Appendix 2: JORC 2012 Table I- Check list and comments. KURISKOVA

Criteria	Commentary
Section 1 Sampling Techniques and Data **(Criteria in this section apply to all succeeding sections.)**	
Sampling techniques	Samples included in the Mineral Resource Estimate comprise Half Drill Core samples from recent holes (2005-2011) and eU values from gamma logging of historical holes (before 1990).Geochemical analysis of half drill core samples is based on geological logging and sampling. eU values form historical holes are based on downhole gamma logging.
	Sample selection for Geochemical analysis was based on geological logging with sample breaks at geologic boundaries. Competent Person reviewed sample procedure in detail. Competent Person also reviewed gamma logging and calibration procedures used during drilling of historical holes and recent holes. The details of data verification work carried out were documented for an audit trail. Verification included closed can analysis for equilibrium analysis and selected recent drill holes were left open/cased for future re-probing with downhole tools.
	Industry standard core drilling was used for sampling. Competent Person reviewed sample preparation and analytical methods used for sampling and analyses during recent drilling campaigns. Details in the form of sample flowsheet has been provided to Competent Person together with preparation and analytical reports. In general entire sample amount was crushed to min. 75% passing 2 mm. 250g split after crushing for every 20th sample was created and stored to check splitting adequacy, another 250 gram split was pulverized to min. 85% passing 75 micron. 25 grams split after pulverization is preserved as a duplicate and 25g split was created and used for analyses. Crusher and Pulp rejects were sent back to project site and securely stored. Crushing and Pulverization were controlled by Grind checks.
Drilling techniques	The project has been drilled using core (diamond) drilling techniques. The mineralized zones were intersected with PQ, HQ or NQ size core. Approximately 55% of all drilling was HQ diameter and 40% was PQ diameter. The rest was NQ, after the initial first few metres from surface were drilled at 150 mm diameter. One drill hole provided oriented core.
Drill sample recovery	Drill core recoveries were recorded following standard logging practice by recording drill hole run length and recovered length. Recovery in percentage was subsequently calculated and used in the 3D datamine holes file. Statistics on core recovery were recorded and kept in the data base. The historical drilling had poor recovery and so no systematic core sampling was possible, although detailed downhole gamma logging has been done during this time.
	A quality drill rig and experienced team assured high core recovery achieved from all recent holes. A core recovery of +95 % was achieved.
	A relationship between sample recovery and grade was not found by statistical evaluation of data. There is no observation of sample bias due to loss of material.
Logging	Drill holes were geologically logged to provide rock description, rock code and structural information. Geotechnical logging procedure varied with different drilling campaign.
	Drill core photographs are available.
	The entire length of each drill hole was logged.
Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation	Recent drilling includes half core samples which were sawn or split and subsequently shipped for sample preparation and analyses. For historical holes eU% data are used in estimation.
	Details on sample preparation during different drilling campaigns has been provided to Competent Person including a detailed sample preparation flowsheet. Sample preparation techniques adopted were appropriate in all cases.

	In 2005-2006 standard sample preparation and QC procedures were applied at ALS Inc, laboratory in Vancouver, Canada. In 2007 -2008 there was a rigorous QA/QC program under European Uranium Resources control, including well documented procedures describing sample steps, chain of custody, QA/QC procedure and reporting procedures. Sample preparation and analysis by were performed by the primary laboratory (SGS Lakefield). QC samples were inserted and samples were renumbered before analysis by secondary (check) lab. In 2009-2011 Sample Preparation was done by EL lab, Spisska Nova Ves, Slovakia (QC samples inserted by European Uranium Resources). Primary assaying was done at ALS Chemex, Spain with check assays at Geological Survey laboratory, Spisska Nova Ves. During 2010, the primary assaying was changed to the laboratory of the Geological Survey in Spisska Nova Ves. A dedicated geologist tracked the samples, consolidated and reported all the assay results received for each batch and documented any QC action taken. European Uranium Resources monitored quality assurance by plotting and analyzing the data, as received, and requested re-assay of sample batches that did not meet pre-determined standards. Quality control procedure adopted for all sub-sampling and preparation included grind checks after crushing using two stacked screen 2mm and 6mm and grind checks after pulverization to 150 and 106 micrometer. A 250g split after crushing was created for every 20th sample and used for check if there were any questions about splitting in the lab. Field blanks were inserted into the sample stream to check for contamination.
