

31 MARCH 2026

ASX CODE: RWD**DIRECTORS**Colin McCavana
*Chairman*Michael Ruane
*Executive*Rod Della Vedova
*Non-Executive***MANAGEMENT**Lorry Hughes
*CEO*Bianca Taveira
*Company Secretary***HEAD OFFICE**Reward Minerals Ltd
159 Stirling Highway
Nedlands WA 6009PO Box 1104
Nedlands WA 6909ACN 009 173 602
ABN 50 009 173 602

T: 08 9386 4699

E: admin@rewardminerals.comW: www.rewardminerals.com

Expansion of Mountain Pond Gold Project

Consolidates highly prospective ground extending the high-grade Jackpot Prospect

Highlights

- *Reward has executed a binding Letter of Intent to acquire a new Mineral Licence adjoining its highly prospective Mountain Pond Gold Project in Newfoundland, Canada*
- *The acquisition consolidates ground on both sides of the highly prospective Sullivan Pond Fault for the first time in 15 years, enabling systematic and unified exploration across the structure*
- *Historic soil sampling defined strong multi-element (Au, Cu, Zn, As and Co) anomalies within a well-defined demagnetised zone along the Sullivan Pond Fault, with gold values up to 1.88 g/t and heavy mineral concentrate samples returning up to 114 g/t¹*
- *The newly acquired ground captures potential strike and dip extensions of the high-grade Jackpot Prospect, where historic rock-chip sampling returned assays of up to 23.77 g/t Au and 7.48% Cu from a 3-5 m wide outcropping quartz-sulphide vein²*
- *No historic drilling has been completed across the combined tenure, presenting an exceptional discovery opportunity*
- *Data compilation and planning is underway to confirm historic results and undertake maiden drill testing of priority targets during the 2026 field season*

Reward CEO Lorry Hughes commented:

“Securing this key licence, which contains potential strike and dip extensions to known mineralisation at the Jackpot Prospect, is an excellent outcome for Reward. It significantly increases the prospectivity of the Mountain Pond Project, as we now control both sides of the Sullivan Pond Fault where anomalous geochemical results and prospective geophysical data delineated promising targets.

2010 was the last time the combined ground was systematically explored, mineralisation was interpreted to be associated with a hydrothermal alteration zone within the Sullivan Pond Fault. I find it quite remarkable that this highly prospective ground has never been drill tested.

Since 2011, the ground has been held by multiple individual prospectors who undertook only limited surface exploration, presenting Reward with an exceptional opportunity to advance the project through drilling.

This acquisition strengthens our pipeline of high-quality drill targets for testing this year across the Mountain Pond and Copper Lance Projects in Newfoundland.

We look forward to preparing for, and executing, maiden drill testing at several promising targets during the upcoming field season.”

¹ Refer Table 2 and Appendix for details, ² Refer to RWD ASX announcement dated 18 March 2026.

PERTH, Western Australia (31 March, 2026) - Reward Minerals Limited (ASX: RWD) (“Reward” or the “Company”) is pleased to advise it has executed a binding Letter of Intent (LOI) for the acquisition of 100% of the Mineral Licence 040292M adjoining the Company’s Mountain Pond Gold Project in central northern Newfoundland, Canada. The property has been subject to significant historic surface sampling and ground geophysical surveys which have identified multiple anomalous areas for follow-up exploration.

The Mountain Pond Project is in central northern Newfoundland, approximately 530km by road northwest of the capital St John’s, approximately 112km by road from Reward’s Copper Lance Project and 7km northeast of the regional mining service town of Springdale. Acquisition of 040292M expands the project to now include 41 contiguous claims covering ~10km² of road accessible underexplored terrane prospective for precious and base metals (Figures 1 & 2).




Figure 1 – Map of Newfoundland Island showing the location of Reward’s Mountain Pond and Copper Lance projects, current and past gold producers, new significant gold developments, registered gold occurrences and main service towns.

The new tenure is contiguous with Reward’s existing Mountain Pond Project and encompasses highly prospective ground immediately along strike and to the west of the mineralised Sullivan Pond Fault and its associated magnetic trend (Figure 2).

Historic exploration across the combined tenure by Manitor Minerals Inc. in 2009–10 included expansion of the Mountain Pond grid, close-spaced soil sampling and ground-based geophysical surveys. This work delineated strong gold and base metal geochemical anomalies and provided good definition of the magnetic trend, including zones of pronounced demagnetisation that remain untested by drilling.




Figure 2 – Mountain Pond Project regional residual magnetic image showing the Mineral Claim area, the site access road from the town of Springdale and the location of the Jackpot Prospect in relation to the Sullivan Pond Fault and associated magnetic trend.

The Mountain Pond project area is located within the prolific Dunnage Zone Volcanics and is underlain by various Cambrian to Ordovician aged lithologies containing mafic marine volcanic rocks including massive and pillowed basalts, felsic tuffs, pillow breccias and basaltic tuffs. The rock units are host to numerous gold and base metal deposits and occurrences throughout the Springdale Peninsula and are generally confined to shear hosted chloritic schist units.

Historic Exploration

Historic exploration is detailed in Appendix 1 – JORC Code, 2012 Edition Table 1 and a summary is provided below with exploration data included in this release detailed in Figures 3 - 8.

In 1989 the area was staked by Inco Exploration Technical Services (Inco). Inco completed reconnaissance soil sampling across the Springdale Peninsula with follow-up detailed soil and till sampling surveys in anomalous areas. Soil and till sampling immediately west of the current Mountain Pond licences returned 1.88 g/t gold in a soil sample. Subsequent till sampling of the area returned 74 delicate gold grains and assayed 114 g/t gold¹. In 1990 Inco finalised detailed soil sampling and mapping of the Mountain Pond till anomaly. The sampling did not explain the strongly anomalous till sample collected in 1989. A VLF-EM and magnetics survey over the area of the anomalous till defined geological contacts. The approximate location of the till samples are included on the contoured soil geochemistry and magnetic maps compiled by Manitor Minerals Inc. (Manitor) in Figures 3 – 8, all displayed data is included in Table 1.

¹ Source Newfoundland and Labrador Government Geoscience Atlas report 002E_0715.

In 2010, the immediate area was staked by the prospecting team of Garry Fraser and Gord Hume as a result of the discovery of a new gold bearing quartz vein which returned values up to 16.78 g/t Au (The Jackpot Vein)¹. The Fraser/Hume claims were optioned to Manitor in 2010 and a second year assessment report by Fraser involved ground geophysical surveys including magnetics/VLF, ground IP, line cutting, soil sampling prospecting, trenching and rock geochemistry.




Figure 3 – Manitor Minerals Inc. contoured gold-in-soils map highlighting anomalous gold zones over the newly acquired Mineral Licence 040292M and Licence 023238M within the Mountain Pond Project².

¹ Refer to RWD ASX announcement dated 18 March 2026, ² Refer Newfoundland and Labrador Government historic exploration report database, Report NFLD3278 by Manitor Minerals Inc.




