

**NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD
MINUTES: MEETING No. 29**

IKALUKTUTIAK, 5-6 JUNE 2001

Members and Staff Participating

Ben Kovic	Chairperson
David Alagalak	Member
Kevin McCormick	Member
Moses Koonoo	Member
Gordon Koshinsky	Member
Makabe Nartok	Member
Joan Scottie	Member
Okalik Eegeesiak	Member
Jim Noble	Executive Director
Michelle Wheatley	Director of Wildlife Management
Evie Amagoalik	Interpreter

Not Available

Meeka Mike	Member
------------	--------

Other Participants

Karen Ditz	DFO Fisheries Mgmt Biologist, Iqaluit
Winston Fillatre	DFO Chief of Enforcement, Iqaluit
Bert Dean	NTI Director of Wildlife, Rankin Inlet

Tuesday, 5 June 2001

1. Call to Order and Opening Preliminaries

Ben Kovic called the 29th Regular Meeting of the NWMB to order at 9:00 am. He welcomed all the participants. Ben asked Joan Scottie to lead an opening prayer.

Ben advised that a public meeting had been scheduled for Wednesday night, June 6. He also advised that there would be opportunity this evening (June 5) for Members to attend the pre-hearings being conducted jointly by the Impact Review Board and the Water Board with respect to the Jericho diamond property that Tahera Corporation is proposing to develop at Contwoyto Lake.

2. Agenda for Regular Meeting No. 29

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 047**) to accept the agenda for the meeting as presented, with the following additions:

- Interim financial report for the NWR Trust (as item 4.B).
- Chairperson's request to purchase used NWMB vehicle (as item 5.A).
- Report by DFO on Nunavut Implementation Funding (new item 8.H).
- Request from the Baffin Fisheries Coalition for allocation of the 0A turbot quota (new item 10.J).
- Proposal by DSD staff member to conduct polar bear research in Davis Strait (as item 12.A).
- Funding request from Arctic Bay HTO (item 12.C)

Gordon Koshinsky reminded the Members that the Board would need to take some time to revisit the planning workshop that was held over the weekend in Yellowknife.

David Alagalak asked if the Board was violating any protocols by accommodating last-minute additions to the agenda. He wondered if there was any convention about closing a meeting agenda a specific amount of time before a meeting was set to commence. Jim Noble and Kevin McCormick stated that there was no strict procedural requirement about this for an organization of the nature of the NWMB, but acknowledged that it is frustrating and inefficient to have late agenda additions.

3. Minutes: Review and Approval

The Board adopted (**Resolution 2001- 048**) the minutes for Regular Meeting 27, conducted at Rankin Inlet on 28 November - 1 December 2000, with two minor modifications.

The Board adopted (**Resolution 2001- 049**) the minutes for Conference Call 54, conducted on 19 December 2000, as presented.

The Board adopted (**Resolution 2001- 050**) the minutes for Special Meeting 9, conducted at Iqaluit on 15 – 16 January 2001, as presented.

The Board adopted (**Resolution 2001- 051**) the minutes for Conference Call 55, conducted on 12 February 2001, as presented.

The Board adopted (**Resolution 2001- 052**) the minutes for Regular Meeting 28, conducted at Iqaluit on 20 – 23 March 2001, with three minor modifications.

The Board adopted (**Resolution 2001- 053**) the minutes for Conference Call 56, conducted on 5 April 2001, as presented.

The Board adopted (**Resolution 2001- 054**) the minutes for Conference Call 57, conducted on 16 May 2001, with one minor modification.

4. Financial and Administrative Business

4.A Financial Report for NWMB

Jim Noble advised that no financial report had yet been prepared for the NWMB accounts for the new fiscal year.

4.B Financial Report for NWRT

Jim Noble tabled a report on the current financial situation of the Nunavut Wildlife Research Trust. He noted that the market value of the investments has recently decreased.

Gordon Koshinsky advised that NWRT affairs cannot be formally considered without convening a meeting of the Trustees. He suggested that plans be made to conduct such a meeting in conjunction with the next meeting of the Board. He noted that there would be a number of items for the agenda stemming from the last meeting of the NWRT. Among these he identified finalization of the TAL contract and the Statement of Investment Policy, along with a need and obligation to review TAL performance. Jim suggested holding a NWRT conference call to settle the agenda for such a meeting, as well as perhaps moving some of the items forward in the interim. Kevin McCormick urged clearly defining the action items that need to be addressed and establishing time lines for getting them done.

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

5.A Chairperson's Report

Ben referred the Members to his report in the briefing binder. He explained that he had devoted most of April to participating in a diving course. He drew attention to a Department of Education initiative to render the grades 10 – 12 school curriculum more appropriate to Nunavut. The NWMB is participating along with DFO to help modify the oceans component.

Okalik Egeesiak suggested that these reports would be more useful if they provided more details. Ben replied that he usually enlarged on his synopsis by providing separate reports on meetings and other events in which he participated, but he did not have opportunity to prepare such materials this time and besides there were no significant developments to report. Moses Koonoo asked if the Chairperson had met recently with the Chairperson of NTI. Ben replied that he had not done so since the two of them had met with the DSD Minister, at which time they had all agreed to meet quarterly if needed.

