

# **NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD**

## **MINUTES: MEETING No. 30**

**IQALUIT, 18 - 20 SEPTEMBER 2001**

### **Members and Staff Participating**

Ben Kovic	Chairperson
Kevin McCormick	Member
Moses Koonoo	Member
Gordon Koshinsky	Member
Joan Scottie	Member
Okalik Eegeesiak	Member
Jim Noble	Executive Director
Michelle Wheatley	Director of Wildlife Management
Gordon Tomlinson	Director of Finance and Administration
Michael d'Eça	NWMB Legal Counsel
Evie Amagoalik	Interpreter
Mary Nashook	Interpreter

### **Not Available**

David Alagalak	Member
Meeka Mike	Member
Makabe Nartok	Member

### **Other Participants**

Burt Hunt	DFO Area Manager, Iqaluit
Karen Ditz	DFO Fisheries Mgmt Biologist, Iqaluit
Bert Dean	NTI Director of Wildlife, Rankin Inlet

## **Tuesday, 18 September 2001**

### **1. Call to Order and Opening Preliminaries**

Ben Kovic called the 30<sup>th</sup> Regular Meeting of the NWMB to order at 9:00 am. He welcomed all the participants and asked Joan Scottie to lead an opening prayer.

Ben complemented the staff on their fast and efficient action in re-arranging the Meeting to Iqaluit on very short notice when weather conditions made it impossible to proceed to Igloolik as was originally planned.

Ben noted that copies of the new book on Marine Mammals of Nunavut were distributed to Members along with the briefing materials for the Meeting. Ben expressed his appreciation to the people who worked so hard to make this book a reality. A release ceremony was held at Middle School in Iqaluit last Friday afternoon, and was well attended. The book has drawn a lot of praise. It is planned that the next book in the series will deal with terrestrial mammals.

### **2. Agenda for Regular Meeting No. 30**

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 070**) to accept the agenda for the Meeting as presented, with the following deletions:

- Item 8 K (Presentation on satellite and radio telemetry), since the identified DFO presenter, Larry Dueck, will not be available in Iqaluit.
- Item 13.B (Proposals by community representatives to conduct Bowhead hunts in 2002), since the identified presenters are not available in Iqaluit.

Jim Noble noted that the Harvest Study Committee plans to meet following adjournment of the Regular Meeting later this afternoon.

### **3. Minutes: Review and Approval**

The Board adopted (**Resolution 2001- 071**) the minutes for Regular Meeting 29, conducted at Ikaluktutiak on 5-6 June 2001, subject to the following revisions as pointed out by Michelle Wheatley:

- For item 10.G, to reflect that the document was distributed for comment to the RWOs, to NTI, and to the three government agencies (DFO, DSD, and CWS).
- For item 10.I, to indicate that the new 4000 metric tonne turbot quota is for Divisions 0A and 1A combined.

The Board considered the minutes for Conference Call 58, conducted on 21 June 2001. Jim noted that there was no quorum for this Conference Call, and it was more in the nature of a discussion among those Members who were available. No formal decisions were taken, and no motions were tendered or passed.

Michael d'Eça recalled that the main items on the agenda for Conference Call 58 were the report on the closure of the Qikiqtarjuaq narwhal hunt last year, and the NWMB 10-year workplan and funding proposal. The workplan was briefly considered, and was approved by the Board at a subsequent Conference Call. The Qikiqtarjuaq narwhal closure report has been distributed, but there is no record of an NWMB Resolution approving the document. Michael understood that Ben was going to contact Board Members individually to canvass for such approval. Ben replied that in addition to the three Members who had indicated no dispute with the report in the course of the Conference Call, he had obtained telephone endorsement from Gordon Koshinsky and Moses Koonoo.

The Board considered and then adopted **(Resolution 2001- 072)** the minutes for Conference Call 59, conducted on 31 July 2001, with one revision to item 6 (second paragraph) as proposed by Michael.

Ben suggested that it might be useful and appropriate for the Board to adopt more formal mechanisms and procedures to ensure that all Members had convenient reference to all Board decisions and ensuing actions. Kevin suggested that certain categories of materials should be routinely circulated, and that guidelines were needed to define those categories. He suggested that some categories of correspondence be put in the briefing binders for Board meetings. Gordon suggested that the correspondence log could be refined to provide an outline of actions taken and responses received in connection with Board decisions. Michael suggested that any matter involving correspondence with a Minister would be appropriate for this kind of special attention and reference back to Members.

The Board referred the matter to staff, to come up with workable mechanisms to keep Members better informed of actions taken and responses received with respect to Board decisions.

#### **4. Financial and Administrative Business**

##### **4.A Variance Report as at 31 August 2001 and Disposition of Carry-Forwards**

Gordon Tomlinson reported that a year-end surplus of \$92,584, or 1.8 % of the revised budget, is currently projected for the present fiscal year. The revised budget, in the total amount of \$5,229,237, includes \$159,829 to be carried forward from last year. Access to those unexpended funds requires the concurrence of DIAND, sought annually via the Board's November submission. Michael d'Eça reminded the Board that the new funding agreement provides for such carry-forwards, as long as the funds are expended on identified items that pertain to the NWMB mandate under the NLCA.

Gordon led the Board through a detailed consideration of mandated work requirements for which progress and/or delivery would be enhanced by expenditure of funds that are available for carry-forward from 2000/01. Recommended line items for disposition of these funds were: certain capital acquisitions, other-than-Board meetings, wildlife conservation education, and the Wildlife Harvest Study.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001 – 073**) to accept the Variance Report as presented, and to allocate the unexpended funds from last year as outlined therein.

#### **4.B Audit Report for 2000/01**

Gordon Tomlinson referred the Members to the formal Audit Report for the previous fiscal year. The auditors pointed out that a few of the balance sheet accounts were not reconciled, but this is not a serious problem. The auditors identified no shortcomings with respect to the actual financial statement.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 074**) to accept the Audit Report for 2000/01 as put forward by the auditors.

Ben Kovic reminded the Board of the need to appoint an auditor for next year. Kevin McCormick asked how the fees charged by MacKay Landau might compare with those of other providers of the same service. Gordon replied that the cost of the annual audit has been about \$12,000. The work has not been tendered recently, but the MacKay Landau charges seem reasonable, they do good work, and they are very familiar with the financial operations of the NWMB.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 075**) to retain the accounting firm MacKay Landau to provide auditing service for the NWMB for 2001/02.

#### **4.C Workplan Reporting for 2000/01**

Gordon Tomlinson reminded the Members of the requirement to report to DIAND by the end of November with respect to the previous year's workplan. The November report must include a financial accounting. Gordon noted that the overall positive variance of \$159,829 had already been discussed, and allocated by the Board as per Resolution 2001- 073. The largest item of under-expenditure, in absolute terms, was with respect to meetings and workshops other than those of the Board per se.

#### **4.D Workplan and Funding Proposal for 2003 - 2013**

Michael d'Eça referred the Members to the NWMB submission as contained in the red-covered spiral-bound document that was distributed. The submission was sent to the Implementation Panel, with concurrent distribution to the Parties to the Agreement, on August 15. Michael explained the organization of the document as embodied in its four main Parts.

Stephen Atkinson stated that, distribution of the document to his Department notwithstanding, this was the first time that he personally had seen the NWMB submission. He observed that the document echoes many of the concepts that are currently being discussed at DSD. More and better communication between the participating agencies would benefit the development of all the submissions. Gordon Koshinsky urged that personal contacts be made to ensure that staff-on-

the-ground among the NWMB's co-management partners have copies of the NWMB submission.