Figure 4 – Manitor Minerals Inc. contoured copper-in-soils map highlighting anomalous copper zones over the newly acquired Mineral Licence 040292M and Licence 023238M within the Mountain Pond Project ¹.

Note the copper-in-soils dispersion is evident over a much broader area than the gold-in-soil results (compare Figure 3 to 4) which is particularly evident at the Jackpot Prospect and in sub-parallel areas to the south east and along strike which indicate potential to define additional gold prospects.

¹ Refer Newfoundland and Labrador Government historic exploration report database, Report NFLD3278 by Manitor Minerals Inc.




Figure 5 – Manitor Minerals Inc. contoured arsenic-in-soils map highlighting anomalous arsenic zones over the newly acquired Mineral Licence 040292M and Licence 023238M within the Mountain Pond Project¹.

Note the arsenic-in-soils dispersion is evident over a much broader area than the gold-in-soil results (compare Figure 3 to 5) which is particularly evident at the Jackpot Prospect and in sub-parallel areas to the south east and along strike which indicate potential to define additional gold prospects.

¹ Refer Newfoundland and Labrador Government historic exploration report database, Report NFLD3278 by Manitor Minerals Inc.




Figure 6 – Manitor Minerals Inc. contoured zinc-in-soils map highlighting anomalous zinc zones over the newly acquired Mineral Licence 040292M and Licence 023238M within the Mountain Pond Project ¹.

Note the zinc-in-soils dispersion is evident over a much broader area than the gold-in-soil results (compare Figure 3 to 6) which is particularly evident at the Jackpot Prospect and in sub-parallel areas to the south east and along strike which could indicate potential to define further gold prospects.

¹ Refer Newfoundland and Labrador Government historic exploration report database, Report NFLD3278 by Manitor Minerals Inc.




Figure 7 – Manitor Minerals Inc. contoured cobalt-in-soils map highlighting anomalous cobalt zones over the newly acquired Mineral Licence 040292M and Licence 023238M within the Mountain Pond Project ¹.

¹ Refer Newfoundland and Labrador Government historic exploration report database, Report NFLD3278 by Manitor Minerals Inc.




Figure 8 – Manitor Minerals Inc. ground total magnetic intensity map. Note the pronounced magnetic low extending for ~500m of strike in a strike zone along the Sullivan Pond Fault. Given the anomalous multi-element geochemistry and the location of the Jackpot Prospect proximal to the magnetic low, it is a priority area for further geological investigation ¹.

Since the project area was explored by Manitor the area was split up into separate Mineral Licences and held by various prospecting syndicates where only limited exploration of a reconnaissance nature such as prospecting, soil sampling, limited ground geophysical surveying (VLF), and rock sampling occurred.

Reward has now consolidated the prospective area along the Sullivan Pond Fault for the first time in 15 years.

¹ Refer Newfoundland and Labrador Government historic exploration report database, Report NFLD3278 by Manitor Minerals Inc.

Reward is in the process of compiling all available historical geoscientific data across the project area, including soil and rock sampling results along strike and adjacent to the Jackpot Prospect and the prospective Sullivan Pond Fault magnetic trend. This work is expected to generate new targets for follow-up field confirmation and inclusion in a priority target list for drill testing.

Table 1 – Historic soil sampling results on Mineral Licences 040292M & 020238M within the Mountain Pond Project. (Coordinates are in local grid which can be transformed to CRS NAD27 Zone 21N, refer Appendix 1)

Year	Company	Report No	Report Name	Sample No (includes Easting and Northing)	Au (ppb)	Cu (ppm)	Zn (ppm)	As (ppm)	Co (ppm)	Comments
2011	Manitor Minerals Inc.	NFLD/3278	Second and Fifth Year Assessment Report.							
				L8900E 10100N	5	10	22	5	10	
				L8900E 10125N	5	17	11	5	4	
				L8900E 10150N	5	6	8	5	8	
				L8900E 10175N	5	30	28	5	18	
				L8900E 10200N	5	6	9	5	10	
				L8900E 10225N	5	33	29	5	14	
				L8900E 10250N	5	5	10	5	4	
				L8900E 10275N	5	40	31	5	24	
				L8900E 10300N	5	1	6	5	2	
				L8900E 10325N	5	15	48	5	24	
				L8900E 10350N	5	4	5	5	3	
				L8900E 10375N	5	13	15	5	6	
				L8900E 10400N	5	2	5	5	3	
				L8900E 10425N	5	13	15	5	7	
				L8900E 10450N	5	24	20	5	19	
				L8900E 10475N	5	2	5	5	3	
				L8900E 10500N	5	17	21	5	9	
				L9000E 10050N	5	9	6	5	4	
				L9000E 10075N	5	19	10	5	6	
				L9000E 10100N	5	25	29	5	24	
				L9000E 10125N	5	32	37	5	19	
				L9000E 10150N	5	10	31	5	19	
				L9000E 10175N	5	20	53	5	28	
				L9000E 10200N	129	4	6	5	4	High Au
				L9000E 10225N	5	10	6	5	5	
				L9000E 10250N	5	5	18	5	9	
				L9000E 10275N	5	7	12	5	8	
				L9000E 10300N	5	3	4	5	4	
				L9000E 10325N	5	12	15	5	4	
				L9000E 10350N	5	16	15	5	6	
				L9000E 10375N	5	3	5	5	3	
				L9000E 10400N	5	8	8	5	6	
				L9000E 10425N	5	9	11	5	5	
				L9000E 10450N	5	16	16	5	8	
				L9000E 10475N	5	1	5	5	3	
				L9000E 10500N	5	11	10	5	11	
				L9100E 10075N	5	17	38	5	18	
				L9100E 10100N	5	19	16	5	19	
				L9100E 10125N	5	38	33	5	28	
				L9100E 10150N	5	48	40	5	17	
				L9100E 10175N	5	6	9	5	8	
				L9100E 10200N	5	72	19	5	15	
				L9100E 10225N	5	4	4	5	3	
				L9100E 10275N	5	2	5	5	2	
				L9100E 10325N	5	1	3	5	3	
				L9100E 10350N	5	3	6	5	4	
				L9100E 10375N	5	30	17	5	7	
				L9100E 10400N	5	3	4	5	4	
				L9100E 10425N	5	4	6	5	3	
				L9100E 10450N	5	3	3	5	2	
				L9100E 10475N	5	6	6	5	11	
				L9100E 10500N	5	14	14	5	3	
				L9200E 9700N	5	16	32	5	14	
				L9200E 9725N	5	9	17	5	5	
				L9200E 9750N	5	9	19	5	8	
				L9200E 9775N	5	4	11	5	8	
				L9200E 9800N	5	5	15	5	12	
				L9200E 9825N	5	7	13	5	11	
				L9200E 9850N	5	10	23	5	16	
				L9200E 9875N	5	6	20	5	12	
				L9200E 9900N	5	9	10	8	12	

