



ASX ANNOUNCEMENT

22nd December 2022



**VALOR
RESOURCES**

OUTSTANDING HIGH-GRADE URANIUM ROCK CHIP RESULTS UP TO 7.98% U₃O₈ CONFIRM DRILL TARGET AT SURPRISE CREEK

**Outstanding surface sampling assay results confirm priority
drill target extending over 500m strike length**

HIGHLIGHTS

- ▶ Follow-up field program at the Surprise Creek Project, located 25km north-west of Uranium City in Canada's Beaverlodge Uranium District, returns six surface samples above 1% U₃O₈ with associated copper, including:
 - ▶ 7.98% U₃O₈ and 0.67% Cu
 - ▶ 6.83% U₃O₈ and 0.17% Cu
 - ▶ 3.35% U₃O₈ and 0.04% Cu
- ▶ Area of surface uranium mineralisation at Surprise Creek extended to a **strike length of around 500m** at the Surprise Creek Fault target, based on results received from the follow-up field program completed in October.
- ▶ The field program comprised detailed geological mapping and geochemical sampling in the Surprise Creek Fault area as a follow-up to reconnaissance work completed in July which returned several rock chips with assays **>1% U₃O₈** and up to **6.13% U₃O₈** and **1.03% Cu**.
- ▶ Geological mapping has confirmed the proximity of uranium mineralisation to an unconformity and a spatial association with the north-south trending Surprise Creek Fault, highlighting strong geological similarities with significant uranium deposits in the Beaverlodge Uranium District such as Fay-Ace and Gunnar.
- ▶ 50 rock chip samples collected from across the Project, including 28 samples from the Surprise Creek Fault area, of which 16 returned assays >1,000ppm U₃O₈.
- ▶ Samples also taken from a widespread area of copper mineralisation discovered to the west, following-up on copper mineralisation first identified in the July field program, with several samples returning assays of between 0.4% Cu and 1% Cu.
- ▶ The Company is targeting structurally-controlled vein-type uranium deposits at Surprise Creek, a sub-type of the basement-hosted unconformity-related uranium deposits.
- ▶ Drill testing of the Surprise Creek Fault target planned for 2023, plus airborne radiometrics and magnetics across the entire Project area.

For personal use only




Figure 1: Surprise Creek Fault - Simplified geology and surface sampling results



Figure 2: Surprise Creek Fault – historical trench sample site for Sample # 212583 (3.35% U₃O₈).

For personal use only

Further to its announcement of 9 November 2022, Valor Resources Limited (**Valor or the Company**) (ASX: **VAL**) is pleased to report significant uranium assay results from a follow-up field exploration program completed in September 2022 which has further enhanced the potential of its 100%-owned **Surprise Creek Uranium Project**, located near the Beaverlodge Uranium District in northern Saskatchewan, Canada.

The field program mainly comprised detailed geological mapping and geochemical sampling in the Surprise Creek Fault area and was designed to follow-up reconnaissance work undertaken in July which returned several rock chip assay results of **>1% U₃O₈ and up to 6.13% U₃O₈ and 1.03% Cu** (see ASX announcement dated 13 October 2022 titled “*Exceptional Uranium and Copper rock chip results*”).

The latest results have now extended the strike length of known surface uranium mineralisation at Surprise Creek Fault to around 500m, with six rock chip samples returning assays of **>1% U₃O₈** and another 12 samples returning assays of **>0.1% U₃O₈**.

A total of 50 rock chip samples were collected as part of the program, of which **28 samples** were collected from the Surprise Creek Fault prospect.

Detailed geological mapping was also completed over the area around the Surprise Creek Fault, with results highlighting compelling geological similarities to some of the more significant uranium deposits within the Beaverlodge district such as the Fay-Ace and Gunnar deposits.

Follow-up sampling of surface copper mineralisation discovered in the July field program in the western part of the project, which returned high-grade copper assay results including 61.7% Cu, 27.6% Cu, 9% Cu and 4.93% Cu (see ASX announcement dated 13 October 2022 titled “*Exceptional Uranium and Copper Rock Chip Results*”) also returned significant results with several samples grading **>1,000ppm Cu** and up to **1.07% Cu**.

