

8 August 2017

AMUR MINERALS CORPORATION
(AIM: AMC)

Confirmation of Analytical Results
Minimum of variance and well within industry acceptable standards

Amur Minerals Corporation ("Amur" or the "Company"), a nickel-copper sulphide mineral exploration and resource development company focused on the far east of Russia, is pleased to report that Alex Stewart Laboratories ("ASL") has confirmed the Company's site generated nickel and copper analytical results for the first sample batch (containing 561 core sample, plus 104 Quality Assurance and Quality Control ("QAQC") samples) derived at both the Kubuk ("KUB") and Ikenskoe / Sobolevsky ("IKEN") 2017 drill programme.

Over the course of the exploration season, the Company has, and will continue to report, its internally derived analytical results which are available from six to eight weeks earlier than the final and official results generated by the independent certified laboratory, ASL. This allows Amur with to update shareholders up to two months earlier than if it waited for the final certified results.

Highlights:

- The Company generated Niton XL2 500 X-Ray Fluorescence ("RFA") analytical results for the first 561 drill core sample results for nickel and copper, which have been independently verified by ASL of Moscow, Russia.
- The independently certified ASL results will be used for future Mineral Resource Estimate ("MRE") updates at KUB and IKEN.
- ASL results for 12 ore holes, containing 17 mineralised intervals, indicate an average mineralised thickness of 16.8 metres per hole with an average nickel grade of 0.82% and copper of 0.26%. Previously reported RFA results (announced 20 June 2017 (IKEN) and 28 July 2017 (KUB)) for the same 12 holes had indicated an average thickness per hole of 16.9 metres with 0.84% nickel and 0.27% copper average grades.
- Given that the ASL and RFA results are in line with well within industry standards of $\pm 10\%$, the Company believes the reporting of the RFA results continues to provide an accurate representation of drill results with regard to mineralised thicknesses and contained nickel and copper. The minor differences between the RFA and ASL results are similar to differences noted from previous drill seasons.
- ASL nickel analytical procedures are comprised of two methods. One for grades of less than 1.0% with the second being for samples in excess of 1.0%. Again, the ASL results by analytical method are consistent with the RFA reported results showing an absence of bias by analytical method.

- The Company has recently received the final ASL results for the second sample batch (557 core samples with 217 additional trench, QAQC and reconnaissance samples) which are now under management review. The third batch (403 core samples with 320 additional trench, QAQC and reconnaissance samples) is presently in analysis at ASL with the fourth (355 core samples and additional QAQC and trench samples) in transit.
- Use of the RFA unit reduces costs. Fewer samples require analysis by ASL and the savings to date for this year's programme is already projected to be in the order of US\$ 23,000. Without the availability of the RFA units and sample preparation facilities onsite, it is estimated that this year's ASL programme would have already cost nearly US\$ 200,000 due to the additional freight and sample preparation including the need for crushing, pulverizing, drying, sieving and blending.

The Company attributes the relatively small difference between its RFA results and those of the certified ASL to its rigorously implemented Quality Assurance and Quality Control ("QAQC") programme. With daily calibration of both of our RFA units, using available ASL sample results, standards and duplicate analysis of intervals, the RFA and ASL results should not vary significantly. Any large variance can be quickly identified and if a unit suffers a malfunction, the second unit is available to continue work onsite while repair is undertaken.

Robin Young, CEO of Amur Minerals, commented:

"We are pleased to inform shareholders that our first set of analytical results, reported within our previous drill update RNS statements, are being validated by external and certified Alex Stewart Laboratories, based in Moscow. With a minimum of variance, well within industry acceptable standards, the newly delivered analyses will be input into our drill hole data base replacing our internally derived results for inclusion in future Mineral Resource Estimate updates on the Kubuk and Ikenskoe / Sobolevsky deposits. As each set of results is delivered, we shall continue to review the results and provide further updates as our independent information accumulates over the course of our drill season.

"We also note that our sample preparation facilities, results generated onsite and the sample selection procedure for external assaying have been externally audited and our methods and procedures have been approved by the independent mining consultancy of RPM Global. Use of our two Niton XL2 500 X-Ray Fluorescence units and procedures at site, have already reduced our costs for assaying by approximately US\$ 23,000. Without the X-Ray units and approved onsite sample preparation facilities, the projected cost to have implemented our analytical programme to date would already total nearly US\$200,000."

Market Abuse Regulation (MAR) Disclosure

Certain information contained in this announcement would have been deemed inside information for the purposes of Article 7 of Regulation (EU) No 596/2014 until the release of this announcement.

For additional information, visit the Company's website, www.amurminerals.com.

Please follow the links below to view additional information related to the reported drill results and an audio overview.

