

# NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD

## MINUTES: MEETING No. 26

TALOYOAK, 26-28 September 2000

### Members and Staff Participating

Ben Kovic	Chairperson
Gordon Koshinsky	Member
Kevin McCormick	Member
Makabe Nartok	Member
Moses Koonoo	Member
Joan Scottie	Member (not present first day)
Meeka Mike	Member
Jim Noble	Executive Director
Michelle Wheatley	Director of Wildlife Management
Michael d'Eça	NWMB Legal Advisor
Todd Roche	Regional Liaison Officer, Kitikmeot
Leetia Janes	Interpreter
Eunice Paningayak	Interpreter

### Not Available

David Alagalak	Member
Harry Flaherty	Member

### Visitors and Other Participants (at various times)

Burt Hunt	DFO Eastern Arctic Area Director, Iqaluit
Keith Pelly	DFO C and P Officer, Rankin Inlet
Stephen Atkinson	DSD Director of Wildlife, Iqaluit
Glenn Williams	NTI Wildlife Advisor, Iqaluit
Phillip Kadlun	KHTA Chairperson
Agnes Egotak	KHTA Executive Director
Paula Hughson	Parks Canada, Iqaluit

Several other visitors, guests, media and members of the public at large

## Tuesday, 26 September 2000

### **1. Call to Order and Opening Preliminaries**

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, convened the 26<sup>th</sup> regular meeting of the NWMB at 9:00 a.m. Ben welcomed the Board Members and all others present, and called on Moses Koonoo to lead the opening prayer.

The Deputy Mayor, David Tucktoo, welcomed the Board to Taloyoak. Mr. Tucktoo stated that he and the community recognized that the NWMB mandate pertained to matters that were very important to Inuit. He made reference to the current debate regarding the abundance of polar bears. Based on local encounters, the impression of the people is bears are in fact quite numerous in this area. Mr. Tucktoo suggested that assertions to the contrary may be linked to activities associated with surveying the population which could disrupt the ordinary distribution of the bears.

### **2. Agenda for the Meeting**

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 180**) to accept the agenda for Meeting No. 26 as presented, but recognising that there were several additional matters for inclusion under items 8 and 9.

### **3. Minutes: Review and Approval**

#### **3.A Regular Meeting 25, Iqaluit**

The Minutes for Regular Meeting No. 25, held at Iqaluit on 14 – 17 March 2000, were adopted with four minor wording revisions. (**Resolution 2000- 181**)

#### **3.B Conference Calls 48, 49, 50, 51 and 52**

The Minutes for Conference Call No. 48, conducted on 20 April 2000, were adopted as presented. (**Resolution 2000- 182**)

The Minutes for Conference Call No. 49, conducted on 11 May 2000, were adopted as presented, with the exception that the wording for Item 8B pertaining to settlement of compensatory time earned by staff required clarification. (**Resolution 2000- 183**)

The Minutes for Conference Call No. 50, conducted on 14 June 2000, were adopted as presented. (**Resolution 2000- 184**)

The Minutes for Conference Call No. 51, conducted on 28 June 2000, were adopted as presented. (**Resolution 2000- 185**)

The Minutes for Conference Call No. 52, conducted on 14 July 2000, were adopted as presented. (**Resolution 2000- 186**)

## **4. Financial and Administrative Business**

### **4.A Financial Variance Report to 31 August 2000**

Jim Noble led the Board in a line-by-line review of the variance report to the end of August. Jim clarified the line items with the largest variances as follows:

- Capital asset acquisitions: Over-expenditure projected, due to a reporting adjustment in response to the audit; also one unexpected computer replacement, and photocopier replacement cost more than anticipated.
- Contracted services: Under-expenditure projected, related to the prolonged illness of the Fisheries Advisor.
- Hearings: No variance projected at this time, but probably not realistic since no actual hearings are on the horizon.
- Board meetings: Under-expenditure projected, due mainly to cancellation of the June meeting.
- Other meetings and workshops: Under-expenditure projected; reasons include only one meeting of the Walrus Working Group now planned (cf. two meetings budgeted), inability to date to fill the Conservation Education position with corresponding lack of draw on these funds.
- Operation of vehicles: Over-expenditure expected, due to repair costs already incurred in respect to the older vehicle.
- Wages and benefits: Under-expenditure expected, due to inability to recruit an individual to fill the Conservation-Education position.
- Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study: Over-expenditure (no budget), due to costs of printing the final report after the end of the last fiscal year.

The overall projected fiscal-year-end variance at this time is positive \$134,037. This amounts to approximately 2% of the budget. Kevin McCormick suggested that this is a minimal estimate of under-expenditure since it does not include the amount set aside for hearings and which is unlikely to be spent. Michelle Wheatley observed that the Wildlife Studies Fund partially off-sets this. Although only \$99,000 was budgeted for this Fund, the Board has approved studies totalling \$165,000.

Kevin McCormick asked for clarification on how funds are disbursed to RWOs and HTOs. Jim Noble replied that the NWMB annually requests from each organization a budget, financial report and proof of filing with Societies. If this documentation is provided on or before April 1, then the full annual funding allotment is immediately disbursed to them. If not all the documentation is provided, and depending on the nature of the deficiency, a certain amount of interim funding is sometimes given.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 187**) to accept the interim financial variance report as presented.

### **4.B Research Trust Fund: Update**

Jim Noble referred to the documentation provided by TAL Institutional Management (Deborah Lewis) for the present meeting. The NWRT fund currently has invested:

- \$9,859,346 (55.5%) in Canadian bonds
  - \$3,647,701 (20.6%) in Canadian equities
  - \$2,082,806 (11.7%) in American equities
  - \$2,161,709 (12.2%) in Offshore equities
- \$17,751,562 total currently invested

All of these investments are in TAL pooled funds. The amounts indicated are book values, i.e. values at cost. The current overall total market value of these investments is \$18,837,652.

Jim reminded the Board members that exposure to offshore (Europe/Australia/Far East equities) was initiated in February. Year-to-date the NWRT Fund has returned 11.77% compared to the benchmark of 9.89%, with Canadian equities being the best-performing component. For the 1-year period ended June 30, the NWRT Fund posted a positive performance of 12.66% compared to 9.92% for the benchmark.

Jim repeated the concern previously expressed by TAL regarding the implications of very high weighting of just one stock, Nortel Networks, in the Canadian equity index or TSE. It is not realistic for TAL to compete with the TSE because it would be too risky to invest in Nortel Networks in proportion to its weight in the TSE index. TAL has proposed an alternative approach for the consideration of the NWRT, namely to change from evaluating TAL performance against the performance of the TSE, and to evaluate instead against what is called a "Capped Index".

The Board concluded that this matter could be examined by the Trustees at the next meeting of the NWRT, presumably with Ms. Lewis in attendance.

## **5. Chairperson, Senior Staff, and Advisors Reports**

### **5.A Chairperson's Report**

Ben Kovic referred to his list of meetings and other events attended over the period March through June, along with his list of trips and meeting planned. Ben also called attention to his various meeting and trip reports in the last section of the briefing binder.

### **5.B Senior Staff Reports**

Jim Noble referred the Members to the briefing binder for activity and meeting/trip reports in respect to himself (Executive Director), the Director of Wildlife Management, and the Director of Finance and Administration.

### **5.C Advisors' Reports**

Jim Noble tabled activity reports from the Board's Legal Advisor for the period from March 3 through September 10, and from the Board's Fisheries Advisor for the period April 1 through July 30.

## 5.D Members Reports and Concerns

Makabe Nartok expressed concern about the lack of representation from the Kitikmeot region on the Narwhal Working Group. He cited issues concerning narwhal that arose at Pelly Bay this summer that might have been addressed by the Working Group had there been such representation. The Board agreed that such representation would be appropriate, and asked Phillip Kadlun, in his capacity as Chairperson of the Kitikmeot RWO, to ensure that an individual was appointed.

Moses Koonoo expressed concern about the orientation session conducted by DFO at Arctic Bay this summer preparatory to field sampling bowhead whales for genetic analysis. When the researcher (Sue Cosens) arrived to conduct this orientation very few bona fide hunters were available in the community to participate. More thought and planning needs to go into such sessions, particularly to ensure that the timing coincides with the availability of interested and affected persons. The Board agreed that Dr. Cosens would be urged to give more consideration to the timing of such sessions in future.

Gordon Koshinsky suggested that the Board might consider taking a more active interest in wide-ranging environmental issues, such as climate change. At a minimum, it would seem appropriate for Members to become better informed about such matters. It would seem that these kinds of perturbations are already impacting Nunavut wildlife. In the course of its recent strategic planning exercise, the Board set out to adopt a more holistic outlook in its deliberations. Kevin McCormick suggested that it would be useful to get an appreciation of the scope of Canadian and international initiatives that are already underway in respect to such matters. He offered to prepare a synopsis of these initiatives if requested by the Board.

Meeka Mike noted that the Inuit Circumpolar Conference has been working to draw attention to global pollution issues in the context of the Arctic. She suggested that the NWMB declare its support for the work of the ICC in these matters, with particular reference to the forthcoming meeting of the Commission in December. Meeka also commented on the recent meeting of the Canada/Greenland Joint Commission for the Management of Narwhal and Beluga that she attended in Greenland. She learned a great deal about the management of narwhal and other wildlife in that neighbouring country.

Ben Kovic agreed that broad-scale pollution issues merited more attention by the NWMB. He suggested that the Board consider inviting some appropriate person(s) address the Board about it a future meeting. Ben also urged Members to try very hard to honour their commitments, once given, to be available for Board meetings on agreed-upon dates. He acknowledged that unexpected emergencies can and do intervene, but he hoped that Members would consider the NWMB as a high priority. Ben also noted that some RWOs and RIAs have indicated that they would like to have more participation by NWMB Members in/at their AGMs. His (Ben's) response has been that they should issue specific invitations, with the NWMB covering the

costs of such participation. This is another matter that requires active commitment on the part of Members.

## **6. Completion of Assignments and Resolutions from Last Meeting**

Jim Noble referred the Members to the Task List arising from the previous Board meeting (in March) and from the six intervening Conference Calls. He called particular attention to the status notations in respect to each of the tasks listed. Jim noted that the majority of the tasks had been completed or are well underway. He identified a number of tasks that, while not yet completed, are scheduled for specific treatment elsewhere on the agenda for the current meeting.

