

NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD

MINUTES: MEETING No. 28

IQALUIT, 20-23 MARCH 2001

Members and Staff Participating

Ben Kovic	Chairperson
David Alagalak	Member
Kevin McCormick	Member
Moses Koonoo	Member
Gordon Koshinsky	Member
Makabe Nartok	Member
Okalik Eegeesiak	Member
Meeka Mike	Member (Tuesday and Wednesday only)
Jim Noble	Executive Director
Michelle Wheatley	Director of Wildlife Management
Gordon Tomlinson	Director of Finance and Administration
Heather Priest	Harvest Study Coordinator
Michael d'Eça	NWMB Legal Advisor
Rebecca Mike	Interpreter
Evie Amagoalik	Interpreter

Not Available

Joan Scottie	Member
--------------	--------

Visitors and Other Participants (at various times)

Burt Hunt	DFO Area Director, Iqaluit
Karen Ditz	DFO Fisheries Mgmt Biologist, Iqaluit
Jeff Maurice	DFO Licensing Technician, Iqaluit
Stephen Pinksen	DSD Senior Advisor, Legisl and Enforcmnt
Siu-ling Han	DSD Manager of Research, Iqaluit
Mitch Taylor	DSD Polar Bear Biologist, Iqaluit
Sherry Sanderson	DSD Regulation/Ops Co-ordinator, Iqaluit
François Rainville	DOE Manager Corporate Affairs, Nunavut
Bert Dean	NTI Director of Wildlife, Rankin Inlet
Joe Tigullaraq	Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Brd Executive Director
Jim Pealow	AMCES Consulting, Ottawa
Peter Usher	Independent consultant, Ottawa

Tuesday, 20 March 2001

1. Call to Order and Opening Preliminaries

Ben Kovic called the 28th meeting of the NWMB to order at 9:20 am. He welcomed all the participants.

2. Agenda for the Meeting

Ben noted that the Board once again faced a heavy agenda. The Members recognized the particular need to ensure adequate treatment of the research and study proposals.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 011**) to accept the agenda for Meeting No. 28 as presented, but to change the sequence of the items in order to address at the outset the proposals for funding in support of research and study projects.

12. Funding of Research and Study Projects

12A. Allocation of Nunavut Wildlife Research Trust Funding for 2001/02

Ben Kovic reminded the Members that the Nunavut Wildlife Research Trustees, in session yesterday evening, had allocated \$840,000 ± 5% of NWRT funds for research by government agencies in the forthcoming fiscal year.

Before commencing the detailed consideration of the research proposals, Ben reminded the Board that he, along with Moses Koonoo and Michael d'Eça on behalf of the NWMB, recently led and participated in a round of community consultations pertaining to the new community-based management system for narwhal and beluga. Ben suggested that in order to properly underpin community-based management, it will be necessary to have much better estimates of the standing stocks of the animals as well as a more complete tabulation and assessment of traditional insights regarding them. Ben urged that the Board give high priority to these matters when considering the proposals for research and study funding.

Michelle Wheatley noted that last year (at the March 2000 Board meeting and subsequently) the Board approved new and continuing NWRT funding in the total amount of \$770,700 (including carry-overs) for 18 projects. Not all of this approved funding was actually used. The total of the estimated expenditures for 2000/01, based on interim financial reports provided by proponents to date, is \$523,900.

Michelle explained the filing system that she has in place for NWRT research proposals and research projects in order to facilitate tracking. She also reviewed the NWMB process for identifying research priorities to guide agencies in their development of research proposals, as well as the revised (1999) NWMB policy that she followed in evaluating the proposals that were received. Michelle reminded the Board about the scoring system that is in place for evaluating proposals.

Michelle drew attention to a number of issues that she encountered in reviewing the materials that were submitted by government agencies for this exercise. Not all of these issues are new or unique to the current year, but they do seem to be increasing or to have become more problematic than in the past. Michelle suggested that the Board Members might wish to take account of these issues in conducting their own reviews of these materials, and also perhaps take specific steps to address some or all of them for future years. These issues include:

- Generally poor performance by hunters in submitting sample materials for use by researchers, this despite hunters being reimbursed for samples and substantial numbers of animals being harvested in most instances.
- A number of requests to carry-forward funds for projects into a year or years for which the work was not previously approved.
- Increasing evidence of intent by proponents to use project funds to pay graduate students and casual employees.
- References to funding from other sources not always being confirmed.
- A large reduction in funding by the Polar Continental Shelf Project announced in January, and partially reinstated subsequently.
- Anticipated proposals not materialising, for example to conduct population studies of narwhals in Davis Strait.

Kevin McCormick urged, and the Board agreed, that the NWMB complain to the responsible Minister about the serious impact of funding reductions to the PCSP, and the disruptive effect of funding uncertainties on program planning and delivery. Michelle reported that Pierre Richard of DFO indicated that the Department decided against submitting a narwhal research proposal for Davis Strait prior to the forthcoming meeting of the Scientific Working Group of the Canada/Greenland Joint Commission in May. The Board gave consideration to setting aside NWRT funds for such research, but decided against it in view of Mr. Richard's declaration that it was highly unlikely that the work could proceed prior to next March or April.

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

- Interim status reports (prepared by the proponents), along with her (Michelle's) evaluations, with respect to the 18 projects that were approved by the NWMB for NWRT funding for 2000/01. These 18 projects are of two basic categories:
 - Fifteen projects that were completed as scheduled or to the extent practicable in 2000/01. Proponents for three of these projects are requesting some carry-forward of funds from 2000/01 to 2000/02.
 - Three projects that were undertaken in 2000/01 but were not scheduled for completion until 2001/02, this in the context of previously authorized multi-year profiles. The proponents have different funding and program delivery intentions for these projects, characterised as follows:
 - One project which the proponent is aiming to continue in 2001/02 as originally planned;

- One project which the proponent is aiming to continue in 2001/02 as planned, but for which the proponent is also requesting some carry-forward of funds from 2000/01; and
 - One project which the proponent is proposing to re-structure as a new project for 2001/02.
- Proposals (prepared by the proponents), along with her (Michelle's) evaluations, with respect to sixteen new projects which proponents seek to begin in 2001/02. These proposals are arranged by rank (from highest to lowest) according to the scores derived by Michelle in her evaluations.

Michelle advised the Board that the total NWRT funding implications for all the proposals at hand, including those that were previously authorized in a multi-year funding context, is \$887,700. This figure incorporates a number of recent revisions to material contained in the briefing binder. Michelle distributed an information note summarising these revisions. She pointed out that the total amount marginally exceeded the funds that the NWR Trustees had allotted.

Michelle suggested that it would be logical and prudent to consider the various proposals for NWRT funding for 2001/02 in three stages:

1. Ongoing projects earlier authorized for multi-year funding.
2. Projects requesting carry-forward of funds from 2000/01.
3. New proposals, in order of rank.

Turning first to the two ongoing projects previously authorized for multi-year funding, the Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 012**) to approve, subject to receipt of appropriate financial documentation for 2000/01 from the contracting agencies by June 15, new NWRT funding support in the total amount of \$56,800 for 2001/02, for continuing research projects previously authorized for multi-year funding as follows:

- Project 5110-99-2 (Survival and sustainable harvest of the Dolphin-Union caribou herd): Provision of \$21,500 to DSD; final year of funding.
- Project 5120-99-6 (Whale sampling and stock identification): Provision of \$35,300 to DFO; final year of funding.

Turning next to the four proposals to carry forward approved funding from 2000/01 to 2001/02, the Board Members decided and were advised or observed as follows:

- For DFO Project 5120-99-6 (Whale sampling and stock identification), the Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 013**) to approve a carry-forward of \$17,900 mainly to pay hunters for samples not yet submitted. It was noted that this is an ongoing (multi-year) project, with funding implications for next year in addition to this carry-forward.
- For DFO Project 5120-98-1 (Ringed seal status in western Hudson Bay), the Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 014**) to approve a carry-forward of \$2,000. In reviewing this proposal to carry forward funds, it was noted that:

- The project has under-spent its funding allotment every year, due primarily to hunters not submitting projected numbers of samples.
 - The project was especially handicapped in its final year by the loss of the principal investigator.
- For DFO Project 5120-00-8 (Narwhal population survey in northern Hudson Bay), the Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 015**) to approve a carry-forward of \$2,000, primarily to conduct a community workshop in April rather than in March as was originally planned.
 - For DFO Project 5120-00-12 (Walrus stock identification and harvest composition), the Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 016**) to approve a carry-forward of \$4,700, for the completion of certain analyses including with respect to sample materials from Cape Dorset that have not yet been delivered to the proponent. In reviewing this project and the associated proposal to carry forward funds from the previous year, a number of matters were noted and a number of questions were raised:
 - Only a few of the samples that were projected have been obtained. The project is turning back \$42,500 of NWRT funds from last year.
 - The question was asked whether enough samples are being obtained to render a set of analyses that will be viable and meaningful.
 - Hunters were requested to submit walrus tongues along with the other sample materials, to be analysed for Trichinella. Even the promise of those analyses did not generate the necessary interest and commitment.
 - The question was asked whether hunters may have cultural or other reasons for not submitting the tongues of walrus that they harvest.

Turning finally to the 16 new proposals for NWRT funding for 2001/02, the Members reviewed Michelle's evaluations of the applications and her recommendations for any conditions that should accompany funding approval. Following this review, the Board approved funding with respect to 13 of these new proposals by way of an aggregate decision (**Resolution 2001- 017**) as follows:

That the NWMB approve NWRT funding support in the total amount of \$633,700 for 2001/02, subject to routine administrative and other arrangements including confirmation that all funding identified in the proposals is in place, for the following new research projects deemed in general to adequately satisfy NWRT criteria:

- Project 5110-01-1 (Influence of food availability and quality on the movements and population dynamics of the Dolphin-Union caribou herd): Provision of \$24,200 to DSD for 2001/02, conditional on confirmation of support from the communities where the research will be conducted; approved as a three-year project with \$25,500 indicated for 2002/03 and \$26,700 for 2003/04.
- Project 5110-01-3 (Caribou population delineation in the Queen Maud Gulf region): Provision of \$32,000 to DSD for 2001/02, conditional on confirmation of support from the communities where the research will be conducted;

approved as a three-year project with \$25,500 indicated for 2002/03 and \$26,700 for 2003/04.

- Project 5120-01-1 (Bowhead satellite tagging and habitat evaluation): Provision of \$54,100 to DFO, conditional on confirmation of support from the communities where the research will be conducted; approved as a two-year project with \$25,300 indicated for 2002/03 pending confirmation that the participation of the Danish expert is needed in the second year.
- Project 5120-01-2 (Cumberland Sound beluga and narwhal movements and dive behaviour study by satellite telemetry): Provision of \$56,000 to DFO for 2001/02; approved as a one-year project.
- Project 5120-01-3 (Walrus capture/recapture methods): Provision of \$25,000 to DFO for 2001/02, conditional on confirmation of support from the communities where the research will be conducted; approved as a one-year project.
- Project 5120-01-4 (Walrus tagging): Provision of \$38,000 to DFO for 2001/02, conditional on confirmation of support from the Resolute Bay HTO or wherever else the research takes place; approved as a one-year project.
- Project 5120-01-5 (Stock and life history differences in Cumberland Sound Arctic charr): Provision of \$31,500 to FDO for 2001/02, conditional on the field co-ordinator being staffed locally; approved as a one-year project.
- Project 5120-01-6 (Survey of Greenland halibut resource in NAFO Sub-Area 0): Provision of \$145,000 to DFO for 2001/02, conditional on receipt of a complete report on the 2000 survey; approved as a one-year project.
- Project 5120-01-7 (North Baffin narwhal movements and dive behaviour study by satellite telemetry): Provision of \$30,000 to DFO for 2001/02; approved as a one-year project.
- Project 5130-01-1 (Duckling survival and population biology of King Eiders): Provision of \$39,900 to DOE for 2001/02, conditional on confirmation of support from the community where the research will be conducted; one (first) year of funding approved for this multi-year project.
- Project 5130-01-4 (Use of satellite telemetry to locate migration routes and wintering areas of Common Eiders breeding in Nunavut): Provision of \$65,000 to DOE for 2001/02, conditional on confirmation of support from the communities where the research will be conducted; one (first) year of funding approved for this multi-year project.
- Project 5130-01-5 (Ecology of Hudson Bay Eiders wintering at polynyas in the Belcher Islands): Provision of \$34,000 to DOE for 2001/02, conditional on confirmation of support from the community where the research will be conducted; approved as a two-year project with \$34,000 indicated for 2002/03.
- Project 5130-01-6 (Reproductive ecology and survival of the Pacific Common Eider in central Arctic Canada): Provision of \$59,000 to DOE for 2001/02; approved as a three-year project with \$51,000 indicated for 2002/03 and \$53,000 for 2003/04.

The Board, (individual Member and/or in aggregate), and/or Michelle made observations or expressed concerns in connection with ten of these approved new projects as follows:

- For Project 5110-01-2 (Influence of food availability and quality on the movements and population dynamics of the Dolphin-Union caribou herd), the Board agreed with Michelle that the proponent should be encouraged to:
 - Work with the local HTO to ensure that useable animal products from caribou harvested for necropsies are utilized; and
 - Explore the possibility of providing concurrent local training on necropsy techniques, perhaps via a local school.
- For Project 5120-01-1 (Bowhead satellite tagging and habitat evaluation), the Board agreed that the proponent should take concrete steps to:
 - Demonstrate to the Board the actual tagging procedures; and
 - Provide assurance to the Board that the procedure is not detrimental to the animals.
- For Project 5120-01-2 (Cumberland Sound beluga and narwhal movements and dive behaviour study by satellite telemetry), the Board agreed that the proponent should be encouraged to take samples for DNA analyses concurrent with applying satellite tags.
- For Project 5120-01-3 (Walrus capture/recapture methods), Michelle noted:
 - That the object of the work is to develop a library of genetic material that uniquely identifies individual walrus, to be followed by repeat sampling (a form of mark-and-recapture) to estimate population size;
 - That the technique, if and when developed, might also be applicable to other wildlife species.
- For Project 5120-01-4 (Walrus tagging), the Board agreed with Michelle that the proponent should be encouraged to consider:
 - Moving the project to a more accessible location until the technique is better developed (assuming that PCSP support is not a factor); and/or
 - Combining the project with one of the other walrus research projects in an effort to reduce logistic costs.
- For Project 5120-01-5 (Stock and life history differences in Cumberland Sound Arctic charr), the Board agreed that the proponent should be asked to demonstrate to the Board how specifically the products of this research will be applicable to the management of wild charr stocks.
- For Project 5120-01-7 (North Baffin narwhal movements and dive behaviour study by satellite telemetry), Michelle noted that:
 - This project was approved for multi-year funding last year, but the proponent chose to bring it as a new proposal for greater funding;
 - The project is not currently expected to extend beyond 2001/02, but that could change;
 - Preliminary indications from the work last year are that narwhal departing the Creswell Bay area (Somerset Island) move to Baffin Bay and on to Greenland without passing near Pond Inlet.
- For Project 5130-01-4 (Use of satellite telemetry to locate migration routes and wintering areas of Common Eiders breeding in Nunavut), the Board was

encouraged by the significant funding contribution from DOE's Northern Ecosystems Initiative. Kevin McCormick explained that the NEI is a new DOE-sponsored program intended to address over-arching environmental concerns in partnership with other organizations. The program focuses on four themes: climate change, contaminants, cumulative impacts, and environmental monitoring.

- For Project 5130-01-5 (Ecology of Hudson Bay Eiders wintering at polynyas in the Belcher Islands), David Alagalak suggested that the proponent be encouraged to take every advantage of the extensive and well documented traditional knowledge that is available at Sanikiluaq.
- For Project 5130-01-6 (Reproductive ecology and survival of the Pacific Common Eider in central Arctic Canada), Michelle stressed that this proposal was very well done, and could serve as a model for other proponents.