Valor Executive Chairman, George Bauk, commented: “*These results confirm the extent of significant surface uranium mineralisation at Surprise Creek Fault and provide further confidence in the drill target. The known deposits in this part of the Beaverlodge district produced about **57 million pounds of uranium** historically, highlighting the potential of this area to yield very significant uranium deposits.*

“*Prior to drilling, we plan to complete detailed airborne radiometrics and magnetics across the entire Surprise Creek Project area to identify other potential uranium targets as well as enhance our structural geological understanding to assist with drill planning.*

“*We have also recently expanded our landholding to the west which covers a large area of widespread historical copper occurrences which have attracted minimal exploration in the last 40 years.*

“*We plan to follow-up the known copper occurrences on-ground in 2023 once we have completed a detailed historical data compilation and review.*”




Figure 3: Surprise Creek Project location (Historical production figure sourced from Chi et al, 2020²).

SURPRISE CREEK FAULT TARGET

First-pass on-ground reconnaissance exploration of this area was completed by Valor in July this year, with assay results reported in the ASX announcement dated 13th October 2022. Of the 11 rock chip samples taken at Surprise Creek Fault in July, **six returned assays of >1% U₃O₈** with a peak assay of **6.13% U₃O₈**.

During the most recent program, a total of 28 rock chip samples were taken from the Surprise Creek Fault target area, with another two taken from the Plug Lake area to the west.

Six samples returned assays of >1% U₃O₈ and another 10 returned assays of >0.1% U₃O₈. In most cases the uranium mineralised samples have associated anomalous copper, usually >1,000ppm Cu and up to 1.31% Cu. In some instances, anomalous copper occurs with no elevated uranium. The table in Appendix 1 below summarises the latest assay results for key elements.

A handheld RS-125 scintillometer was used to assist in sample selection and the samples are selective in nature with a high potential for bias and should not be considered as being representative of the overall mineralised structure or zone.

Historical drilling at the Surprise Creek Fault prospect from 1968 returned significant intercepts including **2.1m @ 4.37% U₃O₈** from 57m (VT20) including **0.9m at 7.5% U₃O₈**. Details of the historical exploration at the Surprise Creek Project were provided in the Company's ASX announcement dated 6th July 2022 and titled "Surprise Creek data review highlights high-grade targets".

The Surprise Creek Fault is a north-northwest trending fault zone within orthogneisses and mylonite with widespread interpreted albitisation (see Figure 1).

Uranium mineralisation was predominantly found within northeast-southwest and east-west trending carbonate-hematite veins and hematitic breccias (see Figure 4 below), with chlorite alteration and is variably associated with copper (visible malachite) +/- lead mineralisation. The higher-grade uranium mineralisation occurs around the intersection of the Surprise Creek Fault and a north-northeast trending mylonitic zone.

The geological mapping has identified outcropping younger Martin Group red beds (sandstones) which occur unconformably and/or in faulted contact with the older basement orthogneisses (see Figure 1).

Significantly, uranium mineralisation has been found in the Martin Group sandstones and close to the unconformity with the older underlying basement rocks. This mineralisation and the geological setting suggest the Surprise Creek Fault prospect shares many similarities with two of the most significant Beaverlodge Uranium District deposits, Fay-Ace and Gunnar, which are located around 25km south-east and 30km south of Surprise Creek respectively.

Figure 5 below shows geological cross-sections through these two deposits and compares this with an interpreted cross-section through the Surprise Creek fault. Historical production for the Fay-Ace and Gunnar deposits are reported as 42Mlbs and 15Mlbs U₃O₈ respectively (Saskatchewan Mineral Deposit Index – SMDI 1285; Ashton, 2010 ¹).



Figure 4: Uranium mineralisation in hematitic breccia from Surprise Creek Fault target

¹ Ashton, K.E., 2010. The Gunnar Mine: An Episyenite-hosted, Granite-related Uranium Deposit in the Beaverlodge Uranium District, in Summary of Investigation 2010, Saskatchewan Geological Survey, Saskatchewan ENERGY AND Mines, Miscellaneous Report 2010-4 p.21





Figure 5: Schematic cross-section through Surprise Creek fault target compared with cross-sections of Fay and Gunnar deposits, Beaverlodge Uranium District (source – Chi et al, 2020²)

Valor intends to submit drill permit applications for the Surprise Creek Fault area over the northern winter, with the intention of undertaking a drill program in the June Quarter of 2023.