Year	Company	Report No	Report Name	Sample No (includes Easting and Northing)	Au (ppb)	Cu (ppm)	Zn (ppm)	As (ppm)	Co (ppm)	Comments
				L9200E 9925N	5	17	29	8	9	
				L9200E 9950N	5	15	25	5	15	
				L9200E 9975N	5	7	21	5	7	
				L9200E 10025N	5	8	10	5	7	
				L9200E 10050N	5	15	25	5	19	
				L9200E 10075N	5	115	45	5	57	Anom Cu
				L9200E 10100N	5	19	38	5	26	
				L9200E 10125N	5	8	7	5	12	
				L9200E 10150N	5	11	15	5	10	
				L9200E 10175N	5	15	23	5	19	
				L9200E 10200N	5	51	49	20	51	
				L9200E 10225N	5	9	10	5	12	
				L9200E 10250N	5	7	12	5	7	
				L9200E 10275N	5	3	11	5	5	
				L9200E 10300N	5	7	6	5	6	
				L9200E 10325N	5	4	8	5	4	
				L9200E 10350N	5	4	7	5	4	
				L9200E 10375N	5	16	19	5	9	
				L9200E 10400N	5	12	10	5	8	
				L9200E 10425N	5	12	15	5	10	
				L9200E 10450N	5	6	30	5	17	
				L9200E 10475N	5	15	9	5	8	
				L9200E 10500N	5	5	9	5	6	
				L9300E 9700N	5	35	34	20	13	
				L9300E 9725N	5	118	73	16	37	Anom Cu
				L9300E 9750N	5	10	27	13	17	
				L9300E 9775N	5	17	25	5	9	
				L9300E 9800N	5	16	17	5	9	
				L9300E 9825N	5	22	21	6	12	
				L9300E 9850N	5	37	27	14	20	
				L9300E 9875N	5	12	18	5	8	
				L9300E 9900N	5	89	63	82	46	
				L9300E 9925N	5	33	54	11	42	
				L9300E 9950N	5	12	20	10	12	
				L9300E 10000N	5	27	50	5	17	
				L9300E 10025N	5	14	42	5	22	
				L9300E 10050N	5	10	36	5	22	
				L9300E 10075N	5	156	110	16	41	Anom Cu
				L9300E 10100N	5	19	70	5	29	
				L9300E 10125N	5	15	32	5	18	
				L9300E 10150N	5	81	36	5	38	
				L9300E 10175N	5	17	27	5	20	
				L9300E 10200N	5	24	33	5	24	
				L9300E 10225N	5	4	7	5	3	
				L9300E 10250N	5	16	29	5	14	
				L9300E 10275N	5	21	48	19	>550	High Co
				L9300E 10300N	5	51	31	5	24	
				L9300E 10325N	5	25	23	5	14	
				L9300E 10350N	5	2	3	5	3	
				L9300E 10375N	5	22	18	5	12	
				L9300E 10400N	5	5	10	5	7	
				L9300E 10425N	5	15	22	5	19	
				L9300E 10450N	5	6	8	5	11	
				L9300E 10475N	5	3	7	5	7	
				L9300E 10500N	5	14	14	5	9	
				L9400E 9925N	5	17	27	5	4	
				L9400E 9950N	5	44	74	5	31	
				L9400E 9975N	5	17	85	38	35	
				L9400E 10000N	5	57	76	18	31	
				L9400E 10025N	5	16	49	5	25	
				L9400E 10050N	695	11	35	5	24	High Au
				L9400E 10075N	5	20	33	5	27	
				L9400E 10100N	5	10	33	5	14	
				L9400E 10125N	5	17	21	5	9	
				L9400E 10150N	5	23	19	5	19	
				L9400E 10175N	5	24	41	5	28	
				L9400E 10200N	5	25	21	5	9	
				L9400E 10225N	5	76	35	14	12	
				L9400E 10250N	5	6	20	5	9	
				L9400E 10275N	5	16	29	5	19	
				L9400E 10300N	5	33	30	5	32	
				L9400E 10325N	5	10	18	5	11	
				L9400E 10350N	5	8	14	5	11	
				L9400E 10375N	5	40	24	5	18	
				L9400E 10400N	5	18	22	5	17	
				L9400E 10425N	5	17	34	5	24	
				L9400E 10450N	5	46	24	5	35	
				L9400E 10475N	55	10	25	5	7	

Year	Company	Report No	Report Name	Sample No (includes Easting and Northing)	Au (ppb)	Cu (ppm)	Zn (ppm)	As (ppm)	Co (ppm)	Comments
				L9400E 10500N	5	49	26	28	133	
				L9500E 9900N	5	6	26	5	20	
				L9500E 9925N	11	88	46	25	26	
				L9500E 9950N	161	40	21	32	24	High Au
				L9500E 9975N	5	35	25	5	24	
				L9500E 10000N	5	27	26	5	20	
				L9500E 10050N	5	34	46	5	33	
				L9500E 10075N	5	21	13	5	8	
				L9500E 10100N	5	18	20	5	16	
				L9500E 10125N	5	18	20	8	16	
				L9500E 10150N	5	6	8	5	9	
				L9500E 10200N	1324	10	13	5	10	High Au
				L9500E 10225N	5	24	52	5	26	
				L9500E 10250N	108	24	21	8	12	High Au
				L9500E 10275N	5	8	11	5	4	
				L9500E 10300N	5	31	16	7	28	
				L9500E 10325N	5	13	23	5	12	
				L9500E 10350N	5	16	19	5	14	
				L9500E 10375N	5	22	16	5	7	
				L9500E 10400N	5	5	13	5	7	
				L9500E 10425N	5	18	11	5	9	
				L9500E 10450N	5	6	19	5	10	
				L9500E 10475N	5	4	6	5	2	
				L9600E 9900N	7	61	27	23	47	
				L9600E 9925N	5	12	31	5	22	
				L9600E 9950N	5	17	18	14	13	
				L9600E 9975N	5	38	60	5	24	
				L9600E 10000N	5	16	22	5	19	
				L9600E 10025N	5	13	20	5	22	
				L9600E 10050N	5	18	44	5	25	
				L9600E 10075N	5	10	24	5	13	
				L9600E 10100N	5	6	19	5	18	
				L9600E 10125N	5	19	20	5	11	
				L9600E 10150N	5	18	26	5	12	
				L9600E 10175N	5	12	29	5	15	
				L9600E 10200N	5	15	14	5	7	
				L9600E 10225N	5	13	18	5	11	
				L9600E 10275N	111	29	52	5	30	High Au
				L9600E 10300N	5	46	29	12	16	
				L9600E 10325N	5	22	26	5	17	
				L9600E 10350N	5	182	13	5	29	Anom. Cu
				L9600E 10375N	5	60	21	5	14	
				L9600E 10400N	5	20	16	5	10	
				L9600E 10425N	5	16	23	5	10	
				L9600E 10450N	5	17	19	5	13	
				L9700E 9900N	5	11	18	5	21	
				L9700E 9925N	5	19	38	5	27	
				L9700E 9950N	21	276	42	15	37	Anom. Cu, Au
				L9700E 9975N	5	42	14	8	33	
				L9700E 10000N	5	102	26	5	26	Anom. Cu
				L9700E 10025N	5	112	67	133	42	Anom. Cu
				L9700E 10050N	5	126	23	23	16	Anom. Cu
				L9700E 10075N	7	11	34	5	15	
				L9700E 10100N	5	12	39	5	22	
				L9700E 10125N	5	16	26	5	13	
				L9700E 10175N	5	29	49	5	23	
				L9700E 10225N	5	25	20	5	13	
				L9700E 10250N	5	136	57	5	26	Anom. Cu
				L9700E 10275N	5	28	40	5	26	
				L9700E 10300N	5	13	13	5	10	
				L9700E 10325N	5	60	33	16	22	
				L9700E 10350N	5	21	22	5	14	
				L9700E 10375N	5	26	15	9	14	
				L9700E 10400N	5	34	26	5	21	
				L9700E 10425N	5	5	7	5	6	
				L9700E 10450N	5	9	10	5	9	
				L9700E 10475N	5	17	18	5	10	
				L9800E 9850N	5	16	31	5	26	
				L9800E 9875N	5	15	26	5	20	
				L9800E 9900N	5	10	26	5	26	
				L9800E 9925N	5	16	36	5	30	
				L9800E 9950N	5	5	12	5	9	
				L9800E 9975N	8	24	27	5	25	
				L9800E 10000N	5	22	43	5	30	
				L9800E 10025N	5	9	33	5	16	
				L9800E 10050N	5	264	88	92	44	Anom. Cu
				L9800E 10075N	5	143	51	35	24	Anom. Cu
				L9800E 10100N	12	14	19	13	11	