Three of the new proposals for NWRT funding had been set aside during the "first pass" by the Board, and were brought forward at this time for further consideration:

- DSD Project 5110-01-2 (Polar bear population inventory in Davis Strait): Michelle Wheatley noted that this has in fact been designed as a five-year project, but NWMB formats do not have provision to display more than three years. Polar bears have not been identified as a research priority for the Baffin Region. On account of this, the proposal does not meet the evaluation criteria for multi-year funding, so approval would have to be year-by-year. The proposal scored high in the other categories, and a good case can be made for why the work should be done. It should also be recognized that polar bear studies have consumed more than one quarter of research support provided through the NWMB to date. There are other important competing uses for NWRT polar bear research funds even now, notably the work that will probably have to continue with respect to the M'Clintock Channel population. Michelle cited a number of technical difficulties with the proposal, including the unknown nature of the "non-disposable" scientific items that are budgeted for purchase, and the apparent intent not to use the free facilities available at CWS for archiving sample materials. The anticipated funding from the PCSP has apparently not been confirmed.

Gordon Koshinsky asked if the proponent had attempted to secure funding from any of the other jurisdictions that share this polar bear population, notably Quebec, Labrador, and Greenland. Ben Kovic questioned whether the proponent could effectively manage more than one major polar bear research project concurrently, and how this workload would impact on the completion of other polar bear studies that have been underway for some time. Michelle was unable to answer these questions.

The Board decided to defer decision on the matter of funding this proposal, pending clarification from the proponent and/or his Department with respect to the various concerns that were raised.

- DOE Project 5130-01-2 (Long-term trends in the population ecology of polar bears in western Hudson Bay in relation to climate change):

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Members that a year ago the Board conditionally approved this project for multi-year funding, subject to satisfactory progress being made in the first year. In each of the remaining two years of the study, it is planned to capture and examine 20-30 family groups of bears as they leave their denning areas in the spring, and up to 200 bears of all ages and both sexes while they are ashore in early fall. This will provide comparative data from earlier years with respect to litter size, condition and survival rates. Owing to the historical data and the continuing availability of bears, the field work will be conducted in Manitoba.

David Alagalak stated that last year the KWF asked the proponents for \$1,500 to engage the members in a conference call to discuss the proposal, but this call never materialised. He would not be able to support the proposal without evidence of KWF approval. Michelle noted that there was a letter on file from KWF stating support for the project, so the researchers evidently proceeded on that basis. David replied that if this was so he had not seen the letter nor participated in its preparation.

Meeka Mike observed that there was no indication of funding support from Manitoba. She considered this to be a serious shortcoming. Michelle reckoned that this was related to the fact that there was no harvesting of these bears in Manitoba. Meeka suggested that since Manitobans benefit from these bears through tourism, Manitoba should be an active partner in the project.

Meeka reiterated a long-standing concern of hers regarding the effects of handling and immobilising bears on their health and performance. David stated that Arviat hunters will not eat the meat of bears that were previously drugged. Renewable Resource Officers in the communities regularly discourage or even prohibit people from eating the meat of bears that have been drugged within the past three years. The effect of all this is to make a large portion of the polar bear population unavailable to local people in areas where this kind of research is undertaken.

Okalik Eegeesiak observed that there are many alternative sources of funding for research projects pertaining to climate change.

Gordon Koshinsky offered the following observations:

- The NWMB in its various recent planning initiatives has expressed a need to move toward a more holistic perspective in its deliberations, including taking account of such large-scale perturbations as climate change;
- The work that Drs. Sterling and Lunn have had underway on polar bears in the Churchill area is one of the most convincing, or at least one of the most cited, items of evidence that climate change is occurring in the Arctic and that it is having tangible effects on key wildlife species;
- The proponents for this project are among the most respected Arctic researchers in the world;
- Approaching Manitoba for a funding contribution might be interpreted by Manitobans as an invitation to revive their interest in polar bear harvesting;

- There is no evidence that the meat of bears that have been tranquillised poses any kind of long-term health risk to humans.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 018**) not to approve NWRT funding support for this project for 2001/02.

- DOE Project 5130-01-3 (Seasonal movements and home range size of adult male polar bears in western Hudson Bay):

Michelle Wheatley noted that this would be the third and final year of what was designed as a three-year project. The object is to continue the development and testing of satellite transmitters for deployment in the outer ears of primarily adult male polar bears. Such animals are not candidates for radio collars, which has to date precluded effective study of such matters as ranges and movements of this half of the adult polar bear population.

Meeka Mike and David Alagalak repeated their concerns about the possible effects of handling and drugging polar bears. Moses Koonoo stated that Inuit have observed that polar bears that are repeatedly handled and tranquillised end up having difficulty hunting for their prey. Moses also stated that the flavour of the meat is definitely affected by these procedures.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 019**) to approve NWRT funding support for this project in the amount of \$10,000 for one year (2001/02), subject to routine administrative arrangements and conditional on the proponent:

- Demonstrating to the KWF and to the NWMB the tags to be used;
- Obtaining the approval of the KWF; and
- Providing confirmation that all funding identified in the proposal is in place.

12.B Allocation of NWMB Study Funding for 2001/02

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Members that the Board annually establishes a budget out of its internal operating funds that is then available to support studies by other-than-government agencies. She referred to the briefing materials she had prepared for the present meeting that pertained to this NWMB program.

Michelle advised that NWMB Study funding approved last year (for 2000/01) totalled \$215,050 for eight projects. Funding conditions were met and contribution agreements were signed with respect to seven of these projects, for an actual funding commitment of \$154,050. Interim reports and tentative financial statements have been received for six of the projects, and on that basis actual expenditures for the year are projected to be \$93,540. Michelle noted that her briefing material contained her evaluations of the projects that received NWMB Study funding in 2000/01, as well as interim progress reports prepared by the proponents.

Michelle called the attention of the Members to five issues pertaining to NWMB Study funding that in her view warranted the consideration of the Board. These

matters have implications for the present exercise but more particularly for the administration of this program in future years. It may be appropriate for the Board to:

- Encourage a more focussed effort by prospective and actual funding recipients to ensure that projects are planned and executed so as to assist the Board in exercising its mandate for wildlife management;
- Consider whether other funding sources might be more appropriate for projects that are oriented to improvement of habitat;
- Better define the boundaries for participation by Government agencies in projects that are funded by this program;
- Establish parameters to govern assistance (or not) for test fisheries;
- More rigorously enforce the deadlines established for receipt of proposals.

Michelle explained her rationale for identifying each of these issues.

Michelle called the attention of the Board to the request from the Sanikiluaq HTO to carry forward the \$20,000 approved last year to conduct a one-year study of the benthic invertebrates of polynya sites in and near the Belcher Islands. These sites serve as wintering areas for Hudson Bay Eiders. This is a summer project, to be conducted by scuba-diving, and has the active participation of CWS. The community boat that is to serve as the platform for the work ended up being re-assigned to a different project last summer and was not available. Indications are that there will be no such conflict in 2001.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 020**) to approve the request from the Sanikiluaq HTO to carry forward \$20,000 of NWMB Study funding for Project 5214-00-1 (Foraging ecology and diet of Hudson Bay Eiders wintering at polynyas in the Belcher Islands).

Turning to the nine new project proposals for NWMB Study funding for 2001/02, Michelle referred the Members to the briefing binder for copies of the applications along with her (Michelle's) analyses and recommendations. The proposals were evaluated against the same criteria and with reference to the same research priorities as were used to evaluate the NWRT proposals. These new proposals embody funding implications that total \$245,500 for 2001/02. Jim Noble advised that the NWMB budget for this line item for the coming year is \$90,000 plus whatever interest the NWMB will earn on its current accounts in the course of the year. The total funding available is thus of the order of \$120,000.

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

Project 5201-01-1 (Bowhead habitat stewardship at Igaliqtuuq):

The proponent, the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board, proposes to establish baseline data on bowhead whales and their habitats at Isabella Bay by photo-cataloguing

individual whales and recording aspects of the habitats in which they occur. Potential impacts (both positive and negative) of increased tourism activity based on these whales will also be evaluated. Field work will be conducted by WWF and the community of Clyde River, in conjunction with a project ecologist yet to be appointed. Dr. Sue Cosens (DFO) and Kerry Finley (independent consultant) are specialist advisors to the project. Several other agencies (not all of them confirmed) are listed as providing support for the project. These include DOE, DSD, NTI, NRI, and Kakivak Corporation.

Members expressed some concern about the possibility that some aspects of this project might come into conflict with negotiations that are in progress to develop an Inuit Impact and Benefits Agreement in connection with establishing a National Wildlife Area. Burt Dean suggested that such a problem could be managed if it did emerge. Ben Kovic expressed reservations about Kerry Finley being identified as an advisor to the project. In Ben's view, Mr. Finley has expressed unfounded opinions in the past about the status of the eastern Arctic bowhead population, and has misused the input of local elders in some of his previous reports. Kevin McCormick explained that DOE funding support would be by way of the Habitat Stewardship Program, for which DOE is the lead agency. The Program is co-managed by DOE, DFO and Parks Canada, and is meant to be complementary to SARA. The Program recognises that habitat is often a key limiting factor with respect to species at risk.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 021**) to approve NWMB Study funding to the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board in the amount of \$30,000 for Project 5201-01-1 for 2001/02, to assist in obtaining baseline data on bowhead whales and their habitats at Isabella Bay, this subject to obtaining confirmation from the proponents that:

- All of the other funding identified in the proposal is in place;
- The community of Clyde River supports the project; and
- The project will not interfere with the IIBA negotiations.

Project 5204-01-1 (Charr abundance in an improved stream at Clyde River):

The proponent, James Qillaq of Clyde River, proposes to follow up on a rock-removal project conducted on a certain stream in the Clyde River area in 1993 to promote the passage of charr and ultimately to increase the charr population. The plan is to install a traditional fish weir to determine whether the number of fish in the stream has increased.

The Board noted that it was not clear from the proposal whether any baseline data existed from 1993 or earlier to serve as a basis for comparison, and further that the project design did not indicate if or how a quantitative comparison would be attempted. The Board accordingly decided (**Resolution 2001- 022**) not to approve NWMB Study funding to James Qillaq to document charr abundance in an improved stream at Clyde River.

Project 5212-01-1 (Bowhead whale migration):

The proponent, Adamee Veevee of Pangnirtung, proposes to determine whether bowhead whales encountered in Cumberland Sound in a particular season remain there, or whether they eventually move to the Clyde River area. He aims to do this through daily observations from the floe edge, and by boat and kayak in open water. Michelle noted that subsequent to submitting the basic proposal, the proponent provided a detailed budget requesting \$17,100 from the NWMB. Gordon Koshinsky expressed reservations about the proposal as it was written. Without some means of identifying individual whales, it was not clear how the observations would be interpreted. Kevin McCormick suggested that the proponent be directed to work with DFO to further develop the methodology. Gordon suggested that the possibility of obtaining material for genetic analysis concurrently be brought to the attention of DFO.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001-023**) to approve NWMB Study funding to Adamee Veevee in the amount of \$17,100 for Project 5212-01-1 for 2001/02, to assist in a study of bowhead whale migrations within and out from Cumberland Sound, this subject to the proponent:

- Confirming the support of the HTO;
- Arranging for administration of funding through the HTO;
- Further developing the proposal with greater emphasis on the use of photo-identification for individual whales; and
- Identifying a reasonable contribution to the project, by himself or by the HTO, either financially or in-kind.

Project 5212-01-2 (Confirmation of Arctic charr populations in lakes at Pangnirtung):

The proponent, Adamee Veevee of Pangnirtung, proposes to sample a number of lakes in that community's resource-use area in an effort to find new stocks of charr that could be exploited by local residents. The proposal is very sketchy, and begs the question of whether this type of project is appropriate for NWMB Study funding.

The Board took note of the interpretation in effect that the NWMB mandate does not extend to promoting resource and economic development, and particularly does not extend to providing support for feasibility studies for such activities. The Board accordingly decided (**Resolution 2001- 024**) not to approve NWMB Study funding to James Qillaq to document the occurrence of charr populations in lakes near Pangnirtung, and reiterated its position not to fund any other work of this specific nature.

Project 5212-01-3(Identification of new lakes for commercial fishing at Pangnirtung):

The proponent, Levi Evic of Pangnirtung, proposes to sample a number of lakes in the vicinity of that community in an effort to find charr stocks that could support commercial fishing. The Board referred to its earlier decision (**Resolution 2001-024**) in deciding not to approve NWMB Study funding for this proposal.

Project 5212-01-4 (Identification of new cod-fishing areas near Pangnirtung):

The proponent, Levi Evic of Pangnirtung, proposes to sample a number of areas in the vicinity of that community in an effort to find cod stocks that could support new commercial fishing activity. The Board referred to its earlier decision (**Resolution 2001- 024**) in deciding not to approve NWMB Study funding for this proposal.

Project 5246-01-1 (Rationalization of charr fishing sites at Kugluktuk):

The proponent, the Angoniatit Association (HTO) at Kugluktuk, considers it prudent to reduce fishing pressure on Arctic charr stocks in the Coppermine River, and proposes to seek alternate charr stocks for commercial fishing near the community.

Michelle noted that the proposal is well developed, with a good presentation of what the proponents aim to do and why they aim to do it. The proposal does have an economic development orientation but it stems from a conservation concern, namely the desire to maintain the charr stock nearest the community for the benefit of the subsistence fishery.

A majority of Board Members could not reconcile funding this project with rejecting funding for other proposals directed to determining the feasibility of economic ventures. A motion by Moses Koonoo, seconded by Kevin McCormick, to approve NWMB Study funding to the Kugluktuk Angoniatit Association to document viable local alternatives to the Coppermine River for commercial charr fisheries in order to lessen fishing pressure on the Coppermine River was defeated.

Project 5213-01-1 (Ground survey of Peary caribou, muskoxen and wolves on Bathurst, Cornwallis, western Devon, and nearby islands):

The proponent, the Resolute Bay HTO, proposes to verify whether recent aerial surveys yielded accurate population estimates. There is local and regional concern that the survey methods were not well suited to the clumped populations of caribou and muskoxen that occur on these islands, and that these populations may have been under-estimated. The HTO also anticipates that if its members participate directly in a verification exercise of this nature they will be more amenable to accepting management changes that may be necessary if the populations are confirmed to be in a depleted state. This is in fact the second year of this project. It was also supported by NWMB Study funding last year, although no report on that work has been received.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 025**) to approve NWMB Study funding to the Resolute Bay HTO in the amount of \$30,000 for Project 5213-01-1 for 2001/02 to assist in verifying recent aerial surveys for Peary caribou and muskoxen on the nearby Arctic islands, this subject to the proponents:

- Confirming that the other funding identified in the proposal is in place; and
- Submitting a satisfactory report on the work conducted last year.

Project 5264-01-1 (Range-wide monitoring of Beverly and Qamanirjuaq caribou, their habitat, and community use in relation to changing climate and land use):

The proponent, the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board, proposes to compile existing information and traditional knowledge about these two caribou herds, and in particular to identify indicators that could be monitored over time to show how the caribou and their habitats are faring in relation to various stressors. The proposal is modelled on similar work being undertaken elsewhere with respect to the Porcupine caribou herd.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 026**) to approve NWMB Study funding to the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board in the amount of \$30,000 for Project 5264-01-1 for 2001/02, to assist in compiling information for the identification of indicators leading to the development of a monitoring system for changes in caribou populations and their habitats. This approval is subject to obtaining from the proponent:

- Confirmation that all of the other funding identified in the proposal is in place; and
- A satisfactory explanation for why it is not proposed to involve a Nunavut resident in co-ordinating the project.

In summarising this agenda item Michelle Wheatley advised that the Board had approved NWMB Study funding for 2001/02 in the total amount of \$107,100 for four projects.

