

NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD

MINUTES: MEETING No. 25

IQALUIT, 14-17 MARCH 2000

Members and Staff Participating

Ben Kovic	Chairperson
Gordon Koshinsky	Member
Kevin McCormick	Member
Makabe Nartok	Member
Moses Koonoo	Member
David Alagalak	Member
Harry Flaherty	Member (not present first day)
Jim Noble	Executive Director
Michelle Wheatley	Director of Wildlife Management
Gordon Tomlinson	Director of Finance and Administration
Jordan DeGroot	Harvest Study Coordinator
Becky Mike	Assistant Director Wildlife Management
Michael d'Eça	NWMB Legal Advisor
Leetia Janes	Interpreter
Adamee Pitseolak	Interpreter
Becky Mike	Interpreter

Not Available

Joan Scottie	Member
Meeka Mike	Member

Visitors and Other Participants (at various times)

Burt Hunt	DFO Area Manager, Iqaluit
Winston Fillatre	DFO Suprvsr Conservtn & Protectn, Iqaluit
Lynn Siegersma	DFO Land Claims Liaison Officer, Iqaluit
Mike Papst	DFO Div Mgr Arctic Research, Winnipeg
Siu-Ling Han	DSD Manager of Research, Iqaluit
Stephen Atkinson	DSD Director Wildl & Env'tl Protectn, Iqaluit
Bert Dean	NTI Director of Wildlife, Rankin Inlet
Sarah Kalf	DIAND Env'tl Policy Advisor, Ottawa
Anne Snider	DIAND, Ottawa
Jonah Kelly	Govt Nun Law Review Commission, Iqaluit
John Nagy	DRWED Suprvsr Wildlife Mgmt, Inuvik Rgn
Jerry Ell	President Qikiqtaaluk Corporation, Iqaluit
Peter Keenainak	QC Manager of Marine Fisheries, Iqaluit
Dave Dyer	Northern Resources Inc. (R.D. Financial)
Pitsulak Alaing	President Amarok HTO, Iqaluit
Several other visitors, guests, media and members of the public at large	

Tuesday, 14 March 2000

1. Call to Order and Opening Preliminaries

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, convened the 25th regular meeting of the NWMB at 1:35 p.m. Ben welcomed the Board Members and all others present, and called on David Alagalak to lead the opening prayer.

2. Agenda for the Meeting

Ben noted that the Board faced a heavy agenda. The Members recognized the particular need to ensure adequate treatment of the research and study proposals, as well as to finalize the NWMB workplans.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 093**) to accept the agenda for Meeting No. 25 as presented, but to change the sequence of the items in order to address at the outset the proposals for funding in support of research and study projects.

12. Funding of Research and Study Projects

12A. Allocation of Nunavut Wildlife Research Trust Funding for 2000/01

Michelle Wheatley noted that a year ago (in March 1999) the Board approved NWRT funding in the amount of \$449,000 for projects previously approved for multi-year funding, along with \$449,400 for new projects. In addition, carry-overs permitted by the Board from the previous year (1998/99) totalled \$43,600, so that NWRT funding commitments for 1999/00 totalled \$942,000. Not all of this approved funding was actually used. The total of the estimated expenditures for 1999/00, based on interim financial reports provided by proponents to date, is \$700,900.

Michelle explained the filing system that she developed (and applied retroactively) for NWRT research proposals and research projects in order to facilitate tracking. She also reviewed the NWMB process for identifying research priorities to guide agencies in their development of research proposals, as well as the revised (1999) NWMB policy that she followed in evaluating the proposals that were received. The latter included adoption and use of a new scoring sheet.

Michelle referred the Members to the extensive briefing material that she had prepared in respect to this agenda item. She explained that this material included:

- Interim status reports (prepared by the proponents), along with her (Michelle's) evaluations, with respect to the 20 projects that were approved by the NWMB for NWRT funding for 1999/00. These 20 projects are of two basic categories:
 - Ten projects that were completed as scheduled in 1999/00.
 - Ten projects that were not scheduled for completion in 1999/00, but were originally approved for multi-year funding at least into 2000/01. These ten projects are of three types according to the intentions of the proponents:

- Two projects that have been withdrawn or suspended.
 - Two projects that are seeking re-structuring or re-profiling.
 - Six projects that are aiming to proceed as planned.
- Proposals (prepared by the proponents), along with her (Michelle's) evaluations, with respect to fifteen new projects which proponents seek to begin in 2000/01.

Michelle advised the Board that the total funding implication of all the proposals that were at hand, including those that were previously approved in a multi-year funding context, was \$774,500. She reminded the Members that the NWR Trustees meeting earlier in the day had allotted \$796,000 plus-or-minus 5% of NWRT funding to support research by government agencies in 2000/01.

The Board took note of the interim progress reports and evaluations for the ten projects that were completed as scheduled in 1999/00. Kevin McCormick asked if agencies were reporting research results in a satisfactory and timely manner. Michelle replied that reporting seemed to be generally up to expectations. However she aimed to conduct a systematic follow-up of outputs from all research and study projects that have been funded since the inception of the NWMB.

In respect to the two projects that were undertaken to a minor extent in 1999/00 and that have been suspended by the proponents from further immediate funding consideration, Michelle pointed out that the project pertaining to Inuit knowledge of caribou can be considered to be in abeyance rather than completely withdrawn.

Michelle next drew the attention of the Board specifically to the two projects for which the proponents are seeking to re-structure or re-profile their multi-year funding arrangements:

- Project 5110-98-3 (Polar bear population inventory in Davis Strait): This project was originally approved for three years of funding, beginning in 1998/99. Work in the second year (1999/00) did not proceed according to plan due to a shortage of personnel. The proponent (DSD) will be returning the entire \$70,000 NWRT contribution for the year. The proponent now anticipates that the project will require a total of five years for completion.

Michelle advised that this project has been the subject of attention by the Polar Bear Technical Committee at its meeting in Montreal in February. The consensus of the Committee was that the project should focus on reconnaissance activities in the autumn of 2000, in order to ensure that the necessary groundwork is in place for the actual inventory. Michelle noted that polar bears no longer appear on the research priority list for the Baffin region. Gordon Koshinsky cautioned against putting a great deal of stock in this, since the matter has wide-ranging inter-jurisdictional implications of the kind that the Board's priority-setting protocol is not well-designed to uncover.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 094**) to give positive consideration to the provision of NWRT funding support for a year of reconnaissance work with respect to this project in 2000/01, pending receipt from DSD of a revised proposal pertaining to such reconnaissance work; and with the understanding that DSD will provide, by January 2001, a new proposal for completion of this project.

- Project 5120-99-6 (Whale sampling and stock identification): This project was originally approved for three years of NWRT funding beginning in 1999/00. Fewer samples than anticipated were obtained in the first year, and the project has a residual of \$27,380. The proponents are requesting that this residual be carried forward, for addition to the \$47,500 previously approved for 2000/01.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 095**) to approve the request from DFO to carry-forward from 1999/00 NWRT funding up to the amount of \$27,380 for this project, this in addition to any new NWRT funding approved for this project for 2000/01, with the final amount of the carry-forward to be dependent on the number of communities that signify to DFO, prior to June 30, their intention to participate in the project in 2000.

The Board then moved to consider the eight ongoing projects that were previously approved for multi-year funding at least into 2000/01, including a re-visitation of the two projects that were already dealt with in respect to re-structuring (Resolution 2000-094) and re-profiling (Resolution 2000- 095).

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 096**) to approve, subject to receipt of appropriate final financial reports for 1999/00 from the contracting agencies by the end of June, new NWRT funding support in the total amount of \$393,200 for 2000/01, along with \$27,380 to be carried forward from 1999/00, for the following:

- Project 5110-98-2 (Central arctic polar bear inventory): Provision of \$135,500; final year of funding.
- Project 5110-98-3 (Polar bear population inventory in Davis Strait): Provision of \$67,000, subject to receipt of a revised proposal for reconnaissance work only as per Resolution 2000- 094; final year of funding.
- Project 5110-99-1 (Seasonal distribution and herd delineation of north-east mainland caribou): Provision of \$35,200; final year of funding.
- Project 5110-99-2 (Survival and sustainable harvest of the Dolphin-Union caribou herd): Provision of \$20,200; second year of three-year funding.
- Project 5110-99-3 (Re-evaluation of muskox populations, management zones and quotas in the Keewatin and eastern Kitikmeot): Provision of \$4,800; final year of funding.
- Project 5120-98-1 (Ringed seal status in western Hudson Bay): Provision of \$71,000; final year of funding.
- Project 5120-99-6 (Whale sampling and stock identification): Provision of \$47,500, plus carry forward of \$27,400 as per Resolution 2000- 095; second year of three-year funding.

- Project 5130-99-1 (Seasonal movements and home range size of adult male polar bears in western Hudson Bay): Provision of \$12,000; final year of funding.

Wednesday, 15 March 2000

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, re-convened the meeting at 8:40 a.m. He welcomed Harry Flaherty who joined the meeting at this time.

Ben noted that in its session yesterday afternoon, the Board had not completed its treatment of Agenda item 12A, the allocation of NWRT funding for 2000/01. He accordingly directed the meeting back to that item.

Michelle Wheatley referred the Members once again to the new applications for NWRT funding, along with her (Michelle's) evaluations of those applications and her recommendations for any conditions that should accompany funding approval, as contained in the briefing binder. She noted that the 15 new project proposals that were submitted embodied funding requests totalling \$381,300 for 2000/01.

The Board reviewed the material that was provided in connection with each of the new proposals. The Board approved funding with respect to eight of these new proposals by way of an amalgamated decision (**Resolution 2000- 097**) as follows:

That the NWMB approve new NWRT funding support in the total amount of \$221,000 for 2000/01, subject to routine administrative arrangements, for the following research projects, deemed in general to adequately fit NWRT criteria:

- Project 5120-00-2 (Bowhead stock identification): Provision of \$10,000, conditional on confirmation of support from the communities where the research will be conducted; one-year project.
- Project 5120-00-7 (Development of a sampling program for arctic charr at the Pangnirtung fish processing plant): Provision of \$8,000, conditional on confirmation of support from the Pangnirtung HTO; one-year project.
- Project 5120-00-8 (Survey of the northern Hudson Bay narwhal population): Provision of \$67,000, conditional on confirmation of support from the Aiviq HTO and from KWF; one-year project.
- Project 5120-00-9 (North Baffin narwhal / beluga movements and dive behaviour by satellite telemetry): Provision of \$25,000, conditional on support from the Resolute Bay HTO, and on availability of other funding as identified for future years; three-year project (with \$25,000 additional in each of 2001/02 and 2002/03).
- Project 5120-00-10 (Walrus satellite tagging): Provision of \$43,000, conditional on support from Resolute Bay and Grise Fiord HTOs and on notification of Arctic Bay HTO, and clarification of the justification provided in respect to the location of the research; one-year project.

- Project 5120-00-11 (Walrus capture / recapture methods): Provision of \$13,000, conditional on confirmation of funding from DFO as identified in the proposal, and on confirmation of support from the HTOs where the project will be conducted; one-year project.
- Project 5120-00-12 (Walrus stock identification and harvest composition): Provision of \$48,000, conditional on confirmation of support from the pertinent communities and on confirmation of funding from other sources as identified in the proposal; one-year project.
- Project 5130-00-3 (Reproductive ecology and survival of the Pacific common eider in the central Canadian arctic): Provision of \$7,000, conditional on support from the Kugluktuk and Cambridge Bay HTOs; one-year preliminary study.

Observations and/or concerns were made/expressed in respect to three of these approved new projects as follows:

Project 5120-00-7, on developing a sampling program for charr at the Pangnirtung fish processing plant: Michelle noted that many of the fisheries to be sampled are of an experimental nature. It has generally been the case that provision of data and samples from such fisheries is an obligation under the experimental licence. Some of the funding requested for this project would be used to process the fish-age samples. DFO has not made clear who normally pays for fish age determinations with respect to experimental fisheries.

Project 5120-00-10, on walrus satellite tagging: Ben Kovic expressed reservations about conducting this work in the High Arctic where expenses are certain to be maximal, especially when information on walrus is mainly needed in Hudson Bay and Foxe Basin. Kevin McCormick suggested that co-operative arrangements with Greenland, including for cost-sharing, was probably a major consideration.

Project 5120-00-12, on walrus stock identification and harvest composition: Michelle Wheatley noted that this project includes a *Trichinella*-testing component. The NWMB as a matter of mandate has tried to avoid funding research that pertains to parasites and disease. Gordon Koshinsky agreed that other funding sources should be explored for this aspect. However he interpreted the work to be so important that it needed to proceed, even if NWRT funding were necessary to get it underway.

With respect to the seven remaining new project proposals, the Board concluded its deliberations as follows:

- Project 5120-00-1 (Abundance and distribution of kelp at Whale Cove): Mike Papst explained that the proponent asked DFO for advice on sustainable tonnage. DFO provided such an estimate, and concurrently advised that the proponent would need to establish an acceptable monitoring program in conjunction with any harvest. The proponent complained to the DFO Minister about the sustainable tonnage estimate, and also about what the proponent

perceived to be inadequate scientific support. This proposal is an attempt to get that perceived shortcoming addressed. The Board decided (**Resolution 2000-098**) not to approve NWRT funding for this project, and to request DFO to provide an updated brief on the kelp experimental licence and other aspects of this project for the next meeting of the NWMB.