A few of the unfinished items not listed elsewhere on the agenda prompted some discussion, namely:

Item A.35: Approach DSD/NTI about options regarding the NTI decision to seek judicial review of the DSD Minister's rejection of the NWMB final decision to permit a traditional polar bear hunt at Coral Harbour. It was reiterated that the intent was for the Chairman to seek, or at least be alert for an opportunity, to approach the protagonists in an unobtrusive way to explore if they would be interested in having the NWMB trying to play a conciliatory role. Michael d'Eça advised that the review has been postponed to November 1, so the opportunity for NWMB input still exists.

Item A.40: Prepare a definitive comparison of the Board's status vis-à-vis other agencies regarding remuneration of Board members as determined by the federal Treasury Board. Michael d'Eça advised that he was having difficulty obtaining the necessary information, and that extra-ordinary measures might be needed to get it.

Item B.05: Review concerns regarding the *Migratory Birds Convention Act*. Kevin McCormick advised that the best way to move forward on this item would be to prepare a discussion paper identifying concerns and options for addressing them.

Item B.07: Communicate to DFO the NWMB position with respect to identifying "edible portions" of marine mammals. Gordon Koshinsky reminded the Members that the "NWMB position" on this matter was really only that the NWMB would not declare any position, except to declare that it would be DFO's obligation to develop a workable definition(s), taking account of extensive consultations yet to be conducted. It was agreed that the matter should be referred to the committee that has been struck to assist DFO in drafting its new fisheries and marine mammal regulations.

Item B.09: Draft an advisory to the Co-Management Ministers, communicating the NWMB protocols for making its decisions in public forum rather than *in-camera*. Jim Noble noted that this was one of the matters that the NWMB put forward to the independent five-year review. There has been no indication to date from the

Departments/Ministers that they even received this material. It was agreed that follow-up was needed.

Item D.08: Prepare briefing note with respect to the power and capacity of government agencies to implement NWMB decisions including any conditions that may be associated with those decisions. Michael d'Eça reiterated that this would be a worthwhile undertaking, but that other work was of more urgent priority. It was decided to deactivate this item, and to develop a “tasks archive” to accommodate it and similar items that the Board may want to reconsider periodically.

Item D.13: Investigate legal and related considerations regarding wildlife harvesting in National Parks and other protected areas. It was agreed that this would be a useful exercise, but it could not be considered as a pressing priority. Agencies now generally recognize the decision-making authority of the NWMB in this matter. As for Item D.08, it was decided to “archive” this task.

## **7. Environment Canada (CWS): Issues and Decisions**

### **7.A *Species-at-Risk Act (SARA): Update***

Kevin McCormick suggested that Michael d'Eça's Briefing Note of September 12 provided a suitable framework for discussion of this matter.

Michael reminded the Board that the NWMB has a number of roles under the NLCA with respect to species at risk in the NSA, including:

- to approve the designation of rare, threatened and endangered species;
- to approve plans for the management and protection of endangered species and their habitats; and
- to decide harvesting levels and other harvesting limitations for all wildlife, including species at risk.

Michael noted that DOE's previous attempt to develop legislation in this area died on the Order Paper at the time of the last election. It is possible that this will also be the immediate fate of the current bill, which has just passed second reading. In that event, however, it is anticipated that something very like that current bill would quickly re-emerge.

Michael revisited the NWMB's extensive submissions made to the Standing Committee to date. Michael noted that along with his work for the NWMB, he had assisted the ITC and NTI in the preparation of their submissions, at considerable savings in time and cost to all parties. It is expected that the NWMB will be among those called to testify before the Standing Committee, probably in October.

Michael stressed that DOE has been innovative in their approach to developing this legislation. They have consulted with aboriginal organizations and wildlife management boards, and have taken account of much that they heard. The Act in its current form recognises the essential roles of aboriginal people and management

boards established under land claims, along with traditional knowledge. A special subcommittee would be established as part of COSEWIC to specialize in traditional knowledge applications.

Michael identified four remaining concerns regarding the Bill in its present form that he deemed to be important from the perspective of the NWMB:

1. There is no specific recognition in the Bill of the fact that, within the NSA, the NWMB is empowered to approve (by way of formal decision routed to the Minister) any COSEWIC designation of species at risk.
2. Although the Minister has stated his intentions regarding the formation and make-up of a COSEWIC subcommittee to specialize in aboriginal traditional knowledge, there is no clear reflection of those intentions in the Bill.
3. Under the present wording of the Bill, COSEWIC would have 30 days to individually reassess all of the species currently classified as endangered, threatened or extirpated. If COSEWIC does not do a reassessment for a particular species within the 30-day period, and if Cabinet does not specifically grant an extension, then the existing classification for that species would be deemed to continue. Several Nunavut species are presently listed. It would not seem acceptable for the Bill to enable anyone to “deem” consideration of traditional knowledge and approval of the NWMB.
4. It has become regular practise to include a non-derogation clause, with standardized wording, in new federal statutes in Canada. This standard clause indicates that in the event of silence or ambiguity in its wording, the (new) statute is not to be interpreted in any way to interfere with an aboriginal or treaty right. The non-derogation clause for the SARA Bill was apparently drafted without reference to this standard practice, and certainly without input from aboriginal organizations or wildlife management boards. The current wording could in fact be interpreted to underline, and perhaps even to encourage, the limited rights of the Crown to interfere with aboriginal or treaty rights.

Michael tabled, via his briefing note, draft recommendations for the NWMB to consider putting forward in respect to these four concerns. Discussion turned to the third item, regarding re-assessment of currently-listed species. All such reassessments would be done by reference to status reports. Michael’s suggestion was that the NWMB recommend that reassessments be specifically linked to the subcommittee that is to be established for specialization in aboriginal traditional knowledge, and that the time frame for completion be expanded to encompass a period from 6 to 18 months from the date that the subcommittee is set up. The subcommittee would be tasked with ensuring that traditional knowledge is appropriately taken into account in preparation of the status reports and also in the development of recovery plans. Kevin McCormick wondered why, in the case of the NSA, it would not be the responsibility of the NWMB to ensure that traditional knowledge is appropriately reflected in status reports. Gordon Koshinsky noted that the Board’s interests would encompass the scientific inputs along with the traditional knowledge perspective. He suggested that it might be appropriate for the NWMB to

take some initiatives on its own that would be preparatory to its eventual decision-making role. The Board might also want to nominate additional species for consideration/ inclusion.

Kevin McCormick suggested that even 18 months would be far too little time for all of this work to be accomplished. He noted that the COSEWIC secretariat has already commissioned new status reports on bowhead whales and Peary caribou. Michael agreed that even an 18-month time frame was not adequate, but suggested that it might not be a good negotiating tactic to ask for anything longer.

Michael suggested that the Board might wish to determine the COSEWIC priorities for doing re-assessments for the NSA. The simplest procedure would be to contact the Territorial COSEWIC representative, Siu-Ling Han from DSD. Michael also noted that Dr. Peter Usher is formally advising DOE with respect to harmonizing this new legislation with land claim agreements. Michael suggested that it might be productive to extend an invitation for Dr. Usher to make a presentation to the Board.

The Board decided:

- To continue to play a leadership role in development of this legislation;
- To continue working with NTI and ITC on this initiative;
- To use the Legal Advisor's recommendations as the basis for expressing the remaining concerns of the NWMB to the Standing Committee;
- To be represented by the NWMB Chairperson and the Legal Advisor in appearing before the Standing Committee if invited to do so;
- To request the COSEWIC Secretariat to declare their priorities for obtaining new status reports and for drafting decisions with respect to the listing (or not) of species/populations in the NSA under the new Act; and
- To invite Dr. Usher to attend the next quarterly meeting of the NWMB.

## **7.B Proposed Spring Snow Goose Hunting Season in Nunavut**

Kevin McCormick reminded the Board that the CWS and other agencies are trying to address the present over-abundance of snow geese relative to their breeding habitat in Arctic Canada. The method of choice has been to try to increase the harvest. Spring sport hunts were introduced in 1999 and continued in 2000, in Quebec (where 40,000 birds were taken in 1999) and in northern Manitoba (where the hunts have been less successful). Actual harvest numbers for 2000 are not yet available.

It is proposed to expand this initiative by inaugurating, for non-Inuit hunters, a spring sport-hunting season for snow geese in Nunavut. The three RWOs have been consulted and voiced no fundamental objections. The KWF initially proposed that such a season close earlier in the southern part of the Region (to conform with earlier nesting), but eventually agreed to set that concern aside on the

understanding that the situation would be monitored during the first year for possible modification subsequently.

The new season as proposed would be open from May 1 through June 7 throughout Nunavut. The daily limit would be 15 snow geese. There would be no possession limit for Canadian hunters, but non-residents of Canada would be limited to 30 snow geese in possession. Use of electronic calls would be permitted.

Moses Koonoo observed that there seemed to be fewer snow geese in the Baffin region this year, and wondered if the spring sport hunts have had an effect. Kevin replied that there are preliminary indications that production this year was low in the north Baffin, which might account for fewer geese being observed in the fall. He did note that snow geese migrating through Quebec, where the largest spring sport harvests have taken place, are the greater snows that breed on Bylot Island. The general feeling, however, is that snow goose populations would need to cut in half to have the desired positive impact on northern habitat. The harvests that are taking place are well within the desired levels.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 188**) to approve, for non-Inuit hunters, a spring sport-hunting season for snow geese in the Nunavut Settlement Area commencing in 2001 as per the dates and bag limits recommended by the CWS.

## **7.C Shellfish Sanitation Program**

Kevin McCormick referred to the joint briefing material from CWS and DFO. The Canadian Shellfish Sanitation Program is a federal initiative jointly administered by DFO and DOE in conjunction with the Canadian Food Inspection Agency. It is designed to ensure that shellfish are safe to eat, whether consumed locally or exported. The responsibilities of the respective agencies are as follows:

- DOE identifies pollution sources and classifies shellfish growing areas based on contaminant and bacteriological analyses of the overlay water;
- CFIA monitors shellfish for the presence of toxins and initiates closures;
- DFO opens and closes shellfish growing areas;
- Regional Classification Committees review the available information and make recommendations regarding openings and closings.

