

NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD

MINUTES: MEETING No. 24

SANIKILUAQ, 23-25 NOVEMBER 1999

Members and Staff Participating

Ben Kovic	Chairperson
Gordon Koshinsky	Member
Makabe Nartok	Member
Joan Scottie	Member
Moses Koonoo	Member
Harry Flaherty	Member
Meeka Mike	Member
David Alagalak	Member
Jim Noble	Executive Director
Michelle Wheatley	Director of Wildlife Management
Michael d'Eça	NWMB Legal Advisor
Mary Nashook	Interpreter
Caroline Meeko	Interpreter

Not Available

Kevin McCormick	Member
-----------------	--------

Visitors and Other Participants (at various times)

Burt Hunt	DFO Area Manager, Iqaluit
Winston Fillatre	DFO Suprvsr Conservtn & Protectn, Iqaluit
Patrice Simon	DFO, Iqaluit
Lynn Siegersma	DFO, Iqaluit
Jack Mathias	DFO, Winnipeg
Stephen Atkinson	DSD, Iqaluit
Alden Williams	DSD, Iqaluit
Bert Dean	NTI, Rankin Inlet
Annie Amitook	Mayor, Hamlet of Sanikiluaq
Moses Appaqaq	Chairperson, Sanikiluaq HTO

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

Tuesday, 23 November 1999

1. Call to Order and Opening Preliminaries

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, convened the meeting at 9:10 a.m., Sanikiluaq time. Ben called on Joan Scottie to lead the opening prayer.

Ben welcomed the NWMB Members to this the 24th regular meeting of the Board. He introduced Annie Amitook, the Mayor of Sanikiluaq. Ms. Amitook welcomed the NWMB to Sanikiluaq. She noted that this is a peaceful and receptive community but since it is very isolated few organizations come here to hold their meetings. She announced that there would be a public reception and feast on Tuesday evening. She wished the Board success in its deliberations.

Ben thanked the Mayor for her remarks. He announced plans to have a public meeting on Wednesday evening, and issued an invitation for community members to come prepared to interact with the Board.

2. Agenda: Review and Approval

The Agenda was accepted as presented, with the addition of one item pertaining to a request for permission to access the NSA to fish shrimp. **(Resolution 2000- 067)**

3. Minutes: Review and Approval

3.A Regular Meeting 23, Naujaat

The Minutes for Regular Meeting No. 23, held at Naujaat on 24 - 26 August 1999, were adopted with minor adjustments. **(Resolution 2000- 068)**

3.B Conference Call No. 44

The Minutes for Conference Call No. 44, conducted on 14 October 1999, were adopted with minor adjustments. **(Resolution 2000- 069)**

3.C Conference Call No. 45

The Minutes for Conference Call No. 45, conducted on 4 November 1999, were adopted with minor adjustments. **(Resolution 2000- 070)**

4. Financial and Administrative Business

4.A Financial/Variance Report to 22 November 1999

Jim Noble, on behalf of Gordon Tomlinson, tabled an overview of the NWMB financial situation to 22 November, in the form of a detailed variance report. Jim noted that the report was based on a revised budget of \$5,507,934, with respect to which a negative variance of \$42,693 is being projected to the end of the fiscal year.

Board Members questioned a number of details in the report and urged continuing efforts to improve the presentation. The Board accepted the report, subject to a number of minor clarifications. **(Resolution 2000- 071)**

4.B Final Budget Submission to DIAND for 1999/00

Jim Noble reported that the Board's revised 1999/00 expenditure projections as per Resolution 2000- 065 (Conference Call 45) had been submitted to DIAND. The funding agreement has been revised accordingly. Jim reminded the Board that this budgetary revision entailed the re-profiling of \$272,558 to future years.

Gordon Koshinsky asked if the Implementation Panel had been advised of the Board's interpretation of this re-profiling, as the Board had instructed. Jim undertook to confirm that this had been done, and if not to action it immediately.

4.C New Funding Arrangement with DIAND: Update

Michael d'Eça referred to his briefing note of November 18 wherein he reviewed the history of this matter and set out his recommendations to the Board. The Board instructed Mr. d'Eça to continue acting as spokesperson for the NWMB (and for the other IPGs as they deem appropriate) in further negotiating this matter with DIAND. The Board agreed that the priorities for revision remained those current provisions that pertain to termination and repayment of unexpended funds. Secondary objectives for negotiation would pertain to manoeuvrability in respect to satisfying accountability requirements, and entrenchment of the Board's independent profile.

The Board spent some time discussing contingency plans if the negotiations now underway were unexpectedly derailed.

5. Chairperson, Staff and Members' Reports

5.A Chairperson's Report

Ben Kovic focussed his report on a recent meeting with the Premier, the Minister of Sustainable Development, and the President of NTI in which the participants agreed to cement a new partnership for the benefit of wildlife and fishery users in Nunavut. There was considerable discussion about the turbot fishery, and the NTI President confirmed that NTI was proceeding with its appeal of the most recent decision of the Federal Court. All agreed that it would be appropriate to seek a political resolution even while this litigation was underway. The participants agreed to meet quarterly.

5.B Executive Director's Report

Jim Noble provided a straightforward synopsis of his activities since the last Board meeting. Two new staff were hired during this period, to fill the recently-vacated Harvest Study Co-ordinator and the Finance/Administration Officer positions.

Harry Flaherty urged that provision be made for Board Members to play a more active role in screening and hiring decisions in future staffing actions. Ben Kovic noted that he has always been involved in at least some part of the hiring process. Ben observed that the Monday-morning staff meetings that Jim has begun co-ordinating on a regular basis have had a positive impact on office operations.

5.C Director of Wildlife Management Report

Michelle Wheatley referred Members to her activity report for the period since the last Board meeting. She noted that most of her major activity items had specific places in the agenda for the present meeting. Gordon Koshinsky suggested that a procedure be developed to specifically identify items in activity reports that were scheduled for more detailed treatment at subsequent points in the agenda.

5.D Director of Finance and Administration Report

Jim Noble read the activity report on behalf of Gordon Tomlinson. Work is continuing to upgrade the Board's computer systems, streamline personnel management policies, and complete the annual report. David Alagalak requested that a needs assessment report be prepared with respect to office equipment, including and especially EDP components

5.E Legal Advisor's Report

Michael d'Eça tabled a comprehensive report on his work for the Board over the preceding two months. Highlights included the preparation of major briefing documents with respect to the decision by the Federal Court of Canada to dismiss NTI's application for Judicial Review of the DFO Minister's decision of 9 June 1998 with respect to Davis Strait turbot, the position of the IPGs with respect to negotiating with DIAND for a more appropriate permanent funding instrument, and issues for consideration in the preparation of new wildlife legislation. In addition and among other things Mr. d'Eça made extensive preparations for the NWMB Strategic Planning Workshop including background documentation, and also provided extensive input into the arrangements by DFO to charter a vessel from Greenland to serve as the platform for the turbot survey in Davis Strait.

Major items for attention prior to the next Board meeting will include documenting the output from the Strategic Planning Workshop, participating in negotiations to develop a more appropriate funding arrangement for the IPGs, and working with various agencies in their development of new legislation pertinent to the NWMB.

5.F Fisheries Advisor's Report

Michelle Wheatley referred Members to Ray Andrews' activity report for the period since July 15. Highlights in which Mr. Andrews participated on behalf of the NWMB included a meeting of the Federal-Provincial Atlantic Fisheries Committee, the DFO Science Review in respect to groundfish stocks, consultations preparatory to the forthcoming Canada-Greenland meetings, and an inaugural meeting of agencies concerned about marine fisheries and sealing issues in Nunavut.

5.G Members' Reports and Concerns

David Alagalak brought three matters of concern to the attention of the Board:

- **Adequacy (or not) of Funding for RWOs**

David stated that it has been his experience that the RWOs are under-funded. In his view, this has undermined their scope and effectiveness, which in turn has eroded their credibility with the people they are meant to serve. The RWOs could and should be stronger partners of the NWMB in executing its mandate. David suggested that the roles of the RWOs need to be more clearly defined, and that funding needs to be provided that is consistent with their functions. Members noted that NTI had a similar item on their portion of the agenda for the present meeting.

- **Funding for Wildlife Studies and Research**

David advised that in the last couple of years he had tried to motivate the communities in his Region to identify their concerns about wildlife that could be the subject of research programs. When he tried to obtain such input this year there was very little response. There seems to be considerable disillusionment; people perceive that their suggestions for research are not being taken seriously and are not being funded. David suggested that some of the available funds be set aside for each Region to conduct wildlife studies as they and the communities see fit. These would tend to be studies of a lesser scale than research projects ordinarily undertaken by government agencies.

- **Reimbursement of Members for Conference Calls**

Members elected to defer consideration of this matter to a later point in the agenda.

Harry Flaherty also identified three concerns for the attention of the Board:

- **Implementation of new management systems for marine mammals**

Harry expressed concern that elimination of the quota for beluga whales at Iqaluit may be resulting in some abuse of the resource. Harry was also concerned about the utilization of harvested animals, both beluga and narwhal. He noted there was provision in the agenda to address both items, and agreed to postpone detailed discussion.

- **Polar bear management**

Harry reiterated his concern about the “flexible quota system” for polar bear management that is currently in effect. He suggested that the onus that this system places on individual communities is too severe. He continued to advocate for a serious review and a significant overhaul of the system.

- **Communication initiatives of the NWMB**

Harry has come to the conclusion that the Board must not be communicating adequately with the people of Nunavut. If the RWOs could be rendered more effective, it would be a very positive step towards addressing this problem.

Makabe Nartok asked why DSD is considering an extension of the current study of the M’Clintock Channel polar bear population. The study was scheduled to end in 2000, and hunters are concerned about the prospect of more bears being handled. Stephen Atkinson replied that the researchers are having difficulty capturing enough bears to meet the requirements of the statistical programs for confirming population identity and determining abundance. It will not be known until the scheduled three years of study effort are completed if more mark-and-recapture data will be needed.

Joan Scottie advised that she is in receipt of invoices from her Internet provider that she cannot reconcile with her usage and billing arrangements. Jim Noble agreed to investigate.

6. Completion of Assignments and Resolutions from Last Meeting

Jim Noble referred the Members to the Task List with status notations included in the briefing binder. Jim noted that the vast majority of the identified tasks arising from the last meeting were once again completed or are well underway. Two of the items generated some discussion, namely:

- Item 6: Develop a discussion paper on alternative approaches to compensate polar bear defence kills. Bert Dean advised that DSD is incorporating this assignment into their community consultations program. Stephen Atkinson drew attention to the fact that this subject was one of his Department’s agenda items for the present meeting.
- Item 16: Follow up on comments and questions from the Repulse Bay public meeting. Ben Kovic acknowledged that it is the responsibility of the NWMB to respond to items directed to the Board, but noted that many if not most issues raised at such public meetings are directed to government departments. It was agreed that the Board had a role to remind departments of these general and specific obligations, and that it was important for the NWMB and the departments to send each other copies of their particular responses.