- Project 5120-00-3 (Arctic charr population studies in Cumberland Sound): Some Board Members expressed reservations about the present capacity of the Pangnirtung HTO to be an effective partner in a venture of this nature. It was observed that the HTO has not been particularly effective recently in orchestrating sample collection from the fisheries. The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 099**) to agree-in-principle to provide NWRT funding support for this project in 2000/01, with confirmation of this approval subject to clarification or provision by the proponent with respect to:
 - the amount of data required to satisfy the needs of the Project;
 - use that has been made of data that were collected previously; and
 - a revised proposal that integrates this project with Project 5120-00-5.
- Project 5120-00-4 (Influence of fishing pressure on resident Arctic charr): Michelle explained the underlying hypothesis: that populations of preferred migratory charr can be increased by heavily fishing populations of resident charr that share the same freshwaters. The proposed test site is Sylvia Grinnell Lake. David Alagalak stated that the traditional interpretation, at least in his community, is that resident charr are the “seed” that maintains sea-run populations, and accordingly need to be protected rather than destroyed. Gordon Koshinsky wondered if it would even be technically feasible to catch enough resident charr to have an impact. Michael Papst observed that the project would seek to create an impact and as such would probably not have the support of the proponent’s Department. The Board decided (**Resolution 2000-100**) not to approve NWRT funding for this project, at least until the proponent can provide clear evidence of community support for such a study at the proposed study site(s).
- Project 5120-00-5 (Arctic charr life history differences at Pangnirtung): The Board decided (see Resolution 2000- 099) to request the proponent to integrate this proposal with a new proposal to be developed for Project 5130-00-3.
- Project 5120-00-6 (Development of a community-based integrated fisheries management plan for Arctic charr at Pangnirtung): Michelle observed that this proposal did not entail research in the ordinary sense of the word. The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 101**) to agree-in-principle to provide up to \$13,600 of NWMB operational funding support (rather than NWRT funding support) for this project in 2000/01, with confirmation of this approval subject to receipt from the proponent of:
 - a substantially revised project proposal; and

- confirmation that the Pangnirtung HTO was consulted about the project and is supportive.
- Project 5130-00-1 (Long-term trends in the population ecology of polar bears in western Hudson Bay in relation to climate change): The Board decided **(Resolution 2000- 102)** to approve NWRT funding of \$40,000 for this project in 2000/01, conditional on the Board receiving from the proponent:
 - confirmation of support from the Arviat HTO and KWF; and
 - confirmation of all other funding identified in the proposal.
 The Board also agreed-in-principle to support the project in 2001/02 and in 2002/03 pending positive re-evaluation of the project by the NWMB in 2001.
- Project 5130-00-2 (Use of satellite telemetry to locate migration routes and wintering areas of common eider ducks breeding in Nunavut): Michelle Wheatley explained that the proponent is seeking pre-approval for a three-year project that is not scheduled to begin until 2001/02. The long-term funding horizon stems from the need to reserve satellite time by October of the preceding year. Michelle also noted that the proposal scored just below the cut-off for multi-year funding approval. The Board decided **(Resolution 2000- 103)** to agree-in-principle to pre-approve NWRT funding for this project commencing in 2001/02, and to offer suggestions to the proponent for improving the presentation of this proposal for re-evaluation by the NWMB next year.

The Board took some time to consider the overall scope of the material presented by way of NWRT research proposals. Gordon Koshinsky noted the lack of any new proposals from DSD for 2000/01, and wondered if this signalled any fundamental underlying problems. Michelle suggested that the lack of new proposals did not signify a reduction in research focus or commitment on the part of the emerging Department. DSD probably has enough ongoing projects to fully occupy its research capacity at the present time.

Michelle cited the significant portion (25%) of approved funding that was not utilized in 1999/00 as a possible cause for concern. It signifies a significant commitment of funds to unproductive ends, and as such might warrant development by the Board of a policy to discourage over-budgeting by agencies. Kevin McCormick expressed reluctance to deal with this issue on anything other than a case-by-case basis. He applauded efforts by agencies to economize on their research expenditures.

Michelle noted that both DSD and CWS have adopted centralized procedures for vetting research proposals before they are submitted to the NWMB. "Individual DFO researchers, on the other hand, continue to submit their proposals directly without benefit of any overall review or rationalization. As a result, some DFO proposals invariably lack the support of the Department and/or are not relevant to NWRT funding criteria. This creates unnecessary work for the NWMB.

12B. Allocation of NWMB Study Funding for 2000/01

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Members that the Board annually establishes a budget out of its internal operating funds that is then made available to support research by other-than-government agencies. She referred to the briefing materials she had prepared for the present meeting that pertained to this NWMB program. Michelle explained that the identification numbers assigned to each project or proposal identify (in sequence) the proponent HTO or RWO or community or other organization, the year the proposal was originally put forward, and the number of the project according to when it was received by the NWMB within that year.

Michelle explained that the briefing material was grouped into three categories:

- Projects that were approved for funding in 1999/00 and that were undertaken;
- Projects that were approved for funding in 1999/00 but were not initiated; and
- Proposals for NWMB funding support in 2000/01, including:
 - One project that was approved for funding for 1999/00 but was not undertaken, and now requesting carry-over of funding into 2000/01, and
 - Nine completely new project proposals.

Michelle advised that NWMB Study funding approved last year (for 1999/00) totalled \$325,200 for ten new projects and two continuing projects. Funding conditions were met and contribution agreements were signed with respect to six of these projects, for an actual funding commitment of \$216,200. Michelle noted that her briefing material contained her evaluations of the projects that received NWMB Studies funding in 1999/00, as well as interim progress reports prepared by the proponents.

Michelle called the attention of the Board to the request from the Gjoa Haven HTO to carry forward the \$11,000 approved last year to conduct a one-year tagging and domestic utilization study on Arctic charr in the Chantry Inlet area. Michelle noted that the approval of the Board that was granted last year was conditional upon:

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

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 104**) to approve the request from the Gjoa Haven HTO to carry forward \$11,000 of NWMB Study Funding for Project 5244-99-1 (Arctic charr tagging at Chantry Inlet), conditional on the proponents meeting the conditions set out by the NWMB in the context of approving this project last year.

Michelle noted that the interim progress report submitted with respect to the project pertaining to community consultations for input to South Baffin caribou management planning (funded last year) contained reference to the project being ongoing, but

was not accompanied by an actual application. Eligibility for support from the NWMB Study Fund would seem questionable in any event, since the work is more in the nature of Conservation Education. The Board treated this as a matter of information, with no decision taken.

Turning to the nine new project proposals for 2000/01, Michelle referred the Members to the briefing binder for copies of the applications along with her (Michelle's) analyses and recommendations. The proposals were evaluated against the same criteria and with reference to the same research priorities as were used to evaluate the NWRT proposals. These new proposals embody funding implications that total \$234,000 for 2000/01.

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

1. Remove chip rock from two streams at/near Clyde River:

The proponent, "Qillaq Arctic Charr Enterprises" of Clyde River, proposes to remove sharp-edged chip rock that was originally placed in two streams at/near the community to facilitate crossing by vehicles. The rocks are damaging to charr during migration. The project has no research component as it is written, but it would seem that such a component could easily be incorporated although perhaps at some extra cost. Some Members questioned why a community should obtain funding to correct a problem of their own making.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 105**) to approve NWMB study funding in the amount of \$9,600 for 2000/01 for the removal of chip-rock from stream sections at/near Clyde River, subject to the proponents agreeing and arranging to:

- have the study funds processed through the Namautaq HTO;
- ensure that the work is done in accordance with DFO regulations; and
- provide documentary information about the condition of fish using these stream sections before and after the work.

2. Monitor bowhead whales and other ecosystem components at Isabella Bay:

The Namautaq HTO at Clyde River HTO proposes to count and photograph bowhead whales using the Isabella Bay area, and also to catalogue other plant and animal life in the Bay. The Board last year denied funding for a proposal that was meant to hire a consultant to write the current proposal. Some Board Members suggested that the proposal did not contain a clear definition of deliverables, but were less concerned about this if the World Wildlife Fund was going to participate.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 106**) to approve NWMB study funding to the Namautaq HTO in the amount of \$30,000 for 2000/01 to assist with the monitoring of bowhead whales and other ecosystem components at Isabella Bay, this pending confirmation of funding from WWF as outlined in the proposal.

3. Conduct a patrol to record wildlife abundance and utilization in Kane Basin:

The Ivik HTO at Grise Fiord proposes to mount an expedition in the Alexander Fiord region of Kane Basin in order to document the abundance of wildlife (particularly polar bears) and to look for signs of illegal hunting incursions by Greenlanders. In the past, Greenlanders have been encountered hunting polar bears in this area, and this has impacted on the number of bears available to hunters from Grise Fiord. The patrol will have sovereignty and customs implications, and is being planned in conjunction with the RCMP and other government agencies.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 107**) to approve NWMB study funding to the Ivik HTO in the amount of \$29,500 for 2000/01 to assist with the conduct of a wildlife patrol in Alexander Fiord in order to assess the abundance of wildlife and to seek evidence of incursions by Greenland hunters.

4. Conduct ground-based surveys of caribou, muskox and wolves in High Arctic:

The Resolute Bay HTO proposes to conduct ground-based surveys of Peary caribou, muskox and wolves on Bathurst, Cornwallis, western Devon and nearby islands over a 2-year period. The work would complement and verify the results of aerial surveys undertaken by DSD. The HTO believes that aerial survey methods are not well suited to this particular situation, citing the clumped distribution of the animals. The HTO is particularly concerned about trends in numbers of Peary caribou, and wishes to verify any conclusions that may be drawn from aerial surveys before the formal management regimes for any of the three species were to be significantly changed. Data will also be obtained on distribution, foraging habits, recruitment, mortality and snow cover conditions. Samples for genetic, contaminant and feeding analyses will be collected on an opportunistic basis. Michelle noted that the project has been very well planned and the proposal is well written. The HTO would provide most of the basic equipment, but DSD funding and PCSP support would be required along with that from the NWMB.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 108**) to approve NWMB study funding to the Resolute Bay HTO in the amount of \$29,500 for 2000/01 to assist with the conduct of a ground-based survey of Peary caribou, muskoxen and wolves on Bathurst, Cornwallis, western Devon and nearby islands, conditional on the proponents receiving other funding as identified in the proposal.

5. Conduct mark-and-recapture studies on Arctic charr at Browne Bay:

The Resolute Bay HTO wishes to determine the wintering locations of charr that utilize Browne Bay (on the west coast of nearby Prince of Wales Island) as a summer feeding area. Local people believe that the fish here are of two separate groups: an early-departing group that winters in a local lake, and a late-departing (and superior) group that winters in an unknown location. The HTO proposes to tag fish at Browne Bay and later search for them in potential home streams. The findings will underpin management and protection measures. Michelle noted that the project is well conceived and that the proposal was developed with input from DFO.

Besides funding support from the NWMB the project would need funding and other assistance from DFO along with support from DSD.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 109**) to approve NWMB study funding to the Resolute Bay HTO in the amount of \$26,650 for 2000/01 to assist with the conduct of an Arctic charr tagging and tag recovery project, with approval conditional on the proponents receiving additional funding as identified in the proposal.

6. Quantify food available to Hudson Bay eiders foraging in the Belchers in winter: Hudson Bay eiders breeding in the Belcher Islands have suffered serious recent declines and are known to be vulnerable to freezing of leads and polynyas. The Sanikiluaq HTO proposes to measure the density and composition of benthic fauna available for winter foraging by these birds as the final component of a winter ecological studies program. The work would be done in close association with CWS and will provide information needed for the management of this declining population.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 110**) to approve NWMB study funding to the Sanikiluaq HTO in the amount of \$20,000 for 2000/01 to assist with a study of foraging ecology of Hudson Bay eiders wintering at polynyas in the Belcher Islands, with approval conditional on the proponents:

- receiving other funding as identified in the proposal; and
- providing, prior to the end of June, an interim report on study activities during the current winter.

7. Monitor snow and Ross' geese and their habitat near Arviat:

In the past three years the Arviat HTO has participated in a co-operative effort with CWS to jointly monitor goose populations and their habitat. The impetus for this work has been the burgeoning numbers of breeding geese in the area and their probable impact on the habitat. The HTO proposes to continue these efforts this coming summer. Besides the funding request to the NWMB, there are substantial funding implications for the CWS and for the Northern Ecosystems Initiative.

David Alagalak spoke in favour of the proposal but expressed serious reservations about the use of helicopters to herd and coral flightless geese for banding. David expressed the view that this function could and should be accomplished by non-mechanized means.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 111**) to approve NWMB study funding to the Arviat HTO in the amount of \$10,200 for 2000/01 to assist with a project to monitor Snow and Ross' Geese and their habitat near Arviat, conditional on the proponents:

- receiving other funding as identified in the proposal and
- justifying to the satisfaction of the NWMB the use of helicopters to herd snow geese as proposed, with a view to conducting the drives without the use of mechanized vehicles if possible.

8. Continue the Greenland halibut surveys in NAFO Sub-Area 0:

This is the second year of a planned three-year project, organized by DFO with the encouragement of the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board (QWB) and the NWMB along with Greenland and other interests, to determine the status of the Greenland halibut (turbot) resource in NAFO Sub-Area 0. It is proposed to focus the survey effort in the coming summer on that portion of this Sub-Area designated as NAFO Division 0B. The present application is for \$50,000 of NWMB funding to support this second year of the survey. Government agencies are not eligible for NWMB study funding, and the project was funded in the first year through the QWB. DFO is scheduled to contribute over \$200,000 to the project this year.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 112**) to approve NWMB study funding in the amount of \$50,000 for 2000/01 to support the ongoing scientific survey of Greenland halibut in NAFO Divisions 0A and 0B, with this approval conditional on the proponents:

- receiving other funding as identified in the proposal; and
- providing a full report on the 1999 survey.

9. Document physical anomalies in the skin of beluga whales in Nunavut waters:

Dr. David St. Aubin from the Mystic Aquarium in Connecticut, and formerly from the University of Guelph in Ontario, has observed that beluga whales often have marks on their outer skin that cannot readily be attributed to source. Many belugas in eastern Hudson Bay have a very distinctive type of sunken circular skin lesions that might (or might not) be attributable to a virus. He (St. Aubin) will be trying to determine the origin of these marks on beluga whales in Nunavik this summer. Pending funding assistance, he proposes to extend the range of the study into the Nunavut Territory as well as into the western Arctic. This would involve recruiting the services of HTOs to collect and submit samples.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 113**) not to approve NWMB study funding to Dr. David St. Aubin to document skin condition of beluga whales in Nunavut waters, but to invite the proponent to undertake consultations with Nunavut communities to determine if this is a matter of local or regional interest or concern.

In concluding this agenda item Michelle Wheatley advised that the Board had approved Wildlife Study funding for 2000/01 in the total amount of \$216,450. Based on past experience, not all of the proponents will meet their funding conditions so that the actual funding requirement will almost certainly be less. However the Board has budgeted only \$120,000 for this purpose. Michelle suggested that the Board might want to consider moving the Davis Strait turbot survey project from the Wildlife Studies Fund to the Nunavut Wildlife Research Trust in order to alleviate this funding squeeze. The Board agreed to take this suggestion under advisement.

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, moved the meeting back to its ordinary agenda.