5.B Executive Director's Report

Jim Noble referred to his report in the briefing binder. He elaborated on two items:

- Allocation of the new turbot quota for NAFO Division 0A. Jim noted that the Board had directed that the quota be allocated as a single unit, if possible, with a view to maximizing credibility as well as facilitating the stable long-term economic development potential of this new fishery. This entailed a

considerable amount of preparatory work and several meetings (one with the Nunavut Fisheries Working Group and two with industry). The primary result has been the establishment of the Baffin Fisheries Coalition, which is now asking the NWMB for the 0A turbot allocation.

- Completion of the publication series on Arctic wildlife. It is expected that the book on marine mammals will be ready for publication by August.

Jim also identified a number of upcoming meetings, including with DSD on the new *Wildlife Act*. The annual report needs to be prepared, the annual audit has started, and employee appraisals remain to be done.

5.C Wildlife Management Director's Report

Michelle Wheatley referred to her briefing note and other pertinent materials in the binder.

5.D Finance and Administration Director's Report

Jim Noble, on behalf of Gordon Tomlinson, advised that Gordon had not prepared a report for the current meeting.

5.E Legal Advisor's Report

Ben Kovic referred the Members to the briefing note prepared by Michael d'Eça.

David Alagalak asked for clarification of the reference to correspondence with Laurie Pelly regarding muskox harvests in the Kitikmeot. Jim Noble explained that this pertained to a dispute over use of hides at Cambridge Bay. The KHTA has developed a business arm to pursue the production of qiviut. Tags for the commercial hunt were also turned over to the Development Corporation. The hides were collected by the Corporation, which has refused to release them for the Qiviut project. The Corporation would like to use the tanned hides for special projects. The legal issues are being examined, and have not been resolved.

Okalik Egeesiak noted that she was asked to accompany Michael to certain meetings on behalf of the NWMB, but unfortunately was unable to do so. In general she encouraged Board Members to avail themselves of any such opportunities.

5.F Fisheries Advisor's Report

Jim Noble advised that he had not requested an activity report from the Fisheries Advisor with respect to the period since the last Board meeting.

5.G Members' Reports and Concerns

Ben Kovic encouraged all Members to provide reports on any functions that they attend or in which they participate on behalf of the NWMB.

Joan Scottie stressed her ongoing interest in broad-scale environmental issues. She was unable to attend the NWMB meeting in March because it conflicted with a meeting sponsored by DSD on climate change and IQ. The meeting dealt with how climate change has affected wildlife and its use by Inuit. People noted they could no longer cache meat because it spoils too fast. There will be a report on the meeting soon. Joan noted that she had unfortunately been unable to attend a recent meeting in Ottawa regarding contaminants in Arctic country food.

Makabe Nartok reported on the recent KHTA meeting that he attended with Michelle. Part of the meeting was devoted to identifying wildlife management priorities. If action ensues on the priorities that were identified it will be very good. Makabe also noted that there is growing concern among many Kitikmeot hunters about the need to travel increasingly long distances to hunt polar bears.

Moses Koonoo noted the very substantial time commitment that he needs to make to attend NWMB meetings due to travel arrangements from his community. Moses reiterated his desire to continue as a Board Member, but the status of his appointment has not been resolved. Ben Kovic pointed out that the NWMB has not received any correspondence on this matter from QIA, the appointing agency. Clarification has been requested. Meanwhile, QIA has written to the presumed replacement. Until the NWMB is notified otherwise by QIA, we will continue to assume that Mr. Koonoo remains the QIA appointee.

Okalik Egeesiak urged that background materials for NWMB meetings, including translations, be forwarded to Members more expeditiously. Ben Kovic explained that staff try to distribute the briefing binders a week in advance of meetings, but many of the sources of material have been unable to comply with the deadlines to enable this to be achieved consistently. At the present time there is also a bottleneck with obtaining translations.

David Alagalak suggested that the NWMB needed a policy regarding the conduct of conference calls. Agendas and briefing materials should be distributed well in advance. Only truly urgent items should be dealt with. Perhaps more effective use could be made of the Executive Committee. Ben Kovic agreed that there is a need to review the mandate of the Executive Committee, with a view to revitalizing it.

Gordon Koshinsky posed one suggestion and asked two questions:

- Gordon suggested that the next time the Board meets in Iqaluit, preparations be made for a demonstration or explanation on some matter pertinent to the Board's business. Examples might be narwhal reproduction or tagging.
- Gordon asked about the final disposition of the charges brought by DFO against narwhal hunters at Kugaaruk last summer. Winston Fillatre replied that the charges were eventually dropped and the confiscated tusks were returned.

- Gordon asked how and under what circumstances NWMB funding now flows to the HTOs. An extensive discussion ensued on this matter:

Jim Noble reminded the Board that in previous years the NWMB held its own and Territorial Government funding for the HTOs until they submitted their current-year budgets, interim financial statements, and proof of registration with the Registrar of Societies for Nunavut. A different approach is being tried this year: funding for the HTOs is being distributed to the RWOs up front, with the RWOs now responsible to ensure that the HTOs meet these (same) requirements. The RWOs will establish separate accounts for these funds, and will retain any interest earned on undistributed monies for their own use. Hopefully this approach will result in better HTO compliance with basic accounting principles. Jim stressed how much effort had been expended by the NWMB over the years trying to achieve this. He noted that HTO Boards are elected by the public to serve the public, and it is imperative that they be accountable.