	Splitting adequacy was checked by geologists by marking line for cutting. No field duplicates were taken. The second half of selected core has been used for metallurgical testing and expected grade was achieved. This is a direct confirmation of splitting adequacy. A 250g split after crushing was created for every 20th sample and used as a check on splitting in lab.
	Competent Person considers sample sizes to be appropriate. Industry standard sample preparation by accredited labs has been used.
Quality of assay data and laboratory tests	Before 1990 (Historical Holes): Detailed data verification and validation of gamma data was carried out. Closed can analysis confirmed that there are no disequilibrium issues at Kuriskova. Before using gamma for historical holes, a correlation of gamma and chemical assay was done. 26 historical holes which were not verified with original data were not used in Resource Estimates. 2005-2006, European Uranium Resources drilling program: Standard QC procedures applied at ALS Vancouver. All the samples were re-assayed in 2007 by SGS as check assay with good correlation. 2007 -2008: Rigorous QA/QC program under European Uranium Resources control, well documented procedure describing sample steps, chain of custody, QA/QC procedure and reporting procedures. Sample prep and analysis by Primary lab (SGS Lakefield). QC samples were inserted and samples were renumbered before analysis by secondary (check) lab.Selected samples were sent from SGS to ActLab for check assays, to establish precision (repeatability) and analytical bias. Selected drill holes were left open/cased for reprobing with downhole tools. 2009-2011: Sample Prep lab: EL lab, Spisska Nova Ves, Slovakia (QC samples were inserted by European Uranium Resources, Primary Assaying at ALS Chemex, Spain. Check assays were performed at the Geological Survey laboratory, Spisska Nova Ves. During 2010 primary assaying was changed to the laboratory of the Geological Survey in Spisska Nova Ves. A dedicated geologist tracked the samples, consolidated and reported all the assay results received for each batch and documented any QC action taken. European Uranium Resources monitored quality assurance by plotting and analyzing the data, as received, and requested re-assay of sample batches that did not meet pre-determined standards. The laboratory procedures used were in all cases appropriate and represent total assays.

	Gamma (eU) percent values are derived from instruments (down hole probes) that measure orders of magnitudes larger volumes of material than that measured by XRF or ICP for the samples taken from half core. Competent Person reviewed procedures for gamma logging in detail, including depth correction while logging, lowering of the probe into the drill hole, depth marks, registration mode, gamma logging, and logging probe calibration procedure (1. Location of the probe into calibration position, 2. Control of the adjustment of zero measurement point, 3. Measurement of the background for at least 1 minute, 4. Bearings by the ascending sequence of adjusted values of exposure powers. Every bearing is carried out for 1 minute and it has to contain minimum 60 registered values, 5. Background measurement, min. for 1 minute, 6. Control of the adjustment of zero measurement value), standardization of logging probe, measurement, repeat measurement, logging probe stability, logging record, and quantitative interpretation of GK measurement. Competent Person found all steps and procedures to be appropriate.
	A detailed and rigorous QA/QC program was implemented including grind checks, field blanks, pulp duplicates, pulp blanks, and Certified Reference materials to cover all U range and one CRM for Molybdenum. Pulps and coarse rejects have been stored. Acceptable levels of accuracy and precision were established.
Verification of sampling and assaying	Reasonable QA/QC protocol was adopted and drill hole intersections were checked.
	No twin holes have been drilled at this project. However, some holes are close enough to each other to confirm geological continuity.
	All data were compiled into proper and standard electronic database format. Graphical drill hole logs with histograms of U from chemical analyses and eU from gamma logging were generated and available for Competent Person.
Location of data points	Drill hole collar data was surveyed by a certified Slovak company. Instrument used was : SOKKIA POWER SET 4000. Each collar position was surveyed after drilling with high accuracy. Drill hole location was marked with a wooden stake before drilling and after drilling was surveyed again and permanently marked with steel pipe installed in concrete. Software used: GROMA, Reference Points (Permanent Point) : 6214-0220, 6214-0221, 6214-0222. Downhole surveying was done using an EZ Trac down hole surveying tool. During historic drilling until September 2007, down hole surveying in Kuriskova was carried out using a Russian electrical resistance inclinometer by geophysical contractor. Until 2005 Uranpress carried out surveying. Later this Job was given to Koral s.r.o geophysical company in Spiska Nova Ves. In 2006 the drilling contractor was also using Trapori for checks and to understand the deviations while drilling. The survey was carried out at the end of each hole for every 10 metre interval. Though the surveying results were good, but to have better accuracy and industry standard multi shot equipment, in September 2007 European Uranium Resources purchased a latest model magnetic downhole instrument named EZ Trac from Sweden.