Ben Kovic noted that this concluded the NWMB's annual exercise of allocating NWRT and NWMB Study funds based on proposals received from proponents. The meeting will return to its ordinary agenda tomorrow morning.

Wednesday, 21 March 2001

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, re-convened the meeting at 8:45 a.m.

3. Minutes: Review and Approval

The Board decided to defer consideration of minutes from previous meetings and conference calls that had not yet been adopted. These items pertained to:

- Regular Meeting No. 27, held on 27 November to 01 December 2000;
- Conference Call No. 54, conducted on 19 December 2000;
- Special Meeting No. 9, held on 15-16 January 2001; and
- Conference Call No. 55, conducted on 12 February 2001.

4. Financial and Administrative Business

4.A Financial Variance Report as at 28 February 2001

The Board decided to forego consideration of the current financial variance report.

4.B Preparation of Workplan and Budget for the Second Contract Period

Ben Kovic welcomed Jim Pealow of AMCES, the consultant group retained by the NWMB to develop input for preparation of the NWMB workplan and budget for 2003- 2013. Mr. Pealow tabled Version 2 of his *Nunavut Wildlife Management Board 2003 – 2013 Plans and Budgets*, and led the Board through an examination of those portions of the document pertaining to strategic direction and new strategies, including projected financial requirements. In the course of the ensuing discussion, the following points were made and conclusions drawn:

- Everything in the NWMB workplan and funding proposals should clearly relate back to the NLCA, and more particularly to the mandate of the NWMB;
- It will be advantageous in making proposals to demonstrate cost-effectiveness and innovation;
- There should be no reluctance to identify genuine needs, regardless of actual funding assumptions or expectations;
- There will be genuine operational differences between the first and second contract periods, and these should be taken into account in planning;
- Everything that is put forward must be on the assumption that it will have to be vigorously defended, and all background information and calculations should be fully worked out and readily available even if not presented at the outset;
- Performance measures should be incorporated to the greatest extent possible;
- A greater emphasis on IQ in the second contract period would be consistent with a number of new legislative, administrative and protocol requirements;
- The Board needs to give more consideration and offer more guidance regarding if and how it would be appropriate to budget for public hearings;
- Justification for ongoing collection and analysis of harvest data needs to be strengthened and better rationalised if this item is going to be put forward;
- The Board needs to come to grips with the question of whether to pursue adequate funding for the RWOs and HTOs via its own submissions, or whether to try to recruit NTI to carry forward this responsibility.

Mr. Pealow departed the meeting at this point. In continuing its discussions of this matter, the Board noted and/or concluded/decided that:

- The request developed by the NWMB, in concert with the other IPGs, for an extension to June 18 of the present end-of-March deadline for submission of the planning materials has gone forward to the Implementation Panel;
- If this request for extension is approved, it should not be assumed at this stage that it would constitute the final indication of flexibility that may be available;
- Michael d'Eça will prepare a briefing note setting out issues, goals and options for preparing and presenting the NWMB planning documents;
- The Board will come to grips with the briefing note via a conference call, and will give consideration to the need to establish a dedicated working group;
- It is anticipated that Michael, with the assistance of senior NWMB staff, will develop a next version of the planning documents for consideration by the Board, possibly at a workshop in conjunction with the next Board meeting;

- Kevin McCormick will provide a strategic window to the Board in the interim, and the consultant will be retained to provide advice as may be required;
- Kevin will attempt to contact DIAND officials who will be involved with or linked to the negotiations, including if possible DIAND's Chief Implementation Negotiator, in an effort to learn about the underlying parameters that DIAND presumably has established to guide its consideration of the planning materials that it will receive and the protocols that it will follow;
- Prior to submitting its documentation to the Panel, it may be advantageous for the Board or for NWMB officials to meet or otherwise interact:
 - With the NWMB's co-management partners, to confirm linkages and anticipated ongoing co-management relationships; and
 - With the other IPGs, to promote consistency of presentation;
- The NWMB should strive for authorization to represent its own interests in the negotiations.

5. Chairperson, Senior Staff, Advisors' and Members' Reports

The Board decided to forego consideration of the activity reports tabled by the Chairperson, senior staff, and the Fisheries Advisor. Members were referred to copies of these materials in the briefing binders.

5.E Legal Advisor's Report

Michael d'Eça referred to his regular activity report in the meeting binder. He then proceeded to update the Board specifically on his investigations regarding the rates of remuneration for members of Boards and Tribunals that are established by the Federal Government. Treasury Board recognises four categories of such agencies, and the NWMB has been placed in the lowest-paid category (IV). The daily rate of remuneration for Category IV members is only \$200 – \$250, whereas for Category I members it is \$475 – \$550. The NWMB is in the same category as at least some agencies that would appear to have a much narrower and less onerous responsibility. It is of interest that the Inuvialuit Arbitration Board is in Category II.

Michael advised that despite making contact with senior officials in the Privy Council Office who have this matter as part of their mandate, all of his information to date has in fact resulted from an Access-to-Information initiative that he set in motion. It is not yet clear whether officials themselves will yet be more forthcoming, but it seems possible that they may not in fact be able to provide very much by way of explanation or assistance. The process of assignment gives every indication of being quite arbitrary and lacking analysis. There is mention in the material that was obtained of several criteria that are used to establish the category to which an agency will be assigned. The criteria mentioned are complexity, diversity, scope and impact of the activities performed. Officials also mentioned "internal relativity".

Michael undertook to develop for the consideration of the Board a formal submission to the Privy Council Office urging that the NWMB be re-categorised.

5.G Members Reports and Concerns

David Alagalak brought two items to the attention of the Board:

- **Status Report on the Keewatin Wildlife Federation (RWO)**

David thanked the Board for its recent financial contribution to the KWF. With the help of these funds the RWO was able to bring the regional HTOs to a planning workshop in Arviat. A number of new protocols were adopted, putting in place consistent procedures for such matters as hiring of staff. Amendments to the KWF bylaws were adopted and forwarded to the Registrar of Societies. These included a name change for the organization, hence to be known as the Kivalliq Wildlife Board.

- **TAH for Bowhead Whales**

David urged that the NWMB undertake or support work that would lead to a larger harvest of bowhead whales in Nunavut. In David's view, which is supported by hunters and elders to whom he has spoken, the number of bowheads in the NSA has increased substantially since the cessation of commercial whaling. Whereas there were probably only about 500 – 600 bowheads remaining at that time, the number now is probably 4-5 times higher. The harvest rates that are currently permitted do not reflect the strength of this increase. David suggested that the increasing abundance of killer whales in the eastern Arctic in recent years may be linked to the increasing number of bowhead whales. According to traditional knowledge, killer whales were also abundant in the period prior to bowhead whales being hunted to the point of extreme depletion. The traditional view is that young bowhead whales are a preferred food for killer whales and will attract them into an area. This could be a negative factor in maintaining high populations of narwhal and beluga, which are also preyed upon by killer whales. Taken together, it is deemed to be another reason for increasing the harvest of bowheads.

Makabe Nartok expressed his appreciation that his community (Kugaaruk) was included in the recent tour regarding community-based management with respect to narwhal. Makabe observed that NWMB regular meetings are always too rushed, with inadequate opportunity for the Board to interact with the community. Ben Kovic acknowledged the hospitality of Kugaaruk residents, and those of all the other participating communities, in hosting the recent tour.

Moses Koonoo announced that his appointing agency (Qikiqtani Inuit Association) interprets that his term is about to expire and has invited expressions of interest for a new appointment. He (Moses) did not put his name forward. Moses stated that he had enjoyed his time with the Board and the opportunity it provided for him to gain new perspectives on such a wide range of issues. Moses stated that he now has a better appreciation of the need to actively manage wildlife resources.

Moses expressed concern that in some areas, including around his own community (Arctic Bay), polar bears are far more abundant and cause far more problems than tends to be acknowledged by the polar bear biologists. It is now almost impossible to cache meat outside the community without having it disturbed by bears. He

urged that more attention be paid to local and traditional knowledge in considering such matters. Ben Kovic noted that he had never heard a wildlife biologist state a wildlife population number with a high degree of confidence. He agreed that IQ had a larger role to play in such matters than it was usually given.

Gordon Koshinsky stated his understanding that polar bears are highly dependent on seals. He asked if people out on the land were observing anything different about the behaviour of seals, perhaps in connection with changing ice conditions, that might be the reason for some of the apparent changes in polar bear behaviour or abundance. Moses Koonoo suggested that polar bears were simply moving around in relation to their food supply. This is a common phenomenon with wildlife. For example, caribou will move to a different area if they have trampled one area for a long time. Before food became available in stores, Inuit behaved the same way. Ben Kovic expressed the opinion that harp seals were replacing ringed seals in NSA waters. They are much more aggressive, and probably eat the same foods.

Gordon noted that a number of topics had arisen already in this meeting that might be good subjects for demonstrations or mini-workshops for the Board. Examples might include radio- and/or satellite-tagging, estimating the size of animal populations, setting total allowable harvests for charr fisheries, parameters of reproduction in marine mammals, genetic stock differentiation, the use of anaesthetics to immobilise animals, and the NWMB's new web site. Board Members agreed that this was a valid idea and suggested that staff work with the Departments to accommodate it at future meetings.

Ben Kovic agreed with Makabe's observation that the NWMB meeting agenda is invariably over-crowded. Ben suggested that the Board might consider extending the number of days for meetings, or maybe having dedicated workshops on selected topics. It is important not to burn out the Members. At the same time, Members need to demonstrate a great deal of commitment in order to be effective. Ben especially urged that Members keep their commitments to attend meetings.

6. Completion of Assignments and Implementation of Resolutions

The Board decided to forego consideration of the Task List pertaining to assignments arising from the previous Board meeting.

7. Environment Canada (CWS): Issues and Decisions

7.A *Species-at-Risk Act* (SARA): Plans and Provisions for Implementation

Ben Kovic introduced Dr. Peter Usher, who is currently on contract with Environment Canada to help ensure that there is effective provision for the input of traditional knowledge in implementing the *Species at Risk Act* after it is passed.

Dr. Usher focussed his presentation on the role and the mode of operation of COSEWIC, both currently and how it will be under the new legislation. COSEWIC

has been and will remain key to the process of designating species at risk, and will be a vital window for the wildlife management boards (including the NWMB) to make input to the implementation of the new Act. Dr. Usher noted that COSEWIC was established in 1977 to assess species for possible designation as being at-risk. The Committee has 28 members, including one from each “range jurisdiction” (province/territory). Without SARA-type legislation the Committee has not had statutory authority. However COSEWIC did examine and make recommendations with respect to the status of over 500 species of flora and fauna in Canada.

Under the present (pre-SARA) arrangement, COSEWIC commissions status reports for candidate species. Status reports are prepared on the basis of existing information, without benefit of new research. At the present time, COSEWIC decides the designation of a subject species based on the status report. Recently, COSEWIC began obtaining input from other experts and jurisdictions besides the author(s) commissioned to write the status reports. In making its decisions, COSEWIC has been weighing only the risk factors for the species without taking account of economic or social factors. In other words, the process has been at arms-length from political input. Much of this *modus operandi* will change under SARA.

Revised terms of reference have been established to guide COSEWIC operations under the new Act. As previously, there will be eight Species Specialist Groups that will be responsible for identifying candidate species, commissioning status reports, and reviewing and assessing the results. An important provision of the new legislation and of future COSEWIC operations under this legislation is that aboriginal traditional knowledge will have to be taken into account. In order to focus this perspective, the SARA legislation has provision for the creation of an Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge Specialist Group. Terms of reference are being established.

Processes for implementing the new legislation will have to conform to the realities of land claim settlements. Flowing from the NLCA specifically, it is recognized that the NWMB:

- Is the main instrument of wildlife management in the NSA;
- Is the best single source of information on wildlife species in the NSA;
- Has authority to approve species designations.

Dr. Usher stressed that it was very important for the wildlife management boards under land claims, and COSEWIC under the new legislation, to establish clear lines of communication in order to facilitate the species assessment process and to avoid working at cross purposes. He referred to the 13-point outline of proposals prepared by the COSEWIC Secretariat towards that end. He urged the NWMB to consider these proposals carefully and provide formal comment. In the ensuing discussion, the following points were made or emerged:

- It will be prudent for wildlife management boards to have effective lines of communication with one another, particularly in respect to considering species that range across more than one land claim settlement area;

- After SARA is passed, species designations that currently exist will be re-established, barring objections, after a set review period;
- It will not be possible to review all the designations during the review period, and priorities will need to be set;
- Aboriginal traditional knowledge will have to be taken into account in the conduct of these reviews;
- It will not be possible to simply “deem” roll-overs of species designations because it is inconceivable that inclusion of traditional knowledge could be “deemed”;
- The NWMB will probably have to conduct its own consultations in order to develop its own inputs to the species assessment/designation process;
- Active participation in the new process will have financial and workload implications for the NWMB. It will be prudent to take these implications into account when putting forward plans for the next contract period;
- The impetus for having an ATK Specialist Group came mainly from aboriginal organizations in southern Canada that have not settled land claims. This Specialist Group will not have competence that is regionally-specific, but will depend instead on agencies such as the NWMB;
- Listing of a species as being at risk is in fact a starting point for restricting aboriginal harvesting rights in respect to that species;
- It would be useful and appropriate for the NWMB to establish a standard approach vis-à-vis the other wildlife management boards when it comes to implementing SARA. It was suggested that Dr. Usher might play a liaison role in working towards that end.

Michael d'Eça posed a number of specific questions and critiques with respect to the COSEWIC document, listed according to items in the document as follows:

- Item 2: The wildlife management boards will need to be among the parties to agree (or not) on candidate lists of species to be assessed.
- Item 3: Provision should be made for contributors of traditional knowledge to be granted (co-)authorship of species status reports.
- Item 4: Provision should be made for wildlife management boards to participate in the selection of authors for species status reports.
- Item 5: It needs to be made clear that science and traditional knowledge inputs will be complementary under the new legislation. Traditional knowledge will not be a mere add-on or supplement to scientific information.
- Items 12 and 13: In a land-claim-settlement area, the process would end with wildlife management board approval and Ministerial acceptance (or not) of the board's decision. The roles of the Canadian Wildlife Directors Committee and of the Canadian Endangered Species Conservation Council would be unclear in this context.

Michael also noted that the NWMB has written to DOE, asking that a discussion paper be prepared in respect to implementation of regulations that will be promulgated under the new SARA legislation.

Dr. Usher reported that the next (annual) meeting of COSEWIC will be in early May. He referred to an advisory from the COSEWIC Secretariat regarding species that range into Nunavut that will receive attention at the meeting, as follows:

- The Committee will be assessing new or updated status reports for Canada lynx, killer whales, harlequin ducks, northern wolffish and spotted wolffish.
- The Committee is awaiting inputs of traditional knowledge in order to complete assessments for woodland caribou and felt-leaf willow.
- The Committee has commissioned or is about to commission status reports on Peary caribou, wolverine, beluga whale, bowhead whale and right whale.

The Board decided that it would be appropriate to prepare a formal response to the COSEWIC Secretariat's 13-point proposal for ensuring effective communication with the wildlife management boards in order to optimise COSEWIC's species assessment process, and also to indicate how the Board would like to be involved in the preparation and review of species status reports.

Dr. Usher noted that a number of actions are and will continue to be triggered after a species is listed as being at risk, depending on the actual designation. These could include a need to prepare and implement management plans and/or recovery plans, and to determine compensation for landowners and (perhaps) traditional harvesters. None of the procedures for arriving at these responses in accordance with the new legislation have yet been established. These matters require the same kind of attention that is currently being devoted to the species assessment process.

