

Mountain Province Diamonds Inc.  
Form 20-F  
March 27, 2014

UNITED STATES

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20549

FORM 20-F

(Mark One)

REGISTRATION STATEMENT PURSUANT TO SECTION 12(b) OR (g) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

OR

ANNUAL REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR (15d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934  
For the fiscal year ended December 31, 2013

OR

TRANSITION REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

OR

SHELL COMPANY REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

Date of event requiring this shell company report.....

Edgar Filing: Mountain Province Diamonds Inc. - Form 20-F

For the transition period from \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_

Commission file number 001-32468

MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.

(Exact name of Registrant as specified in its charter)

Not Applicable

(Translation of Registrant's name into English)

Ontario

(Jurisdiction of incorporation or organization)

161 Bay Street, Suite 2315, PO Box 216, Toronto, Ontario Canada M5J 2S1

(Address of principal executive offices)

Bruce Ramsden – 416-361-3562

Fax: 416-603-8565; Email: b.ramsden@mountainprovince.com

161 Bay Street, Suite 2315, PO Box 216, Toronto, Ontario Canada M5J 2S1

(Name, Telephone, E-mail and/or Facsimile number and Address of Company Contact Person)

Securities registered or to be registered pursuant to Section 12(b) of the Act.

Title of each class	Name of each exchange on which registered
<u>Common Shares no par value</u>	<u>NYSE MKT</u>

Securities registered or to be registered pursuant to Section 12(g) of the Act.

Not Applicable

(Title of Class)

Securities for which there is a reporting obligation pursuant to Section 15(d) of the Act.

None

(Title of Class)

Indicate the number of outstanding shares of the issuer's classes of capital or common stock as of the close of the period covered by the annual report.

100,501,351

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is a well-known seasoned issuer, as defined in Rule 405 of the Securities Act.

Yes  No

If this report is an annual or transition report, indicate by check mark if the registrant is not required to file reports pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

Yes  No

Note – Checking the box above will not relieve any registrant required to file reports pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 from their obligations under those Sections.

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant (1) has filed all reports required to be filed by Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to file such reports), and (2) has been subject to such filing requirements for the past 90 days.

Yes  No

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant has submitted electronically and posted on its corporate Web site, if any, every Interactive Data File required to be submitted and posted pursuant to Rule 405 of Regulation S-T (§232.405 of this chapter) during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to file such reports)

Yes  No

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, or a non-accelerated filer. See definition of "accelerated filer and large accelerated filer" in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act. (Check one):

Large accelerated filer  Accelerated filer  Non-accelerated filer

Indicate by check mark which basis of accounting the registrant has used to prepare the financial statements included in this filing:

U.S. GAAP  International Financial Reporting Standards  Other   
as issued by the International Accounting Standards Board

If "Other" has been checked in response to the previous question, indicate by check mark which financial statement item the registrant has elected to follow.

Item 17    Item 18

If this is an annual report, indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a shell company (as defined in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act).

Yes    No

(APPLICABLE ONLY TO ISSUERS INVOLVED IN BANKRUPTCY PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PAST FIVE YEARS)

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant has filed all documents and reports required to be filed by Sections 12, 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 subsequent to the distribution of securities under a plan confirmed by a court.

Yes    No

Not Applicable

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GLOSSARY	vii
GLOSSARY OF TECHNICAL TERMS	xi
NOTE REGARDING FORWARD LOOKING STATEMENTS	xvii
PART I	
<b>Item 1 Identity of Directors, Senior Management and Advisors</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Item 2 Offer Statistics and Expected Timetable</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Item 3 Key Information</b>	<b>1</b>
A. <i>Selected financial data</i>	1
B. <i>Capitalization and indebtedness</i>	3
C. <i>Reasons for the offer and use of proceeds</i>	3
D. <i>Risk factors</i>	3
<b>Item 4 Information on the Company</b>	<b>11</b>
A. <i>History and development of the Company</i>	11
B. <i>Business Overview</i>	14
C. <i>Organizational structure</i>	19
D. <i>Property, plants and equipment</i>	20
<b>Item 4A Unresolved Staff Comments</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Item 5 Operating and Financial Review and Prospects</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>Item 6 Directors, Senior Management and Employees</b>	<b>74</b>
A. <i>Directors and Senior Management</i>	74
B. <i>Compensation</i>	76
C. <i>Board practices</i>	79

<b>D.</b>	<i>Employees</i>	81
<b>E.</b>	<i>Share ownership</i>	81
<b>Item 7</b>	<b>Major Shareholders and Related Party Transactions</b>	82
<b>A.</b>	<i>Major shareholders</i>	82
<b>B.</b>	<i>Related party transactions</i>	82

C.	<i>Interests of experts and counsel</i>	83
<b>Item 8</b>	<b>Financial Information</b>	83
A.	<i>Consolidated Statements and Other Financial Information</i>	83
B.	<i>Significant Changes</i>	83
<b>Item 9</b>	<b>The Offer and Listing</b>	84
A.	<i>Offer and Listing Details</i>	84
B.	<i>Plan of Distribution</i>	85
C.	<i>Markets</i>	85
D.	<i>Selling Shareholders</i>	85
E.	<i>Dilution</i>	85
F.	<i>Expenses of the Issuer</i>	85
<b>Item 10</b>	<b>Additional Information</b>	85
A.	<i>Share capital</i>	85
B.	<i>Memorandum and articles of association</i>	85
C.	<i>Material contracts</i>	89
D.	<i>Exchange controls</i>	89
E.	<i>Taxation</i>	92
F.	<i>Dividends and paying agents</i>	101
G.	<i>Statement by experts</i>	101
H.	<i>Documents on display</i>	101
I.	<i>Subsidiary Information</i>	102
<b>Item 11</b>	<b>Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk</b>	102
<b>Item 12</b>	<b>Description of Securities Other than Equity Securities</b>	102



PART II

<b>Item 13</b>	<b>Defaults, Dividend Arrearages and Delinquencies</b>	103
<b>Item 14</b>	<b>Material Modifications to the Rights of Security Holders and Use of Proceeds</b>	103
<b>Item 15</b>	<b>Controls and Procedures</b>	103
<b>Item 16A</b>	<b>Audit Committee Financial Expert</b>	104
<b>Item 16B</b>	<b>Code of Ethics</b>	104
<b>Item 16C</b>	<b>Principal Accountant Fees and Services</b>	105
<b>Item 16D</b>	<b>Exemptions from the Listing Standards for Audit Committees</b>	106
<b>Item 16E</b>	<b>Purchases of Equity Securities by the Issuer and Affiliated Purchasers</b>	106
<b>Item 16F</b>	<b>Change in Registrant’s Certifying Accountant</b>	106
<b>Item 16G</b>	<b>Corporate Governance</b>	106
<b>Item 16H</b>	<b>Mine Safety Disclosure</b>	106

PART III

<b>Item 17</b>	<b>Financial Statements</b>	107
<b>Item 18</b>	<b>Financial Statements</b>	107
<b>Item 19</b>	<b>Exhibits</b>	107

<b>SIGNATURES</b>	108
-------------------	-----

<b>EXHIBIT INDEX</b>	109
----------------------	-----

<b>APPENDIX</b> Item 18. Financial Statements	111
---	-----

GLOSSARY

**2002 Agreement** or **Gahcho Kué Joint Venture Agreement** or means the joint venture agreement entered into by Mountain Province Diamonds Inc., Camphor Ventures Inc., and De Beers Canada Exploration Inc. on October 24, 2002, but which took effect from January 1, 2002, and which was amended and restated on July 3, 2009;

**2009 Agreement** or **Gahcho Kué Amended and Restated Joint Arrangement-Agreement** means the Gahcho Kué Joint Venture Agreement as amended and restated, and entered into by Mountain Province Diamonds Inc., Camphor Ventures Inc., and De Beers Canada Inc. on July 3, 2009;

**2009 Technical Report** means the Technical Report dated as of April 20, 2009 entitled "Gahcho Kué Kimberlite Project NI 43-101 Technical Report, Northwest Territories, Canada" prepared for the Company by AMEC Americas Limited;

**2010 Technical Report, Definitive Feasibility Study, or Feasibility Study** means the "Gahcho Kué Project, Definitive Feasibility Study, National Instrument ("NI") 43-101 Technical Report" dated December 1, 2010 (with Information effective as of October 15, 2010) as prepared and completed by JDS Energy and Mining Inc., and filed by the Company on SEDAR on December 3, 2010;

**2013 Technical Report, Update of the Mineral Resource Estimate for the Tuzo Kimberlite**, means the "Gahcho Kué Project, Update of the Mineral Resource Estimate for the Tuzo Kimberlite, National Instrument ("NI") 43-101 Technical Report" dated July 2, 2013 as prepared and completed by Mineral Services Canada Inc., and filed by the Company on SEDAR on August 14, 2013;

**Affiliate** has the meaning given to affiliated bodies corporate under the *Business Corporations Act (Ontario)*;

**AK Property** means the claims known as the "AK claims" held by the Gahcho Kué Arrangement;

**AK-CJ Properties** means, collectively, the AK Property and CJ Property;

**AMEC** means AMEC Americas Limited;

**AMEX or NYSE AMEX** means the American Stock Exchange prior to the take-over of the American Stock Exchange LLC by the New York Stock Exchange, and subsequently renamed NYSE Amex, then renamed NYSE MKT;

**CJ Property** means the claims known as the "CJ claims", which have now lapsed, previously held by MPV;

**Arrangement** means the arrangement between the Company and Glenmore which was effected as of June 30, 2000;

**Arrangement Agreement** means the Arrangement Agreement dated as of May 10, 2000, and made between MPV and Glenmore, including the Schedules to that Agreement;

**Business Corporations Act (Ontario)** means the R.S.O. 1990, CHAPTER B.16, as amended from time to time;

**CDNX** means the Canadian Venture Exchange Inc, formerly the Vancouver Stock Exchange, and now known as the TSX Venture Exchange;

**Camphor or Camphor Ventures** means Camphor Ventures Inc.;

**Canadian National Instrument 43-101** means the *National Instrument 43-101 (Standards of Disclosure for Mineral Projects)* adopted by the Canadian Securities Administrators;

**Code** means the United States *Internal Revenue Code of 1986*, as amended;

**Company, MPV or Registrant** means Mountain Province Diamonds Inc.;

**De Beers** means De Beers Consolidated Mines Ltd.;

**De Beers Canada or Monopros** means De Beers Canada Inc., formerly known as De Beers Canada Exploration Inc., and before that as Monopros Limited, a wholly-owned subsidiary of De Beers;

**Desktop Study** means the preliminary technical assessment of the Gahcho Kué resource conducted by De Beers Consolidated Mines Ltd. in 2000 (and updated in 2003, 2005, 2006, and 2008) and the Independent Qualified Persons' review of the Desktop Study provided by AMEC;

**Definitive Feasibility Study, Feasibility Study, or 2010 Technical Report** means the "Gahcho Kué Project, Definitive Feasibility Study, National Instrument ("NI") 43-101 Technical Report" dated December 1, 2010 (with Information effective as of October 15, 2010) as prepared and completed by JDS Energy and Mining Inc., and filed by the Company on SEDAR on December 3, 2010;

**Exchange Act** means the U.S. *Securities Exchange Act of 1934*, as amended;

**Feasibility Study, Definitive Feasibility Study, or 2010 Technical Report** means the “Gahcho Kué Project, Definitive Feasibility Study, National Instrument (“NI”) 43-101 Technical Report” dated December 1, 2010 (with Information effective as of October 15, 2010) as prepared and completed by JDS Energy and Mining Inc., and filed by the Company on SEDAR on December 3, 2010;

**GAAP** means Canadian generally accepted accounting principles;

**Gahcho Kué Amended and Restated Joint Arrangement-Agreement or 2009. Agreement** means the Gahcho Kué Joint Venture Agreement as amended and restated, and entered into by Mountain Province Diamonds Inc., Camphor Ventures Inc., and De Beers Canada Inc. on July 3, 2009;

**Gahcho Kué Joint Arrangement or Joint Arrangement** means the joint Arrangement between Mountain Province Diamonds Inc., Camphor Ventures Inc., and De Beers Canada, for the Gahcho Kué Project, and as currently governed by the 2009 Agreement;

**Gahcho Kué Joint Arrangement-Agreement or 2002 Agreement** means the joint arrangement agreement entered into by Mountain Province Diamonds Inc., Camphor Ventures Inc., and De Beers Canada Exploration Inc. on October 24, 2002, but which took effect from January 1, 2002, and which was amended and restated on July 3, 2009;

**Gahcho Kué Project**, located on Kennady Lake, also referred to as the “Kennady Lake Project”, and comprising four mineral leases that are 100% owned by De Beers Canada Inc. (“De Beers Canada”), which holds them on behalf of the Gahcho Kué Joint Arrangement. The participating interest of each of the joint venture parties is governed by the 2009 Agreement;

**Glenmore** means Glenmore Highlands Inc., a company incorporated under the *Business Corporations Act (Alberta)* and which, pursuant to the Arrangement, amalgamated with the Company's wholly-owned subsidiary, Mountain Glen Mining Inc., to form an amalgamated company, also known as Mountain Glen Mining Inc.;

**Glenmore Shares** means the common shares of Glenmore, as the same existed before the Arrangement took effect and "Glenmore Share" means any of them;

**Glenmore Shareholder** means a holder of Glenmore Shares;

**IFRS** means International Financial Reporting Standards, as issued by the International Accounting Standards Board - a system of generally accepted accounting principles, as applied to Mountain Province's financial statements beginning with its transition effective January 1, 2010;

**JDS** means JDS Energy and Mining Inc.;

**Joint Information Circular** means the joint information circular of the Company and Glenmore dated May 10, 2000 for the Extraordinary General Meeting and Special Meeting of the Company and Glenmore respectively to approve the Arrangement;

**Joint Arrangement** or **Gahcho Kué Joint Arrangement** means the joint arrangement between Mountain Province Diamonds Inc., Camphor Ventures Inc., and De Beers Canada, for the Gahcho Kué Project, and as currently governed by the 2009 Agreement;

**Kennady Arrangement** means the arrangement between the Company and Kennady Diamonds Inc. which was effected as of July 6, 2012;

**Kennady Arrangement Agreement** means the Kennady Arrangement Agreement dated as of March 12, 2012, and made between the Company and Kennady Diamonds Inc., including the schedules to that agreement;

***Kennady North Project*** means the mining leases (4330, 4466, 4467, and 4468) and eight mineral claims staked in 2010 (Kwezi 01 to Kwezi 08) which were 100% owned by Mountain Province in the area around the Gahcho Kué Project and Kennady Lake, and which were transferred to Kennady Diamonds Inc. under the plan of arrangement between Kennady Diamonds Inc. and Mountain Province effective July 6, 2012;

***Letter Agreement*** means the letter agreement dated March 6, 1997 among Mountain Province Mining Inc., Camphor Ventures Inc., Glenmore Highlands Inc., 444965 B.C. Ltd. and Monopros as amended or supplemented by: an agreement dated April 10, 1997 among Mountain Province Mining Inc., Camphor Ventures Inc., Glenmore Highlands Inc., 444965 B.C. Ltd. and Monopros; an assurance given to De Beers by the other parties., dated July, 1997; an agreement given to De Beers by the other parties dated November 1, 1997 and two agreements each dated December 17, 1999 among the parties;

***Monopros*** or ***De Beers Canada*** means De Beers Canada Inc., formerly known as Monopros Limited, a wholly-owned subsidiary of De Beers and also formally known as De Beers Canada Exploration Inc.;

***Mountain Glen*** means Mountain Glen Mining Inc., a wholly-owned subsidiary (now dissolved) of the Company;

**MPV, Mountain Province, Company** or **Registrant** means Mountain Province Diamonds Inc.;

**MPV Shares** means the common shares of MPV, and **MPV Share** means any of them;

**Nasdaq** means the National Association of Securities Dealers Automatic Quotation System, now the Nasdaq Stock Exchange;

**NYSE MKT** means the New York Stock Exchange MKT, renamed from NYSE Amex;

**Old MPV** means MPV prior to its amalgamation with 444965 B.C. Ltd.;

**OTCBB** means the OTC bulletin board;

**PFIC** means Passive Foreign Investment Company under the Code;

**Qualified Person** as defined by Canadian National Instrument 43-101 (Standards of Disclosure for Mineral Projects), means an individual who:

- (1) is an engineer or geoscientist with a university degree, or equivalent accreditation, in an area of geosciences, or engineering, relating to mineral exploration or mining;
- (2) has at least five years of experience in mineral exploration, mine development or operation or mineral project assessment, or any combination of these, that is relevant to his or her professional degree or area of practice;
- (3) has experience relevant to the subject matter of the mineral project and the technical report; and



(4) is in good standing with a professional association; and

(5) in the case of a professional association in a foreign jurisdiction, has a membership designation that:

(i) requires attainment of a position of responsibility in their profession that requires the exercise of independent judgment; and

(ii) requires:

A. a favourable confidential peer evaluation of the individual's character, professional judgment, experience, and ethical fitness; or

B. a recommendation for membership by at least two peers, and demonstrated prominence or expertise in the field of mineral exploration or mining;

Except where specifically indicated otherwise, scientific and technical information included in this report on Form 20F regarding the Company's mineral projects has been reviewed by Carl Verley, a Director of the Company and a Qualified Person as defined by National Instrument 43-101. Independent Qualified Persons responsible for the 2013 Technical Report prepared for the Gahcho Kué Joint Arrangement and discussed in Item 4 D "Property, Plants and Equipment" from the headings "Permits" to "–Mineral Resource Summary – Tuzo Deep" are: Mike Makarenko, P.Eng., and Tom E. Nowicki, P.Geo.;

**TSX** means the Toronto Stock Exchange; and,

**VSE** means the Vancouver Stock Exchange, subsequently renamed the Canadian Venture Exchange, and now known as the TSX Venture Exchange.

x

GLOSSARY OF TECHNICAL TERMS

<b><i>Adit</i></b>	A horizontal or nearly horizontal passage driven from the surface for the working of a mine.
<b><i>Archean</i></b>	The earliest eon of geological history or the corresponding system of rocks.
<b><i>Area of Interest</i></b>	A geographic area surrounding a specific mineral property in which more than one party has an interest and within which new acquisitions must be offered to the other party or which become subject automatically to the terms and conditions of the existing agreement between the parties. Typically, the area of interest is expressed in terms of a radius of a finite number of kilometers from each point on the outside boundary of the original mineral property.
<b><i>Bulk Sample</i></b>	Evaluation program of a diamondiferous kimberlite pipe in which a large amount of kimberlite (at least 100 tonnes) is recovered from a pipe.
<b><i>Carat</i></b>	A unit of weight for diamonds, pearls, and other gems. The metric carat, equal to 0.2 gram or 200 milligram, is standard in the principal diamond-producing countries of the world.
<b><i>Caustic Fusion</i></b>	An analytical process for diamonds by which rocks are dissolved at temperatures between 450-600°C. Diamonds remain undissolved by this process and are recovered from the residue that remains.
<b><i>Craton</i></b>	A stable relatively immobile area of the earth's crust that forms the nuclear mass of a continent or the central basin in an ocean.
<b><i>Diabase</i></b>	A fine-grained rock of the composition of gabbro but with an ophitic texture.
<b><i>Dyke</i></b>	A body of igneous rock, tabular in form, formed through the injection of magma.
<b><i>Feasibility Study</i></b>	As defined by Canadian National Instrument 43-101, means a comprehensive study of a deposit in which all geological, engineering, operating, economic and other relevant factors are considered in sufficient detail that it could reasonably serve as the basis for a final decision by a financial institution to finance the development of the deposit for mineral production.
<b><i>Gneiss</i></b>	A banded rock formed during high grade regional metamorphism. It includes a number of different rock types having different origins. It commonly has alternating bands of schistose and granulose material.
<b><i>Indicator mineral</i></b>	Minerals such as garnet, ilmenite, chromite and chrome diopside, which are used in exploration to indicate the presence of kimberlites.

- Jurassic*** The period of the Mesozoic era between the Triassic and the Cretaceous or the corresponding system of rocks marked by the presence of dinosaurs and the first appearance of birds.
- Kimberlite*** A dark-colored intrusive biotite-peridotite igneous rock that can contain diamonds. It contains the diamonds known to occur in the rock matrix where they originally formed (more than 100 km deep in the earth).
- Macrodiamond*** A diamond, two dimensions of which exceed 0.5 millimeters (mm).
- Microdiamond*** Generally refers to diamonds smaller than approximately 0.5 mm, which are recovered from acid dissolution of kimberlite rock.
- Mineral Reserve*** Means the economically mineable part of a Measured Mineral Resource or Indicated Mineral Resource demonstrated by at least a Preliminary Feasibility Study. This study must include adequate information on mining, processing, metallurgical, economic and other relevant factors that demonstrate, at the time of reporting, that economic extraction can be justified. A Mineral Reserve includes diluting materials and allowances for losses that may occur when the material is mined.

THE TERMS "MINERAL RESERVE," "PROVEN MINERAL RESERVE" AND "PROBABLE MINERAL RESERVE" USED IN THIS REPORT ARE CANADIAN MINING TERMS AS DEFINED IN ACCORDANCE WITH NATIONAL INSTRUMENT 43-101 - STANDARDS OF DISCLOSURE FOR MINERAL PROJECTS WHICH INCORPORATES THE DEFINITIONS AND GUIDELINES SET OUT IN THE CANADIAN INSTITUTE OF MINING, METALLURGY AND PETROLEUM (THE "CIM") DEFINITION STANDARDS FOR MINERAL RESOURCES AND MINERAL RESERVES (THE "CIM DEFINITION STANDARDS") AS ADOPTED BY THE CIM COUNCIL ON DECEMBER 11, 2005. IN THE UNITED STATES, A MINERAL RESERVE IS DEFINED AS A PART OF A MINERAL DEPOSIT WHICH COULD BE ECONOMICALLY AND LEGALLY EXTRACTED OR PRODUCED AT THE TIME THE MINERAL RESERVE DETERMINATION IS MADE.

Under United States standards:

"Reserve" means that part of a mineral deposit which can be economically and legally extracted or produced at the time of the reserve determination.

"Economically," as used in the definition of reserve, implies that profitable extraction or production has been established or analytically demonstrated to be viable and justifiable under reasonable investment and market assumptions.

"Legally," as used in the definition of reserve, does not imply that all permits needed for mining and processing have been obtained or that other legal issues have been completely resolved. However, for a reserve to exist, there should be a reasonable certainty based on applicable laws and regulations that issuance of permits or resolution of legal issues can be accomplished in a timely manner.

Mineral Reserves are categorized as follows on the basis of the degree of confidence in the estimate of the quantity and grade of the deposit.

"Proven Mineral Reserve" means, in accordance with CIM Definition Standards, the economically viable part of a Measured Mineral Resource demonstrated by at least a Preliminary Feasibility study. This Study must include adequate information on mining, processing, metallurgical, economic, and other relevant factors that demonstrate at the time of reporting, that economic extraction is justified.

The definition for "proven mineral reserves" under CIM Definition Standards differs from the standards in the United States, where proven or measured reserves are defined as reserves for which (a) quantity is computed from dimensions revealed in outcrops, trenches, workings or drill holes; grade and/or quality are computed from the results of detailed sampling and (b) the sites for inspection, sampling and measurement are spaced so closely and the geographic character is so well defined that size, shape, depth and mineral content of reserves are well established.

"Probable Mineral Reserve" means, in accordance with CIM Definition Standards, the economically mineable part of an Indicated, and in some circumstances a Measured Mineral Resource demonstrated by at least a Preliminary Feasibility Study. This Study must include adequate information on mining, processing, metallurgical, economic and other relevant factors that demonstrate, at the time of reporting, that economic extraction is justified.

The definition for "probable mineral reserves" under CIM Definition Standards differs from the standards in the United States, where probable reserves are defined as reserves for which quantity and grade and/or quality are computed from information similar to that of proven reserves (under United States standards), but the sites for inspection, sampling, and measurement are further apart or are otherwise less adequately spaced. The degree of assurance, although lower than that for proven reserves, is high enough to assume continuity between points of observation.

***Mineral Resource*** Under CIM Definition Standards, a Mineral Resource is a concentration or occurrence of diamonds, natural solid inorganic material, or natural solid fossilized organic material including base and precious metals, coal, and industrial minerals in or on the Earth's crust in such form and quantity and of such a grade or quality that it has reasonable prospects for economic extractions. The location, quantity, grade, geological characteristics and continuity of a Mineral Resource are known, estimated or interpreted from specific geological evidence and knowledge.

THE TERMS "MINERAL RESOURCE", "MEASURED MINERAL RESOURCE", "INDICATED MINERAL RESOURCE", "INFERRED MINERAL RESOURCE" USED IN THIS REPORT ARE CANADIAN MINING TERMS AS DEFINED IN ACCORDANCE WITH NATIONAL INSTRUMENT 43-101 - STANDARDS OF DISCLOSURE FOR MINERAL PROJECTS UNDER THE GUIDELINES SET OUT IN THE CIM DEFINITION STANDARDS. THE COMPANY ADVISES U.S. INVESTORS THAT WHILE SUCH TERMS ARE RECOGNIZED AND PERMITTED UNDER CANADIAN REGULATIONS, THE U.S. SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION DOES NOT RECOGNIZE THEM. THESE ARE NOT DEFINED TERMS UNDER THE UNITED STATES STANDARDS AND MAY NOT GENERALLY BE USED IN DOCUMENTS FILED WITH THE UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION BY U.S. COMPANIES. AS SUCH, INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS REPORT CONCERNING DESCRIPTIONS OF MINERALIZATION AND RESOURCES MAY NOT BE COMPARABLE TO INFORMATION MADE PUBLIC BY U.S. COMPANIES SUBJECT TO THE REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION.

"Inferred Mineral Resource" means, under CIM Definition Standards, that part of a Mineral Resource for which quantity and grade or quality can be estimated on the basis of geological evidence and limited sampling and reasonably assumed, but not verified, geological and grade continuity. The estimate is based on limited information and sampling gathered through appropriate techniques from locations such as outcrops, trenches, pits, workings and drill holes. U.S. INVESTORS ARE CAUTIONED NOT TO ASSUME THAT ANY PART OR ALL OF AN INFERRED RESOURCE EXISTS, OR IS ECONOMICALLY OR LEGALLY MINEABLE.

"Indicated Mineral Resource" means, under CIM Definition Standards, that part of a Mineral Resource for which quantity, grade or quality, densities, shape and physical characteristics, can be estimated with a level of confidence sufficient to allow the appropriate application of technical and economic parameters, to support mine planning and evaluation of the economic viability of the deposit. The estimate is based on detailed and reliable exploration and testing information gathered through appropriate techniques from locations such as outcrops, trenches, pits, workings and drill holes that are spaced closely enough for geological and grade continuity to be reasonably assumed. U.S. INVESTORS ARE CAUTIONED NOT TO ASSUME THAT ANY PART OR ALL OF THE MINERAL DEPOSITS IN THIS CATEGORY WILL EVER BE CONVERTED INTO RESERVES.

"Measured Mineral Resource" means, under CIM Definition standards that part of a Mineral Resource for which quantity, grade or quality, densities, shape and physical characteristics are so well established that they can be estimated with confidence sufficient to allow the appropriate application of technical and economic parameters, to support production planning and evaluation of the economic viability of the deposit. The estimate is based on detailed and reliable exploration, sampling and testing information gathered through appropriate techniques from locations such as outcrops, trenches, pits, workings and drillholes that are spaced closely enough to confirm both geological and grade continuity. U.S. INVESTORS ARE CAUTIONED NOT TO ASSUME THAT ANY PART OR ALL OF THE MINERAL DEPOSITS IN THIS CATEGORY WILL EVER BE CONVERTED INTO RESERVES.

<b><i>Operator</i></b>	The party in a joint venture which carries out the operations of the joint venture subject at all times to the direction and control of the management committee.
<b><i>Ordovician</i></b>	The period between the Cambrian and the Silurian or the corresponding system of rocks.
<b><i>Overburden</i></b>	A general term for any material covering or obscuring rocks from view.
<b><i>Paleozoic</i></b>	An era of geological history that extends from the beginning of the Cambrian to the close of the Permian and is marked by the culmination of nearly all classes of invertebrates except the insects and in the later epochs by the appearance of terrestrial plants, amphibians, and reptiles.
<b><i>Pipe</i></b>	A kimberlite deposit that is usually, but not necessarily, carrot-shaped.
<b><i>Preliminary Feasibility Study</i></b>	Under the CIM Definition Standards, means a comprehensive study of the viability of a mineral project that has advanced to a stage where the mining method, in the case of underground mining, or the pit configuration, in the case of an open pit, has been established, and which, if an effective method of mineral processing has been determined, includes a financial analysis based on reasonable assumptions of technical, engineering, operating, economic factors and the evaluation of other relevant factors which are sufficient for a Qualified Person acting reasonably, to determine if all or part of the Mineral Resource may be classified as a Mineral Reserve.
<b><i>Proterozoic</i></b>	The eon of geologic time or the corresponding system of rocks that includes the interval between the Archean and Phanerozoic eons, perhaps exceeds in length all of subsequent geological time, and is marked by rocks that contain fossils indicating the first appearance of eukaryotic organisms (as algae).
<b><i>Reverse Circulation Drill</i></b>	A rotary percussion drill in which the drilling mud and cuttings return to the surface through the drill pipe.
<b><i>Sill</i></b>	Tabular igneous rock that parallels the bedding or foliation of the country rock.
<b><i>Stringers</i></b>	The narrow veins or veinlets, often parallel to each other, and often found in a shear zone.
<b><i>Tertiary</i></b>	The Tertiary period or system of rocks.

***Till Sample*** A sample of soil taken as part of a regional exploration program and examined for indicator minerals.

***Xenolith*** A foreign inclusion in an igneous rock.

## NOTE REGARDING FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS

This report contains forward-looking statements within the meaning of the United States Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 concerning the Company's exploration, operations, planned acquisitions and other matters. These statements relate to analyses and other information that are based on forecasts of future results, estimates of amounts not yet determinable and assumptions of management.

Statements concerning mineral resource estimates may also be deemed to constitute forward-looking statements to the extent that they involve estimates of the mineralization that will be encountered if the property is developed, and based on certain assumptions that the mineral deposit can be economically exploited. Any statements that express or involve discussions with respect to predictions, expectations, beliefs, plans, projections, objectives, assumptions or future events or performance (often, but not always, using words or phrases such as "expects" or "does not expect", "is expected", "anticipates" or "does not anticipate", "plans", "estimates" or "intends", or stating that certain actions, events or results "may", "could", "would", "might" or "will" be taken, occur or be achieved) are not statements of historical fact and may be "forward-looking statements." Forward-looking statements are subject to a variety of risks and uncertainties which could cause actual events or results to differ from those reflected in the forward-looking statements, including, without limitation:

§ risks and uncertainties relating to the interpretation of drill results, the geology, grade and continuity of mineral deposits;

§ results of initial feasibility, pre-feasibility and feasibility studies, and the possibility that future exploration, development or mining results will not be consistent with the Company's expectations;

§ mining exploration risks, including risks related to accidents, equipment breakdowns or other unanticipated difficulties with or interruptions in production;

§ the potential for delays in exploration activities or the completion of feasibility studies;

§ risks related to the inherent uncertainty of exploration and cost estimates and the potential for unexpected costs and expenses;

§ risks related to foreign exchange fluctuations and prices of diamonds;

§ risks related to commodity price fluctuations;



§ the uncertainty of profitability based upon the Company's history of losses;

§ risks related to failure of the Company and/or its joint venture partner to obtain adequate financing on a timely basis and on acceptable terms, particularly given recent volatility in the global financial markets;

§ development and production risks including and particularly risks for weather conducive to the building and use of the Tibbitt to Contwoyto Winter Road;

§ risks related to environmental regulation, permitting and liability;

§ political and regulatory risks associated with mining and exploration;

§ geological and technical conditions at the Company's Gahcho Kué Project being adequate to permit development;

§ the ability to develop and operate the Company's Gahcho Kué Project on an economic basis and in accordance with applicable timelines;

§ aboriginal rights and title;

§ failure of plant, equipment, processes and transportation services to operate as anticipated;

§ possible variations in ore grade or recovery rates, permitting timelines, capital expenditures, reclamation activities, land titles, and social and political developments, and other risks of the mining industry; and

§ other risks and uncertainties related to the Company's prospects, properties and business strategy.

Some of the important risks and uncertainties that could affect forward-looking statements are described further in this Annual Report under the headings "Risk Factors", "History and Development of Company," "Business Overview," "Property, plants and equipment," and "Operating and Financial Review and Prospects". Should one or more of these risks and uncertainties materialize, or should underlying assumptions prove incorrect, actual results may vary materially from those described in forward-looking statements. Forward-looking statements are made based on management's beliefs, estimates and opinions on the date the statements are made, and the Company undertakes no obligation to update forward-looking statements if these beliefs, estimates and opinions or other circumstances should change. Investors are cautioned against attributing undue certainty to forward-looking statements.

Forward-looking information is based on certain factors and assumptions regarding, among other things, exploration, permitting, construction, mining, and production at the Gahcho Kué Project and any other property as well as world and U.S. economic conditions and the future worldwide demand for diamonds. Specifically, in making statements regarding expected mineral recovery, diamond prices and expectations concerning the diamond industry, the Company has made assumptions regarding, among other things, foreign exchange rates, continuing recovery of world and U.S. economic conditions, our ability to successfully implement our exploration, construction and mining plans, the success of permitting the Gahcho Kué Project, and overall demand for diamonds. While the Company considers these assumptions to be reasonable based on the information currently available to it, they may prove to be incorrect. See "Risk Factors".

#### **CAUTIONARY NOTE TO U.S. INVESTORS REGARDING RESOURCE AND RESERVE ESTIMATES – MINING PROPERTIES**

This Annual Report on Form 20-F has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the securities laws in effect in Canada, which differ from the requirements of United States securities laws. The terms "mineral reserve", "proven mineral reserve" and "probable mineral reserve" are Canadian mining terms as defined in accordance with

Canadian National Instrument 43-101 – Standards of Disclosure for Mineral Projects (“NI 43-101”) and the Canadian Institute of Mining, Metallurgy and Petroleum (the “CIM Definition Standards”) - CIM Definition Standards on Mineral Resources and Mineral Reserves, adopted by the CIM Council, as amended. These definitions differ from the definitions in United States Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) Industry Guide 7 (the “SEC Guidelines”) under the United States Securities Act of 1993, as amended (the “Securities Act”). Under SEC Industry Guide 7 standards, a “final” or “bankable” feasibility study is required to report reserves, the three-year historical average price is used in any reserve or cash flow analysis to designate reserves and the primary environmental analysis or report must be filed with the appropriate governmental authority.

In addition, the terms “mineral resource”, “measured mineral resource”, “indicated mineral resource” and “inferred mineral resource” are defined in and required to be disclosed by NI 43-101; however, these terms are not defined terms under SEC Industry Guide 7 and are normally not permitted to be used in reports and registration statements filed with the SEC. Investors are cautioned not to assume that any part or all of mineral deposits in these categories will ever be converted into reserves. “Inferred mineral resources” have a great amount of uncertainty as to their existence, and great uncertainty as to their economic and legal feasibility. It cannot be assumed that all or any part of an inferred mineral resource will ever be upgraded to a higher category. Under Canadian rules, estimates of inferred mineral resources may not form the basis of feasibility or pre-feasibility studies, except in rare cases. Investors are cautioned not to assume that all or any part of an inferred mineral resource exists or is economically or legally mineable. Disclosure of “contained ounces” in a resource is permitted disclosure under Canadian regulations; however, the SEC normally only permits issuers to report mineralization that does not constitute “reserves” by SEC Industry Guide 7 standards as in place tonnage and grade without reference to unit measures.

Accordingly, information contained in this Annual Report on Form 20-F and the documents incorporated by reference herein contain descriptions of our mineral deposits that may not be comparable to similar information made public by U.S. companies subject to the reporting and disclosure requirements under the United States federal securities laws and the rules and regulations thereunder.

#### NOTE REGARDING FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND EXHIBITS

The financial statements and exhibits referred to herein are filed with this report on Form 20-F in the United States. This report is also filed in Canada as an Annual Information Form. **Canadian investors should also refer to the annual consolidated financial statements of the Company as at December 31, 2013, as filed with the applicable Canadian Securities regulators on SEDAR (the Canadian Securities Administrators' System for Electronic Document Analysis and Retrieval) under "Audited Annual Financial Statements - English".**

#### METRIC EQUIVALENTS

For ease of reference, the following factors for converting metric measurements into imperial equivalents are provided:

<b>To Convert From Metric</b>	<b>To Imperial</b>	<b>Multiply by</b>
Hectares	Acres	2.471
Metres	Feet (ft.)	3.281
Kilometres (km.)	Miles	0.621
Tonnes	Tons (2000 pounds)	1.102

Grams/tonne                      Ounces (troy/ton)      0.029

PART I

Item 1. Identity of Directors, Senior Management and Advisors

Not Applicable

Item 2. Offer Statistics and Expected Timetable

Not Applicable

Item 3. Key Information

A. *Selected financial data.*

You should read the following selected financial data together with Item 5, "Operating and Financial Review and Prospects", the Consolidated Financial Statements in Item 18 and the other information in this Annual Report. The selected financial data presented below is derived from our Consolidated Financial Statements.

The Company's consolidated financial statements have been prepared in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards ("IFRS") as issued by the International Accounting Standards Board ("IASB"), effective with the Company's transition to IFRS on January 1, 2010. Previously, the Company's consolidated financial statements were prepared in accordance with Canadian generally accepted accounting principles ("GAAP"). Material measurement differences between GAAP and accounting principles in the United States, applicable to the Company, were described in the Company's previous consolidated financial statements. With the Company's transition to IFRS in the year ended December 31, 2011 with a transition date of January 1, 2010, there is no requirement to report the material measurement differences between IFRS and accounting principles in the United States.

The Company's financial statements are set forth in Canadian dollars.

The consolidated financial information in the below tables for 2011, 2012 and 2013 was prepared in accordance with IFRS as issued by the IASB.

Edgar Filing: Mountain Province Diamonds Inc. - Form 20-F

For the year ending (except as noted)

All in CDN\$1,000's except Earnings (loss) per Share  
and Number of Common Shares

	December 31, 2013	December 31, 2012	December 31, 2011
Operating Revenue	nil	nil	nil
Working Capital	35,133	46,654	16,717
Net Loss	(26,604	) (3,338	) (11,539
Basic and diluted loss per share	(0.28	) (0.04	) (0.15
Total Assets	110,367	95,590	66,557
Share Capital	209,820	180,170	146,912
Net Assets -	91,193	87,195	57,132
Number of Common Shares issued	100,501,351	94,168,151	80,345,558

No dividends have been declared in any of the years presented above.

**Exchange Rate Information**

All dollar amounts set forth in this report are in Canadian dollars, except where otherwise indicated. The following tables set forth, (i) for the five most recent financial years, the average rate (the "Average Rate") of exchange for the Canadian dollar, expressed in U.S. dollars, calculated by using the average of the U.S. noon exchange rates per the Bank of Canada for each trading day of the fiscal year; and (ii) the high and low exchange rates for each of the previous six calendar months for the Canadian dollar, expressed per the Bank of Canada.

The Average Rate is set out for each of the periods indicated in the table below.

Dec-13	Dec-12	Dec-11	Dec-10	Dec-09 (nine months)
US\$0.9402	US\$0.9949	US\$0.9891	US\$0.9704	US\$ 0.9034

The high and low exchange rates for each month during the previous six months are as follows:

Month	High (US\$)	Low (US\$)
February 2014	0.9132	0.898
January 2014	0.9444	0.8909
December 2013	0.9458	0.9314
November 2013	0.9617	0.9408
October 2013	0.9736	0.9527
September 2013	0.9803	0.948

On March 25, 2014, the noon buying rate in Canadian dollars as per the Bank of Canada (the "Exchange Rate") was \$1 Canadian = US\$0.8948.



B. *Capitalization and indebtedness.*

Not Applicable

C. *Reasons for the offer and use of proceeds.*

Not Applicable

D. *Risk factors.*

The Company, and thus the securities of the Company, should be considered a highly speculative investment and investors should carefully consider all of the information disclosed in this Annual Report prior to making an investment in the Company. In addition to the other information presented in this Annual Report, the following risk factors should be given special consideration when evaluating an investment in any of the Company's securities. Any or all of these risks could have a material adverse effect on the Company's business, financial condition, results of operations, cash flows and on the market price of its common stock.

a) The Company's limited operating history makes it difficult to evaluate the Company's current business and forecast future results.

The Company has only a limited operating history on which to base an evaluation of the Company's current business and prospects, each of which should be considered in light of the risks, expenses and problems frequently encountered in the early stages of growth of all companies, and in mining companies in particular. The Company has not commenced mining operations and is still in the development and permitting stage of the Gahcho Kué Project. The Company may not be able to obtain all of the permits which are necessary for it to commence operations. The Company's mining operations may not be successful. As a result of this limited operating history, period-to-period comparisons of the Company's operating results may not be meaningful and the results for any particular period should not be relied upon as an indication of future performance.

(b) The diamond mining business is speculative and the Company may not be successful in implementing its plans to establish a successful and profitable diamond mining business

Resource exploration and possible development is a speculative business, characterized by a number of significant risks including, among other things, unprofitable efforts resulting not only from the failure to discover mineral deposits but from finding mineral deposits which, though present, are insufficient in quantity and quality to return a profit from production. Diamonds acquired or discovered by the Company may be required to be sold at a price which is reflective of the market at that time.

(c) The Company has no significant source of operating cash flow and failure to generate revenues in the future could cause the Company to go out business.

The Company currently has no significant source of operating cash flow. The Company has limited financial resources. The Company's ability to achieve and maintain profitability and positive cash flow is dependent upon the Company's ability to generate revenues. The Company's current operations do not generate any cash flow. The Company's annual operating costs, excluding its share of costs of the Gahcho Kué Project, are approximately \$2.5 million.

(d) The Company is in the development and permitting stage for the Gahcho Kué Project and may never become profitable.

The Company's Gahcho Kué Project is in the permitting and engineering design stage. The Company's proposed mining operations may never become profitable. Drilling of the 5034, Hearne, and Tuzo kimberlite pipes has been extensive and is completed for purposes for the development of the mine. Reserves have been established through the Feasibility Study but the permitting of the mine is still underway. Estimates of mineral deposits, development plans and production costs, when made, can be affected by such factors as environmental permit regulations and requirements, weather, environmental factors, unforeseen technical difficulties, unusual or unexpected geological formations and work interruptions. In addition, the grade of diamonds ultimately discovered may differ from that indicated by bulk sampling results. Mine plans and processing concepts that have been developed are not necessarily final.

*(e) The preliminary process testing may not be accurate in predicting the actual presence and recoverability of diamonds on Company properties.*

Process testing is limited to small scale testing based on a number of laboratory test programs, trade-off studies and design evaluations. There can be no assurance that diamonds recovered in small scale tests will be duplicated in large scale tests under on-site conditions or in production scale. Difficulties may be experienced in obtaining the expected diamond recoveries when scaling up to a production scale process plant.

*(f) The Company may not have adequate funds to explore properties other than the Gahcho Kué Project.*

The Company may not have the ability to pay for exploration or development costs on any other properties it may acquire. If such funds were available, there is no assurance that expending such funds would result in discovery of any diamondiferous kimberlite.

(g) The Company has a history of losses and is likely to continue to incur losses for the foreseeable future.

The Company has a history of losses and is likely to continue to incur losses for the foreseeable future. During the fiscal years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, the Company incurred net losses.

\$26.604 million loss for the year ended December 31, 2013;

\$3.338 million loss for the year ended December 31, 2012; and

\$11.539 million loss for the year ended December 31, 2011.

As of December 31, 2013, the Company had an accumulated deficit of \$120.8 million. There can be no assurance that the Company will ever be profitable.

None of the Company's properties have advanced to the commercial production stage, and the Company has no history of earnings or cash flow from operations and, as an exploration and development company, has only a history of losses.

(h) The Company may never recover the amounts it has capitalized for mineral property costs.

The recoverability of the amounts capitalized for mineral properties in the Company's consolidated financial statements is dependent upon the ability of the Company to complete exploration and development, the discovery of economically recoverable reserves, and, if warranted, upon future profitable production or proceeds from disposition of some or all of the Company's mineral properties.

(i) The Company's failure to raise required financing in the future could cause the Company to go out of business.

As of December 31, 2013, the Company had cash and short-term investments of approximately \$35.7 million and working capital of approximately \$35.1 million. During the past two fiscal years ended December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012, the Company used approximately \$46.4 million in cash flows in operating activities including approximately \$32.6 million during the year ended December 31, 2013, and \$13.8 million during the year ended December 31, 2012.

The Company's administrative and other expenses are expected to be approximately \$2.5 million for the next year, in addition to an estimated \$92.0 million for the Company's proportional share of expenses for the Gahcho Kué joint Arrangement for 2014. The Company expects that a payment of \$10 million for historic sunk costs will be required during the second quarter of 2014 when permits are expected for the Gahcho Kué Project.

In order to advance the development of the Gahcho Kué Project, the Company will be required to raise additional capital through equity and/or debt financings on terms that may be dilutive to its shareholders' interests in the Company and the value of their common shares. The Company may consider share offerings, private placements, rights offerings, credit and debt facilities, as well as the exercise of outstanding options or other arrangements to meet its capital requirements in the future. Such arrangements may have a material adverse effect on the Company's business or results of operations. As well, there is no guarantee that the Company will be able to raise additional capital, or to raise additional capital on terms and conditions which it finds acceptable. If the Company is not able to raise sufficient capital, it may not be able to grow the Company, or it may be forced to cease doing business.

(j) Gahcho Kué Project probable reserves.

The Gahcho Kué Project is the Company's only property and is in the permitting and development stage. The Gahcho Kué Project has probable reserves in three of the four kimberlite bodies at Kennady Lake. See "Item 4D - Property, plants and equipment - Principal Properties".

(k) If the Company does not hold good title to properties, its ability to explore and eventually mine them could be prevented or restricted.

The Company's business depends upon having clear title to its properties and its ability to explore, develop and mine its properties without undue restriction. If any of its properties are subject to prior unregistered agreements that restrict the use of the properties, or if it does not hold title to the properties as it believes it does, its ability to explore, develop and mine on those properties could be limited or prevented completely. This would have a material adverse effect on the Company and its results of operation.

(l) Diamond prices can fluctuate significantly, and as a result, the Company's results of operation may fluctuate significantly.

The market for rough diamonds is subject to strong influence from demand in the United States, Japan, China and India, which are the largest markets for polished diamonds, and supply from major producers such as Alrosa of Russia and Debswana of Botswana. The price of diamonds has historically fluctuated. The price of diamonds dropped sharply after September 11, 2001. Between 2003 and 2006 diamond prices increased on average by approximately 15%. In 2007, rough diamond prices increased by an average of 25%, and in the first five months of 2008, by a further 11%. From about mid-2008 to mid-April 2009, rough diamond prices fell sharply with concerns of the global economic environment of the time. By mid-April 2009, rough diamond prices rebounded to pre-global recession levels. During 2010, rough diamond prices increased by approximately 30%. This strengthening continued through the first half of 2011 when diamond prices reached historic highs. During the second half of 2011, diamond prices dropped sharply resulting in an overall approximate 17% increase during the year. Accordingly to industry leaders, in 2012 rough diamond prices dropped by approximately 12 percent and remained largely unchanged through 2013. While the supply/demand fundamentals for diamonds would indicate good price support and steadily rising prices in the future, such fluctuations make it difficult to predict future diamond prices with a high degree of certainty. To mitigate against this, the Company uses conservative modeled diamond prices in its economic studies and mine planning. Nonetheless, the Company's future results of operation may fluctuate significantly if rough diamond price volatility continues into the future.

(m) The Company may incur significant costs to comply with Environmental and Government Regulation

The current and anticipated future operations of the Company, including development activities and commencement of production on its properties, require permits from various federal, territorial and local governmental authorities and such operations are and will be governed by laws and regulations governing prospecting, development, mining, production, exports, taxes, labour standards, occupational health, waste disposal, toxic substances, land use, environmental protection, mine safety and other matters. Companies engaged in the development and operation of mines and related facilities generally experience increased costs, and delays in development, production and other schedules as a result of the need to comply with applicable laws, regulations and permits. The Company's development activities and its potential mining and processing operations in Canada are subject to various Canadian Federal and Territorial laws governing land use, the protection of the environment, prospecting, development, production, exports, taxes, labour standards, occupational health, waste disposal, toxic substances, mine safety and other matters.

Such exploration, development and operation activities are also subject to substantial regulation under these laws by governmental agencies and may require that the Company obtain permits from various governmental agencies. The Company believes it is in substantial compliance with all material laws and regulations which currently apply to its activities. There can be no assurance, however, that all permits which the Company may require for construction of mining facilities and conduct of mining operations will be obtainable on reasonable terms or that such laws and regulations, or that new legislation or modifications to existing legislation, would not have an adverse effect on any exploration, development or mining activities which the Company might undertake.