3. Minutes: Review and Approval

3.A Regular Meeting 24, Sanikiluaq

The Minutes for Regular Meeting No. 24, held at Sanikiluaq on 23 - 25 November 1999, were adopted as presented. **(Resolution 2000- 114)**

3.B Conference Calls 46 and 47

The Minutes for Conference Call No. 46 conducted on 17 January 2000, and for Conference Call No. 47 conducted on 28 February 2000 were adopted as presented. **(Resolution 2000- 115)**

4. Financial and Administrative Business

4.A NWMB Workplan 2000-2003

Ben Kovic reminded the Members that a major item of business for this Meeting was to finalize the NWMB Workplan for the remainder of the first contract period, and more specifically for the three years 01 April 2000 through 31 March 2003. This Workplan is meant to satisfy the request from the Implementation Panel for a planning and budgetary submission from the NWMB by the end of March, as well as providing a budget plan for submission to DIAND for 2000/01. Ben noted that the Board provided guidance for the development of the Workplan during its Strategic Planning Workshop last November. Based on the deliberations of the Workshop, Michael d'Eça and Gordon Tomlinson have drafted the documents that have been tabled for the Board's consideration at this meeting.

Michael led the Board through a review of the material that he had prepared for this exercise. Gordon Tomlinson led a similar review of the administrative and budgetary material. Upon completion of these reviews, Michael asked for reaction and suggestions from the Members.

Some Members were of the opinion that the Workplan should contain more detail about the NWMB's achievements since its inception. A compromise solution was chosen: to elaborate on one or two "sample" items, to be clearly identified as such. Kevin McCormick suggested that it would be appropriate to incorporate more explicit reference to the workload implications for the NWMB that could be expected to stem from initiatives that were going to originate externally. He predicted that the new legislation being developed for species-at-risk will create significant immediate workload pertaining to species designations. Kevin also predicted that the Board can soon expect to have for consideration and approval as many as ten management plans for new Wildlife Management Areas. Harry Flaherty suggested that one or more of the NWMB annual reports be attached to the documents.

The Board decided **(Resolution 2000- 116)** to approve the NWMB Workplan documents as outlined, but instructed the drafters to take account of the Board's observations when finalizing the material for presentation to NIP and DIAND.

4.B Financial Variance Report to 29 February 2000

Gordon Tomlinson led the Board through the interim financial variance report as at the end of February. With only one month of the fiscal year still remaining, a year-end under-expenditure of \$182,000 is projected.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 117**) to accept the interim financial variance report as presented.

4.C New Funding Arrangement with DIAND

Michael d'Eça observed that this file has been active since 1997. He referred the Board to his briefing note of March 3, which documents the developments that have taken place since November. This has been a period of intense negotiations. The effort has been on behalf of all the IPGs under the NLCA, and the result is not particular to the NWMB. Michael outlined the key items of those negotiations.

The matter is now very close to being settled. Michael referred to the latest version of the template DIAND/IPG Funding Agreement attached to the briefing note. In summary:

- The funding instrument will no longer be a *contribution agreement* per se. As a result, implementation will not be subject to Treasury Board's particular requirements for contribution agreements.
- Funding for transfer will no longer be a *contribution*, but rather a *flexible transfer payment*. As a result, the IPGs will be able to retain unexpended year-end balances provided that they have met their obligations under the funding agreement.
- Except in very unusual circumstances, the Minister will no longer be able to permanently withhold IPG funds or unilaterally cancel the agreement.

These are very significant improvements. They were achieved by taking on some new reporting requirements. Although onerous, these requirements are not beyond what a responsible agency should be ready and able to provide. In summary:

- IPGs will need to submit detailed proposed budgets and work plans prior to the start of each fiscal year.
- IPGs will need to submit detailed interim and annual activity reports.
- If the Minister has reason to believe that terms and conditions are not being met, or that there are serious financial problems, he can require IPGs to develop and submit remedial management plans.

Ben Kovic thanked Michael for his work on this matter. Board Members were unanimous in declaring it to be a job well done. They stated the expectation that this new funding agreement will inevitably be adopted by land claims organizations across the country.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 118**) to approve the template for a new Funding Agreement with DIAND as presented and as pertinent to the NWMB, subject to the resolution of final details by NWMB Legal Counsel and DIAND officials, this for implementation in respect to 2000/01.

5. Chairperson, Staff and Members' Reports

5.A Chairperson's Report

Ben Kovic referred the Members to the briefing binder for lists of trips and meetings that he completed (since the last Meeting) and planned (through to May) on behalf of the Board. A highlight for the period was a recent trip to Portland to meet with the National Animal Alliance and other groups working to challenge the US Marine Mammal Protection Act. The immediate aim is to develop momentum for addressing Senate hearings in May. In speaking to the gathering Ben stressed the need to "speak from the heart" on what is a highly emotional issue.

5.B Executive Director's Report

Jim Noble referred the Members to the summary of his recently completed and future planned activities contained in the briefing material. A highlight for the recent period has been working with the Nunavut Fisheries Working Group. Jim reported that he has been convening regular staff meetings, has wound down the Nunavut Wildlife Management Advisory Board, and met (along with the other IPGs) with the Nunavut Implementation Panel. Closing out the accounts of the NWMAB yielded about \$20,000 for credit to the NWMB.

5.C Director of Wildlife Management Report

Michelle Wheatley referred the Members to her activity report in the briefing binder. She pointed out that in response to a suggestion from the last meeting she had highlighted (in bold) those items that were also on the current agenda. This should save time by deferring discussion on those items that are to be treated in due course. As is routinely the case, Michelle reported a very busy schedule, dominated in this period by the need to evaluate progress reports and funding proposals in respect to NWRT and NWMB study funding.

5.D Director of Finance and Administration Report

Gordon Tomlinson referred the Members to his activity report in the briefing binder. Considerable attention was devoted in the period to preparing the budget for 2000/01 and assisting with the preparation of a 3-year workplan for the NIP.

5.E Legal Advisor's Report

Michael d'Eça referred the Members to his activity report for the period November 9 to March 2. Michael noted that considerable effort was devoted in this period to the development of comprehensive briefing notes and papers including with respect to:

- The draft MOU on Western Hudson Bay Polar Bear Management;
- NWMB obligations under the NLCA and Implementation Contract;
- A possible enhanced role for the NWMB under a new *Wildlife Act*;
- Developing a new funding instrument for IPGs under the NLCA;
- Recommendations concerning Government's proposals for a *Species at Risk* Bill;
- Powers, duties and functions of HTOs; and
- Guidelines proposed by the NIP with respect to its responsibilities regarding the financing of IPGs.

Other major workload items in this period included preparation for and facilitation of the NWMB Strategic Planning Workshop in November, and drafting of an NWMB workplan for the period April 2000 through March 2003.

5.F Fisheries Advisor's Report

Michelle Wheatley referred the Members to Ray Andrews' activity report for the period from mid November through February. Ray reported that this was one of his busiest periods with the Board since the beginning of his association. Also during this period he began a formal advisory association with DSD with respect to its overlapping interest (with the NWMB) in commercial fishery development. The biggest single source of increased activity stemmed from Ray's appointment to the Fisheries Resource Conservation Council as an *ex-officio* member representing the Nunavut Government. Other activities during the period pertained to NAFO, the Nunavut Fisheries Working Group, Canada-Greenland Bilaterals, and the FPAFC.

5.G Members' Reports and Concerns

Makabe Nartok tabled a letter written by David Igutsaq of Taloyoak requesting an easing of restrictions on muskox harvesting in that area since muskox are observed to be increasing and posing a competitive threat to the preferred caribou species.

6. Completion of Assignments and Resolutions from Last Meeting

Jim Noble referred the Members to the Task List, with status notations, arising from the previous NWMB meeting. Jim pointed out that Gordon Koshinsky had adjusted the format of the Task List from previous versions, breaking it into six categories:

- A. Tasks (recently identified) of an urgent but routine nature
- B. Tasks (recently identified) of an urgent but non-routine nature
- C. Tasks (recently identified) of a less urgent nature
- D. Tasks outstanding from the NWMB meeting prior to the last one
- E. Tasks outstanding from earlier NWMB meetings
- F. Tasks under the purview of other agencies

Jim invited comments on this revised Task List format. Michelle Wheatley acknowledged that there was merit in categorizing the tasks according to some

measure of priorities. She observed however that any system of categories that is devised will invariably be subjective. She also cautioned against interpreting any such task list as an indicator of workloads, since there are a great number of day-to-day tasks that do not derive specifically from Board meetings. Michelle also offered a number of more detailed suggestions if something like the revised Task List format is to be continued:

- Try to develop rigorous definitions for the different categories (e.g. does “Outstanding” mean “Ongoing”, or does it mean “Not yet started”?)
- Highlight one or a few key words for each task in bold.
- Devise a way to indicate if a matter remains unresolved (i.e. if it requires follow-up) even if the specific task that is identified has been completed.

Jim noted that the vast majority of the identified tasks arising from the last meeting were once again completed or are well underway. A few items generated some discussion, namely:

Item A.05: Advise four Nunavut proponents of NWMB decision to allow them to access NSA waters to fish shrimp under the SFA2 exploratory allocation. Michelle Wheatley reported that the NWMB decision and the ensuing consultations with Pangnirtung Fisheries Ltd. were not completed in time to permit this fishery to proceed.

Item A09: Advise proponents of the NWMB’s endorsement of the proposal to establish a Nunavut Environmental Contaminants Committee. Michelle Wheatley advised that the NWMB had in fact requested observer status, in accordance with a Resolution of the Board.

Item B.05: Explore with the Minister’s office the receptivity of DFO to negotiating rather than litigating more favourable consideration for Nunavut interests in the Davis Strait fishery. Michelle Wheatley noted that this matter was discussed at length by the NFWG. Michael d’Eça stated that he has learned from Nancy Karetak-Lindell’s office that the DFO Minister has a new chief of staff who wants to have an early meeting with Nunavut fishery interests, including the NWMB. This might be a good preliminary to a meeting with the Minister about Davis Strait fishery allocations. The NTI appeal litigation is proceeding, and the parties are waiting to learn the date of the hearing. If a solution were to be negotiated, it would need to be done before the appeal is heard.

Item B.07: Communicate to DFO the position of the NWMB with respect to identifying “edible portions” concerning marine mammals. Michelle Wheatley stated that she did not know what the NWMB position was. Gordon Koshinsky explained that the meaning of this entry was simply to communicate to DFO that the NWMB did not have and was unlikely to develop any definitive position on this subject, except that the NWMB considered that it was the responsibility of DFO to develop such a position after consulting widely on the matter.

Item B.13: Draft an advisory to the Co-Management Ministers, communicating the NWMB protocols for making decisions in public forum cf. *in camera*. Michael d'Eça noted that this communication was made indirectly, via the NWMB submission to the Independent Five-Year Review. There has been no response.

Item C.06: Assemble comparative Policy and Procedures documentation used by other agencies of comparable size to the NWMB. Gordon Koshinsky advised that David Alagalak had provided material with respect to the Hamlet of Arviat.

Item C.12: Prepare an outline of the responsibilities of the NWMB Fisheries Advisor. It was decided that this item should be deleted, since the contract already provides such an overview.

Item D.02: Develop an options paper for implementing reciprocal subsistence harvesting arrangements between Nunavut and Nunavik. Michael d'Eça noted that a meeting of the parties has been scheduled.

Item D.05: Draft a protocol, for the consideration and guidance of government agencies, for the development of legislative and regulatory revisions pertinent to wildlife management in the NSA in a manner consistent with the NLCA. Michael d'Eça advised that this is unlikely to get done in the abstract, but that it is gradually evolving through precedent.

Item D.10: Prepare a briefing note with respect to the power and capacity of government agencies to implement NWMB decisions including any conditions that may be associated with those decisions. Michael d'Eça suggested that unless the Board specifically promoted this item, it was unlikely to get done.

Item D.14: Maintain a watching brief on efforts by DSD et al. to finalize the Thelon Wildlife Sanctuary Management Plan. Michelle Wheatley advised that a meeting of the parties is scheduled for Rankin Inlet on May 2 to complete this matter.

Item E.01: Investigate legal and related considerations concerning wildlife harvesting in National Parks and other protected areas. Michael d'Eça advised that dedicated work on this task is in abeyance, partly because the NWMB role and jurisdiction is now so well recognized that it does not seem to warrant extra documentation.

Item E.05: Organize a workshop to define roles and set a common course of action for participating agencies and other interested parties in the management and development of the offshore fisheries. Michelle Wheatley observed that the need for such a workshop has been effectively overtaken by the establishment and deliberations of the Nunavut Fisheries Working Group.

Item F.02: (NTI to) Lead the drafting of a framework for action to address shortcomings in the accountability and administrative competence of the RWOs and HTOs. Bert Dean reported that QWB, on its own initiative, obtained funding from DIAND for a regional workshop on this subject scheduled for this week. The other two regions are likely to host workshops in April.

Ben Kovic stressed that any item in the Task Lists that has not been designated as “Completed” should be considered as the subject for serious continuing attention unless there has been a definite indication to the contrary, even if the item was not specifically discussed or re-iterated at this time.

7. Environment Canada (CWS): Issues and Decisions

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

Kevin McCormick reported that in December the DFO Minister released a plain-language update on the main elements and approaches embodied in this new legislation. Since then, the Department has had concerted discussions about the draft legislation with the provinces and with aboriginal groups. One of the main criticisms of the earlier version of this legislation were the perceived shortcomings in providing for the protection of habitat, especially on private land. The new version attempts to address this gap by including provision for stewardship activities, with substantial funding. There will also be provision for more vigorous action, but only as a last resort, and even then only with compensation. Expectations are that the new legislation will be tabled at the end of March.

7.B Arctic Goose Joint Venture (AGJV): Update

Kevin McCormick reminded the Board that the AGJV is a science-based undertaking that provides scientific advice to wildlife management agencies; it is not a policy-setting or regulatory agency. The impetus for the AGJV derives from the burgeoning population of mid-continent lesser snow geese and, to a lesser extent, of greater snow geese. Three ad hoc Working Groups have been established under the Joint Venture, to explore the technical feasibility of alternate management options which it is hoped will assist the management agencies to formulate sound decisions. The “Direct Control” Working Group has been the most energetic of the three, and its efforts would ordinarily lead quite naturally to an exploration of the option of culling. The AGJV, and certainly also the CWS, are both strongly committed to current management strategies, which do not include the cull option. There is considerable fear that even exploring this option could have negative repercussions. Input from the NWMB would be welcome.

7.C Cape Dorset Bird Sanctuary De-listing

Kevin McCormick reminded the Board that in August of 1995 the NWMB, on the recommendation of CWS, made the decision to de-list the Cape Dorset Bird Sanctuary. This de-listing has finally been put into effect.