Harry Flaherty noted that the designated assignees for tasks seem to be excessively restricted to the most senior staff members. Michelle Wheatley responded that the designations are more than anything a form of shorthand for indicating who is ultimately responsible for any particular task. Subordinate staff members are often the ones who do much or all of the actual work.

7. Environment Canada (CWS): Issues and Decisions

In the absence of any departmental representatives at the meeting, documentation only was tabled by way of providing updates on the following:

- Legislation being developed regarding Species at Risk.
- Ratification of the Protocol to amend the Migratory Birds Convention.
- American proposal to reinitiate harvesting of peregrine falcons.

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

Ben Kovic introduced Burt Hunt, the newly-appointed DFO Area Manager in Iqaluit. Bert noted that Winston Fillatre was also attending his first NWMB meeting.

8.A Integrated Ocean Management Initiatives

Jack Mathias reminded the Board that the new (1997) *Oceans Act* calls for the development and implementation of a national oceans management strategy for Canada. As one tool for the pursuit of that strategy, the Act provides authority for DFO to lead in the establishment of integrated management plans pertaining to activities in or affecting Canada's oceans. The Department is providing support to coastal communities for participation in this planning process.

The Department has initiated the development of such management plans for three coastal areas of Manitoba pertaining to Hudson Bay. The first stage in the development of these plans is to gather the necessary information. Jack noted that since Hudson Bay is part of Nunavut Zone II waters under the NLCA, and since part of the ocean off the Manitoba coast is designated as "Nunavut Waters in Manitoba", this process needs to involve the Nunavut Government as well as the Nunavut institutions of public government.

Jack also advised that the Department is proposing to facilitate an integrated management initiative for the coastal area around Clyde River, contingent upon the establishment of the Igaliqtuuq National Wildlife Area (NWA). In this case, the aim is to conduct a pilot project that places a de facto marine protected area within a broader management-planning framework. The process will entail a detailed examination of coastal resources, and will look for ways that these resources might be more effectively used in an integrated and sustainable manner to generate

wealth at the local level. The process will be conducted independently of the negotiations for an Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement in respect to the NWA. Once again, this initiative cannot proceed and cannot succeed without the active participation of the Nunavut Government and the Nunavut IPGs.

David Alagalak encouraged Jack to ensure that the Keewatin communities are appropriately consulted in the course of planning pertaining to Hudson Bay. Some of those communities have started to be supplied by fuel tankers, and people are concerned about whether there is adequate charting to accommodate such traffic. Bert Hunt pledged that the DFO Area Office will monitor these initiatives to ensure that they do not proceed unilaterally. Jack confirmed that any studies that are undertaken will make provision to collect and take account of traditional knowledge.

8.B Resource Person for the Nunavut Marine Council (NMC)

Jack Mathias confirmed to the Board that DFO is prepared to fund a staff member to assist the NMC in developing positions with respect to Nunavut marine issues pertinent to the Department's efforts to develop an oceans management strategy. The Department envisages that this individual would act as a conduit for information and ideas, and would help to draft documents and other materials for the NMC. He or she would also serve as a resource person with respect to legislation and government programs. It is anticipated that the position would be for a three-year term, subject to annual review. The salary would probably be about \$50,000. DFO would cover salary costs, and also housing if necessary. DFO would also provide some funds for travel to communities for consultations. The IPGs would be equal partners with DFO in developing the job description, and it is hoped that the IPGs will participate actively in the process of selecting a person to fill the position. The duties will need to be designed so as not to impinge on IPG jurisdictions.

Jack reminded the Members that this matter has been under consideration and has been the subject of debate for some time. The NWMB has tended to be the focal point for the discussions on behalf of all the IPGs. It is intended that the individual be located in Nunavut. It is hoped that the individual could be housed in the offices of one of the IPGs, most logically the NWMB. Day-to-day oversight of the position would be the responsibility of the IPG that provided the office accommodation and other administrative amenities. An intensive orientation process is anticipated for whoever is hired. Depending on the individual, this may require spending some time initially in a number of federal offices. The incumbent will need to have, or will need to develop as a matter of considerable priority, a strong comprehension of DFO's oceans sector. The proposal still needs to be presented in detail to the other IPGs. Legal counsels for all the IPGs seem to be in agreement that the NWMB should take the lead on behalf of the others.

David Alagalak, being a relatively new Board member, requested more background on the NMC in general, and on the proposal to hire a resource person in particular.

Michael d'Eça explained that the NMC is founded in Article 15.4.1 of the NLCA. It is made up of the four IPGs: the NIRB, NWB, NPC, and NWMB. As such, the NMC is an optional vehicle for providing advice and recommendations to government concerning marine issues. It is up to the IPGs to shape and operate this entity if and how they see fit. The IPGs have decided that when they assemble themselves for the purpose of jointly considering and recommending with respect to marine issues, they thereby and for that purpose automatically constitute themselves as the NMC. As such, the NMC is viewed as “perpetually available” but not as a standing entity. The first time the NMC was “constituted” was in December 1998, when the IPGs decided to make a joint submission in respect to Bill C-48, an Act respecting Marine Conservation Areas. The NWMB has a natural interest in the NMC mandate because wildlife and wildlife habitat (including fisheries) are central to virtually every marine issue. Although DFO sees a functional NMC as a key ingredient to developing an integrated oceans management strategy vis-à-vis the Arctic, the DFO jurisdiction does not directly extend to the formation or operation of such an entity.

Meeka Mike noted that the NWMB has not been a strong supporter of the NMC concept, and that uncertainty remains about how the NMC will actually work. In view of this she wondered how realistic it was for the NWMB to play the role of lead advocate with respect to this proposed position. She urged that if the position did materialize it should indeed be located in Nunavut. She also suggested that having a good draft of a job description would help put the matter in better perspective.

Jim Noble requested clarification about internal-hiring priorities in the federal government vis-à-vis the proposed staffing action. Jack replied that preference could be given to a Nunavut beneficiary as per the aboriginal hiring strategy. It will be up to the selection committee to decide how widely to advertise for candidates. Jack indicated that if the NWMB registered support, he would work with the IPGs to draft a statement of qualifications and establish a selection committee. He requested direction from the NWMB on whether and how to proceed.

David expressed support for the initiative, while urging that every effort be made to recruit within Nunavut. Gordon noted that there has been no negative indication about the initiative from any of the other IPGs. They all seem prepared to proceed, under the leadership of the NWMB. Michael suggested that the NWMB might support the matter in principle, and formally advise the other IPGs and DFO of details regarding the preferred arrangement(s), including references to a framework of duties, range of salary, selection process, and the parameters of NWMB support. The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 072**) to endorse in principle the DFO proposal to create and staff a position to be located in Nunavut to assist the NMC.

Jack declared his intention to work through the DFO Iqaluit Area Office to implement this initiative.

8.C New Beluga Management System (SE Baffin): Update

Patrice Simon reminded the Board of its decision (August 1998) to eliminate beluga quotas for the communities of Iqaluit and Kimmirut, this pending the initiation of appropriate hunt and harvest monitoring programs. In responding to this NWMB decision, the Minister interpreted that it would be for a one-year trial period. Patrice presented preliminary totals for the 1999 harvest (which he acknowledged to be incomplete) as follows:

<u>Community</u>	<u>Killed and landed</u>	<u>Killed but lost</u>	<u>Wounded and escaped</u>
Iqaluit	55	5	23
Kimmirut	9	2	1
Pangnirtung*	50 +/-2	Not collected	Not collected

*An annual quota of 35 beluga remains in effect at Pangnirtung.

Patrice pointed out that a large number of belugas were harvested at Iqaluit this summer, and more were wounded and lost. It seems that Iqaluit hunters found beluga to be much more readily available than usual in Frobisher Bay. There were also reports that there was a tendency for the beluga to be different than in previous years in respect to colour, size and behaviour. Based on these reports the Department initiated a program to collect samples for genetic analysis. A report on the 1999 season is being prepared for the meeting of the SEBBMC in February. The Department will suggest that the HTOs develop by-laws to govern these beluga hunts, along the lines of what some communities have done to implement the new narwhal management system. Meeka Mike noted that the narwhal hunting rules developed by Pond Inlet were very good, both in content and detail. She suggested that they might serve as a model for a situation such as beluga hunting in the Southeast Baffin.

Harry Flaherty stated that the preliminary beluga harvest data as presented for Iqaluit are “not even close” to numbers that he has been hearing in the community. One individual hunter claims to have taken 17 beluga, and “is proud of it”.

Whatever system may be in place to monitor the beluga hunt at Iqaluit is having little or no effect in constraining it. According to his information, the actual harvest at Iqaluit will be well beyond the harvests of recent years, and this is of concern.

Patrice explained that the preliminary figure of 55 beluga landed at Iqaluit was derived from the data sheets that were returned. These data sheets are part of the monitoring kits that DFO supplies to the HTOs for hunters to take with them when they go hunting. Patrice wondered if Harry’s information might pertain to all belugas struck, not only those landed. The HTOs do actively encourage their members to report, but it is difficult for DFO to ensure that the reports are actually submitted.

David Alagalak asked if information from the Harvest Study could be used to corroborate the number of beluga whales landed at Iqaluit. Patrice replied that the Harvest Study data are not yet sufficiently up-to-date, although those data will

certainly be pertinent eventually. He affirmed that the collection of harvest information and samples had been a primary goal of the new system at the outset.

Meeka asked if DFO compensates hunters for taking and submitting samples and information from harvested whales. Patrice replied that there was no payment this year because the information requested was extremely basic: just numbers of animals landed, killed but lost, and wounded/escaped. Hunters at Iqaluit were also provided with a cord, to be knotted for recording beluga lengths. DFO considers that it is reasonable to expect hunters to do minimal reporting of this nature as part of their responsibility under co-management. If actual tissue samples are requested (as for narwhal and walrus in some communities) then payments are made.

Gordon Koshinsky noted that the decision to eliminate beluga quotas for Iqaluit and Kimmirut was taken in anticipation of enhancing beluga conservation, certainly not with the aim of subverting it. He suggested that it was still premature to try to evaluate whether the new marine mammal management systems were functioning as anticipated. It was certainly not his intention at this point to try to offer congratulations or to assign blame. He was confident that the NWMB would play its proper role, at the proper time, to ensure that any shortcomings were identified and corrected. The next step was for the SEBBMC to conduct its deliberations and, in the case of narwhal, for the Narwhal Working Group to develop and submit its conclusions.

