JORC Code, 2012 Edition - Table 1

Section 1 Sampling Techniques and Data

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

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Sampling techniques	• *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.* • *Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample representivity and the appropriate calibration of any measurement tools or systems used.* • *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 1m samples from which 3kg was pulverised to produce a 30g charge for fire assay'). In other cases, more explanation may be required.*	• This announcement reports the results of plate modelling and interpretation of publicly available airborne electromagnetic (AEM) data. No physical sampling, drilling, geochemical sampling or assaying was undertaken or is reported by New Frontier Minerals Limited (NFM). • AEM is an active-source, time-domain electromagnetic method flown from an aircraft. A transmitted primary field induces eddy currents in conductive ground, and the decaying secondary field is measured across a series of time gates (channels) to infer the conductivity structure of the subsurface with depth. • The dataset used is Geoscience Australia's AusAEM regional airborne electromagnetic survey, acquired and published under the Exploration for the Future programme. • Southern Geoscience Consultants (SGC) extracted from the Geoscience Australia database the section of AusAEM Line 1170001 coincident with the Harts Range tenure, together with a 5km buffer around the tenement boundary. • The extracted profile was reviewed for conductive anomalies. A broad, weak to moderate anomaly identified in the mid-time channels (channels 8 to 15, 0.72 to 16.2 milliseconds) was selected for plate modelling. • No reprocessing, levelling or recalibration of the Geoscience Australia data was undertaken by SGC or NFM; the data were used as published.
Drilling techniques	• *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).*	• Not applicable. No drilling has been undertaken. The announcement reports the modelling and interpretation of pre-existing, publicly available geophysical data.
Drill sample recovery	• *Method of recording and assessing core and chip sample recoveries and results assessed.* • *Measures taken to maximise sample recovery and ensure representative nature of the samples.* • *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.*	• Not applicable. No drilling or physical sample recovery was undertaken.
Logging	• *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.* • *Whether logging is qualitative or quantitative in nature. Core (or costean, channel, etc) photography.* • *The total length and percentage of the relevant intersections logged.*	• Not applicable. No core or chip logging was undertaken. • The modelled AEM response was interpreted against publicly available 1:250,000 scale mapped geology and aerial photography. Mapped units in the vicinity of the modelled plate comprise Proterozoic Arunta Block dolerite, gabbro, meta-ultramafic rocks, basic igneous rocks, porphyritic granite and undivided metasediments.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation	• *If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all core taken.* • *If non-core, whether riffled, tube sampled, rotary split, etc and whether sampled wet or dry.* • *For all sample types, the nature, quality and appropriateness of the sample preparation technique.* • *Quality control procedures adopted for all sub-sampling stages to maximise representivity of samples.* • *Whether sample sizes are appropriate to the grain size of the material being sampled.*	• Not applicable. No physical samples were collected, sub-sampled or prepared.
Quality of assay data and laboratory tests	• *The nature, quality and appropriateness of the assaying and laboratory procedures used and whether the technique is considered partial or total.* • *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.* • *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.*	• No assaying was undertaken. The quality control relevant to this work relates to the acquisition and processing of the AusAEM data by Geoscience Australia, and to the plate modelling completed by SGC. • The AusAEM data were acquired, processed, quality controlled and published by Geoscience Australia. System configuration, geometry, calibration and processing are documented in the public Geoscience Australia release for the survey. NFM has relied on those published specifications and has not independently verified them. • Modelling was completed by SGC using a single, flat-lying thin-plate model to represent the source of the observed anomaly, fitted to the measured decay across channels 9 to 15 (1.12 to 16.2 milliseconds). • Plate modelling is a fitting process, not a measurement. The solution is non-unique: alternative combinations of depth, geometry, dip, size and conductance can produce a comparable fit to the observed data. • Electrical conductivity is a physical property and not an assay. It provides no information as to metal grade or tenor.
Verification of sampling and assaying	• *The verification of significant intersections by either independent or alternative company personnel.* • *The use of twinned holes.* • *Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols.* • *Discuss any adjustment to assay data.*	• The input AEM data are publicly available Geoscience Australia data released under the pre-competitive AusAEM programme. • The modelling and interpretation were completed independently by SGC, an independent geophysical consultancy, and reported to NFM (SGC4781 - Harts Range AusAEM Assessment, 2026). • The modelled conductor has not been verified by ground electromagnetic survey, drilling or any other form of direct ground testing. Twinned holes and alternative-operator verification are not applicable as no drilling is involved. • No adjustment has been made to the published Geoscience Australia data.
Location of data points	• *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.* • *Specification of the grid system used.* • *Quality and adequacy of topographic control.*	• AEM data were acquired along AusAEM Line 1170001. Positioning is by airborne GPS as published by Geoscience Australia; NFM has relied on the published positioning and has not independently verified it. • The modelled plate is centred at 509,813mE, 7,439,737mN at a modelled RL of 459m. • Coordinates are reported in MGA Zone 53, GDA94.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		• Topographic control is derived from the digital elevation data accompanying the AusAEM release.
Data spacing and distribution	• *Data spacing for reporting of Exploration Results.* • *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.* • *Whether sample compositing has been applied.*	• AusAEM is a regional reconnaissance survey flown at wide line spacing. Line spacing is large relative to mineral deposit scale. • The conductor reported here is defined by a single AEM flight line. There is no adjacent line coverage over the anomaly, and the extent, geometry and continuity of the source in the across-line direction are therefore unconstrained. • The data spacing is not sufficient to establish geological or grade continuity, is not sufficient to define a drill target, and is not sufficient for the estimation of a Mineral Resource. Closer-spaced ground geophysics would be required. • No sample compositing has been applied.
Orientation of data in relation to geological structure	• *Whether the orientation of sampling achieves unbiased sampling of possible structures and the extent to which this is known, considering the deposit type.* • *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.*	• AEM measures the ground response beneath and adjacent to the flight line and does not carry the orientation-bias considerations of oriented drilling. • The modelled plate is near-horizontal (modelled dip 0.2 degrees, azimuth 167 degrees). The modelled strike length of 679m and down-dip extent of 1,346m are model-derived parameters rather than measured dimensions and are poorly constrained from a single traverse. • Flat-lying conductive responses can also arise from conductive cover, palaeochannel sediments or clay-rich weathering profiles. The modelled depth to top of approximately 240m below surface is the basis on which SGC interpret a bedrock source.
Sample security	• *The measures taken to ensure sample security.*	• Not applicable in the physical sense. The input data are publicly available Geoscience Australia archives. Modelled outputs, model files and figures are retained by SGC and NFM.
Audits or reviews	• *The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.*	• The AusAEM dataset is acquired, quality controlled and published by Geoscience Australia. • The modelling and interpretation reported here were completed independently by SGC. No external audit or review of the plate model has been commissioned by NFM. • The conductor is a geophysical model derived from a single line of regional airborne electromagnetic data, and it is untested. Electrical conductivity is non-unique: sulphides, graphite, saline groundwater and clay-rich or carbonaceous lithologies can all produce a response of this style. The modelled plate is not a Mineral Resource and is not an Exploration Target; the parameters reported are model outputs that require confirmation by ground-based geophysics, and it is uncertain whether further exploration will result in the estimation of a Mineral Resource.