7.B Controlling Snow Goose Populations: Spring Sport Hunt in Nunavut

Kevin McCormick reminded the Board of its earlier approval of regulations to enable a spring conservation hunt for snow geese in the Nunavut Territory. This initiative is in response to a perceived over-abundance of snow geese and will parallel spring sport hunts established earlier in Quebec, Manitoba and (now also) in Saskatchewan. The regulations for Nunavut have been approved by the Federal Government and will take effect this spring.

7.C Migratory Bird Convention: Amendment

Kevin McCormick confirmed that recent amendments to the Migratory Birds Convention are now in effect and make it legal for aboriginal peoples possessing such rights to hunt migratory birds year-round. Posters are being prepared for dissemination to communities in order to officially communicate this information.

7.D Continental Harvest of Snow Geese: Update

Kevin McCormick reported that there are indications that the spring sport hunts for snow geese that have been initiated in some Canadian provinces (and now also in the Nunavut Territory), as well as in certain American states, may indeed be having their intended effects, including:

- A reduction in the numbers of greater snow geese nesting on Bylot Island and northern Baffin Island; and
- Stabilisation in the numbers of lesser snow geese nesting along Hudson Bay and in the Kitikmeot region.

Thursday, 22 March 2001

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, reconvened the meeting at 09:00 a.m.

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

8.A Community-Based Management System for Narwhal and Beluga

Michael d'Eça tabled his report on the tour with respect to community-based management that was conducted over the period 26 February through 6 March. He described the tour as stimulating and informative. He and Moses Koonoo went to all seven communities; Ben Kovic was at all of them except Kimmirut. David Alagalak and Meeka Mike participated on behalf of the NWMB at some of the communities, and Keith Pelly represented DFO.

Michael interpreted a number of themes or common elements that seemed to run through most of the sessions from the perspective of Inuit:

- There is considerable value and legitimacy in obtaining updated estimates of the narwhal and beluga populations that they hunt.
- Not enough use is made of traditional knowledge in the formulation of management decisions.
- There is a need for improved and more frequent communications among DFO, NTI, the NWMB, the RWOs and the communities.
- Wastage of animals is a (modern) problem in a number of communities. More priority needs to be placed on not wasting edible parts.
- Three years is not enough time to make and evaluate a major adjustment of the type embodied in community-based management. Mistakes are to be expected, and the need for adjustments should be recognized at the outset.
- Reporting of information on animals that are struck and lost can be improved.
- Considerable benefits could be realized from training of new hunters. The most productive approach would be and is to have experienced hunters train young hunters in a hands-on setting.
- A minimum calibre of weapon should be designated for harvesting narwhal and beluga.
- Harvest limits can have a place in wildlife management, but if needed they ought to be set by the HTOs.

Moses Koonoo concurred with Michael's observations. He stressed the concern about three years not being enough time to institute and properly evaluate the new

management system. Given this time frame, some of the older hunters were wondering if it was even worthwhile to try to make corrections and adjustments. Some communities that are aiming to participate have not even had opportunity to get properly started with the new system.

There was considerable discussion at the community meetings about the definitions of struck and lost animals. The general feeling is that if a wound is not deep, and if it is not perceived that the animal will not die, then it should not be reported.

Ben Kovic noted that every community that has participated in the new system has tried to improve the process. More education and better communication are clearly needed. The Inuit people themselves have much useful knowledge to contribute. Several hunters mentioned that they see narwhals with calves in all seasons of the year, which they interpret as evidence of unsynchronised reproduction. It is not uncommon to find pregnant narwhals accompanied by calves. Many Inuit believe that these are contributing factors in what they believe to be a high reproductive potential for this species. It is also clear, and of concern to some community members, that narwhal hunting is becoming more of a commercialised activity than is beluga hunting.

Michael suggested that in communicating the results of the tour to the DFO Minister, the NWMB may want to propose that those communities that have prepared to participate in community-based management but have not yet started on that path, namely Kugaaruk and Arctic Bay, be allowed at least a full three-year evaluation period on the same basis as the communities that participated from the start. Michael also stressed the need for the NWMB, on the basis of the community tour, to respond very specifically to the Minister's interim decision to close the narwhal hunt at Qikiqtarjuaq last fall.

Michael drew the attention of the Board to the recommendations he had put forward at the end of his report, these for the attention and action of the NWMB. In summary, these recommendations are that the NWMB:

- By the end of April, take necessary steps to ensure the ability of the HTOs at Kugaaruk and Arctic Bay to participate in the community-based management system for narwhal starting in 2001. This would include making sure that bylaws and hunting rules are in order.
- Also by the end of April, produce a written Pre-Hearing Consultation Summary, in three languages, including an audio-recorded version in Inuktitut.
- In order to complete the Consultation Summary, collect pertinent information as identified pertaining to narwhal population dynamics and the history of narwhal management and utilization, along with data on human population growth in Nunavut communities that harvest narwhal.
- Convey the Consultation Summary to the DFO Minister, to the NTI President, to the Chairs of the three RWOs, and to the Chairs of the HTOs that participated in the consultations. In communicating the Summary to these agencies and organizations, convey a vigorous defence of community-based

management and set out a proposed framework of roles and obligations of the interested parties, including the NWMB, in ensuring the survival and success of this initiative. In communicating with the RWOs and HTOs, convey a frank warning of the possibly tenuous future of this initiative.

Discussion ensued with respect to Michael's suggestions about what actually needed to be done, and by whom in particular among the various parties concerned with this matter, in order to keep the community-based management initiative on track. Among Michael's proposals were for the parties acting in accordance with their mandates and capacities to undertake to:

- Participate in a workshop designed as a forum for the parties to clarify and confirm their responsibilities, identify funding commitments, and make operational plans for pursuing this matter;
- Conduct population surveys of narwhal in Baffin Bay, and of beluga in Baffin Bay and Hudson Bay;
- Conduct studies of Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit regarding narwhal and beluga in these same areas;
- Ensure the establishment and operation of an appropriate training program for whale hunting, including the production of training videos;
- Assist the RWOs and the HTOs in all aspects of coming to grips with their roles and responsibilities in this matter;
- Not interfere with the communities in their community-based management of narwhal and beluga hunting in 2001, unless serious concerns arise with respect to conservation or public safety.

Michael also suggested that, for the 2001 whale-harvesting season, the NWMB should consider urging the HTOs (and where applicable the RWOs) to, specifically:

- Increase efforts to accurately report the numbers of whales struck and lost;
- Improve the full utilization of edible parts of whales that are landed;
- Improve conformity with best hunting practices in order to minimize the loss of struck whales;
- Adopt and enforce specific harvest limits at the community level;
- Regulate harvesting by HTO members in overlapping hunting areas, and in the hunting areas of other communities;
- Consider dividing the narwhal harvest into commercial and non-commercial components, with separate restrictions for each;
- Conduct members' meetings prior to the start of the 2001 hunting season to discuss these initiatives and the NWMB's Pre-Hearing Consultation Summary, and to consider and put in place any required modifications to hunting rules.

As part of his recommendations Michael tabled a set of possible whale-hunting limits for 2001 for the consideration of all the parties, and in particular the HTOs of those communities that are participants in community-based management. He stressed that such limits would have to be voluntary under the new management system and that his list was just a starting point for discussions. In formulating the list he did try to take account of recent and long-term quotas and harvests as well

as community expectations. A multi-year rolling harvest quota system as has been discussed by the NWMB previously might be an option for some communities.

Burt Hunt expressed appreciation to the NWMB for initiating a process for coming to grips with this matter. Besides the greatly increased harvests by some communities under the new management system, the Department has been concerned about the increasing trend to commercialization of the narwhal hunt. Burt applauded Michael's attempt to develop a possible set of harvest limits for 2001, and expressed enthusiasm for efforts to promote best practices and to minimize wastage. Initiatives to improve communication and the flow of information are obviously to be encouraged. Burt reckoned that incomplete instructions to the communities at the time when community-based management was being established could account for many of the problems that ensued. For instance, Baffin communities were apparently not made aware of the understanding between Canada and Greenland that overall narwhal harvests by both countries should not be allowed to increase until more information is available on population status.

Ben Kovic reiterated an oft-stated plea that DFO needs to develop concrete estimates of harvest levels that would be sustainable. Gordon Koshinsky observed that "population surveys" should not be interpreted as the be-all and end-all for establishing total allowable harvests. Population surveys yield population estimates; they do not yield absolute population numbers as is often surmised. The confidence limits surrounding population estimates will depend on many things, including the effort and funds expended on the surveys. While whale population surveys will assuredly be very expensive and not necessarily very effective, they may not be the most important missing factor for the determination of sustainable harvest levels. It may be equally or more important to improve understanding of such productivity parameters as age-at-maturity, reproductive intervals, and other factors in mortality. Gordon urged that prior to commitments being made to fund and conduct narwhal or beluga population surveys involving large geographic areas, an analysis be made of the total scope of information inputs available (or not), and how best-value-for-money/effort might be achieved to fill these knowledge gaps in order to build a credible risk-based model for management.

8.B Fisheries Management in the Eastern Arctic: Program Update

Karen Ditz referred to her briefing note. She reported and Burt Hunt elaborated that:

- A contract has been let to review the available information regarding the Sylvia Grinnel River and its charr population, as a prelude to developing fishery management measures. The consultant's report is due at the end of March.
- The aerial survey of Hudson Bay narwhal proceeded as planned last summer. The communities were consulted about the best time for conducting the work.
- A report on a recent study of traditional knowledge pertaining to narwhal in the Hudson Bay communities is nearing completion. The fieldwork took the form of a workshop in Repulse Bay, with some time also spent in Rankin Inlet. The project is led by Neida Gonzales, assisted by Keith Hay.

- Existing documentation of hunter knowledge pertaining to narwhal and beluga in Baffin Bay and Davis Strait is being reviewed for input to the Scientific Working Group of the Canada-Greenland Joint Commission in May.

In response to a question from Moses Koonoo about attaching satellite tags to whales, Burt explained that for young male and all female narwhals as well as all belugas, the tags are attached to the backs of the animals. For older male narwhals, the tags are attached to the base of the tusk. These tags are uniquely shaped in an effort to minimize disruption of the animals' ability to echolocate.

8.C Integrated Fishery Management Planning for Pangnirtung

Karen Ditz reviewed her briefing note in the meeting binder. The aim is to develop an integrated fishery management plan to enable the Pangnirtung HTO to pursue fishery development initiatives on the basis of the best available information and up-to-date management models. The HTO reaffirmed its commitment to development of such a plan at a meeting in mid February. The management plan will apply mainly to lakes and rivers, but some saltwater bays will also be included. The exercise has already been useful, for example in identifying problems such as the fact that not all fishermen have been recording their catches properly or consistently.

David Alagalak referred to evidence in the funding requests that have been brought to the NWMB that some individuals at Pangnirtung wish to embark on fishery development activities without the participation or concurrence of the HTO. David wondered if it would be possible to reconcile such activities with integrated fishery management planning. Specifically he was concerned about the NWMB dealing with individuals while DFO was dealing at the level of the HTO. Karen replied that it is indeed a goal to harmonise these kinds of initiatives under the broader plan.

Michael pointed out that those developing this kind of plan should keep in mind the concurrent development of new fisheries regulations, and ensure that incompatibilities are avoided at the outset.

8.D Utilization of Nunavut Implementation Funding by DFO

Burt Hunt reminded the Board that DFO uses its Nunavut Implementation Funding primarily to support stock assessment work. Nineteen proposals were recently considered for 2001/02 funding and a total of \$304,000 of NIF was allocated, some of it to augment studies being supported by NWRT funds. This will also be supplemented by \$74,000 of funding from other DFO sources.

8.E Fish Habitat Management in the Eastern Arctic: Program Update

Burt Hunt advised that development projects in Nunavut that were or are subject to recent or forthcoming DFO attention include:

- Tahera Corporation's Jericho Diamond Mine project. The proposal for this project was recently submitted to NIRB for screening.
- Several municipal projects, including plans to construct a bridge near Kugaaruk in connection with de-commissioning a DEW-line site. DFO intervention is resulting in two clear-span bridges being built instead of one bridge and one culvert.

8.F Developing Fishery Regulations for Nunavut: Update

Burt Hunt reported that the third meeting of the Nunavut Regulatory Review Committee was held in mid December. A draft of at least some components of the new legislation should be ready for the Committee to review by the end of April. However DFO has no intention of trying to ramrod the process. A video, in the form of a dialogue among some Inuit friends, has been prepared with the hope of prompting input during the consultation process. The video is in two languages and awaits approval by DFO Headquarters for release to the public. A plan for community consultations is being developed.

Michael d'Eça confirmed that from his perspective the process has gone very well since it was put on a realistic track. However the difficult parts are obviously yet ahead. Michael noted that the video gives a very general perspective on developing the new legislation, focussing on objectives and the process of change.

Karen Ditz raised the matter of the Arctic charr trophy sport fishery on the Tree River in the context of developing the new fishery regulations. The Tree River fishery is reserved for the benefit of one particular outfitter, and is operated under an annual removal quota of 700 fish. There are limitations on the number of guests who can be accommodated, with very restrictive possession limits for individual anglers. These measures are designed to protect the world-class trophy character of this fishery. The river is identified as a special management area, to enable these unique provisions to be applied. Tree River Lodge is operated as an outpost camp by Plummer's Arctic Fishing Lodges. Plummer's has an agreement with the community of Kugluktuk regarding local employment. DFO is requesting the NWMB to advise whether, and if so to what extent and in what manner, the trophy status of this fishery should be enshrined in the new regulations. The question is whether the NWMB, taking account of all relevant interests, would want to make changes to any of the existing provisions.

Kevin McCormick suggested that there needed to be input on this matter from the various interests, including the Kugluktuk HTO and the Kitikmeot Hunters and Trappers Association. The Board agreed that DFO ought to refer the matter by way of a formal briefing note to the Nunavut Regulatory Review Committee for its consideration, with the Committee also being the preferred vehicle to ensure the necessary consultations.

8.G Requests for Increased Narwhal Quotas: Pangnirtung and Clyde River

Michelle Wheatley tabled letters from the two HTOs requesting increased narwhal quotas. Pangnirtung currently has an annual narwhal quota of 40 animals, which they would like to increase to 95. This desire by Pangnirtung to have access to more narwhals has actually been known for some time; it stems primarily from the rapidly growing human population. Clyde River currently has an annual narwhal quota of 50 animals, which they would like to increase to 75. The community-based management system which is in progress among other communities that probably share this same narwhal population is a complicating factor, and a systematic review of these requests has not yet been made. Michelle noted that narwhal availability and harvests at Pangnirtung in particular are highly variable from year to year, and suggested that one or both of these communities might be good candidates for a flexible rolling quota system of management.

Ben Kovic interpreted that the Pangnirtung HTO was proposing to allocate some of any increased narwhal quota specifically to elders and youths. The Board agreed that this would be an interesting and potentially worthwhile innovation. David Alagalak and Gordon Koshinsky agreed with Michelle's contention that it would not be desirable to change any narwhal quotas in this area while evaluation of the community-based management system was still in progress. In concluding its deliberations the Board asked the Director of Wildlife Management to work with DFO to assess these requests in more detail and report back to the Board.

8.H Live-Capture / Removal of Marine Mammals

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Board of the expressions of interest from Sea World and from Interzoo to obtain marine mammals from the Canadian Arctic for deployment to various zoological institutions around the world. She advised that the DFO Minister responded quite negatively to the Sea World proposal for authorization to begin working towards the live-capture and removal of a number of narwhals in order to launch a captive-breeding program at a controlled facility. As a result of that response Sea World has withdrawn their proposal, at least temporarily. Michelle suggested that the Board consider developing and publicising its own perspective on the matter of live-capture and removal of animals from the NSA.

Michael d'Eça suggested that direction from the NWMB on this issue would be relevant to the development of the new *Wildlife Act* and *Fisheries Regulations* for Nunavut. It might be an appropriate item for community consultations in that context. The current *Marine Mammal Regulations* state that no one can legally move a live marine mammal without a special licence, and a similar provision could be incorporated into the new *Fisheries Regulations*. Michael reminded the Members that the Board had earlier declared opposition to ventures of this nature when proposed with respect to Peary caribou, muskox, and Arctic charr gametes.