Gordon indicated, however, that there was a related matter that was causing him concern beyond the question of whether or not beluga in Frobisher Bay were being appropriately harvested and utilized under the new management system. He referred to the evidence of poor compliance and weak enforcement in respect to some of the very explicit rules that are in effect. Gordon explained that after a long period of often-acrimonious debate, much time and effort was spent a few years ago to negotiate and reconcile an annual beluga quota of (specifically) 35 animals for Pangnirtung. This was established as an interim quota, to be re-assessed after the collection and analysis of an agreed-upon set of new information at the end of a prescribed period of time. In view of all that, Gordon found it disconcerting that 50 or more belugas are now being harvested at Pangnirtung with little apparent attention to the quota of 35, this prior to the scheduled re-assessment of that quota. Gordon noted that the number of beluga harvested at Pangnirtung in recent years has been gradually escalating beyond the quota, and asked how a community could progressively arrive at the point of over-harvesting its beluga quota by 50%. He considered that this was disrespectful of resource-management decisions that were made in good faith, through considerable effort, and with good representation.

Patrice confirmed that the Pangnirtung HTO has had difficulty managing the beluga hunt. Winston Fillatre noted that DFO has generally maintained a low profile in respect to enforcement in the NSA. A few warnings were issued at Pangnirtung this summer, but no charges were laid.

Gordon persisted to know more about how the system is actually administered. How is a particular hunter authorized to go out and harvest a particular number of beluga whales out of the overall allotment? Is there some kind of a tag system in place? Patrice replied that there is no tag system. The HTO is responsible to ensure that the quota is not exceeded. When the harvest approaches the quota, the members are asked to check with the HTO before going out. At Pangnirtung, the HTO has tended to stop the hunt initially at about 30 animals, reserving the other five “for contingencies”. This general approach has not been entirely effective. It is in fact very difficult to manage such a quota without the use of tags.

Patrice reported that both cliff-based and aerial surveys of belugas at Pangnirtung (in Clearwater Fiord) were done this summer. The results will be available for the forthcoming meeting of the SEBBMC. The information will also be discussed with the HTO and hunters at Pangnirtung. The elimination of quotas at Iqaluit and Kimmirut probably was and remains a worthwhile venture. The SEBBMC will need to consider whether any remedies should be attempted. The lack of formal rules and bylaws may have contributed to the larger-than-expected harvest at Iqaluit. Some people may have interpreted the new system as a kind of free for all. It is legitimate to ask whether the reporting system is working as well as was intended, and there is a need to seriously assess if changes should be made. Ben Kovic noted that the mix of cultures (including a variety of Inuit cultures) represented in Iqaluit poses a unique challenge for wildlife management.

Michael d'Eça noted that the NWMB decision to remove beluga quotas for Iqaluit and Kimmirut contained no reference that this was to be for a one-year trial period. It would be unusual for the NWMB to make such a decision, since these kinds of initiatives typically take more than one year to evaluate. That the DFO Minister chose to interpret the NWMB decision in the manner that he did would seem to represent a unilateral modification of the NWMB decision by the Minister.

8.D New Narwhal Management System: Update

Patrice Simon distributed updated 1999 narwhal harvest estimates for the four communities that had been approved by the NWMB to participate in the new non-quota management system. He noted that these figures were not yet final, and that they were probably quite incomplete for Qikiqtarjuaq. The preliminary totals are:

<u>Community</u>	<u>Killed and landed</u>	<u>Killed but lost</u>	<u>Wounded and escaped</u>
Pond Inlet	130	16	14
Repulse Bay	149	30	68
Qikiqtarjuaq	76+	0?	0?
Arctic Bay*	101	N/A	N/A

* Arctic Bay ended up not participating in the new management system in 1999

Patrice suggested that the quality of reporting in respect to narwhal landings and strikes has been very good. The size of some of the harvests remains a concern. Good information is generally lacking on the disposition of the animals that are harvested. The impression is that very little of the meat is utilized, and that only the maktak is typically taken. Some elders have expressed concern about this. Advice from the NWMB is invited. A summary report on the new management system is being prepared for the meeting of the Narwhal Working Group in December.

David Alagalak suggested that the narwhal harvests in particular communities be assessed in the context of the overall harvest in Nunavut. Low harvests in some areas may compensate for high harvests in others. David also requested a copy of whatever data and reports that DFO provides to the Narwhal Working Group. Patrice advised that the Repulse Bay HTO has made some changes and is considering further modifications to their hunting rules in an effort to lessen some of the problems encountered this year.

Harry Flaherty urged that a stronger stand be taken (by DFO) to encourage more complete utilization of harvested animals. David recalled that DFO has requested the NWMB to provide assistance with the definition of edible parts, this in the context of revising the marine mammal regulations.

Patrice predicted that more communities will seek elimination of narwhal quotas. At least three additional communities (Hall Beach, Igloolik and Pelly Bay) have started to prepare hunting rules in anticipation of this. Pangnirtung has also expressed interest. The Pangnirtung quota of 40 narwhal was easily harvested this year, and the community requested and obtained the transfer of some unused tags from Iqaluit (5) and Clyde River (10).

Makabe Nartok asked why Arctic Bay ended up not participating in the new narwhal management system, after obtaining approval from the NWMB to do so. Patrice replied that in the end the Arctic Bay HTO was unable to arrange the necessary meeting to finalize their hunting rules.

Harry suggested that consideration be given to instituting a requirement that narwhals, and probably also belugas, be harpooned before being killed with rifles in order to lessen the numbers lost. Moses Koonoo agreed that conservation and sustainability needed to be first-order priorities of the Board. He suggested that developing guidelines for hunting would be very complicated. Hunting procedures are highly variable among communities, depending on local circumstances. Rules that might be appropriate for open-water hunting might not be appropriate in ice cracks or at the floe edge. Harry agreed that a requirement to harpoon whales before shooting them with a rifle would probably be unrealistic for a floe-edge hunt.

Gordon Koshinsky suggested that the new management systems for marine mammals have produced results in the first year that have been good in some ways, but worrisome in others. These new systems must be evaluated objectively

and with open minds. We must try to promote sound management principles. Harpooning is one possibility, and it is important to start exploring ideas such as this. It will be the responsibility of the SEBBMC and of the Narwhal Working Group to lead in this. The NWMB can of course provide input as well as receive it.

8.E DFO Regulatory Revisions: Update

Winston Fillatre reminded the Board that DFO is developing new Fishery Regulations for Nunavut, pertaining to sport fishing, commercial fishing, fishing by Inuit as specified in the NLCA, harvesting of marine plants, and other fishing-related matters. This will be a “made-in-Nunavut” initiative, and the aim is to have a discussion paper for circulation early in the new year.

Winston also provided an update on what Gary Weber reported at the last NWMB meeting with respect to the development of new Marine Mammal Regulations. The Department aims to have a draft of these new regulations sometime early in the new year, for consideration by the NWMB and others. These (Marine Mammal) Regulations will be national in scope.

Michael d'Eça reviewed some of the history of interactions between the Department and the NWMB pertaining to the initiative to amend the Marine Mammal Regulations. The NWMB seems to be effectively excluded from the process, as a result of a sequence of communications from DFO that were misleading and/or misunderstood. Michael reiterated the concerns he expressed at the last NWMB meeting, that there are fundamental problems with how DFO is pursuing this matter. Not enough attention is being paid to getting agreement on preliminary matters.

Burt Hunt noted that representatives of the NWMB, DSD and NTI did meet for preliminary discussions and mutual assurance regarding participation in these regulatory initiatives. With respect to the new Fishery Regulations, it was agreed that DFO would develop a discussion paper for consideration by the various stakeholders. It was deemed important to prepare something to get the process underway; this is now scheduled for January. DFO will also work with its co-management partners in determining how to approach the communities.

8.F Walrus Sport Hunting in 1999

Winston Fillatre reported that based on the total of 41 walrus sport harvests approved for 1999, eleven walrus were harvested at Igloolik and one at Salluit.

8.G Walrus Sport Hunting in 2000

Michelle Wheatley reported that not all the HTOs have yet submitted their proposals and requests for approval to conduct walrus sport hunting next year. It was agreed to wait until all the requests are received, and then deal with them as a package.

8.H Walrus Working Group

Michelle Wheatley reported that the first meeting of the Walrus Working Group was held in September, and considerable progress was made. One of the key items in the task list that was developed is the commitment by Dr. R. Stewart of DFO to develop an options paper on approaches to walrus management. The Working Group plans to meet again in April.

8.I Request to Fish for Shrimp Inside the NSA

Michelle Wheatley directed the Board to the briefing note that she had prepared on this matter. The matter pertains to the 1750 MT exploratory shrimp fishery in Shrimp Fishing Area (SFA) 2, north of 63°N, off the coast of Baffin Island.

In July, the NWMB allocated a total of 475 MT of this shrimp fishery to four groups that subsequently pooled their allocations and made arrangements with one vessel to fish on their behalf. The vessel made very poor catches in the designated portion of SFA 2 outside the NSA. These four groups are now requesting permission to fish their allocation inside the NSA. The four groups in question are Quliruak Incorporated (Amarok HTO), Mittimatalik HTO, Kabva Marine, and Mayukalik HTO / KTJ Holdings. Michelle also advised that the turbot fishery interests at Pangnirtung are opposed to permitting this shrimp fishing venture to come into the waters of Cumberland Sound, for fear of disrupting turbot habitat.

Gordon Koshinsky observed that granting the request would be tantamount to focussing harvest activity that had been envisioned for quite a large territory into a much smaller area. He asked if this raised any conservation concerns. Michelle suggested that it did not, citing the fact that shrimp are highly mobile organisms.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 073**) to approve the request from the four groups in question to attempt to harvest their 1999 exploratory shrimp allocations in that portion of Shrimp Fishing Area 2 within the NSA, but with the waters of Cumberland Sound to be excluded from this authorization.

Wednesday, 24 November 1999

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, re-convened the meeting at 9:05 a.m. He called on David Alagalak to offer an opening prayer.

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

9.A Compensation for Inadvertent Polar Bear Kills

Stephen Atkinson reminded the Board that polar bears that are occasionally killed by accident or in self-defence are charged to the quota of the nearest community.

This is in fact not so rare an occurrence as is commonly supposed. Over the period 1993 – 1998, a total of 153 polar bears were killed in Nunavut as a consequence of nuisance control, self-defence, or handling by researchers. The bulk of these were perceived problem bears that were killed by beneficiaries.

A streamlined system for handling payment of compensation to communities in these situations has long been an objective for many of the agencies and interests operating in the Arctic that do or could find themselves inadvertently killing polar bears. Agencies conducting research on polar bears per se have a special interest in this matter because they sometimes cause polar bear mortality directly through their work. Discussions among agencies to date led to the conclusion that DSD should draft a discussion paper exploring options for a streamlined, and hopefully standardized, compensation system that addressed polar bear kills that happened in the course of research being conducted in Nunavut. The CWS subsequently urged that such a system be developed to compensate for any polar bears killed by non-beneficiaries, with the exception of those killed in connection with industrial operations. These latter situations would be covered through Article 6 of the NLCA.

Stephen tabled a draft discussion paper that was recently prepared by DSD, and which the Department hopes will be a constructive step in this direction.

