



ASX RELEASE

8 October 2013

SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE UPGRADE FOR WILUNA URANIUM PROJECT

Key Highlights

Toro Energy Limited's (ASX: TOE) 2013 drilling program at Centipede, Lake Way and Millipede prospects within Toro's 100% owned Wiluna uranium project in WA has resulted in:

- **75% increase in Measured and Indicated JORC Resources** which now stand at **25.2 Mt @ 551 ppm for 30.6 Mlb U_3O_8** (at the first three deposits proposed to be mined);
- **100%** of resources for the Centipede and Lake Way deposits, both approved for development, classified as **Measured and Indicated**;
- Confirmation all three deposits host contiguous zones of higher grade mineralisation with total Measured and Indicated Resources, at a 500ppm cut-off, of **10.1 Mt @ 912 ppm for 20.4 Mlb U_3O_8** ; and
- evidence that a high grade start-up mine plan can be achieved.

Toro is pleased to announce a significant resource upgrade at the Company's 100% owned Wiluna Uranium Project in Western Australia. At a 200ppm cut-off, total Measured plus Indicated Resources for the Centipede, Lake Way and Millipede deposits now stand at

25.2 Mt @ 551 ppm for 30.6 Mlb U_3O_8

which represents 95% of the total Resource at this cut-off grade (reported in accordance with the 2012 JORC code). This represents an increase of 75% or 13.3 Mlbs from the previous 2012 estimate for these deposits.

Importantly, 100% of the Centipede and Lake Way and 76% of the Millipede resource is now in the Measured plus Indicated categories. Total JORC Resources including Inferred Resources for these three deposits at a 200ppm cut-off now stand at 27.1 Mt @ 539 ppm for 32.3 Mlb U_3O_8 .

At a 500ppm cut-off, the total Measured plus Indicated Resource for these deposits is

10.1 Mt @ 912 ppm for 20.4 Mlb U₃O₈

representing 97% of the total Resource at this cut-off grade.

"This drilling program was the first significant program undertaken on these deposits since Toro's acquisition of the Wiluna Project in 2007, and was facilitated with the agreement of the local Traditional Owners." Toro Managing Director, Dr Vanessa Guthrie said today.

"While the total resource of U₃O₈ has not materially changed, both the confirmation of Measured plus Indicated Resources, as well as the continuous high grade zones of mineralisation, encourage Toro that selective ore sequencing techniques may allow a processing head grade to be achieved in the first 10 years significantly above the life-of-mine grade, " Dr Guthrie said.

"The improvements in our knowledge of the deposits also underwrite our mine planning, process flow sheet design and economic modelling and form the basis for completion of the Definitive Feasibility Study that incorporates all six deposits in our Wiluna regional resource."

The 2013 drilling program was designed to improve Toro's geological understanding of the resource model, confirm existing data and lift the classification of Inferred Resources to the Measured and Indicated categories. It consisted of 435 holes for 8,106 metres across the Centipede, Lake Way, Millipede and Dawson-Hinkler deposits. Results from Dawson-Hinkler are yet to be finalised.

Resource Tables¹

Resources from the Centipede, Lake Way, Millipede and Nowthanna (also in WA) deposits are now reported according to the 2012 JORC code. The Wiluna Uranium Project also includes the Lake Maitland and Dawson-Hinkler deposits. The acquisition of Lake Maitland from Mega Uranium is due to be completed late in October 2013². The Lake Maitland and Dawson Hinkler deposits are reported according to the 2004 JORC code.

Table I – October 2013 – Wiluna Uranium Project Resources (200 ppm U₃O₈ cut-off)

Deposit	JORC code	Measured			Indicated			Total Measured and Indicated			Inferred			Total		
		Tonnes M's	Grade PPM	Mlb's U ₃ O ₈	Tonnes M's	Grade PPM	Mlb's U ₃ O ₈	Tonnes M's	Grade PPM	Mlb's U ₃ O ₈	Tonnes M's	Grade PPM	Mlb's U ₃ O ₈	Tonnes M's	Grade PPM	Mlb's U ₃ O ₈
Centipede	2012	2.9	551	3.5	7.5	572	9.5	10.4	566	13.0	-	-	-	10.4	566	13.0
Lake Way	2012	-	-	-	10.3	545	12.3	10.3	545	12.3	-	-	-	10.3	545	12.3
Millipede	2012	-	-	-	4.5	530	5.3	4.5	530	5.3	1.9	382	1.6	6.4	486	6.9
Sub-total		2.9	551	3.5	22.3	551	27.1	25.2	551	30.6	1.9	382	1.6	27.1	539	32.3
Lake Maitland	2004	-	-	-	18.9	497	20.7	18.9	497	20.7	1.9	374	1.6	20.8	486	22.3
Dawson Hinkler	2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13.1	312	9.0	13.1	312	9.0
Nowthanna	2012	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11.9	399	10.5	11.9	399	10.5
Total Regional Resource		2.9	551	3.5	41.2	526	47.8	44.1	528	51.3	28.9	357	22.7	73.0	460	74.0

¹ Tonnes and pounds are quoted to one decimal place which may cause rounding errors when tabulating.