The NWMB submission was discussed with NTI officials yesterday. Those officials concurred that the NWMB should seek to represent itself in the negotiations rather than have its submission presented by an intermediary party. Appearance before the chief negotiators for the Parties will tentatively take place the week of October 9.

Jim Noble noted the absence, despite invitations to them, of DSD (also DFO and DOE) at the meeting with NTI yesterday. Kevin McCormick suggested that it was not too late for more and better interaction, although realistically not all aspects of the negotiations will be shareable by all the participants throughout the process. He noted that CWS has not yet been formally advised that the process of negotiating the next ten years of program delivery is actually underway.

Kevin found it interesting that the IPGs were encouraged to move forward on their submissions far ahead of the Parties to the Agreement. Michael suggested that it was only the IPGs that were operating on a realistic schedule if negotiations are to be completed on time. Okalik Egeesiak recalled that intentions were expressed at the outset to liaise with the other IPGs to identify elements of shared purpose and to explore common approaches in developing submissions, but apparently this was not followed up. On one specific matter, Okalik wondered if the aspirations or intentions of any of the other negotiating agencies might be pertinent to the IQ trust fund being proposed by the NWMB. The NWMB may not be the most appropriate agency to administer such a fund, and a better-coordinated approach might be very beneficial. Michael noted that the RWOs and HTOs also had a vital interest in IQ.

Kevin and Michael observed a lack of clarity about how the overall negotiating process is being managed and overseen. There is a basic need for a better understanding of time lines. Following discussion it was decided that the NWMB would write to the Implementation Panel, with copies to the Parties to the NLCA, setting out the NWMB concerns about the process underway to develop implementation contracts for the next planning period. Kevin stressed that the NWMB should not feel bound to the details of its existing submission if ensuing clarifications overturn any of the fundamental assumptions that have been made.

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

### **5.A Chairperson's Report**

Ben Kovic referred the Members to his report in the briefing binder. He highlighted his work in helping to develop a new oceans curriculum for Grade 10. The aim was to complete this exercise by this fall, but this is no longer a possibility.

### **5.B Executive Director's Report**

Jim Noble referred to his report in the briefing binder. He focussed his discussion on the recent work of the Nunavut Fisheries Working Group. It was through the efforts of this Group that the Baffin Fisheries Coalition was formed. The Coalition has agreed to work together, and to keep the new 0A turbot quota intact. The Coalition has retained a consultant, Jerry Ward, to help them achieve their goals.

#### **5.C Wildlife Management Director's Report**

Michelle Wheatley referred the Members to her three-month report. In response to a request from Kevin McCormick for an update on progress with respect to the first item in her report, Michelle replied that it had been agreed in the course of a number of conference calls that Dr. Peter Usher will develop a discussion paper on the role of the co-management boards in the new (13-step) COSEWIC process. Completion of the paper will be followed by a workshop to establish the necessary protocols. The process as outlined will not necessarily resolve all concerns.

#### **5.D Finance and Administration Director's Report**

Jim Noble referred the Board members to Gordon Tomlinson's report in the meeting binder. Considerable attention in the past three months was directed to further developing, managing and trouble-shooting the NWMB local area network.

#### **5.E Legal Advisor's Report**

Michael d'Eça briefly highlighted the content of his report contained in the briefing binder, including reference to his input to development of the NWMB workplan and funding proposal for the next planning period.

Michael perceived ongoing uncertainty about the roles and responsibilities of Board Members vis-à-vis their appointing agencies. Michael stressed the importance of both the appointing agencies and the appointees understanding and respecting the functional independence of Board Members. A common route to challenging a decision of an administrative tribunal (such as the NWMB) is to prove that the decision was not reached independently. Michael referred to a paper he presented at the administrative law conference last year in which he put forward a number of recommendations on this matter that all the IPGs should consider adopting. Michael offered to make a presentation to the Board on the subject if so invited.

With respect to the present state of uncertainty surrounding Moses Koonoo's term as an NWM Board Member, Jim Noble elaborated that QIA officials understand the issue and are working to resolve it. Meanwhile, he (Jim) is proceeding on the assumption that Moses will be the QIA -appointed Member for a full four-year period.

On behalf of himself and the Board, Jim expressed his appreciation for Michael's hard and efficient work over the summer. Jim noted that Michael's dedication to the affairs of the NWMB had impacted his family vacation plans.

## 5.F Fisheries Advisor's Report

Jim Noble referred the Members to Ray Andrews' report in the briefing binder. Jim informed the Board that Ray has resigned his position as NWMB Fisheries Advisor in order to take up duties as Director of Government and Industry Relations with Fishery Products International. The Board will need to decide whether to seek a replacement for Ray in order to continue having access to this type of expertise and input. The cost-sharing arrangement with DSD will also need to be re-evaluated.

The Members agreed that it would probably be useful to maintain someone in the general capacity that Ray had provided, but that the output requirements and the corresponding skill mix should be carefully identified. Ray himself might be a key source of advice on what is needed and on who might provide it. Some of the applicants in the recent competition by the Baffin Fisheries Coalition for their advisor might be prospective candidates. The Members also agreed that the Board should make an appropriate gesture of appreciation to Ray for the valuable service he had provided to the NWMB in particular, and to the development of the Nunavut fisheries in general.

## 5.G Members' Reports and Concerns

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

**Kevin McCormick** brought to the attention of the Board a recent article by a WWF official published in their *Arctic Bulletin* No. 2.01 (dated 11 June 2001) referring to "over-harvest" of narwhal and beluga in Nunavut. The article is heavily based on reports that appeared earlier in *Nunatsiaq News*. Kevin noted that two different individuals had asked him about the article, and he wondered if the reference to over-harvesting having occurred should be left unchallenged by the NWMB. Ben Kovic advised that he had already discussed the matter with WWF officials, and that a correction will appear in the next issue. WWF officials have undertaken to check carefully with the NWMB in future prior to publishing material that pertains to wildlife management issues in the NSA.

**Okalik Egeesiak** brought a number of questions and observations to the table:

- Keeping the appointing agencies (in her case, DSD) informed about issues that affect them: Okalik asked if the NWMB provides its co-management partners with early and reliable access to meeting agendas, minutes, task lists, etc. Jim Noble replied that NWMB meeting agendas and ensuing minutes are sent to the three government agencies as they are developed. Highlight summaries are distributed widely immediately after each meeting. Task lists are treated as internal NWMB documents.
- Marketing strategy for marine mammal products: Okalik referred to a meeting in Arviat in August at which this topic was discussed. She wished to obtain a report of the meeting and a copy of the draft marketing strategy. Stephen Atkinson undertook to obtain copies of the available documentation for her.

- Follow-up to KWF workshop at Arviat in August: Okalik noted that some of the concerns that were discussed at the workshop have been on the table for a long time, and include items for which NWMB intervention is expected and seems warranted. For instance, there are ongoing and new concerns about the federal gun control legislation. It was stressed at the workshop that many hunters still had not received their interim licences to possess firearms. It would seem appropriate for the NWMB to join those who are bringing this matter forcefully to the attention of the federal government.

**Ben Kovic** noted that Gordon Koshinsky had advised his appointing agency (DFO) that he would not be seeking re-appointment when his current term with the NWMB expires in December. Ben wanted to acknowledge Gordon's contribution to the work of the NWMB over the past eight years.

