

NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD

MINUTES: MEETING No. 27

Rankin Inlet, 27 November – 01 December 2000

Members and Staff Participating

Ben Kovic	Chairperson (Thursday and Friday only)
Harry Flaherty	Member (and A/Chairperson: Tuesday and Wednesday)
Gordon Koshinsky	Member
Makabe Nartok	Member
Meeka Mike	Member
David Alagalak	Member
Joan Scottie	Member (arrived Tuesday mid morning)
Johnny Peters	Member for Makivik (by teleconference)*
Pauloosie Novalinga	Member for Makivik (by teleconference)*
* For part of agenda item 8.J only	
Jim Noble	Executive Director
Michelle Wheatley	Director of Wildlife Management
Gordon Tomlinson	Director of Finance and Administration (Tuesday and Wednesday only)
Heather Priest	Harvest Study Coordinator (Tuesday and Wednesday only)
Michael d'Eça	NWMB Legal Advisor
Rebecca Mike	Interpreter
Evie Amagoalik	Interpreter

Not Available

Moses Koonoo	Member (weathered out)
Kevin McCormick	Member (with cause)

Visitors and Other Participants (at various times)

Burt Hunt	DFO Area Director, Iqaluit
Keith Pelly	DFO C and P Officer, Rankin Inlet
Winston Fillatre	DFO Supervisor of Enforcement, Iqaluit
Karen Ditz	DFO Fisheries Mgmt. Biologist, Iqaluit
Stephen Atkinson	DSD Director of Wildlife, Iqaluit
Carey Bonnell	DSD Director Fisheries and Sealing, Iqaluit
Bert Dean	NTI Director of Wildlife, Rankin Inlet
Glenn Williams	NTI Wildlife Advisor, Iqaluit
Attima Hadlari	NTI Wildlife Project Officer, Cambridge Bay
Raymond Ningeocheak	NTI Second Vice-President

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

Tuesday, 28 November 2000

1. Call to Order and Opening Preliminaries

Jim Noble welcomed everyone to the 27th meeting of the NWMB at 9:05 am. Jim advised that Ben Kovic sent his regrets and expected to join the meeting Thursday morning (arriving late Wednesday afternoon). Moses Koonoo was weathered out, and Joan Scottie was expected to arrive later in the morning. Kevin McCormick was unable to attend. Jim called on David Alagalak to lead the opening prayer.

In the absence of the regular Chairperson, Jim called for nominations for another Board Member to act in this capacity. The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 213**) to appoint Harry Flaherty to the position of Acting Chairperson pending the arrival of Mr. Kovic.

2. Agenda for the Meeting

Harry Flaherty advised that arrangements had been made for the Board to hold public meetings here in Rankin Inlet on Wednesday evening, and in Chesterfield Inlet on Thursday evening. Jim Noble advised that an aircraft charter was arranged for the Chesterfield trip, and requested that government agencies make their own arrangements to participate.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 214**) to approve the agenda for Meeting No. 27 as presented, with some re-ordering of items to accommodate Board Members expected to arrive later in the week.

3. Minutes: Review and Approval

3.A Regular Meeting 26, Taloyoak

Gordon Koshinsky pointed out a number of items that had been identified for minor revisions after the Minutes were drafted. David Alagalak suggested that the reference to Kivalliq hunters in Item 12.C be changed to HTO representatives.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 215**) to adopt the Minutes for Regular Meeting No. 26, held at Taloyoak on 26 – 28 September 2000, with minor revisions as noted.

3.B Conference Call 53

Michael d'Eça declared that he had not yet had opportunity to review these Minutes in detail, but that he had noticed a number of typographical errors that he would be pleased to identify. Michael also suggested that Item 3.B be modified to include reference to his offer to contact ITC to obtain their version of the Inuit perspective on the Agreement on International Humane Trapping Standards, and also that Item 6 be modified to more accurately describe the authority for DFO's recent interim decision to close the narwhal hunt at Qikiqtarjuaq.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 216**) to adopt the Minutes for Conference Call No. 53, conducted on 30 October 2000, with amendments as noted.

4. Financial and Administrative Business

4.A Financial Variance Report as at 31 October 2000

Gordon Tomlinson referred the Members to the Financial Variance Report as at 31 October contained in the briefing binder. Gordon explained that this document incorporated a number of adjustments from the version that was approved by the Board in the course of Conference Call 53. The net effect of these revisions was to decrease the projected positive variance at year end from \$192,715 to \$156,342.

4.B Revised Workplan and Interim Activity Report for 2000/01

Gordon Tomlinson informed the Members that a *Revised Workplan for the 2000/2001 Fiscal Year, including An Interim Activity Report from 01 April to 31 October 2000*, was submitted to DIAND on November 1. This submission was made pursuant to Section II, paragraphs 1 and 3 of the Funding Agreement between DIAND and the NWMB for 2000/01 and further, with respect to the Interim Activity Report, in accordance with Annex C of that Agreement. Gordon distributed copies of this document to the Members, noting that this was the most comprehensive interim response that the NWMB had ever prepared in the context of its annual mid-year reporting to DIAND. Gordon explained that Appendix J (Variance Report, as at 31 October) of the Interim Activity Report was the same document that was presented to the Board under the preceding Agenda item.

Michael d'Eça further explained that the Revised Workplan is in fact very similar to the workplan that the Board approved just prior to the start of the new fiscal year. The Revised Workplan makes reference to and carries through on the provisions for flexibility in the administration of NWMB funds as per the new funding arrangement with DIAND. This includes declaration of the projected \$156,342 under-expenditure of budgeted operating funds. The document also reiterates certain continuing NWMB concerns, such as making funding provisions for public hearings.

Gordon Koshinsky asked how the NWMB's mid-year response to DIAND compared, in terms of effort expended and product produced, to what was being put forward by the other IPGs. Jim Noble replied that he had not seen the submissions of the other IPGs, but undertook to obtain copies. Jim noted that the NWMB submission did involve substantial effort and cost. Michael d'Eça confirmed that the NWMB has high credibility with DIAND staff and a good history of quality reporting. Michael reckoned that it was a worthwhile investment to uphold this reputation.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 217**) to approve, in the form already submitted to DIAND, the revised Workplan and the Interim Activity Report, including the adjusted Variance Report as at 31 October 2000.

4.C Disposition of Unexpended Funds from 1999/00 Budget

Michael d'Eça reminded the Members about the discussions that have been ongoing with DIAND officials regarding the disposition of the unexpended balance from 1999/00. The NWMB has held the position that this money (in the specific amount of \$146,574) should be retained by the NWMB for future use in meeting the Board's obligations under the NLCA. Michael referred to the final response from DIAND on this matter, dated November 20. DIAND now has essentially accepted the position of the NWMB, but will require a budget and workplan pertaining to new activities to be undertaken with the retained funds. This will be subject to DIAND approval, after which the material will be incorporated by way of an amendment to the Funding Agreement for the NWMB for 2000/01.

The Board decided to respond affirmatively to the proposition from DIAND, and at the same time to reiterate the continuing NWMB position that unexpended funds from any particular fiscal year remain accessible to the NWMB for legitimate uses pertinent to the NLCA. Members agreed to return to this matter later in the agenda, following opportunity to explore *in-camera* how best to structure a budget and workplan in respect to the subject amount of \$146,574.

5. Chairperson, Senior Staff, Advisors and Members Reports

5.A Chairperson's Report

Jim Noble referred the Members to Ben Kovic's activity report in the briefing binder.

5.B Executive Director's Report

Jim Noble tabled his own activity report for the period since the last Board meeting, and elaborated verbally on most of the items.

Harry Flaherty requested more information on the meeting with SeaWorld. Jim replied that SeaWorld has expressed a long-range interest in the live capture of narwhals for display in one or more of their public facilities. This has never been done and is obviously a very political and contentious subject. The meeting with Brad Andrews from SeaWorld was an opportunity to explain the various administrative and consultative requirements that would have to be met. In preparation for any narwhal live capture SeaWorld recognizes that they would need to mount a large research effort in the Arctic, and they would anticipate extensive participation by local people. They would like to start their research program with some observations in the vicinity of Cresswell Bay. They have been working with Peter Jess and Nat Kalluk from Resolute to that end, and Tom Smith (formerly a Research Scientist with DFO) is also involved.

DSD also participated in the meeting with SeaWorld. Stephen Atkinson noted that it was made clear to the representative that mounting a narwhal research program would not constitute any guarantee that narwhal live captures would be approved.

Gordon Koshinsky asked about progress on the marine mammal book. Jim replied that most of the text has been written and that a search is underway for appropriate photographs. A contribution agreement with DFO and other participants in this project is being prepared.

5.C Director of Wildlife Management Report

Michelle reviewed her activity report for the period since September 13. There were no comments or questions.

5.D Director of Finance and Administration Report

Gordon Tomlinson referred to his note in the briefing binder.

Harry Flaherty asked when completion of the NWMB website was anticipated and how it was proposed to keep the site updated. Gordon replied that he was aiming for completion by the end of the year. He suggested that the ideal arrangement for modifying and updating the site would be to develop the capacity to do so internally.

5.E Legal Advisor's Report

Michael d'Eça gave an overview of his September 11 through November 14 report, noting that more detail is given in his monthly invoices. As is usually the case, considerable effort was expended in this period preparing briefing notes and other substantive documents which included:

- Overview of the powers, duties and functions of the HTOs and RWOs
- The relationship between tribunal members and their appointing agencies
- Submissions to the House of Commons Standing Committee with respect to the *Species at Risk Act*
- Recommendations concerning compensation with respect to the *Species at Risk Act*
- Review of the Decision of the Federal Court of Appeal to dismiss NTI's appeal of the Federal Court's decision of 30 September 1999
- Revised workplan for the 2000-2001 fiscal year, including an interim activity report for the first seven months of the year.

Harry Flaherty asked if there were realistic prospects for improving HTO and RWO administration stemming from the assessment of their powers, duties and functions. Michael noted that this project started with a request from David Alagalak. The two documents mentioned in the work overview were presented at the recent Wildlife Symposium sponsored by NTI. The analysis should provide useful groundwork for addressing the problems faced by these organizations, but succinct recommendations have not yet been formulated for the consideration of the Board. The forthcoming 10-year planning exercise will provide an important opportunity to bring this matter to the fore. It is important for these organizations to grasp the full nature of their responsibilities to enable them to develop realistic plans and budgets.

Jim Noble noted that this material was presented at the Wildlife Symposium primarily in the context of community-based management for narwhal and beluga, rather than as input for more general strategic planning and capacity-building.

Michael reminded the Board of its previous (Conference Call 53) consideration of a request from the Fur Institute of Canada for NWMB assistance in the conduct of consultations with Nunavut trappers regarding the implications of the Agreement on International Humane Trapping Standards. Michael recalled how he had offered to contact ITC to obtain their version of the Inuit perspective on this matter. While it is confirmed that some aboriginal agencies are boycotting the Fur Institute, the ITC is clearly not among them. It is of interest that the Institute, despite its request to the NWMB, appears to have considerable funds available for consultations.

Harry reiterated his view that the trapping standards being talked about are of very little relevance to Nunavut, particularly since an exemption has been granted for Arctic fox (albeit not for wolves). Harry saw nothing further to be gained by interacting with ITC on this matter, but suggested dealing directly with the Fur Institute. The Institute has funding to assist in the development of more humane traps, which might be of interest to some RWOs and/or HTOs. Michael agreed to ask for more information, particularly in respect to the purposes for which funding is available and how it is being distributed.

5.F Fisheries Advisor's Report

Jim made reference to Ray Andrews' quarterly activity report contained in the briefing binder, along with Ray's notes from a November 6 teleconference of the Turbot Steering Committee called to formalize plans for a Committee workshop.

There was discussion on Ray's report pertaining to the NAFO Annual General Meeting, and specifically on Canada's failure to get support for a serious effort to curtail the taking of immature turbot in the course of certain shrimp fisheries. David Alagalak asked for clarification of this controversy. Jim explained that foreign shrimp boats catch immature turbot in greater numbers than Canadian authorities deem reasonable, due to their refusal to install Nordmore grates on their trawls.