The two samples from the Plug Lake area also returned encouraging results with assays of **0.22% U₃O₈** and **0.74% U₃O₈**, with associated anomalous copper (up to 0.98% Cu).

COPPER TARGETS

Follow-up of the copper occurrences identified in the July field program was also carried out as part of the September/October field program. A further **17** samples were collected in this area targeting the copper occurrences. Of the 17 samples, seven returned assays of >1,000ppm Cu and up to 1.07% Cu. Four separate areas of copper mineralisation have now been identified by the field programs.

² Chi, G., Ashton, K.E., Deng, T., Xu, D., Li, Z., Song, H., Liang, R., Kennicott, J., 2020. Comparison of granite-related uranium deposits in the Beaverlodge district (Canada) and South China - A common control of mineralisation by coupled shallow and deep-seated geologic processes in an extensional setting, *Ore Geology Reviews* 117

Figure 6 below shows where copper occurrences have been confirmed in the field along with the assay results from the July and September/October field programs.

The host rocks for most of these copper occurrences are mylonitic granitic rocks and/or metasediments with disseminated sulphides and copper oxides and within veinlets and fractures. Most of these copper occurrences are located close to the unconformity between the Thluico Lake Group sediments and the older Tazin Group mylonites suggesting a possible genetic link.




Figure 6: Surprise Creek: location of copper occurrences and sampling

The Company intends to complete a detailed airborne magnetics and radiometrics survey in 2023 over the entire Surprise Creek Project area, including the recently acquired areas, to help understand the geological controls on the widespread copper mineralisation.

NEXT STEPS CANADA

| Project Task | Target Date | Description |
|---|-------------|--|
| Cluff Lake Gravity and field work results | January | Interpretation and targeting |
| Surprise Creek historical data compilation and review | January | Historical data from new claims to west of Surprise Creek covering Ellis Bay, Bob Lake and Waterloo copper occurrences |
| Pendleton and MacPhersons Lake Historical data review | January | Review of all historical data including targeting |

This announcement has been authorised for release by the Board of Directors.

For further information, please contact:

George Bauk

Executive Chairman

+61 408 931 746

george@totode.com.au

Joe Graziano

Company Secretary

+61 411 649 551

joe@pathwayscorporate.com.au

Media enquiries | Read Corporate

Nicholas Read

+61 419 929 046

nicholas@readcorporate.com.au

ASX : VAL

COMPETENT PERSON STATEMENT

The information in this documents that relates to Exploration Results is based on information compiled by Mr Robin Wilson who is a Member of the Australasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy. Mr Wilson is a consultant and Technical Director for Valor Resources and has sufficient experience relevant to the style of mineralisation and type of deposit under consideration and to the activity which he is undertaking to qualify as a Competent Person as defined in the 2012 Edition of the 'Australasian Code for Reporting of Exploration Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves' (the JORC Code). Mr Wilson consents to the inclusion of this information in the form and context in which it appears.

Ends -----

ABOUT VALOR RESOURCES


Valor Resources Limited (ASX:VAL) (“Valor” or “the Company”) is an exploration company dedicated to creating shareholder value through acquisitions and exploration activities. The Company is focused on two key commodities, copper and uranium, as outlined below, in Peru and Canada.

Valor’s 100% owned Peruvian subsidiary, Kiwanda SAC holds the rights to the Picha Project located in the Moquegua and Puno Departments of Peru, 17 km ENE of the San Gabriel Project (former Chucapaca – Buenaventura SAA (NYSE:BVN)) gold deposit, located in the Puno Department of Peru. The Picha Project is a copper-silver exploration project comprising of twenty granted mining concessions for a total of 16,500 hectares (165 km²), as well as an additional 6,500 hectares (65 km²) staked and currently awaiting title as mining concessions.

In addition to the above, Kiwanda SAC has staked 8 claims covering 6,000 hectares in the Puno Region, 30km northeast of the Picha Project, which make up the Charaqui exploration project.

