however, the depth at which the response occurs is difficult to assess with accuracy. The maximum depth can be estimated from a consideration of the profile shape, but the accuracy of this approach will depend on a minimal current dipole length, and of course sharp boundaries to the body. The *resolution* therefore is not better than half to a quarter of the dipole. Therefore maximum depths of the order of 10 metres may in fact either outcrop or suboutcrop when a 25 metre potential dipole is used. Some moving source array would be required to obtain an *accurate depth estimate*.

Similarly the width of bodies is not easy to determine for zones having a width less than half the dipole spacing used. Thus, estimated maximum widths are educated guesses at best for narrow zones. However, wider bodies can be resolved more accurately.

The *attitude* of a chargeable zone can only really be gauged with any precision in the centre of the gradient array, and of course where the body has a strongly contrasting chargeability and apparent resistivity to that of the enclosing rock units.

All field measurements were taken between slope distances along lines. This will, in steep areas, produce errors in the calculated apparent resistivity data. However, these errors will be arithmetic, and as significant changes in