Michael d'Eça recalled provision for a mid-term review of DFO's 5-year turbot management plan. The time for such a review would be about now. Michael agreed to follow up.

5.G Members Reports and Concerns

Joan Scottie asked about the status of the Baker Lake HTO. Jim Noble replied that the HTO is heavily in debt and that its accounting was found to be seriously deficient. The HTO showed no ability or inclination to rectify this situation, and a consultant was hired by the NWMB to try to get the organization back on track. Until that happens, the HTO is unlikely to open its office or hold any meetings.

Makabe Nartok asked for clarification about administrative problems at the Pelly Bay (Kugaaruk) HTO. Jim replied that the HTO has essentially no recent financial records. A consultant has been hired to try to re-construct these accounts. A complete financial reconciliation is a prerequisite for flowing funds from the NWMB to the HTO. All the funds that the HTO would be in line to receive for the current fiscal year would be needed to address financial obligations that are outstanding. These include the need to make certain remittances to Revenue Canada, regarding which heavy penalties are being incurred.

Makabe raised the matter of the narwhal quota at Pelly Bay being exceeded this summer. This was preceded by considerable confusion about whether or not the quota had been lifted. In any event, a DFO Officer came in and seized several tusks. Makabe asked if these tusks were going to be returned. He understood that narwhal hunters in other communities who exceeded their quotas in the past have managed to keep their tusks.

Winston Fillatre gave his interpretation of events. Pelly Bay, Taloyoak and Gjoa Haven each have annual quotas of ten narwhals. This year, narwhals were highly available at Pelly Bay, and best estimates are that 32 were harvested. Three were also harvested at Taloyoak, so even treating these three communities as a composite quota would indicate that there was an over-harvest of five animals. The DFO Officer who was sent in to investigate found that there were too many tusks without tags. The Officer seized five untagged tusks as evidence, and the Department has these tusks locked up. As per standard procedure, the Officer is preparing a Court Brief for the Crown Attorney; this Brief will also be copied to the defendants and/or their attorneys. The Crown Attorney will undoubtedly discuss the matter with NTI.

Makabe thanked Winston for his presentation. He stated that there was a question about whether the seizures could or would have been avoided if the hunters had taken more females (without tusks) since it seems to be the occurrence of tusks without tags that triggers enforcement action. Winston replied that each narwhal harvested is supposed to be tagged, regardless of the sex of the animal. The usual practice is to tag males on the tusk and females on some part of the body. Tusks are deemed to be illegal if they do not have tags.

Harry Flaherty recalled an incident nearly two decades ago at Grise Fiord when his father harvested four male narwhals and a DFO Officer seized all the tusks. Harry wondered what eventually happened to those tusks, as well as others that have been confiscated over the years. Ben Kovic noted that the hides of polar bears killed in self defence are usually turned over to the local HTO for disposition, and he suggested that this might be a model for handling any seized parts of any animal that have commercial or cultural value. Winston advised that it is the Magistrate's prerogative to decide what happens to such materials. It would be rare for tusks to be returned to the hunter or to the HTO after a guilty verdict in a case that involved over-harvesting. The Magistrate would however have the option of assessing a fine

followed by return of the tusks. Both DFO and the Crown Attorney can make recommendations. The Crown Attorney often asks for such tusks to be forfeited to the Crown for sale or for use in schools or museums. It may be possible to set up some sort of guidance that would pertain in such instances if that were desired.

Michael d'Eça suggested that there were a number of extenuating circumstances in this case that pertained to the administration of tags and the new provisions of the NLCA. He urged that all the co-management partners engage in detailed and frank discussions on the matter before anyone pursues further independent action.

Meeka Mike enquired about certain “mystery ships” that were spotted near Allen Island last summer. There are some indications that those on board may have participated in the illegal harvesting of caribou and charr on Inuit-owned land. Winston Fillatre confirmed that there was a packer boat from Newfoundland at anchor near Allen Island for a period of time in August. Local DFO staff (assisted by Qikiqtaaluk Corporation) did investigate the said incident, but were hampered by a lack of clear jurisdiction along with inadequate personnel and equipment. There were no apparent fisheries offences at the time of this incident, but there may have been a wildlife offence: a fresh caribou head was found on-shore near where the packer boat was anchored. The vessel was inspected when it got back to Newfoundland, but no incriminating evidence was found on board.

Harry Flaherty explained further that when he and others working on the Qikiqtaaluk Corporation project at Resolution Island became aware that a ship was anchored near Allen Island, a helicopter with a local HTO member on board was sent to investigate. Two vessels were discovered at anchor side-by-side, 3 to 5 miles from shore. A small boat with two people in it was seen near the shore, and one person was seen on land. The entire scene was filmed on video, and the video was given to DFO and subsequently (apparently) lost. The two larger vessels were each about 60 feet in length. Use of the Qikiqtaaluk Corporation helicopter was offered to DFO to assist them to investigate but they declined, citing lack of available staff.

Meeka persisted in demanding to know by whom these vessels were licensed and to whom they were contracted. Winston replied that these offshore licences would have been issued by DFO Newfoundland Region, and that ownership of the vessels could be easily ascertained. He interpreted that one of the vessels was a trawler in the process of unloading its catch to a packer boat. Winston also explained that the local office of DFO is not responsible for enforcement in waters adjacent to Nunavut: that is the responsibility of DFO's St. John's office. Meeka declared that she was under the impression that the vessels were at anchor in NSA waters, and wondered what authority local DFO Officers would have had in that case. Winston replied that local DFO authority would be the same as in any other location, but the reality is that Nunavut Officers are not trained for offshore surveillance and enforcement, and specialized crews are not available for this purpose. This differs from the situation at DFO's more southerly marine operations.

Meeka asked if the Coast Guard could regulate the activity of vessels from other jurisdictions operating in Arctic waters. Winston replied that Coast Guard staff and vessels are primarily trained and equipped for ice-breaking, not for enforcement. Meeka expressed frustration that DFO permits all kinds of fishing and other vessels into the Arctic, but apparently is not set up to monitor or enforce their activities. She suggested that this is not in conformity with DFO's Oceans Strategy. She reckoned that the particular incident in question was probably not an isolated case, and suggested that the only real solution was to have an observer on-board each fishing vessel. Meeka stressed that she did not mean to imply that visiting fishermen should be completely denied access to local fish and wildlife for food. She was merely urging that due process be followed, and that there be no covert harvesting.

Harry Flaherty asked what plans DFO had to avoid future incidents of this nature. Burt Hunt replied that when the Regional Director General met with the Chairperson and staff of the NWMB in October he promised to investigate what could be done, and to bring this concern vigorously to the attention of his colleagues in the rest of the Department. Newfoundland Region also has very limited resources, and their patrols into Sub-Area 0 are probably quite limited and infrequent. The RDG also agreed that the DFO presence in Iqaluit and elsewhere in Nunavut needed to be enhanced. He mentioned the possibility of more concerted multi-tasking of vessels, including those of the Coast Guard. The possibility of having an independent observer on each fishing vessel is also under active consideration.

Meeka wanted to know how Qikiqtaaluk Corporation's video of the incident in question came to be lost. Burt Hunt stated that this too was under investigation; the video was apparently last seen in the process of being transferred to a local air carrier, for shipment to Yellowknife to be copied. Burt noted by way of conclusion that the vessels at anchor were engaged in a legal fish-transfer activity as permitted by a valid licence, with no indication of any fishery offences having occurred.

Harry asked whether the NWMB in fact had any role in this issue. Michael replied that the NWMB has no actual role in enforcement. He suggested that the incident demonstrates two systemic problems on the part of DFO, which the NWMB might try to influence. The first stems from DFO's sector management approach, which results in the treatment of waters adjacent to Nunavut as a sort of adjunct to Newfoundland. The second pertains to the Department's apparent lack of adequate resources to fulfil its mandate, which seems to be especially problematic in the Arctic. Michael noted that DFO's Atlantic Fisheries Policy Review exercise currently underway might be an appropriate forum for examining these issues.

Gordon Koshinsky suggested that the NWMB should support DFO's local and regional efforts to obtain the changes that would make the Department more responsive to these concerns. There might also be a role in this for the NMC.

David Alagalak conveyed the impression of the people of Arviat that snow geese are no longer excessively abundant in the area around that community. Residents

suggest that CWS should identify with more precision what areas are appropriate for DOE's "facilitated community domestic hunts" if those are going to continue. Residents especially recommend that this kind of hunting activity be stopped or at least much reduced in the immediate vicinity of the McConnell River Bird Sanctuary. While snow goose numbers appear to have stabilized or are even declining, it seems that the abundance of Ross's geese in the Arviat area is still increasing.

David also stressed the need for clarification and more effective implementation of the role of the NWMB vis-à-vis the RWOs and HTOs. He noted that some background work has been done, but stressed that real progress hinges on the provision of more funding to these organizations. This will enable them to hire and retain good staff. Until their administrative capacities are markedly improved and made more reliable, these organizations will not be effective in exercising their roles and mandates under the NLCA. Yet these organizations are key to the operations of the NWMB. It is therefore incumbent on the NWMB to re-assess the formulas by which the RWOs and HTOs are funded, as well as the total funding available.

Harry Flaherty and Jim Noble agreed with David's overall assessment. Jim noted that NTI has been sponsoring workshops to examine the roles and the associated funding needs of the RWOs and HTOs. Jim pointed to the amalgamation of funding from the NWMB and DSD as an example of a co-operative initiative to streamline RWO and HTO administration. The reality however is that these organizations are to a great extent unable to address their obligations due to their lack of capacity. That includes not just administration and operations, but also accountability. The solution is more complicated than the mere provision of more funds.

Glenn Williams advised that inadequate administrative capacity at the community level is perceived by NTI as a serious impediment to the implementation of numerous provisions of the NLCA. This problem was examined by NTI at their last Annual General Meeting. NTI has approved \$800,000 for 20 community-based Implementation Officers to be hired in the next fiscal year. These Officers are meant to help address these local shortfalls in organization and administration. The RWOs and HTOs represent a significant portion of these local requirements. The communities in fact pose a great diversity of administrative needs and operational opportunities from the perspective of implementing the NLCA.

Stephen Atkinson explained that his Department is doing a review of its programs that are in support of harvesters. A discussion paper is being prepared which will pose options for how such support should best be channelled: to individual harvesters, or for particular initiatives, or by communities, etc. With respect to the HTOs specifically, the Department recognizes that much of their workload pertains to obligations under the NLCA. However the Department also acknowledges that Government agencies are relying on HTOs more and more for other matters. It would make sense for all the interested agencies to work in concert in attempting to address the problems.

Gordon Koshinsky expressed much enthusiasm for a co-ordinated approach to making the HTOs and RWOs more effective. He suggested that even if more resources did become available, it would be far from clear how best to deploy them. He observed that unco-ordinated initiatives are generally not the most productive, and may even conflict. A consensus approach needs to be developed.

Harry Flaherty recalled the accident last summer that almost cost him a finger. He expressed his gratitude to the NWMB for the condolences sent to him while he was in hospital.

Harry also brought to the attention of the Board that charr in the Iqalugaq River at Clyde River are suffering injury during migration because of garbage in the water. He wondered if DFO could do something about this problem. Harry indicated that polar bear research in the NSA is one of his more pressing and ongoing concerns, including the completion of studies that have been underway for some time. He also suggested that the Fisheries Advisor attend the next NWMB meeting.

6. Completion of Assignments and Implementation of Resolutions

Jim referred the Members to the Task List arising from the previous Board meeting (in September) and from the one intervening Conference Call. A few of the unfinished items not scheduled for treatment elsewhere on the agenda prompted some discussion:

Item A27: Prepare NWMB Discussion Paper concerning reform of the *Migratory Birds Convention Act*. The need to do this was re-affirmed.