Valor is also the 100% owner of the following interests in Canada:

- ▶ Right to earn an 80% working interest in the Hook Lake Uranium Project located 60km east of the Key Lake Uranium Mine in northern Saskatchewan. Covering 25,846 hectares (258 km²), the 16 contiguous mineral claims host several prospective areas of uranium mineralisation; and
- ▶ 100% equity interest in 19 contiguous mineral claims covering 57,499 hectares (575 km²) in northern Saskatchewan, known as the Cluff Lake Uranium Project. The property is located 7km east of the former-producing Cluff Lake Uranium Mine and much of the project area is located within the Carswell geological complex that hosts the Cluff Lake Mine; and
- ▶ Six additional projects within the Athabasca Basin with 100% equity interest in 17 mineral claims covering 16,312 hectares at the Hidden Bay Project, Surprise Creek Project, Pendleton Lake Project, MacPherson Lake Project, Smitty Project and Lorado Project.



APPENDIX ONE

Table 1: Table of assay results for selected elements and sample locations (grid system-NAD83 UTM Zone 12N)

| Prospect | SampleID | Sample Type | East | North | U ₃ O ₈ % | Cu_ppm | Pb_ppm | Zn_ppm | Mo_ppm | Ni_ppm | Ag_ppm | Ars_ppm |
|----------------------|----------|---------------------|--------|---------|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212553 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618524 | 6619608 | 0.1533 | 1610 | 215 | 47 | 5 | 54 | 2.7 | 21 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212554 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618524 | 6619609 | 0.0008 | 80 | 46 | 36 | 17 | 74 | 1.1 | 3 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212555 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618479 | 6619607 | 0.0004 | 408 | 27 | 5 | 8 | 3 | -0.2 | 2 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212556 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618525 | 6619588 | 0.3331 | 1320 | 418 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 4.6 | 12 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212557 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618479 | 6619607 | 6.8314 | 1670 | 6050 | 13 | 6 | 6 | 15.8 | 33 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212558 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618514 | 6619577 | 1.2503 | 2450 | 1410 | 40 | 10 | 57 | 8.9 | 90 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212559 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618506 | 6619580 | 0.2712 | 845 | 737 | 49 | 10 | 46 | 3.3 | 24 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212560 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618615 | 6619495 | 0.4311 | 2190 | 210 | 29 | 4 | 5 | 1.7 | 47 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212561 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618621 | 6619618 | 7.9816 | 6680 | 6770 | 34 | 4 | 17 | 14.9 | 97 |
| Northern Copper vein | 212562 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 612699 | 6616857 | 0.0008 | 704 | 16 | 8 | 3 | 18 | 1.2 | 5 |
| Northern Copper vein | 212564 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 612759 | 6616801 | -0.0001 | 31 | 8 | 7 | 11 | 6 | -0.2 | 11 |
| Northern Copper vein | 212565 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 612758 | 6616802 | 0.0001 | 25 | 10 | 4 | 10 | 7 | 0.4 | 8 |
| Northern Copper vein | 212566 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 612848 | 6616747 | 0.0002 | 154 | 19 | 6 | 8 | 20 | 0.9 | 5 |
| Northern Copper vein | 212567 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 612909 | 6616560 | -0.0001 | 4430 | -1 | -1 | 5 | 3 | -0.2 | 7 |
| Northern Copper vein | 212568 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 612810 | 6616581 | -0.0001 | 744 | -1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | -0.2 | 1 |
| Plug Lake | 212569 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 617315 | 6619793 | 0.2170 | 1170 | 896 | 176 | 19 | 24 | 19 | 318 |
| Plug Lake | 212570 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 617623 | 6619903 | 0.7422 | 9750 | 422 | 202 | 6 | 24 | 23.6 | 423 |
| Copper West | 212571 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 614401 | 6617578 | 0.0007 | 81 | 11 | 102 | 4 | 37 | 1.3 | 7 |
| Copper West | 212572 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 614336 | 6617535 | 0.0002 | 544 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 5 | -0.2 | 12 |
| Copper West | 212573 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 614367 | 6617556 | 0.0004 | 10700 | 5 | -1 | 10 | 23 | -0.2 | 31 |
| Copper West | 212574 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 614297 | 6616715 | 0.0004 | 1530 | 36 | 91 | 4 | 12 | -0.2 | 12 |
| Copper West | 212575 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 614322 | 6616656 | 0.0002 | 2460 | 3 | -1 | 10 | 15 | -0.2 | 14 |
| Southern Copper | 212577 | Rock Chip - Grab | 612774 | 6615094 | 0.0002 | 2990 | 11 | -1 | 3 | 16 | -0.2 | 6 |
| Southern Copper | 212578 | Rock Chip - Grab | 612780 | 6615097 | 0.0006 | 2630 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 22 | -0.2 | 9 |
| Southern Copper | 212579 | Rock Chip - Grab | 612846 | 6615065 | -0.0001 | 608 | 10 | 7 | 2 | 8 | -0.2 | 2 |
| Southern Copper | 212580 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 612854 | 6615016 | 0.0002 | 3220 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 19 | -0.2 | 9 |
| Southern Copper | 212581 | Rock Chip - Grab | 612885 | 6614914 | 0.0008 | 261 | 55 | 2 | 27 | 1 | -0.2 | 1 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212582 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618713 | 6619848 | 0.0526 | 356 | 264 | 25 | 4 | 21 | 1.2 | 20 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212583 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618765 | 6619811 | 3.3507 | 432 | 4010 | 14 | 6 | 9 | 4.3 | 78 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212584 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618763 | 6619818 | 0.0362 | 474 | 67 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1.1 | 9 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212585 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618269 | 6619526 | 0.0001 | 238 | 20 | 119 | 4 | 195 | 1.1 | 4 |