² Refer ASX announcement dated 12th August 2013 for the full details of the Lake Maitland acquisition. Toro's shareholder meeting to consider resolutions that give effect to the acquisition outlined in that release will be held on 18th October 2013. Toro expects all conditions precedent for the acquisition to be achieved soon after the shareholder meeting.

Table 2 – October 2013 - Wiluna Uranium Project Resources (500 ppm U₃O₈ cut-off)

Deposit	JORC code	Measured			Indicated			Total Measured and Indicated			Inferred			Total		
		Tonnes M's	Grade PPM	Mlb's U ₃ O ₈	Tonnes M's	Grade PPM	Mlb's U ₃ O ₈	Tonnes M's	Grade PPM	Mlb's U ₃ O ₈	Tonnes M's	Grade PPM	Mlb's U ₃ O ₈	Tonnes M's	Grade PPM	Mlb's U ₃ O ₈
Centipede	2012	1.2	872	2.3	3.1	943	6.5	4.3	923	8.8	-	-	-	4.3	923	8.8
Lake Way	2012	-	-	-	4.2	883	8.2	4.2	883	8.2	-	-	-	4.2	883	8.2
Millipede	2012	-	-	-	1.6	956	3.4	1.6	956	3.4	0.4	887	0.7	2.0	943	4.1
Sub-total		1.2	872	2.3	8.9	917	18.0	10.1	912	20.4	0.4	887	0.7	10.5	911	21.1
Lake Maitland	2004	-	-	-	6.1	882	11.8	6.1	882	11.8	0.3	759	0.6	6.4	875	12.4
Dawson Hinkler	2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.9	604	1.1	0.9	604	1.1
Nowthanna	2012	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.3	794	4.1	2.3	794	4.1
Total Regional Resource		1.2	872	2.3	15.0	903	29.8	16.2	901	32.2	3.9	758	6.5	20.1	873	38.6

JORC Code, 2012 explanation is provided in attachment I.

Vanessa Guthrie
Managing Director

MEDIA CONTACT:

Vanessa Guthrie Toro Energy 08 9214 2100
Kevin Skinner Field Public Relations 08 8234 9555 / 0414 822 631

Competent / Qualified Persons' Statements

The information presented here that relates to Mineral Resources of the Centipede, Lake Way, Millipede and Nowthanna deposits is based on information compiled by Dr Greg Shirliff of Toro Energy Limited and Mr Robin Simpson and Mr Daniel Guibal of SRK Consulting (Australasia) Pty Ltd. Mr Guibal takes overall responsibility for the Resource Estimate, and Dr Shirliff takes responsibility for the integrity of the data supplied for the estimation. Dr Shirliff is a Member of the Australasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy (AusIMM), Mr Guibal is a Fellow of the AusIMM and Mr Simpson is a Member of the Australian Institute of Geoscientists (AIG) and they have sufficient experience which is relevant to the style of mineralisation and type of deposit under consideration and to the activity they are undertaking to qualify as Competent Persons as defined in the 2012 Edition of the 'Australasian Code for Reporting of Exploration Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves (JORC Code 2012)'. The Competent Persons consent to the inclusion in this release of the matters based on the information in the form and context in which it appears.

The information presented here that relates to Mineral Resources of the Dawson Hinkler deposit is based on information compiled by Dr Katrin Karner of Reptile Uranium Namibia Pty. Ltd. (formerly of Toro Energy Limited at the time of the estimation) and Mr Robin Simpson and Mr Daniel Guibal of SRK Consulting (Australasia) Pty Ltd. Mr Guibal takes overall responsibility for the Resource Estimate, and Dr Karner takes responsibility for the integrity of the data supplied for the estimation. Mr Guibal is a Fellow of the Australasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy (AusIMM), Dr Karner is a Member and CP (Geo) of the AusIMM and Mr Simpson is a Member of the Australian Institute of Geoscientists (AIG) and they have sufficient experience which is relevant to the style of mineralisation and type of deposit under consideration and to the activity they are undertaking to qualify as Competent Persons as defined in the 2004 Edition of the 'Australasian Code for Reporting of Exploration Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves (JORC Code 2004)'. The Competent Persons consent to the inclusion in this release of the matters based on the information in the form and context in which it appears.

The information presented here that relates to Mineral Resources of the Lake Maitland Deposit is based on information compiled by Mr Stewart Taylor and Mr Matthew Wheeler of Mega Uranium Limited, and Mr Peter Gleeson and Mr Daniel Guibal of SRK Consulting (Australasia) Pty Ltd. Mr Guibal takes overall responsibility for the Resource Estimate, and Mr Taylor and Mr Wheeler take responsibility for the integrity of the data supplied for the estimation. Mr Taylor is a Fellow of the Australian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy (AusIMM), Mr Guibal is a Member of the AusIMM and Mr Wheeler and Mr Gleeson are Members of the Australian Institute of Geoscientists (AIG), all have sufficient experience which is relevant to the style of mineralisation and type of deposit under consideration and to the activity they are undertaking to qualify as qualified persons as defined by the 2004 Edition of the 'Australasian Code for Reporting of Exploration Results, Mineral Resources and Ore Reserves (JORC Code 2004)'. The Qualified Persons consent to the inclusion in this release of the matters based on the information in the form and context in which it appears.