7.D Spring 2000 Community Snow Goose Harvest: Cape Dorset

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Board that in 1998 the Aiviq HTO and the community of Cape Dorset conducted a community goose harvest to provide meat and down for the community and at the same time to contribute to active management of the over-abundant goose population. The community is proposing a similar hunt this year, and is requesting NWMB approval.

Kevin McCormick advised that CWS has taken a “quietly positive” attitude to “facilitated community domestic hunts” of this nature at this time. Other communities besides Cape Dorset have expressed interest in conducting such hunts this year, and in all likelihood a package of proposals will emerge for the Board to consider. David Alagalak stated that the HTOs are waiting to hear official encouragement about spring goose hunting. The perception that it is illegal or at least very actively discouraged has been deeply ingrained over many decades. People “know” that it is now “legal”, but are nonetheless reluctant to proceed.

Michael d'Eça referred to the NWMB jurisdiction under both the NLCA and the revised Migratory Birds Convention. He suggested that an item such as the Cape Dorset request might now entail an NWMB quota decision as per NLCA 5.3 and 5.6. Michael urged CWS to issue a formal confirmation (or not) of this interpretation. Kevin McCormick stated that the Department has been taking a low-key approach to the whole matter, pending the actual amendment of the *Migratory Birds Convention Act*. Michael suggested that just the amended Convention, in conjunction with the NLCA, provides adequate basis for this kind of action. However he noted that certain details of the Convention and of the Agreement do not appear to be in harmony. For instance, the NLCA provides for Inuit to dispose of their lawful harvests as they will, while the Convention makes no provision for harvested meat to be sold except (perhaps) between Inuit communities.

The Board decided to defer decision on the Cape Dorset request pending receipt of expressions of interest from other communities. In the meantime, staff should seek clarification from CWS on the jurisdictional and legal interpretations of proceeding under the revised Convention.

In response to David's observation about reluctance to hunt, Kevin McCormick acknowledged that CWS has done nothing to advertise that Inuit can now hunt geese in spring without fear of prosecution. This is in keeping with the agency's low-key approach to this matter at the present time. Kevin also noted in passing that the sport hunt for snow geese in Quebec last spring was quite popular and successful, with about 12,000 birds taken. The northern Manitoba spring hunt was less popular/successful, with only a few hundred birds taken.

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

8.A Legislative Changes: Update

Winston Fillatre reported that the Committee which the Department established to work on its legislative revisions had its first meeting on February 15 in Iqaluit. The Committee has representation from DFO Central and Arctic Region (Nunavut Territory), DFO Laurentian Region, NTI, DSD and NWMB. The Committee did a detailed review of a discussion paper that was tabled by DFO. The Department has requested written comments on the paper, with a view to meeting again in early May. DFO has also kept Makivik officials informed of proceedings. Only the NWMB (to date) has formally endorsed the Committee.

Moses Koonoo asked if there was Inuit representation on the Committee. Winston replied that there was not as such, except insofar as some of the participating agencies are specifically mandated to represent the Inuit perspective. Agencies of course are free to send whomever they wish to Committee meetings. Winston stressed that the work right now is in the very preliminary stage of establishing action plans and schedules. Extensive consultations at the community level are envisaged, but this will be a later phase.

Michael d'Eça noted that the DFO discussion paper referred to by Winston is in fact a draft set of new fishery regulations for Nunavut. Michael explained that the empowering statute for these regulations is the *Fisheries Act*, and more particularly the *Fisheries Act* as modified by the NLCA. Michael considered it impractical, or at least not optimal, to address the regulations without paying attention to the enabling legislation, especially when that legislation (the *Fisheries Act*) sometimes provides directions that conflict with the NLCA. Michael observed that for certain claim-related matters the draft regulations (the "discussion paper") simply refer the reader back to the land claim for the necessary details. Michael identified three problems with this approach:

- An Inuit reader would be expected to do legal research and interpretation in order to become aware of his/her rights.
- The NLCA does not necessarily contain all the particulars.
- Confusion is invited because the *Fisheries Act* and the NLCA do not always complement one another.

Michael identified numerous other deficiencies with the material as presented, and referred to his briefing note for details. He went on to suggest a completely different approach for pursuing this exercise, and laid out a series of eight sequential steps. The result should/would be a set of regulations that complemented and particularized the more general directions, and that clarified any conflicting directions, set out in the *Fisheries Act* and in the NLCA. This approach would require that the parties begin by identifying the issues and challenges that are to be met, and agreeing on a plan and approach for meeting them.

The Members decided to adopt the approach as outlined by its Legal Advisor as the Board's stance on this matter. Burt Hunt, on behalf of DFO, stated that if this is the Board's response, it will certainly be considered. Burt noted that it is always a challenge to find a way to start this type of exercise. A common approach is for somebody to draft something for the other participants to consider. The discussion paper was drafted by DFO as a way of trying to get the process started.

8.B Narwhal Working Group: Update

Michelle Wheatley advised that the Narwhal Working Group met in Iqaluit just before Christmas. In addition to the five members of the Working Group, other participants at the meeting included:

- For the NWMB: Ben Kovic, Harry Flaherty Flaherty and Rebecca Mike;
- For DFO: Pierre Richard and Ipelee Itorcheak;
- For NTI: Glenn Williams; and
- From each of the four communities that were the initial participants in the new narwhal management system: one representative.

The perceptions of those present regarding the operation of the new system in 1999 were generally favourable. The Group recognized that some of the harvests were higher than what might have been expected, but attributed this primarily to unusual environmental conditions. It was recognized that the magnitude of harvest that took place at Repulse Bay would not be sustainable on a long-term basis, and the Repulse Bay HTO has already taken steps on its own to ensure that such a high kill could not be repeated. The Group stressed the value of the new information being obtained and the heightened sense of management responsibility emerging in the communities. The Group developed a set of recommendations for the attention of the NWMB that pertained to addressing research needs, making by-law changes, encouraging co-management with Greenland, promoting community participation, expanding the new management system, and facilitating involvement of the RWOs.

Michelle reminded the Members that the NWMB made it a condition of approving the new narwhal management system last year that the participating communities would have to have their enabling by-laws and dedicated hunting rules in place prior to the start of the narwhal hunting season in 2000. NWMB and NTI staff have been working with the communities to assist this process. For administrative clarity the NWMB might want re-affirm this condition and establish an actual cut-off date for compliance. A firm deadline should also be established for receipt by the NWMB for participation by any additional communities in 2000.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 119**) to accept the recommendations developed by the Narwhal Working Group at its meeting in December 1999 with respect to addressing research needs, making by-law changes, encouraging co-management with Greenland, promoting community participation, controlling expansion of the new management system, and facilitating involvement of the RWOs. The Board also adopted the procedures recommended by the Director of

Wildlife Management for implementing the recommendations of the Working Group. The Board reiterated that communities must have their hunting rules and enabling bylaws in place prior to the start of the 2000 hunting season, or face reverting to their previous narwhal quotas.

8.C 2000 Bowhead Hunt

Michelle Wheatley led a detailed review of her briefing note. She reminded the Board of the letter that was sent to the RWOs requesting expressions of interest to conduct a bowhead hunt from the Foxe Basin / Northern Hudson Bay population. The routing of the request was predicated on the assumption that the NWMB would be relying on the RWO(s) to determine the community allocation for any TAH that the NWMB might set, as well as to oversee preparation of the Hunt Plan.

Michelle noted that only one expression of interest has been received in response to the invitation, this from Louie Bruce on behalf of the Coral Harbour Bowhead Hunt Planning Committee. There is no indication of any participation by the RWO in the preparation of this response. The information provided by Mr. Bruce would go a long way towards meeting the requirements of a Hunt Plan, but a number of deficiencies and concerns would still need to be addressed. Many of these stem from the marked departure from the RWO-based planning model that was the basis of the most recent bowhead hunt (which was also very successful).

David Alagalak reported that Coral Harbour has experienced difficulty obtaining the information they need to help them develop their Hunt Plan. The QWB, which oversaw planning for the successful 1998 hunt, has been particularly unresponsive.

The Board deferred more detailed discussion of this matter to an *in-camera* session scheduled for later in the meeting.

8.D DFO Science: Information

Mike Papst explained that he was here to help the Board “put a face” on the DFO Regional Science Program. There is a staff complement of 28 people in Winnipeg doing Arctic fish and marine mammal stock assessment work. On an annual basis the Program has about \$300,000 of A-Base funds, receives about \$600,000 from sources such as the Nunavut Implementation Fund and the Northern Contaminants Program, and obtains about \$600,000 from the various co-management boards such as the NWMB. Besides assessing stocks per se, considerable effort is also devoted to getting information to the boards and to the communities. Emerging fisheries are an evolving priority. Another reality is the increasing interest in the Arctic worldwide, and certainly in the scientific community.

Mike stressed the need to constantly be asking if the available information is adequate to accomplish its necessary purpose. While it is unacceptable not to have

enough information, it is also unnecessary to have too much. It is imperative to combine traditional knowledge with advice from scientists.

Thursday, 16 March 2000

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, re-convened the Meeting at 08:45 a.m.

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

9.A Bluenose Caribou Management Plan: Update

Ben Kovic introduced John Nagy, Supervisor of Wildlife Management for the Inuvik Region of DRWED. Ben noted that Mr. Nagy was here to further enlighten the Board on efforts to develop a management plan or plans for what has traditionally been known as the Bluenose Caribou Herd. Ben reminded the Members that the Board had briefly discussed this topic at the last Meeting, at which time the draft Management Plan was informally tabled.

Mr. Nagy stated that work on a bluenose caribou management plan started soon after the signing of the Gwich'in LCA in 1994. As the NWMB has been made aware, the original work proceeded on the assumption that there was just one herd. Information that came to light during the planning process indicated that there are in fact three distinct herds referable to three separate calving grounds: the Bluenose East, Bluenose West and Cape Bathurst herds.

The management plan in its present draft form is a road map that tries to set out what needs to be done, when and by whom, in order to manage the herds and to address community concerns. The plan was prepared by using available information, while at the same time doing population estimates, determining productivity and recruitment, assembling data on movements and distribution, and recording harvests. Mr. Nagy outlined in some detail the steps in the process that led to the preparation of the current draft document. Considerable effort was made to consult with the communities and to document and use traditional and local knowledge along with the technical information. The first draft of the management plan was reviewed at a major workshop in November 1996. In the course of the next year and a half the draft plan was revised based on the inputs received. Although information is still being gathered and incorporated, preliminary circulation of the new draft management plan started last September. Comments are invited, including from the NWMB, along with advice on how to proceed. One basic question is whether it would be worthwhile to split the exercise into three distinct components based on the new understanding of the population structure. A complication for Nunavut is that no good population estimate exists for the Bluenose East herd.

Stephen Atkinson stated that DSD is looking for a statement from NWMB to the effect that it accepts the interpretation that Bluenose East caribou constitute a

separate herd. Following such recognition, DSD is prepared to commence a more active role in planning and co-management for this particular herd.

David Alagalak considered it to be obvious that there are three different herds, of which the Bluenose East is one. As to the implications of this, David suggested that some time be taken to consider all the available information, with staff helping the Board to come to grips with it before the NWMB makes any more pronouncements.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 120**) to acknowledge that, as a guiding principle for completion of management planning, the weight of evidence indicates that what has historically been regarded and designated as the Bluenose Caribou Herd is in fact comprised of three distinct caribou breeding populations.

Kevin McCormick noted that reference was made in the course of the discussion to a reluctance on the part of the Dogrib Tribal Council to incorporate a harvest study into their pending land claim settlement. Kevin suggested that it would be prudent to somehow advise the Council that it was very much in their own best interests to make provision for such a study.

9.B Federal Policy for Management of Caribou Calving Areas

Ben Kovic introduced Sarah Kalff, Environmental Policy Advisor for DIAND's Northern Affairs Program in Ottawa. Ms. Kalff stated that she was here to talk about DIAND's commitment to develop a federal policy on managing human activities in caribou calving and post-calving areas. She was seeking advice and support for this initiative.

Ms. Kalff noted that caribou are a key species in the Arctic ecosystem and are of fundamental significance to Inuit. The subject of the present exercise has been identified as a priority commitment for DIAND's Sustainable Development Strategy. The Department considers it important to have a policy statement that helps land managers do their work and that provides greater certainty to industry. Managing vulnerable caribou habitats is a priority for northerners. The matter is also important in the context of relations with the USA. Canada has argued that the USA should protect the calving grounds of the Porcupine Caribou Herd from oil and gas development, and Canadians need to show that we effectively manage our own caribou calving grounds. The timing is opportune for this initiative because there is little pressure for development at the moment with respect to these vital areas.

Ms. Kalff reviewed the history of this initiative, on which work began in February 1998. She noted that the policy would apply to federal lands in the NWT and in Nunavut, but not in the Yukon where caribou calving and post-calving areas are already incorporated in national parks. The policy would need to be broad enough to allow for differences in land claims and in calving grounds. It would have to balance the long-term climate for development and the long-term health of caribou.

Ms. Kalff outlined a sequence of probable next steps in the development of this policy. This would start with the use of a questionnaire and/or one-on-one interviews to gather the perspectives, ideas and concerns of land managers and co-management bodies including IPGs, Territorial Governments, and DIAND.

In concluding her presentation Ms. Kalff expressed the hope that the NWMB will support the initiative, since the NWMB has such a vital role in caribou management in a major portion of the area of concern.

David Alagalak asked why the HTOs, RWOs and DIOs have not been built into the process at the outset. Moses Koonoo stressed the need to incorporate Inuit traditional knowledge. Ms. Kalff acknowledged that the Inuit organizations and their individual members had vital contributions to make. Up to now the Department has relied on NTI, perhaps too much so, to bring forward this perspective.

Gordon Koshinsky suggested that a step might be missing in the workplan as it was outlined. It might be useful to provide for agreement on principles before actually proceeding to develop the policy statement. Kevin McCormick stressed the need to be absolutely clear about the reasons for doing this exercise. Matters of rationale, scope and audience are connected and re-iterative, and these considerations in turn should dictate much of the nature of the presentation.

David Alagalak urged that detailed consideration be given to how such a policy is going to be implemented and enforced before it is developed. Michael d'Eça noted that what is called a policy statement may in fact be a management plan. Pursuant to the NLCA, the NWMB has jurisdiction to decide if/how a plan for the management, protection or recovery of a particular species or its habitat applies in the NSA. In such cases the role of the NWMB is not advisory. Rather, the NWMB provides a decision to the Minister.

