6 February 2019

AMUR MINERALS CORPORATION
(AIM: AMC)

2018 Alex Stewart Laboratory Final Results

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 provide its annual update of the Quality Assessment Quality Control ("QAQC") results for its 2018 drill programme completed on its wholly owned Kun-Manie nickel copper sulphide project ("Kun-Manie" or "the Project"). Based on a combination of the Company and Alex Stewart Laboratory ("ASL") QAQC programmes, ASL results are indicated to be devoid of cross sample contamination, devoid of analytical drift and that ASL has successfully internally replicated its results to within the western industry accuracy of 10% and the industry accuracy of 5% for Russia. To further validate the results are suited for inclusion in a Master Data Set ("MDS") to be utilised for Mineral Resource Estimation (MRE), the second mandatory verification stage is being conducted by SGS Minerals ("SGS"). This phase is comprised of SGS's analysing a subset of samples to establish the validity of the ASL results. Lastly, the final drill results for the last five holes completed at the end of the 2018 programme have also been reported and include the QAQC results derived for these five holes.

Highlights:

- The Company has now completed two of the three QAQC steps to confirm the integrity of the 2018 analytical results used to compile the MDS utilised in the compilation of Mineral Resource Estimates. The first step was the acquisition of the original result for each interval sampled with the second being verification that ASL can consistently replicate its results internally.

- The combined Company and ASL QAQC programmes have established that the sample pulps submitted for independent analysis are devoid of sample preparation problems with regard to cross sample contamination and procedural drift that may occur during the analytical process. This has been established through the insertion of blank samples (barren samples).

- ASL's internal check assaying procedure consistently replicated the contained metal values for both nickel and copper. Metal values for selected samples are analysed twice and the differences between the first (Original) and second (Check) are well within the western industry allowable difference of 10%. The original and check assays for nickel grades are within 0.5%. For copper, the difference is projected to be 0.7%.

- Results derived by ASL for Company introduced randomly inserted Blind Duplicates from a series of selected samples (uniquely labelled) indicates that ASL generates mutually supportive results well within the western standard acceptable difference of 10%. Statistically, the Original sample result when compared to the Blind Duplicate result is within 0.4% for nickel and 1.3% for copper.

- The ASL final analytical results based on the QAQC programmes implemented by ASL and AMC confirm that ASL has successfully replicated its results allowing the Company to undertake a second verification step referred to as External Control. This verification phase for a selected subset of the ASL analysed samples is being undertaken by SGS Minerals ("SGS").

- The QAQC ASL internal Check and AMC's Blind Sample introduction has been completed on a combined total of 11% of 5,129 ASL analysed samples. This is nearly double the industry recommended minimum sample number of 5%.

- It is noted that the currently derived ASL results are also within the more stringent Russian Federation acceptable difference of 5% necessary for the compilation of a TEO (Russian Feasibility Study).

- ASL Original results for the comprehensive set of samples submitted from the 2018 drill programme are now complete. This update includes the final ASL Original and QAQC results for the remaining five drill holes that were reported on the basis of Company derived analytical results (5 November 2018).

- Inclusion of the ASL results for the five holes are mutually supportive of the previously reported average mineralised vertical thicknesses and contained metal values reported 5 November 2018. The average mineralised thickness located along the IKEN thorough KUB zone is projected to range from 22 m to 30 m in vertical thickness. The average grade range for nickel is between 0.68% and 0.84% with associated copper being from 0.20% to 0.31%.

Robin Young, CEO of Amur Minerals, commented:

"We are pleased to update our shareholders regarding acquisition of the final analytical results and the important Quality Assessment and Quality Control related to this information obtained from our 2018 drill programme. The combined monitoring programme implemented by our staff and Alex Stewart Laboratories is now complete. We have established that the samples submitted for analysis have been generated in accordance with western industry standards and that the lab can successfully generate consistent results that can be replicated. This is a key factor in the derivation of a Master Data Set to be used in Mineral Resource Estimation.

"Using western industry standards and to further establish the quality of the results, we can now move on to a second independent laboratory for obtaining analyses on a subset of the samples analysed by Alex Stewart Laboratories. As the second lab will not have access to the results generated by the primary lab, we can independently establish the accuracy of the Alex Stewart Laboratory results. This standardised approach has been utilised by Amur since inception of drilling in 2004 and is in accordance with standard western practice ensuring the integrity of the information used to compile Mineral Resource Estimates."