<http://amurminerals.com/content/wp-content/uploads/ASL-vs-RFA-Batch-1.pdf>

<http://amurminerals.com/content/wp-content/uploads/8-August-2017-RNS-audio.mp3>

Enquiries:

<i>Company</i>	<i>Nomad and Broker</i>	<i>Public Relations</i>
Amur Minerals Corp.	S.P. Angel Corporate Finance LLP	Yellow Jersey
Robin Young CEO	Ewan Leggat Soltan Tagiev	Charles Goodwin Harriet Jackson Dominic Barretto
+7(4212)755615	+44(0)2034 700 470	+44 (0)203 735 8825

Notes to Editors

The information contained in this announcement has been reviewed and approved by the CEO of Amur, Mr. Robin Young. Mr. Young is a Geological Engineer (cum laude), a Professional Geologist licensed by the Utah Division of Occupational and Professional Licensing, and is a Qualified Professional Geologist, as defined by the Toronto and Vancouver Stock Exchanges. An employee of Amur for 13 years, previously Mr. Young was employed as an exploration and mine geologist, mining engineer, construction manager of a mine startup as well as independent consultant with Fluor Engineers, Fluor Australia and Western Services Engineering, Inc. during which time his responsibilities included the independent compilation of resources and reserves in accordance with JORC standards. In addition, he has been the lead engineer and project manager in the compilation of numerous studies and projects requiring the compilation of independent Bankable Studies utilised to finance small to large scale projects located worldwide. Mr. Young is responsible for the content of this announcement which includes information sourced from Alex Stewart Laboratories based in Moscow, Russia.

Reporting Protocol on Analytical Results

Over the course of an exploration season, the Company has, and will continue to report, its internally derived analytical results which are available from six to eight weeks earlier than that of the final and official results generated by the independent certified laboratory, ASL. This provides Amur with the ability to update shareholders up to two months earlier than if it waited for the final certified results. It is possible to report these internal results as the Company believes these are both representative and mutually supportive of the contained nickel and copper metal that is ultimately to be reported by ASL, a certified independent laboratory. We note that it is the ASL certified results used in the compilation of Mineral Resource Estimates (“MRE”) and we therefore provide this most critical information when available.

Company Generated Results

The Company reports the internally generated results derived from using its two Niton XL2 500 X-Ray Fluorescence units (“RFA”). To assure the accuracy of the results on a daily basis, these units are calibrated against existing standards and previously derived ASL results. The RFA generated results have historically been, and should continue to be, mutually supportive of all certified and independent results. For this reason, the Company is able to report its results in advance of the certified analytical results allowing for expedited reporting of drill results. All RNS releases related to the 2017 drill season have thus far been reported based on the RFA results.

For Quality Assurance and Quality Control (“QAQC”) purposes, the geological staff insert blind blanks (waste), blind duplicates of samples from within each drill hole and samples from which previously derived ASL results have been derived to ensure the site based analytical team are generating results are of a high standard. The QAQC results are monitored by the geological team allowing the Company to identify any suspect or potential erroneous results which trigger an immediate re-assay procedure.

Benefits in using these units include:

- Adjustments to the drill programme can be made in drill hole site selection and identification of a holes depth optimising our drilling and related expenditures. This can be done within days (often within 24 hours) of receiving the RFA results. This “review and adjust effort” reduces the number of barren holes than would typically be drilled along the periphery of the ore bodies had the RFA results not been available.
- Nickel mineralised intervals, attendant dilution and internal waste can be readily identified for selection and submission to ASL for analysis, thereby allowing the Company to substantially reduce the number of waste samples in the hanging wall above the ore zones requiring certified analyses for use in MRE definition. The removal of a large number of identified waste samples provides the advantage of a more rapid turnaround in the generation of the official ASL results as fewer samples need to be processed without impacting the development and estimation of MRE’s.
- The combination of fewer waste holes, better mineral targeting and the reduction in total number of samples that require ASL verification results improves our staff productivity and provides a substantial cost savings to the Company.

The site sample preparation facility and analytical teams work every day and provide a daily update to our head office in Khabarovsk and to our Amur management team. This information is considered to be inside information.

Alex Stewart Laboratory Certified Analytical Results

Sample pulps are recovered from the site on the return segment of resupply helicopter flights and delivered to our Khabarovsk head office core storage facility. These samples (weighing 300 to 400 grams each) are transshipped by train to ASL’s Moscow, Russia facility. Concurrent with extraction of these samples, the remaining half of the sawn core for the ore intervals is also delivered to our core storage facility where it is available for year round inspection whenever required.

As for sample processing, ASL completes the following work:

- The particle size of all samples is examined to ensure that the Company delivered a properly prepared sample for ensuing analytical work.
- An ME-ICP41 spectral analysis is completed on all samples.
- Samples indicated to contain more than 1.0% nickel are analysed a second time using the ME-ICP41 method which is more accurate for these higher grade samples.
- Two separate atomic absorption tests (“AA45”) are completed allowing for nickel, copper and silver determination.
- Gold, platinum and palladium are determined using the PGM-ICP23 method.

