

CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

FOR THE YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars)



Deloitte LLP 2800 - 1055 Dunsmuir Street 4 Bentall Centre P.O. Box 49279 Vancouver BC V7X 1P4 Canada

Tel: 604-669-4466 Fax: 778-374-0496 www.deloitte.ca

Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm

To the Board of Directors and Shareholders of Northern Dynasty Minerals Ltd.

We have audited the accompanying consolidated financial statements of Northern Dynasty Minerals Ltd. (the "Company"), which comprise the consolidated statements of financial position as at December 31, 2016 and December 31, 2015, and the consolidated statements of comprehensive loss, consolidated statements of changes in equity, and consolidated statements of cash flows for the years then ended, and 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.

Auditor's 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. We were not engaged to perform an audit of the Company's internal control over financial reporting. Our audits included consideration of internal control over financial reporting as a basis for designing audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Company's internal control over financial reporting. Accordingly, we express no such opinion.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the consolidated financial statements. The procedures selected depend on the auditor's judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the consolidated financial statements, whether due to fraud or error. 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 financial position of Northern Dynasty Minerals Ltd. as at December 31, 2016 and December 31, 2015, and its financial performance and its cash flows for the years then ended in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards as issued by the International Accounting Standards Board.

Emphasis of Matter

The accompanying consolidated financial statements have been prepared assuming that the Company will continue as a going concern. As discussed in Note 1 of the consolidated financial statements, the Company incurred a net loss of \$26,982,000 and \$33,829,000 during the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively and had a deficit of \$406,106,000 as at December 31, 2016. This condition, along with other matters as set forth in Note 1, indicate the existence of material uncertainties that raise substantial doubt about the Company's ability to continue as a going concern. Management's plans concerning these matters are also discussed in Note 1 to the consolidated financial statements. The consolidated financial statements do not include any adjustments that might result from the outcome of these uncertainties.

/s/ Deloitte LLP

Chartered Professional Accountants March 30, 2017 Vancouver, Canada

Consolidated Statements of Financial Position

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars)

		De	cember 31	De	cember 31
	Notes		2016		2015
ASSETS					
Non-current assets					
Mineral property, plant and equipment	3	\$	142,472	\$	147,088
Total non-current assets			142,472		147,088
Current assets					
Available-for-sale financial assets	4		_		1,579
Amounts receivable and prepaid expenses	5		679		1,075
Restricted cash	6(b)		_		453
Cash and cash equivalents	6(a)		7,196		7,509
Total current assets			7,875		10,616
Total Assets		\$	150,347	\$	157,704
EQUITY					
Capital and reserves					
Share capital	7(a)	\$	452,132	\$	435,069
Reserves			102,821		99,035
Deficit			(406,106)		(379,124)
Total Equity			148,847		154,980
LIABILITIES					
Current liabilities					
Payables to related parties	8		240		677
Trade and other payables	9		1,260		2,047
Total current liabilities			1,500		2,724
Total Liabilities			1,500		2,724
Total Equity and Liabilities		\$	150,347	\$	157,704

Commitments (note 14)

Events after the reporting date (note 15)

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these consolidated financial statements.

These consolidated financial statements are signed on the Company's behalf by:

/s/ Ronald W. Thiessen /s/ Christian Milau

Ronald W. Thiessen Christian Milau Director Director

Consolidated Statements of Comprehensive Loss

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, except for share information)

			ear ended D	eceml	oer 31
	Notes		2016		2015
Expenses	0.44		= 00=		0.510
Exploration and evaluation expenses	3, 11	\$	7,935	\$	8,718
General and administrative expenses	11		6,729		8,272
Legal, accounting and audit			9,442		17,001
Share-based compensation	7(d)-(f)		2,995		903
Loss from operating activities			27,101		34,894
Foreign exchange (gain) loss			(43)		618
Interest income			(33)		(99)
Interest expense on loans	7(b)		_		144
Other income			(11)		(214)
Amount receivable written off			15		_
Gain on sale of available-for-sale financial assets			(70)		_
Loss on sale of plant and equipment			23		_
Loss before tax			26,982		35,343
Deferred income tax recovery	12		_		(1,514)
Net loss		\$	26,982	\$	33,829
Othor community loss (in some)					
Other comprehensive loss (income)					
Items that may be subsequently reclassified to loss	2.7(-)		4.246		(22.200)
Foreign exchange translation difference	3, 7(g)		4,246		(23,300)
Change in fair value of available-for-sale financial assets	4		-		113
Derecognition of available-for-sale financial assets	4	φ.	(105)		-
Other comprehensive loss (income)		\$	4,141	\$	(23,187)
Total comprehensive loss		\$	31,123	\$	10,642
Basic and diluted loss per common share	10	\$	0.11	\$	0.23

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these consolidated financial statements.

Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars)

		1	Year ended D	ecemb	er 31
	Notes		2016		2015
Operating activities					
Net loss		\$	(26,982)	\$	(33,829)
Non-cash or non operating items		Ψ	(20,702)	Ψ	(00,027)
Amount receivable written off			15		_
Deferred income tax recovery			_		(1,514)
Depreciation	3		205		279
Interest received on cash held	J		(33)		(99)
Interest expense on loans	7(b)		_		144
Gain on sale of surplus site inventory	, (3)		(11)		(173)
Gain on sale of available-for-sale financial assets			(70)		(2,0)
Loss on sale of plant and equipment			23		5
Share-based compensation			2,995		903
Unrealized exchange loss			68		-
Changes in working capital items			00		
Restricted cash			453		826
Amounts receivable and prepaid expenses			405		(8)
Trade and other payables			(645)		(4,374)
Payables to related parties			(437)		294
1 dyables to related parties			(137)		271
Net cash used in operating activities			(24,014)		(37,546)
Investing activities					
Investing activities Acquisition of plant and againment	2				(20)
Acquisition of plant and equipment Proceeds from sale of equipment	3 3		_		(28) 70
Proceeds from sale of equipment Proceeds from sale of available-for-sale financial assets	3 4		- 1,754		280
	4		1,734		173
Proceeds from sale of surplus site inventory			33		99
Interest received on cash and cash equivalents Net cash from investing activities			1,798		594
Net Cash from investing activities			1,790		394
Financing activities					
Cash received on acquisitions net of transaction costs	7(b)		_		12,347
Proceeds from prospectus unit financing net of transaction costs	7(b)		16,030		_
Proceeds from private placement unit financing net of transaction costs	7(b)		1,967		_
Proceeds from private placment of special warrants net of transaction costs	7(b)		_		17,485
Proceeds from private placement of common shares net of transaction costs	7(b)		_		5,166
Proceeds from the exercise of share purchase options and warrants	7(c)		3,974		7
Net cash from financing activities			21,971		35,005
Net decrease in cash and cash equivalents			(245)		(1,947)
Effect of exchange rate fluctuations on cash and cash equivalents			(68)		(1,747) O
Cash and cash equivalents - beginning balance			7,509		9,447
Cash and Cash Equivalents - Deginning Dalance			7,305		7,447
Cash and cash equivalents - ending balance	6(a)	\$	7,196	\$	7,509

Supplementary cash flow information (note 6(a))

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these consolidated financial statements.

Consolidated Statements of Changes in Equity

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, except for share information)

	Notes	Share c	apita	al	Reserves					1				
		Number of common shares (note 7(a))		Amount	sh	ity settled are-based pensation reserve	tra	Foreign currency anslation reserve		vestment valuation reserve	Share Purchase Warrants (note 7(c))	Deficit	Tot	tal equity
Balance at January 1, 2015		95,009,864	¢	389,227	\$	55,294	¢	17,179	¢	6 \$	11,552	\$ (345,295)	¢	127,963
Special warrants issued net of transaction costs	7(c)	75,007,004	Ψ	507,227	Ψ	55,274	Ψ		Ψ	-	17,485	ψ (343,273)	Ψ	17,485
Conversion of special warrants into common shares		- 73,562,735		29,037		_		_		_	(29,037)	_		17,403
•	7(c)					_		-		_	(29,037)	_		- - 046
Common shares issued pursuant to a private placement, net of transaction costs	7(b)	12,573,292		5,046		_		_		_	_	_		5,046
Common shares issued as referral fees relating to a private placement	7(b)	300,000		120		_		-		_	_	_		120
Common shares issued for the acquisition of Cannon Point, net of transaction cost	7(b)	12,881,344		4,062		_		-		_	_	_		4,062
Options and warrants issued for the acquisition of Cannon Point	7(b)	_		_		_		_		_	217	_		217
Common shares issued for the acquisition of Mission Gold	7(b)	27,593,341		7,564		_		-		_	_	_		7,564
Options and warrants issued pursuant to the acquisition of Mission Gold, net of	5 (1)										0.055			0.055
transaction cost	7(b)	_		_		_		_		_	2,255	_		2,255
Common shares issued upon exercise of share purchase options not under option plan	7(a)	10 000		7										7
•	7(c)	18,800		(_		_		_	-	_		/
Fair value allocated to shares issued on options exercised	7(c)	_		6		-		_		-	(6)	-		-
Share-based compensation	7(d)			_		903		_			_	- (22.020)		903
Net loss		_		_		_		-		-	_	(33,829)		(33,829)
Other comprehensive income (loss) net of tax								23,300		(113)				23,187
Total comprehensive loss														(10,642)
Balance at December 31, 2015		221,939,376	\$	435,069	\$	56,197	\$	40,479	\$	(107) \$	2,466	\$ (379,124)	\$	154,980
Balance at January 1, 2016		221,939,376	\$	435,069	\$	56,197	\$	40,479	\$	(107) \$	2,466	\$ (379,124)	\$	154,980
Common shares issued on exercise of share purchase options per option plan Common shares issued upon exercise of share purchase options not issued per	7(d)	548,869		503		-		-		-	_	-		503
option plan	7(c)	376,000		132		-		_		-	_	-		132
Common shares issued upon exercise of warrants	7(c)	5,560,940		3,363		_		_		_	_	_		3,363
Fair value allocated to shares issued on options exercised per plan	7(d)	_		266		(266)		_		_	_	_		_
Fair value allocated to shares issued on options exercised not under option plan	7(c)	_		98		_		_		_	(98)	_		_
Fair value and costs allocated to share capital on exercise of warrants		_		1,090		_		_		_	(1,090)	_		_
Common Shares issued pursuant to prospectus financing, net of transaction costs	7(b)	38,000,000		10,347		_		_		_	_	_		10,347
Warrants issued pursuant to prospectus financing, net of transaction costs	7(b)	_				_		_		_	5,683	_		5,683
Common shares issued pursuant to private placement, net of transaction costs	7(b) 7(b)	4,444,376		1,264		_		_		_	5,005	_		1,264
Warrants issued pursuant to private placement, net of transaction costs	7(b) 7(b)	1, 177,070				_		_			703	_		703
Share-based compensation		_		_		- 2,995		_		_	703	<u>-</u>		
	7(d)-(f)			_							-	(2(,002)		2,995
Net loss		_		_		_		(4.246)		105	_	(26,982)		(26,982)
Other comprehensive (loss) income net of tax		-						(4,246)		105	_	-		(4,141)
Total comprehensive loss														(31,123)
Balance at December 31, 2016		270,869,561	\$	452,132	\$	58,926	\$	36,233	\$	(2) \$	7,664	\$ (406,106)	\$	148,847

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these consolidated financial statements.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

1. NATURE AND CONTINUANCE OF OPERATIONS

Northern Dynasty Minerals Ltd. (the "Company") is incorporated under the laws of the Province of British Columbia, Canada, and its principal business activity is the exploration of mineral properties. The Company is listed on the Toronto Stock Exchange ("TSX") under the symbol "NDM" and on the New York Stock Exchange-MKT ("NYSE-MKT") under the symbol "NAK". The Company's corporate office is located at 1040 West Georgia Street, 15th floor, Vancouver, British Columbia.

The consolidated financial statements ("Financial Statements") of the Company as at and for the year ended December 31, 2016, include financial information for the Company and its subsidiaries (note 2(c)) (together referred to as the "Group" and individually as "Group entities"). The Company is the ultimate parent. The Group's core mineral property interest is the Pebble Copper-Gold-Molybdenum Project (the "Pebble Project") located in Alaska, United States of America ("USA" or "US").

The Group is in the process of exploring and developing the Pebble Project and has not yet determined whether the Pebble Project contains mineral reserves that are economically recoverable. The Group's continuing operations and the underlying value and recoverability of the amounts shown for the Group's mineral property interests, is entirely dependent upon the existence of economically recoverable mineral reserves; the ability of the Group to obtain financing to complete the exploration and development of the Pebble Project; the Group obtaining the necessary permits to mine; and future profitable production or proceeds from the disposition of the Pebble Project.

During the year ended December 31, 2016, the Company raised aggregate gross proceeds of \$19.1 million through a prospectus financing and a private placement of units, consisting of common shares and warrants (note 7(b)), \$4.0 million from the exercise of share purchase options and warrants (notes 7(c)-(d)) and \$1.8 million through the sale of available-for-sale financial assets (note 4).

As at December 31, 2016, the Group has \$7.2 million in cash and cash equivalents for its operating requirements. The Group incurred a net loss of \$27.0 million and \$33.8 million during the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively and had a deficit \$406.1 million as at December 31, 2016. Subsequent to the reporting period, the Group completed a bought deal financing and raised gross proceeds of approximately US\$37.4 million (note 15). Accordingly, the Group has prioritized the allocation of available financial resources in order to meet key corporate and Pebble Project expenditure requirements for at least the next twelve months. Additional financing will be required in order to progress any material expenditures at the Pebble Project beyond 2017. Additional financing may include any of or a combination of debt equity and/or contributions from possible new Pebble Project participants. There can be no assurances that the Group will be successful in obtaining additional financing. If the Group is unable to raise the necessary capital resources and generate sufficient cash flows to meet obligations as they come due, the Group may, at some point, consider reducing or curtailing its operations. As such there is material uncertainty that raises substantial doubt about the Company's ability to continue as a going concern.

In July 2014, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (the "EPA") announced a proposal under Section 404(c) of the Clean Water Act to restrict and impose limitations on all discharges of dredged or fill material ("EPA Action") associated with mining the Pebble deposit. The Company believes that the EPA does not have the statutory authority to impose conditions on the development at Pebble prior to the submission of a detailed development plan and its thorough review by federal and state agencies, including review under the National Environmental Protection Act ("NEPA"). The Pebble Limited Partnership (the "Pebble Partnership"), a whollyowned subsidiary of the Company, along with the State of Alaska and the Alaska Peninsula Corporation, an Alaska Native village corporation with extensive land holdings in the Pebble Project area, filed for an injunction to stop the EPA Action with the US Federal Court in Alaska (the "Court"). However, the Court has deferred judgment thereon until the EPA has issued a final determination. The Company appealed the Court's decision to the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals. The appeal was denied in May 2015. The Pebble Partnership still holds the option to

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

pursue its statutory authority case in the instance that EPA finalizes a pre-emptive regulatory action under the Clean Water Act 404(c). In September 2014, the Pebble Partnership initiated a second action against the EPA in federal district court in Alaska charging that the EPA violated the Federal Advisory Committee Act ("FACA"). In November 2014, the U.S. federal court judge in Alaska granted, in relation to the FACA case, the Pebble Partnership's request for a preliminary injunction, which, although considered by the Company as a significant procedural milestone in the litigation, does not resolve the Pebble Partnership's claims that the EPA Actions with respect to the Bristol Bay Assessment and subsequent 404(c) regulatory process, violated FACA. In June 2015, the EPA's motion to dismiss the FACA case was rejected and as a result the FACA case is moving forward. The Company expects its legal rights will be upheld by the Court and that the Company will ultimately be able to apply for the necessary permits under NEPA. On October 14, 2014, the Pebble Partnership filed suit in the federal district court in Alaska charging that the EPA has violated the *Freedom of Information Act* ("FOIA") by improperly withholding documents related to the Pebble Project, the Bristol Bay Watershed Assessment and consideration of a pre-emptive 404(c) veto under the Clean Water Act.

The EPA has moved for summary judgment claiming that its search for and disclosure of documents was adequate. The Pebble Partnership has opposed the motion pointing out several deficiencies in the EPA's search parameters and pointing out the agency's overly broad assertion of the deliberative process privilege to withhold documents. On August 24, 2015, the U.S. federal court judge granted in part and deferred in part the EPA's motion for summary judgement on the FOIA litigation. The court accepted the EPA's position that it had made an adequate search for documents but left the matter open should the EPA not meet its obligations in the FACA litigation or if additional documents surface. Additionally, the judge ordered the EPA to produce a sample of 183 partially or fully withheld documents so that it could conduct an in camera review of the sample and test the merits of the EPA's withholdings under the deliberative process privilege. Before producing this sample to the Court, the EPA chose to voluntarily release 115 documents (or 63% of the sample ordered by the Court), relinquishing its claim of privilege as to these documents.

In briefings before the Court, the Pebble Partnership argued that the voluntary release of 63% of the agency's same documents conclusively demonstrated that the EPA had been over broad in its assertion of the deliberative process privilege, particularly because the content of the voluntarily released documents was not in fact deliberative. The Court agreed, finding that the EPA "improperly withheld documents in full," and that "many of the documents that the defendant released should have been released to begin with because the portions that the defendant released were not deliberative." It then ordered the EPA to review an additional 65 documents. Of these 65 documents, the EPA voluntarily released 55 documents in whole or in part (or 85% of the documents). Given the EPA's high rate of release, the Pebble Partnership submitted a brief to the Court arguing that the EPA should be forced to review the remaining documents being withheld and arguing that judgment should not be granted to the agency at this time. A decision has not yet been issued. The Court agreed, concluding that it had "no confidence that [the EPA] has properly withheld documents, either in full or in part, pursuant to the deliberative process privilege." The Court reiterated its earlier finding that EPA had been withholding documents that "should never have been withheld to begin with." As a result, the Court ordered the Agency to re-evaluate all remaining documents the EPA is withholding in response to the Pebble Partnership's January 2014 FOIA request and to submit these documents for in camera review. After this review, the Court issued an order resolving Pebble's challenges to the remaining withholdings and forcing EPA, yet again, to produce additional documents that the agency had been improperly withholding for over two years.

On October 27, 2016, the Pebble Partnership and the EPA filed a joint Notice in federal court stating their intent to enter into mediation in an effort to resolve ongoing litigation under FACA.

On December 30, 2016, the Pebble Partnership and the EPA filed a joint Notice in federal court staying the ongoing FACA litigation until March 20, 2017 and, on that date, the parties filed a Joint Motion in federal court to extend a stay of proceedings in ongoing litigation under FACA to May 4, 2017 in the interest of resolving the matter.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

The Company has made substantial progress in recent direct discussions with the EPA and intends to continue negotiating the matter directly, rather than through mediation. US Government representatives are actively engaged in these discussions and, along with the Pebble Partnership, are focused on achieving a resolution that will be agreeable to both parties. In the meantime, the Court's Preliminary Injunction of November 25, 2014, will remain in effect for the duration of any stay.

2. SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

(a) Statement of Compliance

These Financial Statements have been prepared in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards ("IFRS") as issued by the International Accounting Standards Board ("IASB") and interpretations issued by the IFRS Interpretations Committee ("IFRIC"s) that are effective for the Group's reporting year ended December 31, 2016. These Financial Statements were authorized for issue by the Board of Directors on March 28, 2017.

(b) Basis of Preparation

These Financial Statements have been prepared on a historical cost basis using the accrual basis of accounting, except for cash flow information and for financial instruments classified as available-for-sale, which are stated at their fair value (notes 2(e) and 4). The accounting policies set out below have been applied consistently to all periods presented in these Financial Statements.

(c) Basis of Consolidation

These Financial Statements incorporate the financial statements of the Company, the Company's subsidiaries, and entities controlled by the Company and its subsidiaries listed below:

Name of Subsidiary ¹	Place of Incorporation	Principal Activity	Ownership
3537137 Canada Inc. ²	Canada	Holding Company. Wholly-owned subsidiary of the Company.	100%
Pebble Services Inc.	Nevada, USA	Management and services company. Wholly-owned subsidiary of the Company.	100%
Northern Dynasty Partnership	Alaska, USA	Holds 99.9% of the Pebble Limited Partnership and 100% of Pebble Mines Corp.	100% (indirect)
Pebble Limited Partnership	Alaska, USA	Holding Company and Exploration of the Pebble Project.	100% (indirect)
Pebble Mines Corp.	Delaware, USA	General Partner. Holds 0.1% of Pebble Limited Partnership.	100% (indirect)
Pebble West Claims Corporation ³	Alaska, USA	Holding Company. Subsidiary of the Pebble Limited Partnership.	100% (indirect)
Pebble East Claims Corporation ⁴	Alaska, USA	Holding Company. Subsidiary of the Pebble Limited Partnership.	100% (indirect)
U5 Resources Inc. ⁵	Nevada, USA	Holding Company. Wholly-owned subsidiary of the Company.	100%
Cannon Point Resources Ltd.	British Columbia, Canada	Not active. Wholly-owned subsidiary of the Company.	100%
MGL Subco Ltd.	British Columbia, Canada	Not active. Wholly-owned subsidiary of the Company.	100%

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

Delta Minerals Inc.	British Columbia,	Not active. Wholly-owned	100%
	Canada	subsidiary of MGL Subco Ltd.	(indirect)
Imperial Gold Corporation	British Columbia,	Not active. Wholly-owned	100%
	Canada	subsidiary of Delta Minerals Inc.	(indirect)
Yuma Gold Inc.	Nevada, USA	Not active. Wholly-owned	100%
		subsidiary of Imperial Gold	(indirect)
		Corporation.	