Ben stressed the need for greater and more reliable commitment on the part of Board Members regarding their availability for Board meetings and conference calls. Staff are experiencing considerable difficulty ensuring the participation of enough Members to consistently provide a quorum. Ben distributed a "declaration of commitment" form that he had drafted for the consideration of the Members whereby they might confirm their availability. This might be a particularly useful innovation with so many new Board Members, both recent and imminent.

Kevin McCormick considered this to be a legitimate concern. When Members commit to participate it is imperative that they actually are available. Signing a commitment form may not achieve this. Perhaps expectations need to be more clearly stated. Moses Koonoo declared that he did not object to such a form. He occasionally had difficulty participating in conference calls because he lived and worked in two different communities. It was very important for him to have adequate notice.

Okalik asked if the NWMB had a bylaw or a policy pertaining to truancy or incapacity on the part of Board Members. Michael advised that the NWMB Operating Procedures have a section on attendance and participation wherein it is stated that a pattern of tardiness or lack of fitness to participate in meetings shall result in notification to the appointing agency. There is also provision for a Member to be removed for cause. The Board may want to re-visit these provisions.

## **6. Completion of Assignments and Implementation of Resolutions**

Jim Noble stated a need to revisit the minutes for recent Board meetings and conference calls in order to identify any tasks that have not been addressed.

Michael d'Eça observed that the pre-hearing report on community-based management (item 13 of the summary) has not been fully completed as is indicated. However the most important immediate issues have been addressed via the



Qikiqtarjuaq hunt closure report. Consideration might be given to deferring further reporting until the three-year review of the community-based management program.

## **7. Environment Canada (CWS): Issues and Decisions**

### **7.A Recovery Strategy for Peary Caribou**

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Board about the draft National Recovery Strategy for Peary Caribou and Arctic-Island Caribou that Kevin McCormick tabled at the last Board meeting. She recalled being assigned to review the document and to develop recommendations for the Board.

A somewhat condensed version of the Draft Recovery Strategy was subsequently received via COSEWIC and is included in the current briefing binder. The document was developed according to the 1991 designation of the species, namely endangered (Queen Elizabeth Islands and Banks Island), and threatened (remainder of the southern tier of the Arctic Islands). Those (1991) designations were based on a 1990 COSEWIC status report. The objectives in the draft recovery strategy that is now under consideration actually reflect revised designations founded on more current knowledge. A new status report is being solicited.

The Recovery Strategy as currently written does not take full account of the new political and operational realities that stem from the creation of Nunavut and settlement of the land claim. The current version continues to recommend such interventions as live captures, captive breeding and wolf control, as well as restrictions on harvesting. Most of the pertinent communities have already instituted self-imposed harvesting restrictions, and population levels of Peary caribou may already be improving. Moses Koonoo urged that if it became necessary to put more emphasis on controlling wolves, that local hunters be assisted to do so rather than bringing in professional hunters. Stephen Atkinson pointed out that the Territorial Governments would be responsible to implement the recovery strategy, and administrative arrangements with the GNWT would need to be worked out.

Kevin McCormick observed that the matter demonstrates some of the procedural matters that remain to be worked out with respect to dealing with species at risk. There are also some fundamental issues yet to be resolved including, for example the role of the CWS. Michael d'Eça suggested that the agencies should be obtaining their interim guidance on such matters from the impending SARA legislation and from the protocols for COSEWIC communication that are currently being developed.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 076**) not to approve the Recovery Strategy for Peary caribou as put forward by RENEW (the national recovery program established by the Wildlife Ministers Council of Canada), and in conveying this response, urge that:

- COSEWIC, as a first priority, update its status report for Peary caribou taking account of Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit and new scientific information;
- COSEWIC follow the protocols currently being developed for better communication with the wildlife management boards; and
- CWS follow the protocols for developing recovery strategies set out in the draft SARA legislation.

The Board also decided that there would be merit in writing to the various range jurisdictions, encouraging them to continue any appropriate recovery actions that they might already have underway even without a formal Recovery Strategy.

## **7.B Status Designations by COSEWIC for Species that Range into the NSA**

Kevin McCormick reported that COSEWIC met in April and assessed the status of species suspected of being at risk of extinction or extirpation from Canada. Four of the species that were assessed range into the NSA: Canada lynx, harlequin duck, and two species of wolffish. The Canada lynx was confirmed as Not at Risk, the wolffishes were designated as Threatened, and the harlequin duck (South Baffin Island-wintering population) was down-listed two steps, from Endangered to Special Concern. NWMB approval is sought for these revised designations.

Ben Kovic asked if COSEWIC used traditional knowledge in arriving at these designations. Kevin replied that there was input of traditional knowledge with respect to documenting the breeding location (in Greenland) of the eastern population of harlequin ducks, but he could not vouch as to traditional knowledge input with respect to the other species. All in all, the rationale for the new designations is not well documented. Approval of the NWMB is required in order to validate any designations pertaining to species in the NSA, and the Board should not be rushed into making its determinations.

Okalik Egeesiak asked if the NWMB had approved any COSEWIC designations previously. Ben replied that he could not recall the Board making any such decisions. Kevin suggested it was possible that some new designations could have escaped the Board's attention.

Michael d'Eça observed that difficulties can be expected with the designation process until the new protocols have been firmly established and tested. Implementing SARA will carry very significant implications for the NWMB and for Nunavut. Jim Noble referred to the large list of species awaiting NWMB input with respect to designation. The whole process is on hold from the viewpoint of the co-management boards, pending completion of the initiative underway with Dr. Usher.

It was agreed to advise COSEWIC that the NWMB will not consider requests to endorse species designations until all the protocols for the process are in place. In communicating with COSEWIC in that regard, it would be appropriate to point out

that the kind of rationale for designations that was provided with the four items currently at hand would not be adequate for the Board's purposes.

### **7.C Habitat Stewardship Program**

Kevin McCormick reported that the federal government has established a Habitat Stewardship Program (HSP) as part of the initiative to protect species-at-risk. The other two elements of this initiative are the 1998 Accord and the actual SARA legislation. The Program aims to enhance existing or establish new stewardship activities, and specifically to influence human behaviour with respect to habitat.

Environment Canada (EC) has overall responsibility for the HSP, but global oversight of the Program is collectively shared among DOE and two other federal agencies: DFO and Canadian Heritage (Parks Canada). No individual department controls any specific funding allocation, and no government agency (federal, provincial or territorial) is eligible to receive Program funds. Funds are provided on a matching basis with respect to dollar inputs or in-kind contributions of materials, equipment, labour, etc. Contributions from government departments cannot serve as the initial inputs. The overall (Canadian) funding level is \$10 million for the first (current) year, and \$15 million per year thereafter. The current annual allocation for the Arctic is \$250,000.

Projects to prevent habitat degradation will have preference over projects devoted to habitat recovery. The focus will be on the habitats of species that are already deemed to be at risk, be they terrestrial or aquatic (freshwater or marine).

While the Program is funded nationally, planning is meant to be regional and delivery local. Regional Implementation Committees (RICs) will guide the Program at the intermediate level. These Committees have not yet been established for the Arctic. Groundwork for the Arctic Committees will be laid at a workshop planned for October. It may be administratively advantageous to have a single RIC for the Arctic. The Committees do not have to be in place for projects to be approved. One Nunavut project is already underway, at Iqaluit. Some first-year funding is still available, and it is possible that other projects could be identified at the October meeting. It is hoped to show good progress in a short time, and progress will need to be periodically re-confirmed to Treasury Board.