Further detail on governmental regulation may be found in "Item 4 - Business Review - Government Regulation", below.

Failure to comply with applicable laws, regulations and permit requirements may result in enforcement actions thereunder, including orders issued by regulatory or judicial authorities causing operations to cease or be curtailed, and may include corrective measures requiring capital expenditures, installation of additional equipment or remedial actions. Parties engaged in mining operations may be required to compensate those suffering loss or damage by reason of the mining activities and may have civil or criminal fines or penalties imposed for violation of applicable laws or regulations. The amount of funds required to comply with all environmental regulations and to pay for compensation in the event of a breach of such laws may exceed the Company's ability to pay such amounts.

Amendments to current laws, regulations and permits governing operations and activities of mining companies, or more stringent implementation of existing or new laws, could have a material adverse impact on the Company and cause increases in capital expenditures or production costs or reduction in levels of production at producing properties or require abandonment or delays in development of new mining facilities.





(n) Climate and transportation costs may increase and have a negative effect on the Company's results of operation.

The Gahcho Kué Project is subject to climate and transportation risks because of its remote northern location. Such factors can add to the costs of development and operation, thereby increasing costs and negatively affecting profitability. The availability of weather conducive to building and operating the Tibbitt to Contwoyto Winter Road is particularly critical to the development of the mine, and production.

(o) The Company is dependent upon its joint arrangement partner for the success of the Gahcho Kué Project.

The Company, and the success of the Gahcho Kué Project, are dependent on the efforts, expertise and capital resources of our joint arrangement partner, De Beers Canada, and its parent De Beers. De Beers Canada is the project operator and is responsible for exploring, permitting, developing and operating the Gahcho Kué Project. In addition, De Beers Canada is providing its share of financing for the Gahcho Kué Project. The Company is dependent on De Beers Canada for accurate information about the Gahcho Kué Project, and the proper and timely progress of permitting and development.

*(p) Operating Hazards and Risks*

Diamond exploration and mining involves many risks. Operations in which the Company has a direct or indirect interest will be subject to all the hazards and risks (such as accidents, injuries, and hazardous waste) normally incidental to exploration, development and production of resources, any of which could result in work stoppages, damage to property and possible environmental damage.

(q) There are numerous factors beyond the control of the Company that may affect the marketability of any diamonds discovered.

Factors beyond the control of the Company may affect the marketability of any diamonds produced. Significant price movements over short periods of time may be affected by numerous factors beyond the control of the Company, including international economic and political trends, expectations of inflation, currency exchange fluctuations (specifically, the U.S. dollar relative to the Canadian dollar and other currencies), interest rates and global and/or regional consumption patterns. The effect of these factors on the prices of diamonds and therefore the economic viability of any of the Company's projects cannot accurately be predicted.

*(r) The Company's expectations reflected in forward-looking statements may prove to be incorrect.*

This Form 20-F includes "forward-looking statements". A shareholder or prospective shareholder should bear this in mind when assessing the Company's business. All statements, other than statements of historical facts, included in this annual report, including, without limitation, the statements under and located elsewhere herein regarding industry prospects and the Company's financial position are forward-looking statements. Although the Company believes that the expectations reflected in such forward-looking statements are reasonable, such expectations may prove to be incorrect.

(s) The Mineral Resources Industry is intensely competitive and the Company competes with many companies with greater financial means and technical facilities.

The resource industry is intensely competitive in all of its phases, and the Company competes with many companies possessing greater financial resources and technical facilities. Competition could adversely affect the Company's ability to acquire suitable producing properties or prospects for exploration in the future.

(t) Aboriginal Rights and Title

Governments in Canada must consult with aboriginal peoples with respect to grants of mineral rights and the issuance of or amendment to project authorizations. Consultation regarding rights or claimed rights of aboriginal people may require accommodations, including undertakings with respect to employment and other matters. This may affect the Company's timetable and costs of development of mineral properties. Aboriginal rights or title claims could affect the Company's existing operations, in addition to its future acquisitions. These legal requirements, among other things, may affect the Company's ability to develop the Gahcho Kué Project and other mineral properties or may materially delay the development of such properties.

(u) Future equity financings which the Company may undertake would cause shareholders' interests in the Company to be diluted.

The Company's current operations do not generate any cash flow. As the Company seeks additional equity financing, the issuance of additional shares will dilute the interests of the Company's current shareholders. The amount of the dilution would depend on the number of new shares issued and the price at which they are issued. The Company has raised funds in recent years through share, option and warrant issuances. As of December 31, 2013, the Company had cash and short-term investments of approximately \$35.7 million and working capital of approximately \$35.1 million. To develop the Gahcho Kué mine, and perform exploration on any other properties acquired, the Company will need to investigate sources of additional liquidity to increase the cash balances required in the future. These additional sources include, but are not limited to, share offerings, private placements, rights offerings, credit and debt facilities, as well as the exercise of outstanding options. There can be no assurance that the Company will be able to raise additional funds as needed, or that funds raised, if any, would be on terms and conditions acceptable to the Company. The Company's annual cash administrative operating costs, excluding the costs directly associated with the Gahcho Kué Project, are approximately \$2.5 million.

(v) If outstanding options to buy Company stock are exercised, existing shareholders' interests in the Company will be diluted.

As at March 25, 2014, there were 1,400,000 options (including options not fully vested) outstanding with exercise prices ranging from \$4.06 to \$6.13 (expiring at various dates). The stock options, if fully exercised, would increase the number of shares outstanding by 1,400,000. Such options, if fully exercised, would constitute about 1.4% (out of 101,901,351 shares (100,501,351 issued and outstanding, plus total outstanding options)) of the Company's resulting share capital as at March 25, 2014. It is unlikely that outstanding options and warrants would be exercised unless the market price of the Company's common shares exceeds the exercise price at the date of exercise. The exercise of such options and the subsequent resale of such Common shares in the public market could adversely affect the prevailing market price and the Company's ability to raise equity capital in the future at a time and price which it deems appropriate. The Company may also enter into commitments in the future which would require the issuance of additional common shares and the Company may grant new share purchase warrants and stock options. Any share issuances from the Company's treasury will result in dilution to existing shareholders.

(w) Members of our Management and Board of Directors may have outside interests which conflict with the Company or its shareholders.

The President and CEO and Director, Patrick Evans, and the Vice President Finance, CFO and Corporate Secretary, Bruce Ramsden, have Consulting Agreements with the Company (see “Item 6C - Board Practices”). In addition, certain officers and directors of the Company are associated with other natural resource companies that acquire interests in mineral properties. Such associations may give rise to conflicts of interest from time to time.

(x) If the Company is not able to attract and maintain qualified key management personnel, it may not be able to successfully implement its planned business activities and growth.

The nature of the Company's business, its ability to continue its exploration, development and permitting activities and to thereby develop a competitive edge in its marketplace depends, in large part, on its ability to attract and maintain qualified key management personnel. Competition for such personnel is intense, and there can be no assurance that the Company will be able to attract and retain such personnel. The Company's development to date has depended, and in the future will continue to depend, on the efforts of Patrick Evans. See “Item 7B -Related party transactions” and “Item 6C - Board Practices”. Loss of the key person could have a material adverse effect on the Company. The Company does not maintain key-man life insurance on Patrick Evans.

(y) The Company's stock price is subject to significant fluctuations.

Prices for the Company's shares on the TSX and on the NYSE MKT (formerly NYSE Amex), have been extremely volatile. The price for the Company's common shares on the TSX ranged from \$3.88 (low) and \$5.87 (high) during the fiscal year ended December 31, 2013, and from \$3.25 (low) to \$5.6 (high) during the fiscal year ended December 31, 2012. The price on the NYSE MKT ranged from \$3.83 US (low) and \$5.59 US (high) during the fiscal year ended December 31, 2013, and from \$3.13 US (low) to \$5.66 US (high) during the fiscal year ended December 31, 2012. Any investment in the Company's securities is therefore subject to considerable fluctuations in value.

(z) The Company has not paid dividends in the past and does not anticipate paying them in the foreseeable future.

Since its inception, the Company has not paid any cash dividends on its common stock and does not anticipate paying any cash dividends on its common stock until significant cash flow is generated. Without dividends on its common stock, shareholders will be able to profit from an investment only if the price of the stock appreciates before the shareholder sells it.

(aa) Currency rate fluctuations may have a material effect on our financial position, results of operations, and timing of the development of the Company's properties.

Feasibility and other studies conducted to evaluate the Company's properties are typically denominated in U.S. dollars, and the Company conducts a significant portion of its operations and incurs a significant portion of its administrative and operating costs in Canadian dollars. The exchange rate for converting U.S. dollars into Canadian dollars has fluctuated in recent years. Accordingly, the Company is subject to fluctuations in the rates of currency exchange between the U.S. dollar and the Canadian dollar, and these fluctuations in the rates of currency exchange may materially affect the Company's financial position, results of operations and timing of the development of its properties. In particular, a strong Canadian dollar relative to the US dollar would negatively impact the Gahcho Kué Project.

(bb) Historically, the Company has been dependent on the support of De Beers and there is no assurance that their support will continue in the future.

The exploration of the Gahcho Kué Project has historically been funded by De Beers Canada. As well, De Beers Canada is the Operator of the Project, and has an equity investment in the Company. With the execution of the 2009 Agreement, De Beers and the Company share funding responsibility for the Gahcho Kué Project. Under the 2009 Agreement, the Company and De Beers are required to fund their share of costs for future operations. As well, the Company is required to make certain repayments of agreed historic costs of the Gahcho Kué Project, funded by De Beers, if and when certain events occur. If either party is unable to fund their share of historic costs, or, if the Company defaults on its required payments of historic costs if and when they are due, in addition to interest on late or defaulted payments, marketing rights can be diluted for the defaulting party. As well, there is no assurance that the Company will have the required funds on hand when the payments are required to be made. Finally, there is no assurance that the level of support provided by De Beers will continue in the future.

*(cc) It will be difficult for any shareholder of the Company to commence legal action against the Company's executives. Enforcing judgments against them or the Company will be difficult.*

As the Company is a Canadian company, it may be difficult for U.S. shareholders of the Company to effect service of process on the Company or to realize on judgments obtained against the Company in the United States. Some of the Company's directors and officers are residents of Canada and a significant part of the Company's assets are, or will be, located outside of the United States. As a result, it may be difficult for shareholders resident in the United States to effect service of process within the United States upon the Company, directors, officers or experts who are not residents of the United States, or to realize in the United States judgments of courts of the United States predicated upon civil liability of any of the Company directors or officers under the United States federal securities laws. If a judgment is obtained in the U.S. courts based on civil liability provisions of the U.S. federal securities laws against the Company or its directors or officers, it will be difficult to enforce the judgment in the Canadian courts against the Company and any of the Company's non-U.S. resident executive officers or directors. Accordingly, United States shareholders may be forced to bring actions against the Company and its respective directors and officers under Canadian law and in Canadian courts in order to enforce any claims that they may have against the Company or the Company's directors and officers. Subject to necessary registration, as an extra provincial company, under applicable provincial corporate statutes in the case of a corporate shareholder, Canadian courts do not restrict the ability of non-resident persons to sue in their courts. Nevertheless it may be difficult for United States shareholders to bring an original action in the Canadian courts to enforce liabilities based on the U.S. federal securities laws against the Company and any of the Company's Canadian executive officers or directors.

*(dd) The MPV Shares may be delisted from NYSE MKT, and if this occurs, shareholders may have difficulty converting their investment into cash efficiently.*

NYSE MKT has established certain standards for the continued listing of a security on this exchange. If the MPV Shares were to be excluded from NYSE MKT, the prices of the MPV Shares and the ability of shareholders to sell such stock would be adversely affected. If the Company were to be delisted, the Company would be required to comply with the initial listing requirements to be relisted on NYSE MKT.



*(ee) The Company is likely a "passive foreign investment company" which may have adverse U.S. federal income tax consequences for U.S. shareholders.*

U.S. investors in the Common Shares should be aware that the Company believes it was classified as a PFIC during the tax year ended December 31, 2013, and based on current business plans and financial expectations, the Company believes that it will be a PFIC for the tax year ending December 31, 2014, and may be a PFIC in subsequent tax years. If the Company is a PFIC for any year during a U.S. shareholder's holding period, then such U.S. shareholder generally will be required to treat any gain realized upon a disposition of Common Shares, or any so-called "excess distribution" received on its Common Shares, as ordinary income, and to pay an interest charge on a portion of such gain or distributions, unless the shareholder makes a timely and effective "qualified electing fund" election ("QEF Election") or a "mark-to-market" election with respect to the Common Shares. A U.S. shareholder who makes a QEF Election generally must report on a current basis its share of the Company's net capital gain and ordinary earnings for any year in which the Company is a PFIC, whether or not the Company distributes any amounts to its shareholders. However, U.S. shareholders should be aware that there can be no assurance that the Company will satisfy record keeping requirements that apply to a qualified electing fund, or that the Company will supply U.S. shareholders with information that such U.S. shareholders require to report under the QEF Election rules, in the event that the Company is a PFIC and a U.S. shareholder wishes to make a QEF Election. Thus, U.S. shareholders may not be able to make a QEF Election with respect to their Common Shares. A U.S. shareholder who makes the mark-to-market election generally must include as ordinary income each year the excess of the fair market value of the Common Shares over the taxpayer's basis therein. This paragraph is qualified in its entirety by the discussion below under the heading "United States Federal Income Tax Consequences." Each U.S. shareholder should consult its own tax advisor regarding the PFIC rules and the U.S. federal income tax consequences of the acquisition, ownership, and disposition of Common Shares.

#### Item 4. Information on the Company

A. *History and development of the company.*

#### **The Corporate Organization**

Mountain Province Diamonds Inc., formerly Mountain Province Mining Inc., was formed on November 1, 1997 by the amalgamation (the "MPV Amalgamation") of Mountain Province Mining Inc. ("Old MPV") and 444965 B.C. Ltd. ("444965") pursuant to an amalgamation agreement (the "MPV Amalgamation Agreement") dated as of August 21, 1997.

Under the terms of the MPV Amalgamation Agreement, as at November 1, 1997, each Old MPV share was exchanged for one MPV Share and each 444965 share was exchanged for approximately 0.80 of one MPV Share. The conversion ratios reflected the respective interests of Old MPV and 444965 in the AK-CJ Properties prior to the date of the MPV

Amalgamation.

Old MPV was incorporated under the laws of British Columbia on December 2, 1986 under the British Columbia *Company Act* and was engaged in the exploration of precious and base mineral resource properties until the date of the MPV Amalgamation. Prior to the date of the MPV Amalgamation, Old MPV held an undivided 50% interest in the AK-CJ Properties and an interest in each of the other properties which are currently held by MPV, as described below.

444965, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Glenmore Highlands Inc., (Glenmore being a former controlling shareholder of the Company as defined under the *Securities Act*, British Columbia) prior to the MPV Amalgamation, was incorporated under the laws of British Columbia on August 20, 1993. Prior to the MPV Amalgamation, 444965's only material asset consisted of a 40% undivided interest in the AK-CJ Properties.

As of March 31, 2000, the Company had one wholly-owned subsidiary, Mountain Province Mining Corp. (USA), which has since been voluntarily dissolved.

On April 4, 2000, the Company incorporated a wholly-owned subsidiary, Mountain Glen Mining Inc. in Alberta. Pursuant to an arrangement agreement (the "Arrangement Agreement") with Glenmore dated May 10, 2000, Glenmore was amalgamated with Mountain Glen effective as of June 30, 2000 to form a wholly-owned subsidiary (also known as "Mountain Glen Mining Inc.") of the Company. All Glenmore Shares were exchanged for common shares in the Company on the basis of 0.5734401 MPV Shares to one Glenmore Share, and Glenmore Shares were concurrently cancelled. All of the assets of Glenmore became assets of Mountain Glen, including 16,015,696 MPV Shares previously held by Glenmore.

Glenmore had two wholly-owned subsidiaries, Baltic Minerals BV, incorporated in the Netherlands, and Baltic Minerals Finland OY, incorporated in Finland. Pursuant to the Arrangement Agreement, these companies became wholly-owned subsidiaries of the Company.

The Company changed its name from Mountain Province Mining Inc. to Mountain Province Diamonds Inc. effective October 16, 2000. It commenced trading under its new name on the TSX on October 25, 2000.

Pursuant to an Assignment and Assumption Agreement dated March 25, 2004 between the Company and Mountain Glen, Mountain Glen distributed its property and assets *in specie* to the Company with the object of winding up the affairs of Mountain Glen. The property transferred included Mountain Glen's shares in Baltic Minerals BV and the 16,015,696 MPV Shares. On March 30, 2004, the 16,015,696 MPV Shares were cancelled and returned to treasury.

Mountain Glen was voluntarily dissolved on August 4, 2004.

Baltic Minerals BV and its subsidiary Baltic Minerals Finland OY were voluntarily dissolved in 2006.

Pursuant to the repeal of the British Columbia *Company Act* and its replacement by the British Columbia *Business Corporations Act* (the "New Act"), the Company transitioned to the New Act and adopted new Articles of Incorporation. On September 20, 2005, the Company's shareholders approved a special resolution for the continuance of the Company into Ontario, and the Company amended its articles and continued incorporation under the *Business Corporations Act (Ontario)*, transferring from the Company Act (British Columbia).

The Company is domiciled in Canada.

The names of the Company's subsidiaries, their dates of incorporation and the jurisdictions in which they were incorporated as at the date of filing of this Annual Report, are as follows:

<b>Name of Subsidiary</b>	<b>Date of Incorporation</b>	<b>Jurisdiction of Incorporation</b>
Camphor Ventures Inc.	May 9, 1986 (as Sierra Madre Resources Inc.)	British Columbia, Canada

On February 27, 2012, the Company incorporated a wholly-owned subsidiary named Kennady Diamonds Inc. under the Ontario Business Corporations Act. This subsidiary was formed for the purpose of effecting the transfer of Mountain Province's interest in the Kennady North Project in Northwest Territories, Canada and operations to a new company as contemplated under a Mountain Province plan of arrangement which closed July 6, 2012 (see "Kennady North" discussion under "Other Properties"). Until the completion of the plan of arrangement, Kennady Diamonds Inc. was a wholly-owned subsidiary of Mountain Province. Upon completion of the plan of arrangement, Mountain Province distributed the shares of Kennady Diamonds to Mountain Province shareholders on the basis of one Kennady Diamonds' share for every five shares of Mountain Province held by shareholders.

The sole subsidiary of the Company, represented diagrammatically, is as follows:

The Company's registered, records, administrative, and executive office is at 161 Bay Street, Suite 2315, PO Box 216, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5J 2S1, the telephone number is (416) 361-3562, and the fax number is (416) 603-8565.

The Company's initial public offering on the VSE was pursuant to a prospectus dated July 28, 1988 and was only offered to investors in British Columbia. The Company listed its shares on the TSX (Trading Symbol "MPV") on January 22, 1999 and on the Nasdaq Smallcap Market (Trading Symbol "MPVIF") on May 1, 1996. Its shares were delisted from the Vancouver Stock Exchange (now known as the TSX Venture Exchange and prior to that, as the CDNX) on January 31, 2000 and from the Nasdaq Smallcap Market on September 29, 2000. Presently, the Company's shares trade on the TSX under the symbol "MPV" and also on the NYSE MKT (formerly NYSE Amex) under the symbol "MDM". Prior to April 4, 2005, the Company's shares traded on the OTCBB under the symbol "MPVI". The Company is also registered extra-provincially in the Northwest Territories, and is a reporting issuer in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland. The Company files reports in the United States pursuant to Section 13 of the Securities Exchange Act.

The Company's transfer agent is Computershare Investor Services Inc. located at 100 University Avenue, 8th Floor, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5J 2Y1.

### **Principal Capital Expenditures and Divestitures**

There are no principal capital expenditures and divestitures currently in progress.

### **Takeover offers**

There were no public takeover offers by third parties in respect of the MPV Shares or by the Company in respect of other companies' shares during the last and current financial year.

### **Acquisitions and Dispositions**

On October 10, 2002, the Company granted an option for the acquisition by Vision Gate Ventures Limited (now known as Northern Lion Gold Corp.) of a 70% interest in its Haveri Gold Property, which was not considered to be a property that was material to the Company. On October 4, 2004, the Company agreed to exchange the Company's 30% interest in the Haveri Gold Property for 4,000,000 common shares of Northern Lion Gold Corp. The shares were subject to a two-year hold period and there were volume restrictions on re-sale thereafter. The 4,000,000 common shares of Northern Lion Gold Corp. were sold in July 2007.

*Acquisition of Camphor Ventures Inc.*

On July 5, 2006, the Company announced that it had entered into an agreement with certain Camphor Ventures Inc. (“Camphor” or “Camphor Ventures”) shareholders to acquire approximately 33.5 percent of the issued and outstanding shares of Camphor through a private agreement exempt share exchange on the basis of 0.3975 MPV Shares for each Camphor share. The acquisition was completed on July 24, 2006.

On January 19, 2007, the Company announced that Camphor had accepted an offer letter from the Company in terms of which the Company offered, subject to certain conditions, to acquire all of the outstanding securities of Camphor Ventures on the basis of 0.41 MPV Shares, options or warrants (as the case may be) per Camphor common share, option, or warrant. Offering documents and the Camphor Directors’ Circular were mailed to Camphor shareholders on February 23, 2007, and the offer remained open until March 30, 2007, following which Mountain Province took up the Camphor shares tendered into the offer increasing the Company’s interest in Camphor to over 90 percent. The offer was subsequently extended until April 16, 2007, following which the Company’s interest in Camphor increased to 96% percent on a fully diluted basis. On April 19, 2007, the Company issued a Notice of Compulsory Acquisition to acquire the balance of the outstanding shares of Camphor. The Notice expired June 19, 2007 and the Company took up the balance of the Camphor shares. Camphor Ventures was de-listed in July 2007, and is now a wholly owned subsidiary of Mountain Province.

*Disposition of Kennady North Project*

On March 12, 2012, Kennady Diamonds Inc. and Mountain Province entered into an arrangement agreement (the “Kennady Arrangement Agreement”) pursuant to which Mountain Province agreed to would transfer its interest in the Kennady North Project, in the Northwest Territories in Canada, including permits, mining claims, rights and title, to Kennady Diamonds Inc. in exchange for common shares of Kennady Diamonds Inc.

Upon completion of the Kennady Arrangement on July 6, 2012, Kennady Diamonds Inc. issued 16,143,111 shares to Mountain Province which was distributed along with the one share held by Mountain Province to the Mountain Province shareholders in exchange for the assets and cash transferred, as contemplated by the Kennady Arrangement. The transactions contemplated by the Kennady Arrangement was completed on July 6, 2012. Kennady Diamonds Inc. began trading on the TSX Venture Exchange on July 10, 2012 under the ticker symbol “KDI”.

B.

*Business overview.*

*1.1 Introduction*

The Company is a natural resource property exploration and development company. At this time, the Company has interest in one natural resource property – its 49% interest (including the 4.9% interest in the property held by Camphor) in the Gahcho Kué Property located in the Northwest Territories of Canada. See "Item 4D - Property, plants and equipment".

Bulk sampling and drilling on the Gahcho Kué Project is complete, as is the Definitive Feasibility Study which demonstrates an economically viable project. The Project is currently in the permitting and development stage. There are no revenues from the Company's natural resource property.



In July and November 2010, the Company acquired eight (8) mineral claims just north and west of the Gahcho Kué Project mineral leases. The Company referred to these eight claims and its five 100%-owned mineral leases as the Kennady North Project. During 2011, the Kennady North Project underwent a desktop study to compile the historic exploration information in order to assess what exploration, if any, could be done on these 13 claims and leases. In 2012, through a plan of arrangement, Mountain Province's interest in the Kennady North Project and cash were transferred to Kennady Diamonds Inc. See "Other Properties" for further information on the Kennady North Project and Kennady Diamonds Inc.

## *1.2 Historical Corporate Development*

### **AK-CJ Properties, and the Gahcho Kué Project**

In August 1992, the Company acquired a 100% interest in the AK-CJ Properties that encompassed approximately 520,000 acres. Pursuant to an agreement dated November 18, 1993 (as amended), the Company optioned 40% of its interest in the AK-CJ Properties to 444965, a subsidiary of Glenmore.

Pursuant to an agreement dated August 16, 1994 (as amended), the Company also optioned 10% of its interest in the AK-CJ Claims to Camphor. Following the merger of the Company with 444965, the Company held a 90% interest in the AK-CJ Claims, and Camphor, the remaining 10%. Exploration work in the form of soil sampling, aerial geophysical surveys and geochemical and geophysical analysis were undertaken on these properties during the period from 1992 to 1995.

During fiscal 1995, the Company focused the majority of its attention on the AK Property. In February 1995, a diamondiferous kimberlite was discovered (the "5034" kimberlite pipe) and a program of delineation drilling was undertaken. Activity during this period on the Company's other properties was minimal because of the focus on the AK Property.

During 1996, the Company completed a 104-tonne mini-bulk sample from the 5034 kimberlite pipe. The results indicated an average grade of 2.48 carats per tonne. During 1997, the Company concluded a joint venture agreement (the "Letter Agreement") with Monopros, a wholly-owned subsidiary of De Beers now known as De Beers Canada Inc., Camphor Ventures Inc., and other parties, and further amended it (as the Gahcho Kué Joint Venture Agreement) in 2002, to develop the AK-CJ Properties. The Letter Agreement granted De Beers the sole and exclusive right and option to acquire a 51% ownership interest in the AK Property in consideration of incurring certain expenditures.

During the 1997 exploration season, De Beers Canada discovered three new kimberlite pipes on the AK Property: Tesla, Tuzo and Hearne. All are diamondiferous.

During the spring of 1998, De Beers Canada conducted mini-bulk sampling on the three new pipes as well as the 5034 kimberlite pipe, the original pipe discovery on the AK Property. The results were positive enough for De Beers to commit to a major bulk sample in 1999.

During 1999, De Beers Canada completed a major bulk sample of the four major pipes. For the 5034 kimberlite pipe, a total of 1,044 carats were recovered from 609 tonnes of kimberlite. For the Hearne pipe, a total of 856 carats were recovered from 469 tonnes of kimberlite. For the Tuzo pipe, a total of 533 carats were recovered from 523 tonnes of kimberlite. For the Tesla pipe, 64 carats were recovered from 184 tonnes of kimberlite. The Tesla pipe was too low grade to be considered as part of a mine plan.

On March 8, 2000, the Company agreed to extend the feasibility study decision date, and De Beers Canada agreed to carry all exploration, development and other project costs.

On August 4, 2000, De Beers Canada presented the Desktop Study to the Company. Upon presentation, De Beers Canada was deemed to earn a 51% interest in the AK-CJ Properties. Consequently, the Company was left with a 44.1% interest and Camphor with a 4.9% interest in the AK-CJ Properties. The main conclusion of the Desktop Study was that only a 15 percent increase in diamond revenues was needed for De Beers Canada to proceed to the feasibility stage.

On May 4, 2001, De Beers Canada completed the bulk sample program of the Hearne and 5034 pipes. A total of approximately 307 tonnes and 550 tonnes of kimberlite were recovered from the Hearne and 5034 pipes respectively. The modeled values of the diamonds recovered from the Hearne and 5034 pipes were reported on December 18, 2001 and the results were encouraging enough for De Beers to commit to another bulk sample during the winter of 2002. The main purpose was to recover more high quality, top color diamonds, like the 9.9-carat diamond recovered in the 2001 program.

The CJ Property claims substantially lapsed in November 2001 and the remaining CJ Property claims lapsed on August 17, 2002.

During 2002, the Company entered into the Gahcho Kué Joint Venture Agreement. This agreement provided that De Beers Canada could have earned up to a 55% interest in the project by funding and completing a positive definitive feasibility study. The agreement also provided that De Beers Canada could have earned up to a 60% interest in the project by funding development and construction of a commercial-scale mine. This Gahcho Kué Joint Venture Agreement was amended and restated in July 2009 (see “Description of Property – *Amended and Restated Joint Venture Agreement*”).

The winter 2002 bulk sample program of the 5034 and Hearne pipes was completed on April 20, 2002. The modeled grades and values per carat for both pipes were used to update the Desktop Study. De Beers Canada's 2003 updated Desktop Study showed that, due to the decrease in diamond prices since September 11, 2001 and a lower U.S. dollar against the Canadian dollar, the projected return on the project would be slightly less than that obtained previously. As a result of the indicated internal rate of return, well below the agreed hurdle rate of 15%, De Beers decided to postpone a pre-feasibility decision until the next year when the Desktop Study would be updated again.

At the end of July 2003, De Beers notified the Company that they had started work on a detailed internal cost estimate study on the Gahcho Kué Project that incorporated the Kennady Lake diamond deposits. They based their decision on their belief that the improving geo-political and economic conditions supported confidence in longer-term diamond price projections. In November 2003, the Joint Venture's management committee approved a budget of approximately \$25 million for the study which started in January 2004, and was completed mid-2005.

The projected profitability levels were sufficiently encouraging to the Joint Venture to support the Joint Venture's decision to proceed to the next phase of permitting and advanced exploration to improve the resource confidence and input data for mine design to support further study. On July 11, 2005, De Beers reported an increase in the modeled value of the diamonds for the Gahcho Kué Project with the modeled values increasing by approximately 6, 7 and 8 percent for the Tuzo, Hearne and 5034 pipes respectively.

During 2006, 2007 and the winter of 2008, advanced exploration and permitting work continued on the AK Property. For further particulars, reference should be made to “Item 4D - Property, plants and equipment - Principal Properties - Resource Properties”.

In July 2009 the Company entered into an Amended and Restated Joint Arrangement Agreement with De Beers Canada of which details are provided below.

In October 2010 the Company announced the results of the Definitive Feasibility Study. The full Technical report was filed on EDGAR on December 3, 2010 under Form 6K and on the relevant Securities Commissions in Canada on the System for Electronic Document Analysis and Retrieval (“SEDAR”) on December 3, 2010.

Based on the positive results of the Definitive Feasibility Study, the Company and De Beers approved the development of the Gahcho Kué diamond mine in June, 2011, subject to the successful permitting of the project.

On July 22, 2013 Mountain Province and De Beers Canada announced that the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board (MVEIRB) had completed the Gahcho Kué Environmental Impact Assessment and recommended approval of the proposed Gahcho Kué diamond mine subject to certain measures and follow-up programs.

In October 2013 the Canadian Federal Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development approved the development of the Gahcho Kué diamond mine subject to the measures and follow-up programs recommended by the MVEIRB.

On December 2, 2013 Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board approved a pioneer Land Use Permit for the Gahcho Kué diamond mine, which allowed for the commencement of land-based site works in preparation for the start of full construction in 2014.

## **Other Properties**

The Company regards only the AK Property (the “Gahcho Kué Project”) as material at this time. The Company’s former Kennady North Project is discussed only briefly in this document. For further particulars, reference should be made to “Item 4D - Property, plants and equipment - Other Properties”.

### *Kennady North*

The Company (outside of the Joint Arrangement with De Beers Canada) had the following five mining leases at Kennady Lake, adjacent or close to the Gahcho Kué Project, with their respective lease numbers –4340, 4342, 4466, 4467, and 4468. These five mining leases represent about 12,755 acres. In late 2010, the Company also staked eight claims around Gahcho Kué – Kwezi 01 to Kwezi 08. These claims represent approximately 17,619 acres, and together with the five mining leases, comprise 30,374 acres. This was known as the Company’s Kennady North Project. These mining leases and claims were not part of the 2009 Gahcho Kué Joint Arrangement Agreement with De Beers Canada and were not considered part of the Gahcho Kué Project. Historical exploration on the Kennady North Project was done starting in 1992 and continued until about 12 years ago when the Company and De Beers Canada focussed exploration efforts on the Gahcho Kué Project. In 2011, the Company undertook a desktop study of the exploration work done in the past on the Kennady North Project, and in late 2011, undertook an airborne gravity gradiometer survey over the Kennady North Project leases and claims.

On March 12, 2012, Kennady Diamonds Inc. and Mountain Province entered into the Kennady Arrangement Agreement pursuant to which Mountain Province agreed to would transfer its interest in the Kennady North Project, in the Northwest Territories in Canada, including permits, mining claims, rights and title, to Kennady Diamonds Inc. in exchange for common shares of Kennady Diamonds Inc.

Upon completion of the Kennady Arrangement on July 6, 2012, Kennady Diamonds Inc. issued 16,143,111 shares to Mountain Province which were distributed along with the one share held by Mountain Province to the Mountain Province shareholders in exchange for the assets and cash transferred, as contemplated by the Kennady Arrangement. The transactions contemplated by the Kennady Arrangement were completed on July 6, 2012. Kennady Diamonds Inc. began trading on the TSX Venture Exchange on July 10, 2012 under the ticker symbol "KDI".

## Foreign Assets

Until the Arrangement with Glenmore, all of the Company's assets are and have been located in Canada (see Item 4D - Property, plants and equipment - Principal Properties). Since the Arrangement, the Company has not generated any revenue from operations. Pursuant to the Arrangement, the assets of Glenmore, were acquired by Mountain Glen, and are now held by the Company, having been distributed to the Company on the winding up of Mountain Glen.

## Government Regulation

The current and anticipated future operations of the Company, including development activities and commencement of production on its properties, require permits from various federal, territorial and local governmental authorities and such operations are and will be governed by laws and regulations governing prospecting, development, mining, production, exports, taxes, labour standards, occupational health, waste disposal, toxic substances, land use, environmental protection, mine safety and other matters. Companies engaged in the development and operation of mine-related facilities generally experience increased costs, and delays in production and other schedules as a result of the need to comply with applicable laws, regulations and permits. The Company's exploration and development activities, as well as future mining and processing operations in Canada, are subject to various laws governing land use, the protection of the environment, prospecting, development, production, exports, taxes, labour standards, occupational health, waste disposal, toxic substances, mine safety and other matters.

In most jurisdictions, mining is regulated by conservation laws and regulations. In the Northwest Territories, the mining industry operates primarily under Canadian federal law because the ownership of water, fisheries, and surface and sub-surface rights to land are vested in the federal government. Accordingly, federal legislation governs prospecting, development, production, environmental protection, exports, and collective bargaining. Matters of a purely local or territorial nature, such as mine safety standards, the establishment of a minimum wage, education and local health services are matters for the Territorial government. With respect to environmental matters, the Company's properties are subject to federal regulation under, *inter alia*, the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act*, the *Fisheries Act*, the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act*, the *Migratory Bird Act*, the *Northwest Territories Waters Act*, the *Northwest Territories Wildlife Act*, the *Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act*, the *Navigable Waters Protection Act*, the *Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act* and the *Mackenzie Valley Land Use Regulations*. Territorial environmental legislation may also apply for some purposes. The Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board established under the federal *Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act* has the responsibility to receive and to process applications for water licenses under the *Northwest Territories Waters Act* in most areas of the Northwest Territories. Generally, these licenses outline the volume of water the mine may use, how tailings will be treated, the quality and types of waste that may be deposited into the receiving environment and how the quality and types of waste may be monitored and contain requirements regarding the restoration of the tailings disposal and other affected areas. The water licence also has requirements for monitoring and reporting of water and waste as well as determines reclamation and closure requirements. The Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board also issues land use permits applicable to most areas of the Northwest Territories under the *Mackenzie Valley Land Use Regulations*. Such permits govern the manner in which various development activities on federal Crown and other lands may be undertaken.

Applicable territorial legislation and regulations include the *Apprentice and Trade Certification Regulations*, *Archaeological Resources Act*, *Boilers and Pressure Vessels Regulations*, *Business Licence Fire Regulations*, *Civil Emergency Measures Act*, *Environmental Protection Act*, *Environmental Rights Act*, *Explosives Use Act*, *Explosives Regulations*, *Fire Prevention Act*, *Fire Prevention Regulations*, *Labour Standards Act*, *Mine Health and Safety Act*, *Mine Health and Safety Regulations*, *Public Health Act*, *Research Act*, *Wildlife Act*, and *Workers Compensation Act*.



*The Fisheries Act, Northwest Territories Waters Act, Territorial Lands Act and Regulations, Territorial Quarrying Regulations, Mackenzie Valley Land Use Regulations, Real Property Act, Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act, and the Canada Mining Regulations* are federal legislation or regulations. Failure to comply with territorial and/or federal legislation or regulations may result in cease work orders and/or fines.

The Company's operations and exploration activities are also subject to substantial regulation under these laws by governmental agencies. The Company believes it is in substantial compliance with all material laws and regulations which currently apply to its activities. There can be no assurance, however, that all permits which the Company may require for construction of mining facilities and conduct of mining operations will be obtainable on reasonable terms or that such laws and regulations, or that new legislation or modifications to existing legislation, would not have an adverse effect on any exploration, development or mining project which the Company might undertake.

Portions of the Northwest Territories will also be subject to the jurisdiction of the Tlicho Government, a First Nations government which will have certain powers of regulation in respect of "Tlicho Lands" under the "Tlicho Agreement", a land claim agreement entered into between the Tlicho First Nation and the federal and territorial governments.

Failure to comply with applicable laws, regulations and permitting requirements may result in enforcement actions thereunder, including orders issued by regulatory or judicial authorities causing operations to cease or be curtailed, and may include corrective measures requiring capital expenditures, installation of additional equipment or remedial actions. Parties engaged in mining operations may be required to compensate those suffering loss or damage by reason of the mining activities and may have civil or criminal fines or penalties imposed for violation of applicable laws or regulations.

Amendments to current laws, regulations and permits governing operations and activities of mining companies, or more stringent implementation thereof, could have a material adverse impact on the Company and cause increases in capital expenditures or production costs or reduction in levels of production at producing properties or require abandonment or delays in development of new mining properties.

On October 17, 2007, the Company entered into an agreement with the Government of the Northwest Territories pursuant to which it agreed to make available 10% of its share of the diamonds from the Gahcho Kué Project to the Northwest Territories diamond cutting and polishing facilities.

C. *Organizational structure.*

See "Item 4 A - History and development of the Company - The Corporate Organization".



D. *Property, plants and equipment.*

### **Principal Properties**

**In this section on "Principal Properties", the reader should note that where disclosures pertaining to mineral resources are made, these are not mineral reserves and do not have demonstrated economic viability. The Company has only one principal property, the AK Property also known as the Gahcho Kué Project, which is located in the Canada's Northwest Territories. The Gahcho Kué Project is in the development and permitting stage.**

**A "mineral resource" as defined under the CIM Definition Standards, differs from the SEC Guidelines and means a concentration or occurrence of natural, solid, inorganic or fossilized organic material in or on the Earth's crust in such form and quantity and of such a grade or quality that it has reasonable prospects for economic extraction. The location, quantity, grade, geological characteristics and continuity of a Mineral Resource are known, estimated or interpreted from specific geological evidence and knowledge. See "Glossary of Technical Terms" in this Report.**

**A "mineral reserve" as defined under the CIM Definition Standards, which are different from the SEC Guidelines, means the economically mineable part of a Measured Mineral Resource or Indicated Mineral Resource demonstrated by at least a Preliminary Feasibility Study. This study must include adequate information on mining, processing, metallurgical, economic and other relevant factors that demonstrate, at the time of reporting, that economic extraction can be justified. A Mineral Reserve includes diluting materials and allowances for losses that may occur when the material is mined. See "Glossary of Technical Terms" in this Report.**

**In this Annual Report, because the Company is a Canadian company with mining properties in Canada, the definitions and disclosures are made in accordance with the CIM Definition Standards as required by Canadian law for disclosure of material facts. The CIM Definition Standards differ from those adopted by the SEC in its SEC Guidelines. See "Glossary of Technical Terms" in this Report.**

**It should be noted that the SEC Guidelines define "reserve" to mean "that part of a mineral deposit which could be economically and legally extracted or produced at the time of the reserve determination". See the Mineral Reserves Section, below.**

Description of Property

#### Administrative Offices

The Company's administrative office is located at 161 Bay Street, Suite 2315, PO Box 216, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5J 2S1. The Company considers these premises suitable for its current needs.

#### Mineral Properties

The Company's main property is the Gahcho Kué Project.

#### *Amended and Restated Joint Venture Agreement*

Under the 2002 Agreement with De Beers Canada previously in effect, the Company was not responsible for funding the Gahcho Kué Project, and De Beers Canada had no recourse to the Company for repayment of funds until, and unless, the Gahcho Kué Project was built, in production, and generating net cash flows.

On July 3, 2009, the Company entered the “2009 Agreement” with De Beers Canada (jointly, the “Participants”) with respect to the Gahcho Kué Project that replaces the 2002 Agreement entered into by the Participants. Under the 2009 Agreement:

- The Participants’ continuing interests in the Gahcho Kué Project will be Mountain Province 49% and De
1. Beers Canada 51%, with Mountain Province’s interest no longer subject to the dilution provisions in the 2002 Agreement except for normal dilution provisions which are applicable to both Participants;
  2. Each Participant will market their own proportionate share of diamond production in accordance with their participating interest;
  3. Each Participant will contribute their proportionate share to the future project development costs;
  4. Material strategic and operating decisions will be made by consensus of the Participants as long as each Participant has a participating interest of 40% or more;
  5. The Participants agreed that the sunk historic costs to the period ending on December 31, 2008 will be reduced and limited to \$120 million;
  6. Mountain Province would repay De Beers Canada \$59 million (representing 49% of an agreed sum of \$120 million) in settlement of the Company’s share of the agreed historic sunk costs on the following schedule:
    - \$200,000 on execution of the 2009 Agreement (Mountain Province’s contribution to the 2009 Gahcho Kué Joint Arrangement expenses to date of execution of the 2009 Agreement) (paid);
    - Up to \$5.1 million in respect of De Beers Canada’s share of the costs of the feasibility study (paid \$4,417,421 to December 31, 2013, capitalized as “Mineral Properties” in the Company’s financial statements – no further costs expected);
    - \$10 million upon the completion of a feasibility study with at least a 15% IRR and approval of the necessary development work for a mine (as defined in the 2009 Gahcho Kué Joint Arrangement Agreement – paid March 15, 2011);
    - \$10 million following the issuance of the construction and operating permits;
    - \$10 million following the commencement of commercial production; and
    - The balance of approximately \$24.4 million plus accrued interest within 18 months following commencement of commercial production.

Mountain Province has agreed that the marketing rights provided to the Company in the 2009 Agreement will be diluted if the Company defaults on certain of the repayments described above.

Extracts from Technical Reports

Unless otherwise stated, the technical information in this section from the sub-headings “Property Setting” to “Economic Analysis - Summary” is based upon Independent Qualified Person's Technical Report dated as of December 1, 2010 (with information effective as of October 15, 2010) (the "2010 Technical Report") entitled "Gahcho Kué Project, Definitive Feasibility Study, NI 43-101 Technical Report, Northwest Territories, Canada" prepared for the Gahcho Kué Project by JDS Energy and Mining Inc. by:

.	Daniel D. Johnson, P.Eng. (JDS)
.	Mike Makarenko, P.Eng. (JDS)
.	Ken Meikle, P.Eng. (JDS)
.	Bob Prince-Wright, P.Eng. (JDS)

- Jarek Jakubec, C.Eng. (SRK (Canada) Consulting Inc.)
- Kevin Jones, P.Eng. (EBA Engineering Consultants Inc.)

The details about the 2010 Technical Report were filed on EDGAR on December 3, 2010 under Form 6K. The full Technical Report was also filed on SEDAR on December 3, 2010.

An updated mineral resource estimate for the deep portion of the Tuzo kimberlite was provided in an Independent Qualified Person's Technical Report with an effective date of July 2, 2013 (the "2013 Technical Report") entitled "Update of the Mineral Resource Estimate for the Tuzo Kimberlite, Gahcho Kué Project, Northwest Territories, Canada: NI 43-101 Technical Report" prepared for Mountain Province by Mineral Services Canada Inc. by:

- Tom E. Nowicki, P.Geo. (Mineral Services Canada Inc.)
- Michael Makarenko, P.Eng. (JDS Energy & Mining Inc.)

The details about the 2013 Technical Report were filed on EDGAR on August 14, 2013 under Form 6K. The full Technical Report was also filed with the relevant Securities Commissions in Canada on SEDAR on August 13, 2013.

Portions of the following information are based on assumptions, qualifications and procedures which are not fully described herein. Reference should be made to the full text of the 2010 Technical Report and the 2013 Technical Report.

#### Property Setting

The Gahcho Kué Project is located at the informally-named Kennady Lake, approximately 300 km east-northeast of Yellowknife in the Northwest Territories (NWT), Canada at the approximate latitude 63.26.16N and longitude 109.12.05W (NAD83 Zone 12 coordinates 7035620N, 589735E).

The Gahcho Kué Project is located 150 km south-southeast of the Diavik and Ekati diamond mines operated by Diavik Diamond Mines Inc. (Rio Tinto) and BHP Diamonds Inc. (BHP Billiton) respectively at Lac de Gras, and 80 km east-southeast of the De Beers Canada Snap Lake mine.

The Gahcho Kué Project consists Hearne North and South; 5034 West, Central and North-East; 5034 South Pipe; 5034 North Pipe; Tuzo; Wallace; Dunn Sheet and Tesla diamondiferous kimberlite pipes, sheets and dykes. Except for the northernmost part of 5034, the main kimberlite pipes all lie beneath Kennady Lake.

There are myriad lakes in the area. Kennady Lake, under which the kimberlite pipes lie, is a local headwater lake with a minimal catchment area, nutrient-poor water, and relatively low potential for aquatic life.

### Physiography

The Gahcho Kué Project lies on the edge of the continuous permafrost zone in an area known as the “barren lands”, which are characterized by heath and tundra, with occasional knolls, bedrock outcrops, and localized surface depressions interspersed with lakes. Thin, discontinuous covers of organic and mineral soil and glacial till deposits overlie bedrock, which occurs typically within a few metres of surface. Some small stands of stunted spruce occur in the area.



Fauna includes red fox, arctic fox, sic sic, grizzly bear, wolf and caribou (during annual migration), ptarmigan, abundant migratory bird life in summer, and clouds of mosquitoes and black flies during the height of the summer months (mid-June to mid-August).

Vegetation in the area is characteristic of low arctic tundra. Shrubs of willow and birch occur in drainages, and in some areas may reach over 2 m in height. Heath tundra covers most upland areas. Conifer stands occur in patchy distribution north of the tree line in lowland, sheltered areas, and riparian habitats, and are found as far north as Kirk Lake.

Topographic elevations within the property range between 400 meters above sea level (“masl”) to 450 masl.

#### Accessibility

The Gahcho Kué Project occurs at the informally-named Kennady Lake, 20 km north of tree line with no permanent road access. Access to the Gahcho Kué Project is by float-equipped planes during summer months and ski- or wheel-equipped planes in winter. During winter, larger aircraft such as the Dash-7 and Super Hercules L100 Transport can operate from an artificially-thickened ice landing strip on Kennady Lake.

Helicopter pads are located within the base camp to support drilling and logistical operations. During the short ‘shoulder seasons’, access to the property is via a 1,000 ft long runway established on an esker at Kirk Lake Camp located approximately 26 km north of the Gahcho Kué Project; passengers and supplies are transferred to the site by helicopter.

During winter, a permitted 120 km winter ice road connecting the Gahcho Kué Project with the main Tibbitt Lake to Contwoyto Lake winter road is built, if required. The winter ice road supports shipment of fuel, heavy equipment, construction materials and bulk samples. The main winter ice road connects Yellowknife to the Snap Lake, Ekati, and Diavik mines from February to April each year to the extent that weather allows. The road is operated under a Licence of Occupation by the Joint Venture Partners who operate the Ekati (Dominion Diamonds), Snap Lake (De Beers Canada) and Diavik (Rio Tinto) mines. The Gahcho Kué Joint Venture is also a full partner in the Licence of Occupation, which provides equal access to and use of the ice road.

#### Climate

As the Gahcho Kué Project is located 230 km south of the Arctic Circle, the climate is extreme and semi-arid. Temperatures range from  $-45^{\circ}\text{C}$  to  $+25^{\circ}\text{C}$  over a twelve-month period. Winter normally lasts from November to May and has average temperatures of about  $-20^{\circ}\text{C}$ . Summer temperatures prevail from early July to mid-September, and average about  $18^{\circ}\text{C}$ . Freeze-up and ice break-up occur in November and June, respectively. Activities are possible on-site year-round.

Daylight hours range from near zero in mid winter (Winter Solstice) to effectively 24 hours (Summer Solstice). The spring and fall equinox occur in March and September respectively, marking the period when length of daylight and darkness are equal.

## **Infrastructure**

*Camp* – The exploration camp erected on the shore of Kennady Lake (near the southeast edge of the postulated future limits of the 5034 pit) has seen an increase to accommodations in order to lodge the preliminary construction work crew. Living quarters are a mixture of three-person stick-built cabins and skid-mounted dorm units; providing a maximum capacity of 180 beds. Support buildings include the kitchen and dining room; recreation building; office building; core storage; men’s and women’s dry; toilet facilities; fuel storage; shops; and warehouses.