In essence, it is proposed (as per this discussion paper):

- That a joint inter-agency fund be established, perhaps to be administered by the NWMB;
- That the following considerations be taken into account in determining if compensation is to be paid and, if so, the amount:
 - The validity of the kill: was it “justifiable”?
 - The impact of the kill on quota(s): how many tags were lost?
 - The replacement value of a polar bear tag.

A number of alternative ways are explored in the discussion paper for calculating the replacement value of a polar bear tag. These values might be determined on a community-specific, regional, or territorial basis. The underlying determinant would be the use pattern for polar bears, notably the apportionment between sport hunting (valued at, say \$15,000 per bear) and subsistence use (valued at, say \$1,500 per polar bear hide). It is envisaged that there would be a payout from the fund only if the kill was found to have been justified. Alternatively, the fund might pay out regardless, and then seek redress from the perpetrator or from his/her agency if the kill was deemed to be unnecessary or avoidable.

Meeka Mike urged that assigning valuation to a polar bear in the subsistence economy take account of more than the value of the hide. For instance, the meat has value in the order of \$1,000 per animal, and the claws are worth up to \$1,500 per bear. Stephen agreed that determining the value of a polar bear is the key and probably most difficult part of this exercise. He also noted that it is not only the

communities that have a stake in the market value of a polar bear sport hunt; other contenders might include outfitters outside Nunavut, booking agents, airlines, etc.

Meeka also observed that formally alerting communities to the potential loss of polar bear harvesting opportunities from inadvertent kills, even if compensation is assured, might be a motivation for opposing the conduct of research during the polar bear hunting season if and when sport-hunting tags have not yet been completely filled. Stephen pointed out that that there would be no new harvesting loss implications under such a compensation system, but rather that such losses would now be compensated in a pre-agreed manner.

David Alagalak suggested that it often is and would continue to be difficult to assign a particular polar bear that was killed inadvertently to a particular community or even to a particular group of communities. Both polar bears and the people who benefit from using the bears tend to be more far-ranging than is often appreciated. The “ownership” of polar bears is in fact widely held among the people of Nunavut.

Harry Flaherty noted that the compensation system as proposed would key on the present system of polar bear management in Nunavut to the extent that it would extrapolate from the age and sex of any bear so-killed to the number of tags subsequently lost. Many communities have expressed serious dissatisfaction with this management system, and it would be useful to obtain the input of the RWOs before proceeding very far to build a compensation system that is based upon it. Stephen agreed that a compensation system could not be developed without consulting the RWOs; in fact it would be prudent to also consult the HTOs, at least those that have experienced the most incidents of polar bear defence kills.

Moses Koonoo advised that more consideration should be given to the possibility that increasing encounters with problem polar bears are simply due to an over-abundance of bears. A major source of difficulty with such bears is their destruction of meat caches. Moses noted that the value of a polar bear sport hunt in his community (Arctic Bay) is \$20,000.

Harry noted that the compensation formulas as drafted end up computing fractional numbers of polar bear tags lost. Such derivations would be very difficult to explain at the local level. Any formulas used should deal in whole numbers of bears. Stephen agreed that simplicity was a key consideration, and that it was crucial that people in the affected communities understand how compensation would be calculated. Harry also suggested that not all killing of the so-called nuisance bears by beneficiaries is completely legitimate. He noted that there are no penalties for this, other than reductions in the community quota. David suggested that the number of problem bears is in fact increasing in some places, such as around Coral Harbour and Chesterfield Inlet. He attributed this in part to a recent increase in the numbers of beached bowhead whales.

Gordon Koshinsky applauded the initiative of Mr. Atkinson and DSD in this matter, and offered encouragement for the work to be taken to a functional conclusion.

9.B Development of a Public Safety Program vis-à-vis Bears

Stephen Atkinson reviewed a DSD initiative now underway to increase public safety with respect to bears, and simultaneously to reduce the number of bear defence kills. The main focus of this effort in Nunavut, of course, is polar bears; however grizzly bears are also of concern in this context. It is planned to develop a comprehensive program to include public education, behavioural research, and development of deterrents. A number of more immediate interim projects are also underway; these include the production of a video on ways to avoid problem encounters, and field tests of a new type of electric fence. A longer-term undertaking might be the development of community-specific “action plans” for bear management. Such plans could include the identification of different types of zones adjacent to and within the community, in each of which the discovery of a bear would trigger a prescribed type and intensity of response.

9.C Nunavut Inter-settlement Trade Committee

Stephen Atkinson advised that the Nunavut Development Corporation (NDC) is proposing to establish a multi-stakeholder Nunavut Inter-settlement Trade Committee (NITC). DSD has been involved in preliminary discussions with NDC and other proponents, and the participation of the NWMB is advocated in the event that such a Committee is formed. As it is currently envisaged, the NITC would:

- Plan, lead and co-ordinate the activities of the participating agencies in order to encourage, facilitate and promote:
 - The movement of country food among Nunavut communities;
 - The utilization of country food in Nunavut households;
 - The application of agri-food standards in respect to country food;
 - The country food sector in general in Nunavut.
- Provide a sub-committee to meet the administrative requirements for Territorial participation in the Canadian Adaptation and Rural Development (CARD) program of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada.

Stephen explained that the CARD program provides funding for projects designed to assist the agriculture and agri-food sector to adapt to new challenges and support new ways of doing business. Commercial uses of wildlife (other than fish) are deemed to qualify as part of the agri-food sector in this context. Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada disburses its funding under this program only to provincial or territorial agri-business umbrella groups, of which none currently exist in Nunavut. The proposed new Committee would serve this requirement. However it would be difficult to justify establishing a new entity just to perform this function, which is why

it is proposed to concurrently incorporate into its mandate the various promotional functions outlined above.

David Alagalak asked about the reaction of Arctic Co-operatives Ltd. (ACL) to the proposal to establish this Committee. Stephen replied that ACL supports the initiative, including the matter of NWMB membership. Meeka Mike asked about the reaction of NTI. Bert Dean replied that the NTI executive was in favour of creating the Committee, although the initiative has not been discussed with the membership.

Stephen stressed that the main function of the Nunavut CARD Subcommittee would be to assess applications for CARD funding and then to oversee the use of those funds. Meeka urged that the list of criteria according to which applications for funding are to be evaluated be enlarged to include considerations of public health.

Some Members were concerned that NWMB participation in this Committee might create or invoke significant new workload and costs. Stephen suggested that this was not likely. No overhead costs are anticipated, meeting costs could be minimized through teleconferencing, and the Nunavut Development Corporation will most likely play the pivotal administrative role including provision of the chairperson.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 074**) to endorse the initiative to establish a Nunavut Inter-settlement Trade Committee. The Board also agreed in principle to participate in the Committee if invited to do so.

9.D New Nunavut Wildlife Act: Update on Development

Stephen Atkinson reported on work done or underway to develop a *Wildlife Act* that will be specific to Nunavut. This is a priority for the new government because:

- The NWT *Wildlife Act* (which the Nunavut government inherited) does not fully reflect changes in the legislative, political and social environment;
- Parts of the NWT *Wildlife Act* are in conflict with the NLCA.

The overall aim is to develop legislation that is simple, modern, consistent with the NLCA, and respectful of the roles and responsibilities of resource users. A series of documents has been completed outlining the mandatory requirements for any such legislation in Canada. These documents also identify what options exist in respect to incorporating discretionary elements into the new legislation. These options will be the focus of discussion during public consultations, and those consultations will then guide the actual drafting process.

A consultation plan has been developed that sets out who will be consulted about what. The task of conducting consultations, producing a consultation report, and developing instructions for drafting the legislation has been taken forward as a legislative proposal to the Cabinet of the Nunavut Government. If approved, consultations will begin in early 2000. Cabinet approval will be followed by a public

announcement, which may include a summary of material produced to date. Stephen noted that prior to Territorial division, it was not feasible to take this exercise beyond preliminary planning stages.

A three-year time line is envisaged for completion of the project, once it is approved. The process will have many steps. There are even some fundamental matters of definition to resolve at the outset. For instance, the definitions of wildlife in the current Act and in the NLCA are not the same. Some of these matters will require consultation with NWMB and NTI. The most complicated component will probably be the public consultations. The Department's Land Claim Implementation Officers will likely play key roles in organizing those. It is not planned to go to communities with draft legislation. It is planned instead to go with issues and options.

David Alagalak urged that the RWOs be included in the agenda for consultations. Stephen agreed that would be important. One of the issues under consideration is the matter of administering penalties. Perhaps it would be appropriate and useful to delegate more responsibilities to the HTOs.

Harry Flaherty asked about a "draft Wildlife Act" that he recalled hearing about earlier. Stephen replied that the Nunavut Implementation Commission did contract for such a document; however it was merely intended to signal a need rather than to provide an actual blueprint. That effort in fact led to the very definite conclusion that producing new legislation had to be a much more fundamental exercise than simply revising the existing legislation to make it fit the NLCA.

Michael d'Eça noted that he had provided brief comments on the background documents that have been prepared to date. He expressed strong general support for the procedure that has been adopted, but requested a number of clarifications:

- An internal working group has provided some general oversight to the exercise to date. This group has had representation from DSD, NWMB and NTI. NWMB has requested that this group be formalized. What is planned for this group? Stephen agreed that it will be appropriate to formalize the Working Group once Cabinet approves the initiative.
- The Department earlier circulated a discussion paper on the subject of consultations. NWMB provided comment on the paper with some suggestions for improvements. The understanding has been that this is leading to a consultation plan. Has this plan now in fact been completed? Stephen replied that not all the anticipated inputs on the discussion paper have yet been received to enable the consultation plan to be finalized. However the basic framework for consultations is reasonably apparent.
- It has been suggested that the NWMB could have an enhanced role under the new legislation. The NWMB has begun to consider such a possibility. Has the Department advanced this proposition further?

Stephen replied that the idea has met with considerable interest. Under such an arrangement, the Department would act more as a co-ordinator. However it is still just an idea or an option. It could of course only be implemented with the full concurrence and co-operation of the NWMB.

- A three-year time line is being identified for this initiative. Would that be to final completion and enactment of the new legislation? Stephen replied that the intention in the highest levels of the Department apparently is to pass the new Act by the end of 2002 or early in 2003.

Joan Scottie expressed satisfaction that the new Act will be specific to Nunavut.

9.E Bluenose Caribou Management Plan: Update

Michelle Wheatley distributed copies of the draft management plan. According to this plan, what was formerly regarded as one caribou herd (the Bluenose) would now be split into three components for management purposes. This naturally has significant jurisdictional implications.

Michael d'Eça noted that the document distributed by Michelle had not yet been formally presented to the NWMB by its authors and proponents. He suggested that this was a reasonable prerequisite for an NWMB response. He also observed that a "one-size-fits-all" approach was not appropriate for setting out the jurisdictions of the various management agencies that are implicated in the document. For instance, a subject about which one co-management body may be able to make a recommendation may be something about which the NWMB has the power to make a decision.