Enquiries:

Company	*Nomad and Broker*	*Public Relations*
Amur Minerals Corp.	**S.P. Angel Corporate Finance LLP**	**Blytheweigh**
Robin Young CEO	Linday Mair Soltan Tagiev	Megan Ray Tim Blythe

+7(4212)755615 +44(0)20 3470 0470 +44 (0) 20 7138 3203

Notes to Editors

Competent Person's Statement

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 and a qualified person as defined by the AIM Rules for Companies. An employee of Amur for 12 years, previously Mr. Young was employed as an 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 was the lead engineer and participant 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 results reported by Alex Stewart Laboratories, SGS Minerals and RPM Global.

For further information, see the Company website at www.amurminerals.com.

Click on, or paste the following link into your web browser, to view the associated PDF document.

http://amurminerals.com/content/wp-content/uploads/20180202_RNS_QC_Results.pdf

Database Integrity (Analytical Results)

To establish the integrity of its resource database, the Company implements an independently audited Standard Operating Plan ("SOP") designed to ensure drill procedures, sampling and the subsequently derived analytical results provide a valid, high quality set of analytical results. Validation and confirmation that the analytical results are robust enables the Company to compile and report Mineral Resource Estimates ("MRE") that meet guidelines associated with JORC Code (Dec. 2012) and / or CIM (NI43-101) standards. It is from the MRE, that Mining Ore Reserves ("MOR") are identified and permitting the generation of a production schedule defining the amount of recovered metal for use in the determination of a project's economic potential.

Approved Standard Operating Plan

The Company has systematically acquired its exploration and drill information in accordance with the Company's 2005 established SOP. This includes a standardised set of procedures in the derivation of its analytical results for inclusion in a Master Data Set ("MDS") used to generate its MRE statements.

Per JORC standards, the SOP programme has been independently audited by the mining consultancy, RPM Global ("RPM"). RPM has confirmed the SOP and associated results are derived per industry recognised standards and that AMC's drill procedures, core collection and handling, geological logging, sample identification and preparation, final analytical results are of good quality and that the information has been appropriately encoded for use in the compilation of MRE's.

RPM's approval of the programme is based on two separate site visits (the most recent being September 2017) and concluded that the implemented field procedures and analytical results generated through 31 December 2017 and used to report the March 2018 MRE were implemented to industry standard and were suited for compilation of the MRE dated March 2018. Validation of the SOP includes the MRE estimates at each of the deposits including Maly Kurumkon / Flangovy ("MKF"), Vodorazdelny ("VOD"), Ikenskoe / Sobolevsky ("IKEN"), Kubuk ("KUB") and the ISK area (located between IKEN and KUB).

The 2018 drill programme was implement using the RPM audited protocols and procedures of the SOP.

Quality Assurance Quality Control ("QAQC") of the Analytical Results

This most critical element of AMC's SOP programme is the derivation and validation of its analytical results. To establish high quality results, three specific parameters are examined to define the following:

- Accuracy – the degree to which an analysis is reflective of the expected result
- Precision – the repeatability of the result
- Identification of sampling failures/errors/contamination

This is accomplished by using two independent industry certified laboratories. A subset of samples selected from the primary results generated by Alex Stewart Laboratories ("ASL") are analysed by SGS Minerals ("SGS") to determine the accuracy, precision and potential of sampling errors. Chronologically, ASL completes its remit which is then followed by SGS's follow-up verification work. QAQC procedures are implemented at both ASL and SGS. The ASL results are now complete and are based on the following steps for the submitted samples:

- The Company uses **Blank Samples** that contains no detectable trace of the key mineral(s) identified within the resource. Inserted into every sample batch, it is possible to identify if a sample or samples have been inadvertently contaminated during the sample preparation stage. The Company sources its blanks from drill intervals of barren Kun-Manie core. No contamination was determined to be present during the course of the analysis of the 291 blanks introduced into the 2018 analytical programme.