*Transport* – Regular shipments of consumables and materials can occur over an annual winter road and, for year-round access and deliveries, by aircraft.

*Power* – There is currently no local electrical grid or power plant for power supply to site. Power generation for any planned mining operation is likely to be produced by an on-site diesel generation plant.

*Communications* – Current site communications depends entirely on satellite connections for internet and phones.

*Water* – Process water for any planned mining operation may be obtained from open-pit water collection, recycling of process water, water management ponds and from re-treatment of water from waste piles. Hydrogeological studies are required to confirm whether there is adequate process water from these sources. Kennady Lake is the current source of potable water.

## **Tenure History**

The Gahcho Kué Project was part of a larger group of mining claims, known as the AK Property, which currently consists of four remaining mining leases. The AK Property was initially staked in 1992 by Inukshuk Capital Corp., and optioned to Mountain Province Mining, Inc. (now Mountain Province Diamonds Inc.) later the same year.

On staking, the AK Property covered about 520,000 ha, and included the AK and CJ claims. The CJ claims substantially lapsed in November 2001, and the remaining CJ claims lapsed on August 17, 2002, leaving only the AK claims as current.

Additional partners in the AK Property included Camphor Ventures Inc. (“Camphor Ventures”), and 444965 B.C. Ltd, a subsidiary company of Glenmore Highlands Inc. (“Glenmore Highlands”). At the time, Glenmore Highlands was a controlling shareholder of Mountain Province Mining Inc. as defined under the Securities Act of British Columbia. The Glenmore Highlands subsidiary amalgamated with MPV in 1997, and Camphor Venture’s interest in the AK Property was acquired by MPV during 2007.

In 1997, Monopros (now De Beers Canada) joint ventured the property.

## Mineral Tenure

The Gahcho Kué Project comprises four mining leases, 4199, 4341, 4200, and 4201, covering a total area of 10,353 hectares. The mining leases are 100% owned by De Beers Canada which holds them on behalf of the Gahcho Kué Joint Arrangement. The participating interest of each participant of the Gahcho Kué Joint Arrangement is governed by the 2009 Agreement, which supersedes the (2002) Agreement. The (2002) Agreement is registered against the mineral leases. The 2009 Agreement provides for De Beers Canada's participating interest to be 51% and MPV's interest (including Camphor's) to be 49% of the Gahcho Kué Project.

Annual lease payments, payable to the Receiver General Canada (Northwest Territories, c/o Mining Recorders Office), comprise \$1.00 per acre for the duration of the 21-year lease period (note that fees are payable on acres, not hectares, in the Northwest Territories and Nunavut). Payments increase to \$2.00 per acre if a second 21-year term is granted after application to the Northwest Territories Mining Recorder for the extension. Payments for the leases for 2007 totalled \$10,353, and a similar amount is expected for each succeeding year. All mining leases were legally surveyed by licensed surveyors.

## Agreements

The Letter Agreement, dated March 6, 1997, was entered into between Monopros Ltd. (a wholly-owned Canadian subsidiary of De Beers Consolidated Mines and now known as De Beers Canada), MPV, and Camphor Ventures. The parties amended the Monopros Ltd. Joint Venture Agreement in 2000, as a result of agreements reached at a meeting on March 8, 2000.

The Gahcho Kué Joint Venture Agreement became effective on January 1, 2002, was signed October 24, 2002. The 2002 Agreement provided that De Beers Canada could earn up to a 55% interest in the Gahcho Kué Project by funding and completing a positive definitive feasibility study. The 2002 Agreement also provided that De Beers Canada could earn up to a 60% interest in the Gahcho Kué Project by funding development and construction of a commercial-scale mine.

MPV acquired Camphor Ventures' interest in the joint venture in 2007.

An updated and amended joint Arrangement agreement between De Beers Canada and MPV was executed effective July 3, 2009. The 2009 Agreement superseded the previous joint venture agreements. The 2009 Agreement maintains the Gahcho Kué Project ownership at 51% De Beers Canada and 49% MPV. Each party is responsible for funding

their respective share of the Gahcho Kué Project development costs from January 1, 2009 onward, and each party shall receive a proportional share of the diamond production.

The 2009 Agreement also sets forth the amount of “allowable” expenses of exploration work between March 8, 2000 and December 31, 2008 previously funded by De Beers Canada, and sets forth a repayment schedule by MPV to De Beers Canada for their 49% share of the allowable expenses. The repayment schedule is triggered by milestone events with the final payment plus accrued interest required to be made 18 months after the start of commercial production.

## Permits

### *Exploration Programs*

Exploration programs to date were conducted under the permits obtained from the appropriate authority, including:

- Indian and Northern Affairs Canada – Class A Land Use Permit
- Indian and Northern Affairs Canada – Type B Water Licence
- Workers' Compensation Board (WCB), Mine Health and Safety – Drilling Authorization
- Indian and Northern Affairs Canada – Quarry Permit
- Indian and Northern Affairs Canada – Registration of Fuel Storage Tanks
- Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre – Archaeology.

### *Development*

The Gahcho Kué Project is being permitted under the Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act. A list of the permits that may be required for Gahcho Kué Project development is presented in the 2010 Technical Report and the 2013 Technical Report.

On July 22, 2013 Mountain Province and De Beers Canada announced that the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board (MVEIRB) completed the Gahcho Kué Environmental Impact Assessment and recommended approval of the proposed Gahcho Kué diamond mine subject to measures and follow-up programs.

On December 2, 2013 Mountain Province and De Beers Canada announced that Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board approved a pioneer Land Use Permit for the Gahcho Kué diamond mine. The pioneer Land Use Permit allows land-based site works to commence in preparation for deliveries planned for the 2014 winter road season. Major permits required for the completion of construction and operation of the Gahcho Kué mine include a Class A Land Use Permit and Class A Water Licence, which are expected to be issued during the course of 2014.

### Previous Work

There is no recorded exploration prior to 1992 for diamonds, base, or precious metals in the area covered by the Gahcho Kué Project. Exploration conducted on behalf of MPV by Canamera Geological Ltd. during 1995 resulted in the discovery of the 5034 kimberlite.

De Beers Canada became the operator of the property via a joint-venture agreement in 1997. Additional kimberlites, including Tesla, Hearne, and Tuzo were discovered the same year. Tesla, Tuzo, Hearne and 5034 form the main Gahcho Kué kimberlite cluster.

In July 2012, Mountain Province completed a plan of arrangement whereby the Kennady North project, bounding the Gahcho Kué Project to the north and east, and containing the Kelvin and Faraday kimberlites, was transferred in full to the newly-created Kennady Diamonds Inc. There is no overlap between the Gahcho Kué Project and the Kennady Diamonds Project.



## Summary of Exploration and Development Work Undertaken

Exploration and development work undertaken during 1997–2008 included:

- sediment sampling, including glacial till, sediment and outcrop sampling
- geological mapping
- airborne electromagnetic and ground geophysical surveys
- core drilling, including large diameter core mini-bulk sampling
- reverse circulation drilling, including mini-bulk and bulk sampling programs utilizing reverse-flood air-lift assist large diameter drill rigs
- geotechnical, hydrogeology, and civil engineering drilling
- micro- and macro-diamond sample processing and analysis
- diamond valuation and diamond breakage analysis
- bulk density determinations
- ore dressing studies
- construction of geological and micro-diamond grade models and Mineral Resource block models
- construction of density, geotechnical, and volume models
- conceptual mine plans
- conceptual process plant design.

A first-time Mineral Resource estimate was completed in 2003 to support a conceptual desktop study of the potential of these pipes. The study included Inferred Mineral Resources, considered too speculative geologically to have economic considerations applied to them.

From 2003 to 2008, a number of additional desktop studies were completed that considered aspects of conceptual mining studies. These comprised conceptual mining and processing considerations, evaluation of different potential input factors and assumptions.

None of the above desktop studies completed provided for a sufficiently economic robust project.

Between August 2009 and December 2010, JDS was engaged to provide a feasibility study that outlined a sufficiently robust mine development plan. On October 15, 2010, JDS delivered the definitive Feasibility Study report to the Gahcho Kué Joint Arrangement of which a detailed summary is provided in the December 1, 2010 Technical Report. The 2010 Technical Report outlined a plan that exceeded the minimum hurdle rate required by the 2009 Agreement to proceed with mine development.

Additional work completed since 2010 includes:

- Airborne gravity survey over the entire project area completed in October 2011, comprising 1198 line-kilometers;  
· Drilling and sampling of the deeper portions of Tuzo.

This work provided the basis for the updated mineral resource estimate for the deep portion of the Tuzo kimberlite.

## Geology

*This excerpt from the 2010 Technical Report was taken from the 2009 Technical Report. JDS reviewed the 2009 Technical Report and believes the information contained in this section to be accurate.*

The Gahcho Kué kimberlite cluster occurs in the southeast Slave Craton.

Several kimberlite bodies were discovered and delineated by drilling. The 5034, Hearne North, Hearne South, and Tuzo pipes have the most attractive grades and tonnages delineated to date. Of the larger kimberlites on the property, the 5034 kimberlite is interpreted as forming an irregular hypabyssal root zone, Hearne and Tesla as transitional diatreme to root zones and Tuzo as the deeper part of a diatreme zone (Tesla is not included in the Gahcho Kué Mineral Resource because of its small size (0.4 ha) and relatively low-grade).

The 5034, Hearne, and Tuzo kimberlites have contrasting pipe shapes. The West Lobe, Centre Lobe, and eastern portion of the North-East Lobe of the 5034 kimberlite sub-crop below lake-bottom sediments; the northern portion of the 5034 North-East Lobe (referred to as the North Lobe) is a blind lobe overlain by approximately 80 m of in-situ country rock. The 5034 pipe is dominantly infilled with hypabyssal kimberlite (“HK”). Hearne South is a roughly circular pipe and smaller than Hearne North, which is a narrow elongated pipe. Hearne South is infilled predominantly with tuffisitic kimberlite breccia (“TK”); Hearne North is infilled with approximately equal amounts of HK and TK. Tuzo is characterized by smooth, steep-sided pipe walls and is predominantly infilled with TK with HK at depth.

In most cases, the top of the kimberlites occur between 380 and 390 masl. Except for the 5034 North Lobe, which intrudes 70 to 80 m below a peninsula, the kimberlites subcrop at the bottom of Kennady Lake, covered by 10 to 15 m of water and between 5 to 15 m of glacial lake sediments. The kimberlites are surrounded laterally by granite and granite-gneiss country rock.

In the 2009 Technical Report, AMEC Americas Limited determined that the geological understanding of the deposit setting, lithologies, and kimberlite type distributions was adequate to support Mineral Resource estimation. Understanding of diamond distributions within each kimberlite type, as well as the style of mineralization were sufficient to support Mineral Resource estimation.

*The following paragraph is not an excerpt from the 2010 Technical Report.*

The 2013 Technical Report provided a more detailed analysis of the geological and geotechnical characteristics of the Tuzo kimberlite, including 3D modelling. A Mineral Resource estimate for the upper portion of the Tuzo kimberlite extending to a depth of 354 mbs was undertaken by De Beers Canada in 2009, subsequently incorporated into the 2010 Technical Report. Following completion of the Tuzo Deep drilling and sampling program in 2012, De Beers Canada undertook a Mineral Resource estimate for the section of the Tuzo kimberlite extending between 354 and 564 mbs. A Mineral Resource statement, summarizing the new and updated estimates for Tuzo Deep (300 to 564 mbs) was provided in a letter from De Beers Canada Inc. to Mountain Province on April 4, 2013. The purpose of the 2013 Technical Report was to verify and document this Mineral Resource estimation.

### Drilling and Sampling

Drilling completed to date on and surrounding the Gahcho Kué kimberlite cluster totals 510 drill holes (100,618 meters). An additional 50 drill holes were completed on exploration targets located away from the Gahcho Kué cluster. Core holes included PQ (85.0 mm), HQ (63.5 mm) and NQ (47.6 mm) core sizes, and 76 mm tricone drilling for overburden. RC drill diameters included 140 mm, 149 mm, 324 mm, 334 mm and 610 mm sizes.

Exploration drilling programs were performed during 1995-2003 around the Gahcho Kué kimberlite cluster to test geophysical anomalies, discover kimberlites, define pipe boundaries and morphology, delineate internal geology and provide large diameter reverse circulation (“RC”) drill (“LDD”) mini-bulk samples for value and grade evaluation purposes.

Drilling between 2004 and 2008 comprised LDD and large diameter core (“LDC”) mini-bulk sample, programs, core drilling to provide information to support advanced evaluation geology, Mineral Resource estimation and ore dressing studies, civil engineering, geotechnical, hydrological, and geothermal core drilling programs. These drill programs also provided core that was used to inform and support environmental baseline studies.

*The following paragraph is not an excerpt from the 2010 Technical Report.*

An additional 6 HQ diameter core drill holes (4,126.62 m) were drilled in 2011/2012 with the purpose of further delineating the deep (354 – 564 mbs) portion of the Tuzo kimberlite and obtaining material for microdiamond sampling.

5034

Canamera Geological Ltd. (“Canamera”) conducted the earliest drilling that resulted in the discovery of the 5034 kimberlite. Drilling in 1995 included 39 delineation NQ core holes (6,522 m). Since then, small-diameter NQ core drilling was used extensively to test kimberlite indicator mineral trains and geophysical anomalies in addition to delineation of the 5034 kimberlite.

Large diameter core drilling was used to collect small mini-bulk samples from 5034. In 1996, Canamera obtained PQ-sized core samples (85 mm diameter), and in 2007, the Gahcho Kué Project obtained 149 mm diameter LDC samples. The LDC samples provide additional information (macro-diamonds) regarding the diamond content of the pipes.

Large diameter reverse circulation drilling was used to collect kimberlite mini-bulk samples. LDD programs have included smaller scale 140 mm (5.5-inch) diameter drillholes in 1998, 311 mm (12.25-inch) drill holes in 1999, to the largest employed, the 610 mm (24-inch) diameter drill holes in the 2001, 2002, and 2008 mini-bulk sampling programs. The LDD mini-bulk sample programs obtained macro-diamonds for grade and revenue estimation.

The 1998 and 1999 drilling focused on the 5034 West, Centre and East lobes; in 2001 the East Lobe and the west neck of the Centre Lobe were drilled; in 2002 work focused on the narrow corridor drilled previously in 1999 through the West and Centre lobes. There was one delineation NQ core hole drilled by Gahcho Kué Joint Venture at 5034 in 2003.

In 2004, 13 core holes drilled into the 5034 kimberlite as part of pit geotechnical, hydrogeology, and ore dressing studies (“ODS”). In 2005, a single core hole for hydrogeology studies drilled through the East Lobe of 5034, and two core holes were drilled at the North Lobe of 5034 to provide additional geological data. A substantial core program followed this in 2006 that comprised 13 HQ core holes for pit geotechnical, pipe volume delineation, and geological investigations. The last campaign of core drilling was conducted in 2007 with five HQ core holes being drilled to provide geological data from the 5034 East Lobe and 5 LDC holes (149 mm, 5.875-inch) drilled into the 5034 North Lobe to obtain a small parcel of macro-diamonds for comparative purposes.

*Hearne*

A total of 24 core holes were drilled in and around the Hearne kimberlite during 1997-2003 for delineation. In 1998, 19 LDD holes (140 mm diameter) were drilled into the Hearne kimberlite to test the diamond grade.

In 1999, 10 LDD (311 mm diameter) holes were drilled into Hearne to obtain macro-diamonds for initial revenue estimation. In 2001, 5 LDD (610 mm diameter) holes were drilled into Hearne North, and 6 more LDD (610 mm diameter) holes tested in 2002, to increase the parcel of macro-diamonds available for revenue estimation.

In 2004, 14 NQ core holes were drilled into the Hearne kimberlite as part of pit geotechnical and ODS programs. In 2005 a single core hole was drilled for hydrogeological studies, and in 2006 a single core hole was drilled to support pit geotechnical studies.

*Tuzo*

Between 1997 and 1999, 7 NQ and 3 NQ3 core holes were drilled into Tuzo. All of these were angle holes collared outside the kimberlite body and drilled into, and sometimes through, the kimberlite. In 2002, 7 vertical HQ core holes were drilled into the pipe. LDD mini-bulk sample drilling took place in 1998 and 1999. Drilling to a maximum depth of 166 m, 18 LDD holes (140 mm diameter) were completed in 1998, and an additional 11 LDD holes (311 mm diameter) were completed in 1999 to a maximum depth of 300 m.

In 2004, 2 HQ core holes were drilled at Tuzo as part of a pit geotechnical study. This was followed by a 16-hole HQ core program in 2006 to provide pipe delineation and geological data and pilot holes. Two 610 mm holes were drilled in 2006 to provide samples. In 2007, a grid of 27 HQ core holes was completed to provide additional geological and pipe volume delineation data. The final resource drilling at Tuzo was an LDD mini-bulk sample program conducted in 2008 with 9 holes (610 mm) completed to provide additional macro-diamonds for diamond revenue estimation.

*The following paragraph is not an excerpt from the 2010 Technical Report.*

In 2011/2012 an additional 6 HQ diameter core drill holes (4,126.62 m) were drilled with the purpose of further delineating the deep (354 – 564 mbs) portion of the Tuzo kimberlite and obtaining material for microdiamond sampling. Previous evaluation work had not adequately represented this zone. Samples of approximately 8 kg each

were collected for microdiamonds at 12 m spacing down hole throughout the entire length of the kimberlite intersection in each drill hole.

*AMEC's Assessment*

*This excerpt from the 2010 Technical Report was taken from the 2009 Technical Report. JDS reviewed the 2009 Technical Report and believes the information contained in this section to be accurate.*

AMEC assessed the exploration results to be appropriate to the style of mineralization and adequate to support Mineral Resource estimation. Drill hole types and orientations were appropriate for the type of mineralization. Small-diameter core holes defined the limits of the kimberlite bodies. Large-diameter core and reverse circulation drilling provided mini-bulk samples of kimberlite material for macro-diamond extraction. Micro-diamonds were extracted from the small-diameter cores drilled to define the limits of the deposit. Three diamond breakage studies indicated that breakage was about 10–15% that is typical for this type of drilling program. The diamond parcels obtained in 2007–2008 were not evaluated for diamond breakage.



AMEC also assessed that the sampling and sample lengths were appropriate for the type of mineralization. Core sample lengths were somewhat variable during the early years of the Gahcho Kué Project. Later in the Gahcho Kué Project, core sample lengths were standardized at 12 m. These standardized samples provided most of the data used for the Mineral Resource estimates reported in the 2009 Technical Report.

Core and cuttings logging met and typically significantly exceeded industry practices. Core was quick-logged on site, and the kimberlite intersections were transported to De Beers' core logging facility in Sudbury, Ontario where experienced geologists log kimberlite type, mineral and inclusion types and concentrations, and structures. AMEC assessed that geotechnical work to date was appropriate for the stage of the Gahcho Kué Project and type of mining planned. Geotechnical logging of exploration core is a routine procedure performed by geologists trained in the logging methods required. A number of core holes were drilled specifically to obtain geotechnical data. Collar and downhole surveys were performed using industry-standard methods and instruments.

AMEC determined that the analytical and diamond recovery procedures were adequate to support Mineral Resource estimation. Macro-diamond and micro-diamond extractions were performed using procedures standard to the industry. Micro-diamonds were recovered from core using either caustic fusion or acid dissolution procedures. Both are standard to the industry, although caustic fusion is the most common procedure. Macro-diamonds are extracted using small-scale diamond recovery plants. Geochemical samples were analyzed using standard procedures and instrumentation. Density determinations were performed using standard procedures, and the number of density data is adequate to support Mineral Resource estimation. Most of the density data were obtained using a water immersion procedure standard to the industry. Some of the data were obtained using geophysical methods, and some were obtained by water displacement methods. Quality control during drilling, sampling, and sample analysis is adequate and reflects industry best practices. Quality control of diamond extractions consists of spikes using marked diamonds and tailings audits of a portion of the samples.

Sample and diamond security throughout the exploration process was determined by AMEC to be excellent and consisted of rigorous chain-of-custody procedures, multiple locks requiring at least two persons to open critical areas or containers, cameras in all plants and processing areas, and dedicated security personnel at all plants and processing areas. Shipping of diamonds and diamond concentrates conforms to requirements of Kimberley Process chain-of-custody procedures.

## **Geological Setting**

*This excerpt from the 2010 Technical Report was taken from the 2009 Technical Report. JDS reviewed the 2009 Technical Report and believes the information contained in this section to be accurate.*

*Gahcho Kué Kimberlites*

The main Gahcho Kué kimberlite cluster comprises four pipes; the Hearne, 5034, Tuzo, and Tesla bodies. The Hearne Pipe, most of the 5034 Pipe, and the Tuzo and Tesla pipes occur under Kennady Lake, which has an average depth of 8 m.

Gahcho Kué kimberlites are overlain by varying thickness of glacial boulder outwash and lake sediments (averaging 10 m thick), and have a combined water and sediment cover as much as 25 m thick.

### *Hearne Kimberlite*

Two bodies comprise the Hearne kimberlite, Hearne South and Hearne North. The bodies have smooth, steep-sided walls, and cover an area of about 1.5 ha. Hearne South is a roughly circular pipe, whereas Hearne North is a narrow, elongate pipe trending north–south. The pipes may join at depth. The width of country rock between the two bodies varies from a minimum of approximately 20 m at the sub-crop to approximately 70 m at depth. Hearne North measures a maximum of 250 m x 50 m north–south. Hearne South has a dimension of about 80 m x 90 m at surface.

The present pipe geological model for Hearne South extends to 225 masl; there is no drill information below this level. At Hearne North, the pipe narrows to less than 10 m wide in the centre of the body at approximately 130 m below lake-surface. There is also evidence at the north and south ends of the body that the pipe extends below 115 masl.

The distance from the south end of Hearne to Tuzo is about 2 km.

### *5034 Kimberlite*

The 5034 kimberlite is a highly irregularly-shaped pipe and dyke complex, which is comparable to kimberlite root zones elsewhere and has a surface area of approximately 2.1 ha (West, Centre and East Lobe).

The 5034 kimberlite is modelled as a semi-continuous occurrence composed of five discrete kimberlite bodies, three of which are modelled as joined at the subcrop to form one main continuous body, with two small outlying satellite pipes.

The five modelled kimberlite bodies are referred to as follows:

5034 South Pipe (that occurs along an interpreted dyke, the “Southwest Corridor”, that is also modelled incorporating the Wallace and Tuffisitic Kimberlite BBB drill core intersections)

5034 “Main” West Lobe

5034 "Main" Centre Lobe  
5034 "Main" North-East Lobe (i.e., East Lobe and North Lobe)  
5034 North Pipe.

The main part of the 5034 occurrence that reaches the surface occurs under Kennady Lake and can be divided into three lobes: West, Centre, and East. These three lobes are joined at the surface, but separate at depth. The Centre and East lobes are modelled separately at shallow depth, but rejoin at greater depth producing what appears to be a window of granite within the kimberlite. The East and North lobes are joined at depth, geologically continuous, and are collectively referred to as the North-East Lobe. The surface measurements of the three lobes of the 5034 Main Pipe are approximately as follows:

West Lobe – 125 m x 45 m  
Centre Lobe – 125 m x 80 m  
East Lobe – 85 m x 65 m.

The northern portion of the 5034 North-East lobe, the North Lobe, is blind, and occurs under 60 m to 90 m of country rock cap. Approximately half of this northern lobe lies below the lake bed and half beneath the main peninsula. The blind northern portion of the 5034 North-East Lobe measures 240 m long and varies from approximately 20 to 50 m wide, averaging 30 m wide. A combined internal geology model is developed for the 5034 North-East Lobes. There are four major kimberlite types, three of which occur across both lobes.

*The following excerpt about the Tuzo kimberlite is from the 2013 Technical Report.*

#### *Tuzo Kimberlite*

The Tuzo kimberlite pipe has a circular outline in plan view, with steep-sided walls in the south and rounding towards the North, East and West. The surface dimensions are ~108 m by 88 m, and the overall surface area of the pipe is ~0.76 hectares. The top of the pipe is covered by variable thicknesses of water (average of ~8.4 m for drill cores collared on lake ice), and overburden (e.g. lake-bottom sediment and glacial till; average of ~8 m). The pipe shape bulges with depth towards the North and West into an ellipsoidal outline oriented northeast to southwest, reaching a maximum surface area at a depth of ~330 mbs that is approximately four times that at surface (~233 m by 165 m; ~3 ha).

Information obtained from the 2011/2012 Tuzo Deep program enabled extension of the Tuzo pipe model from 354 mbs to 564 mbs, establishing that below 330 mbs, the pipe maintains an ellipsoidal outline oriented northeast to southwest, but that the pipe dimensions gradually narrow with depth. The surface area of the pipe at the base of the model is approximately 1.3 ha.

All bodies remain open at depth.

#### Data Verification

Independent data verifications were undertaken on a number of occasions between 1999 and 2008:

- 1999, 2004, 2007 – independent consultants made site visits to review quality assurance/quality control (“QA/QC”)
- 1999 – external consultant audit of the 1999 evaluation program
- 2000 – geology (petrological) peer review
- 2004 – geotechnical and hydrogeology consultants QA/QC site visit, internal and external Mineral Resource evaluation data base audits, geology (petrological) peer review, Gemcom® three-dimensional (“3D”) model peer review

2007 – internal and external petrological peer reviews; external verification of macro-diamond resource evaluation data set

- 2008 – external review of 2003 Technical Report resource estimation and density (rock density) models.

Resource evaluation data base verification included:

- audits of drill collar locations and lengths
- down-hole survey data
- geological logs
- bulk density data
- macro-diamond data.

*The following paragraph is not an excerpt from the 2010 Technical Report.*

The Mineral Resource estimate and classification for Tuzo Deep (300 to 564 metres below surface) has been subject to an extensive internal peer-review process within the De Beers Group. All geological work is reviewed internally by senior DeBeers Canada KPU staff, and geological models and Mineral Resource estimates were reviewed by senior De Beers MRM Group resource specialists in Johannesburg.

Independent reviews of critical aspects of the estimate have been undertaken as follows:

- Review of geological solids models undertaken by D. Farrow of GeoStrat Consulting Inc.; and
- External review of the zonal estimate for Tuzo Deep Lower by D. Bush of ZStar Mineral Resource Consultants.

#### Diamond Valuations

The Qualified Persons are not able to apply quality control measures to the valuation process performed by either De Beers or WWW.

The reason for this is that diamond valuation is, at best, only partially analytical (in the way that a gold assay process can be termed analytical), as the diamonds are sieved and subjectively classified by colour, clarity, and other factors. The dollar per carat determinations for various stones, however, is ultimately governed by the valuator's price-book. This part of the process is proprietary, governed by a given valuator's view of the marketplace and can vary from valuator to valuator, particularly for larger stones. Even in larger parcels, valuers must then 'model' or extrapolate values in the larger stone size classes where there may be few representatives. The methodology for modelling is also proprietary.

These diamond valuation procedures do not lend themselves to quality control measures that a qualified person could apply as with a commercial assay laboratory. At every step, the QPs are relying on the valuator's opinions of the diamond market and their subjective view of diamond values.

The Qualified Persons also rely on the valuers models which are heavily dependent on their view of the diamond market, their proprietary estimates of the likelihood of finding larger stones in the deposit because of sample-size support, and the perceived value of those larger stones.

The culmination of the process is the average prices for given zones, lobes or pipes. The heavy dependence of the process on economic market assessments, and the proprietary nature of the valuator's assumptions and methods, materially affects the quality of, and confidence in, the Mineral Resource estimate. In this way, the valuations used in the Mineral Resource assessments are markedly different than the concept of analytical mineral assays in, for instance, a precious metal project. The proprietary nature of the processes employed for valuations limit any quantitative assessment of the added risk to the Gahcho Kué Project. Other than reviewing the De Beers Canada data and the WWW report for transcription errors in the transfer of the valuation figures into the database, no other data verification procedures can be applied.



Diamond valuers are experts, but not Qualified Persons, and the Qualified Persons preparing the Mineral Resource estimates and assessing the reasonable prospects for economic extraction have had to completely rely on the De Beers Canada and WWW diamond values provided.

### **Mineral Resource and Mineral Reserve Estimates**

*Mineral Resource Summary (not including Tuzo Deep (300 to 564 metres below surface))*

*This Mineral Resource Summary excerpt and summary from the 2010 Technical Report was taken from the 2009 Technical Report. JDS reviewed the 2009 Technical Report and believes the information contained in this section to be accurate.*

**Cautionary Note to U.S. Investors concerning estimates of Indicated and Inferred Resources.** This section uses the terms "indicated" and "inferred resources." We advise U.S. investors that while those terms are recognized and required by Canadian regulations, the SEC does not recognize them. "Inferred resources" have a great amount of uncertainty as to their existence, and great uncertainty as to their economic and legal feasibility. It cannot be assumed that all or any part of an Inferred Mineral Resource will ever be upgraded to a higher category. Under Canadian rules, estimates of Inferred Mineral Resources may not form the basis of feasibility or pre-feasibility studies, except in rare cases.

**U.S. investors are cautioned not to assume that any part or all of mineral deposits in these categories will ever be converted into reserves.**

**U.S. investors are cautioned not to assume that part or all of an inferred resource exists, or is economically or legally minable.**

The estimation and classification of the mineral resources was completed by AMEC and are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1

Resource	Classification	Volume (Mm <sup>3</sup> )	Tonnes (Mt)	Carats (Mct)	Grade (cpht)
5034	Indicated	5.1	12.7	23.9	188
	Inferred	0.3	0.8	1.2	150
Hearne	Indicated	2.3	5.3	11.9	223
	Inferred	0.7	1.6	2.9	180
Tuzo	Indicated	5.1	12.2	14.8	121
	Inferred	1.5	3.5	6.2	175
Summary	Indicated	12.4	30.2	50.5	167
	Inferred	2.5	6.0	10.3	173

Notes:

- 1) Mineral Resources are reported at a bottom cut-off of 1.0 mm; cpht = carats per hundred tonnes.
- 2) Mineral Resources are not Mineral Reserves and do not have demonstrated economic viability
- 3) Volume, tonnes, and carats are rounded to the nearest 100,000
- 4) Tuzo volumes and tonnes exclude 0.6 Mt of a granite raft

5) Diamond price assumptions used to assess reasonable prospects of economic extraction reflect mid-2008 pricebooks with a 20% increase factor. The prices assumed, on a per pipe basis (in US\$), equate to \$113/ct for 5034, \$76/ct for Hearne and \$70/ct for Tuzo.

*Mineral Resource Summary - Tuzo Deep (300 to 564 metres below surface)*

*This Mineral Resource Summary was taken from the 2013 Technical Report.*

The estimation and classification of the mineral resources for Tuzo Deep was completed by Mineral Services Canada Inc. and are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

Resource	Classification	Volume (Mm <sup>3</sup> )	Tonnes (Mt)	Carats (Mct)	Grade (cpht)
TZDu (300 to 360 mbs)	Indicated	1.5	3.6	6.0	167
TDZI (360 to 564 mbs)	Inferred	3.7	8.9	14.4	161

Notes:

- 1) Mineral Resources are reported at a bottom cut-off of 1.0 mm; cpht = carats per hundred tonnes.
- 2) Mineral Resources are not Mineral Reserves and do not have demonstrated economic viability
- 3) Volume, tonnes, and carats are rounded to the nearest 100,000
- 4) Tuzo volumes and tonnes exclude 0.4 Mt of a granite raft and 0.3 Mt of highly diluted country-rock breccia in TZDu

*Mineral Reserves*

**Cautionary Note for U.S. Investors**

**The SEC Guidelines define the following with respect to mining operations:**

***Reserves.* That part of a mineral deposit which could be economically and legally extracted or produced at the time of reserve determination.**

***Proven (Measured) Reserves.* Reserves for which (a) quantity is computed from dimensions revealed in outcrops, trenches, workings or drill holes; grade and/or quality are computed from the results of detailed sampling and (b) the sites for inspection, sampling and measurement are spaced so closely and the geologic character is so well defined that size, shape, depth and mineral content of reserves is well-established.**

***Probable (Indicated) Reserves.* Reserves for which quantity and grade and/or quality are computed from information similar to that used for proved (measured) reserves, but the sites for inspection, sampling, and measurements are farther apart or are otherwise less adequately spaced. The degree of assurance, although lower than that for proven (measured) reserves, is high enough to assume continuity between points of observation.**

In Canada, a Mineral Reserve is the economically mineable part of a Measured or Indicated Mineral Resource demonstrated by at least a Preliminary Feasibility Study. This Feasibility Study includes adequate information on mining, processing, metallurgical, economic, and other relevant factors that demonstrate, at the time of reporting, that economic extraction is justified.

Mineral Reserves are those parts of Mineral Resources which, after the application of all mining factors, result in an estimated tonnage and grade which is the basis of an economically viable project. The project must take account of all relevant processing, metallurgical, economic, marketing, legal, environmental, socioeconomic and governmental factors. Mineral Reserves are inclusive of diluting material that will be mined in conjunction with the Mineral Reserves and delivered to the treatment plant or equivalent facility. The term 'Mineral Reserve' need not necessarily signify that extraction facilities are in place or operative or that all governmental approvals have been received. It does signify that there are reasonable expectations of such approvals.

Mineral Reserves are subdivided in order of increasing confidence into Probable Mineral Reserves and Proven Mineral Reserves. A Probable Mineral Reserve has a lower level of confidence than a Proven Mineral Reserve.

The reserve classifications used in this report conform to the CIM classification of NI 43-101 resource and reserve definitions and Companion Policy 43-101CP and are listed below.

A 'Proven Mineral Reserve' is the economically mineable part of a Measured Mineral Resource demonstrated by at least a Preliminary Feasibility Study. This Study must include adequate information on mining, processing, metallurgical, economic, and other relevant factors that demonstrate, at the time of reporting, that economic extraction is justified. Application of the Proven Mineral Reserve category implies that the Qualified Person has the highest degree of confidence in the estimate with the consequent expectation in the minds of the readers of the report. The term should be restricted to that part of the deposit where production planning is taking place and for which any variation in the estimate would not significantly affect potential economic viability.

A 'Probable Mineral Reserve' is the economically mineable part of an Indicated Mineral Resource, and in some circumstances a Measured Mineral Resource, demonstrated by at least a Preliminary Feasibility Study. The study must include adequate information on mining, processing, metallurgical, economic, and other relevant factors that demonstrate, at the time of reporting, that economic extraction can be justified.

*The information that follows is excerpted from the 2010 Technical Report as prepared by JDS.*

*Open Pit Mineral Reserves*

The detailed pit designs determined the mineral reserve estimate for each pipe as summarized in Table 2. A mining recovery of 100% was used in mine design and planning to determine the mineral reserve estimate. The full mining recovery reflects 1.5 m of waste dilution being added to the circumference of the kimberlite pipes. Therefore, mining ore recovery is 100% because the plan mines an additional 1.5 m of material past the ore contact around the pipe on every bench.

Table 2

Pipe	Classification	Tonnes (Mt)	Carats (Mct)	Grade (cpt)
5034	Probable	13.2	23.3	1.77
Hearne	Probable	5.4	11.5	2.10
Tuzo	Probable	12.6	14.2	1.13
Total	Probable	31.3	49.0	1.57

The Mineral reserves identified in Table 2 comply with CIM definitions and standards for an NI 43-101 Feasibility Study. Detailed information on mining, processing, metallurgical, and other relevant factors are contained in the followings sections of this report and demonstrate, at the time of this report, that economic extraction is justified.

The economic viability of the Gahcho Kué Project is presented in the economic analysis section of the full 2010 Technical Report, and confirms the probable reserve estimates meet and comply with CIM definitions and NI 43-101 standards. At the time of this report, and currently, the Gahcho Kué Project is economically viable using current diamond prices and, JDS believes, prevailing long-term price estimates.

The 2010 Technical Report did not identify any mining, metallurgical, infrastructure or other relevant factors that may materially affect the estimates of the mineral reserves or potential production.

#### Data Interpretation

The Qualified Persons, as authors of the 2010 Technical Report, have reviewed the data for the Gahcho Kué Project and are of the opinion that:

Mining tenure held by De Beers Canada on behalf of the Gahcho Kué Joint Arrangement is valid and sufficient to support Mineral Reserves and plans for mine development. The Gahcho Kué Joint Arrangement has taken appropriate steps to insure extension of the leases which will remain valid for several years. Surface rights have not, as yet, been acquired but this is not viewed by JDS as a significant obstacle to further development of the Gahcho Kué Project. Those rights can be obtained by application to the Crown and are part of the normal permitting processes.

At this time, all permits required for ongoing exploration are in force. Permits required for construction and operation were identified and the process for obtaining those permits defined.

The 2009 Technical Report which provided Mineral Resource estimations and resources models suitable for feasibility project work were completed to acceptable standards.

Metallurgical testwork is appropriate for the stage of the Gahcho Kué Project and is adequate to support Mineral Reserve estimation, Gahcho Kué Project feasibility, and economic analysis.

Estimates of Mineral Reserves conform to industry-standard practices. Mine plans, dilution and economic parameters applied to resource estimates have been prepared to industry standard practices.



Pit slope stability analysis work has been done to industry standards and conclusions are supported by practices at similar sized operations in the area.

- Mineral reserves support a 3M tonne per year operation with a mine life of 11 years.
- Mine plans use traditional open pit mining utilizing proven equipment.
- Process plant design has been adequately defined for cost estimating purposes.
- Mine infrastructure has been adequately designed and estimated in the feasibility study.
- Sound environmental management plans have been developed for the feasibility study.
- Progressive reclamation plans are included in the feasibility study.
- Mine closure plans have been developed.

The Gahcho Kué Project is sufficiently robust for proceeding into a staged development program commencing with environmental permitting and detail design phases as precursors for mine construction and operations.

### Feasibility Study Conclusions

*(All amounts, unless otherwise indicated, are in Canadian dollars.)*

The 2010 Technical Report represents an economically viable, technically credible and environmentally sound development plan for the Gahcho Kué Project. The Gahcho Kué Project is economically viable, generating \$4,143 million in realized value (“RV”) revenues over an 11-year mine life resulting in a 20.7% internal rate of return (“IRR”) (including agreed historic “sunk” costs) and a \$136 million net present value (“NPV”) at 15%. Excluding sunk costs, the Gahcho Kué Project yields a 33.9% IRR and a \$277 million NPV. Diamond values averaged US\$74.52 per carat over the life of the mine. Total life-of-mine capital costs are estimated at \$776.5 million consisting of \$141.5 million in sunk costs; \$549.5 million initial capital; \$49.4 million working capital; and \$36.1 million in sustaining and closure costs. Total life-of-mine pre-tax cash operating costs are estimated at \$1,522 million, which equates to \$48.68 per tonne processed or \$31.04 per carat recovered.

The Gahcho Kué Project is technically credible, utilizing designs and practices that are proven in the Canadian diamond industry. The Gahcho Kué Project design is based on open pit mining of the 5034, Hearne and Tuzo deposits in a sequential fashion. Mine plans call for the extraction of 234 metric tonnes (“Mt”) of waste and 31.3 Mt of ore over a 13-year period utilizing standard drill/blast - truck/shovel equipment and pit designs that are similar to other open pit diamond mines operating in the area. Ore will be fed to a 3.0 Mt per annum (“Mt/a”) processing plant with three stages of crushing, dense media separation and X-ray/grease belt diamond recovery circuits. Process plant designs and equipment selection are based on experience from other operations and utilize proven suppliers. Security designs are based on De Beers Canada’s standards and practices.

Supporting infrastructure includes a 14.1 megawatt packaged diesel power plant, 1,350 meter gravel airstrip, five-bay truckshop, emulsion plant, 40 million litres of fuel storage and a 432 bed accommodation/office complex. The primary facilities are interconnected by utilidor (enclosed corridors) providing interior access for personnel. These basic fit-for-purpose designs and plans are prepared by Feasibility Study project personnel that have designed, constructed and operated similar facilities at other diamond mines operating in the area. Likewise, the suppliers, contractors and service providers nominated in the Feasibility Study are providing similar services for other mines in the north. Cost

estimates are built up from first principles and are benchmarked against relevant operations. Appropriate contingencies have been applied. De Beers Canada operates the Snap Lake mine in the NWT and has provided estimates of general and administrative costs, payroll costs, licenses and fees. De Beers Canada has a trained workforce that can assist in the design, commissioning, training and operation of the Gahcho Kué mine.

The Gahcho Kué Project is environmentally sound, utilizing simple and proven management plans. Water management plans are adaptations of plans used successfully at other diamond mines. At Gahcho Kué, all potentially contaminated water is kept within a controlled management basin formed by natural drainage patterns. Excess storage capacity allowances provide for operational flexibility and contingencies. Normal mine operations incorporate a program of progressive reclamation that minimizes costs and allows time monitoring of performance. The mined out 5034 and Hearne pits are used for waste storage during the later years of the mine life providing ample time for the completion of reclamation of waste storage areas used in the earlier years. A viable plan for fish habitat compensation has been developed and provides for no-net-loss of habitat. New lake areas for fish habitat replacement are created at the beginning of operations providing ample time to monitor and measure effectiveness during the mine operation period.

The Gahcho Kué Project provides socioeconomic benefits. The mine will create close to 1,000 jobs during the two-year construction phase and some 400 permanent jobs during the 11-year operational phase. Additional employment will be created by service providers to operations. Territorial and Federal taxes and royalties are estimated to be close to \$800 million. In addition, property and payroll taxes will add significant tax revenues to the local municipality. Impact benefit agreements are planned for the First Nation groups in the area.

Risks for the Gahcho Kué Project are identified and considered reasonable. The greatest economic risk/opportunity is related to diamond values. Over the past several years, rough diamond demand/prices/sales have experienced unprecedented volatility as a result of the world economic crisis. Currently demand is strong, and the Gahcho Kué Joint Arrangement partners forecast a 1% real growth in diamond prices over the life of the Gahcho Kué Project.

The Gahcho Kué Project also faces environmental and regulatory risks, as the Gahcho Kué Project must proceed through the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board environmental screening process. There are risks that the permitting process might take longer than the scheduled 24 to 27 months, causing delays in construction start-up, and/or the regulatory authorities might require significant modifications to be made to the plans, which will affect designs and costs. In this event, a decision might even be taken to not proceed with the Gahcho Kué Project.

#### Economic Analysis - Summary

The financial evaluation of the Gahcho Kué Project has been undertaken on an after-tax, unleveraged, real rate of return to the Gahcho Kué Joint Arrangement partners as a whole. The analyses assumed that three kimberlite ore bodies will be developed, with production on the first pipe (5034) starting in January 2015. Only probable reserves (derived from indicated resources) were used in the 2010 Technical Report. Production for the base case ceases part way through the 11<sup>th</sup> year of production. All production, costs, and revenues are based on calendar fiscal years.

The Gahcho Kué Project is economically viable and the projected returns surpass the hurdle rates established by the 2009 Agreement. The Gahcho Kué Project provides a real rate of return to the partners of 20.7% and a real net present value at 15% of \$135.9 million in calendar 2010 Canadian dollars. After excluding sunk costs incurred to September 30, 2010, the Gahcho Kué Project provides a real rate of return of 33.9% and a real NPV of \$277.4 million at a discount rate of 15%. The Gahcho Kué Project is most sensitive to changes in diamond prices, with real dollar returns decreasing the IRR by 3.4% for a 10% reduction in prices and increasing the IRR by 3.0% for a 10% increase in prices. The Gahcho Kué Project shows a lesser sensitivity to capital with returns changing by 1.3% for a 10% change in either direction for capital. The sensitivity to operating cost is about 1.2% in the IRR rate for a 10% in operating costs.

Table 3 provides a summary of selected financial model inputs and the corresponding results. All costs are quoted in July 2010 Canadian dollars unless otherwise indicated.

Table 3

Description	3.0 Mt/a Case
Material Processed – Annual million tonnes (Mt)	3.0
Material Processed – Life-of-mine million tonnes (Mt)	31.3
Sunk Costs Exploration and Development pre-July 2009 (\$millions)	120.0
Sunk Costs Feasibility Study and Permitting– 2009-2010 (\$millions)	21.5
Initial Gahcho Kué Project Capital – 2011 to 2014 (\$millions)	549.5
Working Capital (4 months of operating costs) (\$millions)	49.4
Sustaining Capital including Mine Closure (\$millions)	36.1
Operating Costs – Average over life-of-mine (\$/tonne processed)	48.68
Real Diamond Price Escalation – 2010 forward (%/annum) [amount over U.S. Consumer Price Index]	1.00
Projected Mine Life (years)	11.0
Processing Diamond Cut-off Size (millimeter)	1.0
Inflation used for Escalation/De-escalation – (%/annum)	1.80
Total Carats Recovered (millions)	49.0
Diamond Price (RV life-of-mine Escalated, U.S.\$/carat)	102.48
Diamond Price (RV life-of-mine Un-Escalated, U.S.\$/carat)	74.52
Gahcho Kué Project IRR – Including sunk costs (%)	20.7
NPV @ 5% – Including sunk costs (\$millions)	650.5
Gahcho Kué Joint Venture Required IRR Hurdle Rate (%)	15.0
Gahcho Kué Project IRR – Sunk costs not included (%)	33.9
NPV @ 5% – Sunk costs not included (\$millions)	792.0

The Gahcho Kué Project is a joint venture. All of the numbers presented in this table are based upon 100% ownership and do not include any management fees or financing costs that are payable between the joint venture partners. Furthermore, the Gahcho Kué Project is evaluated on a 100% equity basis only, and excludes any financial leveraging effects, as well as any interest expense items that could impact taxable income and/or provide interest deduction tax shields.

One primary case has been considered, with variations from this base case model assessed as sensitivities. The base case uses an open pit mining operation with a processing throughput of 3.0 Mt/annum using probable reserves and is based on a nominal +1.00 mm carat cut-off size for the processing plant. The variations of the base case are as follows:

- project delay of one year due to permitting with the same throughput of 3.0 Mt/annum for base case

· sensitivity analyses on diamond prices, capital costs, and operating costs.

The financial analysis is based on mineral reserves, with the objective of demonstrating economic viability; therefore, the analysis is classified as a “feasibility study” under NI 43-101. The feasibility study is a precursor to formal permit applications, definitive engineering design, formal commitment to construct, and includes mineral resources that are sufficiently defined geologically to have economic considerations applied to them that would enable them to be categorized as mineral reserves.

**GAHCHO KUÉ PROJECT LOCATION MAP (2007)**

42

**Gahcho Kué Leases (2011)**

43



**GAHCHO KUE MAP – LOCATION OF PIPES (2007)**

44

## Information Prepared by the Company

The following information is prepared by the Company. The Company has issued press releases commenting upon recent results and activities for the Gahcho Kué Project. Such disclosure has been reviewed by Carl G. Verley, P.Geo., or Daniel D. Johnson from JDS (for disclosure relating to the Definitive Feasibility Study), who serve as the Qualified Persons in relation to such disclosures.

### *2010 Independent Diamond Valuation*

On August 4, 2010, the Company announced the results of an updated independent diamond valuation of the diamonds recovered from the Gahcho Kué Project during the exploration phase. The valuation was conducted by WWW International Diamond Consultants Ltd. (“WWW”) and took place at the London offices of the Diamond Trading Company in early April 2010. All diamond values presented below are based on the WWW Price Book as at April 13, 2010.

The independent diamond valuation resulted in substantially the same actual price of the Gahcho Kué diamonds to US\$134 per carat compared to the 2008 independent diamond valuation done by WWW International Diamond Consultants Ltd. for the Company.

Table 6 below reflects the actual price per carat for the parcel of 8,243.56 carats of diamonds recovered from the Gahcho Kué Project.

**Table 6**

Actual Price US\$/carat				
Pipe	Zone	Total	\$/Carat	Total Dollars
5034	Centre Lobe	633.80	80.23	\$ 50,852
	West Lobe	1,119.40	79.63	89,134
	North/East Lobe Lobe	1,264.21	178.59	225,770
5034 Total		3,017.41	121.22	365,757
Hearne		2,906.45	60.44	175,654
Tuzo		2,319.70	243.03	563,750
Total		8,243.56	134.06	\$ 1,105,161

Table 7 below presents models of the average price per carat (US\$/carat) for each kimberlite lithology. The modeled price per carat is determined using statistical methods to estimate the average value of diamonds that will be recovered from potential future production from Gahcho Kué.

**Table 7**

## Modeled Average Price US\$/carat

Pipe	+ 1.00mm			+1.50mm		
	High	Base	Low	High	Basestr	Low
5034 NE Lobe	131	107	96	143	116	104
5034 Centre	122	100	91	137	113	102
5034 West	141	114	103	157	127	114
Tuzo	81	67	61	93	77	70
Hearne	82	68	62	93	78	71

*Note: 1.50mm prices provided for reference purposes only.*

In their report to Mountain Province, WWW stated: "The Tuzo sample and the 5034 East sample both contained one high value large stone. For Tuzo there was a 25.13 carat stone valued at \$17,000 per carat and 5034 East had a 9.90 carat stone valued at \$15,000 per carat. It is encouraging that such high value stones were recovered in samples of this size. If they are found in the same frequency throughout the resource then the modelled APs [Average Prices] will certainly be towards the 'high' values."