Burt Hunt noted that the program has not as yet been incorporated into the fisheries management regime for Nunavut. It will need to be introduced if and when a significant shellfish fishery develops. Restricting shellfish harvests would be matters for NWMB decision, even for reasons of toxicity or contamination. DFO would be encouraging the participation of the NWMB if and when a Regional Classification Committee is established for Nunavut. The matter is raised at this time merely to give advance notice of an initiative that can reasonably be expected.

## **8. Fisheries and Oceans (DFO): Issues and Decisions**

### **8.A DFO Staffing Activity**

Burt Hunt advised that Fisheries Management Biologist Patrice Simon will be leaving the Region. Karen Dietz, a biologist from Yellowknife, will be filling this position starting November 13. The Habitat Management Biologist position was recently filled by Jordan DeGroot, who was previously employed with the NWMB. The competition to replace Lynn Siegersma in the Land Claims Liaison Officer position has closed; the aim is to eventually have two such Liaison Officers for Nunavut: one for the east and another for the west. Another aim is to have on-site representation by the Department in the Kitikmeot Region. There is reason for optimism that this can soon be achieved. The Department is trying to be less insistent and more realistic about enforcing qualification requirements in order to maximise opportunities for Territorial residents on its Nunavut staff roster.

### **8.B Arctic Science Planning Initiative**

Burt Hunt advised that \$185 million was being made available over 5 years. The aim is to develop Canada as the world's Arctic authority. A substantial component will be devoted to such topics as climate change. Michelle Wheatley noted that the NWMB was invited to make input to planning for this initiative, and did in fact do so.

### **8.C Legislative Changes: Update**

Burt Hunt reported that DFO has changed its approach to the task of developing new fisheries regulations for Nunavut. The original concept was to adjust the existing regulations to accommodate the NLCA. Based on the urgings of the NWMB and others, it is now the intent to identify the issues and challenges posed by the NLCA and use that analysis as the starting point for the exercise. The Committee that was set up in February to pursue this matter has recently hired a consultant (Nigel Banks) to develop some preliminary documentation with an initial reporting date in November. The Committee has also commissioned a video to be used in the consultation process.

### **8.D Conservation and Protection: Update**

Keith Pelly explained that DFO has four Fishery Officers based in Iqaluit: Winston Fillatre (Supervisor), one Senior Fishery Officer, and two trainees. There are also two Fishery Officer positions at Rankin Inlet but one of these is currently vacant. Keith explained the various patrols in which these Officers have participated over the spring and summer, including some in conjunction with DSD Wildlife Officers. Staff aim to do a lot of conservation-education work in schools during the less-busy winter period.

### **8.E 2000 Bowhead Hunt: Update**

Keith Pelly reported that Winston Fillatre was DFO's on-site Officer for this hunt. The hunt was a fast and efficient operation, being completed in two hours. Three

shots were required to dispatch the whale with an exploding harpoon. All the muktuk was taken. A large part of the meat was left behind along with the baleen, this (latter) has now been retrieved. All licence conditions were met to the satisfaction of DFO. The harvested whale was a young male. Biological samples were taken. The muktuk is still being distributed.

## **8.F Community-Based Narwhal Management : Update and New Developments**

Burt Hunt advised that the overall harvest of narwhals as reported is increasing under the new management system. He referred the members to the current-year harvest statistics (to September 20) for the four communities participating in the new system. He predicted that the final total reported narwhal landings for these communities this year would likely be around 350 animals. Burt also interpreted some of the information to be quite suspect. As one example, in some cases there have been more reports of narwhal “found dead” than narwhal “struck and lost”. This is very suspicious. If a narwhal is “found dead”, the finder can swear an affidavit and then obtain a permit to possess the tusk.

Burt reported that three more communities (Chesterfield Inlet, Coral Harbour and Rankin Inlet) are keen to participate in the new management system for narwhal and are in process of developing MOUs to that effect. Pangnirtung has requested that their annual narwhal quota be increased from 40 to 90 animals. These are worrisome trends, in view of what has been happening. Burt noted an agreement between Canada and Greenland that neither country would increase its overall narwhal harvest until the Scientific Working Group of the Canada/Greenland Joint Commission had opportunity to examine the available population data, perhaps obtain more data, and make recommendations.

Burt reminded the Board that one of the reasons for adopting the community-based (non-quota) management approach on a trial basis was the hope of obtaining better information on actual harvests and especially on animals struck and lost. This was seen as a sort of trade-off: no quotas in exchange for more complete and better reporting. Some of the communities are having a great deal of difficulty getting their members to provide full and accurate information. The HTOs and their members must understand that they have a key role to play. If they are not providing the information as agreed, then they are not fulfilling their responsibilities.

Glenn Williams stressed that there are a number of roles to be played and responsibilities to be exercised in implementing the new community-based management system. This is a crucial initiative, but everybody seems to be fumbling the ball in their own court. The initial meetings and workshops in the four communities were well received and productive, but there has been a remarkable lack of effective follow-up. Opportunities are continually being missed. Part of the problem stems from a lack of adequate support for the HTOs.

Burt Hunt reported that the results of this year’s survey of the Hudson Bay narwhal stock should be available by December. The Department is also considering the

possibility of doing a traditional knowledge study and melding the results with the scientific work. It seems unlikely that the communities will be open to any significant changes in the management regime until they see the new information.

Burt Hunt pointed out that Pelly Bay, where the quota system is still in effect for narwhals, has harvested 30 narwhals this year. They have a quota of ten, and an investigation of the over-harvest is underway. The HTO has taken some steps to develop narwhal hunting rules in hopes of and in preparation for moving to community-based management.

## **8.G Requests to Transfer Narwhal Quotas or Tags**

Ben Kovic advised that the Pangnirtung HTO recently asked the Kimmirut HTO for a transfer of unused narwhal tags. Moses Kaapik, Chairman of the Pangnirtung HTO, also acknowledged in a letter to Ben that Pangnirtung has over-harvested their 2000 narwhal quota by seven animals. Kimmirut HTO agreed to make 10 narwhal tags available to Pangnirtung. They did not know about the over-harvest when they agreed to this transfer, and they are uncomfortable about their decision in this light. However they are also not inclined to rescind it. Pangnirtung HTO had not considered that the ten transferred tags could or should be used in the first instance to cover their over-harvest. Ben suggested to Mr. Kaapik that this might be the appropriate approach. The suggestion was not well received.

Meeka Mike noted that the DFO briefing material states that Pangnirtung has over-harvested by ten animals rather than seven. Burt Hunt explained how the DFO estimate of ten was obtained. Burt also revealed that the DFO Minister has a request from the Pangnirtung HTO for an increase in their annual narwhal quota from 40 to 90 animals. Meeka observed that the population of Pangnirtung is increasing rapidly, and the present quota of 40 narwhal is certainly not in line with the basic need of this growing community. Unless and until the quota is increased, however, any transferred tags should first be applied to the over-harvest. Makabe Nartok and Moses Koonoo both agreed with this assertion.

Makabe suggested that the NWMB needed a policy to guide its decisions in respect to transferring quotas. Moses agreed, and suggested that one of the main considerations should be if the communities are harvesting the same stock. Meeka suggested that Michelle and Jim, with help from Michael, draft a policy for the December meeting. Gordon Koshinsky noted that marine mammal quotas were usually set in the first instance with the expectation that not every community would take their full quota every year. If transferring unused quotas between communities had been contemplated, the quotas may well have been set lower in the first place. Of course the reality is that most marine mammal quotas, and especially for narwhal, do not have a strong biological basis. Before sanctioning more room to harvest eastern Arctic narwhal, however, the Board might want to consider the commitment made through the Canada/Greenland Joint Commission not to increase harvests until more information is available to do a proper assessment.

Michael d'Eça interpreted that the issue under consideration revolved around the assignment of harvesting rights. Assignment is the purview of Inuit as per the NLCA, and no one (including the NWMB) has any authority to limit it. However if harvest controls are in place for a particular stock it has to be understood that harvesting rights can only be assigned with respect to that same stock. Gordon pointed out an assignment would generally be perceived as an arrangement that was made before an over-harvest occurred, rather than as a way of sanctioning an over-harvest. Michael agreed that it would not be appropriate to try to use assignment as a way of nullifying an illegal act. This however did not prevent the Board from directing that assigned quota be used to cover an over-harvest.

Ben acknowledged that it is not known if Pangnirtung and Kimmirut are harvesting the same narwhal stock. The main thing that the NWMB can and should be insistent about is that any transferred tags be used in the first instance to cover any over-harvest. The absence of a policy need not deter the Board from making a decision on the matter at hand, although the Board could also give notice that a policy is being developed.

Gordon suggested that delimiting eastern Arctic narwhal stocks be made a research priority, along with obtaining estimates of population abundance. Michelle advised that samples for narwhal stock differentiation were in fact being obtained.

Kevin McCormick suggested that the tag system used to track and control polar bear hunting seems to be quite effective. He wondered why the same principles could not be applied to other species such as narwhal. Ben pointed out one of the problems is the different behaviours of polar bears and marine mammals. Narwhal tend to show up at a community only occasionally, and then often in rather large numbers. Meeka further explained that when this happens and many hunters are trying to harvest narwhal in the same short period of time it is easy for an over-harvest to occur. Still, over-harvesting is illegal and it should be possible to develop a system that makes it less likely to happen. Kevin noted that in the final analysis, control and reporting of the harvest are matters that need to be improved.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 189**) to acknowledge the transfer (assignment) of ten narwhal tags from the unused narwhal quota at Kimmirut to Pangnirtung for the current hunting season, and at the same time encourage the Pangnirtung HTO to ensure that this transferred quota is used in the first instance to cover the current over-harvest of narwhal prior to using the additional quota for any additional hunting.

The Board also directed NWMB staff to draft a policy with respect to transferring quotas or tags for the consideration of the Board at the next meeting.

Ben advised that he also had a request, recently delivered to him by the Chairman of the Clyde River HTO, for a transfer of "any number" of unused narwhal tags from

Resolute to Clyde River for the current season. The Board concluded that this was a straight-forward matter of assignment.