- **Blind Duplicates**, the most common industry QAQC approach allows for the determination of analytical precision. Blind Duplicates are generated by Company personnel. This is accomplished by creating a second split from the same sample. Equal weights for both splits are submitted for analysis. These Blind Duplicates are randomly inserted into the sample stream and within every sample batch. Using industry good practice, the original sample and the blind duplicate are assigned distinct sample ID's and are separated from one another to preclude identification by the laboratory that the two splits are derived from the same sample. This allows AMC to determine that ASL can successfully replicate results for the sample as well as identify the presence of any assay drift that may be present. The Company's comparison of the Original value with that of the Blind Duplicate indicates ASL successfully replicated results and that assay drift was not present.

- In addition to the Company QAQC efforts, ASL also implements an **Internal QAQC Check** of its results. This is implemented by ASL sample handling personnel which randomly select samples from the sample stream and resubmit them for derivation of a second analytical result for a single sample. The Original result and the Internal QAQC Check result are subsequently compared by ASL quality control team allowing ASL to swiftly and readily identify the presence

of any sampling error. The comparison of the ASL Internal QAQC results indicated it was capable of replicating mutually supportive results.

A summary of the distribution of the sampling results for the 2018 drill programme is provided in the table below. It is noted that approximately 5% of the total number of samples should comprise the QAQC programme. The combination of ASL Internal Check results and AMC Blind Duplicates represent approximately 11% of the sample population.

Distribution of Sample Analyses

Parameter	Samples	%
Drilled Metres	32,526.5 m	
Company RFA* Results	10,548	
ASL Samples	5,129	100
Primary Analysis	5,129	100
High Grade Repeat Analysis**	720	14
ASL Internal QAQC Check	324	6
AMC Blind Duplicate QAQC	244	5

***RFA**: Company generated results based on Niton XL2 500 X-Ray Fluorescence units ("RFA"), not utilised in MRE estimation.
****High Grade Analysis**: Samples wherein the Primary Analysis indicates the presence of more than 0.9% nickel content are reassayed by the ICP ORE analytical method. This more accurate determination of the nickel content and the ICP ORE result replaces that of the first analysis.

With regard to nickel, the Internal ASL control results are within 0.5% of the Oo~~o~~riginal analytical results. Regarding the accuracy of the results between the Original sample and the Company inserted Blind Duplicate, these are within 0.4%. These differences are well within the western industry standards of 10% (5% for Russian industry standards) for the global results and for six examined nickel grade ranges. Detailed results for nickel are provided in the following tables. Similarly, the results are within the industry standards for copper. The link below provides charts of the results, http://amurminerals.com/content/wp-content/uploads/20180202_RNS_QC_Results.pdf

ASL Original Result vs. ASL Internal Check Value Result

Nickel Grade Range	Samples	Ni % Original	Ni % Internal	Ni % Delta	Cu % Original	Cu % Internal	Cu% Delta
All	324	0.408	0.406	0.5%	0.134	0.133	0.7%
<0.25%	165	0.074	0.074	0.0%	0.037	0.037	0.0%
0.25% -- 0.50%	35	0.386	0.377	2.3%	0.180	0.176	2.2%
0.50% - 0.75%	42	0.626	0.618	1.3%	0.217	0.216	0.5%
0.75% - 1.00%	55	0.864	0.861	0.3%	0.262	0.260	0.8%
1.00% - 1.25%%	21	1.109	1.115	-0.5%	0.277	0.277	0.0%
>1.25%	6	1.550	1.546	0.3%	0.274	0.280	-2.2%

ASL Original Result vs. AMC Blind Duplicate Result

Nickel Grade Range	Samples	Ni % Original	Ni % Blind	Ni % Delta	Cu % Original	Cu % Blind	Cu% Delta
All	244	0.568	0.566	0.4%	0.155	0.157	-1.3%
<0.25%	75	0.173	0.172	0.6%	0.061	0.061	0.0%
0.25% - 0.50%	61	0.390	0.383	1.8%	0.129	0.129	0.0%

0.50% - 0.75%	38	0.658	0.653	0.8%	0.195	0.201	-3.1%
0.75% - 1.00%	26	0.884	0.881	0.3%	0.240	0.245	-2.1%
1.00% - 1.25%%	27	1.109	1.125	-1.4%	0.247	0.252	-2.0%
>1.25%	17	1.408	1.404	0.3%	0.297	0.301	-1.3%

In summary, review of the analytical results using the Company implemented SOP and ASL Internal Control indicates ASL has generated results that are void of contamination and assay drift whilst simultaneously demonstrating its procedures replicate results.

