

NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD

MINUTES: MEETING NO. 21

23-26 MARCH 1999

IQALUIT, NT

Members and Staff Participating:

Ben Kovic	Chairperson
Pauloosie Keyootak	Member
David Alagalak	Member
Gordon Koshinsky	Member
Makabe Nartok	Member
Joan Scottie	Member
Kevin McCormick	Member
Meeka Mike	Member
Jim Noble	Executive Director
Gordon Tomlinson	Director of Finance and Administration
Michelle Wheatley	Director of Wildlife Management
Rebecca Mike	A/Director of Wildlife Management
Johnny McPherson	Harvest Study Co-ordinator
Tom Demcheson	Regional Liaison Officer, Baffin
Michael d'Eça	NWMB Legal Advisor
Mary Nashook	Interpreter
Blandina Tulagardjuk	Interpreter

Not Available:

Harry Flaherty	Member (business conflict)
----------------	----------------------------

Guests, Visitors and Other Participants (at various times):

Gary Weber	DFO Area Manager, Iqaluit
Lynn Siegersma	DFO Land Claims Liaison Officer, Iqaluit
Stephen Atkinson	RWED Director Wildl & Env'tl Protection, Iqaluit
Joe Tigullaraq	RWED Sr Advisor Wildlife and Fisheries, Iqaluit
Siu-ling Han	RWED Manager of Wildlife Research, Iqaluit
Stephen Pinksen	RWED Sr Advisor Legisl & Enforcement, Iqaluit
Richard Wyman	RWED Manager Parks and Conservation Areas
Bert Dean	A/Wildlife Manager NTI, Rankin Inlet
Glenn Williams	Wildlife Consultant to NTI, Iqaluit
Joanasie Akumalik	Executive Director QWB, Iqaluit
Peter Kilabuk	DSD Minister, Nunavut Government
Katherine Trumper	DSD Deputy Minister, Nunavut Government

Several other presenters and members of the public at large

Tuesday, 23 March 1999 (Morning Session)

1. Call to Order

The Chairperson Ben Kovic convened the meeting at 9:00 a.m. in the meeting room of the Parnaivik Centre at Iqaluit. Joan Scottie led the opening prayer.

2. Opening Preliminaries

Ben Kovic welcomed the NWMB Members to this the 21st regular meeting of the Board. He began by calling on the Members, staff, guests, and other participants in attendance to introduce themselves.

Ben noted that this first session of the NWMB meeting would be brief. It was to be followed immediately by a meeting of the Nunavut Wildlife Research Trust (NWRT). The purpose of this preliminary session was two-fold: to consider the meeting agenda and to swear-in David Alagalak as a new Member of the NWMB. It was necessary that Mr. Alagalak be sworn-in prior to the NWRT meeting to enable him to participate in that meeting as a *bona fide* Trustee.

3. Agenda

Members reviewed the agenda for the meeting. The agenda was accepted with the addition of a provision, as already noted, to swear-in a new Board Member. **(Resolution 99- 114)**

Swearing-in Ceremony

At this point in the meeting Michael d'Eça, the NWMB Legal Advisor, swore-in David Alagalak as the new Nunavut Wildlife Management Board Member appointed by the Keewatin Inuit Association. All those present offered their congratulations and best wishes to Mr. Alagalak after the ceremony.

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, then temporarily suspended the NWMB meeting in order to make way for the meeting of the Nunavut Wildlife Research Trust (NWRT). The record of the NWRT meeting is archived elsewhere.

Tuesday, 23 March 1999 (Afternoon Session)

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, re-convened the NWMB meeting at 2:30 p.m., this following the morning meeting of the Nunavut Wildlife Research Trust.

5. Allocation of NWRT Funding for 1999/00

Michelle Wheatley noted that the Trustees for the Nunavut Wildlife Research Trust, in session earlier today, had approved an allotment of \$752,000 plus-or-minus 5% for support of research by government agencies in 1999/00. It now remained for the Board to decide on the allocation of those funds with respect to the applications that were at hand.

Michelle referred the Members to the briefing binder that contained:

- Progress reports (prepared by Michelle, based on material provided by the proponents) on projects that were previously approved for NWRT funding, and that were originally scheduled for completion, in 1998/99. These projects are of two categories:
 - Eight projects that were completed as scheduled (or that may be seeking re-profiling as new projects) and that are not proposing to carry-forward into 1999/00 any previously-approved funds that may not have been utilized.
 - Two projects that are not yet quite completed, and that are proposing to carry forward some or all of the funds allotted to them for 1998/99 that were not fully utilized.
- Progress reports (again, prepared by Michelle), on projects that were previously approved for a multi-year profile that included a 1999/00 funding component. Again, these projects are of two categories:
 - Four projects that utilized all the funds allotted to them for 1998/99.
 - Four projects that are proposing to carry forward some of the funds allotted to them for 1998/99 that were not fully utilized.
- Her (Michelle's) recommendations pertaining to 1999/00 funding for these previously-approved projects (as per the categories above).
- All the new applications for NWRT funding, along with her (Michelle's) evaluations of those applications and her recommendations for any conditions that should accompany funding approval.

Michelle explained the new project numbering system that she had developed for this program. Each project has been assigned a unique number that also identifies the parent agency and the year in which the application first came forward. Michelle next directed the attention of the Board in the first instance to the previously-funded projects, and in particular to those that embody funding requests that pertain to the current year (1999/00). She identified six such projects (see above), all of which are requesting to carry forward funds from 1998/99 to 1999/00. In all except one of these cases the request to carry forward funds does not have incremental funding implications. The lone

exception (DOE Project 130-97-2, on productivity of eider ducks at Karrak Lake) involves an incremental amount of \$2,000.

The Board reviewed each of the progress reports in some detail, with particular attention to the six that contained proposals to carry forward funding. The Board perceived no compelling reason to continue approving funding support for DFO Project 120-95-1, the collection of charr fishery data from Baffin communities. The Board considered the two existing DFO projects pertaining to walrus (Project 120-97-1 on walrus population studies; and Project 120-98-2 on walrus satellite tagging). In respect to both of these projects, the proponent has requested to carry forward funds. Looking forward, the Board also noted a new project proposal from the same proponent (120-99-9) that purports to combine the other two studies. The Board concluded that if the proponent was aiming to simplify his overall presentation he had not been very successful. The Board decided to deal with only Project 120-97-1 in the present context, and to defer consideration of carrying forward funds for Project 120-98-2 for later treatment in conjunction with the new walrus research proposal.

Some Board Members expressed considerable dissatisfaction about some Projects tying up but not using considerable fractions of the available NWRT funding. These resources are thereby and needlessly rendered unavailable to fund other projects. Gordon Koshinsky observed that the NWRT Trustees theoretically can compensate for this somewhat in the course of deciding the annual allotment. However he agreed that the Board should be vigilant against habitual behaviour of this sort by particular agencies/researchers. Michelle pointed out what might be emerging as a systematic problem of this nature whereby proponents may budget for a traditional-ecological-knowledge (TEK) component but then fail to carry it out. Projects 110-98-2 and 110-98-3 may be examples. Meeka Mike was adamant that if a proposal contains a formal TEK component, then something more than informal community consultations would generally be expected. If it is not delivered, the funds should be returned.

The Board concluded its deliberations by deciding **(Resolution 99- 115)** to approve requests to carry forward Nunavut Wildlife Research Trust funds from 1998/99 to 1999/00 in respect to research projects that were previously approved for multi-year funding and that were originally characterized as ongoing through 1999/00, these approvals being as follows:

- Project 110-98-1: Traditional knowledge study of caribou on Baffin Island and Melville Peninsula, as per DSD request to carry forward \$59,000 and shift the funding profile for each of the remaining years of the project back by one year. The new approved multi-year funding profile is thus: \$59,000 for 1999/00; \$62,000 for 2000/01; and \$ 47,000 for 2001/02.
- Project 120-97-1: Walrus population studies, as per DFO request to carry forward \$9,100 and apply this towards the funding that was previously approved for 1999/00.

- Project 120-98-1: Ringed seal study in western Hudson Bay, as per DFO request to carry forward \$42,000, to be added to the funding previously approved for 1999/00.
- Project 130-97-2: Productivity and survival study of king eiders at Karrak Lake, as per CWS request to carry forward \$2,000, to be added to the funding previously approved for 1999/00.

The Board also decided (**Resolution 99- 116**) to deny the request by DFO to carry forward funding in respect to NWRT Project 120-95-1 (Collection of arctic charr fishery data from Baffin communities); thereby reaffirming the end of funding for this project in 1998/99 as previously scheduled.

Wednesday, 24 March 1999

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, re-convened the meeting at 8:05 a.m. Pauloosie Keyootak led the opening prayer.

Ben noted that in its session yesterday afternoon, the Board had not completed its treatment of **Agenda item 5**, the allocation of NWRT funding for 1999/00. He accordingly addressed the meeting back to that item.

Michelle Wheatley directed the attention of the Members once again to the new applications for NWRT funding, along with her (Michelle's) evaluations of those applications and her recommendations for any conditions that should accompany funding approval, as contained in the briefing binder. She noted that there were 13 new project proposals, with funding requests totaling \$518,900 for 1999/00.

The Board reviewed the material that was provided in connection with each of the proposals. The Board's approvals with respect to funding were amalgamated as a composite decision (**Resolution 99- 117**) as follows:

That the NWMB approve, with conditions as set out elsewhere in these Minutes (see below), requests by government agencies for funding from the Nunavut Wildlife Research Trust Fund in respect to new research projects in the total amount of \$449,400 for use and for delivery in 1999/2000 as follows:

- Project 110-99-1: Study seasonal distribution and herd delimitation of NE Mainland caribou (\$35,200 to DSD for 1999/00; two-year project);
- Project 110-99-2: Study survival and sustainable harvest of Dolphin-Union caribou (\$64,000 to DSD for 1999/00; three-year project);
- Project 110-99-3: Re-evaluate management boundaries, population status and quotas for muskox in the Keewatin and eastern Kitikmeot regions (\$41,400 to DSD for 1999/00; two-year project);
- Project 110-99-4: Monitor Qamanirjuaq caribou using satellite telemetry (\$16,200 to DSD for 1999/00);

- Project 120-99-1: Study movements and dive behaviour of Baffin Bay narwhal using satellite-linked radio tags (\$25,000 to DFO for 1999/00);
- Project 120-99-2: Conduct summer surveys of SE Baffin beluga in Cumberland Sound (\$65,000 to DFO for 1999/00);
- Project 120-99-3: Study movements and dive behaviour of beluga whales in Cumberland Sound using satellite-linked radio tags (\$22,800 to DFO for 1999/00);
- Project 120-99-6: Obtain samples from harvested narwhal and beluga and analyze for stock identity (\$59,000 to DFO for 1999/00; three-year project);
- Project 120-99-7: Study habitat selection, behaviour and size distribution of bowhead whales in northern Foxe Basin (\$27,800 to DFO for 1999/00);
- Project 120-99-8: Study charr populations in the Cumberland Sound area and develop a management model (\$15,000 to DFO for 1999/00; two-year project);
- Project 120-99-9: Study walrus population dynamics, including use of satellite tags (\$53,000 to DFO for 1999/00);
- Project 130-99-1: Study seasonal movements and home range of adult male polar bears in western Hudson Bay using satellite ear tags (\$25,000 to CWS for 1999/00; two-year project).

As noted in the Resolution (No. 99-117, above), the Board prescribed certain funding conditions, and also made certain observations and/or expressed concerns, in respect to some (not all) of these approved projects, as follows:

Project 110-99-1, on distribution of Northeast Mainland caribou: Michelle noted that this is really a six-year project. The proposal covers just the first three years, focusing on the Repulse Bay area.