| Prospect | SampleID | Sample Type | East | North | U ₃ O ₈ _% | Cu_ppm | Pb_ppm | Zn_ppm | Mo_ppm | Ni_ppm | Ag_ppm | Ars_ppm |
|----------------------|----------|---------------------|--------|---------|----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212586 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618423 | 6619407 | 0.1392 | 90 | 139 | 21 | 4 | 17 | 1.6 | 18 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212587 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618655 | 6619476 | 0.1415 | 1720 | 133 | -1 | 3 | 3 | 1.1 | 10 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212588 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618615 | 6619674 | 0.0001 | 4380 | 4 | -1 | 3 | 5 | -0.2 | 6 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212589 | Rock Chip - Grab | 618621 | 6619371 | 0.2653 | 200 | 133 | 12 | 2 | 20 | 1.6 | 295 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212590 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618484 | 6619113 | 1.3503 | 1530 | 1800 | 6 | 6 | 11 | 4.8 | 19 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212591 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618541 | 6619078 | 1.2403 | 372 | 1360 | 42 | 21 | 40 | 8 | 143 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212601 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618588 | 6619897 | 0.0002 | 2830 | 6 | -1 | 4 | 18 | -0.2 | 8 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212602 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618489 | 6619350 | 0.0001 | 2720 | 10 | -1 | 3 | 5 | 0.5 | 4 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212603 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618489 | 6619304 | 0.1368 | 2890 | 246 | 65 | 5 | 9 | 1.6 | 8 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212604 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618611 | 6619646 | 1.5903 | 3410 | 1170 | 8 | 5 | 8 | 3.6 | 19 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212605 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618618 | 6619644 | 0.0001 | 4300 | 8 | -1 | 3 | 7 | 0.5 | 7 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212606 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618626 | 6619524 | 1.4803 | 13100 | 1240 | 24 | 5 | 8 | 4.1 | 58 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212607 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618609 | 6619521 | 0.0487 | 5510 | 40 | -1 | 1 | 6 | -0.2 | 11 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212608 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618608 | 6619519 | 0.2583 | 6940 | 146 | 16 | 2 | 14 | 2 | 120 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212609 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618616 | 6619531 | 0.1769 | 4850 | 379 | 93 | 4 | 9 | 1.8 | 32 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212610 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618593 | 6619553 | 0.0002 | 5940 | 3 | -1 | 2 | 16 | -0.2 | 10 |
| Surprise Creek Fault | 212611 | Rock Chip - Outcrop | 618523 | 6619308 | 0.0196 | 382 | 88 | 19 | 9 | 20 | 1.6 | 11 |