Item A28: Refer the matter of identifying “edible portions” of marine mammals to the Nunavut Regulatory Review Committee; advise DFO of action taken. David Alagalak asked for clarification of this task, noting that the topic is not a simple one and will benefit from extensive discussions with elders. Jim Noble reviewed how this task stemmed from a DFO request to the NWMB when the Department still had simplistic plans for amending the Marine Mammal Regulations. It is precisely because this is seen to be such a complex matter that the NWMB decided some time ago that it would not attempt to make its own response. It has been presumed that this item will be on the agenda, along with a host of others, for the community consultation process that DFO has now embarked upon enroute to modifying these regulations. Gordon Koshinsky explained that this item appears as an NWMB task merely to ensure that the topic is actually transferred to the consultation process, and that DFO is formally advised that the NWMB will not be pursuing it unilaterally. It is only proper that the Department receives a formal response to their request.

Item A29: Follow up on NWMB recommendations put forward to the Five-Year Independent Review. The need to do this was re-affirmed.

Item B01: Prepare a definitive comparison of the Board's status vis-à-vis other agencies regarding remuneration of Board Members as set out by the federal Treasury Board. Michael d'Eça advised that a new set of guidelines has apparently been established, and officials have promised to send him a copy. He will follow up.

Item B03: Advise the Co-Management Ministers of the NWMB desire to establish protocols to help minimize the possibility of Ministerial rejections of NWMB final decisions. It was decided to ask the NWMB Legal Advisor to prepare a briefing note on this matter for the Board.

There was some discussion about the most meaningful and efficient way to deal with the Task List in future meetings. It was decided that in future:

- The lead assignee will speak to each item that has not been completed;
- Discussion on any particular item will be deferred if that matter appears elsewhere on the agenda.

7. Environment Canada (CWS): Issues and Decisions

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

Jim Noble referred to the briefing note that was provided by Kevin McCormick. Since the governing party was returned to power in the recent Federal election, it is deemed probable that the SARA legislation will be re-introduced and fast-tracked, quite possibly even under the same Minister. Kevin advised in his note that the federal/provincial accord with respect to species-at-risk remains intact, and a number of bi-lateral agreements are being developed. Ultimately it is expected that there will be such an agreement with respect to Nunavut.

7.B Preparation of Species Status Reports by COSEWIC

Jim Noble referred to Kevin McCormick's confirmation of recent COSEWIC activity on some species status reports of interest to the NWMB, including:

- A review of the status of polar bears (recently completed), with a status of "Special Concern" assigned (equivalent to "Vulnerable" formerly);
- A review of the status of harlequin ducks under serious consideration.

COSEWIC has not to date sought to involve the NWMB in any of its decisions leading up to these reviews, and has given no indication of recognising the role of the NWMB in approving them. Jim drew attention to Item A07 in the Task List which states: "Request the COSEWIC Secretariat to provide plans for preparation of status reports for species-at-risk in Nunavut, and convey the nature of the NWMB jurisdiction in this matter". The Board reiterated the need to transmit such a communication to COSEWIC, in order to position the NWMB to discharge its mandate as per Section 5.2.34 (f) of the NLCA.

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

Burt Hunt began by reporting that the DFO position that was developed in part to provide support to the NMC has now been filled. The incumbent, Mr. Jean-Pierre Thonney, is established in DFO's Iqaluit office.

8.A Community-Based Management for Narwhal and Beluga

Burt Hunt referred the Members to the briefing note on this topic. Iqaluit and Kimmirut participated in community-based management for beluga in 2000, but Pangnirtung did not. The following data have been reported by the HTOs (for 2000):

	<u>Landed</u>	<u>Struck and escaped</u>	<u>Killed and lost</u>
Iqaluit	3	0	0
Kimmirut	21	2	2
Pangnirtung	37	N/C	N/C

Gordon Koshinsky asked if the beluga numbers reported for Iqaluit were deemed to be accurate. Burt stated that these numbers were provided by the HTO, but he was of the opinion that they might well be low. Harry Flaherty suggested that 7 to 10 belugas were actually harvested at Iqaluit last season, with harvest activity limited by ice conditions and weather.

With respect to narwhal, the same three communities (Mittimatalik, Qikiqtarjuaq and Repulse Bay) participated in community-based management in 2000 as in 1999. The Department believes that there are some discrepancies between reported and actual harvests. The following data were provided by the HTOs (for 2000):

	<u>Landed</u>	<u>Struck and escaped</u>	<u>Killed and lost</u>
Mittimatalik	166	21	10
Qikiqtarjuaq	127	79	40
Repulse Bay	45	9	5

Burt reminded the Board of DFO's interim decision, taken on October 16, to close the Qikiqtarjuaq narwhal hunt pursuant to provision 5.3.24 of the NLCA. Burt outlined the reasons for this decision, as set out in his letter to the NWMB of November 1. There was considerable discussion by the Board about the expectations and events that led up to the DFO decision.

Burt stated that DFO does not believe that community-based management is achieving its objectives. The Department is concerned about the large numbers of animals being harvested, and the numbers being struck and lost. It seems that harvesting is frequently attempted without adequate provision for retrieval. The accuracy of reporting by the HTOs is also considered to be questionable, at least in some situations. The new system seems to have led in some instances to a new focus on commercialization for the benefit of a few individuals, rather than for the immediate or long-term benefit of the community as a whole. In light of these

concerns, the Department is recommending that community-based management in its present form be reconsidered. The Department stands ready to participate in the further development of an acceptable system of community-based management.

Michelle Wheatley noted that in the deliberations leading up to introduction of the new management system for narwhal in its present form two years ago, the Narwhal Working Group had the expectation that this change would not significantly increase the harvest of narwhals. That expectation proved to be ill-founded. Other concerns have also arisen with respect to the new system. Glenn Williams stated that the expectation that harvests would remain relatively constant was not communicated to the communities in the preparatory round of consultations that preceded the introduction of the new system. Burt Hunt referred to what he had believed was a well-known understanding between Canada and Greenland to the effect that both jurisdictions would try to ensure that harvests of Baffin Bay narwhal did not increase until more was known about the population(s). Harry Flaherty noted that in his home community of Grise Fiord, the accepted historical practice has been to harpoon narwhals before they are shot so as to minimize losses. Glenn urged that a new round of consultations be undertaken with the communities. He suggested that these consultations might even take the form of public hearings.

Michelle re-introduced the alternative approach to community-based management for narwhal that she tabled at the Board's Conference Call (No. 53) on October 30. The central feature of this approach would be a 5-year revolving quota. Harvest ceilings would be established over a 5-year time frame, with the participating communities free to decide within which part of each 5-year period they would harvest what portion of the 5-year quota. The number of animals actually harvested in any given year would be reflected in the quota for the next 5-year time frame. Michelle outlined the advantages that she saw for such an approach, including:

- Elimination of conservation concerns (assuming that the 5-year quotas were defensible in the first place);
- Retention of community control with respect to annual harvest levels (within an overall 5-year quota); and
- Retention of ability by communities to take account of annual variations in availability of animals.

Michael d'Eça noted that there seemed to be near universal support for the general concept of community-based management, but he interpreted that the initiative in the form in which it had been implemented was now in considerable jeopardy. It seemed probable that the 3-year trial period was not providing enough time for effective implementation and proper evaluation, and a more concerted effort to understand and assist the implementation process would perhaps be in order. Michael offered to develop a briefing note to set out alternatives available to the NWMB for quick and decisive action. The Board agreed with this approach, and called for the inclusion of provision for conducting a review of DFO's interim decision to close the 2000 narwhal hunt at Qikiqtarjuaq.

8.B Integrated Fishery Management Plan for Pangnirtung

Burt Hunt tabled a briefing note that outlined an initiative which DFO is pursuing to develop such a management plan. The first-line product would be a status report on all lakes and rivers available to Pangnirtung fishery users. This information would be input to decisions by the HTO on fishery priorities, allocations, and harvest planning. DFO is awaiting the response of the Pangnirtung HTO to this idea.

8.C Utilization of Nunavut Implementation Funding by DFO

Burt Hunt tabled an update on DFO research projects in the NSA that are being supported by Nunavut Implementation funds made available to the Department. Eighteen projects are underway, seven pertaining to fish (turbot and charr) and eleven pertaining to marine mammals (all species). Detailed interim reports on these projects are due early in the new year.

8.D Greenland Halibut (Turbot) Survey in NAFO Divisions 0A and 0B

Burt Hunt referred the Members to the meeting binder for the briefing note pertaining to this 3-year project. The survey work in Division 0A in 1999 revealed a larger resource base than what had previously been assumed for management purposes, and the quota has been increased as a result. Survey effort in 2000 was directed to Division 0B. Preliminary indications are that productivity there is similar to what it is in 0A. It had been assumed that, being farther south, it would be higher. This has been a very successful collaborative project, involving Newfoundland Region of DFO along with Greenland. Survey effort in 2001 will be directed to both Divisions 0A and 0B.

8.E Implementing DFO Obligations under the NLCA: Update

Burt Hunt advised that DFO, in conjunction with other Federal Departments and NTI, are setting up a working group with the aim of improving Federal performance with respect to fulfilling staffing obligations as per Article 23 of the NLCA. DFO currently employs three beneficiaries within its staffing complement of eleven at Iqaluit. Following completion of a staffing action now in progress, half of DFO's staff at Rankin Inlet will be Inuit.

Burt also advised that DFO is in the process of producing a Northern Sustainable Development Strategy.

8.F Fish Habitat Management in the Eastern Arctic

Burt Hunt advised that the Habitat Management arm of DFO in the Eastern Arctic works in conjunction with the Nunavut Water Board and the Nunavut Impact Review Board, among other co-management partners, to ensure that fish habitat concerns are addressed in connection with existing and proposed development projects. Recent activities include:

- Review of Tahera Corporation's Jericho Diamond Mine project proposal;
- Monitoring of the Nanisivik, Polaris and Lupin mining operations;
- Advice on plans to construct a bridge near Kugarruk;
- Advice on an application to build a tannery at Qikiqtarjuaq;
- Intervention with respect to Iqaluit's application to renew its water licence;
- Tracking of several projects to clean up contaminated sites.

8.G Developing Fishery Regulations for Nunavut: Update

Winston Fillatre reported that DFO Headquarters has endorsed the concept of developing Fishery Regulations specific to Nunavut, this with the particular aim of achieving conformity with the NLCA. Headquarters is amenable to having provisions for the regulation of activities pertaining to marine mammals incorporated into the new Fishery Regulations if this can be done in an expeditious manner.

Winston advised that plans are to convene the Nunavut Regulatory Review Committee, which last met in February, about two weeks hence in order to move this matter forward. Nigel Banks, the law professor who has been retained by the Committee as a consultant, has prepared a background document for the exercise. A video is also being prepared for use in the community consultation process.

Michael d'Eça applauded the document prepared by the consultant, but observed that it contained a few errors of interpretation. One such pertains to appropriate mechanisms for granting Variation Orders. To be in conformity with the NLCA, such Orders must have the participation and approval of the NWMB. There is a similar problem of interpretation regarding the appropriate mechanism for granting experimental licences. Michael noted that the document is still in draft form, and anticipated no problems getting these matters corrected in the course of the Committee's forthcoming deliberations with the consultant.

Wednesday, 29 November 2000

The Interim Chairperson, Harry Flaherty, re-convened the meeting at 08:40 a.m. He asked Joan Scottie to lead the opening prayer.

8.H Walrus Sport Hunting in 2000

Winston Fillatre reported on walrus sport-hunting activity stemming from the 33 approvals granted for the summer of 2000. There were seven successful hunts, six at Igloolik and one at Hall Beach. Except for the failure of one party (at Coral Harbour) to reach its hunting destination on account of weather, and one struck-and-loss incident at Hall Beach, all hunts that were attempted were successful. Winston suggested that more benefits could be derived from this economic and recreational opportunity if it was promoted more actively.

8.I Walrus Working Group: Update

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Board that the Walrus Working Group was established primarily in response to the emerging walrus sport-hunting industry in the NSA, with the main aim of developing a management plan to guide this and other walrus harvesting activities. Michelle reported that the Working Group held its second meeting in October. The Group reviewed progress on the task list developed at its first meeting. A number of possible management options for walrus were discussed in general terms. The Working Group identified three options for further consultation at the community level. These options were: keeping the current system; removing all quotas; and limiting the number of walrus killed to some proportion of the population. Another meeting of the Working Group is planned for April, assuming that feedback is received from the communities.