Jim advised that the Kugaaruk HTO never met its requirements for funding last year, while the Amarak HTO was almost a year late meeting its requirements. The Baker Lake HTO has also posed an ongoing problem in these regards.

Kevin McCormick wondered if the RWOs could realistically discharge this kind of oversight responsibility regarding HTO accountability. He stressed the fundamental significance of this matter, not only for the NWMB but for all the co-management partners. Okalik Eegeesiak suggested that shortfalls in accounting competence among the HTOs could likely be attributed mainly to inadequate funding. She urged that this matter be given a very high priority in planning for the next contract period.

Moses Koonoo observed that minor increases in funding to the HTOs would not guarantee improved fiscal accountability. There are many competing demands on the meagre resources available. Even if funds are used to hire and retain more competent staff, there seems invariably to be high turnover in the communities. A centralised accounting service for the HTOs might be part of the answer.

David Alagalak suggested that the RWOs are capable of handling this oversight responsibility with respect to the HTOs. He noted that the Kivalliq Wildlife Board is currently debating whether to advance funds to one or two HTOs in that Region because of uncertainty about their managerial capabilities. David suggested that the accounting requirements to be met by the HTOs are not particularly onerous.

6. Completion of Assignments and Implementation of Resolutions

Jim Noble reported that no formal task list was prepared following the previous meeting and hence there is no systematic basis for reviewing task completions.

7. Environment Canada (CWS): Issues and Decisions

7.A Peary Caribou Recovery Plan: Update

Kevin McCormick referred to the draft National Recovery Strategy for Peary Caribou and Arctic-Island Caribou. The Strategy was prescribed in the last status report for these populations that was commissioned by COSEWIC about ten years ago. (Another status report is now being contemplated, but it is not anticipated that it would lead to substantive alterations to the recovery strategy.)

A summary of the Strategy has been tabled with the two Territorial (range) jurisdictions, as well as with the Inuvialuit Wildlife Management Advisory Council. All of these agencies are mandated to review and comment. The approval of the NWMB will be required before the Strategy can be implemented. The Strategy necessarily includes a number of specific management actions. These could only be undertaken with the full participation of the communities.

Gordon Koshinsky noted that the Strategy identifies a large number of information requirements to underpin implementation. He wondered what expectations there would be of the NWMB to address these needs. Kevin interpreted that the NWMB role was to consider and approve species designations and recovery plans, not to fund such plans. However if the NWMB approved a recovery plan it would be reasonable to assume that it assigned some priority to associated research.

Makabe Nartok asked if the reasons for the decline in the Peary caribou population were well understood. Kevin replied that there were a number of views on this matter. Some of the experts think it is just part of a regular natural cycle; others attribute increased predation. The most common view is that the decline is linked to changing weather patterns: more rain in fall and winter icing-over vegetation and impairing access to food. Moses Koonoo reported encountering large numbers of wolves on some of the islands in question, and suspected they have played a role.

The Director of Wildlife Management was assigned to review the material and provide recommendations to the Board. This review should take account of and make reference to the procedural framework for NWMB input to such matters as per COSEWIC's newly evolving species assessment and related processes.

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

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

Karen Ditz advised that as an aftermath of the closure of the Qikiqtarjuaq narwhal hunt last October, DFO has conducted its own review of the new community-based management system. Aspects of this review are continuing, and the Department wants to emphasise that it continues to support the new system in general terms. In the interim DFO has identified a number of concerns and suggestions:

- Implementation of the system at Iqaluit has been hampered by key vacancies at the Amarak HTO.
- Suggestions came forward at both Iqaluit and Kimmirut that posters be developed to identify and stress community obligations.

- A suggestion was made that a large box be provided at the beach in each community to hold incoming meat for pickup by community members.

8.B Hudson Bay Narwhal Population Survey

Karen Ditz reported that the aerial survey results from 2000 have now been analysed. Survey conditions were generally good, and the researchers are quite confident about the results. The estimate derived from the photographic component of the survey is 1780 animals with a 95% confidence interval of 1210-2490. This estimate can be approximately doubled to account for submerged animals, and is comparable to estimates derived in 1983/84. The results were presented by DFO at a workshop in Repulse Bay in April. Workshop participants concluded that the current community-imposed annual harvest level of 100 is probably sustainable.

Kevin McCormick noted that the “rule-of-thumb” annual availability of 2% of 3500 animals would indicate an allowable harvest of 70 narwhals (rather than 100) from this population on an annual basis. Karen replied that the conclusion about the community-imposed harvest level probably being sustainable is based in part on the new emphasis on reducing hunting losses and focussing on the harvest of males, along with the fact that last year’s unusually favourable hunting conditions are unlikely to recur very often. Karen did stress that despite the success of the survey the confidence interval is quite wide and if the true population is actually closer to 2500 animals it could be problematic. These kinds of risks need to be taken into account when a formal management decision is actually made.