	The local S-JTSK grid system was used. S-JTSK was adopted on the territory of the Czech and Slovak Republics (former Czechoslovakia) in 1927. This system is used for all geodetic surveying and cartographic activities (state mapping) in the Slovak Republic. State cadastral large-scale maps (1:500 – 1:5 000) and basic topographic maps (1:10 000 –1:200 000) also use S-JTSK.
	DTM generated from contour map available from a Slovak geophysical company.
Data spacing and distribution	Competent Person is of opinion that drill hole spacing and distribution and geologic continuity are sufficient for resource categories presented.
	Sample compositing was applied for the resource estimation. The majority of the drill hole intercept values used for modeling were “chemical assay” %U values. A histogram of sample lengths within Main Zone North wireframe shows a clustering of assay sample lengths at 0.5m. To preserve the integrity of the primary assay data a composite length of 0.5m was selected and a down-hole composite database was created. Compositing was controlled by domain ZCODE (each composite has a single ZCODE) with a minimum composite length of 0.1m.
Orientation of data in relation to geological	Strike and DIP of the mineralization is described and shown in many historical reports and confirmed by drilling and this assures that orientation of sampling is not biased.

structure	Drilling orientation is considered proper and as not causing any sampling bias.
Sample security	Security of samples from 2005 - 2011 drilling was maintained very well from dispatch of samples up to data storage. Samples in the form of half core, coarse and pulp rejects are stored in secure facility in Novoveska Huta. Transport to the laboratories was secured meeting all necessary requirements for chain of custody.
Audits or reviews	Sampling techniques and data were audited / reviewed several times by independent consultants in preparation of Canadian National Instrument 43-101 resource estimates and prefeasibility study on behalf of European Uranium Resources Ltd.
Section 2 Reporting of Exploration Results **(Criteria listed in the preceding section also apply to this section.)**	
Mineral tenement and land tenure status	The Kuriskova deposit lies within the current exploration license issued to Ludovika Energy (50% Forte Energy NL and 50% European Uranium Resources Ltd). The license, formally named "Cermel-Jahodna - U-Mo, Cu ores" was granted on March 21, 2005 by the Geology and Natural Resources Department at the Ministry of the Environment of the Slovak Republic N. 1250/230/2005-7. The licence was extended to April 19, 2015 by the Ministry of the Environment of the Slovak Republic N. 3119/2014-1.10. The project license area totals 31.75 km2. The exploration license can be extended or converted to a mining license. The company is currently preparing documents to extend licence for a further 10 years.
	Since the Kuriskova deposit and exploration license area is situated under and/or adjacent to a Natura 2000 area mining-associated surface disturbances within the Natura 2000 boundary will be kept to a minimum and performed in accordance with requirements for this area. Natura 2000 is a special area of conservation and protection of habitat and species as per European Union legislation. There is active logging taking place within this Natura 2000 area.
Exploration done by other parties	The Czechoslovakian group CSUP discovered the Kuriskova uranium deposit in 1985. The deposit is essentially a blind target, with only rare outcrop exposed through the several metres of soil cover and arboreal growth. The exploration group had flown a series of airborne radiometric surveys over the region, which had recorded a number of surface radiometric anomalies. Follow-up ground radiometric surveys were conducted and followed with surface geological mapping and trenching. Weak uranium mineralization was discovered within Permian andesitic rocks, which was later determined to be the distal periphery of the mineralization. The thickness of soil cover was too great for conventional trenching and pitting for geologic mapping and hand-held scintillometer follow-up. A systematic diamond drilling program was instituted by Uranpres to investigate the ground radiometric anomalies. Over the next five years, 53 diamond drill holes were drilled on the property totaling 17,000 metres. The depth of the target necessitated drill holes to 1,000 metres in depth. The thin-walled drill pipe and pre-wireline drilling technology coupled with poor ground conditions, resulted in continued drill-path deflection and poor recovery (overall average of 50%). Downhole radiometric logging was successfully used on all drill holes. The same system developed by CSUP at other uranium exploration projects in the region (Novoveska Huta) was used for Kuriskova to derive correlation coefficients to convert the radiometric readings into equivalent uranium assay data (e U3O8). The implied continuity of mineralization was impacted by the poor core recovery. The drilling program was terminated in 1990, and the last investigation of the property during this historic phase ended in 1996, as state funding for exploration programs ceased.