Ms. Kalff elaborated that this initiative is not an attempt to protect caribou calving and post-calving grounds in the same way that would be achieved by means of establishing protected areas. Such a level of detail would be far beyond what is envisaged for this exercise. It is more an attempt to develop a conceptual framework to guide protective action. It seeks above all to be innovative.

The Board decided to give support-in-principle to this initiative, and to communicate this decision to DIAND.

9.C Polar Bear Population Inventory M'Clintock Channel: Preliminary Results

Stephen Atkinson reminded the Board that in 1997 the Territorial Government initiated a study of the Gulf of Boothia and M'Clintock Channel populations of polar bears. The study was designed to begin by evaluating and if necessary refining all

the population boundaries, and after that to estimate the size and status of these populations. The latter aspect involves four years of mark-and-recapture studies, of which two years have now been completed.

Stephen noted that any interpretation of the technical results at this half-way point in the study can only be very preliminary. However he suggested that some of those preliminary indications are sufficiently unsettling to warrant early consideration by all parties concerned. Those indications are that the M'Clintock Channel polar bear population is much reduced from the population estimate (dating from 1973) on which the present quota is based. There are also indications that the fecundity of the M'Clintock Channel population is lower than that of the adjoining Gulf of Boothia population. This may relate to ice conditions and availability of seals. Or it may be indicative of population depletion to the point that reproduction has been affected. Females harvested from the M'Clintock Channel population are older on average than females harvested from the Gulf of Boothia population. The reverse is true for harvested males, which are younger in M'Clintock Channel. There has also been a tendency for some of the M'Clintock Channel quota to remain unharvested in recent years. All these indicators are consistent with a much higher rate of male-biased harvesting, relative to the size of the population, for the M'Clintock Channel population than for Gulf of Boothia. The concern is that the quota that is currently in place for the M'Clintock Channel population may not be sustainable. A complicating consideration is that this is one of the few polar bear populations in Nunavut that is approved under the US Marine Mammal Protection Act for importation of hides into the USA. This approval is contingent upon the population being managed in a sustainable manner.

Stephen stressed that DSD is not making any specific recommendations at this time. However it seems prudent to start preparing for changes that may need to be made relatively soon. The preliminary results were discussed with the affected communities in December, with mixed reaction.

Kevin McCormick asked if the original (1973) population estimate for the M'Clintock Channel population was based on a comparable methodology. Stephen replied that the methodology was basically the same, but that many logistical problems were encountered at the time of the first estimate. As a result and on the basis of community consultations, the raw estimate was considerably adjusted (upward), which may have helped set the stage for the possible problem we are seeing today.

Gordon Koshinsky expressed appreciation for a good presentation, albeit the news seems to be quite bad. All concerned will have to be ready to take action. Gordon stated his impression that the area around Taloyoak was the scene of quite a few unpleasant encounters between humans and polar bears in recent years, and he wondered if there could be a connection between that and the state of the polar bear population. Stephen confirmed the same impression about the frequency of encounters, but cautioned that not all of the encounters by Taloyoak residents could automatically be attributed to M'Clintock Channel polar bears.

David Alagalak acknowledged that this may be a very serious matter. He was not prepared to concede that the entire solution lay with the communities situated in this geographic area. He suggested that Resolute Bay and Arctic Bay might need to be brought into any equation for corrective action.

9.D Review of Polar Bear MOUs: Consultation Plan

Stephen Atkinson reminded the Board that polar bear management in Nunavut is in part described and governed by MOUs among the HTOs, RWOs and the Territorial Minister responsible for wildlife. A separate MOU is in place for each polar bear population. The current MOUs came into effect during the 1996/97 harvest season.

In October 1999 the Minister of DSD expressed his support for the MOUs as a tool for polar bear management. At the same time he made a public commitment to completely review the versions now in effect.

Stephen listed five specific objectives that these reviews would be designed to accomplish. It is envisaged that the process would proceed in two parts:

- A preparatory phase, in which written comments and concerns would be obtained and summarized, and all outstanding studies would be completed and distributed.
- A consultation phase, based on the results of the preparatory work.

Stephen explained that the preparatory phase would be undertaken and funded as part of the Department's ongoing polar bear program, and would commence as soon as the Minister approved the overall process. The consultation phase would probably require incremental effort and funding, depending on the nature of the consultation plan that was actually adopted, hopefully later this summer. In addition to the HTOs and RWOs, DSD will be seeking the participation of NWMB and NTI throughout the review process.

In response to questions from Members, Stephen responded as follows:

- The issue of compensation for defence kills will be incorporated in the process.
- The preparatory phase would include distributing the results of the newest studies on handling effects, bear movements, population estimates, etc.
- During community consultations, a portable computer might be used to demonstrate the impacts of different hunting regimes and harvest levels, including with reference to the flexible quota system.
- Bear population surveys are timed to avoid the denning season.

Moses Koonoo suggested that Arctic Bay has the greatest number of polar bears but the smallest quota for polar bears in that area. Harry Flaherty noted that some of the quota allocations among communities that are currently in effect were initially established by the Hudson's Bay Company by reference to the distribution and importance of trading posts. Both Members wondered if allocations would be re-visited as part of the review. Stephen replied that information will certainly be

circulated and input obtained in respect to this matter, but noted that allocation among communities in the final analysis is the purview of the NWMB via the RWOs.

The Board agreed to encourage DSD to proceed with a formal review of the current system of polar bear management, and in particular to work toward the development of a consultation plan along the lines that were discussed.

9.E New Nunavut Wildlife Act: Update on Development

Stephen Atkinson advised that DSD is still waiting for formal Cabinet approval to proceed with consultations identified as integral to this legislative renewal process. He noted that the GNWT is proceeding apace to re-write their *Wildlife Act*.

Michael d'Eça made reference to his draft "NWMB position" with respect to the initiative being proposed by DSD for developing this new legislation. Michael urged that the DSD Minister officially appoint the inter-agency group that has been working on the matter. The possibility of enhancing the role of the NWMB under the new Act needs to be very carefully considered.

Kevin McCormick questioned whether the process as outlined by DSD might be too prescriptive and ultimately too costly. He suggested that the exercise might be streamlined somewhat by focussing particularly on principles.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 121**) to adopt the briefing document prepared by the NWMB Legal Counsel as the NWMB position with respect to the DSD initiative to develop a new *Wildlife Act* for Nunavut, and to transmit this position to DSD.

9.F Dolphin and Union Caribou: Request for Quota Increase

Michelle Wheatley referred to her briefing note on this subject. The request for the quota increase comes via the KHTA and is endorsed by DSD. This particular herd occurs on southern Victoria Island and the adjoining mainland. It is harvested by the communities of Cambridge Bay (autumn), Kingaok and Omingmaktok (winter), Kugluktuk (spring), and Holman (summer). The total annual domestic harvest is about 2,000 animals (8-10% of the estimated population), and is mainly comprised of females. In addition about 35 animals, primarily bulls, are taken annually by sport hunters. COSEWIC has classed the status of the herd as "threatened".

The changes being requested are to increase the non-resident sport-hunting quota from 25 to 35 animals for Cambridge Bay and from 10 to 15 animals for Kugluktuk. A new sport-hunting quota of 15 animals will probably also be instituted for Holman. The harvest rate (as a percentage of the population) is already causing concern, particularly in view of the COSEWIC designation. However the current harvest of bulls is deemed by DSD to be insignificant in the context of the overall removal.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 122**) to approve the request from the Kitikmeot Hunters and Trappers Association for increases in the annual number of sport-hunting tags that may be issued in respect to the Dolphin-Union Caribou Herd as follows:

- from 25 to 35 tags for Cambridge Bay; and
- from 10 to 15 tags for Kugluktuk.

9.G Requests for Muskox Quota Increases: MX09 and MX11 (Kitikmeot)

Michelle Wheatley referred to her briefing material documenting recommendations for muskox quota increases brought forward by DSD on the initiative of the KHTA.

The Taloyoak HTO has requested that the muskox quota for Muskox Management Area MX-09 be doubled to 20 animals per year. Muskox started colonizing the Boothia Peninsula from the north about ten years ago. An aerial survey in 1995 yielded an estimate of 554 +/-205 animals, mainly confined to the north end of the Peninsula. Colonization has continued in the interim, with more and more muskoxen being encountered farther and farther south. The harvest quota for these animals has been 10 per year since 1996, and the herd has grown and significantly expanded its range while subjected to this level of harvest.

The Ekaluktutiak HTO Cambridge Bay has requested that their muskox quota for Muskox Management Area MX-11 be substantially increased. The muskoxen in MX-11 have been rapidly increasing in numbers. The present quota of 1,000 is based on the 1993 population estimate of about 18,700 animals. Subsistence use and sport hunting together account for about 100 animals taken per year, with the remainder going to the commercial harvest. An aerial survey in 1999 indicated that the population had grown to 26,300 animals. The KHTA has recommended that the quota be revised upward to 1,300 animals. The resulting harvest would be about 5% of the population, consistent with conventional muskox management norms.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 123**) to approve the request from the Kitikmeot Hunters and Trappers Association for increases in annual quotas of muskox as follows:

- from 10 to 20 animals for Taloyoak with respect to MX 09; and
- from 1,000 to 1,300 animals for Cambridge Bay with respect to MX 11.

9.H Bathurst Caribou Management Plan: Update

Michelle Wheatley advised that she had attended an introductory meeting organized by the GNWT and GN departments with responsibilities for wildlife to examine how all the legitimate interests might work together to develop a management plan for the Bathurst caribou herd. She referred the Board to the briefing material provided.

Although this herd is distributed primarily to the west of the NSA, the residents of Kugluktuk participate in its harvest. Consequently the management of this herd is of interest and concern to the NWMB and the KHTA, as well as to the Kugluktuk

HTO. Active participation by the NWMB in the planning process was strongly endorsed by attendees at the introductory meeting. It was recognized that the NWMB would have the right and the obligation to approve (or not) any management plan that resulted from this initiative.

A Planning Agreement has been drafted for the consideration of the parties that would be signatory, including the NWMB. It is likely that this Agreement will emerge as an MOU in its final format. The primary objective of the parties would be “To co-operatively prepare a management plan for the Bathurst caribou herd and its habitat so as to ensure the conservation of the herd.” A Planning Committee with representation from all the signatory parties would be established to do the work. DIAND has agreed to provide up to \$20,000 to address the participation costs of each of the named aboriginal organizations, including the KHTA. The Planning Agreement would be for a three-year term.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 124**) that the NWMB should participate as a member of the team or Planning Committee working to develop a management plan for the Bathurst Caribou Herd.

10. NWMB Internal Items: Issues and Decisions

10.A Nunavut Wildlife Harvest Study: Update

Jordan DeGroot reported good progress on several aspects of the Harvest Study since November:

- The database has been brought up to date.
- The technical review has been completed, with most of the recommendations addressed.
- An assistant to the Study Co-ordinator has been hired, on a casual basis for now, into the position of Database Manager as recently advertized.
- Requests for data are ongoing, with 12 received since November.
- An agreement has been developed to govern data-sharing.
- Interim data reports are being developed for the communities, with distribution expected by June.

Jordan reported that hunter participation is over 80%, and a strong team of interviewers is in place. The technical review concluded that the Study is well structured and on-track. Testing of data reliability is an on-going issue.

Moses Koonoo asked if information was being collected on harvests of clams and eggs. Jordan replied that indeed it was. Kevin McCormick asked if the interim community reports will be strictly for data verification or if they will be available for circulation. Jordan replied that these reports will be primarily to verify data and to encourage participation in the Study; however they will also be available to government agencies after the community reviews are done and taken into account.

Harry Flaherty updated the Board on the meeting of the Harvest Study Committee earlier in the week. Harry Flaherty reported that the Committee re-visited its earlier (November) conclusion that there was no urgency about dealing with the question of whether the NWMB should contribute to hiring a consultant to document the pros and cons and examine the feasibility of extending the Harvest Study beyond its present mandate.

10.B Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study: Update

Michelle Wheatley advised that the Study has been completed, and that both the comprehensive report and the summary brochure are now being printed.

The Board engaged in some discussion of “What next?” Keith Hay in his final status report suggested that consideration be given to using the IBKS information and results as input to the production of a comprehensive video on the bowhead whales of Nunavut. Gordon Koshinsky urged that avenues be explored for publishing some or all of the Study in a respected journal.

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

Michelle Wheatley advised that the Working Group plans to meet in Iqaluit in early April. Representatives from Nunavut Tourism and from Nunavut Arctic College will also be invited to the meeting.

10.D Resource Centre Coalition: Update

Michelle Wheatley advised that the members of the Coalition met on February 1 to discuss the future of the Coalition. The members agreed that the Coalition should continue. CWS has asked to join. DSD plans to fill a permanent librarian position in the new fiscal year, but there will still be a need for an individual to circulate through the offices of the other members (DFO, CWS, NRI, and NWMB) to keep their files up-to-date and integrated with the central system. It is envisaged that this would be a casual (probably a trainee) position, supervised by the DSD librarian, and administered through the NWMB. The financial implications for the NWMB would be of the order of \$9,000, perhaps slightly reduced from previous years.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 125**) to maintain the current level of NWMB participation in the Resource Centres Coalition initiative.

10.E NWMB Strategic Plan Implementation: Update

Jim Noble referred the Members to the “Report Card” in the briefing material in respect to the progress of the NWMB in addressing its strategic planning objectives as set out in the NWMB Strategic Plan of May 1996. This “report Card” format was prepared by way of input to the recent Independent Five-Year Review sponsored by the Implementation Panel. There was no new discussion on this document.

10.F Traditional Bear Hunt (Coral Harbour): Update

Jim Noble advised that there was in fact nothing new to report.

10.G *Species-at-Risk Act (SARA): NWMB Participation*

Michael d'Eça referred to his briefing note concerning NWMB participation in the development of this legislation. Michael reminded the Board that this is the second attempt by DOE to introduce endangered species legislation. The first attempt died on the Order Paper in 1997. The new Act is expected to be tabled shortly.

Throughout this process the NWMB has worked consistently to ensure that the eventual legislation recognizes and reflects:

- The key role of traditional knowledge in assessing, classifying and managing species at risk;
- Aboriginal and land claims rights; and
- The jurisdiction of wildlife management boards.

Michael observed that DOE deserves much credit for the innovative steps it has taken to obtain the views of aboriginal organizations and wildlife management boards regarding the content of the new Act. The NWMB has responded to these opportunities by way of verbal and written submissions. Once the Bill is tabled, the focus of attention for any further adjustments will shift to the Standing Committee.