### *2011 Independent Diamond Valuation*

On May 5, 2011, the Company announced the results of an updated independent valuation of the diamonds recovered from the Gahcho Kué Project. The valuation was conducted by WWW International Diamond Consultants Ltd. and took place at the London offices of the Diamond Trading Company in early April, 2011. All diamond values presented below are based on the WWW Price Book as at April 11, 2011.

Importantly, for the first time, the Gahcho Kué diamonds were grouped into larger parcels, each parcel representing diamonds from the Hearne, Tuzo and the separate lobes of the 5034 kimberlite. In the opinion of WWW, grouping of the diamonds into larger parcels increased the accuracy of the diamond valuation.

The Company commented that the results of the independent diamond valuation reflect the strong performance of rough diamond prices since the previous valuation conducted on April 2010. Further, it noted that based on the analysis of leading diamond producers and analysts, the global diamond industry will experience peak diamond supply during 2011, with burgeoning demand – particularly from the robust Chinese and Indian markets – outstripping mine supply. There is a strong probability that rough diamond prices will continue to experience strong double digit increases as production from aging mines decrease and new mine supply falls short of growing demand.

Table 8 below reflects the actual price per carat for the parcel of 8,317.29 carats of diamonds recovered from the Gahcho Kué Project.

**Table 8**

Actual Price US\$/carat				
Pipe	Zone	Total Carats	\$/Carat	Total Dollars
5034	Centre/East Lobe	1,957.54	210	411,683
	West Lobe	1,132.14	108	122,676
Hearne		2,905.76	93	269,689

Edgar Filing: Mountain Province Diamonds Inc. - Form 20-F

Tuzo	2,321.85	315	730,975
Total	8,317.29	\$ 185	\$ 1,535,024

*Note: Total Dollars are the result of rounding.*

In their report to Mountain Province, WWW stated: "The most valuable stone is in the Tuzo sample. This 25.13 carat stone is the largest stone in all of the bulk samples. The stone is an octahedron of H/I colour which WWW valued at \$20,000 per carat giving a total value of \$502,600". WWW added: "The stone with the highest value per carat sample is a 9.90 carat stone in the 5034 C/E sample. This is a makeable stone of high colour (D/E) which WWW valued at \$24,000 per carat giving a total value of \$237,600".

Table 9 below presents models of the average price per carat (US\$/carat) for each kimberlite. The modeled price per carat is determined using statistical methods to estimate the average value of diamonds that will be recovered from potential future production from Gahcho Kué.

**Table 9**

Pipe	High Model	Base Model	Low Model
5034 Centre	\$ 169	\$ 134	\$ 116
5034 West	172	133	120
5034 North/East	196	144	123
Hearne	139	110	100
Tuzo	136	103	97
Average	\$ 161	\$ 122	\$ 109

*Note: 1 mm nominal square mesh*

*Diamond values are in US Dollars*

For mine feasibility studies, WWW recommends using the base case models for defining the resources and reserves. The “high” and “low” models are included for sensitivity analysis.

The WWW averaged modeled price per carat for the Gahcho Kué kimberlites is \$122, which represents a 41 percent increase over the WWW 2010 average price. The WWW models use size distribution models (carats per size class) developed by De Beers.

#### *2012 Updated Independent Valuation*

In March 2012, Mountain Province retained WWW International Diamond Consultants Ltd. (“WWW”) to provide an updated valuation of the diamonds recovered from the Gahcho Kué Project. The valuation took place at the London offices of the Diamond Trading Company. All diamond values presented below are based on the WWW Price Book as at March 7, 2012.

Table 10 below reflects the actual price per carat for the parcel of 8,317.29 carats of diamonds recovered from the Gahcho Kué Project.

**Table 10**

Actual Price US\$/carat				
Pipe	Zone	Total Carats	\$/Carat	Total Dollars
5034	Centre/East Lobe	1,957.54	211	413,885
	West Lobe	1,132.14	109	123,216
Hearne		2,905.76	96	277,652
Tuzo		2,321.85	316	734,111
Total		8,317.29	\$ 186	\$ 1,548,864

*Note: Total Dollars are the result of rounding.*

Besides the high-value 25.13 and 9.9 carat diamonds referred to above, several other large high-value diamonds of gem quality have been recovered from Gahcho Kué, including 7.0 carat, 6.6 carat and 5.9 carat diamonds from the 5034 kimberlite and 8.7 carat, 6.4 carat and 4.9 carat diamonds from the Hearne kimberlite. The presence of coarser diamonds is an important driver of overall diamond value at Gahcho Kué.

The results of the 2012 independent diamond valuation indicated that there was almost no change (+0.9%) from the previous valuation conducted in April 2011.

Table 11 below presents models of the March 2012 average price per carat (US\$/carat) for each kimberlite. The modeled price per carat is determined using statistical methods to estimate the average value of diamonds that will be recovered from potential future production from Gahcho Kué.

**Table 11**

Pipe	High Model	Base Model	Low Model
5034 Centre	167	134	117
5034 West	169	131	118
5034 North/East	195	145	124
Hearne	138	109	100
Tuzo	136	104	99
Average	\$ 160	\$ 122	\$ 110

*Note: 1 mm nominal square mesh*

*Diamond values are in US Dollars*

For mine feasibility studies, WWW recommends using the base case models for defining the resources and reserves. The “high” and “low” models are included for sensitivity analysis.

The WWW averaged modeled price per carat for the Gahcho Kué kimberlites is US\$122, which represents a 41 percent increase over the WWW April 2010 average modeled price. The WWW models use size distribution models (carats per size class) developed by De Beers.



*2014 Updated Independent Valuation*

In February 2014, Mountain Province retained WWW International Diamond Consultants Ltd. (“WWW”) to provide an updated valuation of the diamonds recovered from the Gahcho Kué Project. The valuation took place at the London offices of the Diamond Trading Company. All diamond values presented below are based on the WWW Price Book as at February 24, 2014

Table 12 below reflects the actual price per carat for the parcel of 8,317.29 carats of diamonds recovered from the Gahcho Kué Project.

**Table 12**

Actual Price US\$/carat				
Pipe	Zone	Total Carats	\$/Carat	Total Dollars
5034	Centre/East Lobe	1,957.54	196	383,561
	West Lobe	1,132.14	102	115,767
Hearne		2,905.76	88	254,935
Tuzo		2,321.85	298	690,805
Total		8,317.29	\$ 174	\$ 1,445,068

*Note: Total Dollars are the result of rounding.*

In their report to Mountain Province, WWW stated: “The valuations have fallen by more than the WWW overall rough price index because, due to the size of the samples there were only 10 percent of the carats in the 3 to 8 grainer size fractions, and these sizes have seen significant price increases since March 2012. The prices of the two most valuable stones have also been reduced by over 5 percent”.

Table 13 below presents models of the February 2014 average price per carat (US\$/carat) for each kimberlite. The modeled price per carat is determined using statistical methods to estimate the average value of diamonds that are likely to be recovered from future production at Gahcho Kué.

**Table 13**

Pipe	High Model	Base Model	Low Model
5034 Centre	167	132	114
5034 West	172	131	118
5034 North/East	194	142	120
Hearne	137	107	97
Tuzo	134	101	95
Average	\$ 160	\$ 120	\$ 110

*Note: 1 mm nominal square mesh*

*Diamond values are in US Dollars*

In their report to the Company, WWW stated: “The chart below shows the WWW overall rough price index since 2009. Immediately after the April 2011 valuation prices increased at unsustainable levels to peak more than 30 percent higher in August before falling back to early 2011 levels.

“Prices dipped in H2 2012 before recovering in H1 2013. Since then they have remained relatively stable. The index is currently 2.2 percent lower than the last re-pricing exercise which was undertaken in March 2012, and 2.3 percent lower than April 2011 when the physical valuation took place.

“The overall index is based on WWW’s model of world production and changes in average prices will vary from mine to mine or sample to sample dependent upon the mix of diamonds. It should also be noted that since March 2012 prices of the 3 to 8 grainer goods are significantly higher in today’s market, whereas prices in other sizes are lower.”

### **Definitive Feasibility Study**

On September 1, 2009, the Company announced that the Gahcho Kué Joint Arrangement had appointed JDS, an independent engineering firm, to produce the Definitive Feasibility Study for the Gahcho Kué Joint Arrangement. The Definitive Feasibility Study was expected to take approximately twelve months to complete with a budget of approximately \$10 million.

On October 21, 2010, in a press release titled “Mountain Province Diamonds Announces Positive Gahcho Kué Independent Feasibility Study”, Mountain Province announced the results of the independent feasibility study. JDS led and prepared the feasibility study dated October 15, 2010, which was presented to the Gahcho Kué Joint Arrangement. The Company filed the 2010 Technical Report, representing a detailed summary of the Feasibility Study, on SEDAR and provided notification of such filing under Form 6K on EDGAR on December 3, 2010. See Item 4.D, Property Plant and Equipment, for a full summary of the 2010 Technical Report.

The following are the financial and project highlights from the 2010 Technical Report:

· Project IRR including sunk costs	20.7%*
· Project IRR excluding sunk costs	33.9%
· Initial project capital	\$549.5 million
· Working capital	\$49.4 million
· Sustaining capital including mine closure	\$36.1 million
· Operating costs	\$48.68 per tonne
· Project mine life	11 years
· Average annual production	3 million tonnes
· Total diamond production	49 million carats
· Average annual diamond production	4.45 million carats
· Diamond price	US\$102.48 per carat**

\*After taxes/royalties and unleveraged

\*\*The base case model uses an average realized diamond price of US\$102.48 per carat derived from the mean average between the modeled values of De Beers and WWS (based on their respective April 2010 price books) inclusive of a real 1% escalation over LOM less an assumed 4% marketing fee.

## Permitting

In November 2005, De Beers Canada, as Operator of the Gahcho Kué Project, applied to the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board for a Land Use Permit and Water License to undertake the development of the Gahcho Kué diamond mine. On December 22, 2005, Environment Canada referred the applications to the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board (“MVEIRB”), which commenced an Environmental Assessment (“EA”). On June 12, 2006, the MVEIRB ordered that an Environment Impact Review (“EIR”) of the applications should be conducted.

The EIR was designed to identify all of the key environmental issues that could be impacted by the development of the Gahcho Kué diamond mine and to facilitate participation by key stakeholders in addressing these issues.

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Gahcho Kué mine was submitted to the Gahcho Kué Environmental Impact Review Panel (the “Panel”) of the MVEIRB in December 2010. The EIS detailed the construction and operation of the proposed mine and was assembled to meet the rigorous Terms of Reference established by the Panel for the Gahcho Kué Project.

The feasibility study commissioned in August 2009 was expected to impact the final project description and the Project Operator, De Beers Canada, had previously advised the MVEIRB that submission of the EIS would be further deferred pending the completion of an updated project description.

The final Gahcho Kué Project description was presented to the Gahcho Kué Joint Arrangement partners, and was incorporated into the EIS to be submitted to the MVEIRB before the end of 2010. Key elements of the project description include the following:

- Average annual production rate of approximately 3 million tonnes of ore;
- Life of mine from the open-pit resource of approximately 11 years; and
- Average annual production rate of approximately 4.45 million carats.

On November 5, 2010, the Company announced that the Operator of the Gahcho Kué Joint Arrangement, De Beers Canada, had notified the MVEIRB on November 3, 2010 that the Gahcho Kué EIS was on track for completion and submission before the end of 2010. The Company also announced that the submission of the EIS would result in the resumption of the environmental impact review by the independent administrative tribunal established under the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Resource Management Act.

On December 23, 2010, the Company, in a joint news release with De Beers Canada, announced that the EIS for the Gahcho Kué mine had been submitted to the Gahcho Kué Environmental Impact Review Panel (the "Panel") of the MVEIRB. The EIS detailed the construction and operation of the proposed mine.

On August 2, 2011, the Company announced that the Panel had informed the Gahcho Kué Project Operator, De Beers Canada that the EIS conformed to the terms of reference set by the Panel, thus clearing the way for the EIR to commence.

On January 8, 2013, the Company announced that the MVEIRB closed the public record for the Gahcho Kué environmental impact review on January 3, 2013 and that the MVEIRB is expected to complete their report by July 2013.

On July 22, 2013, De Beers and the Company announced that the MVEIRB on July 19, 2013 had concluded the Gahcho Kué Environmental Impact Assessment and had recommended approval of the proposed Gahcho Kué diamond mine subject to measures and follow-up programs. The Gahcho Kué Panel recommended, pursuant to sub-section 134(2) of the Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act, that the development be allowed to proceed subject to implementation of the measures and follow-up programs described in its 'Report' which are necessary to prevent potentially significant adverse impacts on the environment. A full copy of the Report of Environmental Impact Review and Reasons for Decision is available at [www.reviewboard.ca](http://www.reviewboard.ca).

On October 22, 2013 Mountain Province and De Beers Canada announced that the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada, the Hon. Bernard Valcourt, had approved the development of the Gahcho Kué diamond mine as recommended by the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board.

On December 2, 2013 Mountain Province and De Beers Canada announced that Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board approved a pioneer Land Use Permit for the Gahcho Kué diamond mine. The pioneer Land Use Permit allowed land-based site works to commence in preparation for deliveries planned for the 2014 winter road season.

**Project Costs to Date**

The 2009 Agreement contains the following key terms with respect to the Gahcho Kué Project costs:

1. Each Joint Venture partner will contribute their proportionate share to the future project development costs;
2. The Joint Venture partners have agreed that the sunk historic costs to the period ending on December 31, 2008 will be reduced and limited to \$120 million;
3. Mountain Province will repay De Beers Canada \$59 million (representing 49% of an agreed sum of \$120 million) in settlement of the Company's share of the agreed historic sunk costs on the following schedule:



- \$200,000 on execution of the 2009 Agreement (Mountain Province's contribution to the 2009 Joint Arrangement expenses to date of execution of the 2009 Agreement – paid);
- Up to \$5.1 million in respect of De Beers Canada's share of the costs of the feasibility study commissioned in August 2009 (paid \$4,417,421 to December 31, 2013, recorded as "sunk cost repayment" in the Company's financial statements);
- \$10 million upon the completion of the feasibility study with at least a 15% IRR and approval of the necessary development work for a mine (as defined in the 2009 Gahcho Kué Joint Arrangement Agreement – paid March 15, 2011);
- \$10 million following the issuance of the construction and operating permits;
- \$10 million following the commencement of commercial production; and
- The balance of approximately \$24.4 million plus accrued interest within 18 months following commencement of commercial production.

The following table outlines the Gahcho Kué Project costs (at 100%) to date:

Period of Time	Amount
Agreed historic sunk costs to December 31, 2008	\$120,000,000
Expenditures January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009	1,654,383
Costs for Feasibility Study from August 2009 to December 2009 (of approved budget of \$10 million)	2,531,056
Total Costs to December 31, 2009	\$124,185,439
Expenditures January 1, 2010 to December 31, 2010	10,754,884
Costs for Feasibility Study from January 2010 to December 2010 (of approved budget of \$10 million)	5,593,913
Total Costs to December 31, 2010	\$140,534,236
Expenditures January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011	16,320,970
Costs for Feasibility Study from January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011	466,526
Total Costs to December 31, 2011	\$157,321,732
Expenditures January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2012	21,698,473
Costs for Feasibility Study from January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2012	100,114
Total Costs to December 31, 2012	\$179,120,319
Expenditures January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2013	47,175,630
Costs for Feasibility Study from January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2013	Nil
Total Costs to December 31, 2013	\$226,295,679
Budget January 1, 2014 to December 31, 2014 (subject to approval in tranches)	\$To Be Finalized

#### Item 4A. Unresolved Staff Comments

On December 20, 2013, we received a comment letter from the staff of the SEC's Division of Corporation Finance in connection with the staff's review of our Annual Report on Form 20-F for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2012. We submitted our response letter to the SEC on January 10, 2014. On January 31, 2014 we received an additional comment letter from the staff. On February 14, 2014, we filed Amendment No. 1 on Form 20-F/A for the Year Ended December 31, 2012, in response to the staff's comments, filing a redacted version of the 2009 Agreement as Exhibit 4.14 to the Form 20-F/A. We also applied to the SEC for confidential treatment of certain portions of the Agreement. On March 14, 2014, we received a comment letter from the staff with respect to the confidential treatment application. As of the date of this Form 20-F for the Year Ended December 31, 2013, we have not yet submitted our response.

Item 5. Operating and Financial Review and Prospects

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**

**MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS**

**FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2013**

This Management's Discussion and Analysis ("MD&A") provides a review of the financial performance of Mountain Province Diamonds Inc. (the "Company" or "Mountain Province" or "MPV") and should be read in conjunction with the audited consolidated financial statements and the notes thereto as at December 31, 2013 and 2012 and for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011.

The Company's audited consolidated financial statements have been prepared in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards ("IFRS") as issued by the International Accounting Standards Board ("IASB").

All amounts are expressed in Canadian dollars unless otherwise stated.

Technical information included in this MD&A regarding the Company's mineral property has been reviewed by Carl Verley, a Director of the Company and a Qualified Person as defined by National Instrument 43-101 - Standards of Disclosure for Mineral Properties ("NI 43-101").

Additional information, related to the Company is available on SEDAR at [www.sedar.com](http://www.sedar.com), and on EDGAR at <http://sec.gov/edgar.shtml>, and on the Company's website at [www.mountainprovince.com](http://www.mountainprovince.com).

**COMPANY HIGHLIGHTS**

**On March 12, 2014**, the Company has increased the size of its previously announced public offering to 3,500,000 common shares (the "Common Shares"), at a price of \$5.10 per Common Share for gross proceeds of \$17,850,000 (the "Offering"). The Offering is being led by BMO Capital Markets.

**On March 11, 2014**, the Company announced that it has entered into an agreement with a syndicate of underwriters led by BMO Capital Markets, under which the underwriters have agreed to buy, on a bought deal basis by way of private placement, 3,000,000 common shares (the “Common Shares”) of the Company, at a price of \$5.10 per Common Share for gross proceeds of \$15,300,000 (“the Offering”).

Concurrent with the bought deal private placement, the Company intends undertaking a non-brokered private placement (“Non-brokered Private Placement”) of Common Shares of the Company at a price not less than \$5.10 per Common Share. The Non-brokered Private Placement may be sold to Bottin (International) Investments Ltd. (controlled by Dermot Desmond) (“Bottin”) and other qualified investors.

The Company intends to use the net proceeds of the Offering for the continued development of the Company's Gahcho Kué Project (“Project”) and for general corporate purposes.

**On February 18, 2014**, De Beers Canada Inc. (“De Beers”) and the Company announced that De Beers, as Operator (“Operator”) of the Project, entered into an Impact Benefit Agreement (IBA) with the Yellowknives Dene First Nation for the proposed Gahcho Kué mine. The agreement puts in place a framework for De Beers and the Yellowknives Dene First Nation (“Yellowknives”) to work together over the life of the mine and it enables participation by the Yellowknives in the opportunities that the mine provides.

This agreement provides certainty that training, employment and business opportunities are made available to Yellowknives and it includes financial provisions necessary for ensuring fair participation in opportunities the project will provide.

**On January 27, 2014**, De Beers and the Company announced that the Operator of the Project, has entered into an Impact Benefit Agreement with the Th̄chō Government (“Th̄chō”) for the proposed Gahcho Kué mine. The agreement puts in place a framework for De Beers and the Th̄chō to work together over the life of the mine enabling participation by the Th̄chō in the opportunities that the mine provides.

This agreement will provide training, employment and business opportunities from the Project for Th̄chō and also includes financial provisions that enable the Th̄chō to participate in the opportunities that the Project provides.

**On December 2, 2013**, De Beers and the Company announced that the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board has approved a pioneer Land Use Permit for the Gahcho Kué diamond mine. The pioneer Land Use Permit allows land-based site works to commence in preparation for deliveries planned for the 2014 winter road season.

Approval of the permit allows Gahcho Kué to position itself for the start of full construction pending the receipt of the full Land Use Permit and Water License expected in 2014.

**On November 27, 2013**, the Company announced the closing of the previously announced non-brokered private placement of common shares for gross proceeds of \$29.4 million. The Company issued 5,889,200 common shares at a price of \$5.00 per share. The shares are subject to a four month hold period, expiring on March 26, 2014.

Proceeds of the private placement are being used to support the Company's share of initial capital expenditures at Gahcho Kué, the 2014 Tuzo Deep drill program and for general corporate purposes. A finder's fee in the amount of \$567,330 was paid in relation to the private placement.

**On October 22, 2013**, De Beers and the Company announced that the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada, the Hon. Bernard Valcourt, had approved the development of the Gahcho Kué diamond mine as recommended by the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board on July 22, 2013.

**On August 19, 2013**, the Company announced that a National Instrument (NI) 43-101 Technical Report on the Gahcho Kué project has been filed on SEDAR and EDGAR.

The updated NI 43-101 resource estimate was prepared by Mineral Services Canada Inc. ("Mineral Services") and the results were announced on July 2, 2013.

**On July 10, 2013**, De Beers and the Company announced that the Operator of the Project, entered into its first Impact Benefit Agreement with the North Slave Métis Alliance ("North Slave Metis") for the proposed Gahcho Kué mine.

The agreement sets in place a framework for De Beers and the North Slave Métis to optimize the participation of the North Slave Métis in the Gahcho Kué mine through employment, business opportunities, training and development, and financial benefits.

**On July 2, 2013**, the Company announced the results of the updated independent mineral resource estimate completed for the Project.

Following completion of the Tuzo Deep drill program in 2012, which was managed by the Operator, an updated National Instrument (NI) 43-101 resource estimate for Tuzo Deep was prepared by Mineral Services and filed on SEDAR and EDGAR on August 13, 2013. This estimate incorporates information from geological data updates completed since the previous NI 43-101 Technical Report released in 2009.

The updated resource estimate indicates an approximate 12% percent increase in the Project indicated resource from 30.2 million tonnes to 33.8 million tonnes and an approximate 90% increase in inferred resource from 6 million tonnes to 11.3 million tonnes. The diamond content of the indicated resource increased by approximately 12% from 50.5 million carats to 56.6 million carats and the diamond content of the inferred resource increased by approximately 80% from 10.3 million carats to 18.5 million carats. The reasons for these increases are the upgrading of the 300 to 360 meter zone in Tuzo from inferred resource to indicated resource and also the inclusion of the newly defined Tuzo inferred resource from a depth of 360 meters to 564 meters below surface, which was delineated during the 2011/12 Tuzo Deep drill program.

**On June 28, 2013** De Beers and Mountain Province announced that the Operator of the Joint Venture, had entered into a Socio Economic Agreement (“SEA”) with the Government of the Northwest Territories (“GNWT”). The agreement formalizes commitments made with respect to employment, training, business opportunities and other related benefits for NWT residents. It also establishes measures to monitor possible socio-economic impacts related to the mine and establishes the mechanism to work with communities close to the mine site to ensure an adaptive management approach to socio-economic performance of the mine.

## **Financial position**

As at December 31, 2013, Mountain Province had cash and short-term investments of \$35,687,694 and a working capital balance of \$35,133,368. See Financial Position and Liquidity below.

## **Overview**

Mountain Province was incorporated on December 2, 1986 under the British Columbia Company Act. The Company amended its articles and continued incorporation under the Ontario Business Corporation Act effective May 8, 2006. The Company's registered office and its principal place of business is 161 Bay Street, Suite 2315, PO Box 216, Toronto, ON, Canada, M5J 2S1. The Company's shares are listed on the Toronto Stock Exchange under the symbol 'MPV' and on the New York Stock Exchange – MKT under the symbol 'MDM'.

Mountain Province is a Canadian resource company and holds a 49% interest in the Gahcho Kué Project, located in the Northwest Territories of Canada and De Beers Canada holds the remaining 51% interest. The Arrangement between the Company and De Beers Canada is governed by the 2009 Agreement. The Company's primary asset is its 49% interest in the Project.

Drilling, bulk sampling, environmental and engineering studies have been completed. A Definitive Feasibility Study demonstrates an economically viable project. The Project is currently in the development stage. At this time there are no revenues from the Project.

## **OUTLOOK**

The development of the Project remains a priority. The Project feasibility study ("GK Feasibility Study", "Feasibility Study") of December 3, 2010 is currently being updated and is scheduled for completion by the end of March, 2014. A NI 43-101 compliant technical report will be posted on SEDAR and EDGAR within 45 days following completion and announcement of the updated results.

Following the completion of deep drilling at the Tuzo kimberlite to a depth of 560 meters, the Company retained Mineral Services Canada Inc. to prepare an independent NI 43-101 resource statement, which was released in Q3, 2013. Further deep drilling to potentially extend the Tuzo resource to 750 meters is currently underway. Drilling on

ten exploration targets was completed during Q2 2013. Kimberlite was intercepted in only one of the ten holes drilled.

The Company is in discussion with a number of potential lenders and is currently assessing various financing proposals, which include project financing, off-take financing and a variety of other financing instruments. These are being considered together with alternatives available to finance the ongoing operations of the Company. See Financial Position and Liquidity below.

## **JOINT VENTURE AGREEMENT**

The Gahcho Kué Project is an unincorporated Joint Arrangement between De Beers (51%) and Mountain Province (49%). The Company accounts for the Project as a joint operation in accordance with IFRS 11. Mountain Province holds an undivided 49% ownership interest in the assets, liabilities and expenses of the Project.

On July 3, 2009, the Company entered into an amended and restated Joint Arrangement Agreement with De Beers (jointly, the “Participants”) under which:

- (a) The Participants’ continuing interests in the Gahcho Kué Project will be Mountain Province 49% and De Beers 51%, except for normal dilution provisions which are applicable to both Participants;
- (b) Each Participant will market their own proportionate share of diamond production in accordance with their participating interest;
  - (c) Each Participant will contribute their proportionate share to the future project development costs;
- (d) Material strategic and operating decisions, including plans and budgets, will be made by consensus of the Participants as long as each Participant has a participating interest of 40% or more;
- (e) The Participants have agreed that the sunk historic costs to the period ending on December 31, 2008 will be reduced and limited to \$120 million;



(f) The Company will repay De Beers \$59 million (representing 49% of an agreed sum of \$120 million) plus accrued interest in settlement of the Company's share of the agreed historic sunk costs on the following schedule:

- \$200,000 on execution of the 2009 Agreement (the Company's contribution to the 2009 Arrangement expenses to date of execution of the 2009 Agreement) – paid and expensed;
- Up to \$5.1 million in respect of De Beers' share of the costs of the feasibility study (paid - \$4,417,421 to December 31, 2012, included in "Mineral Properties"; no further payments are expected);
- \$10 million upon the completion of a feasibility study with at least a 15% IRR and approval of the necessary development work for a mine (as defined in the 2009 Agreement) - paid March 15, 2011;
- \$10 million following the issuance of the construction and operating permits;
- \$10 million following the commencement of commercial production; and

The balance of approximately \$24.4 million plus accumulated interest within 18 months following commencement of commercial production. Accumulated interest is being calculated at the prevailing LIBOR rate plus 5%.

Since these payments are contingent upon certain events occurring, and/or work being completed, they will be recorded as the payments become due or are made. As these contingent payments are made, they are being capitalized to Mineral Properties as "acquired exploration and evaluation".

Mountain Province has agreed that the Company's marketing rights under the 2009 Agreement may be diluted if the Company defaults on the repayments described above, if and when such payments become due.

The 2009 Agreement's provision for consensus decision-making for material strategic and operating decisions provides the Company with joint control of the Project with De Beers, and the Company accounts for the Project as a joint operation.

The underlying value and recoverability of the amounts shown for the Company's Mineral Properties is dependent upon the ability of the Project to complete the successful design, permitting, funding and construction of the mine, and future profitable production. Failure to achieve the above will require the Company to write-off costs capitalized to date.

## **GAHCHO KUÉ PROJECT**

The Project is located in the Northwest Territories, about 300 kilometres northeast of Yellowknife. The Project covers approximately 10,353 acres, and encompasses four mining leases (numbers 4341, 4199, 4200, and 4201) held in trust by the Operator, De Beers. The Project hosts four primary kimberlite bodies – Hearne, Tuzo, Tesla, and 5034. The four main kimberlite bodies are within two kilometres of each other.

### **Technical Feasibility and Commercial Viability**

The key factors management uses in determining technical feasibility and commercial viability of the Project are demonstrable, are the following;

- Completion of a feasibility study;
- Obtaining required permits to construct and operate the Gahcho Kué mine;
- Completion of an evaluation of the financial resources required to construct the Gahcho Kué mine;

The availability of financial resources necessary to commence development activities to construct the Gahcho Kué mine;

Management's determination that a satisfactory return on investment, in relation to the risks to be assumed, is likely to be obtained.

### **Independent Feasibility Study**

On October 21, 2010, in a press release titled "*Mountain Province Announces Positive Gahcho Kué Independent Feasibility Study*", Mountain Province announced the results of the independent feasibility study on the Gahcho Kué diamond project dated October 15, 2010. JDS Energy and Mining Inc. led and prepared the feasibility study, which was presented to the Participants. The Company filed a detailed summary of the Feasibility Study, dated December 1, 2010, as the NI 43-101 Technical Report on SEDAR on December 3, 2010. As noted above, the Project feasibility study of December 3, 2010 is currently being updated.

The following are the financial and project highlights from the 2010 Feasibility Study:

· Project IRR* including sunk costs	20.7%**
· Project IRR excluding sunk costs	33.9%
· Initial project capital	\$549.5M
· Working capital	\$49.4M
· Sustaining capital including mine closure	\$36.1M
· Operating costs	\$48.68 per tonne
· Project mine life	11 years
· Average annual production	3 million tonnes
· Total diamond production	49 million carats
· Average annual diamond production	4.45 million carats
· Revenue	US\$102.48 per carat***

\*Internal Rate of Return (“IRR”)

\*\*After taxes/royalties and unleveraged

\*\*\*The base case model uses an average realized diamond price of US\$102.48 per carat derived from the mean average between the modeled values of De Beers and WWC International Diamond Consultants (based on their respective April 2010 price books) inclusive of a real 1% escalation over LOM less an assumed 4% marketing fee.

The feasibility study delivers an economically viable, technically credible and environmentally sound development plan for the Project. Also, the IRR exceeds the minimum 15% required under the Joint Arrangement Agreement to support a decision by the Participants to proceed to development.

On June 14, 2011, the Participants announced that they had approved the Gahcho Kué feasibility study with agreed revisions and clarifications; approved the execution of the necessary development work for the Project; and mandated the Operator to prepare a plan and budget for the development of the first mine at Gahcho Kué.

### **Gahcho Kué Mineral Reserve**

On October 21, 2010, Mountain Province announced a Mineral Reserve estimate for the Project. The Mineral Reserve is the Indicated Resource contained in the proposed open pit mine that can be mined and processed profitably and is scheduled for treatment in the feasibility study life of mine plan. The Gahcho Kué mineral reserve estimate is summarized in Table 1 below.

**Table 1****Gahcho Kué Mineral Reserve Estimate**

Pipe	Classification	Tonnes(Mt)	Grade (carats per tonne)	Carats(Mct)
5034	Probable	13.2	1.77	23.3
Hearne	Probable	5.4	2.10	11.5
Tuzo	Probable	12.6	1.13	14.2
Total	Probable	31.3	1.57 *	49.0

\* Fully diluted mining grade

## Independent Diamond Valuation

Mountain Province retained WWW International Diamond Consultants Ltd. (“WWW”) to provide an updated independent valuation of the diamonds recovered from the Project. All diamond values presented below are based on the WWW Price Book as at February 24, 2014.

Table 2 below reflects the actual price per carat for the parcel of 8,317.29 carats of diamonds recovered from the Project.

**Table 2**

### Actual Price US\$/carat

Pipe	Zone	Total Carats	\$/Carat	Total Dollars
5034	Centre/East Lobe	1,957.54	196	383,561
	West Lobe	1,132.14	102	115,767
Hearne		2,905.76	88	254,935
Tuzo		2,321.85	298	690,805
Total		8,317.29	\$ 174	\$ 1,445,068

*Note: Total Dollars are the result of rounding.*

In their report to Mountain Province, WWW stated: “The most valuable stone is in the Tuzo sample. This 25.13 carat stone is the largest stone in all of the bulk samples. The stone is an octahedron of H/I colour which WWW valued at \$19,000 per carat giving a total value of \$477,470”.

WWW added: “The stone with the highest value per carat in the sample is a 9.90 carat stone in the 5034 C/E sample. This is a makeable stone of high colour (D/E) which WWW valued at \$22,000 per carat giving a total value of \$217,800”.

Besides the high-value 25.13 and 9.9 carat diamonds, several other large high-value diamonds of gem quality have been recovered from Gahcho Kué, including 7.0 carat, 6.6 carat and 5.9 carat diamonds from the 5034 kimberlite and 8.7 carat, 6.4 carat and 4.9 carat diamonds from the Hearne kimberlite. The presence of larger diamonds is an important driver of overall diamond value at Gahcho Kué.

The results of the 2014 independent diamond valuation indicated that there was a 6.7 percent decline from the previous valuation conducted in March 2012. In their report, WWW state: “The valuations have fallen by more than the WWW overall rough price index because, due to the size of the samples there were only 10 percent of the carats in the 3 to 8 grainer size fractions, and these sizes have seen significant price increases since March 2012. The prices of the two most valuable stones have also been reduced by over 5 percent.

Table 3 below presents models of the February 2014 average price per carat (US\$/carat) for each kimberlite. The modeled price per carat is determined using statistical methods to estimate the average value of diamonds that are likely to be recovered from future production at Gahcho Kué.

**Table 3**

Pipe	High Model	Base Model	Low Model
5034 Centre	167	132	114
5034 West	172	131	118
5034 North/East	194	142	120
Hearne	137	107	97
Tuzo	134	101	95
Average	\$ 160	\$ 120	\$ 110

*Note: 1 mm nominal square mesh*

*Diamond values are in US Dollars*

For mine feasibility studies, WWW recommends using the base case models for defining the resources and reserves. The “high” and “low” models are included for sensitivity analysis.

The WWW averaged modeled price per carat for the Gahcho Kué kimberlites is US\$120 , which represents a 40 percent increase over the WWW April 2010 average modeled price, which was the base case used in the 2010 feasibility Study. The WWW models use size distribution models (carats per size class) developed by De Beers.

The 2010 independent definitive feasibility study, under which the revenue assumption was based on the mean average of the April 2010 WWW and De Beers modeled diamond prices, reported a 33.9 percent IRR excluding sunk costs. Further, sensitivity analysis shows that a 10 percent increase in modeled diamond prices results in an approximate 3 percent increase in the project IRR.

## **Permitting**

On July 22, 2013, De Beers and the Company announced that the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board had concluded the Gahcho Kué Environmental Impact Review and recommended approval of the proposed Gahcho Kué diamond mine subject to measures and follow-up programs.

On October 22, 2013 the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada, the Hon. Bernard Valcourt, approved the development of the Gahcho Kué diamond mine as recommended by the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board and on December 2, 2014, the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board has approved a pioneer Land Use Permit for the Gahcho Kué diamond mine, which allowed land-based site works to commence in preparation for deliveries planned for the 2014 winter road season.

Issuance of the full Class A Land Use Permit is expected in mid-2014 and issuance of a Class A Water License is expected in Q3 2014.

## **Gahcho Kué Development**

The first blast in the quarry at Gahcho Kué occurred on December 13, 2013. Production of aggregate material for infrastructure foundations, roads and the landing strip is underway. Deliveries of machinery, equipment, fuel tanks, the main camp and other supplies are underway. Approximately 600 truck loads are planned for delivery to Gahcho

Kué on the 2014 ice road. Full construction activities will commence upon receipt of the full Class A Land Use Permit. Subject to the receipt of all necessary permits, construction of the Gahcho Kué mine is expected to be completed by late 2015/early 2016, following which commissioning of the diamond plant will commence. Production is expected to commence during the second half of 2016.

### Tuzo Deep Project

Following completion of the Tuzo Deep drill program in 2012, which was managed by the Operator, an updated National Instrument (NI) 43-101 resource estimate for Tuzo Deep (Table 4 below) was prepared by Mineral Services Canada Inc. This estimate incorporates information from geological data updates completed since the previous NI 43-101 Technical Report released in 2009. The 2009 resource estimate for Tuzo Deep is included for reference purposes.

**Table 4**

Pipe	Year	Resource Classification	Volume (Mm3)	Tonnes (Mt)	Carats (Mct)	Grade (cpht)
Tuzo Deep	2009	Inferred	1.5	3.5	6.2	175
Tuzo Deep	2013	Indicated	1.5	3.6	6.0	167
Tuzo Deep	2013	Inferred	3.7	8.9	14.4	161

Notes:

- 1) Mineral Resources are reported at a bottom cut-off of 1.0 mm
- 2) cpht = carats per hundred tonnes
- 3) Volume, tonnes, and carats are rounded to the nearest 100,000
- 4) Tuzo volumes and tonnes exclude 0.6Mt of a granite raft



Table 4 above reflects the updated Tuzo Deep mineral resource. There has been no change in the geological data for the Tuzo Upper, 5034 and Hearne kimberlites since the 2009 Technical Report.

Table 5 below incorporates the updated Tuzo Deep mineral resource estimate into the existing Gahcho Kué mineral resource estimate.

**Table 5**

Pipe	Resource Classification	Volume (Mm <sup>3</sup> )	Tonnes (Mt)	Carats (Mct)	Grade (cpht)
5034	Indicated	5.1	12.7	23.9	188
	Inferred	0.3	0.8	1.2	150
Hearne	Indicated	2.3	5.3	11.9	223
	Inferred	0.7	1.6	2.9	180
Tuzo	Indicated	6.6	15.8	20.8	132
	Inferred	3.7	8.9	14.4	161
Summary	Indicated	14.0	33.8	56.6	167
	Inferred	4.7	11.3	18.5	164

As discussed in the Highlight Section, the updated Tuzo Deep resource estimate indicates an approximate 12% percent increase in the Gahcho Kué indicated resource from 30.2 million tonnes to 33.8 million tonnes and an approximate 90% increase in inferred resource from 6 million tonnes to 11.3 million tonnes. The diamond content of the indicated resource increased by approximately 12% from 50.5 million carats to 56.6 million carats and the diamond content of the inferred resource increased by approximately 80% from 10.3 million carats to 18.5 million carats. The reasons for these increases are the upgrading of the 300 to 360 meter zone in Tuzo from inferred resource to indicated resource and also the inclusion of the newly defined Tuzo inferred resource from a depth of 360 meters to 564 meters below surface, which was delineated during the 2011/12 Tuzo Deep drill program.

The Tuzo Deep resource update released in mid-2013 defined a resource at the Tuzo kimberlite to a depth of 560 meters, with the kimberlite remaining open to depth. A follow-up deep drilling program commenced in February 2014 to test the Tuzo kimberlite to a depth of at least 750 meters. Drilling of three planned vertical holes has commenced. The 2,250 meter drill program is expected to be completed by May, 2014.

#### Qualified Person

The Qualified Person for the updated Tuzo Deep estimate is Mr. Tom Nowicki, PhD, P Geo, a Mineral Services employee. The estimation and classification of the mineral resources conform to industry-best practices and meet the requirements of CIM (2005).

### **Gahcho Kué Capital Program**

On May 28, 2012, the Company announced that the Participants had approved the initial capital of \$31.3 million to advance the Gahcho Kué diamond mine in preparation for development and in January 2013 approved additional \$85.6 million. The 2014 budget is currently under review.

The 2012 and 2013 budget focused on advancing:

1. Preparation work for the construction and operating permit applications;
2. Front-end engineering and design (FEED);
3. Preparations and procurement for the 2013 winter road;
4. Detailed engineering;
5. Purchase of critical long-lead equipment; and
6. Feasibility study update.

As mentioned above, an update of the 2010 feasibility study is currently underway, which will incorporate agreed revisions and clarifications, design refinements and cost adjustments to reflect changes since completion of the 2010 feasibility study and is expected to be filed within 45 days after the draft results are released on March 28, 2014.

## RESULTS OF OPERATIONS

The financial results for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 are reported under IFRS as issued by the IASB, as well as for the quarterly interim periods.

### Selected Annual Information

	December 31, 2013	December 31, 2012	December 31, 2011
Other income	\$ 355,428	\$ 10,869,407	\$ 792,835
Operating expenses	(26,935,484 )	(14,179,216 )	(12,268,455 )
Other expenses	(23,882 )	(27,801 )	(63,315 )
Net loss for the period	(26,603,938 )	(3,337,610 )	(11,538,935 )
Basic and diluted loss per share	(0.28 )	(0.04 )	(0.15 )
Cash flow used in operations	(32,619,536 )	(13,786,541 )	(13,672,048 )
Cash, end of year	11,344,472	274,696	21,546
Total assets	110,367,203	95,590,052	65,839,943
Long-term liabilities	5,224,662	6,284,770	6,178,004
Dividends declared	Nil	Nil	Nil

## FINANCIAL REVIEW

*Three and Twelve months ended December 31, 2013 compared to the Three and Twelve months ended December 31, 2012*

For the three months ended December 31, 2013, the Company recorded a net loss of \$6,839,466 or \$0.07 per share, compared to \$3,089,892 net loss or \$0.04 per share for the three months ended December 31, 2012. For the twelve months ended December 31, 2013, the Company recorded a net loss of \$26,603,938 or \$0.28 per share, compared to \$3,337,610 net loss or \$0.04 per share for the twelve months ended December 31, 2012.

*Three and Twelve months ended December 31, 2012 compared to the Three and Twelve months ended December 31, 2011*

For the three months ended December 31, 2012, the Company recorded a net loss of \$3,089,892 or \$0.04 per share, compared to \$5,347,662 net loss or \$0.07 per share for the three months ended December 31, 2011. For the twelve months ended December 31, 2012, the Company recorded a net loss of \$3,337,610 or \$0.04 per share, compared to \$11,538,935 net loss or \$0.15 per share for the twelve months ended December 31, 2011.

Quarterly financial information for the past eight quarters is shown in Table 1.

**SUMMARY OF QUARTERLY RESULTS****Table 1 - Quarterly Financial Data**

Unaudited	Three months ended			
	December 31 2013	September 30 2013	June 30 2013	March 31 2013
	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>Earnings and Cash Flow</b>				
Interest income	60,810	69,974	99,300	125,344
Expenses	(6,894,257 )	(8,666,472 )	(6,418,760 )	(4,955,995 )
Net loss for period	(6,839,466 )	(8,602,452 )	(6,325,415 )	(4,836,605 )
Cash flow from operations	(17,625,994 )	(5,448,390 )	(7,447,742 )	(2,097,410 )
Basic and diluted loss per share	(0.07 )	(0.09 )	(0.07 )	(0.05 )
Investing activities	(6,186,388 )	5,555,729	11,537,319	3,415,711
Financing activities	29,366,941	-	-	-
<b>Balance Sheet</b>				
Total assets	110,368,408	81,072,132	86,194,722	96,795,427

Unaudited	Three months ended			
	December 31 2012	September 30 2012	June 30 2012	March 31 2012
	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>Earnings and Cash Flow</b>				
Interest income	44,313	8,047	43,994	51,408
Expenses	(3,127,198 )	(2,521,631 )	(4,078,554 )	(4,451,833 )
Gain on asset transfer to Kennady Diamonds Inc.	-	10,721,645	-	-
Net income (loss) for period	(3,089,892 )	8,201,130	(4,041,492 )	(4,407,356 )
Cash flow from operations	(2,285,124 )	(4,656,841 )	(4,479,813 )	(712,577 )
Basic and diluted earnings (loss) per share	(0.04 )	0.10	(0.05 )	(0.05 )
Investing activities	(44,446,197)	8,132,745	6,013,355	672,956
Financing activities	43,062,632	-	88,200	516,000
<b>Balance Sheet</b>				
Total assets	95,590,052	52,856,175	60,312,633	64,470,663

**COSTS AND EXPENSES**

*The costs and expenses for the three and twelve months ended December 31, 2013, December 31, 2012 and December 31, 2011 are comparable except for the following:*

**Consulting fees**

Consulting fees for the three months ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 respectively were \$509,589, \$316,101 and \$353,188. For the twelve months ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 consulting fees respectively were \$2,459,140, \$1,434,917 and \$1,631,188. Included in these amounts for the twelve months ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 respectively were \$1,240,821, \$463,500 and \$487,085 relating to stock based compensation.

### **Exploration and evaluation expenses**

Exploration and evaluation expenses for the three months ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 respectively were \$5,456,405, \$2,617,266 and \$4,462,899. For the twelve months ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 exploration and evaluation expenses respectively were \$21,837,083, \$10,651,622 and \$9,032,585. The increase from 2011 through 2013 is a result of increased work being conducted by various engineering companies in preparation for the construction of the mine at Gahcho Kué.

### **Gahcho Kué Project management fees**

Gahcho Kué Project management fees for the three months ended December 31 2013, 2012 and 2011 respectively were \$460,104, \$80,663 and \$106,269. For the twelve months ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 Gahcho Kué Project management fees respectively were \$1,113,848, \$311,076 and \$236,464. The increase for the same period in 2012 is mainly as a result of increased activity and expenditure being incurred at the Company's Gahcho Kué Project. The management fee is payable to the Operator and is expected to increase during construction of the Project.

### **Professional fees**

Professional fees for the three and twelve months ended December 31 2013, 2012 and 2011 respectively were \$74,115, (\$43,288) and \$56,669. For the twelve months ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 professional fees respectively were \$344,701, \$664,878 and \$361,148. During 2012, the Company incurred significant professional fees relating to the spin-out of Kennady Diamonds Inc.

### **Interest income**

Interest income for the three and twelve months ended December 31 2013, 2012 and 2011 respectively were \$60,810, \$44,313 and \$118,658. For the twelve months ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 interest income respectively were \$355,428, \$147,762 and \$303,354 respectively. The increase in 2013 is as a result of the \$47 million proceeds from the Rights Offering, which closed in late 2012 being invested in short-term investments.

### **Gain on asset transfer to Kennady Diamonds Inc.**

The gain on asset transfer to Kennady Diamonds of \$10,721,645 in the twelve months ended December 31, 2012 resulted from the spin out of the Kennady North Project.

## **INCOME AND RESOURCE TAXES**

The Company is subject to income taxes in Canada with the statutory income tax rate at 26.5%.

No deferred tax asset has been recorded in the financial statements as a result of the uncertainty associated with the ultimate realization of these tax assets.

The Company is subject to assessment by Canadian authorities, which may interpret tax legislation in a manner different from the Company. These differences may affect the final amount or the timing of the payment of taxes. When such differences arise the Company makes provision for such items based on management's best estimate of the final outcome of these matters.

## **FINANCIAL POSITION AND LIQUIDITY**

Since inception, the Company's capital resources have been limited. The Company has had to rely upon the sale of equity securities to fund property acquisitions, exploration, capital investments and administrative expenses, among other things.

The Company reported working capital of \$35,133,368 at December 31, 2013 (\$46,653,539 as at December 31, 2012), including cash and short-term investments of \$35,687,694 (\$47,693,693 at December 31, 2012). The short-term investments reflected in the December 31, 2013 and 2012 figures were guaranteed investment certificates held with a major Canadian financial institution with nominal counter party credit risk associated with the bank.



The Company had no long-term debt at December 31, 2013 and 2012. The Company's required payments to De Beers, described within Note 8 to the Company's audited consolidated financial statements for December 31, 2013, are contingent on certain events occurring such as receipt of permits, and production.

As at December 31, 2013, the Company has not achieved profitable operations and continues to be dependent upon its ability to obtain external financing to meet the Company's liabilities as they become payable. The Company's ability to continue operations beyond the next twelve months is dependent on the successful permitting, the ability of the Company to obtain necessary financing to fund its operations, the successful construction of the mine, and the future production or proceeds from developed properties.

The Company's mineral asset, the Gahcho Kué Project was in the exploration and evaluation stage. On December 2, 2013, the approval of a pioneer Land Use Permit for the Gahcho Kué diamond mine was obtained. Based on this approval the Company believes that all further permits will be of a procedural nature and when considered in connection with the other identified criteria to demonstrate technical feasibility and commercial viability (Note 3(vii)) of the consolidated financial statements) of the Gahcho Kué Project, the Company will now capitalize all future development expenditures incurred related to the Gahcho Kué Project.

The Company currently has no source of revenues. In the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011, the Company incurred losses, had negative cash flows from operating activities, and will be required to obtain additional sources of financing to complete its business plans going into the future. Although the Company had working capital of \$35,133,368 at December 31, 2013, including \$35,687,694 of cash and short-term investments, the Company has insufficient capital to finance its operations and the Company's share of development costs of the Gahcho Kué Project (Note 8) over the next 12 months. The Company is currently investigating various sources of additional funding to increase the cash balances required for ongoing operations over the foreseeable future. These additional sources include, but are not limited to, share offerings, private placements, rights offerings, credit and debt facilities, as well as the exercise of outstanding options. However, there is no certainty that the Company will be able to obtain financing from any of those sources. These conditions indicate the existence of a material uncertainty that results in substantial doubt as to the Company's ability to continue as a going concern.

