• Lab standards and repeat samples were carried out as part of the assay procedure.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<i>Location of data points</i>	<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>• Samples were located with handheld GPS.</li> </ul>
<i>Data spacing and distribution</i>	<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>• Samples were taken at random with the intent to generally cover the tailings dam.</li> <li>• The data is not suitable for resource estimation.</li> <li>• Samples were composited as described prior.</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>• No particular geological structure is evident in the tailings</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>• Sample chain of custody was maintained by the geologist throughout delivery to their place of storage.</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>• No audits or reviews have been done.</li> </ul>

## Section 2 Reporting of Exploration Results

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

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<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>• Work was conducted on 21853-HQ-SEL in the Kitwe Cobalt Copper Tailings Project near Kitwe in northern Zambia..</li> <li>• The licence is reportedly held by Australian Mining Company Zambia Limited and is now the subject of an option agreement with Cape Lambert Resources Details of tenure are to be confirmed as part of the due diligence.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<i>Exploration done by other parties</i>	<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>No known exploration has been conducted on the tailings.</li> <li>Historical plant records are being sought.</li> </ul>
<i>Geology</i>	<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>Post processing tailings.</li> </ul>
<i>Drill hole Information</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>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:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>easting and northing of the drill hole collar</i></li> <li><i>elevation or RL (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in metres) of the drill hole collar</i></li> <li><i>dip and azimuth of the hole</i></li> <li><i>down hole length and interception depth</i></li> <li><i>hole length.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li><i>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.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See attached table for sample information.</li> </ul>
<i>Data aggregation methods</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>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.</i></li> <li><i>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.</i></li> <li><i>The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values should be clearly stated.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No data aggregation was done. Assays represent individual samples taken.</li> </ul>
<i>Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>These relationships are particularly important in the reporting of Exploration Results.</i></li> <li><i>If the geometry of the mineralisation with respect to the drill hole angle is known, its nature should be reported.</i></li> <li><i>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’).</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Samples were taken vertically down the walls of pit excavations.</li> <li>The base of the tailings was not intersected at any time.</li> </ul>

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<i>Diagrams</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <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></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See attached location plan.</li> </ul>
<i>Balanced reporting</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <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></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All results have been reported</li> </ul>
<i>Other substantive exploration data</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <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></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<i>Further work</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The nature and scale of planned further work (eg tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling).</i></li> <li>• <i>Diagrams clearly highlighting the areas of possible extensions, including the main geological interpretations and future drilling areas, provided this information is not commercially sensitive.</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The tailings are to be drilled on a regular grid to ascertain representative grades and accurate depths of tails.</li> </ul>