- Included within the submitted batch of samples are blanks (samples of zero metal content), blind duplicates and blind samples from previously derived ASL allowing the Company to monitor ASL's results for QAQC purposes.
- In addition, ASL will also select numerous samples for re-assay to enable its implementation of a QAQC programme.

Lastly, to further ensure the accuracy of the ASL results, a subset of the samples is provided to a second independent laboratory for analysis which should replicate the ASL results. This external control has historically replicated the ASL results and is a key component to maintaining an industry standard set of analytical results. By implementation of these QAQC procedures, a comprehensive and representative analytical data set can be confidently reported and used in the compilation of the MRE's at Kun-Manie in accordance to JORC (Dec 2012) standards.

Management Review of RFA and ASL Results

Management conducts a review and comparison of the results to identify any anomalous results allowing for a re-assay request by either or both of its team results (RFA) and ASL of these specific anomalous results. Due to the detail of the information, this is a complex and critical final step in establishing the highest quality analytical data base for MRE derivation. This carefully implemented review takes time due to the large number of samples and the number of elements (11).

Status of ASL Analytical Programme

To date, a total of four batches of sample pulps have been extracted from site. A summary of the status of each batch is provided in the table below. The first batch of ASL results have been received and passed through the Management Review process and are the subject of this RNS.

Alex Stewart Laboratory Core Sample Status Update (Excludes QAQC, Trench and Reconnaissance Samples)

Batch ID	Number Of Samples Core Only	Status
1	561	Complete – Reported Herein
2	557	Under Management Review
3	403	In Analysis by ASL
4	355	In Transit to Moscow

"Please note that the total number of samples within Sample Batch 3 was 723 and not 273, as previously reported in the announcement dated 28 July 2017."

Comparative Analysis By Grade Range

A total of 561 sample pulps were analysed by ASL from the first batch of samples. Of these, a total of 247 samples contained nickel grades in excess of 0.15% nickel averaging 0.62% nickel and .019% copper. The comparative RFA results were 0.64% nickel and 0.19% copper. The RFA results for nickel were approximately 2.3% higher than those derived by ASL. There was no difference in copper.

Further statistical analyses by grade groupings were completed to establish the potential for resource increase in the advent there is a significant increase in the price of nickel which could ultimately result in

the addition of currently undefined low grade mineral tonnes (open pit potential) and to allow for direct comparison of the results by ASL based on its two implemented analytical method:

- Grouped by cutoff grade (“COG”) ranging from 0.15% nickel to 0.399% nickel. This category was examined to evaluate the potential of identifying open pit potential not included in current 10 February 2017 MRE modeling approach where a mineralised limit of 0.4% nickel COG was utilised. For this sample group, there was no difference between the average nickel or copper content. A substantial increase (to \$7.50 per pound - \$16,530 per tonne) in the nickel price could expand the resource by an addition of 16% more tonnage averaging 0.25% nickel and 0.11% copper which is not presently considered in the MRE.
- Grouped by COG from 0.4% nickel to 0.999% nickel. These samples were evaluated by ASL using the ME-ICP41 spectral analysis method. The RFA results were marginally higher for both nickel (4.4%) and copper (3.8%). The RFA nickel average was projected to be 0.70% with ASL results being 0.67%. For copper, the average RFA content was 0.23% with ASL being 0.22%.
- The final examined grouping was for those samples in excess of 1.0% nickel content analysed by ASL using the ME-ICPORE method. The RFA results were 0.7% higher for nickel and 3.3% higher for copper than those derived by ASL. The RFA nickel grade was 1.30% nickel with ASL being 1.29% nickel. RFA copper was calculated to be 0.30% with ASL copper content being 0.29%.

RFA vs ASL Nickel and Copper Comparison

Grouping By Nickel Content	Samples	RFA	ASL	Ni Difference (%)	RFA	ASL	Cu Difference (%)
>0.15% to <0.40%	101	0.25	0.25	0.0%	0.11	0.11	0.0%
0.40% to 0.999%	96	0.70	0.67	4.4%	0.23	0.22	3.8%
>1.00%	50	1.30	1.29	0.7%	0.30	0.29	3.3%
Total	247	0.64	0.62	2.3%	0.19	0.19	0.0%

In conclusion, the results are considered to be mutually supportive and a pure RFA to ASL sample comparative basis.

Comparative Analysis by Length Weighted Analysis

The final comparison was based on a length weighted basis for intervals that are identified as potential ore intervals suitable for use in the generation of MRE’s at a 0.4% COG. This required minimum thickness of the mineralisation is three metres.