Michael stated that to the best of his knowledge, the present version of the Bill is the most positive general legislative acknowledgement of land claim rights and traditional knowledge yet produced by the federal government. This is not to suggest that the current version is perfect. A large number (in fact most) of the recommendations contained in the NWMB written submission have not (at least not yet) been accepted by the DFO Minister.

Gordon Koshinsky reiterated a concern that he noted having expressed previously. He acknowledged that the NWMB continues to make excellent progress in getting new legislation to recognize and reflect new political and jurisdictional realities. But he was less confident that the NWMB was making its mark in matters that pertained to its own particular mandate. In this case one might ask if what the NWMB is achieving will actually ensure that species-at-risk will be better protected. Michael expressed the hope that these two aspirations are mutually supportive.

Moses Koonoo asked whether the new legislation would make it impossible for Inuit to continue hunting bowhead whales, being that they are classed as endangered. Michael replied that the short answer is "No". Changes to the draft legislation that were inspired at least in part by the submissions of the NWMB have clarified that where a land claim has been settled it is up to the land claim body with jurisdiction (in this case the NWMB) to decide such matters. If a species is in fact listed as endangered (which the NWMB would have the power to approve or not in any new

situation), then there would need to be a recovery plan which would also require the sanction of the NWMB.

The Board reaffirmed the general approach that has been taken in this matter, and instructed its Legal Counsel and staff to continue on the present course.

11. NTI Wildlife Division: Issues and Decisions

11.A Workshop and Symposium: Requests for Funding Assistance

Bert Dean briefed the Board on recent developments regarding overlap issues with Makivik. NTI is organizing a meeting (workshop format) with Makivik officials to discuss the matter of reciprocal harvesting rights and other overlap issues such as polar bear management agreements and beluga harvesting in the context of Sanikiluaq. Johnny Peters and Raymond Ningeocheak will co-chair the workshop, which is scheduled for early April. NTI is requesting funding assistance from NWMB in the amount of \$10,000 to cover the travel costs of RWO chairpersons and executive directors.

Bert Dean reminded the Board that NTI organized a Wildlife Symposium in 1997 that brought together the chairpersons and secretary-managers of all the HTOs, along with the chairpersons and executive directors of the RWOs, in what amounted to a kind of training session. The NWMB was a major participant in this event, both with respect to the agenda and also in providing funds. NTI is making plans to conduct another such Symposium the first week of May, possibly in the Kitikmeot Region. A number of funding sources are being explored, and NTI is requesting a \$50,000 contribution from NWMB. For the previous symposium the HTOs were asked to cover the costs of honouraria for their own chairpersons, which provided significant savings to the organizing agencies.

David Alagalak expressed enthusiasm about such a Symposium, and asked if the NWMB would be able to influence the agenda. Bert replied that the NWMB influenced the previous agenda and would be able to do so again. David suggested that this would also be an opportune time for the NWMB to re-assess its own responsibilities pertaining to these organizations. Gordon Koshinsky advised that the Executive Committee had discussed this funding request at its Conference Call on February 17, and had agreed to recommend that the Board provide funding.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 126**) to provide contributions to NTI in the amounts indicated, for forthcoming initiatives being organized by NTI as follows:

- To support RWO participation in a workshop with Makivik to address reciprocal harvesting rights and other overlap issues pertaining to the management and utilization of wildlife: \$10,000.
- To support RWO/HTO participation in a Nunavut Wildlife Symposium: Up to \$50,000.

11.B Future of the Nunavut Wildlife Harvest Study

Bert Dean reported that NTI has an interest in the ongoing collection of fish and wildlife harvest statistics. NTI cites numerous reasons for continuing the Nunavut Harvest Study beyond its end point as currently scheduled. Bert reminded the Board that the matter was briefly examined by a number of agencies last October. They concluded that there would be merit in retaining a consultant to explore the expectations of the various agencies in maintaining the Harvest Study, and at the same time providing a basis for designing continuation of the Study if there was an adequate expression of interest. The NWMB Harvest Study Committee meanwhile concluded that it would be better to wait until the original term of the Harvest Study was completed so that the results were available to inform the process of deciding whether to continue. NTI is concerned about the Inuvialuit experience in stopping and starting their harvest study program. It is apparent from that experience that the importance of maintaining momentum in such a program cannot be overstated. NTI is proposing that a workshop be convened to further look into this matter.

Gordon Koshinsky elaborated on the perspective of the Harvest Study Committee. Those people most closely connected with the Study are already showing considerable fatigue regarding the project. The Committee concluded that it would be appropriate to wait until more Study results are available before deciding if and how the Study might be continued. However the Committee did not take into account the need for a relatively early decision about continuation for input to the planning/budgeting process for the next contract period. With that in mind the original conclusion of the Committee may need to be re-considered. Michael d'Eça pointed out that in order to meet the current version of the Implementation Panel's guidelines, the NWMB will need to submit its proposals for the next contract period by January 2001.

Kevin McCormick cautioned that good value will not necessarily derive from simply continuing the Study. It is valid to ask how much information is really needed and can effectively be used. The Inuvialuit study was set up to run indefinitely, but encountered significant observer fatigue on the part of field workers. It may be useful to repeat the Nunavut Harvest Study at regular intervals, say every 10 or 15 years, rather than try to run it continuously. However the NLCA does not provide even for that.

Ben Kovic foresaw that continuing the Harvest Study would provide valuable input to the ongoing development and implementation of wildlife management plans. Moses Koonoo stated that he perceived from the beginning that the Study was under-funded and for too short a time frame. David Alagalak suggested that the possibility of extending the Study would be an appropriate topic for discussion at the forthcoming Nunavut Wildlife Symposium.

12. Miscellaneous Requests for NWMB Funding Contributions

12.A Tuktu and Nogak Traditional Ecological Knowledge Project

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Board that this project was supported from the NWMB Study Fund last year. However the funding proposal for the current year does not conform to the NWMB's Study Funding criteria. Hence the proposal has been scheduled for consideration as a miscellaneous NWMB funding request.

The proposal pertains to communicating the results of the project. The proponents propose to:

- prepare and distribute a poster to document Inuit recommendations on managing caribou calving grounds in the Kitikmeot;
- Update their English website into Inuinnaqtun to make it more accessible in the Kitikmeot; and
- Present a paper and a poster at the 12th Annual Inuit Studies Conference.

Michelle noted that this project was and continues to be funded mainly by WKSS. It does seem unusual that the primary funding source for such a project would not cover the costs of preparing and distributing the results. The proposal embodies substantial salary and honourarium costs. These are difficult to justify in a training situation: the context in which the proposal is presented. Michelle recommended that the Board approve funding, but exclusive of salaries and honouraria.

The Board decided **(Resolution 2000- 127)** to approve a contribution of \$5,200 to the Tuktu and Nogak Project for the production of materials to communicate traditional knowledge pertaining to caribou that has been documented by the Project, and up to \$4,000 for the principal researcher to participate in the 12th annual Inuit Studies Conference in Aberdeen, Scotland.

12.B Attagoyuk High School (Pangnirtung) Class Trip to Scotland

Jim Noble referred the Board to the request from Attagoyuk School in Pangnirtung for funding to help defray the costs of a class trip to Peterhead (Scotland) in May. The purpose of the trip would be to re-connect with the origins of many of the whaling traditions that remain so much in evidence in the Cumberland Sound area.

The Board decided **(Resolution 2000- 128)** to approve a contribution of \$1,000 to students from Attagoyuk School in Pangnirtung to support travel to Scotland to conduct research on the history of whaling in Cumberland Sound.

12.C Miscellaneous Requests for NWMB Funding

Jim Noble presented four miscellaneous requests for NWMB funding support:

1. From Dr. Francois Messier of the University of Saskatchewan, for the production of 100 copies of an atlas depicting polar bear movements.
2. From Kamatsiaqtut, the Nunavut Help Line, for a fund-raising dinner.

3. From Teevi MacKay, for training costs pertinent to membership in Teen Missions International.
4. From the Sanikiluaq Senior Men's Hockey Club, for travel to the Hudson Bay Cup tournament in Nunavik.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 129**) not to provide funding support for any of these four requests.

In reference to the funding request from Dr. Messier, Michelle Wheatley alerted the Board to a controversy between the proponent and DSD regarding ownership of, and distribution rights to, the atlas. While DSD officials agree that it will be appropriate and useful to present this information to the communities, they believe that DSD should be sending it out. They contend that the material should be put in context and presented as a component of the broad-based consultations they are planning as part of their forthcoming review of polar bear management in Nunavut.

The Board recognized the value of providing Inuit with convenient access to information about polar bear movements to help them develop their own interpretations about such matters as population boundaries. However the Board concluded that the question of how and by whom this should be done would best be resolved by the proponent and the Department in direct negotiations, without the involvement of the NWMB.

13. Other Presentations

13.A Qikiqtaaluk Corporation: Exploratory Crab Fishery (Proposal)

Ben Kovic introduced Jerry Ell, President of Qikiqtaaluk Corporation, and Dave Dyer, representing Northern Resources Incorporated, along with their associates. Ben explained that these gentlemen were here to make a presentation to the Board with respect to a proposal to conduct an exploratory crab fishery in Davis Strait and other waters adjacent to Nunavut. He referred to the written proposal as tabled.

Mr. Dyer stated that the proposal is to explore the potential for a crab fishery and, if the results are positive, to develop such a fishery. QC has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with Northern Resources Inc. of Newfoundland to form a Joint Venture to pursue this initiative. QC will own 51% of the Joint Venture from the outset, moving to full ownership over time. Mr. Dyer declared that the Joint Venture as constituted has the capability to provide all the necessary technology and infrastructure to harvest and process crabs, to market the products, to provide the necessary initial human resources, and to provide training and human resource development. The aim would be for all jobs connected with this fishery to eventually be filled by Nunavut residents. The Joint Venture is seeking the support of the NWMB and authorization from DFO to proceed with this exploratory fishery. The exploratory results and the data generated would input to preparation by the resource management agencies of a development plan for a long-term sustainable harvest based on sound management principles. The proponents predict that

substantial immediate and long-term economic and social benefits would accrue to Nunavut from the development of a successful crab fishery.

The focus of the venture will be snow crab, offshore in NAFO Divisions 0A and 0B and south into 2G, part way down the Labrador coast. There is not, and never has been, a commercial crab fishery in these locations. The fishery would target on migratory male snow crabs. The traps employed would be such as to allow female crabs to escape, and there would be very little by-catch of other species.

Snow crabs typically concentrate in estuaries; however this is thought to be more of a reflection of preference for muddy or mud-sand bottoms rather than an obligatory dependence on estuaries per se. Indirect indications, including the recent crab-fishing experience in Davis Strait off Greenland, suggest that substrates adjacent to Nunavut would be good crab habitat. The prevalence of ice cover is another key determinant of snow crab abundance. Ice patterns in Davis Strait are similar to those associated with productive snow crab fisheries in Alaska and Russia.

The proposal as written would entail a 5-year experimental licence, starting with 125 fishing days in the summer of 2000. The proponents contemplate producing 15,000 pounds of finished product output per fishing day in this exploratory phase. This estimate is referenced to a raw material conversion rate of 60%, and would imply a harvest of about 1400 MT. At current market prices, the postulated seasonal output would have a projected market value of \$11 million. Indirect or peripheral benefits might be of the order of an additional 10-15%. The exploratory phase of the fishery would produce 70-100 jobs. About one-third of these would be onboard the fishing vessel, with half of these engaged in processing. Up to half of the total employment projection would derive from shore-based processing activities, with the actual number of jobs linked to product mix. The proponents anticipate leasing a 150-foot catcher/processor vessel, with option to purchase. It is most likely that the vessel would be one that is American-owned, and that has been deployed in Alaska.

Demand for snow crab outstrips supply and is increasing, with the principal markets being in Japan and the USA. Snow crab fisheries are declining in Alaska, and are probably on the verge of declining in Newfoundland as well. An offshore snow crab fishery was initiated off Greenland only two years ago and has been very successful; it is expected to expand substantially this year in response to the early fishing results and the strong product demand. The nature of the demand for snow crab is also creating significant interest in substitute crab species, some of which are probably also present in waters adjacent to Nunavut.

The most likely output from the experimental snow crab fishery off Nunavut would be shell-on cooked crab sections. The actual product type and mix will be geared to meet demand. Crabs will be processed onboard the harvest vessel within an hour of landing, supplemented by onshore processing as may be necessary to accommodate the catch and to satisfy requirements for product mix. Any shore-based processing requirements will initially be met in Atlantic Canada. For the

longer term and depending on confirmation of the resource base, a processing plant in Nunavut is a distinct possibility.

Jerry Ell declared that QC interprets this to be a very exciting new opportunity. In addition to the intrinsic benefits that such a venture would be expected to generate for Nunavut, developmental participation by Nunavut interests will set important precedents for future participation in this and other marine fisheries.

Ben Kovic thanked the presenters for a very good and interesting presentation. Members of the Board sought and obtained clarification on a number of technical matters with respect to the proposal. It was pointed out that the recent positive experience by Greenland in Davis Strait might not be indicative of snow crab productivity off Nunavut because the nature of the ocean currents is completely different on the two sides of the Strait. The Board recognized and iterated that by virtue of the offshore nature of the proposed venture, the Board's role in the matter could only be advisory. The Board undertook to devote serious attention to the proposal nonetheless, and committed to providing early advice to DFO after consulting with other fishery interests in Nunavut and obtaining the input of its own Fisheries Advisor.

13.B Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board: Presentation from “Host” RWO

The QWB declined to make a general presentation to the Board at this meeting.

In-Camera Session

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

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

- To go *in-camera* (**Resolution 2000- 130**)
- To close the *in-camera* session (**Resolution 2000- 131**)

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

On the matter of making provision for the harvest for a bowhead whale, the Board decided (**Resolution 2000-132**) to establish a Total Allowable Harvest (TAH) of one bowhead whale from the Foxe Basin – Hudson Bay stock, with the provisos:

- That the harvest take place during open water in 2000 or 2001; and
- That two strikes be permitted for the landing of one bowhead whale.

On the matter of the proposal by Qikiqtaaluk Corporation and associates to conduct an exploratory crab fishery in waters adjacent to Nunavut, the Board decided **(Resolution 2000- 133)** to support the proposal in principle and, taking into account forthcoming reviews of the proposal by the NWMB Fisheries and Legal Advisors and by the Nunavut Fisheries Working Group, to convey the Board's general endorsement of the proposal to the principals and to the appropriate government agencies.

