22 JULY 2026

EXCELLENT ORE SORTING RESULTS FROM WEBBS STOCKPILE ORE

FIRST-PASS ORE SORTING COMPLETED FROM HISTORICAL STOCKPILES AT WEBBS - EXCELLENT MASS REDUCTION AND SILVER RECOVERIES TO OVER 1000 G/T AG

HIGHLIGHTS

- TOMRA Sorting Pty Ltd has completed X-ray Transmission (**XRT**) ore sorting test work on material from historical stockpile ore material and historical waste material present at the Webbs Silver mine (**Webbs**).
- The outstanding ore sorting results will be transformative for the Webbs project significantly increasing the mill feed grade and greatly improving the project economics as a result. Further work is justified on the drill core recovered from the current resource drilling to confirm the results are achieved on spatially separated fresh samples.
- Sample WPWHS was screened to 6-14mm and was comprised of 21.8kg of material collected from the historical stockpile of processed, waste material at Webbs.
- Sample WSHMM was screened to 10-40mm and was comprised of 553.8kg of material collected from the historical, unprocessed ore stockpiled at Webbs.
- Two different XRT processing types were used in the test work: contrast-XRT processing is used to classify high-density inclusions (e.g. argentite / galena) from host-rock while dual energy XRT (**DE-XRT**) is used to classify and reject any base metal sulphides. For this set of test work, contrast-XRT has been implemented for the first runs while DE-XRT was used in the scavenger runs.
- Two passes through the sorter were completed for both WPWHS and WSHMM; firstly, a high-grade concentrate was produced, secondly the waste from the first run was re-run through the sorter to produce middlings and waste.
- WSHMM (Historical ore)
    - Run 5: 44% mass rejection relative to TOMRA feed.
    - Silver (565.26 g/t in feed to **994 g/**t **Ag** in product).
    - Run 6 comprising the waste from Run 5: 71% mass rejection relative to TOMRA feed.
    - Silver (20 g/t in feed to **52.9 g/t Ag** in product).
- WPWHS (Historically Processed Waste):
    - Run 1: 94% mass rejection relative to TOMRA feed.
    - Silver (164.6 g/t in feed to **1120 g/**t **Ag** in product).
    - Run 2 comprising the waste from Run 1: 94% mass rejection relative to TOMRA feed.
    - Silver (104 g/t in feed to **878 g/t Ag** in product).
- Significant silver upgrades were achieved across all samples, with high recoveries from the unprocessed ore (WSHMM) and strong mass reduction from the processed waste (WPWHS).
- For the WPWHS and WSHMM material, silver concentrate grades approached or exceeded 1,000 ppm with significant mass reduction. As the WPWHS sample has already been processed and has a much lower feed grade, the mass reduction and recovery are lower in comparison, but still considered very successful.
- **These results reflect the well-liberated nature of the sulphides and barren waste particles, and the clear density differential between sulphides and waste, which enables effective classification and separation.**
- Across all runs, samples and size fractions, the material responded to XRT sorting, with a silver upgrade and mass reduction achieved in every run.

- Ore sorting has the potential to reject barren host rock before milling, reducing milling throughput, energy consumption, tailings storage requirements and operating costs, while potentially enabling a smaller processing plant and maintaining metal units delivered to the concentrator.

Commenting on the TOMRA test work, Rapid's Managing Director, Byron Miles, said:

"Rapid has stockpiles of historical waste material where initial samples have responded excellently to TOMRA XRT sorting that has yielded excellent mass reduction and silver recoveries to over 1000ppm. Rapid is evaluating the possibility of processing this material to generate potential cash flow.

The Webbs/Consol ore is very amenable to ore sorting and the results are very positive for the project. We were particularly excited to see the results of the previously mined but unprocessed ore, with it almost doubling in grade with losing minimal ore. Also, the low grade ore that is mined to be processed rather than go to the waste dump is a large plus which will add value to the economics of the upcoming scoping study. We also expect the main ore deposits to behave the same as the dumps that were tested. Ore sorting has been a game changer for the resource industry and is not considered new technology but mainstream. We expect to undertake further work in the future on the drill core samples obtained from the resource drilling currently underway."

TOMRA Sorting Pty Ltd completed XRT ore sorting test work on two representative samples from Webbs: WPWHS, a historically processed waste stockpile, and WSHMM, an unprocessed historical ore stockpile. Each sample was passed through the TOMRA sorter in two stages, with an initial pass producing a high-grade concentrate and a second pass re-processing the rejected material to recover a secondary middlings fraction.

