Jervois Mining increases contained Idaho Measured cobalt resource by 22%

22.01.2020 | Newsfile

HIGHLIGHTS

- Updated Idaho Cobalt Operations ("ICO") Mineral Resource Estimate ("MRE"), to improve geological certainty ahead of project financing and mine development, has increased the contained Measured cobalt resource by 22%. Total tonnage of Measured and Indicated resources (available for conversion under JORC into Reserves) also rose by 22%.
- Jervois bankable feasible study ("BFS") team has revisited and substantially modified stope design and mine plan execution versus the approach taken by prior ICO owners. This will increase mined cobalt grade and reduce dilution versus published historical studies.
- Updated ICO MRE audited by CSA Global (an ERM Group Company) ahead of appointment of lender Independent Engineer associated with project financing.
- BFS mine design is underway with an updated ICO Reserve estimate to be released in conjunction with BFS.
- ICO BFS remains on track for completion by the end of March 2020, with first concentrate production scheduled in Q4 2021.

Melbourne, January 21, 2020 - Jervois Mining Ltd. (ASX: JRV) (TSXV: JRV) (OTCQB: JRVMF) (FSE: IHS) ("Jervois" or the "Company") is pleased to announce updated Mineral Resource Estimate ("MRE") modelling at its Idaho Cobalt Operations ("ICO") in the United States.

Jervois updated the ICO MRE after completing 3,125m (19 holes) of diamond drilling to support its bankable feasibility study ("BFS"). The updated model uses modified methodology to improve estimation using industry standard applications for narrow orebodies, with Jervois also adopting a more appropriate approach to stope and mine plan design. This has involved block rotation and adoption of a smaller cell size than previously used, as the previous MRE released by eCobalt Solutions on 7 February 2018 was unrotated and used cell sizes not conducive to the narrow high-grade interzone intercepts found in the Main Ram zone.

The updated MRE is outlined below at an adjusted updated cut-off of 0.15% Co. The broader mineralized envelope at ICO is significant; this represents potential upside to Jervois in the event that future cobalt prices are higher than prevail today. Battery demand for cobalt is expected to rise sharply, and ethical, non-DRC, low capital sources of supply outside of ICO are essentially non-existent. A grade-tonnage sensitivity table is also presented at 0.2% Co cut off to enable comparison with previously published models.

Table 1 below details the updated MRE for January 2020 at a 0.15% Co cut-off. Table 2 details the January 2020 updated grade-tonnage sensitivity table at a 0.2% Co cut-off. Table 3 details the previous February 2018 MRE also at a 0.2% Co cut-off.

Table 1: 2020 Updated MRE for ICO using 0.15% Co cut-off

Category	Resource (M Tons)	Resource (M tonnes)	Co (%)	Co (M lbs)	Cu (%)	Cu (M lbs)	Au (oz/Ton)	Au (g/tonne)	Au (oz)
Measured[(1)]	2.92	2.65	0.45	26.2	0.59	34.4	0.013	0.45	38,000
Indicated[(1)]	2.85	2.59	0.42	23.8	0.80	45.7	0.018	0.62	51,000
M+I	5.77	5.24	0.44	50.1	0.69	80.1	0.015	0.53	89,000
Inferred[(2)]	1.73	1.57	0.35	12.0	0.44	15.2	0.013	0.45	23,000

1. Mineral Resources are not Mineral Reserves and by definition do not have demonstrated economic viability. The Mineral Resources in this news release were estimated using the Canadian Institute of Mining, Metallurgy and Petroleum (CIM), CIM Standards on Mineral Resources and Reserves, Definitions and Guidelines prepared by the CIM Standing Committee on Reserve Definitions and adopted by CIM Council (2014).
2. This MRE includes Inferred Mineral Resources that are normally considered too speculative geologically to have economic considerations applied to them and must not be converted to a Mineral Reserve. It is reasonably expected that the majority of the Inferred Mineral Resources could be upgraded to Indicated Mineral Resources with continued exploration.
3. The Cobalt cut-off grade for inclusion in the resource is 0.15%, no consideration of copper or gold content was used in determination of cut-off grade.
4. Contained metal values and totals may differ due to rounding of figures.
5. The MRE was prepared by Scott Zelligan, P.Geo., who is an independent resource geologist.
6. The effective date of the MRE is January 20, 2020.
7. The MRE was based on the results of 111 drill holes completed at the Ram Property.
8. The model was domained using newly modelled constraining wireframes. These were prepared based on a new compilation of all available data and a thorough review of the geological interpretation, including new structural modelling. This included 9 "zone" wireframes as well as multiple offsetting "fault surface" wireframes.
9. The block model used to estimate the MRE has a block size of 12 ft x 12 ft x 4 ft and was rotated -14° around the Z-axis and -58° around the Y axis. These parameters were chosen in order to better represent the deposit with regards to potential mining methods.
10. Drill hole data was composited to 2 ft lengths based on the statistical review of sample lengths.
11. In the main zone Co grades were capped at 4% and Cu grades were capped at 4%. In surrounding zones, Co grades were capped at 0.7% and Cu grades were capped at 2%.
12. Inverse-distance-squared was chosen as the estimation method after a thorough statistical and iterative review of different methods, as it reproduced the grade distribution of the input data best.
13. Maximum search distances in the main zone were 320 ft, and 240 ft in the surrounding zones. Three search passes were used in order to best honour the grade distribution of input data.
14. Resource categorization has been made in consideration of drill spacing, statistical continuity, deposit type, and consideration of the CIM definition standards.