Michael d'Eça observed that the NLCA requires the NWMB to identify and establish Basis Needs Levels for walrus; an obligation that has been deferred. Michael suggested that the Working Group be alerted to this requirement, and consider ways to facilitate its implementation.

8.J Walrus Sport Hunting in 2001

Michelle Wheatley referred to her extensive briefing note on the matter of requests for, and considerations and recommendations regarding, sport-hunting quotas for walrus in 2001. To date, applications have been received from six communities, requesting that a combined total of 80 walrus be allocated to guided sport hunting. Michelle explained that she had once again based her assessment of the applications on the interim policy adopted by the Board for this purpose in May 1999 (Resolution 2000- 003).

The Board considered the request from Aiviq HTO at Cape Dorset for approval to take up to five walrus by sport hunting in 2001. This is the same number requested (and approved) last year, albeit no sport hunting was actually conducted.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 218**) to approve a total of five walrus sport hunts for the Aiviq (Cape Dorset) Hunters and Trappers Association for the 2001 hunting season, subject to the Board's standard suite of conditions, namely:

- That the total walrus harvest at Cape Dorset in 2001 not exceed the average annual harvest by the community over the last 5 years;
- That the allocation of the right to sport-hunt each walrus be made by way of an assignment, executed in writing;
- That the number of walrus landed and the number struck and lost be reported at the time of the next application for a sport-hunting quota;
- That the hunts be conducted according to the hunt plan as submitted by the HTO for the 2001 season.

Gordon Koshinsky noted that since Makivik Members did not participate in this decision, the approval is implicitly confined to that portion of the Cape Dorset traditional hunting area that lies outside the Area of Equal Use and Occupancy. The Board reviewed the request from Igloodik HTO for approval to take up to twelve walrus by sport hunting in 2001. This is the same number requested (and approved) last year, when six animals were taken.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 219**) to approve a quota of twelve walrus sport hunts for the Igloodik Hunters and Trappers Association for the 2001 hunting season, subject to the same framework of conditions attached to the Board's approval of the 2001 sport-hunting quota for the Aiviq HTO.

The Board examined the request from the Hall Beach HTO for approval to take up to ten walrus by sport hunting in 2001. The request was submitted on behalf of Kungut Outfitting. Hall Beach was awarded a quota of three walrus for sport hunting in 2000. One walrus was taken; another was struck and lost. Gordon Koshinsky suggested that in view of the very limited history of walrus sport hunting at Hall Beach, and considering the Board's previously-stated intent to foster the orderly development of this new industry, that it would be appropriate to approve a somewhat smaller quota than had been requested. Gordon suggested approving a sport-hunting quota of five walrus for Hall Beach for 2001.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 220**) to approve a quota of ten walrus sport hunts for the Hall Beach Hunters and Trappers Association for the 2001 hunting season, subject to the Board's standard suite of conditions.

The Board considered the request from the Aiviit HTO at Coral Harbour for approval to take up to 25 walrus by sport hunting in 2001. Five walrus sport hunts were awarded by the NWMB in 2000; one hunt was conducted but no walrus were taken. Gordon Koshinsky suggested that Coral Harbour HTO was not being realistic to request a sport-hunting quota of 25 walrus in view of the very limited nature of the community's history in this venture and the NWMB's stated intent that walrus sport hunting should not enlarge the recent total harvest. Michelle Wheatley advised that the total average harvest of walrus at Coral Harbour over the most recent 5-year period was 18 animals.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 221**) to approve a quota of fifteen walrus sport hunts for the Aiviit (Coral Harbour) Hunters and Trappers Association for the 2001 hunting season. Since the overall walrus harvest at Coral Harbour is already controlled by quota, this approval is made subject only to the following conditions:

- That the number of walrus landed and the number struck and lost be reported at the time of the next application for a sport-hunting quota;
- That the hunts be conducted according to the hunt plan as submitted by the HTO for the 2001 season.

The Board reviewed the request from the Nattivak HTO at Qikiqtarjuaq for approval to take up to 20 walrus by sport hunting in 2001. This is the first time that this community has requested approval to sport-hunt walrus. Michelle reported that the average annual walrus harvest at Qikiqtarjuaq over the most recent available five-year period of record has been only five animals. She recommended that the Board not approve a sport-hunt in excess of that amount.

Meeka Mike questioned the reliability of the reported annual average harvest of five walrus, and wanted to know if this conformed to the findings of the NWMB Harvest Study. Michelle replied that the figures were as provided by DFO, and that the Harvest Study results were not yet available. Meeka suggested that if that was the case, the Board should place greater reliance on input from the HTO. Michelle noted that the HTO, in the process of completing their application, had requested historic harvest information thereby indicating that they were in no position to provide it themselves. Gordon Koshinsky proposed a sport-hunting quota of five walrus for Qikiqtarjuaq, with the possibility of extension if the Harvest Study results demonstrate that the recent historic average annual harvest was higher than five. Makabe Nartok agreed that the Board should not approve a sport-hunting quota greater than the recent historic harvest.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 222**) to approve a quota of ten walrus sport hunts for the Nattivak (Qikiqtarjuaq) Hunters and Trappers Association for the 2001 hunting season, subject to the Board's standard suite of conditions.

The Board turned its attention to the request from Willie Keatainak of Salluit for approval to take up to eight walrus by sport hunting in 2001. Makivik Members Johnny Peters and Pauloosie Novalinga (both via teleconference) replaced DIO-appointed Members Moses Koonoo (absent) and Makabe Nartok for this agenda item. Michelle noted that the applicant was awarded eight walrus sport hunts last year, but failed to conduct any. Johnny Peters explained that Mr. Keatainak did have a number of bookings last year but they were cancelled when the hunters learned that they would not be able to export tusks. Johnny confirmed that Mr. Keatainak has the support of his community in this venture. Michelle reminded the Members that the applicant has conducted as many as four walrus sport hunts per year on previous occasions.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 223**) to approve a quota of eight walrus sport hunts for Willie Keatainak of Salluit for the 2001 hunting season, subject to the Board's standard suite of conditions and with the added proviso that these hunts take place in the Area of Equal Use and Occupancy around Nottingham and Salisbury Islands.

Meeka Mike asked if allocations to walrus sport hunting would have any impact on or implications for establishing Basic Needs Levels eventually. Michael d'Eça stated that in his view there were no negative implications. It has been the policy of the Board that, in the absence of quotas, allocations of walrus to sport hunting must

take place by way of formal assignments by individual beneficiaries. After BNLs are set, individuals will still have the right to assign. It is also pertinent that the Board has a precautionary policy to guide its deliberations in setting sport-hunting quotas. Gordon Koshinsky called for an evaluation of the walrus sport-hunting initiative in the NSA to date. He suggested that the Walrus Working Group take this on as a discrete task, to examine and report to the Board in particular on whether:

- Assignments are being administered as contemplated by the Board;
- Walrus sport hunting is having any effect on overall harvests; and
- The magnitude of walrus sport-hunting quota approvals in particular instances is having any impact on investment, or on the ability to attract clients, or on any other aspects in the development of the industry.

8.K Request for Increase in Kelp Quota, Hudson Bay

Michelle Wheatley referred the Members to the request from Kivalliq Land and Sea Resources Ltd. for an increase in their Hudson Bay commercial kelp-harvesting quota from 75 to 320 MT annually. The proponent has been working to develop this venture over the past several years, with activity centred in the vicinity of Whale Cove. The proponent states that 35 MT were harvested under the existing quota in the summer of 2000 and seeks an increase to help ensure economic viability. DFO experts have stated that an annual quota of 320 MT would represent a small portion of the available biomass, even without taking account of recruitment.

David Alagalak questioned the credibility of the venture, and asked if DFO had inspected the operation last summer. He was unable to visualise how a harvest of 35 MT could have been taken. David also suggested that it would be more logical if proper handling facilities were actually in place before additional quota was granted. Burt Hunt suggested that the kind of facility inspection that David had in mind would be the purview of the Canada Food Inspection Agency. Michelle suggested that the proponent is seeking the larger quota as a lever for obtaining funding support. Gordon Koshinsky noted that this request is being considered in an experimental context, and urged that provision be made to ensure that the proponent does not simply “high-grade” the best available kelp beds, perhaps to their destruction.

Carey Bonnell expressed some concern about the present and ongoing use of dredges in this venture. Dredges are not standard equipment for harvesting kelp, and probably will impact negatively on long-term kelp productivity and fish habitat. On the other hand, the amount of kelp under consideration for harvesting is very small relative to the available biomass, and the potential health-food market is huge. Carey placed considerable stock in the recommendations that Michelle was bringing forward as proposed conditions on approval of this request by the Board. If there is provision for adequate inspections and monitoring in conjunction with these conditions, it should be possible to alleviate or at least address any concerns.

Michelle elaborated the conditions that she was proposing for the Board to apply in the event that the Board approved this request, namely:

- That a monitoring plan be in place prior to the commencement of harvesting;
- That the licence stipulate that long-term right of access is not implicit;
- That all recommendations included in the scientific advice are incorporated;
- That the proponent have commercial diving certificates as required by the Worker's Compensation Board for harvesting by means of diving;
- That approval of other communities (besides Whale Cove) where harvesting is contemplated be obtained prior to harvesting near those communities;
- That renewal of the licence is subject to annual reports and a review of the harvest and monitoring results by the Nunavut Fisheries Working Group;
- That the applicant be encouraged to pursue the development of Nunavut-based processing facilities where appropriate, as the fishery develops.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 224**) to approve the request of Kivalliq Land and Sea Resources Limited to harvest 320 metric tonnes of kelp in the Whale Cove area in the 2001 season, subject to the restrictions set out by the Director of Wildlife Management in her briefing note to the Board.

8.L Proposal for Renewal of Experimental Quota for Sea Urchins (Keewatin)

Michelle Wheatley reminded Members that the Board earlier this summer (Conference Call 52) approved (Resolution 2000- 177) an experimental fishery for sea urchins in Hudson Bay for the benefit of Canadian Sea Urchin Harvesting Ltd. The experimental quota was set at 50,000 kg of green urchins (or up to 5,000 kg of eggs), with a number of provisions.

The proponent, Don Larochelle of Olds, Alberta, claims that he received his licence too late last summer to enable the fishery to proceed as planned. Mr. Larochelle has requested renewal of the experimental quota for 2001.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 225**) to approve renewal of an experimental quota in favour of Canadian Sea Urchin Harvesting Limited for the harvesting of 50,000 kg of sea urchins (or 5,000 kg of sea urchin eggs) in western Hudson Bay in 2001, subject to the same conditions that were established when this quota was initially approved for 2000.

8.M Requests for Commercial Charr and Lake Trout Quotas at Kugluktuk

Michelle Wheatley referred the Members to the briefing materials in the meeting binder. The HTO at Kugluktuk has requested that DFO grant experimental licences to enable them to fish small quantities of lake trout and/or Arctic charr in a number of water bodies in their area that have not recently been licensed. The HTO reports that there is no subsistence or commercial harvest from these waters at the present time. The applications have the support of DFO, provided it is understood and that provision is made to sample the catches in order to provide material for the Department to evaluate if the harvests are sustainable.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 226**) to approve commercial quotas for Arctic charr and lake trout as requested by the local HTO for the following water bodies in the vicinity of Kugluktuk:

- Kugaryoak Lake/River: 1000 kg of lake trout and 1000 kg of Arctic charr;
- Cape Lambert Area Lake: 3000 kg of Arctic charr;
- Kikitalik Lake: 1500 kg of lake trout;
- Contwoyto Lake: 1500 kg of lake trout and 1500 kg of Arctic charr; and
- Bernard Harbour: 1000 kg lake trout and 1000 kg of Arctic charr;

These approvals are granted with the following understandings and conditions:

- That the licences are renewable for up to 5 years;
- That biological samples (length, weight, sex, otoliths) must be collected, as per DFO instructions, from 100 fish of each species from each water body, in both the first and fifth years of the approved harvest period; and
- That information on fishing effort and catch success must be submitted to DFO on an annual basis.