Notes:

- 1. An inactive wholly-owned subsidiary, 0796412 BC Ltd., was dissolved on February 17, 2016.
- 2. Holds 20% interest in the Northern Dynasty Partnership. The Company holds the remaining 80% interest.
- 3. Holds the Pebble Project claims.
- 4. Holds certain of the Pebble Project claims and claims located south and west of the Pebble Project claims.
- 5. Holds certain mineral claims located north of the Pebble Project claims.

Control is achieved when the Group 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. Specifically, the Group controls an investee if, and only if, the Company has power over the investee (i.e. existing rights that give it the current ability to direct the relevant activities of the investee); exposure, or rights, to variable returns from its involvement with the investee; and the ability to use its power over the investee to affect its returns.

Intra-Group balances and transactions, including any unrealized income and expenses arising from intra-Group transactions, are eliminated in preparing the Financial Statements. Unrealized gains arising from transactions with equity accounted investees are eliminated against the investment to the extent of the Group's interest in the investee. Unrealized losses are eliminated in the same way as unrealized gains, but only to the extent that there is no evidence of impairment.

(d) Foreign Currencies

The functional currency is the currency of the primary economic environment in which the entity operates and has been determined for each entity within the Group. The functional currency of U5 Resources Inc., Pebble Services Inc., Pebble Mines Corp., the Pebble Partnership and its subsidiaries, and Yuma Gold Inc. is the US dollar and for all other entities within the Group, the functional currency is the Canadian dollar. The functional currency determinations were conducted through an analysis of the factors for consideration identified in IAS 21, *The Effects of Changes in Foreign Exchange Rates*.

Transactions in currencies other than the functional currency are recorded at the rates of exchange prevailing on dates of transactions. At the end of each reporting period, monetary assets and liabilities that are denominated in foreign currencies are translated at the rates prevailing at that date. Non-monetary assets and liabilities carried at fair value that are denominated in foreign currencies are translated at rates prevailing at the date when the fair value was determined. Non-monetary items that are measured in terms of historical cost in a foreign currency are not retranslated.

The results and financial position of entities within the Group which have a functional currency that differs from that of the Group are translated into Canadian dollars as follows: (i) assets and liabilities for each statement of financial position are translated at the closing exchange rate at that date; (ii) income and expenses for each income statement are translated at average exchange rates for the period; and (iii) the resulting exchange differences are included in the foreign currency translation reserve within equity.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

(e) Financial Instruments

Non-derivative financial assets:

The Group has the following non-derivative financial assets: available-for-sale financial assets (note 4) and loans and receivables.

Available-for-sale financial assets

Available-for-sale ("AFS") financial assets are non-derivatives that are either designated as AFS or are not classified as (i) loans and receivables, (ii) held-to-maturity investments or (iii) financial assets at fair value through profit or loss. The Group's investments in marketable securities are classified as AFS financial assets. Subsequent to initial recognition, they are measured at fair value and changes therein, other than impairment losses, are recognized in other comprehensive income or loss and accumulated in the investment revaluation reserve within equity. When an investment is derecognized, the cumulative gain or loss in the investment revaluation reserve is transferred to profit or loss.

The fair value of AFS monetary assets denominated in a foreign currency is determined in that foreign currency and translated at the spot rate at the end of the reporting period. The change in fair value attributable to translation differences that result from the amortized cost of the monetary asset is recognized within other comprehensive income or loss. The change in fair value of AFS equity investments is recognized in other comprehensive income or loss.

Loans and receivables

Loans and receivables are financial assets with fixed or determinable payments that are not quoted in an active market. Such assets are initially recognized at fair value plus any directly attributable transaction costs. Subsequent to initial recognition, loans and receivables are measured at amortized cost using the effective interest method, less any impairment losses.

Loans and receivables consist of cash and cash equivalents, restricted cash (note 6), and amounts receivable (note 5).

Cash and cash equivalents and restricted cash

Cash and cash equivalents and restricted cash in the statements of financial position are comprised of cash and highly liquid investments having maturity dates of three months or less from the date of purchase, which are readily convertible into known amounts of cash.

The Group's cash and cash equivalents and restricted cash are invested in business and savings accounts and guaranteed investment certificates at major financial institutions and are available on demand by the Group for its programs and, as such, are subject to an insignificant risk of change in value.

Non-derivative financial liabilities:

The Group's non-derivative financial liabilities comprise trade and other payables (note 9) and a payable to a related party (note 8(b)).

All financial liabilities fall within the classification of other financial liabilities versus financial liabilities through profit or loss, and are recognized initially at fair value net of any directly attributable transaction costs. Subsequent to initial recognition these financial liabilities are measured at amortized cost using the effective interest method.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

<u>Impairment of financial assets:</u>

When an AFS financial asset is considered to be impaired, cumulative gains or losses previously recognized in other comprehensive income or loss are reclassified to profit or loss in the period. Financial assets are assessed for indicators of impairment at the end of each reporting period. Financial assets are impaired when there is objective evidence that, as a result of one or more events that occurred after the initial recognition of the financial assets, the estimated future cash flows of the investments have been impacted. For marketable securities classified as AFS, a significant or prolonged decline in the fair value of the securities below their cost is considered to be objective evidence of impairment.

For all other financial assets, objective evidence of impairment could include:

- significant financial difficulty of the issuer or counterparty; or
- default or delinquency in interest or principal payments; or
- it becoming probable that the borrower will enter bankruptcy or financial re-organization.

For certain categories of financial assets, such as amounts receivable, assets that are assessed not to be impaired individually are subsequently assessed for impairment on a collective basis. The carrying amount of financial assets is reduced by the impairment loss directly for all financial assets with the exception of amounts receivable, where the carrying amount is reduced through the use of an allowance account. When an amount receivable is considered uncollectible, it is written off against the allowance account. Subsequent recoveries of amounts previously written off are credited against the allowance account. Changes in the carrying amount of the allowance account are recognized in profit or loss.

With the exception of AFS equity instruments, if, in a subsequent period, the amount of the impairment loss decreases and the decrease can be related objectively to an event occurring after the impairment was recognized, the previously recognized impairment loss is reversed through profit or loss to the extent that the carrying amount of the investment at the date the impairment is reversed does not exceed what the amortized cost would have been had the impairment not been recognized. In respect of AFS equity securities, impairment losses previously recognized through profit or loss are not reversed through profit or loss. Any increase in fair value subsequent to an impairment loss is recognized directly in equity.

When an AFS financial asset is considered to be impaired, cumulative gains or losses previously recognized in other comprehensive income are reclassified to profit or loss in the reporting period.

Derivative financial assets and liabilities:

The Group has no derivative financial assets or liabilities.

(f) Exploration and Evaluation Expenditure

Exploration and evaluation expenditures include the costs of acquiring licenses, costs associated with exploration and evaluation activity, and the acquisition date fair value of exploration and evaluation assets acquired in a business combination or an asset acquisition. Exploration and evaluation expenditures are expensed as incurred except for expenditures associated with the acquisition of exploration and evaluation assets through a business combination or an asset acquisition. Costs incurred before the Group has obtained the legal rights to explore an area are expensed.

Acquisition costs, including general and administrative costs, are only capitalized to the extent that these costs can be related directly to operational activities in the relevant area of interest where it is considered likely to be

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

recoverable by future exploitation or sale or where the activities have not reached a stage which permits a reasonable assessment of the existence of reserves.

Exploration and evaluation ("E&E") assets are assessed for impairment only when facts and circumstances suggest that the carrying amount of an E&E asset may exceed its recoverable amount and when the Group has sufficient information to reach a conclusion about technical feasibility and commercial viability.

Industry-specific indicators for an impairment review arise typically when one of the following circumstances applies:

- Substantive expenditure on further exploration and evaluation activities is neither budgeted nor planned;
- title to the asset is compromised;
- adverse changes in the taxation and regulatory environment;
- adverse changes in variations in commodity prices and markets; and
- variations in the exchange rate for the currency of operation.

Once the technical feasibility and commercial viability of the extraction of mineral resources in an area of interest are demonstrable, exploration and evaluation assets attributable to that area of interest are first tested for impairment and then reclassified to mining property and development assets within property, plant and equipment.

Recoverability of the carrying amount of any exploration and evaluation assets is dependent on successful development and commercial exploitation, or alternatively, sale of the respective assets.

(g) Mineral property, plant and equipment

Mineral property, plant and equipment are carried at cost, less accumulated depreciation and accumulated impairment losses.

The cost of mineral property, plant and equipment consists of the acquisition costs transferred from E&E assets, any costs directly attributable to bringing the asset to the location and condition necessary for its intended use, including costs to further delineate the ore body, development and construction costs, removal of overburden to initially expose the ore body, an initial estimate of the costs of dismantling, removing the item and restoring the site on which it is located and, if applicable, borrowing costs.

Mineral property acquisition and development costs are not currently depreciated as the Pebble Project is still in the development stage and no saleable minerals are being produced.

The cost of an item of plant and equipment consists of the purchase price, any costs directly attributable to bringing the asset to the location and condition necessary for its intended use, and an initial estimate of the costs of dismantling and removing the item and restoring the site on which it is located.

Depreciation is provided at rates calculated to write off the cost of plant and equipment, less their estimated residual value, using the declining balance method at various rates ranging from 20% to 30% per annum.

An item of equipment is derecognized upon disposal or when no future economic benefits are expected to arise from the continued use of the asset. Any gain or loss arising on disposal of the asset, determined as the difference between the net disposal proceeds and the carrying amount of the asset, is recognized in profit or loss.

Where an item of equipment consists of major components with different useful lives, the components are accounted for as separate items of equipment. Expenditures incurred to replace a component of an item of equipment that is accounted for separately, including major inspection and overhaul expenditures, are capitalized.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

Residual values and estimated useful lives are reviewed at least annually.

(h) Impairment of Non-Financial Assets

At the end of each reporting period the carrying amounts of the Group's non-financial assets are reviewed to determine whether there is any indication that these assets are impaired. If any such indication exists, the recoverable amount of the asset is estimated in order to determine the extent of the impairment loss, if any. Where it is not possible to estimate the recoverable amount of an individual asset, the Group estimates the recoverable amount of the cash-generating unit to which the asset belongs. The recoverable amount is the higher of fair value less costs to sell and value in use. Fair value is determined as the amount that would be obtained from the sale of the asset in an arm's length transaction between knowledgeable and willing parties. 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. If the recoverable amount of an asset is estimated to be less than its carrying amount, the carrying amount of the asset is reduced to its recoverable amount and the impairment loss is recognized in profit or loss for the period. For an asset that does not generate largely independent cash inflows, the recoverable amount is determined for the cash generating unit to which the asset belongs.

Where an impairment loss subsequently reverses, the carrying amount of the asset (or cash-generating unit) is increased to the revised estimate of its recoverable amount. This increase in the carrying amount is limited to the carrying amount that would have been determined had no impairment loss been recognized for the asset (or cash-generating unit) in prior years. A reversal of an impairment loss is recognized immediately in profit or loss. The Group has not recorded any impairment charges in the years presented.

(i) Share Capital, Special Warrants and Warrants

Common shares, special warrants and warrants (notes 7(b)-(c)) are classified as equity. Transaction costs directly attributable to the issue of common shares, share purchase options, special warrants and warrants are recognized as a deduction from equity, net of any tax effects. Where units comprising of common shares and warrants are issued (note 7(b)), the proceeds and any transaction costs are apportioned between the common shares and warrants according to their relative fair values.

Upon conversion of special warrants and warrants into common shares, the carrying amount, net of a pro rata share of the transaction costs, is transferred to common share capital.

(j) Share-based Payment Transactions

Equity-settled share-based Option Plan

The Group operates an equity-settled share-based option plan for its employees and service providers (note 7(d)). The fair value of share purchase options granted is recognized as an employee or consultant expense with a corresponding increase in the *equity-settled share-based payments reserve* in equity (the "Equity Reserve"). An individual is classified as an employee when the individual is an employee for legal or tax purposes ("direct employee") or provides services similar to those performed by a direct employee.

The fair value is measured at grant date for each tranche, which is expensed on a straight line basis over the vesting period, with a corresponding increase in the Equity Reserve. The fair value of share purchase options granted is measured using the Black-Scholes option pricing model, taking into account the terms and conditions upon which the share purchase options were granted and forfeiture rates as appropriate. At the end of each reporting period,

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

the amount recognized as an expense is adjusted to reflect the actual number of share purchase options that are expected to vest.

Deferred Share Unit ("DSU") Plan

The Group adopted and operates a DSU plan for its non-executive directors. The Group determines whether to account for DSUs as equity-settled or cash-settled based on the terms of the contractual arrangement. The fair value of DSUs granted is recognized as an employee expense with a corresponding increase in the Equity Reserve if deemed equity-settled or a liability is raised if cash-settled at grant date.

The fair value is estimated using the quoted market price of the Company's common shares at grant date and expensed over the vesting period as share-based compensation in the statement of loss and comprehensive loss until they are fully vested. If the DSUs are cash-settled, the expense and liability are adjusted each reporting period for changes in the quoted market price of the Company's common shares.

Restricted Share Unit ("RSU") Plan

The Group has also adopted a RSU plan for its employees, executive directors and eligible consultants of the Group. The Group determines whether to account for the RSUs as equity-settled or cash-settled based on the terms of the contractual arrangement. The fair value of RSUs is recognized as an employee expense with a corresponding increase in the Equity Reserve if deemed equity –settled or a liability is raised if cash settled at grant date.

The fair value is estimated using the number of RSUs and the quoted market price of the Company's common shares at the grant date. It is then expensed over the vesting period with the credit recognized in equity in the Equity Reserve. If cash-settled, the expense and liability are adjusted each reporting period for changes in the quoted market value of the Company's common shares.

(k) Income Taxes

Income tax on the profit or loss for the years presented comprises current and deferred tax. Income tax is recognized in profit or loss except to the extent that it relates to items recognized in other comprehensive income or loss or directly in equity, in which case it is recognized in other comprehensive income or loss or equity.

Current tax expense is the expected tax payable on the taxable income for the year, using tax rates enacted or substantively enacted at year end, adjusted for amendments to tax payable with regard to previous years.

Deferred tax is provided using the balance sheet liability method, providing for unused tax loss carry forwards and temporary differences between the carrying amounts of assets and liabilities for financial reporting purposes and the amounts used for taxation purposes. The following temporary differences are not provided for: goodwill not deductible for tax purposes; the initial recognition of assets or liabilities that affect neither accounting nor taxable profit; and differences relating to investments in subsidiaries, associates, and joint ventures to the extent that they will probably not reverse in the foreseeable future. The amount of deferred tax provided is based on the expected manner of realization or settlement of the carrying amount of assets and liabilities, using tax rates enacted or substantively enacted at the end of the reporting period applicable to the period of expected realization or settlement.

A deferred tax asset is recognized only to the extent that it is probable that future taxable profits will be available against which the asset can be utilized.

Additional income taxes that arise from the distribution of dividends are recognized at the same time as the liability to pay the related dividend.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

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 Group intends to settle its current tax assets and liabilities on a net basis.

(1) Restoration, Rehabilitation, and Environmental Obligations

An obligation to incur restoration, rehabilitation and environmental costs arises when environmental disturbance is caused by the exploration or development of a mineral property interest. Such costs arising from the decommissioning of plant and other site preparation work, discounted to their net present value, are provided for and capitalized at the start of each project to the carrying amount of the asset, along with a corresponding liability as soon as the obligation to incur such costs arises. The timing of the actual rehabilitation expenditure is dependent on a number of factors such as the life and nature of the asset, the operating license conditions and, when applicable, the environment in which the mine operates.

Discount rates using a pre-tax rate that reflects the time value of money are used to calculate the net present value. These costs are charged against profit or loss over the economic life of the related asset, through amortization using either the unit-of-production or the straight line method. The corresponding liability is progressively increased as the effect of discounting unwinds, creating an expense recognized in profit or loss.

Decommissioning costs are also adjusted for changes in estimates. Those adjustments are accounted for as a change in the corresponding capitalized cost, except where a reduction in costs is greater than the unamortized capitalized cost of the related assets, in which case the capitalized cost is reduced to nil and the remaining adjustment is recognized in profit or loss.

The operations of the Group have been, and may in the future be, affected from time to time in varying degree by changes in environmental regulations, including those for site restoration costs. Both the likelihood of new regulations and their overall effect upon the Group are not predictable.

The Group has no material restoration, rehabilitation and environmental obligations as the disturbance to date is immaterial.

(m) Loss per Share

The Group presents basic and diluted loss per share data for its common shares, calculated by dividing the loss attributable to common shareholders of the Group by the weighted average number of common shares and any fully prepaid special warrants outstanding during the year. Diluted loss per share does not adjust the loss attributable to common shareholders or the weighted average number of common shares outstanding when the effect is anti-dilutive.

(n) Segment Reporting

The Group operates in a single reportable operating segment – the acquisition, exploration and development of mineral properties. The Group's core asset, the Pebble Project, is located in Alaska, USA.

(o) Significant Accounting Estimates and Judgments

The preparation of these Financial Statements requires management to make certain estimates, judgments 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 Financial Statements include estimates which, by their nature, are uncertain. The impacts of such estimates are pervasive throughout the Financial Statements, 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

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

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.

Sources of estimation uncertainty

Significant assumptions about the future and other sources of estimation uncertainty that management has made at the end of the reporting period, that could result in a material adjustment to the carrying amounts of assets and liabilities, in the event that actual results differ from assumptions made, relate to, but are not limited to, the following:

- 1. The Group uses the Black-Scholes option pricing model to calculate the fair value of share purchase options granted for determining share-based compensation included in the loss for the year. Inputs used in this model require subjective assumptions, including the expected price volatility from three to five years. Changes in the subjective input assumptions can affect the fair value estimate, and therefore the existing models do not necessarily provide a reliable single measure of the fair value of the Group's share purchase options. The weighted average assumptions applied are disclosed in Note 7(d).
- 2. Significant assumptions about the future and other sources of estimation uncertainty are made in determining the provision for any deferred income tax expense included in the loss for the year and the composition of deferred income tax liabilities included in the Statement of Financial Position.

Critical accounting judgments

These include:

- 1. In terms of IFRS 6, Exploration for and Evaluation of Mineral Resources, management identified indicators that required testing the Group's mineral property interest ("MPI") for impairment. The Group used judgment in determining from an analysis of facts and circumstances that no impairment of the MPI was necessary.
- 2. Pursuant to IAS 21, *The Effects of Changes in Foreign Exchange Rates* ("IAS 21") in determining the functional currency of the parent and its subsidiaries, the Group used judgment in identifying the currency in which financing activities are denominated and the currency that mainly influences the cost of undertaking the business activities in each jurisdiction in which each entity operates.
- 3. The Group has employed judgement that going concern was an appropriate basis for the preparation of the Financial Statements, as the Group considered existing and future available financial resources (note 15) in determining that such financial resources are able to meet key corporate Pebble Project expenditure requirements for at least the next twelve months (refer note 1).

(p) Amendments, Interpretations, Revised and New Standards Adopted by the Group

The Group adopted the following amendments and annual improvements that became effective January 1, 2016:

- Amendments to IAS 1, Presentation of Financial Statements
- Amendments to IAS 16, Property, Plant and Equipment
- Amendments to IAS 28, Investments in Associates
- Amendments to IAS 38, Intangible Assets
- Amendments to IFRS 10, Consolidated Financial Statements
- Amendments to IFRS 11, Joint Arrangements
- Annual improvements to IFRS 2012 2014 Cycle ("AIP 2012-2014")

The amendments and annual improvements had no material effect on the Financial Statements.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

(q) Accounting Standards, Amendments and Revised Standards Not Yet Effective Effective for annual periods commencing on or after January 1, 2018

• IFRS 9, Financial Instruments ("IFRS 9")

IFRS 9 replaces IAS 39, Financial Instruments: Recognition and Measurement, in its entirety. The standard incorporates a number of improvements: a) includes a logical model for classification and measurement (IFRS 9 provides for principle-based approach to classification which is driven by cash flow characteristics and the business model in which an asset is held); b) includes a single, forward-looking "expected loss" impairment model (IFRS 9 will require entities to account for expected credit losses from when financial instruments are first recognized and to recognize full lifetime expected losses on a timely basis); and c) includes a substantially-reformed model for hedge accounting with enhanced disclosures about risk management activity (IFRS 9's new model aligns the accounting treatment with risk management activities). The standard permits early adoption.

The Group will adopt IFRS 9 at the effective date and anticipates that the adoption will have no material impact on its financial statements given the extent of its current use of financial instruments.

• IFRS 15, Revenue from Contracts with Customers ("IFRS 15")

IFRS 15 supersedes IAS 11, Construction Contracts, IAS 18, Revenue, IFRIC 13, Customer Loyalty Programmes, IFRIC 15, Agreements for the Construction of Real Estate, IFRIC 18, Transfers of Assets from Customers and SIC 31, Revenue – Barter Transactions Involving Advertising Services. IFRS 15 establishes a single five-step model framework for determining the nature, amount, timing and certainty of revenue and cash flows arising from a contract with a customer. The standard permits early adoption.

The Group will adopt IFRS 15 at the effective date and anticipates that the adoption will have no material impact on its financial statements as the Group does not generate significant revenue given the Group's current stage of development of the Pebble Project. The Group will reassess the impact once significant revenue is generated.

Effective for annual periods commencing on or after January 1, 2019

• IFRS 16, Leases ("IFRS 16") and revised IAS 17, Leases ("IAS 17").