Project 110-99-2, on survival and productivity of Victoria Island caribou: Makabe Nartok expressed concern about the possibility of induced mortality from collaring. Siu-ling Han explained that other recent studies have shown little indication of collaring mortality, but acknowledged that seasonal migration of this group of animals across Dolphin and Union Strait might pose a particular hazard for any that did have collars. However the collars that will be used for the study are lighter and deemed to be generally superior to any that have been used previously. There is also provision for very rapid follow-up to determine cause of death should there be any mortality among collared animals. It was noted that the mortality/survival aspects of this project might be of interest to the WWF. Approval of funding, to a maximum of three years at this time, was made subject to the proponent:

- Exploring other funding sources including RWED, since some of the results of the work will be applicable outside (west of) the NSA.
- Confirming the support of the communities that harvest this population.

Project 110-99-3, on productivity of Keewatin/Kitikmeot muskoxen: Michelle noted that the Pelly Bay HTO has submitted a related proposal. If that project were also approved, co-ordination between the two studies should be made mandatory. Approval of funding was made subject to the proponent obtaining the written support of the RWOs.

Project 110-99-4, on distribution of Qamanirjuaq caribou: The Board will require assurance that this project will not duplicate work that has already been done or that it might be possible to synthesize by reference to the database being developed by the Beverly/Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board.

Project 120-99-1, on movements of Baffin Bay narwhal: Approval of funding was made subject to the proponent:

- Clarifying the time frame for the project, especially the end point.
- Ensuring that the attachment of short-term release instruments will not interfere with the attachment of satellite tags, the latter being integral to the central objectives of the project.
- Refining the budget presentation. Attributing \$35,000 (nearly a quarter of the budget total) to "Miscellaneous field costs" is far too open-ended.

Kevin McCormick noted that there are marked inconsistencies in the level of financial detail provided by different proponents. He urged that the most delinquent among them be encouraged to improve their presentations.

Project 120-99-2, on abundance of SE Baffin beluga: No comments or concerns were expressed, other than that the proponent should obtain written evidence of continuing support from the Pangnirtung HTO.

Project 120-99-3, on movements of SE Baffin beluga: Kevin McCormick noted that this was fundamentally a tagging project based on netting, and that it was already attempted in previous years. He asked about the earlier success rate. Michelle replied that no beluga were caught or tagged in 1997 despite considerable effort. The researchers were prepared to abandon the project, but the community partners were more optimistic. Seven beluga were captured and tagged in 1998, and the confidence of the researchers is much enhanced. However most of the details regarding how the project will be conducted in 1999 still remain to be worked out. Gordon Koshinsky questioned the validity of the assumptions being made about WWF funding participation. Michelle agreed that this could be vital, and suggested that it signaled a need to co-ordinate the funding approaches of the two agencies. Approval of funding was made subject to the proponent providing more details on the study design.

Project 120-99-6, on beluga and narwhal sampling, primarily for identification of stocks: Gordon Koshinsky noted that this is an omnibus-type of project that would underpin many other projects, not all of them mentioned here. Michelle explained that the primary focus would be to fill information gaps, since the distribution of previous sampling effort has been haphazard. She suggested that it might be the type of project that would interest the WWF. Approval of funding, for a maximum of three years, was made subject to the proponent:

- Clarifying the proposal to pay administration fees to the HTOs, since this is not something that the NWMB would ordinarily support.
- Providing evidence of community support.

Project 120-99-7, on behaviour of Foxe Basin bowheads: David Alagalak noted the lack of detail in the proposal about where the transects are to be flown, and urged that the researchers be guided by local knowledge.

Project 120-99-8, on Cumberland Sound charr fishery modeling: Funding was approved on the basis that the proponent:

- Demonstrates the support of the HTO.
- Reports on the results of last year's work.

It was also decided that there can be no consideration of funding for this work beyond 1999/00 unless and until an extended project plan is developed.

Project 120-99-9, on walrus population studies, including satellite tagging: Michelle noted that this proposal amalgamates two previous ongoing studies. The Board has already considered some of the implications for carry-forward of funding. Funding was approved for 1999/00, subject to the proponent:

- Clarifying which of the budgeted items are to be addressed with NWMB funds, particularly differentiating between the tagging studies and the population work.
- Identifying how the difficulties encountered with the tagging component of the project last year will be addressed.
- Confirming the support of the Grise Fiord HTO for the tagging studies.

It will be necessary for the proponent to demonstrate that the tagging problems have been resolved before funding beyond 1999/00 will be considered.

Project 130-99-1, on movements of male polar bears in Hudson Bay: Kevin McCormick pointed out that the project aims to deploy a new innovation that will permit, for the first time, the collaring of male polar bears. Michelle noted that the project did not rate particularly high on the scoring system, but that it was intuitively attractive. Gordon Koshinsky observed that the proponent demonstrated a type of enthusiasm that was not evident in most of the proposals. Approval of funding was made subject to the proponent confirming the support of the Keewatin communities that harvest the Western Hudson Bay polar bear population.

Consideration of Project proposal 120-99-5 (to develop a charr fishery model for Nunavut, based on Keewatin data) yielded the observations that the estimated costs were not adequately justified, nor was the need to retain the services of a consultant adequately demonstrated. The Board concluded that the proponent should be encouraged to develop this model, but should not approach the Board for funding until the work could be outlined in clearer terms. The project therefore was excluded from the list of project approvals as per Resolution 99-117, above.

6. Allocation of NWMB Study Funding for 1999/00

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Members that the Board annually establishes a budget out of its internal operating funds that is then made available to support research by

other-than-government agencies, such as HTOs. Michelle referred the Members to the binder of briefing materials pertaining to research projects, as per this NWMB program, grouped in three categories:

- Projects that were approved for 1998/99, and were either completed or were (apparently) never initiated;
- Projects that were approved for 1998/99, and are requesting continuing support through carry-forward of funds to 1999/00; and
- Projects that are requesting support in 1999/00 and that are being classified as new projects for this exercise on the basis of having submitted new project proposals, often but not always reflecting a start-up mode.

Michelle identified three projects that were approved for 1998/99 and are requesting authorization to carry forward funds to 1999/00. They are:

- Benthic survey, by Nattivak HTO: \$10,000
- South Baffin caribou workshop, organized by DSD: \$8,500
- Publication on narwhal and beluga behaviour, by DFO: \$4,000

The Nattivak project, to identify shellfish resources for possible exploitation around Broughton Island, produced encouraging early results but was temporarily stalled by equipment problems. These problems have now been resolved and the HTO plans to continue this survey if the funding remains available. The carry-forward requests in respect to the other two projects have been rolled into new project proposals by these same proponents. The Board noted that all of these requests are within the spending authority of the Director of Wildlife Management, and that it was appropriate for her to act on them or administer them according to her own best judgement.

Turning to the new project proposals, Michelle pointed out that this marked the first time that the Board's new one-annual-window policy for considering new proposals has been in effect. In total, 15 proposals have been received from agencies outside of government, for NWMB support of studies to be done in 1999/00. The applications, along with various supporting materials including her (Michelle's) analyses and recommendations, are contained in the briefing binders. The proposals were evaluated against the same criteria and with reference to the same research priorities as were used to evaluate the NWRT proposals. The 15 new proposals total \$369,520 for 1999/00.

The Board reviewed the materials that were provided in connection with each of the new proposals. The Board's discussions, concerns and decisions were as follows:

1. Provide vessel support for Greenland halibut surveys in NAFO Sub-Area 0:

This is a three-year project, being organized by DFO with the encouragement of the NWMB, among others. The Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board (QWB) has applied for NWMB funding (\$120,000 in the first year) to lease a vessel to support the field work. The Board has devoted considerable attention to the design of this survey in the process of negotiating with DFO for its inclusion in the Department's 1999/00 workplan. The

Department and the Minister have been positive about the prospects for this project, but have not absolutely confirmed their financial and technical participation.

The Board decided **(Resolution 99- 118)** to give its approval-in-principle to the provision of NWMB study funding to the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board in the amount of \$120,000 for 1999/00 to support a scientific survey of Greenland halibut in NAFO Divisions 0A and 0B, with final approval contingent upon:

- The confirmation of complementary funding (as budgeted) by DFO;
- Confirmation by DFO of financial and technical participation for the full three-year time horizon of the survey as planned; and
- Preparation by DFO of a plan to report the survey results and interpretations to the adjacent communities.

2. Study winter ecology of common eiders in the Belcher Islands:

This project aims to determine the distribution and movements of eiders in relation to changing ice conditions to help explain the population declines that have been observed, and also to document other ecological and human interactions. This would in fact be the second year of studies devoted to the present objectives, these following upon a survey of the eider population in 1997. The 1997 survey was supported by NWRT funds and the subsequent work has been classified as new NWMB funding initiatives. The proponent is the Sanikiluaq HTO, and the CWS is affiliated. The HTO has applied for NWMB funding of \$27,000 for 1999/00.

The Board decided **(Resolution 99- 119)** to approve \$27,000 of NWMB study funding to the Sanikiluaq HTO in 1999/00 for continuing study of the winter ecology of common eiders in the Belcher Islands, this subject to provision by the proponent of satisfactory reports on the 1998/99 program.

3. Document traditional knowledge of Bathurst caribou:

This project aims to help ensure the continuity of Inuit ecological knowledge and to promote the transmittal of this information from elders to youths. The project is well developed and is embarking on its third year, although not previously funded by the NWMB. The proponent is the Tuktu and Nogak Advisory Board at Iqalukutiaq, which has applied for NWMB funding of \$30,000 for 1999/00.

The Board decided **(Resolution 99- 120)** to approve \$30,000 of NWMB study funds to the Tuktu and Nogak Advisory Board in 1999/00 for a one-year compilation of elders' knowledge about the Bathurst caribou herd and its calving grounds, this subject to the confirmation of other funding required to complete the budget.

4. Continue development of a management plan for South Baffin caribou:

This project is contributory to a larger initiative that the territorial government has had underway for some time. That larger initiative is to develop a comprehensive management plan for the South Baffin caribou population, with a major grounding in traditional historical knowledge. The project that is here under consideration supports those elements of that initiative that pertain to consultations with Inuit elders and with communities. The NWMB provided some funding for the project last year, but the

results have not yet been well documented. The proponent, operating through the Qikiktaaluk Wildlife Board (QWB), is requesting \$14,000 from the NWMB to continue this work in 1999/00. Of this amount, \$8,500 would be carried forward from last year.

The Board decided (**Resolution 99- 121**) to approve \$14,000 of NWMB study funding to the QWB in 1999/00 for completion (second year) of community consultations and related work pertinent to developing a management plan for the South Baffin caribou population, with this approval contingent upon:

- The proponent providing clarification about work completed in 1998/99, and possible resultant cost savings that are available for 1999/00.
- Confirmation by DSD of complementary funding and staff resources (as budgeted).

5. Mark/recapture Arctic charr and document domestic fishery at Chantrey Inlet

This project aims to document the domestic utilization of Arctic charr in the Chantrey Inlet area and to elucidate the seasonal movements and distribution of these fish. There is a substantial commercial fishery for Arctic charr in the area and the Gjoa Haven HTO is concerned about the possibility of over-fishing. As project proponent, the HTO is requesting a \$11,000 contribution from the NWMB for 1999/00. The project, as planned, has a major tagging and tag-recovery component. DFO did a tagging project in this area in 1997.

Gordon Koshinsky considered that the proposal had technical aspects that would be difficult or impossible to execute without dedicated technical assistance or a great deal of appropriate training. He also suggested that the Nunavut Wildlife Harvest Study, especially in conjunction with returns from DFO's earlier tagging program, should provide most of the information being sought. Johnny McPherson stated that there had been some tag returns from the Back River, but apparently none from any of the other key locations. Johnny was concerned that domestic fishers would be reluctant to provide harvest data to two different programs simultaneously.

The Board decided (**Resolution 99- 122**) to approve \$11,000 of NWMB study funding to the Gjoa Haven HTO in 1999/00 for a one-year tagging and domestic utilization study on Arctic charr in the Chantry Inlet area. This approval is contingent upon:

- Provision of assurance that the harvest-monitoring aspects will do more than duplicate the Harvest Study;
- Clarification of the objectives for the proposed tagging aspect;
- Provision of a research permit by DFO for any tagging activity;
- Clarification by DFO of the status of the previous tagging studies; and
- Participation of a qualified technician or trained personnel in all fish tagging activities.