Moses Koonoo suggested that narwhals are distributed in response to their available food and ice conditions. These factors vary greatly from year to year, so another population survey in a different year might yield quite different results. Moses also recalled that killer whales were present in unusual numbers around Repulse Bay at the time of the 2000 narwhal hunt, and were cited as a possible factor contributing to the high narwhal harvest. Moses asked if it was known where these killer whales came from, if they are known to follow migrating narwhals, and if they contribute significantly to narwhal mortality. Karen replied that she knew of no studies of movement patterns of killer whales or their effects on narwhal in this particular area. These could be subjects for directed research.

Makabe Nartok asked if records are kept of the number of narwhals taken by killer whales. Karen replied that losses to killer whales would be considered as part of natural mortality and as such would/could not be recorded.

David Alagalak urged that all of the communities having a direct interest in this narwhal population be explicitly advised, through their HTOs, of the conservation measures needed to maintain the stock. Karen agreed, and suggested that this be done in the context of specific management objectives yet to be defined.

8.C Objective-Based Fishery Management: A Proposal

Karen Ditz advised that DFO is actively promoting an objective-based model for fishery management, and would like the support of the NWMB to pursue this model in the NSA. The model was initially developed with commercial fisheries in mind, but the Department wants to try to expand its application to some northern situations. Officials have specifically in mind a pilot project with respect to the northern Hudson Bay narwhal stock, since there is a good recent population estimate along with a recent compilation of traditional knowledge. Key to this model is the setting out of specific goals and objectives for a stock and the identification of contingencies and plans to deal with problems that may arise. The communities would need to be involved, along with the NWMB and other agencies.

Kevin McCormick expressed uncertainty about the differences between objective-based and integrated fisheries management approaches. He observed that the proposed approach seemed to be very prescriptive and may or may not be applicable to the particular circumstances in the NSA. Michelle Wheatley suggested that a comprehensive presentation to the Board would be beneficial. She wondered how the model would relate to Article 5 of the NLCA as well as to community-based management. Karen indicated that she could arrange a more detailed presentation to the Board if requested to do so.

Moses Koonoo suggested that it would be more practical to run a pilot project for narwhal where these animals are more numerous, such as in the Arctic Bay or Pond Inlet areas. He was particularly concerned that management decisions made by application of the model in one area would be extrapolated to other areas. Michelle explained that only the process would be extrapolated, not the results. Karen observed that one of the criteria for a pilot project would be the existence of good up-to-date information. This is generally not available for High Arctic stocks.

David Alagalak agreed that initial efforts to develop such a model should focus where the best information is available, but hoped that the approach could be expanded geographically if it was successful. Gordon Koshinsky suggested that the NWMB should always be open to exploring new ways of doing its business. He saw no harm or danger in conducting a pilot project as proposed, as long as it remained clear that the NWMB was mandated to approve (or not) fishery management plans. Gordon anticipated that there would not be a need for a heavy commitment of time or effort by the NWMB until the model proved to be a viable approach. David suggested that there might be a role for the Narwhal Working Group in overseeing the pilot project. Kevin recalled that Michelle some time ago introduced the Board to the concept of a flexible quota system as it might be made applicable to marine mammals. He suggested that it would be useful if Michelle provided an expanded demonstration of that concept for the Board. If it is a viable approach, it might merge easily with objective-based management.

The Board concluded that it would be appropriate for DFO to continue its efforts to develop the concept of objective-based fishery management and to use the Hudson Bay narwhal population as a pilot, this on the assumption that there will be full and

ongoing involvement of the RWO along with the HTOs in the region, and that the NWMB will be kept fully informed and provided with additional instruction.

8.D Oceans Sector Activities: Update

Winston Fillatre provided a list of DFO Oceans Program initiatives being undertaken in 2001 pursuant to the Canadian Oceans Strategy:

- Formation of a working group to begin development of an integrated management plan for the Western Hudson Bay area;
- Input to development of a comprehensive Shipping Strategy for Nunavut;
- Hosting of a radio-panel discussion on ocean-related issues;
- Completion of an “issues scan” for the Baffin Region, to provide input for development of an integrated management plan to address local and regional needs;
- Preparations for Oceans Day 2001, in anticipation of this event taking place in Iqaluit in the fall.

8.E Fisheries Management Planning for Pangnirtung: Update

Karen Ditz gave a brief update on this initiative. The available information on the charr fisheries in the area has now been input to a GIS database and a visual display has been developed for presentation to the community. Before this is done NWMB Harvest Study staff will be consulted to ensure adherence to all confidentiality protocols. The aim is to use the database in working with the community to identify problems (such as declines in numbers or size of fish) and opportunities (such as unexploited accessible waters), and then to set goals and objectives for management.

David Alagalak reiterated his concern (expressed previously) about the potential for conflict between this broad-based planning initiative and the test-fishing efforts that are being pursued simultaneously by individuals in the Pangnirtung area.

