

(b) Results

<u>Test Product</u>	<u>Weight %</u>	<u>Assay % Sn</u>	<u>Distribution % Sn</u>
Sulphide Ro Conc	48.95	0.58	20.85
Tin Ro Conc 1	3.53	13.1	33.96
Tin Ro Conc 2	3.08	8.7	19.68
Tin Ro Conc 3	2.10	5.92	9.13
Tin Ro Conc 4	1.63	2.70	3.23
Tin Ro Conc 5	2.03	1.48	2.21
Tin Ro Conc 6	2.42	1.28	2.27
Tin Ro Conc 7	1.61	0.75	0.89
Tin Ro Conc 8	2.10	0.57	0.88
Tin Ro Conc 9	2.36	0.495	0.86
Tin Ro Conc 10	1.81	0.43	0.57
Tin Ro Conc 11	1.68	0.395	0.49
Tin Ro Conc 12	1.57	0.48	0.55
(Tin Ro Conc)	(25.92)	(3.93)	(74.72)
Tin Ro Tail	<u>25.13</u>	<u>0.24</u>	<u>4.43</u>
Calc Head	100.00	1.36	100.00
Assay Head		1.40	
(Tin Ro Conc 1 to 6)	(14.79)	(6.49)	(70.48)

(c) Comments

- (i) Composite SCl responded well to similar flotation treatment established for PC2.
- (ii) Overall tin recovery (in sulphide + rougher concentrates) was up to 95.57% while tin recovery in tin rougher concentrate was 74.72% at 3.93% Sn grade.
- (iii) Tin losses in the sulphide product was much higher for SCl than PC2 and this reflected the nature of more extensive of locking between sulphide minerals and cassiterite in SCl.