8.N SE Baffin Beluga Management Committee: Future of the Committee

Ben Kovic referred the Board to his briefing note in the meeting binder. Ben advised that, in response to instructions from the Board, he had telephoned the four Inuit Committee members individually to solicit their views on the future of the Committee. The members were unanimous in the view that the Committee should be dissolved, assuming that it could be re-established if a need arose subsequently.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 227**) to disband the Southeast Baffin Beluga Management Committee, and to provide a letter and plaque to each member in appreciation of their work on behalf of this Committee.

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

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

Stephen Atkinson tabled documentation and reviewed the developments that led up to the present state of concern about the status of the M'Clintock Channel polar bear population. He also summarized the efforts of DSD to date to advise and obtain input from the three communities that rely on this population, along with the briefings previously provided to the NWMB. Stephen referred the Members to the briefing note prepared by Michelle Wheatley for a synopsis on these matters.

In summary, the current best estimate (after three years of concerted study) is that the M'Clintock Channel polar bear population numbers about 288 animals. This is much less than the estimate of 700 bears that has served as the foundation for management, and which has been the basis upon which quotas have been set.

In the most recent consultation effort Departmental staff, along with the KHTA Chairperson, travelled to each of the three communities to update the HTOs on the

results-to-date of the mark-and-recapture studies, and to interview experienced hunters to determine if the preliminary population estimate was in line with the hunters' observations. These consultations took place over the period September 11-15. Stephen provided an overview of what transpired at these meetings. Reaction to the DSD presentation, not surprisingly, was mixed. However most of the experienced hunters who were specifically interviewed did report observing a gradual decline in the number of polar bears in the area. Some expressed the opinion that this decline was more or less confined to large males. Many attributed it to migration of bears out of the area. Some hunters reported what they interpreted to be a decline in the body condition of harvested bears.

Stephen advised that the Department is planning a workshop next week with the three communities that share this polar bear population. DSD will then follow up with a formal proposal to the NWMB. All concerned need to give consideration to the range of available management options. These options would seem to include:

- Take no new action. In view of the best-available information, this could not be reconciled with the principles of conservation as per the NLCA.
- Take steps to stabilise the population at its current level. According to the current calculations, this could be achieved by reducing the annual quota to seven or eight animals. Harvesting at that level would be "sustainable", but only in the context of maintaining a depleted population. With no expectation that the population would increase to its former level under this harvesting regime, it would not be possible to reconcile such a course of action with the principles of conservation.
- Reduce the annual quota to something less than seven or eight animals. Such action would presumably allow the population to recover, albeit at a rate that was reduced in proportion to the number of animals still being taken.
- Institute a hunting moratorium for an indefinite period, or at least until studies now underway are fully completed.
- Institute some combination of some or all of these measures.

An important complicating factor is the reaction of the US Fish and Wildlife Service to the status of the population. The Service previously interpreted that this population was being "managed sustainably" as per the criteria of the US Marine Mammal Protection Act, and accordingly designated the population as approved for the importation of sport-hunting trophies (specifically hides) into the USA. The current indication that the population is depleted has placed this designation in considerable jeopardy, and with it a very significant source of income for the three communities (Taloyoak, Gjoa Haven and Cambridge Bay). USFWS personnel are aware of the forthcoming workshop with the communities. They are not rushing to make the decision on whether or not to de-list this population, but they will need to decide within the next month. It is also pertinent that most polar bear sport hunting occurs in the spring. Booking agents have started taking a conservative approach, but a number of sport hunts have already been booked from Taloyoak.

The forthcoming community workshop will be hosted by the KHTA at Kugluktuk. DSD will certainly welcome input and support from the NWMB and NTI at the meeting. The Board decided to send Makabe Nartok to participate. It was also decided that Makabe's role will not be to try to influence the discussion, but rather to enunciate the principles of conservation that will guide the NWMB deliberations.

On a different matter pertaining to polar bear management, Raymond Ningeocheak observed that the inclusion of the north-western tip of Quebec within the territorial boundaries of the Foxe Basin population was a matter of some inconvenience. He asked if any consideration was being given to reviewing this boundary. Stephen replied that while some work is being done on possible boundary revisions, all indications are that the Foxe Basin population is indeed shared by Nunavut and Nunavik. He suggested that a management agreement was required between these two jurisdictions with respect to this shared population.

9.B Review of Harvester Support Programs: Update

Stephen Atkinson advised the Board that DSD is reviewing all of its programs that provide support to harvesters. These programs have included not only assistance to harvesters directly, but also support for RWOs and HTOs (administered via the NWMB); support for outpost camps, fur prices, and fish transportation; as well as disaster compensation, plus the workers compensation program for harvesters.

A discussion paper is being prepared: it should be ready by the end of December and will be used to obtain input from the public. The paper will summarize interviews and discussions conducted this summer. It will include questions that the Department wants answered as well as an examination of program choices that need to be made. Meetings will be conducted in seven communities in January.

Raymond Ningeocheak asked if fuel subsidies were being considered. Stephen confirmed that fuel subsidies are part of the agenda for discussion.

9.C Study of Polar Bear Sport Hunting

Stephen Atkinson advised that DSD is helping to fund a socio-economic study of the polar bear sport-hunting industry in Nunavut. The aim of the study is to help ensure that opportunities for benefits to the communities are maximized. The study will focus on three communities (Resolute Bay, Clyde River and Taloyoak), and a field worker will be on-site in each community during the polar bear sport-hunting season. The study is being led by Dr. George Wenzel from McGill University.

9.D Effects of Capture and Handling on Polar Bears as Research Subjects

Stephen Atkinson advised that the study contracted to Dr. François Messier at the University of Saskatchewan has now been completed. Copies of the final report were provided to the NWMB, and the Executive Summary is included in the meeting

binder. The study documented no detectable effects of handling on long-term parameters such as survival and reproduction. Stephen stressed that hunters are not the only ones who are vitally concerned about these matters. A researcher knows that if his methodology is affecting the animals on which he is working, then his results will be compromised. This subject will thus be of ongoing interest, with constant striving for improvements to the extent that such may be possible. There are also other matters that should be studied, such as possible short-term effects.

The Department is looking for interesting and effective ways to get these study results out to the communities. Posters may be a useful tool. Stephen drew attention to a rough draft of a poster that he had brought to the meeting with a view to obtaining feedback and suggestions from the Board.

Harry Flaherty observed that there has been a long-standing concern about the length of time that drugs used as anaesthetics remain in the bears. Stephen replied that this matter was not specifically examined in this study. However the subject has been researched previously, and the findings can be included in any demonstration materials, such as posters, that will be prepared to assist the communities.

Glenn Williams offered some pertinent observations based on traditional knowledge:

- Weather conditions in early spring (late March through early April) when family groups of bears emerge from their dens tend to make this a high-risk period for handling such groups, especially in respect to the cubs;
- Ear-tagging cubs-of-the-year cannot be relied upon to produce good results:
 - the actual tags can have a negative impact on small cubs, and
 - cubs will often chew such tags from the ears of their siblings.

Glenn also requested assurance that any radio collars that are applied to polar bears in future will be designed to self-release after a designated period of time. This will prevent bears being obliged to wear collars for extended periods for no reason on those occasions when the radios cease to transmit.

Stephen replied that researchers share the same concerns identified by Glenn. The Department tries to avoid handling cubs prior to April, although this is not always feasible in mark-and-recapture studies. The Department now entirely avoids handling cubs-of-the-year on extremely cold days. The Department is also moving to the use of lip tattoos instead of ear tags for cubs. The Department has no polar bear research currently in progress that involves the use of collars, but it is probable that only self-releasing collars would be used in future.

Makabe Nartok asked if hunters were noticing tattooed bears in the field. Stephen replied that a fair number of tattoos are indeed being turned in by hunters.

9.E Use of Electric Fences to Deter Polar Bears

Stephen Atkinson reported on studies that DSD has undertaken or has planned to evaluate the effectiveness of various electric fence configurations as polar bear deterrents. Tests conducted at Churchill, Manitoba last October were encouraging and suggested some possibilities for additional work to test the practicality of deploying such fences in terms of instalment, maintenance and public safety. The Department is planning to conduct field tests at two outpost camps, with the fences to be monitored by camp residents.

Makabe Nartok asked about the electrical output of these fences. Stephen replied that they are powerful enough to deter a polar bear, but not enough to harm humans. The ones being tested are battery-powered, with solar chargers. They conserve power by discharging only when a grounded object touches the fence.

10. NWMB Internal Items: Issues and Decisions

10.A Nunavut Wildlife Harvest Study: Update

Heather Priest referred the Members to her briefing note. Josée Galipeau took over as full-time Database Manager in October and is now doing much of the day-to-day work on the database including data verification. This has allowed the Co-ordinator to focus more attention on the preparation of community reports. Data are now complete for seven communities through May 1999. It is anticipated that all community reports will be completed by April 2001. Fieldworker turnover remains a problem in some areas, especially in the Baffin region and most notably at Iqaluit. This has also been a problem at Rankin Inlet, Chesterfield Inlet and Whale Cove in the Keewatin. It has been much less of a problem in the Kitikmeot region. Calendars for 2001 will be shipped to the communities within the next two weeks. Commemorative buck knives will be distributed to participants with the calendars.

As the Study is now constituted, the final month of data collection will be this coming May. A number of agencies have expressed interest in continuing the collection of harvest data beyond that date. Jack Hicks of the GN Department of Executive and Intergovernmental Affairs is co-ordinating a study to assess the feasibility of doing this. Requests for proposals to conduct the study will be advertised soon.

Raymond Ningeocheak reported that there was strong support in the community of beneficiaries for some sort of continuation of the Harvest Study. The Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board, on instructions from its membership, sponsored a resolution that was passed at the recent Wildlife Symposium urging continuation of the Study. NTI also recognizes the ongoing utility of this kind of information. Heather acknowledged widespread interest and support for continuation. It will be up to the feasibility study to quantify this support and to better document expectations.

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

Michelle Wheatley stated that there were no new developments to report. Members of the Working Group were charged to consult in their respective regions and organizations on the ideas developed at the last meeting of the Group in April.

10.C Implementation of NWMB Strategic Plan: Progress Report

Jim Noble referred the Members to the meeting binder for a synopsis of progress in addressing the items identified by the Board in its latest (November 1999) strategic planning exercise for attention during the remainder of the present planning period.

The Board accepted the progress report with little discussion. With respect to the task of pursuing fishery development, Jim observed that the exploratory snow crab fisheries (two licences) were not successful in finding any snow crabs. There is some thought that the searches may have been more successful had they been conducted closer to shore. Harry Flaherty suggested that the work was done too late in the season for best results.

10.D Performance Audit of Research Projects Supported by NWRT Funding

Michelle Wheatley referred the Members to the report she had prepared based on her extensive review of the results of NWMB support via (primarily) NWRT funds of fisheries and wildlife research by government agencies over the past seven years. Among the highlights documented in the report:

- The total amount of funding approved over the period was \$4,374,696;
- Only about 80% of approved funds have actually been spent to date;
- DFO has been the destination agency for half of the approved funding;
- Agencies of the Territorial Government(s) have been destined for 38% of approved funding, with DOE/CWS approved for the remainder (12%);
- NWRT/NWMB funding has been significantly matched by other sources:
 - By (slightly) more than a doubling from the recipient agencies;
 - By two-thirds again from other contributors;
- Slightly more than a quarter (26%) of approved funding has been to support polar bear research;
- Other species that have received major research-funding emphasis have been narwhal/beluga (often undifferentiated) 16%, and caribou 13%;
- Of the funding approvals that can be designated as pertaining to specific regions, 47% has been for Baffin, 28% for Kitikmeot and 25% for Keewatin. One-fifth of approved funding has been pertinent to some combination of regions, or to all of the NSA;
- Local employment accounts for 8.7% of approved budgets;
- Actual amounts spent on local employment have been only half the budgeted amounts;
- A significant number of projects have passed the deadline for submitting final reports.

Michelle went on to review the 14 recommendations that she developed from her analysis. She explained that the purpose of Recommendation 3 would be to discourage agencies that have a variety of funding sources for a particular project from using NWRT funds disproportionately. Michelle considered that there were too many instances of agencies obtaining funding approvals and then either not doing the project at all or proceeding in some highly abbreviated fashion. She felt that such hoarding of NWRT funds had the effect of denying access to other potentially worthy projects. Recommendation 4 is meant to address this problem. Michelle also expressed her intention (as per Recommendation 13) to instate a rigorous new requirement for researchers to identify the management implications of their results.