Jim Noble asked what the role of the NWMB would be if something like this were proposed as an economic venture for or with one or more Nunavut individuals or

communities. Michael replied that it would still be a type of harvest, and to that extent would fall under NWMB jurisdiction. Moses Koonoo stated his general opposition to proposals to take wildlife out of the Arctic for propagation in captivity. He reckoned that such ventures could undermine the value of natural wildlife populations. Kevin McCormick cautioned against putting a blanket prohibition into the new Regulations.

The Board requested staff to prepare a draft policy on this matter for the Board's consideration, and at the same time to alert the Regulatory Review Committee and suggest this as a subject for community consultations.

8.I Atlantic Fisheries Policy Review: Update

Burt Hunt drew attention to the briefing note in the meeting binder. The AFPR is a DFO initiative to develop a consistent and cohesive policy framework for the management of Canadian East Coast fish stocks. Iqaluit was included in the list of communities where an initial round of public consultations was held in June 1999. A discussion document was prepared and was released to the public a little more than a year ago in preparation for another round of consultations. Iqaluit is scheduled for a public session on April 18. An External Advisory Board has been created to advise the AFPR working group in its deliberations. The EAB has representation from the Aboriginal community including northern interests, and the Government of Nunavut has *ex officio* status.

Burt advised that the Nunavut Fisheries Working Group aims to meet prior to April 18 in order to develop a strategy for approaching the public session. The Board asked its Legal Advisor to prepare an NWMB submission for this event, as a follow-up to what was submitted previously.

8.J Ocean Act Implementation: Update

Burt Hunt advised that Jean-Pierre Thonney, DFO's new Oceans Co-ordinator for Nunavut, has been building contacts with the Nunavut IPGs and other Nunavut partners and stakeholders. The plan is to recruit a protégé to work with Mr. Thonney and eventually take over his role. That role is currently focussed on obtaining Nunavut input for developing the national oceans strategy and pursuing integrated oceans management. The workshops last fall to examine regional marine issues of significance to coastal communities of western Hudson Bay were concrete steps in that direction. A report on those workshops has been prepared and follow-up consultations are scheduled.

Michael d'Eça suggested that it would be useful to obtain an indication of the operational impacts that DFO's oceans initiatives might have on the NWMB, as input to the preparation of workplans and identification of funding requirements for the next 10-year contract period. Burt agreed to provide such material, at least to the extent that it was available from the western Hudson Bay planning exercise.

8.K Canadian Shellfish Sanitation Program: Update

Jim Noble reminded the Members that Kevin McCormick brought the Canadian Shellfish Sanitation Program (CSSP) to the attention of the Board at the September meeting. Jim then introduced François Rainville from DOE and Jeff Maurice from DFO to speak further to this matter.

Mr. Rainville advised that the CSSP is operational in most parts of Canada, but not (yet) in Nunavut. The Program aims to ensure that shellfish are safe for consumers by controlling various aspects of the harvesting, processing and marketing of such bivalves as clams, mussels and scallops. The Program is administered jointly by DOE, DFO, and the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA). There are commercial, recreational and subsistence shellfish fisheries in Nunavut, all of which are expected to increase. The program agencies would like to expand the Program in a staged manner to include the Nunavut Territory. Doing so would have implications not only for local consumers, but would also open access for Nunavut bivalve shellfish to world markets. At the present time (without this program), bivalve shellfish (such as clams) from Nunavut can be sold within the Territory but cannot be exported. The benefits notwithstanding, such a program would admittedly be very expensive to operate in this region and funds have not as yet been identified for it.

Mr. Rainville referred to Program information in the meeting binder. He explained that bivalve shellfish feed by filtering the water in which they live. They will readily accumulate chemicals within their bodies and, as a result of their feeding method, they also tend to concentrate bacteria and naturally-occurring toxins. All warm-blooded animals have the potential to contaminate receiving waters with bacteria that can be taken up by shellfish. A major component of the CSSP is to identify safe shellfish growing areas for both commercial and recreational harvesting.

DOE is responsible for classifying shellfish growing areas based on monitoring of water quality under the Program. CFIA does the actual shellfish monitoring, and DFO has ultimate responsibility for opening and closing growing areas as appropriate. Monitoring of water quality indicates the potential for bacterial contamination but the shellfish themselves have to be tested to assess the presence of paralytic shellfish poisoning. It is only recently that the toxins responsible for paralytic shellfish poisoning have been found in Newfoundland waters, and the problem seems to be spreading northwards.

Mr. Rainville listed the immediate objectives of the program agencies:

- To establish a Regional Classification Committee for Nunavut, to facilitate local/regional input in implementing the Program;
- To adopt a risk-assessment approach taking account of harvest size and pollution sources to establish priorities and delimit the intensity of surveys;
- To make the Iqaluit tidal flats, and specifically Koojesse Inlet and Tarr Inlet, priority areas for classification attention, this based on the existence of known pollution sources;

- Pending the availability of survey results from Koojesse and Tarr Inlets, invoke the automatic closure provisions of the Program as these pertain to zones within 125 metres of wharves and within 300 metres of sewage outfalls;
- To survey and classify the bivalve shellfish beds at Qikiqtarjuaq to ensure that the products of this developing fishery are acceptable for external marketing;
- To partner with HTOs to facilitate Program implementation at the local level;
- To establish a central laboratory for monitoring in Nunavut, provisioned with appropriate portable equipment that can be taken out into the field.

In respect to these objectives, Mr. Rainville specifically requested that the NWMB:

- Serve as the key member of the Regional Classification Committee; and
- Endorse a prohibition on harvesting bivalve shellfish on the Iqaluit tidal flats.

Kevin McCormick asked if there were any sampling results to back up the proposed closure of the tidal flats at Iqaluit. Mr. Rainville replied that there are no such results. Samples that were taken for bacterial analysis actually tested negative, but this is believed to have been an erroneous result. Closing parts of Koojesse and Tarr Inlets would conform to standard practice to close areas near sewage outfalls and wharves. The proposal is actually to close a larger area since dye studies have shown that discharge from the sewage treatment plant is present throughout the entire bay area. Gordon Koshinsky asked if the quality of sewage treatment has a bearing. Mr. Rainville replied that it is pertinent with respect to adjacent areas, that is beyond 300 metres. He also stated that if the quality of sewage effluent changes, then an area can be reclassified accordingly and/or the boundaries of the restricted area can be changed in accordance with the new information.

Ben Kovic noted that the material presented contains a proposal that NTI be granted observer status on the Regional Classification Committee. Ben suggested that full membership would be more appropriate for NTI in its capacity as the official representative for Inuit per se. Mr. Rainville responded that it was the practice to have regulatory agencies rather than agencies with economic development mandates as full members of these committees. He further interpreted that the NWMB was the regulatory agency that was best positioned to represent the full scope of Nunavut fishery interests including those of Inuit.

Michael d'Eça advised that closure of a harvest area would be a non-quota limitation and a decision to make such a closure would be the purview of the NWMB. This needs to be reflected in the terms of reference of the Regional Classification Committee. Michael also agreed with Ben that it would probably be useful and appropriate for NTI to have membership on the Committee.

Ben identified the need for consultations with the community prior to any decisions being made to close any areas to shellfish harvesting. He suspected that there was in fact very little if any shellfish harvesting in the contaminated area. Ben also considered that a closure might have unforeseen implications, real or perceived, on other associated activities such as charr harvesting in the same waters. David

Alagalak reckoned that consultations about a possible closure would be the responsibility of DFO.

Mr. Rainville expressed the hope that the Regional Classification Committee could be up and running by late spring. The Committee would ordinarily meet once or twice per year in Nunavut. It might be possible for the Committee to meet in conjunction with NWMB meetings in order to reduce travel costs.

The Board decided to defer decision on the two questions posed, pending further dialogue between NWMB staff and evidence that the community of Qaluit has been consulted with respect to the proposed closure of the bay to shellfish harvesting.

8.L Prospective Commercial Seal Harvest

Burt Hunt advised that this item was on the agenda in response to a request from the Board for certain clarifications. Although there is no seal quota for Nunavut at the present time, DFO has included a notional allocation of 2,000 seals for Nunavut in the Atlantic Seal Management Plan for 2001. This is out of a total allocation of 275,000 harp seals for Canadian interests overall. DFO Science personnel have been asked to develop background material that would be pertinent to establishing a Nunavut commercial quota in the event that this becomes a priority. Besides obtaining and assessing the scientific (productivity) information, a number of other intermediate steps would of course be required including a declaration of interest, determination of basic needs level, and calculation of available surplus (if any).

Michael d'Eça noted that the NWMB was not a participant in the preparation or approval of this management plan despite having a clear mandate under the NLCA. Michael saw certain similarities emerging that are reminiscent of the Division 0B turbot fishery. The pattern seems to be that Nunavut interests are effectively excluded from participating in the development of a fishery involving Nunavut resources at the outset, then later are excluded from participating once the fishery is established on the grounds that they did not participate in its development. With respect to harp seals, which spend a significant portion of the year feeding in Arctic waters, large quotas have been established and have once again been almost fully allocated to Atlantic fishery interests in southern Canada where some 14,000 licences were granted last year. The small notional allocation which may be attributable to some "friends of Nunavut" comes nowhere near reflecting a realistic division of the resource. The process of establishing this allocation has ignored the legislated authority of the NWMB. The management plan states that aboriginal people participated in its formulation but this certainly was not the case for Inuit.

Burt observed that while the harp seal resource would indeed seem to be very substantially allocated, this allocation is not by any means yet fully harvested. Only about 92,000 animals were harvested last year. Burt suggested that a significant window of opportunity still remains for Nunavut interests to state their case and claim a substantial portion. Jim Noble suggested that seal skins taken as an

adjunct to a traditional hunt (as in the Arctic) should enjoy a significant advantage in the court of world public opinion relative to skins taken from seals that were otherwise essentially wasted. He cautioned against getting any Nunavut seal hunt too closely aligned with the southern Canadian hunts, thereby diluting this advantage. Okalik Eegeesiak agreed. She also suggested that licensing RWOs and/or HTOs rather than individual hunters for any emerging commercial sealing venture in the NSA would help to minimise the administrative burden for hunters. Moses Koonoo cautioned that harp seal meat is rarely consumed by humans in any circumstances, but noted that in the Arctic it does find considerable use as dog food.

The Board decided to refer this matter to the Nunavut Fisheries Working Group, with a view to determining the extent of interest in the NSA for establishing a commercial seal harvest, as well as for developing an approach to DFO with the object of establishing an historical precedent in this fishery. The matter will also be brought to the attention of the Nunavut Regulatory Review Committee for consideration in the context of developing new Fisheries Regulations for Nunavut, and will also be tabled at the forthcoming public session of the Atlantic Fisheries Policy Review.

9. Nunavut Wildlife (DSD) Issues and Decisions

9.A Delineation of Polar Bear Populations: Research Status Report

Mitch Taylor noted that the first requirement for managing a population of polar bears (or any species) is to identify the population boundaries. A substantial body of work on this subject has now been completed and analysed although studies are ongoing in some locations. Data derived by tracking 145 radio-collared female bears are the subject of a formal paper that has been submitted to and accepted by the Canadian Journal of Zoology for publication. Data provided by CWS were included in the analysis. Mitch pointed out a number of maps that he had put up to show his cluster analyses of these telemetry data. The general conclusion was and is that polar bears do maintain themselves in reasonably discrete groups or populations that can serve as management units.

Mitch used the example of Baffin Bay to demonstrate the particular technique used to establish and confirm polar bear population boundaries. The technique involved drawing contours around progressively higher levels (percentages) of movement or activity by radio-collared bears. These activity contours were then interpreted by reference to a set of pre-defined criteria in order to yield graphic estimations of population boundaries. Based on these analyses most of the boundaries that had been set up previously were more or less confirmed, although a few significant changes will be required. One or two of these boundary changes (e.g. for Viscount Melville Sound) would be large enough to warrant altering quotas for the respective populations. The conclusions about population boundaries derived from tracking radio-collared bears are supported by analyses of DNA materials. The good agreement with previous results suggests that the population boundaries are rather

permanent. Global climate change is a variable that could upset that permanence. If climate change is manifested as some predict, it may necessitate more frequent updates of population boundaries and other variables. The confirmed or revised population boundaries as derived through this work will be taken to the communities for local input prior to being formally presented to the NWMB for approval.

Gordon Koshinsky noted that there were some overlaps between adjacent populations according to the activity contours as plotted. He also asked how observations from different years were treated. Mitch agreed that some polar bear populations do overlap to a degree. This is more pronounced in populations with substantial open-ocean components. The strongest separation between populations is evident in spring. The contours as presented combine data from all seasons and years. There is some indication of north and south groups of bears in Baffin Bay, but not enough to satisfy the criteria that were used to distinguish populations.

Mitch went on to explain that the second requirement for management is to obtain estimates of population abundance. Territorial Governments have expended considerable money and effort over the years to develop and maintain reliable population inventories. These are used to corroborate existing quotas or to adjust quotas as may be indicated. The science of estimating population numbers from mark-and-recapture information has also been evolving. In the past, it was always assumed that each polar bear had an equal chance of being captured / recaptured. However it is now recognized that factors such as age and sex of the animal and the time of year can have an influence and should be taken into account. This is why the estimate for the M'Clintock Channel population has been changing slightly over the past few months, as the data have been run in different ways. Although there has been a great deal of progress, more work needs to be done before all of the Nunavut polar bear populations can be estimated using these new insights. The Department would aim to institute a formal schedule for re-visiting the various populations to obtain the information to regularly update population numbers. Mitch presented a status summary and a proposed monitoring schedule for each of the various polar bear populations in Nunavut. A 15-year return interval is seen as the minimum necessary to stay up to date on any particular population. This is in part because population monitoring can be accomplished in (generally) three years if marked bears from the previous inventory are still present. If they are not still present, then "old marks" need to be "created" by doing four years of initial work, followed by a two-year hiatus, followed by a concluding year. Mitch stated that this monitoring schedule is integral to the management plan being proposed. He also noted that such a program would be too expensive for DSD to sustain without a funding partnership such as would hopefully be provided by the NWMB.

Moses Koonoo asked how many polar bears occur in the NSA and how this compares to previously. Mitch replied that there are estimated to be about 12,000 bears in the Territory in total, which may be slightly lower than 20 years ago. Moses then asked how many cubs were being born in a single year. Mitch suggested that if half the bears were females, and half of them were old enough to

reproduce, and half of those actually did so in a given year but produced more than one cub on average, the figure might be in the order of 2,600 cubs born per year.

9.B Risk-Based Model for Polar Bear Management

Mitch Taylor observed that besides population boundaries and abundance, an effective management model must also take account of the productivity of the animals. Productivity parameters include age at maturity, birthing intervals, birth rates, and mortality. These parameters are all incorporated into calculations of sustainable harvests. At the present time, polar bear harvests in Nunavut are administered in the form of flexible quotas based on the goal of maximum sustainable yield or MSY.

Mitch noted that over the last few decades, numerous changes have been made to Nunavut polar bear quotas in a continuing effort to ensure sustainability of harvests. Five Nunavut polar bear populations are probably not at maximum carrying capacity at the present time due to recent or perhaps even continuing over-harvest. The M'Clintock Channel population is the most recent example that has come to light. Except perhaps for the Kane Basin population being impacted by incursions of hunters from Greenland, problems have not been due to illegal hunting but rather have been due to imperfect hunting rules based on imperfect information.

Mitch outlined an option to the MSY model for polar bear management. This option is termed risk-based management, and in the view of the Department it has definite advantages. Previous modelling efforts have not incorporated the full range of information that was available, or at least that is rapidly becoming available. Population-specific birth and death rates are now known for many of the populations. For instance, annual rates of increase range from less than 1% to greater than 4% among the various populations. This information can and should be incorporated in estimating sustainable harvest potentials.