The Company's audited consolidated financial statements have been prepared on the basis that the Company will continue as a going concern, and do not reflect adjustments to assets and liabilities that would be necessary if the going concern assumption were not appropriate. These adjustments could be material.

#### **Off-Balance Sheet Arrangements**

The Company has no off-balance sheet arrangements.

## **SUBSEQUENT EVENTS**

On February 14, 2014, the Company issued 200,000 stock options to officers and employees of the Company at an exercise of \$5.29 per option, expiring on February 13, 2019.

The fair value of the stock options has been estimated on the date of the grant using the Black-Scholes option pricing model, using the assumptions below, and total \$274,600. The expected volatility is calculated by reference to the weekly closing price for a period that reflects the expected life of the options, recalculated for each of the grants.

Date of grant	February 14, 2014	
Number of options granted	200,000	
Fair Value per option	\$ 1.373	
Fair Value total for grant	\$274,600	
Term of option	5 years	
Vesting	immediate	
Assumptions:		
Exercise price	\$5.29	
Expected volatility	38.19	%
Expected option life (years)	3	
Expected forfeiture	none	
Expected option cancellation	none	
Expected dividend yield	0	%
Risk-free interest rate	1.21	%

On March 11, 2014, the Company entered into an agreement with a syndicate of underwriters, under which the underwriters have agreed to buy, on a bought deal basis by way of private placement, 3,000,000 common shares of the Company, at a price of \$5.10 per Common Share for gross proceeds of \$15,300,000 (“the Offering”).

On March 12, 2014, the Company has increased the size of its Offering to 3,500,000 common shares, at a price of \$5.10 per Common Share for gross proceeds of \$17,850,000.

Concurrent with the bought deal private placement, the Company is undertaking a non-brokered private placement (“Non-brokered Private Placement”) of Common Shares of the Company at a price not less than \$5.10 per Common Share. The Non-brokered Private Placement may be sold to Bottin (International) Investments Ltd. (controlled by Dermot Desmond) (“Bottin”) and other qualified investors.

The Company intends to use the net proceeds of the offering for the continued development of the Company's Project and for general corporate purposes.

The Offering and the Non-brokered Private Placement are expected to close on or about March 28, 2014 and are subject to the Company receiving all necessary regulatory approvals, including the approval of the Toronto Stock Exchange and NYSE MKT.

## **SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING JUDGMENTS, ESTIMATES AND ASSUMPTIONS**

The preparation of the Company's audited consolidated financial statements requires management to make judgments, estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and reported amounts of expenses during the reporting period. Actual outcomes could differ from these estimates. These audited consolidated financial statements include estimates, which, by their nature, are uncertain and may require accounting adjustments based on future occurrences. Revisions to accounting estimates are recognized in the period in which the estimate is revised and future periods if the revision affects both current and future periods. These estimates are based on historical experience, current and future economic conditions, and other factors, including expectations of future events that are believed to be reasonable under the circumstances.

i) Significant Judgments in Applying Accounting Policies

The areas which require management to make significant judgments in applying the Company's accounting policies in determining carrying values include, but are not limited to:

a) *Mineral reserves*

The information relating to the geological data on the size, depth and shape of the ore body requires complex geological judgments to interpret the data. Changes in the proven mineral reserves or measured and indicated and inferred mineral estimates may impact the carrying value of the properties.

b) *Impairment analysis – mineral properties*

As required under IFRS 6 – Exploration for and evaluation of mineral resources and IAS 36 – Impairment of assets (“IAS 36”), the Company reviewed its mineral properties for impairment based on results to date and when events and changes in circumstances indicate that the carrying value of the assets may not be recoverable. The Company is required to make certain judgments in assessing indicators of impairment. The Company’s assessment is that as at December 31, 2013, no impairment in the carrying value of its mineral properties had occurred.

c) *Determination of development phase*

The Company applies significant judgment when determining and assessing its criteria used to determine technical feasibility and commercial viability is demonstrable. The Company determined that the Gahcho Kué Project has met the key factors used by management and, accordingly, that all costs of development activities will be capitalized to mineral properties.

ii) Significant Accounting Estimates and Assumptions

The areas which require management to make significant estimates and assumptions in determining carrying values include, but are not limited to:

a) *Mineral reserves and resources*

Mineral reserve and resource estimates include numerous uncertainties and depend heavily on geological interpretations and statistical inferences drawn from drilling and other data, and require estimates of future price for the commodity and future cost of operations. The mineral reserve and resources are subject to uncertainty and actual results may vary from these estimates. Results from drilling, testing and production, as well as material changes in commodity prices and operating costs subsequent to the date of the estimate, may justify revision of such estimates. Changes in the proven and probable mineral reserves or measured and indicated and inferred mineral resources estimates may impact the carrying value of the properties.

b) *Impairment analysis - mineral properties*

As required under IFRS 6 – Exploration for and evaluation of mineral resources and IAS 36 – Impairment of assets (“IAS 36”), the Company reviewed its mineral properties for impairment based on results to date and when events and changes in circumstances indicate that the carrying value of the assets may not be recoverable. Upon the Company’s determination of technical feasibility and commercial viability an impairment test of the capitalized costs related to the Gahcho Kué Project was completed. IAS 36 requires the Company to make certain estimates in respect of recoverability of the asset, including estimated development costs, life of mine, discount rates and diamond prices. The Company’s assessment is that there is no impairment in the carrying value of its mineral properties.

*c) Provision for decommissioning and restoration*

The decommissioning and restoration liability and the accretion recorded are based on estimates of future cash flows, discount rates, and assumptions regarding timing. The estimates are subject to change and the actual costs for the decommissioning and restoration liability may change significantly.

*d) Stock options*

The stock option pricing model requires the input of highly subjective assumptions including the expected life and volatility. Changes in the subjective input assumptions can materially affect the fair value estimate.

*e) Deferred taxes*

Deferred income tax assets and liabilities are determined based on differences between the financial reporting and tax bases of assets and liabilities and on unused losses carried forward, and are measured using the substantively enacted tax rates that are expected to be in effect when the differences are expected to reverse or losses are expected to be utilized. Deferred tax assets are recorded to recognize tax benefits only to the extent that, based on available evidence, including forecasts, it is probable that they will be realized. The Company has not recorded the benefit of any tax losses or deductible temporary differences.

## **STANDARDS, AMENDMENTS AND INTERPRETATIONS TO EXISTING STANDARDS THAT ARE NOT YET EFFECTIVE AND HAVE NOT BEEN ADOPTED EARLY BY THE COMPANY**

At the date of authorization of these financial statements, certain new standards, amendments and interpretations to existing standards have been published but are not yet effective, and have not been adopted early by the Company.

The Company anticipates that all relevant pronouncements will be adopted in the Company's accounting policy for the first period beginning after the effective date of the pronouncement. Information on new standards, amendments and interpretations that are expected to be relevant to the Company's financial statements is provided below. Certain other new standards and interpretations have been issued but are not expected to have a material impact on the Company's financial statements and are therefore not discussed below.

### **IFRS 9 – Financial Instruments**

The IASB issued IFRS 9 “Financial Instruments” (“IFRS 9”) which proposes to replace IAS 39 “Financial Instruments: recognition and measurement”. The replacement standard has the following significant components: establishes two primary measurement categories for financial assets — amortized cost and fair value; establishes criteria for classification of financial assets within the measurement category based on business model and cash flow characteristics; and eliminates existing held to maturity, available-for-sale, and loans and receivable categories.

In November 2013, the IASB issued an amendment to IFRS 9 which includes a new hedge model that aligns accounting more closely with risk management, as well as enhancements to the disclosures about hedge accounting and risk management. Additionally as the impairment guidance in IFRS 9, as well as certain limited amendments to the classification and measurement requirements of IFRS 9 is not yet complete, the previously mandated effective date of IFRS 9 of January 1, 2015, has been removed. Entities may apply IFRS 9 before the IASB completes the amendments, but are not required to. The Company has not yet determined the impact of adoption of IFRS 9 and will evaluate the impact of the change to its financial statements based on the characteristics of its financial instruments at the time of adoption.

### **IFRIC 21 – Levies**

IFRIC 21 Levies (“IFRIC 21”) was issued in May 2013 and is an interpretation of IAS 37 – Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets (“IAS 37”), on the accounting for levies imposed by governments. IAS 37 sets out criteria for the recognition of a liability, one of which is the requirement for the entity to have a present obligation as a result of a past event (“obligating event”). IFRIC 21 clarifies that the obligating event that gives rise to a liability to pay a levy is the activity described in the relevant legislation that triggers the payment of the levy. IFRIC 21 is effective for annual periods commencing on or after January 1, 2014. The Company is assessing the impact of this new standard, if any, on the consolidated financial statements.

**IAS 32 – Offsetting Financial Assets and Liabilities**

IAS 32 was amended to clarify that an entity currently has a legally enforceable right to set-off if that right is not contingent on a future event; and enforceable both in the normal course of business and in the event of default, insolvency or bankruptcy of the entity and all counterparties. This amendment also clarifies when a settlement mechanism provides for net settlement or gross settlement that is equivalent to net settlement. Amendments to IAS 32 are effective for annual periods beginning on or after January 1, 2014. The Company intends to adopt the amendments to IAS 32 in its consolidated financial statements for the annual period beginning January 1, 2014. The Company does not expect the amendments to have a material impact on the consolidated financial statements.

**RELATED PARTY TRANSACTIONS**

The Company's related parties include the operator of the Gahcho Kué Project, Bottin (International) Investments Ltd. ("Bottin"), key management and their close family members, and the Company's directors. Kennady Diamonds Inc. ("Kennady Diamonds") is also a related party since the Company and Kennady Diamonds have common members of key management.



None of the transactions with related parties incorporate special terms and conditions, and no guarantees were given or received. Related party transactions are recorded at their exchange amount, being the amount agreed to by the parties. Outstanding balances are settled in cash.

The Company had the following transactions and balances with its related parties including key management personnel and the Company's directors, Bottin, the operator of the Gahcho Kué Project, and Kennady Diamonds. The transactions with key management personnel are in the nature of remuneration. The transactions with the operator of the Gahcho Kué Project relate to the funding of the Company's interest in the Gahcho Kué Project for the current year's expenditures and capital additions. The transactions with Kennady Diamonds are for a monthly management fee charged by the Company and reimbursement of expenses paid on behalf of Kennady Diamonds.

	December 31, 2013	December 31, 2012	December 31, 2011
The total of the transactions:			
Bottin - Stand-by Fee under Stand-by Agreement	\$ -	\$ 706,261	\$ -
Kennady Diamonds	152,500	120,940	-
Remuneration	2,457,759	1,477,715	1,450,068
Payable to the operator of the Gahcho Kué Project	5,647,892	685,290	-
Payable to key management personnel	357,967	30,180	313,000

The remuneration expense of directors and other members of key management personnel for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 were as follows:

	Year ended December 31 2013	Year ended December 31, 2012	Year ended December 31, 2011
Consulting fees, director fees, bonus and other short-term benefits	\$ 1,216,938	\$ 1,014,215	\$ 962,983
Share-based payments	1,240,821	463,500	487,085
	\$ 2,457,759	\$ 1,477,715	\$ 1,450,068

In accordance with IAS 24 *Related Parties*, key management personnel are those persons having authority and responsibility for planning, directing and controlling the activities of the Company directly or indirectly, including any directors (executive and non-executive) of the Company.

## CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS

The Company has consulting agreements with the President and CEO and the VP Finance, CFO and Corporate Secretary for their services in these capacities.

For the year ended December 31, 2013, the Company's proportional interest (49%) of purchase commitments relevant to project expenditure by the operator of the Gahcho Kué Project is \$31,609,307.

	2014	2015	2016	Total
Future Gahcho Kué Project commitments	\$25,296,426	\$6,164,608	\$148,273	\$31,609,307

The total future minimum lease payments for office space by the Company under non-cancellable operating leases are as follows:

	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total
Future minimum lease payments	\$142,256	\$142,256	\$142,256	\$11,855	\$438,623

## **Other Management Discussion and Analysis Requirements**

## **RISKS**

Mountain Province's business of exploring, permitting and developing mineral resources involves a variety of operational, financial and regulatory risks that are typical in the mining industry. The Company attempts to mitigate these risks and minimize their effect on its financial performance, but there is no guarantee that the Company will be profitable in the future, and investing in the Company's common shares should be considered speculative.

Mountain Province's business of exploring, permitting and developing mineral properties is subject to a variety of risks and uncertainties, including, without limitation:

- § risks and uncertainties relating to the interpretation of drill results, the geology, grade and continuity of mineral deposits;
- § results of initial feasibility, pre-feasibility and feasibility studies, and the possibility that future exploration, development or mining results will not be consistent with the Company's expectations;
- § mining exploration risks, including risks related to accidents, equipment breakdowns or other unanticipated difficulties with or interruptions in production;
- § the potential for delays in exploration activities or the completion of feasibility studies;
- § risks related to the inherent uncertainty of exploration and cost estimates and the potential for unexpected costs and expenses;
- § risks related to foreign exchange fluctuations and prices of diamonds;
- § risks related to commodity price fluctuations;
- § the uncertainty of profitability based upon the Company's history of losses;
- § risks related to failure of the Company and/or its joint venture partner to obtain adequate financing on a timely basis and on acceptable terms, particularly given recent volatility in the global financial markets;
- § development and production risks including and particularly risks for weather conducive to the building and use of the Tibbitt to Contwoyto Winter Road;
- § risks related to environmental regulation, permitting and liability;
- § risks related to legal challenges to construction and/or operating permits that are approved and/or issued;
- § political and regulatory risks associated with mining, exploration and development;
- § geological and technical conditions at the Company's Gahcho Kué Project being adequate to permit development;
- § the ability to develop and operate the Company's Gahcho Kué Project on an economic basis and in accordance with applicable timelines;
- § aboriginal rights and title;
- § failure of plant, equipment, processes and transportation services to operate as anticipated;
- § possible variations in ore grade or recovery rates, permitting timelines, capital expenditures, reclamation activities, land titles, and social and political developments, and other risks of the mining industry; and
- § other risks and uncertainties related to the Company's prospects, properties and business strategy.

As well, there can be no assurance that any further funding required by the Company will become available to it, and if so, that it will be offered on reasonable terms, or that the Company will be able to secure such funding. Furthermore, there is no assurance that the Company will be able to secure new mineral properties or projects, or that they can be secured on competitive terms.

#### **Disclosure of Outstanding Share Data**

The Company's common shares are traded on the Toronto Stock Exchange (TSX) under the symbol MPV and on the New York Stock Exchange MKT under the symbol MDM.

At March 25, 2014, there were 100,501,351 shares issued and 1,400,000 stock options outstanding. There were no warrants outstanding.

There are an unlimited number of common shares without par value authorized to be issued by the Company.

## **Controls and Procedures**

### **Disclosure Controls and Procedures**

The Company's Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer have evaluated the effectiveness of the Company's disclosure controls and procedures (as such term is defined in Rules 13(a)-15(e) and 15(d)-15(e) under the "Exchange Act" as of the end of the period covered by this annual report (the "Evaluation Date"). Based on such evaluation, such officers have concluded that, as of the Evaluation Date, the Company's disclosure controls and procedures are effective. Such disclosure controls and procedures are designed to ensure that the information required to be disclosed by the Company in reports that it files or submits to the Securities and Exchange Commission under the Exchange Act is recorded, processed, summarized and reported within the time periods specified in applicable rules and forms, and includes controls and procedures designed to ensure information relating to the Company required to be included in our reports filed or submitted under the Exchange Act is accumulated and communicated to the Company's management to allow timely decision regarding disclosure.

## **INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING**

The Company's management, under the supervision of the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, are responsible for establishing and maintaining the Company's Internal Control Over Financial Reporting ("ICFR"). Management has conducted an evaluation of internal control over financial reporting based on the framework established in "Internal Control – Integrated Framework (1992) issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission ("COSO") as at December 31, 2013. There have not been any changes in the Company's ICFR or in other factors during 2013 or that have been identified in connection with the evaluation that occurred during the year ended December 31, 2013, that has materially affected, or is reasonably likely to materially affect, the Company's ICFR.

### **Management's Annual Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting**

Management of the Company is responsible for establishing and maintaining adequate internal control over financial reporting for the Company. Management has designed such internal control over financial reporting to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of financial reporting and the preparation of financial statements for external purposes in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards as issued by the International Accounting Standards Board.

Because of its inherent limitations, the Company's internal control over financial reporting may not prevent or detect all possible misstatements or frauds. Also, projections of any evaluation of effectiveness to future periods are subject to the risk that controls may become inadequate because of changes in conditions, or that the degree of compliance with policies or procedures may deteriorate.

To evaluate the effectiveness of the Company's internal control over financial reporting, Management has used the Internal Control – Integrated Framework (1992), which is a suitable, recognized control framework established by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission ("COSO"). Management has assessed the effectiveness of the Company's internal control over financial reporting and concluded that such internal control over financial reporting is effective as of December 31, 2013. The Company's independent auditors, KPMG LLP, have issued an unqualified opinion on the effectiveness of the Company's internal control over financial reporting as of December 31, 2013.

## **CAUTIONARY NOTE ON FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS**

*Certain of the statements made and information contained herein is “forward-looking information” within the meaning of the Ontario Securities Act. Forward-looking information may include, but is not limited to, statements with respect to the success of exploration activities, future mineral exploration, permitting time lines, requirements for additional capital, sources and uses of funds, the estimation of mineral reserves and mineral resources, the realization of mineral reserve and mineral resource estimates, future remediation and reclamation activities, the timing of activities and the amount of estimated revenues and expenses. Forward-looking information is based on various assumptions including, without limitation, the expectations and beliefs of management, the assumed long term price of diamonds; that the Company can access financing, appropriate equipment and sufficient labour and that the political environment where the Company operates will continue to support the development and operation of mining projects. Should underlying assumptions prove incorrect, or one or more of the risks and uncertainties described below materialize, actual results may vary materially from those described in forward-looking statements. Accordingly, readers are advised not to place undue reliance on forward-looking statements.*

*Forward-looking information is subject to a variety of risks and uncertainties which could cause actual events or results to differ from those reflected in the forward-looking information, including, without limitation, risks and uncertainties relating to foreign currency fluctuations; risks inherent in mining including environmental hazards, industrial accidents, unusual or unexpected geological formations, ground control problems and flooding; delays or the inability to obtain necessary governmental permits or financing; risks associated with the estimation of mineral resources and reserves and the geology, grade and continuity of mineral deposits; the possibility that future exploration, development or mining results will not be consistent with the Company's expectations; the potential for and effects of labor disputes or other unanticipated difficulties with or shortages of labor or interruptions in production; failure of plant, equipment or processes to operate as anticipated; actual ore mined varying from estimates of grade, tonnage, dilution and metallurgical and other characteristics; the inherent uncertainty of production and cost estimates and the potential for unexpected costs and expenses, diamond price fluctuations; uncertain political and economic environments; changes in laws or policies, and other risks and uncertainties, including those described under Risk Factors.*

*Historical results of operations and trends that may be inferred from the following discussions and analysis may not necessarily indicate future results from operations. The Company undertakes no obligation to publicly update or review the forward-looking statements whether as a result of new information, future events or otherwise, other than as required under applicable securities laws.*

### ***Cautionary Note to U.S. Investors – Information Concerning Preparation of Resource Estimates***

*This MD&A has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the securities laws in effect in Canada, which differ from the requirements of United States securities laws. Unless otherwise indicated, all resource and reserve estimates included in this MD&A have been prepared in accordance with NI 43-101 and the Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy Classification System. NI 43-101 is a rule developed by the Canadian Securities Administrators which establishes standards for all public disclosure an issuer makes of scientific and technical information concerning mineral projects.*

*Canadian standards, including NI 43-101, differ significantly from the requirements of Industry Guide 7 promulgated by the United States Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") under the United States Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and resource and reserve information contained herein may not be comparable to similar information disclosed by U.S. companies. In particular, and without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the term "resource" does not equate to the term "reserves". Under U.S. standards, mineralization may not be classified as a "reserve" unless the determination has been made that the mineralization could be economically and legally produced or extracted at the time the reserve determination is made. The SEC's disclosure standards under Industry Guide 7 do not define the terms and normally do not permit the inclusion of information concerning "measured mineral resources", "indicated mineral resources" or "inferred mineral resources" or other descriptions of the amount of mineralization in mineral deposits that do not constitute "reserves" by U.S. standards in documents filed with the SEC. U.S. Investors should also understand that "inferred mineral resources" have a great amount of uncertainty as to their existence and great uncertainty as to their economic and legal feasibility. It cannot be assumed that all or any*

*part of an “inferred mineral resource” will ever be upgraded to a higher category. Under Canadian rules, estimated “inferred mineral resources” may not form the basis of feasibility or pre-feasibility studies except in rare cases. Investors are cautioned not to assume that all or any part of an “inferred mineral resource” exists or is economically or legally mineable.*

*Disclosure of “contained ounces” (or “contained carats”) in a resource is permitted disclosure under Canadian regulations; however, the SEC normally only permits issuers to report mineralization that does not constitute “reserves” by SEC standards as in place tonnage and grade without reference to unit measures. The requirements of NI 43-101 for identification of “reserves” are also not the same as those of the SEC’s Industry Guide 7, and reserves reported by the Company in compliance with NI 43-101 may not qualify as “reserves” under Industry Guide 7 standards. Accordingly, information concerning mineral deposits set forth herein may not be comparable with information made public by companies that report in accordance with U. S. standards.*



## Item 6. Directors, Senior Management and Employees

A. *Directors and Senior management.*

Each director of MPV is elected by the shareholders to serve until close of the next annual meeting of shareholders or until a successor is elected or appointed, unless such office is earlier vacated in accordance with the Corporation's by-laws. The following table sets forth certain information regarding the current directors and executive officers of MPV, as of March 25, 2014.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Position with Company</b>	<b>Date of First Appointment</b>
Jonathan Comerford	Chairman and Director <sup>(2)(3)</sup>	Chairman of the Company since May 11, 2006 and Director since September 21, 2001
Patrick Evans	President, Chief Executive Officer and Director	President and Director of the Company since November 15, 2005
Bruce Ramsden	Vice-President Finance and CFO	Vice President Finance since February 1, 2013 and Chief Financial Officer effective May 1, 2013
Bruce Dresner	Director <sup>(1)</sup>	Director since March 11, 2013
Peeyush Varshney	Director <sup>(1) (2)</sup>	Director since April 13, 2007
Carl Verley	Director <sup>(1)(3)</sup>	Director of Old MPV since December 2, 1986 and Director of the Company since November 1, 1997
David E. Whittle	Director <sup>(2)(3)</sup>	Director since November 1, 1997

(1) Member of the Company's Corporate Governance Committee.

(2) Member of the Company's Audit Committee.

(3) Member of the Company's Compensation Committee.

The following is a description of the Company's directors and senior management. The information provided is not within the knowledge of the management of the Company and has been provided by the respective directors and senior officers.

*Jonathan Christopher James Comerford, B.A. (Econ.), M.B.S. (Finance)*

Mr. Jonathan Comerford has been a director of the Company since September 2001 and Chairman since April 2006. Mr. Comerford is resident in Dublin, Ireland. He obtained his Masters in Business from the Michael Smurfit Business School in 1993 and his Bachelor of Economics from University College, Dublin in 1992. Mr. Comerford has been Investment Manager at IIU since August 1995. He serves as a director of Kennady Diamonds Inc. since February 2012, and is Chairman of Optimal Payment Plc.

***Patrick C. Evans, B.A., B.Sc.***

Mr. Patrick C. Evans has been President, CEO and a director of Mountain Province Diamonds Inc. since November 2005. He is a resident of Arizona, USA. Mr. Evans is a graduate of the University of Cape Town where he received his Bachelor of Arts degree in 1977 and Bachelor of Science degree in 1978. In 1999 he was appointed a Vice President of Placer Dome Inc. (a major gold mining company) and a non-executive director of SouthernEra Resources Ltd. (a diamond and platinum exploration, development and mining company). In 2001, he was appointed President and CEO of SouthernEra Resources Ltd. and Messina Limited (a platinum mining company). In 2004, he was appointed President, CEO and a director of Southern Platinum Corp. (a platinum mining company), which was acquired by Lonmin Plc in June 2005. In September 2005, he was appointed President, CEO and a director of Weda Bay Minerals Inc. (a nickel exploration and development company), which was acquired by Eramet S.A. in May 2006. Mr. Evans was appointed the CEO and a director of Norsemont Mining Inc. (a copper exploration and development company) in June 2007 which was taken over by Hudbay in the March 2011. He also served as a non-executive director of Anvil Mining Limited (a copper mining company) from March 2009 to February 2012 when Anvil Mining was acquired by Minmetals. Mr. Evans has served as the President and CEO and a director of Kennady Diamonds Inc. since February 2012. Mr. Evans is a non-executive director of Indico Resources Ltd.

***Bruce C. Ramsden, B.Comm, A.C.I.S.***

Mr. Bruce Ramsden has been the Company's Vice President Finance and Chief Financial Officer since May 2013. Mr. Ramsden is also Vice President Finance and Chief Financial Officer for Kennady Diamonds Inc., since May 2013. He has been a resident of Ontario, Canada since February 1996 and prior to that resided in South Africa where he graduated by correspondence with a Bachelor of Commerce degree from the University of South Africa and gained through correspondence a C.I.S through the Institute of Chartered Secretaries and Administrators. Mr. Ramsden worked for a number of large companies in South Africa, including Mobil Oil, Philips South Africa and Castrol Oil South Africa prior to immigrating to Canada in 1996. Since 1996, Mr. Ramsden has provided financial consulting services to Vaaldiam Resources Ltd. (May 1996 to December 2001) and in addition to his CFO and Corporate Secretary roles was also a Director. Mr. Ramsden was also a Director and Chief Financial Officer of Sierra Minerals Inc. (January 1998 to September 2006). Mr. Ramsden also consulted to St Andrew Goldfields Ltd. (January 2002 to June 2005) and was VP Finance, CFO and Corporate Secretary. Mr. Ramsden was also CFO and a Director for Heritage Exploration Ltd. (January 2005 to June 2005). Mr. Ramsden joined Vaaldiam Mining Inc., formerly Tiomin Resources Inc. (June 2005 to June 2010) as VP Finance, CFO and Corporate Secretary. Mr. Ramsden was also a Director of Freegold Ventures Limited (October 2009 to April 2011). Mr. Ramsden consulted to Andean American Gold Corp. (July 2010 to October 2012), which was acquired by Lupaka Gold Corp. (October 2012) and Southern Legacy Minerals Inc., formerly Sinchao Metals Corp. (July 2010 to June 2012) where in addition to his VP Finance, CFO and Corporate Secretary roles, he also provided financial and administrative services to both companies.

***Bruce Dresner, MBA, BA***

Mr. Dresner has had a distinguished career as an investment professional, including Director of Investments and Chief Investment Officer at Dartmouth College (1985-1990), Vice President for Investments and Chief Investment Officer at Columbia University (1990-2002), Principal of Quellos Group LLC (2002-2007) and Managing Director, BlackRock Inc. (2007-2008). Since his retirement from BlackRock, Mr. Dresner has held a number of board and advisory positions, including serving on the advisory board of Capstone Investment Advisors (2008-2010), as a member of the strategic advisory board of Wilshire Private Markets at Wilshire Associates Inc. (2010-present), and a trustee of the Gottex Multi-Asset Endowment and Alternative Asset Funds (2011-present). Bruce Dresner is a graduate of Dartmouth College Tuck School of Business (MBA, 1971) and the University of Miami (BA Economics, 1969). Mr. Dresner also received his CFA (Chartered Financial Analyst) designation in 1980. Mr. Dresner is a resident of Connecticut, USA. Mr. Dresner was appointed as a director of Mountain Province in March 2013. He is also a director of the Sherman Fairchild Foundation (nonprofit).

***Peeyush Varshney, LL.B.***

A resident of British Columbia, Canada, Mr. Peeyush Varshney has been actively involved in the capital markets since 1996 and has been a principal of Varshney Capital Corp., a private merchant banking, venture capital and corporate advisory firm since 1996. Since September 2005, he has also been the Chief Executive Officer and a director of Canada Zinc Metals Corp., a resource exploration company listed on the TSX Venture Exchange. Mr. Varshney obtained a Bachelor of Commerce degree (Finance) in 1989 and a Bachelor of Laws in 1993, both from the University of British Columbia. He then articulated at Farris, Vaughan, Wills & Murphy, a law firm in Vancouver, British Columbia, from 1993 to 1994, and has been a member of the Law Society of British Columbia since September 1994. Mr. Varshney is also director of Afrasia Mineral Fields Inc., Mexigold Corp., Trigen Resources Inc., Minaean International Corp., Open Gold Corp., Broome Capital Inc. and JDV Capital Corp.

***Carl G. Verley, B.Sc., P. Geo.***

Mr. Carl Verley is a resident of British Columbia, Canada, and a graduate of the University of British Columbia where he received his Bachelor of Science Degree in May of 1974. He worked for Cordilleran Engineering Ltd. from 1975 to 1982. He has been a self-employed geologist since 1982. From August of 1990 to January 2002, he served on the Board of Directors of Gee-Ten Ventures Inc., from May 2002 to July 2003 he was a director of Rome Resources Ltd., from July 2003 to December 2011, he was a director of Alphamin Resources Corp., and from October 2007 to May 2012 he was a director of African Metals Corp. He was vice president of exploration for Windstorm Resources Inc from July 2011 to October 2012. Currently and since 1986 he has been a director of Mountain Province Diamonds Inc. and since February 2012, he has been a director of Kennady Diamonds Inc. He is the President of Amerlin Exploration Services Ltd., a private company providing exploration services to the mineral industry, that he formed 1983. He is a registered Professional Geoscientist with the British Columbia Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists.

***David E. Whittle, B.Comm., C.A.***

Mr. Whittle is a Chartered Accountant and is a resident of British Columbia, Canada. He has been a director of Mountain Province Diamonds Inc. since November 1997. From 2004 to August 2007, Mr. Whittle was Chief Financial Officer of Hillsborough Resources Limited, a public company in the mining business. Since October 2007, Mr. Whittle's principal occupation has been Chief Financial Officer of Alexco Resource Corp., a public company both in the mining business and in the business of providing consulting services to third parties in respect of environmental remediation and permitting. He is also a director of Kennady Diamonds Inc. since February 2012.

***B. Compensation.***

The Company has two executive officers (collectively, the "Executive Officers"): Patrick Evans, the President and CEO, and Bruce Ramsden, Vice President Finance and CFO. For particulars on these executive officers, reference should be made to "Item 6A - Directors and Senior Management".

The compensation paid to the executive officers and details of management contracts and incentive options granted to the two executive officers of the Company for the Company's most recently completed financial years is as follows:

Patrick Evans, President and Chief Executive Officer, earned other annual compensation of \$536,667 in the most recent fiscal year ending December 31, 2013 including \$530,000 pursuant to a consulting agreement (as amended) for his services as President and CEO, as well as a director's fee of \$6,667 for the year ended December 31, 2013. As at December 31, 2013, he had 300,000 stock options.

Grant date	Number	Vesting	Exercise Price	Term
January 10, 2011	100,000	Immediately	\$ 6.13	5 years
March 8, 2012	100,000	Immediately	\$ 4.84	5 years
May 14, 2013	100,000	Immediately	\$ 5.00	5 years

Bruce Ramsden, Chief Financial Officer and Corporate Secretary, was paid \$183,040 pursuant to a consulting agreement for his services as CFO and Corporate Secretary for the year ended December 31, 2013. As at December 31, 2013, he has 100,000 stock options as follows:

Grant date	Number	Vesting	Exercise Price	Term
February 1, 2013	100,000	1/3 immediately, 1/3 after year 1 and 1/3 after year 2	\$ 4.08	5 years

Effective January 1, 2013, compensation for the directors was approved at the following levels: Chairman of the Board receives \$30,000 per annum, the Chairman of the Audit Committee receives \$25,000 per annum, the Director acting as Qualified Person receives \$25,000, and all other Directors receive \$20,000 per annum. These amounts continue to be paid semi-annually, in advance. Effective January 1, 2014, compensation for the directors was approved at the following levels: Chairman of the Board receives \$40,000 per annum, the Chairman of the Audit Committee receives \$35,000 per annum, the Director acting as Qualified Person receives \$35,000, and all other Directors receive \$30,000 per annum. These amounts continue to be paid semi-annually, in advance.

For the year ended December 31, 2012, the compensation for the directors was approved and paid at the following levels: Chairman of the Board - \$30,000, the Chairman of the Audit Committee - \$25,000, and all other Directors - \$20,000 per annum. These amounts were paid semi-annually, in advance.

During each of the years ended December 31, 2013, December 31, 2012, and December 31, 2011, director fees were earned by the following directors:

Director/Position	December 31, 2013	December 31, 2012	December 31, 2011
Jonathan Comerford	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 20,000
<i>Chairman of the Board</i>			
David Whittle	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 15,000
<i>Chairman of the Audit Committee</i>			
Bruce Dresner <sup>(2)</sup>	\$ 16,082	\$N/A	\$N/A
<i>Director</i>			
Patrick Evans	\$ 6,667	\$ 20,000	\$ 10,000



Edgar Filing: Mountain Province Diamonds Inc. - Form 20-F

*Director*

Elizabeth Kirkwood<sup>(3)</sup>

\$ 10,000      \$ 20,000      \$ 10,000

*Director*

Carl Verley

\$ 25,000      \$ 25,000      \$ 10,000

*Director*

Peeyush Varshney

\$ 20,000      \$ 20,000      \$ 10,000

*Director*

(1) The Directors' Fees were prorated for the first semi-annual payment in 2010 to adjust for the payment, in advance, of the January 1, 2010-March 31, 2010 fees paid in October 2009 before the Company's change in year end.

(2) Mr. Dresner joined the board on March 18, 2013.  
 (3) Ms. Kirkwood resigned from the board on June 11, 2013.

The Company has no Long-Term Incentive Plan ("LTIP") in place and therefore there were no awards made under any long-term incentive plan to the Executive Officers during the Company's most recently completed financial year. A "Long-Term Incentive Plan" is a plan providing compensation intended to motivate performance over a period of greater than one financial year, other than a plan for options, SARs (stock appreciation rights) or compensation through shares or units that are subject to restrictions on resale.

The following table sets out incentive stock options exercised by the Executive Officers during the most recently completed financial year, as well as the financial year end value of stock options held by the Executive Officers. During this period, no outstanding SARs were held by the Executive Officers.

Name	Securities, Acquired on Exercise (#)	Aggregate Value Realized (\$) <sup>(1)</sup>	Unexercised Options at Financial Year-End Exercisable / Unexercisable (#)	Value of Unexercised In-the- Money Options at Financial Year-End Exercisable / Unexercisable (\$) <sup>(2)</sup>
Patrick Evans	Nil	Nil	300,000/0	\$74,000/\$0
Bruce Ramsden	Nil	Nil	33,334/66,666	\$40,334/\$80,666

(1) Based on the difference between the option exercise price and the closing market price of the Company's shares on the date of exercise.

(2) In-the-Money Options are those where the market value of the underlying securities as at the most recent financial year end exceeds the option exercise price. The closing market price of the Company's shares as at December 31, 2013, (i.e. financial year end) was \$3.89.

There were no options or freestanding SARs held by the Executive Officers that were re-priced downward during the most recently completed financial year of the Company.

The Company does not have a defined benefit/actuarial plan, under which benefits are determined primarily by final compensation and years of service of the Company's officers and key employees.

In addition to the foregoing, some of the executive officers of the Company are also entitled to medical and dental benefits, reimbursement of all reasonable business expenses and, from time to time, the grant of stock options.

No plan exists, and no amount has been set aside or accrued by the Company or any of its subsidiaries, to provide pension, retirement or similar benefits for directors and officers of the Company, or any of its subsidiaries.

C.

*Board practices.*

The directors of the Company are elected annually and hold office until the next annual general meeting of the shareholders of the Company or until their successors in office are duly elected or appointed. The Company does not have an executive committee. All directors are elected for a one-year term. All officers serve at the pleasure of the Board. None of the directors, with the exception of Patrick Evans, who serves as the Company's President and CEO, have any service agreements with the Company. Mr. Evans' agreement contains a termination clause that would provide him with 24 months of compensation if there is a change of control of the Company plus benefits and full incentive compensation for the same period, all payable within 30 days of termination. In addition, the Company will fully fund Mr. Evans RBC life insurance policy to maturity through a lump sum payment, estimated at approximately \$400,000 based on term of the policy and prevailing interest rates. All stock options held by Mr. Evans will vest upon the Change of Control.

The next Annual General Meeting of the shareholders of the Company has been scheduled for June 17, 2014.

The Board has adopted a Charter under which it and the Board's committees operate. The Company's board of directors has three committees- the Audit Committee, the Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee and the Compensation Committee.

#### *Audit Committee*

The members of the Audit Committee do not have any fixed term for holding their positions and are appointed and replaced from time to time by resolution of the Board of Directors. It is composed of at least three directors, and the Board has determined that David Whittle, C.A. of the Audit Committee meets the requirement of an "audit committee financial expert" as defined in Item 16A of Form 20-F. Each member of the Audit Committee has the financial ability to read and understand a balance sheet, an income statement and a cash flow statement. All three members of the Audit Committee are independent.

The current members of the Audit Committee are Jonathan Comerford, Peeyush Varshney and David Whittle. Except for the chairman, David Whittle, the Audit Committee members receive no separate remuneration for acting as such and their appointments are not for any fixed term.

The Audit Committee is appointed by the Board to assist the Board in fulfilling its oversight responsibilities. Its primary duties and responsibilities are to:

- a. identify and monitor the management of the principal risks that could impact the financial reporting of the Company;
- b. monitor the integrity of the Company's financial reporting process and system of internal controls regarding financial reporting and accounting compliance;
- c. make recommendations regarding the selection of the Company's external auditors (by shareholders) and monitor their independence and performance;
- d. provide an avenue of communication among the external auditors, management and the Board;

- e. handle complaints regarding the Company's accounting practices; and
- f. administer and monitor compliance with the Company's Ethics and Conflict of Interest Policy.

*Corporate Governance Committee*

The members of the Corporate Governance Committee are Peeyush Varshney (Chair), Carl Verley and Bruce Dresner. They are unrelated.

The Corporate Governance Committee is responsible for assessing directors on an ongoing basis and for developing the Company's approach to governance issues and for the Company's response to the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, as implemented by the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Toronto Stock Exchange's governance guidelines.

*Compensation Committee*

The Compensation Committee is composed of Carl Verley (Chair), David Whittle, and Jonathan Comerford, all of whom are independent. The Committee, in consultation with the Chairman and CEO of the Company, makes recommendations to the Board on the Company's framework of executive remuneration and its cost and on specific remuneration packages for each of the executives. The remuneration of non-executives, including members of the Compensation Committee, is determined by the Board.

D. *Employees.*

As at the end of the fiscal years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011, the Company had no full-time employees. The President and CEO, Patrick Evans, and the VP Finance, CFO and Corporate Secretary, Bruce Ramsden, have consulting agreements with the Company. The Toronto administrative and executive office uses outsourced administrative assistance on an as-needed, part-time basis. De Beers Canada employs personnel who conduct the development, permitting and other activities for the Gahcho Kué Project.

*E. Share ownership.*

The following table sets forth, as of March 25, 2014, the number of the MPV Shares beneficially owned by (a) the directors and members of senior management of the Company, individually, and as a group, and (b) the percentage ownership of the outstanding common shares represented by such shares. The security holders listed below are deemed to be the beneficial owners of common shares underlying options which are exercisable within 60 days from the above date.

Name of Beneficial Owner	Amount and Nature	Percentage <sup>(9)(10)</sup> of Class	
Patrick C. Evans <sup>(1)</sup>	1,719,055	1.7	%
Bruce Dresner <sup>(2)</sup>	474,148	*	%
Carl G. Verley <sup>(3)</sup>	433,890	*	%
Jonathan Comerford <sup>(4)</sup>	273,500	*	%
Peeyush Varshney <sup>(5)</sup>	212,622	*	%
David E. Whittle <sup>(6)</sup>	236,600	*	%
Bruce Ramsden <sup>(7)</sup>	116,667	*	%
<b>Officer and Directors as a Group<sup>(9)</sup></b>	<b>3,466,482</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>%</b>

\* less than 1%

Includes 1,317,555 MPV Shares and 400,000 options. 100,000 options are exercisable at a price of \$6.13 per MPV Share, and expire on January 9, 2016. 100,000 options are exercisable at a price of \$4.84 per MPV share, and expire on March 7, 2017. 100,000 options are exercisable at a price of \$5.00 per MPV share, and expire on May 13, 2018. 100,000 options are exercisable at a price of \$5.29 per MPV share, and expire on February 13, 2019.

Includes 324,148 MPV Shares and 150,000 options. 100,000 options are exercisable at a price of \$4.06 per MPV (2)Share, and expire on March 10, 2018. 50,000 options are exercisable at a price of \$5.28 per MPV share, and expire on July 2, 2018.

(3) Includes 333,890 MPV Shares and 100,000 options. 100,000 options are exercisable at a price of \$5.28 per MPV share, and expire on July 2, 2018.

(4) Includes 123,500 MPV Shares and 150,000 options. 150,000 options are exercisable at a price of \$5.28 per MPV share, and expire on July 2, 2018.

(5) Includes 112,622 MPV Shares and 100,000 options. 100,000 options are exercisable at a price of \$5.28 per MPV share, and expire on July 2, 2018.

(6) Includes 136,600 MPV Shares and 100,000 options. 100,000 options are exercisable at a price of \$5.28 per MPV share, and expire on July 2, 2018.

Includes Nil MPV Shares, and 116,666 options. 66,666 options are exercisable at a price of \$4.08 per MPV Share (7)and expire on January 1, 2018. 50,000 options exercisable at a price of \$5.29 per MPV share, and expire on February 13, 2019.

Includes 1,400,000 options outstanding, of which 1,116,667 are held by the directors and senior management (8)(exercisable). The calculation does not include stock options that are not exercisable presently or within 60 days (of which there are 33,332).

(9) Total issued and outstanding capital as at the close of March 25, 2014 was 100,501,351 shares.

(10) The Company has no actual knowledge of the holdings of each individual. The above information was provided by the respective individuals to the Company.

The Company has a stock option plan pursuant to which stock options may be granted to its directors, officers and employees. Stock options are awarded by resolution of the board of directors.

#### Item 7. Major Shareholders and Related Party Transactions

##### A. *Major shareholders.*

A major shareholder is a shareholder beneficially owning more than 5% of the issued shares of the Company.

As at March 25, 2014, the Company's issued and outstanding capital was 100,501,351 MPV Shares.

The Company is a publicly-owned corporation the majority of the MPV Shares of which are owned by persons resident outside the United States. To the best of the Company's knowledge, the Company is not directly owned or controlled by another corporation or any foreign government. As at March 25, 2014, the Company believes that approximately 17,402,000 of the MPV Shares were held by 76 shareholders with addresses in the United States. A number of these shares are held in "street" name and may, therefore, be held by several beneficial owners.

The following table shows, to the best knowledge of the Company, the number (as at March 25, 2014) and percentage of MPV Shares, warrants and options held by the Company's major shareholders:

<b>Name of Shareholder<sup>(1)</sup></b>	<b>No. of MPV Shares Held <sup>(2)</sup></b>	Percentage of issued and outstanding share capital of 94,168,151 shares as at March 28, 2013)
--	--	--



Edgar Filing: Mountain Province Diamonds Inc. - Form 20-F

Bottin (International) Investments Ltd. (controlled by Dermot Desmond)	23,481,490	23.36	%
Desmond P. Sharkey Dublin, Ireland	6,356,000	6.32	%
De Beers Canada Inc.	3,045,543	3.03	%

(1) The Company has no actual knowledge of the above shareholdings. The above information was provided to the Company by the named shareholders.

(2) There are no options or warrants held by these shareholders.

Major shareholders of the Company do not have any special voting rights.

B. *Related party transactions.*

The Company is not directly or indirectly controlled by any enterprise and does not control, directly or indirectly, any other enterprises other than its subsidiaries, other than that listed under “Item 4A. Bottin (International) Investments Ltd.” (“Bottin”). Bottin is controlled by Dermot Desmond and has significant influence over the Company because it is currently the Company’s largest single shareholder with 23.36% of the outstanding shares: see “Item 7A - Major shareholders”, above.

The Company's related parties include the operator of the Gahcho Kué Joint Project, Bottin, key management and their close family members, and the Company's directors. Kennady Diamonds Inc. ("Kennady Diamonds") is also a related party since the Company and Kennady Diamonds have common members of key management.

None of the transactions with related parties incorporate special terms and conditions, and no guarantees were given or received. Related party transactions are recorded at their exchange amount, being the amount agreed to by the parties. Outstanding balances are settled in cash.

Key management personnel of the Company are Patrick Evans, who is President and CEO, and Bruce Ramsden, who is VP Finance, Chief Financial Officer and Corporate Secretary. Patrick Evans is also a director of the Company. See "Item 6B – Compensation". Both Mr. Evans and Mr. Ramsden have consulting agreements with the Company.

There are no debts owing directly or indirectly to the Company or its subsidiaries by any director or officer of the Company or vice versa other than normal accounts payable for timing of payments of fees.

C. *Interests of experts and counsel.*

Not Applicable

Item 8. Financial Information

A. *Consolidated Statements and Other Financial Information*

Listed in Item 19 hereto are audited consolidated financial statements as at December 31, 2013 and 2012, and for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012 and 2011, accompanied by the report of our independent registered accounting firm, including:

- Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm on Internal Control over Financial Reporting.
- Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm on Consolidated Financial Statements.

Edgar Filing: Mountain Province Diamonds Inc. - Form 20-F

Consolidated Balance Sheets as of December 31, 2013 and 2012.

Consolidated Statements of Equity for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011.

Consolidated Statements of Comprehensive Loss for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011.

Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012 and 2011.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements.

There are no legal proceedings currently pending.

The Company has not paid dividends in the past and does not expect to pay dividends in the near future.

B.

*Significant Changes.*

There have been no significant changes to the Company since the end of last fiscal year, other than the granting of options as disclosed in the financial statements included in this Form 20-F.

**Item 9. The Offer and Listing.****A. Offer and listing details.**

The MPV Shares were listed and posted for trading on TSX on January 22, 1999. The MPV Shares were delisted from the VSE on January 31, 2000, and from the Nasdaq Smallcap Market on September 29, 2000. The MPV Shares traded on the OTC-Bulletin Board ("OTCBB") under the symbol "MPVI" until June 1, 2005. Commencing on April 4, 2005, the MPV Shares were listed for trading on the NYSE MKT under the symbol "MDM".

The following tables set forth the reported high and low prices of the MPV Shares on the TSX, and for the NYSE MKT, for (a) the five most recent fiscal years; (b) each quarterly period for the past two fiscal years, and (c) for the most recent six months.

Fiscal Year Ended	TSX		NYSE MKT / OTCBB <sup>(1)</sup>	
	High (CDN\$)	Low (CDN\$)	High (US\$)	Low (US\$)
December 31, 2013	\$ 5.87	\$ 3.88	\$ 5.59	\$ 3.83
December 31, 2012	\$ 5.60	\$ 3.25	\$ 5.66	\$ 3.13
December 31, 2011	\$ 6.50	\$ 3.52	\$ 6.74	\$ 3.48
December 31, 2010	\$ 6.65	\$ 2.02	\$ 6.64	\$ 1.96
December 31, 2009	\$ 3.07	\$ 0.86	\$ 2.90	\$ 0.69

The MPV Shares were listed on the Nasdaq Smallcap Market on May 1, 1996 and delisted from the Nasdaq Smallcap Market on September 29, 2000, at which time they commenced trading on the OTCBB and continued through April 1, 2005. On April 4, 2005, the MPV Shares began trading on the AMEX. AMEX was taken over by NYSE Euronext which then rebranded to NYSE Amex, and subsequently to NYSE MKT.