Some Members expressed consternation about the number of final reports that remain outstanding, and requested an explanation of what these final reports were meant to entail. Michelle explained that in the context of administering the NWRT Fund, and hence for the purposes of her review, submission of a final report does not necessarily signal completion of the work or the benefits flowing from it. The final report as here defined is simply the way for a researcher to formally confirm that, and in a general way how, the NWRT funds were utilized. A final report, in this context, is the (only) realistic basis upon which a project file can be closed.

Glenn Williams applauded the analysis as a very useful exercise and a responsible undertaking by the NWMB. He looked forward to the responses of the Government agencies to the report.

Gordon Koshinsky observed that while there is obviously room for improvement in how government agencies manage and conduct their research programs, it must also be acknowledged that a great deal of useful work is being done. In addition to singling-out shortcomings in the funding program and the performance of the recipients, it would be equally logical and appropriate to recognize and applaud excellent performance and success. Gordon also cautioned against being too insistent about encouraging agencies to spend all their approved funds. There is danger that this could be interpreted as encouragement to waste, and in any event the Board seems generally to have had adequate funds for the research projects it wished to support.

Ben thanked Michelle for doing her analysis which he characterized as a useful piece of work, well done.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 228**) to accept the 14 recommendations developed by the Director of Wildlife Management from her review of files pertaining to research projects conducted by government agencies with the support of the NWMB, sourced primarily from the Nunavut Wildlife Research Trust Fund.

10.E Establishing Wildlife Management Priorities: Policy Proposal

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Board of the direction given to her at the previous Board meeting to draft a revision to the approach being used to establish priorities for fish and wildlife research. Michelle drew the attention of the Board to the policy proposal that she had prepared in response to this assignment. The point of departure for the proposal is the proposition that the legitimate research needs of a management agency such as the NWMB should be linked to and should ultimately derive from that agency's management objectives. Identification of management priorities is thus a reasonable starting point for establishing research priorities.

The new procedure as proposed would piggy-back on the Annual General Meetings of the RWOs, usually held in summer or fall. Full-scale wildlife-management-prioritization workshops would be conducted in conjunction with these AGMs at three-year intervals. Considerable effort and attention would be directed to advance preparations to ensure that these workshops were focussed and productive.

In answer to specific questions from Members, Michelle offered the following:

- Management priorities also have other prioritization applications, such as with respect to management planning initiatives, quota reviews, population boundary assessments, developmental opportunities, and wildlife research topics outside the purview of the NWMB (such as in connection with disease or contaminants).
- The system as proposed has provision for and will help to foster communication between RWOs and HTOs with respect to identifying wildlife management (and research) needs.
- The concept was presented to the RWOs and HTOs at the recent Wildlife Symposium and was well received.
- The beginning of the new calendar year would be an appropriate time to begin the process of implementing the new policy.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 229**) to adopt the new *Policy for the Identification of Wildlife Management Priorities* (November 2000) as presented.

10.F Fisheries Allocation: Proposed Policy Revision

Michelle Wheatley referred the Members to her briefing note. She acknowledged that the NWMB already had a policy to govern the allocation of established turbot and shrimp fisheries; however she (Michelle) had come to the conclusion that the existing policy was too restrictive in that it did not provide guidance for allocation in respect to new or emerging fisheries. The new/revised policy as proposed sets out general principles and procedures for allocation. Details with respect to particular fisheries are included as appendices to the policy, and can subsequently be amended, added to, or subtracted from as may be required.

Michael d'Eça offered a number of suggestions regarding additional references to the NLCA that he deemed appropriate for inclusion in the document. Gordon Koshinsky requested that Michael peruse the document carefully to ensure that there is nothing in it that conflicts with the NWMB's historic stance on turbot

allocations to Nunavut interests by DFO. Meeka Mike suggested that the document would benefit from the addition of a glossary.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 230**) to adopt the revised *Policy for the Allocation of Commercial Marine Fisheries in the NSA and in Marine Zones I and II* (November 2000) as presented by the Director of Wildlife Management, subject to the development and inclusion of amendments as noted in the discussion.

10.G Transfer of Tags / Quotas between Communities: Policy Proposal

Michael d'Eça referred to his briefing note on this subject. He noted that from time to time the NWMB is requested, either directly by communities or indirectly via government departments, to transfer tags and/or quotas pertaining to the harvest of wildlife from one community to another. He reminded the Board that the need for a policy to guide the administration of such transfers was identified in conjunction with a decision at the last NWMB regular meeting to approve a transfer of narwhal tags from Kimmirut to Pangnirtung. Michael directed the attention of the Members to the draft policy that he had prepared, consistent with Inuit rights and all relevant laws. The policy is envisaged as an interim measure, pending completion of legislative and regulatory initiatives now underway by the Territorial Government and DFO.

In making his presentation, Michael made a number of observations, including:

- That there is nothing in existing legislation or regulations that is of assistance in defining tags;
- That both DSD and DFO do require the use of tags as a prerequisite to and/or in conjunction with harvesting in certain prescribed circumstances;
- That the NLCA specifically exempts an Inuk with proper identification from requiring licences, or tags that form part of licences, in order to harvest wildlife up to his/her adjusted basic needs level;
- That the term “basic needs level” is not synonymous with a food harvest or a subsistence level of harvest, but has a broader connotation;
- That the transfer of tags is *de facto* the transfer of a share of a quota or TAH;
- That the NLCA guarantees an Inuk (or an HTO or an RWO) the right to assign harvesting rights without reference to the NWMB or to any government agency;
- That the NWMB has taken initiatives to entrench the use of tags for narwhal harvests under the community-based management system. In doing so the NWMB has acted within its purview under the NLCA.

The interim policy for the transfer of quotas or tags by the NWMB would have the following characteristics and provisions as proposed:

- Transfers would only be made in respect to a common population of animals;
- Transfers should take place prior to harvesting of the animals in question;
- Transfers would first be applied against any over-harvests that may have occurred;
- Transfers would need to be exercised within the year they were approved.

Michael recommended that if the Board saw merit in enacting a policy with these sorts of provisions, that the input and opinions of the NWMB's co-management partners be sought and taken into account before the policy was formally adopted.

The Board gave approval-in-principle (**Resolution 2000- 231**) to the draft *Policy on Transfer of Tags and/or Quotas between Nunavut Communities*, and instructed staff to solicit input from the NWMB's co-management partners for consideration by the Board in anticipation of finalizing the policy at the first available opportunity.

10.H Continuation of the BQCMB beyond 2002

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Board that the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Barren Ground Management Agreement is set to expire in June 2002. In anticipation, the B/Q Caribou Management Board wrote to the Ministers of the four signatory Departments requesting that consideration be given to extending the B/Q Board's mandate beyond the present expiry date. The B/Q Board Chairman has reported favourable responses from all four Ministers, and at the same time has requested the views of the NWMB in the matter.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 232**) to support continuation of the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board beyond the year 2002.

Thursday, 30 November 2000

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, re-convened the meeting at 09:15 a.m. An earlier start was precluded by the fact that some of the meeting participants were engaged in a separate session to discuss the formation of a Nunavut Inter-settlement Trade Committee. (See Agenda item 13.A.)

In-Camera Session

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

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

- To go *in-camera* (**Resolution 2000- 233**)
- To close the *in-camera* session (**Resolution 2000- 234**)

11. NTI Wildlife Division: Issues and Decisions

Raymond Ningeocheak conveyed the gratitude of NTI for the NWMB's funding assistance with respect to the recent Wildlife Symposium. The Symposium was an undeniable success. It is hoped to entrench these Symposia as biennial events.

Raymond confirmed that NTI has created three new positions in its Wildlife Division. It is envisaged that much of the workload of these new employees will be oriented to assisting the RWOs and HTOs become more effective and more accountable. It seems that achievement of this goal will ultimately depend on substantially increased funding for these organizations. At present funding levels, the RWOs and HTOs are unable to retain qualified staff, and efforts to recruit, train and motivate staff are often wasted.

Raymond reported on plans underway to meet with renewable resources personnel from Greenland. There may be an opportunity for the NWMB to participate in such a meeting. Ben Kovic asked about progress on NTI's efforts to address overlap issues with Makivik, noting that the Board had appointed Meeka Mike to represent the NWMB in this initiative. Raymond replied that the two groups met last spring but there have been no developments since. Makivik does not seem to have the same kind of close working relationship with the provincial government in Quebec as NTI has with the Nunavut Government, and this may be delaying progress.

Glenn Williams reiterated his enthusiasm about the audit done by the NWMB Director of Wildlife Management with respect to research by Government agencies that has been funded by the NWMB/NWRT. The matter of training and employment of beneficiaries is of particular interest and concern to NTI. The commitment to this on the part of Government agencies as shown by the NWMB audit is not adequate in NTI's view. Hopefully the NWMB will be able to use its influence by way of research funding approvals to bring about positive changes.

Meeka Mike noted that the NTI mandate is more concrete than the mandate of the NWMB with respect to the training and employment of Inuit. The NWMB has taken seriously and has acted according to its responsibility, as per Paragraphs 5.3.28 (b) and (c) of the NLCA, to promote and encourage the training and employment of Inuit in research. Meeka asked what plans NTI itself has for helping Inuit to realize opportunities that are available to them in this field. Michael d'Eça noted that Paragraph 5.1.6 of the NLCA confirms that Government and Inuit share recognition of the need for Inuit to be involved in all aspects of wildlife management (including research). Michael interpreted that this opens the door to active participation by NTI.

Glenn reviewed the initiatives that NTI has had underway to promote awareness and dialogue on this issue. He interpreted that NTI does not have a mandate to instruct government agencies as to their behaviour in this regard. NTI urges the NWMB to make performance in training and hiring of Inuit a condition of approval for research funding. Meeka replied that the NWMB does take an agency's stated intentions seriously into account when assessing research-funding applications, but suggested that NTI could also take a more active role in the process. Michelle Wheatley repeated an earlier suggestion that NTI could do more to identify Inuit candidates to train and to work in wildlife research. Glenn acknowledged that this was discussed previously, but did not interpret that NTI had a secretarial kind of role or obligation. Perhaps there was a substantive role in this for the schools, but the

bottom line is that Government agencies need to make a bigger effort. This could include indirect initiatives, such as classroom presentations by scientists. Glenn also acknowledged that NTI could perhaps play a role by drawing the attention of the Regional Inuit Organizations to approved research projects, and enlisting those Organizations to canvass for Inuit participants.

Gordon Koshinsky cautioned against trying to set generalized targets for Inuit participation in research projects, since no two projects are likely to offer the same suite of opportunities. It would be relatively simple, but not necessarily effective, to absolutely require research agencies to spend a certain percentage of project funds on Inuit participation. Such a requirement could actually be counter-productive if it did not relate to genuine opportunities. Gordon doubted that government research agencies would consciously try to subvert the training and hiring of Inuit, but he acknowledged that not every individual researcher would necessarily share the same priority or commitment. Gordon wondered if NTI could do anything to increase the profile and credibility of fisheries and wildlife research in the communities. At the present time, young Inuit do not necessarily view research as a desirable career choice.

Gordon suggested that it would probably be more useful to identify opportunities for Inuit participation in the whole range of activities that comprise the overall approach to a wildlife management problem, rather than focussing on just one component, i.e. research. The newly-adopted system for establishing research priorities as a component of management priorities should facilitate this. Glenn stressed that NTI does not seek to shirk its role, but merely asks that all agencies review their own roles and take them seriously. In the final analysis, a co-operative effort is required.

Ben remarked that while he was still in Iqaluit yesterday he heard a progress report on the present meeting on CBC Radio. One item sounded like a formal call by Glenn on behalf of NTI for the NWMB to conduct public hearings on community-based management. Ben asked for clarification: is this in fact the NTI position, and if so why was it not communicated to the NWMB explicitly? Raymond replied that the NTI Board had not discussed the matter and certainly has not decided to ask for public hearings. Glenn was merely suggesting a possible course of action. It does seem clear that the communities will need to be visited in some formal manner to determine what can be done to get the new management system back on track.