6. Document traditional knowledge of Nunavut polar bears:

The three RWOs are proposing to mount a two-year project to document and analyze Inuit traditional knowledge and socio-economic factors pertinent to the management of polar bears. The project as envisaged would culminate in recommendations for management policy, practice and planning. The RWOs are requesting \$20,000 each year for two years from the NWMB, or about one-sixth of the total estimated study cost.

Gordon Koshinsky observed that the proposal was elegantly constructed, and he interpreted it to be the work of a prospective consultant. Gordon took exception to a fundamental proposition upon which the proposal is built, that "Inuit forms of management differ fundamentally from those of wildlife managers by managing not individual species per se, but by managing human activities in relation to animals". The NWMB is the paramount wildlife management agency in the NSA, and it would be difficult to find an example of a "wildlife management" decision by the NWMB that did not in fact hinge on managing human activities.

The Board decided (**Resolution 99- 123**) to approve \$20,000 of NWMB study funding to the three RWOs in concert in 1999/00, this for the first year of a planned two-year Inuit knowledge study of polar bears in the NSA, with this approval subject to the following conditions:

- That the DSD contribution as identified be confirmed;
- That NWMB funding would be one-year-at-a-time;
- That the NWMB contribution would flow through the QWB; and
- That the proponents of all NWMB- and NWRT-funded projects having traditional-knowledge components in respect to polar bears provide joint assurance that there is no overlap among their activities.

7. Document the cultural and traditional importance and use of ringed seals:

The proponent, Mr. Sam Emiktowt of Coral Harbour, is requesting NWMB funding support in the amount of \$30,000 to assist him to interpret and document historical practices of harvesting and utilizing ringed seals as well as traditional knowledge of their ecological and cultural importance.

Gordon stated his interpretation that the first test of eligibility of a research proposal for NWMB support should be that it had the potential to assist the NWMB in executing its mandate. He was not convinced that this proposal, nor possibly some others in this group, had that potential. Kevin McCormick suggested that there must be more appropriate funding sources for such a study than the NWMB.

The Board decided (**Resolution 99- 124**) not to approve NWMB study funding to Mr. Sam Emiktowt to examine the traditional importance of ringed seals in Inuit culture and survival, and instead to direct the proponent to approach other funding sources having a stronger cultural orientation.

8. Monitor Snow and Ross' geese and their habitat near Arviat:

This would be the third and final year of a project to follow the population abundance of these geese in this breeding area, and to assess their effects on the vegetation. The NWMB has supported the project in each of the previous years, and the proponent is requesting \$10,240 for 1999/00. The work is done in affiliation with the CWS, and contributes to that agency's research and management planning mandate.

The Board decided (**Resolution 99- 125**) to approve NWMB study funding to the Arviat HTO in the amount of \$10,240 for 1999/00 to complete (third year) a project to monitor the abundance and impacts on habitat of snow and Ross' geese in the Arviat area. The Board noted that the proponent(s) needs to:

- Reconcile the 1999/00 budget with the budgets of previous years; and
- Develop a plan for reporting the study results to the community.

9. Document traditional knowledge of wildlife in the Baffin Region:

The Niutaq Cultural Institute, headquartered in Igloolik, proposes to document traditional knowledge of elders pertaining to wildlife in 12 Baffin communities. The Institute is seeking NWMB funding in the amount of \$30,000 to assist with this work.

Meeka Mike and Pauloosie Keyootak spoke in favour of the project. However most of the Board Members considered that the workplan was too ambitious for the schedule and the budget that were set out for the project.

The Board decided (**Resolution 99- 126**) not to approve NWMB study funding to the Niutaq Cultural Institute to gather traditional knowledge pertaining to Baffin mammals and birds, and instead to direct the proponent to approach other funding sources having a stronger cultural orientation.

10. Publish satellite-telemetry studies of beluga and narwhal behaviour:

Funding for this project was approved last year but the final stages of collecting and preparing the materials for publication were not completed and the NWMB funding was not used. The proponent, a DFO researcher, proposes to carry this funding forward in order to complete the project in the form of a special issue of the journal *Arctic*. The item has been included for the Board's consideration because it was submitted as a new project proposal under this program.

The Board decided (**Resolution 99- 127**) to approve the request from DFO to carry forward into 1999/00 NWMB funding in the amount of \$4,000 in order to complete a publication pertaining to beluga and narwhal behaviour determined by satellite telemetry. The Board did suggest that this project would more appropriately be coded to the Board's budget for Conservation Education.

11. Conduct ground-based survey of muskox and caribou near Pelly Bay:

Gordon Koshinsky noted that the proposal is predicated on the expectation by the Pelly Bay HTO of being able to document a population increase (of muskox) in order to justify a request for increased quota. However no previous population estimates have been made using the proposed (ground-based) survey methodology, so there will be no theoretical possibility of demonstrating a population change on this basis alone. It is very unlikely that it will be possible to correlate the ground-based results with previous aerial surveys to the extent necessary to achieve this aim. However ground-based surveys can be very useful tools for helping to plan aerial surveys and, if repeated over time, can provide relatively economical and very useful indices of abundance.

Michelle Wheatley pointed out that DSD has been involved in the preparation of the HTO proposal. The department is also moving towards conducting an aerial survey, probably in 2000. Michelle referred the Board to DSD Project 110-99-3, which the Board had already approved for NWRT funding.

The Board decided (**Resolution 99- 128**) to approve NWMB study funding to the Pelly Bay HTO in the amount of \$15,000 for 1999/00 for a one-year ground-based survey of muskox and caribou in Muskox Management Area MX17, with this funding conditional upon the proponent:

- Ensuring that the project is planned and executed in a manner to maximize its value as input to the forthcoming DSD aerial survey;
- Committing to make the results available to DSD; and
- Clarifying the reference to caribou in the project title;
- Confirming that complementary RWED and DSD funding is available;
- Agreeing to a payment schedule as prescribed by the NWMB.

12. Study seasonal movements of Beverly caribou:

The Beverly/Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board proposes to collar, and then to track by means of satellite technology, ten female Beverly caribou over a two-year period, to obtain information for managing the increasing land-use activities on the seasonal ranges of the herd. The BQCMB is seeking \$28,000 from the NWMB in the first year of a three-year commitment to this project.

Kevin McCormick noted that this project seems to parallel a DSD project being funded under the NWRT program in respect to the Qamanirjuaq herd. Kevin also questioned how this project would relate to the work that Leslie Wakelyn is doing for the BQCMB pertaining to caribou habitat utilization.

The Board decided (**Resolution 99- 129**) to approve NWMB study funding to the B/Q Board in the amount of \$28,000 for 1999/00, this being the first year of a planned three-year study of the seasonal movements of Beverly caribou. Approval is contingent upon the proponent:

- Clarifying the relationships between this project and:
 - the concurrent BQCMB initiative to produce a CD-ROM pertaining to caribou habitat.

- the DSD project to document seasonal habitats of Qamanirjuaq caribou.
- Confirming funding from the West Kitikmeot / Slave Study as indicated in the proposal.
- Obtaining the written support of the communities that utilize the Beverly herd, including addressing the concerns of the elders in northern Saskatchewan communities.
- Refining the various aggregated budget estimates.

13. Develop a plan for monitoring bowhead whales at Igalirtuug:

The Clyde River HTO is requesting \$5,000 from the NWMB to hire a local Inuk consultant to develop a plan for a community-based monitoring program for bowhead whales in Isabella Bay. It is envisaged that this plan would serve as the basis for developing a funding proposal to conduct the actual monitoring.

Michelle Wheatley advised that a subsequent proposal from the HTO, which may represent a next stage in the development of this overall concept, arrived too late for consideration in the present round. Michelle noted that the Board has not previously provided funding to retain consultants to develop proposals, and that the Board might want to consider the precedent that would be set.

The Board decided (**Resolution 99- 130**) not to approve NWMB study funding to the Clyde River HTO to conduct planning activities for studies of bowhead whales in Isabella Bay, and instead to offer to assist the HTO to prepare an actual proposal and also to encourage them to seek other funding sources.

14. Trench rivers to aid fish migration in Belcher Islands:

The Sanikiluaq HTO perceives that trenching the mouths of certain rivers in their region would benefit the passage of fish in these rivers, in both directions. The HTO is requesting \$23,675 from the NWMB to support this work.

Michelle Wheatley noted that the Board has provided funding of up to about \$10,000 for similar projects at other locations in the past. The results of those projects have apparently not been evaluated to date. The project might obtain favourable consideration from the habitat-improvement program of the WWF, but that could only be on a cost-shared basis. David Alagalak stated that trenching streams to improve charr access has the potential to reduce over-wintering capacity and thus can sometimes have a negative net impact.

The Board decided (**Resolution 99- 131**) to approve NWMB study funding to the Sanikiluaq HTO in the amount of \$10,000 for 1999/00 to help address the costs of trenching the mouths of certain streams on the Belcher Islands as an aid to arctic charr migrations; and to advise the HTO that the NWMB is prepared to assist them in efforts

to attract additional funding from other sources for this project. Approval is contingent upon the HTO:

- Incorporating a before-and-after monitoring element in the project design to enable evaluation;
- Clarifying the items in the budget pertaining to personnel costs; and
- Declaring plans for reporting progress and results to the NWMB and to the community.

15. Evaluate electric fencing as a polar bear deterrent:

The Clyde River HTO proposes to conduct an experiment to evaluate electric fencing as an alternative to killing problem polar bears. They consider that, if successful, such a passive deterrent would be especially useful around outpost camps. New electrical-fencing technology now available has proven successful in deterring black bears and grizzly bears, but has not been tested with polar bears. The HTO is requesting \$6,100 from the NWMB to fund a test.

David Alagalak confirmed that he had seen electrical fencing used successfully to control the movements of black and grizzly bears, and agreed that the technology should be evaluated with polar bears. However, a number of concerns were identified with the design of the experiment as proposed. Pauloosie Keyootak wondered about the dangers of the equipment to children and dogs. Pauloosie also noted the planned use of bait, and was concerned about inadvertently attracting other animals. Kevin McCormick noted the plan to record the results with a hand-held video camera, and wondered if that sort of human activity might not affect the behaviour of the bears. Kevin also was not certain that the use of solar-powered chargers as planned would be practical in the Arctic.

In view of perceived shortcomings in the project design, the Board decided **(Resolution 99- 132)** not to approve NWMB study funding to the Clyde River HTO for an assessment of electric fencing as a deterrent to polar bears. The Board did want to indicate, however, that it considered the idea to merit further development.

7. Minutes

7.A Regular Meeting No. 20, Yellowknife

The Minutes for Regular Meeting No. 20, held on 5-6 December 1998, were adopted with minor adjustments. **(Resolution 99- 133)**

7.B Special Meeting No. 08, Yellowknife

The Minutes for Special Meeting No.08, held on 04 December 1998, were adopted with minor adjustments. **(Resolution 99- 134)**

7.C Conference Call No. 42

The Minutes for Conference Call No. 42, conducted on 08 February 1999, were adopted with minor adjustments. **(Resolution 99- 135)**

8. Financial and Administrative Business

8.A Financial/Variance Report as at 28 February 1999

Gordon Tomlinson provided an overview of the NWMB financial situation to 28 February, including a detailed variance report. A negative variance of \$51,590 is currently indicated. The Board accepted the financial report as presented. **(Resolution 99- 136)**

8.B Funding Arrangement with DIAND for 1999/00: Update

Jim Noble advised that DIAND's proposal for a Contribution Agreement for the coming year had just been received. Jim indicated that the Agreement as proposed contained a number of problems. The Board asked its Legal Advisor, Michael d'Eça, to develop an overview of the situation and to draft a possible response.