To facilitate benchmarking versus prior MRE's, a comparison between the 2020 and 2018 MRE at the prior 2018 cut-off of 0.2% Co is outlined below in Tables 2 and 3:

Table 2: January 2020 Updated Grade -Tonnage Sensitivity Table for ICO using 0.20% Co cut-off

Category	Resource (M short Tons)	Co (%)	Co (M lbs)	Cu (%)	Cu (M lbs)	Au (oz/Ton)	Au (oz)
Measured[(1)]	2.34	0.52	24.2	0.63	29.5	0.015	35,000
Indicated[(1)]	2.36	0.47	22.1	0.86	40.7	0.020	47,000
M+I	4.70	0.49	46.3	0.74	70.2	0.017	82,000
Inferred[(2)]	1.22	0.42	10.3	0.50	12.2	0.016	20,000

Table 3: February 2018 MRE for ICO using 0.20% Co cut-off

Category	Resource (M short Tons)	Co (%)	Co (M lbs)	Cu (%)	Cu (M lbs)	Au (oz/Ton)	Au (oz)
Measured[(1)]	1.50	0.66	19.9	0.78	23.6	0.017	26,000
Indicated[(1)]	2.37	0.54	25.8	0.89	42.2	0.018	42,000
M+I	3.87	0.59	45.7	0.85	65.8	0.017	68,000
Inferred[(2)]	1.82	0.46	16.7	0.81	29.4	0.015	27,000

1. Mineral Resources are not Mineral Reserves and by definition do not have demonstrated economic viability. The Mineral Resources in this news release were estimated using the Canadian Institute of Mining, Metallurgy and Petroleum (CIM) Standards on Mineral Resources and Reserves, Definitions and Guidelines prepared by the CIM Standing Committee on Reserve Definitions and adopted by CIM Council (2014).
2. This MRE includes Inferred Mineral Resources that are normally considered too speculative geologically to have economic considerations applied to them and must not be converted to a Mineral Reserve. It is reasonably expected that the majority of the Inferred Mineral Resources could be upgraded to Indicated Mineral Resources with continued exploration.
3. The Cobalt cut-off grade for inclusion in the resource is 0.20%, no consideration of copper or gold content was used in determination of cut-off grade.

4. Contained metal values and totals may differ due to rounding of figures
5. The Mineral Resources reported by eCobalt set out in Table 3 has been prepared in accordance with the NI 43-101 standards of disclosure for Mineral Projects published by the Canadian Security Administrators and estimated using the CIM Standards on Mineral Resources and Reserves, Definitions and Guidelines. NI 43-101 is different from the reporting standard ordinarily applicable to Australian publicly listed companies, the JORC Code. Please refer to the ASX announcement dated 21 June 2019 "Notice of General Meeting/Proxy form", section 8.2.

Discussion of Results

The updated 2020 MRE increases the resource tonnage available for Reserve conversion (Measured and Indicated classifications), by over 20%. It has also increased the Measured contained cobalt resource by 22% over the previous 2018 model at the same cut-off grade. This has been achieved via additional drilling undertaken in 2019 and the modified block modelling methodology. By rotating the model cells to orientate with the main Ram zone and changing to an inverse distance estimation method, the model now more accurately reflects the nature of the narrow high-grade within the mineralized zones, minimizing grade smearing both into and out of the zones. By minimizing grade smearing, it will now be easier to capture high grades into the mine design stopes. Thus, despite the lower headline MRE grades (at higher tonnages), mined cobalt grades are expected to be higher than in studies published by prior ICO owners.

Figure 1 below shows the distribution of grade ranges in long section of the Main Ram zone at the ICO.