Toro Energy is a modern Australian uranium company with progressive project development, acquisition and growth. The company is based in Perth, Western Australia.

Toro's flagship and wholly-owned Wiluna uranium project is 30 kilometres southeast of Wiluna in Central Western Australia.

Toro's wholly owned Theseus Project is a recent discovery with results to date indicating the potential for a high grade mineralised system. The Company also owns uranium assets in the Northern Territory and in Namibia, Africa.

JORC Code, 2012 Edition – 1 report

Section 1 Sampling Techniques and Data

(Criteria in this section apply to all succeeding sections.)

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Sampling techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> <i>Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample representivity and the appropriate calibration of any measurement tools or systems used.</i> <i>Aspects of the determination of mineralisation that are Material to the Public Report.</i> <i>In cases where 'industry standard' work has been done this would be relatively simple (eg 'reverse circulation drilling was used to obtain 1 m samples from which 3 kg was pulverised to produce a 30 g charge for fire assay'). In other cases more explanation may be required, such as where there is coarse gold that has inherent sampling problems. Unusual commodities or mineralisation types (eg submarine nodules) may warrant disclosure of detailed information.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> U₃O₈ values are calculated from U values derived from both geochemistry and down-hole gamma radiation measurements. Geochemistry – Toro's geochemical samples on all of the Wiluna deposits represent 0.5m half core lengths (prior to 2013) or full core lengths (2013 and planned into the future) of 100mm sonic drill core. Full core samples provide an 8-10kg sample to the lab, half core samples are half this weight approximately. After crushing the lab splits a 2.5 kg sub-sample for milling (pulverizing) to 90% passing 75micron, before taking an aliquot for U analysis by 4 acid digest ICPMS (prior to 2013) or fusion-ICPMS (2013 and into the future). In the case of half core samples field duplicates of the core are taken to ensure sample representivity, these field duplicates are the other half of the core that has been sampled. In the case of full core samples, duplicates are taken at the first sample split at the lab, directly after the initial crush, these duplicates are taken with a rotary splitter after pushing the sample back through the crusher after the initial split. It should be noted that due to the size of the sample supplied to the lab, the initial crushing is a two-step process, a primary crush to 10mm and a secondary crush to 3mm. Both these duplicates are taken at a rate of 1 in 20 or 5% of all non standard samples. Differences in U concentrations between the duplicates and their corresponding samples are used to produce a mean standard sampling error. Lab duplicates are taken at every stage of the sub-sampling process prior to analysis at the rate of 1 in 20. Geochemical samples are taken through the ore zones as determined by hand-held scintillometers and if available at the time of sampling, down-hole gamma measurements. The half metre intervals are determined from marking up half metre intervals down the full length of the core from the surface. This is completed at the rig so that any drilling issues can be observed and the geologist can have direct

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		<p>communication 'on the spot' with the driller. To gain geochemical and mineralogical information of waste material or for metallurgical purposes etc, often the entire hole is sampled for geochemistry and a larger suite of elements are analysed for, some having to employ different analytical techniques.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Depth corrections are made to geochemistry samples where appropriate, these are based on comparing the down-hole geochemistry to the down-hole gamma U values and assuming the down-hole depth as measured by the gamma probe during probing is correct. Winch cable stretch is not considered an issue in the Wiluna drilling due to the shallow depth of almost all drilling (maximum depth of approximately 25m). • Gamma derived eU₃O₈ – Toro uses Auslog natural gamma probes, either in-house or from external contractors, to measure down-hole gamma radiation. Measurements are made every 2 cm with a logging speed of 3.5m per minute. • The gamma probes are used on all holes, which include sonic holes also used for geochemical sampling and air core holes drilled specifically for gamma probe measurements. 100mm sonic core holes are usually 150mm in diameter and air core holes are usually 100mm in diameter. Approximately 95% of all holes are aircore. • Prior to the drilling program all gamma probes are calibrated at the Adelaide Calibration Model pits in Adelaide, South Australia. During probing operations every 10th hole is logged twice as a duplicate log. Selected holes across the deposits are used as reference holes for relogging to detect drift in the instrument during each program. • As protection from hole collapse and to protect the probe, all logging is done inside 40mm or 50mm PVC pipe (unless larger diameter has been used for water bores) with an average wall thickness of 1.9 mm. • Gamma measurements are converted to equivalent U₃O₈ values (eU₃O₈) by an algorithm that takes into account the probe and crystal used, density, hole diameter, ground water where applicable and PVC pipe thickness. • Down-hole gamma probe data is also deconvolved to more accurately reflect what would be expected in nature for down-hole response (gamma curves). • All gamma data is compared with geochemistry data both via down-