The IASB issued IFRS 16 and revised IAS 17 in January 2016. IFRS 16 specifies how to recognize, measure, present and disclose leases. IFRS 16 provides a single lessee accounting model, requiring the recognition of assets and liabilities for all leases, unless the term of the lease is twelve months or less or the underlying asset has a low value. Lessor accounting however remains unchanged from IAS 17 and the distinction between operating and finance leases is retained. IAS 17, as revised, now prescribes the accounting policies and disclosures applicable to leases, both for lessees and lessors.

The Group will adopt IFRS 16 at the effective date and anticipates that the adoption will not have a significant impact other than the accounting for office, accommodation and storage leases the Group may have entered into where the minimum lease term is more than 12 months. In October 2016, the Group entered into a 5 year long term office lease (refer note 14).

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

3. MINERAL PROPERTY, PLANT AND EQUIPMENT

The Group's exploration and evaluation assets are comprised of the following:

Year ended December 31, 2016	Minera	al Property interest ¹	 ant and iipment	Total
Cost				
Beginning balance	\$	112,541	\$ 1,032	\$ 113,573
Additions		_	_	_
Dispositions		_	(151)	(151)
Ending balance	\$	112,541	\$ 881	\$ 113,422
Accumulated depreciation				
Beginning balance	\$	_	\$ (481)	\$ (481)
Depreciation ²		_	(205)	(205)
Eliminated on disposal		-	128	128
Ending balance	\$	-	\$ (558)	\$ (558)
Foreign currency translation difference		29,381	227	29,608
Net carrying value - Ending balance	\$	141,922	\$ 550	\$ 142,472

Year ended December 31, 2015	Mineral Property interest ¹		Plant and equipment		Total
Cost	meerest		cqc	принене	1000
Beginning balance	\$	112,541	\$	1,155	\$ 113,696
Additions		· –		28	28
Dispositions		_		(151)	(151)
Ending balance	\$	112,541	\$	1,032	\$ 113,573
Accumulated depreciation Beginning balance Depreciation ²	\$	- -	\$	(278) (279)	\$ (278) (279)
Eliminated on disposal		_		76	76
Ending balance	\$		\$	(481)	\$ (481)
Foreign currency translation difference		33,743		253	33,996
Net carrying value - Ending balance	\$	146,284	\$	804	\$ 147,088

Notes to table:

- 1. Comprises the Pebble Project, a contiguous block of 2,402 mineral claims covering approximately 417 square miles located in southwest Alaska, 17 miles (30 kilometers) from the villages of Iliamna and Newhalen, and approximately 200 miles (320 kilometers) southwest of the city of Anchorage.
- 2. Depreciation is included in exploration and evaluation expenses.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

4. AVAILABLE-FOR-SALE FINANCIAL ASSETS

The Group's available-for-sale financial assets was comprised of an investment in marketable securities of a Canadian publicly listed company acquired through the acquisition of Mission Gold Ltd. (note 7(b)). The Group disposed of the marketable securities for \$1,754 during the year ended December 31, 2016.

5. AMOUNTS RECEIVABLE AND PREPAID EXPENSES

	Dece	mber 31	Dece	mber 31
		2016		2015
Sales tax receivable	\$	50	\$	164
Amounts receivable		138		514
Prepaid expenses		491		397
Total	\$	679	\$	1,075

6. CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS AND RESTRICTED CASH

(a) Cash and Cash Equivalents

	Decen	nber 31	Dece	ember 31
		2016		2015
Business and savings accounts	\$	7,196	\$	7,509

Supplementary cash flow information

Non-cash investing and financing activities:

- In the year ended December 31, 2016, 41,334 options were exercised and common shares were issued but not delivered as payment was only received after the reporting date (note 15).
- In the year ended December 31, 2015, the following non-cash transactions occurred:
 - (a) The Group converted special warrants on a one-for-one basis into common shares of the Company at no additional cost to the holder (note 7(c)); and
 - (b) The Group issued options and warrants pursuant to the acquisition of Cannon Point Resources Ltd. and Mission Gold Ltd. (note 7(b)).

(b) Restricted Cash

The Group held restricted cash in the amount of \$453 at December 31, 2015 for certain equipment demobilization expenses relating to the Pebble Partnership's activities undertaken while it was subject to joint control of the Group and Anglo American plc. ("Anglo American"). This cash was not available for general use by the Group. During the year ended December 31, 2016, the Group drew down \$393 from restricted cash for expenditures incurred in the last quarter of 2015 and returned the remaining balance of \$60 to Anglo American in accordance with the terms of the agreement between both parties.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

7. CAPITAL AND RESERVES

(a) Authorized Share Capital

At December 31, 2016, the authorized share capital comprised an unlimited (2015 – unlimited) number of common shares with no par value. As of the reporting date, the Company had 270,828,227 common shares issued and fully paid and 41,334 common shares issued to be delivered on receipt of payment (note 7(d)).

(b) Financings and Other

2016 Prospectus Financing

In June 2016, the Group completed a prospectus offering of 38,000,000 units in the capital of the Company at a price of \$0.45 per unit for gross proceeds of \$17,100. Each Unit consisted of one common share and one common share purchase warrant, which entitles the holder to purchase an additional common share at an exercise price of \$0.65 per common share until June 10, 2021.

As of the reporting date, the Group incurred a total of \$1,070 in issuance costs related to agents, advisory, regulatory and legal fees. The Group apportioned the gross proceeds and issuance costs between share capital and warrants based on their relative fair values on date of issue, with share capital using the quoted market price for shares on date of issue and warrants based on the Black Scholes option pricing model (using inputs of \$0.65 exercise price; \$0.42 valuation date share price; 81% expected volatility; 0.57% risk free rate; 5 years remaining life; and nil% dividend). Accordingly, net proceeds of \$10,347 was allocated to share capital and \$5,683 to warrants.

2016 Private Placement

In July 2016, the Group completed a private placement of 4,444,376 units in the capital of the Company, each unit comprising of one common share and one share purchase warrant, at a price of \$0.45 per unit for gross proceeds of \$2,000. Each share purchase warrant is exercisable into one common share at an exercise price of \$0.65 per common share until June 10, 2021. The common shares and share purchase warrants were subject to applicable resale restrictions, including a four month hold under Canadian legislation.

As of the reporting date, the Group incurred a total of \$33 in issuance costs related to regulatory and legal fees. The Group apportioned the gross proceeds and issuance costs between share capital and warrants based on their relative fair values on date of issue, with share capital using the quoted market price for shares on date of issue and warrants based on the Black Scholes option pricing model (using inputs of \$0.65 exercise price; \$0.45 valuation date share price; 81% expected volatility; 0.54% risk free rate; 5 years remaining life; and nil% dividend). Accordingly, net proceeds of \$1,264 was allocated to share capital and \$703 to warrants.

2015 Private Placement

In December 2015, the Group completed a private placement of 12,573,292 common shares in the Company at a price of \$0.412 per share for gross proceeds of \$5,180. The Group issued 300,000 common shares as referral fees to an arm's length third party and recorded the fair value of these common shares of \$120 as share issuance cost. Other legal and regulatory costs incurred in relation to the private placement was \$14.

2015 Acquisition of Listed Entities

During the year ended December 31, 2015, the Group acquired TSX Venture listed entities, Cannon Point Resources Ltd. ("Cannon Point") and Mission Gold Ltd. ("Mission Gold"), each by way of a plan of arrangement in which the Group acquired 100% of the issued and outstanding common shares by issuing 12,881,344 and

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

27,593,341 common shares respectively. The acquisitions enabled the Group to have access to their primary asset being cash resources of which Cannon Point had \$4,397 and Mission Gold had \$8,338. The Group incurred transaction costs of \$104 and \$284 respectively which was recorded within equity.

Pursuant to the Cannon Point arrangement, Cannon Point advanced to the Group \$4,250 (the "Cash Advance") with a one year term at an interest rate of 15% per annum. The Group accrued \$103 in interest on the Cash Advance up to the date of the acquisition.

Pursuant to the Mission Gold arrangement, Mission Gold provided the Group with a credit facility of \$8.4 million (the "Credit Facility") with a 6-month term at an interest rate of 15% per annum. The Group only drew down \$2 million of the Credit Facility before the acquisition was completed and accrued \$41 in interest on the \$2 million from the Credit Facility up to that date.

The following is a summary of each acquisition:

	Canno	on Point	Missi	on Gold
	Fa	air value	Fa	ir value
Cash and cash equivalents	\$	4,397	\$	8,338
Common shares of a publicly listed investment (note 4)		_		1,684
Amounts receivable		126		81
Accounts payable and accrued liabilities assumed		(140)		
Financial instruments acquired	\$	4,383	\$	10,103
Consideration ¹ :				
Common shares issued (12,881,344 and 27,593,341)	\$	4,166	\$	7,838
Share purchase warrants and options (4,394,500 and 16,673,348 (note 7(c)))		217		2,265
Total consideration	\$	4,383	:	\$10,103

Note

1. The fair value of the financial assets and liabilities was allocated to the common shares and the share purchase options/warrants issued in proportion to their relative fair values; for common shares, the quoted market price on date of issue was used and for the options and warrants, the Black Scholes options pricing model was used (using weighted average valuation inputs for i) Cannon Point: \$1.63 exercise price; \$0.55 valuation date share price; 87% expected volatility; 0.49% risk free rate; 0.82 years remaining life; and nil% dividend yield; and ii) Mission Gold: \$0.97 exercise price; \$.43 valuation date share price; 83% expected volatility; 0.59% risk free rate; 4.06 years remaining life; and nil% dividend yield).

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

(c) Share Purchase Warrants and Options not Issued under the Group's Incentive Plan

The following reconciles warrants and non-employee options (options which are not issued under the Group's incentive plan (note 7(d)), each exercisable to acquire one common share, at the beginning and end of the year for 2016:

	Year ended December 31, 2016										
Exercise	_										
price per common		Beginning				Ending					
share (\$)	Expiry date	balance	Issued	Exercised	Expired	balance					
Options issu	ed pursuant to the acquis	sition of Cannon	Point								
0.29	January 29, 2016	150,400	-	(150,400)	-	-					
0.37	January 29, 2016	220,900	-	(61,100)	(159,800)	-					
0.40	January 29, 2016	150,400	-	-	(150,400)	-					
0.43	January 29, 2016	37,600	-	-	(37,600)	-					
0.37	July 23, 2017	18,800	-	-	-	18,800					
0.37	June 30, 2019	56,400	-	-	-	56,400					
0.40	June 30, 2019	225,600	-	(133,950)	-	91,650					
0.37	March 10, 2021	9,400	-	-	-	9,400					
0.40	March 10, 2021	150,400	-	(11,750)	-	138,650					
0.37	December 15, 2021	37,600	-	-	_	37,600					
0.40	December 12, 2022	75,200	-	(18,800)	-	56,400					
0.29	December 8, 2024	37,600	-	-	-	37,600					
Total		1,170,300	-	(376,000)	(347,800)	446,500					
Warrants iss	ued pursuant to the acqu	isition of Missio	n Gold								
0.55	July 9, 2020	13,801,672	-	(2,512,974)	-	11,288,698					
3.00	September 14, 2017	2,871,676	_	-	_	2,871,676					
Total		16,673,348	-	(2,512,974)	-	14,160,374					
Warrants iss	sued pursuant to financin	gs ¹									
0.65	June 10, 2021	-	42,444,376	(3,047,966)	=	39,396,410					
Total		-	42,444,376	(3,047,966)	-	39,396,410					
Grand Total		17,843,648	42,444,376	(5,936,940)	(347,800)	54,003,284					

Note to 2016 table:

1. The Group issued warrants pursuant to the June 2016 prospectus and July 2016 private placement financings (note 7(b)).

At December 31, 2016, warrants and non-employee options had a weighted average exercise price of 0.75 (2015 – 0.93) and a weighted average remaining life of 0.95 (2015 – 0.94) are considered average remaining life of 0.95 (2015 – 0.94) are considered average remaining life of 0.95 (2015 – 0.94) are considered average remaining life of 0.95 (2015 – 0.94) and 0.95 (2015 – 0.94) are considered average remaining life of 0.95 (2015 – 0.94) are considered average remaining life of 0.95 (2015 – 0.94) are considered average remaining life of 0.95 (2015 – 0.94) are considered average remaining life of 0.95 (2015 – 0.94) are considered average remaining life of 0.95 (2015 – 0.94) are considered average remaining life of 0.95 (2015 – 0.94) are considered average remaining life of 0.95 (2015 – 0.94) are considered average remaining life of 0.95 (2015 – 0.94) are considered average remaining life of 0.95 (2015 – 0.94) are considered average remaining life of 0.95 (2015 – 0.94) are considered average remaining life of 0.95 (2015 – 0.94) are considered average remaining life of 0.95 (2015 – 0.94) are considered average remaining life of 0.95 (2015 – 0.94) are considered average remaining life of 0.95 (2015 – 0.94) are considered average remaining life of 0.95 (2015 – 0.94) are considered average remaining life of 0.95 (2015 – 0.95) are considered average remaining life of 0.95 (2015 – 0.95) are considered average remaining life of 0.95 (2015 – 0.95) are considered average remaining life of 0.95 (2015 – 0.95) are considered average remaining life of 0.95 (2015 – 0.95) are considered average remaining life of 0.95 (2015 – 0.95) are considered average remaining life of 0.95 (2015 – 0.95).

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

The following table reconciles warrants for year ended December 31, 2015:

		Year ended December 31, 2015				
Exercise price per common share (\$)	Expiry date	Beginning balance	Issued	Exercised/ conversion	Expired	Ending balance
Special war	rants issued for cash ¹					
nil	Not applicable	27,622,642	45,940,093	(73,562,735)	-	-
Warrants a	nd options issued pursuar	nt to the acquisit	ion of Cannon P	oint ²		
0.37	December 2, 2015	_	28,200	-	(28,200)	_
0.40	December 2, 2015	_	47,000	_	(47,000)	-
2.13	December 17, 2015	_	3,149,000	_	(3,149,000)	_
0.29	January 29, 2016	_	150,400	_	_	150,400
0.37	January 29, 2016	_	220,900	_	_	220,900
0.40	January 29, 2016	_	150,400	_	_	150,400
0.43	January 29, 2016	_	37,600	_	_	37,600
0.37	July 23, 2017 ³	_	18,800	_	_	18,800
0.37	June 30, 2019	_	56,400	_	_	56,400
0.40	June 30, 2019	_	225,600	_	_	225,600
0.37	March 10, 2021	_	9,400	_	_	9,400
0.40	March 10, 2021	_	150,400	_	_	150,400
0.37	December 15, 2021	_	37,600	_	_	37,600
0.40	December 12, 2022	_	75,200	_	_	75,200
0.29	December 8, 2024	_	37,600	_	_	37,600
Total 3		-	4,394,500	-	(3,224,200)	1,170,300
Warrants a	nd options issued pursuar	nt to the acquisit	ion of Mission G	iold ²		
0.55	July 9, 2020	-	13,801,672	-	-	13,801,672
3.00	September 14, 2017	_	2,871,676	_	_	2,871,676
Total		-	16,673,348	-	-	16,673,348
Grand Tota	 1	27,622,642	67,007,941	(73,562,735)	(3,224,200)	17,843,648

Notes to the 2015 table:

1. In the year ended December 31, 2015, the Group completed two private placement financings of share purchase warrants ("Special Warrants"). Each of the Special Warrants was convertible, without payment of any additional consideration by the holder, into one common share of the Company, either at the option of the holder or automatically within a maximum of a two year period from the issuance date. The Special Warrants issued were all converted into common shares by the end of the year. The Group incurred a total of \$1,112 in advisory, finders', regulatory, and legal fees on the financing.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

- 2. The Group exchanged options and warrants to purchase shares in Cannon Point Resources Ltd. ("Cannon Point") and warrants to purchase shares in Mission Gold Ltd. ("Mission Gold") for options and warrants to purchase shares in the Company pursuant to the acquisition of Cannon Point in October 2015 and Mission Gold in December 2015 respectively. The options and warrants were recognized at their relative fair values.
- 3. The ending number of options outstanding has been changed from the number that was reported in the year ended December 31, 2015, in order to correct an immaterial disclosure error in which these options were erroneously shown as having been exercised but were still outstanding. Accordingly, the total number of options and warrants outstanding at December 31, 2015 increased by 18,800 from what was previously reported.

(d) Share Purchase Option Compensation Plan

The Group has a share purchase option plan approved by the Group's shareholders that allows the Board of Directors to grant share purchase options, subject to regulatory terms and approval, to its officers, directors, employees, and service providers. The share purchase option plan (the "2014 Rolling Option Plan") is based on the maximum number of eligible shares equaling a rolling percentage of up to 10% of the Company's outstanding common shares including any issuances from the Group's RSU and DSU plans, calculated from time to time. Pursuant to the 2014 Rolling Option Plan, if outstanding share purchase options ("options") are exercised and the number of issued and outstanding common shares of the Company increases, then the options available to grant under the plan increase proportionately (assuming there are no issuances under the RSU and DSU plans). The exercise price of each option is set by the Board of Directors at the time of grant but cannot be less than the market price, being the 5-day volume weighted average trading price calculated the day before the grant. Options can have a maximum term of five years and typically terminate 90 days following the termination of the optionee's employment or engagement. In the case of death or retirement, any outstanding vested options will expire the earlier of the expiry date or one year from date of death or retirement. The vesting period for options is at the discretion of the Board of Directors at the time the options are granted.

The following summarizes the Group's options outstanding at the beginning and end of the year:

	2016		2015	
		Weighted		Weighted
		average		average
		exercise		exercise
	Number of	price	Number of	price
Continuity of options	options	(\$/option)	options	(\$/option)
Beginning balance	9,755,600	1.27	7,687,000	1.95
Granted	6,806,000	0.49	3,657,500	0.50
Expired	(27,000)	15.44	(1,241,800)	3.00
Exercised	(548,869)	0.92	-	_
Forfeited	(38,000)	0.50	(25,400)	0.97
Cancelled	(86,600)	1.40	(321,700)	2.17
Ending balance	15,861,131	0.92	9,755,600	1.27

During the year ended December 31, 2016, the Group granted 200,000 options to consultants for engineering advisory and administrative consulting services. The Group determined that given the nature of the services being provided and that are continued to be provided, it could not determine the fair value of these services reliably. As a consequence, the Group estimated that the value of these services approximated the fair value of the options granted measured using the Black-Scholes option pricing model which at December 31, 2016 amounted to \$144 (2015 – \$11).

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

For options granted in the year ended December 31, 2016, the weighted average fair value was estimated at 0.46 (2015 – 0.28) per option and was based on the Black-Scholes option pricing model using the following weighted average assumptions:

Assumptions	2016	2015
Risk-free interest rate	0.54%	0.78%
Expected life	4.73 years	4.36 years
Expected volatility ¹	82.89%	81.76%
Grant date share price	\$0.67	\$0.47
Expected dividend yield	Nil	Nil

Note:

1. Expected volatility is based on the historical volatility of the Company's common share price on the TSX.

Details of options exercised during the year ended December 31, 2016 were as follows:

Period	Share purchase options exercised	Weighted average exercise price (\$/option)	Weighted average market share price on exercise (\$)
August 31, 2016	10,000	0.49	0.96
September 1 to 30, 2016	46,667	0.50	1.00
October 24, 2016	60,000	0.50	0.97
November 1 to 30, 2016	271,668	1.20	1.56
December 1 to 31, 2016	160,534	0.74	2.44
	548,869	0.92	1.70

No options were exercised in the year ended December 31, 2015.

The following summarizes information on options outstanding at December 31, 2016 and 2015:

2016	Option	ns outstanding	5	Options exercisable			
		XAX - 1 - 1	Weighted			Weighted	
		Weighted	average		Weighted	average	
		average	remaining		average	remaining	
		exercise	contractual		exercise	contractual	
Exercise	Number	price	life	Number	price	life	
prices (\$)	outstanding	(\$/option)	(years)	outstanding	(\$/option)	(years)	
0.48	600,000	0.48	4.21	200,000	0.48	4.21	
0.49	6,147,000	0.49	4.25	2,009,670	0.49	4.28	
0.50	3,266,831	0.50	3.23	2,074,676	0.50	3.27	
0.72	200,000	0.72	2.71	200,000	0.72	2.71	
0.89	1,180,500	0.89	2.20	1,113,498	0.89	2.22	
1.77	3,991,800	1.77	1.71	3,991,800	1.77	1.71	
3.00	475,000	3.00	0.49	475,000	3.00	0.49	
	15,861,131	0.92	3.11	10,064,644	1.17	2.61	

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

2015	Optio	ns outstanding		Options exercisable				
			Weighted			Weighted		
		Weighted	average		Weighted	average		
		average	remaining		average	remaining		
		exercise	contractual		exercise	contractual		
Exercise	Number	price	life	Number	price	life		
prices (\$)	outstanding	(\$/option)	(years)	outstanding	(\$/option)	(years)		
0.50	3,639,500	0.50	4.15	1,217,172	0.50	4.15		
0.72	200,000	0.72	3.71	133,334	0.72	3.71		
0.89	1,180,500	0.89	3.20	745,166	0.89	3.22		
1.77	4,233,600	1.77	2.70	4,233,600	1.77	2.70		
3.00	475,000	3.00	1.50	475,000	3.00	1.50		
15.44	27,000	15.44	0.21	27,000	15.44	0.21		
	9,755,600	1.27	3.26	6,831,272	1.57	2.94		

(e) Deferred Share Units ("DSUs")

The Group has a DSU plan which was approved by the Group's shareholders in 2015 which allows the Board, at its discretion, to award DSUs to non-executive directors for services rendered to the Group and also provides that non-executive directors may elect to receive up to 100% of their annual compensation in DSUs. The aggregate number of DSUs outstanding pursuant to the DSU plan may not exceed 2% of the issued and outstanding common shares ("Shares") from time to time provided the total does not result in the total Shares issuable under all the Group's share-based compensation plans (i.e. including Share purchase option and RSU plans) exceeding 10% of the total number of issued outstanding Shares. DSUs are payable when the non-executive director ceases to be a director including in the event of death. DSUs may be settled in Shares issued from treasury, by the delivery to the former director of Shares purchased by the Group in the open market, payment in cash, or any combination thereof, at the discretion of the Group.