The Department would aim to go to the communities on the next round of consultations to talk in terms of ranges, probabilities and risks inherent in different courses of action, rather than to talk in terms of promoting specific quotas. Community input would come primarily in deciding what level of risk would be acceptable, recognising that different levels of harvest would carry different probabilities of different levels of damage to the population, with different estimates of time to recovery, all of this linked in turn to the vital rates specific to that population. The support of the NWMB is requested for pursuing this approach. If and when adopted for polar bears, it could also be applied to other species.

Moses Koonoo reiterated that polar bears are becoming more and more of a nuisance at Arctic Bay, and there is considerable local enthusiasm for a larger quota. Moses asked how that might be accommodated by way of the proposed approach. Mitch replied that the Department would simply try to make clear the risks that higher quotas would entail, in terms of the probabilities of corrective

actions being required at a later date. Corrective action is envisaged as moratoria on harvesting, with the duration of moratoria being the estimated time required to restore the population.

Kevin McCormick suggested that subscribing to the MSY model (“trying to harvest the last available bear”) has invoked substantial costs, both to the management agencies in constantly trying to define that last available bear, and also to the bear populations (and eventually to the users) when mistakes are inevitably made. Kevin suggested that it would be much more economical to manage on a more conservative basis. Mitch agreed that there would be advantages, including the possibility of reducing the frequency of population inventories. However as long as harvesting is maintained at or near levels that are believed to be the maximum sustainable, then at least the larger and more important populations should be monitored no less frequently than every 15 years. If the populations were harvested less intensively they could be monitored less frequently, or even not at all.

Kevin observed that the flexible quota system was difficult to understand, explain and appreciate, and that it would seem that the risk-based management model would be even more difficult. A more conservative management approach would be simpler and might be a better model overall. Kevin observed that polar bears were already our most intensively managed species, and this at very substantial cost. Reducing the intensity of management should also bring down the cost. Mitch replied that the risk-based management approach was developed for consideration in response to obvious problems stemming from the MSY approach. He allowed that there might be other approaches, but if anything approaching optimal use is going to be made of polar bear populations while simultaneously ensuring their protection, then a simple approach is not really an option. Mitch suggested that a more productive challenge will be to communicate what has to be done in an understandable way, rather than simplifying the method.

Gordon Koshinsky drew the attention of the Board back to the DSD research proposal to conduct an inventory of the Davis Strait polar bear population. He reminded the Members that they had set this proposal aside earlier in the meeting for further clarification with respect to a number of concerns that were raised. Among them was the apparent lack of funding commitments from other jurisdictions that share this population. Mitch replied that he had made some calls in the interim and that Makivik has now agreed to cover some costs. Labrador has been positive, but has not yet confirmed any funding. Greenland has contributed substantially to funding polar bear surveys for the Baffin Bay and Kane Basin populations, and do not harvest much from Davis Strait. Gordon asked if the proposal could be updated with new funding numbers. Mitch agreed to provide revised funding information for the project by early tomorrow.

9.C Co-Management Planning for Polar Bears

Mitch Taylor stated that DSD aims to develop co-management plans for all wildlife species in its purview. The Department recognizes a need to better anticipate management issues and to be better prepared to respond to them when they arise. Another objective is to formalize long-term partnership commitments to such matters as population monitoring, and also to be more systematic about incorporating traditional knowledge. Of course any such management plans that are developed will be brought to the NWMB for review and approval.

9.D Nunavut – Greenland MOU on Polar Bear Management: Update

Mitch Taylor observed that Nunavut and Greenland share three populations of polar bears, namely the Baffin Bay, Kane Basin, and Davis Strait populations. At present there are no agreements between Canada and Greenland or between Nunavut and Greenland governing the shared use of these populations. There are two main reasons why such agreements would be desirable:

- To ensure that the combined harvests do not exceed sustainable amounts;
- To qualify these shared populations for approval by the USFWS for importation of sport-hunting trophies into the USA.

USFWS approval is out of the question without having comprehensive management plans in place for these shared populations, and certainly while Greenland continues to hunt without restrictions. Circumstances appear to be more favourable than in the past for such co-management agreements. Population studies for the Kane Basin and Baffin Bay populations were recently completed and provide the basis for determining total allowable harvests. A study of the Davis Strait population is planned. There are also indications that Greenland may be amenable to establishing quotas for polar bear harvesting and is contemplating the placement of resource officers in the communities who could enforce such measures. A meeting is planned for early summer in Nuuk to discuss this matter. The ideal Canadian delegation would have representatives from DSD, NWMB, NTI, and the Baffin Bay and Davis Strait communities.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 027**) to support the DSD initiative to develop a co-management agreement with Greenland pertaining to shared polar bear populations in Kane Basin, Baffin Bay and, if possible, Davis Strait.

Ben Kovic noted that he will be part of an NTI-sponsored delegation to a meeting with Greenland officials in Qaanaaq next week. He promised to be alert for opportunities to lay groundwork for this initiative. Jim Noble referred to recent suggestions in the southern Canadian media that Greenland hunters were making illegal incursions into Canadian territory to hunt polar bears.

9.E Re-Negotiating Polar Bear MOUs

Mitch Taylor reviewed the function and the history of these MOU agreements, which bear the signatures of the user agencies and the Territorial Minister having responsibilities for wildlife. The current MOUs are nearing the end of their fifth year. The DSD Minister, while expressing support for these MOUs as management tools, has also directed that they be reviewed. Mitch announced that DSD has allocated resources for a one-year term position to co-ordinate these reviews. The incumbent will also assist in the development of inter-jurisdictional management agreements for polar bear populations that are shared among Nunavut and its neighbouring territories, provinces and countries.

Mitch referred to the outline and schedule of the planned review process as set out in a briefing note in the meeting binder. In the first phase of the review, all polar bear studies that have been underway but not yet finished will be completed, and the results will be distributed to all interested parties. Items in this package will include studies of handling effects, population boundaries, population numbers, and sustainable harvests. Most of the new information that will be brought forward pertains to five particular polar bear populations. Also as part of the first phase, an assessment will be made of how the MOUs have been working and how they might be improved. This review will be contracted to a third party, and will gather and analyse input from HTOs, RWOs, the NWMB, NTI, and others.

In the second phase of the project, results from the first phase will be used to develop and implement a consultation plan. Consultations will likely take the form of meetings and/or workshops at the community, regional and territorial levels. Following these interactions, work will begin to re-draft the MOUs in preparation for further consultations. This aspect will likely begin in autumn.

Michael d'Eça suggested that it would be beneficial for the NWMB to participate in selecting the contractor to conduct the reviews of the current MOUs. Mitch saw no reason why participation of the NWMB could not be accommodated.

Kevin McCormick asked if DSD really considered it feasible to incorporate the risk-based management model into the next series of polar bear MOUs. Mitch reckoned that it was feasible, but he stressed the need to have the support of the NWMB.

9.F M'Clintock Channel Polar Bear Population: Work Underway and Planned

Mitch Taylor advised that continuing refinement of the analysis has resulted in a further reduction in the estimated present size of this polar bear population, from 388 to 366. More work is planned over the next two years, or longer depending upon how easily existing questions about the database can be resolved. Another aggressive phase of mark-and-recapture studies may be needed. Information on cub survival for this population is very limited since only one marked cub-of-the-year has been recaptured thus far. An IQ study is also being developed; it will be funded by DSD and conducted by an independent contractor working through the RWO.

The Department is vigorously searching for alternative economic opportunities for communities that are affected by the loss of guided polar bear sport hunting. One possibility that is being examined is for communities hunting the Gulf of Boothia population to transfer some of their tags to hunters from communities that have depended on M'Clintock Channel polar bears. There is particular concern about Gjoa Haven, which otherwise will lose all its polar bear hunting opportunities under a M'Clintock Channel moratorium. The scope of a multi-year study by Dr. George Wenzel of McGill University regarding the importance of polar bear sport hunting to Nunavut communities has been modified to include Taloyoak.

Ben Kovic reported that Dr. Wenzel had called him with concerns about this contract. Dr. Wenzel noted that, after the contract was signed, Taloyoak was substituted for Grise Fiord as one of the three communities to be studied. It seems that the change will add to the cost of the work, and there is apparently no provision to cover this. Mitch advised that the substitution was made when Grise Fiord declined to share their financial records with the study, and after Taloyoak emerged as a community where the study would have particular relevance. Mitch foresaw no difficulties in resolving Dr. Wenzel's concerns. DIAND will probably cover the incremental costs if DSD and the NWMB indicate support for the project.

Kevin McCormick asked about the cost of the studies that are planned to start in M'Clintock Channel in 2001. Mitch estimated that the cost will be something over \$200,000 annually. Two years of work may suffice, but as many as four years may be needed depending on the initial results. Kevin pointed out that this would be one of two high-cost polar bear research projects that DSD aims to run concurrently.

Moses Koonoo suggested that if more attention had been paid to IQ, quotas for the M'Clintock Channel population would not have gotten so far out-of-line with population realities. He hoped that IQ would be regarded more seriously in future.

Makabe Nartok asked if the polar bear quota reductions that have been instituted for M'Clintock Channel were transferred somewhere else. Mitch stated that the tags in question were and are specific to the M'Clintock Channel population, and could not be transferred. He pointed out that wildlife management is based on the proposition that populations are more or less discrete. If a particular population requires reduced harvesting to assist it to recover, this does not mean that some other different population will automatically be able to support more harvesting. Excess tags in a situation such as M'Clintock Channel are simply not used at all.

David Alagalak recalled that when polar bear quotas were first established, hunters were told that a fixed number of tags had been allocated for the communities of the (then) NWT as part of a (then) new international agreement. This is the basis for the common interpretation that when a quota is changed for a particular community a compensating quota change must be made somewhere else in order to avoid violating the international agreement. Mitch replied that the international agreement did not allocate any quotas, but established guidelines for managing polar bears.

This might not have been accurately represented to the people at the time. Authority for setting or changing quotas rests with the provincial or regional management agencies within each federal jurisdiction. These agencies are free to establish whatever rules they consider appropriate and necessary for managing their polar bears, as long as they do not lead to systematic over-harvesting.

Makabe made reference to Inuit hunters finding the remains of three polar bears close to one another on the land last summer. Mitch elaborated that the animals were very badly decomposed but appeared to be complete. They seemed to date from 1999, or maybe even 1998. The hunters found no evidence for and did not speculate about how the animals had died. The Department plans to send investigators to the site next summer, to look for tags and any other evidence.

The Board continued its discussion of polar bear research following the departure of Dr. Taylor from the meeting. The Board directed staff to advise DSD that the NWMB clearly wishes to financially support polar bear studies but does not want to overweight itself in that direction. The Board would like to have the Department's reaction to the NWMB's inclination to support only one major polar bear study at a time. The Board notes the aspirations as conveyed by Dr. Taylor to conduct two major research projects simultaneously, one in M'Clintock Channel and another in Davis Strait. The Board wishes to be assured that the Department is confident that it has the technical capacity to pursue such a schedule. From the Board's perspective the work in M'Clintock Channel would have the higher priority.

9.G Management of Grizzly Bears

Siu-ling Han reported that people in parts of the Kitikmeot region are convinced that grizzly bears are becoming more abundant and they would like to be able to harvest more of them. One of the concerns pertains to human encounters with grizzly bears on the land; these seem to be increasing. The Department is trying to hire a grizzly bear biologist to develop a rational approach to the management of this species. There is a need to obtain hard information and formulate management objectives.

9.H Shared Position with DSD: Update

Jim Noble reminded the Board of the long-standing effort that has been underway to staff a position in conjunction with DSD to be devoted to conservation/education. Such a position was advertised several times, but no suitable applicants came forward. DSD eventually did hire a Conservation/Education Officer on their own, and the incumbent has suggested that a shared hunter-education position might be particularly useful. Jim requested direction on if/how to proceed, noting that the NWMB is coming to the end of its first funding period with an emerging shortage of funds. Jim suggested that it might be prudent to put the matter on hold pending clarification of workload and funding for the next 10-year planning period.

David Alagalak supported the concept of sharing positions such as this. He considered that conservation education in all its dimensions, including hunter education, were important aspects of the NWMB mandate that were only being addressed very incidentally without the benefit of dedicated staff. If the NWMB did not have enough funding to proceed, other avenues should be explored.

The consensus of the Board was that this matter should be kept at the forefront, but that there should be no staffing action until it was at least clear what the financial position of the NWMB would be at fiscal-year-end, as well as how the matter was going to be put forward in the NWMB proposals for the next planning period.

Friday, 23 March 2001

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

10. NWMB Internal Items: Issues / Decisions

10.A Harvest Study Update

Heather Priest referred to her briefing note in the meeting binder. She noted that the Harvest Study Committee did not have opportunity to meet in conjunction with the current meeting of the Board. There are a number of matters that the Committee will have to consider, perhaps by way of a conference call, notably the draft community reports that have been prepared for the Kitikmeot communities.

Heather advised that the data for the first three full years of the Study for the Kitikmeot communities have now been incorporated into the main database. This means that the data have been verified, and then scaled up to account for hunters who were not sampled or did not participate, in order to yield estimates of total harvests for each month of the period. Work to bring the data from the other regions to the same level of completion is proceeding well.

Data collection is on track in all the Baffin communities except one. In Iqaluit, only about half the data for 2000 have been collected; two Fieldworkers have been deployed in an effort to catch up on that backlog as well as to collect data for 2001. All of the data for 2000 have been entered into the database for all communities in the Keewatin region and also for most of the communities in the Kitikmeot. The final month of all data collection is still scheduled as May 2001, with most of the final data actually to be collected in June. Staff will be retained until September to continue addressing any backlogs and more particularly to assist with verification. The long-heralded study to assess the feasibility of continuing to collect and analyse harvest data after the NWMB Harvest Study ends has been contracted to Dr. Peter Usher and Lorraine Brooke. The contractors are scheduled to report in September.

Heather reminded the Board that the Harvest Study as it has been profiled and budgeted will not yield five full years of data for three of the communities, namely

Iqaluit, Cape Dorset and Rankin Inlet. Approximately one year of data will be missing from each of these communities. As per earlier instructions from the Board, an advisory to the Implementation Panel is being developed on this matter. Michael d'Eça noted that the Panel may decide that if the terms of the NLCA are not going to be met in this regard, then an amendment to the Agreement may be required. This probably depends on the actual significance of the missing data in terms of their intended purposes, and whether it is possible to make acceptable allowances for these data shortfalls. The NWMB will be relying completely on these data for the important process of establishing basic needs levels.

Heather advised that work is underway to assess the significance (or not) of the missing data. A complete assessment would require access to all the actual data. Unfortunately not all of the data are in fact accessible: some of the data are still in the process of being collected, and others have yet to be verified. The Director of the Nunavut Bureau of Statistics has suggested that this amount of missing data is hardly surprising for a study of this size and duration. It should be relatively easy to deal with these shortfalls statistically.

Heather noted that if the Harvest Study were to be continued in three communities for another year it would be very disruptive to the overall completion of the Study as this has been scheduled. There would also be a substantial financial cost, as well as significant staffing implications. The same sorts of considerations would apply to any effort to continue the overall program to collect harvest data under some new arrangement if that arrangement required significant input from the NWMB.

Ben Kovic noted that the Harvest Study was in fact conducted “over a period of five years” as the NLCA stipulates, even if not quite so in every particular community. The NLCA also states that the Study “shall be undertaken in, and cover, each of the three Regions” of the NSA, and does not mention communities. These are technicalities, perhaps, but they may have some relevance for defining the scope of the Study. Kevin McCormick agreed, noting that even the formulas given in the NLCA for calculating BNLs do not appear to be adamant about five separate years of data being specifically required. Ben observed that it was always in the best interests of the communities to fully participate in the Study.