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		hole comparisons and overall populations bivariate analysis, and distribution analysis to check for potential error or disequilibrium. To adequately compare with geochemistry gamma probe data is composited into half metre composites at the same intervals represented by the corresponding geochemical samples.
<i>Drilling techniques</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both sonic and aircore drilling techniques are utilized on the Wiluna Project. The sonic drilling utilizes a 100mm core barrel (inside diameter) with outside casing where needed, producing a 150mm hole diameter and 100mm core. Depending on the ground conditions and thus quality of core being produced, core is retrieved from the 3m barrel in either 1 to 3m length, 1m at a time. Upon exiting the barrel, core is transferred into tubular plastic bags that fit the core before being placed in core trays. Aircore drilling is conventional with a 72mm bit producing an approximate 100mm diameter hole.
<i>Drill sample recovery</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Method of recording and assessing core and chip sample recoveries and results assessed.</i> <i>Measures taken to maximise sample recovery and ensure representative nature of the samples.</i> <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> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chip sample recoveries are not recorded as the chips are not used for any systematic analysis of uranium concentrations. Sonic core recoveries are estimated based on the drillers direction to definitive lost core, observations made on quality of sample during geological logging and sample weight comparisons to average weights and rock type. It should be noted that precise core recovery estimation on sonic drillcore in the Wiluna deposits is inherently difficult due to expansion and contraction of soft sediments during drilling and during recovery of core from the barrel. Core loss is minimized by 'casing as we drill' through all ore zones or any zone where the geological information is critical such as for geotechnical purposes. There is no correlation between estimated core loss and grade Grade in geochemical samples is also checked against composited gamma derived grades (see above), which acts as another check on errors in the geochemistry that may (or may not) be due to core recovery.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Logging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> <i>Whether logging is qualitative or quantitative in nature. Core (or costean, channel, etc) photography.</i> <i>The total length and percentage of the relevant intersections logged.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Geology is not used in the resource estimation process, the reasons for this are explained in more detail below, however, basically the deposit has been found to be correlated more to groundwater and depth from the surface than to any geological unit. Thus the geological logging is adequate for resource estimation. Current geological logging (all Toro, 2009 onwards) is considered to be adequate for the stage of mine planning that Toro is currently at on the Wiluna Project. Further work is considered necessary to amalgamate or align historical geology logs and geology to current. This can be achieved with the results of the 20313 drilling campaign, which was Toro's largest and which covered all but 1 of the Wiluna Project deposits (Nowthanna Deposit). Current logging is both qualitative (subjective geological opinion of rock type and colour) and quantitative (recording specific depth intervals and percentages of grain sizes). Core photographs are taken for each individual metre (prior to 2013) and half metre (2013) after core has been split down the middle for logging and so as to see sedimentological features for logging (avoiding clay smear on outer surface of core made by drill rods). Historical costeans were not geologically logged, although in some circumstances photographs of costean walls were taken and stored on the company drive.
Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all core taken.</i> <i>If non-core, whether riffled, tube sampled, rotary split, etc and whether sampled wet or dry.</i> <i>For all sample types, the nature, quality and appropriateness of the sample preparation technique.</i> <i>Quality control procedures adopted for all sub-sampling stages to maximise representivity of samples.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As described above, geochemical samples represent 0.5m half core lengths (prior to 2013) or full core lengths (2013 and planned into the future) of 100mm sonic drill core. Aircore chips were not sampled for geochemistry. Sample preparation has been described above under 'sampling techniques, it is considered that all sub-sampling and lab preparations are consistent with other laboratories in Australia and overseas and are satisfactory for the intended purpose. Lab duplicates are taken by the lab to test their own sub-sampling techniques, for full core geochemical samples the lab duplicate taken at the first split after the initial crush (sampled with a rotary splitter) is used by Toro to calculate the sampling error.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> <i>Whether sample sizes are appropriate to the grain size of the material being sampled.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total sampling errors calculated from half core field duplicates typically range from ± 10-20%. Total sampling errors for the first split at the lab in case of full core sampling typically range from ± 1-5%. The laboratory used for Toro's geochemical analysis bases all crushing grain sizes and subsequent sub-sampling weights on being inside accepted Gy safety lines for sample representivity. These grains sizes and sub-sample weights have been described above under 'sampling techniques'.
Quality of assay data and laboratory tests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The nature, quality and appropriateness of the assaying and laboratory procedures used and whether the technique is considered partial or total.</i> <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> <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> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prior to 2013 a four acid digest followed by ICPMS was employed for analysis for geochemistry – this was assumed to be an almost total rock digest technique although with recognition that highly resistant minerals are sometimes not entirely digested. In 2012 a test was done to compare four acid digest/ICPMS with sodium peroxide fusion followed by ICPMS with fused glass XRF. Analysis of a number of standards suggested that the Fusion/ICPMS was the most accurate. So in 2013, fusion/ICPMS has been used as the bases for all U analyses, however on a number of samples four acid digest/ICPMS and fused glass XRF are still used for comparative purposes. Performance against standards is excellent. Historical geochemistry data is almost entirely XRF. Down-hole gamma tools are used as explained above. All tools are Auslog natural gamma probes calibrated at the Adelaide Calibration Model pits in Adelaide, South Australia. Certified matrix matched standards are used to check analyses at the lab at a rate of 5% or 1 in 20 samples. Coarse quartz sand is used as blanks and are used at a rate of 5% or 1 in 20 samples as well as being strategically placed in front of and behind samples expected to have high concentrations of U so that thresholds for potential cross-contamination within preparations can be obtained.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Duplicates are used as already explained in detail above. Limited laboratory checks have been made – in 2013 these represented approximately 3% of all samples.
Verification of sampling and assaying	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The verification of significant intersections by either independent or alternative company personnel.</i> <i>The use of twinned holes.</i> <i>Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols.</i> <i>Discuss any adjustment to assay data.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited interlab geochemistry analytical checks are completed for each drilling campaign, the last interlab check represented 3% of all the geochemical samples. Toro has a calibrated (at the Adelaide Calibration Model pits in Adelaide, South Australia) Auslog gamma probe to check the probing results achieved by external contractors. In large areas of inferred resource covered by historical holes up to 10% of all holes are twinned using the sonic drilling technique for geochemical sampling and comparison with historical data. All primary data (gamma log las files, geochemical sample lists, final collar files, geological logs, core photographs, electronic geochemical results, drillers plods, probing plods, deconvolved gamma files, gamma gamma density logs, disequilibrium analysis results etc) are stored on the company server in the appropriate drive and folders. Any hardcopy data, such as official geochemistry results or any paper copy geological logs, are kept in hardcopy in folders and archives as well as being scanned and kept on the company server in the appropriate drives and folders. Data entry procedures are described in some detail below in section 3 under 'data integrity'. To date, there has been no adjustments made to either geochemical assay U_3O_8 data (or for any other elements) or gamma probe eU_3O_8 data. Slight adjustments are made to some geochemical assay data to account for depth corrections if an interval error is discovered, this is rare and always restricted to the near surface above mineralized zones.
Location of data points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All drill hole collars are pegged to the planned collar location using a differential GPS (DGPS) with base station (currently an Austech ProMark500 and ProFlex500). At the end of the drilling campaigns all collars are picked up using the same DGPS equipment for the final collar locations that are entered into the database. Accuracy of the