Year	Company	Report No	Report Name	Sample No (includes Easting and Northing)	Au (ppb)	Cu (ppm)	Zn (ppm)	As (ppm)	Co (ppm)	Comments
				L9800E 10125N	5	18	26	5	16	
				L9800E 10150N	5	62	26	5	72	
				L9800E 10175N	5	50	23	11	17	
				L9800E 10200N	5	3	10	5	4	
				L9800E 10225N	5	12	64	5	24	
				L9800E 10250N	5	13	16	5	9	
				L9800E 10300N	5	16	35	21	16	
				L9800E 10325N	5	5	8	5	6	
				L9800E 10350N	5	7	21	5	7	
				L9800E 10375N	5	8	15	7	13	
				L9800E 10400N	5	20	29	62	19	
				L9800E 10425N	5	74	22	30	26	
				L9800E 10450N	5	18	20	5	11	
				L9800E 10477N	5	59	9	5	1	
				L9800E 10500N	5	18	7	5	4	
				L9900E 9850N	5	20	22	5	16	
				L9900E 9875N	5	15	24	5	16	
				L9900E 9900N	5	17	34	5	27	
				L9900E 9925N	5	14	34	5	27	
				L9900E 9950N	5	8	9	5	5	
				L9900E 9975N	5	19	30	5	24	
				L9900E 10000N	5	9	26	5	21	
				L9900E 10025N	5	11	41	5	21	
				L9900E 10050N	5	277	78	60	31	Anom. Cu
				L9900E 10075N	5	243	95	216	42	Anom. Cu
				L9900E 10100N	5	35	18	10	14	
				L9900E 10125N	5	29	34	5	21	
				L9900E 10150N	5	163	42	16	132	Anom. Cu, Co
				L9900E 10175N	5	9	8	5	6	
				L9900E 10200N	5	35	46	5	24	
				L9900E 10225N	5	19	9	5	6	
				L9900E 10250N	5	14	3	5	2	
				L9900E 10300N	5	180	6	10	9	Anom. Cu
				L9900E 10325N	5	17	21	5	12	
				L9900E 10350N	5	19	29	5	12	
				L9900E 10375N	5	57	39	19	16	
				L9900E 10400N	5	17	27	25	15	
				L9900E 10425N	5	78	36	31	42	
				L9900E 10450N	5	21	17	5	10	
				L9900E 10475N	5	18	10	5	5	
				L9900E 10500N	5	13	12	6	8	
				L9950E 9700N	5	16	18	5	10	
				L9950E 9725N	5	70	20	5	13	
				L9950E 9750N	5	7	8	5	6	
				L9950E 9775N	5	31	45	5	18	
				L9950E 9800N	5	18	12	5	8	
				L9950E 9825N	5	31	23	5	16	
				L9950E 9850N	5	132	19	56	64	
				L9950E 9875N	5	15	12	5	10	
				L9950E 9900N	5	24	28	5	17	
				L9950E 9925N	5	16	8	5	3	
				L9950E 9950N	5	25	35	5	24	
				L9950E 9975N	5	18	65	5	24	
				L9950E 10000N	5	11	18	5	9	
				L9950E 10025N	5	16	30	5	23	
				L9950E 10050N	5	111	25	16	44	Anom. Cu
				L9950E 10075N	5	39	31	54	25	
				L9950E 10100N	5	26	30	5	33	
				L9950E 10125N	5	12	15	5	14	
				L9950E 10150N	5	98	70	5	26	
				L9950E 10175N	5	163	20	21	48	Anom. Cu
				L9950E 10200N	5	48	11	5	8	
				L10000E 9775N	5	77	16	42	16	
				L10000E 9800N	5	22	28	5	19	
				L10000E 9825N	5	18	16	5	9	
				L10000E 9850N	5	55	19	5	13	
				L10000E 9875N	5	11	17	5	9	
				L10000E 9900N	5	14	17	5	12	
				L10000E 9925N	5	25	22	5	16	
				L10000E 9950N	5	14	18	5	10	
				L10000E 9975N	5	280	17	31	62	Anom. Cu
				L10000E 10000N	80	41	41	5	22	Anom. Au
				L10000E 10025N	5	6	17	5	12	
				L10000E 10050N	5	11	22	5	17	
				L10000E 10075N	5	66	40	6	25	
				L10000E 10100N	5	185	76	52	35	Anom. Cu
				L10000E 10125N	5	18	42	5	24	
				L10000E 10150N	5	27	38	5	30	

