Shedding Light onto the Rare Earth Playing Field

Due to its inherent complexity, the rare earth element (REE) space is difficult to understand. Unfortunately, investors doing their due diligence have not necessarily had an easy time finding the sought-after clarity due to the many different voices commenting on the space. For example, a recent article by Jon Hykawy on illegal Chinese REE production was arguably inaccurate on some basic fundamentals. However, when taking a look at the recently published article “Levelling the Rare Earth Playing Field” from Alastair Neill, one can only roll their eyes in disbelief. With 13 articles published over the last 2 years, Rockstone has attempted to shed much needed light onto this space and I feel the need to chime in here again.
I find very little to agree with in Mr. Neill's very simplistic ranking system, apart from him noting that the focus should be on the magnet feed REEs (Nd, Pr, Tb, Dy) and not exclusively on the heavy REEs.

A rare earth project will sink or swim on their ability to economically produce those key magnet feed elements in the proper relative proportion, and product form.

Neill's article attempts to address revenue potential; however, the most fundamental of all economic factors is missing; that being OPERATIONAL EXPENDITURES (OPEX). Revenue (i.e. gross income) is irrelevant in an evaluation if not coupled with the other side of the equation (i.e. cost of production). That is, if your cost of production is higher than your revenue, then the project is a bust no matter how you look at it!

Therefore, for any relevant comparison to be done, the proper questions to ask are, what are the operating costs for these projects- relative to the products they will produce - and do they actually have a projected positive net margin? In other words, do they actually have a reasonable potential to generate a profit?

It’s not about which project can produce the highest value REE product in the greatest volume per mined tonne of ore; it’s about what REE project can produce the proper product(s) (i.e. stable, long-term market demand and price), at the lowest cost possible, to have a positive net income (i.e. profit) throughout a commodity cycle. In this regard, based on all the projects I follow in the REE space, Commerce’s Ashram Project is at the top of the list and far above Lynas, who are barely, just barely, cash positive (if you believe their actual released numbers, as accounting practices can easily cloud reality, if necessary).

In March 2015, Rockstone published the article “The REE basket Price Deception and the Clarity of OPEX”, providing a chart comparing the OPEX and adjusted basket price for various advanced stage REE deposits. The endeavour was to normalize a project’s REE basket price (i.e. adjusted basket price) to reflect the product suite targeted (generalized to three categories; mixed concentrate, partial separation, or full separation), and to normalize OPEX to the USD as many projects report in AUD or CAD. The idea was to compare projected production costs across projects while also reflecting the differences in end-product(s) targeted, which will have a direct impact on the cost of production and revenue generated.

I have taken the liberty of updating this chart for added clarity in this discussion.

---

**OPEX for Select Advanced-Stage Rare Earth Deposits**

(In $US/kg REO Produced)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deposit</th>
<th>OPEX ($US/kg REO Produced)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lofdal</td>
<td>$50.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yangibana</td>
<td>$41.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norra Klar</td>
<td>$39.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Top</td>
<td>$33.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobyn Mountain</td>
<td>$31.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nechhalbo</td>
<td>$28.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne Range</td>
<td>$27.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonew Hill</td>
<td>$26.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Zone</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopawa</td>
<td>$15.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lodge</td>
<td>$15.05 (discounted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zandipolriff</td>
<td>$13.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguella</td>
<td>$11.75 (discounted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolanti Bore</td>
<td>$10.45 (discounted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steenkampskraal</td>
<td>$8.77 (discounted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashram</td>
<td>$5.77 (discounted)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPEX and Adjusted REE Basket Price (adjusted based on produce suite) of Select Advanced Stage REE Deposits**

1. Discount of 30% (mixed con), 20% (partial separation), or 0% (full separation) applied to basket price to reflect targeted product suite and allow for approximate, normalized comparison
2. OPEX has been normalized to USD using AUD and CAD exchange rates of 0.73 and 0.72 respectively

**Source:** OPEX from public company disclosure
In terms of projected OPEX, from lowest to highest, the projects are:

1. Ashram: Commerce Resources Corp.
2. Steenkampskraal: Great Western Minerals Group Ltd. (NA - done in by company debt and poor management)
3. Nolans Bore: Arafura Resources Ltd.
4. Ngualla: Peak Resources Ltd.
5. Zandkopsdrift: Frontier Rare Earths Ltd. (since delisted)
6. Bear Lodge: Rare Element Resources Ltd.
7. Kipawa: Matamec Explorations Inc.
8. B Zone: Quest Rare Minerals Ltd.
9. Songewe Hill: Mkango Resources Ltd.
11. Nechalacho: Avalon Rare Metals Inc. (since changed focus to tin-indium)
12. Bokan Mountain: Ucore Rare Metals Inc.
13. Round Top: Texas Rare Earth Resources Corp.
15. Yangibana: Hastings Technology Metals Ltd.
16. Lofdal: Namibia Rare Earths Inc.