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Specification of the grid system used.</i> <i>Quality and adequacy of topographic control.</i> 	<p>DGPS is approximately to 100mm in the vertical and 50mm on the horizontal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to all drill holes being shallow (maximum depth of 25m) and vertical no down-hole surveying is required. The grid system used on the Wiluna Project is Geocentric Datum of Australia (GDA) 94, zone 51 for the Centipede, Millipede, Lake Way and Dawson Hinkler deposits and zone 50 for the Nowthanna Deposit. Topographic control is largely achieved by the DGPS with base station and a LiDAR Survey. As stated above, all Toro drill holes are accurate to approximately 100mm on the vertical, this covers all holes drilled from 2011 through to current. All historical holes at Centipede, Millipede and Lake Way have been 'pinned' to a topographic surface created from a LiDAR survey. At Dawson Hinkler all drill holes have been 'pinned' to a topographic surface created from current drill hole collars surveyed in a with a DGPS and base station. At Nowthanna, no major corrections have been made to the drill hole collars, investigation in 3-Dimensions has shown no significant offsets.
<i>Data spacing and distribution</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Data spacing for reporting of Exploration Results.</i> <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> <i>Whether sample compositing has been applied.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No exploration results, resource drilling only For Centipede/Millipede deposits: Measured resources drilled at 25-35m x 25-35m. Indicated Resources 50m x 50m to 100 m x 100 m drill spacing, with good cover of sonic drilling. Inferred Resources: all other holes within mineralization envelope, greater than 100 x 100m. Lake Way: all Indicated (75m x 75m drilling, with good sonic drilling cover). Dawson Hinkler: all Inferred Sample compositing to 0.5m composites has been applied to the 2cm interval eU3O8 data to match the 0.5m geochemical core samples.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Orientation of data in relation to geological structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the orientation of sampling achieves unbiased sampling of possible structures and the extent to which this is known, considering the deposit type. 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sampling is non-subjective down-hole sampling from the surface, either at 2cm intervals in the case of gamma probe data or 0.5m samples in the case of geochemistry. Historical geochemistry represents a similar non-bias down-hole process. The sampling orientation employed provides no bias to the groundwater related distribution of mineralization. No bias suspected.
Sample security	The measures taken to ensure sample security.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sampling of drill core for geochemistry is achieved in the field directly after drilling at the drill site. All samples are bagged firstly in plastic and then again in calico (double bagged). A unique non-descript identifier number is used to number each sample that bears no relation to the deposit or the drill hole. All sample details are entered into a fixed format file ready for later import into the database. Samples are immediately transported by utility to the field camp where they are weighed before being packed into steel 44 gallon drums with lock-down lids and tested for radiation for transport classification. The drums are then fitted on timber pallets and transported to the local transport dock at Wiluna for delivery to Perth. Approximate time between sampling and transport to the laboratory is 4 weeks. Sampling of gamma derived measurements is achieved by a single contractor using a gamma probe (see sampling techniques above). Raw gamma probe data is converted into a las file and sent to a Perth based office on a daily basis by email. This data is then packaged and sent to the Toro Energy Database Manager, who sends it to the analyst (consultant) for calculation into U concentrations and deconvolution.
Audits or reviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The results of any audits or reviews of sampling techniques and data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An internal review of geochemical sampling techniques in 2012 lead to a change in practice from non-selective half-core sampling to full core sampling so as to reduce total sampling error. This recommendation was followed in 2013 and has satisfactorily reduced sampling error to below $\pm 10\%$.