Year	Company	Report No	Report Name	Sample No (includes Easting and Northing)	Au (ppb)	Cu (ppm)	Zn (ppm)	As (ppm)	Co (ppm)	Comments
				L10000E 10175N	5	113	29	10	19	Anom. Cu
				L10000E 10200N	5	28	17	5	11	
				L10000E 10225N	5	21	18	5	8	
				L10000E 10275N	5	181	7	5	4	Anom. Cu
				L10000E 10300N	5	9	11	5	8	
				L10000E 10325N	5	340	14	7	19	
				L10050E 9700N	5	2	7	5	5	
				L10050E 9725N	5	10	15	5	13	
				L10050E 9750N	5	23	23	5	15	
				L10050E 9775N	5	15	20	58	17	
				L10050E 9800N	5	14	18	5	12	
				L10050E 9825N	5	99	20	5	13	
				L10050E 9850N	5	31	18	11	10	
				L10050E 9875N	5	15	18	5	9	
				L10050E 9900N	5	15	17	5	13	
				L10050E 9925N	5	17	28	5	20	
				L10050E 9950N	5	43	21	15	14	
				L10050E 9975N	5	512	20	18	258	High Cu, Co Anom. Cu
				L10050E 10000N	5	105	32	6	15	
				L10050E 10025N	5	10	25	5	13	
				L10050E 10050N	5	7	12	5	12	
				L10050E 10075N	5	28	21	5	21	
				L10050E 10100N	21	64	82	52	58	Anom. Au
				L10100E 9700N	5	21	16	5	10	
				L10100E 9725N	5	4	3	5	2	
				L10100E 9750N	5	22	19	5	10	
				L10100E 9775N	5	17	18	5	12	
				L10100E 9800N	5	41	12	20	14	
				L10100E 9825N	5	57	27	8	11	
				L10100E 9850N	5	13	12	5	8	
				L10100E 9875N	5	28	17	5	12	
				L10100E 9900N	5	31	21	5	14	
				L10100E 9925N	5	16	51	12	19	
				L10100E 9950N	5	5	19	45	21	
				L10100E 9975N	5	5	13	17	13	
				L10100E 10000N	5	5	25	35	13	
				L10100E 10025N	5	5	27	36	22	
				L10100E 10050N	5	5	14	16	8	
				L10100E 10075N	5	5	19	31	28	
				L10100E 10100N	5	57	138	34	43	

Table 2 – Historic heavy mineral concentrate (till) sampling results on Mineral Licences 040292M within the Mountain Pond Project. (Coordinates have been estimated from local grid with baseline with azimuth 054 degrees and transformed to CRS NAD27 Zone 21N, refer Appendix 1)

Year	Company	Report No	Report Name	Sample No	Easting	Northing	Au (ppb)	Comments
1989	Inco Exploration & Technical Services Inc.	002E_0715	Report on Geological and Geochemical Surveys Licence 3691 Springdale South Project					
				HSX161618	575845	5488570	103	
				HSX161619	575815	5488540	<5	
				HSX161620	575780	5488510	511	
				HSX161621	575758	5488490	<9	
				HSX161622	575725	5488455	42	
				HSX161623	575700	5488435	31	
				HSX161624	575670	5488400	<5	
				HSX161604	575880	5488525	419	
				HSX161605	575860	5488497	32	
				SX150728	575825	5488475	1880	Soil Sample
				HSX150871	575825	5488475	114	
				HSX161606	575800	5488490	88	
				HSX161607	575770	5488415	26	
				HSX161640	576015	5488570	<5	
				HSX161639	575980	5488535	<6	
				HSX161638	575945	5488440	6	
				HSX161637	575835	5488440	<5	
				HSX161636	575850	5488395	237	
				HSX161608	575775	5488350	2274	
				HSX161609	575747	5488325	690	

Year	Company	Report No	Report Name	Sample No	Easting	Northing	Au (ppb)	Comments
				HSX161655	575720	5488292	8660	
				HSX161656	575690	5488260	863	
				HSX161641	576010	5488490	<5	
				HSX161613	575980	5488460	123	
				HSX161612	575930	5488435	<5	
				HSX161611	575900	5488405	1400	
				HSX161614	575875	5488375	59	
				HSX161651	575830	5488335	<5	
				HSX161652	575808	5488300	9	
				HSX161653	575730	5488265	1180	
				HSX161654	575750	5488240	39	
				HSX161642	576000	5488415	230	
				HSX161643	575975	5488385	109	
				HSX161644	575950	5488348	23	
				HSX161615	575905	5488282	1500	
				HSX161616	575875	5488253	12	
				HSX161617	575840	5488210	166	

Table 3 – Mineral Claims to be acquired by Reward at completion of the transaction.

LICENSE NBR	FILE NUM	CLIENT NAME	NUM CLAIMS	STATUS	STAKE DATE	REC DATE	ISS DATE	RPT DUE	EXPIRY DATE
040292M	7765729	Alexander S. Duffitt	9	Recorded	17/02/2026	17/02/2026	Null	Null	Null

Acquisition Terms

Pursuant to the terms of the LOI, the Company has entered a binding agreement to acquire 100% of Mineral Licence 040292M under the following terms from Alexander & Margaret Duffitt, Robert Snook and Jeanette Martin (the Vendors). Reward to acquire one Mineral Deposition in accordance with Table 3 from the Vendors;

- Payment of CA\$10,000.00 cash to the Vendors upon execution of the LOI – **Paid**.
- Reward to issue 150,000 Fully Paid Ordinary shares in Reward to the Vendors within three business days of executing the Definitive Asset Purchase Agreement.
- Payment of CA\$10,000.00 cash to the Vendors upon the 1st Anniversary of execution of Definitive Asset Purchase Agreement.
- Reward to issue 250,000 Fully Paid Ordinary shares in Reward to the Vendors within three business days of making the 1st Anniversary payment.
- Payment of CA\$20,000.00 cash to the Vendors upon the 2nd Anniversary of execution of Definitive Asset Purchase Agreement.
- Reward to issue 250,000 Fully Paid Ordinary shares in Reward to the Vendors within three business days of making the 2nd Anniversary payment.
- The Vendor to retain a 1.0% Net Smelter Return Royalty (NSR) that shall apply to the Mineral Deposition listed in Table 3.
- Reward has the right to purchase the NSR for CA\$1,000,000 at any time.
- If a JORC or NI 43-101 Mineral Resource (“Mineral Resource”) of 750,000 ounces of AuEq (gold equivalent) is defined within 040292M, Reward to issue 1,000,000 Fully Paid Ordinary Shares in Reward to the Vendors within three business days of an ASX release by Reward detailing the Mineral Resource.
- The parties have agreed to negotiate in good faith and enter into a binding Definitive Agreement incorporating the terms and conditions set out in the LOI within thirty (30) calendar days from 26 March 2026, or within such other time frame as may be mutually agreed upon by the parties in writing.

Next Steps

Over the next two quarters, Reward will focus on the following key activities at the Mountain Pond Project;

- Geophysical and geochemical data set compilation;
- Planning and commencement of a confirmation sampling program at the Jackpot prospect and to follow-up anomalous soil geochemical results along and adjacent to the Sullivan Pond Fault magnetic trend. Includes generation of a priority target list for drilling in 2026;
- Planning for drill testing Jackpot Prospect and other priority targets this field season.

Authorised by the Board of Reward.