## **8.H Community-Based Beluga Management : Update**

Burt Hunt interpreted that the new management system was working well at Kimmirut, but certainly was not working at Iqaluit where there has been essentially no reporting. (Michelle Wheatley noted that Kimmirut, in fact, does not yet have their hunting rules in place.) Burt reported that agreement was reached to maintain but increase the beluga quota at Pangnirtung, from 35 to 41 animals this also pending the affirmation of certain arrangements by the community. Although the pre-adjusted quota has already been exceeded by two animals as reported, there is no indication that the conditions/arrangements for expanding the quota have been met. These conditions include:

- development of community hunting rules;
- development of an effective reporting system for landings and struck/lost;
- development of procedures to ensure that the quota is respected; and
- development of an action plan to deal with entrapped beluga.

Ben Kovic reported that the Iqaluit HTO is trying to obtain the necessary beluga harvest and related statistics and monitoring data, but the hunters have not been responding. He interpreted the problem to be based in the highly mixed nature of the community in terms of culture and perspectives. Ben asked for suggestions on what the NWMB might do to improve the situation. He noted that failure to improve the implementation aspects of community-based management could be expected to result in the demise of the new system. He could not excuse hunters for not meeting their reporting and monitoring commitments.

## **8.I Protection of Fish and Fish Habitat**

Burt Hunt explained that the DFO Habitat Biologist in Iqaluit reviews, screens and provides advice on projects, activities and development proposals. This includes reviewing land-use and lease applications as well as municipal and industrial water license applications. Mining and mineral exploration is the most significant industrial activity in Nunavut and is a major source of public concern. Burt presented a list of these mining activities. Some items on the list pertain to cleanup and reclamation; these tend not to be trivial matters. For instance, it is anticipated that closing the Polaris mine will be just about as problematic environmentally as operating it. DFO predicts that its Nunavut habitat file will be an expanding one.

## **8.J Oceans-Related Matters**

Burt Hunt reiterated the commitment by the Minister of DFO to be the lead (among many Departments) in delivering an Oceans Strategy as per the new *Oceans Act*.

Burt reminded the Board about the staff position that has been made available to work on obligations and opportunities pertaining to this initiative, and in so doing to serve as a resource person to the Nunavut Marine Council. DFO has decided to accommodate this position in its Iqaluit office. The position has been classified as a PM-3, and every effort will be made to fill it with an NLCA beneficiary.

Ben Kovic urged DFO to update the other IPGs on this initiative as it proceeds. Burt agreed to try to find a way to involve all the IPGs in the actual staffing process.

#### **8.K SE Baffin Beluga Management Committee: Future of the Committee**

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Members that the Board had, in a previous Conference Call (No. 50), considered the proposal that the Southeast Baffin Beluga Management Committee be disbanded. The Board at that time (June 14) decided to solicit the views of the Committee members and particularly of their HTOs on this matter. This was done by letter of June 15 to the three HTOs and to the QWB. Although it is known that some consideration has been given to the question, formal responses to the letter have not been received.

Gordon Koshinsky reiterated his contention that the Committee should be disbanded. While he applauded what the Committee had achieved, he noted that the rationale for the Committee stemmed from the assumption that the three communities (Pangnirtung, Iqaluit and Kimmirut) were harvesting from a common stock of beluga whales. Information recently acquired has refuted this assumption. Gordon suggested that the focus now should be community-based beluga management rather than regionally-oriented beluga management. He expressed concern that the Committee might in fact become an obstacle rather than remain a catalyst for the kind of management attention that was now required.

The Board decided that the Chairperson and the Director of Wildlife Management should follow up on the requests to the HTOs and the RWO for input on this matter.

#### **8.L Walrus Working Group: Update**

Michelle Wheatley advised that the Working Group is scheduled to meet at the end of October. Community representatives will present information stemming from their tasks. An options paper on walrus management being prepared by Rob Stewart of DFO with Michelle's participation will be the main basis of discussion.

### **9. Government of Nunavut Wildlife (DSD): Issues and Decisions**

#### **9.A M'Clintock Channel Polar Bears: Population Status**

Stephen Atkinson reminded the Board about his presentation at the March meeting concerning polar bear population studies underway with respect to the M'Clintock

Channel (MC) population. This, along with similar work being done in the Gulf of Boothia (GB), is being financially supported by the NWRT Fund. Preliminary results in March indicated that the GB population was healthy, but that the MC population was considerably smaller than the estimate that was being used to set quotas.

The results from another year of work this April and May, although not yet finalised, serve to confirm the original indications. The preliminary best estimate for the MC population at the present time is 288 bears: much less than the estimate of 700 that has been the basis for the current calculation of sustainable harvest. A population estimate of 288 yields an annual sustainable harvest estimate of only eight bears. The present quota is 32, and is well above what the data indicate is sustainable. Stephen explained that "sustainable" in this context does not provide for recovery of the population but merely preservation of the status quo. Assuming that the population was indeed a fully isolated entity, it would take an estimated 22 years of no harvesting at all for the population to recover to the point at which the current rate of harvest would be sustainable. Stephen also noted that the annual harvest being newly recommended to assure sustainability of the population at its present size was calculated on the basis of equal harvest of males and females (at least temporarily) due to the disproportionately depleted status of adult males.

DSD staff very recently visited the three communities that harvest the MC polar bear population. The group met formally with the HTOs (except in Cambridge Bay, where bad weather precluded a quorum), and also interviewed individual hunters. The HTOs recognized that serious action was required, but could not commit to specifics without consulting further with their constituents. Hunters who were interviewed generally concurred with the trends identified via the scientific studies.

It is important to note that the MC polar bear population is one of those approved by US authorities for importation of trophies by sport hunters into the USA. On account of the US interest in the matter, the preliminary information has been forwarded (via the CWS) to the US Fish and Wildlife Service, along with an indication of how the situation would or could be addressed. The main message to the US authorities was that we are working in a co-management environment and that there is adequate time to take action since most polar bear hunting occurs in the spring. Of some concern is the fact that at least eight, and possibly more, polar bear sport hunts have already been booked for spring 2001.

Makabe Nartok asked about the field time devoted to this study to date, and if more work was planned for next year. Stephen replied that 120 hours were devoted to fieldwork this year, similar to the previous two years of the project. It may not be cost-effective to do more fieldwork in 2001. Delaying additional fieldwork for a year or two might confer advantages for the interpretation of the mark/recapture data.

Stephen stated that a summary report has been very recently prepared, and will be provided to the HTOs and to the KHTA. DSD aims to have follow-up meetings in the three communities over the next two months, and hopes to bring community

representatives together for a joint session to try to resolve this issue. The plan is to have some kind of consensus for the consideration of the NWMB by December.

Phillip Kadlun, Chairman of the KHTA speaking from the floor, strongly endorsed the plan to conduct more consultation with the three communities.

Gordon Koshinsky observed that there is a natural preference to never hear anything except good news, but this is not a realistic expectation. The Board will have to be prepared to play a responsible role in this matter, taking account of all information and being consistent with the principles of conservation. Kevin McCormick noted that how this issue is resolved will affect how the management of polar bears in Nunavut is generally perceived. It may be appropriate to encourage the three communities not to book any more polar bear sport hunts from the MC population until this problem has been satisfactorily addressed.

Ben Kovic followed up on Stephen's assertion that the original (1978) calculation for the size of this population was actually 350, but that this was "bumped up" in the course of finalizing the population estimate. Ben wondered why this was done, and if the initial calculation might actually have been more correct. Stephen advised that the adjustment was done at the time of the calculation, but could not offer a reason.

### **In-Camera Session**

The Board decided to conduct an *in-camera* (evening) session in order to discuss some administrative and other matters having confidential implications.

Resolutions passed in connection with holding this *in-camera* session were:

- To go *in-camera* (**Resolution 2000- 190**)
- To close the *in-camera* session (**Resolution 2000- 191**)

### **Wednesday, 27 September 2000**

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, re-convened the meeting at 08:30 a.m.

Ben Kovic directed the attention of the Board to the matters discussed *in-camera* that require further treatment by the Board in open forum.

On the matter of encouraging hunters and HTOs to meet their co-management obligations under the new community-based management systems for narwhal and beluga, the Board decided (**Resolution 2000-192**) that the NWMB Chairperson,

with the assistance of Board Member Moses Koonoo, should interact with the HTOs participating in these new management systems in order to impress upon them and upon their members the need to fully meet their responsibilities to report their harvests and to provide sampling information with respect to their catches.

On the matter of the request from DIAND to return year-end funds for 1999/00, the Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 193**) that the NWMB should formally decline the request on the grounds that to comply would be contrary to the NLCA, to the Implementation Contract, and to the Funding Agreement with DIAND.

On the matter of hiring an NWMB Office Manager, the Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 194**) that the NWMB should authorize the Executive Director to explore and develop a proposal for a staffing action.

On the matter of hiring a full-time Database Manager for the Harvest Study, the Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 195**) that the Executive Director should negotiate with the current casual Database Management Assistant to fill this position, and to advise the Harvest Study Committee accordingly.

## **9.B Review of Polar Bear Management MOUs: Consultation Plan**

Stephen Atkinson reminded the Board that a year ago the DSD Minister, while affirming his general support for the MOU-approach to the governance of polar bear management in Nunavut, directed his department to conduct a review of these MOUs. Stephen referred to the briefing note contained in the background material for this meeting, and observed that it is little changed from what was presented to the Board in March. The MOUs were completed in 1996, and included provision for review within five years. The objectives identified for these reviews are:

1. To update them to reflect new information, both scientific and traditional;
2. To examine and assess the current system of management;
3. To evaluate progress on implementing Government commitments;
4. To recommend revisions to reflect new thinking and new priorities;
5. To amend the MOUs as may be appropriate in light of new realities.

Stephen stated that an important consideration in planning these reviews is that five population surveys remain in progress, the results for which have not been completed and distributed to the communities. Meaningful consultation is dependent upon completion of this work, which has accordingly been made a matter of high priority.

Stephen noted that a frequent point of contention embodied in the MOUs has been the flexible quota system and its perceived complexity. The Department has tried to develop a computer program that people can “play with” to help visualise the impacts of different harvest configurations on the ensuing quota. The Department also has a computer program for animating polar bear movements. This program demonstrates how information is used to estimate population boundaries. Other

issues include dealing with problem bears, managing defence kills, developing deterrents, and compensating for bears killed by other-than hunters or sportsmen.

Meeka Mike asked about the Government commitments in the MOUs that remain unaddressed. Stephen replied that two such items would be the development of bear deterrents and the documentation of polar bear habitat, particularly denning locations. Stephen suggested that the latter would be a prime area for the input of traditional knowledge and for community-based studies.

