

Tawana Resources NL
(Incorporated in Australia)
(Registration number ACN 085 166 721)
Share code on the JSE Limited: TAW
ISIN: AU000000TAW7
Share code on the Australian Stock Exchange Limited: TAW
ISIN: AU000000TAW7

New Mineralisation Targets Discovered

PLEASE NOTE: ALL GRAPHICS HAVE BEEN REMOVED FOR SENS PURPOSES. PLEASE REFER TO TAWANA WEBSITE FOR THE COMPLETE ANNOUNCEMENT.

Tawana Resources NL ('Tawana' or 'the Company') is excited to announce the recent discovery of new and additional iron ore mineralisation identified from outcropping iron formations at both the Koehnko North East (NE) and Koehnko East (E) prospects within Tawana's 100% owned Mofe Creek project (the Project) in Liberia.

The Koehnko NE and Koehnko E prospects are both located within 5kms of the Koehnko hub's maiden inferred resource of 16.2 Mt at 31% Fe (refer ASX release 31st March 2014)¹. The mineralisation has been mapped as predominantly friable itabirite with some higher grade hematite capping, mostly recorded on the flanks of the hills. From initial field observations, both prospects have the potential to significantly grow the Koehnko resource estimate and the overall Project resource base of 61.9Mt at 33% Fe¹. The Koehnko NE deposit is inferably the largest potential outcropping iron ore formation discovered to date, across the Company's 100%-owned Mofe Creek licences.

The combined strike of mapped surface iron mineralisation is 1.35km with an average grade of 35% Fe determined from rock chip samples analyzed by hand held XRF. These two prospects represent the first areas explored since the resumption of field based exploration. This low cost form of exploration continues to generate and firm up exploration targets to aid in prioritising future drilling programs targeting additional resource tonnage.

Executive Chairman and Chief Executive Officer Mr Wayne Richards said "These exciting results, along with the Company's recent Direct Shipping Ore (DSO) discoveries, are extremely encouraging and further strengthen the exploration rationale for a potential Bomi Hills analogue within our two 100%-owned tenements".

Koehnko North East (NE) Prospect

The Koehnko NE prospect is currently defined by outcropping iron formations mapped over a surface expression with an approximate strike length of 850m at an average width of 80m. From rock chip samples taken from the outcropping itabirite, which also is the largest outcropping iron formation observed in the Project to date, and analyzed by hand-held XRF the assays ranged in grade from 22.3% to 57.3% Fe with an average grade of 35% Fe, 1.35% AL, 0.057% P, and 0.11% S.

Koehnko East (E) Prospect

The Koehnko E prospect is located 15km along strike from the historical Bomi Hill Iron Mine, which produced in excess of 50Mt of DSO during the 1950's-70's, and is interpreted to be a possible western extension of the iron formation.

The Koehnko E prospect consists of iron mineralisation mapped over a high hill with a strike length of 500m at an average width of 30m. The rock chip samples collected from the defined iron mineralisation footprint ranged in grade from 26.7% to 50.9% Fe with an average grade of 35.8% Fe with acceptable impurity levels of 1.92% Al, 0.05% P, and 0.05% S.

Within the 10km window of the Koehnko E prospect to the eastern boundary of Tawana's MEL12029 licence intermittent magnetic anomalies interpreted to be extensions to the Koehnko East prospect are currently being mapped and sampled by Tawana's field crew.

About Tawana (ASX & JSE: TAW)

Tawana Resources NL is an iron ore focused ASX and JSE-listed company with its principal project in Liberia, West Africa. Tawana's 100%-owned Mofe Creek project is a new discovery in the heart of Liberia's historic iron ore district, located 20km from the coast and 85km from the country's capital city and major port, Monrovia.

Tawana is committed to advance the development of its 100% owned Mofe Creek project, which covers 475km² of highly prospective tenements in Grand Cape Mount County. The project hosts high-grade friable itabirite mineralisation, which can be easily upgraded to a premium quality iron ore product of +64-68% Fe grade, via simple, low capital intensity beneficiation.

Detailed information on all aspects of Tawana's project can be found on the Company's website www.tawana.com.au.

For further information, contact:

Wayne Richards

Executive Chairman

Ph: +61 8 9489 2600

06 August 2015

Sponsor

PricewaterhouseCoopers Corporate Finance (Pty) Ltd

Forward Looking Statement

This announcement may contain or refer to previously reported forward looking statements and projections regarding estimated resources and reserves; planned production and operating costs profiles; planned capital requirements; and planned strategies and corporate objectives. Such forward looking statements/projections are estimates only and should not be unduly relied upon. They are not guarantees of future performance and involve known and unknown risks, uncertainties and other factors many of which are beyond the control of Tawana Resources NL. The forward looking statements/projections are inherently uncertain and may therefore differ materially from results ultimately achieved.