The results for the unprocessed ore sample (WSHMM) were particularly strong. Material grading 565 g/t Ag was upgraded to a concentrate grading 994 g/t Ag, with 98% of the contained silver reporting to that concentrate (*see Table 1*). In practical terms, this points to the potential for a substantially smaller processing plant than would otherwise be required to treat this material, while losing only around 2% of the contained silver to the rejected fraction.

The historically processed waste sample (WPWHS) also responded strongly to sorting, with silver upgraded from 164.6 g/t to 1,120 g/t Ag in the first pass, and 94% of the sample mass rejected as barren. As this material has already been through processing once and starts from a lower feed grade, the overall mass reduction and recovery are naturally lower than for the unprocessed ore, though still considered a strong result.

Across all runs, samples and size fractions tested, the material consistently responded to XRT sorting, supporting the broad applicability of this approach across the stockpiled material at Webbs. Ore sorting has the potential to reject barren host rock ahead of milling, which can reduce milling throughput, energy use, tailings storage requirements and operating costs, while supporting a smaller processing plant footprint without materially reducing the silver units delivered to the concentrator.

Sample	Test	Fraction	Ag			Mass		
			ppm	Recovery	Cumulative Recovery	kg	%	Cumulative Product Mass
WPWHS	Run 1	Feed	164.6	41%	41%	21.8	100%	6%
		Product	1120.0			1.3	6%	
		Waste	104.0			20.5	94%	
	Run 2	Feed	104.0	54%	72%	20.5	100%	12%
		Product	878.0			1.3	6%	
		Waste	51.6			19.2	94%	
WSHMM	Run 5	Feed	565.2	98%	98%	553.8	100%	56%
		Product	994.0			310.0	56%	
		Waste	20.0			243.8	44%	
	Run 6	Feed	20.0	77%	100%	243.8	100%	69%
		Product	52.9			70.8	29%	
		Waste	6.5			173.0	71%	

Table 1: **Assay results for Webbs sorted material. All values are original or calculated from received assays.**

Figure 1: **Photos taken of all sorted WPWHS sample. Results included in this announcement.**

Figure 2: **Photos taken of all sorted WSHMM sample. Results included in this announcement.**

This ASX release was authorised on behalf of the Rapid Critical Metals Board by Byron Miles, Managing Director.

For further information, please contact:
Byron Miles
Managing Director
Rapid Critical Metals Limited
E: bmiles@rapidmetals.com.au

About Rapid Critical Metals

Rapid Critical Metals (ASX: RCM, RCMO) is an exploration company driving the discovery and development of high-grade silver and critical mineral assets. Following a transformational pivot in mid-2025, Rapid has assembled a high-impact portfolio anchored by the Webbs, Webbs Consolidated and Conrad Silver Projects in New South Wales and the Prophet River Gallium–Germanium Project in British Columbia, Canada. Both projects sit within geologically rich, infrastructure-ready regions and present strong potential for near-term exploration success.

Headquartered in Sydney, Rapid is fully funded and strategically positioned to deliver growth through aggressive exploration and value-accretive development. Led by an experienced team, including Chairman John Poynton AO and Managing Director Byron Miles, the Company is advancing a catalyst-rich program — with resource upgrades, step-out drilling, and new target testing set to drive a steady flow of news and shareholder value in the months ahead.

For more information, visit: www.rapidmetals.com.au

Forward Looking Statements

This announcement may contain forward-looking statements, including statements regarding the potential processing of stockpiled material and the generation of future cash flow. Forward-looking statements are not guarantees of future performance and involve known and unknown risks, uncertainties and other factors that may cause actual results to differ materially from those expressed or implied. Rapid Critical Metals Limited does not undertake to update or revise these statements to reflect events or circumstances arising after the date of this announcement, except as required by law.

Competent Person Statement

The information contained in this announcement, relating to mineral processing results, is based on, and fairly and accurately represent the information and supporting documentation compiled by Mr. Damian Connelly. Mr. Connelly is a full-time employee of METS Engineering who are a contractor to Rapid Critical Metals and a Fellow of The Australasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy. Mr. Connelly has sufficient experience which is relevant to the style of mineralisation and type of deposit under consideration, and to the activity being undertaken to qualify as a Competent Person as defined in the 2012 Edition of the Australasian Code for Reporting of Exploration Results, Exploration Targets, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves. Mr. Connelly consents to the inclusion in this announcement of the matters based on the results in the form and context in which they appear.

The information in this announcement that relates to the Exploration Results is based on information compiled by Eoin Rothery, (RPGeo, MSc), who is a member of the Australian Institute of Geoscientists (No. 2374). Mr. Rothery works through Avoca Minerals Pty Ltd and acts as a geological consultant. Mr Rothery 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 Rothery consents to the inclusion in the report of the matters based on his information in the form (see plan below) and context in which it appears.