Twelve holes within the first batch of samples contained ore intervals meeting the current MRE modeling parameters. The length weighted comparison indicates that the RFA and ASL were again mutually supported and displayed a minimal difference. Observations include the following.

- The total mineralised length between RFA and ASL differed by 0.5 meters representing a difference of only 0.25%. The total RFA mineralised length was 202.3 metres whilst that of ASL was 201.8 metres.

- The average RFA length weighted nickel grade was 0.84% nickel and 0.82% for ASL. The RFA results were marginally higher by 2.4% than those based on the ASL results.
- The average RFA length weighted copper grade was 0.27% with ASL being 0.26%. Again the RFA results were marginally higher by 3.8% than that of ASL.

RFA vs ASL Ore Grade Interval Comparison

Source	RFA Ore Intercepts					ASL Ore Intercepts					
Hole ID	From (m)	To (m)	Length (m)	Ni (%)	Cu (%)	From (m)	To (m)	Length (m)	Ni (%)	Cu (%)	
C341	86.6	92.4	5.8	0.65	0.11	86.6	92.4	5.8	0.62	0.10	
C342	81.0	84.0	3.0	0.60	0.20	81.0	84.0	3.0	0.54	0.11	
C343	83.7	86.7	3.0	1.10	0.24	83.7	86.7	3.0	0.90	0.25	
C344	51.4	54.4	3.0	0.40	0.21	51.4	54.4	3.0	0.42	0.19	
	62.0	69.0	7.0	0.89	0.21	62.0	69.0	7.0	0.89	0.21	
C346	4.0	13.5	9.5	0.72	0.29	4.0	14.5	10.5	0.67	0.27	
	24.0	37.6	13.6	0.62	0.25	24.0	37.6	13.6	0.60	0.25	
C347	39.6	51.2	11.6	1.14	0.25	39.6	51.2	11.6	1.15	0.26	
	57.2	76.4	19.2	1.02	0.29	58.7	76.4	17.7	1.09	0.28	
C348	146.8	167.4	20.6	1.14	0.32	146.8	167.4	20.6	1.12	0.30	
	182.6	185.6	3.0	0.61	0.17	182.6	185.6	3.0	0.65	0.17	
C349	74.4	87.9	13.5	0.92	0.35	74.4	87.9	13.5	0.90	0.32	
	146.3	153.8	7.5	0.65	0.29	146.3	153.8	7.5	0.65	0.28	
C446	6.8	37.7	30.9	0.82	0.25	6.8	37.7	30.9	0.74	0.36	
C447	40.5	47.2	6.7	0.86	0.22	40.5	47.2	6.7	0.84	0.21	
C448	82.0	98.3	16.3	0.88	0.22	82.0	98.3	16.3	0.89	0.22	
C451	200.2	228.3	28.1	0.62	0.35	200.2	228.3	28.1	0.60	0.21	
Total / Average			202.3	0.84	0.27				201.8	0.82	0.26
Per Interval			11.9	0.84	0.27				11.9	0.82	0.26
Per Hole			16.9	0.84	0.27				16.8	0.82	0.26

The 300 series holes have been drilled at the IKEN deposit.

The 400 series holes have been drilled at the KUB deposit.

RFA vs ASL Conclusion

The RFA results are well within the industry standard of $\pm 10\%$ accuracy of the results generated by the certified ASL results. The mutually supportive results provide support in the Company's reporting of its RFA results in advance of obtaining the final ASL results which are available substantially later (from six to eight weeks). The Company does note that the RFA results are marginally higher but not of a sufficient difference to halt its reporting procedure and process allowing for more rapid reporting of drill results.

Cost Savings Related to Use of the RFA Units.

The ASL incurred cost per sample is presently US\$ 8.83 including transport to the Moscow based laboratory facility. Use of the RFA unit allows the Company to identify and send a subset (the mineralised samples including internal waste and dilution) of the total number of drill sample intervals. To date, 36.9% (1,876 samples from the total of 5,078 sample intervals) of the drilled metres have been forwarded to ASL. Without the RFA units, the waste interval samples would have also had to be shipped and analysed. To date, the RFA units have already reduced our total external assaying cost by approximately US\$ 23,000.

Without the onsite sample preparation facility (independently inspected and its procedures approved by RPM Global) and use of the RFA units, these costs would be substantially higher as the Company would be shipping a far greater weight per sample (half core samples) as well as all ore and waste intervals to ASL for analysis. The half core samples would have to be crushed, pulverised, dried, sieved and blended as well as completing the final analysis. The estimated all in cost using this approach would be in the order of US\$ 40.00 per sample versus that of US\$ 8.83. Without the RFA units, it is projected that an analytical cost would already be in the order of US\$ 200,000.