For further information please contact:

Michael Ruane
Executive Director

michael.ruane@rewardminerals.com

Lorry Hughes
CEO

lorry.hughes@rewardminerals.com

Appendix 1 – JORC Code, 2012 Edition Table 1

Section 1: Sampling Techniques and Data.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Sampling techniques	<i>Nature and quality of sampling (e.g. cut channels, random chips, or specific specialised industry standard measurement tools appropriate to the minerals under investigation, such as down hole gamma sondes, or handheld XRF instruments, etc.). These examples should not be taken as limiting the broad meaning of sampling.</i>	<p>All reported results are historical and derived from assessment reports published and/or produced to be published by the Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Industry, Energy and Technology https://www.gov.nl.ca/iet/mines/geoscience/geofiles/ as part of statutory reporting relating to ownership of the corresponding licences.</p> <p>Assay results reported in Tables 1 & 2 are from conventional auger soil and till sampling.</p> <p>Manitor auger soil samples were collected at 25m intervals where possible on lines spaced 50-100m apart. It was noted that immature soils were developed and in general no soils were deeper than 10-25cm. Boggy areas were too deep to obtain a sample.</p> <p>Inco till samples were taken and a heavy mineral concentrate produced for Au determination via fire assay and gold grains counted and classified.</p>
	<i>Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample representivity and the appropriate calibration of any measurement tools or systems used.</i>	<p>The sample representivity of the soil sampling by Manitor in Table 1 is estimated to be reasonable as the data spacing as it was done on a relatively tight spacing of 25m between samples on 100m spaced lines with some 50m infill. Note that the soil signature picks up the Jackpot Prospect well as there is a known vein there with strong gold and copper mineralisation picked up by the soil program.</p> <p>The sample representativity of the till samples by Inco in Table 2 are thought to be less reasonable by the very nature of the till samples likely to have been transported. The till samples show there is gold in the area but is likely to be further away from the source than the soils.</p>
	<i>Aspects of the determination of mineralisation that are Material to the Public Report.</i>	The soil sample program appears to show very good correlation for gold and copper mineralisation that has been uncovered at the Jackpot prospect. The outcropping Jackpot vein has had extensive assays returned from rock chip and trench sampling that validate the soil program.
	<i>In cases where 'industry standard' work has been done this would be relatively simple (e.g. 'reverse circulation drilling was used to obtain 1 m samples from which 3 kg was pulverised to produce a 30 g charge for fire assay'). In other cases more explanation may be required, such as where there is coarse gold that has inherent sampling problems. Unusual commodities or mineralisation types (e.g. submarine nodules) may warrant disclosure of detailed information.</i>	<p>Manitor auger soil samples were assayed for gold using fire assay and for 30 elements using ICP by Eastern Analytical in Springdale, Newfoundland.</p> <p>Inco till sampling Inco till samples were taken weighing ~10kg and were concentrated on a shaking table by Overburden Management Ltd of Deer Lake, Newfoundland. The number of grains of gold within the heavy mineral concentrate were counted and the shapes of the grains were classified. Concentrates were forwarded to Activation Laboratories Ltd of Ancaster, Ontario for multi-element Neutron activation analysis.</p>
Drilling techniques	<i>Drill type (e.g. core, reverse circulation, open-hole hammer, rotary air blast, auger, Bangka, sonic, etc.) and details (e.g. core diameter, triple or standard tube, depth of diamond tails, face-sampling bit or other type, whether core is oriented and if so, by what method, etc.).</i>	There has been no historic drilling on the project. There is only one diamond hole in the region which is situated ~2km to the southwest of the project along strike of the Sullivan Pond Fault and magnetic trend.
Drill sample recovery	<i>Method of recording and assessing core and chip sample recoveries and results assessed.</i>	There has been no historic drilling on the project.
	<i>Measures taken to maximise sample recovery and ensure representative nature of the samples.</i>	There has been no historic drilling on the project.
	<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>	There has been no historic drilling on the project.
Logging	<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</i>	There has been no historic drilling on the project.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<i>and metallurgical studies.</i>	
	<i>Whether logging is qualitative or quantitative in nature. Core (or costean, channel, etc.) photography.</i>	There has been no historic drilling on the project.
	<i>The total length and percentage of the relevant intersections logged.</i>	There has been no historic drilling on the project.
Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation	<i>If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all core taken.</i>	There has been no historic drilling on the project.
	<i>If non-core, whether riffled, tube sampled, rotary split, etc. and whether sampled wet or dry.</i>	Manitor auger soil samples were collected at 25m intervals where possible on lines spaced 50-100m apart. It is unknown how the samples were prepared or what size was used prior to assay or if they were dry. Inco till sampling Inco till samples were taken weighing ~10kg and were concentrated on a shaking table by Overburden Management Ltd of Deer Lake, Newfoundland. The number of grains of gold within the heavy mineral concentrate were counted and the shapes of the grains were classified. It is unknown how the samples were prepared or what size was used prior to assay or if they were dry.
	<i>For all sample types, the nature, quality and appropriateness of the sample preparation technique.</i>	Laboratory preparation at Eastern Analytical Laboratories in Springdale typically involves crushing rock samples to 80% passing -10 mesh. Reward has not viewed any sample crushing specifications for the submitted samples however estimate it was appropriate.
	<i>Quality control procedures adopted for all sub-sampling stages to maximise representivity of samples.</i>	For the Manitor auger soil sampling (Reports NFLD_3188, 3256 & 3278) blanks, standards and field duplicates were submitted for laboratory analysis. For the Inco till sampling (Reports 002E_715, 716 & 786) no reference as to the use of blanks, standards and field duplicates.
	<i>Measures taken to ensure that the sampling is representative of the in situ material collected, including for instance results for field duplicate/second-half sampling.</i>	There was regular use of field duplicates for Manitor auger soil samples (every 20 samples). No use of field duplicates was viewed in historic reports for the Inco till samples.
	<i>Whether sample sizes are appropriate to the grain size of the material being sampled.</i>	It is assumed the sample sizes are appropriate for the soil samples as good correlation between soils and outcropping vein mineralisation at the Jackpot prospect have been noted.
Quality of assay data and laboratory tests	<i>The nature, quality and appropriateness of the assaying and laboratory procedures used and whether the technique is considered partial or total.</i>	Manitor auger soil samples were analysed at Eastern Analytical Laboratories in Springdale, Newfoundland using classical wet chemistry and spectrographic methods. Inco till samples were analysed at Eastern Analytical Laboratories in Springdale, Newfoundland using classical wet chemistry and spectrographic methods and at Activation Laboratories Ltd of Ancaster, Ontario for multi-element Neutron activation analysis.
	<i>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.</i>	No geophysical tools were used.
	<i>Nature of quality control procedures adopted (e.g. standards, blanks, duplicates, external laboratory checks) and whether acceptable levels of accuracy (i.e. lack of bias) and precision have been established.</i>	For the Manitor auger soil sampling (Reports NFLD_3188, 3256 & 3278) blanks, standards and field duplicates were submitted for laboratory analysis. For the Inco till sampling (Reports 002E_715, 716 & 786) no reference as to the use of blanks, standards and field duplicates. There was no external laboratory checks completed in historic sampling. The blanks, standards and field duplicates assay results suggest reasonable accuracy and lack of bias.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Verification of sampling and assaying	<i>The verification of significant intersections by either independent or alternative company personnel.</i>	<p>The Inco till assays for Au and the Manitor auger soil assays for gold do not correlate very well. This is not unreasonable as till samples by the very nature of them should be transported compared to soils which should be largely insitu.</p> <p>Rock chip sampling at the Jackpot Prospect outcropping vein appears to verify the accuracy of the soils in that area. The Inco till samples did not cover that area.</p>
	<i>The use of twinned holes.</i>	No drilling has been completed on the project.
	<i>Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols.</i>	Historic electronic data is captured on the Newfoundland Geoscience database where historic exploration reports are stored. It is unknown where original data such as hard copy files have been stored or if they exist.
	<i>Discuss any adjustment to assay data.</i>	No adjustments have been made.
Location of data points	<i>Accuracy and quality of surveys used to locate drill holes (collar and down-hole surveys), trenches, mine workings and other locations used in Mineral Resource estimation.</i>	<p>For Manitor soils a total of 19.3-line km of gridding was completed by SCl Explorations Ltd. based out of Miles Cove, Newfoundland during August of 2010. All lines were chainsaw cut and hard chained at 25m intervals on 50-200m line spacings. All pickets were flagged and marked using aluminum tags. The grid was cut using a baseline azimuth of 55 degrees and crossline orientation bearing of 145 degrees.</p> <p>Inco tills were collected on 9.9-line km grid established with a baseline at an azimuth of 54 degrees with grid lines cut at right angles.</p> <p>There has been no Mineral Resource estimation.</p>
	<i>Specification of the grid system used.</i>	<p>Manitor auger sails have been tabled in local coordinates. The translation of each line to Reference System NAD 27, UTM Zone 21N (ref Report NFLD_3278);</p> <p>Infinity Location Base Station – 576330E, 5487643N</p> <p>L10100 9700 N, E576510: N5488281 L10100 10500 N, E576053: N5488916</p> <p>L10050 9700 N, E576460: N5488245 L10050 10200 N, E576187: N5488642</p> <p>L10000 9700 N, E576417: N5488227 L10000 10500 N, E575960: N5488850</p> <p>L9950 9700 N, E576359: N5488202 L9950 10200 N, E576093: N5488586</p> <p>L9900 9700 N, E576331: N5488161 L9900 10500 N, E575877: N5488806</p> <p>L9700 9700 N, E576173: N5488054 L9700 10500 N, E575736: N5488689</p> <p>L9600 9700 N, E576078: N5487974 L9600 10500 N, E575656: N5488638</p> <p>L9500 9700 N, E576024: N5487933 L9500 10500 N, E575565: N5488576</p> <p>L9400 9700 N, E575940: N5487870 L9400 10500 N, E575484: N5488501</p>
	<i>Quality and adequacy of topographic control.</i>	<p>The location of the Inco grid referenced in reports 002E_715, 716 & 786 could have some accuracy issues in translation to NAD 27, UTM Zone 21N due to historic discrepancies which could explain the differences to the Manitor results although soils and tills are not exclusively correlatable.</p> <p>The Manitor grid references are interpreted to be adequately accurate.</p>
Data spacing and distribution	<i>Data spacing for reporting of Exploration Results.</i>	Sampling was reconnaissance in nature, with auger soils and till results in accordance with Tables 1 & 2.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<i>Whether the data spacing and distribution is sufficient to establish the degree of geological and grade continuity appropriate for the Mineral Resource and Ore Reserve estimation procedure(s) and classifications applied.</i>	The data are insufficient and not of the required type to establish the degree of geological and grade continuity for Mineral Resource estimation.
	<i>Whether sample compositing has been applied.</i>	No sample compositing.
Orientation of data in relation to geological structure	<i>Whether the orientation of sampling achieves unbiased sampling of possible structures and the extent to which this is known, considering the deposit type.</i>	Given the interpretation of the underlying geology based on geophysics it would appear the positioning of the sampling grids and the directions of the sampling lines are at an appropriate orientation. No structural data recorded.
	<i>If the relationship between the drilling orientation and the orientation of key mineralised structures is considered to have introduced a sampling bias, this should be assessed and reported if material.</i>	There has been no drilling.
Sample security	<i>The measures taken to ensure sample security.</i>	Not recorded in historical documentation.
Audits or reviews	<i>The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.</i>	No audits or reviews are known. Reward has not yet verified the historical sampling results.