External Control

The Company is now entered in the External Control phase. Implemented during previous drill programmes, this is comprised of a second industry certified laboratory, SGS conducting a second blind analysis on a subset of samples for which ASL has reported its results. SGS maintains an internal control QAQC programme wherein each sample is analysed twice. This is a key component of the Company's SOP QAQC programme.

Supplemental Drill Results

The final drill report of 5 November 2018 included all drill results for the 169 diamond core holes (32,526.5 m) completed during the 2018 season. For convenience, the following table presents a summary of the distribution of drilling over the course of the season.

Distribution of 2018 Drill Programme

2018 Totals		Area
Holes	**(m)**	
169	32,526.5	All
36	6,604.4	Metallurgical Sample
19	2,887.0	MKF GKZ
14	777.2	IKEN GKZ
23	2,703.0	Kubuk GKZ
6	375.0	VOD GKZ
31	9,063.5	IIHG
15	3,922.6	Kubuk Step Out
21	5,406.8	ISK Step Out
4	787.0	Gorny - Geological

Analytical results reported in the 5 November 2018 RNS were based on a combination of Company and ASL generated results for five holes. The five holes for which ASL results were not available have now been provided to the Company and QAQC results are also complete. The five holes were distributed along a 2,700 metre length of the now joined Ikenskoe / Sobolevsky ("IKEN") and Kubuk ("KUB") deposits. Two each were located within the deposits of IKEN Inferred High Grade Area ("IIHG") and KUB with one hole located in the ISK area.

Replacement of the Company results with those derived by ASL has resulted in a minimal change in the thickness of the mineralisation (vertical metres) and grade of contained metal within the three drilled areas. For convenience, a comparison of the 5 November 2018 RNS and newly attained ASL results by drilled area are provided in the following table. The vertical mineralised thicknesses and contained length

weighted nickel and copper grades (based on a 0.4% nickel cutoff grade and a three metre minimum thickness) are mutually supportive.

Adjusted Vertical Mineral Thickness, Nickel Grade and Copper Grade

Deposit		Vertical Thickness (m)			
		Per Hole	Per Interval	Ni (%)	Cu (%)
IIHG	5 Nov 2018 RNS	27.1	16.3	0.83	0.22
	ASL Inclusion	26.0	16.1	0.84	0.22
ISK	5 Nov 2018 RNS	29.7	18.8	0.79	0.31
	ASL Inclusion	29.8	18.9	0.79	0.31
KUB	5 Nov 2018 RNS	22.2	12.1	0.68	0.20
	ASL Inclusion	22.2	12.1	0.68	0.20

The Company concludes that the average contained metal within each of the drilled areas will not vary significantly by inclusion of the ASL results and that the identified mineralised limits will likely remain unchanged.

For completeness, a global summary of all holes completed within the IIHG, ISK and KUB areas is provided below. The drill holes using the newly reported ASL results are presented at the bottom of each table (depicted in ***italicised*** and ***bold*** fonts).

Ikenskoe / Sobolevsky Area
IIHG Drill Results
Final ASL 2018 Drill Results

Hole	From (m)	To (m)	Length (m)	Ni ASL (%)	Cu ASL (%)	Vertical Thickness (m)
C600	166.7	209.5	42.8	0.82	0.27	42.8
C601	152.0	155.0	3.0	0.86	0.19	3.0
	159.6	172.1	12.5	0.85	0.23	12.5
	176.3	205.6	29.3	1.08	0.24	29.3
C602	201.9	209.5	7.6	0.73	0.19	7.6
	212.5	229.3	16.8	0.76	0.19	16.8
C603	271.0	278.5	7.5	0.89	0.19	7.5
	287.5	293.1	5.6	1.09	0.24	5.6
C604	235.8	238.8	3.0	0.38	0.09	3.0
	245.5	253.6	8.1	0.59	0.16	8.1
C605	No Mineral					
C606	124.0	131.8	7.8	0.76	0.15	7.8
C607	88.0	97.0	9.0	0.42	0.12	9.0
	104.5	112.0	7.5	0.95	0.19	7.5
C608	63.0	76.0	13.0	0.89	0.21	13.0
	82.0	116.5	34.5	1.10	0.26	34.5
C609	No Mineral					
C610	188.5	235.0	46.5	0.85	0.26	46.5
C611	171.6	176.5	4.9	0.98	0.24	4.9
	181.0	214.0	33.0	0.54	0.23	33.0