8.F Fish Habitat Management: Update

Winston Fillatre tabled a briefing note prepared by Jordan deGroot. Attention is currently focussed on:

- Jericho diamond mine project proposal (environmental assessment);
- Polaris mine closure and decommissioning (providing authorization);
- Nanisivik water licence renewal (advice to Nunavut Water Board);
- Cullaton Lake gold mine decommissioning (reviewing plans);
- Kugaaruk permanent bridge construction (providing authorization);
- Boston gold project water licence renewal (advice to Water Board).

Kevin McCormick asked about issues regarding decommissioning of the Cullaton Lake mine. Winston replied that the main issue is a contaminated lake.

8.G Developing Fishery Regulations for Nunavut: Update

Winston Fillatre reported that a first draft of the new regulations has been completed and a policy document to accompany it is being prepared. This material will be circulated to the Nunavut Regulatory Review Committee shortly.

Gordon Koshinsky asked if there was any progress regarding how the regulatory situation for the Tree River charr fishery would be resolved. Winston replied that the present draft is more in the nature of a framework rather than specific material. He indicated that there were unlikely to be major changes in such matters as the regulation of the Tree River fishery unless specific direction was received or ensued from the planned consultations.

8.H Utilization of Nunavut Implementation Funding by DFO

Karen Ditz reminded the Board that DFO received a block of funding pursuant to the NLCA to be used for incremental aspects of implementation. The Department is directing those funds to support stock assessment activities. Karen tabled a listing of the 14 projects that have been approved to receive funding support in 2001/02, in the total amount of \$304,100.

9. Nunavut Wildlife (DSD) Issues and Decisions

There were no DSD representatives at the meeting, and no issues specific to DSD were discussed.

10. NWMB Internal Items: Issues / Decisions

10.A Harvest Study Update

Michelle Wheatley referred to the briefing document prepared by Heather Priest. Three full years of data for all Kitikmeot and Keewatin communities are now incorporated in the main database. Verification of Baffin data will begin shortly. The data have been converted to a different system to make verification easier. Community reports for the Kitikmeot have now been circulated to HTOs in the Region. The Inuktitut translations have been completed, but Inuinnaqtun translations have not. Community reports for the Keewatin will be produced next.

Josée Galipeau will be leaving the position of Database Manager but will remain on staff and will be available to train her replacement. Lee Ann Pugh, a Nunavut beneficiary, has been hired as a trainee replacement on a six-month term initially. The Nunavut Geoscience Office has offered to train the Database Manager in the use of ArcView GIS software, which will assist greatly in the verification and display of the abundant geographic data in the database.

Ordinary data collection is proceeding normally in all Regions in this the last month for this activity in the Study. Preparations are underway for a final wrap-up survey, to obtain feedback from hunters along with socio-economic data.

10.B Big Game Guides Working Group: Update

Michelle Wheatley reported that she had obtained a resolution of support at the recent annual general meeting of the KHTA concerning the draft set of qualifications for guides that the Big Game Guides Working Group prepared last April. Michelle indicated that she aimed to have this item put on the agendas for the forthcoming meetings of the Kivalliq and Baffin RWOs as well. Pending the unanimous support of these three organizations, the Working Group will be re-convened in order to formulate final recommendations for the Board.

10.C Walrus Working Group: Update

Michelle Wheatley reported that she plans to seek the comments and support of the Baffin and Kivalliq RWOs at their forthcoming annual general meetings with respect to the management options prepared earlier by the Working Group. Following receipt of this input she will arrange a follow-up meeting of the Working Group to complete the management plan for consideration by the Board.

10.D Resource Centre Coalition: Update

Michelle Wheatley advised that a draft contribution agreement for 2001/02 operation of the Resource Centre has the agreement in principle of the Coalition participants: DSD, DOE, DFO, NRI and the NWMB. The new NWMB website provides access to the Resource Centre database.

10.E NWMB Response to COSEWIC Process

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Board about Dr. Peter Usher's presentation at the last meeting in which he outlined a possible framework for how the NWMB and other wildlife management boards might be integrated into the process of designating species at risk. This process has been led by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC) which will continue to exist; however roles have been evolving with the settlement of land claims, and passage of the new *Species at Risk Act* will have further implications.

Michelle suggested that the 13-point framework for interaction that was presented by Dr. Usher (and that had been developed by the COSEWIC Secretariat) was basically reasonable, but she did identify a number of concerns which were elaborated in her briefing document. Michelle noted that ITC is arranging a conference call of interested parties to discuss this and related matters, and it would be useful to have a clear NWMB position to put forward.

In the Board's examination of the matter and particularly in its study of the suggestions posed by Michelle, the following additional points were made:

- That instead of asking for clarifications regarding specific parts of the proposed process, the NWMB should propose actual wording;
- That the NWMB should not accept all the operational demands that are explicitly identified or implied in the process as currently written;

- That the need for an Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge Specialist Group is not clear, assuming that the wildlife management boards will be exercising their mandates;
- That the suggestions and concerns of the NWMB should be transmitted as a formal response to the COSEWIC Secretariat.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 055**) that the NWMB should bring to the attention of the other Arctic wildlife management boards the concerns identified by the NWMB Director of Wildlife Management and further elaborated by the Board with respect to the COSEWIC Secretariat's proposals for formalizing and facilitating the participation of these boards in the species assessment process under the new federal species-at-risk legislation, this with the aim of helping the NWMB to finalize a formal response to the Secretariat.