Figure 2 below shows the distribution of Resource classifications, Measured, Indicated and Inferred in long section of the Main Ram zone and hanging-wall zones at the ICO.

Figure 1: Long Section of 2020 ICO MRE - Grade Ranges

To view an enhanced version of Figure 1, please visit:
https://orders.newsfilecorp.com/files/5508/51707_2d6c2674644b288c_001full.jpg

Figure 2: Long Section of 2020 ICO MRE - Resource Classifications

To view an enhanced version of Figure 2, please visit:
https://orders.newsfilecorp.com/files/5508/51707_2d6c2674644b288c_002full.jpg

Figure 3: Plan View of 2020 Resource Model showing distribution of Grade Ranges

To view an enhanced version of Figure 3, please visit:
https://orders.newsfilecorp.com/files/5508/51707_2d6c2674644b288c_003full.jpg

Figure 4: Cross Section of 2020 Resource Model showing distribution of Grade Ranges

To view an enhanced version of Figure 4, please visit:
https://orders.newsfilecorp.com/files/5508/51707_2d6c2674644b288c_004full.jpg

Figure 3 shows the distribution of grade ranges in plan view of all mineralized zones at the ICO. Figure 4 shows the distribution of grade ranges in cross section. Of note is the higher grades (>0.6% Co) within the Main Ram zone which is flanked by lower grade ranges, displaying a reduction in grade smearing across the orebody. This level of "in zone" grade definition will allow more accurate stope design and grade recovery in the mining process. As the deposit is developed, closer spaced underground drilling will add further definition to the grade ranges and further improve Resource classification.

Jervois' confidence in the economic potential of the ICO resource continues to grow as more information is generated for the updated BFS. Mine design and scheduling are progressing, as is plant design. An updated Reserve is expected to be released with completion of the BFS by the end of March 2020.

CSA Global (an ERM Group Company) were appointed to audit the updated ICO MRE ahead of this publication and release of the geological model to lenders as part of the project financing process currently underway.

Jervois continues to believe there is significant potential to operate at higher production rates than currently formalised under existing feasibility studies in an environmentally responsible manner, with the rotation of block cells part of this. This will require no modification to the existing ICO operating permits which currently cap ore production at 1,200 short tons per day. Similar to the audit role of CSA Global on the MRE, the Wood Group (who are also undertaking the ICO refinery scoping study) were appointed in Q4 2019 to undertake an audit of ICO environmental compliance and operating permits ahead of the appointment of lender Independent Engineers.

2020 drill programme planning will be undertaken in Q1 to further prove up and expand the MRE once the summer drilling season commences. Wood's scoping study on a domestic cobalt refinery within the United States continues, with the production design scope rising to reflect the positive impact of a mining operation delivering higher volumes of cobalt concentrate.

Quality Assurance

Core samples are sent to ALS Elko Nevada, an independent and fully accredited laboratory in the USA for analysis for gold & multi-element Induction Coupled Plasma Spectroscopy. Core samples from the main Ram zone were also sent to SGS Lakefield, Canada for analysis as per ALS Elko and for further metallurgical testing. Jervois also has a regimented Quality Assurance, Quality Control program where at least 10% duplicates, standards and blanks are inserted into each sample shipment.

On behalf of Jervois Mining Ltd.,
Bryce Crocker, CEO

For further information, please contact:

Investors and analysts:
Simon Clarke
EGM Corporate Affairs
sclarke@jervoismining.com
Cell: +1 604 551 9665

Media:
Nathan Ryan
NWR Communications
nathan.ryan@nwrcommunications.com.au
Mob: +61 420 582 887

Competent Person's Statement

The information in this release that relates to Mineral Resources is based on information compiled by Jervois's Geological consultants, Orix Geoscience, and analysed by Scott Zelligan, P.Geol who is an independent consultant to Jervois. The information has been reviewed by David Selfe who is full time employee of the company and a Fellow of the Australasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy. David Selfe has sufficient experience which is relevant to the style of mineralization 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'. David Selfe consents to the inclusion in the release of the matters based on their information in the form and context in which it appears.

Disclosure required for TSX-V Regulations

Qualified Person's Statement

The technical content of this news release has been compiled and approved by Scott Zelligan, P.Geol a Qualified Person as defined by National Instrument 43-101.

Neither TSX Venture Exchange nor its Regulation Services Provider (as that term is defined in policies of the TSX Venture Exchange) accepts responsibility for the adequacy or accuracy of this release.