Section 2 Reporting of Exploration Results

NOT APPLICABLE TO THIS RESOURCE UPDATE

Section 3 Estimation and Reporting of Mineral Resources

(Criteria listed in section 1, and where relevant in section 2, also apply to this section.)

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Database integrity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Measures taken to ensure that data has not been corrupted by, for example, transcription or keying errors, between its initial collection and its use for Mineral Resource estimation purposes.</i> <i>Data validation procedures used.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Logging and sampling data is entered into a template with fixed formatting and fixed lithological choices (selected from fixed drop-down lists) by the geologist responsible for logging each hole. The template is formatted so that it can be imported directly into a DataShed database. All importing and exporting into and from the database is achieved by a single point of entry/exit responsible for the database (database manager), access for such tasks is restricted to the database manager. All files are transferred from the field to the database manager using a secure commercial based DropBox folder system with automatic back-up and error correction functions. Data files for resource estimation are transferred in a single zip file to the resource consultant, direct from the database manager. All geological interval and gamma data is validated via a systematic check of down-hole gamma to down-hole scintillometer readings (made for each lithological unit) for every hole (both sonic and aircore). A secondary check on actual lithology logging is made by examining core and chip photographs cross-referenced to the geological logs. All historical data is validated in ISATIS against the same data used in previous estimations.
Site visits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Comment on any site visits undertaken by the Competent Person and the outcome of those visits.</i> <i>If no site visits have been undertaken indicate why this is the case.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The competent person responsible for the resource estimate, Daniel Guibal, has not had a visit to site. It is considered that a site visit is not necessary given Mr Guibal's experience with Toro's Wiluna uranium deposits, some 6 years, including numerous estimations, as well as experience elsewhere with calcrete associated surficial uranium deposits, such as Lake Maitland.

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
Geological interpretation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The use of geology in guiding and controlling Mineral Resource estimation.</i> <i>Confidence in (or conversely, the uncertainty of) the geological interpretation of the mineral deposit.</i> <i>Nature of the data used and of any assumptions made.</i> <i>The effect, if any, of alternative interpretations on Mineral Resource estimation.</i> <i>The factors affecting continuity both of grade and geology.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The geological model is not used in the resource estimate since it has been found that mineralization is not necessarily correlated to any particular rock type, despite being often associated with carbonate or carbonated sediments. The mineralization has been found to be associated with the water table and so is more correlated to depth from the surface than any given lithology, maintaining grade across different lithologies. Thus the geological model for estimation is a simple mineralization envelope based on a concentration of U that represents that concentration where the background population of U ends and the U mineralization exists (in a classic bimodal distribution). In the Wiluna deposits this is 70 ppm U_3O_8 for the Centipede and Millipede deposits and 80 ppm U_3O_8 for the Lake Way, Dawson Hinkler and Nowthanna deposits. Examination of 3D LeapFrog models of different grade shells of the resource give a high level of confidence to the above interpretation of a ground water controlled deposit. No geological data used in estimation, all data used is based on U values from deconvolved gamma derived equivalents and geochemistry. A minimum of 5% of all drill holes are required to test the validity of gamma and to introduce into the estimation. Density values used in the resource estimates are single values representing average densities for the entire mineralization envelope. The advantage of using a mineralization envelope based on U concentrations only (both chemistry and deconvolved gamma derived equivalents) is that there are no assumptions made. Domains are based on variance within the data and so in effect, real changes in the behavior of the data and data distribution, there is no forcing statistical predictions into domains based on lithology that is not necessarily correlated spatially at all times. A different geological interpretation, if used in the resource estimate, may affect the results of the resource estimate slightly, however, since geology is not used in estimations a change in geological interpretations would make no difference. Grade Continuity can be affected by numerous factors, including drilling density (down to 50m x 50 m and locally closer for