During the year ended December 31, 2016, the Group granted 458,129 DSUs with an aggregate fair value of \$316 at date of grant which was recorded as share-based compensation in the statement of loss with a corresponding increase in the equity-settled share payment reserve in equity.

(f) Restricted Share Units ("RSUs")

The Group's RSU plan which was approved by the Group's shareholders, allows the Board to grant employees, executive directors and consultants RSUs from time to time. The RSUs are granted conditionally and entitle the recipient to receive one share (or the cash equivalent) upon attainment of a time-based vesting period. The RSU plan limits the aggregate number of RSUs outstanding to 3% of the issued and outstanding Shares from time to time provided the total does not result in the total Shares issuable under all the Group's share-based compensation plans (i.e. including Share purchase option and RSU plans) exceeding 10% of the total number of issued outstanding Shares. RSUs can be settled by the Group at its discretion in Shares issued from treasury, by the delivery of Shares purchased by the Group in the open market, payment in cash or in any combination thereof.

During the year ended December 31, 2016, the Group granted an aggregate 639,031 RSUs to its Chairman, Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer with a vesting term of one year from the date of grant. The fair value of the RSUs at date of grant was \$441 determined using the quoted market price of Shares at date of grant. The Group has recognized \$209 during the year as share-based compensation with a corresponding increase in the equity-settled share payment reserve in equity

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

(g) Foreign Currency Translation Reserve

	Year ended December 3			er 31
		2016		2015
Beginning balance	\$	40,479	\$	17,179
Foreign exchange translation differences incurred:				
(Loss) gain on translation of foreign subsidiaries		(4,246)		23,300
Ending balance	\$	36,233	\$	40,479

The foreign currency translation reserve represents accumulated exchange differences arising on the translation, into the Group's presentation currency (the Canadian dollar), of the results of operations and net assets of the Group's subsidiaries with a US dollar functional currency.

8. RELATED PARTY BALANCES AND TRANSACTIONS

Balances and transactions between the Company and its subsidiaries, which are related parties of the Company, have been eliminated on consolidation (note 2(c)). Details between the Group and other related parties are disclosed below:

(a) Transactions and Balances with Key Management Personnel ("KMP")

The aggregate value of transactions with KMP, being the Group's directors, Chief Financial Officer ("CFO") and senior management including the Senior Vice President ("VP") Corporate Development, VP Corporate Communications, VP Engineering, VP Public Affairs, Chief Executive Officer of the Pebble Partnership ("PLP CEO"), Chairman of Pebble Mines Corp ("PMC Chair"), Senior VP Corporate Affairs of the Pebble Partnership ("PLP Senior VP") and Company Secretary, was as follows for the year ended December 31, 2016 and 2015:

Transactions	2016	2015
Compensation		
Amounts paid to HDSI for services of KMP employed by HDSI ¹	\$ 2,274	\$ 2,800
Amounts paid and payable to KMP ^{2,3}	1,737	2,700
	4,011	5,500
Share-based compensation 3,4	2,428	500
Total compensation	\$ 6,439	\$ 6,000
Transfer of resources to the Group ⁵	\$ _	\$ (364)

Notes:

- 1. The Group's Chairman, CEO, CFO and senior management (other than disclosed in 2 below) are employed by the Group through Hunter Dickinson Services Inc. (refer (b) below).
- 2. The Group directly employs its non-executive directors, PLP CEO, PMC Chair and PLP Senior VP. Payments represent short term employee benefits incurred, including salaries and directors fees.
- 3. Includes the cost of DSUs issued to non-executive directors for annual compensation payable (note 7(e)) and RSUs issued to the Group's Chairman, CEO and CFO (note 7(f)) in the current year.
- 4. Includes cost of options granted during the year and options still vesting from prior grants.
- 5. During the year ended December 31, 2015, three directors and officers and spouses of officers subscribed and paid for 912,336 Special Warrants pursuant to the private placement of Special Warrants (note 7(c)).

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

(b) Transactions and Balances with other Related Parties

Hunter Dickinson Services Inc. ("HDSI") is a private company that provides geological, engineering, environmental, corporate development, financial, administrative and management services to the Group and its subsidiaries at annually set rates pursuant to a management services agreement. The annually set rates also include a component of overhead costs such as office rent, information technology services and general administrative support services. HDSI also incurs third party costs on behalf of the Group which are reimbursed by the Group at cost. Several directors and other key management personnel of HDSI, who are close business associates, are also key management personnel of the Group.

For the year ended December 31, 2016, and 2015, the aggregate value of transactions were as follows:

Transactions		2016		2015
Services rendered by HDSI:	\$	3,584	\$	4,680
Technical		1,157		1,600
Engineering		83		140
Environmental		375		580
Socioeconomic		660		670
Other technical services		39		210
General and administrative		2,427		3,080
Management, corporate communications, secretarial, financial and				
administration		1,908		2,420
Shareholder communication		519		660
Reimbursement of third party expenses incurred by HDSI		499		610
Conferences and travel		175		160
Insurance		54		60
Office supplies and information technology		270		390
Sale of available-for-sale financial assets to HDSI		-		(280)
Total value of transactions with HDSI	\$	4,083	\$	5,010
The outstanding balances with HDSI were as follows				
	Dece	mber 31	Dece	ember 31
Balances payable to HDSI		2016		2015
Services rendered to the Group and expenses incurred for the Group	\$	240	\$	677

9. TRADE AND OTHER PAYABLES

	December 31		Dece	mber 31
Falling due within the year		2016		2015
Trade	\$	1,260	\$	1,594
Other (note 6(b))		-		453
Total	\$	1,260	\$	2,047

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

10. BASIC AND DILUTED LOSS PER SHARE

The calculation of basic and diluted loss per share was based on the following for the year ended December 31, 2016 and 2015:

	Year ended I	December 31
	2016	2015
Loss attributable to common shareholders	\$26,982	\$ 33,829
Weighted average number of common shares outstanding (000s)	246,161	146,313

Diluted loss per share does not include the effect of 15,861,131 (2015 - 9,755,600) employee share purchase options outstanding and 54,003,284 (2015 - 17,843,648) non-employee share purchase options and warrants as they are anti-dilutive.

11. EMPLOYMENT COSTS

During the year ended December 31, 2016, the Group recorded \$10,626 (2015 - \$9,900) in salaries and benefits, including share-based payments of \$2,995 (2015 - \$903) and amounts paid to HDSI for services provided to the Group by HDSI personnel (note 8(b)).

12. INCOME TAX EXPENSE

	Ye	ar ended D	ecemb	er 31
		2016		2015
Current tax (recovery) expense				
Current year (recovery) expense	\$	_	\$	_
Current income tax (recovery) expense	\$	-	\$	-
Deferred income tax (recovery) expense				
Current year (recovery) expense	\$	-	\$	(1,514)
Deferred income tax (recovery) expense	\$	-	\$	(1,514)

	Year ended December 31			
Reconciliation of effective tax rate	2016 20			2015
				_
Net loss	\$	(26,982)	\$	(33,829)
Total income tax (recovery) expense		-		(1,514)
Loss excluding income tax		(26,982)		(35,343)
Income tax using the Company's domestic tax rate		(7,015)		(9,189)
Non-deductible expenses (recoveries) and other		512		(1,245)
Deferred income tax assets not recognized		6,503		8,920
	\$	-	\$	(1,514)

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

The Company's domestic tax rate for the year was 26% (2015 – 26%).

	December 31		December 31	
Deferred income tax assets (liabilities)		2016		2015
Tax losses	\$	3,214	\$	3,117
Net deferred income tax assets		3,214		3,117
Resource property/investment in Pebble Partnership		(3,191)		(3,005)
Equipment		(23)		(112)
Net deferred income tax liability	\$	_	\$	_

The Group had the following temporary differences at December 31, 2016 in respect of which no deferred tax asset has been recognized:

	Resource					
Expiry	T	ax losses	pools			Other
Within one year	\$	-	\$	_	\$	_
One to five years		_		_		3,342
After five years		109,116		_		_
No expiry date		78		101,325		146
Total	\$	109,194	\$	101,325	\$	3,488

The Group has taxable temporary differences in relation to investments in foreign subsidiaries or branches of \$7.8 million (2015 – \$7.3 million) which was not recognized because the Group controls the reversal of liabilities and it is expected it will not reverse in the foreseeable future.

13. FINANCIAL RISK MANAGEMENT

The Group is exposed in varying degrees to a variety of financial instrument related risks. The Board approves and monitors the risk management processes, inclusive of documented investment policies, counterparty limits, and controlling and reporting structures. The type of risk exposure and the way in which such exposure is managed is provided as follows:

(a) Credit Risk

Credit risk is the risk of potential loss to the Group if a counterparty to a financial instrument fails to meet its contractual obligations. The Group's credit risk is primarily attributable to its liquid financial assets, including cash and cash equivalents, restricted cash (\$nil at December 31, 2016) and amounts receivable. The Group limits the exposure to credit risk by only investing its cash and cash equivalents and restricted cash with high-credit quality financial institutions in business and saving accounts, guaranteed investment certificates, and in government treasury bills which are available on demand by the Group for its programs. Amounts receivable (note 5) include receivable balances with government agencies and refundable deposits. The following is the Group's maximum exposure:

	Dece	mber 31	Dece	mber 31
		2016		2015
Amounts receivable	\$	679	\$	1,075
Restricted cash		-		453
Cash and cash equivalents		7,196		7,509
Total exposure	\$	7,875	\$	9,037

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

(b) Liquidity Risk

Liquidity risk is the risk that the Group will not be able to meet its financial obligations when they become due. The Group ensures, as far as reasonably possible, it will have sufficient capital in order to meet short to medium term business requirements, after taking into account cash flows from operations and the Group's holdings of cash and cash equivalents and restricted cash (\$nil at December 31, 2016), where applicable. The Group's cash and cash equivalents at the reporting date were currently invested in business accounts.

The Group's financial liabilities are comprised of trade and other payables (note 9) and a payable to a related party (note 8(b)), which are due for payment within 12 months from the reporting date. The carrying amounts of the Group's financial liabilities represent the Group's contractual obligations.

(c) Foreign exchange risk

The Company is subject to both currency transaction risk and currency translation risk: the Pebble Partnership and U5 Resources Inc. have the US dollar as functional currency, and certain of the Company's corporate expenses are incurred in US dollars. The operating results and financial position of the Group are reported in Canadian dollars in the Group's consolidated financial statements. The fluctuation of the US dollar in relation to the Canadian dollar will consequently have an impact upon the losses incurred by the Group as well as the value of the Group's assets and the amount of shareholders' equity.

The Group has not entered into any agreements or purchased any instruments to hedge possible currency risks.

The exposure of the Group's US dollar- denominated financial assets and liabilities to foreign exchange risk is as follows:

Decen	iber 31	Dece	ember 31
	2016		2015
\$	326	\$	595
	2,232		6,408
	2,558		7,003
	(652)		(1,529)
\$	1,906	\$	5,474
	\$	\$ 326 2,232 2,558 (652)	\$ 326 \$ 2,232 2,558 (652)

Based on the above net exposures and assuming that all other variables remain constant, a 10% change in the value of the Canadian dollar relative to the US dollar would result in a gain or loss of \$191 (2015 – \$502) in the year. This sensitivity analysis includes only outstanding foreign currency denominated monetary items.

(d) Interest rate risk

The Group is subject to interest rate cash flow risk with respect to its investments in cash and cash equivalents. The Group's policy is to invest cash at fixed rates of interest and cash reserves are to be maintained in cash and cash equivalents in order to maintain liquidity, while achieving a satisfactory return for shareholders. Fluctuations in interest rates when cash and cash equivalents mature impact interest income earned.

Assuming that all other variables remain constant, a 100 basis points change representing a 1% increase or decrease in interest rates would have resulted in a decrease or increase in loss of \$73 (2015: \$85).

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

(e) Capital Management

The Group's policy is to maintain a strong capital base so as to maintain investor and creditor confidence and to sustain future development of the business. The capital structure of the Group consists of equity, comprising share capital, reserves and Special Warrants, net of accumulated deficit. There were no changes in the Group's approach to capital management during the year. The Group is not subject to any externally imposed capital requirements.

(f) Fair value

The fair value of the Group's financial assets and liabilities approximates the carrying amount. The fair value of the AFS financial asset was classified into level 1 of the fair value hierarchy as quoted market prices was used in the fair value determination.

14. COMMITMENTS AND CONTINGENCIES

(a) Leases

The Group has the following commitments as of December 31, 2016:

	Fiscal	Fiscal	Fiscal	
	2017	2018	2019	Total
	('000s)	('000s)	('000s)	('000s)
Anchorage office lease ¹	US\$ 88	US\$ 91	US\$ 94	US\$ 273
Pebble Project site leases ²	56	_	_	56
Total	US\$ 144	US\$ 91	US\$ 94	US\$ 329
Total in Canadian dollars ³	\$ 193	\$ 122	\$ 126	\$ 441

Notes:

- 1. The initial 5 year lease term expired on October 31, 2016. The Group negotiated for new office space from November 1, 2016 with an initial 5 year term to November 30, 2021.
- 2. The Group has leases for a hangar at site and core storage. The hanger lease expires May 1, 2017 and the core yard lease expires June 1, 2017.
- 3. Converted at the closing Bank of Canada rate of \$1.3427 per US\$1 on December 31, 2016.

(b) Legal

The Group, through the Pebble Partnership, is advancing its multi-dimensional strategy to address the EPA's preemptive regulatory action under Section 404(c) of the Clean Water Act, through litigation against the EPA contesting the EPA's statutory authority to act pre-emptively under the Clean Water Act, and alleging violation of FACA and the unlawful withholding of documentation under FOIA (refer note 1). The Group has a contingent liability for additional legal fees and costs that may be due to the Group's counsel should there be a successful outcome or settlement. However, the Group is unable to estimate or determine the length of time that each of the legal initiatives mentioned above will take to advance to specific milestone events or final conclusion. As of the reporting date, if there was a favourable outcome or settlement, the Company estimates there would potentially be additional legal fees of approximately \$20.2 million (US\$15.1 million converted at the closing Bank of Canada rate on December 31, 2016 of \$1.3427 per US\$1) payable by the Group.

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

For the years ended December 31, 2016 and 2015

(Expressed in thousands of Canadian Dollars, unless otherwise stated, except per share or option)

15. EVENTS AFTER THE REPORTING DATE

In January 2017, the Company completed a bought deal financing of 20,240,000 common shares at a price of US\$1.85 per common share for gross proceeds of US\$37.4 million.

On February 14, 2017, short seller investment firm Kerrisdale Capital Management LLC published a negative piece (the "Kerrisdale Report") regarding the Pebble Project, which the Company is attempting to develop. On February 15 and 17, 2017, two purported shareholder class actions were filed against the Company and certain of its current officers and directors in US federal courts, specifically the Central District of California (Los Angeles) and the Southern District of New York (New York City). The cases are captioned: *Diaz v. Northern Dynasty Minerals Ltd. et al, Case No. 17-cv-01241 (C.D. Cal.)* and *Kirwin v. Northern Dynasty Minerals Ltd. et al, Case No. 17-cv-01238 (S.D.N.Y.)*. The complaints appear to rely on the claims made in the Kerrisdale Report and allege damages to a class of investors who purchased shares of the Company prior to the publication of the Kerrisdale Report and allege liability for losses pursuant to Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act of 1934 and SEC Rule 10b-5 thereunder, as well as control person liability against the individual defendants pursuant to Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act. The Company has not yet been served with either of these complaints, but has seen them and assessed their substance. The Company believes that the allegations in these complaints are without merit, and it intends to defend itself vigorously against these actions.



MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2016

Northern Dynasty Minerals Ltd. Management's Discussion And Analysis Year ended December 31, 2016

Table of Contents

1.1	DATE		3
1.2	OVERVI	EW	5
	1.2.1	Pebble Project	8
		1.2.1.1 TECHNICAL INFORMATION	8
		1.2.1.2 LEGAL MATTERS	11
	1.2.3	FINANCINGS	
	1.2.4	Market Trends	19
1.3	SELECTE	ED ANNUAL INFORMATION	20
1.4	SUMMA	ARY AND DISCUSSION OF QUARTERLY RESULTS	20
1.5	RESULT	S OF OPERATIONS	21
1.6	LIQUIDI	тү	23
1.7	Сарітаі	L RESOURCES	24
1.8	OFF-BA	ALANCE SHEET ARRANGEMENTS	24
1.9	TRANSA	ACTIONS WITH RELATED PARTIES	24
1.10	FOURTH	+ Quarter 2016 vs 2015	25
1.11	PROPOS	SED TRANSACTIONS	26
1.12	CRITICA	L ACCOUNTING ESTIMATES	26
1.13	CHANG	ES IN ACCOUNTING POLICIES INCLUDING INITIAL ADOPTION	26
1.14	FINANC	IAL INSTRUMENTS AND OTHER INSTRUMENTS	26
1.15		MD&A REQUIREMENTS	
		DISCLOSURE OF OUTSTANDING SHARE DATA	
		DISCLOSURE CONTROLS AND PROCEDURES	
		MANAGEMENT'S REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING	
		CHANGES IN INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING	
		LIMITATIONS OF CONTROLS AND PROCEDURES	
	1.15.6	RISK FACTORS	30

Year ended December 31, 2016

1.1 Date

This Management's Discussion and Analysis ("MD&A") should be read in conjunction with the audited consolidated financial statements ("Financial Statements") of Northern Dynasty Minerals Ltd. ("Northern Dynasty" or the "Company") for the year ended December 31, 2016 as publicly filed under the Company's profile on SEDAR at www.sedar.com.

The Company reports in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards as issued by the International Accounting Standards Board ("IASB") and interpretations of the IFRS Interpretations Committee (together, "IFRS"). The following disclosure and associated Financial Statements are presented in accordance with IFRS. This MD&A is prepared as of March 28, 2017. All dollar amounts herein are expressed in Canadian dollars, unless otherwise specified.

This MD&A contains certain forward-looking information and forward-looking statements within the meaning of applicable Canadian securities laws and forward-looking statements within the meaning of the United States Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995. Forward-looking statements describe our future plans, strategies, expectations and objectives, and are generally, but not always, identifiable by use of the words "may", "will", "should", "continue", "expect", "anticipate", "estimate", "believe", "intend", "plan" or "project" or the negative of these words or other variations on these words or comparable terminology.

Forward-looking statements contained or incorporated by reference into this MD&A include, without limitation, statements regarding:

- the outcome of our multi-dimensional strategy to address the United States Environmental Protection Agency's ("EPA") pre-emptive regulatory action under Section 404(c) of the Clean Water Act (the "CWA") and our plans to prepare the Pebble Project (as hereinafter defined) to initiate federal and state permitting under the National Environmental Policy Act (the "NEPA") (the "Multi-dimensional Strategy");
- the outcome of the legal and direct discussions, including possible mediation proceedings that we are engaged in with the EPA and any future actions that may or may not be taken by the EPA;
- the outcome of any other legal proceedings in which we are engaged;
- the impact of any change in the administration of the EPA resulting from the new federal administration in Washington, DC;
- our ability to proceed with applications for federal and state permitting under the CWA and the NEPA;
- our expectations regarding the potential for securing the necessary permitting of a mine at the Pebble Project;
- our expected financial performance in future periods;
- our plan of operations, including our plans to carry out and finance the Multi-dimensional Strategy activities, exploration and development activities, legal and direct discussion, and possible mediation proceedings with the EPA;
- our ability to raise capital for the Multi-dimensional Strategy activities, exploration and development activities;
- our expectations regarding the exploration and development potential of the Pebble Project; and
- factors relating to our investment decisions.

Forward-looking information is based on the reasonable assumptions, estimates, analysis and opinions of management made in light of its experience and its perception of trends, current conditions and expected developments, as well as other factors that management believes to be relevant and reasonable in the circumstances at the date that such statements are made, but which may prove to be incorrect. We believe that the assumptions and expectations reflected in such forward-looking information are reasonable.

Key assumptions upon which the Company's forward-looking information are based include:

Year ended December 31, 2016

- that we will be able to secure sufficient capital necessary for the Multi-dimensional Strategy activities,
 the outcome of litigation against and direct discussions, including possible mediation with the EPA,
 continued environmental assessment and permitting activities and engineering work which must be
 completed prior to any potential development of the Pebble Project which would then require
 engineering and financing in order to advance to ultimate construction;
- we will ultimately have the opportunity to proceed with permit application preparations under the CWA and NEPA for the Pebble Project;
- that we will ultimately be able to demonstrate that a mine at the Pebble Project can be developed and
 operated in an environmentally sound and socially responsible manner, meeting all relevant federal,
 state and local regulatory requirements so that we will be ultimately able to obtain permits authorizing
 construction of a mine at the Pebble Project;
- that the market prices of copper, gold, molybdenum and silver will not significantly decline or stay depressed for a lengthy period of time;
- that our key personnel will continue their employment with us; and
- that we will continue to be able to secure minimal adequate financing on acceptable terms.

Readers are cautioned that the foregoing list is not exhaustive of all factors and assumptions which may have been used. Forward looking statements are also subject to risks and uncertainties facing our business, any of which could have a material impact on our outlook.