9.F Other Items Pertaining to DSD

Stephen Atkinson presented some other items of information for the attention of the Board:

9.F.1 Polar Bear Population Studies: A small study is underway, with Ontario being the lead participant, to refine estimates for the South Hudson Bay polar bear population. The impetus for this work is the growing momentum to develop inter-jurisdictional polar bear management agreements for this area.

9.F.2 Study of Handling Effects on Polar Bears: Formal comments on the draft report were submitted to the consultant who did the work, by DSD and also by GNWT and WMAC. The consultant will presumably take account of these comments in finalizing the report. Once the report is received, DSD will produce a summary and then bring the package to the NWMB.

9.F.3 DSD Staffing: The Department is considering putting a Resource Officer in Sanikiluaq next year.

9.F.4 Thelon Sanctuary Management Plan: This remains an active file. The update of the final report has not yet been completed.

9.G Questions and Concerns of Board Members and Staff Pertaining to DSD

Ben Kovic noted that there is considerable concern in the community of Sanikiluaq about the inability of hunters to encounter caribou. Some people are suggesting that they may have moved to the mainland. Does DSD have a plan to find them? Stephen Atkinson acknowledged that the Department is aware of the problem. The HTO has suggested deployment of some radio collars to assist tracking these animals, but there have been no decisions.

Harry Flaherty asked if Michael Ferguson's work was leading to the development of co-management plans for caribou in both the south and north Baffin similar to what has been drafted for the Bluenose caribou. Stephen replied that such was precisely the orientation of Mr. Ferguson's work.

Joan Scottie enquired about the results of last year's muskox survey near Baker Lake. Stephen replied that the results are still being assembled and interpreted.

In view of polar bear studies underway in his area, Makabe Nartok pressed for information about the effects of fitting bears with ear tags or telemetry collars. In his experience, polar bears that have been handled do not appear normal and seem less healthy than unmarked bears. Stephen replied that he personally had never seen a case where handling had a negative effect on the condition of a polar bear. He admitted that this does not necessarily mean that such cases do not exist. But researchers aim always to avoid causing any negative effects. The study that has been mentioned, when finished, will shed more light on the matter.

Jim Noble asked about the status of the studies underway on the M'Clintock Channel polar bear population. Stephen replied that over twenty years of harvest information and two years of mark-and-recapture data are starting to indicate that the population may be significantly lower than the current estimate. Harvest locations seem to have moved progressively northward, and reproductive rates seem to be declining. However these conclusions are very preliminary. The data will be discussed next week in the three communities that harvest this population.

Jim asked if the NWMB should be participating in those meetings. Stephen replied that participation was welcome, but it is anticipated that the meetings will be rather routine study briefings. Nothing has been formulated as yet by way of any recommendations for changing the polar bear management agreements.

10. NWMB Internal Items: Issues and Decisions

10.A Nunavut Wildlife Harvest Study: Update

Michelle Wheatley reported that Jordan DeGroot took over from Johnny McPherson as Harvest Study Co-ordinator on October 22. A considerable backlog of 1999 data remains to be appended to the database. Aside from that, attention is being directed to the development of preliminary harvest reports for transmittal to the communities and regions, and also to preparations for writing the final report.

Gordon Koshinsky suggested that an important lesson from the Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study is that the final stages of these kinds of projects tend to take much more time and effort than is generally forecast. He asked if there was any consideration about hiring a trainee or other type of assistance now, in order to help clear the way for and even begin to undertake the analyses and writing that will need to be done at the end of the project. Michelle replied that funds have been budgeted for analytical work, and that thought is being given to how additional assistance might be used most effectively. It is expected that the technical review that is now well underway will have some specific recommendations in that regard.

10.B Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study: Update

Michelle Wheatley advised that Keith Hay is completing his revision of the main body of the report based on input from the English-language reviewers and members of the Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study Committee. Keith is also writing the Conclusions section. When these steps are completed the material will be translated and sent to the IBKS Committee for review of the Inuktitut text. A call for proposals will be issued very soon for printing of the document. Michelle noted that she and Keith had also devoted considerable time to a detailed analysis of a draft COSEWIC report on the status of bowhead whales in the Eastern Arctic.

Gordon Koshinsky once again urged that every effort be made to get the final IBKS report published in a recognized journal or equivalent.

10.C NWMB Strategic Planning

Ben Kovic noted that the Board had met over the preceding weekend in workshop format to devote attention to Strategic Planning. He reiterated that the workshop results will be the basis for the planning and budgetary submission that has been requested by the Implementation Panel for delivery by the end of March.

Michael d'Eça reiterated that he would be working, with NWMB staff, to prepare drafts of the required submissions for consideration by the Board at its next meeting.

10.D Big-Game Hunting Guides Working Group: Update

Michelle Wheatley reported that all members of the Working Group have been advised of their appointments and have been sent an information package. The members are Louis Pilakapsi (KWF), Joannie Ikkidluak (QWB), Larry Adjun (KHTA), Winston Fillatre (DFO), Stephen Pinksen (DSD), and herself (Michelle Wheatley, NWMB). In addition, representatives from Nunavut Tourism and from Arctic College will participate on an as-needed basis. A conference call is planned for early in December to discuss terms of reference and to make plans for the first meeting.

Harry Flaherty asked if the RWO appointees have had personal experience in guiding or outfitting. Michelle replied that she could not confirm that they had; however the letter that went to the RWOs requesting their nominations for appointments to the Working Group suggested that this be taken into account.

10.E Nunavut Environmental Contaminants Committee

Michelle Wheatley reported attending the recent workshop of the Northern Contaminants Program (NCP), sponsored by DIAND. One of the items on the agenda was to consider the formation of a Nunavut Environmental Contaminants Committee (NECC).

Michelle tabled the tentative terms of reference for an NECC that were developed at the NCP workshop. The document lists the Nunavut IPGs, including the NWMB, as prospective members. Also listed are the RWOs and the Regional Inuit Associations. Representatives from the other IPGs at the workshop all expressed interest in such a committee, but all of them also indicated that they would not be able to participate as full and active members. There was considerable enthusiasm for the active participation of the NWMB. It was noted that the NCP has been using the NWMB list of research priorities as a point of reference for evaluating applications that are submitted to them for contaminants research funding.

One function of the NECC would be to review applications for NCP funding that pertain to contaminants research in Nunavut. The review process takes place annually during the same time period as our own (NWMB) assessments of research proposals. It would be difficult to accommodate a very active new role for the NWMB that was focussed in that particular time frame.

The NWMB to date has generally adopted a profile of not participating in matters pertaining to contaminants unless there were clear and direct links to wildlife management. Most concerns about contaminants pertain to food safety, human health, or wildlife abnormalities. One recent study linked contaminant burdens to survival of polar bear cubs; this would be an example of a wildlife management issue with a basis in contaminants that would or could be of interest to the NWMB.

Gordon Koshinsky acknowledged that the subject of contaminants is a very important one, and suggested it is not a matter that the NWMB should be ignoring. However it is not a subject about which anyone can reasonably identify the NWMB as the organization that is best mandated to carry the leadership role among the IPGs. Meeka Mike stressed that the NWMB needed to guard against getting co-opted by this initiative. David Alagalak suggested that freedom to play more of a critical role might be more productive than active participation in such a program.

Michael d'Eça noted that the Board had indicated at the recent planning workshop a desire to orient progressively more to an ecosystem approach in its functions, with more attention to various environmental insults, presumably including contaminants. This is an area of Nunavut environmental administration that is not clearly in the mandate of any existing entity. As such, there is danger of it “falling through the cracks”. The NLCA has no provision for a “Nunavut Lands Council” in a manner that would correspond to the provision in the NLCA for a Nunavut Marine Council. However a connection could be interpreted to exist even to/with the NMC. This then is a subject to which the resource person that DFO is proposing to provide for the NMC might reasonably devote some attention.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 075**) to endorse the proposal to establish a Nunavut Environmental Contaminants Committee, but to advise the proponents that the NWMB would not be able to participate as a full member. Rather, the Board decided that the NWMB would request observer status, and would offer to provide its expertise as might be requested from time to time.

10.F Wildlife Research Priorities Workshop

Michelle Wheatley advised the Board that the workshop to guide the preparation and evaluation of research proposals over the next two years was held in Iqaluit on October 19 – 21. The workshop followed the usual format, with a number of additions. Government representatives spent half a day with Glenn Williams of NTI to consider ways to involve Inuit more actively and more meaningfully in governmental research projects.

Regional research priorities were once again derived by Regional break-out groups. The research topics proposed by individual communities were evaluated by these groups through the use of standardized scoring sheets. A number of problems were identified with the process in the course of the exercise. Some procedural adjustments were made immediately while others will require further consideration:

- The score sheet as it is now constructed contains no provision for directly inputting the actual priorities as envisaged by the originating communities. Such provision should probably be added. In the meantime (for this workshop), the Regional groups were given leeway to modify their numerical ratings slightly to reflect the priorities of the communities.

- Small numerical differences in derived rankings were often deemed by the Regional groups not to be meaningful, and in some cases even to be counter-intuitive. The solution adopted was to aggregate the Regional items into three categories (high, medium or low priority) for purposes of presentation, with each Region deciding its own numerical break points between these categories.
- The fundamental purpose of this biennial exercise is still not completely clear to all the participating groups. This will be a matter for continuing education and interaction.

Michelle tabled the lists of wildlife research priorities for the three Regions as developed at the workshop. The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 076**) to approve the Regional research priorities as presented. The Board also asked the Director of Wildlife Management to:

- Review the scoring sheet with the workshop participants and develop recommendations for improvement for consideration by the Board; and
- Devote more attention to explaining the purpose of this biennial exercise to the participating parties prior to the next such session.

10.G World Wildlife Fund Bowhead Conservation Plan

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Board that the WWF is working to develop a conservation plan for eastern Arctic bowhead whales, and aims to hold a multi-stakeholder workshop as part of this process in mid December. The NWMB has agreed to provide information and support-in-kind for this overall project, and NWMB staff member Evie Amagoalik is currently translating a preliminary draft of the Conservation Plan as background for the workshop. The WWF has recently requested that the NWMB make a contribution towards the workshop costs.

Some members continued to express their unease about NWMB involvement in this project. Meeka Mike described the World Wildlife Fund as basically an animal-welfare organization, but acknowledged that the Canadian arm might be less vociferous than the parent body in that regard. Gordon Koshinsky suggested that there was nothing to indicate that the WWF was unalterably opposed to limited and sustainable hunting of bowhead whales by Inuit, and might even promote a small amount of hunting as an indirect tool for conservation. Ben Kovic observed that having the WWF “on-board” should help the NWMB to withstand the pressures that will undoubtedly be forthcoming against establishing future total allowable harvests.