JORC CODE, 2012 EDITION – TABLE 1 REPORT

SECTION 1 SAMPLING TECHNIQUES AND DATA

| Criteria | JORC Code explanation | Commentary |
|--|---|--|
| Sampling techniques | <i>Nature and quality of sampling (eg cut channels, random chips, or specific specialised industry standard measurement tools appropriate to the minerals under investigation, such as down hole gamma sondes, or handheld XRF instruments, etc). These examples should not be taken as limiting the broad meaning of sampling.</i> | 50 rock chip samples were taken by the Company during the Sept/Oct 2022 field program referenced in this report and were selective by nature. In the instance of the U showings, scintillometers (RS-125) were used to identify outcrops with anomalous radioactivity that were subsequently sampled. |
| | <i>Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample representivity and the appropriate calibration of any measurement tools or systems used.</i> | Samples taken by the Company were selective by nature. Scintillometer readings were taken on outcrop at each sample site to ensure consistency in cps values. The RS-125 assay feature was used to acquire preliminary U values but are not included in this report. The RS-125 scintillometers were calibrated before the field program began and this is considered adequate for ensuring accuracy. |
| | <i>Aspects of the determination of mineralisation that are Material to the Public Report.</i> | In the instance of the Cu showings, visible Cu mineralisation and/or knowledge of prospectivity of certain rocks were used for determining mineralisation for selective sampling. |
| Drilling techniques | <i>Drill type (eg core, reverse circulation, open-hole hammer, rotary air blast, auger, Bangka, sonic, etc) and details (eg core diameter, triple or standard tube, depth of diamond tails, face-sampling bit or other type, whether core is oriented and if so, by what method, etc).</i> | Not applicable – no drilling reported.herein. |
| Drill sample recovery | <i>Method of recording and assessing core and chip sample recoveries and results assessed.</i> | Not applicable – no drilling reported herein |
| | <i>Measures taken to maximise sample recovery and ensure representative nature of the samples.</i> | Not applicable – no drilling reported herein |
| | <i>Whether a relationship exists between sample recovery and grade and whether sample bias may have occurred due to preferential loss/gain of fine/coarse material.</i> | Not applicable – no drilling reported herein |
| Logging | <i>Whether core and chip samples have been geologically and geotechnically logged to a level of detail to support appropriate Mineral Resource estimation, mining studies and metallurgical studies.</i> | Rock type and geological information recorded at each sample location. |
| | <i>Whether logging is qualitative or quantitative in nature. Core (or costean, channel, etc) photography.</i> | Logging is qualitative in nature |
| | <i>The total length and percentage of the relevant intersections logged.</i> | Not applicable – no drilling reported herein. |
| Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation | <i>If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all core taken.</i> | Not applicable – no drilling reported herein |
| | <i>If non-core, whether riffled, tube sampled, rotary split, etc and whether sampled wet or dry.</i> | Not applicable – no drilling reported herein |
| | <i>For all sample types, the nature, quality and appropriateness of the sample preparation technique.</i> | At the laboratory, all samples are tested for radioactivity and sorted accordingly. Samples are dried, if required, in their original bags, then crushed to -2mm (80% passing). The sample is then homogenized by passing through a splitter riffing out a 150g aliquot. The aliquot then undergoes an agate or steel grind, depending on level of radioactivity, to -0.106mm (90% passing). The aliquot is then prepared for analysis by either partial or total digestion in a test tube or Teflon tube. Industry standard sample preparation considered appropriate |
| | <i>Quality control procedures adopted for all sub-sampling stages to maximise representivity of samples.</i> | Not applicable – no sub-sampling |
| | <i>Measures taken to ensure that the sampling is representative of the in situ material collected, including for instance results for field duplicate/second-half sampling.</i> | No duplicate sampling or analytical checks were performed for any sampling except at the laboratory where standards and repeats were employed for laboratory internal QAQC purposes |
| | <i>Whether sample sizes are appropriate to the grain size of the material being sampled.</i> | Sample sizes were considered appropriate for the purpose of detecting mineralisation with an average size of approximately 0.5 - 1 kg |