Bert Dean expressed regret that Glenn's remarks came to Ben via the media, and that the media had interpreted those remarks as a formal call by NTI for public hearings. There has been much prompting from beneficiaries to NTI on this matter, and the response of NTI staff stems from that pressure from its clients. NWMB staff have been aware of this also. Bert also pointed out that the NWMB had earlier decided to send Ben and Moses Koonoo to the communities, but this has not yet taken place.

Ben replied that preparations were started for him and Moses to meet with the communities, but a number of circumstances have intervened. It is still the intention to have those meetings. Ben thanked Raymond, Bert and Glenn for their input and continuing determination to help in the effective management of Nunavut wildlife.

12. Matters of Funding: Status Reports on Programs and New Requests

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

Michelle Wheatley reported that all three government agencies approved for NWRT funding for 2000/01 have now met the reporting requirements and project conditions to enable funds to flow to them. A total of 22 projects were approved overall, and contribution agreements have been or are being finalized as follows:

- With DFO: \$414,000
- With DSD: \$195,700
- With CWS: \$91,000

12.B Status of NWMB Study Funding for Projects Approved for 2000/01

Michelle Wheatley reported that cheques in the total amount of \$150,057 have now been issued in respect to all but one of the nine projects approved for Study Funding support for 2000/01. The one approved project that has not been funded to date has not met its funding conditions. This project pertains to charr tagging at Gjoa Haven.

12.C Funding Request: Aiviit (Coral Harbour) HTO

Jim Noble advised the Board that the Aiviit HTO is experiencing a funding shortfall, created when the HTO failed to take account of certain financial commitments that needed to be honoured from the previous year. The problem can be linked to the fact that the HTO has no accounting expertise on staff. The HTO has requested an infusion of \$8,300 to enable it to operate until the start of the next fiscal year.

David Alagalak was of the opinion that the HTO might have a number of receivables that will reduce or may even eliminate the problem. The Board decided not to take any action at the present time, but to maintain a watching brief. Gordon Koshinsky noted that there invariably seem to be one or more HTOs that could benefit from interim loans from the NWMB. He suggested that the Board might consider establishing a budget line item to provide a contingency fund for such loans.

13. Other Presentations

13.A Nunavut Inter-Settlement Trade Committee: Revived Proposal

Jim Noble briefed the Board on a meeting earlier this morning of a group of individuals to consider the formation of a Nunavut Inter-Settlement Trade Committee. Jim reminded the Board that it had earlier (at Sanikiluaq) decided to

endorse the initiative to establish such a committee, and agreed in principle to participate if the committee was formed. The most immediate impetus for establishing such a committee remains to provide a vehicle to meet the administrative requirements for Territorial participation in the Canadian Adaptation and Rural Development (CARD) program of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada.

After hearing a presentation from Alex Milton of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, and reviewing a draft terms of reference for such a committee presented by John Hickey of the Nunavut Development Corporation, the group decided to proceed to establish the committee as outlined. Bert Dean will be the chairperson, and the Nunavut Development Corporation will act as secretariat. Jim Noble will be a member of the committee representing the NWMB.

13.B Keewatin Wildlife Federation Presentation: David Alagalak, Chairperson

David Alagalak began his presentation by reporting that the KWF Executive Director is on a one-year maternity leave. The RWO has been unable to find a fully qualified individual to back-fill. An under-qualified person has been hired on a temporary basis, and Janet Akat has taken on the responsibility to oversee KWF operations. The Project Co-ordinator position is also vacant.

With the temporary closure of the Baker Lake and Whale Cove HTO offices due to accounting and funding problems, there are currently only five fully operational HTOs in the Region. The Coral Harbour HTO office is also in danger of shutting down due to lack of funds. Some operations of these HTOs are being maintained by way of volunteer assistance. For instance, the Baker Lake Hamlet is taking care of the HTO's financial records and the Baker Lake HTO Chairperson participates in RWO Executive Committee meetings on a voluntary basis.

The RWO would like to hire a consultant to help update RWO and HTO operating procedures to bring them into full conformity with the NLCA. The aim is to set the stage for active and co-ordinated operations once all the HTOs get out of debt. Incremental funding is of course required to allow this exercise to take place.

Meeka Mike recalled the enquiry by two ladies at the public meeting last night about the possibility of establishing a polar bear quota for Baker Lake to accommodate the development of sport hunting. David noted that Baker Lake already holds two polar bear tags which are allocated from the Foxe Basin population. Depending on precisely where Baker Lake would aim to conduct such sport-hunting activity, they would need to negotiate with (probably) Chesterfield Inlet or Coral Harbour for additional quotas.

Ben asked if the debt incurred by KWF in connection with the bowhead hunt at Repulse Bay in 1996 had been repaid. David replied that a contribution of \$30,000 was received from NTI for that purpose, but that about \$35,000 remains to be paid.

14. Executive Committee Report and Recommendations

Gordon Koshinsky in his capacity as Chairperson of the Executive Committee reported that the Committee was not bringing forward any items on its own to be dealt with by the Board. However he noted that the Board had discussed a number of matters *in camera*, some of which had been under consideration by the Executive Committee, and which did require further attention by the Board in open forum. Ben Kovic directed the attention of the Board to these matters.

On the matter of preparing inputs for the next planning period, the Board decided **(Resolution 2000- 235)** to adopt the time-line proposed by the Director of Finance and Administration for development of a 10-Year workplan and budget, and in particular agreed that the NWMB will:

- Conduct a Planning Workshop in Iqaluit the week of January 15; and
- Aim to contract a Nunavut-based consultant(s) to facilitate the Workshop.

On the matter of contracting Rebecca Mike to provide interpretation and translation services to the NWMB, the Board decided **(Resolution 2000- 236)** to approve the contract as set out by the Board's Legal Advisor and modified by the Board in consultation with Ms. Mike. The Board also briefly discussed the disposition of the staff position being vacated by Ms. Mike, and ended by inviting the Director of Wildlife Management to develop a description for a position to provide more explicit assistance to herself in respect to her own ongoing duties.

On the matter of vacation travel assistance for NWMB employees, the Board decided **(Resolution 2000- 237)** to approve the revised policy for *Vacation Travel Assistance (VTA)* as prepared by the Director of Finance and Administration, with the new policy to come into effect as at 30 November 2000.

On the matter of its northern allowance benefit for NWMB employees, the Board decided **(Resolution 2000- 238)** to amend its current *Northern Allowance Benefit Policy* to provide as follows:

- Married and/or with dependants benefit: \$20,000 per annum; and
- Single with no dependants benefit: \$16,800 per annum.

On the matter of its relocation benefit for NWMB employees, the Board decided **(Resolution 2000- 239)** to amend its *Relocation Benefits Policy* in the manner recommended by the Director of Finance and Administration, with noted changes.

On the matter of providing ongoing guidance for the acquisition, replacement and upgrading of electronic data processing systems and equipment, the Board decided **(Resolution 2000- 240)** to adopt the *Electronic Data Processing Systems Policy* (November 2000) prepared by the Director of Finance and Administration, with minor amendments as noted.

On the matter of replacing the current server for its EDP network, the Board decided **(Resolution 2000- 241)** to approve the acquisition of a new Dell PowerEdge 4400 server at a quoted cost of \$27,342.

On the matter of replacing its 1996 Jeep Cherokee which is beyond economical repair, the Board decided **(Resolution 2000- 242)** to approve the purchase of a new 2001 Ford Explorer Sport XL at a cost of approximately \$42,000, with the vehicle to be shipped to Iqaluit via summer 2001 sealift.

On the matter of the disposition of the \$146,574 of unexpended funds from its 1999/00 operating budget, the Board adopted **(Resolution 2000- 243)** a budget revision identifying new activities to account for the expenditure of these funds in 2000/01, this in accordance with the protocol recently approved by DIAND.

On the matter of accessing support available from the Nunavut Implementation Training Committee Incorporated, the Board decided **(Resolution 2000- 244)** to accept the *Training Protocol Agreement* between the Committee and the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board as negotiated by the Executive Director.

On the matter of anticipated shortfalls in the five-year Harvest Study database, the Board decided **(Resolution 2000- 245)** to inform the Nunavut Implementation Panel that the Study as it has been profiled and budgeted will not yield five full years of harvest data for three of the communities, namely Iqaluit, Cape Dorset and Rankin Inlet. In anticipation of and in preparation for informing the Implementation Panel of this, the Board directed:

- That the NWMB Harvest Study Co-ordinator confirm the precise extent of the problem from a practical perspective; and
- That the NWMB Legal Advisor research the legal and operational implications of these expected data shortfalls.

Friday, 01 December 2000

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, re-convened the meeting at 09:15 a.m.

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 meeting binder pertaining to two events in which staff members participated since the last Board meeting in September. These items were:

- International Workshop on Arctic Parasitology, held 1-4 October at Prince Albert: Heather Priest participated on behalf of the NWMB. The workshop identified the underpinnings for an effective program to better define the role of parasitism and disease in Arctic wildlife populations.
- Meeting of DFO's Science Advisory Council, held 2-3 October in Winnipeg: Michelle Wheatley attended, in her new capacity as a member of the Council.

Topics that were covered included (DFO's) recently-published Strategic Plan for Science, priority-setting process for science, stock-assessment process, partnering strategies, and implications of the anticipated *Species-at-Risk Act*.

Ben referred to his Activity Report (Agenda item 5.A), as well as that of the Executive Director (Agenda item 5.B) for information on other events attended in this period. Gordon Koshinsky noted the omission of a summary sheet of meetings and other events attended, such as had been prepared for the previous meeting.

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 December 1. The following decisions were made with respect to attendance:

- Community workshop on M'Clintock Channel polar bear management; December 6-7 in Kugluktuk: Makabe to attend.
- Federal-Provincial Atlantic Fisheries Committee meeting; December 7-8 in Ottawa: Ray to attend.
- DFO/Industry consultations on NAFO strategy; December 18 in Montreal: Ray to attend.
- KHTA Annual General Meeting; January 8-10 in Kugaaruk: Makabe to attend.
- Turbot Steering Committee workshop; January 25-27 in Montreal: Ray to attend, with Ben to accompany if agenda indicates this to be warranted.
- Polar Bear Technical Committee meeting; February 4-6 in Edmonton: Michelle and Harry to attend.
- Canadian Biodiversity Network conference; March 1-4 in Ottawa: Michael to attend if agenda indicates this to be warranted.
- Arctic Science Summit Week; April 22-27 in Iqaluit: Nobody to attend.
- North American Caribou Workshop; April 23-27 in Kuujuaq: Michelle to attend.
- Meeting of the Scientific Working Group, Canada/Greenland Joint Commission on Conservation and Management of Narwhal and Beluga; May 7-11 in Greenland: Michelle to attend.
- Meeting of the Canada/Greenland Joint Commission on Conservation and Management of Narwhal and Beluga; August 27-31 in Kimmirut: Ben and Michelle to attend.

16. Date and Location of Next Meeting

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 246**) to conduct its next (28th) regular meeting in Iqaluit the week of 19 March 2001.

17. Adjournment

Ben Kovic thanked the Board Members for participating. He especially acknowledged the assistance of the interpreters. Ben thanked the NWMB staff and the other presenters for all of their inputs.

- That the hunts be conducted according to the hunt plan as submitted by the HTO for the 2001 season.

Moved by David Alagalak

Seconded by Makabe Nartok

Carried

29 November 2000

Resolution 2000- 219: Resolved that the NWMB approve a quota of twelve walrus sport hunts for the Igloodik Hunters and Trappers Association for the 2001 hunting season, subject to the following conditions:

- That the total walrus harvest at Igloodik in 2001 not exceed the average annual harvest by the community over the last 5 years;
- That the allocation of the right to sport-hunt each walrus be made by way of an assignment, executed in writing;
- That the number of walrus landed and the number struck and lost be reported at the time of the next application for a sport-hunting quota;
- That the hunts be conducted according to the hunt plan as submitted by the HTO for the 2001 season.