Section 2 Reporting of Exploration Results

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

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Mineral tenement and land tenure status	• *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.* • *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.*	• The modelled conductor lies within EL 34147, held 100% by New Frontier Minerals Limited, which forms part of the Company's Harts Range Heavy Rare Earths, Niobium and Tungsten Project in the Northern Territory, located approximately [TO CONFIRM]km northeast of Alice Springs. • EL 34147 is [TO CONFIRM: granted / under application] and is in good standing. [TO CONFIRM: grant date and expiry date.] • The tenement is subject to the Northern Territory Mineral Titles Act 2010. Native title, sacred site and Aboriginal Areas Protection Authority clearance requirements apply to on-ground activity, and heritage and access agreements will be required ahead of any ground disturbing work. • The Company is not aware of any impediment to obtaining a licence to operate in the area.
Exploration done by other parties	• *Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.*	• The AusAEM airborne electromagnetic data were acquired and published by Geoscience Australia under the Exploration for the Future programme. The data are pre-competitive and publicly available; NFM incurred no data acquisition cost. • The plate modelling and interpretation reported in this announcement were completed by SGC on behalf of NFM. • NFM is not aware of any previous ground electromagnetic survey or drilling over the modelled conductor. • Regional geological context referred to in this announcement, including the C2 conductor and the Blackadder, Baldrick and Basil prospects, was reported by Litchfield Minerals Limited (ASX: LMS) on 18 June 2026 and originally by Mithril Resources Limited (ASX releases 7 October 2009 and 21 March 2012). • That third party information relates to tenure in which NFM holds no interest, is historical in nature, has not been verified by NFM to JORC Code (2012 Edition) standards, and should not be relied upon for the purposes of Mineral Resource estimation or economic evaluation. It is provided for regional geological context only and is not necessarily indicative of the mineralisation, or of the exploration potential, of tenure held by NFM.
Geology	• *Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.*	• The Harts Range Project lies within the eastern Arunta Region of central Australia, in and adjacent to the Irindina Province, a high-grade metamorphic terrane with a history of rifting, mafic-ultramafic magmatism, basin inversion and reactivation during the Alice Springs Orogeny.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		• Mapped geology (1:250,000) in the vicinity of the modelled plate comprises Proterozoic Arunta Block units including dolerite, gabbro, meta-ultramafic rocks, basic igneous rocks, porphyritic granite and undivided metasediments. • The deposit styles under consideration are orthomagmatic nickel-copper-PGE sulphide mineralisation associated with mafic and ultramafic intrusions, and structurally controlled hydrothermal copper and copper-cobalt mineralisation. • No mineralisation has been identified at the modelled conductor. The feature reported is a geophysical model only, and no drilling, ground geophysics or surface geochemistry has been completed over it.
Drill hole Information	• *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: easting and northing of the drill hole collar; elevation or RL of the drill hole collar; dip and azimuth of the hole; down hole length and interception depth; hole length.* • *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.*	• Not applicable. No drilling has been undertaken and no drill hole results are reported.
Data aggregation methods	• *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.* • *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.* • *The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values should be clearly stated.*	• Not applicable. No assay intervals, grades or metal equivalent values are reported. • The parameters reported (position, RL, dip, azimuth, strike length, depth extent and conductance) are direct outputs of the plate model and are not aggregated, weighted, truncated or cut in the manner of assay data.
Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths	• *These relationships are particularly important in the reporting of Exploration Results.* • *If the geometry of the mineralisation with respect to the drill hole angle is known, its nature should be reported.* • *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').*	• Not applicable. No mineralised intersections are reported. The dimensions quoted for the modelled plate are model-derived parameters describing a geophysical feature, not mineralisation.
Diagrams	• *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.*	• Figure 1 shows the regional geological setting and NFM tenure. Figure 2 shows the location of the modelled plate relative to NFM Harts Range tenure and AusAEM Line 1170001. • Plan and section views of the plate model, the extracted AEM profile, and the modelled versus observed decay curves are contained in the SGC report (SGC4781, 2026).