One of the biggest challenges for the Arctic RIC(s) will be to make the Program relevant to northern Canada. What is most appropriate and works best in the rest of the country will not necessarily be most effective in the Arctic. For example, devoting attention to how harvesting is conducted may well be a more productive avenue for protecting species at risk in the Arctic than focussing on habitat per se. There is also the possibility that Arctic perspectives could have a national influence. In the Arctic, the co-management boards will need to decide if and how to participate. The kinds of projects that are being considered include protecting and improving streams and shorelines, monitoring population abundance, installing

nesting boxes, improving hunting practices, reducing by-catches, and developing land-use guidelines.

Burt Hunt suggested that there were many projects that could be done in the Arctic that should promote the aims of the Program. Working to improve hunting methods has been oft-discussed and comes to mind. Perhaps the NWMB could apply for Program funding. DFO can be counted on for support and participation.

Michael d'Eça noted that the \$250,000 allotted to the Arctic is only 2.5% of the overall Program budget. Although the human population in the Arctic is admittedly small, the Arctic makes up a very large portion of Canadian territory and would seem to warrant a much larger share of the funding. Kevin replied that pressures on habitat are generally most urgent in southern Canada. Only about 35 of the approximately 500 species deemed to be at risk in Canada occur in the Arctic. The concept of stewardship also meshes easily with private ownership of lands. Ben Kovic suggested that while the number of species at risk in the Arctic may be relatively small, the importance of the Arctic as breeding habitat would seem to point to a larger share of Program funding. Kevin suggested it was possible that the share of Program funding devoted to the Arctic might increase over time.

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

### **8.A Objective-Based Management Plan: Northern Hudson Bay Narwhal**

Karen Ditz reminded the Members that the Board decided at its last Meeting to support continuation by DFO of its efforts to develop the concept of objective-based fishery management using the Hudson Bay narwhal population as a pilot, this with the understanding that the NWMB will be kept fully informed.

Karen advised that DFO officials were still in the process of assembling and analysing the available information. DFO proposes to establish a working group of about ten individuals, and to conduct a workshop in order to carry the exercise forward. The workshop might be followed by meetings in those communities that harvest from this narwhal population. Karen requested that the NWMB:

- identify organizations and/or nominate individuals to participate in the working group, particularly to represent RWO and HTO interests, and
- provide \$10,000 toward the cost of the workshop (DFO will provide \$13,000).

Kevin McCormick asked if this process really differed from, or should be merged with, community-based management. Karen replied that some or all of the principles of community-based management will inevitably be embodied in objective-based management, and that both approaches have the overall aim of preventing or resolving conflicts. Objective-based management requires/involves:

- setting clear conservation limits for the species and the ecosystem;
- setting fishery management objectives (biological and socio-economic);
- developing a fishery management strategy;
- identifying barriers to achievement of management objectives;

- making contingency plans;
- developing operational plans;
- identifying decision points; and
- setting out appropriate actions to be taken at decision points.

Moses Koonoo and Ben Kovic suggested that the amount budgeted for honouraria seemed rather light for accommodating adequate HTO/RWO representation at a three-day workshop. Karen replied that the budget assumes only two community representatives, but this is subject to further discussions and change.

Ben asked if DFO would make up the shortfall if the NWMB contributed something less than \$10,000. Karen replied that the DFO contribution will be mainly from a fund established by DFO Headquarters for this initiative. Fisheries Management in Winnipeg has made a commitment to cover the travel costs for a Winnipeg-based biologist to participate. No further resources are available in DFO.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 077**) to provide \$10,000 to DFO in support of the workshop being organized enroute to developing an objective-based management plan, on a pilot basis, for northern Hudson Bay narwhal.

## **8.B Charr Fisheries Management Planning for Pangnirtung: Update**

Karen Ditz reported that their new Fisheries Management Technician, Leese Papatsie, presented the available information for this project to the community in GIS format, and that the presentation was well received. Fishermen appreciated the ability to zoom in and retrieve data for particular fishing areas. The HTO has agreed to work with DFO to set up management goals and an information-gathering system. The plan is for Ms. Papatsie to continue working with the HTO to clarify certain location names and then to prioritize water bodies for future sampling.

Karen mentioned that DFO would like to demonstrate the GIS program to the Board. Ms. Papatsie was invited to come to the Meeting, whereupon she gave a short version of the presentation that she had given earlier at Pangnirtung.

## **Wednesday, 19 September 2001**

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

## **8.C Oceans Sector Activities in Nunavut: Update**

Burt Hunt reminded the Board that the Oceans Program being delivered through DFO's Iqaluit Office for Nunavut has a number of initiatives underway according to the mandated directives of the Canadian Oceans Strategy. DFO-Oceans and CBC-Radio co-hosted a panel discussion on oceans issues in June. The NWMB Chairman participated as a member of that panel. Paul Kennedy of the CBC *Ideas*

program conducted an oceans forum in Iqaluit that will air on CBC Radio in December. Mr. Kennedy obtained a large amount of material for the program. An Oceans Day was conducted September 13 – 15 in Iqaluit. Many people participated in various events including a beach cleanup, several school programs, and release of the book on marine mammals. Oceans Day was undoubtedly a community highlight for the year. Ben Kovic agreed that it was very successful.

Plans are underway to form a working group to begin actual development of an integrated ecosystem-based management plan for Western Hudson Bay. Background for a similar exercise is being developed for the East Baffin Region, starting with the identification of local and regional ocean-related topics of concern.

Michael d'Eça recalled that a couple of years ago DFO invited the Nunavut Marine Council to develop a Nunavut component for the Canadian Oceans Strategy. Michael noted that there had been no movement on this matter on the part of the NMC, and asked whether there had been any other progress. Burt replied that there has been no identifiable progress for Nunavut. DFO remains available and enthusiastic to assist an NMC initiative if and when it gets organized.

#### **8.D Fish Habitat Management: Update**

Burt Hunt tabled a briefing note prepared by Jordan DeGroot. Work is continuing on environmental impact assessments regarding five projects in Nunavut.

#### **8.E New Fishery Regulations for Nunavut: Update**

Burt Hunt tabled a briefing note prepared by Winston Fillatre. The Nunavut Regulatory Review Committee met in Ottawa in early August. Another meeting is planned for late October in Iqaluit, and a draft of the Regulations suitable for community consultations should be available shortly thereafter. The Committee is recommending that Nigel Banks be kept on as an advisor, at least until the next draft is done. Costs would presumably be split among DFO, NTI and the NWMB.

Michael d'Eça interjected that not all of the Committee members share Winston's optimism about the time line for this project. A great deal has been done, but much work still remains.

#### **8.F Personnel Management in the Eastern Arctic Area: Update**

Burt Hunt referred to his outline of recent staff changes and current initiatives as set out in the briefing material. The three additional positions announced for this Area a year ago have all been staffed. These positions are an Oceans Co-ordinator, a Fisheries Management Technician, and a Fisheries Officer. Jean-Pierre Thonney, who has occupied the post of Oceans Co-ordinator, will soon be leaving on a one-year leave of absence; his position will be back-filled by Judy Anililiak formerly from Pangnirtung. Leese Papatsie, also from Pangnirtung, is the new Fisheries

Management Technician. The new Fisheries Officer is Jonathon McCotter, originally from Kugluktuk. It is intended to create a "DFO Operational Office" in a downtown location separate from the present and continuing Area Office.