Some of the risks we face and the uncertainties that could cause actual results to differ materially from those expressed in the forward-looking statements include:

- a negative outcome of the Multi-dimensional Strategy, including legal and political challenges with which we are engaged regarding the Pebble Project, which would have a material adverse effect on us;
- an inability to ultimately obtain permitting for a mine at the Pebble Project;
- an inability to continue to fund the Multi-dimensional Strategy, exploration and development activities and other operating costs;
- the highly cyclical and speculative nature of the mineral resource exploration business;
- the pre-development stage economic viability and technical uncertainties of the Pebble Project and the lack of known reserves on the Pebble Project;
- an inability to recover even the financial statement carrying values of the Pebble Project if we cease to continue on a going concern basis;
- the potential for loss of the services of key executive officers;
- a history of, and expectation of further, financial losses from operations impacting our ability to continue on a going concern basis;
- the volatility of copper, gold, molybdenum and silver prices and mining share prices;
- the inherent risk involved in the exploration, development and production of minerals, and the presence of unknown geological and other physical and environmental hazards at the Pebble Project;
- the potential for changes in, or the introduction of new, government regulations relating to mining, including laws and regulations relating to the protection of the environment and project legal titles;
- potential claims by third parties to titles or rights involving the Pebble Project;
- the possible inability to insure our operations against all risks;
- the highly competitive nature of the mining business;
- the potential equity dilution to current shareholders from future equity financings; and
- that we have never paid dividends and will not do so in the foreseeable future.

While the effort was made to list the primary risk factors, this list should not be considered exhaustive of the factors that may affect any of our forward-looking statements or information. Forward-looking statements or information are statements about the future and are inherently uncertain, and actual achievements of the Company or other future events or conditions may differ materially from those reflected in the forward-looking

Year ended December 31, 2016

statements or information due to a variety of risks, uncertainties and other factors, including, without limitation, the risks and uncertainties described above and otherwise contained herein.

Our forward-looking statements and risk factors are based on the reasonable beliefs, expectations and opinions of management on the date of this MD&A. Although we have attempted to identify important factors that could cause actual results to differ materially from those contained in forward-looking information, there may be other factors that cause results not to be as anticipated, estimated or intended. There is no assurance that such information will prove to be accurate, as actual results and future events could differ materially from those anticipated in such information. Accordingly, readers should appreciate the inherent uncertainty of, and not place undue reliance on forward-looking information. We do not undertake to update any forward-looking information, except as, and to the extent required by, applicable securities laws.

During the period 2007 to 2013, a major part of the project expenditures were on exploration programs, resource estimates, environmental data collection and technical studies, with a significant portion spent on engineering of various possible mine development models, as well as related infrastructure, power and transportation systems. These costs are not reflected in the Company's asset accounts as they were largely incurred by third parties or are required to be expensed. The technical and engineering studies that were completed relating to mine-site and infrastructure development are not considered to be current or necessarily representative of management's current understanding of the most likely development scenario for the Project. Accordingly, the Company is uncertain whether it can realize significant value from this prior work. Environmental baseline studies and data, as well as geological information from exploration, remain important information available to the Company from this period in continuing its advancement of the Project.

For more information on the Company, investors should review the Company's annual information form and home jurisdiction filings that are available on SEDAR at www.sedar.com.

The Company reviews its forward looking statements on an ongoing basis and updates this information when circumstances require it.

Cautionary Note to Investors Concerning Estimates of Measured and Indicated Resources

The following section uses the terms "measured resources" and "indicated resources". The Company advises investors that although those terms are recognized and required by Canadian regulations, the SEC does not recognize them. Investors are cautioned not to assume that all or any part of mineral deposits in these categories will ever be converted into reserves.

Cautionary Note to Investors Concerning Estimates of Inferred Resources

The following section uses the term "inferred resources". The Company advises investors that although this term is recognized and required by Canadian regulations, the SEC does not recognize it. "Inferred resources" have a great amount of uncertainty as to their existence, and as to their economic and legal feasibility. It cannot be assumed that all or any part of a mineral resource will ever be upgraded to a higher category. Under Canadian rules, estimates of inferred mineral resources may not form the basis of economic studies, except in rare cases. Investors are cautioned not to assume that all or any part of an inferred resource exists, or is economically or legally mineable.

1.2 Overview

Northern Dynasty is a mineral exploration company which, via its subsidiaries, holds a 100% interest in mining claims on State of Alaska land in southwest Alaska, USA ("US"). The claims are part of or in the vicinity of the Pebble Copper-Gold-Molybdenum-Silver Project (the "Pebble Project" or "Pebble"). The Company's Alaska mineral resource exploration business is operated through an Alaskan registered

Year ended December 31, 2016

limited partnership, the Pebble Limited Partnership (the "Pebble Partnership"), in which the Company owns a 100% interest.

The Pebble Project is an initiative to develop one of the world's most important mineral resources, as measured by aggregate contained metals. The current estimate of these mineral resources at a 0.30% copper equivalent (CuEQ)¹ cut-off grade comprise:

- 6.44 billion tonnes in the combined Measured and Indicated categories at a grade of 0.40% copper, 0.34 g/t gold, 240 ppm molybdenum and 1.66 g/t silver, containing 57 billion pounds of copper, 70 million ounces of gold, 3.4 billion pounds of molybdenum and 344 million ounces of silver; and
- 4.46 billion tonnes in the Inferred category at a grade of 0.25% copper, 0.26 g/t gold, 222 ppm molybdenum and 1.19 g/t silver, containing 24.5 billion pounds of copper, 37 million ounces of gold, 2.2 billion pounds of molybdenum and 170 million ounces of silver.

Mineralization indicating the presence of the Pebble deposit was discovered by a prior operator in 1987, and by 1997 an initial outline of the deposit had been identified. Northern Dynasty acquired the right to earn an interest in the Pebble property in 2001. Exploration since that time has led to significant expansion of the Pebble deposit, including the discovery of a substantial volume of higher grade mineralization in the eastern part of the deposit. Comprehensive deposit delineation, environmental, socioeconomic and engineering studies of the Pebble deposit began in 2004. A number of other occurrences of copper, gold and molybdenum have also been identified along the extensive northeast-trending mineralized system that underlies the property. The potential of these earlier-stage prospects has not yet been fully explored.

From 2001 when Northern Dynasty's involvement began to December 31, 2016, a total of \$814 million (US\$758 million) has been invested to advance the Pebble Project.²

In February 2014, the US Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") announced the initiation of a preemptive regulatory action under the Clean Water Act ("CWA") to consider restriction or a prohibition on mining activities associated with the Pebble deposit. Much of the Company's efforts since that time have been focused on legal and other initiatives to ward off this action, and ensure the Pebble Project can proceed into normal course permitting unencumbered by any extraordinary development restrictions.

In 2016, work by Northern Dynasty and the Pebble Partnership concentrated on three key activities:

• advancing a Multi-dimensional Strategy, including litigation as described in section 1.2.1.2 below, to address the EPA's pre-emptive regulatory action under Section 404(c) of the CWA;

¹ For additional details, see section 1.2.1 below.

² Of this, approximately \$595 million (US\$573 million) was provided by a wholly-owned subsidiary of Anglo American plc ("Anglo American") which participated in the Pebble Partnership from 2007 to 2013, and the remainder was financed by Northern Dynasty. During the period 2007 to 2013, a major part of the expenditures were on exploration programs, resource estimates, environmental data collection and technical studies, with a significant portion spent on engineering of various possible mine development models, as well as related infrastructure, power and transportation systems. The technical and engineering studies that were completed relating to mine-site and infrastructure development are not considered to be current or necessarily representative of management's current understanding of the most likely development scenario for the Project. Accordingly, the Company is uncertain whether it can realize significant value from this prior work. Environmental baseline studies and data, as well as geological information from exploration, remain important information available to the Company from this period in continuing its advancement of the Project.

Year ended December 31, 2016

- maintaining an active corporate presence in Alaska in order to advance relationships with political and regulatory offices of government, Alaska Native partners and other stakeholder groups; and
- working toward securing a transaction with a potential partner(s) to further advance the Pebble Project.

On October 27, 2016, the Pebble Partnership and the EPA ("the parties") filed a joint Notice in federal court stating their intent to enter into mediation in an effort to resolve ongoing litigation under the Federal Advisory Committee Act ("FACA"), as described in section 1.2.1.2 Legal Matters below. On December 30, 2016, the parties filed a joint Notice in federal court staying the ongoing FACA litigation until March 20, 2017 and, on that date, the parties filed a Joint Motion in federal court to extend a stay of proceedings in ongoing litigation under FACA to May 4, 2017 in the interest of resolving the matter.

The Company has made substantial progress in recent discussions with the EPA and intends to continue negotiating the matter directly, rather than through mediation. Government representatives are actively engaged in these discussions and, along with the Pebble Partnership, are focused on achieving a resolution that will be agreeable to both parties. In the meantime, the Court's Preliminary Injunction of November 25, 2014, will remain in effect for the duration of any stay.

In 2017, the Company plans to:

- continue to advance the Multi-dimensional Strategy to address the EPA's pre-emptive CWA regulatory action with the goal that the Pebble Project will be able to initiate federal and state permitting under the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") unencumbered by any extraordinary development restrictions imposed by the EPA;
- maintain an active corporate presence in Alaska to advance relationships with political and regulatory
 offices of government (both in Alaska and Washington, D.C.), Alaska Native partners and broader
 stakeholder relationships;
- if either the Multi-dimensional Strategy is successful or the EPA changes it position with the result that permit applications can proceed, prepare documentation to initiate federal and state permitting under the CWA and the NEPA. In the event permit applications can proceed, the Company plans to undertake environmental monitoring, engineering and environmental studies, field investigations and related technical studies to finalize a proposed development plan, in order to prepare documentation to initiate federal and state permitting;
- maintain the Pebble Project and Pebble claims in good standing; and
- continue to seek potential partner(s) to further advance the Pebble Project.

The current Multi-dimensional Strategy may be impacted by the change in the leadership of the EPA that was completed in the first quarter of 2017 as a result of the new federal administration in Washington, DC. Through the Pebble Partnership, the Company has had preliminary discussions with certain members of the new administration and believes, based on these discussions and other public statements, that there is a possibility that the new leadership of the EPA will reconsider its position with respect to the EPA's previously proposed pre-emptive action under Section 404(c) of the CWA. This would allow the Pebble Project to proceed with the permitting process. These discussions are, however, not binding and there is no assurance that this change of leadership will result in the EPA reversing its position. In addition, on February 22, 2017, the US House Committee on Science, Space and Technology recommended that the

Year ended December 31, 2016

new EPA Administrator rescind the federal agency's pre-emptive Section 404(c) action. As of the date of this MD&A, there has not yet been a formal response to this recommendation.

At this time, the Pebble Partnership is still planning to remain engaged in direct discussions, including possible mediation with the EPA. There can also be no assurance of the results of the discussion and possible mediation with the EPA. In the event that there is a change in the EPA's position that results in Pebble being able to proceed into the permitting process, it is anticipated that (i) the Multi-dimensional Strategy will change, as the key objective of this strategy will have been met, however, political and stakeholder outreach efforts will continue; (ii) the Pebble Partnership will execute technical studies and prepare documentation to initiate applications for federal and state permitting under the CWA and the NEPA; and (iii) the Company may re-direct some of its efforts on the Multi-dimensional Strategy to these permitting activities. In the event that there is no change in the EPA position, then the Multi-dimensional Strategy and the related discussion and possible mediation proceedings with the EPA will continue. Even if the dealings with the EPA are successful and the permitting process for the Pebble Project commences, there can be no assurance that the permits required to build and operate the Pebble Project will be successfully secured.

Corporate

As at December 31, 2016, the Company has \$7.2 million in cash and cash equivalents for its operating requirements.

Subsequent to December 31, 2016, the Company received US\$37.44 million in a bought deal offering of 20,240,000 common shares at US\$1.85 per common share.

The Company has prioritized the allocation of available financial resources in order to meet key corporate and Pebble Project expenditure requirements for at least the next twelve months. Although the Company will seek financing as necessary to advance its programs, there can be no assurances that it will be successful in obtaining additional financing. If the Company is unable to raise the necessary capital resources to meet obligations as they come due, the Company will at some point have to reduce or curtail its operations.

1.2.1 Pebble Project

1.2.1.1 Technical Information

The Pebble property ("Pebble") is located in southwest Alaska, approximately 17 miles (27 kilometers) from the villages of Iliamna and Newhalen, and approximately 200 miles (320 kilometers) southwest of the city of Anchorage. The property consists of 2,402 mineral claims. Situated approximately 1,000 feet above sea-level and 65 miles (100 kilometers) from tidewater on Cook Inlet, the site conditions are favorable for sound mine site and infrastructure development.

Mineral Resources

The current estimate of the mineral resources in the Pebble deposit, effective date December 2014, is based on drilling to the end of 2013 and includes approximately 59,000 assays obtained from 699 drill holes. The resource was estimated using ordinary kriging by David Gaunt, P.Geo., a qualified person who is not independent of Northern Dynasty. A base case cut-off of 0.3% CuEq is highlighted.

Year ended December 31, 2016

Pebble Project Mineral Resources

Cut-off			Cu	Au	Мо	Ag	Cu	Au	Мо	Ag
CuEq %	CuEq%	Tonnes	(%)	(g/t)	(ppm)	(g/t)	Blbs	Moz	Blbs	Moz
Measured										
0.3	0.65	527,000,000	0.33	0.35	178	1.66	3.83	5.93	0.21	28.13
0.4	0.66	508,000,000	0.34	0.36	180	1.68	3.80	5.88	0.20	27.42
0.6	0.77	279,000,000	0.40	0.42	203	1.84	2.46	3.77	0.12	16.51
1.0	1.16	28,000,000	0.62	0.62	302	2.27	0.38	0.56	0.02	2.04
Indicated										
0.3	0.77	5,912,000,000	0.41	0.34	245	1.66	53.42	64.62	3.20	315.50
0.4	0.82	5,173,000,000	0.45	0.35	260	1.75	51.31	58.21	2.97	291.05
0.6	0.99	3,450,000,000	0.55	0.41	299	1.99	41.82	45.47	2.27	220.71
1.0	1.29	1,411,000,000	0.77	0.51	343	2.42	23.95	23.14	1.07	109.79
Measured -	+ Indicated									
0.3	0.76	6,439,000,000	0.40	0.34	240	1.66	56.76	70.38	3.40	343.63
0.4	0.81	5,681,000,000	0.44	0.35	253	1.75	55.09	63.92	3.17	319.62
0.6	0.97	3,729,000,000	0.54	0.41	291	1.98	44.38	49.15	2.39	237.37
1.0	1.29	1,439,000,000	0.76	0.51	342	2.42	24.11	23.60	1.08	111.97
Inferred										
0.3	0.54	4,460,000,000	0.25	0.26	222	1.19	24.55	37.25	2.18	170.49
0.4	0.68	2,630,000,000	0.33	0.30	266	1.39	19.14	25.38	1.55	117.58
0.6	0.89	1,290,000,000	0.48	0.37	291	1.79	13.66	15.35	0.83	74.28
1.0	1.20	360,000,000	0.69	0.45	377	2.27	5.41	5.14	0.30	25.94

Notes to the above table:

These resource estimates have been prepared in accordance with NI 43-101 and the CIM Definition Standards. Inferred Mineral Resources are considered to be too speculative to allow the application of technical and economic parameters to support mine planning and evaluation of the economic viability of the project. Under Canadian rules, estimates of Inferred Mineral Resources may not form the basis of feasibility or pre-feasibility studies, or economic studies except for Preliminary Economic Assessments as defined under 43-101. It cannot be assumed that all or any part of the Inferred Resources will ever be upgraded to a higher category.

The mineral resource tabulation uses copper equivalency that incorporates the contribution of copper, gold and molybdenum. Although the estimate includes silver, it was not used as part of the copper equivalency calculation in order to facilitate comparison with previous estimates which did not consider the silver content or its potential economic contribution.

Copper equivalent calculations use metal prices of US\$1.85/lb for copper, US\$902/oz for gold and US\$12.50/lb for molybdenum, and recoveries of 85% for copper 69.6% for gold, and 77.8% for molybdenum in the Pebble West zone and 89.3% for copper, 76.8% for gold, 83.7% for molybdenum in the Pebble East zone.

Contained metal calculations are based on 100% recoveries.

A 0.30% CuEQ cut-off is considered to be appropriate for porphyry deposit open pit mining operations in the Americas.

All mineral resource estimates, cut-offs and metallurgical recoveries are subject to change as a consequence of more detailed economic analyses that would be required in pre-feasibility and feasibility studies.

Year ended December 31, 2016

The resource estimate is constrained by a conceptual pit that was developed using a Lerchs-Grossman algorithm and is based on the parameters set out below:

	Parameter	Units	Cost (\$)	Value
Metal Price	Gold	\$/oz	-	1,540.00
	Copper	\$/lb	-	3.63
	Molybdenum	\$/lb	-	12.36
Metal Recovery	Copper	%	-	89
	Gold	%	-	72
	Molybdenum	%	-	82
Operating Cost	Mining (mineralized material or waste)	\$/ton mined	1.01	-
	Added haul lift from depth	\$/ton/bench	0.03	-
	Process			
	 Process cost adjusted by total crushing energy 	\$/ton milled	4.40	-
	- Transportation	\$/ton milled	0.46	-
	– Environmental	\$/ton milled	0.70	-
	– G&A	\$/ton milled	1.18	-
Block Model	Current block model	ft	-	75 x 75 x 50
Density	Mineralized material and waste rock	-	-	Block model
Pit Slope Angles	-	degrees	-	42

Additional details can be found in the technical report, entitled "2014 Technical Report on the Pebble Project, Southwest Alaska, USA," authored by J. David Gaunt, PGeo., James Lang, PGeo., Eric Titley, PGeo., and Ting Lu, PEng., effective date December 31, 2014, which is filed under the Company's profile at www.sedar.com.

Environmental and Socioeconomic

Extensive environmental baseline data has been collected since 2004. The goal is to design and plan a project that protects clean water, healthy fish and wildlife populations, and other natural resources in the region.

In January 2012, the Pebble Partnership publicly released the 27,000-page Environmental Baseline Document ("EBD") for the Pebble Project, which characterizes a broad range of environmental and social conditions in southwest Alaska – including climate, water quality, wetlands, fish and aquatic habitat, wildlife, land and water use, socioeconomics and subsistence activities. The purpose of the EBD is to provide the public, regulatory agencies and the Pebble Partnership with a detailed compendium of predevelopment environmental and socioeconomic conditions in the project area. Research for the Pebble EBD was conducted by more than 40 respected independent research firms, utilizing over 100 scientific experts and engineering groups, laboratories and support services. Researchers were selected for their specific areas of expertise and Alaskan experience, with cooperating government agencies participating in several studies. Information for the EBD was gathered through field studies, laboratory tests, review of government records and other third-party sources, and interviews with Alaska residents. The EBD study is available at http://pebbleresearch.com/. The Pebble Partnership also facilitated a four-day workshop with federal and state regulatory agencies in January 2012 to present the EBD findings. The workshop was broadcast publicly via the Internet. In addition, a series of public presentations of the EBD

Year ended December 31, 2016

findings was coordinated in more than 20 communities throughout southwest Alaska and elsewhere around the State. Public and expert review of the EBD was facilitated under the Keystone initiative³.

The EBD encompasses data from the range of environmental and social conditions described above during the period 2004-2008 and from some disciplines in 2009. Environmental baseline data reports through 2014 are being integrated with the database from the EBD so that this information can be shared with state/federal agencies and the public as part of the future permitting process under NEPA. Environmental monitoring of the site has continued at reduced levels over the past two years.

In March 2017, the Company announced that the Pebble Partnership had selected HDR Alaska, Inc. to serve as lead regulatory and permitting consultant for the Pebble Project, with the goal of preparing necessary documentation to initiate federal and state permitting under the CWA and NEPA by the end of the year, in anticipation of a successful outcome of the Company's Multi-dimensional Strategy to address the EPA's pre-emptive regulatory action under Section 404(c) of the CWA.

Community Engagement

An active program of stakeholder outreach has been undertaken at Pebble, and has included community meetings, stakeholder visits, presentations and event appearances as well as stakeholder tours to the Pebble Project site and to operating mines in the United States and Canada. The focus of these outreach activities is to update stakeholders on the Pebble Project, to receive feedback on stakeholder priorities and concerns and to advise participants about modern mining practices.

Stakeholder outreach and community engagement is ongoing, although at a reduced scale commensurate with other project activities. As the Pebble Project advances toward the completion of a Project Description and preparation for project permitting under NEPA, it is expected that the Pebble Partnership will initiate further stakeholder engagement programs to involve stakeholders in the planning process.

1.2.1.2 Legal Matters

Environmental Protection Agency and Bristol Bay Watershed Assessment

In February 2011, the EPA announced it would undertake a Bristol Bay Watershed Assessment study focusing on the potential effects of large-scale mine development in Bristol Bay and, specifically the Nushagak and Kvichak area drainages. This process was ostensibly initiated in response to calls from persons and groups opposing the Pebble Project for the EPA to pre-emptively use its asserted authority under Section 404(c) of the CWA to prohibit discharges of dredged or fill material in waters of the US within these drainages. However, evidence exists that the EPA may have been considering a Section 404(c) veto of the Pebble Project at least as far back as 2008 – two years before it received a petition from several Alaska Native tribes.