Discussion turned to the matter of participation at the forthcoming workshop. Michelle noted that the intention of the WWF is to invite representatives from each of the RWOs, plus probably four elders (to be nominated by the RWOs). NWMB

Board members and members of the Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study (IBKS) Committee will also be welcome to attend. David Alagalak stated that he would like to see the participation of at least some people who have actual on-the-water knowledge and experience about bowhead whales. Since Pelly Bay is promoting a bowhead hunt, perhaps there should be representation from there. David also suggested that Moses Koonoo attend the workshop on behalf of the NWMB. Meeka stated that she planned to attend, as a member of the IBKS Committee. Ben advised that he will attend as a member of the Advisory Committee to the Study.

Meeka asked for a clearer definition of the use to which the expected output from the project will be put. Michelle explained that the Conservation Plan that WWF will produce is not being developed for or on behalf of any government department or agency. It will be a WWF document, which others can use or not as they see fit. That said, it is expected that the document will have considerable influence in shaping public opinion about bowhead conservation, especially outside of Nunavut.

There was considerable discussion about input to the project from the NWMB, and specifically about the provision of information derived through the IBKS. Concern was expressed about the timing of the upcoming workshop in that context. Members remained adamant that access to the IBKS information not be granted until the IBKS report is finished, and further that the report could not be deemed finished until the input (if any) of the Inuit contributors with respect to the draft was received and taken into account. Meeka Mike pointedly urged that the NWMB resist and deny any request to provide the draft IBKS report as background for the workshop. Harry Flaherty wondered if the WWF would be receptive to setting back the date of the workshop. Michelle noted that WWF is committed to completing the project by the end of March. While it is expected that the IBKS report will be published by then, it will not likely be available for distribution much earlier.

Members did recognize that the WWF would need to take account of the IBKS in order to develop a credible Conservation Plan. In view of its determination to respect the input of its contributors, however, the Board decided (**Resolution 2000-077**) that it would be appropriate to urge the WWF not to finalize its Conservation Plan for Eastern Arctic Bowhead Whales until the NWMB completes its IBKS.

Harry Flaherty requested opportunity to examine any further drafts of the Conservation Plan that the WWF may produce in the interim.

10.H Bowhead Hunt Proposal: Pelly Bay

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Board about the formal request from the Pelly Bay HTO (tabled at the previous Board meeting) for authorization to hunt a bowhead whale in the summer of 2000. Three or four verbal expressions of interest have also been received from other communities regarding authorization for such a hunt.

Michelle noted that bowhead sightings in the Pelly Bay area have started to occur only recently. She advised that the stock affinity of bowhead whales summering near Pelly Bay has not been definitively confirmed. However the available evidence suggests that these whales do not belong to the Foxe Basin / Hudson Bay stock. One line of evidence is that informants to the IBKS did not report bowhead migrations through Fury and Hecla Strait. Moses Koonoo asked if it was possible that the bowhead whales at Pelly Bay came from the abundant Beaufort Sea population to the west. Michelle acknowledged that was possible, albeit unlikely.

Michelle advised that bowhead whales in the Kitikmeot region are ranked a high priority for research, with confirmation of stock identity being a predominant objective. It is expected that DFO will bring proposals for such work to the next round of funding allocations from the Nunavut Wildlife Research Trust. Makabe Nartok expressed enthusiasm for a bowhead hunt at Pelly Bay, but acknowledged that it was important to know the identity of the stock before proceeding. Gordon Koshinsky noted that the resumption of bowhead hunting in Nunavut as per the two harvests that have been authorized to date represented an important achievement by Inuit and by the Board. It was incumbent on the NWMB to safeguard the basis for continuation of this renewed hunt in future. One way to do that was to ensure that decisions about future harvesting were backed up by reliable information.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 078**) to deny the request from the Pelly Bay HTO to hunt a bowhead whale in 2000 due to the need to determine beforehand, among other things, the stock to which the bowhead whales at Pelly Bay belong. The Board also decided to encourage DFO to conduct the necessary research in order to elucidate the matter of bowhead stock affinity in this location.

10.I Bowhead TAH for 2000

Michelle Wheatley outlined the conclusions contained in the stock status report on the Foxe Basin / Hudson Bay bowhead population that was recently produced by DFO in collaboration with others, including the NWMB. Indications continue to be that harvesting one bowhead whale every two years from this population (as per the operating guidelines that have been used up to now) should be readily sustainable. Since the last harvest from this population was in 1996 (at Repulse Bay), a harvest of one bowhead whale in this area as early as this coming summer would easily be within these bounds. The Board needs to consider whether to establish a Total Allowable Harvest (TAH) to accommodate such a hunt. A bowhead hunt based on the Foxe Basin / Hudson Bay population could conceivably be conducted by communities in either or both of the Baffin and Keewatin Regions. Michelle noted that information is still not adequate to support another bowhead hunt for any other bowhead population in Nunavut in the near future.

Michelle briefly reviewed other recent information and initiatives that are pertinent to the matter of establishing a bowhead TAH as proposed. All communities adjacent to Foxe Basin / Hudson Bay that participated in the Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study reported more sightings of bowhead whales by elders in recent years compared to when they were children or young adults. The Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board, in its report on the 1998 bowhead hunt in Cumberland Sound, has concluded that up to a year should be allowed for planning in order to have a successful hunt, and that RWO participation in planning is vital. The three RWOs have declared that they were generally supportive of another bowhead hunt in Nunavut, although the KWF drew attention to the cost of the previous hunts and indicated that they were in no position to contribute funding to a bowhead hunt in the near future. The World Wildlife Fund, in partnership with NWMB and DFO, is working to develop a conservation plan for Eastern Arctic bowhead whales by the end of March; the NWMB may wish to consider waiting for completion of that document prior to moving unilaterally to establish a TAH. The Board may also wish to take account of the recent draft report prepared for COSEWIC on the status of Eastern Arctic bowheads. This report in its present draft form is very negative about continuing the initiative to resume the traditional bowhead hunt in Nunavut.

Gordon Koshinsky suggested that the Board, if it were to establish a TAH without at least some preliminary planning input from the RWO(s), might be interpreted to be signalling a more proactive stance in the matter than the Board actually intended. He proposed that the Board put the initial onus on the RWOs, and invite them to submit proposals for the harvest of one bowhead whale from the Foxe Basin / Hudson Bay stock, including joint proposals from more than one RWO as they may wish. The proposals should address such matters as hunt planning, funding needs and sources, equipment to be used, and proposed time of harvest.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 081**) to adopt the approach of seeking RWO input for its ongoing deliberations about whether and when to establish a TAH for another bowhead hunt.

10.J Traditional Polar Bear Hunt: Noah Kadlak Proposal

Ben Kovic reminded the Board that the Minister of DSD, Hon. Peter Kilabuk, had disallowed the final decision of the NWMB that would have enabled Noah Kadlak's traditional polar bear hunt to take place. The Minister cited concerns about public safety as the rationale for his disallowance.

Stephen Atkinson noted that a number of unique circumstances contributed to what occurred in this instance. The first was that the Board's final decision went to the NWT Minister in Yellowknife. With the birth of Nunavut, the file was first put in abeyance and then transferred to the new Minister in the new Government of Nunavut. Another problem was that the initial NWMB decision became a matter of public knowledge, contrary to the procedure specified in the NLCA. Finally, it was

and remained apparent that the Board was far from completely comfortable with its own initial decision (or with its final decision) on the matter.

With respect to the Board's initial decision becoming public, Michael d'Eça explained that the Board is faced with the requirement as per the NLCA to keep its initial decisions confidential, and its "natural" obligation to conduct its business in open forum. The Board has tried to reconcile this dilemma by meeting (for the most part) in public, but not publicising its decisions that need to go to Ministers. This is obviously not a perfect solution, and the problem has been brought to the attention of the Implementation Panel through the five-year independent review.

With respect to the matter at hand, Michael reiterated the points he had made in a recent NWMB Conference Call. He noted that this is the first time that an NWMB final decision was disallowed. Michael suggested that it would be useful to establish protocols aimed at forestalling any more such occurrences. One way to do that might be to have in place a process whereby disallowance of an initial NWMB decision triggered an automatic meeting of the Minister and the NWMB Chairperson to try to negotiate a solution prior to the Minister receiving the Board's final decision. It might also be appropriate to suggest that the Minister establish a "Council of Elders" to provide advice on traditional matters, rather than relying on the advice of any single elder selected on an ad hoc basis in a particular situation.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 053**) to formally transmit these suggestions to the DSD Minister.

Wednesday, 24 November 1999; Evening Session

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, re-convened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

In-Camera Session

The Board decided to go *in-camera* in order to discuss some administrative matters having confidential implications.

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

- To go *in-camera* (**Resolution 2000- 080**)
- To close the *in-camera* session (**Resolution 2000- 081**)

Thursday, 25 November 1999

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, re-convened the meeting at 8:40 a.m. He called on Joan Scottie to offer an opening prayer.

11. NTI Wildlife Division: Issues and Decisions

11.A Concerns about Increasing Abundance of Harp Seals

Bert Dean reported that hunters in Nunavut are noticing substantial changes in their encounters with harp seals, including:

- increased abundance of harp seals in traditional summering areas;
- expansion of harp seal summering ranges;
- more young and more immature harp seals in the summering areas;
- earlier arrivals and later departures of harp seals; and
- seals feeding on fish species not previously known to be typical prey.

Hunters have expressed concern about the impacts that these changes in harp seal populations and behaviour may be having on other Arctic marine mammals through increased competition for prey, as well as the possible direct effects on economically-important fish and shellfish stocks. NTI is requesting that the NWMB urge DFO to develop and provide overview documentation pertaining to these concerns. It seems likely that some directed field research would be warranted.

Michelle Wheatley observed that it would have been timely if NTI had ensured that these concerns were identified at the recent workshop on research priorities. Since these matters were not mentioned in that forum, it would be difficult and may not even be appropriate to bring them to DFO for research attention so soon after the workshop took place. Gordon Koshinsky suggested that communities may not be accustomed to thinking about nuisance situations as appropriate subjects for research. This may be a matter for inclusion when working with communities to improve their ability to contribute to the biennial priority-setting exercise. Bert noted that the concerns about harp seals in Nunavut came forcibly to light in the course of a very recent meeting with DFO officials to prepare for Canada-Greenland fishery consultations. The DFO priority in the context of those preparations was focussed on the perception that harp seals are being over-harvested by Greenland.

David Alagalak asked from what areas of Nunavut these concerns are coming forward. Bert replied that hunters at Iqaluit and Coral Harbour have been the most vocal about it. Meeka Mike recalled that when Joannie Ikkidluak was a member of the NWMB he used to mention that harp seals were increasing. It is clear that they are indeed becoming more abundant. She herself has harvested 30 or 40 already this year for dog food. Unfortunately the skins tend to be discoloured and “bumpy”; perhaps these are abnormalities that reflect over-abundance. Harry Flaherty agreed that harp seals are indeed becoming somewhat of a nuisance. He noted

that in Frobisher Bay, harp seals have become much more abundant than ringed seals. Hunters notice the increasing numbers of harp seals, but the HTOs have tended not to recognize them as a matter for priority attention. Moses Koonoo stated that there were now lots of harp seals at Arctic Bay. He hadn't realized that their increasing abundance was being recognized in other areas.