On the matter of Terms of Reference for the NWMB Executive Committee, the Board decided **(Resolution 2000- 134)** to adopt revised Terms of Reference for the Committee as developed and presented by the Committee on its own behalf.

On the matter of insurance for Board Members, the Board decided **(Resolution 2000- 135)** to discontinue its current accidental death insurance policy for Board Members as recommended by the Executive Committee, and contract instead with Carlton Financial Group, in the amount of approximately \$6,800 per year, for a package policy with the following provisions:

- \$500,000 accidental death and dismemberment (for 50 travel days);
- \$250 per week short-term accidental disability;
- \$100,000 permanent total accidental disability;
- Outside of territory/country health coverage beyond existing coverage;
- \$25,000 group life insurance.

On the matter of the system of remuneration for NWMB employees, the Board decided **(Resolution 2000- 136)** to adopt the 18-step pay grid, as recommended by the Executive Committee, effective 01 April 2000.

On the matter of cost-of-living adjustment for NWMB employees, the Board decided **(Resolution 2000- 137)** to adopt the increase in the Canadian Consumer Price Index for 1999 (1.12%) as the rate of increase for staff salaries in respect to the cost-of-living adjustment for 2000/01.

On the matter of the NWMB loan to the Keewatin Wildlife Federation, the Board decided **(Resolution 2000- 138)** to extend the term of the loan from three years to four years, with the last two years of the loan as originally constituted now payable in three equal annual instalments.

On the matter of scheduling NWMB meetings, the Board decided **(Resolution 2000- 139)** to revise the basic schedule for its regular meetings to a June/September/December/March framework.

Friday, 17 March 2000

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, re-convened the meeting at 08:50 a.m.

13 Other Presentations, continued

13.C Jonah Kelly: Nunavut Law Reform Commission

Ben Kovic welcomed Jonah Kelly, and invited him to address the Board.

Mr. Kelly explained that he was one of four Commissioners, appointed through the Office of the Nunavut Premier, to review all legislation that is in place having application to Nunavut. Over 200 Acts or pieces of legislation are in effect that were adopted from the NWT when Nunavut was created. The ultimate aim of this two-year project is to determine if and how any or all of this legislation can be made more culturally relevant to Inuit. The authority of the Commission, of course, extends only to making recommendations for change.

The Commission is mandated to consult as widely as possible in the course of its work. Formal consultations with communities will take place in 2001. In the meantime, the Commissioners are meeting with various organizations as opportunities permit. Since some of the legislation pertains to wildlife and fisheries, it is reasonable and necessary to obtain input from the NWMB. Wildlife is a big concern for Inuit people. Some input with respect to the *Wildlife Act* has already been obtained from the HTOs. It should be noted that besides Nunavut legislation per se, the Commission is also directing attention to some of the pertinent legislation of other jurisdictions, such as DFO.

There are a number of considerations of a general nature that pertain to most or all legislation, and that will have to be dealt with in a framework context. One example is the matter of identifying beneficiaries under the NLCA. Specific matters that require attention with respect to wildlife/fisheries legislation might include incorporating Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit and Traditional Knowledge into research activities and management practices, and taking steps to avoid wastage of meat.

Ben thanked Mr. Kelly for his presentation. He gave a number of specific examples of work that the NWMB does to manage and conserve wildlife and fishery resources, and how legislation comes into play in the process. Ben asked if the Commission was up-to-date on work already underway to develop a completely new *Wildlife Act* for Nunavut, as well as the initiative to develop regulations specific to Nunavut under the federal *Fisheries Act*. Mr. Kelly replied that the Commission was aware of this work, and was under instruction to co-ordinate its efforts with those of other agencies engaged in such initiatives. Gordon Koshinsky suggested that some aspects of the process of developing the new *Wildlife Act* might serve as a model for the work of the Commission. Michael d'Eça suggested that the Commission might want to consider developing a set of principles to guide its

efforts, and that it might be useful for it to identify priorities regarding which legislation was most important for the Commission to consider.

14. Executive Committee Report and Recommendations

Gordon Koshinsky reported that the Executive Committee met by way of Conference Call on February 17 and developed a number of recommendations for the consideration of the Board. These recommendations pertained to:

- Revised Terms of Reference for the Committee;
- Accidental death, disability and life insurance for Board Members;
- Pay grid for remuneration of NWMB employees;
- Cost-of-living adjustment for NWMB employees for 2000/01;
- Terms of the NWMB loan to KWF.

Gordon noted that the Board discussed all these items during its *in-camera* session yesterday, and that the Board dealt with all of the items in open session afterwards.

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 eight meetings or workshops in which Board Members and/or Staff/Advisors participated since the last Board Meeting in November. These items:

- Workshop sponsored by DFO on priorities for developing stock status reports, held December 2-3 in Winnipeg: Michelle Wheatley participated for the NWMB. DFO priorities for developing stock status reports for Nunavut are, in sequential order, walrus throughout the Territory, charr at Cambridge Bay, Beluga in Cumberland Sound, and charr in Cumberland Sound.
- Meeting of DFO and NWMB officials to discuss fisheries issues, held December 7 in Iqaluit: Ben Kovic, Jim Noble, Ray Andrews and Michelle participated for the NWMB. DSD and NTI officials also attended. Attention was focussed on Davis Strait turbot and shrimp fisheries and harp seal populations.
- Consultations sponsored by DFO preparatory to bi-lateral meetings with Greenland were held December 9 in Ottawa: Ben attended. The possibility of establishing a formal agreement in respect to turbot, shrimp and seals, modeled on the narwhal/beluga agreement, was discussed. The pros and cons of joining NAMMCO were debated.
- Workshop sponsored by WWF on developing the conservation plan for eastern Arctic bowhead whales, held December 16-17 in Iqaluit: Ben and Michelle were accompanied by Meeka Mike, Moses Koonoo and Keith Hay. A draft of the Conservation Plan was reviewed. Discussion focussed on threats to bowheads.
- Meeting of the External Advisory Board to the Atlantic Fisheries Policy Review, held January 25 in Halifax: Ben attended, accompanied by Ray. Jerry Ell was also present. The group considered the content and organization of a discussion document that is being prepared, hopefully to be available by the end of March.

- Meeting of the Polar Bear Technical Committee, held February 6-8 in Montreal: Michelle and Harry Flaherty attended. Jurisdictions with interests in the Davis Strait population met separately one evening to discuss the research underway.
- Meeting of the DSD Science Camps Advisory Group, held February 13 in Iqaluit: Michelle attended. The Group is trying to identify ways to incorporate traditional knowledge and familiar experience into the Nunavut science curriculum. The NWMB Study Fund was identified as a possible source of guidelines for designing projects, and perhaps even as a source of funding for some of them.
- Meeting of the Nunavut Fisheries Working Group, held on February 16 in Iqaluit: Michelle participated for NWMB. Brian Wong was there from Ottawa to bring the DFO perspective and to coach the Working Group on how it might become more effective in attaining its objectives.

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 March 13. The following new decisions were reached regarding attendance:

- DFO Northern Shrimp Advisory Committee meeting; March 16 in Newfoundland: Ray attended.
- NTI Annual General Meeting; March 21-23 in Kugluktuk: Ben to attend.
- DFO meeting on NAFO Sub-Area 0 turbot; March 22 in Nfld: Ray to attend.
- DRWED meeting on grizzly bear research and management; March 24-25 in Inuvik: Nobody to attend.
- WMC meeting to review environmental studies pertaining to Meladine Project; March 28 in Rankin Inlet: David to attend.
- NTI Nunavut-Nunavik overlap workshop; April 6-7 in Iqaluit: Ben or Jim to attend
- CITES 11th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties; April 10-20 in Nairobi: Nobody to attend.
- CNAC Northern Regional meeting; April 11-12 in Iqaluit: Ben or Jim to attend.
- Bathurst Caribou Management Planning meeting of the parties; April 26-27: Michelle to attend.
- Thelon Sanctuary Management Planning meeting of the parties; May 2 in Rankin Inlet: Michelle to attend.
- NTI Wildlife Symposium; May in Kitikmeot: Jim and/or Ben to attend.
- DFO Science Advisory Council meeting; May 26 or 29 in Halifax: Ben to attend.
- Mohawk Council 8th North American Fur Trade Conference; May 24-28 in Akwesasne: Nobody to attend.
- DOE National Millennium Conference; June 3-6 in Guelph: Nobody to attend

16. Date and Location of Next Meeting

Ben Kovic advised that according to the revolving schedule, the next Board meeting should be in the Kitikmeot Region. Harry Flaherty suggested that this could be a

good opportunity for local/regional discussions regarding the emerging polar bear population problems in M'Clintock Channel. Michelle Wheatley suggested that management planning in respect to the Bluenose East and Bathurst herds would be other candidate subjects for discussion.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 140**) to hold its next (26th) regular meeting in Taloyoak the week of 12 June 2000.

17. Adjournment

Ben Kovic thanked the Board Members for participating, and the NWMB staff for their help and presentations. He expressed appreciation for the competence and dedication of the interpreters throughout the meeting. He acknowledged the contributions of departmental and other representatives to the meeting.

The 25th meeting of the NWMB adjourned at 12:00 noon (**Resolution 2000- 141**)

Minutes Approved by: _____
Chairperson Date

NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD

RESOLUTIONS: MEETING No. 25

Iqaluit, 14 –17 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 093

Resolved that the NWMB accept the agenda for Meeting No. 25 as presented, but that the sequence of items be altered in order to address at the outset the requests for research and study funding.

Moved by Gordon Koshinsky
Carried

Seconded by Kevin McCormick
14 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 094

With respect to the request from DSD to re-profile funding for Project 5110-98-3 (Polar bear population inventory in Davis Strait), resolved that the NWMB advise DSD that the NWMB will consider providing NWRT funding support for a year of

reconnaissance work with respect to this project in 2000/01, and further in this regard that the NWMB request DSD to submit:

- a revised proposal pertaining to such reconnaissance work; and
- a new proposal, by January 2001, for completion of this project.

Moved by Kevin McCormick
Carried

Seconded by Gordon Koshinsky
14 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 095

Resolved that the NWMB approve the request from DFO to carry-forward from 1999/00 NWRT funding up to the amount of \$27,380 for Project 5120-99-6 (Whale sampling and stock identification), this in addition to any new NWRT funding approved for this project for 2000/01, with the final amount of the carry-forward to be dependent on the number of communities that indicate to DFO, prior to June 30, their intention to participate in the project in 2000.

Moved by Gordon Koshinsky
Carried

Seconded by Moses Koonoo
14 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 096

Resolved that the NWMB approve, subject to receipt of appropriate final financial reports for 1999/00 from the contracting agencies by the end of June, new NWRT funding support in the total amount of \$393,200 for 2000/01, along with \$27,400 of funds to be carried forward from 1999/00, for continuing research projects previously approved for multi-year funding as follows:

- Project 5110-98-2 (Central arctic polar bear inventory): Provision of \$135,500; final year of funding.
- Project 5110-98-3 (Polar bear population inventory in Davis Strait): Provision of \$67,000, subject to receipt of a revised proposal for reconnaissance work only as per Resolution 2000- 094; final year of funding.
- Project 5110-99-1 (Seasonal distribution and herd delineation of north-east mainland caribou): Provision of \$35,200; final year of funding.
- Project 5110-99-2 (Survival and sustainable harvest of the Dolphin-Union caribou herd): Provision of \$20,200; second year of three-year funding.
- Project 5110-99-3 (Re-evaluation of muskox populations, management zones and quotas in the Keewatin and eastern Kitikmeot): Provision of \$4,800; final year of funding.
- Project 5120-98-1 (Ringed seal status in western Hudson Bay): Provision of \$71,000; final year of funding.
- Project 5120-99-6 (Whale sampling and stock identification): Provision of \$47,500, plus carry forward of \$27,400 as per Resolution 2000- 095; second year of three-year funding.
- Project 5130-99-1 (Seasonal movements and home range size of adult male polar bears in western Hudson Bay): Provision of \$12,000; final year of funding.

Moved by David Alagalak
Carried

Seconded by Makabe Nartok
14 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 097

Resolved that the NWMB approve new NWRT funding support in the total amount of \$216,000 for 2000/01, subject to routine administrative arrangements, for the following research projects:

- Project 5120-00-2 (Bowhead stock identification): Provision of \$10,000, conditional on confirmation of support from the communities where the research will be conducted; one-year project.
- Project 5120-00-7 (Development of a sampling program for arctic charr at the Pangnirtung fish processing plant): Provision of \$8,000, conditional on confirmation of support from the Pangnirtung HTO; one-year project.
- Project 5120-00-8 (Survey of the northern Hudson Bay narwhal population): Provision of \$67,000, conditional on confirmation of support from the Aiviq HTO and from KWF; one-year project.
- Project 5120-00-9 (North Baffin narwhal / beluga movements and dive behaviour by satellite telemetry): Provision of \$25,000, conditional on support from the Resolute Bay HTO, and on availability of other funding as identified for future years; three-year project (with \$25,000 additional in each of 2001/02 and 2002/03).
- Project 5120-00-10 (Walrus satellite tagging): Provision of \$43,000, conditional on support from Resolute Bay and Grise Fiord HTOs and on notification of Arctic Bay HTO, and clarification of the justification provided in respect to the location of the research; one-year project.
- Project 5120-00-11 (Walrus capture / recapture methods): Provision of \$13,000, conditional on confirmation of funding from DFO as identified in the proposal, and on confirmation of support from the HTOs where the project will be conducted; one-year project.
- Project 5120-00-12 (Walrus stock identification and harvest composition): Provision of \$48,000, conditional on confirmation of support from the pertinent communities and on confirmation of funding from other sources as identified in the proposal; one-year project.
- Project 5130-00-3 (Reproductive ecology and survival of the Pacific common eider in the central Canadian arctic): Provision of \$7,000, conditional on support from the Kugluktuk and Cambridge Bay HTOs; one-year preliminary study.

Moved by David Alagalak
Carried

Seconded by Harry Flaherty
15 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 098

Resolved that the NWMB not approve NWRT funding for Project 5120-00-1 (Abundance and distribution of kelp at Whale Cove), and that the NWMB request DFO to provide an updated brief on the kelp experimental licence and other aspects of this project for the next meeting of the NWMB.