C612	383.2	399.4	16.2	0.69	0.20	16.2
C613	No Mineral					
C614	No Mineral					
C615	335.5	343.0	7.5	0.73	0.20	7.5
	346.0	349.0	3.0	1.41	0.32	3.0
C616	322.0	334.0	12.0	0.82	0.20	12.0
C617	253.0	272.5	19.5	0.84	0.19	19.5
C618	209.5	240.9	31.4	0.89	0.14	31.4
C619	No Mineral					
C626	302.2	314.5	12.3	1.06	0.29	12.3
	332.5	348.1	15.6	0.93	0.29	15.6
C627	334.2	371.7	37.5	0.95	0.23	37.5
	380.8	385.0	4.2	1.00	0.27	4.2
C628	368.7	392.8	24.1	0.74	0.20	24.1
C629	256.3	286.0	29.7	1.04	0.26	29.7
	296.5	307.0	10.5	0.34	0.16	10.5
	343.0	347.9	4.9	0.38	0.23	4.9
C630	No Mineral					
C631	No Mineral					
C632	No Mineral					
C634	No Mineral					
C580	***65.6***	***100.3***	***34.7***	***0.63***	***0.16***	***5.9***
C581	***246.6***	***268.0***	***21.4***	***0.57***	***0.16***	***20.1***
Average Vertical m / Hole- 26.0 Average Vertical m / Interval – 16.1				0.84	0.22	

ISK Area
Final ASL 2018 Drill Results

Hole	From (m)	To (m)	Length (m)	Ni ASL (%)	Cu ASL (%)	Vertical Thickness (m)
C558	101.9	143	41.1	0.86	0.25	41.1
	146	203.6	57.6	0.87	0.22	57.6
C559	245.9	251.8	5.9	0.64	0.17	5.9
	257.8	260.8	3.0	0.45	0.25	3.0
	268	278.1	10.1	0.85	0.24	10.1
C560	209.8	232.5	22.7	0.61	0.16	22.7
C561	169.2	184.9	15.7	0.92	0.22	15.7
C562	181.0	201.0	20.0	0.62	0.17	20.0
C563	180.3	183.3	3.0	0.36	0.09	3.0
	187.6	193.2	5.6	0.83	0.18	5.6
C564	No Mineral					
C633	176.5	237.8	61.3	0.88	0.22	61.3
C635	173.7	188.5	14.8	0.97	0.25	14.8
	191.5	203.8	12.3	0.80	0.23	12.3
C573	300.7	303.7	3.0	0.36	0.19	3.0
C636	115.0	142.0	27.0	0.88	0.25	27.0
	164.5	167.5	3.0	0.37	0.18	3.0

	173.5	176.5	3.0	0.35	16.90	3.0
C574	No Mineral					
C637	177.0	185.5	8.5	0.53	0.14	8.5
	233.5	238.0	4.5	0.60	0.28	4.5
C575	No Mineral					
C638	200.6	224.5	23.9	1.01	0.26	23.9
	227.5	263.6	36.1	0.77	0.24	36.1
C576	286.0	292.0	6.0	0.37	0.18	5.9
C639	193.0	217.0	24.0	0.80	0.19	24.0
	220.0	229.0	9.0	0.84	0.26	9.0
C640	169.0	194.5	25.5	0.79	0.21	25.5
	197.5	218.5	21.0	0.69	0.24	21.0
C641	178.0	210.7	32.7	0.85	0.26	32.7
C642	188.8	200.3	11.5	0.75	0.21	11.5
C643	284.0	307.0	23.0	0.68	0.18	20.8
C577	***212.5***	***248.4***	***35.9***	***0.64***	***0.18***	***33.9***
Average Vertical m / Hole- 29.8 Average Vertical m / Interval – 18.9				0.79	0.31	