Geology	The main zone of uranium mineralization is associated with andesitic tuff/tuffite units at the base of the main andesite unit . Mineralization occupies zones along the geologic contact between the overlying competent andesitic metavolcanic unit and the underlying metasediments. The tuffs are phosphorous rich and it appears that phosphorous has preferentially fixed the uranium minerals, resulting in localized high-grade zones of 1-5%U. The uranium mineralization is also hosted directly on the andesite/sediment contact, which is generally lower grade (0.1-0.5°%U) and is regarded as a more tectonised form

	of the tuff hosted zone described above. Uranium mineralization hosted within hanging wall andesites is characterized by discrete lenses associated with thin quartz-carbonate veins, stockwerks. Uranium grades within these zones are variable. The overall dimensions of the main deposit established to date are approximately 750 by 550 metres, and about 2.5 metres in average thickness, though in some areas the thickness is more than 10m. The Main zone mineralization dips to the southwest at 45 to 70 degrees. Uraninite is the most dominant uranium mineral, with lesser amounts of coffinite accompanied by abundant fine-grained molybdenite (MoS2). The Kuriskova deposit is located in Permian rocks with a typical folded structure. The orientation of rock layers is NW-SE, and the inclination of the layers in the deposit block is towards the SW. There has been extensive tectonic displacement. Tectonic disturbances have resulted in fault offsets, some of which disrupt the main deposit. The Permian formations comprise three lithostratigraphic formations: Knola, Petrova Hora and Novoveska Huta. The Knola formation consits of conglomerates and the sandstones. This formation creates litostratigrafic footwall of the mineralization. The Petrova Hora formation is variable and consists of mainly volcanic, volcaniclastic and sedimentary rocks. This unit hosts uranium mineralization. The Novoveska Huta formation is represented by conglomerates, sandstones and shales, and Bielovodske layers represented by evaporites, shales and sandstones. The genesis of Kuriskova uranium deposit is not completely understood; however, it is suggested that the deposit is the result of secondary uranium derived from anomalously enriched volcanic/ volcanoclastic rock. The uranium mineralization was remobilized and precipitated in structurally-favorable units during the Variscan and early Alpine Orogenies. It is postulated that high heat flow through thinned crust, saline brine production, and thrusting and fracturing provided a permeability pathway into the meta-volcanic units, and the mobilization mechanisms to accommodate hydrothermal fluid flow. The high phosphorous content and suitable oxidation potential of the meta-volcanic rocks may have been the deposition control for fracture-controlled uranium mineralization. The Kuriskova uranium deposit is, therefore, best described as an epigenetically remobilized stratiform to stockwork type uranium deposit, although it may have had precursor sedimentary, volcanic and/or hypogene origins.
Drill hole Information	The Competent Person reviewed all data related to drill holes including Easting, Northing, Elevation, Downhole Survey data, Hole Length, Drilling Diameter, Intersection depth. All drill hole information was used to define the resource estimate.
	All information were reviewed by Competent Person and 26 historical holes which could not be verified with primary records were not used in resource estimation and reporting exploration results.
Data aggregation methods	A data assessment was carried out to identify outliers and data has been treated accordingly. Competent Person has applied Top cut / capping on assays from Main Zone North to avoid undue influence on outlier grade samples on grade estimates in. The decision to cap at 6.95 % U is based on log probability plot. This is applied in resource estimation not in reporting exploration results. Exploration results are reported based on down hole length of sampling intervals.
	In these cases, high grade has been capped and further compositing has been carried out to reduce the impact of short length high grade samples. The majority of the drill hole intercept values used for modeling will be chemical assays %U values. Histogram of sample lengths within Main Zone North wireframe shows a clustering of assay sample lengths at 0.5m. To preserve the integrity of the primary assay data a composite length of 0.5m was selected and a down-hole composite database was created. Compositing was controlled by domain ZCODE (each composite has a single ZCODE) with a minimum composite length of 0.1m. Statistic of the combined %U and %eU composite statistics and %Mo composite statistics by domain showed as expected the Main Zone North (ZCODE 1) and Zone 45 (ZCODE 5) have significantly higher grades than the other domains. The coefficient of variation for the separate domains is in general lower than that for all domains, which is an indication that the

	population segregation by domain is reasonable. This is applied in resource estimation not in reporting exploration results. Exploration results are reported on length weighted average.
Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths	True thickness has been taken in account by 3D interpretation. Exploration results are reported on down hole length.
	Drilling DIP has been oriented as close as possible to perpendicular intersection with mineralized body.
	Competent Person reviewed drill hole intersections and with the 3D interpretation only true thickness has been taken in account by 3D interpretation. Exploration results are reported on length weighted average using down hole length.
Diagrams	Not applicable
Balanced reporting	This has been done.
Other substantive exploration data	Early exploration began in the 1970s. Recent exploration began in 2005 and continues to present. Exploration has consisted of airborne geophysical surveys and exploration core drilling. Exploration of the Kuriskova deposit was initiated in 2005 as confirmatory diamond drilling of the historically delineated Main and Hanging Wall mineralized zones, followed by infill drilling to connect and extend uranium mineralization at depth and along strike. The work has been undertaken by a local geological staff that has both uranium exploration experience and knowledge and experience specific to Kuriskova. Extensive regional surveys of Permian volcaniclastics along strike from Kuriskova, in the Gemericum and Veporicum Units (former basins) have been completed as well as follow-up surveys of historical radiometric anomalies first noted by the Czechoslovakian state exploration entities in the 1980s. MCompetent Personhar Geophysical, a well-known geophysical contracting group of Canada, was contracted and flew approximately 1,450 km2 of airborne radiometric surveys in 2007. Total kilometres flown in the survey were in excess of 16,250 line-kilometres. The airborne geophysical survey consisted of magnetics, and spectral radiometrics (potassium, thorium, and uranium).
Further work	There are several exploration targets identified within the Kuriskova license, which will be drilled in future.
	Diagrams are presented in an attached plan.
Section 3 Estimation and Reporting of Mineral Resources **(Criteria listed in section 1, and where relevant in section 2, also apply to this section.)**	
Database integrity	The database was compiled in a spreadsheet and maintained in a MS Access format. Detailed database verification and QA/QC was conducted. The database comprises of collar, down hole survey, geology, assay, and density data. Geological records and assay data are handled through the spreadsheet and a MS Access data entry system. Validation queries were created in MS Access and MS Excel to perform data validation before the data was input to Datamine Studio3®,a mine modeling software. Datamine built-in validation rules also checked for errors while importing. The drill hole information imported in Datamine Studio3®, consisted of 151 drill holes. This is a “mixed” database; gamma eU% values are used only for 27 historical drill holes . While the mixing of data types is undesirable it is necessary as the 27 historic drill holes have only eU% Kuriskova values available. The justification of using eU% for these 27 holes is based on detail data verification and justification.

	The following was performed to ensure data are valid and fit for resource estimation purpose (each point is well recorded and documentation available): - Double entry of data for eU percent from historical drill hole files. - Confirmation of drilling results from historical to current, and from year to year. - Equilibrium measurements. - Correspondence of multiple assay methods for U percent. - The rigorous quality control program. - Verification of the consistency of formulas and process used during calculation of equivalent Uranium for historical holes. - Each data capture from historic holes was manually checked for data entry error. Competent Person reviewed data verification and QA/QC to support the data incorporated into mineral resource estimation.
Site visits	The Competent Person has been actively involved in this project since 2005 and has made numerous site visits during that time.
Geological interpretation	Competent Person has reasonable confidence of geological interpretation of the deposit.
	Data are considered appropriate for this stage of project and stated resource category.
	Mineral resource has been tested by a variety of grade estimation and weighting methodologies including inverse to the distance, with various powers, and kriging.
	The interpretation of mineralization limits is based on geology and on natural break / sharp change in U grade representing some sort of mineralization phenomenon.
	Structural features such as faults has been modelled and accounted for grade and tonnage estimation and mineralization continuity. Geological domains are divided into Sub-domain by faults.