10.F Determining Regional Wildlife Management Action Priorities: Kitikmeot

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Members that the Board at its November meeting replaced its previous policy for determining wildlife research priorities with a new policy for identifying regional wildlife management concerns from which research priorities and needs for other management actions can be inferred. The new policy embodies a major procedural change: a shift from Nunavut-wide meetings to Regional workshops. The first of these workshops under the new policy was held in conjunction with the Kitikmeot HTA annual general meeting in early May.

Michelle tabled her report of the Kitikmeot workshop. She noted that all the HTO representatives were well prepared to make their inputs. DFO was not represented due to a communication error. Gordon Koshinsky recalled that DFO had earlier been invited in a different context to identify research needs and opportunities in the Kitikmeot Region, and he suggested that it would be useful to obtain DFO input for the current exercise even if it had to be sent in late. Kevin McCormick observed that it still remains to glean actual research priorities out of this material.

10.G Policy for Live-Capture (and Export) of Wildlife

Michelle Wheatley recalled that she had been asked by the Board to draft a policy pertaining to the live-capture (and export) of wildlife from the NSA. Michelle went on to present an outline that she had prepared for such a policy. She noted that the reasons for live-capturing wildlife fall into three general categories:

- For display in zoos or aquaria;
- For breeding and/or propagation;
- For research.

Each of these categories entails unique considerations vis-à-vis the development of a policy. Michelle elaborated these various considerations, as per her briefing note. Michelle advised that the Kitikmeot HTA passed a resolution at its recent AGM registering opposition to any type of live-capture initiative for wildlife. In reviewing

Michelle's policy outline, Board Members made a number of observations and suggestions:

- That the NWMB might have limited jurisdiction to influence the disposition of wildlife within Canada;
- That the resource-management Departments of Government had a legitimate stake in this issue;
- That it might not be appropriate to establish a blanket prohibition against capturing wildlife for export that completely precluded economic opportunities for people of Nunavut in such ventures;
- That there should not be a blanket prohibition against culturing, propagating or displaying wildlife species within the NSA;
- That provision for propagation or husbandry of wildlife species within the NSA should be actionable only with specific community endorsement;
- That specific allowance should be made for such things as live-capture and captive-breeding initiatives within the NSA if, for example, they were prescribed as integral to an approved management plan or recovery plan;
- That the matter of export should be made explicit in any policy prohibition, so as to enable such things as capturing/measuring/tagging/releasing fish, waterfowl or mammals for research purposes.

The Board directed Michelle to distribute her policy outline to the RWOs, NTI and the appropriate Departments of Government for comment, and then to prepare a draft policy document according to the outline as presented but taking account of any observations and suggestions that came forward. Once the policy document has been drafted and subsequently received and approved in principle by the Board, it will be circulated to government agencies for further reaction and input.

Wednesday, 06 June 2001

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, re-convened the meeting at 08:30 a.m.

10.H Request to Live-Capture Greenland Sharks

Michelle Wheatley referred to the recent request (contained in the Meeting binder) from Mr. George Benz of the Tennessee Aquarium and the Southeast Aquatic Research Institute to live-capture two Greenland sharks at Arctic Bay for export to the USA for research purposes. This is part of a larger project which would involve holding Greenland sharks captive at Arctic Bay and killing approximately 12 of them for necropsy purposes. Mr. Abraham Tunraluk of Iqaluit is listed as a collaborator in the project.

Michelle noted that with reference to the proposed policy pertaining to live-capture of wildlife (see previous agenda item), this proposal would not be suitable for approval by the NWMB on a number of counts, including that:

- It is proposed to remove the animals from Nunavut and from Canada;
- It is proposed to eventually place the sharks in aquaria for public display;
- No indication is given of intent to follow guidelines for care of animals;
- No justification is given for why the sharks need to be moved to the USA;
- No Canadian government researcher is identified with the project;
- It would seem that Greenland sharks taken as by-catch in the turbot fishery could serve just as well for the necropsy purposes identified.

The proponent has submitted a request to DFO for a permit to conduct the live-capture and transport. DFO has responded that NWMB approval for live-capture as well as US authorization to import sharks would be prerequisites to any such permit.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 056**) to deny the request from Mr. George Benz of the Tennessee Aquarium and Southeast Aquatic Research Institute for approval to live-capture Greenland sharks at Arctic Bay for export to the USA, and further to obtain additional information from the proponent before approving the live-capture and holding of sharks at Arctic Bay.