JORC Code, 2012 Edition Table 1

Section 2: Reporting of Exploration Results.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Mineral tenement and land tenure status	<i>Type, reference name/number, location and ownership including agreements or material issues with third parties such as joint ventures, partnerships, overriding royalties, native title interests, historical sites, wilderness or national park and environmental settings.</i>	The Mountain Pond Project comprises three (4) mineral dispositions in north central Newfoundland, totalling 41 claims. Licences: 039180M, 023238M and 040450M are owned by Christopher Pilgrim and 040292M is owned by Alexander S. Duffitt, Robert Snook and Jeanette Martin. Licence 039180M was issued on 25/04/25, 023238M was issued on 03/08/2015 and 040450M has not been issued yet as it was recorded on 28/02/26. 040292M was issued on the 19/03/26. Reward holds an exclusive right to acquire 100% of 039180M, 023238M and 040450M for a total of CA\$125,000 and 850,000 Reward shares over three years, Vendors will retain a 1% NSR royalty which can be acquired by Reward at any time for CA\$1 million. Reward also holds an exclusive right to acquire 100% of 040292M for a total of CA\$40,000 and 650,000 Reward shares over three years, Vendors will retain a 1% NSR royalty which can be acquired by Reward at any time for CA\$1 million. Also if a JORC or 43-101 Mineral Resource of 750,000 ounces of AuEq (gold equivalent) is defined within 040292M, Reward is to issue 1,000,000 to the 040292M Vendors.
	<i>The security of the tenure held at the time of reporting along with any known impediments to obtaining a licence to operate in the area.</i>	No known impediments to exploration.
Exploration done by other parties	<i>Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.</i>	In 1989 the area was staked by Inco Exploration Technical Services completed reconnaissance soil sampling across the Springdale Peninsula with follow-up detailed soil and till sampling surveys in anomalous areas. The soil sampling immediately west of the current Mountain Pond licences returned 1.88 g/t gold in a soil sample. Subsequent till sampling of the area returned 74 delicate gold grains and assayed 114 g/t gold. In 1990 Inco finalised detailed soil sampling and mapping of the Mountain Pond till anomaly. The sampling did not explain the strongly anomalous till sample collected in 1989. Several of the Inco reconnaissance soil lines did transect the northeastern portion of the current Mountain Pond Property. A VLF-EM and magnetics survey over the area of the anomalous till defined geological contacts. In 2007, Golden Dory Resources obtained the mineral rights through staking of a large portion of the Springdale Peninsula. The claims covered the area of the current Mountain Pond Property. The Golden Dory exploration work was focused on the