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Balanced reporting	• *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.*	• The feature reported is a modelled geophysical conductor, not mineralisation. No Mineral Resource, no Exploration Target and no mineralised intercept is reported or implied. • The full set of modelled plate parameters is reported in this Table 1. No parameters have been omitted. • SGC describe the source anomaly as broad and weak to moderate in the mid-time channels, and the model required to fit it has a relatively low conductance of 5.6 siemens. That conductance is well below the range typically associated with well-connected massive sulphide accumulations and does not, of itself, indicate the presence of sulphide mineralisation. • Electrical conductivity is non-unique. Responses of this style can be produced by metallic sulphides, graphite, saline groundwater, clay-rich weathering profiles, or carbonaceous or otherwise conductive sedimentary units. • The modelled conductor is defined by a single AEM flight line and is untested by ground electromagnetic survey or drilling. It requires follow-up work before it can be regarded as a drill target. • Statements attributed to SGC concerning the prospectivity of the Harts Range belt are regional in nature and do not constitute a conclusion that the modelled conductor is caused by mineralisation. • It is uncertain whether further exploration will result in the determination of a Mineral Resource.
Other substantive exploration data	• *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.*	• Modelled plate parameters (SGC, 2026), plate 1170001_p1: Easting 509,813m; Northing 7,439,737m (MGA Zone 53, GDA94); RL 459m; dip 0.2 degrees; azimuth 167 degrees; rotation 0 degrees; strike length 679m; depth extent 1,346m; conductance 5.6 siemens. • The interpreted depth to top of the modelled plate is approximately 240m below surface. • The anomaly is expressed in mid-time channels 8 to 15 (0.72 to 16.2 milliseconds). Significant variation in the early time channels is interpreted to reflect variable near-surface conductivity along the line. • No ground electromagnetic, gravity or induced polarisation data have been acquired over the modelled conductor, and no rock chip or soil geochemistry has been collected over its projected surface position. • The Kings Cross magnetic anomaly, a separate target for which drilling approval has been received (ASX announcement 10 November 2025), lies approximately 3.5km to the north of the modelled conductor. Kings Cross is a magnetic feature and is not related to the AEM response reported here.
Further work	• *The nature and scale of planned further work (eg tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling).* • *Diagrams clearly highlighting the areas of possible extensions, including the main geological interpretations and future drilling areas, provided this information is not commercially sensitive.*	• Review of NFM's existing magnetic, radiometric and geological datasets across southern EL 34147 for coincident structure, lithology and magnetic response. • Reconnaissance mapping and rock chip sampling along the projected surface position of the modelled conductor.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		• Ground electromagnetic surveying (moving loop or fixed loop TEM) to confirm the presence, position, geometry and conductance of the source, and to discriminate between a bedrock and a near-surface source, ahead of any drill testing. • Heritage, access and approvals planning ahead of any ground disturbing work. • Potential integration with the planned Kings Cross drilling programme, with a view to a single combined mobilisation. • Any drill testing of the modelled conductor would be subject to the results of the follow-up ground geophysics and to heritage, access and approvals being in place. No drill testing of the conductor is currently scheduled. • Results will be reported as they become available.