Bert Dean recalled that NTI and others have been urging DFO to establish a physical presence in the Kitikmeot Region. Burt replied that this was an active file, but at the present time the Department does not have the resources to support a position in the western part of the Area.

## **8.G Community-Based Management for Beluga: Update**

Karen Ditz reminded the Board that community-based management (CBM) for beluga was in effect at Iqaluit and Kimmirut. The Department's top priority recently vis-à-vis CBM has been to ensure better communication with the HTOs. In the course of the annual reviews before the new season began, the Department undertook to assist the HTOs to produce a poster to inform the public in general, and beluga hunters in particular, about the CBM system for beluga.

The Department had some concerns about the Iqaluit hunt this summer. There were some indications that not all hunters were reporting fully. A couple of joint patrols were conducted to check on this hunt. Some irregularities did come to light but the HTO chose not to take any action. DFO also did a hunt-monitoring trip to Kimmirut, with the Mayukalik HTO participating. The HTOs have not yet verified that all kits have been returned, but harvest data available to September 18 are as follows:

	<u>Iqaluit</u>	<u>Kimmirut (spring only)</u>
Number landed	45	16
Number wounded and escaped	3	0
Number sunk and lost	12	0

There was some discussion about when (in what seasons) CBM is actually in effect at Kimmirut. This is being clarified with the HTO. Karen also noted that hunting rules for beluga are still being developed at Pangnirtung as a prerequisite for CBM. She referred to the current draft of the hunting rules in the briefing binder. The remaining item of contention concerns the desire of the HTO to include provision for the use of nets (Rule 8). Karen also pointed out that at the time of the most recent reporting, Pangnirtung has over-harvested its 2001 beluga quota by three animals. It is not clear how the Department should respond. Since the HTO has been working very hard to get its hunting rules in place and to implement CBM (which would render the matter of quota moot) the Department is inclined to be lenient. Gordon Koshinsky suggested that an over-harvest of only three animals would be as close as Pangnirtung hunters have come to staying within their beluga quota in recent years, and should not pose much of a concern.

Karen stated that there has been considerable debate with the Pangnirtung HTO about rules for dealing with stranded or entrapped whales. An action plan has been developed for such eventualities, a copy of which is included in the briefing binder.

The first step to be taken with regard to a stranding in a river or in a tidal zone is to see if the whales escape in the course of a succession of high tides. Failing that, and assuming that an existing quota has already been reached, DFO will need to issue a variation order if it is agreed that the whales are to be harvested. There was occasion to implement and test this action plan at Pangnirtung this fall. Three stranded belugas were discovered and placed under observation by the community. They remained stranded for over a month. Following consultation with NWMB staff, a variation order was issued by DFO. Two of the whales were subsequently harvested and one was lost. The HTO provided a very detailed account of the incident, and in doing so demonstrated a high level of responsibility and concern.

Moses Koonoo explained that whales tend to get stranded or entrapped in areas where there is an abundance of food. He suggested that the harvest of such animals should be allowed. Long-term stranding or entrapment, at least in the case of narwhals, makes the maqtaq overly salty and causes the meat to deteriorate rapidly. If polar bears have access to the whales, they will spoil much of the maqtaq. Harvesting should thus be permitted early in the course of such an event.

Gordon suggested that if a beluga or narwhal stranding or entrapment does not involve females with calves, and if any quota that is in existence has not been reached, there would not be any legitimate cause for concern if the animals were harvested. He asked if a special and elaborate administrative procedure was in fact required to deal with such situations. Michael d'Eça stated that hunters would be free to harvest stranded or entrapped whales the same as any others, provided that there was no question of exceeding any total allowable harvest. Michael also pointed out that a variation order to change a quota can only be issued pursuant to an NWMB decision. In accordance with the NLCA, such a decision must go to the Minister for his concurrence and implementation.

Michael suggested that a practical approach to dealing with stranded or entrapped whales might be for the NWMB to make one of more pre-emptive decisions for the consideration of the Minister, especially for communities where this is a common occurrence. Such decisions could spell out what is to be done when such an event happens. The decisions could be put in place ahead of time and still meet the requirements of the NLCA.

Kevin McCormick was enthusiastic about the NWMB developing a policy to guide actions with respect to stranded or entrapped whales. He perceived that such a policy might underpin a set of automatic procedures. He asked if it was mandatory for the DFO Minister to sign variation orders. Burt Hunt replied that he, as Area Manager, is authorised to sign such orders; however he routinely notifies the Minister's office before signing them and expects to be advised if any problems are foreseen. Whale strandings and entrapments are dealt with on a case-by-case basis, so a comprehensive blanket policy might not be practical. On the other hand it might be possible to have in place some blanket procedures for dealing with the



routine elements of such situations, with provision to refer any particular circumstances to the NWMB.

Jim Noble stated that DFO Headquarters staff have made the general observation that the large number of NWMB decisions being forwarded to the Minister is a matter of some concern. They would appreciate whatever could be done to make this flow less burdensome. Michelle elaborated that the main point of concern pertains to the creation of small quotas or making small quota adjustments. Okalik Eegeesiak observed that people in the communities are the ones who ultimately suffer the effects of drawn-out bureaucratic processes.

Michael pointed out that Article 5.2.35 of NLCA provides authority for the NWMB to perform “other duties” as agreed by the NWMB and government. This could be an avenue by which the DFO Minister delegated more resource management responsibilities to the NWMB. Even more creative approaches may be possible. Certain resource-management decisions might be re-delegated to the communities. Perhaps protocols could be established whereby communities could make certain decisions following some trigger from the NWMB. Kevin was of the opinion that it would be very attractive for the DFO Minister to delegate more responsibilities to positions in his Department. He noted that the DOE Minister had made such a delegation for matters concerning NIRB. Burt Hunt declared that he was amenable to trying to streamline the process, and cited some steps he had already taken to explore alternative approaches. With respect to dealing with whale entrapments specifically, Burt concurred with the idea of trying to invest more of the decision-making in the communities. This is where the best decision-making capacity lies for a number of matters, for example in respect to the prevention of wastage. However Burt saw a continuing role for some external agency, specifically the NWMB, to contribute what he regarded as “sober second thought”.

The Board requested that Michelle and Karen draft procedures, compatible with the NLCA and for the Board’s consideration, to streamline the interactions of the NWMB with the DFO Minister, and making particular provision for dealing with stranded or entrapped whales.

## **8.H Community-Based Management System for Narwhal: Update**

Karen Ditz reminded the Board that this is the last year of the three-year pilot project for community-based management of narwhal. All five communities that were involved in the initial round of consultations on the project are participating this year. Representatives from DFO, NWMB and NTI met with the HTOs in Pond Inlet and Arctic Bay on July 25 and 26 respectively, and in Kugaaruk on August 2, to discuss implementation of the system. Jayko Alooloo represented the QWB at the two north Baffin meetings. Qikiqtarjuaq and Repulse Bay remain to be visited.

At the meetings, DFO staff focussed on ensuring that effective recording and reporting systems were in place. Pond Inlet is demonstrating a lot of leadership in

implementing community-based management. Arctic Bay is also making a good effort, and the hunters have instituted an innovative system for distributing tags. However this is the first year for Arctic Bay in the program and the hunters as a group are hampered by some inherent lack of cohesion. The community very much wants to have a three-year trial as per the original participants. All five communities have provided interim reports on their 2001 narwhal hunts.