Moved by David Alagalak

Seconded by Makabe Nartok

Carried

29 November 2000

Resolution 2000- 220: Resolved that the NWMB approve a quota of ten walrus sport hunts for the Hall Beach Hunters and Trappers Association for the 2001 hunting season, subject to the following conditions:

- That the total walrus harvest at Hall Beach in 2001 not exceed the average annual harvest by the community over the last 5 years;
- That the allocation of the right to sport-hunt each walrus be made by way of an assignment, executed in writing;
- That the number of walrus landed and the number struck and lost be reported at the time of the next application for a sport-hunting quota;
- That the hunts be conducted according to the hunt plan as submitted by the HTO for the 2001 season.

Moved by Meeka Mike

Seconded by David Alagalak

Carried

29 November 2000

Two abstentions: Gordon Koshinsky and Joan Scottie

Resolution 2000- 221: Resolved that the NWMB approve a quota of fifteen walrus sport hunts for the Aiviit (Coral Harbour) Hunters and Trappers Association for the 2001 hunting season, subject to the following conditions:

- That the number of walrus landed and the number struck and lost be reported at the time of the next application for a sport-hunting quota;
- That the hunts be conducted according to the hunt plan as submitted by the HTO for the 2001 season.

Moved by Gordon Koshinsky

Seconded by David Alagalak

Carried

29 November 2000

Resolution 2000- 222: Resolved that the NWMB approve a quota of ten walrus sport hunts for the Nattivak (Qikiqtarjuaq) Hunters and Trappers Association for the 2001 hunting season, subject to the following conditions:

- That the total walrus harvest at Qikiqtarjuaq in 2001 not exceed the average annual harvest by the community over the last 5 years;
- That the allocation of the right to sport-hunt each walrus be made by way of an assignment, executed in writing;
- That the number of walrus landed and the number struck and lost be reported at the time of the next application for a sport-hunting quota;
- That the hunts be conducted according to the hunt plan as submitted by the HTO for the 2001 season.

Moved by David Alagalak

Seconded by Meeka Mike

Carried

29 November 2000

Two opposed: Makabe Nartok and Gordon Koshinsky

Resolution 2000- 223: Resolved that the NWMB approve a quota of eight walrus sport hunts for Willie Keatainak of Salluit for the 2001 hunting season, subject to the following conditions:

- That these hunts take place in the Area of Equal Use and Occupancy around Nottingham and Salisbury Islands;
- That the total walrus harvest at Salluit in 2001 not exceed the average annual harvest by the community over the last 5 years;
- That the allocation of the right to sport-hunt each walrus be made by way of an assignment, executed in writing;
- That the number of walrus landed and the number struck and lost be reported at the time of the next application for a sport-hunting quota;
- That the hunts be conducted according to the hunt plan as submitted by the HTO for the 2001 season.

Moved by Meeka Mike

Seconded by Johnny Peters

Carried

29 November 2000

Resolution 2000- 224: Resolved that the NWMB approve the request from Kivalliq Land and Sea Limited to harvest 320 metric tonnes of kelp in the Whale Cove area in the 2001 season, subject to the following restrictions:

- Approval will be for a one-year period, with the possibility of renewal;
- That long-term right of access to the stock is not implied by this approval, this to be stipulated in the licence;
- That a monitoring plan is in place prior to the commencement of harvesting;
- That all recommendations set out in DFO's scientific advisory document are stipulated in the licence;
- That the proponent have the appropriate commercial diving certificates as required by the Worker's Compensation Board;
- That formal approval from any other communities besides Whale Cove where harvesting is planned is obtained prior to harvesting near each community;

- That renewal of the licence is subject to annual reports and a review of the harvest and monitoring results by the Nunavut Fisheries Working Group;
- That the applicant be encouraged to pursue the development of Nunavut-based processing facilities where appropriate, as the fishery develops.

Moved by David Alagalak
Carried

Seconded by Joan Scottie
29 November 2000

Resolution 2000- 225: Resolved that the NWMB approve the renewal of an experimental quota in favour of Canadian Sea Urchin Harvesting Limited for 50,000 kg of sea urchins (or 5,000 kg of sea urchin eggs), subject to the same conditions that were established when the quota was initially approved for 2000, namely that:

- Approval will be for one year only, with the possibility of renewal;
- This approval does not imply long-term right of access to the stock;
- All recommendations set out in DFO's scientific advisory document are stipulated in the licence;
- An appropriate maximum harvest per unit of habitat (for example, 7000 kg of urchins per 50 km stretch of coastline, or a similar amount in each traditional community hunting/fishing area) is stipulated in the licence;
- Approval from each community where harvesting is planned is obtained prior to harvesting in the community's traditional resource-use area;
- The proponent have the required commercial diving certificates, as required by the Worker's Compensation Board.

Moved by David Alagalak
Carried

Seconded by Gordon Koshinsky
29 November 2000

Resolution 2000- 226: Resolved that the NWMB approve commercial quotas for Arctic charr and lake trout as requested by the local HTO for the following water bodies in the vicinity of Kugluktuk:

- Kugaryoak Lake/River: 1000 kg of lake trout and 1000 kg of Arctic charr;
- Cape Lambert Area Lake: 3000 kg of Arctic charr;
- Kikitalik Lake: 1500 kg of lake trout;
- Contwoyto Lake: 1500 kg of lake trout and 1500 kg of Arctic charr; and
- Bernard Harbour: 1000 kg lake trout and 1000 kg of Arctic charr;

These approvals are granted with the following understandings and conditions:

- That the licences are renewable annually for up to 5 years;
- That biological samples (length, weight, sex, otoliths) must be collected, as per Department of Fisheries and Oceans instructions, from 100 fish of each species from each water body, in both the first and fifth years of the program; and
- That information on fishing effort and catch success must be submitted to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans on an annual basis.

Moved by Meeka Mike
Carried

Seconded by Gordon Koshinsky
29 November 2000

Resolution 2000- 227: Resolved that the NWMB disband the Southeast Baffin Beluga Management Committee, and that the NWMB provide a letter and a plaque to each member in appreciation of their work on this Committee.

Moved by Makabe Nartok
Carried

Seconded by Harry Flaherty
29 November 2000

Resolution 2000- 228: Resolved that the NWMB accept the fourteen recommendations developed by the Director of Wildlife Management with respect to overseeing and administering research projects undertaken by Government agencies and supported by way of the Nunavut Wildlife Research Trust Fund.

Moved by David Alagalak
Carried

Seconded by Joan Scottie
29 November 2000

Resolution 2000- 229: Resolved that the NWMB adopt the new *Policy for the Identification of Wildlife Management Priorities* (November 2000) as presented by the Director of Wildlife Management.

Moved by David Alagalak
Carried
One abstention: Meeka Mike

Seconded by Gordon Koshinsky
29 November 2000

Resolution 2000- 230: Resolved that the NWMB adopt the revised *Policy for the Allocation of Commercial Marine Fisheries in the NSA and in Marine Zones I and II* (November 2000) as presented by the Director of Wildlife Management, with a number of minor amendments as identified.

Moved by Harry Flaherty
Carried
One abstention: Meeka Mike

Seconded by Joan Scottie
29 November 2000

Resolution 2000- 231: Resolved that the NWMB approve in principle the draft *Policy on Transfer of Tags and/or Quotas between Nunavut Communities* as developed by the NWMB Legal Advisor, and further that the NWMB instruct its staff to solicit input from the NWMB's co-management partners for consideration by the Board in anticipation of finalizing the policy at the first available opportunity.

Moved by Harry Flaherty
Carried

Seconded by Meeka Mike
29 November 2000

Resolution 2000- 232: Resolved that the NWMB support continuation of the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board beyond the term of its present mandate which ends in the year 2002.

Moved by David Alagalak
Carried

Seconded by Gordon Koshinsky
29 November 2000

Resolution 2000- 233: Resolved that the NWMB move to an *in-camera* session.

Moved by
Carried

Seconded by
30 November 2000

Resolution 2000- 234: Resolved that the NWWB move out of *in-camera* session.

Moved by Harry Flaherty

Seconded by Makabe Nartok

Carried

30 November 2000

Resolution 2000- 235: Resolved that the NWMB adopt the time-line as proposed by the Director of Finance and Administration for preparation of a 10-Year Workplan and Budget for the NWMB, and in particular that the Board:

- Conduct a planning workshop in Iqaluit the week of January 15; and
- Endeavour to contract a Nunavut-based consultant(s) to facilitate the workshop.

Moved by David Alagalak

Seconded by Makabe Nartok

Carried

30 November 2000

Resolution 2000- 236: Resolved that the NWMB approve the contract (as revised) with Rebecca Mike to provide interpretation and translation services for the NWMB.

Moved by Joan Scottie

Seconded by Harry Flaherty

Carried

30 November 2000

One abstention: Meeka Mike

Resolution 2000- 237: Resolved that the NWMB approve the amended *Vacation Travel Assistance (VTA) Policy* for NWMB employees as prepared by the Director of Finance and Administration, with the amended policy to come into effect as at 30 November 2000.

Moved by Meeka Mike

Seconded by Joan Scottie

Carried

30 November 2000

Resolution 2000- 238: Resolved that the NWMB amend its *Northern Allowance Benefit Policy* for NWMB employees to incorporate the following provisions:

- Married and/or with dependants: To be paid \$20,000 per annum;
- Single with no dependants: To be paid \$16,800 per annum.

Moved by Gordon Koshinsky

Seconded by Joan Scottie

Carried

30 November 2000

Resolution 2000- 239: Resolved that the NWMB accept the revised *Relocation Benefit Policy* for NWMB employees as recommended by the Director of Finance and Administration, with minor changes as noted.

Moved by Joan Scottie

Seconded by David Alagalak

Carried

30 November 2000

Resolution 2000- 240: Resolved that the NWMB adopt the *Electronic Data Processing System Policy* (November 2000) as recommended by the Director of Finance and Administration, with minor changes as noted.

Moved by Gordon Koshinsky

Seconded by Harry Flaherty

Carried

30 November 2000

Resolution 2000- 241: Resolved that the NWMB approve the acquisition of a new Dell PowerEdge 4400 server for its EDP network at a quoted cost of \$27,342, this to replace and upgrade the current server.

Moved by Gordon Koshinsky Seconded by Makabe Nartok
Carried 30 November 2000

Resolution 2000- 242: Resolved that the NWMB approve the purchase of a new 2001 Ford Explorer Sport XL to replace the 1986 Jeep Cherokee, with the vehicle to be shipped to Iqaluit via summer 2001 sealift.

Moved by Makabe Nartok Seconded by Harry Flaherty
Carried 30 November 2000

Resolution 2000- 243: Resolved that the NWMB adopt the budget revision developed by the Board in consultation, identifying new activities to account for the use in 2000/01 of unexpended operating funds from 1999/00, this in accordance with the protocol recently approved by DIAND.

Moved by David Alagalak Seconded by Harry Flaherty
Carried 30 November 2000

Resolution 2000- 244: Resolved that the NWMB accept the *Training Protocol Agreement* between the Nunavut Implementation Training Committee and the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board, as negotiated by the Executive Director.

Moved by Harry Flaherty Seconded by David Alagalak
Carried 30 November 2000

Resolution 2000- 245: Resolved that the NWMB inform the Nunavut Implementation Panel that the Nunavut Wildlife Harvest Study as it has been profiled and budgeted will not yield five full years of harvest data for the communities of Iqaluit, Cape Dorset and Rankin Inlet. In anticipation of and in preparation for advising the Panel, the Board directed that:

- The NWMB Harvest Study Co-ordinator confirm more precisely the extent of the problem from a practical perspective; and
- The NWMB Legal Advisor research the legal and operational implications.

Moved by Gordon Koshinsky Seconded by Harry Flaherty
Carried 30 November 2000

Resolution 2000- 246: Resolved that the next (28th) regular meeting of the NWMB be conducted in Iqaluit the week of 19 March 2001.

Moved by David Alagalak Seconded by Harry Flaherty
Carried 01 December 2000

Resolution 2000- 247: Resolved that the 27th regular meeting of the NWMB be adjourned.

Moved by Harry Flaherty Seconded by Meeka Mike
Carried 01 December 2000