Tawana Resources NL does not make any representations and provides no warranties concerning the accuracy of the projections, and disclaims any obligation to update or revise any forward looking statements/projects based on new information, future events or otherwise except to the extent required by applicable laws. While the information contained or referred to in this announcement has been prepared in good faith, neither TAW or any of its directors, officers, agents, employees or advisors give any representation or warranty, express or implied, as to the fairness, accuracy, completeness or correctness of the information, opinions and conclusions contained or referred to in this announcement. Accordingly, to the maximum extent permitted by law, none of TAW, its directors, employees or agents, advisers, nor any other person accepts any liability whether direct or indirect, express or limited, contractual, tortious, statutory or otherwise, in respect of, the accuracy or completeness of the information or for any of the opinions contained or referred to in this announcement or for any errors, omissions or misstatements or for any loss, howsoever arising, from this announcement.

Competent Persons Statement

The information in this report that relates to Exploration Results and Resources is based on information compiled by Shane Tomlinson, who is a member of the Australian Institute of Geoscientists. Shane Tomlinson has sufficient experience which is 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'. Shane Tomlinson consents to the inclusion of the matters in this report based on his information in the form and context in which it appears.

The information in this Report relating to the Mofe Creek Resource Estimate and Scoping Study are extracted from the 31 March 2014 Maiden Resource and 3 July 2014 Scoping Study announcements. The Company is not aware of any new information or data that materially affects the information included in the original market announcements. The Company confirms that the form and context in which the Competent Person's findings are presented have not been materially modified from the original market announcements.

Notes

¹ For more information on the Resource estimate, refer to ASX announcement dated 31 March 2014. Tawana Resources is not aware of any new information or data that materially affects the information included in the said announcement.

APPENDIX 1

The following extract from the JORC Code 2012 Table 1 is provided for compliance with the Code requirements for the reporting of Mineral Resources: (CP: ST = Shane Tomlinson)

SECTION 1 SAMPLING TECHNIQUES AND DATA (Criteria in this section apply to all succeeding sections).

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary	Competent Person
Sampling techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Include reference to measures taken to ensure sample representivity and the appropriate calibration of any measurement tools or systems used. Aspects of the determination of mineralisation that are Material to the Public Report. In cases where 'industry standard' work has been done this would be relatively simple (eg 'reverse circulation drilling was used to obtain 1m samples from which 3kg was pulverised to produce a 30g 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rock chip samples were collected in the field from outcrop, sub-crop and boulder float material. Rock chip samples were analysed by handheld XRF. 	ST
Drilling techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No drilling results are reported as part of this submission. 	ST
Drill sample recovery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Method of recording and assessing core and chip sample recoveries and results assessed. Measures taken to maximise sample recovery and ensure representative nature of the samples. 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No drilling results are reported as part of this submission. 	ST
Logging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Whether logging is qualitative or quantitative in nature. Core (or costean, channel, etc) photography. The total length and percentage of the relevant intersections logged. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rock chip samples were geologically logged for lithology, hardness, grain size, fabric and where possible dip/dip direction for structural interpretation. 	ST

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary	Competent Person
Sub-sampling techniques and sample preparation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If core, whether cut or sawn and whether quarter, half or all core taken. ▪ If non-core, whether riffled, tube sampled, rotary split, etc and whether sampled wet or dry. ▪ For all sample types, the nature, quality and appropriateness of the sample preparation technique. ▪ Quality control procedures adopted for all sub-sampling stages to maximise representivity of samples. ▪ 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. ▪ Whether sample sizes are appropriate to the grain size of the material being sampled. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All rock chip samples were dried prior to analysis at room temperature ▪ Blanks and certified reference materials were inserted every 10th sample. ▪ No sub sampling techniques were carried out on the original rock chip sample. 	ST
Quality of assay data and laboratory tests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The nature, quality and appropriateness of the assaying and laboratory procedures used and whether the technique is considered partial or total. ▪ 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. ▪ 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assaying was by handheld XRF instrument Olympus Delta Premium GeoChem (Mining Plus) Analyzer using geochem mode. ▪ Reading time was 1 second per reading with a total of 4 readings per sample. ▪ The instrument automatically calculated an average grade from the readings per sample. ▪ The instrument automatically calibrates on a daily basis. ▪ Blanks and certified reference material standards were inserted every 10th sample and acceptable levels of accuracy and precision have been established. 	ST
Verification of sampling and assaying	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The verification of significant intersections by either independent or alternative company personnel. ▪ The use of twinned holes. ▪ Documentation of primary data, data entry procedures, data verification, data storage (physical and electronic) protocols. ▪ Discuss any adjustment to assay data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It was noted that handheld XRF results reported were consistently lower when compared with laboratory analysis reported previously. ▪ No twinned holes are reported as part of this submission. ▪ All mapping data is collected manually in the field and entered subsequently into excel spreadsheet mapping and rock chip database. ▪ All handheld XRF data is collected in the field office and downloaded from the instrument to excel spreadsheet. ▪ No adjustments have been made to the assay data. 	ST
Location of data points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Accuracy and quality of surveys used to locate drillholes (collar and down-hole surveys), trenches, mine workings and other locations used in Mineral Resource estimation. ▪ Specification of the grid system used. ▪ Quality and adequacy of topographic control. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All sampling points have been surveyed using handheld GPS instrument on WGS 84 UTM zone 29N grid system. ▪ No topographic control is reported as part of this submission. 	ST
Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary	