Dimensions	The Main Zone is a thin stratiform (2 to 8 metres thick) zone of fracture-controlled mineralization developed along the fractured or sheared/faulted meta-sediment-meta-volcanic contact, with dimensions of at least 600 metres along strike in a northwest-southeast direction, and explored depth of at approx. 530 metres. The main zone mineralization does not crop out at surface, beginning at about 200 metres below the surface. Hanging wall mineralization is peripheral to the Main zone and was noted in sub-crop exposures during the original exploration. The Main Zone is fairly continuous. The Main zone mineralization dips to the southwest at 45 to 70 degrees. Zone 45 occurs at a shallower depth (100-150 metres from surface) Mineralization in Zone 45 is 1 to 2.5 metres thick and as currently defined extends 220 metres along strike and 120 metres down dip.
Estimation and modelling techniques	A top cut has been applied at 6.95% U for the Main Zone North (a population break is interpreted at approximately 6.95 %U). There has been no top cutting for molybdenum. Grades in excess of this value are considered anomalous, or “outliers” to the distribution. For all the zones other then Zone 2 and 3, only model block positions within the wireframed domains were estimated and only the relevant domain composites were used. The wireframe boundaries are exact as drill hole were “snapped” to during their creation and there is no extrapolation beyond these boundaries. Zone 2 and 3 were estimated without hard boundary wireframe using domain blocks created within a tight search ellipse. Datamine software was used for the resource estimation.
	There are 43-101 reports available from this property. They have been considered and relied upon in the preparation of this resource estimate.
	Mineral Resource Statement includes molybdenum (Mo) as a potential by-product. Mo has only been included where it occurs within U blocks above the U cutoff grade.
	Estimation of other elements beside U and Mo has not been done in this mineral resource estimate.
	A parent block size of 10 m in X direction, 10 m in Y direction and 2m in Z direction was created considering drilling density, geological domain and subdomains dimensions.
	There are no selective mining units modeled in this resource estimate.

	Molybdenum has grade values at approximately one-tenth that of uranium.While their distributions appear to have similar shapes, the two metals have a moderate correlation of 0.69% within a range of 0.001 to 10%.
	Mineralized zones interpretation was carried out by conventional two dimensional structural interpretations and outlining of mineralization. Mineralization outlines were interpreted section-by-section incorporating geological and assay information from drill holes. The string outlines were snapped at drill hole contacts while digitizing to preserve accuracy of volume of mineralization.
	Top cut / capping was done on assays from Main Zone north to avoid undue influence of outlier grade samples on grade estimates. The decision to cap at 6.95 % U is based on log probability plot.
	Block model validations were done to check for global and local accuracy of grade estimate. The classical statistics was tabulated between composites and block grade. As the estimation method objective is to estimate the grade distribution, the grade population between block model and composites were compared and found to be within reasonable limits using log histogram of block model and composites. For local grade validation, visual checks in section and plan view between block model and composites was done through entire resource area.
Moisture	The tonnages are estimated on a natural moisture.
Cut-off parameters	The cutoff is based on a natural (geologic) cutoff in assays and appears reasonable based on estimated mining processing costs and expected future commodity prices.
Mining factors or assumptions	No mineral reserves have been calculated as part of this resource estimate. Waste units internal to the Main Zone North wireframe, with a drill hole intercept thickness greater than 1 metre, were considered to be separable mineable units of waste and were modeled with internal waste wireframes. Most of the waste thickness is greater than 2m.
Metallurgical factors or assumptions	Three composite samples were sent by European Uranium Resources to Hazen Research Inc. (Hazen) for use in a metallurgical test program. The composites were prepared as a means to represent the mineralogy of the various resources encountered in the Kuriskova deposit. Carbonate leach procedures including pressure oxidation (POX) were developed to extract the uranium and molybdenum constituents. Results from POX tests performed on two composites indicate that 93% to 94% of the uranium and 90% to 93% of the molybdenum could be extracted. Hazen reviewed and evaluated flow sheets prepared by Pincock, Allen, and Holt in earlier studies. Hazen considered alternative flow sheets that may improve recovery of uranium and molybdenum and may reduce cost in a production operation. A flow sheet developed for further evaluation was prepared using design criteria generated from the test work. Hazen further investigated operating parameters and reagent consumption quantities associated with several unit operations as they relate to uranium and molybdenum recovery. A preliminary process flow sheet was ultimately derived from the test work results wherein a carbonate leach POX circuit is operated to extract the uranium and molybdenum from the metal bearing mineralization. In this circuit a bleed stream of pregnant liquor is advanced to the uranium recovery circuit from which uranium is extracted as sodium diuranate via acidification and treatment with hydrogen peroxide; the yellow cake product containing 67% to 68% uranium. The residual leach solution, which is barren in uranium yet carrying the leached molybdenum, would be processed to extract the molybdenum by direct precipitation of MoS3 using sodium hydrosulfide. Further process studies are anticipated as the Kuriskova Uranium Project advances toward a feasibility study.