Gordon Koshinsky asked if the funding that the NWMB provided to Arctic Bay for training is being utilized. Karen replied that the funds were used to conduct one workshop with another workshop planned. A person has also been hired to assist with data collection.

### **8.I Establishing a TAH for Future Bowhead Whale Hunting**

In consideration of the altered Meeting venue having resulted in no community representatives being available at this time to discuss this subject, treatment of the matter was deferred to a later date.

### **8.J Canadian Shellfish Sanitation Program: Update**

Lawrence Ignace, Environmental Assessment Specialist for DOE, made a Power Point presentation to the Board regarding the Canadian Shellfish Sanitation Program (CSSP). A Regional Shellfish Area Classification Committee (RSACC) for Nunavut was established about three months ago, and has met twice already. Lawrence reminded the Members that the NWMB had agreed earlier to interact with the Committee in an observer capacity. Michelle Wheatley has been capably acting on that basis but it is perceived that the NWMB needs to participate as a full and permanent member. It would not matter if the representative was a Board Member or a staff person. Michelle observed that her main input to date has been to explain how the NWMB operates and how it could or would mesh with the CSSP.

Lawrence reiterated that the keystone objective of CSSP is to protect the public from the consumption of contaminated bivalve mollusks. The Program is actually North American in scope, with separately-administered Canadian and American components. The Canadian SSP is jointly administered and operated by:

- Environment Canada, which identifies pollution sources impacting shellfish growing areas, classifies growing areas based on evaluation of pollution sources and bacteriological analyses of the overlying waters, promotes pollution prevention, and chairs the various RSACCs;
- The Canadian Food Inspection Agency, which controls handling, processing, labelling, storage and transportation of shellfish; and which also administers product monitoring with respect to biotoxins, bacteria, and chemical contaminants; and
- DFO, which opens and closes shellfish growing areas, as well as patrolling and ensuring compliance in areas that are closed.

The National CSSP committee, with representation from the three government agencies, sets the standards for the overall Program. The RSACCs identify survey requirements, review survey results, and recommend area classifications.

Michael d'Eça stressed that the NWMB would be the decision-making authority for closing shellfish growing areas to harvesting in the NSA. DFO could act only pursuant to an NWMB decision. Program materials need to reflect this reality. Karen Ditz acknowledged that DFO would not open or close a shellfish fishery in the absence of an NWMB decision.

Kevin McCormick asked if trading of shellfish within a particular jurisdiction was subject to scrutiny under the CSSP. Lawrence replied that such would be the ideal situation, but in reality the Program focuses on inter-provincial and international trade. Funding for the Program is not particularly generous.

Lawrence noted that the Nunavut communities are currently being catalogued for shellfish stocks and growing conditions. An initial shoreline survey was recently conducted at Qikiqtarjuaq. Trace amounts of paralytic shellfish poisoning have been found in some Nunavut locations. The greater concern at present is the potential for shellfish contamination by human sewage, particularly adjoining the larger communities. The most problematic situation is Koojeessee Inlet at Iqaluit. The Amarak HTO has endorsed closure of Koojeessee Inlet to shellfish harvesting.

Burt Hunt noted that the extensive clam stocks at Qikiqtarjuaq and the aspirations of the community to exploit them have given impetus to the CSSP initiative. The Program seems to be in serious need of adaptation to northern realities. It is obvious that a strong and active NWMB presence on the RSACC would be helpful.

Kevin deemed it best for the NWMB to be represented by a technical staff member, and suggested that Michelle continue in her basic role. Michael noted that the work of the Committee includes making recommendations for NWMB consideration, another reason why it is preferable for the NWMB representative not to be an active Board member.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 078**) that the NWMB will participate as a full and permanent member of the Regional Shellfish Area Classification Committee for Nunavut as part of the Canadian Shellfish Sanitation Program, and that the NWMB will be represented on the Committee by the Director of Wildlife Management.

## **8.K Experimental Beluga Harvest by Makivik in James Bay**

Jim Noble advised that notice was received from Johnny Peters on June 21 that three northern Quebec communities proposed to conduct an experimental beluga harvest in James Bay. The aim was to harvest 30 animals in order to:

- Obtain samples to determine if the James Bay belugas are genetically distinct, or if they are part of the East or West Hudson Bay stocks;

- Determine the feasibility of hunting beluga whales in James Bay, with reference to transportation costs, product spoilage, and other constraints;
- Augment local supplies of beluga maqtaq and meat.

The proposal was consistent with the current draft management plan for northern Quebec beluga, and had been specifically recommended by DFO scientists. It was not possible to obtain a quorum of NWM Board Members to consider the matter in a reasonable period at that particular time. A few available Members were polled by telephone; no serious concerns were identified, and Makivik was advised over the signature of the NWMB Chairperson that the NWMB concurred with the proposal. It is not known if the hunt took place or if it was successful.

None of the Members expressed concern about the action that was taken. It was recognized that the matter demonstrated a problem that, while infrequent, is of considerable concern to staff. It is not always feasible to obtain an NWMB quorum for urgent decisions that are the purview of the Board. Michael d'Eça urged the Board to develop an appropriate policy for such contingencies. Fortunately the particular matter in question pertained to Zone II, for which NWMB advice must be sought but no NWMB decision is required.

#### **8.L Presentation on Satellite and Radio Telemetry**

The formal presentation was deferred, since the scheduled presenter was not available in Iqaluit following the change in venue for the NWMB Meeting. Michelle Wheatley referred the Members to some items of telemetry equipment that were on display at the back of the room.

#### **8.M New Quotas for Aquatic Plants, Kelp and Invertebrates: Kivalliq Region**

Michelle Wheatley referred the Board to her briefing note concerning requests that have come forward from three Kivalliq communities, as recommendations via DFO, for certain new harvesting quotas in that Region. These are all small quota requests, pertaining variously to rockweed, dulse, kelp, blue mussels, and Iceland scallops. DFO scientists generally support all the requests, subject to certain sampling and reporting requirements.

Considerable discussion ensued with respect to the following matters:

- The fact that, in the absence of a TAH, Inuit in the NSA have an existing right to harvest up to their full level of needs;
- The uncertain interpretation of the existing right to harvest by Inuit in respect to at least some types of corporations;
- The very limited experience exploiting aquatic plants, kelp and invertebrates in the NSA, and thus the weak basis for identifying conservation concerns;
- The lack of any formal indication of support from the Whale Cove HTO regarding the Ingnirq Development Corporation application;

- The fact that the Ingnirq Development Corporation is the *de facto* same entity as Kivalliq Land and Sea Resources;
- The fact that the NWMB has already established a 320 metric tonne quota of rockweed, dulse and kelp for Kivalliq Land and Sea Resources;
- The possibility that the Ingnirq Development Corporation is a participant in all three of the current applications; and
- The need to ensure that various issues raised by these applications are addressed by way of the new Fishery Regulations that are being developed.

Following its discussion the Board decided (**Resolution 2001 – 079**) to establish and allocate certain quotas for rockweed, dulse and kelp, and also for blue mussels and Iceland scallops, for certain communities in the Kivalliq Region as follows:

- For Ingnirq Development Corporation at Whale Cove: 1 MT rockweed; 4 MT dulse and kelp; 1 MT blue mussels; 1 MT Iceland scallops;
- For Chesterfield Inlet HTO: 1 MT rockweed; 4 MT dulse and kelp; and
- For Arviat HTO: 1 MT rockweed; 4 MT dulse and kelp.