The EPA's first draft Bristol Bay Watershed Assessment ("BBWA") report was released on May 18, 2012. In the Company's opinion after review with its consultants, the draft report is a fundamentally flawed document. By the EPA's own admission, it evaluated the effects of a "hypothetical project" that has neither been defined nor proposed by the Pebble Partnership, and for which key environmental mitigation strategies have not yet been developed and, hence, would not yet be known. It is believed by the Company

³ An independent stakeholder dialogue process concerning the Pebble Project initiated in late 2010 by the Keystone Center – a non-profit organization specializing in facilitating stakeholder-driven consultation processes concerning contentious, science-based issues.

Year ended December 31, 2016

that the assessment was rushed – because it was based on studies conducted over only one year in an area of 20,000 square miles. In comparison, the Pebble Project has studied the ecological and social environment surrounding Pebble for over a decade. The EPA also failed to adequately consider the comprehensive and detailed data that the Pebble Partnership provided as part of its 27,000-page Environmental Baseline Document (further described under Environmental Baseline Studies above).

The EPA called for public comment on the quality and sufficiency of scientific information presented in the draft BBWA report. In response, the Pebble Partnership and Northern Dynasty made submissions on the draft report. Northern Dynasty made a presentation highlighting these shortcomings at public hearings held in Seattle, Washington, on May 31, 2012 and in Anchorage, Alaska, on August 7, 2012. In July 2012, the Company also submitted a 635-page critique of the draft report in response to the EPA's call for public comment, and called upon the EPA to cease such unwarranted actions until such time as a definitive proposal for the development of the Pebble deposit is submitted into the rigorous NEPA permitting process. All submissions prepared by Northern Dynasty and the Pebble Partnership with respect to the EPA's BBWA and CWA 404(c) regulatory action can be found on Northern Dynasty's website.

Concerns about the reasonableness of the basis of risk assessment in the draft EPA report were stated by many of the independent experts on the peer review panel assembled to review the BBWA, as summarized, in a report entitled *External Peer Review of EPA's Draft Document: An Assessment of Potential Mining Impacts on Salmon Ecosystems of Bristol Bay, Alaska* released in November 2012. In a wide-ranging critique of the draft report's methodology and findings, many peer review panellists called the EPA's effort to evaluate the effects of a "hypothetical mining scenario" on the water, fish, wildlife and cultural resources of Southwest Alaska "inadequate", "premature", "unreasonable", "suspect" and "misleading". A list of these peer review documents can be found on the Company's website.

On April 26, 2013, the EPA released a revised draft of the BBWA report and announced another public comment and Peer Review period. The Pebble Partnership and Northern Dynasty made submissions on the revised draft. In late May 2013, Northern Dynasty filed a 205-page submission which describes the same major shortcomings as the original report published in May 2012.

In mid-January 2014, the EPA released the final version of its BBWA. The report still reflects many of the same fundamental shortcomings as previous drafts.

On February 28, 2014, the EPA announced the initiation of a pre-emptive regulatory action under Section 404(c) of the CWA to consider restriction or a prohibition on mining activities associated with the Pebble deposit in order to protect aquatic resources in southwest Alaska. In late April 2014, the Pebble Partnership submitted a comprehensive response to the EPA's February 28, 2014 notification letter.

Preliminary Injunction

In late May 2014, the Pebble Partnership filed suit in the US District Court for Alaska and sought an injunction to halt the pre-emptive regulatory action initiated by the EPA under the CWA, asserting that, in the absence of a permit application, the action exceeds the federal agency's statutory authority and violates the Alaska Statehood Act among other federal laws. The State of Alaska and Alaska Peninsula Corporation, an Alaska Native village corporation with extensive land holdings in the Pebble Project area, later joined in the Pebble Partnership's lawsuit against the EPA as co-plaintiffs. On September 26, 2014, a US federal court in Alaska granted the EPA's motion to dismiss the case. This ruling did not judge the merits of the statutory authority case, it only deferred that hearing and judgment until after a final Section 404(c) determination has been made by the EPA. If or when the EPA action is deemed "final", the Pebble Partnership will pursue the underlying case. The Company also appealed the decision to grant the motion to dismiss to the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals. This appeal was denied in May 2015. The Pebble

Year ended December 31, 2016

Partnership still holds the option to pursue its statutory authority case in the instance that EPA finalizes a pre-emptive regulatory action under the CWA.

Proposed Determination

On July 18, 2014, EPA Region 10 announced a "Proposed Determination" to restrict the discharge of dredged or fill material associated with mining the Pebble deposit in a 268 square mile area should that disposal result in any of the following: loss of five or more miles of streams with documented salmon occurrence; loss of 19 or more miles of streams where salmon are not documented but that are tributaries of streams with documented salmon occurrence; the loss of 1,100 or more acres of wetlands, lakes, and ponds that connect with streams with documented salmon occurrence or tributaries of those streams; and stream flow alterations greater than 20 percent of daily flow in nine or more linear miles of streams with documented salmon occurrence. Northern Dynasty management does not accept that the EPA has the statutory authority to impose conditions on development at Pebble, or any development project anywhere in Alaska or the US, prior to the formal submission of a development plan and its thorough review by federal and state agencies including development of an Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") and review under NEPA.

On September 19, 2014, the Pebble Partnership submitted a comprehensive legal and technical response to EPA Region 10's Proposed Determination. Northern Dynasty and the Pebble Partnership believe the Proposed Determination is flawed and unsupported by the administrative record as established by the Bristol Bay Watershed Assessment, and is therefore arbitrary and capricious.

Federal Advisory Committee Act ("FACA") action

On September 3, 2014, the Pebble Partnership initiated a second action against EPA in federal district court in Alaska charging that EPA violated the FACA due to its close interactions with, and the undue influence of Environmental Non-Governmental Organizations and anti-mining activists in developing the BBWA, and with respect to its unprecedented pre-emptive regulatory action under the CWA. On September 24, 2014, the US federal court judge in Alaska released an order recognizing that the EPA agreed not to take the next step to advance its 404(c) regulatory action with respect to southwest Alaska's Pebble Project until at least January 2, 2015.

On November 24, 2014, a US federal court judge in Alaska granted the Pebble Partnership's request for a preliminary injunction in relation to the FACA case. While the preliminary injunction does not resolve the Pebble Partnership's claims that the EPA actions with respect to the BBWA and subsequent 404(c) regulatory action violated FACA, the decision permits the further discovery process of the underlying facts to enable the court to issue a final decision on the merits of the FACA case. Granting of a preliminary injunction also reflects the court's view that PLP has a likelihood of prevailing on the merits of its case. On June 4, 2015, the federal court in Alaska issued an order denying the EPA's motion to dismiss this case.

The Pebble Partnership has filed numerous requests for production of documents and has received tens of thousands of documents produced by the EPA. The Pebble Partnership has also served a number of notices of depositions for current and former EPA employees, EPA contractors and relevant third parties. More than a dozen depositions of EPA witnesses have been completed. Additionally, the Pebble Partnership has asked the Court to compel the Agency and certain third parties to produce documents that are relevant to its FACA claims and that are being improperly withheld. Should the Pebble Partnership prevail in its FACA litigation against the EPA, the federal agency may be unable to rely upon the BBWA as part of the administrative record for any regulatory action at the Pebble Project.

Year ended December 31, 2016

Mediation

On October 27, 2016, the Pebble Partnership and the EPA filed a joint Notice in federal court stating their intent to enter into mediation in an effort to resolve ongoing litigation under FACA.

On December 30, 2016, the Pebble Partnership and the EPA filed a joint Notice in federal court staying the ongoing FACA litigation until March 20, 2017 and, on that date, the parties filed a Joint Motion in federal court to extend a stay of proceedings in ongoing litigation under FACA to May 4, 2017 in the interest of resolving the matter.

To date, no mediator has been appointed in these mediation proceedings as the Company has made substantial progress in recent direct discussions with the EPA and intends to continue negotiating the matter directly, rather than through mediation. Government representatives are actively engaged in these discussions and, along with the Pebble Partnership, are focused on achieving a resolution that will be agreeable to both parties. In the meantime, the Court's Preliminary Injunction of November 25, 2014, will remain in effect for the duration of any stay.

Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA") action

On October 14, 2014, the Pebble Partnership filed suit in federal district court in Alaska charging that EPA has violated the FOIA by improperly withholding documents related to the Pebble Project, the Bristol Bay Watershed Assessment and consideration of a pre-emptive 404(c) veto under the CWA. The EPA moved for summary judgment claiming that its search for and disclosure of documents was adequate. The Pebble Partnership opposed the government's motion, pointing out several deficiencies in the EPA's search parameters and the agency's overly broad assertion of the deliberative process privilege to withhold documents. On August 24, 2015, the US federal court judge granted in part and deferred in part the EPA's motion for summary judgement on the FOIA litigation. The court accepted the EPA's position that it had made an adequate search for documents but left the matter open should the EPA not meet its obligations in the FACA litigation or if additional documents surface. Additionally, the judge ordered EPA to produce a sample of 183 partially or fully withheld documents so that it could conduct an in-camera review of the sample and test the merits of EPA's withholdings under the deliberative process privilege. Before producing this sample to the Court, EPA chose to voluntarily release 115 documents (or 63% of the sample ordered by the Court), relinquishing its claim of privilege as to these documents.

In briefings before the Court, the Pebble Partnership argued that the voluntary release of 63% of the agency's same documents conclusively demonstrated that the EPA had been over broad in its assertion of the deliberative process privilege, particularly because the content of the voluntarily released documents was not in fact deliberative. The Court agreed, finding that EPA "improperly withheld documents in full," and that "many of the documents that defendant released should have been released to begin with because the portions that defendant released were not deliberative." It then ordered the EPA to review an additional 65 documents. Of these 65 documents, the EPA voluntarily released 55 documents in whole or in part (or 85% of the documents). Given the EPA's high rate of release, the Pebble Partnership submitted a brief to the Court arguing that the EPA should be forced to review the remaining documents being withheld and arguing that judgment should not be granted to the agency at this time. The Court agreed, concluding that it had "no confidence that [EPA] has properly withheld documents, either in full or in part, pursuant to the deliberative process privilege." The Court reiterated its earlier finding that EPA had been withholding documents that "should never have been withheld to begin with." As a result, the Court ordered the Agency to re-evaluate all remaining documents EPA is withholding in response to the Pebble Partnership's January 2014 FOIA request and to submit these documents for in-camera review. After this review, the Court issued an order resolving Pebble's challenges to the remaining withholdings and forcing EPA, yet again, to produce additional documents that the agency had been improperly withholding for over two years.

Year ended December 31, 2016

Office of the EPA Inspector General ("OIG") review

Counsel for Northern Dynasty and the Pebble Partnership has submitted numerous letters to the independent OIG since January 2014, raising concerns of apprehension of bias, process irregularities and undue influence by environmental organizations in the EPA's preparation of the Bristol Bay Watershed Assessment. In response to Congressional and other requests, on May 2, 2014, the OIG announced that it would investigate the EPA's conduct in preparing *An Assessment of Potential Mining Impacts on Salmon Ecosystems of Bristol Bay, Alaska*, "to determine whether the EPA adhered to laws, regulations, policies and procedures in developing its assessment of potential mining impacts in Bristol Bay, Alaska." On January 13, 2016, the OIG published its report (the "OIG Report"). While acknowledging significant "scope limitations" in its review and subsequent OIG Report, the OIG concluded that: "we found no evidence of bias in how the EPA conducted its assessment of the Bristol Bay watershed, or that the EPA predetermined the assessment outcome," but that an EPA Region 10 employee may have been guilty of "a possible misuse of position."

Several other investigations of EPA conduct at Pebble contradict the OIG Report. The US Congress' House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform found "that EPA employees had inappropriate contact with outside groups and failed to conduct an impartial, fact-based review of the proposed Pebble mine." In addition, a report by former United States Senator and Defense Secretary William S. Cohen and his firm (further described below), said their investigation "raise(s) serious concerns as to whether EPA orchestrated the process to reach a pre-determined outcome; had inappropriately close relationships with anti-mine advocates; and was candid about its decision-making process."

The findings of the OIG Report are not expected to materially affect the Pebble Partnership's strategy for addressing the EPA's CWA Section 404(c) regulatory action. The Company remains confident that the Pebble Project will ultimately enter federal and state permitting unencumbered by any extraordinary development restrictions.

Cohen report

In March 2015, William Cohen and his firm, The Cohen Group, assisted by the law firm DLA Piper, was retained by the Pebble Partnership to conduct an independent review of whether the EPA acted fairly in connection with its evaluation of potential mining in the Bristol Bay watershed. Secretary Cohen was requested to evaluate the fairness of EPA's actions and decisions in this matter based upon a thorough assessment of the facts and relying on his experience as a senior government official, as well as his 24 years as a member of the US Senate and House of Representatives.

A team of independent investigators employed by The Cohen Group and DLA Piper reviewed thousands of documents secured through FOIA requests and interviewed approximately 60 individuals involved with the EPA or its review of the Pebble Project. On October 6, 2015, Mr. Cohen released his report entitled Report of an Independent Review of the United States Environmental Protection Agency's Actions in Connection with its Evaluation of Potential Mining in Alaska's Bristol Bay Watershed. The report stated the conclusion of Mr. Cohen that he did not believe the EPA used the "fairest and most appropriate process" in its proposed pre-emptive regulatory action under the CWA.

Mr. Cohen urged policymakers to require that the permitting process under NEPA and the regulations developed by the Council on Environmental Quality (the "Permit/NEPA Process") be followed. Mr. Cohen commented that the Permit/NEPA Process is more comprehensive than the pre-emptive Section 404(c) action employed by the EPA and he could find no valid reason why that process was not used.

The Cohen report also raised a number of concerns about the EPA's Bristol Bay Watershed Assessment study and the CWA Section 404(c) regulatory action, including possible prejudice and pre-determination

Year ended December 31, 2016

of outcomes by the EPA, inappropriately close relationships between certain EPA officials and anti-mine advocates, EPA's candor with respect to certain actions it took, lack of consistency between the BBWA and the proposed determination, and lack of cooperation by EPA personnel with respect to Congressional queries and FOIA requests.

Northern Dynasty does not consider the Cohen report to constitute an "expert's" report but rather considers it to constitute an informed view of the Company's treatment by the EPA expressed by a person familiar with governmental due process goals. Mr. Cohen has appeared before a Congressional committee (House Committee on Science, Space and Technology) with respect to the findings in his report.

US House Committee on Science, Space and Technology

On February 22, 2017, the US House Committee on Science, Space and Technology Chairman, Lamar Smith, sent a letter to the EPA Administrator Scott Pruit recommending that "the incoming Administration rescind the EPA's proposed determination to use Section 404(c) in a pre-emptive fashion for the Pebble Mine in Bristol Bay, Alaska. This simple action will allow a return to the long-established Clean Water Act permitting process and stop attempts by the EPA to improperly expand its authority. Moreover, it will create regulatory certainty for future development projects that will create jobs and contribute to the American economy."

Multi-dimensional Strategy

In summary, in 2016 the Pebble Partnership has advanced a Multi-dimensional Strategy to address the EPA's pre-emptive regulatory action under Section 404(c) of the CWA. The goal is to position the Pebble Project to initiate federal and state permitting under NEPA unencumbered by any extraordinary development restrictions imposed by the federal agency. This strategy includes three discrete pieces of litigation against the EPA, including:

- challenging the EPA's statutory authority to pre-emptively impose development restrictions at the Pebble Project under Section 404(c) of the CWA prior to the Pebble Partnership submitting a proposed development plan for the project or the development of an EIS under NEPA;
- alleging that the EPA violated FACA in the course of undertaking the Bristol Bay Watershed Assessment and subsequent Section 404(c) of the CWA regulatory action; and
- alleging that the EPA is unlawfully withholding relevant documentation and other information sought by the Pebble Partnership under FOIA.

In 2017, the Company intends to continue with the Multi-dimensional Strategy and the Pebble Partnership plans to engage in direct discussion, including possible mediation with the EPA. There can be no assurance of the results of the discussion and possible mediation with the EPA. Even if the dealings with the EPA are successful and the permitting process for the Pebble Project commences, there can be no assurance that the permits required to build and operate the Pebble Project will be successfully secured.

Northern Dynasty and the Pebble Partnership are represented by respected international law firm Steptoe & Johnson LLP ("Steptoe"), which for more than seven decades has been acknowledged as a leader in litigation and advocacy in Washington DC. Steptoe and the Pebble Partnership have agreed to cap legal fees related to the FACA suit and other ongoing legal matters at US\$1 million to the point at which motions for summary judgment in the case have been fully argued to the court and are ripe for adjudication, expected to be in 2017. Steptoe will be due a success fee payment upon prevailing in the FACA litigation or arising from other positive outcomes (see section 1.6 for estimate of success fees payable as at December 31, 2016).

Year ended December 31, 2016

Other Matters

On February 14, 2017, short seller investment firm Kerrisdale Capital Management LLC published a negative piece (the "Kerrisdale Report") regarding the Pebble Project, which the Company is attempting to develop. On February 15 and 17, 2017, two purported shareholder class actions were filed against the Company and certain of its current officers and directors in US federal courts, specifically the Central District of California (Los Angeles) and the Southern District of New York (New York City). The cases are captioned: Diaz v. Northern Dynasty Minerals Ltd. et al, Case No. 17-cv-01241 (C.D. Cal.) and Kirwin v. Northern Dynasty Minerals Ltd. et al, Case No. 17-cv-01238 (S.D.N.Y.). The complaints appear to rely on the claims made in the Kerrisdale Report and allege damages to a class of investors who purchased shares of the Company prior to the publication of the Kerrisdale Report and allege liability for losses pursuant to Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act of 1934 and SEC Rule 10b-5 thereunder, as well as control person liability against the individual defendants pursuant to Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act. The Company has not yet been served with either of these complaints, but has seen them and assessed their substance. The Company believes that the allegations in these complaints are without merit, and it intends to defend itself vigorously against these actions.

Kerrisdale is not a mining company and does not disclose any record of success in mining investments or issuing mining valuation or investment reports. On the contrary, Kerrisdale has a track record of aggressive short selling and activism. In contrast, Northern Dynasty's Pebble team has extensive experience in mining and a formidable track record of success in developing and operating mines internationally. The Kerrisdale Report relies on anonymous co-authors whose mining credentials, if any, Kerrisdale has not disclosed and who likewise may hold or have held short positions in Northern Dynasty. Specifically, Kerrisdale has not disclosed if these anonymous authors have any requisite technical qualifications or practical mining experience to substantiate the claims of the short report. In contrast, Northern Dynasty publicly files technical reports which have been certified by named, independent, experienced and reputable Qualified Persons (as defined by securities laws) who have certified the accuracy and completeness of these reports. An internationally recognized engineering firm conducted and compiled an extensive and independent Preliminary Assessment (also referred to as a Preliminary Economic Assessment, or "PEA") of the Pebble Project on behalf of Northern Dynasty. This PEA, published in 2011, showed the project possesses significant value. While the analyses of this assessment now require updating, it remains a source of much useful information and is available for download at www.sedar.com. The PEA shows the large mineral endowment and potential of the Pebble Project. The Kerrisdale's short report purports to develop a zero value thesis without requesting or having had access to the necessary and extensive technical, analytical, geological and economic information that Northern Dynasty's Qualified Persons used. No Kerrisdale personnel have visited the Pebble Project or had discussions with Northern Dynasty's technical team or executives.

For further information, refer to the Company's Annual Information Form for the year ended December 31, 2016 which is filed on www.sedar.com.

1.2.3 Financings

\$17.1 Million Prospectus Financing

In June 2016, Northern Dynasty completed a prospectus offering of 38,000,000 units of the Company at a price of \$0.45 per unit (the "Offering") for gross proceeds to the Company of approximately \$17.1 million. Each Unit consists of one common share (a "Share ") and one common share purchase warrant (a "Warrant"). Each Warrant will be exercisable into one common share (a "Warrant Share") at an exercise price of \$0.65 per Warrant Share for a period of five (5) years from the closing of the Offering. On the closing date, the Warrants were listed for trading on the TSX under the symbol NDM.WT.B.

Year ended December 31, 2016

In Canada, the Offering was qualified by the Company's short form base shelf prospectus dated March 7, 2016 and the Company's prospectus supplement dated May 26, 2016, as filed by the Company with the Canadian securities regulatory authorities in the Provinces of British Columbia, Alberta and Ontario.

The Units were offered in the US pursuant to a base shelf prospectus contained in the Company's registration statement on Form F-3 (the "Registration Statement") filed by the Company with the US Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission") under the *United States Securities Act* of 1933, as amended (the "US Securities Act"). The Registration Statement was declared effective by the Commission on March 30, 2016. On March 31, 2016, the Company filed with the Commission pursuant to Rule 424(b) under the US Securities Act the base prospectus related to the Registration Statement (the "US Base Prospectus"). On May 26, 2016, the Company filed with the Commission pursuant to Rule 424(b) under the US Securities Act a prospectus supplement relating to the Shares and Warrants. On July 15, 2016, the Company filed with the Commission pursuant to Rule 424(b) under the US Securities Act a prospectus supplement relating to the additional Shares that may be issued should the Warrants held by US investors be exercised.

The net proceeds of the Offering were to fund the Company's Multi-dimensional Strategy to address the EPA's proposed pre-emptive regulatory action under the CWA, prepare the Pebble Project to initiate federal and state permitting under NEPA, keep the project in good standing, advance a potential partner(s) transaction and for working capital and general corporate purposes.

\$2 Million Private Placement

In July 2016, the Company completed a private placement of 4,444,376 units in the capital of the Company, each comprising of one share and one share purchase warrant, at a price of \$0.45 per unit for gross proceeds of approximately \$2 million. Each share purchase warrant is exercisable into one common share of the Company at the exercise price of \$0.65 per share until June 10, 2021. The shares and warrants were subject to applicable resale restrictions, including a four month hold under Canadian legislation. Following a four-month hold period, the warrants were listed for trading under the symbol NDM.WT.B.