Moved by David Alagalak
Carried

Seconded by Kevin McCormick
15 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 099

Resolved that the NWMB agree-in-principle, pending confirmation of approval at the next meeting of the NWMB, to provide NWRT funding support in 2000/01 for Project 5120-00-3 (Cumberland Sound charr population studies), subject to clarification or provision by the proponent with respect to:

- the amount of data required to satisfy the needs of the Project;
- use that has been made of data that were collected previously; and
- a revised proposal that integrates this project with Project 5120-00-5.

Moved by Kevin McCormick

Seconded by Moses Koonoo

Carried

15 March 2000

Abstentions: Harry Flaherty, David Alagalak

Resolution 2000- 100

Resolved that the NWMB not approve NWRT funding for Project 5120-00-4 (Influence of fishing pressure on resident arctic charr) until there is clear evidence of community support for such a study at the proposed study site(s).

Moved by Kevin McCormick

Seconded by Harry Flaherty

Carried

15 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 101

Resolved that the NWMB agree-in-principle to provide up to \$13,600 of NWMB operational funding support (rather than NWRT funding) in 2000/01 for Project 5120-00-6 (Development of a community-based integrated fisheries management plan for arctic charr at Pangnirtung), with confirmation of this approval subject to receipt from the proponent of:

- a substantially revised Project proposal; and
- confirmation that the Pangnirtung HTO was consulted about the Project and is supportive.

Moved by Gordon Koshinsky

Seconded by Harry Flaherty

Carried

15 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 102

Resolved that the NWMB approve NWRT funding of \$40,000 in 2000/01 for Project 5130-00-1 (Long-term trends in the population ecology of polar bears in western Hudson Bay in relation to climate change), conditional on receiving from the proponent:

- confirmation of support from the Arviat HTO and KWF; and
- confirmation of all other funding identified in the proposal; and further that the NWMB agree-in-principle to support the project in 2001/02 and in 2002/03 pending positive re-evaluation of the project by the NWMB in 2001.

Moved by Gordon Koshinsky

Seconded by David Alagalak

Carried

15 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 103

Resolved that the NWMB agree-in-principle to pre-approve NWRT funding for 2001/02 for Project 5130-00-2 (Use of satellite telemetry to locate migration routes and wintering areas of common eider ducks breeding in Nunavut), and that the NWMB offer suggestions to the proponent for improving the presentation of this proposal for re-evaluation by the NWMB next year.

Moved by Gordon Koshinsky
Carried

Seconded by David Alagalak
15 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 104

Resolved that the NWMB approve the request from Gjoa Haven HTO to carry forward \$11,000 of NWMB Study Funding for Project 5244-99-1 (Arctic charr tagging at Chantrey Inlet), conditional on the proponents meeting the conditions set out by the NWMB in the context of approving this project last year.

Moved by Gordon Koshinsky
Carried

Seconded by Harry Flaherty
15 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 105

Resolved that the NWMB approve the request from James Qillaq of Clyde River for NWMB Study Funding in the amount of \$9,600 for Project 5204-00-1 (Removal of chip-rock from stream sections at Clyde River), subject to the proponents agreeing and arranging to:

- have the study funds processed through the Namautaq HTO;
- ensure that the work is done in accordance with DFO regulations; and
- provide documentary information about the condition of fish using these stream sections before and after the work.

Moved by Harry Flaherty
Carried

Seconded by Moses Koonoo
15 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 106

Resolved that the NWMB approve the request from Namautaq HTO for NWMB Study Funding in the amount of \$30,000 for Project 5204-00-2 (Bowhead whale monitoring), pending confirmation of WWF funding as identified in the proposal.

Moved by Kevin McCormick
Carried

Seconded by Harry Flaherty
15 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 107

Resolved that the NWMB approve the request from Iviq HTO for NWMB Study Funding in the amount of \$29,500 for Project 5208-00-1 (Patrol and assessment of wildlife abundance at Alexander Fiord).

Moved by Harry Flaherty
Carried

Seconded by Makabe Nartok
15 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 108

Resolved that the NWMB approve the request from Resolute Bay HTO for NWMB Study Funding in the amount of \$29,500 for Project 5213-00-1 (Ground-based survey of Peary caribou, muskoxen and wolves on Bathurst, Cornwallis, western Devon and nearby islands), conditional on the proponents receiving other funding as identified in the proposal.

Moved by David Alagalak
Carried

Seconded by Kevin McCormick
15 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 109

Resolved that the NWMB approve the request from Resolute Bay HTO for NWMB Study Funding in the amount of \$26,650 for Project 5213-00-2 (Arctic charr tagging at Resolute Bay), conditional on the proponents receiving other funding as identified in the proposal.

Moved by David Alagalak
Carried

Seconded by Makabe Nartok
15 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 110

Resolved that the NWMB approve the request from Sanikiluaq HTO for NWMB Study Funding in the amount of \$20,000 for Project 5214-00-1 (Foraging ecology of Hudson Bay eiders wintering at polynyas in the Belcher Islands), conditional on the proponents:

- receiving other funding as identified in the proposal; and
- providing, prior to the end of June, an interim report on study activities during the current winter.

Moved by David Alagalak
Carried

Seconded by Harry Flaherty
15 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 111

Resolved that the NWMB approve the request from Arviat HTO for NWMB Study Funding in the amount of \$10,200 for Project 5222-00-1 (Monitoring Snow and Ross' Geese and their habitat near Arviat), conditional on the proponents:

- receiving other funding as identified in the proposal and
- justifying to the satisfaction of the NWMB the use of helicopters to herd snow geese as proposed, with a view to conducting the drives without the use of mechanized vehicles if possible.

Moved by David Alagalak
Carried

Seconded by Harry Flaherty
15 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 112

Resolved that the NWMB approve the request from QWB / DFO for NWMB Study Funding in the amount of \$50,000 for Project 5262-00-1 (Survey of Greenland Halibut in NAFO Subarea 0, Division 0B), conditional on the proponents:

- receiving other funding as identified in the proposal; and
- providing a full report on the 1999 survey.

Moved by Gordon Koshinsky
Carried

Seconded by Kevin McCormick
15 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 113

Resolved that the NWMB not approve the request from David St. Aubin for NWMB Study Funding for Project 5265-00-1 (Skin condition of beluga whales in Nunavut waters), but that the proponent be invited to undertake consultations with Nunavut communities to determine if this is a matter of local or regional interest or concern.

Moved by David Alagalak
Carried

Seconded by Harry Flaherty
15 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 114

Resolved that the NWMB adopt the minutes for Meeting No. 24 conducted at Sanikiluaq on 23 –25 November 1999.

Moved by Moses Koonoo
Carried

Seconded by Kevin McCormick
15 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 115

Resolved that the NWMB adopt the minutes for Conference Call No. 46 conducted on 17 January 2000, and for Conference Call No. 47 conducted on 28 February 2000.

Moved by Harry Flaherty
Carried

Seconded by Moses Koonoo
15 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 116

Resolved that the NWMB approve the NWMB Workplan documents as outlined, but instruct the drafters of the documents to take account of the Board's observations when finalizing the material for presentation to NIP and DIAND.

Moved by Kevin McCormick
Carried

Seconded by Moses Koonoo
15 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 117

Resolved that the NWMB accept the Financial Variance Report as at 29 February 2000.

Moved by Harry Flaherty
Carried

Seconded by Moses Koonoo
15 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 118

Resolved that the NWMB approve the template for a new Funding Agreement with DIAND as pertinent to the NWMB, subject to the resolution of final details by NWMB Legal Counsel and DIAND officials, this for implementation in respect to 2000/01.

Moved by Gordon Koshinsky
Carried

Seconded by Harry Flaherty
15 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 119

Resolved that the NWMB accept the recommendations developed by the Narwhal Working Group at its meeting in December 1999 with respect to addressing research needs, making by-law changes, encouraging co-management with Greenland, promoting community participation, controlling expansion of the new management system, and facilitating involvement of the RWOs. The Board also reiterated that communities must have their hunting rules and enabling bylaws in place prior to the start of the 2000 hunting season, or face reverting to their previous narwhal quotas.

Moved by David Alagalak
Carried

Seconded by Harry Flaherty
15 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 120

Resolved that the NWMB acknowledge that, as a guiding principle for completion of management planning, the weight of evidence indicates that what has historically been regarded and designated as the Bluenose Caribou Herd is in fact comprised of three distinct caribou breeding populations.

Moved by David Alagalak
Carried

Seconded by Harry Flaherty
16 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 121

Resolved that the NWMB adopt the draft Position Paper prepared by the NWMB Legal Counsel as the NWMB position with respect to the DSD initiative to develop a new *Wildlife Act* for Nunavut, and to transmit this position to DSD.

Moved by Kevin McCormick
Carried

Seconded by Moses Koonoo
16 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 122

Resolved that the NWMB approve the request from the Kitikmeot Hunters and Trappers Association for increases in the annual number of sport-hunting tags that may be issued in respect to the Dolphin-Union Caribou Herd as follows:

- from 25 to 35 tags for Cambridge Bay; and
- from 10 to 15 tags for Kugluktuk.

Moved by David Alagalak
Carried

Seconded by Moses Koonoo
16 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 123

Resolved that the NWMB approve the request from the Kitikmeot Hunters and Trappers Association for increases in annual quotas of muskox as follows:

- from 10 to 20 animals for Taloyoak with respect to MX 09; and
- from 1000 to 1300 animals for Cambridge Bay with respect to MX 11.

Moved by Moses Koonoo
Carried

Seconded by Kevin McCormick
16 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 124

Resolved that the NWMB formally participate as a member of the Planning Committee working to develop a management plan for the Bathurst Caribou Herd.

Moved by Gordon Koshinsky
Carried

Seconded by Kevin McCormick
16 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 125

Resolved that the NWMB maintain its current level of participation in the Resource Centre Coalition initiative.

Moved by Kevin McCormick
Carried

Seconded by Harry Flaherty
16 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 126

Resolved that the NWMB provide contributions to NTI in the amounts indicated, for forthcoming initiatives being organized by NTI as follows:

- To support RWO participation in a meeting with Makivik to address reciprocal harvesting rights and other overlap issues pertaining to the management and utilization of wildlife: \$10,000.
- To support RWO/HTO participation in a Nunavut Wildlife Symposium: Up to \$50,000.

Moved by David Alagalak
Carried

Seconded by Harry Flaherty
16 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 127

Resolved that the NWMB approve a contribution of \$5,200 to the Tuktu and Nogak Project for the production of materials to communicate traditional knowledge pertaining to caribou that has been documented by the Project, and up to \$4,000 for the principal researcher to participate in the Inuit Studies Conference in Aberdeen.

Moved by David Alagalak
Carried

Seconded by Makabe Nartok
16 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 128

Resolved that the NWMB approve a contribution of \$1,000 to students from Attagoyuk School in Pangnirtung to support travel to Scotland to conduct research on the history of whaling in Cumberland Sound.

Moved by David Alagalak
Carried

Seconded by Harry Flaherty
16 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 129

Resolved that the NWMB not provide funding support in respect to the following requests:

- From Dr. Francois Messier of the University of Saskatchewan, for the production of 100 copies of an atlas depicting polar bear movements.
- From Kamatsiaqtut, the Nunavut Help Line, for a fund-raising dinner.
- From Teevi MacKay, for training costs pertinent to membership in Teen Missions International.

- From the Sanikiluaq Senior Men's Hockey Club, for travel to the Hudson Bay Cup tournament.

Moved by David Alagalak
Carried

Seconded by Harry Flaherty
16 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 130

Resolved that the NWMB meet *in-camera*.

Moved by David Alagalak
Carried

Seconded by Harry Flaherty
16 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 131

Resolved that the *in-camera* session be closed.

Moved by Moses Koonoo
Carried

Seconded by Makabe Nartok
16 March 2000

Resolution 2000-132

Resolved that the NWMB establish a Total Allowable Harvest (TAH) of one bowhead whale from the Foxe Basin – Hudson Bay stock, with the provisos:

- That the harvest take place during open water in 2000 or 2001; and
- That two strikes be permitted for the landing of one bowhead whale.

Moved by Moses Koonoo
Carried

Seconded by David Alagalak
16 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 133

Resolved that the NWMB support-in-principle the proposal by Qikiqtaaluk Corporation and associates to conduct an exploratory crab fishery in waters adjacent to Nunavut and, taking into account forthcoming reviews of the proposal by the NWMB Fisheries and Legal Advisors and by the Nunavut Fisheries Working Group, that the NWMB convey its general endorsement of the proposal to the principals and to the appropriate government agencies.

Moved by Harry Flaherty
Carried

Seconded by David Alagalak
16 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 134

Resolved that the NWMB adopt revised Terms of Reference for the NWMB Executive Committee as developed and presented by the Committee.

Moved by Kevin McCormick
Carried

Seconded by Moses Koonoo
16 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 135

Resolved that the NWMB discontinue its current accidental death insurance policy for Board Members as recommended by the Executive Committee, and contract instead with Carlton Financial Group, in the amount of approximately \$6,800 per year, for a package policy with the following provisions:

- \$500,000 accidental death and dismemberment (for 50 travel days);
- \$250 per week short-term accidental disability;

- \$100,000 permanent total accidental disability;
- Outside of territory/country health coverage beyond existing coverage;
- \$25,000 group life insurance.

Moved by Harry Flaherty

Seconded by Makabe Nartok

Carried

16 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 136

Resolved that the NWMB adopt the 18-step pay grid for NWMB employees, as recommended by the Executive Committee, effective 01 April 2000.

Moved by Harry Flaherty

Seconded by Moses Koonoo

Carried

16 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 137

Resolved that the NWMB adopt the increase in the Canadian Consumer Price Index for 1999 (1.12%) as the rate of increase for staff salaries in respect to the cost-of-living adjustment for 2000/01.

Moved by Moses Koonoo

Seconded by Kevin McCormick

Carried

16 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 138

Resolved that the NWMB extend the term of the loan to the Keewatin Wildlife Federation from three years to four years, with the last two years of the loan as originally constituted now payable in three equal annual instalments.

Moved by Harry Flaherty

Seconded by Moses Koonoo

Carried

16 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 139

Resolved that the NWMB revise its basic schedule for regular meetings to a June/September/December/March framework.

Moved by Kevin McCormick

Seconded by Harry Flaherty

Carried

16 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 140

Resolved that the next (26th) regular Meeting of the NWMB be conducted in Taloyoak the week of June 12th, 2000.

Moved by Harry Flaherty

Seconded by Makabe Nartok

Carried

17 March 2000

Resolution 2000- 141

Resolved that the 25th regular Meeting of the NWMB be adjourned.

Moved by Kevin McCormick

Seconded by Harry Flaherty

Carried

17 March 2000