10.I Request for 0A Turbot Allocation: Baffin Fisheries Coalition

Michelle Wheatley confirmed that DFO has authorized the NWMB to allocate the Canadian share of the new turbot quota for NAFO Divisions 0A and 1A, set at 4000 metric tonnes for 2001. As was agreed at the March meeting, staff have been working with the Nunavut Fisheries Working Group and other regional fishery interests to develop a comprehensive plan for the utilization of this fishery so as to maximize long-term prospects and benefits for the people of Nunavut. This effort has culminated in the formation of the Baffin Fisheries Coalition representing all of the regional groundfish interests including all the regional HTOs. These have agreed to pursue the new allocation jointly, and if they obtain it to arrange to fish it as a coalition. The Coalition will tender for operators to fish the new turbot quota on their behalf in 2001, but aims to incorporate and seek its own groundfish licence for subsequent years. Armed with the allocation and a licence, the Coalition would seek to develop an appropriate infrastructure, including eventually one or more suitable vessels.

Michelle referred the Members to the Memorandum of Understanding establishing the Coalition, and to the Coalition's application for the 0A allocation. The Coalition would aim to invest the revenues generated from the fishery for a specified period in fisheries development initiatives in the Region.

Jim Noble elaborated that no groundfish licences have been issued to Nunavut fishery interests to date, and it has been necessary to contract operators based in southern Canada who are licensed in the south. Some time ago, the DFO Minister indicated that he would issue a licence for 0B, but this would be a "lesser" type of licence if it were restricted to that area. The new 0A allocation, if pursued in a

credible and integrated manner by Nunavut fishery interests, should provide a strong basis for approaching the Minister to grant a regular groundfish licence.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 057**) to allocate the Canadian share of the new turbot quota for NAFO Divisions 0A and 1A to the Baffin Fisheries Coalition for 2001, and at the same time undertake to support the Coalition as the first-choice candidate for a groundfish licence if and when DFO makes such a licence available to Nunavut fishery interests.

11. NTI Wildlife Division: Issues / Decisions

11.A NTI Perspective on M'Clintock Channel Polar Bear Management

Bert Dean observed that there was less emphasis and reliance on traditional knowledge when the recent management decisions for the M'Clintock Channel polar bear population were made than would have been expected by NTI and others. It is imperative that traditional knowledge be tapped for purposes of evaluating and adjusting the new management regime. NTI recently conducted a small-scale traditional knowledge study at Ikaluktutiak on their own initiative: a number of elders were interviewed and a few preliminary maps were developed. NTI would like to see this study expanded to encompass Taloyoak and Gjoa Haven, and has developed a proposal to that end. DSD has expressed some interest but has not taken any initiative. The support of the NWMB would be very welcome.

Michelle Wheatley stated that NWMB Study funding has already been fully subscribed for 2001/02. However the project might well qualify for NWMB funding support through some other avenue, such as the Conservation-Education program. It would be up to NTI to ensure that a formal proposal came to the Board.

Bert made reference to the DSD Minister's recent (May 30) announcement of \$200,000 for economic initiatives to offset the loss of income to the communities from polar bear sport hunting. The press release called for more traditional knowledge studies, and also made positive reference to scientific research, quota-sharing and meat-sharing between affected communities, and continuing discussions with the US Fish and Wildlife Service. It is understood that Gjoa Haven is the most adversely affected of the three communities that share this population.

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

12.A Status of NWRT Funding for Projects Approved for 2001/02

Michelle Wheatley confirmed that the Board, at its March Meeting, approved \$633,700 of new funding and authorized \$56,000 of continuing funding for a total NWRT commitment of \$689,700 for 2001/02. June 15 is the deadline for agencies to meet the various conditions that must precede the release of funds to them.

12.B Status of NWMB Study Funding for Projects Approved for 2001/02

Michelle Wheatley confirmed that the Board, at its March Meeting, approved \$107,000 for wildlife studies by other-than-government agencies in 2001/02. Work is underway with a number of the proponents to help them meet funding conditions.

12.C Funding Request: Hunter Training (Ikajutit HTO)

Jim Noble referred the Members to the request from the Ikajutit HTO at Arctic Bay for NWMB funding to help defray the costs of a training program for novice narwhal hunters along with hiring a co-ordinator and recording clerk for the 2001 narwhal hunt. The proposal is pertinent to implementation of the new community-based management system for narwhal, albeit Arctic Bay is not yet a formal participant in this system. The training component would involve formal sessions and the development and use of a training video. The total estimated cost of the project is \$15,390; the NWMB is requested to provide \$10,000.

Members readily supported the general concepts embodied in the proposal, but expressed numerous concerns, caveats and suggestions about the details:

- David Alagalak suggested that there were other potential sources of training funds that should not be overlooked. Ben Kovic suggested that DFO and NTI should be approached to participate in the training aspect in particular, as per the recommendations contained in the Pre-Hearing Consultation report.
- Jim suggested that the training aspects including the video component might be generalized. Ben Kovic was of the opinion that hunting conditions and methods are too diverse for a unified training approach. Moses Koonoo observed that there is a substantial and perhaps rather unique floe-edge component to the Arctic Bay narwhal hunt, where it is standard practice to harpoon the animals before killing them with rifle fire. Gordon Koshinsky agreed that it would likely be very difficult to produce a generalized video and training program. It seemed more realistic for each community to produce its own material; perhaps looking to one another for common inputs. Okalik Eegeesiak stressed the need to include matters in training besides those pertaining to the actual hunt: matters such as preparation of equipment and butchering of harvested animals.
- Karen Ditz noted that the proposal coincides neatly with what government agencies have been advocating, and as such she doubted that it was a genuine product of the Arctic Bay hunters. She suggested that those hunters would probably realize that novices would benefit more from accompanying experienced hunters than from watching a video about hunting practices.
- Kevin McCormick suggested that considerable thought and planning should go into the production of a training video. It should be decided in advance what message to convey and what aspects of the hunt to include.
- Jim suggested that provision of financial assistance to hire a hunt co-ordinator would be precedent-setting: every community would want to follow suit. Kevin pointed out that the cost of the co-ordinator could be absorbed within the HTO's own equity contribution that they have identified for the project.
- Gordon suggested that many of the most tangible problems encountered with community-based management to date have stemmed from a lack of adequate