JORC CODE Tables

Section 1 Sampling Techniques and Data

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Sampling techniques	• *Nature and quality of sampling (eg cut channels, random chips, or specific specialised industry standard measurement tools appropriate to the minerals under investigation, such as down hole gamma, 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 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.*	• Samples were grab samples from surface ore and waste stockpiles • These date from mining up to 1965 and information is limited • Prior to ore sorting, the samples were screened to a particle size ranges of 6–40 mm as described in the body of the report. • Samples were collected from different parts of the stockpiles to address representivity. This is regarded as sufficient for a preliminary evaluation such as described. • Bulk sample WSHMM was taken from the mineralised waste stockpile #1 (see plan below): collected at 40 different points across the area by shovel to make a bulk sample of 553.8 kg. • Bulk sample WPWHS was taken from ore stockpiles 2 and 3 (see plan below). The bulk composite sample was collected by choosing individual rocks of between 10-30cm in size

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	Unusual commodities or mineralisation types (eg submarine nodules) may warrant disclosure of detailed information.	at 1-2m separation across the areas, resulting in approximately 600 sample points for a total weight of 21.8kg. • Samples were collected in plastic buckets, sealed and transported to the TOMRA facility in NSW for the test work program
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).*	• No drilling is reported above
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.*	• No drilling is reported above
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.*	• No drilling is reported above • Chip samples were logged qualitatively • Sorted sample photographs are included in the body of the report
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.* • *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.* • *Whether sample sizes are appropriate to the grain size of the material being sampled.*	• No sub sampling was done • As described above the grab sampling was composed of composited samples from across the stockpiles • Sufficient sample weights were achieved to ensure appropriateness of sample size
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*	• Samples were assayed at an accredited laboratory ALS Brisbane) by the 4 acid digest Inductively Coupled Plasma (ICP) technique. • Laboratory standards, duplicates and blanks were added in the process

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	acceptable levels of accuracy (ie lack of bias) and precision have been established.	
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.*	• Laboratory results were reviewed by the Exploration Manager. • No twin holes were drilled. • Commercial laboratory certificates are supplied by ALS. • The certified standards and blanks are checked
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.*	• As the samples were taken from mined and processed ore and waste the original sample location is unknown, other than from the underground Webbs Silver Mine.
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.*	• Samples were composite
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.*	• The orientation is unknown • These were not drill hole samples
Sample security	• *The measures taken to ensure sample security.*	• The samples were transported to the laboratory by Company personnel
Audits or reviews	• *The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.*	• No audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data have been reported.

(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 Webbs Silver project lies on granted NSW EL 5674 which is in good standing
Exploration done by other parties	• *Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.*	• Silver mineralisation at Webb's was discovered in 1884 • From 1884 to 1901 approximately 55,000 t of ore was mined at an average grade of at least 23 oz/t Ag. At Webb's Main, mining reached 210 m below surface and extracted a high-grade south-plunging chute. Numerous shafts, some up to 50 m deep, and smaller prospecting pits occur along the 2 km long trend • In 1946-47 Zinc Corporation conducted mapping, sampling, costeaning and metallurgy. • Between 1962-1965 a private venture re-developed the main workings and there was minor production from underground, old dumps, and tailings material. • Exploration continued to modern times including by Planet Management, Phoenix Mines NL, Mt Conquere Mines and Silver Mines Ltd: but none affected the material sampled for this report. Rapid has previously documented this historic exploration (ASX release 22 May 2025)
Geology	• *Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.*	• The Webbs deposit is a silver-base metal structurally hosted fracture vein system within the New England Fold Belt of NSW • The dominant feature in the area is the Upper Permian Mole Granite which is mapped as a granite/granodiorite • Locally, the main lithology is silicified and altered black shale which has undergone pervasive silica sericite alteration. Within this sequence, numerous dipping lines of

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		lode are developed, typically forming prominent variably iron-stained outcrops up to 15 metres wide and traceable for 1.7 kilometres.

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 (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in metres) 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.*
		• No drilling is 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 and some typical examples of such aggregations should be shown in detail.* • *The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values should be clearly stated.*	• The samples are composite grab samples • No cutting of grades was done • Samples from both “ore” and “waste” were tested
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’).*	• The original location and geometry of the samples is unknown
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.*	• This is an analysis of historically mined material, not a discovery
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.*	• Samples from both “ore” and “waste” were tested
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.*	• No geophysical data is regarded as material to the release • Geology and geochemistry are discussed above • No other exploration data is material to the work discussed

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
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.*	• Further testing of ore characteristics • Drilling for resource definition and expansion

Sample Areas: WSHMM taken from red area – Stockipile #1 Mineralised waste; WPWHS taken from Ore Stockpiles #2 and #3