



See before you drill.

ADR OPPORTUNITY REPORT

Desk-based feasibility assessment of Atomic Dielectric Resonance for a defined subsurface target

Client: [Client name]

Project / site: [Project name, location, country]

Report reference: [VXR-OPP-0000]

Prepared for: [Contact name, title]

Prepared by: VEXRAD Ltd, Edinburgh, Scotland

Date: [DD Month YYYY]

Status: Final — Commercial in confidence

This assessment reviews whether ADR can add value to the stated objective. It is a desk study, not a survey, and does not itself detect or measure the subsurface. Every finding is tagged to VEXRAD's four-tier evidence framework so its standing is explicit.

1. Summary verdict

One short paragraph: can ADR help here, yes / partly / no, and the single most important reason. Write this last; lead with the honest answer.

[e.g. ADR is well suited to the primary objective — mapping the depth and lateral extent of a conductive horizon between approximately 150 and 250 m. It can narrow drill targeting and reduce the number of exploratory holes. It cannot return grade, and mineral discrimination at this site is indicative rather than demonstrated. On balance a full survey is recommended, scoped in Section 7.]

At a glance

Client question	ADR assessment	Tier
Can ADR resolve a conductive sulphide horizon at ~150–250 m?	Yes — depth and contrast are within demonstrated range.	Validated
Can it discriminate Ni-bearing from barren sulphide?	Indicative only; spectral separation is target-dependent.	Candidate
Can it return grade or assay values?	No — ADR does not quantify grade.	Known null

Replace the three example rows with the client's actual questions. Keep the verdicts plain and tier every one — the honest "no" rows build more trust than the "yes" rows.

2. Objective & scope

State, in the client's own terms, what they are trying to find out and what decision it feeds. Define the boundary of this report.

[The client is evaluating whether to commit a drilling programme at (site). The question put to VEXRAD is whether ADR can (define target, depth, decision). This report is a desk-based assessment only; no field data has been acquired.]

Out of scope for this report:

- Any acquisition, processing or interpretation of new ADR field data.
- Guarantees of detection, grade, volume or economic outcome.

3. Target & setting

Summarise the geological setting and the physical target from the material the client supplied. This is where you show you understood the problem.

Commodity / target: [e.g. magmatic Ni-Cu sulphide]

Target depth of interest: [e.g. 100–300 m]

Host setting: [e.g. mafic intrusion, cover thickness, terrain]

Access / logistics notes: [terrain, permitting, seasonality]

4. Information reviewed

List exactly what the client provided and what you drew on. Note gaps — missing data is itself a finding.

- [Client-supplied: e.g. target coordinates, prior geophysics, historic drill logs, licence map.]
- [VEXRAD reference: comparable ADR case histories, spectral fingerprint database entries.]
- [Gaps / assumptions: e.g. no local ground-truth borehole within the target block.]

5. ADR suitability assessment

The core section. Work through what ADR can realistically resolve for this target, at what depth, and — just as important — what it cannot. Tag each claim.

What ADR can contribute here:

- [e.g. Depth and geometry of the conductive horizon — Validated for comparable contrast and depth.]

- [e.g. Lateral continuity between existing holes — Theoretically grounded.]

Where the evidence is weaker:

- [e.g. Discrimination of ore-grade from barren sulphide — Candidate; target-dependent.]

What ADR will not do here:

- [e.g. Return grade, tonnage or assay values — Known null.]

6. Evidence basis — how to read our claims

Every technical statement in this report carries an evidence tier. The tier tells you how far the claim is proven, not how confident we sound. This is the standard we hold all VEXRAD work to.

Evidence tier	What it means in this report
Validated	Demonstrated for comparable targets by controlled, blind or repeat ADR surveys. Cited with the supporting case.
Theoretically grounded	Supported by the physics of ADR but not yet directly demonstrated for this specific setting or material.
Candidate	Plausible and under active investigation; not yet substantiated. Flagged so expectations stay honest.
Known null	Established limits — what ADR does not resolve at this site. Stating these openly is part of the method.

7. Indicative survey design & proposal

Turn the verdict into a concrete next step. Give a realistic survey outline, what it would deliver, and a scoped price. This is the conversion engine of the report.

Suggested survey outline:

- [e.g. N sounding stations / M line-km over the target block.]
- [Deliverables: virtual boreholes, depth-tagged material classification, interpretation report — all tier-tagged.]
- [Indicative field window and mobilisation notes.]

Indicative survey price: [£ range]

The £2,500 fee for this Opportunity Report is credited in full against a subsequent ADR survey commissioned within 6 months.

8. Limitations & assumptions

This is a desk-based assessment of suitability. It is an informed professional opinion, not a guarantee of subsurface conditions or survey outcome. Findings depend on the accuracy and completeness of the information supplied by the client. No liability is accepted for decisions taken solely on the basis of this report; a full survey is required before any drilling or investment decision. Full terms accompany the engagement.

9. Prepared & reviewed

Prepared by: [Author name], VEXRAD Ltd

Scientific QA: Dr Kees van den Doel, Scientific Lead, VEXRAD Ltd

Date: [DD Month YYYY]

VEXRAD Ltd · Edinburgh, Scotland · Company No. SC872149 · vexrad.com
 ADR technology invented by Dr G. Colin Stove (1949–2026), Founding Inventor. Carried forward by VEXRAD.