High and Low Prices for Each Quarterly Period for the Past Two Fiscal Years

Period Ended:	TSX		NYSE MKT/ OTCBB	
	High (CDN\$)	Low (CDN\$)	High (US\$)	Low (US\$)
December 31, 2013	\$ 5.72	\$ 4.90	\$ 5.38	\$ 4.69
September 30, 2013	\$ 5.87	\$ 4.77	\$ 5.58	\$ 4.60
June 30, 2013	\$ 5.70	\$ 4.25	\$ 5.59	\$ 4.13
March 31, 2013	\$ 4.69	\$ 3.88	\$ 4.75	\$ 3.83

Edgar Filing: Mountain Province Diamonds Inc. - Form 20-F

December 31, 2012	\$4.25	\$ 3.40	\$4.33	\$ 3.42
September 30, 2012	\$5.03	\$ 3.90	\$5.02	\$ 3.81
June 30, 2012	\$5.60	\$ 3.25	\$5.69	\$ 3.13
March 31, 2012	\$5.28	\$ 3.90	\$5.28	\$ 3.85

## High and Low Prices for the Most Recent Six Months

Month Ended	TSX (CDN\$)		NYSE MKT <sup>(1)</sup>	
	High	Low	High	Low
February 2014	\$5.69	\$5.10	\$5.19	\$4.62
January 2014	\$5.87	\$4.87	\$5.58	\$4.46
December 2013	\$5.87	\$4.77	\$5.58	\$4.66
November 2013	\$5.87	\$4.70	\$5.59	\$4.50
October 2013	\$5.87	\$4.53	\$5.59	\$4.45
September 2013	\$5.87	\$4.25	\$5.59	\$4.13

<sup>(1)</sup> On December 31, 2013, the closing price of the MPV Shares on the TSX was \$5.29 and on March 24, 2014 was \$5.17. The closing price of MPV Shares on NYSE MKT on December 31, 2013 was US\$4.96 per share. The closing price on March 24, 2014 on the NYSE MKT was US\$4.64 per MPV Share.

*B. Plan of distribution.*

Not Applicable.

*C. Markets.*

The MPV Shares are listed on the TSX under the symbol "MPV" and were also quoted on the over-the-counter (OTC) Bulletin Board pursuant to Rule 6530(a) of the NASD's OTC Bulletin Board Rules under the symbol "MPVI.OB" until April 1, 2005. Commencing April 4, 2005, the Company's shares commenced trading on the AMEX (subsequently NYSE Amex and now NYSE MKT) under the symbol "MDM". The Common Shares are not registered to trade in the United States in the form of American Depository Receipts or similar certificates.

*D. Selling shareholders.*

Not Applicable.

*E. Dilution.*

Not Applicable.

*F. Expenses of the issue.*

Not Applicable.

Item 10. Additional Information.

A. *Share capital.*

Not applicable.

B. *Memorandum and articles of association.*

**Incorporation**

The Company was amalgamated in British Columbia under incorporation number 553442 on November 1, 1997 under the name of Mountain Province Mining Inc. The Company changed its name to Mountain Province Diamonds Inc. on October 16, 2000. The Company was amalgamated under the British Columbia *Company Act*, which has now been replaced by the *Business Corporations Act (British Columbia)* (the "BCA"). The BCA came into effect on March 29, 2004. The Company has completed its transition from the Company Act to the BCA and adopted new Articles which reflect the provisions of the BCA. The Company's Memorandum of Articles has been replaced by a Notice of Articles. Pursuant to the Shareholders special resolution on September 20, 2005 approving the continuance of the Company into Ontario, the Company continued under the laws of the Province of Ontario pursuant to Articles of Continuance dated May 8, 2006.

The Company is also registered as an extra-territorial corporation in the Northwest Territories (Registration no. E 6486, on February 25, 1998, amended October 16, 2000 for the name change).

The Company does not have any stated "objects" or "purposes" as such are not required by the corporate laws of the Province of Ontario. Rather, the Company is, by such corporate laws, entitled to carry on any activities whatsoever, which are not specifically precluded by other statutory provisions of the Province of Ontario.

### **Powers, functions and qualifications of Directors**

The powers and functions of directors are set forth in the Ontario Securities Act and in the Bylaws of the Company.

With respect to the voting powers of directors, the Ontario Securities Act provides that a director (or senior officer) has a disclosable interest in a contract or transaction if the contract or transaction is material to the Company and the director has a material interest in the contract.

The Bylaws provide that a director or senior officer who has, directly or indirectly, a material interest in an existing or proposed material contract or transaction of the Company or who holds any office or possesses any property whereby, directly or indirectly, a duty or interest might be created to conflict with his duty or interest as a director or senior officer, has to disclose the nature and extent of this interest or conflict with his duty and interest as a director or senior officer, in accordance with the provisions of the Ontario Securities Act. A director is also prohibited from voting in respect of any such proposed material contract or transaction and if he does so, his vote shall not be counted, but he shall be counted in the quorum at the meeting at which such vote is taken. Notwithstanding this, if all of the directors have a material interest in a proposed material contract or transaction, any or all of those directors may vote on a resolution to approve the contract or transaction. However, in this case the directors must have the contract or transaction approved by special resolution of the shareholders to avoid accountability for any profits.

The Bylaws further provide that, subject to the provisions of the Ontario Securities Act, no disclosure is required of a director or senior officer, and a director need not refrain from voting in respect of the following types of contracts and transactions:

- a) A contract or transaction where both the Company and the other party to the contract or transaction are wholly owned subsidiaries of the same corporation;



- b) A contract or transaction where the Company is a wholly owned subsidiary of the other party to the contract or transaction;
- c) A contract or transaction where the other party to the contract or transaction is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Company;
- d) A contract or transaction where the director or senior officer is the sole shareholder of the Company or of a corporation of which the Company is a wholly owned subsidiary;

An arrangement by way of security granted by the Company for money loaned to, or obligations undertaken by, the e) director or senior officer, or a person in whom the director or senior officer has a material interest, for the benefit of the Company or an affiliate of the Company;

f) A loan to the Company, which a director or senior officer or a specified corporation or a specified firm in which he has a material interest has guaranteed or joined in guaranteeing the repayment of the loan or any part of the loan;

g) Any contract or transaction made or to be made with, or for the benefit of a corporation that is affiliated with the Company and the director or senior officer is also a director or senior officer of that corporation or an affiliate of that corporation;

h) Any contract by a director to subscribe for or underwrite shares or debentures to be issued by the Company or a subsidiary of the Company;

i) Determining the remuneration of the director or senior officer in that person's capacity as director, officer, employee or agent of the Company or an affiliate of the Company;

j) Purchasing and maintaining insurance to cover a director or senior officer against liability incurred by them as a director or senior officer; or

k) The indemnification of any director or senior officer by the Company.

The Ontario Securities Act provides that a contract or transaction with a company is not invalid merely because a director or senior officer of the company has an interest, direct or indirect, in the contract or transaction, a director or senior officer of the company has not disclosed an interest he or she had in the contract or transaction, or because the directors or shareholders of the company have not approved the contract or transaction in which a director or senior officer of the company has an interest.

The Ontario Securities Act also provides that a director or senior officer with a "disclosable interest" in a contract or transaction with the Company is liable to account for any profit made from the contract or transaction unless disclosure of the director's interest in such contract or transaction had been made and the director abstained from voting on the approval of the transaction.

Subject to the provisions of the Ontario Securities Act, the directors may vote on compensation for themselves or any members of their body. A contract relating primarily to a fiduciary's remuneration as a director, officer, employee or agent of the Company or its affiliates is a permitted conflict of interest under the Company's Corporate Governance Policy.

There are no limitations on the exercise by the board of directors of the Company's borrowing powers.

There are no provisions for the retirement or non-retirement of directors under an age limit.

There is no requirement for any director to hold any shares in the Company.

**Rights and Restrictions Attached to Shares**

As all of the authorized and issued MPV Shares are of one class, there are no special rights or restrictions of any nature or kind attached to any of the shares. All authorized and issued shares rank equally in respect of the declaration and receipt of dividends, and the rights to share in any profits or surplus on liquidation, dissolution or winding up of the Company. Each MPV Share has attached to it one vote.

### **Alteration of Share Rights**

To alter the rights of holders of issued shares of the Company, such alteration must be approved by a vote of not less than two-thirds of the shareholders voting in person or by proxy at a meeting of the shareholders of the Company.

### **Annual General Meetings**

Annual general meetings are called and scheduled upon decision by the board of directors. The directors may also convene a general meeting of shareholders at any time. There are no provisions in the Company's Bylaws for the requisitioning of special meetings by shareholders. However, the Ontario Securities Act provides that the holders of not less than 5% of the issued shares of the Company may requisition the directors to call a general meeting of the shareholders for the purposes stated in the requisition. All meetings of the shareholders may be attended by registered shareholders or persons who hold powers of attorney or proxies given to them by registered shareholders.

On June 13, 2013 the shareholders of the Company adopted an Advance Notice Policy for director nominations to the Board of the Company prior to any meeting of Shareholders where directors are to be elected.

### **Foreign Ownership Limitations**

There are no limitations prohibiting shares being held by non-residents, foreigners or any other group.

### **Change of Control**

There are no provisions in the Company's Bylaws that would have the effect of delaying, deferring or preventing a change in the control of the Company, or that would operate with respect to any proposed merger, acquisition or corporate re-structuring of the Company.

At the November 18, 2010 Annual and Special Meeting of the shareholders, a Shareholder Rights Plan dated September 9, 2010 (the "Shareholder Rights Plan") was approved, ratified, confirmed and adopted by the shareholders

of the Company in accordance with and subject to its terms and conditions. The objectives of the Shareholder Rights Plan are to ensure, to the extent possible, that all shareholders of the Company are treated equally and fairly in connection with any take-over bid for the Company.

The Shareholder Rights Plan is designed to discourage discriminatory or unfair take-over bids for the Company and gives the Board of Directors time, if appropriate, to pursue alternatives to maximize shareholder value in the event of an unsolicited (or "hostile") take-over bid for the Company. The Shareholder Rights Plan will encourage a person proposing to make, or who has made, a take-over bid for the Company (an "Offeror") to proceed by way of a Permitted Bid or to approach the Board with a view to negotiation, by creating the potential for substantial dilution of the Offeror's position. The Permitted Bid provisions of the Shareholder Rights Plan are designed to ensure that, in any take-over bid, all shareholders are treated equally, receive the maximum value for their investment and are given adequate time to properly assess the take-over bid on a fully informed basis.

The Shareholder Rights Plan may, however, increase the price to be paid by a potential Offeror to obtain control of the Company and may discourage certain transactions, including a take-over bid for less than all the common shares of the Company. Accordingly, the Shareholder Rights Plan may deter some take-over bids.

In addition, the Shareholder Rights Plan Agreement provides that the continued existence of the Shareholder Rights Plan must be ratified by a majority of the shareholders of the Company at a meeting of the shareholders at or prior to the annual meeting of the shareholders in the year 2013.

### **Share Ownership Reporting Obligations**

There are no provisions in the Company's Bylaws requiring share ownership to be disclosed. The securities laws of the Province of Ontario and other provinces in Canada having jurisdiction over the Company require disclosure of shareholdings by:

- b) insiders who are directors or senior officers of the Company; and
  
- c) a person who has direct or indirect beneficial ownership of, control or direction over, or a combination of direct or indirect beneficial ownership of and of control or direction over securities of the Company carrying more than 10% of the voting rights attached to all the Company's outstanding voting securities.

The threshold of share ownership percentage requiring disclosure of ownership is higher in the home jurisdiction of Ontario than in the United States where United States law prescribes a 5% threshold for ownership disclosure.

### **C. *Material contracts.***

The Company did not enter into any material contracts in the last two fiscal periods, up to the date of this Form 20-F other than a plan of arrangement agreement (the "Kennady Arrangement Agreement"), which was executed on March 12, 2012. The Kennady Arrangement Agreement was between the Company and its subsidiary company, Kennady Diamonds Inc., and was the agreement for the spin-out of the Company's Kennady North Project to Kennady Diamonds Inc. It included various terms and conditions for the parties, and was included in an information circular mailed to shareholders of the Company for a special shareholder meeting held April 25, 2012. The plan of arrangement was concluded on July 6, 2012 with court, regulatory and shareholder approval.

De Beers Canada, as Operator of the Gahcho Kué Project, has entered into purchase agreements relating to the Gahcho Kué Project. As at December 31, 2013, the Company's proportional interest (49%) of the commitments made by the Operator is \$31,609,307. The commitments are in the course of normal development of the Gahcho Kué Project.

D.

Exchange controls.

**Exchange Controls and Investment Canada Act**

Canada has no system of exchange controls. There are no exchange restrictions on borrowing from foreign countries nor on the remittance of dividends, interest, royalties and similar payments, management fees, loan repayments, settlement of trade debts, or the repatriation of capital. Any such remittances to United States residents, however, may be subject to a withholding tax pursuant to the Canadian Income Tax Act as modified by the reciprocal tax treaty between Canada and the United States. See "Item 10E, Taxation".

89

Subject to certain exemptions, every "acquisition of control"<sup>1</sup> by a "non-Canadian"<sup>2</sup> of a "Canadian business",<sup>3</sup> even where such business is already controlled by a non-Canadian, requires either notification (essentially a post-closing administrative formality) or detailed review under the *Investment Canada Act* (the "ICA"). Whether a transaction is subject to notification or review depends upon whether certain asset thresholds are satisfied, which thresholds generally depend on (1) the transaction structure (direct or indirect acquisition),<sup>4</sup> (2) whether the purchaser (referred to as the "investor" under the ICA) and/or current owner of the Canadian business is a "WTO investor"<sup>5</sup>, (3) whether the Canadian business is a "cultural business"<sup>6</sup>, and (4) whether the value of the Canadian assets and assets of the Canadian entities being acquired exceeds 50% of the value of all assets being acquired. The table below provides a summary of the relevant asset thresholds.

<b>Transaction Structure</b>	<b>Status of Investor/ Vendor</b>	<b>Cultural Business</b>	<b>Threshold for Review</b>
Direct	WTO Investor <i>or</i> Vendor	No	≥C\$330 million <sup>7</sup>
	Non-WTO Investor <i>and</i> Non-WTO Vendor	Yes	≥C\$5 million (book value of assets)
Indirect		WTO Investor <i>or</i> Vendor	No
	Yes		≥C\$50 million* (book value of assets)
	Non-WTO Investor <i>and</i> Non-WTO Vendor	No	
		Yes	

\* Note that a C\$5 million threshold (rather than C\$50 million) applies to indirect acquisitions where the value of the assets of the entity carrying on the Canadian business and of all other entities in Canada being acquired exceeds 50% of the value of all the assets acquired.

<sup>1</sup> What constitutes an "acquisition of control" is set out in the ICA and includes the acquisition of all or substantially all of the assets used in carrying on the Canadian business, or the acquisition of a majority of the voting interests of an entity, whether the entity is of corporate or some other form (*e.g.*, a partnership). The acquisition of less than one-third of the voting shares of a corporation is deemed not to be an acquisition of control of that corporation, while the acquisition of less than a majority but one-third or more of such shares is presumed to be an acquisition of control unless it can be established that the purchaser will not control the corporation in fact through the ownership of voting shares. The acquisition of less than a majority of the voting interests of a non-corporation is deemed not to be an acquisition of control.

<sup>2</sup> A "non-Canadian" is a purchaser the ultimate control of which resides outside of Canada.

<sup>3</sup> A "Canadian business" is defined as a business carried on in Canada that has (a) a place of business in Canada, (b) an individual or individuals in Canada who are employed or self-employed in connection with the business, and (c) assets in Canada used in carrying on the business.

<sup>4</sup> A direct acquisition is the acquisition of assets or voting interests of an entity in Canada that carries on the Canadian business, while an indirect acquisition is the acquisition of the voting shares of a non-Canadian corporation that



controls, directly or indirectly, an entity in Canada carrying on the Canadian business.

<sup>5</sup> A "WTO investor" is a purchaser that is controlled ultimately by nationals or residents of a World Trade Organization ("WTO") member country.

<sup>6</sup> A "cultural business" is one that (i) publishes, distributes or sells books, magazines, periodicals or newspapers, (ii) produces, distributes, sells or exhibits film or video recordings or audio or video music recordings, (iii) produces, distributes or sells music in print or machine readable form, or (iv) is a radio, television, cable television or satellite broadcast undertaking.

<sup>7</sup> Note that the current C\$330 million threshold is based on the book value of assets of the Canadian business for the fiscal year immediately preceding implementation of the transaction. On a day that is to be fixed by order of the Governor in Council (the federal Cabinet), the threshold for direct acquisitions by WTO investors will change to one based on the "enterprise value" of the Canadian business. The enterprise value threshold will be established at C\$600 million for investments made in the first two-year period; and will increase to C\$800 million in the following two years and C\$1 billion thereafter, subject to indexation to Canada's GDP. The ICA does not define "enterprise value"; its manner of calculation will be set out in as yet to be promulgated regulations.

Where the ICA applies and a transaction is not reviewable, a notification (containing certain prescribed information about the purchaser, the transaction and the Canadian business) is required to be filed by the investor with the Investment Review Division of Industry Canada any time prior to closing the transaction or within thirty (30) days thereafter. However, in the case of an investment in a Canadian business that has activities related to Canada's cultural heritage or national identity (as prescribed), the Governor in Council has the option of ordering a review, if notice of same is provided to the investor within 21 days of the filing of the completed notification. (Note that notification under the ICA is also required with respect to the establishment of a new Canadian business.)

Where a transaction is reviewable and is a direct acquisition, an application for review must be filed by the investor prior to closing and the parties are prohibited from closing until the Minister of Industry and/or, in the case of acquisitions of "cultural businesses", the Minister of Canadian Heritage, confirms to the purchaser that he/she is satisfied or is deemed to be satisfied that the investment is likely to be of "net benefit to Canada", based on certain prescribed factors set out in the ICA (set out below) and in view of any legally binding undertakings the purchaser is willing to make. Where a transaction is reviewable and is an indirect acquisition, an application for review must be filed by the investor within 30 days after closing.

Once an application for review has been filed, whether pre-or post-closing, and has been certified to be complete, the responsible Minister has a 45-day period within which to make a "net benefit" determination, which period may be unilaterally extended once by the Minister for an additional 30 days, and thereafter extended with the consent of the investor. (Where notices related to a national security review are given to an investor (see below), the length of the initial 45-day review period and any subsequent extension periods are deemed to expire five days after the expiry of certain time periods or the issuance of certain notices related to the national security review.)

The Minister will determine whether the investment is likely to be of net benefit to Canada, taking into account the information provided and having regard to certain assessment factors. These factors include: (i) the effect of the investment on the level and nature of economic activity in Canada, including the effect on employment, on resource processing, and on the utilization of parts, components and services produced in Canada; (ii) the effect of the investment on exports from Canada; (iii) the degree and significance of participation by Canadians in the Canadian business and in any industry in Canada of which it forms a part; (iv) the effect of the investment on productivity, industrial efficiency, technological development, product innovation and product variety in Canada; (v) the effect of the investment on competition within any industry or industries in Canada; (vi) the compatibility of the investment with national industrial, economic and cultural policies taking into consideration industrial, economic and cultural objectives enunciated by the government or legislature of any province likely to be significantly affected by the investment; and (vii) the contribution of the investment to Canada's ability to compete in world markets.

Where the Minister has advised the investor that he is not satisfied that the investment is likely to be of net benefit to Canada, the investor has the right to make representations and submit undertakings within 30 days of the date of the notice (or any further period that is agreed upon between the investor and the Minister). Within a reasonable time after the expiration of this 30 day period (or the agreed extension), the Minister must notify the acquiror (i) that he is now

satisfied that the investment is likely to be of net benefit to Canada or (ii) that he is not satisfied that the investment is likely to be of net benefit to Canada. In the latter case, the investor may not proceed with the investment or, if the investment has already been consummated, must divest itself of control of the Canadian business.

Effective February 6, 2009, every investment by a non-Canadian to (i) establish a new Canadian business, (ii) acquire control of a Canadian business, or (iii) acquire in whole or in part (*e.g.*, a minority interest) or establish an entity carrying on all or any part of its operations in Canada (if the entity has a place of operations in Canada, employees or assets in Canada used in connection with its operations) may be subjected to a national security review under the ICA, regardless of the value of the investment. Investors that receive notice of a potential or actual national security review are prohibited from implementing a proposed investment pending the outcome of the review. Where the Minister of Industry, after consultation with the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, is satisfied that the investment would be "injurious to national security" (an undefined phrase), the Governor in Council may "take any measures it considers advisable" to protect national security, including: (i) prohibiting implementation of a proposed investment; (ii) authorizing the investment on terms and conditions or subject to written undertakings from the investor; and (iii) in the case of completed investments, requiring the investor to divest control of the Canadian business or its interest in the Canadian business.

Unless a transaction is otherwise subject to notification or to review under the ICA, an investor is not required to notify Industry Canada of transactions that may raise potential national security issues. Where, however, a national security review is ordered, an investor is afforded the right to make representations to the Minister, and is required to provide any information considered necessary by the Minister for purposes of the review. New National Security Review of Investments Regulations, in effect since September 2009, set out timelines for each step of the national security review process. If the maximum prescribed periods are fully utilized, a national security review could take 130 days (assuming a notice of possible review is issued), with the potential for the Minister of Industry to request from the investor an extension of the review period.

E.

*Taxation.*

A brief description of certain provisions of the tax treaty between Canada and the United States, *Canada-United States Tax Convention (1980)*, as amended, (the "Convention"), is included below, together with a brief outline of certain taxes, including withholding provisions, to which United States holders of common stock of the Company are subject under the *Income Tax Act (Canada)* and the regulations thereunder (the "Canadian Tax Act"). The consequences, if any, of provincial, territorial, state, local or foreign taxes (other than Canadian federal income taxes) are not considered.

**The following information is of a general nature only and is not, and is not intended to be, legal or tax advice to any holder or prospective holder of common stock of the Company and no representations with respect to the income tax consequences to any such holder are made. Holders of common stock of the Company should seek the advice of their own tax advisors, tax counsel or accountants with respect to the applicability or effect on their own individual circumstances of the matters referred to herein.**

*Certain Canadian Federal Income Tax Consequences*

The discussion under this heading is a general summary of the principal Canadian federal income tax consequences pursuant to the Canadian Tax Act of acquiring, holding and disposing of shares of common stock of the Company for a shareholder of the Company who, at all relevant times and for purposes of the Canadian Tax Act and the Convention, is not, and is not deemed to be, a resident of Canada, and is solely a resident of the United States, holds shares of common stock of the Company as capital property, deals at arm's length and is not affiliated with the Company, and, does not use or hold, is not deemed to use or hold shares of the common stock of the Company in, or in the course of, carrying on business in Canada. (a "U.S. Holder"). This summary is based on the current provisions of the Canadian Tax and on the Company's understanding of the administrative policies and assessing practices of Canada Revenue Agency, in effect as of the date hereof, and takes into account all specific proposals to amend the Canadian Tax Act and regulations to it publicly announced by the Minister of Finance of Canada prior to the date hereof. No assurances can be given that such proposed amendments will be enacted in the form proposed, or at all. This summary is not exhaustive of all potential Canadian federal income tax consequences to a U.S. Holder and does not take into account or anticipate any other changes in law or administrative policies or assessing practices, whether by judicial, governmental or legislative action or decision. This discussion is general only and is not a substitute for independent advice from a shareholder's own Canadian and U.S. tax advisors.

The provisions of the Canadian Tax Act are subject to income tax treaties to which Canada is a party, including the Convention.

*Dividends on Common Shares and Other Income*

Under the Canadian Tax Act, a non-resident of Canada is generally subject to Canadian non-resident tax at the rate of 25 percent on amounts that are paid or credited or deemed under the Canadian Tax Act to be paid or credited as, on account or in lieu of payment of, or in satisfaction of dividends to a U.S. Holder by a corporation resident in Canada. The Convention limits the rate to 15 percent if the shareholder is a resident of the United States entitled to all of the benefits of the Convention and the dividends are beneficially owned by and paid to such shareholder, and to 5 percent if the shareholder is a corporation entitled to all of the benefits of the Convention that beneficially owns at least 10 percent of the voting stock of the Canadian payor corporation.

The non-resident tax payable on dividends is to be withheld at source by the Company or people acting on its behalf.

*Dispositions of Common Shares*

Under the Canadian Tax Act, a U.S. Holder will generally not be subject to tax in respect of capital gains realized on the disposition or deemed disposition of shares of the common stock of the Company unless, at the time of disposition, the shares constitute "taxable Canadian property" (as defined in the Canadian Tax Act) of the U.S. Holder at the time of disposition and the U.S. Holder is not entitled to relief under the Convention.

Provided that shares are listed on a "designated stock exchange" (which includes the TSX) at the time of disposition, the shares of common stock of the Company will not constitute taxable Canadian property of a U.S. Holder at a particular time unless (i) at any time in the 60 months immediately preceding the disposition of such shares 25% or more of the issued shares of any class or series in the capital stock of the Company were owned by one or more persons in a group comprising the U.S. Holder and persons with whom the U.S. Holder did not deal at arm's length; and (ii) more than 50% of the fair market value of the common stock of the Company was derived directly or indirectly from one or any combination of: (a) real or immovable property situated in Canada; (b) "Canadian resource properties" (as defined in the Canadian Tax Act), (c) "timber resource properties" (as defined in the Canadian Tax Act), or (d) options in respect of, or interests in, or for civil law right in, any of the foregoing, whether or not the property exists.

The Convention generally relieves U.S. Holders from liability for Canadian tax on capital gains derived on a disposition of shares that are "taxable Canadian property" unless

a) the value of the shares is derived principally from "real property" situated in Canada, including the right to explore for or exploit natural resources and rights to amounts computed by reference to production, or

93

b) the shareholder was an individual resident in Canada for 120 months during any period of 20 consecutive years preceding the disposition of the shares, and at any time during the 10 years immediately preceding the disposition of the shares the individual was a resident of Canada, and the shares were owned by the individual when he or she ceased to be resident in Canada.

If a U.S. Holder realizes a capital gain or capital loss from a disposition of a share of common stock of the Company which constitutes taxable Canadian property for purposes of the Canadian Tax Act and is not otherwise exempt from Canadian tax under the Convention, then the capital gain or capital loss is the amount, if any, by which the U.S. Holder's proceeds of disposition exceed (or are exceeded by, respectively) the aggregate of the U.S. Holder's adjusted cost base of the share and reasonable expenses of disposition as determined under the Canadian Tax Act. The capital gain or loss must be computed in Canadian currency using a weighted average adjusted cost base for identical properties. Generally one-half of a capital gain ("taxable capital gain") is included in income for Canadian tax purposes in the year of the disposition, and one-half of a capital loss ("an allowable capital loss") must be deducted from taxable capital gains realized by the U.S. Holder in that year. Allowable capital losses in excess of taxable capital gains for that year may generally be carried back three years or forward indefinitely and deducted against net taxable capital gains in those years, in the manner permitted under the Canadian Tax Act.

#### United States Federal Income Tax Consequences

The following is a summary of certain U.S. federal income tax consequences to a U.S. Holder (as defined below) arising from and relating to the acquisition, ownership, and disposition of shares of common stock of the Company ("Common Shares").

This summary is for general information purposes only and does not purport to be a complete analysis or listing of all potential U.S. federal income tax consequences that may apply to a U.S. Holder as a result of the acquisition, ownership, and disposition of Common Shares. In addition, this summary does not take into account the individual facts and circumstances of any particular U.S. Holder that may affect the U.S. federal income tax consequences of the acquisition, ownership, and disposition of Common Shares. Except as specifically set forth below, this summary does not discuss applicable tax reporting requirements. This summary is not intended to be, and should not be construed as, legal or U.S. federal income tax advice with respect to any U.S. Holder. Each U.S. Holder should consult its own tax advisor regarding the U.S. federal, U.S. state and local, and foreign tax consequences of the acquisition, ownership, and disposition of Common Shares.

No legal opinion from U.S. legal counsel or ruling from the Internal Revenue Service (the "IRS") has been requested, or will be obtained, regarding the U.S. federal income tax consequences of the acquisition, ownership and disposition of Common Shares. This summary is not binding on the IRS, and the IRS is not precluded from taking a position that is different from, and contrary to, the positions taken in this summary. In addition, because the authorities on which this summary is based are subject to various interpretations, the IRS and the U.S. courts could disagree with one or more of the conclusions described in this summary.





## Circular 230 Disclosure

**Any statement made herein regarding any U.S. federal tax is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, by any taxpayer for purposes of avoiding any penalties. Any such statement herein is written in connection with the marketing or promotion of the transaction to which the statement relates. Each taxpayer should seek advice based on the taxpayer's particular circumstances from an independent tax advisor.**

## Scope of this Disclosure

### Authorities

This summary is based on the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the "Code"), Treasury Regulations, published IRS rulings, published administrative positions of the IRS, the Convention Between Canada and the United States of America with Respect to Taxes on Income and on Capital, signed September 26, 1980, as amended (the "Canada-U.S. Tax Convention"), and U.S. court decisions that are applicable as of the date of this Annual Report. Any of the authorities on which this summary is based could be changed in a material and adverse manner at any time, and any such change could be applied on a retroactive basis. This summary does not discuss the potential effects, whether adverse or beneficial, of any proposed legislation or proposed changes to the Canada-U.S. Tax Convention.

### U.S. Holders

For purposes of this summary, a "U.S. Holder" is a beneficial owner of Common Shares that, for U.S. federal income tax purposes, is (a) an individual who is a citizen or, or resident in, the U.S., (each as defined under U.S. tax laws), (b) a corporation, or other entity classified as a corporation for U.S. federal income tax purposes, that is created or organized in or under the laws of the U.S. or any state in the U.S., including the District of Columbia, (c) an estate if the income of such estate is subject to U.S. federal income tax regardless of the source of such income, or (d) a trust if (i) such trust has validly elected to be treated as a U.S. person for U.S. federal income tax purposes or (ii) a U.S. court is able to exercise primary supervision over the administration of such trust and one or more U.S. persons have the authority to control all substantial decisions of such trust.

### Non-U.S. Holders

A "non-U.S. Holder" is a beneficial owner of Common Shares other than a U.S. Holder. This summary does not address the U.S. federal income tax consequences of the acquisition, ownership, and disposition of Common Shares to non-U.S. Holders.

U.S. Holders Subject to Special U.S. Federal Income Tax Rules Not Addressed

This summary does not address the U.S. federal income tax consequences of the acquisition, ownership, and disposition of Common Shares to U.S. Holders that are subject to special provisions under the Code, including but not limited to the following: (a) U.S. Holders that are tax-exempt organizations, qualified retirement plans, individual retirement accounts, or other tax-deferred accounts; (b) U.S. Holders that are financial institutions, insurance companies, real estate investment trusts, regulated investment companies or broker-dealers or dealers in securities; (c) U.S. Holders that have a "functional currency" other than the U.S. dollar; (d) U.S. Holders that are subject to the alternative minimum tax provisions of the Code; (e) former U.S. citizens or former long-term residents of the United States as defined in Section 877 of the Code; (f) U.S. Holders that own Common Shares as part of a straddle, hedging transaction, conversion transaction, constructive sale, or other arrangement involving more than one position; (g) U.S. Holders that acquired Common Shares in connection with the exercise of employee stock options or otherwise as compensation for services; (h) partners of partnerships that hold Common Shares or owners of other entities classified as partnerships or "pass-through" entities for U.S. federal income tax purposes that hold Common Shares, (i) U.S. Holders that hold Common Shares other than as a capital asset within the meaning of Section 1221 of the Code, and (j) U.S. Holders that own or have owned (directly, indirectly, or by attribution) 10% or more of the total combined voting power of the outstanding shares of the Company. U.S. Holders that are subject to special provisions under the Code, including U.S. Holders described immediately above, should consult their own tax advisors regarding the tax consequences of the acquisition, ownership, and disposition of Common Shares.

Tax Consequences Other than U.S. Federal Income Tax Consequences Not Addressed

This summary does not address U.S. state, local or foreign tax consequences to U.S. Holders of the acquisition, ownership, and disposition of Common Shares, nor does it address U.S. federal tax consequences other than income tax. Each U.S. Holder should consult its own tax advisors regarding these and other tax consequences of the acquisition, ownership, and disposition of Common Shares.

**U.S. Federal Income Tax Consequences of the Acquisition, Ownership, and Disposition of Common Shares**

Passive Foreign Investment Company

The Company generally will be a PFIC if, for a taxable year, (a) 75% or more of the gross income of the Company for such taxable year is passive income or (b) 50% or more of the assets held by the Company either produce passive income or are held for the production of passive income. "Gross income" generally includes all sales revenues less the cost of goods sold, plus income from investments and from incidental or outside operations or sources. "Passive income" includes, for example, dividends, interest, certain rents and royalties, certain gains from the sale of stock and securities, and certain gains from commodities transactions.

For purposes of the PFIC income and asset test described above, if the Company owns, directly or indirectly, 25% or more of the total value of the outstanding shares of another foreign corporation, the Company will be treated as if it (a) held a proportionate share of the assets of such other foreign corporation and (b) received directly a proportionate share of the income of such other foreign corporation. If the Company is a PFIC, in addition to the rules discussed below, U.S. Holders generally may be required to file certain information returns with the IRS. The PFIC rules are extremely complex, and U.S. Holders should consult their own U.S. tax advisors concerning the application of the PFIC rules.

The Company believes it was classified as a PFIC during the tax year ended December 31, 2013, and based on current business plans and financial expectations, the Company believes that it will be a PFIC for the tax year ending December 31, 2014 and may be a PFIC in subsequent tax years. The determination of whether any corporation was, or will be, a PFIC for a tax year depends, in part, on the application of complex U.S. federal income tax rules, which are subject to differing interpretations. In addition, whether any corporation will be a PFIC for any tax year depends on the assets and income of such corporation over the course of each such year and, as a result, cannot be predicted with certainty as of the date of this document. There can be no assurance, however, that the IRS will agree with a determination made by the Company concerning its PFIC status.

In any year in which the Company is classified as a PFIC, U.S. Holders would be required to file an annual report with the IRS containing such information as Treasury Regulations and/or other IRS guidance may require. U.S. Holders should consult their own tax advisors regarding the requirements of filing such information returns under these rules, including the requirement to file a IRS Form 8621.

*Default PFIC Rules Under Section 1291 of the Code*

If the Company is a PFIC, the U.S. federal income tax consequences to a U.S. Holder of the acquisition, ownership, and disposition of Common Shares will depend on whether such U.S. Holder makes an election to treat the Company as a "qualified electing fund" or "QEF" under Section 1295 of the Code (a "QEF Election") or makes a mark-to-market election under Section 1296 of the Code (a "Mark-to-Market Election"). A U.S. Holder that does not make either a QEF Election or a Mark-to-Market Election will be referred to in this summary as a "Non-Electing U.S. Holder."

A Non-Electing U.S. Holder will be subject to the rules of Section 1291 of the Code with respect to (a) any gain on the disposition of Common Shares and any "excess" distribution paid on the Common Shares.

Under Section 1291 of the Code, any gain recognized on the sale or other disposition of Common Shares, and any excess distribution paid on the Common Shares, must be ratably allocated to each day in a Non-Electing U.S. Holder's holding period for the Common Shares. The amount of any such gain or excess distribution allocated to prior years of such Non-Electing U.S. Holder's holding period for the Common Shares will be subject to U.S. federal income tax at the highest tax applicable to ordinary income in each such prior year. A Non-Electing U.S. Holder will be required to pay interest on the resulting tax liability for each such prior year, calculated as if such tax liability had been due in each such prior year. The amount of any such gain or excess distribution allocated to the current year of such Non-Electing U.S. Holder's holding period for the Common Shares will be treated as ordinary income in the current year (but will not qualify for the preferential dividend rate previously discussed), and no interest charge will be incurred with respect to the resulting tax liability for the current year.

If the Company is a PFIC for any taxable year during which a Non-Electing U.S. Holder holds Common Shares, the Company will continue to be treated as a PFIC with respect to such Non-Electing U.S. Holder, regardless of whether the Company ceases to be a PFIC in one or more subsequent years. A Non-Electing U.S. Holder may terminate this deemed PFIC status by electing to recognize gain (which will be taxed under the rules of Section 1291 of the Code discussed above) as if such Common Shares were sold on the last day of the last taxable year for which the Company was a PFIC.

*QEF Election*

A U.S. Holder that makes a QEF Election generally will not be subject to the rules of Section 1291 of the Code discussed above. However, a U.S. Holder that makes a QEF Election will be subject to U.S. federal income tax annually on such U.S. Holder's pro rata share of (a) "net capital gain" of the Company, which will be taxed as capital gain to such U.S. Holder, and (b) the "ordinary earnings" of the Company, which will be taxed as ordinary income to

such U.S. Holder, regardless of whether such amounts are actually distributed to such U.S. Holder by the Company. However, a U.S. Holder that makes a QEF Election may, subject to certain limitations, elect to defer payment of current U.S. federal income tax on such amounts, subject to an interest charge. In addition, a U.S. Holder that makes a QEF Election generally will recognize capital gain or loss on the sale or other taxable disposition of Common Shares, as long as the U.S. Holder always had a QEF election in effect.

Each U.S. Holder should consult its own U.S. tax advisors regarding the advisability of, and procedure for making, a QEF Election. U.S. Holders should be aware that there can be no assurance that the Company will satisfy record keeping requirements so that a U.S. Holder may make certain information returns to the IRS, or that the Company will supply U.S. Holders with information that such U.S. Holders are required to report under the QEF rules, in the event that the Company is a PFIC and a U.S. Holder wishes to make a QEF Election. Thus, U.S. Holders may not be able to make a QEF Election with respect to their Common Shares. Each U.S. Holder should consult its own tax advisor regarding the availability of, and procedure for making, a QEF Election.

### *Mark-to-Market Election*

As an alternative to the foregoing rules, a U.S. Holder may make a Mark-to-Market. A U.S. Holder that makes a Mark-to-Market Election generally will not be subject to the rules of Section 1291 of the Code discussed above. However, if a U.S. Holder makes a Mark-to-Market Election after the beginning of such U.S. Holder's holding period for the Common Shares and such U.S. Holder has not made a timely QEF Election, the rules of Section 1291 of the Code discussed above will apply to dispositions of, and certain distributions on, the Common Shares.

A U.S. Holder that makes a Mark-to-Market Election will include as ordinary income, for each taxable year in which the Company is a PFIC, an amount equal to the excess, if any, of (a) the fair market value of the Common Shares as of the close of such taxable year over (b) such U.S. Holder's tax basis in such Common Shares. A U.S. Holder that makes a Mark-to-Market Election will be allowed a deduction in an amount equal to the lesser of (a) the excess, if any, of (i) such U.S. Holder's adjusted tax basis in the Common Shares over (ii) the fair market value of such Common Shares as of the close of such taxable year or (b) the excess, if any, of (i) the amount included in ordinary income because of such Mark-to-Market Election for prior taxable years over (ii) the amount allowed as a deduction because of such Mark-to-Market Election for prior taxable years.

A U.S. Holder that makes a Mark-to-Market Election generally also will adjust such U.S. Holder's tax basis in the Common Shares to reflect the amount included in gross income or allowed as a deduction because of such Mark-to-Market Election. In addition, upon a sale or other taxable disposition of Common Shares, a U.S. Holder that makes a Mark-to-Market Election will recognize ordinary income or loss (not to exceed the excess, if any, of (a) the amount included in ordinary income because of such Mark-to-Market Election for prior taxable years over (b) the amount allowed as a deduction because of such Mark-to-Market Election for prior taxable years).

Each U.S. Holder should consult its own tax advisors regarding the advisability of, and procedure for making, a Mark-to-Market Election.

### *Other PFIC Rules*

Under Section 1291(f) of the Code, the IRS has issued proposed Treasury Regulations that, subject to certain exceptions, would cause a U.S. Holder that had not made a timely QEF Election to recognize gain (but not loss) upon certain transfers of Common Shares that would otherwise be tax-deferred (e.g., gifts and exchanges pursuant to corporate reorganizations).



An individual U.S. Holder's estate may not receive a step-up in basis in the Common Shares at the U.S. Holder's death, if the Company is or was a PFIC during the U.S. Holder's period of ownership of the Common Shares.

Certain additional adverse rules will apply with respect to a U.S. Holder if the Company is a PFIC, regardless of whether such U.S. Holder makes a QEF Election. For example under Section 1298(b)(6) of the Code, a U.S. Holder that uses Common Shares as security for a loan will, except as may be provided in Treasury Regulations, be treated as having made a taxable disposition of such Common Shares.

The PFIC rules are complex, and each U.S. Holder should consult its own financial advisor, legal counsel, or accountant regarding the PFIC rules and how the PFIC rules may affect the U.S. federal income tax consequences of the acquisition, ownership, and disposition of Common Shares.

### Distributions on Common Shares

#### *General Taxation of Distributions*

Generally, and subject to the discussion above, concerning PFICs, a U.S. Holder that receives a distribution, including a constructive distribution, with respect to the Common Shares will be required to include the amount of such distribution in gross income as a dividend (without reduction for any Canadian income tax withheld from such distribution) to the extent of the current or accumulated "earnings and profits" of the Company (as determined under U.S. tax principles). To the extent that a distribution exceeds the current and accumulated "earnings and profits" of the Company, such distribution will be treated (a) first, as a tax-free return of capital to the extent of a U.S. Holder's tax basis in the Common Shares and, (b) thereafter, as gain from the sale or exchange of such Common Shares. (See more detailed discussion at "Disposition of Common Shares" below). However, the Company may not maintain the calculations of earnings and profits in accordance with U.S. federal income tax principles, and each U.S. Holder should therefore assume that any distribution by the Company with respect to the Common Shares will constitute ordinary dividend income. Dividends received on Common Shares generally will not be eligible for the "dividends received deduction". Subject to applicable limitations and provided the Company is eligible for the benefits of the Canada-U.S. Tax Convention, dividends paid by the Company to non-corporate U.S. Holders, including individuals, generally will be eligible for the preferential tax rates applicable to long-term capital gains for dividends, provided certain holding period and other conditions are satisfied, including that the Company not be classified as a PFIC in the tax year of distribution or in the preceding tax year. The dividend rules are complex, and each U.S. Holder should consult its own tax advisor regarding the application of such rules.

### Disposition of Common Shares

Subject to the discussion of the PFIC rules, above, a U.S. Holder will recognize gain or loss on the sale or other taxable disposition of Common Shares in an amount equal to the difference, if any, between (a) the amount of cash plus the fair market value of any property received and (b) such U.S. Holder's tax basis in the Common Shares sold or otherwise disposed of. Any such gain or loss generally will be capital gain or loss, which will be long-term capital gain or loss if the Common Shares are held for more than one year.

Although preferential tax rates currently apply to long-term capital gains of a U.S. Holder that is an individual, estate, or trust, such preferential tax rates are not available if the Company is a PFIC, unless a "qualified electing fund" ("QEF")

election is timely made, as described above. There are currently no preferential tax rates for long-term capital gains of a U.S. Holder that is a corporation. Deductions for capital losses and net capital losses are subject to complex limitations.

#### Foreign Tax Credit

A U.S. Holder who pays (whether directly or through withholding) Canadian income tax with respect to the Common Shares generally will be entitled, at the election of such U.S. Holder, to receive either a deduction or a credit for such Canadian income tax paid. Generally, a credit is more advantageous because it will reduce a U.S. Holder's U.S. federal income tax liability on a dollar-for-dollar basis, whereas a deduction will reduce a U.S. Holder's income subject to U.S. federal income tax. This election is made on a year-by-year basis and applies to all foreign taxes paid (whether directly or through withholding) by a U.S. Holder during a year.

Complex limitations apply to the foreign tax credit, including the general limitation that the credit cannot exceed the proportionate share of a U.S. Holder's U.S. federal income tax liability that such U.S. Holder's "foreign source" taxable income bears to such U.S. Holder's worldwide taxable income. In applying this limitation, a U.S. Holder's various items of income and deduction must be classified, under complex rules, as either "foreign source" or "U.S. source." Generally, dividends paid by a foreign corporation should be treated as foreign source for this purpose, and gains recognized on the sale of stock of a foreign corporation by a U.S. Holder should be treated as U.S. source for this purpose, except as otherwise provided in an applicable income tax treaty, and if an election is properly made under the Code. In addition, this limitation is calculated separately with respect to specific categories of income known as "baskets", and there are limitations under the basket rules also. Unused foreign tax credits generally can be carried back one year and forward ten years. The foreign tax credit rules are complex, and each U.S. Holder should consult its own tax advisors regarding the foreign tax credit rules.

#### Receipt of Foreign Currency

The amount of any distribution paid to a U.S. Holder in foreign currency, or on the sale, exchange or other taxable disposition of Common Shares, generally will be equal to the U.S. dollar value of such foreign currency based on the exchange rate applicable on the date of receipt (regardless of whether such foreign currency is converted into U.S. dollars at that time). A U.S. Holder will have a basis in the foreign currency equal to its U.S. dollar value on the date of receipt. Any U.S. Holder who converts or otherwise disposes of the foreign currency after the date of receipt may have a foreign currency exchange gain or loss that would be treated as ordinary income or loss, and generally will be U.S. source income or loss for foreign tax credit purposes. Each U.S. Holder should consult its own U.S. tax advisor regarding the U.S. federal income tax consequences of receiving, owning, and disposing of foreign currency.

#### Additional Tax on Passive Income

For tax years beginning after December 31, 2012, certain individuals, estates and trusts whose income exceeds certain thresholds will be required to pay a 3.8% Medicare surtax on "net investment income" including, among other things, dividends and net gain from dispositions of property (other than property held in a trade or business). U.S. Holders should consult with their own tax advisors regarding the effect, if any, of this tax on their ownership and disposition of Common Shares.

#### Information Reporting: Backup Withholding Tax

Under U.S. federal income tax law and Treasury Regulations, certain categories of U.S. Holders must file information returns with respect to their investment in, or involvement in, a foreign corporation. For example, recently enacted legislation generally imposes new U.S. return disclosure obligations (and related penalties) on individuals who are

U.S. Holders that hold certain specified foreign financial assets in excess of \$50,000. The definition of specified foreign financial assets includes not only financial accounts maintained in foreign financial institutions, but also, unless held in accounts maintained by a financial institution, any stock or security issued by a non-U.S. person, any financial instrument or contract held for investment that has an issuer or counterparty other than a U.S. person and any interest in a foreign entity. U.S. Holders may be subject to these reporting requirements unless their Common Shares are held in an account at a domestic financial institution. Penalties for failure to file certain of these information returns are substantial. U.S. Holders should consult with their own tax advisors regarding the requirements of filing information returns under these rules, including the requirement to file an IRS Form 8938.

Payments of dividends made on, and proceeds arising from certain sales or other taxable dispositions of, Common Shares generally will be subject to information reporting and backup withholding tax, at the rate of 28%, if a U.S. Holder (a) fails to furnish such U.S. Holder's correct U.S. taxpayer identification number (generally on Form W-9), (b) furnishes an incorrect U.S. taxpayer identification number, (c) is notified by the IRS that such U.S. Holder has previously failed to properly report items subject to backup withholding tax, or (d) fails to certify, under penalty of perjury, that such U.S. Holder has furnished its correct U.S. taxpayer identification number and that the IRS has not notified such U.S. Holder that it is subject to backup withholding tax. However, U.S. Holders that are corporations generally are excluded from these information reporting and backup withholding tax rules. Any amounts withheld under the U.S. backup withholding tax rules will be allowed as a credit against a U.S. Holder's U.S. federal income tax liability, if any, or will be refunded, if such U.S. Holder furnishes required information to the IRS. Each U.S. Holder should consult its own tax advisors regarding the information reporting and backup withholding tax rules.

F. *Dividend and paying agents*

Not Applicable

G. *Statement by experts.*

The references herein to excerpts of or summaries from the "Gahcho Kué Project, Definitive Feasibility Study, NI 43-101 Technical Report, Northwest Territories, Canada" dated December 1, 2010 (Information effective as of October 15, 2010)" have been consented to by Daniel D. Johnson, P.Eng., Michael Makarenko, P.Eng, and Kenneth Meikle, P.Eng., all of JDS at Suite 200 - 532 Leon Ave Kelowna, British Columbia V1Y 6J6. The references herein to excerpts of or summaries from the "Update of the Mineral Resource Estimate for the Tuzo Kimberlite, Gahcho Kué Project, Northwest Territories, Canada: NI 43-101 Technical Report" with an effective date of July 2, 2013 have been consented to by Tom E. Nowicki, Ph.D., P. Geo., Stephen Moss, Ph.D., P. Geo. and Gareth Garlick, all of Mineral Services Canada Inc. at 501-88 Lonsdale Avenue, North Vancouver, British Columbia V7M 2E6 and Michael Makarenko, P.Eng. of JDS at Suite 200 - 532 Leon Ave Kelowna, British Columbia V1Y 6J6.

H. *Documents on display.*

Any statement in this Annual Report about any of the Company's contracts or other documents is not necessarily complete. If the contract or document is filed as an exhibit to this Annual Report, the contract or document is deemed to modify the description contained in this Annual Report. Readers must review the exhibits themselves for a complete description of the contract or document.

Readers may review a copy of the Company's filings with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission ("the SEC"), including exhibits and schedules filed with it, at the SEC's public reference facilities at 100 F Street, N.E.,

Edgar Filing: Mountain Province Diamonds Inc. - Form 20-F

Washington, D.C. 20549. Readers may call the SEC at 1-800-SEC-0330 for further information on the public reference rooms. The SEC maintains a Web site (<http://www.sec.gov>) that contains reports, submissions and other information regarding registrants that file electronically with the SEC. The Company has only recently become subject to the requirement to file electronically through the EDGAR system most of its securities documents, including registration statements under the Securities Act of 1933, as amended and registration statements, reports and other documents under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the "Exchange Act").