8.C Funding Re-Allocations by the Nunavut Implementation Panel (NIP)

Jim Noble tabled a recent letter from Bruce Gillies stating that the Panel recognized that the RWOs and HTOs required more funds to fulfil their responsibilities under the NLCA, and giving notice that the Panel considered funding that had already been allotted to the NWMB to be one potential source for addressing this shortfall. The Panel is requesting the NWMB to provide certain information to assist the Panel in deciding how to deal with this problem. All this follows on the heels of the recent Panel decision to unilaterally re-allocate IPG funding (including some from the NWMB) to the NIRB for the current fiscal year.

Michael d'Eça suggested that there were two issues of concern:

- The relationship of the Panel to the NWMB (and to all the IPGs). The Panel has the authority to take these kinds of actions. However the Panel is not immune from the rules of procedural fairness. These rules require the giving of notice, providing reasons, engaging in consultation, providing opportunity for response, etc.
- The need for the Panel to engage in these kinds of actions. The Panel is not authorized to act capriciously. This means that in these particular situations, as examples, the recipients of re-profiled funding should have demonstrable need linked to responsible actions of their own.

Kevin McCormick asked about the projected financial position of the NWMB to the end of the ten-year contract period assuming that there is no further re-profiling of NWMB funds by the NIP. Gordon Tomlinson stated that a shortfall of about one million dollars was currently projected for the final fiscal year, but that this was rather an artificial problem that derived from the lack of convergence between fiscal years of the NWMB and funding years as per the Implementation Contract. Gordon Koshinsky counseled that if a certain amount of the NWMB's "carryover funding" is proposed for re-profiling to another agency, the NWMB should be in a position to identify specifically what the impact would be on NWMB programs.

9. Chairman, Staff, and Member Reports

9.A Chairperson's Report

Ben Kovic reported attending three national and/or international meetings on behalf of the Board since the last meeting. He referred the Members to the briefing binders for details.

9.B Executive Director's Report

Jim Noble noted that his recent illness kept him away from work for about a month in the preceding quarter. He referred to his report in the briefing binder.

9.C Director of Wildlife Management Report

Michelle Wheatley noted that a large part of her time over the past two months was devoted to receiving and evaluating proposals to obtain funding from the Nunavut Wildlife Research Trust Fund and from the NWMB Studies Fund.

9.D Director of Finance and Administration Report

Gordon Tomlinson noted that in addition to his ordinary duties, he had devoted considerable attention to the design and implementation of upgrades to the NWMB computer network.

9.E Legal Advisor's Report

Michael d'Eça referred to his briefing note. Work items completed since mid November include final drafting of the NWMB submission concerning Bill C-48, extensive input on preparations for the new narwhal management system, and various interactions pertaining to the NWMB's funding arrangement with DIAND, the NWT's initiative to draft new wildlife legislation, the ongoing disputes with DFO concerning resource allocations in Davis Strait, and other matters.

9.F Fisheries Advisor's Report

Michelle Wheatley referred to the progress from Ray Andrews in the briefing binder. In one important development, the Fisheries Advisor succeeded in obtaining specific inclusion of the Arctic in DFO's forthcoming Atlantic Fisheries Policy Review. Considerable recent attention was focussed on addressing matters of common concern with Greenland.

9.G Members' Reports and Concerns

There was no focused treatment of this agenda item at this Meeting. Members expressed their concerns in conjunction with the treatment of other topics.

10. Completion of Assignments and Resolutions from Last Meeting

Jim Noble referred Members to the list of assignments stemming from the last meeting, along with the notations pertaining to the status of each item listed therein. Kevin McCormick once again expressed general satisfaction with the format of this presentation and more importantly with the progress that it revealed.

Thursday, 25 March 1999

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, re-convened the meeting at 8:40 a.m. David Alagalak led the opening prayer.

11. Environment Canada (CWS) Issues/Decisions

11.A Proposed Spring Hunt for Snow Geese: Update

Kevin McCormick reported that Environment Canada has received notice that a consortium of animal welfare interests is mounting a court challenge to block the regulatory revision that would permit the spring snow goose hunt. The Dene Nation has joined the consortium in this action, on the grounds (their claim) that consultations were inadequate. If it survives the challenge, the expanded hunting season will be in Quebec and around Churchill, Manitoba. It is probable that the NWMB will be asked for an opinion, and might do well to prepare accordingly.

The Board decided to develop a short position statement in support of the regulatory change. This matter was subsequently revisited and a position paper was adopted.
(Resolution 99- 137)

12. Fisheries and Oceans (DFO): Issues/Decisions

12.A Walrus Management Plan: Update

Michelle Wheatley reported that comments of a technical/legal nature were prepared and forwarded to DFO with respect to the fourth draft. Gordon Koshinsky asked if there had ever been any input from Makivik. Gary Weber reported that all materials have been copied to Makivik and they have been given every opportunity to respond but have not done so.

12.B Precautionary Approach: DFO Case Studies

Michelle Wheatley advised that some Federal departments have recently and deliberately adopted “the precautionary approach” as a guiding principle. In essence, this approach holds that programs should err on the side of caution. DFO has been trying to incorporate this approach in their fishery management profile. The department is undertaking a number of case studies to that end.

As an example of a marine mammal population for their case studies, DFO has tentatively selected the Eastern Hudson Bay beluga. They propose to hold a workshop on the subject, and have indicated that the NWMB would be included. The initiative seems interesting and may be useful, but the material circulated too date is much too technical to serve as useful background.

Kevin McCormick questioned the motivation for the exercise. Gary Weber suggested that it was quite simply rooted in DFO’s growing commitment to conservation. David Alagalak urged that provision be made to include the KWF in the consultation process, since the Keewatin communities have a vital interest in Hudson Bay belugas.

13. GNWT Wildlife (RWED): Issues/Decisions

Prior to proceeding to this agenda item in detail the Chairperson, Ben Kovic, noted the arrival in the meeting of Mr. Peter Kilabuk, the Minister-designate of the Department of Sustainable Development in the new Nunavut Government. Mr. Kilabuk was accompanied by a number of officials led by the Deputy Minister of the new Department, Ms Katherine Trumper.

Mr. Kovic introduced Mr. Kilabuk and his officials to those assembled. Mr. Kilabuk declared his enthusiasm about having been selected for this portfolio, which he viewed as one of the most central in the new government. He cited his experience in the Nunavut commercial fisheries and considered that this would be pertinent to one of the new government’s priorities: to increase the access of Nunavut interests to the marine fishery resources. He very much looked forward to working with the NWMB and others in a co-management framework with respect to wildlife.

Mr. Kovic assured the incoming Minister that the NWMB shared his enthusiasm and optimism about working together for the benefit of Nunavut interests in the use of fish and wildlife resources, and for the conservation of those resources. Being so near at hand to the Minister with a key and complementary responsibility was certain to be a plus for co-management.

13.A Study of Handling Effects on Polar Bears: Update

Stephen Atkinson briefly reviewed the history of this project. Data analysis has been completed but interpretation of the information has not yet reached a stage where conclusions can be drawn. Completion of the report is still expected by the end of March. At that point it will be up to the NWMB to decide on any next steps, including how to disseminate the results.

13.B Population Status of Arctic Wolves: Update

Stephen Atkinson reported that RWED has been continuing its efforts to quantify the harvest of wolves in Nunavut. Soon to be initiated is a genetic study, for which hunters will provide the necessary tissue samples. The aim of this work will be to confirm (or refute) the validity of the *arctos* subspecies and, if found to be valid, to clarify its distribution on the High Arctic Islands.

13.C Strategic Planning for the Nunavut Offshore Fisheries: Update

Stephen Atkinson re-iterated the intentions expressed earlier by the Minister-designate that the new Department (DSD) is determined to get off to a strong start in this area. It is recognized that there are many players in this field, and the first step will be to clarify mandates and roles. Forthcoming initiatives will probably include preparation of a background document, and then a workshop.

Gordon Koshinsky declared that he was encouraged by this presentation. He urged that in its process the new Department try to do more than clarify roles, but move very quickly to develop and obtain agreement on quantifiable objectives. Ben Kovic issued an invitation for DSD representatives to participate in the forthcoming (April 6-7) meeting of the NWMB with DFO.

13.D Peary Caribou Research and Management: Update

Stephen Atkinson reported that the Peary Caribou Recovery Team has completed its final draft of a Recovery Plan. The Plan includes goals for recovery and an identification of potential management actions. The need for more and better information on

abundance and distribution of these animals continues to be paramount. RWED is firming up its plans and preparations to conduct a caribou survey on the Queen Elizabeth Islands next March.

The Recovery Plan document goes to the attention of the national body, and will subsequently make its way to the NWMB and other pertinent agencies and individuals. The mandate for approving the Plan rests with the NWMB. Michelle Wheatley advised that she attended the Recovery Team meeting (in Edmonton, in February) in the capacity of an observer. She noted that the overall recovery planning process includes the development of an Implementation Plan. The specific management actions to be pursued in each region would be decided in consultation with local and regional bodies, and would be the key considerations in developing the Implementation Plan.

13.E Jurisdiction for Polar Bears on Sea Ice

Stephen Atkinson reported that a suggestion has come forward from a Federal Government source that Territorial jurisdiction concerning polar bears might be confined to when the bears are on land. The Territorial Government does not consider this to be a serious possibility, but does have the matter under advisement. If such a contention were upheld it would have implications extending far beyond polar bears, and indeed beyond wildlife. Michael d'Eça reminded Stephen that the NWMB has already asked to be included in any formal consideration of this matter.

13.F Manitoba / Nunavut MOU re Western Hudson Bay Polar Bears

Stephen Atkinson advised that the Territorial Government is in the process of negotiating a formal management agreement (MOU) with the Province of Manitoba to govern the relationship between the two agencies concerning the Western Hudson Bay polar bear population. If and when completed, this would be the first inter-jurisdictional agreement in which the Government of Nunavut was a participant.

Manitoba currently manages this population when the bears are on land. Manitoba's management regime does not have provision for harvesting, partly because the "preferred use" of polar bears in Manitoba is for tourist viewing. However Manitoba does have a program of controlling nuisance bears, and one or two are killed in most years under this provision. Since Manitoba allows no polar bear hunting as such, they "loan" their share of the annual allowable harvest for this population to the Territorial Government, which in turn makes these bears available to Nunavut hunters. This loan currently comprises 27 bears annually, and Manitoba presumes that the loan is recallable. There seems to be no good reason to dispute this presumption, but no formal agreement is actually in place regarding the arrangement. The proposed MOU would provide for equal sharing of the annual allowable harvest, but would formally entrench the "loan" provisions.

Manitoba wants the MOU to include a prohibition against hunting by non-beneficiaries in the marine area east of Manitoba as defined in Article 42 of the NLCA. On (at least)

one recent occasion, an American hunting party with a Nunavut guide was encountered on Manitoba soil with a polar bear that had apparently been killed on the adjacent sea ice. When hunters who originate in Nunavut hunt polar bears on the ice off Manitoba, especially for other-than-subsistence purposes, and particularly when they camp in Manitoba in the course of their hunting trip, this undermines efforts by Manitoba to hold the line against prospective hunters from its own jurisdiction. Prospective Manitoba hunters include Indian land claimants who are in the process of land-claim negotiations. A breakdown in the present albeit informal arrangement would be to the certain disbenefit of polar-bear-viewing interests in Manitoba, not to mention polar-bear-hunting interests in Nunavut. That is why both parties consider it important to formalize, and if possible to improve upon, the present informal arrangement.

Michelle Wheatley reported that she had been an observer at negotiations on this matter that were conducted in conjunction with the recent meeting of the Polar Bear Technical Committee in Edmonton. Michelle confirmed that Manitoba would like to include a provision to restrict polar bear hunting by Inuit in the marine area east of Manitoba to subsistence harvesting only. Manitoba wishes to preclude the possibility of tags that they loan to Nunavut being used for commercial hunts in or immediately adjacent to an area where Manitoba itself does not permit polar bear hunting of any sort.