| Criteria | JORC Code explanation | Commentary |
|--|---|---|
| Quality of assay data and laboratory tests | <i>The nature, quality and appropriateness of the assaying and laboratory procedures used and whether the technique is considered partial or total.</i> | Samples were prepared (as described above) and assayed by SRC Geoanalytical Laboratories in Saskatoon, SK Canada. Multi-element analysis with both partial digestion, using Aqua Regia, and total digestion, using a three-acid digest, methods employed. The digested solution was then analysed by ICP-OES. |
| | <i>For geophysical tools, spectrometers, handheld XRF instruments, etc, the parameters used in determining the analysis including instrument make and model, reading times, calibrations factors applied and their derivation, etc.</i> | For data acquired in the 2022 Field Program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An RS-125 Scintillometer was used for all samples. - A minimum and maximum scintillometer reading was recorded for each sample. - Calibration was completed on all machines prior to field work - Readings are given in cps (counts per second) |
| | <i>Nature of quality control procedures adopted (eg standards, blanks, duplicates, external laboratory checks) and whether acceptable levels of accuracy (ie lack of bias) and precision have been established.</i> | Laboratory QAQC procedures involve the use of appropriate laboratory standards and repeat assays-considered appropriate for early-stage exploration. Lab standards and duplicates are utilised by SRC and inserted for every 20 samples analysed. |
| Verification of sampling and assaying | <i>The verification of significant intersections by either independent or alternative company personnel.</i> | Internal verification of significant mineralisation by more than one company geologist |
| | <i>The use of twinned holes.</i> | Not applicable – no drilling undertaken. |
| | <i>Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols.</i> | Data is recorded in the field using a tablet-based GIS system, with some locations also being marked with a GPS. Data is uploaded to cloud storage daily and added to the Valor geological database which is managed by Terra Resources in Perth. |
| | <i>Discuss any adjustment to assay data.</i> | Uranium assays are reported by the assay laboratory as uranium elemental results and have been converted to uranium oxide U3O8 for reporting purposes using the conversion factor: 1.179243 |
| Location of data points | <i>Accuracy and quality of surveys used to locate drill holes (collar and down-hole surveys), trenches, mine workings and other locations used in Mineral Resource estimation.</i> | For the 2022 field program, no historic drill-holes were located. Co-ordinates were taken using a Garmin 66ST with an accuracy of +/- 5m. Historic trench locations were confirmed and located where possible. |
| | <i>Specification of the grid system used.</i> | The geodetic system used for all spatial data was NAD83 in UTM Zone 12N. |
| | <i>Quality and adequacy of topographic control.</i> | Topographic control is considered fit for purpose. |
| Data spacing and distribution | <i>Data spacing for reporting of Exploration Results.</i> | The project is at an early exploration stage and sample spacing is not considered an important factor at this stage. Samples were selective in nature and taken with the aim of identifying mineralisation. |
| | <i>Whether the data spacing and distribution is sufficient to establish the degree of geological and grade continuity appropriate for the Mineral Resource and Ore Reserve estimation procedure(s) and classifications applied.</i> | Not applicable – no Mineral Resource estimation. |
| Orientation of data in relation to geological structure | <i>Whether sample compositing has been applied.</i> | No sample compositing has been applied. |
| | <i>Whether the orientation of sampling achieves unbiased sampling of possible structures and the extent to which this is known, considering the deposit type.</i> | Samples were selective in nature, with efforts to maintain representivity of the whole structure |
| Sample security | <i>If the relationship between the drilling orientation and the orientation of key mineralised structures is considered to have introduced a sampling bias, this should be assessed and reported if material.</i> | Surface samples taken during the 2022 field program were selective and thus a spatial relationship to geological structures is intrinsic to this method. |
| | <i>The measures taken to ensure sample security.</i> | Samples were stored securely before being delivered to the SRC Laboratory in Saskatoon. The Company is not aware of any risk to sample integrity. General access to the samples prior to transport is only available to site personnel. |
| Audits or reviews | <i>The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data.</i> | Not applicable for early-stage exploration. |

SECTION 2 REPORTING OF EXPLORATION RESULTS (Criteria listed in the preceding section also apply to this section.)