Gordon Koshinsky stressed that it would be prudent to proceed quickly to advise the Implementation Panel, as the Board has already decided, about the impending data shortfall. Kevin urged that the letter to the Panel be written in a positive light, citing the circumstances that led to the data shortfall, declaring the NWMB’s intention to terminate data collection as scheduled, indicating how the NWMB expects to deal with the matter and why the NWMB is confident about being able to do so successfully, identifying the complications of trying to fill in or replace the missing data, and seeking the Panel’s concurrence with this approach. None of the Board Members voiced any opposition to this course of action.

David Alagalak asked what is going to be done with the Harvest Study papers and equipment that are now in the RLO offices once the Study is completed. Heather acknowledged that careful attention will need to be given to where and how the Study documents will be archived.

10.B Big Game Guides Working Group: Update

Michelle Wheatley advised that there were still no new developments to report. Feedback is awaited from the members of the Working Group on consultations they were assigned to conduct with their respective appointing organizations and in their regions. The Board directed Michelle to make one more attempt to obtain feedback from the members, and also to bring the matter (including lack of recent progress) to the attention of NTI's newly established Wildlife Policy Advisory Committee.

10.C Walrus Working Group: Update

Michelle Wheatley reported that members of the Working Group are working to a self-imposed end-of-March deadline to submit the results of their consultations with their communities on the three management options that were developed by the Group at their last meeting in October. Once these materials are received, a follow-up meeting of the Working Group will be arranged.

10.D Turbot Allocations for NAFO Sub-Area 0 for 2001

10.D.1 Turbot Allocations for Division 0A

Michelle Wheatley referred to her briefing note. She confirmed that DFO recently approved a new turbot fishery for NAFO Division 0A, and that the NWMB is authorized to allocate the entire Canadian quota which will be at least 2000 metric tonnes (MT). Until now this has been an exploratory fishery only, and was allocated by fishing days rather than by quotas.

Michelle explained that she invited and evaluated the proposals for allocations as per the usual NWMB procedures. Ten companies submitted applications. Michelle suggested that the overall allotment was probably sufficient to support a concerted developmental initiative, including perhaps the acquisition of a fishing vessel by Nunavut interests. To that end Michelle proposed that the allotment be kept intact, and that all the potential participants be brought together in an effort to develop a coherent approach. This could conveniently be done in conjunction with the forthcoming session of the Atlantic Fisheries Policy Review Committee in Iqaluit.

Gordon Koshinsky spoke in favour of this approach. In his view it had the best potential for addressing this opportunity to the greatest advantage. A coherent approach does not necessarily mean a single approach, but the NWMB should use this new opportunity to encourage a developmental perspective. The alternative approach of simply dissipating the resource to a number of unconnected interests is not the way to maximise the long-term secondary benefits.

The Board instructed Michelle to work with the applicants she had identified, along with other interested agencies including the QWB, to develop a comprehensive plan to pursue this new fishery in a coherent and integrated manner. The Board will await the results of that effort before considering this matter further.

10.D.2 Turbot Allocations for Division 0B

Michelle Wheatley once again drew the attention of the Board to her briefing note. She reminded the Members that the NWMB is authorised to allocate 1500 MT of turbot for Division 0B. Of this, 1000 MT is an inshore quota and 500 is allocated offshore. The first call on this fishery has traditionally been the Pangnirtung winter fishery. The Board is authorised to move, and previously has moved, the residual inshore quota (after accommodating the Pangnirtung winter catch) to offshore for allocation in the summer fishery.

Ten applications were received, and were evaluated in the usual fashion. Michelle noted that all of the returning applicants from 2000 harvested their full allocation last year. On that basis, and with reference to the current documentation, Michelle recommended that the same allocations as for 2000 pertain again to 2001. Michael d'Eça stressed the importance of the Board being able to defend its allocation decisions, by reference to criteria that are rational and well publicised. He noted that there was a tie for fifth place in Michelle's rankings, but that only one of these two tied proponents is being recommended for an allocation. Michelle explained that the proponent not being recommended for an allocation in this case has no history in the turbot fishery, and has focussed instead on the shrimp fishery where they are one of the main participants.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 028**) to allocate turbot quotas for NAFO Sub-Area 0, Division 0B, for 2001 as follows:

- Cumberland Sound Fisheries Ltd: 750 MT
- Nattivak HTA: 330 MT
- Mittimatalik HTO: 45 MT
- Clyde River HTO: 45 MT
- Qikiqtaaluk Corporation: 285 MT
- Pangnirtung winter fishery: 45 MT

In conjunction with and as part of this allocation decision, the Board also decided:

- To move the remaining inshore quota for 2001 (approximately 955 MT) to the offshore for purposes of these allocations;
- That all allocations will be conditional on fishing being undertaken as outlined in the fishing plans submitted by the applicants, with any variations from these plans requiring approval in advance by the NWMB;
- That any harvesting inside the NSA will require the prior approval of the NWMB;
- That if the final tally for the 2001 Pangnirtung winter fishery is different from the 45 MT currently estimated, that difference is to be added to or subtracted from (as appropriate) the allocation for Cumberland Sound Fisheries.

10.E Shrimp Allocations for 2001

10.E.1 Allocation of the Shrimp Quota for the Nunavut Settlement Area

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Members that the Board is responsible to allocate 500 MT of striped pink shrimp (*Pandalus montagui*) inside the NSA (near Resolution Island) to Nunavut fishing interests. The overall quota for *P. montagui* in Shrimp Fishing Areas (SFAs) 2, 3, and 4 is 3800 MT, of which 3300 MT is harvested competitively by the 17 permanent licence holders in the Northern Coalition. Besides the 500 MT reserved specifically for Nunavut fishing interests, an additional 500 MT (out of the residual 3800 MT) may be harvested inside the NSA with the permission of the NWMB. This component is fished competitively in conjunction with the fishery outside the NSA. Contrary to the original intent of the NWMB, the DFO Minister has rendered this component accessible only to the permanent licence holders. The NWMB intent was/is that this component be reserved for Nunavut fishers who had already been awarded quota in the NSA fishery.

In response to the published invitations, seven applications were received for shrimp allocations for the 2001 fishing year inside the NSA. The applications were evaluated in the usual manner, with reference to the NWMB Fisheries Allocation Policy. Only one of the applicants did not participate in previous NSA shrimp fisheries. Michelle referred the Members to her analysis and recommendations.

Michelle noted that Qikiqtaaluk Corporation did not put forward their own application this year. Instead, QC is supporting an application for 500 MT put forward by the Northern Coalition. As one of the 17 permanent licence holders comprising the Northern Coalition, QC is eligible to access the extra 500 MT that is available (beyond the baseline allotment of 500 MT that is the subject of the present allocation exercise) to the permanent licence holders for utilization inside the NSA. By casting their lot with the Coalition, QC also aims to protect their right to harvest shrimp in more southerly Canadian waters.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 029**) to allocate the striped pink shrimp quota for the waters of the Nunavut Settlement Area for 2001 as follows:

- Quliruaq Incorporated: 350 MT
- Mayukalik HTO (Kimmirut): 150 MT
- Northern Coalition: 500 MT

The allocation to the Northern Coalition for fishing inside the NSA is granted with the understanding that it will be exercised as part of the 3300 MT competitive quota.

In conjunction with and as part of this allocation decision, the Board also decided:

- That all allocations are conditional on fishing being undertaken as outlined in the fishing plans submitted by the applicants, with any variations from these plans requiring approval in advance by the NWMB;
- That successful applicants must comply with all applicable conservation measures set out in the *Northern Shrimp Integrated Fisheries Management Plan, 1997-99* or the successor to that Plan;

- That Mayukalik HTO must clarify the fishing method it intends to use before proceeding.

10.E.2 Allocation of the Shrimp Quota for the SFA2 Exploratory Fishery

Michelle Wheatley reminded Members that two years ago DFO established a 3500 MT exploratory fishery for northern shrimp (*Pandalus borealis*) in Shrimp Fishing Area (SFA) 2 north of 63°N. The NWMB was authorized to allocate half of that quota (1750 MT) specifically to Nunavut fishing interests. The remainder was shared equally among the 17 permanent licence holders. The harvest in both years to date had been very small. The DFO Minister has not yet confirmed that this fishery will be continued in 2001, and if so at what level and in what format. However it does seem reasonable to assume that the fishery will indeed be continued, on the same terms as last year. It seems prudent for the NWMB to proceed on that basis, Recognizing that any decisions made now will have to be conditional.

In response to the published invitations, nine applications were received for access to any exploratory shrimp fishery that transpires in SFA 2 this year. The applications were evaluated in the same general manner as for the NSA shrimp fishery, except with less weight placed on training and employment criteria due to the experimental nature of the SFA 2 fishery. Instead, emphasis was placed on maximising benefits to communities and businesses adjacent to or near the fishing area, especially those with interests in other more established fisheries.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 030**) to allocate a tentative/assumed exploratory northern shrimp quota of 1750 MT for Shrimp Fishing Area 2 north of 63° N for 2001 as follows:

• Quliruaq Incorporated:	350 MT
• Cumberland Sound Fisheries Ltd:	650 MT
• Aqviq Marine at Pangnirtung:	150 MT
• Kabva Marine at Iqaluit:	150 MT
• Clyde River HTO:	150 MT
• Mittimatalik HTO at Pond Inlet:	150 MT
• Mayukalik HTO at Kimmirut:	150 MT

In conjunction with and as part of these allocation decisions the Board also recognized/decided that:

- These allocations are conditional on an experimental quota being established as presumed;
- All allocations are conditional on fishing being undertaken as outlined in the fishing plans submitted by the applicants, with any variations from these plans requiring approval in advance by the NWMB;
- Successful applicants must comply with all applicable conservation measures set out in the *Northern Shrimp Integrated Fisheries Management Plan, 1997-99* or the successor to that document.

10.F Resource Centre Coalition: Update

The Board decided to defer consideration of this item.

11. NTI Wildlife Division: Issues / Decisions

11.A Proposal to Hunt a Polar Bear by Traditional Methods: Noah Kadlak

Bert Dean noted with regret that this has been a divisive issue. The DSD Minister, in response to an admonition from the Nunavut Court of Justice, has essentially re-affirmed his ongoing stance that the hunt as proposed has inherent dangers to public safety that prevent him from concurring with it. NTI is now seeking to pursue a completely different approach, which would once again require the active involvement of the NWMB. In essence, NTI is requesting the NWMB to conduct its own consultations, including with elders, and with NTI and DSD, to develop conditions for the hunt that would satisfy the DSD Minister's public safety concerns.

Ben Kovic confirmed that he had participated in a meeting with the NTI President and the DSD Minister at which this proposed procedure was discussed. Ben also recalled that the Board had asked him to confirm Mr. Kadlak's continuing interest in this venture. In this he had not been successful, since Mr. Kadlak did not return his call. Bert stated that NTI was seeing to enshrine a general proposition or principle, and that Mr. Kadlak's continuing interest was of secondary concern. The Minister has placed considerable stock in a consultation session he had with elders that underpinned his most recent decision, but there is some concern about the perceived closed nature of that session. Okalik Eegeesiak declared that she was given opportunity to attend the session, but declined to do so.

After some discussion, the Board decided that the matter would best be addressed via the process of developing a new *Wildlife Act*, and to advise NTI accordingly.

11.B Future Funding for RWOs and HTOs

Bert Dean advised that efforts are continuing to refine workplans and budget estimates for input to the next 10-year planning period under the NLCA. NTI met with the RWOs to reconcile the estimates for funding requirements that were earlier developed independently by each RWO with the help of a consultant. Another adjustment has been made to provide for a technical advisor for each Region. NTI recently declared an intention to spend \$800,000 to phase in community liaison officer positions. These officers might be housed in HTO offices, but their duties would extend to any matters of NLCA implementation in which NTI has an interest.

Gordon Koshinsky urged that serious consideration be given to the possibility of incorporating workplans and budgets for the RWOs and HTOs into NTI's planning package, rather than keeping it with the NWMB. The funding directive in the NLCA notwithstanding, these are after all Inuit organizations. NTI initiatives such as the creation of community liaison officer positions would seem to provide a more

plausible basis for streamlining and integrating program administration among these organizations than anything that the NWMB would be able to identify or offer.

12. Applications for Funding

For treatment of this Agenda item, refer to the beginning of these Minutes.

13. Other Presentations

13.A Akitsiraq Law School Society

Ben Kovic advised the Board that the Chairperson of the Akitsiraq Law School Society has established contact with the NWMB. Classes in the new Law School, which will be based in Iqaluit, will start in September. An information package about the new School was received, and the Chairperson has offered to meet with the NWMB at its convenience. The Society is looking for sponsors for the program.

13.B Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board Report

Joe Tigullaraq, Executive Director of the QWB, began by thanking the Board for providing funds to assist with financial audits of three of the HTOs last year. It is expected that all 13 of the HTOs in the Region will be audited annually henceforth.

Joe tabled a report pertaining to recent and upcoming QWB activities. An HTO Managers' workshop was held in February and serious consideration was given to establishing a centralized payroll system. Also discussed was the possibility of developing a standardized job description for HTO Managers. An important consideration is that those HTOs that already have the most effective administrative systems are reluctant to give up these kinds of controls.

Joe raised a number of issues that are of concern to the RWO and the HTOs in the Region and that have implications for the NWMB:

- Appointment of the NWMB Member from the Region. The QWB considers it to be less than satisfactory for the Regional Inuit Association to have the sole authority to appoint the Regional NWMB Member, which it typically does without reference to the RWO. This concern has been communicated to the QIA.
- Participation by the RWO in NWMB meetings. The QWB is not satisfied with how the NWMB obtains briefings and advice with respect to its agenda items. It is for the most part only government agencies that contribute, to the exclusion of the RWOs and HTOs. Community and Regional perspectives are seldom if ever represented in these discussions. Not does there seem to be much opportunity for RWOs and HTOs to put items on the NWMB meeting agenda.
- Communication with the RWO. The QWB often feels marginalized in its role as a co-management partner of the NWMB. There needs to be a forum for the NWMB and the government agencies to meet periodically with the RWOs to

discuss and co-ordinate approaches to wildlife management issues. The RWOs should be given copies of the NWMB meeting binders, or at least they should get regular access to those components of the briefing materials that have implications for Regional wildlife management.

- Role of the RWO in fisheries development. The QWB is not clear what role it can or should play in representing the HTOs as they apply for quota allocations and developmental support. There is a confusing mesh of interests at play.

Ben Kovic assured Joe that the Board is sensitive to these concerns. The Board meets in every Region only once per year but at that time does provide opportunity for the RWO to make formal representation. Public meetings are also held in conjunction with Board meetings in order to obtain local input and perspectives. RWOs and HTOs are always free to suggest items for NWMB meeting agendas, and indeed they often do so. Joe replied that the concerns he was expressing in these regards pertained more to how the NWMB executed its regular meetings, and in particular how and from whom the NWMB obtained its advice.

Gordon Koshinsky complimented Joe on his presentation and for the ideas that he put forward. The issues that he presented warrant serious exploration by the Board. Gordon suggested that Joe's presentation could serve as a model for what it would be useful for the NWMB to have from one or more of the RWOs at each of its meetings. Ben also thanked Joe for his report.

14. Executive Committee Report and Recommendations

Gordon Koshinsky, speaking in his capacity as Chairperson of the Executive Committee, advised that the Committee was not bringing forward any items on its own initiative for the Board to deal with. However there was an administrative matter that did require consideration by the Board at this time. That was the matter of office space for the NWMB going forward.

Jim Noble reminded the Board that the lease with Qikiqtaaluk Corporation for current office space in the Parnaivik Building will expire at the end of the month. Ben Kovic advised that he and Gordon Tomlinson recently met with Jerry Ell of QC, which resulted in the outline of a proposal from QC to provide space for the NWMB in the new Igluvut Building. Jim Noble interpreted that the QC proposal provided no breaks or incentives for the NWMB in recognition of what should be its preferred-tenant status. Ben suggested that there was probably room to negotiate with QC.