David Alagalak noted that the Nunavut hunting party that was observed in Manitoba last year was in fact occupying territory and utilizing a cabin that has traditionally been used exclusively by Inuit from Nunavut. David suggested that RWED has acted too unilaterally in these negotiations with Manitoba. He urged that a meeting be held in Arviat or Whale Cove to obtain local Inuit input and to decide a course of action before the Territorial Government takes this matter further on its own.

Stephen advised that there are plans to discuss the matter with community representatives in conjunction with the May meeting of the Beverly Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board, in order to obtain that sort of input. He explained that while the B/Q Board has no mandate for or interest in this particular matter, its meeting provided a convenient venue to discuss it. Michael d'Eça reminded all present of the NWMB's effective jurisdictions in the matter.

13.G North Baffin and N. Melville Peninsula Caribou: Inuit Knowledge Study

Joe Tigullaraq reminded the Board of its earlier (in 1998) approval of NWRT funding for a scheduled three-year documentation and analysis of Inuit knowledge about the distribution, movements, abundance, diseases, mortality factors and feeding ecology of caribou on northern and northwestern Baffin Island and northern Melville Peninsula. This is envisaged as the introductory phase in the development of an ecological model and comprehensive management plan. Joe advised that the purpose of his presentation was to convey that the proponent had been delayed in starting the project, and to request that the funding schedule as previously approved be set back by one year. Ben Kovic informed Joe that the Board had already dealt with this matter and had decided to approve the carry-forward of 1998/99 funding to 1999/00.

13.H South Baffin Caribou: Consultations with Elders and Communities

Joe Tigullaraq reminded the Board of its earlier (in 1998) approval of NWMB study funding for a scheduled two-year program to help defray the costs of community participants to attend meetings and workshops in order to provide traditional historical knowledge as input to development of a comprehensive management plan for the South Baffin caribou population. Joe advised that the purpose of his presentation was to brief the Board on progress and particularly to advise that an initial consultation workshop and a major use for the 1998/99 funding is scheduled to be held in March. Ben Kovic informed Joe that the Board had already considered this project and had decided to approve the updated funding request for 1999/00.

13.I Responses to Questions and Concerns from Previous NWMB Meeting

Joe Tigullaraq tabled the following responses:

- Polar bear populations in Nunavut for which the USA permits importation of trophies (Makabe Nartok): Southern Beaufort Sea, Northern Beaufort Sea, M'Clintock Channel, Viscount Melville Sound, and Western Hudson Bay. (Michelle Wheatley added that the US Fish and Wildlife Service recently announced the approval of two more populations: Lancaster Sound and Norwegian Bay. Approval of the Queen Elizabeth Islands, Baffin Bay, and Kane Basin populations is also being actively considered.)
- NWMB participation in discussions concerning jurisdiction of polar bears on sea ice (Michael d'Eça): See item 13.E above.
- Migration rather than mortality as a key factor in wolf population changes (Joan Scottie): This possibility is always taken into account.
- Ecological relationships between Peary caribou and muskox on the Eastern Queen Elizabeth Islands (Harry Flaherty): Not currently considered by the HTOs to be a priority for planning caribou research.
- Status of shared position for Conservation Education (Harry Flaherty): Stephen Pinksen has been assigned to work out details with Jim Noble.
- Need for all agencies to submit written briefing materials in respect to agenda items for NWMB meetings, and to do so well in advance of the meetings (Ben Kovic): RWED will make every effort to comply.

13.J RWED and DSD Projects for NWRT Funding: Situation Report

Joe Tigullaraq provided a brief update on the ongoing RWED research projects that are supported from the Nunavut Wildlife Research Trust. He also mentioned the new project proposals that have been submitted on behalf of DSD to commence in 1999/00. Ben Kovic advised Joe that all these matters (total of seven projects) were considered

by the Board earlier in its agenda, and that funding for the new projects had been approved with conditions.

13.K Thelon Wildlife Sanctuary Management Plan: Update

Richard Wyman reviewed the evolving history of the Management Plan. Concerns expressed by KIA and NTI with the initial draft in 1997 were reviewed at a meeting in October 1998. The list of participating agencies was by this time considerably expanded, and included the NWMB. RWED was tasked with revising the Plan to incorporate and highlight changes that had been agreed to at the meeting. RWED circulated its revised draft Plan for comment later that same month. The document was reviewed at a meeting of the interested parties in January 1999, and further changes have been made. The KIA has accepted the revised Plan in principle. However the KIA is not prepared to accept it formally until it is translated, with the translation to highlight the various changes. Meanwhile RWED and NTI plan to meet shortly to discuss changes that have been made to the Plan since RWED completed its draft in October 1998.

Continuing controversy about the plan hinges on:

- Provision (or not) for the establishment of Special Management Areas. Since these are identified and proposed in an optional context, with no mandatory implications, RWED considers that they should stay in the Plan.
- Restriction (or not) of harvesting rights by Inuit in the Sanctuary. Inuit organizations argue that there can/should be no restrictions. Legal advisors to RWED contend that restrictions can and should be incorporated or at least made available in the Plan.

Stephen Atkinson invited the NWMB to help break the impasse on the question of Inuit harvesting rights in federally-designated parks and wildlife sanctuaries. Michael d'Eça acknowledged that this was an important and challenging question, and one that was certain to be the focus of increasing attention with the drive to create more National Parks in Nunavut. The Board directed Michael to research the question in the broad context, and also with a view to helping the Board to formulate a course of action with respect to the Thelon situation specifically.

13.L Shared Conservation-Education Position (RWED/NWMB)

Stephen Pinksen reported that there were no applicants for this position when it was advertised. RWED has been able to recruit an individual to fill one of its own similar positions, to start April 1. Perhaps once that individual gets underway and establishes some momentum in the work, the search for someone to take on the RWED/NWMB position will be more productive.

Gordon Koshinsky suggested that consideration be given to converting this employment opportunity into a trainee position, with the soon-to-be-deployed individual serving as a kind of mentor. David Alagalak suggested that consideration be given to stationing the position somewhere other than Iqaluit, in an effort to broaden the field of potential candidates.

13.M Nunavut Wildlife Legislation

Stephen Pinksen reiterated the Department's earlier conclusion, based on a consultant's review, that its wildlife legislation was out-of-date in its own right, as well as being inconsistent with the NLCA. It was decided that it would be better to develop completely new legislation rather than attempt to remodel the current version. A (the same) consultant has been retained and is working to get this process underway. It is expected that an overall time line for the project, including an outline of community consultations that will be required, will be completed by the end of April.

14. NWMB Internal Items: Issues / Decisions

14.A Harvest Study: Update

Johnny McPherson referred the Board to the briefing note he had prepared for inclusion in the meeting binders. The briefing note provided a good snap shot of the Harvest Study, which has now passed the mid-point of the data-collection phase. There are currently 5,326 hunters registered for the Study. Of these, 4,266 are interviewed monthly to have their hunting activities and harvests recorded. Among those interviewed routinely are all hunters classified as intensive or active. Occasional hunters may be interviewed in their entirety or on a sampling basis, depending on the community. The overall response rate to date is 83%. Data obtained from respondents are used to estimate harvests for non-respondents and for occasional hunters who are not interviewed.

As part of his report, Johnny tabled a community-by-community tally to demonstrate the month-by-month coverage that has been achieved. Of the 924 possible data files that "should" exist to date, 85% have been processed for entry into the database. Irretrievable data gaps exist for four communities: Iqaluit, Cape Dorset, Baker Lake, and Rankin Inlet. These communities will require special attention if a five-year data set is going to be obtained.

The effort is continuing to identify a contractor to conduct a technical review of the Study. This effort has encountered a series of frustrations. It is starting to seem likely that more than the one year that is currently budgeted will be needed to complete the analysis and reporting phases at the end of the Study.

Kevin McCormick urged that a concerted effort be made to start taking Harvest Study reports back to the communities, not only to encourage participation but also to assist in data verification. Johnny acknowledged that this was important, and confirmed that work was proceeding in that direction. Joan Scottie called for greater opportunities for participation by the Kitikmeot and Keewatin Regions in the production of the Harvest Study calendars. Johnny noted that printing of the calendars is regularly tendered, and that Artisan Enterprises of Yellowknife were the successful bidders the last couple of years. Makabe Nartok expressed displeasure with the photograph on the cover of the current issue: it appears to show an Inuk about to harpoon a young walrus and/or its mother. David Alagalak suggested aiming for better regional representation for the photographs that appear in the calendar. Johnny replied that the Harvest Study Committee has the final say in photograph selection.

Johnny noted that the Harvest Study Committee had recently lost a member with the passing of David Tagoona, and would soon lose another with the departure of Pauloosie Keyootak. The Board decided to appoint David Alagalak and Gordon Koshinsky to the Committee to replace the two members who were mentioned. **(Resolution 99- 138)**

14.B Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study: Update

Michelle Wheatley reported that her analysis of the situation led her to conclude that completion of the project would be best served by the continuing participation of Keith Hay to the extent that he was available and able, with the provision of additional capacity for analysis and writing. Keith has been retained on a casual contract basis (paid for hours actually worked), and another biologist, Catherine Filion, has been hired on the same basis to focus on the cultural aspects of the Study. The arrangement has been a success so far, and the two individuals are working productively.

Gordon Koshinsky asked if the “vision” for the final product of the Study had suffered significant deterioration or erosion as a consequence of the various false starts on getting the Study completed. Michelle replied that everyone involved continues to aim for the best possible product, rather than just a minimal effort.

14.C Nunavut Wildlife Resource Centre Coalition: Update

Michelle Wheatley gave a short report on this ongoing initiative. Coalition members have adopted a working arrangement to govern access to documents listed in the database. Only agency staff and NWMB Board Members may borrow items; others may use materials in-house and have access to photocopying services for reasonable requests. A formal policy regarding access and cost-recovery (for photocopying, postage, etc.) will be drafted in conjunction with establishing the Coalition Website, and will be presented to the Board for consideration and approval.

Gordon Koshinsky asked about progress on the Stock Database Catalogue. Michelle replied that RWED is currently staffing two Biologist positions with the aim (in part) of assigning those individuals to lead the initiation of this project.

14.D Establishing Qualifications for Big-Game Hunting Guides

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Board about the report on this subject that was commissioned by the Board and was presented by one of the authors (Glenn Williams) at the last Board meeting. Work is underway to develop the discussion paper that the Board assigned at the December meeting. Input from the Board is requested on a number of matters to assist this exercise:

- Should the actual qualifications that guides would be required to meet be controlled by the specific outfitter (or the outfitters in concert), the HTO(s), or the government?
- Should guiding for non-resident hunters require the same qualifications as guiding local people who have fewer than two years of residency?
- Would the NWMB be prepared to fund the cost of setting up local certification boards?

The ensuing discussion touched many aspects of the matter, but provided little in the way of firm direction concerning the questions raised by Michelle. Pauloosie Keyootak noted that Inuit hunters have informally (and successfully) “guided” their families and colleagues in big-game hunting expeditions for centuries. However the traditional skills upon which they depended are slowly being lost, and proficiency in the use of modern methods and “high-tech” equipment requires a different kind of training. David Alagalak noted that big-game guides are required to exercise a high level of competence and responsibility, and that insurance companies can be expected to be increasingly demanding about certification. Joan Scottie stated that it was important for the communities to be involved in setting qualifications for guides. Kevin McCormick cited the responsibility of the HTOs in this matter as set out in the NLCA, and saw no need to establish additional bodies to deal with certification.

In the end, the Board directed that staff and advisors continue to work on the discussion paper, with the aim of presenting it at the next Board meeting.

14.E Marine Mammal Protection Act (USA): ITC Initiative

Michelle Wheatley noted that this item was a carry-forward from the December meeting. The United States Marine Mammal Protection Act restricts the importation of marine mammals or marine mammal products into the USA. The Act is up for review and re-authorization in 1999. This opportunity to influence the content of the Act occurs only once every five years. The Inuit Tapirisat of Canada (ITC) has been promoting and lobbying for changes in the Act that would, in particular, make it easier for seal products (including skins) to be imported into the USA. The ITC argument is that the MMPA

contravenes the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The ITC is looking for support for their cause, including from the NWMB.