Data spacing and distribution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data spacing for reporting of Exploration Results. ▪ 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. ▪ Whether sample compositing has been applied. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ sampling is defined by the extent of outcrop available. ▪ Sampling distribution is considered sufficient for reporting of exploration results. ▪ No sample compositing has been applied. 	ST
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 orientation is dictated by presence of outcrop. Where possible, rock chip sampling has been conducted perpendicular to regional strike. ▪ No drilling results are reported as part of this submission. 	ST
Sample security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The measures taken to ensure sample security. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All rock chips have been securely stored at the project field office. 	ST
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"> ▪ Sampling techniques and data were regularly reviewed by internal company staff. 	ST

SECTION 2 REPORTING OF EXPLORATION RESULTS (CRITERIA LISTED IN THE PRECEDING SECTION ALSO APPLY TO THIS SECTION).

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary	Competent Person
Mineral tenement and land tenure status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. ▪ 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MEL 1223/14 is located within the Grand Cape Mount county of Liberia and is 100% held by Tawana Liberia Inc, a wholly owned subsidiary of Tawana Resources NL. ▪ There are no known impediments or material issues related to security of tenure at the time of reporting. 	ST
Exploration done by other parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Acknowledgment and appraisal of exploration by other parties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Mofe Creek project is a grassroots discovery with no previous mineral exploration or other work completed. 	ST
Geology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Deposit type, geological setting and style of mineralisation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Mofe Creek project is characterised by a series of itabirite hosted iron ore deposits of likely Archean or Palaeoproterozoic age as possible strike continuations of the historic Bomi Hills and Bong Range mines. ▪ Mineralisation is hosted within banded iron formations (BIFs) that have undergone regional metamorphism and recrystallization to itabirite and likely additional recrystallization to coarse grained, coarsely banded magnetite-hematite itabirite as seen today. A minimum of one and up to three major itabirite bands are recognised stratigraphically of both silicate and oxide iron formation facies and interbedded with metasediments (variably garnet overprinted), Fe rich mafics and quartzites. Collectively the iron units and interbedded metasediments can be considered a 'greenstone' belt that unconformably overlies granite/gneiss basement. ▪ The sequence has been folded and faulted through at least two major phases of deformation causing recrystallization, increase in average grain size and potential enrichment of the itabirite units. ▪ The sequence has then been subject to intense tropical weathering causing oxidation of magnetite to hematite, and variable hydration to goethite and limonite within the upper 30-60m thick weathering profile. ▪ Some minor faults are recognised in the Gofolo Main prospect but are not considered to have a major influence on the currently established resource; they will be incorporated into resource modelling when further infill drilling has become available. 	ST
Drillhole Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A summary of all information material to the understanding of the exploration results including a tabulation of the following information for all Material drillholes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ easting and northing of the drillhole collar □ elevation or RL (Reduced Level – elevation above sea level in metres) of the drillhole collar □ dip and azimuth of the hole 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No drill hole results are reported as part of this submission. 	ST

Criteria	JORC Code Explanation	Commentary	Competent Person
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ down hole length and interception depth □ hole length ▪ 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. 		
Data aggregation methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. ▪ 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. ▪ The assumptions used for any reporting of metal equivalent values should be clearly stated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Arithmetic averages of iron grade were calculated for all rock chip samples occurring within the interpreted iron formation target footprints. ▪ No weighted average grades have been reported. ▪ No metal equivalent grades have been reported. 	ST
Relationship between mineralisation widths and intercept lengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ These relationships are particularly important in the reporting of Exploration Results. ▪ If the geometry of the mineralisation with respect to the drillhole angle is known, its nature should be reported. ▪ 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'). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No drill hole results are reported as part of this submission. ▪ True width of mineralisation is not known. 	ST
Diagrams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 drillhole collar locations and appropriate sectional views. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All relevant plan maps have been included in the body of the announcement. 	ST
Balanced reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Where surface rock chip samples are reported, the total number of samples collected, the average and a range of assay results have been reported. 	ST
Other substantive exploration data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All relevant regional and prospect scale geological observations and geophysical survey results are included in relevant announcements accordingly. 	ST
Further work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The nature and scale of planned further work (eg tests for lateral extensions or depth extensions or large-scale step-out drilling). ▪ Diagrams clearly highlighting the areas of possible extensions, including the main geological interpretations and future drilling areas, provided this information is not commercially sensitive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ongoing mapping and rock chip sampling along additional target footprints will continue. ▪ Exploration drilling will be planned along defined exploration targets post completion of access tracks and assessment of geology exposed in road cuttings resulting from this work. 	ST