The proceeds are to be used for working capital purposes.

US\$37.44 Million Bought Deal

In January 2017, the Company completed a bought deal offering of 20,240,000 common shares at a price of US\$1.85 per unit for gross proceeds of approximately US\$37.44 million. The offering was made through a syndicate of underwriters co-led by Cantor Fitzgerald Canada Corporation, TD Securities Inc. and BMO Capital Markets.

The net proceeds are to be used for (i) advancement of the Company's Multi-dimensional Strategy to address the pre-emptive regulatory action of the EPA under Section 404 (c) of the CWA; (ii) to prepare the Pebble Project for the initiation of federal and state permitting under NEPA; (iii) environmental monitoring, engineering and environmental studies, field investigations and related technical studies to finalize a proposed development plan for the Pebble Project, (iv) enhanced outreach and engagement with political and regulatory offices in the Alaska state and U.S. federal government and among Alaska Native partners and broader regional and state-wide stakeholder groups, (v) Alaskan corporate, tenure and site maintenance, (vi) general corporate purposes, and (vii) working capital requirements.

Year ended December 31, 2016

1.2.4 Market Trends

Copper prices have been variable since late 2011 and averaged lower in 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015. Prices were variable to improving for most of 2016, then began an uptrend late in the year that has, largely, been sustained so far in 2017. The recent trend is related to current and expected disruptions in some production as well as the potential for new demand, for example, from infrastructure development in the US. The recent closing price is US\$2.62/lb.

The gold price was on an uptrend over several years to 2012, then decreased in 2013. Prices were variable in 2014 and 2015, and the average annual prices decreased. Gold prices trended upward for most of 2016, with some variability from October to December which has continued in 2017. The recent closing price is US\$1,257/oz.

Following increases in 2010 and 2011, molybdenum prices were variable and weakening in 2012 and 2013. Prices increased from January to August 2014, then largely decreased over the next 18 months to the end of 2015. Prices improved in the first half of 2016, then dropped slightly and have, largely, been flat since that time, with a recent price of US\$6.92/lb.

Silver prices ranged from \$26/oz and \$35/oz between October 2011 and the end of 2012, then trended downward in 2013. Prices were variable in 2014 and 2015, with the average annual prices decreasing in both years. Prices were variable to increasing during most of 2016, then variable to decreasing late in the year. In 2017, silver prices have been variable to increasing, with a recent price of US\$17.94/oz.

Average annual prices of copper, gold, molybdenum and silver for the past five years as well as the average prices so far in 2017 are shown in the table below:

	Average metal price ¹							
Year	Copper US\$/lb	Gold US\$/oz	Molybdenum US\$/lb	Silver US\$/oz				
2012	3.61	1,669	12.81	31.16				
2013	3.32	1,410	10.40	23.80				
2014	3.14	1,276	11.91	19.08				
2015	2.49	1,160	6.73	15.68				
2016	2.21	1,251	6.56	17.14				
2017 (to the date of this MD&A)	2.64	1,218	6.92	17.39				

1. Source: LME Official Cash Price as provided at www.metalprices.com

Year ended December 31, 2016

1.3 Selected Annual Information

The following selected annual information is from the audited consolidated financial statements which have been prepared in accordance with IFRS. Unless otherwise stated, all monetary amounts are expressed in thousands of Canadian dollars except per share amounts, which are expressed in Canadian dollars.

	Fiscal year	Fiscal year		Fiscal year
	2016		2015	2014
				\$
Total assets	\$ 150,347	\$	157,704	135,510
				\$
Total non-current liabilities (non-financial)	\$ _	\$	_	1,514
Total current liabilities	\$ 1,500	\$	2,724	\$ 6,033
				\$
Exploration and evaluation expenses	\$ 7,935	\$	8,718	12,877
General and administrative expenses	6,729		8,272	9,059
Legal, accounting and audit	9,442		17,001	8,325
Share-based compensation	2,995		903	3,877
Other items ⁽ⁱ⁾	(119)		(1,065)	(2,791)
				\$
Loss for the year	\$ 26,982	\$	33,829	31,347
Basic and diluted loss per common share	\$ 0.11	\$	0.23	\$ 0.33
Weighted average number of common shares outstanding ('000')	246,161		146,313	95,009

Notes

1.4 Summary and Discussion of Quarterly Results

All monetary amounts are expressed in thousands of dollars except per share amounts and where otherwise indicated. Minor differences are due to rounding.

Excerpts from Statements of Comprehensive Loss (Income)	Dec 31 2016	Sep 30 2016	Jun 30 2016	Mar 31 2016	Dec 31 2015	Sep 30 2015	Jun 30 2015	Mar 31 2015
Expenses								
Exploration and evaluation	\$ 2,610	\$ 2,006	\$ 1,294	\$ 2,025	\$ 3,374	\$1,786	\$ 1,484	\$ 2,074
General and administrative ¹	1,311	1,444	1,844	2,130	1,813	3,076	1,567	1,816
Legal, accounting and audit ²	984	1,286	3,318	3,854	6,379	4,452	2,922	3,248
Share-based compensation	714	1,939	186	156	469	33	41	360
Other items ³	(95)	(68)	(54)	98	373	50	(236)	(1,252)
Loss for the quarter	\$ 5,524	\$ 6,607	\$ 6,588	\$ 8,263	\$ 12,408	\$ 9,397	\$ 5,778	\$ 6,246
Basic and diluted loss per common share Weighted average number	\$ 0.02	\$ 0.02	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.07	\$ 0.07	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.05
of common shares (000s)	266,767	264,622	230,920	222,106	181,339	137,173	130,973	130,082

- 1. The Company did not accrue or pay CEO, CFO and directors' fees in Q1 and Q2 of 2015.
- 2. Primarily, legal costs incurred by the Group in response to the EPA's activities surrounding the Pebble Project.

⁽i) Other items include interest income and expense, exchange gain or loss, other income, amounts written off and deferred income tax.

Year ended December 31, 2016

3. Other items include interest income and expense, exchange gain or loss, gain or loss on disposal of financial assets and plant and equipment and deferred income tax (recovery) expense.

Discussion of Quarterly Trends

Exploration and evaluation expenses ("E&E") have trended down other than in Q4 2016 and Q4 2015 as the Company paid annual claim fees. E&E includes costs for Native community engagement, select environmental monitoring programs, annual fees for claims (paid in Q4 each year), site leases, land access agreements and technical studies undertaken.

General and administrative expenses ("G&A") have fluctuated based on the level of corporate and financing activities undertaken. G&A has averaged approximately \$1.8 million per quarter over the period, with the exception of Q3 2015, when G&A increased mainly due to the recognition of arrear CEO, CFO and directors' fees and a 2014 bonus commitment.

Legal, accounting and audit expenses are comprised primarily of legal costs incurred by the Group in response to the EPA's activities surrounding the Pebble Project and have fluctuated in line with ongoing activities to advance the Company's Multi-dimensional Strategy to address the EPA's pre-emptive regulatory action as discussed in Section 1.2.1.2 Legal Matters.

Share-based compensation expense ("SBC") has fluctuated due to the timing and quantum of share purchase option ("option") grants and the vesting periods associated with these grants. Grants of options occurred in Q3 2016 (6,206,000 options) and Q4 2015 (3,657,500 options). In Q3 2016 SBC was also impacted by the grant of 639,031 restricted share units ("RSUs") and 458,129 deferred share units ("DSUs").

1.5 Results of Operations

The following financial data has been prepared from the Financial Statements for the year ended December 31, 2016, and is expressed in thousands of Canadian dollars unless otherwise stated.

The Company's operations and business are not driven by seasonal trends, but rather are driven towards the achievement of project milestones relating to the Pebble Project such as the achievement of various technical, environmental, socio-economic and legal objectives, including obtaining the necessary permits, the completion of pre-feasibility and final feasibility studies, preparation of engineering designs, as well as receipt of financings to fund these objectives along with mine construction.

1.5.1 Results of Operations for the Year Ended December 31, 2016 vs. 2015

The Company recorded a decrease in loss of approximately \$6.8 million due primarily to the decrease in legal, accounting and audit expenses of approximately \$7.6 million and G&A of approximately \$1.5 million which was offset by an increase in SBC of approximately \$2.1 million.

E&E comprised mainly of the following for the year as compared to 2015, expressed in thousands of dollars:

E&E	2016	2015
Engineering	\$ 282	\$ 224
Environmental	732	907
Site activities	1,298	2,176
Socio-economic	4,186	3,963

Year ended December 31, 2016

Property fees and assessments	1,351	1,276
Other activities and travel	86	 172
Total	\$ 7,935	\$ 8,718

E&E was approximately \$0.8 million lower than 2015 due largely to the reduction in costs relating to environmental and site activities as both were impacted by demobilization and remediation activities in 2015. The Company's incurred higher socio-economic costs relating to maintaining relationships with political and regulatory offices of government, Alaska Native partners and other stakeholder groups, increased marginally by approximately \$0.2 million. Annual rental fees for the Pebble claims also increased from 2015 as some claims fell into a new fee category due to age of the claims.

The following table provides a breakdown of G&A, and legal, accounting and audit expenses incurred in the year as compared to 2015, expressed in thousands of dollars:

	2016	2015
Conference and travel	\$ 366	\$ 369
Consulting	388	232
Insurance	417	398
Office costs, including information technology	875	1,188
Management and administration	3,842	5,009
Shareholder communication	634	759
Trust and filing	207	317
Total G&A	6,729	8,272
Legal, accounting and audit	9,442	17,001
	\$ 16,171	\$ 25,273

G&A decreased by approximately \$1.5 million due primarily to a decrease in management and administration costs. In 2016, certain of the director fees were paid through the issue of DSUs and RSUs, the cost of which is included in SBC (see below). In 2015, the Company paid a 2014 bonus commitment. The Company however paid additional consulting fees relating to advice on various corporate matters. Legal, accounting and audit costs decreased by \$7.6 million as legal fees incurred were lower than in 2015 and the Company had entered into a fixed fee arrangement with Steptoe (refer 1.2.1.2 Legal Matters).

SBC has fluctuated due to the timing and quantum of share purchase option grants and the vesting periods associated with these grants. SBC increased by \$2.1 million in the year as the Company granted 6,206,000 options in July 2016. In 2015, 3,657,500 options were granted in October of that year. For each grant, the vesting terms are: one-third on grant date, one-third in 12 months and one-third in 24 months. SBC was also impacted by the SBC on the 639,031 RSUs issued to the Chairman, CEO and CFO (which vest in 12 months) and SBC on 458,129 DSUs issued to non-executive directors (2015 – no DSUs or RSUs were issued).

1.5.2 Financial position as at December 31, 2016 vs. December 31, 2015

The total assets of the Company decreased by \$7.4 million due in large part to the appreciation in the Canadian dollar versus the US dollar which resulted in a \$4.6 million decrease in the value of the Company's mineral property, plant and equipment when translated to the Company's reporting currency. As well, the Company sold its available-for-sale financial assets (refer 1.6 Liquidity).

Year ended December 31, 2016

1.6 Liquidity

The Company's major sources of funding has been the issuance of equity securities for cash, primarily through private placements and prospectus offerings to sophisticated investors and institutions, the issue of common shares pursuant to the exercise of share purchase options and most recently through the exercise of warrants. The Company has also acquired companies in 2015 whose primary assets were cash and equivalents through the issuance of equity securities. The Company's access to financing is always uncertain. There can be no assurance of continued access to significant equity funding.

As at December 31, 2016, the Company's cash and cash equivalents were approximately \$7.2 million, a decrease of approximately \$0.3 million from December 31, 2015. In 2016, the Company completed financings for gross proceeds of approximately \$19.1 million (refer 1.2.3 Financings), raised approximately \$1.8 million from the sale of its available-for-sale financial assets (being shares in a listed entity which the Company received on the acquisition of Mission Gold Ltd. in 2015), received approximately \$3.4 million from the exercise of warrants, received approximately \$0.6 million from the exercise of options and employed approximately \$24.0 million in its operating activities. Subsequent to the reporting date, the Company completed a bought deal financing and raised gross proceeds of approximately US\$37.4 m (refer 1.2.3 Financings). Accordingly, the Company has prioritized the allocation of its available financial resources (cash at year end and funds from the forementioned financing) in order to meet key corporate and Pebble Project expenditure requirements for at least the next twelve months (refer 1.2 *Overview* and the Company's plans for 2017). Additional financing will be required to pursue any material expenditures at the Pebble Project beyond 2017. There can be no assurances that the Company will be successful in obtaining additional financing at that point. If the Company is unable to raise the necessary capital resources to meet obligations as they come due, the Company will at some point have to reduce or curtail its operations.

At December 31, 2016, the Company had working capital of approximately \$6.4 million as compared to \$7.9 million at December 31, 2015. The Company has no long term debt, capital lease obligations, operating leases or any other long term obligations other than those disclosed below:

The following commitments and payables (expressed in thousands) existed at December 31, 2016:

	 Payments due by period as of the reporting da								
	 Total	:	≤ 1 year	1-	5 years	> 5	years		
Trade and other payables	\$ 1,260	\$	1,260	\$	_	\$	_		
Payables to related parties	240		240		_		_		
Lease commitments	695		193		502		_		
Total	\$ 2,195	\$	1,693	\$	502	\$	_		

The Company, through the Pebble Partnership, is advancing its Multi-dimensional Strategy to address the EPA's pre-emptive regulatory action under Section 404(c) of the CWA, including through litigation against the EPA, contesting the EPA's statutory authority to act pre-emptively under the CWA, and alleging violation of FACA and the unlawful withholding of documentation under FOIA. The Company has a contingent liability for additional legal fees and costs that may be due to the Company's counsel should there be a successful outcome or settlement. However, the Company is unable to estimate or determine the length of time that each of the legal initiatives mentioned above will take to advance to specific milestone events or final conclusion. As of the reporting date of the Financial Statements, if there was a favourable outcome or settlement, the Company estimates there would potentially be additional legal fees of approximately \$20.2 million (US\$15.1 million at closing Bank of Canada rate on December 31, 2016, of \$1.3427 per US\$1) payable by the Company which would be payable in three equal tranches over three years.

Year ended December 31, 2016

The Company has no "Purchase Obligations", defined as any agreement to purchase goods or services that is enforceable and legally binding on the Company that specifies all significant terms, including: fixed or minimum quantities to be purchased; fixed, minimum or variable price provisions; and the approximate timing of the transaction. The Company is responsible for maintenance payments on the Pebble Project claims and routine site and office leases (included in table above).

1.7 Capital Resources

The Company's capital resources consist of its cash reserves. As of December 31, 2016, the Company had no long term debt or commitments for material capital expenditures.

The Company has no lines of credit or other sources of financing.

1.8 Off-Balance Sheet Arrangements

There are none.

1.9 Transactions with Related Parties

Transactions with Hunter Dickinson Services Inc. ("HDSI")

Hunter Dickinson Inc. ("HDI") and its wholly owned subsidiary, HDSI are private companies established by a group of mining professionals engaged in advancing and developing mineral properties for a number of private and publicly-listed exploration companies, one of which is the Company.

Current directors of the Company namely Robert Dickinson and Ron Thiessen are active members of the HDI Board of Directors. Marchand Snyman, the Company's CFO, is also an active member of the HDI Board of Directors. Other key management personnel of the Company – Doug Allen, Stephen Hodgson, Bruce Jenkins, Sean Magee and Trevor Thomas – are active members of HDI's senior management team.

The business purpose of the related party relationship

HDSI provides technical, geological, corporate communications, regulatory compliance, administrative and management services to the Company, on an as-needed and as-requested basis from the Company.

HDSI also incurs third party costs on behalf of the Company. Such third party costs include, for example, directors and officers insurance, travel, conferences, and technology services.

As a result of this relationship with HDSI, the Company has ready access to a range of diverse and specialized expertise on a regular basis, without having to engage or hire full-time experts. The Company benefits from the economies of scale created by HDSI.

The measurement basis used

The Company procures services from HDSI pursuant to an agreement (the "Services Agreement") dated July 2, 2010 whereby HDSI agreed to provide technical, geological, corporate communications, administrative and management services to the Company. A copy of the Services Agreement is publicly available under the Company's profile at www.sedar.com.

Services from HDSI are provided on a non-exclusive basis as required and as requested by the Company. The Company is not obligated to acquire any minimum amount of services from HDSI. The fees for services is determined based on an agreed upon charge-out rate for each employee performing the service and the time spent by the employee. The charge-out rate also includes overhead costs such as office rent,

Year ended December 31, 2016

information technology services and administrative support. Such charge-out rates are agreed and set annually in advance.

Third party expenses are billed at cost, without any markup.

Ongoing contractual or other commitments resulting from the related party relationship

There are no ongoing contractual or other commitments resulting from the Company's transactions with HDSI, other than the payment for services already rendered and billed. The agreement may be terminated upon 60 days' notice from either the Company or HDSI.

Transactions during the Reporting Period and Balances with HDSI at the end of the Reporting Period

Disclosure as to transactions with HDSI and any amounts due to or from HDSI is provided in Note 8(b) in the notes to the Financial Statements which accompany this MD&A and which are available under the Company's profile at www.sedar.com.

Key Management Personnel

The required disclosure for the remuneration of the Company's key management personnel is provided in Note 8(a) in the notes to the Financial Statements which accompany this MD&A and which are available under the Company's profile at www.sedar.com.

1.10 Fourth Quarter 2016 vs. 2015

The Company recorded a \$6.7 million decrease in loss to \$5.7 million, primarily due to a decrease in legal expenses as discussed herein.

E&E comprised mainly of the following during the three months ended December 31, 2016 as compared to the prior year quarter, expressed in thousands of dollars:

E&E	2016	2015
Engineering	\$ 16	\$ 27
Environmental	194	256
Site activities	228	726
Socio-economic	798	1,078
Property fees and assessments	1,351	1,276
Other activities and travel	23	11
Total	\$ 2,610	\$ 3,374

E&E was approximately \$0.8 million lower than 2015 as site activities were reduced and socio-economic costs relating to relationships with political and regulatory offices of government, Alaska Native partners and other stakeholder groups were lower. The Company however, incurred higher rental payments for claims. In 2015, E&E was impacted by and the completion of demobilization and remediation activities at site.

Year ended December 31, 2016

The following G&A, and legal, accounting and audit expenses were incurred during the three months ended December 31, 2016 as compared to 2015, expressed in thousands of dollars:

	2016	2015
Conference and travel	\$ 75	\$ 77
Consulting	18	61
Insurance	101	105
Office costs	223	207
Management and administration	716	1,127
Shareholder communication	137	184
Trust and filing	41	52
Total G&A	1,311	1,813
Legal, accounting and audit	984	6,379
	\$ 2,295	\$ 8,192

G&A decreased by approximately \$0.5 million due primarily to lower management and administration costs. Legal, accounting and audit costs decreased by approximately \$5.4 million as less time was incurred by legal counsel and the Company had entered into a fixed fee arrangement with Steptoe (refer 1.2.1.2 Legal Matters).

1.11 Proposed Transactions

There are no proposed asset or business acquisitions or dispositions, other than those in the ordinary course, before the Board of Directors for consideration.

1.12 Critical Accounting Estimates

The required disclosure is provided in Note 2 in the notes to the Financial Statements which accompany this MD&A and which are available under the Company's profile at www.sedar.com.

1.13 Changes in Accounting Policies including Initial Adoption

The required disclosure is provided in Note 2 in the notes to the Financial Statements which accompany this MD&A and which are available under the Company's profile at www.sedar.com.

1.14 Financial Instruments and Other Instruments

The Company is exposed in varying degrees to a variety of financial instrument related risks. The Board approves and monitors the risk management processes, inclusive of documented investment policies, counterparty limits, and controlling and reporting structures. The type of risk exposure and the way in which such exposure is managed is provided as follows:

Credit Risk

Credit risk is the risk of potential loss to the Company if a counterparty to a financial instrument fails to meet its contractual obligations. The Company's credit risk is primarily attributable to its liquid financial assets, including cash and cash equivalents, restricted cash (\$nil at December 31, 2016) and amounts receivable. The Company limits the exposure to credit risk by only investing its cash and cash equivalents and restricted cash with high-credit quality financial institutions in business and saving accounts,

Year ended December 31, 2016

guaranteed investment certificates, and in government treasury bills which are available on demand by the Group as and when required. There has been no change in the Company's objectives and policies for managing this risk except for changes in the carrying amounts of financial assets exposed to credit risk, and there was no significant change to the Company's exposure to credit risk during the year ended December 31, 2016. Amounts receivable include receivable balances with government agencies, prepaid expenses and refundable deposits. Management has also concluded that there is no objective evidence of impairment to the Company's amounts receivable.

Liquidity Risk

Liquidity risk is the risk that the Company will not be able to meet its financial obligations when they become due. There has been no change in the Company's objectives and policies for managing this risk. The Company's liquidity position has been discussed in Section 1.6 *Liquidity*.

Foreign Exchange Risk

The Company is subject to both currency transaction risk and currency translation risk: the Pebble Partnership, Pebble Services Inc. and U5 Resources Inc. have the US dollar as functional currency; and certain of the Company's corporate expenses are incurred in US dollars. The fluctuation of the US dollar in relation to the Canadian dollar has an impact upon the losses incurred by the Company as well as the value of the Company's assets and total shareholders' equity as the Company's functional and presentation currency is the Canadian dollar. The Company has not entered into any agreements or purchased any instruments to hedge possible currency risks at this time.