In a pricing environment such as now, where REEs are trading potentially at the bottom of the cycle, it is the projects with the lower production costs that will have the greatest chance to survive. The above chart strongly indicates that the Ashram Deposit is best positioned in such an environment with the lowest approximated production cost of its peers at $5.77 per kg REO produced.

By comparison, one of Mr. Neill’s top picks, Northern Minerals’ Browns Range Project, has a normalized OPEX of $27.07 per kg REO produced for a projected operating margin of negative $4.97. As both Ashram and Browns Range are targeting the exact same end-product in their respective studies (mixed rare earth carbonate), this side by side comparison is even more directly applicable.

For further discussion and analysis of Northern Minerals’ Browns Range Project, I suggest our readers review another article by Ben Kramer-Miller, released the same day as Alastair Neill, that highlighted Northern Minerals as an emphatic short sell target, including an in-depth analysis. Although I do not agree with everything Mr. Kramer-Miller notes, and am not advocating a short position in Northern Minerals, it does highlight an unusually strong divide for that specific project and serious pause for thought.

In general, to quote my prior article on the subject; “The REE basket Price Deception and the Clarity of OPEX”:

“It is evident that the higher operating margins are not from those deposits with the higher basket prices, but rather those that have the lower OPEX. This notion is bolstered by the six major hardrock producers that all have relatively low basket prices...

It is clear those companies that have the lowest OPEX will have the greater flexibility during prolonged depression of prices. Some companies may appear profitable today; however, as an investor, I am most interested in those projects that will be profitable in a depressed market (i.e. the current market).”

![Operating Margin for Select Advanced-Stage Rare Earth Deposits](image)

Source: OPEX from public company disclosure

1. Operating margin is approximated from Adjusted REE Basket Price (i.e. revenue) minus OPEX (i.e. cost of production)
The bottom-line is, the lower OPEX companies with good, balanced distributions anchored by the magnet feed REEs (most notably Nd and Pr) will have the greatest chance of success in this complicated space. A higher basket price (i.e. higher projected revenue) may clearly be counterfeited by a high production cost (OPEX), negating the potential for any healthy operating margin. This is absolutely essential to understand with Northern Mineral’s Browns Range Project a good example of this.

Certainly, there are other factors to consider, such as capital expenditure (CAPEX), tonnage, and jurisdiction; however, it all starts with and stops with OPEX. I have reviewed essentially all players in the REE development space, and have continued to review them as their projects have progressed; however, I find that I am always arriving at the same conclusion. That is that the Ashram Deposit can produce what the market needs at some of the lowest costs projected, if not the lowest in the space. Their CAPEX is middle of the pack, but they have already demonstrated with their Preliminary Economic Assessment that their OPEX is a target to beat. This is where I am putting my money and I look very forward to the pending Pre-feasibility Study that will further delineate the project’s potential economic viability in accordance with NI 43-101 requirements.

Turning back to Mr. Neill’s article, unfortunately he has not only avoided including OPEX as a criteria of note, but he has also several fundamental points noted incorrectly or that are arguable to say the least. Specifically:

- How can Molycorp and Tantalus be given a real market cap? Both companies are in some form of receivership at this time.
- Not all market caps were correct at the time of publication.
- Commerce’s Ashram total resource is being used as opposed to the MHREO Zone, which will be mined for most of the first 25 years. The MHREO zone has 24.6% combined Nd-Pr-Tb-Dy, or 3rd highest in his listing, materially higher than is noted.
- To say that Quest has a “key investor” is somewhat of a misnomer. The company has been awarded (and has not necessarily received) funding from Sustainable Development Technology Canada (SDTC) to address their VERY complicated metallurgy under the guise of clean technology.
- Remoteness is a very relative term and a good project can overcome remoteness. There are examples of this in nearly every commodity.
- Rare Element Resources (I assume “RER” as noted in Mr. Neill’s listing) is in a terrible location, being in the middle of a National Forest, with permitting a nightmare. The Fraser Institute may rank the jurisdiction well, but this can still be a bit of a misnomer if your project is within a protected area!
- Avalon’s Nechalacho Project is no longer being advanced by the company in any meaningful way, and their focus has clearly switched to tin-indium in Nova Scotia.