Readers may read and copy any reports, statements or other information that the Company files with the SEC at the address indicated above and may also access them electronically at the Web site set forth above. These SEC filings are also available to the public from commercial document retrieval services.

The Company is required to file reports and other information with the SEC under the Exchange Act. Reports and other information filed by the Company with the SEC may be inspected and copied at the SEC's public reference facilities described above. As a foreign private issuer, the Company is exempt from the rules under the Exchange Act prescribing the furnishing and content of proxy statements and the Company's officers, directors and principal shareholders are exempt from the reporting and short-swing profit recovery provisions contained in section 16 of the Exchange Act. Under the Exchange Act, as a foreign private issuer, the Company is not required to publish financial statements as frequently or as promptly as United States companies.

Any of the documents referred to above can also be viewed at the offices of the Company's attorneys, Dorsey and Whitney LLP, 161 Bay Street, Suite 4310, Toronto, Ontario M5J 2S1. All of the documents referred to above are in English.

I. *Subsidiary Information.*

Not applicable.

Item 11. Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk.

The Company owns shares of other listed companies. Certain of these shares are presented under current assets on the Company's balance sheet as at December 31, 2013 as "Marketable Securities" at an amount of \$3,590, which is their quoted market value. Market risk represents the risk of loss that may impact the financial position, results of operations, or cash flows of the Company due to adverse changes in financial market prices, including interest rate risk, foreign currency exchange rate risk, commodity price risk, and other relevant market or price risks.

As the Company is in the permitting and development stage, it presently has no activities related to derivative financial instruments or derivative commodity instruments.

The financial results are quantified in Canadian dollars. In the past, the Company has raised equity funding through the sale of securities denominated in Canadian dollars, and the Company may in the future raise additional equity funding or financing denominated in Canadian dollars. The Company currently does not believe it currently has any



materially significant market risks relating to operations resulting from foreign exchange rates. However, if the Company enters into financing or other business arrangements denominated in currency other than the Canadian or United States dollar, variations in the exchange rate may give rise to foreign exchange gains or losses that may be significant.

The Company currently has no long-term debt obligations. The Company does not use financial instruments for trading purposes and was not at December 31, 2013 a party to any leverage derivatives. In the event the Company experiences substantial growth in the future, the Company's business and results of operations may be materially affected by changes in interest rates and certain other credit risk associated with the Company's operations.

Item 12. Description of Securities Other than Equity Securities

Not Applicable.

PART II

Item 13. Defaults, Dividend Arrearages and Delinquencies.

None.

Item 14. Material Modifications to the Rights of Security Holders and Use of Proceeds.

Not Applicable.

Item 15. Controls and Procedures.

d)

**Disclosure Controls and Procedures.**

The Company's Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer have evaluated the effectiveness of the Company's disclosure controls and procedures (as such term is defined in Rules 13(a)-15(e) and 15(d)-15(e) under the "Exchange Act" as of the end of the period covered by this annual report (the "Evaluation Date"). Based on such evaluation, such officers have concluded that, as of the Evaluation Date, the Company's disclosure controls and procedures are effective. Such disclosure controls and procedures are designed to ensure that the information required to be disclosed by the Company in reports that it files or submits to the Securities and Exchange Commission under the Exchange Act is recorded, processed, summarized and reported within the time periods specified in applicable rules and forms, and includes controls and procedures designed to ensure information relating to the Company required to be included in our reports filed or submitted under the Exchange Act is accumulated and communicated to the Company's management to allow timely decision regarding disclosure.

**(b) Management's Annual Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting.**

Management is responsible for establishing and maintaining adequate internal control over financial reporting for the Company. Management has designed such internal control over financial reporting to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of financial reporting and the preparation of financial statements for external purposes in accordance with IFRS as issued by the International Accounting Standards Board.

Because of its inherent limitations, the Company's internal control over financial reporting may not prevent or detect all possible misstatements or frauds. Also, projections of any evaluation of effectiveness to future periods are subject to the risk that controls may become inadequate because of changes in conditions, or that the degree of compliance with policies or procedures may deteriorate.

To evaluate the effectiveness of the Company's internal control over financial reporting, Management has used the Internal Control – Integrated Framework (1992), which is a suitable, recognized control framework established by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission ("COSO"). Management has assessed the effectiveness of the Company's internal control over financial reporting and concluded that such internal control over financial reporting is effective as of December 31, 2013.

**(c) Attestation Report of the Company's Registered Accounting Firm.**

The Registrant's independent registered public accounting firm, KPMG LLP, has issued an attestation report expressing an opinion on the Company's internal control over financial reporting as of December 31, 2013. For KPMG LLP's report, see Item 19 of this Annual Report on Form 20-F.

**(d) Changes in Internal Controls over Financial Reporting.**

There have not been any changes in the Company's internal controls over financial reporting or in other factors that have been identified in connection with the evaluation described above that occurred during the period covered by this Annual Report that has materially affected, or is reasonably likely to materially affect, the Company's internal controls over financial reporting.

**Item 16A. Audit Committee Financial Expert.**

The Company's Board of Directors has determined that there is at least one audit committee financial expert, as defined under Item 16A of Form 20-F, serving on its audit committee, namely, David Whittle, whose qualifications are set out in Item 6, above. Mr. Whittle is independent, as such term is defined by the listing standards of the NYSE MKT. All other members of the Audit Committee are also independent as defined by the listing standards of the NYSE MKT.

**Item 16B. Code of Ethics.**

The Board of Directors, on February 2, 2003, adopted a Code of Ethics (the "Code") entitled "Ethics and Conflict of Interest Policy" which applies to each of the directors and officers of the Company and its affiliates. A copy of the 2003 Code has been previously filed. On May 29, 2006, the Board of Directors adopted an updated and expanded set of Corporate Governance Policies, which replaced the 2003 Code. On September 7, 2010, the Board of Directors approved an updated set of the 2006 Corporate Governance Policies. A copy of the updated 2006 Corporate Governance Policies has been previously filed, and is incorporated by reference to this Annual Report.

The Corporate Governance Policy governs the actions of and is applicable to all of the directors and officers of the Company and its subsidiaries, and their affiliates. The updated 2006 Corporate Governance Policies address the following:

compliance with all the laws and regulations identified therein and with the requirements of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission as mandated by the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, and the requirements of the Toronto Stock Exchange;

· corporate opportunities and potential conflicts of interest;

· the quality of public disclosures;

· the protection and appropriate use of the Company's assets and resources;

· the protection of confidential information;

· insider trading;

· fair behaviour; and

· reporting violations of the Policy or Board Directives.

The Company has also adopted an Insider Trading Policy which applies to all employees of the Company.

The Company will provide a copy of the updated 2006 Corporate Governance Policies to any person, without charge. To obtain a copy without charge, send a request, in writing, to the Company at Mountain Province Diamonds Inc., Attention: Corporate Secretary, 161 Bay Street, Suite 2315, PO Box 216, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5J 2S1.

Item 16C. Principal Accountant Fees and Services.

A. *Audit Fees*

"Audit Fees" are the aggregate fees billed by KPMG LLP ("KPMG") for the audit of the Company's consolidated annual financial statements, assistance with interim financial statements, attestation services that are provided in connection with statutory and regulatory filings or engagements, services associated with registration statements, prospectuses, periodic reports and other documents filed with securities regulatory bodies and stock exchanges and other documents issued in connection with securities offerings and admissions to trading, and assistance in responding to comment letters from securities regulatory bodies, and consultations with the Company's management as to accounting or disclosure treatment of transactions or events and/or the actual or potential impact of final or proposed rules, standards or interpretations by the securities regulatory authorities, accounting standard setting bodies, or other regulatory or standard setting bodies.

Aggregate audit fees paid to KPMG in fiscal December 31, 2013 were \$211,759 including fees for the 2013 audits of the consolidated financial statements and services that are normally provided by the accountant in connection with statutory and regulatory filings or engagements (fiscal year ended December 31, 2012 - \$257,619). All such fees were approved by the Audit Committee.

B. *Audit-Related Fees*

"Audit-Related Fees" are fees that are or would be charged by KPMG for services reasonably related to the performance of the audit or interim review that are not reported under "Audit Fees". "Audit Related Fees" charged by KPMG during the fiscal period ended December 31, 2013 were \$nil and \$nil for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2012.

C. *Tax Fees*

"Tax Fees" are fees for professional services rendered by KPMG for tax compliance, tax advice on actual or contemplated transactions.

Aggregate tax fees for compliance services paid to KPMG in fiscal December 2013 were \$15,000 (December 31, 2012 - \$19,112). These services were approved by the Audit Committee.

D.

*All Other Fees*

In the fiscal year ending December 31, 2013, all other fees billed by KPMG were \$nil (December 31, 2012 - \$nil).

The Audit Committee pre-approves all audit services to be provided to the Company by its independent auditors. The Audit Committee's policy regarding the pre-approval of non-audit services to be provided to the Company by its independent auditors is that all such services shall be pre-approved by the Audit Committee. Non-audit services that are prohibited to be provided to the Company by its independent auditors may not be pre-approved. In addition, prior to the granting of any pre-approval, the Audit Committee must be satisfied that the performance of the services in question will not compromise the independence of the independent auditors. All non-audit services, performed by the Company's auditor, for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2013, were pre-approved by the Audit Committee of the Company. No non-audit services were approved pursuant to the *de minimis* exemption to the pre-approval requirement.

Item 16D. Exemptions from the Listing Standards for Audit Committees.

Not Applicable.

Item 16E. Purchases of Equity Securities by the Issuer and Affiliated Purchasers.

There were no purchases made by or on behalf of the Company or any affiliated purchaser of shares or other units of the Company's equity securities.

**Item 16F. Change in Registrant's Certifying Accountant.**

Not Applicable.

**Item 16G. Corporate Governance.**

**NYSE MKT Corporate Governance Matters**

The MPV Shares are listed on NYSE MKT. Section 110 of the NYSE MKT Company Guide permits the NYSE MKT to consider the laws, customs and practices of the foreign issuer's country of domicile in relaxing certain NYSE MKT listing criteria. A description of the significant ways in which the Company's governance practices differ from those followed by domestic companies pursuant to NYSE MKT standards is as follows:

*Shareholder Meeting Quorum Requirement:* The NYSE MKT minimum quorum requirement for a shareholder meeting is one-third of the outstanding common shares. In addition, a company listed on NYSE MKT is required to state its quorum requirement in its bylaws. The Company's quorum requirement (set forth in its Articles) is two persons who are, or who represent by proxy, shareholders who, in the aggregate, hold at least 5% of the issued shares entitled to be voted at the meeting.

*Proxy Delivery Requirement:* NYSE MKT requires the solicitation of proxies and delivery of proxy statements for all shareholder meetings, and requires that these proxies shall be solicited pursuant to a proxy statement that conforms to SEC proxy rules. The Company is a "foreign private issuer" as defined in Rule 3b-4 under the Exchange Act and Rule 405 under the Securities Act and the equity securities of the Company are accordingly exempt from the proxy rules set forth in Sections 14(a), 14(b), 14(c) and 14(f) of the Exchange Act. The Company solicits proxies in accordance



with applicable rules and regulations in Canada.

*Shareholder Approval Requirement:* The Company will follow the Canadian securities regulatory authorities and TSX rules for shareholder approval of new issuances of its common shares. Following securities and exchange rules, shareholder approval is required for certain issuances of shares that: (i) materially affect control of the Company; or (ii) provide consideration to insiders in aggregate of 10% or greater of the market capitalization of the listed issuer and have not been negotiated at arm's length. Shareholder approval is also required, pursuant to TSX rules, in the case of most private placements: (x) for an aggregate number of listed securities issuable greater than 25% of the number of securities of the listed issuer which are outstanding, on a non-diluted basis, prior to the date of closing of the transaction if the price per security is less than the market price; or (y) that during any six month period are to insiders for listed securities or options, rights or other entitlements to listed securities greater than 10% of the number of securities of the listed issuer which are outstanding, on a non-diluted basis, prior to the date of the closing of the first private placement to an insider during the six month period.

*Board of Director Nomination Requirements:* the NYSE MKT requires Board of Director nominations must be either selected, or recommended for the Board's selection, by either a nominating committee comprised solely of independent directors or by a majority of the independent directors. The Company currently does not have a nominating committee and follows the Canadian securities regulatory authority and Toronto Stock Exchange rules with respect to the nomination and selection of directors. The directors of the Company are elected annually and hold office until the next annual general meeting of the shareholders of the Company or until their successors in office are duly elected or appointed.

*Executive Sessions:* the NYSE MKT requires the Company to hold meetings of its Board of Directors on at least a quarterly basis. The independent directors should meet on a regular basis as often as necessary to fulfill their responsibilities, including at least annually in executive session without the presence of non-independent directors and management. The Company follows the Canadian securities regulatory authority and Toronto Stock Exchange rules. The Company is not required to, and currently does not, conduct executive sessions without the presence of non-independent directors and management.

**Item 16H. Mine Safety Disclosure.**

Not applicable.

**PART III**

**Item 17. Financial Statements.**

Not Applicable.

**Item 18. Financial Statements.**

The Company's consolidated financial statements are stated in Canadian dollars and are prepared in accordance with IFRS as issued by the IASB.

The financial statements and notes thereto as required under Item 18 are attached hereto and filed as part of this Annual Report, are individually listed under Item 19, and are found immediately following the text of this Annual Report. The reports of KPMG LLP, independent registered public accounting firm, are included herein immediately preceding the financial statements.

Item 19. Exhibits

***Financial Statements***

The Consolidated Financial Statements of the Company and exhibits listed below are filed with this annual report on Form 20-F in the United States. This report is also filed in Canada as an Annual Information Form and the Canadian filing includes the Consolidated Financial Statements and exhibits listed below. Canadian investors should refer to the audited Financial Statements of the Company as at and for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 filed with Canadian Securities Regulators on SEDAR under "Audited Annual Financial Statements - English" and incorporated herein by reference.

The following financial statements are attached to and form a part of this Annual Report filed with the SEC (see Appendix):

*Consolidated Financial Statements of the Company:*

- Management's Annual Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting
- Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm on Internal Control over Financial Reporting.
- Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm on Consolidated Financial Statements.
- Consolidated Balance Sheets as of December 31, 2013 and 2012.
- Consolidated Statements of Comprehensive Loss for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012 and 2011.
- Consolidated Statements of Equity for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012 and 2011.
- Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012 and 2011.
- Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements.

SIGNATURES

The registrant hereby certifies that it meets all of the requirements for filing on Form 20-F and that it has duly caused and authorized the undersigned to sign this annual report on its behalf.

**Mountain Province Diamonds Inc.**  
(Company)

By: "Patrick C. Evans"  
(Signature)\*

Date: March 26, 2014 **Patrick C. Evans**  
**President, CEO and Director**

\*Print the name and title of the signing officer under this signature.

108

## EXHIBIT INDEX

The following exhibits are attached to and form part of this Annual Report:

<i>Exhibit</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
1.1 By-Laws of the Company	(3)
1.2 Arrangement Agreement between the Company and Glenmore Highlands Inc. dated May 10, 2000.	(5)
1.3 Joint Information Circular of the Company and Glenmore Highlands Inc.	(4)
4.1 Transfer agreement between MPV, Monopros and Camphor dated November 24, 1999 pursuant to which MPV and Camphor transferred the GOR to Monopros.	(3)
4.2 Letter Agreement between MPV, Monopros, Glenmore and Camphor dated December 17, 1999 relating to acquisition of property, within the "Area of Interest" as defined in the agreement and acquisition of property through third party agreements.	(3)
4.3 Letter Agreement dated December 17, 1999 between MPV, Monopros, Camphor and Glenmore amending the Monopros Joint Venture Agreement.	(3)
4.4 Form of Subscription Agreement for the private placement described in item 1 of "Material Contracts".	(3)
4.5 Agreement dated as of January 1, 2002 between the Company, Camphor Ventures Inc. and De Beers Canada Exploration Inc.	(1)
4.6 Second Amendment Agreement dated January 1, 2002 between the Company and Paul Shatzko.	(3)
4.7 Second Amendment Agreement dated January 1, 2002 between the Company and Jan Vandersande.	(3)
4.8 Third Amendment Agreement dated December 13, 2002 between the Company and Jan Vandersande	(3)
4.9 Letter agreement dated December 13, 2002 between the Company and Elizabeth Kirkwood	(3)
4.10 Consulting Agreement dated January 1, 2004 between the Company and Jan W. Vandersande	(3)
4.11 Consulting Agreement dated November 1, 2005 between the Company and Patrick Evans	(3)
4.12 Revised Consulting Agreement dated January 31, 2006 between the Company and Patrick Evans	(3)
4.13 Consulting Agreement dated May 11, 2006 between the Company and Jennifer Dawson	(3)
4.14 Amended and Restated Joint Venture Agreement, dated July 3, 2009, by and among the Company, Camphor Ventures Inc. and De Beers Canada Inc.	(1), (3)
8.1 List of Subsidiaries	(2)
11.1 Corporate Governance Policies dated May 29, 2006, and updated September 7, 2010	(3)
11.2 Ethics and Conflict of Interest Policy	(3)
12.1 Section 302 Certification of the Company's Chief Executive Officer	-
12.2 Section 302 Certification of the Company's Chief Financial Officer	-
13.1 Section 906 Certification of the Company's Chief Executive Officer	-
13.2 Section 906 Certification of the Company's Chief Financial Officer	-
15.1 Independent Qualified Persons' Technical Report dated April 20, 2009 entitled Gahcho Kué Kimberlite Project NI 43-101 Technical Report prepared by Ken Brisebois, P.Eng., Dr. Ted Eggleston, P.Geo., and Alexandra Kozak, P.Eng., all of AMEC Americas Limited.	(6)
15.2 Independent Qualified Persons' Technical Report dated December 1, 2010 (with Information Effective as of October 15, 2010) entitled "Gahcho Kué Definitive Feasibility Study NI 43-101 Technical Report" prepared by Daniel D. Johnson, Mike Makarenko, and Ken Meikle, all of JDS	(6)

Energy and Mining Inc.

Independent Qualified Persons' Technical Report with effective date July 2, 2013 entitled "Update of the Mineral Resource Estimate for the Tuzo Kimberlite, Gahcho Kué Project, Northwest

15.3 Territories, Canada: NI 43-101 Technical Report" prepared by Tom E. Nowicki, Stephen Moss, and (7) Gareth Garlick, all of Mineral Services Canada Inc. and Michael Makarenko, of JDS Energy and Mining Inc.

15.4 Consents for inclusion of the Technical Report in Exhibit 15.1 and reference in Form 20-F (6)

15.5 Consents for inclusion of the Technical Report in Exhibit 15.2 and reference in Form 20-F (6)

15.6 Consents for use of information and inclusion of the Technical Report in Exhibit 15.3 and reference in Form 20-F -

- (1) Portions of the Agreement have been omitted pursuant to a request for confidential treatment filed with SEC.
- (2) See list of subsidiaries on page 11 of this Annual Report.
- (3) Previously filed and incorporated by reference.
- (4) Previously furnished under cover of Form 6K dated June 2, 2000 and incorporated by reference.
- (5) Attached as Appendix A to the Joint Information Circular of the Company and Glenmore Highlands Inc. which information circular was previously furnished under cover of Form 6K dated June 2, 2000, and incorporated by reference.
- (6) Previously filed and incorporated by reference.
- (7) Previously filed Exhibit 99.1 to Form 6K dated August 14, 2013 and incorporated by reference.



Appendix

**Item 18. Financial Statements**

Consolidated Financial Statements

(Expressed in Canadian Dollars)

MOUNTAIN PROVINCE  
DIAMONDS INC.

As at December 31, 2013 and 2012

And for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**

**CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
Responsibility for Consolidated Financial Statements	3
Management's Annual Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting	4
Independent Auditors' Report of Registered Public Accounting Firm	5
Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting	6
Consolidated Statements of Balance Sheets	8
Consolidated Statements of Comprehensive Loss	9
Consolidated Statements of Equity	10
Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows	11
Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements	12 – 35

## **MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**

### Responsibility for Consolidated Financial Statements

The accompanying consolidated financial statements of Mountain Province Diamonds Inc. (the "Company") are the responsibility of the Board of Directors.

The consolidated financial statements have been prepared by management, on behalf of the Board of Directors, in accordance with the accounting policies disclosed in the notes to the Company's consolidated financial statements. Where necessary, management has made informed judgments and estimates in accounting for transactions which were not complete at the balance sheet date. The consolidated financial statements have been prepared in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards ("IFRS") as issued by the International Accounting Standards Board ("IASB") appropriate in the circumstances.

Management has established processes, which are in place to provide sufficient knowledge to support management representations that it has exercised reasonable diligence that the consolidated financial statements fairly present in all material respects the financial condition, results of operations and cash flows of the Company, as of the date of and for the periods presented by the consolidated financial statements.

The Board of Directors is responsible for reviewing and approving the consolidated financial statements together with other financial information of the Company and for ensuring that management fulfills its financial reporting responsibilities. An Audit Committee assists the Board of Directors in fulfilling this responsibility.

The Audit Committee meets with management to review the financial reporting process and the consolidated financial statements together with other financial information of the Company. The Audit Committee reports its findings to the Board of Directors for its consideration in approving the consolidated financial statements together with other financial information of the Company for issuance to the shareholders.

Management recognizes its responsibility for conducting the Company's affairs in compliance with IFRS as issued by the IASB, and applicable laws and regulations, and for maintaining proper standards of conduct for its activities.

*"Patrick C. Evans"*  
Patrick C. Evans

*"Bruce Ramsden"*  
Bruce Ramsden

President and Chief Executive Officer VP Finance and Chief Financial Officer

Toronto, Canada  
March 25, 2014

Page | 3

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**

**MANAGEMENT'S ANNUAL REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING**

Management of the Company is responsible for establishing and maintaining adequate internal control over financial reporting for the Company. Management has designed such internal control over financial reporting to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of financial reporting and the preparation of financial statements for external purposes in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards as issued by the International Accounting Standards Board.

Because of its inherent limitations, the Company's internal control over financial reporting may not prevent or detect all possible misstatements or frauds. Also, projections of any evaluation of effectiveness to future periods are subject to the risk that controls may become inadequate because of changes in conditions, or that the degree of compliance with policies or procedures may deteriorate.

To evaluate the effectiveness of the Company's internal control over financial reporting, Management has used the Internal Control – Integrated Framework (1992), which is a suitable, recognized control framework established by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission ("COSO"). Management has assessed the effectiveness of the Company's internal control over financial reporting and concluded that such internal control over financial reporting is effective as of December 31, 2013. The Company's independent auditors, KPMG LLP, have issued an unqualified opinion on the effectiveness of the Company's internal control over financial reporting.

March 25, 2014

Page | 4

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**

**INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT OF REGISTERED PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIRM**

To the Shareholders of Mountain Province Diamonds Inc.

We have audited the accompanying consolidated financial statements of Mountain Province Diamonds Inc., which comprise the consolidated balance sheets as at December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012, the consolidated statements of comprehensive loss, equity and cash flows for each of the years in the three-year period ended December 31, 2013, and notes, comprising a summary of significant accounting policies and other explanatory information.

**Management's Responsibility for the Consolidated Financial Statements**

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of these consolidated financial statements in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards as issued by the International Accounting Standards Board, and for such internal control as management determines is necessary to enable the preparation of consolidated financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

**Auditors' Responsibility**

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these consolidated financial statements based on our audits. We conducted our audits in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards and the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States). Those standards require that we comply with ethical requirements and plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the consolidated financial statements are free from material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the consolidated financial statements. The procedures selected depend on our judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the consolidated financial statements, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, we consider internal control relevant to the entity's preparation and fair presentation of the consolidated financial statements in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances. An audit also includes evaluating the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of accounting

estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the consolidated financial statements.

We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained in our audits is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinion.

#### Opinion

In our opinion, the consolidated financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the consolidated financial position of Mountain Province Diamonds Inc. as at December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012, and its consolidated financial performance and its consolidated cash flows for each of the years in the three-year period ended December 31, 2013 in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards as issued by the International Accounting Standards Board.

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**

Emphasis of Matter

Without modifying our opinion, we draw attention to Note 1 in the consolidated financial statements which describes that the Company expects to require additional capital resources to meet planned expenditures in 2014. These conditions, along with other matters as set forth in Note 1, indicate the existence of a material uncertainty that casts substantial doubt about the Company's ability to continue as a going concern.

Other Matter

We also have audited, in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States), Mountain Province Diamonds Inc.'s internal control over financial reporting as of December 31, 2013, based on the criteria established in Internal Control – Integrated Framework (1992) issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO), and our report dated March 25, 2014 expressed an unmodified (unqualified) opinion on the effectiveness of Mountain Province Diamonds Inc.'s internal control over financial reporting.

Chartered Professional Accountants, Licensed Public Accountants

March 25, 2014

Toronto, Canada



**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**

**REPORT OF INDEPENDENT REGISTERED PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIRM ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING**

The Shareholders of Mountain Province Diamonds Inc.

We have audited Mountain Province Diamonds Inc.'s internal control over financial reporting as of December 31, 2013, based on criteria established in Internal Control – Integrated Framework (1992) issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO). Mountain Province Diamonds Inc.'s management is responsible for maintaining effective internal control over financial reporting and for its assessment of the effectiveness of internal control over financial reporting, included in the accompanying Management's Annual Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the Company's internal control over financial reporting based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States). Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether effective internal control over financial reporting was maintained in all material respects. Our audit included obtaining an understanding of internal control over financial reporting, assessing the risk that a material weakness exists, and testing and evaluating the design and operating effectiveness of internal control based on the assessed risk. Our audit also included performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

A company's internal control over financial reporting is a process designed to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of financial reporting and the preparation of financial statements for external purposes in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. A company's internal control over financial reporting includes those policies and procedures that (1) pertain to the maintenance of records that, in reasonable detail, accurately and fairly reflect the transactions and dispositions of the assets of the company; (2) provide reasonable assurance that transactions are recorded as necessary to permit preparation of financial statements in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, and that receipts and expenditures of the company are being made only in accordance with authorizations of management and directors of the company; and (3) provide reasonable assurance regarding prevention or timely detection of unauthorized acquisition, use, or disposition of the company's assets that could have a material effect on the financial statements.

Because of its inherent limitations, internal control over financial reporting may not prevent or detect misstatements. Also, projections of any evaluation of effectiveness to future periods are subject to the risk that controls may become inadequate because of changes in conditions, or that the degree of compliance with the policies or procedures may

deteriorate.

In our opinion, Mountain Province Diamonds Inc. maintained, in all material respects, effective internal control over financial reporting as of December 31, 2013, based on the criteria established in Internal Control – Integrated Framework (1992) issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO).

We also have audited, in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards and the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States), the consolidated balance sheets of Mountain Province Diamonds Inc. as of December 31, 2013 and 2012, and the related consolidated statements of comprehensive loss, equity, and cash flows for each of the years in the three-year period ended December 31, 2013, and our report dated March 25, 2013 expressed an unqualified opinion on those consolidated financial statements.

Chartered Professional Accountants, Licensed Public Accountants

Toronto, Canada

March 25, 2014

Page | 7

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.****Consolidated Balance Sheets**

In Canadian dollars

	Notes	December 31, 2013	December 31, 2012
<b>ASSETS</b>			
Current assets			
Cash	5	\$11,344,472	\$274,696
Short-term investments	5	24,343,222	47,418,997
Marketable securities	5	3,590	9,521
Amounts receivable	5	614,609	337,907
Advances, prepaid expenses, and supplies	6	12,776,825	722,402
		49,082,718	48,763,523
Property and equipment	7	15,687,956	146,010
Mineral properties	8	45,596,529	46,680,519
Total assets		\$110,367,203	\$95,590,052
<b>LIABILITIES AND SHAREHOLDERS' EQUITY</b>			
Current liabilities			
Accounts payable and accrued liabilities	<b>5 &amp; 13</b>	\$13,949,350	\$2,109,984
Decommissioning and restoration liability	9	5,224,662	6,284,770
Shareholders' equity:			
Share capital	10	209,820,460	180,170,247
Share-based payments reserve	10	2,191,406	1,233,857
Deficit		(120,817,633)	(94,213,695 )
Accumulated other comprehensive income		(1,042 )	4,889
Total shareholders' equity		91,193,191	87,195,298
Total liabilities and shareholders' equity		\$110,367,203	\$95,590,052
Going concern	1		
Contingencies and commitments	<b>8 &amp; 12</b>		
Subsequent events	<b>10(iii) &amp; 18</b>		

**On behalf of the Board:**

*“Patrick Evans” “Jonathan Comerford”*  
**Director                      Director**

*The notes to the consolidated financial statements are an integral part of these statements.*

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.****Consolidated Statements of Comprehensive Loss**

In Canadian dollars

	Notes	Year ended December 31, 2013	Year ended December 31, 2012	Year ended December 31, 2011
Expenses:				
Consulting fees	<b>10 &amp; 13</b>	\$ (2,459,140	) \$ (1,434,917	) \$ (1,631,188 )
Depreciation		(259,334	) (21,246	) (14,789 )
Exploration and evaluation expenses	14	(21,837,083	) (10,651,622	) (9,032,585 )
Gahcho Kué Project management fee		(1,113,848	) (311,076	) (236,464 )
Office and administration		(286,539	) (285,698	) (458,467 )
Professional fees		(344,701	) (664,878	) (361,148 )
Promotion and investor relations		(179,277	) (245,936	) (109,854 )
Director fees		(145,153	) (166,668	) (97,812 )
Transfer agent and regulatory fees		(180,412	) (200,461	) (169,489 )
Travel		(129,997	) (196,714	) (156,659 )
Net loss for the year from operations		\$ (26,935,484	) \$ (14,179,216	) \$ (12,268,455 )
Accretion expense on decommissioning and restoration liability	9	(23,882	) (27,801	) (63,315 )
Other income:				
Interest income		355,428	147,762	303,354
Gain on revaluation of warrants exercisable in foreign currency		-	-	489,481
Gain on asset transfer to Kennady Diamonds Inc.	17	-	10,721,645	-
Net loss for the year		\$ (26,603,938	) \$ (3,337,610	) \$ (11,538,935 )
Other Comprehensive Loss				
Items that may be reclassified subsequently to profit and loss:				
Change in fair value of available-for-sale marketable securities		(5,931	) (8,157	) (5,384 )
Comprehensive loss for the year		\$ (26,609,869	) \$ (3,345,767	) \$ (11,544,319 )
Basic and diluted loss per share	10(iv)	\$ (0.28	) \$ (0.04	) \$ (0.15 )
Weighted average number of shares outstanding		94,838,537	82,191,626	79,553,515

*The notes to the consolidated financial statements are an integral part of these statements.*

Page | 9

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.****Consolidated Statements of Equity**

In Canadian dollars

	Notes	Number of shares	Share Capital	Warrants	Share-based Payments Reserve	Deficit	Accumulated other comprehensive income (loss)	Total
Balance, January 1, 2011		77,416,057	\$133,344,866	\$969,942	\$1,026,302	\$(79,337,150 )	\$18,430	\$56,022,390
Net loss for the year		-	-	-	-	(11,538,935 )	-	(11,538,935)
Issuance of common shares – exercise of options		270,635	665,000	-	-	-	-	665,000
Issuance of common shares – exercise of warrants		2,658,866	7,242,471	-	-	-	-	7,242,471
Fair value of options exercised from share-based payments reserve		-	429,965	-	(429,965 )	-	-	-
Fair value of warrants exercised transferred from Warrants		-	969,942	(969,942)	-	-	-	-
Fair value of warrants (exercised in a foreign currency)		-	4,259,751	-	-	-	-	4,259,751
Share-based payment expense		-	-	-	487,085	-	-	487,085
Other Comprehensive Loss:								
Available-for-sale financial assets - current period unrealized losses		-	-	-	-	-	(5,384 )	(5,384)

Edgar Filing: Mountain Province Diamonds Inc. - Form 20-F

Balance, December 31, 2011		80,345,558	\$ 146,911,995	\$-	\$ 1,083,422	\$(90,876,085 )	\$ 13,046	\$ 57,132,378
Net loss for the year		-	-	-	-	(3,337,610 )	-	(3,337,610 )
Issuance of common shares – Rights Offering, net of costs	10(ii)	13,452,593	46,062,632	-	-	-	-	46,062,632
Issuance of common shares – exercise of options		370,000	604,200	-	-	-	-	604,200
Fair value of options exercised from Share-based Payments Reserve		-	313,065	-	(313,065 )	-	-	-
Share-based payment expense		-	-	-	463,500	-	-	463,500
Dividend-in-kind Other	17	-	(13,721,645 )	-	-	-	-	(13,721,645 )
Comprehensive Loss: Available-for-sale financial assets - current period unrealized losses		-	-	-	-	-	(8,157 )	(8,157 )
Balance, December 31, 2012		94,168,151	\$ 180,170,247	\$-	\$ 1,233,857	\$(94,213,695 )	\$ 4,889	\$ 87,195,298
Net loss for the year		-	-	-	-	(26,603,938 )	-	(26,603,938 )
Issuance of common shares – Private Placement	10(ii)	5,889,200	28,807,501	-	-	-	-	28,807,501
Issuance of common shares – exercise of options	10(iii)	444,000	559,440	-	-	-	-	559,440
Fair value of options exercised from share-based payments reserve		-	283,272	-	(283,272 )	-	-	-
Share-based payment expense		-	-	-	1,240,821	-	-	1,240,821
Other Comprehensive Loss: Available-for-sale financial assets -		-	-	-	-	-	(5,931 )	(5,931 )



current period  
unrealized losses

Balance,

December 31, 2013	100,501,351	\$209,820,460	\$-	\$2,191,406	\$(120,817,633)	\$(1,042)	\$91,193,191
----------------------	-------------	---------------	-----	-------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------

*The notes to the consolidated financial statements are an integral part of these statements.*

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.****Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows**

In Canadian dollars

	Notes	Year ended December 31, 2013	Year ended December 31, 2012	Year ended December 31, 2011
Cash provided by (used in):				
Operating activities:				
Net loss for the year		\$ (26,603,938	) \$ (3,337,610	) \$ (11,538,935 )
Adjustments:				
Accretion expense on decommissioning and restoration liability	9	23,882	27,801	63,315
Depreciation		259,334	21,246	14,789
Share-based payment expense		1,240,821	463,500	487,085
Interest income		(355,428	) (147,762	) (303,354 )
Gain on asset transfer to Kennady Diamonds Inc.	17	-	(10,721,645	) -
Gain on revaluation of warrants exercisable in foreign currency		-	-	(489,481 )
Changes in non-cash operating working capital:				
Amounts receivable		(276,702	) 948,267	(786,983 )
Advances, prepaid expenses and supplies		(12,054,423	) (620,761	) 32,533
Accounts payable and accrued liabilities		5,146,918	(419,577	) (1,151,017 )
		(32,619,536	) (13,786,541	) (13,672,048 )
Investing activities:				
Mineral properties		-	(51,058	) (10,237,929 )
Interest income		355,428	147,762	303,354
Purchase of property and equipment		(9,108,832	) (124,031	) (15,261 )
Redemption (purchase) of short-term investments		23,075,775	(29,599,814	) (8,042,094 )
		14,322,371	(29,627,141	) (17,991,930 )
Financing activities:				
Transfer to Kennady Diamonds Inc.	17	-	(3,000,000	) -
Proceeds from option exercises	10(iii)	559,440	604,200	665,000
Proceeds from exercise of warrants		-	-	7,242,471
Proceeds from rights offering		-	46,062,632	-
Proceeds from share issuance, net of costs	10(ii)	28,807,501	-	-
		29,366,941	43,666,832	7,907,471
Increase in cash		11,069,776	253,150	(23,756,507 )
Cash, beginning of year		274,696	21,546	23,778,053

Cash, end of year	\$ 11,344,472	\$ 274,696	\$ 21,546
-------------------	---------------	------------	-----------

*The notes to the consolidated financial statements are an integral part of these statements.*

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**  
**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**  
**As at December 31, 2013 and 2012 and**  
**For the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011**  
**In Canadian Dollars**

**1. Nature of Operations AND GOING CONCERN**

Mountain Province Diamonds Inc. (“Mountain Province” or the “Company”) was incorporated on December 2, 1986 under the British Columbia Company Act. The Company amended its articles and continued incorporation under the Ontario Business Corporation Act effective May 8, 2006. The Company is involved in the discovery and development of diamond properties in Canada’s Northwest Territories.

The address of the Company’s registered office and its principal place of business is 161 Bay Street, Suite 2315, PO Box 216, Toronto, ON, Canada, M5J 2S1. The Company’s shares are listed on the Toronto Stock Exchange under the symbol ‘MPV’ and on the New York Stock Exchange – MKT under the symbol ‘MDM’.

The Company is in the process of permitting and developing the Gahcho Kué project (“Gahcho Kué Project”) in conjunction with De Beers Canada Inc. (“De Beers Canada”) (Note 8). The underlying value and recoverability of the amounts shown as “Mineral Properties” are dependent upon the ability of the Company and/or its mineral property partner to develop economically recoverable reserves, to have successful permitting and development, and upon future profitable production or proceeds from disposition of the Company’s mineral properties. Failure to meet the obligations to the Company’s share in the Gahcho Kué Project may lead to dilution of the interest in the Gahcho Kué Project and may require the Company to write off costs capitalized to date.

As at December 31, 2013, the Company has not achieved profitable operations and continues to be dependent upon its ability to obtain external financing to meet the Company’s liabilities as they become payable. The Company’s ability to continue operations beyond the next twelve months is dependent on the successful permitting, the ability of the Company to obtain necessary financing to fund its operations, the successful construction of the Gahcho Kué Project, and the future production or proceeds from developed properties.

The Company’s mineral asset, the Gahcho Kué Project was in the exploration and evaluation stage. On December 2, 2013, the approval of a pioneer Land Use Permit for the Gahcho Kué diamond mine was obtained. Based on this approval the Company believes that all further permits will be of a procedural nature and when considered in connection with the other identified criteria to demonstrate technical feasibility and commercial viability (Note 3(vii)) of the Gahcho Kué Project, the Company will now capitalize all future development expenditures incurred related to the Gahcho Kué Project.

The Company currently has no source of revenues. In the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011, the Company incurred losses, had negative cash flows from operating activities, and will be required to obtain additional sources of financing to complete its business plans going into the future. Although the Company had working capital of \$35,133,368 at December 31, 2013, including \$35,687,694 of cash and short-term investments, the Company has insufficient capital to finance its operations and the Company's share of development costs of the Gahcho Kué Project (Note 8) over the next 12 months. The Company is currently investigating various sources of additional funding to increase the cash balances required for ongoing operations over the foreseeable future. These additional sources include, but are not limited to, share offerings, private placements, rights offerings, credit and debt facilities, as well as the exercise of outstanding options. However, there is no certainty that the Company will be able to obtain financing from any of those sources. These conditions indicate the existence of a material uncertainty that results in substantial doubt as to the Company's ability to continue as a going concern.

The Company's audited consolidated financial statements have been prepared on the basis that the Company will continue as a going concern, and do not reflect adjustments to assets and liabilities that would be necessary if the going concern assumption were not appropriate. These adjustments could be material.

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**  
**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**  
**As at December 31, 2013 and 2012 and**  
**For the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011**  
**In Canadian Dollars**

*Authorization of Financial Statements*

The audited consolidated financial statements for the year ended December 31, 2013 (including comparatives) were approved by the Board of Directors on March 25, 2014.

**2. BASIS OF PRESENTATION**

These consolidated financial statements of the Company were prepared in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards (“IFRS”) as issued by the International Accounting Standards Board (“IASB”). The policies set out below were consistently applied to all the periods presented.

These financial statements were prepared under the historical cost convention, as modified by the revaluation of cash, short-term investments and available-for-sale financial assets at fair value.

**3. Significant accounting policies**

**(i) Basis of Preparation**

The consolidated financial statements are presented in accordance with IAS 1, *Presentation of Financial Statements*.

The Company has elected to present the ‘Statements of Comprehensive Loss’ as a single financial statement with its statements of loss, titled ‘Consolidated Statements of Comprehensive Loss’.

The significant accounting policies adopted in the preparation of the consolidated financial statements are set out below.

**(ii) Basis of consolidation**

The consolidated financial statements include the accounts of the Company and its wholly-owned subsidiary:

Camphor Ventures Inc. (100% owned - inactive)

The Company's interest in the Gahcho Kué Project has been proportionally consolidated (see Note 8).

A subsidiary is an entity controlled by the Company. Control is defined as the power to govern the financial and operating policies of an entity so as to obtain benefits from its activities. A subsidiary is included in the consolidated financial statements from the date control is obtained until the date control ceases. All intercompany balances, transactions, income, expenses, profits and losses, including unrealized gains and losses have been eliminated on consolidation.

The Company has determined that its interest in the Gahcho Kué Project through its joint arrangement is a joint operation under IFRS 11 and, accordingly has recorded the assets, liabilities, revenues and expenses in relation to its interest in the joint operation. The Company's interest in the Gahcho Kué Project is bound by a contractual arrangement establishing joint control over the project through required unanimous consent of each of the Participants for strategic, financial and operating policies of the Gahcho Kué Project. The Gahcho Kué Project management committee has two representatives of each of Mountain Province and De Beers Canada. The Participants have appointed De Beers Canada as the operator of the Gahcho Kué Project.

**(iii) Foreign Currency**

The Company's presentation currency is the Canadian Dollar ("CAD"). The functional currency of the Company and its subsidiaries is the Canadian Dollar.

In preparing the consolidated financial statements, transactions in currencies other than the Company's functional currency, known as foreign currencies, are recognized at the rates of exchange prevailing at the dates of the transactions.

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**  
**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**  
**As at December 31, 2013 and 2012 and**  
**For the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011**  
**In Canadian Dollars**

At the end of each reporting period, monetary items denominated in foreign currencies are re-translated at the rates prevailing at that date. Non-monetary items carried at fair value that are denominated in foreign currencies are re-translated at the rates prevailing at the date when the fair value was determined.

Exchange differences are recognized in profit or loss in the period in which they arise and presented in consolidated Statements of Comprehensive Loss within Office and administration.

In the year ended December 31, 2013, \$1,482 of foreign exchange loss was recognized in Office and administrative costs, in the Company's consolidated Statements of Comprehensive Loss (December 31, 2012 - \$6,792; December 31, 2011 - \$241,564).

**(iv)**

**Interest income**

Interest income from financial assets is recognized when it is probable that the economic benefits will flow to the Company and the amount of income can be measured reliably. Interest income is accrued on the basis of time that has passed, by reference to the principal outstanding and at the effective interest rate applicable.

**(v)**

**Share-based payments**

Equity-settled share-based payments to employees and others providing similar services are measured at the fair value of the equity instruments at the grant date. Details regarding the determination of the fair value of equity-settled share-based payment transactions are set out in Note 10.

The fair value determined at the grant date of the equity-settled share-based payments is expensed to the consolidated Statement of Comprehensive Loss over the vesting period, if any, which is the period during which the employee becomes unconditionally entitled to equity instruments. At the end of each reporting period, the Company revises its estimate of the number of equity instruments expected to vest, if any.

Equity-settled share-based payment transactions with parties other than employees, if any, are measured at the fair value of the goods or services received, except where that fair value cannot be estimated reliably, in which case they are measured at the fair value of the equity instruments granted, measured at the date the entity obtains the goods or



the counterparty renders the service.

(vi)

**Income Taxes and Deferred Taxes**

The income tax expense or benefit for the period consists of two components: current and deferred. Income tax expense or benefit is recognized in the consolidated Statements of Comprehensive Loss except to the extent it relates to a business combination or items recognized directly in equity.

Current tax is the expected tax payable or receivable on the taxable profit or loss for the year. Current tax is calculated using tax rates and laws that were enacted or substantively enacted at the balance sheet date in each of the jurisdictions and includes any adjustments for taxes payable or recovery in respect of prior periods.

Taxable profit or loss differs from profit or loss as reported in the consolidated Statements of Comprehensive Loss because of items of income or expense that are taxable or deductible in other years, and items that are never taxable or deductible.

Deferred tax is recognized on temporary differences between the carrying amounts of assets and liabilities in the financial statements and the corresponding tax bases used in the computation of taxable profit. Deferred tax liabilities are generally recognized for all taxable temporary differences. Deferred tax assets are generally recognized for all deductible temporary differences, loss carryforwards and tax credit carryforwards to the extent that it is probable that taxable profits will be available against which they can be utilized. To the extent that the Company does not consider it to be probable that taxable profits will be available against which deductible temporary differences, loss carryforwards, and tax credit carryforwards can be utilized, a deferred tax asset is not recognized.

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**  
**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**  
**As at December 31, 2013 and 2012 and**  
**For the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011**  
**In Canadian Dollars**

Deferred tax assets and liabilities are not recognized if the temporary difference arises from the initial recognition (other than in a business combination) of other assets and liabilities in a transaction that affects neither the taxable profit nor the accounting profit.

Deferred tax liabilities are recognized for taxable temporary differences associated with investments in subsidiary, except where the Company is able to control the reversal of the temporary difference and it is probable that the temporary difference will not reverse in the foreseeable future. Deferred tax assets arising from deductible temporary differences associated with such investments and interests are only recognized to the extent that it is probable that there will be sufficient taxable profits against which to utilize the benefits of the temporary differences and they are expected to reverse in the foreseeable future.

Deferred tax assets and liabilities are measured at the tax rates that are expected to apply in the period in which the liability is settled or the asset realized, based on tax rates (and tax laws) that have been enacted or substantively enacted by the end of the reporting period. The measurement of deferred tax liabilities and assets reflects the tax consequences that would follow from the manner in which the Company expects, at the end of the reporting period, to recover or settle the carrying amount of its assets and liabilities.

Deferred tax assets and liabilities are offset when there is a legally enforceable right to set off current tax assets against current tax liabilities and when they relate to income taxes levied by the same taxation authority and the Company intends to settle its current tax assets and liabilities on a net basis.

Current and deferred taxes are recognized in profit or loss, except when they relate to items that are recognized in other comprehensive income or directly into equity, in which case, the current and deferred taxes are also recognized in other comprehensive income or directly in equity respectively.

**(vii) Mineral properties and exploration and evaluation costs and development costs**

Exploration and evaluation (“E&E”) costs are those costs required to find a mineral property and determine commercial viability. E&E costs include costs to establish an initial mineral resource and determine whether inferred mineral resources can be upgraded to measured and indicated mineral resources and whether measured and indicated mineral resources can be converted to proven and probable reserves.

Exploration and evaluation costs consist of:

- gathering exploration data through topographical and geological studies;
- exploratory drilling, trenching and sampling;
- determining the volume and grade of the resource;
- test work on geology, metallurgy, mining, geotechnical and environmental; and
- conducting and refining engineering, marketing and financial studies.

Costs in relation to these activities are expensed as incurred until such time that the technical feasibility and commercial viability of extracting the mineral resource are demonstrable. At such time, mineral properties are assessed for impairment, and an impairment loss, if any, is recognized, and future development costs will be capitalized to assets under construction.

The key factors management use in determining technical feasibility and commercial viability of the Gahcho Kué Project are demonstrable are the following;

- completion of a feasibility study;

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**  
**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**  
**As at December 31, 2013 and 2012 and**  
**For the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011**  
**In Canadian Dollars**

obtaining required permitting to construct the Gahcho Kué Project;  
completion of an evaluation of the financial resources required to construct the Gahcho Kué Project ;  
availability of financial resources necessary to commence development activities to construct the Gahcho Kué Project;  
management's determination that a satisfactory return on investment, in relation to the risks to be assumed, is likely to be obtained.

The Company also recognizes exploration and evaluation costs as assets when acquired as part of a business combination, or asset purchase, or as a result of rights acquired relating to a mineral property. These assets are recognized at fair value, or relative fair value if applicable. Acquired capitalized exploration and evaluation consists of:

interest in exploration properties,  
amounts paid for acquired rights associated with exploration properties, and  
amounts paid in connection with sunk cost repayments (Note 8).

(viii)

**Property and equipment**

Property and equipment are stated at cost less accumulated amortization and accumulated impairment losses. Cost comprises the fair value of consideration given to acquire an asset and includes the direct charges associated with bringing the asset to the location and condition necessary to put the asset into use, as well as the future cost of dismantling and removing the asset. When parts of an item of property, plant and equipment have different useful lives, they are accounted for as separate items (major components) of property, plant and equipment. Replacement cost, including major inspection and overhaul expenditures are capitalized for components of property, plant and equipment, which are accounted for separately.

Development costs are capitalized under assets under construction. Expenditures, including engineering to design the size and scope of the project, environmental assessment and permitting and borrowing costs are capitalized to assets under construction.

Amortization is provided on property, plant and equipment. Amortization is calculated so as to write off the cost of each asset over its expected useful life to its estimated residual value. The estimated useful lives, residual values and amortization method are reviewed at the end of each annual reporting period. Mineral properties are not amortized until the properties to which they relate are placed into commercial production, at which time the costs will be amortized on a unit-of-production method following commencement of commercial production. Assets under construction are not amortized; rather it is deferred until the asset is ready for use, at which point the deferred amount is transferred to the appropriate asset category and amortized as set out below.