Joan Scottie asked if recent accounts on the effects of global warming on polar bears will be on the agenda for these reviews. Stephen replied that the communities will certainly be given opportunity to express their views and concerns in this regard.

Moses Koonoo was not clear about the term “flexible quota system”. He asked if it referred to a possibility of changing quota allotments among communities. He noted that Arctic Bay and Grise Fiord have had disagreements about this in the past. Grise Fiord has not always used their entire quota, but they have not been willing to transfer unused tags when Arctic Bay (for example) used up all of theirs. Stephen noted that these communities, along with Resolute Bay, harvest from the Lancaster Sound polar bear population, which is one of those for which a new population study is nearing completion. This study will be instrumental in deciding whether the present overall quota of 78 is appropriate. It is ultimately up to the participating communities to decide how these quotas are divided up. The RWO, the NWMB, and DSD can provide historical information and guidance if requested.

Makabe Nartok asked when community consultations were likely to get underway. Stephen replied that the aim was to get the results of the studies out to the communities early in the new year. Consultations would commence once the communities had time to consider the findings, hopefully before summer.

Ben Kovic asked if traditional knowledge is being collected and taken into account. Stephen replied that, except in the case of Davis Strait, traditional knowledge is not receiving concerted attention in the polar bear population studies now being completed. However hunters and elders will have ample opportunity to provide their input in the course of the community consultations.

Michael d'Eça suggested that the NWMB take time to develop a full and formal response to the review process as outlined by DSD. His first impression was that it might be useful for DSD to develop a scoping paper to set the stage for the whole exercise. He questioned the assertion that the reviews and comments of the HTOs, RWOs and other interested individuals with respect to the MOUs were going to be obtained in written form. Michael also suggested that draft MOUs be developed at an intermediate stage in the process, and that these drafts be circulated to the communities as part of the consultations. He also noted that the existing polar bear MOUs, and the MOUs that are expected to result from this exercise, are in fact (at

least in part) management plans. As such there will need to be provision in the process for the NWMB to consider and approve them.

Stephen questioned the value of spending much time and effort developing a scoping paper. The assertion that comments are going to be obtained in written form simply means that DSD staff will write down what people say at the consultation meetings. No single draft MOU would serve in all situations, but communities will have opportunity to develop a sense of the emerging MOU product as it evolves in each case. The authority of the NWMB to approve (or not) the wildlife management aspects of the MOUs is recognised.

### **9.C Use of Snow Machines for Sport-Hunting Polar Bears**

Stephen Atkinson reminded the Board of the request from Arviat HTO that the legislation governing polar bear hunting be changed to allow the use of snowmobiles and all-terrain vehicles (ATVs). The Board decided (Conference Call No. 50) to ask DSD to brief the Board on the legislation and agreements that pertain to this matter, and the implications of making such a change. Stephen referred the Members to the briefing material in the meeting binder.

Stephen noted that Canada is the only country that allows polar bear sport hunting. Canada was roundly criticised when it enacted this provision. The provision was justified on the basis that it would be a “token” sport hunt, rooted in traditional customs and rights. Last year there were 75 successful polar bear sport hunts in Nunavut. Five of these were at Arviat, the only community that sport-hunts the Western Hudson Bay population. The rationale that this is a “token” activity would be put in question if snowmobiles or other forms of mechanization were legalized for the conduct of the hunts. Stephen stressed that the Arviat request is not perceived as a conservation issue. A regulation is in place that states the prohibition, but no Departmental or Ministerial position has been enunciated on the matter.

Ben Kovic explained the reason for the Arviat request. The community is not typical because polar bears are available for hunting only in the fall, before there is enough snow to run dog teams effectively. When the ice forms on the Bay, the bears move offshore. Only the frozen beach strip generally provides opportunity to use dog teams while the bears are in the vicinity. This strip tends to be narrow so that the bears are able to get into the water before the hunter (using dogs) can get close enough to make a kill, or (sometimes) before the hunter can finish off a wounded animal. Being able to use snow machines would help, because the machines would provide more rapid access to any bear that was seen or wounded. Community hunters at Arviat tend to use ATVs and usually hunt farther inland. Another option for the sport hunt might be to use stronger and faster dogs.

Stephen stressed that what is at stake is the perception of the hunt, notably in the context of the *International Agreement on the Conservation of Polar Bears and their Habitats* that Canada signed and ratified in 1978. This Agreement commits the five

signatory parties (countries) to pursue what the title of the Agreement implies, and includes (in Article III) the following provisions regarding the taking of polar bears:

1. Subject to the provisions of Articles II and IV, any contracting party may allow the taking of polar bears when such taking is carried out:
  - d) by local people using traditional methods in the exercise of their traditional rights and in accordance with the laws of that party;
  - e) wherever polar bears have or might have been subject to taking by traditional means by its nationals.

The Canadian declaration on the ratification of the Agreement clarified the Canadian position and the understanding according to which Canada signed the Agreement. The declaration includes the following statement(s):

2. As regards the hunting rights of local people, protected under Article III, paragraph 1, sub-paragraphs d) and e), Canadian practice is based on the following considerations:
  - b) The polar bear hunt in Canada is an important traditional right and cultural element of the Inuit and Indian peoples. In certain cases this hunt may extend some distance seaward. Traditional methods are followed in this hunt.
  - c) In the exercise of these traditional polar bear hunting rights, and based on the clause “in accordance with the laws of that party”, the local people in a settlement may authorize the selling of a polar bear permit from the sub-population quota to a non-Inuit or non-Indian hunter, but with additional restrictions providing that the hunt be conducted under the guidance of a native hunter and by using a dog team and be conducted within Canadian jurisdiction.

In summary, the arguments against the Arviat proposal to use mechanized equipment for sport-hunting polar bears are based on the perceived importance to:

- Honour the terms of the international Agreement, as set out above;
- Foster the use of dog teams, which are useful in an Arctic economy;
- Enhance the sport-hunting experience for sport-hunting clients;
- Protect the fair-chase concept, which is integral to sport-hunting culture;
- Not incite anti-hunting sentiments in the population at large.

Ben Kovic wondered if the prohibition on use of mechanized equipment as per the International Agreement might in fact be the purview of the NWMB as a matter of non-quota limitation. Ben referred to Article IV of the International Agreement which states that: The use of aircraft and large motorized vessels for the purpose of taking polar bears shall be prohibited except where the application of such prohibition would be inconsistent with domestic laws. Ben noted that the Southwest Hudson Bay polar bear population appears to be in a healthy state, and wondered if consideration could be given to meeting the Arviat request on a pilot basis as a test of community-based co-management.

Michael d'Eça interpreted Ben's observations to be worthy of consideration. He noted that Canada would have to have implementing legislation to bring the International Agreement into effect. Stephen said that he assumed that this was done through the Canada *Wildlife Act*, but he could not confirm. Kevin McCormick doubted that this was the avenue that was actually used. Kevin wondered if an Agreement carried the same implications as a Convention in this context. Kevin also stressed that there were far more fundamental matters to consider than whether a loophole could be found to get around the prohibition. The real issue is how the hunt and the conduct of the hunt are perceived. Gordon Koshinsky suggested that it might not be wise to attempt changes that could draw a lot of attention to Canadian Arctic polar bear sport hunt. It is not inconceivable that the International Agreement could be interpreted by some in a way that would put even the domestic polar bear hunt as currently conducted in some jeopardy.

Ben Kovic wondered if circumpolar Inuit were involved in negotiating the International Agreement. He assumed probably not. Kevin McCormick observed that the Agreement would have been developed according to the norms that prevailed at the time. He doubted that the prescribed use of dog teams for sport hunting would have been forced on Inuit against their will. Stephen Atkinson stated that if anything, there was Inuit pressure in favour of a prohibiting mechanization since there was concern at the time about the emerging possibility of aircraft being used to hunt polar bears.

Joan Scottie asked if Arviat was the only community requesting this change. Other communities may be opposed to the introduction of snowmobiles and ATVs for sport hunting. Moses Koonoo stated that in his experience, the use of traditional means (including dog teams) contributes a large part to a sport hunter's euphoria when he has had a successful polar bear hunt. If one community started to use vehicles, others would feel compelled to follow suit. Part of the problem at Arviat may stem from using the wrong kind of dogs or from using improper techniques. Training might be part of the solution.

The Board decided to defer decision on the Arviat request. It was agreed to advise the HTO and KWF that the Board was giving the matter further consideration.

#### **9.D Polar Bear Harvest Report and Quotas for Next Season**

Stephen Atkinson referred the Board to the updated community harvest statistics for the 1999/00 polar bear hunting season, along with the Department's quota recommendations for 2000/01. All the communities have been informed, and all of them (except Sanikiluaq, which hunts its own distinct population) have indicated that they understand and appreciate (albeit are not necessarily delighted about) their situations. The recommendations take account of any credit exchanges that the communities have been able to negotiate among themselves to cover over-harvests with respect to particular populations. In summary (for 1999/00):

- Four communities exceeded the total allowable harvest;

- Ten communities on the flexible quota system exceeded the sustainable harvest of females;
- Six of these ten communities had credits to cover their over-harvest;
- Three communities not on the flexible quota system exceeded the sustainable harvest of females and do not have credits to cover.

After reviewing the recommendations of the Department for polar bear quota revisions for the 2000/01 hunting season, the Board decided (**Resolution 2000-196**) as follows::

- To restore the quota for Taloyoak with respect to the Gulf of Boothia polar bear population from 6 to 15 animals.
- To restore the quota for Igloodik with respect to the Foxe Basin polar bear population from 5 to 9 animals.
- To decrease the quota for Pangnirtung with respect to the Davis Strait polar bear population from 14 to 12 animals.
- To decrease the quota for Sanikiluaq with respect to the Southern Hudson Bay polar bear population from 25 to 13 animals.
- To decrease the quota for Kimmirut with respect to the Foxe Basin polar bear population from 10 to 5 animals.

Stephen noted that there are ongoing discussions about the possible loan of credits to Kimmirut from Hall Beach (Foxe Basin population) which, if successfully concluded, would warrant revision to the Kimmirut quota as now decided. Stephen also noted that concrete quota recommendations with respect to the M'Clintock Channel population are not being put forward at this time. Such will await further consultations with the three participating communities.