Environmental factors or assumptions	Baseline studies were conducted with the primary goal of collecting and analyzing technically adequate data that will support the required permit applications and environmental documentation including an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Many of the baseline studies were initiated in 2008 and have been advanced since 2009 as the Project moved forward. The primary study areas include: Water resources; Geochemical characterization; Water treatment; Ecology (flora and fauna); Meteorology, climatology, and air quality; Soils; and Radiological monitoring. The radiological monitoring program was done

	separately from the applicable programs. The initial ecological surveys were conducted within a roughly 120 km2 area.
Bulk density	A total of 4,845 samples were analyzed for bulk density (specific gravity) by wet methods. Competent person reviewed data with statistical evaluation for each domain and an average density of 2.75 tonnes per cubic metre (t/m3) was used for all domains in the calculation of the geologic resources.
	A bulk density of 2.75 is representative of mineralization in the deposit. The bulk density of waste has been measured separately.
	A weighted average bulk density has been applied.
Classification	Search parameters are the key factors for resource confidence classification used for the resource estimation at Kuriskova. The ellipsoidal search volume (SVOL) is initially 50m, 50m, and 25m, reflecting the assumed preferential directions of continuity along strike and downdip, with a two-to-one anisotropy. The first axis with a 50m search is oriented down dip. The second orthogonal axis, also with a 50m search, is oriented along strike. For all the zones other then Zone 2 and 3, only model block positions within the wireframed domains were estimated and only the relevant domain composites were used. The wireframe boundaries are exact as drill hole were "snapped" to during their creation and there is no extrapolation beyond these boundaries. Zone 2 and 3 were estimated without hard boundary wireframe using domain blocks created within tight search ellipse. The ellipsoidal search volume (SVOL) for these two zones is 20m, 15m, and 2m, with no second and third search. This approach was taken to be conservative and avoid getting extrapolated blocks in the resource. Only blocks not estimated with the first set of parameters were estimated with the subsequent expanded search. In order to preserve this local variation of grades and have a requirement for grade assignment using data from more than one drill hole, a minimum of four 0.5m composites were required, with a maximum of three from any given hole, for estimation with the first two search volumes. The interpolation methodology and search neighborhood strategy were selected subsequent to experimentation and are intended to preserve the variation of grades observed primarily in the Main Zone. The search ranges were defined based on results of variogram and jackknifing validation of variogram parameters. Competent Person supplemented numerical and statistically derived resource classifications with geological interpretation to avoid a "spotty" representation.
	Appropriate account has been taken of all relevant factors (ie relative confidence in tonnage/grade estimations, reliability of input data, confidence in continuity of geology and metal values, quality, quantity and distribution of the data)., accordingly part of resource has been classified as inferred.
	The results appropriately reflects the Competent Person's view of the deposit based on data verification, QA/QC, interpretation done by Competent Person, and validation of estimation parameters and results.
Audits or reviews.	Prior mineral resource estimates at Kuriskova were audited / reviewed by independent consultants to prepare Canada National Instrument 43-101 resource estimates on behalf of European Uranium Resources Ltd. The mineral resource estimate herein relies and is based upon the most recent of these reviewed and audited estimates.
Discussion of relative accuracy/ the confidence	Detail analysis and validation and justification of estimation parameters have been done. The interpolation methodology and search neighborhood strategy were selected subsequent to experimentation and are intended to preserve the variation of grades observed in the sub domains. The resource confidence classification is restricted to indicated (FCLASS=2) and inferred (FCLASS=3); a measured classification is not obtainable with the available data.
	The Kuriskova block model was validated through a visual comparison between the estimated block grades and the grades of the composites. These were examined in some detail on screen and the distribution of grades in the model appears to honor the distribution of composited values given the controlling anisotropies and wireframed domains derived from geological interpretations. The local variation of grades appears to be relatively well preserved. The comparison of domain composite and model block average is reasonable.