hunt co-ordination and local record-keeping. In his view, addressing these matters effectively as per the Ikajutit proposal would have an immediate impact on safe-guarding the future of the new management system. The training components of the proposal, although ultimately crucial to the success of the new system, would pay dividends over the longer term. Gordon deemed it important for the Board to signal a positive reaction to the co-ordination and clerical aspects of the proposal, even if it was precedent-setting and ultimately within the mandate and capacity of the HTO. He also envisioned that there were other duties that a hunt co-ordinator and a hunt recorder could and probably should do beyond those mentioned in the proposal, such as tracking the disposition of the meat and maktaq.

- Kevin recalled that when HTOs have signed on to community-based management it has been implicit if not explicit that they will co-ordinate their hunts, collect the prescribed data, and even ensure that their hunters are competent. It seems somewhat anomalous for the NWMB to end up providing material assistance in order for the HTOs to meet their end of their own bargain.
- Several Members suggested that the project be considered as a pilot.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 058**) to provide \$10,000 of NWMB Conservation/Education funding to assist the Ikajutit HTO at Arctic Bay in its efforts to develop a hunter training program, produce a hunting methods video, and staff a hunt co-ordinator position to help underpin the implementation of community-based management for narwhal, and further that the NWMB encourage and assist the HTO to seek additional partners for this initiative.

13. Other Presentations

Ben Kovic observed that the “host” Regional Wildlife Organization ordinarily makes a presentation at this point in the agenda of NWMB meetings. He noted that no KHTA representatives were in attendance to make such a presentation.

14. Meetings, Workshops and Other Pertinent Events

14.A Past Events: Reports and Briefings

Ben Kovic referred the Members to the three reports by Michelle Wheatley with respect to events in which she participated for the NWMB since the last meeting:

- North American Caribou Workshop at Kuujuuaq on April 23 – 27, at which Michelle presented a paper explaining caribou co-management in Nunavut;
- KHTA annual general meeting at Gjoa Haven on May 3 – 5. Michelle conducted a Regional Wildlife Priorities Workshop in conjunction with this meeting. Makabe Nartok also attended on behalf of the NWMB.
- Meeting of the Scientific Working Group of the Canada-Greenland Joint Commission on Conservation and Management of Narwhal and Beluga in Qeqertarsuaq, Greenland, on May 8–14.

14.B Upcoming Events: Review and Participation

Ben Kovic led the Board through the tabulation of notices and invitations in respect to forthcoming events, prepared as at 01 June 2001. The following decisions were made with respect to attendance:

- Federal-Provincial Atlantic Fisheries Committee meeting; June 7 in Halifax: Nobody to attend.
- Meeting of Canadian Council of Administrative Tribunals; June 17 – 20 in Quebec City: Nobody to attend.
- Meeting of Canada-Greenland Joint Commission on Narwhal and Beluga; August 27 – 31 in Kimmirut: Ben and Michelle attending, along with the two hunters who participated in the earlier meeting of the Scientific Working Group.
- Conference on Putting Fishers' Knowledge to Work; August 27 – 30 at UBC: Nobody to attend.
- 52nd Arctic Science Conference; September 12 –15 in Anchorage: Nobody to attend.
- NAFO annual meeting; September 17 – 21 in Cuba: Ray Andrews attending.
- Beverly-Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board regular meeting; November 23 – 25 in Yellowknife: Joan Scottie to attend.

In-Camera Session

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 059**) to meet *in camera*.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 060**) to close its *in-camera* session.

15. Business Arising from the *In-Camera* Session and Other Business

15.A Qikiqtarjuaq Narwhal Fishery Closure Report

Karen Ditz requested that local DFO staff be given opportunity to participate in further developments pertaining to and stemming from finalization of the NWMB's Qikiqtarjuaq closure report.

Kevin McCormick stated that he was not convinced that the current draft of the report was written in appropriately neutral language. He suggested that DFO staff be invited to provide specific comments. Ben Kovic pointed out that DFO had declined to take full advantage of opportunities to respond to earlier drafts.

It was agreed that local DFO staff would be given another opportunity to comment on the current draft of the report before it was finalized.

15.B Funding Proposal and Workplan for Next Planning Period

Members scheduled a conference call for June 18 with the aim of finalizing the funding proposal and workplan. Other items for the conference call agenda would include the Pre-Hearing Consultation Summary and the Qikiqtarjuaq closure report.

15.C Director of Wildlife Management Position and Incumbent