Kubuk Area
Final ASL 2018 Drill Results

Hole	From (m)	To (m)	Length (m)	Ni ASL (%)	Cu ASL (%)	Vertical Thickness (m)
C553	353.4	360.2	6.8	0.51	0.16	6.8
C554	253.4	260.1	6.7	0.66	0.17	6.7
C555	256.8	259.8	3	0.81	0.25	3.0
C556	No Mineral					
C557	No Mineral					
C565	128.2	141.0	12.8	0.51	0.19	12.8
	183.4	194.6	11.2	0.49	0.14	11.2
	198.8	203.0	4.2	0.84	0.18	4.2
C566	No Mineral					
C567	131.5	139.5	8.0	0.50	0.21	8.0
	190.2	202.0	11.8	0.91	0.24	11.8
C568	119.0	143.0	24.0	0.88	0.24	24.0
	149.0	198.5	49.5	0.61	0.19	49.5
C569	211.6	241.0	29.4	0.78	0.21	29.4
	248.5	288.1	39.6	0.74	0.18	39.6
C570	213.0	217.1	4.1	0.51	0.15	3.4
C571	152.5	158.5	6.0	0.47	0.12	5.4
	188.5	191.5	3.0	0.34	0.15	2.7
	221.5	226.0	4.5	0.41	0.20	4.1
	250.0	256.0	6.0	0.51	0.26	5.4
	277.0	282.9	5.9	0.43	0.15	5.4
C572	230.5	236.5	6.0	0.50	0.24	6.0
	249.6	260.9	11.3	0.92	0.23	11.3
C578	***183.2***	***193.6***	***10.4***	***0.67***	***0.21***	***8.8***

C579	***183.3***	***189.7***	***6.4***	***1.01***	***0.32***	***6.4***
Average Vertical m / Hole- 22.2 Average Vertical m / Interval – 12.1				0.68	0.20	

March 2018 Mineral Resource Estimate
0.4% Nickel Cutoff Grade

Resource Classification	Ore Mt	Ni %	Cu %	Co %	Pt g/t	Pd g/t	Eq Ni (%)	Contained Metal (t)					
								Ni (1000's)	Cu (1000's)	Co (1000's)	Pt (t)	Pd (t)	Eq Ni (1000's)
MKF													
Measured													
Indicated	57.5	0.77	0.22	0.015	0.15	0.16	1.06	445	124	8.9	8.8	9.3	606.5
M+I	**57.5**	**0.77**	**0.22**	**0.015**	**0.15**	**0.16**	**1.06**	**445**	**124**	**8.9**	**8.8**	**9.3**	**606.5**
Inferred	3.4	0.80	0.22	0.017	0.16	0.15	1.06	27	7	0.6	0.5	0.5	36.1
MKF TOTAL	**60.9**	**0.78**	**0.22**	**0.015**	**0.15**	**0.16**	**1.06**	**472**	**131**	**9.5**	**9.3**	**9.8**	**643.0**
IKEN													
Measured	10.6	0.71	0.18	0.011	0.22	0.26	0.98	75	19	1.1	2.3	2.8	103.2
Indicated	13.6	0.66	0.17	0.012	0.18	0.20	0.91	89	24	1.7	2.4	2.8	123.7
M+I	**24.2**	**0.68**	**0.18**	**0.012**	**0.19**	**0.23**	**0.94**	**164**	**43**	**2.8**	**4.7**	**5.6**	**226.9**
Inferred	27.8	0.80	0.23	0.017	0.19	0.19	1.10	222	63	4.6	5.2	5.3	306.5
IKEN TOTAL	**51.9**	**0.75**	**0.20**	**0.014**	**0.19**	**0.21**	**1.03**	**386**	**106**	**7.5**	**9.9**	**10.8**	**534.0**
KUB													
Measured													-
Indicated	32.9	0.69	0.19	0.014	0.13	0.12	0.93	226	63	4.7	4.3	3.9	306.0
M+I	**32.9**	**0.69**	**0.19**	**0.014**	**0.13**	**0.12**	**0.93**	**226**	**63**	**4.7**	**4.3**	**3.9**	**306.0**
Inferred	4.7	0.70	0.19	0.014	0.12	0.12	0.94	33	9	0.7	0.6	0.6	44.5
KUB TOTAL	**37.6**	**0.69**	**0.19**	**0.014**	**0.13**	**0.12**	**0.93**	**259**	**72**	**5.3**	**4.9**	**4.5**	**349.9**
VOD													
Measured	0.6	0.74	0.22	0.012	0.29	0.32	1.24	5	1	0.1	0.2	0.2	7.6
Indicated	3.2	0.85	0.21	0.017	0.16	0.16	1.13	27	7	0.5	0.5	0.5	36.0
M+I	**3.8**	**0.85**	**0.21**	**0.016**	**0.20**	**0.19**	**1.15**	**32**	**8**	**0.6**	**0.7**	**0.7**	**43.9**
Inferred	1.0	0.81	0.22	0.016	0.17	0.16	1.06	8	2	0.2	0.2	0.2	11.0
VOD TOTAL	**4.8**	**0.83**	**0.21**	**0.016**	**0.18**	**0.18**	**1.13**	**40**	**10**	**0.8**	**0.9**	**0.9**	**54.6**
TOTAL													
Measured	11.2	0.71	0.18	0.011	0.23	0.26	0.99	80	20	1.3	2.5	3.0	110.8
Indicated	107.0	0.74	0.20	0.015	0.15	0.15	1.00	787	217	16.2	16.0	16.6	1,075.1
M+I	**118.2**	**0.73**	**0.20**	**0.015**	**0.16**	**0.17**	**1.00**	**867**	**237**	**17.5**	**18.5**	**19.6**	**1,185.9**
Inferred	37.0	0.79	0.22	0.017	0.17	0.18	1.08	290	81	6.0	6.4	6.6	398.2
TOTAL	**155.1**	**0.75**	**0.21**	**0.015**	**0.16**	**0.17**	**1.02**	**1,157**	**319**	**23.5**	**24.9**	**26.0**	**1,581.6**