Lynn Siegersma declared that to the best of her knowledge this was the first time that increasing harp seal populations in Nunavut had been brought to the attention of the DFO Area Office in Iqaluit as a potential problem. Lynn promised to work with NTI at the local level to try to move this forward as a matter for the attention of the Department. Bert suggested that concerns about harp seals as an emerging competitor and/or predator species in Nunavut might be addressed as components of other research projects already approved and underway, such as projects having to do with any of the harp seal's competitor and/or prey species.

11.B Polar Bear Management Agreements

Bert Dean noted that in following-up the discussion on this matter at the last Board meeting, the NWMB conveyed to the DSD Minister certain concerns about unmet DSD obligations in the current MOUs governing polar bear management. NTI remains apprehensive that if these concerns are not addressed there will be a negative impact on the development of future agreements between the communities and the resource co-management agencies.

Bert reiterated that the communities need incremental resources to enable them to function as full partners in the process of revisiting these MOUs. The MOUs are currently in their third year. While they contain no specific reference to expiry, it has generally been presumed that they will be seriously re-examined within five years. It is imperative for the HTOs to consult with each as part of the re-examination process. It is unrealistic and improper to expect them to prepare their cases in isolation, especially in respect to shared polar bear populations. The previous round of consultations for community input cost more than \$150,000. The source of the necessary funds for the coming round remains unresolved.

David Alagalak observed that the quota system embodied in the present MOUs, with its heavy emphasis on sex ratios of harvested bears, is going to prompt a great deal of discussion. It is a source of much misunderstanding and dissatisfaction among hunters. It has even caused hunters to go against one another. Perhaps the communities themselves should have greater input into the type of management system that they would follow in their own particular situations.

Michael d'Eça urged the various interested parties to get together to work out the process that will be followed in re-negotiating these MOUs. The parties should agree at the outset on their respective roles, the issues to be addressed, the funding sources, the time frame for the exercise, and an outline of the end product.

11.C Funding, Performance and Accountability of the RWOs and HTOs

Bert Dean stated that all three of the RWOs are currently in a deficit financial position. The amount of funding that is made available to them seems to be a basic factor in the equation. Probably a more important factor is the general lack and overall inconsistency among the Regions with respect to administrative procedures, such as salary scales and benefit packages. The RWOs and the HTOs all need assistance in working toward better administrative fundamentals, such as budgeting and protocols for accountability. All of them need administrative guidelines, of the sort that are routinely established by Treasury Board to govern the workings of government departments and agencies. It would seem that the NWMB would have considerable interest and responsibility in these matters, since it is the source of funding for these organizations. NTI will be meeting with the three RWO executive directors in Rankin Inlet next week to discuss these and other matters.

Ben Kovic noted that the NWMB has not been entirely motionless on this issue. Numerous efforts have been made and are continuing, by the NWMB alone and in concert with other agencies (including NTI), to come to grips with deficiencies in RWO and HTO operations. A key impediment to progress is the fact that while the NWMB is responsible under the NLCA to provide funding for the RWOs and HTOs, these are ultimately Inuit organizations under the purview of NTI. Yet NTI has not shown much imagination or initiative in addressing their problems. The only advice that the NTI President ever had for the NWMB in this matter was to increase the effort devoted to training. Yet despite considerable training that has been undertaken, these problems persist. Extensive turnover among RWO and HTO staff and Board members has been a persistent source of problems. The NWMB could focus hard on accountability, but the ultimate lever for that approach has to be the threat of shutting down an organization that is persistently delinquent or in arrears. The NWMB, as an institution of public government, does not consider that it has the authority to even contemplate such action against an Inuit organization. Now and increasingly, the slightest indication of a hardening line by the NWMB is met by claims that the problems derive from inadequate funding.

Bert acknowledged that considerable effort has already been devoted to training. All the RWOs and HTOs have participated in various workshops for this purpose. There is substantial agreement among the RWOs and HTOs that there are many opportunities for administrative improvements. It is generally perceived, for example, that standardized salaries for the managers and centralized regional payroll systems would be useful. What is most lacking is a set of consistent operational guidelines to underpin such measures. As the funding agency, the NWMB has to be the key to corrective action. Funds should not flow automatically, but only on the basis of clear and demonstrated accountability.

Bert noted that the problems among the RWOs and HTOs are not universal in the NSA. Some of these organizations have been able to retain staff and have shown that they can benefit from training. Administrative guidelines are considered to be

the key to further progress, however. NTI is asking the NWMB to work in partnership with it, and with the RWOs and HTOs, to develop such guidelines and to encourage their adoption and implementation.

Gordon Koshinsky suggested that the parties need to sit down together to decide exactly what needs to be done and how to go about doing it. As in so many initiatives, a clear framework for action at the outset can be expected to pay major dividends in terms of results. Simply providing more funds to the RWOs and HTOs is unlikely to be the answer; it may even be counter-productive.

Ben suggested that it may not be necessary or even appropriate for all the RWOs and HTOs in the NSA to come to the same stage of implementing administrative improvements simultaneously. Those that were most ready and able to do so might serve as examples and catalysts for the others. He requested that NTI take the lead in planning the required initiative to get this matter moving.

12. Funding Programs: Reviews and Decisions

12.A Nunavut Wildlife Research Trust Fund

Michelle Wheatley advised that there were no new developments in the administration of NWRT funds since the last NWMB meeting. DSD has indicated that they may not require quite as much funding as had been anticipated (and approved) for their final instalment this year due to probable delays in some work on the Davis Strait polar bear project.

12.B NWMB Study Fund

Michelle Wheatley presented an updated summary of the status of each of the 13 projects by HTOs and other non-government agencies that were approved by the Board. The only substantive change since the last reporting is that funding conditions have been met by the proponents for community consultations in respect to completion of the South Baffin caribou population study, and a cheque was issued to the proponents in the amount of \$14,000 (as approved).

12.C Requests for Donations and other Funding

12.C.1 Extension of Harvest Study

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Board that the NWMB Harvest Study is being done to document levels of wildlife use by Inuit for the purpose of calculating Basic Needs Levels (BNLs), and to provide other information pertinent to wildlife management in the NSA. It is not envisioned that the BNLs will be static, but rather that they will

need to be periodically adjusted to meet increasing use of wildlife by Inuit. No mechanism has yet been identified to obtain the information that will be needed to make these adjustments. It would be appropriate for the NWMB to begin to consider ways of meeting this data requirement beyond the termination date for data collection via the Harvest Study as that Study is currently scheduled.

Several agencies have expressed interest in collecting or participating in the collection of wildlife harvest and/or consumption statistics after the current Harvest Study ends. These include the Nunavut Bureau of Statistics and the three wildlife co-management departments of government (DSD, DFO and CWS). The objectives of these agencies (and of the NWMB) would not be completely uniform, but an ongoing quantification of wildlife harvests will be integral to addressing various aspects of the NLCA. While the NWMB is under no specific obligation to continue collecting harvest data beyond 2001, participation in a collaborative effort beyond that date may be justified. There are pros and cons about starting such a program immediately after the current Harvest Study ends.

A meeting of the said agencies was held in October to consider if and how such an extension of the Harvest Study, in whatever form, might be pursued. It was decided to contract for a feasibility study to identify the interests of the various agencies more specifically, and to help determine if these interests were sufficiently compatible to underpin a collaborative effort. The Nunavut Bureau of Statistics (NBS) is drafting the terms of reference for such a study and will co-ordinate the project. The NBS, DSD and DFO have each committed to contribute \$5,000 to the contract, and the NWMB is invited to consider making a similar contribution.

After some discussion it was decided to refer this matter to the attention of the NWMB Harvest Study Committee.

12.C.2 Bowhead Conservation Planning Workshop: World Wildlife Fund

Ben Kovic referred to the letter from Robert Moshenko (for WWF) requesting a contribution of up to \$4,500 from the NWMB in support of this workshop. These funds would be directed to cover the incremental costs of attendance of the three RWO representatives.

Meeka Mike vividly recalled that there were supposed to be no further costs to the NWMB for this project beyond the in-kind support committed at the outset. Michelle agreed that was the understanding; the problem is that the workshop is a new component that was not identified in the original budget.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 082**) to approve a contribution of up to \$4,500 towards the travel costs of RWO representatives to attend the forthcoming workshop leading to the preparation of a Conservation Plan for Eastern Arctic Bowhead Whales. The Board also decided to stipulate that this contribution would

be subject to the WWF agreeing not to finalize the Conservation Plan before the Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study is completed.

12.C.3 Production of CD-ROM: University of Guelph

Jim Noble referred to the letter from Dr. Judy Wearing-Wilde (University of Guelph) outlining a proposal to produce a “DVD, CD-ROM, and website on Canada’s Arctic environment and the organisms that inhabit it”. This would be an educational effort, and the proponents would aim “to provide a copy of the DVD and CD-ROM at no cost to every school in Canada”. A considerable portion of the necessary funding for the project has been secured, but a \$250,000 shortfall remains. In addition to welcoming any cash contribution from the NWMB, the proponents identify a number of ways by which support-in-kind could be provided.

Gordon Koshinsky described the proposal as interesting but notably sketchy with respect to the point of view to be projected by the product(s). He suggested that it would be useful for the Board to see some actual examples of previous work. The Board would also need to come to grips with such questions as whether staff time was available to provide in-kind translation service, and whether the Board would want to vet the final product(s). It was agreed to request more details from the proponents to enable a more informed decision regarding NWMB support.

12.C.4 Establishing a Testing Facility for *Trichinella*: Coral Harbour

Jim Noble explained that the Coral Harbour Hamlet Office has written to promote the idea of establishing a *Trichinella* testing facility in that community. The concept arose out of the early deliberations of the Walrus Working Group. Apparently there is a small laboratory in northern Quebec that does such testing and that could serve as a model. Such a laboratory would require both initial and ongoing support, the need for which is identified. The magnitude of that requirement is not yet known.

David Alagalak confirmed the severity of the “trichinosis problem” at Coral Harbour. Seventeen people were recently infected there. Another reason for high interest in meat inspection in that community stems from the commercial caribou operation.

Gordon Koshinsky suggested that this is fundamentally a public health issue rather than a wildlife management issue. While it would not seem to be an appropriate matter for the NWMB to lead, it could warrant NWMB support. It should come under the umbrella of the new Nunavut Inter-settlement Trade Committee, creation of which the Board endorsed in an earlier Resolution (this meeting). Jim noted that several issues of this nature seem to be opening up more or less simultaneously: agri-food inspections, parasites, abnormalities in wildlife, contaminants, etc. Dealing with matters such as these requires specialized equipment and expertise.

It may be appropriate for Nunavut as a whole to establish links with one or more universities in order to address them.