David Alagalak suggested that this is primarily an economic development issue that does not fit well with the mandate of the NWMB. The NWMB should not expect to be very credible or effective in lobbying on an issue of this nature. That of course does not preclude encouraging and assisting others, such as the ITC. Michael d'Eça counseled that the NWMB might join the debate along the lines of declaring that wildlife management was in good hands and that there were no conservation concerns to legitimize continued restrictions on movement of seal products. Kevin McCormick noted that this matter has come up in the past (every five years), and the proposed revisions have not been consistently well supported, even by interests that would intuitively be considered to be on-side. There are concerns that opening up the Act could lead to the loss of other provisions with a net result that would be worse.

The Board assigned its staff and advisors to draft a "careful" letter in support of the ITC initiative, for the further consideration of the Board.

14.F WWF Proposal to Monitor Abnormalities in Wildlife

Michelle Wheatley noted that this item was brought forward from the December meeting. The World Wildlife Fund (WWF) proposal to do this work has arisen on account of the documented contamination of the Arctic ecosystem, the reports of increasing incidence of abnormalities in wildlife, and the concern expressed by many communities that the two trends may be linked. The project would engage hunters to collect and submit any abnormalities they encounter, for analysis by the Canadian Co-operative Wildlife Health Centre. The project would be community-based, and would operate only in communities that confirm their support. If contaminants were shown to be affecting the structure and function of animals, and stemming from that their productivity and survival, the matter would be a wildlife management concern and thus of interest to the NWMB.

Pauloosie Keyootak noted that hunters have been submitting samples of unusual wildlife material to Resource Officers for many years. Michelle explained that in the past the focus in analyzing these materials has been to document or refute the incidence of parasites and disease, not to correlate with contaminant burdens. Meeka Mike noted that DFO is studying contaminant burdens as part of their whale-sampling program. Michelle explained that the focus of the DFO effort is to try to delineate stocks based on different contaminant loading, and that there is no attempt in this program to correlate contamination with abnormalities. Makabe Nartok observed that results from these kinds of projects are seldom if ever brought back to the communities. Stephen Atkinson explained that in the case of RWED's ongoing survey of the incidence of parasites and disease, submitted samples are routinely sent out for analysis but the hunter is notified only if something is found that poses some kind of danger. Otherwise the information is simply logged. Stephen also noted that hermaphroditic polar bears

(showing characteristics of both sexes in the same animal) are starting to show up, and this is a very interesting (and disturbing) development.

14.G Partnership Opportunity with WWF in Supporting Research

Michelle Wheatley reported that the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) has requested the assistance of the NWMB in identifying proposals that may be eligible for support from their Arctic Endangered Species Recovery Fund and/or their Arctic Fund for Species of Local Concern. Kevin McCormick observed that the NWMB and the WWF do appear to have a number of goals in common. Members did identify a number of concerns, however, including:

- Meeka Mike: Who owns and controls the information that is produced by a project to which the WWF contributes financially?
- Gordon Koshinsky: Is the WWF amenable to support projects being done by government agencies?
- Ben Kovic: What does the WWF do with its own information?
- Kevin McCormick: What requirements does the WWF have for its financial participation?

The Board asked the Director of Wildlife Management to continue her dialogue with the WWF to clarify these and other matters, and in general to explore how the programs of the two agencies can be made mutually supportive.

14.H Policy for Establishing Wildlife Research Priorities: Revision

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Board that Dan Pike had initiated a major overhaul of the Board's policy for establishing research priorities prior to his departure. She (Michelle) was carrying this work forward and aimed to have a revised document for the Board's consideration at the next meeting.

14.I Policy for Supporting Projects with NWRT Funding: Revision

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Board that Dan Pike, prior to his departure, had also initiated a substantial upgrade of the Board's policy for supporting projects from the Nunavut Wildlife Research Trust (NWRT) Fund. She (Michelle) had picked up on this initiative and expected to have a revised document for the Board's consideration at the next meeting. Items that will receive significant new treatment include treatment of proposals for multi-year funding and the fostering more certainty on the part of applicants as to what is expected of them.

14.J Policy for Supporting Projects with NWMB Study Funding: Revision

Michelle Wheatley informed the Board that in view of the policy revisions being pursued for the two related subjects (see above), she had decided to undertake a concurrent revision of the Board's policy for supporting projects from the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board's own operating funds. Completion is expected to be concurrent with the other two items.

14.K Rules of Practice for Public Hearings of the NWMB: Update

Michael d'Eça reminded the Board that the exercise of producing a set of rules to govern how the NWMB conducted a public hearing, were it ever necessary to do so, has been underway for some time. The Board last considered the matter at its August 1998 meeting at Baker Lake, at which time he (Michael) had been assigned to make certain revisions to the latest draft. Michael directed the Members to the updated version in the briefing binder.

Michael led the Board through an item-by-item review of the most recent changes. These included:

- Opening up the pre-hearing process to all potential participants;
- Recognizing that one purpose of the pre-hearing process would be to help the Board decide whether to actually proceed with a hearing;
- Increasing the period of notice for a hearing to 60 days;
- Adding a reference to entitlement regarding full-party-status.

David Alagalak asked why NTI and other Inuit organizations were not listed specifically among those accorded full-party status (Rule 3.1). Michael explained that the wording as it stands is according to the NLCA, but that in any event any "person" (which includes any organization) who/that has an interest (if deemed appropriate by the NWMB) shall have full-party status.

Gordon Koshinsky suggested that the wording of Rule 3.2(a) be revised to include the words, "not of a nature to warrant".

The Board decided to adopt the *Rules of Practice for Public Hearings of the NWMB* as prepared by the NWMB Legal Advisor with input from the Board, subject to two minor revisions. **(Resolution 99- 139)**

14.L Implementation of NWMB Strategic Plan: Update

Jim Nble referred to his regular quarterly implementation update contained in the briefing binders. Jim advised that the Nunavut Implementation Panel is commissioning a five-year independent review of progress on implementing the Land Claim and the

Contract. He suggested that the Board's progress in implementing its own Strategic Plan would likely capture the interest of the reviewers. Jim asked if it would be useful and appropriate for the Board to conduct its own "mid-term review" in preparation for the broader exercise, including an in-depth re-visiting of the Strategic Plan and with particular attention to the Board's goals and plans for the remaining period under the present Implementation Contract.

The Board agreed that the matter warranted more consideration. As an interim step the Board decided to ask the Executive Committee to try to improve the format of the progress report on the Strategic Plan as periodically prepared by the Executive Director, to make it more meaningful to an outside reader.

Friday, 26 March 1999

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, re-convened the meeting at 8:45 a.m. Joan Scottie led the opening prayer.

15. Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated (NTI) Wildlife Division

15.A Narwhal Working Group Report

Glenn Williams, who has been assisting the Narwhal Working Group in his capacity as Wildlife Consultant to NTI, gave a report on the activities of the Working Group to date. Four community meetings have been held, to lay the groundwork for comprehensive workshops. Glenn identified this as the first time that representatives from DFO, NTI, and the RWOs have traveled together to communities for a common purpose. The Group was very well received. Workshops were subsequently held (in February) in Arctic Bay, Broughton Island, and Repulse Bay, led by Glenn with the assistance of Abraham Tunraluk. Pond Inlet gave notice that they wanted to develop the initiative on their own.

At the workshops, the various jurisdictions for narwhal management were explained, in the context of the NLCA. Briefing materials and suggestions provided by Michael d'Eça were indispensable to the process. Assistance was provided in the drafting of local hunting rules to enable the new management system to be implemented. Two of the communities had already prepared draft rules in an effort to speed the process.

David Alagalak asked if it was true that hunting rules of this nature would need to be approved by the HTO membership. Glenn replied that that was correct; the necessary resolution can stem from an AGM or from an extra-ordinary meeting of the HTO. Michael d'Eça pointed out that this was one of the main advantages of enacting these measures as rules rather than as by-laws. If they were enacted as by-laws they would need to be formally registered, with the payment of a fee, etc. However there is some debate about whether the current HTO by-laws actually enable the HTOs to establish and implement local rules of this nature. This may require further attention and

refinement. Michael reiterated that the NWMB will need to be satisfied that its criteria are met before it will be able to agree to actually implement the new narwhal management system for any particular HTO.

Glenn noted that a common concern was that removal of narwhal quotas might open the way for hunters from other communities to come in. Under the NLCA, HTOs have authority only over their own members. The solution that is being considered would be to require non-members to hunt under an assignment from a member. The assignor conveys his/her membership obligations to the assignee in respect to that particular assignment. However this process requires the sanction of the RWO(s). Further consideration would have to be given to the question of assignments to non-beneficiaries.

Michael d'Eça elaborated that in order for the assignment process to work as intended in this instance, it would be necessary for the HTOs to know the boundaries of their hunting areas with some precision. This could be problematic, especially since some hunting areas are undoubtedly shared, maybe even differently for different species. It would also be useful to know if hunters from adjoining communities who might wish to move about were customarily hunting the same stock. If and when the NWMB were to set total allowable harvests, the situation would be resolved in a different way. Michael also explained that non-beneficiaries could not pose an issue in this instance, since they are basically disallowed from hunting narwhal as per the NLCA.

The community of Repulse Bay is especially concerned about a potential influx of narwhal hunters from other communities. No other community in their area routinely has narwhal accessible to it. The HTO is not keen to accept the responsibility of monitoring hunters from elsewhere. They would much prefer if the new system applied only to their own members, and they have decided to take the whole concept to their membership before proceeding further.

Makabe Nartok asked about the prospects for participation by other communities, such as his (Pelly Bay), in this new initiative. Glenn replied that the report that is being prepared on the project will include specific instructions that other HTOs will be able to follow if they want to take the same route. For the moment there would seem to be no particular advantage or urgency for other communities to do this. In view of the work involved, it is not realistic to try to extend the initiative beyond the four "pilot" communities for 1999. David Alagalak suggested that a general advisory should be sent out explaining why the initial focus was on the four particular communities, and also how other communities would be able to participate eventually if they chose to do so.

Glenn reported that all communities were concerned about the incremental costs of implementing the various provisions of the new narwhal management system. At issue are such matters as preparing sampling kits, obtaining sample materials, and forwarding sample materials to DFO. Presumably sample kits will be provided, but other questions of cost will need to be addressed by DFO and/or NWMB.

Gordon Koshinsky asked whether Pond Inlet was realistic in expecting to meet the requirements of the new management system without taking advantage of the assistance being made available. Michael d'Eça explained that the Pond Inlet HTO has in fact been working extensively with the NWMB (including with himself) on a direct basis. They have already drafted a set of narwhal management rules (including harvesting rules) that are very comprehensive and include a great deal of background material. There is some expectation that the route they finally adopt may be somewhat unique, but this is not interpreted to be of particular concern. Gordon urged that the Pond Inlet HTO be kept updated on progress being made by the other HTOs, so that they have opportunity to benefit from the broader experience. Pauloosie Keyootak perceived considerable benefit in having hunting rules as uniform as possible among communities. Otherwise hunters might be tempted to seek out communities having rules that they interpreted to be less onerous. Glenn cautioned that it is not practical for local hunting rules to be completely uniform. For example, Repulse Bay would want to institute a rule prohibiting caching of narwhal at considerable distances from the community, since ice conditions tend to make subsequent access to distant cache sites impossible. This never becomes a problem at Arctic Bay or Broughton Island.

Gary Weber asked if there was any role for the RWOs in establishing some of the generic hunting rules that might be applicable or in making other arrangements of a generalized nature. Glenn suggested that the RWOs (in conjunction with DFO) could/should resolve a generalized narwhal tagging system that could be used universally.

Glenn urged that there be active follow-up and continuing support with provision for:

- The HTOs, and particularly Repulse Bay, to get the help and encouragement they still require; and
- The RWOs to be kept updated on the initiative, and particularly on the emerging requirements from them for its implementation.