Office furniture	five years, straight line
Vehicles	five years, straight line
Production equipment	five years, straight line
Computer equipment	three years, straight line
General infrastructure	ten years, straight line
Mining & treatment equipment	ten years, straight line
Earth moving equipment	estimated hours
Assets under construction	not depreciated until production

**(ix) Impairment of non-financial assets**

The carrying value of the Company's capitalized Mineral Properties and property and equipment is assessed for impairment when indicators of such impairment exist. If any indication of impairment exists, an estimate of the asset's recoverable amount is calculated to determine the extent of the impairment loss, if any. The recoverable amount is determined as the higher of the fair value less costs to sell for the asset and the asset's value in use. In assessing value in use, the estimated future cash flows are discounted to their present value using a pre-tax discount rate that reflects current market assessments of the time value of money and the risks specific to the asset for which the estimates of future cash flows have not been adjusted.

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**  
**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**  
**As at December 31, 2013 and 2012 and**  
**For the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011**  
**In Canadian Dollars**

Impairment is determined on an asset by asset basis, whenever possible. If it is not possible to determine impairment on an individual asset basis, then impairment is considered on the basis of a cash generating unit (“CGU”). CGUs represent the lowest level for which there are separately identifiable cash inflows that are largely independent of the cash flows from other assets or Company’s other group of assets. The Company has determined that it operates one CGU.

If the carrying amount of the asset exceeds its recoverable amount, the asset is impaired and an impairment loss is charged immediately to the consolidated Statements of Comprehensive Loss so as to reduce the carrying amount to its recoverable amount.

An assessment is made at each reporting date as to whether there is any indication that previously recognized impairment losses may no longer exist or may have decreased. If such indication exists, the Company makes an estimate of the recoverable amount.

A previously recognized impairment loss is reversed only if there has been a change in the estimates used to determine the asset’s recoverable amount since the last impairment loss was recognized. If this is the case, the carrying amount of the asset is increased to its recoverable amount. The increased amount cannot exceed the carrying amount that would have been determined had no impairment loss been recognized for the asset in prior years. Such reversal is recognized in the consolidated Statements of Comprehensive Loss.

(x)

**Financial Instruments**

Financial instruments are classified into one of the following four categories: loans and receivables; fair value through profit or loss; held-to-maturity; and available-for-sale. Financial assets are initially measured at fair value. Subsequent measurement and recognition of the changes in fair value of financial instruments depends upon their initial classifications, as follows:

- Financial assets and financial liabilities at fair value through profit and loss include financial assets and financial liabilities that are held for trading or designated upon initial recognition as at fair value through profit and loss. These financial instruments are measured at fair value with changes in fair values recognized in the consolidated Statements of Comprehensive Loss.

- Financial assets classified as available-for-sale are measured at fair value, with changes in fair values recognized as Other Comprehensive Income (“OCI”) in the consolidated Statements of Comprehensive Loss, except when there is objective evidence that the asset is impaired, at which point the cumulative loss that had been previously recognized in OCI is recognized within the consolidated Statements of Comprehensive Loss.
- Financial assets classified as held-to-maturity and loans and receivables are measured subsequent to initial recognition at amortized cost using the effective interest method.
- Financial liabilities, other than financial liabilities classified as fair value through profit and loss, are measured in subsequent periods at amortized cost using the effective interest method.

The effective interest method is a method of calculating the amortized cost of a financial liability and of allocating interest expense over the relevant period. The effective interest rate is the rate that exactly discounts estimated future cash payments (including all fees and points paid or received that form an integral part of the effective interest rate, transaction costs and other premiums or discounts) through the expected life of the financial liability, or where appropriate, a short period, to the net carrying amount on initial recognition.

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**  
**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**  
**As at December 31, 2013 and 2012 and**  
**For the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011**  
**In Canadian Dollars**

The Company has classified its financial instruments as follows:

Asset/Liability	Classification	Measurement
Cash	Fair Value through Profit and Loss	Fair Value
Short-term investments	Fair Value through Profit and Loss	Fair Value
Amounts receivable	Loans and Receivables	Amortized Cost
Marketable securities	Available-for-Sale	Fair Value
Accounts payable and accrued liabilities	Other liabilities	Amortized Cost

The Company's cash consists of balances with banks. Short-term investments are investments with original maturities of greater than three months when acquired (see Note 5).

The Company had no held-to-maturity financial assets at December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012.

The market values of marketable securities are determined based on the closing prices reported on recognized securities exchanges and over-the-counter markets. Such individual market values do not necessarily represent the realizable value of the total holding of any security, which may be more or less than that indicated by market quotations.

The fair values of the Company's amounts receivable, advances and accounts payable and accrued liabilities approximate their carrying values because of the immediate or short-term to maturity of these financial instruments.

*Derivative financial liabilities*

Derivative instruments, including embedded derivatives, are recorded at their fair value on the date the derivative contract is entered into. They are subsequently remeasured at their fair value at each consolidated Balance Sheet date, and the changes in the fair value are recognized in the consolidated Statements of Comprehensive Loss. Fair values for derivative instruments are determined using valuation techniques, including assumptions based on market conditions existing at the date of the consolidated Balance Sheets.



Warrants denominated or exercisable in a foreign currency different from the functional currency of the Company meet the definition of a derivative financial liability and are fair valued at each consolidated Balance Sheet date using the Black-Scholes option pricing model, with changes in the fair value recognized in the consolidated Statements of Comprehensive Loss. There are no derivative financial liabilities as at December 31, 2013 or 2012.

**(xi)**

**Provisions**

Provisions represent liabilities to the Company for which the amount or timing is uncertain. Provisions are recognized when the Company has a present legal or constructive obligation as a result of past events, it is probable that an outflow of resources will be required to settle the obligation, and the amount can be reliably estimated. Provisions are not recognized for future operating losses. Provisions are measured at the present value of the expected expenditures to settle the obligation, applying a risk-free discount rate. The increase in the provision due to passage of time is recognized as accretion expense. The Company does not have any provisions as of December 31, 2013 other than the provision for decommissioning and restoration associated with the Mineral Properties.

The Company records as decommissioning and restoration liability the present value of estimated costs of legal and constructive obligations required to restore locations in the period in which the obligation is incurred. The nature of these decommissioning and restoration activities includes dismantling and removing structures, rehabilitating mines and tailings dams, dismantling operating facilities, closure of plant and waste sites, and restoration, reclamation and re-vegetation of affected areas.

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**  
**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**  
**As at December 31, 2013 and 2012 and**  
**For the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011**  
**In Canadian Dollars**

The obligation generally arises when the asset is installed or the ground and/or environment is disturbed at the production location. When the liability is initially recognized, the present value of the estimated cost is capitalized if the Company has a related asset on its balance sheet, or expensed as part of exploration and evaluation expenditures if no asset exists. Over time, the discounted liability is increased for the change in present value. The periodic unwinding of the discount is recognized in the consolidated Statement of Comprehensive Loss as a finance cost called “accretion expense on decommissioning and restoration liability”. Additional disturbances or changes in rehabilitation costs will be recognized as additional capitalized costs (or exploration and evaluation expense depending on whether there was a related asset when the liability was initially recognized) and additional decommissioning and restoration liability when they occur. If it is determined that the expected costs for decommissioning and restoration are reduced, the change in the present value of the reduction is recorded as a reduction in the capitalized costs (or a charge against exploration and evaluation expense), and a reduction of the decommissioning and restoration liability. For closed sites, changes to estimated costs are recognized immediately in the consolidated Statement of Comprehensive Loss.

**(xii)**

**Loss per share**

Basic loss or earnings per share is calculated by dividing loss or earnings attributable to common shares divided by the weighted average number of shares outstanding during the period.

Diluted loss or earnings per share is calculated using the denominator of the basic calculation described above adjusted to include the potentially dilutive effect of outstanding stock options and warrants. The denominator is increased by the total number of additional common shares that would have been issued by the Company assuming exercise of all stock options and warrants with exercise prices below the average market price for the year.

**(xiii)**

**New accounting policies**

The Company adopted the following new standards and interpretations issued by the IASB or International Financial Reporting Standards Interpretation Committee (“IFRIC”) as of January 1, 2013.

**IFRS 10 Consolidated Financial Statements**

IFRS 10 requires an entity to consolidate an investee when it is exposed, or has rights, to variable returns from its involvement with the investee and has the ability to affect those returns through its power over the investee. IFRS 10 replaces SIC-12 *Consolidation – Special Purpose Entities* and parts of IAS 27 *Consolidated and Separate Financial Statements*. The adoption of IFRS 10 did not have a material effect on our consolidated financial statements.

**IFRS 11 Joint Arrangements**

IFRS 11 requires a venturer to classify its interest in a joint arrangement as a joint venture or joint operation. Joint ventures are accounted for using the equity method of accounting whereas for a joint operation, the venturer recognizes its share of each of the assets, liabilities, revenue and expenses of the joint operation. IFRS 11 supersedes IAS 31, *Interests in Joint Ventures*, and SIC-13 *Jointly Controlled Entities – Non-monetary Contributions by Venturers*. The Company has determined that its interest in its Gahcho Kué Project through its joint arrangement, is a joint operation under IFRS 11 and, accordingly have recorded the assets, liabilities, revenues and expenses in relation to its interest in the joint operation. The adoption of IFRS 11 did not have a material effect on our consolidated financial statements.

**IFRS 13 Fair Value Measurement**

IFRS 13 is a comprehensive standard for fair value measurement and disclosure requirements for use across all IFRS statements. The new standard clarifies that fair value is the price that would be received to sell an asset, or paid to transfer a liability in an orderly transaction between market participants, at the measurement date. It also establishes disclosures about fair value measurement. The disclosures required under IFRS 13 for the consolidated financial statements have been included in Note 5.

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**  
**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**  
**As at December 31, 2013 and 2012 and**  
**For the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011**  
**In Canadian Dollars**

**IFRIC 20 – Stripping Costs in the Production Phase of a Surface Mine**

IFRIC 20 clarifies the requirements for accounting for the costs of stripping activity in the production phase when stripping improves access to further quantities of material that will be mined in future periods. The adoption of IFRS 11 did not have a material effect on our consolidated financial statements.

**IAS 28 Investments in Associates and Joint Ventures**

IAS 28 was amended as a consequence of the issuance of IFRS 11. In addition to prescribing the accounting for investments in associates, it also addresses joint ventures that are to be accounted for by the equity method. The application of the equity method has not changed as a result of the amendment. The adoption of the amended standard did not have a material effect on the consolidated financial statements.

**(xiv) Standards, amendments and interpretations to existing standards that are not yet effective and have not been adopted early by the Company**

At the date of authorization of these financial statements, certain new standards, amendments and interpretations to existing standards have been published but are not yet effective, and have not been adopted early by the Company.

The Company anticipates that all of the relevant pronouncements will be adopted in the Company's accounting policy for the first period beginning after the effective date of the pronouncement. Information on new standards, amendments and interpretations that are expected to be relevant to the Company's financial statements is provided below. Certain other new standards and interpretations have been issued but are not expected to have a material impact on the Company's financial statements and are therefore not discussed below.

**IFRS 9 – Financial Instruments**

The IASB issued IFRS 9 "Financial Instruments" ("IFRS 9") which proposes to replace IAS 39 "Financial Instruments: recognition and measurement". The replacement standard has the following significant components: establishes two primary measurement categories for financial assets — amortized cost and fair value; establishes criteria for classification of financial assets within the measurement category based on business model and cash flow characteristics; and eliminates existing held to maturity, available-for-sale, and loans and receivable categories.

In November 2013, the IASB issued an amendment to IFRS 9 which includes a new hedge model that aligns accounting more closely with risk management, as well as enhancements to the disclosures about hedge accounting and risk management. Additionally as the impairment guidance in IFRS 9, as well as certain limited amendments to the classification and measurement requirements of IFRS 9 is not yet complete, the previously mandated effective date of IFRS 9 of January 1, 2015, has been removed. Entities may apply IFRS 9 before the IASB completes the amendments, but are not required to. The Company has not yet determined the impact of adoption of IFRS 9 and will evaluate the impact of the change to its financial statements based on the characteristics of its financial instruments at the time of adoption.

### **IFRIC 21 - Levies**

IFRIC 21 Levies (“IFRIC 21”) was issued in May 2013 and is an interpretation of IAS 37 – Provisions, Contingent Liabilities and Contingent Assets (“IAS 37”), on the accounting for levies imposed by governments. IAS 37 sets out criteria for the recognition of a liability, one of which is the requirement for the entity to have a present obligation as a result of a past event (“obligating event”). IFRIC 21 clarifies that the obligating event that gives rise to a liability to pay a levy is the activity described in the relevant legislation that triggers the payment of the levy. IFRIC 21 is effective for annual periods commencing on or after January 1, 2014. The Company is assessing the impact of this new standard, if any, on the consolidated financial statements.

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**  
**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**  
**As at December 31, 2013 and 2012 and**  
**For the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011**  
**In Canadian Dollars**

**IAS 32 – Offsetting Financial Assets and Liabilities**

IAS 32 was amended to clarify that an entity currently has a legally enforceable right to set-off if that right is not contingent on a future event; and enforceable both in the normal course of business and in the event of default, insolvency or bankruptcy of the entity and all counterparties. This amendment also clarifies when a settlement mechanism provides for net settlement or gross settlement that is equivalent to net settlement. Amendments to IAS 32 are effective for annual periods beginning on or after January 1, 2014. The Company intends to adopt the amendments to IAS 32 in its consolidated financial statements for the annual period beginning January 1, 2014. The Company does not expect the amendments to have a material impact on the consolidated financial statements.

**4. SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING JUDGMENTS, ESTIMATES AND ASSUMPTIONS**

The preparation of the Company's consolidated financial statements requires management to make judgments, estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and reported amounts of expenses during the reporting period. Actual outcomes could differ from these estimates. These consolidated financial statements include estimates, which, by their nature, are uncertain and may require accounting adjustments based on future occurrences. Revisions to accounting estimates are recognized in the period in which the estimate is revised and future periods if the revision affects both current and future periods. These estimates are based on historical experience, current and future economic conditions, and other factors, including expectations of future events that are believed to be reasonable under the circumstances.

i) Significant judgments in applying accounting policies

The areas which require management to make significant judgments in applying the Company's accounting policies in determining carrying values include, but are not limited to:

a) *Mineral reserves*

The information relating to the geological data on the size, depth and shape of the ore body requires complex geological judgments to interpret the data. Changes in the proven mineral reserves or measured and indicated and inferred mineral estimates may impact the carrying value of the properties.

b) *Impairment analysis – mineral properties*

As required under IFRS 6 – Exploration for and evaluation of mineral resources and IAS 36 – Impairment of assets (“IAS 36”), the Company reviewed its mineral properties for impairment based on results to date and when events and changes in circumstances indicate that the carrying value of the assets may not be recoverable. The Company is required to make certain judgments in assessing indicators of impairment. The Company’s assessment is that as at December 31, 2013, no impairment in the carrying value of its mineral properties had occurred.

c) *Determination of development phase*

The Company applies significant judgment when determining and assessing its criteria used to determine technical feasibility and commercial viability is demonstrable. The Company determined that the Gahcho Kué Project has met the key factors used by management and, accordingly, that all costs of development activities will be capitalized to mineral properties.

ii) Significant accounting estimates and assumptions

The areas which require management to make significant estimates and assumptions in determining carrying values include, but are not limited to:

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**  
**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**  
**As at December 31, 2013 and 2012 and**  
**For the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011**  
**In Canadian Dollars**

a) *Mineral reserves and resources*

Mineral reserve and resource estimates include numerous uncertainties and depend heavily on geological interpretations and statistical inferences drawn from drilling and other data, and require estimates of future price for the commodity and future cost of operations. The mineral reserve and resources are subject to uncertainty and actual results may vary from these estimates. Results from drilling, testing and production, as well as material changes in commodity prices and operating costs subsequent to the date of the estimate, may justify revision of such estimates. Changes in the proven and probable mineral reserves or measured and indicated and inferred mineral resources estimates may impact the carrying value of the properties.

b) *Impairment analysis - mineral properties*

As required under IFRS 6 – Exploration for and evaluation of mineral resources and IAS 36 – Impairment of assets (“IAS 36”), the Company reviewed its mineral properties for impairment based on results to date and when events and changes in circumstances indicate that the carrying value of the assets may not be recoverable. Upon the Company’s determination of technical feasibility and commercial viability an impairment test of the capitalized costs related to the Gahcho Kué Project was completed. IAS 36 requires the Company to make certain estimates in respect of recoverability of the asset, including estimated development costs, life of mine, discount rates and diamond prices. The Company’s assessment is that there is no impairment in the carrying value of its mineral properties.

d) *Provision for decommissioning and restoration*

The decommissioning and restoration liability and the accretion recorded are based on estimates of future cash flows, discount rates, and assumptions regarding timing. The estimates are subject to change and the actual costs for the decommissioning and restoration liability may change significantly.

e) *Stock options*

The stock option pricing model requires the input of highly subjective assumptions including the expected life and volatility. Changes in the subjective input assumptions can materially affect the fair value estimate.

f) *Deferred taxes*



Deferred income tax assets and liabilities are determined based on differences between the financial reporting and tax bases of assets and liabilities and on unused losses carried forward, and are measured using the substantively enacted tax rates that are expected to be in effect when the differences are expected to reverse or losses are expected to be utilized. Deferred tax assets are recorded to recognize tax benefits only to the extent that, based on available evidence, including forecasts, it is probable that they will be realized. The Company has not recorded the benefit of any tax losses or deductible temporary differences.

## **5. FAIR VALUE MEASUREMENT**

For financial instruments recorded at fair value, the Company categorizes each of its fair value measurements in accordance with a fair value hierarchy. The fair value hierarchy establishes three levels to classify the inputs to valuation techniques used to measure fair value. Level 1 inputs are quoted prices (unadjusted) in active markets for identical assets or liabilities. Level 2 inputs are quoted prices in markets that are not active, quoted prices for similar assets or liabilities in active markets, inputs other than quoted prices that are observable for the asset or liability (for example, interest rate and yield curves observable at commonly quoted intervals, forward pricing curves used to value currency and commodity contracts and volatility measurements used to value option contracts), or inputs that are derived principally from or corroborated by observable market data or other means. Level 3 inputs are unobservable (supported by little or no market activity).

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**  
**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**  
**As at December 31, 2013 and 2012 and**  
**For the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011**  
**In Canadian Dollars**

The fair value hierarchy gives the highest priority to Level 1 inputs and the lowest priority to Level 3 inputs.

The Company's financial assets as at December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012 measured at fair value are summarized in the following table:

	December 31, 2013		
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Cash	\$11,344,472	\$-	\$ -
Short-term investments	-	24,343,222	-
Marketable securities	3,590	-	-

  

	December 31, 2012		
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Cash	\$274,696	\$-	\$-
Short-term investments	-	47,418,997	-
Marketable securities	9,521	-	-

Short-term investments at December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012 are cashable guaranteed investment certificates ("GICs") held with a major Canadian financial institution. GICs are measured using a discounted cash flow model, the future value of the GIC is discounted to the reporting period using the market interest rate.

The quoted market value of marketable securities at December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012 was \$3,590 and \$9,521, respectively. The original cost of these marketable securities at December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012 was \$4,632 for both periods.

The fair values of the amounts receivable, and accounts payable and accrued liabilities approximate their carrying values due to the relatively short-term maturity of these financial instruments.

The carrying amounts by classification are:

	Balance as at	
	December 31, 2013	December 31, 2012
Financial assets		
Fair Value Through Profit or Loss		
Cash	\$11,344,472	\$274,696
Short-term investments	24,343,222	47,418,997
Loans and Receivables		
Amounts receivable	614,609	337,907
Available-for-Sale		
Marketable securities	3,590	9,521
Financial liabilities		
Financial liabilities measured at amortized cost		
Accounts payable and accrued liabilities	(13,949,350)	(2,109,984 )

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**  
**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**  
**As at December 31, 2013 and 2012 and**  
**For the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011**  
**In Canadian Dollars**

The Company had no transactions with marketable securities classified as available-for-sale during the year ended December 31, 2013 or the year ended December 31, 2012.

Financial Instruments Risks

The Company has examined the various financial instrument risks to which it is exposed and assesses the impact and likelihood of those risks. These risks may include credit risk, liquidity risk, market risk, foreign currency risk and interest rate risk.

*Credit risk*

Credit risk is the risk of financial loss to the Company if a customer or counterparty to a financial instrument fails to meet its obligations. The Company's maximum exposure to credit risk for its amounts receivable is summarized as follows:

	December 31, 2013	December 31, 2012
0-30 days	\$ 572,551	\$ 279,107
30 to 90 days	-	39,200
More than 90 days	42,058	19,600
Total	\$ 614,609	\$ 337,907

On December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012, the Company does not have any allowance for doubtful accounts, and does not consider that any such allowance is necessary.

All of the Company's cash and short-term investments are held with a major Canadian financial institution and thus the exposure to credit risk is considered insignificant. The short-term investments are in the form of guaranteed investment certificates ("GICs") and are cashable in whole or in part, with interest, at any time to maturity. Management actively monitors the Company's exposure to credit risk under its financial instruments, including with respect to amounts receivable. The Company considers the risk of loss for its amounts receivable to be remote and significantly

mitigated due to the financial strength of the parties from whom most of the amounts receivable are due - the Canadian government for harmonized sales tax ("HST") refunds receivable in the amount of approximately \$572,551 (December 31, 2012 – approximately \$153,500).

The Company's current policy is to invest excess cash in GICs. It periodically monitors the investments it makes and is satisfied with the credit ratings of its bank.

*Liquidity risk*

Liquidity risk is the risk that the Company will not be able to meet its obligations associated with financial liabilities. The Company has a planning and budgeting process in place by which it anticipates and determines the funds required to support its operating requirements. The Company coordinates this planning and budgeting process with its financing activities through its capital management process (see Note 1). The Company's financial liabilities comprise its accounts payable and accrued liabilities, all of which are due within the next 12 month period. Other than minimal office space rental commitments, there are no other operating lease commitments.

*Market risk*

The Company's marketable securities are classified as available-for-sale, and are subject to changes in the market prices. They are recorded at fair value in the Company's financial statements, based on the closing market value at the end of the period for each security included. The original cost of the marketable securities is \$4,632. The Company's exposure to market risk is not considered to be material.

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**  
**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**  
**As at December 31, 2013 and 2012 and**  
**For the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011**  
**In Canadian Dollars**

*Foreign currency sensitivity*

The Company is exposed to foreign currency risk at the balance sheet date through its U.S. denominated accounts payable and cash. A 10% depreciation or appreciation of the U.S. dollar against the Canadian dollar would result in an approximate \$3,400 (December 31, 2012 - \$8,000) decrease or increase, respectively, in both net and comprehensive loss. The Company currently has only limited exposure to fluctuations in exchange rates between the Canadian and U.S. dollar. Accordingly, the Company has not employed any currency hedging programs during the current period.

*Interest rate sensitivity*

The Company has no significant exposure at December 31, 2013, 2012 or 2011 to interest rate risk through its financial instruments. The short-term investments are at fixed rates of interest that do not fluctuate during the remaining term. The Company has no interest-bearing debt.

**6. ADVANCES, PREPAID EXPENSES, AND SUPPLIES**

	December 31, 2013	December 31, 2012
Advances	\$-	\$ 115
Prepaid expenses	6,749,843	722,287
Supplies	488,411	-
Reclamation deposit	5,538,571	-
	\$ 12,776,825	\$ 722,402

Supplies consist of \$304,607 of diesel fuel and \$183,804 of spare parts as at December 31, 2013.

Reclamation deposit is made for the Gahcho Kué Project for the short-term.

**7. PROPERTY AND EQUIPMENT**

The Company's property and equipment as at December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012 are as follows:

	Office furniture	Vehicles	Production equipment	Computer equipment	General infrastructure	Earthmoving & equipment	Mining & Treatment equipment	Assets under construction	Total
<b>Cost</b>									
At January 1, 2012	\$-	\$58,155	\$7,473	\$1,206	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$66,834
Additions	32,996	1,837	(1,838 )	6,616	7,326	-	-	77,094	124,031
At December 31, 2012	32,996	59,992	5,635	7,822	7,326	-	-	77,094	190,865
Additions	5,881	668,271	57,171	952	985,837	1,773,510	105,450	12,204,208	15,801,280
At December 31, 2013	\$38,877	\$728,263	\$62,806	\$8,774	\$993,163	\$1,773,510	\$105,450	\$12,281,302	\$15,992,145
<b>Accumulated depreciation</b>									
At January 1, 2012	\$-	\$(22,220 )	\$(1,121 )	\$(268 )	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$(23,609 )
Depreciation	(6,049 )	(12,274 )	(851 )	(1,950 )	(122 )	-	-	-	(21,246 )
At December 31, 2012	(6,049 )	(34,494 )	(1,972 )	(2,218 )	(122 )	-	-	-	(44,855 )
Depreciation	(8,070 )	(53,225 )	(10,873 )	(3,560 )	(145,431 )	(37,287 )	(888 )	-	(259,334 )
At December 31, 2013	\$(14,119 )	\$(87,719 )	\$(12,845 )	\$(5,778 )	\$(145,553 )	\$(37,287 )	\$(888 )	\$-	\$(304,189 )
<b>Carrying amounts</b>									
At December 31, 2012	\$26,947	\$25,498	\$3,663	\$5,604	\$7,204	\$-	\$-	\$77,094	\$146,010
At December 31, 2013	\$24,758	\$640,544	\$49,961	\$2,996	\$847,610	\$1,736,223	\$104,562	\$12,281,302	\$15,687,956

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**  
**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**  
**As at December 31, 2013 and 2012 and**  
**For the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011**  
**In Canadian Dollars**

During the year ended December 31, 2013, the Company through its 49% share in the Gahcho Kué Project capitalized assets under construction totaling \$12,204,208. Included in this amount is construction equipment which was brought to site for future construction use.

## **8. MINERAL PROPERTIES**

The Company holds a 49% interest in the Gahcho Kué Project located in the Northwest Territories, Canada, and De Beers Canada holds the remaining 51% interest. The arrangement between the Company and De Beers Canada is governed by an agreement entered into on July 3, 2009 (the “2009 Agreement”). The Company considers that the operator of the Gahcho Kué Project is a related party under IAS 24 – *Related Parties*.

The 2009 Agreement’s provision for consensus decision-making for material strategic and operating decisions provides the Company with joint control for the Gahcho Kué Project with De Beers Canada, and represents a joint arrangement in accordance with IFRS 11. The arrangement is not structured through a legal entity or vehicle separate from the Company and De Beers Canada and accounts for the Project as a joint operation in accordance with IFRS 11. The Company has determined its proportionate share (49%) of the assets, liabilities, revenues and expenses of the joint operation, and recorded them in its consolidated financial statements.

Under a previous agreement (the “2002 Agreement”) in effect until July 3, 2009, De Beers Canada carried all costs incurred by the Project, and De Beers Canada had no recourse to the Company for repayment of funds until, and unless, the Project was built, in production, and generating net cash flows.

On July 3, 2009, the Company entered the 2009 Agreement with De Beers Canada (jointly, the “Participants”) under which:

- The Participants’ continuing interests in the Gahcho Kué Project will be Mountain Province 49% and De Beers
- (a) Canada 51%, with the Company’s interest no longer subject to the dilution provisions in the 2002 Agreement except for normal dilution provisions which are applicable to both Participants;
  - (b) Each Participant will market their own proportionate share of diamond production in accordance with their participating interest;
  - (c) Each Participant will contribute their proportionate share to the future project development costs;
  - (d)



Material strategic and operating decisions will be made by consensus of the Participants as long as each Participant has a participating interest of 40% or more;

- (e) The Participants have agreed that the sunk historic costs to the period ending on December 31, 2008 will be reduced and limited to \$120,000,000;

The Company will repay De Beers Canada \$59 million (representing 49% of an agreed sum of \$120,000,000) plus (f) interest compounded on the outstanding amounts in settlement of the Company's share of the agreed historic sunk costs on the following schedule:

\$200,000 on execution of the 2009 Agreement (the Company's contribution to the 2009 Joint Arrangement expenses to date of execution of the 2009 Agreement – paid and expensed);

Up to \$5.1 million in respect of De Beers Canada's share of the costs of the feasibility study; (paid - \$4,417,421 to December 31, 2012, included in "Mineral Properties"; no further payments are expected);

\$10 million upon the completion of a feasibility study with at least a 15% IRR and approval of the necessary development work for a mine (as defined in the 2009 Agreement) (paid March 15, 2011, included in "Mineral Properties");

\$10 million following the issuance of the construction and operating permits;

\$10 million following the commencement of commercial production; and

The balance of approximately \$24.4 million plus accumulated interest within 18 months following commencement of commercial production.

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**  
**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**  
**As at December 31, 2013 and 2012 and**  
**For the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011**  
**In Canadian Dollars**

Mountain Province has agreed that the marketing rights provided to the Company in the 2009 Agreement will be diluted if the Company defaults on certain of the repayments described above.

Since these payments are contingent on certain events occurring, and/or work being completed, they will be recorded as the payments become due or are made. As these contingent payments are made, they are being capitalized to Mineral Properties as “acquired exploration and evaluation”.

The continuity of the Mineral Properties is as follows:

Balance, January 1, 2011	\$35,901,973
Change in expected decommissioning and restoration liability	410,593
Amounts capitalized for sunk cost repayments in the year	10,237,929
Balance, December 31, 2011	\$46,550,495
Change in expected decommissioning and restoration liability	78,965
Amounts capitalized for sunk cost repayments in the year	51,059
Balance, December 31, 2012	\$46,680,519
Change in expected decommissioning and restoration liability	(1,083,990 )
Amounts capitalized for sunk cost repayments in the period	-
Balance, December 31, 2013	\$45,596,529

The Company’s proportional interest (49%) of commitments made by the operator of the Gahcho Kué Project is \$31,609,307 at December 31, 2013.

The total commitments are as follows:

	2014	2015	2016	Total
Future Gahcho Kué Project commitments	\$25,296,426	\$6,164,608	\$148,273	\$31,609,307

**9. DECOMMISSIONING AND RESTORATION LIABILITY**

The Gahcho Kué Project decommissioning and restoration liability was calculated using the following assumptions as at December 31, 2013 and 2012:

	December 31, 2013	December 31, 2012
Expected undiscounted cash flows	\$ 13,849,717	\$ 13,484,544
Discount rate	4.10	% 2.38 %
Periods	between 2015 and 2028	between 2014 and 2028
With probabilities between	10% and 70%	10% and 70%

The decommissioning and restoration liability has been calculated using expected cash flows that are current dollars, with inflation.

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**  
**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**  
**As at December 31, 2013 and 2012 and**  
**For the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011**  
**In Canadian Dollars**

The continuity of the decommissioning and restoration liability at December 31, 2013 is follows:

	Year ended December 31, 2013	Year ended December 31, 2012	Year ended December 31, 2011
Balance, beginning of year	\$ 6,284,770	\$ 6,178,004	\$ 5,704,096
Change in estimate of discounted cash flows for the year	(1,083,990 )	78,965	410,593
Accretion recorded during the year	23,882	27,801	63,315
Balance, end of the year	\$ 5,224,662	\$ 6,284,770	\$ 6,178,004

**10. SHAREHOLDERS' EQUITY**

i. Authorized share capital

Unlimited common shares, without par value

There is no other class of shares in the Company.

ii. Share capital

The number of common shares issued and fully paid as at December 31, 2013 is 100,501,351. There are no shares issued but not fully paid.

On November 27, 2013, the Company closed a non-brokered private placement of common shares for gross proceeds of \$29,446,000. The Company issued 5,889,200 common shares at a price of \$5.00 per share. Transaction costs in the amount of \$567,330 were paid in relation to the private placement and share issuance costs of \$71,169 were incurred in connection with the private placement. The shares are subject to a four month hold period, expiring on March 26, 2014.

On November 28, 2012, the Company closed a Rights Offering for gross proceeds of approximately \$47.1 million. Under the Rights Offering, each registered holder of common shares of the Company as of the record date established as October 30, 2012, received one right (a "Right") for each share held. Six (6) Rights plus the sum of \$3.50 (the "Subscription Price") were required to subscribe for one share ("Rights Share"). The Rights expired on November 28, 2012 (the "Expiry Date") with unexercised Rights becoming void and without value. The Rights were listed on the TSX until their expiry.

The Company entered into a stand-by agreement with Bottin (International) Investments Ltd. ("Bottin") under which Bottin undertook to fully subscribe for those Rights Shares not otherwise subscribed for on the Expiry Date.

A total of 65,100,414 Rights were exercised by shareholders for 10,850,069 shares, and Bottin subscribed to an additional 2,602,524 Rights Shares for the Rights not otherwise subscribed for on the Expiry Date, under the stand-by agreement. Fees charged by Bottin in connection with the stand-by agreement have been recorded as share issuance costs (Note 13).

In 2011, the remaining 2,658,866 warrants outstanding were exercised before expiry for gross proceeds of \$7,242,471 (2010 – 558,124 warrants for gross proceeds of \$1,251,928). The warrants issued August 4, 2009 were exercisable for either \$2.00 Canadian or \$1.73 US. As they could be exercised in a foreign currency different than the functional currency of the Company, they met the definition of a financial liability. They were revalued at fair value at each period using the Black-Scholes option pricing model. The revaluation of these warrants generated an accounting gain of \$489,481 in the year ended December 31, 2011.

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**  
**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**  
**As at December 31, 2013 and 2012 and**  
**For the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011**  
**In Canadian Dollars**

iii. Stock Options and Share-based Payments Reserve

The Company, through its Board of Directors and shareholders, adopted a stock option plan (the “Plan”) which, among other things, allows for the maximum number of shares that may be reserved for issuance under the Plan to be 10% of the Company’s issued and outstanding shares at the time of the grant. The Board of Directors has the authority and discretion to grant stock option awards within the limits identified in the Plan, which includes provisions limiting the issuance of options to insiders and significant shareholders to maximums identified in the Plan. The aggregate maximum number of shares pursuant to options granted under the Plan will not exceed 10,050,135 shares, and as at December 31, 2013, there were 8,850,135 shares available to be issued under the Plan. All stock options are settled by the issuance of common shares.

The following table summarizes information about the stock options outstanding and exercisable:

	December 31, 2013		December 31, 2012		December 31, 2011	
	Number of options	Weighted average exercise price	Number of options	Weighted average exercise price	Number of options	Weighted average exercise price
Balance at beginning of year	794,000	\$ 2.12	964,000	\$ 2.16	1,084,635	\$ 1.69
Granted during the year	850,000	4.89	200,000	4.84	150,000	6.13
Exercised during the year	(444,000 )	1.26	(370,000 )	1.63	(270,635 )	2.46
Balance at end of the year	1,200,000	\$ 5.04	794,000	\$ 2.12	964,000	\$ 2.16
Options exercisable at the end of the year	1,100,000		794,000		964,000	

The fair value of the 850,000 stock options granted during the year ended December 31, 2013 has been estimated on the date of the grant using the Black-Scholes option pricing model. The assumptions are presented below. Expected volatility is calculated by reference to the weekly closing share price for a period that reflects the expected life of the options. 200,000 stock options were granted in the year ended December 31, 2012 and valued using the assumptions below and 150,000 stock options were granted in the year ended December 31, 2011 and valued using the assumptions below.

Year ended                      Year ended                      Year ended

Edgar Filing: Mountain Province Diamonds Inc. - Form 20-F

	December 31, 2013	December 31, 2012	December 31, 2011
Exercise price	\$4.06 - \$5.28	\$4.84	\$ 6.13
Expected volatility	42.17% - 44.04%	66.29 %	60.22 %
Expected option life	3.00 - 3.50 years	3.50 years	5 years
Expected forfeiture	none	none	none
Expected option cancellation	none	none	none
Expected dividend yield	0	% 0	% 0
Risk-free interest rate	1.14% - 1.77%	1.50%	2.46%

During the year ended December 31, 2013, 444,000 stock options were exercised for gross proceeds of \$559,440 (December 31, 2011 – 270,635 stock options were exercised for gross proceeds of \$665,000; December 31, 2011 – 270,635 stock options were exercised for gross proceeds of \$665,000). The market price of stock options exercised during the year ended December 31, 2013 was \$2,261,240 (December 31, 2012 - \$1,826,200; December 31, 2011 - \$1,543,610).

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**  
**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**  
**As at December 31, 2013 and 2012 and**  
**For the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011**  
**In Canadian Dollars**

The following tables reflect the Black-Scholes values (share-based payments reserve amounts), the number of stock options outstanding, the weighted average of options outstanding, and the exercise price of stock options outstanding at December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012.

**At December 31, 2013**

Expiry Date	Black-Scholes Value	Number of Options	Exercise Price
January 9, 2016	487,085	150,000	6.13
March 8, 2017	463,500	200,000	4.84
January 31, 2018	133,700	100,000	4.08
March 10, 2018	129,300	100,000	4.06
March 17, 2018	64,250	50,000	4.11
May 13, 2018	156,700	100,000	5.00
July 2, 2018	802,500	500,000	5.28
	\$ 2,237,035	1,200,000	5.04

At December 31, 2012

Expiry Date	Black-Scholes Value	Number of Options	Exercise Price
November 23, 2013	\$ 283,272	444,000	1.26
January 9, 2016	487,085	150,000	6.13
March 8, 2017	463,500	200,000	4.84
	\$ 1,233,857	794,000	2.12

The weighted average remaining contractual life of the options outstanding at December 31, 2013 is 3.89 years (December 31, 2012 - 2.12 years).

The share-based payments recognized as an expense for each year are:



	Year ended December 31, 2013	Year ended December 31, 2012	Year ended December 31, 2011
Expense recognized in the year for share-based payments	\$ 1,240,821	\$ 463,500	\$ 487,085

The share-based payments expense for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 is recorded in consulting fees.

Subsequent to the year-end, as detailed in the table below, stock options were granted by the Board of Directors. The fair value of the stock options has been estimated on the date of the grant using the Black-Scholes option pricing model, using the assumptions below, and total \$274,600. The expected volatility is calculated by reference to the weekly closing price of the Company's publicly traded shares for a period that reflects the expected life of the options.

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**  
**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**  
**As at December 31, 2013 and 2012 and**  
**For the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011**  
**In Canadian Dollars**

Date of grant	February 14, 2014	
Number of options granted	200,000	
Fair Value per option	\$ 1.373	
Fair Value total for grant	\$ 274,600	
Term of option	5 years	
Vesting	immediate	
Assumptions:		
Exercise price	\$ 5.29	
Expected volatility	38.19	%
Expected option life (years)	3	
Expected forfeiture	none	
Expected option cancellation	none	
Expected dividend yield	0	%
Risk-free interest rate	1.21	%

i. Loss Per Share

The following table sets forth the computation of basic and diluted loss per share:

	Year ended December 31, 2013	Year ended December 31, 2012	Year ended December 31, 2011
Numerator			
Net loss for the year	\$ (26,603,938	) \$ (3,337,610	) \$ (11,538,935 )
Denominator			
For basic - weighted average number of shares outstanding	94,838,537	82,191,626	79,553,515
Effect of dilutive securities	-	-	-
For diluted - adjusted weighted average number of shares outstanding	94,838,537	82,191,626	79,553,515
Loss Per Share			
Basic	\$ (0.28	) \$ (0.04	) \$ (0.15 )
Diluted	\$ (0.28	) \$ (0.04	) \$ (0.15 )

For the year ended December 31, 2013, stock options totaling 1,200,000 (December 31, 2012 – 794,000 stock options; 2011 – 964,000 stock options) are not included in the calculation of diluted earnings per share since to include them would be anti-dilutive.

*ii. Shareholder Rights Plan*

On September 7, 2010, the Board of Directors of the Company approved an amended Shareholder Rights Plan (the “Rights Plan”), which was ratified by the shareholders at the Annual General Meeting on November 18, 2010. The Rights Plan is intended to provide all shareholders of the Company with adequate time to consider value enhancing alternatives to a take-over bid and to provide adequate time to properly assess a take-over bid without undue pressure. The Rights Plan is also intended to ensure that the shareholders of the Company are provided equal treatment under a takeover bid.

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**  
**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**  
**As at December 31, 2013 and 2012 and**  
**For the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011**  
**In Canadian Dollars**

**11. INCOME TAXES**

*Rate Reconciliation*

The provision for income tax differs from the amount that would have resulted by applying the combined Canadian statutory income tax rates of approximately 26.5% (2012 and 2011 – 26.5%):

	December 31, 2013		December 31, 2012		December 31, 2011	
Loss before income taxes	\$ (26,603,938	)	\$ (3,337,610	)	\$ (11,538,935	)
	26.5	%	26.5	%	26.50	%
Tax recovery calculated using statutory rates	(7,050,044	)	(884,467	)	(3,057,818	)
Non-taxable portion of gain on Kennady Diamond asset transfer	-		(1,420,618	)	-	
(Expenses not deductible) earnings not taxable	329,796		123,904		69,491	
Change in tax benefits not recognized	6,720,248		2,181,181		2,988,327	
Income tax expenses (recovery)	-		-		-	

*Unrecognized deferred tax assets*

Deductible temporary differences for which no deferred tax assets have been recognized are attributable to the following:

	December 31, 2013	December 31, 2012
Mineral properties	\$ 85,636,713	\$ 59,372,002
Property and equipment	463,248	203,914
Decommissioning and restoration liability	5,224,662	6,284,770
Loss carryforwards	10,705,056	8,635,923
Share issuance cost	1,468,812	1,672,149

\$ 103,498,491      \$ 76,168,758

As at December 31, 2013, the Company had the following non-capital losses available for carryforward and certain other tax attributes as follows:

	Amounts	Expiry Date
Tax basis of mineral properties	\$ 109,620,000	Indefinite
Tax basis of property and equipment	\$ 16,151,000	Indefinite
Loss carryforwards	\$ 10,705,000	2026-2032

## 12.

## OTHER COMMITMENTS

The total future minimum lease payments for office space by the Company under non-cancellable operating leases are as follows:

Page | 32

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**  
**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**  
**As at December 31, 2013 and 2012 and**  
**For the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011**  
**In Canadian Dollars**

	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total
Future minimum lease payments	\$142,256	\$142,256	\$142,256	\$11,855	\$438,623

**13. RELATED PARTIES**

The Company's related parties include the operator of the Gahcho Kué Project, Bottin, key management and their close family members, and the Company's directors. Kennady Diamonds Inc. ("Kennady Diamonds") is also a related party since the Company and Kennady Diamonds have common members of key management.

None of the transactions with related parties incorporate special terms and conditions, and no guarantees were given or received. Related party transactions are recorded at their exchange amount, being the amount agreed to by the parties. Outstanding balances are settled in cash.

The Company had the following transactions and balances with its related parties including key management personnel and the Company's directors, Bottin, the operator of the Gahcho Kué Project, and Kennady Diamonds. The transactions with key management personnel are in the nature of remuneration. The transactions with the operator of the Gahcho Kué Project relate to the funding of the Company's interest in the Gahcho Kué Project for the current year's expenditures and capital additions. The transactions with Kennady Diamonds are for a monthly management fee charged by the Company and reimbursement of expenses paid on behalf of Kennady Diamonds.

	Notes	December 31, 2013	December 31, 2012	December 31, 2011
The total of the transactions:				
Bottin - Stand-by Fee under Stand-by Agreement	10(ii)	\$ -	\$ 706,261	\$ -
Kennady Diamonds		152,500	120,940	-
Remuneration		2,457,759	1,477,715	1,450,068
Payable to the operator of the Gahcho Kué Project		5,647,892	685,290	-
Payable to key management personnel		357,967	30,180	313,000

The remuneration expense of directors and other members of key management personnel for the year ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 were as follows:

	Year ended December 31 2013	Year ended December 31, 2012	Year ended December 31, 2011
Consulting fees, director fees, bonus and other short-term benefits	\$ 1,216,938	\$ 1,014,215	\$ 962,983
Share-based payments	1,240,821	463,500	487,085
	\$ 2,457,759	\$ 1,477,715	\$ 1,450,068

In accordance with IAS 24 *Related Parties*, key management personnel are those persons having authority and responsibility for planning, directing and controlling the activities of the Company directly or indirectly, including any directors (executive and non-executive) of the Company.

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**  
**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**  
**As at December 31, 2013 and 2012 and**  
**For the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011**  
**In Canadian Dollars**

**14. EXPLORATION AND EVALUATION COSTS**

	December 31, 2013	December 31, 2012	December 31, 2011
Camp support and personnel	\$ 1,001,910	\$ 490,166	\$ 612,186
Transportation and fuel	1,871,771	425,617	354,599
Drilling	990,223	1,915,926	2,215,774
Permitting	3,469,838	3,862,311	2,765,156
Safety, health and environmental costs	44,574	42,818	416,342
De Beers overhead	1,866,632	1,349,607	679,841
Engineering, procurement and construction management	12,483,069	2,191,757	956,520
Other	109,066	373,420	1,032,167
Total	\$ 21,837,083	\$ 10,651,622	\$ 9,032,585

**15. CAPITAL MANAGEMENT**

The Company considers its capital structure to consist of share capital, share-based payments reserve, and options. The Company manages its capital structure and makes adjustments to it, in order to have the funds available to support the acquisition, exploration and development of mineral properties. The Board of Directors does not establish quantitative return on capital criteria for management, but rather relies on the expertise of the Company's management to sustain future development of the business.

The Company's main property, Gahcho Kué Project, is in the development and permitting stage, and as such the Company is dependent on external equity financing to fund its activities. In order to carry out the planned management of our properties and pay for administrative costs, the Company will spend its existing working capital and raise additional amounts as needed.

Management reviews its capital management approach on an ongoing basis and believes that this approach, given the relative size of the Company, is reasonable.

The Company's capital for the reporting periods is summarized as follows:



	December 31, 2013	December 31, 2012
Share capital	\$209,820,460	\$180,170,247
Share-based payments reserve	2,191,406	1,233,857
Deficit	(120,817,633)	(94,213,695 )
	\$91,194,233	\$87,190,409

There were no changes in the Company's approach to capital management during the year ended December 31, 2013. Neither the Company nor its subsidiaries are subject to externally imposed capital requirements.

## **16. SEGMENTED REPORTING**

The Company has determined that it has only one operating segment.

**MOUNTAIN PROVINCE DIAMONDS INC.**  
**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**  
**As at December 31, 2013 and 2012 and**  
**For the Years Ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011**  
**In Canadian Dollars**

**17. PLAN OF ARRANGEMENT WITH KENNADY DIAMONDS INC.**

In January 2012, the Company announced that the Board of Directors had approved a proposal to spin-out the Company's 100%-controlled Kennady North project into a newly incorporated company, Kennady Diamonds, through a plan of arrangement and subject to regulatory, court and shareholder approvals.

On March 12, 2012, Kennady Diamonds and Mountain Province entered into an arrangement agreement (the "Arrangement") pursuant to which Mountain Province would transfer its interest in the Kennady North Project, including permits, mining claims, rights and title, in the Northwest Territories in Canada, and \$3 million of cash, to Kennady Diamonds in exchange for one common share of Kennady Diamonds for every five common shares of Mountain Province outstanding. The Arrangement called for the share capital of Mountain Province to be reorganized into a new class of shares which would be distributed, with the Kennady Diamonds common shares, to the existing Mountain Province common shareholders.

The Arrangement was approved by the Board of Directors of Mountain Province and was subject to approval by two-thirds of the votes cast by holders of Mountain Province common shares, at a special meeting of Mountain Province shareholders held on April 25, 2012. The Mountain Province shareholders voted 99.57% in favour of the Arrangement. As well, on April 30, 2012, Mountain Province received final court approval for the Arrangement. Regulatory approval was obtained by the Toronto Stock Exchange and the TSX Venture Exchange.

The various transactions under the Arrangement were completed on July 6, 2012, the effective date of the Arrangement. The Company transferred the Kennady North Project and cash of \$3 million to Kennady Diamonds in exchange for 16,143,111 shares of Kennady Diamonds which in turn were distributed to the Mountain Province shareholders on the basis of one Kennady Diamonds' share for every five shares of Mountain Province held by the shareholders.

The Company recorded the fair value of the transaction as a dividend-in-kind of \$13.7 million. The fair value was calculated by applying the simple average of the closing share price for Kennady Diamonds on the TSX Venture Exchange for the first five days of its trading to the number of shares outstanding. The fair value in excess of the book value of the transferred assets was recorded as a gain on asset transfer to Kennady Diamonds of \$10.7 million in the Company's Statement of Comprehensive Loss.

## **18.SUBSEQUENT EVENT**

On March 11, 2014, the Company entered into an agreement with a syndicate of underwriters, under which the underwriters have agreed to buy, on a bought deal basis by way of private placement, 3,000,000 common shares (the “Common Shares”) of the Company, at a price of \$5.10 per Common Share for gross proceeds of \$15,300,000 (“the Offering”).

On March 12, 2014, the Company has increased the size of its Offering to 3,500,000 common shares, at a price of \$5.10 per Common Share for gross proceeds of \$17,850,000.