The Board also decided (as per the same Resolution):

- That all such harvesting must be accompanied by the collection and submission of catch and effort data, and biological samples as outlined by DFO in its recommendations to the NWMB; and
- That in transmitting these decisions to the DFO Minister, the NWMB inform the Minister:
  - That harvesting by the Ingnirq Development Corporation at Whale Cove is contingent upon clear evidence of support from the local HTO;
  - That harvesting of rockweed, dulse and kelp at Whale Cove will proceed under the existing quota of 320 MT; and
  - That the new Fishery Regulations (currently being developed) will need to address the management of new fisheries, specifically taking into account (as per the NLCA) that:
    - Establishment of any (new) total allowable harvest (TAH) must be grounded in a valid conservation purpose; and
    - In the absence of a TAH, Inuit are entitled to harvest up to the full level of their economic, social and cultural needs, subject to the terms of NLCA Article 5.

## 9. Nunavut Wildlife (DSD) Issues and Decisions

Stephen Atkinson introduced two new DSD staff members to the Board:

- Reginald Girard, Area Manager for Kitikmeot Region; and
- Chris King, Management/Planning Biologist. Mr. King will work on:
  - inter-jurisdictional agreements, and more specifically
  - with Mitch Taylor on new MOUs for polar bear management.

### 9.A M'Clintock Channel Polar Bear Management: Update

Stephen Atkinson referred to his briefing note contained in the Meeting binder. He reminded the Board that a moratorium is in effect for the M'Clintock Channel population. This moratorium follows last year's curtailed harvest of 12 bears.

There is no concrete plan yet for what is to be done after the current hunting season. Some uncertainty remains about the population estimate, but work to refine the estimate is on hold to enable the marks that are now extant to "age". This implies that the next field season would be in the spring of 2003. However fieldwork could be done earlier if a need were identified. There have been suggestions by people in the communities that polar bears might have moved out of the area, along with suggestions that movements could perhaps be clarified through deployment of satellite tags. That might perhaps be done as early as next spring. The Gjoa Haven HTO has put forward a proposal for an IQ study, and DSD plans to meet with them to further develop this concept. Initial work could take place this winter, with preliminary results by May 2002. Another idea that has emerged is that sea ice conditions in M'Clintock Channel may have changed recently, and that such changes may have impacted polar bears. A study of sea ice conditions over the last 20 years has been contracted to the Centre for Earth Observation Science at the University of Manitoba, for completion by the end of March 2002.

With respect to the socio-economic impacts of the lost opportunities to hunt polar bears in M'Clintock Channel, DSD is funding a study by George Wenzel of McGill University. The study, which focuses on Taloyoak and some other communities in Nunavut, pertains specifically to the sport-hunting aspect. It should be completed within the next few months. Gjoa Haven is the only community that has been left completely without access to polar bear tags this year, and arrangements are being made to import polar bear meat into the community for special events. Efforts are also underway to obtain tags from one or more of the communities hunting in the Gulf of Boothia, with the hope of providing Gjoa Haven hunters with some access to that population. Any such hunts might be conducted as community events.

Stephen stated that besides briefing the Board his purpose today was to obtain feedback and direction. Options for the future (not mutually exclusive) include:

- Continue with the current moratorium, with the aim of building the population back up to the full level that the habitat can support;
- Establish an interim quota, with the aim of maintaining the present population level but without prospect of achieving a full recovery;
- Go with the information already (or soon to be) available; interpret it conservatively (and realize substantial savings in dollars and effort);
- Continue working to refine and upgrade the pertinent information.

The Board decided to encourage DSD to develop these (and perhaps other) options in more detail for the next Board Meeting, elaborating on the implications of each option as well as on the information at hand or yet needed to support each one.

Moses Koonoo continued to urge that alternative approaches be found that do not require polar bears to be anaesthetised. In his view, bears are negatively affected by drugging, and sometimes show these effects for many years. Stephen referred to a poster that he had put up pertaining to the effects of handling on polar bears. No long-term effects of handling (including anaesthetisation) have ever been demonstrated. The existence of handled bears and the occurrence of sick bears do not necessarily indicate cause and effect. Researchers also occasionally encounter sick bears, including ones that have not been handled previously. It should also be noted that handling techniques (including anaesthetisation) have improved significantly over the past 20 years.

Stephen recounted to the Board the case of a report received earlier this year about the remains of three bears lying in close proximity to one another on an island in northern M'Clintock Channel. Ensuing interviews indicated that there were in fact the remains of only two bears. A site visit in the company of the person making the report uncovered only one set of remains, namely a very old skeleton that was overgrown with vegetation. Indications were that the bear had died in a den, which would be a typical natural mortality site. There were no indications of tags or other markings. Given the apparent age of the remains it is very unlikely that this bear was ever handled by researchers.

## **9.B Polar Bear Quotas for 2001/02**

Stephen Atkinson tabled the Department's polar bear harvest summary for 2000/01, along with the Department's polar bear quota recommendations for 2001/02. A total of 395 polar bears were taken in the 2000/01 hunting season: 270 males and 125 females. Fifty-three sport hunts were successful and 21 were not. Sport hunters took 45 males and 8 females. There were 35.4 defence kills, more than double the number from the previous year.

There is considerable urgency in dealing with the quotas for 2001/02 because the hunting season has already started. Based on their historical hunt performances, the Department is recommending that every community except one be given its full baseline quota allocation for 2001/02. This would involve increasing the quotas from last year in two situations. A quota reduction from nine to seven bears is recommended for Kimmirut in respect to the Foxe Basin population. This quota could be restored to nine bears if Kimmirut can negotiate two male credits for Foxe Basin from another community. Quota reductions to zero with respect to the M'Clintock Channel population are implicit in the moratorium that is already in effect.

The Board decided **(Resolution 2001- 080)**, in accordance with the recommendations presented by DSD, to establish quota changes for polar bear harvesting for the 2001/02 season as follows:

- For Pangnirtung (Davis Strait polar bear population): An increase from 12 to 14 bears;
- For Sanikiluaq (Southern Hudson Bay polar bear population): An increase from 13 to 25 bears;

- For Kimmirut (Foxe Basin polar bear population): A decrease from 9 to 7 bears;
- For the M'Clintock Channel polar bear population: A decrease to 0 bears for all communities, as per the moratorium already in effect.

### **9.C Polar Bear Management: General Framework for Going Forward**

Mitch Taylor began by summarizing for the Board a presentation he had given at the recent meeting of the IUCN Polar Bear Specialist Group. The presentation was about managing the harvest of polar bear on the basis of uncertain information. Mitch introduced the subject with an innovative explanation of the differences between accuracy and precision, known and unknown bias, and the various possible manifestations vis-à-vis good and bad science, conjecture and opinion.

Mitch pointed out that a very broad range of possible expenditure options could be spelled out for investment in research, monitoring and management for polar bears or any other wildlife species. There is a relationship between the money and effort devoted to research, for example, and the number of animals that will be available for sport hunting or for other uses. Harvesting is a risk factor for wild animal populations, along with such external variables as global warming.

Mitch went on to present the advantages, as he saw them, of setting aside the maximum-sustainable-yield (MSY) model in favour of a risk-management model for establishing polar bear (or any other) quotas. Mitch pointed out that adherence to the MSY model embodies a 50% probability of clearing the way for an over-harvesting error with every iteration, yet this has been the model of choice up to now. Adoption of a risk-management approach would imply enunciation of clear management goals for each animal population. In the case of polar bears, management goals would be established as part of negotiating the MOUs.