Gordon asked if it would be possible, and if it might be beneficial, to renew the present lease, perhaps including provision for additional space. Ben acknowledged that this might be an option; QC has in fact already been asked to respond to this proposition. The Board requested that staff continue negotiating with QC on all pertinent fronts, with a view to developing a firm proposal for the Board to consider.

15. Meetings, Workshops and Other Pertinent Events

15.A Past Events: Reports and Briefings

Ben Kovic directed the attention of the Members to the meeting reports in the meeting binder, namely:

- From himself (Ben Kovic) regarding his attendance at the Canada/Greenland consultations (March 7-8 in Ottawa) pertaining to turbot, shrimp and seal fisheries, either shared or of common interest.
- From Okalik Eegeesiak regarding her attendance at the National Marine Mammal Peer Research Committee Meeting (February 27 to March 02 in Winnipeg), to examine current research projects by Canadian scientists with respect to marine mammals.

15.B Upcoming Events: Review and Participation

The Board took note of the most recent tabulation of notices and invitations in respect to forthcoming events, prepared as at March 15. The Board deferred consideration of these notices and invitations to a later date.

16. Date and Location of Next Meeting

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 031**) to conduct its next (29th) regular meeting in Kugluktuk the week of June 4 – 8.

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. He urged the Members to take very seriously their responsibilities vis-à-vis the NWMB, and especially to honour their commitments to attend Board meetings.

The 28th meeting of the NWMB adjourned at 12:45 p.m. (**Resolution 2001- 032**)

Minutes Approved by: _____
Chairperson Date

NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD

RESOLUTIONS: MEETING 28

Iqaluit, 20 - 23 March 2001

Resolution 2001- 011: Resolved that the NWMB accept the agenda for Meeting No. 28 as presented, but that the sequence of items be altered in order to address at the outset the proposals for NWRT research and NWMB Study funding.

Moved by Kevin McCormick

Seconded by Makabe Nartok

Carried

20 March 2001

Resolution 2001- 012: Resolved that the NWMB approve, subject to receipt of appropriate final financial reports for 2000/01 from the contracting agencies by mid June, NWRT funding support in the total amount of \$56,800 for 2001/02 for continuing research projects previously authorized for multi-year funding as follows: Project 5110-99-2 (Survival and sustainable harvest of the Dolphin-Union caribou herd): Provision of \$21,500 to DSD; final year of funding.

Project 5120-99-6 (Whale sampling and stock identification): Provision of \$35,300 to DFO; final year of funding.

Moved by Kevin McCormick

Seconded by Moses Koonoo

Carried

Date: 20 March 2001

Resolution 2001- 13: Resolved that the NWMB approve the request from DFO to carry forward unexpended NWRT funding that was approved for 2000/01, up to the amount of \$17,900 for Project 5120-99-6 (Whale sampling and stock identification), this in addition to any new NWRT funding approved for this project for the 2001/02, with the final amount of the carry-forward to be dependent on the number of communities that signify to DFO, prior to June 15, their intention to participate in this project in 2001.

Moved by David Alagalak

Seconded by Moses Koonoo

Carried

Date: 20 March 2001

Resolution 2001- 14: Resolved that the NWMB approve the request from DFO to carry forward unexpended NWRT funding that was approved for 2000/01, up to the amount of \$2,000 for Project 5120-98-1 (Ringed seal status in western Hudson Bay), for the completion of posters and reports to communities. It is also noted that the final financial report and the final project report will be due 30 September 2001.

Moved by Kevin McCormick

Seconded by Makabe Nartok

Carried

Date: 20 March 2001

Resolution 2001- 15: Resolved that the NWMB approve the request from DFO to carry forward unexpended NWRT funding that was approved for 2000/01, up to the amount of \$2,000 for Project 5120-00-8 (Survey of the northern Hudson Bay narwhal population), for the completion of analyses and for a community workshop. It is also noted that the final financial report and the final project report will be due by 30 September 2001.

Moved by David Alagalak
Carried

Seconded by Meeka Mike
Date: 20 March 2001

Resolution 2001- 16: Resolved that the NWMB approve the request from DFO to carry forward from unexpended NWRT funding that was approved for 2000/01, up to the amount of \$2,000 for Project 5120-00-12 (Walrus stock identification and harvest composition), for the completion of analyses. It is also noted that the final financial report and the final project report will be due by 30 September 2001.

Moved by Kevin McCormick
Carried, with one abstention (Makabe Nartok) Date: 20 March 2001

Seconded by Moses Koonoo

Resolution 2001- 017: Resolved that the NWMB approve NWRT funding support in the total amount of \$633,700 for 2001/02, subject to routine administrative arrangements, for the following new research projects:

- Project 5110-01-1 (Influence of food availability and quality on the movements and population dynamics of the Dolphin-Union caribou herd): Provision of \$24,200 to DSD, conditional on confirmation of support from the communities where the research will be conducted and written confirmation that all funding identified in the proposal is in place; three-year project, with \$25,500 indicated for 2002/03 and \$26,700 for 2003/04). The researcher is also encouraged to work with the local HTO in harvesting the caribou for necropsies and to explore the possibility of teaching the sampling and necropsy techniques in a local school.
- Project 5110-01-3 (Caribou population delineation in the Queen Maud Gulf region of Nunavut): Provision of \$32,000 to DSD, conditional on confirmation of support from the communities where the research will be conducted and written confirmation that all funding identified in the proposal is in place; three-year project, with \$25,500 indicated for 2002/03 and \$ 26,700 for 2003/04.
- Project 5120-01-1 (Bowhead satellite tagging and habitat evaluation): Provision of \$54,100 to DFO, conditional on confirmation of support from the communities where the research will be conducted and written confirmation that all funding identified in the proposal is in place; two-year project, with \$25,300 indicated for 2002/03 pending confirmation that the participation of the Danish expert is needed in the second year.
- Project 5120-01-2 (Cumberland Sound beluga and narwhal movements and dive behaviour study by satellite telemetry): Provision of \$56,000 to DFO, conditional on written confirmation that all funding identified in the proposal is in place; one-year project.
- Project 5120-01-3 (Walrus capture/recapture methods): Provision of \$25,000 to DFO, conditional on confirmation of support from communities where the research will be conducted and written confirmation that all funding identified in the proposal is in place: one-year project.
- Project 5120-01-4 (Walrus tagging): Provision of \$38,000 to DFO, conditional on confirmation of support from the Resolute Bay HTO or the community(ies) where the research will take place, and written confirmation that all funding

identified in the proposal is in place; one-year project. The researcher is also encouraged to consider moving the project to a more accessible location until the technique is better developed, and/or to combine this project with another walrus research project in an effort to minimize logistic costs.

- Project 5120-01-5 (Stock and life history differences in Cumberland Sound Arctic charr): Provision of \$31,500 to DFO, conditional on the field coordinator being staffed locally, and written confirmation that all funding identified in the proposal is in place; one-year project.
- Project 5120-01-6 (Survey of Greenland halibut resource in NAFO Sub-Area 0): Provision of \$145,000 to DFO, conditional on receipt of a complete report on the 2000 survey and written confirmation that all funding identified in the proposal is in place: one-year project.
- Project 5120-01-7 (North Baffin narwhal movements and dive behaviour study by satellite telemetry): Provision of \$30,000 to DFO, conditional on written confirmation that all funding identified in the proposal is in place: one-year project.
- Project 5130-01-1 (Duckling survival and population biology of King Eiders): Provision of \$39,900 to DOE, conditional on confirmation of support from the community where the research will be conducted and written confirmation that all funding identified in the proposal is in place; one (first) year of funding for this multi-year project.
- Project 5130-01-4 (Use of satellite telemetry to locate migration routes and wintering areas of Common Eiders breeding in Nunavut): Provision of \$65,000 to DOE, conditional on confirmation of support from the communities where the research will be conducted and written confirmation that all funding identified in the proposal is in place; one (first) year of funding for this multi-year project.
- Project 5130-01-5 (Ecology of Hudson Bay Eiders wintering at polynyas in the Belcher Islands): Provision of \$34,000 to DOE, conditional on confirmation of support from the community where the research will be conducted and written confirmation that all funding identified in the proposal is in place; two-year project, with \$34,000 indicated for 2002/03.
- Project 5130-01-6 (Reproductive ecology and survival of the Pacific Common Eider in central Arctic Canada: Provision of \$59,000 to DOE, conditional on written confirmation that all funding identified in the proposal is in place; three-year project, with \$51,000 indicated for 2002/03 and \$53,000 for 2003/04.

Moved by David Alagalak
Carried

Seconded by Kevin McCormick
Date: 20 March 2001

Resolution 2001- 018: Resolved that the NWMB not approve NWRT funding for 2001/02 for DSD Project 5130-01-2 (Long-term trends in the population ecology of polar bears in western Hudson Bay in relation to climate change).

Moved by Meeka Mike
Carried

Seconded by David Alagalak
20 March 2001

Two abstentions (Gordon Koshinsky and Kevin McCormick)

Resolution 2001- 019: Resolved that the NWMB approve NWRT funding support in the amount of \$10,000 for 2001/02, subject to routine administrative arrangements, for DOE Project 5130-01-3 (Seasonal movements and home range size of adult male polar bears in western Hudson Bay), this in the context of a one-year project, conditional on the proponent:

- Demonstrating the tags to be used to the KWF and to the NWMB;
- Obtaining the approval of the KWF; and
- Providing confirmation that all funding identified in the proposal is in place.

Moved by David Alagalak

Seconded by Makabe Nartok

Carried, with one abstention (Meeka Mike) Date: 20 March 2001

Resolution 2001- 020: Resolved that the NWMB approve the request from the Sanikiluaq HTO to carry forward \$20,000 of NWMB Study funding for Project 5214-00-1 (Foraging ecology and diet of Hudson Bay Eiders wintering at polynyas in the Belcher Islands) from 2000/01 to 2001/02.

Moved by Moses Koonoo

Seconded by Okalik Eegeesiak

Carried

20 March 2001

Resolution 2001- 021: Resolved that the NWMB approve Study funding to the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board in the amount of \$30,000 for Project 5201-01-1 for 2001/02, to assist in obtaining baseline data on bowhead whales and their habitats at Isabella Bay, this subject to obtaining confirmation from the proponents that: All of the other funding identified in the proposal is in place; The community of Clyde River supports the project; and The project will not interfere with the IIBA negotiations.

Moved by Meeka Mike

Seconded by Moses Koonoo

Carried

20 March 2001

Resolution 2001- 022: Resolved that the NWMB not approve Study funding to James Qillaq for Project 5204-01-1 to document charr abundance in an improved stream at Clyde River.

Moved by Gordon Koshinsky

Seconded by Kevin McCormick

Carried

20 March 2001

Resolution 2001- 023: Resolved that the NWMB approve Study funding to Adamee Veevee in the amount of \$17,100 for Project 5212-01-1 for 2001/02, to assist in a study of bowhead whale migrations within and out from Cumberland Sound, this subject to the proponent:

- Confirming the support of the HTO;
- Arranging for administration of funding through the HTO;
- Further developing the proposal with greater emphasis on the use of photo-identification for individual whales; and
- Identifying a reasonable contribution to the project, by himself or by the HTO, either financially or in-kind.

Moved by Meeka Mike
Carried

Seconded by Moses Koonoo
20 March 2001

Resolution 2001- 024: Resolved that the NWMB reaffirm its interpretation that the NWMB mandate does not extend to promoting resource and economic development, and particularly does not extend to providing support for feasibility studies for such ventures. In light of this interpretation be it further resolved that the NWMB not approve Study funding with respect to the following project proposals:

- To document the occurrence of charr populations in lakes near Pangnirtung, proposed by Adamee Veevee (Project 5212-01-2);
- To identify new lakes for charr commercial fisheries around Cumberland Sound, proposed by Levi Evic (Project 5212-01-3); and
- To identify cod stocks for commercial fishing in Cumberland Sound, also proposed by Levi Evic (Project 5112-01-4).

Moved by Moses Koonoo
Carried

Seconded by David Alagalak
20 March 2001

Resolution 2001- 025: Resolved that the NWMB approve Study funding to the Resolute Bay HTO in the amount of \$30,000 for Project 5213-01-1 for 2001/02, to assist in verifying recent aerial surveys for Peary caribou and muskoxen on the nearby Arctic islands, this subject to the proponents:

- Confirming that the other funding identified in the proposal is in place; and
- Submitting a satisfactory report on the work conducted last year.

Moved by David Alagalak
Carried

Seconded by Makabe Nartok
20 March 2001

Resolution 2001- 026: Resolved that the NWMB approve Study funding to the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board in the amount of \$30,000 for Project 5264-01-1 for 2001/02, to assist in compiling information for the identification of indicators leading to the development of a monitoring system for changes in caribou populations and their habitats. This approval is subject to the proponent providing:

- Confirmation that all of the other funding identified in the proposal is in place; and
- A satisfactory explanation for why it is not proposed to involve a Nunavut resident in co-ordinating the project.

Moved by Gordon Koshinsky
Carried

Seconded by Moses Koonoo
20 March 2001

Resolution 2001- 027: Resolved that the NWMB support the DSD initiative to develop a co-management agreement with Greenland pertaining to shared polar bear populations in Kane Basin, Baffin Bay and, if possible, Davis Strait.

Moved by Kevin McCormick
Carried

Seconded by Gordon Koshinsky
21 March 2001

Resolution 2001- 028: Resolved that the NWMB allocate turbot (Greenland halibut) quotas for NAFO Sub-Area 0, Division 0B (total of 1500 metric tonnes) for 2001 as follows:

- Cumberland Sound Fisheries: 750 MT
- Nattivak HTA: 330 MT
- Mittimatalik HTO: 45 MT
- Clyde River HTO: 45 MT
- Qikiqtaaluk Corporation: 285 MT
- Pangnirtung Winter Fishery: 45 MT

Moved by Moses Koonoo
Carried

Seconded by Kevin McCormick
Date: 23 March 2001

Resolution 2001- 029: Resolved that the NWMB allocate the striped pink shrimp quota for the waters of the Nunavut Settlement Area for 2001 as follows:

- Quliruaq Incorporated: 350 MT
- Mayukalik HTO (Kimmirut): 150 MT
- Northern Coalition: 500 MT

The allocation to the Northern Coalition for fishing inside the NSA is granted with the understanding that it will be exercised as part of the 3300 MT competitive quota.

Moved by Kevin McCormick

Seconded by Makabe Nartok

Carried, with one abstention (Okalik Eegeesiak) Date: 23 March 2001

Resolution 2001- 030: Resolved that the NWMB allocate a tentative/assumed exploratory northern shrimp quota of 1750 MT for Shrimp Fishing Area 2 north of 63° N for 2001 as follows:

- Quliruaq Incorporated: 350 MT
- Cumberland Sound Fisheries Ltd: 650 MT
- Aqviq Marine at Pangnirtung: 150 MT
- Kabva Marine at Iqaluit: 150 MT
- Clyde River HTO: 150 MT
- Mittimatalik HTO at Pond Inlet: 150 MT
- Mayukalik HTO at Kimmirut: 150 MT

Moved by Moses Koonoo
Carried

Seconded by Gordon Koshinsky
Date: 23 March 2001

Resolution 2001- 031

Resolved that the next (29th) regular Meeting of the NWMB be conducted in Kugluktuk the week of 04 - 08 June 2001.

Moved by Kevin McCormick

Seconded by Makabe Nartok

Carried

23 March 2001

Resolution 2001- 032

Resolved that the 28th regular Meeting of the NWMB be adjourned.

Moved by Kevin McCormick

Seconded by Moses Koonoo

Carried

23 March 2001