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		<p>known historical copper deposits of Sterling and Lady Pond which occur 5 to 7 km to the west of the Mountain Pond Project. In 2008 a helicopter-borne AeroTEM electromagnetic and magnetic survey was completed over their mineral licences on the Springdale Peninsula. The survey identified the magnetic trend related to the Sullivan Pond Fault shown in Figure 3.</p> <p>In 2010, the immediate area was staked by the prospecting team of Garry Fraser and Gord Hume as a result of the discovery of a new gold bearing quartz vein which returned values up to 16.78 g/t Au (The Jackpot Vein). The subsequent work included compilation of historical data and general prospecting of the area. The Fraser/Hume claims were optioned to Manitor Minerals in 2010 and a second year assessment report by Fraser outlined ground geophysical surveys including magnetics/VLF, ground IP, line cutting, soil sampling prospecting, trenching and rock geochemistry.</p> <p>Trenching of the Jackpot Prospect vein was performed during the fall of 2010. An approximate 30 m section of the vein was cleared using an excavator. The vein could be observed over a strike length of approximately 20 meters and 3-5m in width. The general orientation of the vein is a northeast direction and appears to dip steeply to the northwest. It was reported the vein appears to pinch out on its southwest side and disappears on the northeast under a bog, possibly dislocated by a cross-cutting structure. Refer to Figure 4, a schematic sketch map of the trenching and sampling program. All known rock chip and trench sampling results from the immediate Jackpot Prospect are included in Table 1.</p> <p>The Jackpot Prospect gold-mineralised vein is spatially associated with a strong shear zone interpreted to be related to the Sullivan Pond Fault, a regional structure that can be traced for more than 1 km along strike and for over 5 km using the regional magnetic dataset (Figure 3). Within the Jackpot Prospect area, the structure is expressed as a well-developed chlorite-carbonate-quartz shear zone with a width of up to approximately 8m. The structure has not been subject to detailed exploration, representing a key target for further evaluation and potential drill testing.</p> <p>The area was staked by Christopher Pilgrim in 2015, following which reconnaissance exploration was undertaken, including prospecting, soil sampling, limited ground geophysical surveying (VLF), and rock sampling. Subsequent exploration completed in 2018 expanded on this work and included additional soil, rock and till sampling, together with a more focused VLF geophysical survey.</p>
Geology	<i>Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.</i>	The Mountain Pond Project is situated within the prolific Dunnage Zone Volcanics where rock types include mafic pillow lava, pillow breccia, aquagene tuff, sheeted diabase dykes, massive basalt flows, thin sills of gabbro and small bodies of ultramafics. Historic exploration has identified favourable settings for fault and shear zone related mesothermal volcanic-hosted gold deposits and Kuroko-type and possibly Cyprus or Noranda type VMS deposits. Currently known gold and copper mineralisation occurs as pyrite and chalcopyrite within a quartz vein and a carbonate and chlorite altered shear zone.
Drill hole Information	<p><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></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>easting and northing of the drill hole collar</i> • <i>elevation or RL (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in metres) of the drill hole collar</i> • <i>dip and azimuth of the hole</i> • <i>down hole length and interception depth</i> • <i>hole length.</i> <p><i>If the exclusion of this information is justified on the basis that the information is not Material and this</i></p>	There has been no drilling on the project.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<i>exclusion does not detract from the understanding of the report, the Competent Person should clearly explain why this is the case.</i>	
Data aggregation methods	<i>In reporting Exploration Results, weighting averaging techniques, maximum and/or minimum grade truncations (e.g. cutting of high grades) and cut-off grades are usually Material and should be stated.</i>	There has been no alteration to the data or assay compositing.
	<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>	No data aggregation has been used.
	<i>The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values should be clearly stated.</i>	No metal equivalents have been reported.
Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths	<i>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.</i>	There are no drilling intercepts reported.
	<i>If it is not known and only the down hole lengths are reported, there should be a clear statement to this effect (e.g. 'down hole length, true width not known').</i>	Only till, auger-in-soil and rock chip samples are reported.
Diagrams	<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>	Maps illustrating licence boundaries and historical sampling locations are included in the ASX release.
Balanced reporting	<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>	All information is being reported that has been compiled by historic explorers and Reward.
Other substantive exploration data	<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>	Data compilation of geophysical data, soil and rock chip sampling programs is ongoing. No modern exploration has been conducted by Reward Minerals to date.
Further work	<i>The nature and scale of planned further work (e.g. tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling).</i>	Planned further work includes full data compilation, geological mapping, rock chip sampling and base of soil sampling to confirm and generate targets for potential drill testing.
	<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>	Refer to diagrams in this ASX release.

About Reward

Reward is an ASX-listed advanced-stage sulphate of potash technology and development company. Reward's current flagship asset is its 100%-owned Beyondie Potash Plant, located ~160km southeast of Newman in Western Australia. Reward intends to combine the plant and its technology to establish a new Potash operation at the current site or an alternative site involving relocating the plant.

The Company is the 100% owner and developer of new processing technology for recovery of high-purity SOP from seawater and other high sulphate brines (Reward Process). The Company submitted an Australian Provisional Patent Application (Application Number - 2022902277) for the Reward Process on 11 August 2022 and completed the international application prior to 11 August 2023. On 24 June 2024 Reward received a positive preliminary report on the patentability of the Reward Process from the International Preliminary Examining Authority.

In addition, Reward owns a suite of early-stage mineral exploration projects in Newfoundland, Canada and Western Australia that are prospective for gold and base metal deposits.

Forward-Looking Statements

This document may contain certain "forward-looking statements". When used in this document, the words such as "could", "plan", "estimate", "expect", "intend", "may", "potential", "should", and similar expressions are forward-looking statements. Although Reward believes that the expectations reflected in these forward-looking statements are reasonable, such statements involve risks and uncertainties, and no assurance can be given that actual results will be consistent with these forward-looking statements.

For a more detailed discussion of such risks and uncertainties, see Reward's other ASX Releases, Presentations and Annual Reports. Readers should not place undue reliance on forward-looking statements. Reward does not undertake any obligation to release publicly any revisions to any forward-looking statement to reflect events or circumstances after the date of this ASX Release, or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events, except as may be required under applicable securities laws.

Exploration Results – Competent Persons Statement

The information in this document that relates to Exploration Results, geology and data compilation is based on information compiled by Mr Lorry Hughes, a Competent Person who is a Fellow of The Australasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy. Mr Hughes is the CEO of the Company, is a full-time employee and holds shares and options in the Company.

Mr Hughes has sufficient experience which is relevant to the style of mineralisation and type of deposit under consideration and to the activity which he is undertaking to qualify as a Competent Person as defined in the 2012 Edition of the 'Australasian Code for Reporting of Exploration Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves'. Mr Hughes consents to the inclusion in this announcement of the matters based on this information in the form and context in which it appears.