In conclusion, the REEs are not an easy space and it is certainly not an easy task to evaluate and rank REE projects amongst themselves, and to this notion I give Mr. Neill some credit for his attempt. However, a proper evaluation must include simple fundamental factors, such as OPEX.

Back in April 2014, Rockstone published the article “Rare Earth Deposits: A Simple Means of Comparative Evaluation”, in which 6 criteria of evaluation were taken into account for comparing REE projects in development. Perhaps it’s time I update this ranking to reflect a changing REE market where critical REE (CREEs) and heavy REEs (HREEs) do not hold the stature they once did, and where the magnet feed REEs have now been established as the firm and long-term anchor to any REE project.
Disclaimer and Information on Forward Looking Statements:
All statements in this report, other than statements of historical fact should be considered forward-looking statements. Much of this report is comprised of statements of projection. Statements in this report that are forward looking include that REE and metal prices are expected to rebound; that Commerce Resources Corp. or its partner(s) can and will start exploring further; that exploration has or will discover a mineable deposit; that the company can raise sufficient funds for exploration or development; that any of the mentioned mineralization indications or estimates are valid or economic. Such statements involve known and unknown risks, uncertainties and other factors that may cause actual results or events to differ materially from those anticipated in these forward-looking statements. Risks and uncertainties respecting mineral exploration and mining companies are generally disclosed in the annual financial or other filing documents of Commerce Resources Corp. and similar companies as filed with the relevant securities commissions, and should be reviewed by any reader of this report. In addition, with respect to Commerce Resources Corp., a number of risks relate to any statement of projection or forward statements, including among other risks: the receipt of all necessary approvals and permits; the ability to conclude a transaction to start or continue development; uncertainty of future REE and metal prices, capital expenditures and other costs; financings and additional capital requirements for exploration, development, construction, and operating of a mine; the receipt in a timely fashion of further permitting for its legislative, political, social or economic developments in the jurisdictions in which Commerce Resources Corp. carries on business; operating or technical difficulties in connection with mining or development activities; the ability to keep key employees, joint-venture partner(s), and operations financed. There can be no assurance that such statements will prove to be accurate, as actual results and future events could differ materially from those anticipated in such statements. Accordingly, readers should not place undue reliance on forward-looking information. Rockstone and the author of this report do not undertake any obligation to update any statements made in this report.

Disclosure of Interest and Advisory Cautions:
Nothing in this report should be construed as a solicitation to buy or sell any securities mentioned. Rockstone, its owners and the author of this report are not registered broker-dealers or financial advisors. Before investing in any securities, you should consult with your financial advisor and a registered broker-dealer. Never make an investment based solely on what you read in an online or printed report, including Rockstone’s report, especially if the investment involves a small, thinly-traded company that isn’t well known. The author of this report is paid by Zimtu Capital Corp., a TSX Venture Exchange listed investment company. Part of the author’s responsibilities at Zimtu is to research and report on companies in which Zimtu has an investment. So while the author of this report is not paid directly by Commerce Resources Corp., the author’s employer Zimtu will benefit from appreciation of Commerce Resources Corp.’s stock price. In addition, the author owns shares of Commerce Resources Corp. and would also benefit from volume and price appreciation of its stock. In this case, Commerce Resources Corp. has one or more common directors with Zimtu Capital Corp. Thus, multiple conflicts of interests exist. The information provided herewithin should not be construed as a financial analysis but rather as an advertisement. The author’s views and opinions regarding the companies featured in reports are his own views and are based on information that he has researched independently and has received, which the author assumes to be reliable. Rockstone and the author of this report do not guarantee the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any content of this report, nor its fitness for any particular purpose. Lastly, the author does not guarantee that any of the companies mentioned will perform as expected, and any comparisons made to other companies may not be valid or come into effect. Please read the entire Disclaimer carefully. If you do not agree to all of the Disclaimer, do not access this website or any of its pages including this report in form of a PDF. By using this website and/or report, and whether or not you actually read the Disclaimer, you are deemed to have accepted it. Information provided is educational and general in nature.