Glenn also urged that:

- The response(s) to concerns about controlling “immigrant” hunters be further developed;
- The requirement for sample materials posed by DFO be clarified and not be made too onerous;
- The outstanding questions pertaining to funding be resolved; and
- The dialogue between DFO and the HTOs be strengthened.

Gordon Koshinsky stressed that this is very much a ground-breaking initiative and that it is very important that it be introduced in a mature way and without the sorts of negative incidents that could have been avoided with better planning. Otherwise it will be very difficult to expand the initiative later. Glenn added that the initiative is starting to stir imaginations, and it can be expected that there will be spin-offs that go beyond the management of narwhal.

The Board decided (**Resolution 99- 140**) to continue its active support of HTO efforts to meet the conditions required for entry into the new “non-quota” management system

for narwhal and, more specifically, to encourage and work with the four communities that were identified as candidates for the initial round of entry into the system in 1999. The Board also agreed to make available additional funding to support one or more of those communities in this undertaking, with any further funding being conditional upon a clear identification of need and the submission of a detailed budget by the HTO(s).

16. Requests for Donations: Reviews and Decisions

Jim Noble presented the three donation requests that were on the agenda and led the ensuing separate discussions.

16.A Publication of a Field Guide to Arctic Marine Fishes

This is a partnership project led by DFO in conjunction with the Canadian Museum of Nature, the (Inuvialuit) Fisheries Joint Management Committee, and the NWMB. Timelines have been such that, although considerable progress was made this year (1998/99), the NWMB funding (\$20,000) was not used. The request is to carry forward this funding into 1999/00. The project was not considered as part of the NWRT Fund or NWMB Study Fund packages (dealt with earlier on the meeting agenda) because it is being administered from the NWMB budget for Conservation Education.

The Board decided to approve the carry-forward request. **(Resolution 99- 141)**

16.B Request by Akeeshoo Nowdluk Family for Travel Assistance

The family of Akeeshoo Nowdluk, recently deceased, wishes to make a return visit to their ancestral outpost camp home on Allen Island in order to re-connect with their heritage and to ease the burden of Akeeshoo's passing. About 30 people would like to make the trip and the family is seeking donations (any amounts) and other types of support to make this trip possible.

Meeka Mike expressed concern about precedent, noting that there are many other families in similar situations. David Alagalak was concerned that no family member had been found to sign the request, it having been prepared and forwarded by a government official. David also questioned if all the family members who were planning to make the trip were well enough to do so.

The Board decided **(Resolution 99- 142)** to approve a donation of \$2,000 to the family of Akeeshoo Nowdluk to help defray the costs of a return trip by the family to visit their ancestral outpost camp as a source of inspiration and healing in this time of their recent bereavement. This contribution is to be conditional upon the family providing medical

certification that any members currently under the care of a doctor are physically competent to make the trip.

16.C Nunavut Sivuniksavut New Zealand Trip

This program perennially seeks funding support for a major student project, usually a class trip. The NWMB has provided such support in the past. The program itself has been quite successful, and different students are involved in successive years. The present request is for a donation (any amount) to support a class trip to New Zealand in April.

The Board decided (**Resolution 99- 143**) to approve a donation of \$3,000 to the Nunavut Sivuniksavut program to help defray the costs of the forthcoming class trip to New Zealand.

In-Camera Session

The Board decided to go *in-camera* to consider the negotiations-in-progress with DIAND concerning the new funding agreement for 1999/00. The Board decided on the wording of its next communication to DIAND on the subject, but no other decisions were made *in-camera* that required subsequent referral to the open Board Meeting.

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

- To go *in-camera* (**Resolution 99- 144**)
- To close the *in-camera* session (**Resolution 99- 145**)

17. Executive Committee Report and Recommendations

Gordon Koshinsky reported to the Board in his capacity as Chairperson of the Executive Committee. Gordon advised that the Committee had met the evening of March 24. The Committee had identified two items for presentation to the Board. Discussion highlights and decisions made by the Board in respect to these items were as follows:

- **Signing Authority Administration:** Gordon reported that the Executive Committee considered that the need for the Board, as per its current By-laws and Operating Procedures, to pass and administer periodic Resolutions to update its signing authority designations was not conducive to efficient signing authority administration. Gordon tabled for the Board's consideration a revision to NWMB By-law 15.2 that would alleviate this problem. Under the proposed revision, the Board

would designate positions rather than individuals as its representatives for signing-authority purposes. The proposed wording for this revision is as follows:

“15.2 Notwithstanding Sub-section 15.1, bank drafts, deposits, withdrawals, receipts, and similar papers associated with financial transactions on behalf of the NWMB shall be signed by two representatives of the NWMB. Those representatives shall be any two of the following: the Executive Director, the Director of Finance and Administration, the Chairperson, one other NWMB member.”

The Committee recognized that the Operating Procedures would need to be appropriately amended to reflect this by-law change.

The Board decided (**Resolution 99- 146**) to revise its By-law 15.2 in accordance with the recommendation of the Executive Committee, such that signing authority would henceforth be designated to offices or positions rather than to individuals, and specifically that any two of the following would be designated to sign: the Executive Director, the Director of Finance and Administration, the Chairperson, one other NWMB member.

- **New Contract for/with Legal Advisor:** Gordon advised that the Board’s contract with its Legal Advisor expires on March 31. The Executive Committee met with the Legal Advisor to pursue and conclude negotiations that had been initiated earlier by the Executive Director. With the concurrence of Mr. d’Eça, the Executive Committee agreed to recommend to the Board that it sign a contract with Mr. d’Eça for the provision of ongoing legal advice. This recommendation would embody the following key revised provisions vis-à-vis the current contract:

- A term of four years, to 31 March 2003, to cover the duration of the Implementation Contract.
- A modest increase in the rate of remuneration for both work time and travel time, and in the guaranteed minimum hours of work.
- Provision for annual non-cumulative merit bonuses of up to 5%, set out without reference to the Board’s system of providing merit bonuses to staff.

The Board decided (**Resolution 99- 147**) to sign a new contract with Michael d’Eça for the continuing provision of legal advisory services to the Board and to the Research Trust, with this new contract to contain the provisions recommended by the Executive Committee.

18. Meetings, Workshops and Other Pertinent Events

18.A Recent Events: Attendance and Briefings

Jim Noble referred the Members to the notes contained in the briefing material pertaining to events that Board Members and/or Staff/Advisors attended since the last Board Meeting in December. These items included:

- Canada-Greenland consultations on turbot, shrimp and seals, January 18-19 in Nuuk: Ben Kovic, Michelle Wheatley and Ray Andrews attended.
- Community consultations on proposed new management system for narwhal, January in Arctic Bay, Pond Inlet, Broughton Island and Repulse Bay: Becky Mike attended.
- DFO's National Marine Mammal Review Committee meeting, February 1-5 in Ottawa: Ben Kovic attended.
- Peary Caribou Recovery Team meeting February 4-6 in Edmonton: Michelle Wheatley attended.
- Polar Bear Technical Committee meeting, February 7-9 in Edmonton: Michelle Wheatley attended.
- DFO Science Advisory Council meeting, February 23-24 in Ottawa: Ben Kovic attended.

18.B Upcoming Events: Attendance and Participation

Jim Noble led the Board through the schedule of imminent events tabulated as at March 22. The following decisions were reached regarding attendance:

- DFO et al. workshop on fisheries in Davis Strait, April 7-8 in Iqaluit: Ben Kovic, Jim Noble and Michelle Wheatley to attend.
- Canadian Marine Advisory Council National Meeting, May 4-6 in Ottawa: Michael d'Eça to attend.
- Beaufort Sea Conference 2000 (FJMC), September 15-18 in Inuvik: Ben Kovic or Jim Noble to attend (pending review of agenda).

19. Date and Location of Next Meeting

It was decided to hold the next (22nd) Regular Meeting of the NWMB at Iqalukutiak (Cambridge Bay) the week of 17 May 1999. **(Resolution 99- 148)**

20. Adjournment

The 21st Regular Meeting of the NWMB adjourned at noon on 26 March 1999. **(Resolution 99- 149)**

Minutes Approved by: _____
Chairperson

Date

NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD

RESOLUTIONS: MEETING No. 21

IQALUIT, 23-26 MARCH 1999

Resolution 99- 114: Resolved that the NWMB accept the agenda for Meeting No. 21 as presented, with the addition of a provision to swear-in a new Board member at the start of the proceedings.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick Seconded by: Gordon Koshinsky
Carried Date: 23 March 1999

Resolution 99- 115: Resolved that the NWMB approve requests by agencies to carry forward Nunavut Wildlife Research Trust funds from 1998/99 to 1999/00 in respect to research projects that were previously approved for multi-year funding and that were originally characterized as ongoing through 1999/00, these approvals as follows:

- Project 110-98-1: Traditional knowledge study of caribou on Baffin Island and Melville Peninsula, as per DSD request to carry forward \$59,000 and shift the funding profile for each of the remaining years of the project back by one year. The new approved multi-year funding profile is thus: \$59,000 for 1999/00; \$62,000 for 2000/01; and \$ 47,000 for 2001/02.
- Project 120-97-1: Walrus population studies, as per DFO request to carry forward \$9,100 and apply this towards the funding that was previously approved for 1999/00.
- Project 120-98-1: Ringed seal study in western Hudson Bay, as per DFO request to carry forward \$42,000, to be added to the funding previously approved for 1999/00.
- Project 130-97-2: Productivity and survival study of king eiders at Karrak Lake, as per CWS request to carry forward \$2,000, to be added to the funding previously approved for 1999/00.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky Seconded by: Pauloosie Keyootak
Carried Date: 23 March 1999

Resolution 99- 116: Resolved that the NWMB deny the request by DFO to carry forward funding in respect to NWRT Project 120-95-1 (Collection of arctic charr fishery data from Baffin communities); thereby reaffirming the end of funding for this project in 1998/99 as previously scheduled.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick Seconded by: Pauloosie Keyootak
Carried Date: 23 March 1999

Resolution 99- 117: Resolved that the NWMB approve, with conditions as set out in the minutes for the meeting, requests by agencies for funding from the Nunavut

Wildlife Research Trust Fund in respect to new research projects in the total amount of \$449,400 for use and for delivery in 1999/2000 as follows:

- Project 110-99-1: Study seasonal distribution and herd delimitation of NE Mainland caribou (\$35,200 to DSD for 1999/00; two-year project);
- Project 110-99-2: Study survival and sustainable harvest of Dolphin-Union caribou (\$64,000 to DSD for 1999/00; three-year project);
- Project 110-99-3: Re-evaluate management boundaries, population status and quotas for muskox in the Keewatin and eastern Kitikmeot regions (\$41,400 to DSD for 1999/00; two-year project);
- Project 110-99-4: Monitor Qamanirjuaq caribou using satellite telemetry (\$16,200 to DSD for 1999/00);
- Project 120-99-1: Study movements and dive behaviour of Baffin Bay narwhal using satellite-linked radio tags (\$25,000 to DFO for 1999/00);
- Project 120-99-2: Conduct summer surveys of SE Baffin beluga in Cumberland Sound (\$65,000 to DFO for 1999/00);
- Project 120-99-3: Study movements and dive behaviour of beluga whales in Cumberland Sound using satellite-linked radio tags (\$22,800 to DFO for 1999/00);
- Project 120-99-6: Obtain samples from harvested narwhal and beluga and analyze for stock identity (\$59,000 to DFO for 1999/00; three-year project);
- Project 120-99-7: Study habitat selection, behaviour and size distribution of bowhead whales in northern Foxe Basin (\$27,800 to DFO for 1999/00);
- Project 120-99-8: Study charr populations in the Cumberland Sound area and develop a management model (\$15,000 to DFO for 1999/00; two-year project);
- Project 120-99-9: Study walrus population dynamics, including use of satellite tags (\$53,000 to DFO for 1999/00);
- Project 130-99-1: Study seasonal movements and home range of adult male polar bears in western Hudson Bay using satellite ear tags (\$25,000 to CWS for 1999/00; two-year project).