This news release may contain certain "Forward-Looking Statements" within the meaning of the United States Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 and applicable Canadian securities laws. When used in this news release, the words "anticipate", "believe", "estimate", "expect", "target, "plan", "forecast", "may", "schedule" and other similar words or expressions identify forward-looking statements or information. These forward-looking statements or information may relate to the Mineral Resource Estimate, exploration work to be undertaken in Idaho, the reliability of third party information, and certain other factors or information. Such statements represent the Company's current views with respect to future events and are necessarily based upon a number of assumptions and estimates that, while considered reasonable by the Company, are inherently subject to significant business, economic, competitive, political and social risks, contingencies and uncertainties. Many factors, both known and unknown, could cause results, performance or achievements to be materially different from the results, performance or achievements that are or may be expressed or implied by such forward-looking statements. The Company does not intend, and does not assume any obligation, to update these forward-looking statements or information to reflect changes in assumptions or changes in circumstances or any other events affections such statements and information other than as required by applicable laws, rules and regulations.

JORC Code, 2012 Edition - Table 1 report

Section 1 Sampling Techniques and Data

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

Criteria	JORC Code explanation
Sampling techniques	● Nature and quality of sampling (eg cut channels, random chi measurement tools appropriate to the minerals under investi or handheld XRF instruments, etc). These examples should of sampling. ● Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample repre any measurement tools or systems used. ● Aspects of the determination of mineralization that are Mater ● In cases where 'industry standard' work has been done this v circulation drilling was used to obtain 1 m samples from whic charge for fire assay'). In other cases, more explanation may gold that has inherent sampling problems. Unusual commodi nodules) may warrant disclosure of detailed information.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation
Drilling techniques	● Drill type (eg core, reverse circulation, open-hole hammer, ro and details (eg core diameter, triple or standard tube, depth c type, whether core is oriented and if so, by what method, etc)
Drill sample recovery	● Method of recording and assessing core and chip sample rec ● Measures taken to maximise sample recovery and ensure re ● Whether a relationship exists between sample recovery and occurred due to preferential loss/gain of fine/coarse material.
Logging	● Whether core and chip samples have been geologically and support appropriate Mineral Resource estimation, mining stu ● Whether logging is qualitative or quantitative in nature. Core ● The total length and percentage of the relevant intersections
Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation	● If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all c ● If non-core, whether riffled, tube sampled, rotary split, etc and ● For all sample types, the nature, quality and appropriateness ● Quality control procedures adopted for all sub-sampling stag ● Measures taken to ensure that the sampling is representative for instance results for field duplicate/second-half sampling. ● Whether sample sizes are appropriate to the grain size of the
Quality of assay data and laboratory tests	● The nature, quality and appropriateness of the assaying and the technique is considered partial or total. ● For geophysical tools, spectrometers, handheld XRF instrum determining the analysis including instrument make and mod applied and their derivation, etc. ● Nature of quality control procedures adopted (eg standards, checks) and whether acceptable levels of accuracy (ie lack o established.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation
Verification of sampling and assaying	● The verification of significant intersections by either independ ● The use of twinned holes. ● Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data electronic) protocols. ● Discuss any adjustment to assay data.
Location of data points	● Accuracy and quality of surveys used to locate drill holes (co workings and other locations used in Mineral Resource estim ● Specification of the grid system used. ● Quality and adequacy of topographic control.
Data spacing and distribution	● Data spacing for reporting of Exploration Results. ● Whether the data spacing and distribution is sufficient to esta continuity appropriate for the Mineral Resource and Ore Res classifications applied. ● Whether sample compositing has been applied.
Orientation of data in relation to geological structure	● Whether the orientation of sampling achieves unbiased samp which this is known, considering the deposit type. ● If the relationship between the drilling orientation and the orie considered to have introduced a sampling bias, this should b
Sample security	● The measures taken to ensure sample security.
Audits or reviews	● The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques a
Section 2 Reporting of Exploration Results	
(Where relevant to reporting Mineral Resources)	