### **9.E New Nunavut Wildlife Act: Update**

Stephen Atkinson advised that a Wildlife Legislation Working Group has now been established to take this matter forward. Terms of reference for the Working Group were adopted last week by the three parties to its creation: the Nunavut Government as represented by DSD, NTI and NWMB. The Nunavut Government has given its authorization for this initiative to proceed. It is hoped that the new Act will be ready for introduction to the Nunavut Legislature by fall of 2002.

Meeka Mike requested that documents developed in the course of this exercise be circulated to all Members of the NWMB.

### **9.F Thelon Wildlife Sanctuary Management Plan: Update**

Stephen Atkinson reminded the Board that Article 9.5.2 of the NLCA requires the Territorial Government to “co-ordinate the preparation of a management plan to jointly conserve and manage” the Sanctuary based on the recommendations of the DIO and affected communities. This process has taken much longer than was

anticipated. A final draft of the plan was completed following a meeting of the Nunavut interests in May. The last step before the ultimate approval process is to obtain the agreement of Lutsel K'e and of the GNWT.

### **9.G Bluenose Caribou Management Plan: Next Steps**

Stephen Atkinson reviewed the history of this initiative, particularly the fact that following John Nagy's presentation in March the NWMB accepted that Bluenose caribou was in fact comprised of three separate breeding populations, with only the Eastern Bluenose (Ahiak) component being of direct interest to Nunavut. The NWMB subsequently decided (Conference Call No. 50) to support the development of a separate management plan for the Bluenose East (Ahiak) herd

Stephen indicated that most of what is needed for the Ahiak caribou management plan can be teased out of the documentation that was produced when the Bluenose was assumed to be a single herd. An important exception may be the need to produce an independent population estimate for the Ahiak herd, since preliminary indications are that the harvest may be greater than what is sustainable. DSD has asked the Regional Office to make arrangements for a meeting of the parties with an interest in the management of the Ahiak caribou herd. Those parties will of course include the GNWT and the Sahtu.

### **9.H Bathurst Caribou Management Planning: Update**

Michelle Wheatley reviewed her report on the first official meeting of the Bathurst Caribou Management Planning Committee, held in July at Daring Lake. Makabe Nartok represented the NWMB as a member of the Committee.

The aim of the meeting was to draw up a work plan for developing the actual management plan. This was achieved; the resulting work plan has a three-year time horizon and includes provision for the development of options papers and the conduct of workshops. DIAND has provided funds for the participation of aboriginal groups in the Planning Committee, and DSD and RWED are also willing to contribute resources. Nevertheless, funding shortfalls are anticipated, and the NWMB can expect to be approached to cover more than the costs of its member's participation.

### **9.I General Status of Wildlife Species in Nunavut**

Stephen Atkinson advised the Board that as part of the "Accord for the Protection of Species at Risk in Canada" developed in 1996, all territories and provinces agreed to conduct general monitoring of all species every five years (beginning in late 2000) in order to classify species into priority categories to guide COSEWIC in the production of more detailed assessments. This is a "flagging exercise" which is not

specifically tied to any legislation, and the results will not have legal status. However they will be widely distributed and should contribute to the general commitment of the Ministers responsible for wildlife to prevent species in Canada from becoming extinct as a consequence of human activity.

Stephen explained that this is very much a co-operative exercise, with inputs taken from a broad cross-section of experts and sources. The GNWT has been a key participant in preparing the 2000 report for Nunavut. The procedure being used is based on the scoring of seven standard biological indicators (pertaining to population size, trend and threat) to yield one of nine possible status categories to represent the general “health” of the species (from “secure” to “at risk”). Stephen also noted that the number of species/populations in Nunavut that are currently classified by COSEWIC as either endangered, threatened, or of special concern include five listings under the purview of the Nunavut Government, six under the purview of CWS, and four under the purview of DFO.

Michael d'Eça drew attention to the statement in the briefing material that “Under Bill C-33, the Nunavut Government (will be) obligated to have recovery and management plans for species-at-risk. Michael simply urged that the mandate of the NWMB to approve any such plans not be forgotten.

## **9.J DSD Suggestion that the NWMB Administer CARD Program**

Jim Noble reminded the Board that this item was on the agenda of a previous meeting (No.24, in Sanikiluaq) in the context of efforts by the Nunavut Development Corporation (NDC) and others to establish a Nunavut Inter-Settlement Trade Committee (NI-ST Committee) to meet the administrative requirements for Territorial participation in the CARD program. The acronym stands for Canadian Adaptation and Rural Development, and the program comes under Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada. The program provides funding for projects designed to assist the agriculture and agri-food sector to adapt to new challenges and support new ways of doing business. Commercial uses of wildlife (other than fish) are deemed to qualify as part of the agri-food sector in this context. The Board previously endorsed the initiative to establish a NI-ST Committee (Resolution 2000- 074) and agreed in principle to participate in the Committee if invited to do so.

It had been anticipated that the NDC would be the agency to spearhead this initiative in Nunavut, but they have backed away. DSD sees the program as an opportunity to access funding for development of the country food industry. With creation of a NI-ST Committee no longer being considered, DSD has turned to the NWMB as a possible “responsible body” that would meet the Federal Government’s administrative requirements to oversee the CARD program.

Kevin McCormick argued that it is not in the mandate of the NWMB to play a lead role in such a developmental initiative. Despite assurances to the contrary, it seemed probable that it would entail considerable new workload. Kevin suggested

that, given the NDC decision to stand aside, DSD could play the required role equally or more effectively than the NWMB. In his view, this would also be more consistent with the DSD mandate than with that of the NWMB.

The Board agreed to decline the request from DSD to consider administering the CARD initiative on behalf of Nunavut.

## **10. NWMB Internal Items: Issues and Decisions**

### **10.A Nunavut Wildlife Harvest Study: Update**

Michelle Wheatley referred to the briefing note prepared by Heather Priest. Heather started in the position of Harvest Study Co-ordinator on July 17. Her briefing note is essentially a report on her activities since that time. Michelle advised that Heather has already made a great deal of progress in getting the Harvest Study back on track. One of the first things she discovered was that there had been no additions to the main database since last November. The database is now up-to-date through 1998, with data for several communities entered through May 1999. Almost all of the 1999 data have been received, and need to be verified and appended. The task of developing community reports is once again underway. These are meant to cover the period up to May 1999. The Database Manager, Daniel Kulugutuk, has been absent from work for no apparent cause. Given the volume and importance of the work, Josée Galipeau has been hired on a casual basis and is being trained to continue this work until permanent staffing arrangements can be made. Arrangements have been made for printing of the Harvest Study calendar for 2001.

Gordon Koshinsky noted that the Harvest Study is not going to end up with an unbroken five-year record for every community. It does not appear that the gaps will be numerous, but thought needs to be given to how the gaps that do occur are going to be dealt with. The most onerous approach would be to extend the Study in those particular instances. It seems unlikely, however, that long sequences of reliable harvest data could ever be obtained in some communities such as Iqaluit. We must start directing attention to the question of how the formulas set out in the NLCA for calculating basic needs levels are going to be implemented.

Michelle reminded the Board that some agencies have expressed an interest to have the collection of harvest data continue after the scheduled completion of field work under the Harvest Study in May 2001. NTI is one of the leading proponents, being concerned about loss of momentum if data collection were to cease and if it then had to be started again. Terms of reference have been drafted for a contract to assess the feasibility of continuing the Study. Feasibility would include identifying all of the agencies having an interest in continuation of this work, and documenting their specific needs. Glenn Williams noted that the RWOs and HTOs at the recent Wildlife Symposium unanimously passed a resolution calling for the collection of harvest data to be continued.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 197**) to provide \$10,000 towards the cost of such a feasibility study, subject to input by the Harvest Study Committee on the terms of reference.

### **10.B Big-Game Hunting Guides Working Group: Update**

Michelle Wheatley advised that at the last meeting of the Working Group in April, members of the Group were assigned to consult with their respective regions and organizations on the ideas developed at the meeting. No feedback has yet been received from any of the members, and the process of following up has begun. A meeting to finalise recommendations to the NWMB is planned for later in the fall.

### **10.C Establishing Wildlife (Management) Research Priorities: Policy Proposal**

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Members that the NWMB has had in place for a number of years a process for establishing wildlife research priorities. It has become apparent that this process has a number of serious shortcomings, such as the failure to clearly link research priorities with management requirements and the lack of a clear avenue for the NWMB to promote and solicit research projects that the Board deems to be necessary.

Michelle proposed a new and different approach, with basic elements as follows:

- Identify wildlife management issues;
- Consider if and how those management issues could be addressed;
- Prioritise the management issues to be addressed;
- Identify information needs (research and study requirements);
- Prioritise research and study requirements;
- Solicit proposals to do the work.

Michelle tabled an outline of how such a system might be implemented. The process as proposed would focus heavily on obtaining input from HTOs with respect to wildlife management issues and how they could be addressed, and on digesting this input at the Regional (RWO) level. The new approach could be implemented as early as next summer, in conjunction with the RWO AGMs. This would allow for the review and consolidation of wildlife management priorities (issues) at the fall meeting of the NWMB, including the identification and prioritisation of research needs to address those priorities. These research needs would then be communicated to government agencies, giving them opportunity to develop and submit proposals for NWRT funding by early in the next calendar year. Communities would be on a similar time line for developing proposals for NWMB Study funding. Michelle estimated that this approach would cost about the same as the current method of establishing wildlife research priorities for the NSA.

Kevin McCormick considered that the proposal was generally meritorious. He recalled previous discussions about developing a database with respect to wildlife

populations in the NSA, and suggested that such a database would be a very useful underpinning for the proposed approach. Burt Hunt predicted that management issues brought forward by communities would tend to focus on species that were being used for human consumption. He appreciated the need to make way for inputs from other sources besides the communities, including from the NWMB itself. It was important that management needs and opportunities (including research and study aspects) in respect to such matters as potential and emerging fisheries, interaction among and between species, and broad-scale ecological concerns, could be brought to the table. Such items might not ordinarily emerge in a list of community priorities as would be expressed by representative at a meeting.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 198**) to instruct the Director of Wildlife Management to draft a new policy statement regarding the identification of wildlife management priorities in the NSA, this statement to be devised according to the general framework as presented, and to provide a basis for establishing wildlife research and study priorities.