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		Centipede/Millipede 100m x 100m for Dawson Hinkler and 75m x 75m for Lake Way), nugget effect, itself linked to the type of measurement (geochemical data are more variable than radiometric deconvolved radiometric data), uncertainties on the data themselves due to calibration problems or/and disequilibrium for the radiometric values, sampling/assaying issues for the geochemical measurements (controlled by QA/QC), and geological continuity, which is reasonably established at Wiluna. Geology has been controlled by recent to Quaternary sediment deposition with overprinting calcretisation being controlled by the ground water flow.
Dimensions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The extent and variability of the Mineral Resource expressed as length (along strike or otherwise), plan width, and depth below surface to the upper and lower limits of the Mineral Resource. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Wiluna deposits are superficial with a vertical thickness of a few meters at most. Occasionally deeper (15 to 25m below surface) mineralization exists, but its continuity is not proved, because of the lack of deep drilling
Estimation and modelling techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The nature and appropriateness of the estimation technique(s) applied and key assumptions, including treatment of extreme grade values, domaining, interpolation parameters and maximum distance of extrapolation from data points. If a computer assisted estimation method was chosen include a description of computer software and parameters used. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimation technique is Uniform Conditioning followed by Localised Uniform Conditions using the specialised geostatistical software, Isatis. The various steps of the estimation are the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Use of combined radiometric and geochemical data, with priority given to geochemistry in the infrequent case when both exist (2) Creation of a mineralisation envelope using Leapfrog 3D at a cut-off of 70 ppm eU3O8 to define the hanging wall and the footwall (3) Compositing to 0.5m (4) For Centipede and Dawson-Hinkler, domaining by zones of reasonably consistent grade (5) Top-cuts used in Centipede and Dawson-Hinkler: 4500 ppm, 5000 ppm and 500 ppm respectively depending on the domain. The top-cuts have very little impact on mean grade (less than 1%) and variance (6) Block model based on 30m x 30m x 0.5m panels for Centipede and Lake Way and 200m x 100m x 0.5m for Dawson-Hinkler. The panel sizes are chosen from the drilling density (7) Ordinary Kriging estimation of panels, after neighbourhood analysis to optimise quality of kriging. (8) Validation of Kriging results through statistics and swath plots

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
		<p>(9) Uniform conditioning (UC) for 10m x 10m x 0.5m Selective Mining Units (SMU), which is a realistic assumption for a future operation where grade control using radiometric information will be possible.</p> <p>(10) Localised Uniform Conditioning: creation of a 10m x 10m x 0.5m block model based on the results of UC</p> <p>(11) The tonnage are estimated using a constant dry density per deposit, based on the average value of existing measurements</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The availability of check estimates, previous estimates and/or mine production records and whether the Mineral Resource estimate takes appropriate account of such data.</i> <i>The assumptions made regarding recovery of by-products.</i> <i>Estimation of deleterious elements or other non-grade variables of economic significance (eg sulphur for acid mine drainage characterisation).</i> <i>In the case of block model interpolation, the block size in relation to the average sample spacing and the search employed.</i> <i>Any assumptions behind modelling of selective mining units.</i> <i>Any assumptions about correlation between variables.</i> <i>Description of how the geological interpretation was used to control the resource estimates.</i> <i>Discussion of basis for using or not using grade cutting or capping.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Previous resource estimates (for a number of years also SRK and Mr Daniel Guibal) are available and are considered in all current estimations. No by-products are assumed to be recovered nor are any planned to be recovered. Currently there are no geostatistical estimations made on deleterious elements, however, such elements have been included in the analysis of drill core samples since 2009 and so such estimations will be able to be accomplished in the future as more coverage across the deposits is achieved. Current analysis of drill core geochemistry and Metallurgical samples strongly suggests there are no significant economic issues related to deleterious elements. See above See above No assumptions See above – no geological control in any of the 2012 JORC compliant resources. See above

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The process of validation, the checking process used, the comparison of model data to drill hole data, and use of reconciliation data if available. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See above
Moisture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the tonnages are estimated on a dry basis or with natural moisture, and the method of determination of the moisture content. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tonnages are dry tonnages
Cut-off parameters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The basis of the adopted cut-off grade(s) or quality parameters applied. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grade-tonnage curve are provided for a range of cut-offs. Optimal cut-off will be determined from the mining studies.
Mining factors or assumptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumptions made regarding possible mining methods, minimum mining dimensions and internal (or, if applicable, external) mining dilution. It is always necessary as part of the process of determining reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction to consider potential mining methods, but the assumptions made regarding mining methods and parameters when estimating Mineral Resources may not always be rigorous. Where this is the case, this should be reported with an explanation of the basis of the mining assumptions made. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mining technique has been tested successfully on site, the main points follow. Shallow strip mining to 15m maximum depth using a combination of a Vermeer surface miner, loader and articulated trucks. 25-50cm benches De-watering of pits for process water In-pit tailings disposal below natural ground surface in lined pits, progressive compartmental mining, tailings and rehabilitation Current - strip 3.8:1, using 250ppm cut-off Up to 14 year life of mine, regional resources increase to 20+ years dependent on future approvals 5 years at Centipede followed by Lake Way
Metallurgical factors or assumptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The basis for assumptions or predictions regarding metallurgical amenability. It is always necessary as part of the process of determining reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction to consider potential metallurgical methods, but the assumptions regarding metallurgical treatment processes and parameters made when reporting Mineral Resources may not always be rigorous. Where this is the case, this should be reported with an explanation of the basis of the metallurgical assumptions made. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laboratory scale pilot plant has been successfully trialled that include all of the currently proposed process from crushing/grinding to product – actual product produced. Every part of the processing circuit has been tested and/or had research associated with it. Main factors follow. Alkaline tank leach with direct precipitation. Target production is 780 tpa U₃O₈ Processing 1.3 Mtpa at a head grade of 716ppm U₃O₈
Environmental factors or assumptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumptions made regarding possible waste and process residue disposal options. It is always necessary as part of the process of determining reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction to consider the potential environmental impacts of the mining and processing operation. While at this stage the determination of potential environmental impacts, particularly for a greenfields project, may not always be well advanced, the status of early consideration of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two of the deposits have been approved for mining by the West Australian EPA as part of the Wiluna Uranium Project and thus the project has gone through the Environmental Review and Management Programme process (The ERMP and all of the associated documents can be found on the Toro Energy website at http://www.toroenergy.com.au/sustainability/health-safety/environmental-review-and-management-programme-ermp/