Criteria	JORC Code explanation
Mineral tenement and land tenure status	● Type, reference name/number, location and ow parties such as joint ventures, partnerships, ove wilderness or national park and environmental s ● The security of the tenure held at the time of rep licence to operate in the area.
Exploration done by other parties	● Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration b
Geology	● Deposit type, geological setting and style of min
Drill hole Information	● A summary of all information material to the und of the following information for all Material drill h ● easting and northing of the drill hole collar ● elevation or RL (Reduced Level - elevation ● dip and azimuth of the hole ● down hole length and interception depth ● hole length. ● If the exclusion of this information is justified on exclusion does not detract from the understandi explain why this is the case.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation
Data aggregation methods	● In reporting Exploration Results, weighting aver truncations (eg cutting of high grades) and cut-o ● Where aggregate intercepts incorporate short le grade results, the procedure used for such aggr such aggregations should be shown in detail. ● The assumptions used for any reporting of meta
Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths	● These relationships are particularly important in ● If the geometry of the mineralisation with respec reported. ● If it is not known and only the down hole lengths effect (eg 'down hole length, true width not know
Diagrams	● Appropriate maps and sections (with scales) an significant discovery being reported These shou collar locations and appropriate sectional views.
Balanced reporting	● Where comprehensive reporting of all Explorati both low and high grades and/or widths should Results.
Other substantive exploration data	● Other exploration data, if meaningful and materi geological observations; geophysical survey res method of treatment; metallurgical test results; characteristics; potential deleterious or contami
Further work	● The nature and scale of planned further work (e large-scale step-out drilling). ● Diagrams clearly highlighting the areas of possi interpretations and future drilling areas, provide

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
Database integrity	● Measures taken to ensure that data has not been corrupted by, for ex errors, between its initial collection and its use for Mineral Resource e ● Data validation procedures used.
Site visits	● Comment on any site visits undertaken by the Competent Person and ● If no site visits have been undertaken indicate why this is the case.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation
Geological interpretation	● Confidence in (or conversely, the uncertainty of) the geological interp ● Nature of the data used and of any assumptions made. ● The effect, if any, of alternative interpretations on Mineral Resource e ● The use of geology in guiding and controlling Mineral Resource estim ● The factors affecting continuity both of grade and geology.
Dimensions	● The extent and variability of the Mineral Resource expressed as lengt width, and depth below surface to the upper and lower limits of the Mi
Estimation and modelling techniques	● The nature and appropriateness of the estimation technique(s) applie treatment of extreme grade values, domaining, interpolation paramete extrapolation from data points. If a computer assisted estimation meth description of computer software and parameters used. ● The availability of check estimates, previous estimates and/or mine pr 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 ec acid mine drainage characterisation). ● In the case of block model interpolation, the block size in relation to th 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 th ● Discussion of basis for using or not using grade cutting or capping. ● The process of validation, the checking process used, the comparison and use of reconciliation data if available.
Moisture	● Whether the tonnages are estimated on a dry basis or with natural mo determination of the moisture content.
Cut-off parameters	● The basis of the adopted cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applie
Mining factors or assumptions	● Assumptions made regarding possible mining methods, minimum min applicable, external) mining dilution. It is always necessary as part of reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction to consider po assumptions made regarding mining methods and parameters when not always be rigorous. Where this is the case, this should be reporte of the mining assumptions made.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation
Metallurgical factors or assumptions	● The basis for assumptions or predictions regarding metallurgical ame part of the process of determining reasonable prospects for eventual potential metallurgical methods, but the assumptions regarding metal parameters made when reporting Mineral Resources may not always case, this should be reported with an explanation of the basis of the m
Environmental factors or assumptions	● Assumptions made regarding possible waste and process residue dis necessary as part of the process of determining reasonable prospects to consider the potential environmental impacts of the mining and pro stage the determination of potential environmental impacts, particular always be well advanced, the status of early consideration of these po should be reported. Where these aspects have not been considered t explanation of the environmental assumptions made.
Bulk density	● Whether assumed or determined. If assumed, the basis for the assum used, whether wet or dry, the frequency of the measurements, the na of the samples. ● The bulk density for bulk material must have been measured by meth void spaces (vugs, porosity, etc), moisture and differences between r deposit. ● Discuss assumptions for bulk density estimates used in the evaluation
Classification	● The basis for the classification of the Mineral Resources into varying ● Whether appropriate account has been taken of all relevant factors (ie tonnage/grade estimations, reliability of input data, confidence in cont quality, quantity and distribution of the data). ● Whether the result appropriately reflects the Competent Person's view
Audits or reviews	● The results of any audits or reviews of Mineral Resource estimates.
Discussion of relative accuracy/ confidence	● Where appropriate a statement of the relative accuracy and confidenc estimate using an approach or procedure deemed appropriate by the the application of statistical or geostatistical procedures to quantify th within stated confidence limits, or, if such an approach is not deemed discussion of the factors that could affect the relative accuracy and co ● The statement should specify whether it relates to global or local estim relevant tonnages, which should be relevant to technical and economi should include assumptions made and the procedures used. ● These statements of relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate production data, where available.

To view the source version of this press release, please visit https://www.newsfilecorp.com/release/51707