#### **10.D Review of NWRT Funding Disbursements**

Michelle Wheatley advised that she is conducting a review of all NWRT projects funded to date according to a number of criteria, including whether final reports have been submitted and whether the research results have been used. The resulting database will have application in such determinations as expenditures made by species and regions. It is already apparent that total NWRT expenditures have been roughly equivalent for the three regions, and that by far the greatest amount of funding has been disbursed in respect to research on polar bears.

#### **10.E NWMB Strategic Plan Implementation: Update**

Jim Noble tabled his regular report on progress implementing the one-year and three-year strategic plans. The one-year plan is pretty well on track, but a much more concerted effort needs to be applied in respect to most of the items identified in the three-year plan. Jim reminded the Members that the NWMB is required to submit a status report on the one-year workplan to DIAND by November 1. Michael d'Eça observed that the three-year plan is really just a collection of ideas arising from the NWMB's November 1999 Strategic Planning Meeting, and has never been approved as an actual planning document by the Board.

Jim suggested that the Board may need to conduct a workshop early in the new year in order to lay the groundwork for the NWMB submissions for the next Planning Period (expected to be from 2003 to 2013). Michael d'Eça interpreted the requirement, as per the guidelines that have been received, for each IPG to provide the Implementation Panel with a 10-year funding proposal, including workplans, by the first of April 2001.

## **11. NTI Wildlife Division: Issues and Decisions**

### **11.A Promotion of Inuit Training and Employment: NWMB Responsibilities**

Glenn Williams reminded the Board of the challenge he issued at a Board meeting about a year ago (Meeting No. 23, Repulse Bay) that the NWMB take more seriously those of its responsibilities under the NLCA that pertain to training and employing Inuit. Those responsibilities are set out in Clause 5.2.38 of the Agreement and require the NWMB to:

- (b) promote and encourage training for Inuit in the various fields of wildlife research and management;
- (c) promote and encourage the employment of Inuit and Inuit organizations in research and technical positions made available through government and private sector research contracts.

Glenn noted that when he raised this matter the Board suggested that it be referred to the (then) forthcoming workshop on wildlife research priorities. This was done, and led to a subsequent broader-based meeting last November. There was considerable optimism after that meeting, going forward. Government departments active in this area acknowledged that they could indeed be doing more. NTI believes that the matter warrants continuing follow up, and urges the NWMB to take an active role in doing so.

Specifically, NTI is recommending that the NWMB:

- Make the training and employment of Inuit and Inuit organizations in the conduct of research a prerequisite for obtaining NWRT funding; and
- Establish a system of reporting by government departments to the NWMB on Inuit involvement in research projects being funded by the NWRT.

Kevin McCormick recalled that participants at the initial meeting called for the development and maintenance of a registry of Inuit people in the different communities who would be interested in and available for training and/or employment in wildlife research. Kevin also recalled that NTI undertook to follow up on this. Glenn acknowledged that such a registry was discussed, but noted that most if not all government agencies that are active in wildlife research in Nunavut already have lists of this nature. The problem is in how these lists are (or are not) being used. NTI has no interest in duplicating what is already being done, but wants to move forward and remove false barriers. When a government agency undertakes to conduct wildlife research in the NSA, then that agency should employ local people to the greatest extent possible. Most of these opportunities will admittedly be short-term, but that is a start. What is really disconcerting is when an agency declares that there will be a certain amount of Inuit participation in a project, and then fails to follow through. They should be held accountable in such instances.

Kevin considered the idea of monitoring and reporting progress in this area to be reasonable, but expressed concern about the NTI recommendation that training and employment of Inuit be made an absolute prerequisite for accessing NWRT funding. Burt Hunt noted that DFO already has a system for monitoring the employment of aboriginal people in research. However DFO does not have reliable registries of available Inuit candidates. If NTI (or anyone) were to develop and maintain such a list, then DFO would surely take it very seriously. However making it absolutely compulsory to hire Inuit no matter what the realities of the project could result in some very good and necessary project proposals not being brought forward. Or good projects might be scuttled if no local hires were found to be available.

Michelle Wheatley pointed out that training and employment of local people is in fact one of the criteria used to assess proposals for project funding under the NWRT. For example, multi-year funding will not be granted unless a project achieves a passing grade on this (and three other) factors. Michelle also advised that performance in local hiring is one of the factors that she is assessing in her audit of research projects that have been or are being funded. There does seem to have been some improvement over time. However Michelle stressed that not all projects are equally amenable to the employment and/or training of local people. She also noted that the NWMB is not the only agency cited in the NLCA as having an obligation to promote the training of Inuit even, it can be assumed, in the area of wildlife research.

Moses Koonoo considered the provisions in the NLCA on this matter to be of considerable importance. It is imperative to get Inuit into more professions than just those that they have traditionally occupied. If the NWMB cannot get researchers to take these provisions seriously and/or if they do not honour their commitments, then those researchers should not be eligible for further funding. It may be that Arctic College should have a direct role in this. Meeka Mike asked if anyone knew what views were held by NRI. Glenn noted that Bruce Rigby attended the second meeting, and spoke mostly about scholarships and training opportunities.

Stephen Atkinson suggested that employment and training are very different matters. It is one thing, and generally relatively simple, to provide a few weeks of local employment on a particular project. However training is a longer-term proposition. DSD has established three full-time training positions for technicians, with a training period of two years. DSD believes that this kind of initiative needs to be encouraged.

Gordon Koshinsky could see pitfalls if it were made completely mandatory for every research project being funded by the NWRT to hire Inuit. Such a provision would invite artificial and manipulative behaviour by researchers and their managers. Some research projects by their very nature will be much more effective generators of local training and employment opportunities than other research projects. If the method of developing research priorities is changed to focus on wildlife management issues in the first instance (as has been suggested), this could open

the way to looking for training and employment opportunities over a broader range of possibilities. In addressing a particular wildlife management issue, the bulk of the training and employment opportunities may well be in those aspects of the overall project that do not encompass research of the nature that is funded by the NWRT. Looking at the issue holistically should help to ensure that the full range of opportunities can be identified so that maximum advantage can be taken.

Ben Kovic suggested that the government departments know what they need to do. Michelle has an audit underway that will show what has been done. It is reasonable for NTI to be prodding for better performance. The Board looks forward to receiving an update on this topic at its next meeting.

### **11.B Formation of Wildlife Policy Advisory Committee (NTI)**

Glenn Williams advised that NTI has established a Wildlife Policy Advisory Committee, made up of the three RWO Chairpersons along with the executive member of NTI responsible for wildlife issues (currently Raymond Ningeocheak). Terms of reference have not yet been finalized, but the Committee will focus primarily on issues that affect RWOs and HTOs. The recent Wildlife Symposium assigned the Committee to create movement on the file pertaining to assignment of harvesting rights, and particularly with respect to finalizing an assignment form.

### **11.C Nunavut Wildlife Symposium: Report**

Glenn Williams reported that delegates from the RWOs and HTOs conducted a very successful Nunavut Wildlife Symposium last week in Iqaluit. Glenn tabled the resolutions passed at the Symposium. As confirmed by way of these resolutions the delegates to the Symposium decided:

1. That the NTI enrolment card would be adopted as constituting proper identification for an Inuk for purposes of implementing the NLCA;
2. That the Nunavut Harvester Support Program should clarify and update its policies for program delivery, and should seek increased funding;
3. That the Wildlife Policy Advisory Committee should draft a policy for assignment of harvesting rights, including preparation of an appropriate assignment form;
4. That DSD develop and distribute a detailed consultation plan with respect to assessing the polar bear management agreements or MOUs;
5. That DSD take steps to ensure that appropriate community consultations are undertaken and incorporated into the process of developing a new *Wildlife Act*.
6. That the Nunavut Wildlife Harvest Study be continued after its scheduled termination in May of 2001;
7. That the Nunavut Wildlife Symposium be enshrined as a biennial event with sponsorship by NTI, the RWOs, the HTOs, and their co-management partners;
8. That steps be taken to ensure the active and senior participation by government departments connected with fish and wildlife management at future Symposia;

9. That steps be taken to ensure that sufficient funding is made available to the RWOs and HTOs to enable them to meet their obligations;
10. That NTI evaluate the impacts of escalating fuel costs on Inuit, and work with Governments to minimize the social and cultural effects.

A debate ensued with respect to Resolution No. 8, and the implication that government departments had been poorly represented at the workshop that had just transpired. Stephen Atkinson stated that DSD was under the impression that this was intended to be a gathering of RWOs and HTOs, with outside participation not particularly encouraged. It is sometimes perceived that the presence of government staff, especially senior staff, will inhibit free expression at such a meeting. Burt Hunt expressed the same interpretation on behalf of DFO. Kevin McCormick wanted to know which specific CWS staff were invited. He stressed the importance of inviting, or at least copying the invitation to, the particular persons whose attendance is actually desired.

Glenn acknowledged that there were communication glitches and that the invitation process was flawed. The RWO and HTO delegates clearly had in mind that government representatives would stay and participate beyond their narrow time slots on the agenda.

Burt counselled care and tact in how this resolution is transmitted to the Government departments. It would not be appropriate to imply criticism about the level of attendance at an event to which people did not realize they were invited.

Ben Kovic reckoned that there was enough goodwill among the agencies to overcome this misunderstanding and to move forward. In general, Government departments should recognize that they will earn more respect and will be taken more seriously if their attendance at such gatherings extends beyond the limited time that they are actually on the agenda. Departments should also try to participate more fully and more actively in the AGMs of the HTOs and RWOs.

#### **11. D NTI Interactions with Greenland**

Glenn Williams reported that NTI has met twice with the Greenland Home Rule Government to discuss matters of mutual interest including shared and adjacent natural resources. This is part of NTI's effort to step up its profile in representing Inuit internationally. The first of the meetings with Greenland took place in conjunction with the NAMMCO session last year. Attempts to meet recently have been called off but the intention remains to meet again later in the winter and before the time when the Greenlanders hunt polar bears. This polar bear hunt is alleged to include, in recent years, activity within Canadian territory. Avenues of communication among scientists and among administrators in the two jurisdictions are well established; one of the aims now is to establish comparable lines of communication among hunters.