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky

Seconded by: David Alagalak

Carried

Date: 24 March 1999

Resolution 99- 118: Resolved that the NWMB approve in principle, with administrative conditions as set out in the minutes for the meeting, NWMB study funding to the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board in the amount of \$120,000 for 1999/00 for a scientific survey of Greenland halibut in NAFO Divisions 0A and 0B, this being the first year of a planned three-year project. Approval is also contingent upon the provision of complementary funding (as budgeted) by DFO.

Moved by: David Alagalak

Seconded by: Joan Scottie

Carried

Date: 24 March 1999

Resolution 99- 119: Resolved that the NWMB approve, with administrative conditions as set out in the minutes for the meeting, NWMB study funding to the Sanikiluaq HTO in the amount of \$27,000 for 1999/00 for continuing study of the

winter ecology of common eiders in the Belcher Islands, this being the second year of NWMB funding for this the final year of the three-year project.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky Seconded by: Makabe Nartok
Carried Date: 24 March 1999

Resolution 99- 120: Resolved that the NWMB approve, with administrative conditions as set out in the minutes for the meeting, NWMB study funding to the Tuktu and Nogak Advisory Board in the amount of \$30,000 for 1999/00 for a one-year compilation of elders' knowledge about the Bathurst caribou herd and its calving grounds.

Moved by: Meeka Mike Seconded by: David Alagalak
Carried Date: 24 March 1999

Resolution 99- 121: Resolved that the NWMB approve, with administrative conditions as set out in the minutes for the meeting, NWMB study funding to the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board in the amount of \$14,000 for 1999/00 for completion (second year) of community consultations and related work pertinent to developing a management plan for the South Baffin caribou population. Approval is also contingent upon the provision of complementary funding and staff resources (as budgeted) by DSD.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick Seconded by: Gordon Koshinsky
Carried Date: 24 March 1999

Resolution 99- 122: Resolved that the NWMB approve, with administrative conditions as set out in the minutes for the meeting, NWMB study funding to the Gjoa Haven HTO in the amount of \$11,000 for 1999/00 for a one-year tagging study on arctic charr in Chantry Inlet. Approval is also contingent upon clarification of the objectives for the tagging aspect, provision of a research permit by DFO, and the active participation of a qualified technician or trained personnel in all fish tagging activity.

Moved by: David Alagalak Seconded by: Kevin McCormick
Carried Abstained: Joan Scottie Date: 24 March 1999

Resolution 99- 123: Resolved that the NWMB approve, with administrative conditions as set out in the minutes for the meeting, NWMB study funding to the three RWOs in concert in the amount of \$20,000 for 1999/00, this being the first year of a planned two-year Inuit knowledge study of polar bears in the NSA.

Moved by: Meeka Mike Seconded by: Makabe Nartok
Carried Opposed: Gordon Koshinsky
Abstained: David Alagalak, Kevin McCormick Date: 24 March 1999

Resolution 99- 124: Resolved that the NWMB not approve NWMB study funding to Mr. Sam Emiktowt of Coral Harbour for a study of the traditional importance of ringed seals in Inuit culture and survival, and instead to direct the proponent to approach other funding sources having a stronger cultural orientation.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky
Carried

Seconded by: Kevin McCormick
Date: 24 March 1999

Resolution 99- 125: Resolved that the NWMB approve, with administrative conditions as set out in the minutes for the meeting, NWMB study funding to the Arviat HTO in the amount of \$10,240 for 1999/00 for completion (third year) of a project to monitor the abundance and impacts on habitat of snow and Ross' geese in the Arviat area.

Moved by: David Alagalak
Carried

Seconded by: Gordon Koshinsky
Date: 24 March 1999

Resolution 99- 126: Resolved that the NWMB not approve NWMB study funding to the Niutaq Cultural Institute to gather traditional knowledge pertaining to mammals and birds in twelve Baffin communities, and instead direct the proponent to approach other funding sources having a stronger cultural orientation.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky

Seconded by: Makabe Nartok

Carried Opposed: Meeka Mike, Pauloosie Keyootak Date: 24 March 1999

Resolution 99- 127: Resolved that the NWMB approve the request from DFO to carry-forward into 1999/00 NWMB funding in the amount of \$4,000 in order to complete a publication pertaining to beluga and narwhal behaviour determined by satellite telemetry, this publication to be in the form of a special issue of the journal *Arctic*.

Moved by: David Alagalak
Carried

Seconded by: Makabe Nartok
Date: 24 March 1999

Resolution 99- 128: Resolved that the NWMB approve, with administrative conditions as set out in the minutes for the meeting, NWMB study funding to the Pelly Bay HTO in the amount of \$15,000 for 1999/00 for a one-year ground-based survey of muskox and caribou in Muskox Management Area MX17.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick
Carried

Seconded by: David Alagalak
Date: 24 March 1999

Resolution 99- 129: Resolved that the NWMB approve, with administrative conditions as set out in the minutes for the meeting, NWMB study funding to the Beverly/ Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board in the amount of \$28,000 for 1999/00, this being the first year of a planned three-year study of the seasonal movements of Beverly caribou. Approval is also contingent upon satisfactory clarification of the relationship between this project and the concurrent BQCMB initiative to produce a CD-ROM pertaining to caribou habitat.

Moved by: David Alagalak
Carried

Seconded by: Pauloosie Keyootak
Date: 24 March 1999

Resolution 99- 130: Resolved that the NWMB not approve NWMB study funding to the Clyde River HTO to conduct studies of bowhead whales in Isabella Bay, and

instead offer to assist the HTO to prepare an actual proposal and encourage them to seek other funding sources.

Moved by: David Alagalak

Seconded by: Gordon Koshinsky

Carried

Date: 24 March 1999

Resolution 99- 131: Resolved that the NWMB approve, with administrative conditions as set out in the minutes for the meeting, NWMB study funding to the Sanikiluaq HTO in the amount of \$10,000 for 1999/00 to help address the costs of trenching the mouths of certain streams on the Belcher Islands as an aid to arctic charr migrations; and further, that the NWMB is prepared to assist the HTO in an effort to attract other funding sources for this project. Approval is also contingent upon the HTO incorporating a before-and-after monitoring element in the project design.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky

Seconded by: David Alagalak

Carried

Abstained: Pauloosie Keyootak

Date: 24 March 1999

Resolution 99- 132: Resolved that, in view of perceived shortcomings in the project design, the NWMB not approve NWMB study funding to the Clyde River HTO for an assessment of electric fencing as a deterrent to polar bears.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky

Seconded by: Pauloosie Keyootak

Carried

Opposed: Two Members

Date: 24 March 1999

Resolution 99- 133: Resolved that the minutes for NWMB Meeting No. 20 conducted at Yellowknife on 5-6 December 1998 be adopted as amended.

Moved by: Joan Scottie

Seconded by: Makabe Nartok

Carried

Date: 24 March 1999

Resolution 99- 134: Resolved that the minutes for NWMB Special Meeting No. 8 conducted in Yellowknife on 04 December 1998 be adopted as amended.

Moved by: Pauloosie Keyootak

Seconded by: Makabe Nartok

Carried

Date: 24 March 1999

Resolution 99- 135: Resolved that the minutes for Conference Call No. 42 conducted on 08 February 1999 be adopted with minor corrections.

Moved by: Makabe Nartok

Seconded by: Meeka Mike

Carried

Date: 24 March 1999

Resolution 99- 136: Resolved that the NWMB Financial and Variance Reports as at 28 February 1999 be accepted as presented.

Moved by: David Alagalak

Seconded by: Makabe Nartok

Carried

Date: 24 March 1999

Resolution 99- 137: Resolved that the NWMB adopt the position paper tabled by the Director of Wildlife Management pertaining to the spring hunting season for snow

geese that is being proposed by the Canadian Wildlife Service in concert with other North American waterfowl management agencies.

Moved by: David Alagalak

Seconded by: Pauloosie Keyootak

Carried

Date: 25 March 1999

Resolution 99- 138: Resolved that the NWMB appoint David Alagalak and Gordon Koshinsky to the Harvest Study Committee.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick

Seconded by: Meeka Mike

Carried

Date: 25 March 1999

Resolution 99- 139: Resolved that the NWMB adopt the Rules of Practice for Public Hearings as drafted by the NWMB Legal Advisor with input from the Board, subject to two minor revisions.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky

Seconded by: David Alagalak

Carried

Date: 25 March 1999

Resolution 99- 140: Resolved that the NWMB continue to actively support HTO efforts to meet the conditions required for entry into the new “non-quota” management system for narwhal; and more specifically, that the NWMB:

- Encourage and work with the four communities that were identified as candidates for the initial round of entry into the system in 1999; and
- Provide advice and additional funding to support one or more of those four communities, with any further funding conditional upon:
 - the identification of clear need, and
 - the submission of a detailed budget.

Moved by: David Alagalak

Seconded by: Pauloosie Keyootak

Carried

Date: 26 March 1999

Resolution 99- 141: Resolved that the NWMB approve the request from DFO to carry forward into 1999/00 the \$20,000 approved in the NWMB Conservation Education budget in 1998/99 for publication of the book *A Field Guide to Arctic Marine Fishes*.

Moved by: David Alagalak

Seconded by: Gordon Koshinsky

Carried

Date: 26 March 1999

Resolution 99- 142: Resolved that the NWMB approve a donation of \$2,000 to the family of Akeeshoo Nowdluk to help defray the costs of a return trip by the family to visit their ancestral outpost camp as a source of inspiration and healing in this time of their recent bereavement. This contribution is to be conditional upon the family providing medical certification that any members currently under the care of a doctor are physically competent to make the trip.

Moved by: Meeka Mike

Seconded by: Pauloosie Keyootak

Carried

Opposed: Two Members

Date: 26 March 1999

Resolution 99- 143: Resolved that the NWMB approve a donation of \$3,000 to the Nunavut Sivuniksavut program to help defray the costs of a trip by students to New Zealand in April.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky Seconded by: Meeka Mike
Carried Opposed: One Member Date: 26 March 1999

Resolution 99- 144: Resolved that the NWMB meet *in-camera*.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick Seconded by: David Alagalak
Carried Date: 26 March 1999

Resolution 99- 145: Resolved that the *in-camera* session be closed.

Moved by: Makabe Nartok Seconded by: Gordon Koshinsky
Carried Date: 26 March 1999

Resolution 99- 146: Resolved that the NWMB revise its By-law 15.2 with respect to signing authority for financial transactions, such that signing authority henceforth be designated to offices or positions rather than to individuals, and specifically that any two of the following be designated to sign: the Executive Director, the Director of Finance and Administration, the Chairperson, one other NWMB member.

Moved by: David Alagalak Seconded by: Kevin McCormick
Carried Date: 26 March 1999

Resolution 99- 147: Resolved that the NWMB sign a new contract with Michael d'Eça for the continuing provision of legal advisory services to the Board and to the Research Trust, with this new contract to contain the following provisions:

- A term of four-years, to cover the duration of the Implementation Contract;
- A modest increase in the rate of remuneration for both work time and travel time, and in the guaranteed hours of work; and
- Annual non-cumulative merit bonuses of up to 5%, set out without reference to the Board's system of establishing merit bonuses for staff.

Moved by: Pauloosie Keyootak Seconded by: Meeka Mike
Carried Date: 26 March 1999

Resolution 99- 148: Resolved that the next (22nd) regular Meeting of the NWMB be conducted in Iqaluktutiaq (Cambridge Bay) the week of 17 May 1999.

Moved by: Makabe Nartok Seconded by: Joan Scottie
Carried Date: 26 March 1999

Resolution 99- 149: Resolved that the 21st Meeting of the NWMB be adjourned.

Moved by: Pauloosie Keyootak Seconded by: Makabe Nartok
Carried Date: 26 March 1999