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
	<i>these potential environmental impacts should be reported. Where these aspects have not been considered this should be reported with an explanation of the environmental assumptions made.</i>	<p>Main factors follow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shallow open pit mining • In-pit tailings disposal below natural ground surface in lined pits, progressive compartmental mining, tailings and rehabilitation • Tailings integrity modeled for 10,000 years • Mining footprint returned as close as possible to natural land surface level • No standing landforms remain post closure
<i>Bulk density</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Whether assumed or determined. If assumed, the basis for the assumptions. If determined, the method used, whether wet or dry, the frequency of the measurements, the nature, size and representativeness of the samples.</i> • <i>The bulk density for bulk material must have been measured by methods that adequately account for void spaces (vugs, porosity, etc), moisture and differences between rock and alteration zones within the deposit.</i> • <i>Discuss assumptions for bulk density estimates used in the evaluation process of the different materials.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density determined by calibrated gamma gamma probe during 2011 drilling campaign for Centipede and Millipede • Density determined by bulk density determinations from costeans in 1978 at Lake Way. • Density has been averaged across each deposit so that a single density is applied to across the block model. • Density derived by consensus from surrounding deposits for Dawson Hinkler.
<i>Classification</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The basis for the classification of the Mineral Resources into varying confidence categories.</i> • <i>Whether 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).</i> • <i>Whether the result appropriately reflects the Competent Person's view of the deposit.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The classification is based on the consideration of drill spacing, existence of geochemical data in such numbers that the radiometric data are well supported and finally the quality of the estimation as measured by kriging slope of regression. • For Centipede/Millipede: Measured resources drilled at 25 m x 25m Indicated Resources 50m x 50m to 100 m x 100 m drill spacing, with good cover of sonic drilling Inferred Resources: the rest • Lake Way: all Indicated (75m x 75m drilling, with good sonic drilling cover) • Dawson Hinkler: all Inferred

Criteria	JORC Code explanation	Commentary
<i>Audits or reviews</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The results of any audits or reviews of Mineral Resource estimates.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There has been no audit of the resources reporting material change within this ASX release, other than internal Toro assessment and geological interpretation.
<i>Discussion of relative accuracy/confidence</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Where appropriate a statement of the relative accuracy and confidence level in the Mineral Resource estimate using an approach or procedure deemed appropriate by the Competent Person. For example, the application of statistical or geostatistical procedures to quantify the relative accuracy of the resource within stated confidence limits, or, if such an approach is not deemed appropriate, a qualitative discussion of the factors that could affect the relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate.</i> <i>The statement should specify whether it relates to global or local estimates, and, if local, state the relevant tonnages, which should be relevant to technical and economic evaluation. Documentation should include assumptions made and the procedures used.</i> <i>These statements of relative accuracy and confidence of the estimate should be compared with production data, where available.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As mentioned, the classification is partly based on the quality of kriging. In addition, since 2009, various drilling campaigns took place at Wiluna in particular and there has been a good consistency of the estimates. There is more uncertainty at the individual panel level. Other factors having an impact on the estimation are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Possible disequilibrium - current measurements suggest that it is unlikely to be significant; (2) Relationship between radiometric values and geochemical data can be variable; (3) The assaying methods, as there are indications that XRF tends to overestimate grades by about 5% (by comparison to mass spectrometry) – XRF is mostly in historical data; (4) The cut-off grades- due to the estimation method (UC), the high cut-off grades (over 500 ppm) which depend on the modeling of the tail of the grade distributions are more uncertain at local level. No production statistics available – not an operating mine

Section 4 Estimation and Reporting of Ore Reserves

NOT APPLICABLE – NO RESERVES REPORTED

Section 5 Estimation and Reporting of Diamonds and Other Gemstones

NOT APPLICABLE – URANIUM ONLY