Numbers may not be precise due to rounding.

Glossary

DEFINITIONS OF EXPLORATION RESULTS, RESOURCES & RESERVES EXTRACTED FROM THE JORC CODE: (December 2012) (www.jorc.org)

A 'Mineral Resource' is a concentration or occurrence of material of intrinsic economic interest in or on the Earth's crust in such form, quality and quantity that there are reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction. The location, quantity, grade, geological characteristics and continuity of a Mineral Resource are known, estimated or interpreted from specific geological evidence and knowledge. Mineral Resources are sub-divided, in order of increasing geological confidence, into Inferred, Indicated and Measured categories.

An 'Inferred Mineral Resource' is that part of a Mineral Resource for which tonnage, grade and mineral content can be estimated with a low level of confidence. It is inferred from geological evidence and assumed but not verified geological and/or grade continuity. It is based on information gathered through appropriate techniques from locations such as outcrops, trenches, pits, workings and drill holes which may be limited or of uncertain quality and reliability.

An 'Indicated Mineral Resource' is that part of a Mineral Resource for which tonnage, densities, shape, physical characteristics, grade and mineral content can be estimated with a reasonable level of confidence. It is based on exploration, sampling and testing information gathered through appropriate techniques from locations such as outcrops, trenches, pits, workings and drill holes. The locations are too widely or inappropriately spaced to confirm geological and/or grade continuity but are spaced closely enough for continuity to be assumed.

A 'Measured Mineral Resource' is that part of a Mineral Resource for which tonnage, densities, shape, physical characteristics, grade and mineral content can be estimated with a high level of confidence. It is based on detailed and reliable exploration, sampling and testing information gathered through appropriate techniques from locations such as outcrops, trenches, pits, workings and drill holes. The locations are spaced closely enough to confirm geological and/or grade continuity.

An 'Ore Reserve' is the economically mineable part of a Measured and/or Indicated Mineral Resource. It includes diluting materials and allowances for losses which may occur when the material is mined. Appropriate assessments and studies have been carried out, and include consideration of and modification by realistically assumed mining, metallurgical, economic, marketing, legal, environmental, social and governmental factors. These assessments demonstrate at the time of reporting that extraction could reasonably be justified. Ore Reserves are sub-divided in order of increasing confidence into Probable Ore Reserves and Proved Ore Reserves.