| Criteria | JORC Code explanation | Commentary |
|---|---|--|
| Mineral tenement and land tenure status | <i>Type, reference name/number, location and ownership including agreements or material issues with third parties such as joint ventures, partnerships, overriding royalties, native title interests, historical sites, wilderness or national park and environmental settings.</i> | The Surprise Creek Project comprises 8 contiguous mineral dispositions covering 8,169 hectares. |
| | <i>The security of the tenure held at the time of reporting along with any known impediments to obtaining a licence to operate in the area</i> <i>Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties.</i> | All mineral claims are currently granted and in good standing with no known impediments. |
| Exploration done by other parties | | Exploration was previously completed on the Surprise Creek Project by several companies since the 1950s including CONS VAN TOR, CULTUS, ENEX, Phelps Dodge, PINEX, Independent Mining Company, SMDC and independent prospectors. this includes but is not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Airborne Magnetic surveys, Electromagnetic surveys, IP surveys, Scintillometer prospecting. - Geochemical sampling, prospecting and mapping - Diamond drilling |
| Geology | <i>Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation.</i> | The Surprise Creek Project is situated to the North of the Athabasca basin in the Zemlak Domain of the Rae Province. The area is underlain predominantly by Precambrian rocks of the Archean Tazin Group, overlain in places by the Martin Formation. Historically, the Athabasca Basin region produces over 20% of the world's primary uranium supply. The exploration target is basement-hosted and Athabasca sandstone-hosted unconformity-style uranium deposits. |
| Drill hole Information | <i>A summary of all information material to the understanding of the exploration results including a tabulation of the following information for all Material drill holes:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>easting and northing of the drill hole collar</i> • <i>elevation or RL (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in metres) of the drill hole collar</i> • <i>dip and azimuth of the hole</i> • <i>down hole length and interception depth</i> • <i>hole length.</i> | Not applicable – no drilling reported. |
| | <i>If the exclusion of this information is justified on the basis that the information is not Material and this exclusion does not detract from the understanding of the report, the Competent Person should clearly explain why this is the case.</i> | Not applicable – no drilling reported. |
| Data aggregation methods | <i>In reporting Exploration Results, weighting averaging techniques, maximum and/or minimum grade truncations (eg cutting of high grades) and cut-off grades are usually Material and should be stated.</i> | Not applicable-these techniques don't apply to the type of sampling undertaken. |
| | <i>Where aggregate intercepts incorporate short lengths of high grade results and longer lengths of low grade results, the procedure used for such aggregation should be stated and some typical examples of such aggregations should be shown in detail.</i> | Not applicable – sample aggregation was not used. |
| Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths | <i>The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values should be clearly stated.</i> | Not applicable – No metal equivalents reported. |
| | <i>These relationships are particularly important in the reporting of Exploration Results.</i> | Not applicable – point data only reported. |
| | <i>If the geometry of the mineralisation with respect to the drill hole angle is known, its nature should be reported.</i> | Not applicable – no drilling reported. |
| | <i>If it is not known and only the down hole lengths are reported, there should be a clear statement to this effect (eg 'down hole length, true width not known').</i> | Not applicable – no drilling reported. |

| Criteria | JORC Code explanation | Commentary |
|---|--|--|
| Diagrams | <i>Appropriate maps and sections (with scales) and tabulations of intercepts should be included for any significant discovery being reported. These should include, but not be limited to a plan view of drill hole collar locations and appropriate sectional views.</i> | Sample location maps are provided within this report – see Figures 1 and 5 |
| Balanced reporting | <i>Where comprehensive reporting of all Exploration Results is not practicable, representative reporting of both low and high grades and/or widths should be practiced to avoid misleading reporting of Exploration Results.</i> | All assay results for key elements are included in this report – see Appendix 1. |
| Other substantive exploration data | <i>Other exploration data, if meaningful and material, should be reported including (but not limited to): geological observations; geophysical survey results; geochemical survey results; bulk samples – size and method of treatment; metallurgical test results; bulk density, groundwater, geotechnical and rock characteristics; potential deleterious or contaminating substances.</i> | Geological information material to the assay results discussed in this report are included in the body of the report. Previous work completed by Valor Resources on the Surprise Creel Project reported to ASX on 13 October 2022, 9 November 2022 and 22 November 2022 |
| Further work | <i>The nature and scale of planned further work (eg tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling).</i> | Further work on the project will include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning and implementation of airborne magnetic and radiometric survey to delineate areas of mineral potential on the property. • Drill program planning |
| | <i>Diagrams clearly highlighting the areas of possible extensions, including the main geological interpretations and future drilling areas, provided this information is not commercially sensitive.</i> | Refer to Figures 1 and 5 above in body of text. |