It was agreed to write to the Coral Harbour Hamlet Office expressing support for the concept of a *Trichinella* testing facility, but not offering any concrete assistance at the present time.

13. Other Business

Ben Kovic acknowledged the presence in the meeting of two renowned visitors:

- Peter Kaituk, MLA for Sanikiluaq, and
- Terry Audla, Nunavut Implementation Panel (for Nunavut Government).

14. Executive Committee Report and Recommendations

Gordon Koshinsky advised that the Executive Committee met in the course of the present NWMB session. However there were no new developments to report to the Board at this time.

15. Meetings, Workshops and Other Pertinent Events

15.A Past Events: Reports and Briefings

Ben Kovic referred the Members to the notes contained in the briefing material pertaining to four events that Board Members and/or Staff/Advisors attended or participated in since the last Board Meeting in May. These items were:

- NTI planning workshop, held September 14 –16 in Rankin Inlet: Ben participated for the NWMB. The purpose of the workshop was to assist NTI in developing a five-year strategic plan.
- Meeting with Nunavut Premier Paul Okalik, DSD Minister Peter Kilabuk and NTI President Jose Kusugak, held October 6 in Iqaluit: Ben participated for the NWMB. Discussion centred on litigation concerning turbot allocations.
- Preparatory session for upcoming Canada-Greenland bilateral meeting, held November 1 in Ottawa: Ben attended, accompanied by Ray Andrews. Issues discussed centred on turbot, shrimp and seals.
- Initial meeting of the Nunavut Fisheries (Working) Group, held November 9 in Iqaluit: Facilitated by Ray Andrews. Twelve items were identified for further consideration and discussion.

15.B Upcoming Events: Review and Participation

Ben Kovic led the Board through the tabulation of notices and invitations in respect to forthcoming events, prepared as at November 22. The following decisions were reached regarding attendance:

- BQCMB General Meeting, Nov 26-28 in Winnipeg: Nobody available to attend.
- WCU and Arctic Council Circumpolar Marine Workshop, November 28 – December 2 in Montreal: Ben Kovic to attend.
- FPAFC Working Group Meeting, Nov 30 in Ottawa: Ray Andrews to attend.
- DOE review of Species-at-Risk legislation, Dec 1-2 in Ottawa: Michael to attend.
- DFO Stock and Research Priorities Workshop, December 2-3 in Winnipeg: Michelle and David to attend.
- Canada-Greenland Bilateral Meeting on Fisheries, December 9-10 in Iqaluit: Ben, Michelle, and possibly Ray to attend.
- WWF Workshop on bowhead conservation planning, December 16-17 in Iqaluit: Ben, Michelle, Meeka and Moses to attend.
- Polar Bear Technical Committee Meeting, February 6-8 in Montreal: Michelle and Harry to attend.

16. Date and Location of Next Meeting

The Board had a vigorous debate about where to conduct its next meeting. It was noted that the natural rotation among Regions would indicate that the next meeting should be in Kitikmeot. It was also noted that the March meeting is typically the most complex and the most onerous meeting of the year. Easy access to office staff and to back-up materials (as in Iqaluit) would help to facilitate the deliberations. Harry Flaherty suggested that the Board needed to devote more attention to community-specific concerns in making preparations for its meetings.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 083**) to hold its next (25th) regular meeting in Iqaluit the week of 13 March 2000. It was understood that the main item of agenda would be the assessment of research proposals by agencies and the allocation of research funds. Ben Kovic noted that a short meeting of the Nunavut Wildlife Research Trust would need to be held prior to the Board meeting to identify research funds available for allocation.

17. Adjournment

Ben Kovic thanked Members for participating, and the NWMB staff for their help and presentations. He expressed appreciation for the valiant efforts of the interpreters throughout the meeting, and noted especially the never-failing dedication of Mary Nashook. He acknowledged the contributions of departmental and other representatives to the meeting. He expressed gratitude to the Mayor and

to the community for the use of their facilities, and also for the community feast and celebration. He thanked the Education Council and the students from Kindergarten to Grade 12, and echoed Harry Flaherty's admiration for the art work with which they had decorated the meeting room. Ben offered condolences to the local family that lost a member this week, and expressed regret that events conspired against having a public meeting while the Board was in the community.

The 24th meeting of the NWMB adjourned at 12:05 p.m. (**Resolution 2000- 084**)

Minutes Approved by: _____ **Chairperson** _____ **Date**

Minutes drafted by G. Koshinsky with the help of notes provided by M. Wheatley and comments from Michael d'Eça, as at 18 May 2000. Minutes updated by G. Koshinsky 06 January 2001.

NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD

RESOLUTIONS: MEETING No. 24

Sanikiluaq, 23 – 25 November 1999

Resolution 2000- 067: Resolved that the NWMB accept the agenda for Meeting No. 24 as presented, with the addition of one item.

Moved by: Moses Koonoo

Seconded by: Harry Flaherty

Carried

Date: 23 November 1999

Resolution 2000- 068: Resolved that the NWMB adopt the minutes for Meeting No. 23 conducted at Naujaat on 24-26 August 1999, with minor revisions.

Moved by: David Alagalak

Seconded by: Makabe Nartok

Carried

Date: 23 November 1999

Resolution 2000- 069: Resolved that the NWMB adopt the minutes for Conference Call No. 44 conducted on 14 October 1999, with minor revisions.

Moved by: Harry Flaherty

Seconded by: Moses Koonoo

Carried

Date: 23 November 1999

Resolution 2000- 070: Resolved that the NWMB adopt the minutes for Conference Call No. 45 conducted on 04 November 1999, with minor revisions.

Moved by: Harry Flaherty

Seconded by: Joan Scottie

Carried

Date: 23 November 1999

Resolution 2000- 071: Resolved that the NWMB accept the Financial Variance Report as at 22 November 1999, with minor clarifications.

Moved by: David Alagalak

Seconded by: Moses Koonoo

Carried

Date: 23 November 1999

Resolution 2000- 072: Resolved that the NWMB endorse in principle the staffing of a position by DFO, to be located in the NSA, in support of the NMC.

Moved by: David Alagalak

Seconded by: Harry Flaherty

Carried

Date: 23 November 1999

Resolution 2000- 073: Resolved that the NWMB approve the request from Quliruaq Incorporated (Amarok HTO), Mittimatalik HTO, Kabva Marine, and Mayukalik HTO / KTJ Holdings, in respect to the 1999 exploratory shrimp fishery allocations that were granted to them earlier by decision of the NWMB for Shrimp Fishing Area 2 north of 63°N, to fish 475 metric tonnes of their allocations in the waters of the NSA (i.e. within 12 miles of shore) in this same Shrimp Fishing Area, but with none of this fishing to take place in the waters of Cumberland Sound.

Moved by: Moses Koonoo

Seconded by: Meeka Mike

Abstained: Harry Flaherty

Carried

Date: 23 November 1999

Resolution 2000- 074: Resolved that the NWMB endorse the initiative by the Nunavut Development Corporation and others to establish a Nunavut Inter-Settlement Trade Committee, and further that the NWMB agree in principle to participate in this Committee as the NWMB considers appropriate.

Moved by: David Alagalak

Seconded by: Harry Flaherty

Carried

Date: 24 November 1999

Resolution 2000- 075: Resolved that the NWMB endorse the current initiative to establish a Nunavut Environmental Contaminants Committee (NECC), but that the NWMB communicate with the proponents:

- Advising that conflicting work schedules will preclude participation by the NWMB as a full member of the Committee;
- Requesting that the NWMB be accorded observer status with the Committee;
- Offering to serve in a resource capacity in respect to matters pertaining to the expertise of the NWMB that the NECC may identify from time to time.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky

Seconded by: Moses Koonoo

Opposed: Harry Flaherty, Meeka Mike, Joan Scottie

Carried

Date: 24 November 1999

Resolution 2000- 076: Resolved that the NWMB approve the research priorities developed during the recent Wildlife Research Priorities Workshop; and also that:

- The Director of Wildlife Management review the present score sheet and scoring process with the participants, and develop recommendations for changes for the consideration of the Board; and that
- More attention be devoted to explaining the purposes of these exercises to the participants well in advance of future wildlife research priorities workshops.

Moved by: David Alagalak

Seconded by: Harry Flaherty

Carried

Date: 24 November 1999

Resolution 2000- 077: Resolved that the NWMB urge the World Wildlife Fund not to finalize its Conservation Plan for Eastern Arctic Bowhead Whales until the NWMB publishes its Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study.

Moved by: Moses Koonoo

Seconded by: Gordon Koshinsky

Carried

Date: 24 November 1999

Resolution 2000- 078: Resolved that the NWMB deny the request from the Pelly Bay HTO to hunt a bowhead whale in 2000 due to the prior need to determine, among other things, the stock to which bowhead whales at Pelly Bay belong; and further that the NWMB encourage DFO to conduct the necessary research in order to elucidate the matter of bowhead stock affinity in this location.

Moved by: Joan Scottie

Seconded by: Meeka Mike

Carried

Date: 24 November 1999

Resolution 2000- 079: Resolved that the NWMB advise the RWOs that the NWMB is considering establishing a total allowable harvest of one bowhead whale from the Hudson Bay / Foxe Basin stock, and inviting the RWOs to submit proposals,

including joint proposals as they may wish, for the conduct of a bowhead hunt, with the proposals to address such matters as hunt planning, funding needs and sources, equipment to be used, and proposed time of harvest.

Moved by: Moses Koonoo

Seconded by: Makabe Nartok

Carried

Date: 24 November 1999

Resolution 2000- 080: Resolved that the NWMB meet *in-camera*.

Moved by: David Alagalak

Seconded by: Makabe Nartok

Carried

Date: 24 November 1999

Resolution 2000- 081: Resolved that the *in-camera* session be closed.

Moved by: Moses Koonoo

Seconded by: Gordon Koshinsky

Carried

Date: 24 November 1999

Resolution 2000- 082: Resolved that the NWMB approve a contribution of up to \$4,500 towards the travel costs of RWO representatives to attend the forthcoming workshop sponsored by World Wildlife Fund (WWF) leading to the preparation of a Conservation Plan for Eastern Arctic Bowhead Whales, this contribution subject to the condition that the WWF not finalize its Conservation Plan before the Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study is published.

Moved by: Harry Flaherty

Seconded by: David Alagalak

Carried

Date: 25 November 1999

Resolution 2000- 083: Resolved that the next (25th) regular Meeting of the NWMB be conducted in Iqaluit the second week of March 2000.

Moved by: Makabe Nartok

Seconded by: Harry Flaherty

Carried

Date: 25 November 1999

Resolution 2000- 084: Resolved that the 24th regular Meeting of the NWMB be adjourned.

Moved by: David Alagalak

Seconded by: Harry Flaherty

Carried

Date: 25 November 1999

Resolutions drafted by G. Koshinsky from notes provided by J. Noble, and with input from M. Wheatley and M. d'Eça, as at 14 December 1999.