## **11.E Reciprocal Harvesting Rights: Nunavut/Nunavik**

Glenn Williams reported that NTI and Makivik recently signed an MOU pertaining to reciprocal hunting rights between the two jurisdictions.

## **12. Matters of Funding: Reviews / Decisions**

### **12.A Status of NWRT Projects Approved for 2000/01**

Michelle Wheatley announced that the Board has approved a total of 22 projects for NWRT funding for 2000/01. This includes the Board's transfer of the Davis Strait turbot survey project to NWRT funding; this project was initially approved under the NWMB Studies Fund. The total NWRT commitment for 2000/01, including carry-forwards, is \$717,4000. Funding conditions that were appended to various project approvals were met in all except one instance. In that case (a DFO proposal to sample the catch at the Pangnirtung fish plant), the project has been withdrawn. Contribution agreements with each Department are done on a batch basis, and are not completed until all financial accounts from the previous year have been resolved. All three Departments have at least one project about which some financial questions remain. These are not considered to be serious impediments.

### **12.B Status of NWMB Study Fund Projects Approved for 2000/01**

Michelle Wheatley advised that at its March meeting the Board approved nine projects for NWMB Studies funding, including carry-forward funding for one project. As already noted, one of these projects was subsequently transferred to NWRT funding. Funding committed for the remaining eight projects is \$165,000. All except the carry-forward project have met their funding conditions, and contribution agreements have either been signed or are in transit with/to all the proponents.

### **12.C Funding Request: Western Hudson Bay Workshop**

Jim Noble tabled an announcement from Helen Fast of DFO's Oceans Program Division in Winnipeg concerning a forthcoming workshop in Winnipeg in October. The workshop is to help chart a course "for a co-ordinated approach to the future management of the Western Hudson Bay Region". Marine harvesting is seen as a significant component of this equation, and the Department has invited six hunters from six separate communities in the Kivalliq Region to participate.

The Department has some grant funding available for travel assistance, but anticipates a shortfall of up to about \$800 per delegate for the hunter representatives. The Department is requesting funding support from the NWMB.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 199**) to approve a contribution of \$5,000 of Conservation Education funding to assist with the travel costs of six HTO representatives from the Kivalliq Region to participate in DFO's forthcoming Western Hudson Bay Workshop.

### **13. Other Presentations**

#### **13.A Parks Canada: Presentation by Paula Hughson**

Jim Noble introduced Paula Hughson, a conservation biologist with Parks Canada, who was here (for the second time) to make a presentation to the Board.

Paula opened her remarks by reminding the Board that three new National Parks have been designated in Nunavut since last August. They are:

- Quttinirpaaq National Park, formerly Ellesmere Island National Park Reserve;
- Auyuittuq National Park, near Qikiqtarjuaq and Pangnirtung; and
- Sirmilik National Par, near Arctic Bay and Pond Inlet.

A fourth National Park, Ukkusiksalik National Park, is under negotiation in the Kivalliq Region. Agreement-in-principle has been achieved.

The Nunavut Field Unit of Parks Canada has 20 staff plus four vacant positions, with headquarters in Iqaluit. Park management offices are located in Pangnirtung and Pond Inlet. The Superintendent of the Unit is Elizabeth Seale.

Research projects underway include:

- A study to measure the impacts of human traffic and natural disturbances on the land in Quttinirpaaq National Park;
- A study of the plant communities of Auyuittuq National Park, including plant abundance, distribution, and baseline mapping.

Michael d'Eça pointed out that Inuit Impact Benefit Agreements for the three newly established National Parks were settled about a year ago. The NWMB should soon receive copies of these Agreements.

Ben Kovic thanked Ms. Paulson for her presentation and for her patience in standing by to deliver it.

#### **13.B Kitikmeot HTA: Presentation by Phillip Kadlun, Chairperson**

Ben Kovic introduced Phillip Kadlun, Chairperson of the Kitikmeot Hunters and Trappers Association, and here to make a presentation on behalf of the host RWO.

Phillip tabled a short synopsis pertaining to the administrative status of each of the seven HTOs in the Region. All of the HTOs have secretary-managerial expertise on staff or have access to such expertise, and all except one have met their requirements to qualify for 2000/01 funding. The Bay Chimo HTO is still working on their documentation.

Philip reported that the KHTA conducted its Regional AGM in June, with Makabe Nartok and Michelle Wheatley in attendance representing the NWMB. It is unfortunate that the high cost of travel precluded two of the HTOs from sending

delegates. It was decided at the AGM to develop a 10-year workplan for the RWO and the HTOs and to engage the services of Consilium Consultants for this exercise. The hope is that the workplan will provide a basis and rationale for obtaining increased funding.

Phillip reported that the KHTA recently received a request to supply live muskoxen to a prospective purchaser in southern Canada. There was also a request for permission to produce commercial items from the hair of the captive muskox population at the University of Saskatchewan at Saskatoon. These requests were turned down, primarily because the KHTA fears jeopardising the market for qiviut that is now being produced in the Region via the Qiviut Project. Michelle noted that there had been a similar request for live muskoxen from a Yukon interest. Ben observed that Nunavut is not the only potential source of muskoxen that could be exploited to the disbenefit of the Qiviut Project. He suggested that it might be wise to lobby the Inuvialuit to resist any overtures to export live muskoxen from their territory.

Phillip noted that the Burnside HTO at Bathurst Inlet aims to put forward a request to double the number of grizzly bear tags annually allotted to them, from five to ten. He also stated that the RWO would very much like to see one or more DFO personnel stationed in the Kitikmeot Region.

The Pelly Bay HTO is concerned about the seizure of several narwhal tusks by DFO in connection with this summer's apparent over-harvest. This seems to be a new tactic on the part of the Department. People are wondering if the tusks are going to be returned. Makabe Nartok noted that the narwhal quota at Pelly Bay has been exceeded on previous occasions without this kind of DFO response.

Keith Pelly advised that the tusks were seized as evidence in an investigation that is still underway and that may result in charges being laid. There is no doubt that the quota was exceeded. DFO will keep possession of the tusks at least until a decision is made on how to proceed.

Ben Kovic thanked Mr. Kadlun for his presentation. In adjourning the meeting for the day, Ben reminded those present about the community feast and meeting at the community hall this evening.

#### **Thursday, 28 September 2000**

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, re-convened the meeting at 08:35 a.m.

#### **14. Executive Committee Report and Recommendations**

Gordon Koshinsky reminded the Board that the Executive Committee has been working to develop, modify or update a number of policy and procedural items that pertain to the operation of the NWMB. At its *in-camera* session earlier this week,

the Board worked through several of these items as brought forward by the Executive Committee, and concluded that three of the items were ready for approval pending a few minor modifications as identified.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 200**) to adopt new operating procedures as presented by the Executive Committee, with minor modifications as identified by the Board *in camera*, for the following administrative matters:

- Disposal of fixed assets.
- Staff salary adjustments.
- Compassionate consideration.

## **15. Meetings, Workshops and Other Pertinent Events**

### **15.A Past Events: Reports and Briefings**

Ben Kovic referred the Members to the notes contained in the briefing material pertaining to meetings, workshops and other events attended by himself and NWMB staff. There were no comments or questions. Gordon Koshinsky applauded the new addition of a summary sheet, but urged that this sheet be titled in future iterations, and that it be amended to include the name of the NWMB participant(s).

### **15.B Upcoming Events: Review and Participation**

Ben Kovic led the Board through the tabulation of notices and invitations in respect to forthcoming events, prepared as at September 11.

Ben noted the forthcoming meeting of DFO's Science Advisory Council on October 2-3 in Winnipeg. Ben has talked with the Chairman, Dr. Paul LeBlond, about Michelle Wheatley replacing him (Ben) on the Council. Ben has found the SAC to be too heavily science-oriented for him to be able to make a worthwhile contribution. Dr. LeBlond has no objections to the change, and Michelle is willing to accept. Gordon Koshinsky pointed out that the DFO Assistant Deputy Minister whom the Council advises had vetoed a previous NWMB appointment.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 201**) to appoint Dr. Michelle Wheatley to the DFO Science Advisory Council, replacing Ben Kovic.

Jim Noble referred once again to DFO's Western Hudson Bay Workshop, to be held October 24-25 in Winnipeg. Representation by Kivalliq hunters has been arranged and assured, but it may be appropriate for the NWMB per se to attend. Michael d'Eça concurred with this assessment. It was then noted that David Alagalak has already been identified as a workshop participant, in his capacities as Mayor of Arviat and as President of KWF. Kevin McCormick suggested that, if David is willing, he also cover off for the NWMB at this workshop. The Board agreed that David should be approached about taking on this triple challenge.

The Board took notice of the invitation to attend the Ninth North American Caribou Workshop next April in Kuujjuaq. The Board directed staff to reserve at least one space for NWMB representation.

The Board reiterated its previous decisions (Conference Call No. 50, June 14) not to have representation at the following:

- World Council of Whalers General Assembly; November 14-18 in New Zealand.
- Canadian Marine Advisory Council Regional Meeting, November 15-16 in Hay River.

## 16. Date and Location of Next Meeting

Ben Kovic declared that according to the sequence of rotation, the next meeting of the Board should be in the Keewatin. An important consideration will be not to conflict with municipal elections the second week of December. It will also be necessary to have a meeting of the Nunavut Wildlife Research Trust. It may be appropriate to have one or more workshops in conjunction with this meeting to give concerted attention to one or more specific topics.

Jim Noble pointed out that travel is always problematic at that time of year. He urged that the meeting be in Rankin Inlet, with the possibility of chartering to a nearby community such as Chesterfield Inlet for an evening session, time and weather permitting.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 202**) that the next (27<sup>th</sup>) regular meeting of the NWMB would be held in Rankin Inlet the week of November 27<sup>th</sup>, 2000.

The Board also decided (**Resolution 2000- 203**) that the Chairperson and the Executive Director should explore the merits and the feasibility of chartering to Chesterfield Inlet on November 30 to hold a public meeting in that community.

## 17. Adjournment

Ben Kovic thanked the Board Members for participating. He especially acknowledged the assistance of the interpreters, and of Todd Roche who performed many errands for the Board during the week. Ben thanked the NWMB staff and the other presenters for all of their inputs.

The 26<sup>th</sup> meeting of the NWMB adjourned at 14:05 p.m. (**Resolution 2000- 204**)

Minutes Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson Date