There has been no change in the Company's objectives and policies for managing this risk, except for the changes in the carrying amounts of the financial assets exposed to foreign exchange risk, and there was no significant change to the Company's exposure to foreign exchange risk during the year ended December 31, 2016.

Interest rate risk

The Company is subject to interest rate risk with respect to its investments in cash and cash equivalents. There has been no change in the Company's objectives and policies for managing this risk and no significant change to the Company's exposure to interest rate risk during the year ended December 31, 2016.

Commodity price risk

While the value of the Company's Pebble Project, held through its 100% interest in the Pebble Partnership, is related to the price of copper, gold, molybdenum and silver and the outlook for these minerals, the Company currently does not have any operating mines and hence does not have any hedging or other commodity based risks in respect of its operational activities.

Copper, gold, molybdenum and silver prices have fluctuated widely historically and are affected by numerous factors outside of the Company's control, including, but not limited to, industrial and retail demand, central bank lending, forward sales by producers and speculators, levels of worldwide production, short-term changes in supply and demand because of speculative hedging activities, and certain other factors related specifically to gold.

Year ended December 31, 2016

Capital Management

The Company's policy is to maintain a strong capital base so as to maintain investor and creditor confidence and to sustain future development of the business. The capital structure of the Company currently consists of equity, comprising share capital and reserves, net of accumulated deficit.

There were no changes in the Company's approach to capital management during the period. The Company is not subject to any externally imposed capital requirements.

1.15 Other MD&A Requirements

Additional information relating to the Company, including the Company's 2016 Annual Information Form, is available under the Company's profile on SEDAR at www.sedar.com.

1.15.1 Disclosure of Outstanding Share Data

The capital structure of the Company as of the date of this MD&A is shown in the following table:

	Number
Common shares issued and outstanding	298,787,573
Share options pursuant to the Company's incentive plan	14,867,331
Deferred share units	458,129
Restricted share units	639,031
Warrants and non-incentive plan options ¹	47,311,472

Notes:

1. Non-incentive plan options were issued on the acquisition of Cannon Point in October 2015. Warrants were issued pursuant to the acquisition of Mission Gold in December 2015, the prospectus financing in June 2016 and the private placement in July 2016.

1.15.2 Disclosure Controls and Procedures

The Company's management, with the participation of its Chief Executive Officer ("CEO") and Chief Financial Officer ("CFO"), have evaluated the effectiveness of the Company's disclosure controls and procedures. Based on that evaluation, the Company's CEO and CFO have concluded that, as of the end of the period covered by this report, the Company's disclosure controls and procedures were effective to provide reasonable assurance that the information required to be disclosed by the Company in reports it files is recorded, processed, summarized and reported, within the appropriate time periods and is accumulated and communicated to management, including the CEO and CFO, as appropriate to allow timely decisions regarding required disclosure.

1.15.3 Management's Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting

The Company's management, including the CEO and the CFO, is responsible for establishing and maintaining adequate internal control over financial reporting. Internal control over financial reporting ("ICFR") is a process designed by, or under the supervision of, the Company's principal executive and principal financial officers and effected by the Company's Board of Directors, management and other personnel, to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of financial reporting and the

Year ended December 31, 2016

preparation of consolidated financial statements for external purposes in accordance with IFRS. The Company's ICFR includes those policies and procedures that:

- pertain to the maintenance of records that, in reasonable detail, accurately and fairly reflect the transactions and dispositions of the assets of the Company;
- provide reasonable assurance that transactions are recorded as necessary to permit preparation
 of financial statements in accordance with IFRS, and that receipts and expenditures of the
 Company are being made only in accordance with authorizations of management and directors of
 the company; and
- 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 consolidated financial statements.

The Company's management assessed the effectiveness of the Company's ICFR as of December 31, 2016. In making the assessment, it used the criteria set forth in the Internal Control-Integrated Framework (2013) issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission ("COSO"). Based on their assessment, management has concluded that, as of December 31, 2016, the Company's ICFR was effective based on those criteria.

1.15.4 Changes in Internal Control over Financial Reporting

There has been no change in the Company's ICFR that has materially affected, or is reasonably likely to materially affect, the Company's ICFR.

1.15.5 Limitations of Controls and Procedures

The Company's management, including its CEO and CFO, believe that any system of disclosure controls and procedures or ICFR, no matter how well conceived and operated, can provide only reasonable, not absolute, assurance that the objectives of the control system are met. Furthermore, the design of a control system must reflect the fact that there are resource constraints and the benefits of controls must be considered relative to their costs. Because of the inherent limitations in all control systems, they cannot provide absolute assurance that all control issues and instances of fraud, if any, within the Company have been prevented or detected. These inherent limitations include the realities that judgments in decision-making can be faulty and breakdowns can occur because of simple error or mistake. Additionally, controls can be circumvented by the individual acts of some persons, by collusion of two or more people, or by unauthorized override of controls. The design of any system of controls is also based in part upon certain assumptions about the likelihood of future events, and there can be no assurance that any design will succeed in achieving its stated goals under all potential future conditions. Accordingly, because of the inherent limitations in a cost effective control system, misstatements due to error or fraud may occur and not be detected.

Year ended December 31, 2016

1.15.6 Risk Factors

The securities of Northern Dynasty are highly speculative and subject to a number of risks. A prospective investor or other person reviewing Northern Dynasty for a prospective investor should not consider an investment in Northern Dynasty unless the investor is capable of sustaining an economic loss of their entire investment. The risks associated with Northern Dynasty's business include:

In the event that we are unsuccessful in our litigation against the EPA, the EPA refuses to withdraw its regulatory action or we are otherwise unable to reach a settlement with the EPA, we may never be able to proceed with permitting with respect to the pebble project.

The principal risk currently facing the Company is that we may be unable to resolve our ongoing issues with the EPA with respect to its pre-emptive regulatory action under Section 404(c) of the CWA. While we believe our position has merit, the proceedings have been lengthy and have required us to expend substantial funds and time.

There is no assurance that there will be any change in the position taken by the EPA with respect to its preemptive regulatory action under Section 404(c) of the CWA resulting from the new federal administration in Washington, DC and the resulting change in the leadership of the EPA.

There has recently been a change in the leadership of the EPA resulting from the appointment of a new administrator of the EPA by the new federal administration in Washington, DC. There is no assurance that this change of leadership will result in the EPA reversing its position with respect the EPA's pre-emptive regulatory action under Section 404(c) of the CWA or otherwise enable the Company to proceed with its permit application process. The Company can provide no assurance with respect to the reaching or timing of a resolution, if any, with the EPA or with respect to other matters relating to the EPA. Even if the current issues with the EPA are resolved, there is no assurance that the Company will be successful in obtaining the required permits to proceed with the development of the Pebble Project.

Inability to Ultimately Achieve Mine Permitting and Build a Mine at the Pebble Project.

Notwithstanding any possible negotiated or other settlement with the EPA or a change in the EPA's position that enables us to proceed with our permit applications, the Company may ultimately be unable to secure the necessary permits under United States Federal and Alaskan State laws to build and operate a mine at the Pebble Project. There is no assurance that the EPA will not seek to undertake future regulatory action to impede or restrict the Pebble Project. In addition, there are prominent and well organized opponents of the Pebble Project and the Company may be unable, even if we present solid scientific and technical evidence of risk mitigation, to overcome such opposition and convince governmental authorities that a mine should be permitted at the Pebble Project. The Company faces not only the permitting and regulatory issues typical of companies seeking to build a mine, but additional public and regulatory scrutiny due to its location and likely size. Accordingly, there is no assurance that the Company will obtain the required permits even if the current issues with the EPA are resolved and the Company is able to proceed with the permit application process. In the ordinary course the Company's permitting process would first involve filing CWA 404 permit applications with the US Army Corps of Engineers, which would trigger an EIS process under NEPA. The EIS process under NEPA, and the requirement for the Company to secure a broad range or other permits and authorizations from multiple federal and state regulatory agencies will take several years. After all permits are in hand, a number of years would be required to finance and build a mine and commence operations. During these periods, the Company would likely have no income and so would require additional financing to continue its operations. Unless and until we build a mine at the Pebble Project we will be unable to achieve revenues from operations and may not be able to sell or otherwise recover our investment in the Pebble Project,

Year ended December 31, 2016

which would have a material adverse effect on the Company and an investment in the Company's common shares.

Negative Operating Cash Flow

The Company currently has a negative operating cash flow and will continue to have that for the foreseeable future. Accordingly, the Company will require substantial additional capital in order to fund its future exploration and development activities. The Company does not have any arrangements in place for this funding and there is no assurance that such funding will be achieved when required. Any failure to obtain additional financing or failure to achieve profitability and positive operating cash flows will have a material adverse effect on its financial condition and results of operations.

Risk of Secure Title or Property Interest

There can be no certainty that title to any property interest acquired by the Company or any of its subsidiaries is without defects. Although the Company has taken reasonable precautions to ensure that legal title to its properties is properly documented, there can be no assurance that its property interests may not be challenged or impugned. Such property interests may be subject to prior unregistered agreements or transfers or other land claims, and title may be affected by undetected defects and adverse laws and regulations.

The Pebble Partnership's mineral concessions at Pebble are located on State of Alaska lands specifically designated for mineral exploration and development. Alaska is a stable jurisdiction with a well-developed regulatory and legal framework for resource development and public lands management, a strong commitment to the rule of law and lengthy track record for encouraging investment in the development if its land and natural resources.

The Pebble Project is Subject to Political and Environmental Regulatory Opposition

As is typical for a large scale mining project, the Pebble Project faces organized opposition from certain individuals and organizations who are motivated to preclude any possible mining in the Bristol Bay Watershed (the "BBW"). The BBW is an important wildlife and salmon habitat area. The EPA has gone so far as to suggest that it may peremptorily prevent the Pebble Project from proceeding even before a mine permitting application is filed. Accordingly, one of the greatest risks to the Pebble Project is seen to be political/permitting risk which may ultimately preclude construction of a mine at the Pebble Project. Opposition may include legal challenges to exploration and development permits, which may delay or halt development. Other tactics may also be employed by opposition groups to delay or frustrate development at Pebble, included political and public advocacy, electoral strategies, media and public outreach campaigns and protest activity.

The Pebble Partnership's Mineral Property Interests Do Not Contain Any Ore Reserves or Any Known Body of Economic Mineralization

Although there are known bodies of mineralization on the Pebble Project, and the Pebble Partnership has completed core drilling programs within, and adjacent to, the deposits to determine measured and indicated resources, there are currently no known reserves or body of commercially viable ore and the Pebble Project must be considered an exploration and feasibility evaluation project only. Extensive additional work is required before Northern Dynasty or the Pebble Partnership can ascertain if any mineralization may be economic and hence constitute "ore".

Year ended December 31, 2016

Mineral Resources Disclosed by Northern Dynasty or the Pebble Partnership for the Pebble Project are Estimates Only

Northern Dynasty has included mineral resource estimates that have been made in accordance with NI 43-101. These resource estimates are classified as "measured resources", "indicated resources" and "inferred resources". Northern Dynasty advises investors that while these terms are mandated by Canadian securities administrators, the SEC does not recognize these terms. Investors are cautioned not to assume that any part or all of mineral deposits classified as "measured resources" or "indicated resources" will ever be converted into ore reserves. Further, "inferred resources" have a great amount of uncertainty as to their existence, and 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 prefeasibility studies, except in rare cases. Investors are cautioned not to assume that part or all of an inferred resource exists, or is economically or legally mineable.

All amounts of mineral resources are estimates only, and Northern Dynasty cannot be certain that any specified level of recovery of metals from the mineralized material will in fact be realized or that the Pebble Project or any other identified mineral deposit will ever qualify as a commercially mineable (or viable) ore body that can be economically exploited. Mineralized material which is not mineral reserves does not have demonstrated economic viability. In addition, the quantity of mineral reserves and mineral resources may vary depending on, among other things, metal prices and actual results of mining. There can be no assurance that any future economic or technical assessments undertaken by the Company with respect to the Pebble Project will demonstrate positive economics or feasibility.

Northern Dynasty has no history of earnings and no foreseeable earnings, and may never achieve profitability or pay dividends

Northern Dynasty has only had losses since inception and there can be no assurance that Northern Dynasty will ever be profitable. Northern Dynasty has paid no dividends on its shares since incorporation. Northern Dynasty presently has no ability to generate earnings as its mineral properties are in the predevelopment stage.

Northern Dynasty's consolidated financial statements have been prepared assuming Northern Dynasty will continue on a going concern basis

Northern Dynasty's consolidated financial statements have been prepared on the basis that Northern Dynasty will continue as a going concern. At December 31, 2016, Northern Dynasty had working capital of approximately \$6.4 million. Northern Dynasty has prioritized the allocation of available financial resources in order to meet key corporate and Pebble Project expenditure requirements in the near term. Additional financing will be required for continued corporate expenditures and expenditures at the Pebble Project. Northern Dynasty's continuing operations and the underlying value and recoverability of the amounts shown for mineral property interest are entirely dependent upon the existence of economically recoverable mineral reserves at the Pebble Project, the ability of the Company to finance its operating costs, the completion of the exploration and development of the Pebble Project, the Pebble Partnership obtaining the necessary permits to mine, and on future profitable production at the Pebble Project. Furthermore, failure to continue as a going concern would require that Northern Dynasty's assets and liabilities be restated on a liquidation basis, which would likely differ significantly from their going concern assumption carrying values. Refer also to discussion in 1.6 Liquidity.

As the Pebble Project is Northern Dynasty's only mineral property interest, the failure to establish that the Pebble Project possesses commercially viable and legally mineable deposits of ore may cause a significant

Year ended December 31, 2016

decline in the trading price of Northern Dynasty's common shares and reduce its ability to obtain new financing

The Pebble Project is, through the Pebble Partnership, Northern Dynasty's only mineral project. Northern Dynasty's principal business objective is to carry out further exploration and related activities to establish whether the Pebble Project possesses commercially viable deposits of ore. If Northern Dynasty is not successful in its plan of operations, Northern Dynasty may have to seek a new mineral property to explore or acquire an interest in a new mineral property or project. Northern Dynasty anticipates that such an outcome would adversely impact the price of Northern Dynasty's common shares. Furthermore, Northern Dynasty anticipates that its ability to raise additional financing to fund exploration of a new property or the acquisition of a new property or project would be impaired as a result of the failure to establish commercial viability of the Pebble Project.

If prices for copper, gold, molybdenum and silver decline, Northern Dynasty may not be able to raise the additional financing required to fund expenditures for the Pebble Project

The ability of Northern Dynasty to raise financing to fund the Pebble Project, will be significantly affected by changes in the market price of the metals for which it explores. The prices of copper, gold, molybdenum and silver are volatile, and are affected by numerous factors beyond Northern Dynasty's control. The level of interest rates, the rate of inflation, the world supplies of and demands for copper, gold, molybdenum and silver and the stability of exchange rates can all cause fluctuations in these prices. Such external economic factors are influenced by changes in international investment patterns and monetary systems and political developments. The prices of copper, gold, molybdenum and silver have fluctuated in recent years, and future significant price declines could cause investors to be unprepared to finance exploration of copper, gold, molybdenum and silver, with the result that Northern Dynasty may not have sufficient financing with which to fund its exploration activities.

Mining is inherently dangerous and subject to conditions or events beyond the Company's control, which could have a material adverse effect on the Company's business

Hazards such as fire, explosion, floods, structural collapses, industrial accidents, unusual or unexpected geological conditions, ground control problems, power outages, inclement weather, seismic activity, caveins and mechanical equipment failure are inherent risks in the Company's exploration, development and mining operations. These and other hazards may cause injuries or death to employees, contractors or other persons at the Company's mineral properties, severe damage to and destruction of the Company's property, plant and equipment and mineral properties, and contamination of, or damage to, the environment, and may result in the suspension of the Company's exploration and development activities and any future production activities. Safety measures implemented by the Company may not be successful in preventing or mitigating future accidents.

Northern Dynasty competes with larger, better capitalized competitors in the mining industry

The mining industry is competitive in all of its phases, including financing, technical resources, personnel and property acquisition. It requires significant capital, technical resources, personnel and operational experience to effectively compete in the mining industry. Because of the high costs associated with exploration, the expertise required to analyze a project's potential and the capital required to develop a mine, larger companies with significant resources may have a competitive advantage over Northern Dynasty. Northern Dynasty faces strong competition from other mining companies, some with greater financial resources, operational experience and technical capabilities than Northern Dynasty possesses. As a result of this competition, Northern Dynasty may be unable to maintain or acquire financing, personnel, technical resources or attractive mining properties on terms Northern Dynasty considers acceptable or at all.

Year ended December 31, 2016

Compliance with environmental requirements will take considerable resources and changes to these requirements could significantly increase the costs of developing the Pebble Project and could delay these activities

The Pebble Partnership and Northern Dynasty must comply with stringent environmental legislation in carrying out work on the Pebble Project. Environmental legislation is evolving in a manner that will require stricter standards and enforcement, increased fines and penalties for non-compliance, more stringent environmental assessments of proposed projects and a heightened degree of responsibility for companies and their officers, directors and employees. Changes in environmental legislation could increase the cost to the Pebble Partnership of carrying out its exploration and, if warranted, development of the Pebble Project. Further, compliance with new or additional environmental legislation may result in delays to the exploration and, if warranted, development activities.

Changes in government regulations or the application thereof and the presence of unknown environmental hazards on Northern Dynasty's mineral properties may result in significant unanticipated compliance and reclamation costs

Government regulations relating to mineral rights tenure, permission to disturb areas and the right to operate can adversely affect Northern Dynasty. Northern Dynasty and the Pebble Partnership may not be able to obtain all necessary licenses and permits that may be required to carry out exploration at our projects. Obtaining the necessary governmental permits is a complex, time-consuming and costly process. The duration and success of efforts to obtain permits are contingent upon many variables not within our control. Obtaining environmental permits may increase costs and cause delays depending on the nature of the activity to be permitted and the interpretation of applicable requirements implemented by the permitting authority. There can be no assurance that all necessary approvals and permits will be obtained and, if obtained, that the costs involved will not exceed those that we previously estimated. It is possible that the costs and delays associated with the compliance with such standards and regulations could become such that we would not proceed with the development or operation of a mine at the Pebble Project. Refer to further discussion in 1.2.1.2 Legal Matters.

Litigation

The Company is currently and may in future be subject to legal proceedings, including with regard to actions in <u>1.2.1.2 Other Matters</u> in the pursuit of its Pebble Project. Given the uncertain nature of these actions, the Company cannot reasonably predict the outcome thereof. If the Company is unable to resolve these matters favorably it will likely have a material adverse effect of the Company. Please refer to the Risk Factor regarding the EPA litigation above.

Northern Dynasty is subject to many risks that are not insurable and, as a result, Northern Dynasty will not be able to recover losses through insurance should such certain events occur

Hazards such as unusual or unexpected geological formations and other conditions are involved in mineral exploration and development. Northern Dynasty may become subject to liability for pollution, cave-ins or hazards against which it cannot insure. The payment of such liabilities could result in increase in Northern Dynasty's operating expenses which could, in turn, have a material adverse effect on Northern Dynasty's financial position and its results of operations. Although Northern Dynasty and the Pebble Partnership maintain liability insurance in an amount which we consider adequate, the nature of these risks is such that the liabilities might exceed policy limits, the liabilities and hazards might not be insurable against, or Northern Dynasty and the Pebble Partnership might elect not to insure itself against such liabilities due to high premium costs or other reasons, in which event Northern Dynasty could incur significant liabilities and costs that could materially increase Northern Dynasty's operating expenses.

Year ended December 31, 2016

If Northern Dynasty loses the services of the key personnel that it engages to undertake its activities, then Northern Dynasty's plan of operations may be delayed or be more expensive to undertake than anticipated

Northern Dynasty's success depends to a significant extent on the performance and continued service of certain independent contractors, including HDSI (refer 1.9 *Transactions with Related Parties*). The Company has access to the full resources of HDSI, an experienced exploration and development firm with in-house geologists, engineers and environmental specialists, to assist in its technical review of the Pebble Project. There can be no assurance that the services of all necessary key personnel will be available when required or if obtained, that the costs involved will not exceed those that we previously estimated. It is possible that the costs and delays associated with the loss of services of key personnel could become such that we would not proceed with the development or operation of a mine at the Pebble Project.

The Market Price of Northern Dynasty's Common Shares is Subject to High Volatility and Could Cause Investor Loss.

The market price of a publicly traded stock, especially a resource issuer like Northern Dynasty, is affected by many variables in addition to those directly related to exploration successes or failures. Such factors include the general condition of markets for resource stocks, the strength of the economy generally, the availability and attractiveness of alternative investments, and the breadth of the public markets for the stock. The effect of these and other factors on the market price of the Company's common shares suggests Northern Dynasty's shares will continue to be volatile. Therefore, investors could suffer significant losses if Northern Dynasty's shares are depressed or illiquid when an investor needs to sell Northern Dynasty shares.

Northern Dynasty Will Require Additional Funding to Meet the Development Objectives of the Pebble Project.

Northern Dynasty will need to raise additional financing (share issuances, debt or asset level partnering) to achieve permitting and development of the Pebble Project. In addition, a positive production decision at the Pebble Project would require significant capital for project engineering and construction. Accordingly, the continuing development of the Pebble Project will depend upon Northern Dynasty's ability to obtain financing through debt financing, equity financing, the joint venturing of the project, or other means. There can be no assurance that Northern Dynasty will be successful in obtaining the required financing, or that it will be able to raise the funds on terms that do not result in high levels of dilution to shareholders.