Adoption of the risk-management approach would also bring with it the need to identify and adhere to population inventory cycles. That would mean establishing a schedule for inventorying the various populations and following through on that schedule. Mitch suggested that an inventory interval of 15 years might be generally appropriate for polar bears. The interval might be (much) longer for (very) small populations. It would depend on how much risk is deemed to be acceptable, and on how often an error was deemed to be tolerable. All these are matters that could and should be negotiated with the communities. It is increasingly appreciated that Nunavut polar bears warrant the most thoughtful management that can be brought to bear. The worth of polar bears to the communities is currently estimated at \$3 million per year. Polar bears are understood to contribute more unsubsidized revenue to the Nunavut economy than is realized from all other wildlife uses.

Gordon Koshinsky asked if it would be feasible to cost-out a 15-year polar bear population inventory cycle of the sort being proposed. Mitch replied that it would be relatively easy to prepare such a 15-year budget. He urged the Board, in reviewing



any such estimates, to keep in mind the expenditures that are now being made to monitor the populations of other species.

Michelle Wheatley asked if it would be feasible to use less costly technology, such as aerial surveys, instead of the mark-and-recapture method that is now the norm for inventorying polar bear populations. This would also eliminate the problem of hunter opposition to handling and tagging. Mitch replied that the length of flight lines needed to achieve similar accuracy in estimating such low-density populations would be enormous, with no cost savings envisaged. Polar bears are also relatively difficult to see from the air on a consistently reliable basis. The biases inherent in aerial survey technology as applied to this species would be very difficult to accommodate. Concurrent data on sex and age distribution, survival, etc. would not be obtained. Mitch also noted that hunter resistance to handling tends to diminish as hunters become more and more involved in the actual work. Michelle suggested that it might be useful to do a comparative aerial-survey and mark-and-recapture study on the same polar bear population. Mitch agreed, but cited a reluctance to shift away from a method known to be working and producing interpretable results.

Kevin McCormick expressed reservations about the confidence to be placed in the Department's estimates of target polar bear population levels. He also noted that estimates of maximum sustainable yield do exist, and wondered if a simpler and much less costly approach might be to just "step-back" the MSY estimates by 15% or whatever (as a conservative approach), and use those numbers for management purposes. Kevin was concerned about the complexity of the risk-management approach as presented, and stressed that no approach could succeed unless it could be explained to the communities.

Mitch replied that he did not foresee difficulty explaining the risk-management model. He envisaged implementing it via continuation of the present "flexible quota system". The key will be for the communities to understand the implications of various levels of harvesting on the future prospects for the population, and thence on the long-term prospects for harvesting per se. The Department would look to the NWMB to identify a specific range of acceptable risk for polar bear populations. DSD would then go to the communities, explain the concept, and discuss/negotiate where they want to operate within that range of acceptable risk. The discussion would be structured around a number of management or harvest options for each population. Harvest options or quotas would be expressed as discrete numbers rather than as confidence intervals around a particular number. Dealing with inadvertent errors would also be proscribed in each MOU.

Michael d'Eça cautioned that the NWMB can only establish harvesting restrictions if they pertain to defensible conservation concerns. It might be a challenge to meld that fundamental operating constraint with the concept of risk management.

Moses Koonoo expressed the opinion that polar bears near his community are increasing in abundance. In the face of this, hunters are finding it more and more

difficult to maintain caches of meat out on the land. The priority of these hunters in the present circumstances would be to increase the polar bear harvest rather than to negotiate about how to better protect the population.

Ben Kovic noted that the presentation and ensuing discussion were in the nature of a workshop. He asked for direction from the Board on how to proceed. The Board directed that Michelle should work with Mitch to develop recommendations on the stance to be taken by the NWMB in preparation for upcoming negotiations between DSD and the communities, or with respect to other jurisdictions, in order to update or develop MOUs for polar bear management.

#### **9.D Polar Bear Management: Shared Populations (Nunavut / Inuvialuit)**

Stephen Atkinson advised the Board that an invitation has been received from the Wildlife Management Advisory Council (WMAC) to participate in a workshop to finalize inter-jurisdictional MOUs for the shared (Inuvialuit / Nunavut) North Beaufort (NB) and Viscount Melville (VM) polar bear populations. Along with the invitation, WMAC submitted a list of issues that they perceive to require resolution. This list is included in the briefing binder, along with a draft copy of an MOU for joint management of the North Beaufort polar bear population.

Stephen suggested that coming to grips with the issues connected with the management of these shared populations, including the matter of what quotas may be appropriate, should only be attempted with reference to the sorts of considerations that were explored by Mitch Taylor in his presentation. Specifically required would be an understanding of the risks for the population that are inherent in any particular quota that might be contemplated. As viewed by the Department, these estimates of risk should be documented in the MOUs. DSD is only prepared to consider specific quotas in the context of the associated risk.

The Inuvialuit are especially eager to finalise an MOU for the Viscount Melville polar bear population. They propose to accomplish this at an October workshop. To that end they have also been in direct contact with the two Nunavut communities that have an interest: Cambridge Bay (for the VM population) and Kugluktuk (for the NB population). DSD is seeking the advice of the NWMB on how to address the issues that have been identified with respect to this matter. To be in context, that advice would need to include a response to the risk-management approach that has been put forward by the Department. Mitch will be making a presentation to the workshop if and when it takes place.

Michael d'Eça recalled that two years ago he was in contact with Inuvialuit officials on this same matter of developing joint MOUs for managing polar bears. His impression at the time was that the two jurisdictions have fundamentally different management systems in place. Mitch replied that the differences are less real than is commonly perceived. The flexible quota system tends to be misunderstood or at least misrepresented by Inuvialuit officials. Even so, in his view, MOUs could be

designed that did not depend on having exactly the same management system in place in both regions. Kevin McCormick expressed doubt that all the issues that were identified actually needed to be resolved, at least not necessarily in full conformity with the norms of Nunavut. Since the matter is inter-jurisdictional, it is to be expected that some give-and-take will have to prevail. Kevin cautioned against trying to be too prescriptive, counselled flexibility, and urged not losing sight of the broader issues.

The Board directed that Michelle and Michael should review the issues that were identified with respect to developing inter-jurisdictional MOUs for polar bear management vis-à-vis the Inuvialuit, and return to the Board with recommendations on how to respond. DSD is encouraged to negotiate with the Inuvialuit for a more reasonable time frame for developing these MOUs.

### **9.E Ungulate Research in the Queen Elizabeth Islands: Update**

Stephen Atkinson drew the attention of the Board to the briefing note in the meeting binder. This research project is a co-operative venture between the HTOs and DSD, and includes financial support from the NWMB to the HTOs. The Nunavut program is being co-ordinated with similar work in that portion of the Queen Elizabeth Islands lying within the Inuvialuit Settlement Region. The HTO at Resolute Bay has driven the project, which was initiated primarily due to concerns about the population status of Peary caribou.

Ground-based and helicopter-transect surveys were done this May. More than 100 live Peary caribou were seen, and work is underway to translate these sightings into a population estimate. At the time of the last survey in 1997 when only 12 animals were actually sighted, this population was estimated at about 75 animals. The present tentative findings are thus quite encouraging.

The project provides an excellent example of integrating traditional approaches with the capabilities of modern science. This spring the HTO tapped the expertise of its members to delineate areas that contained or probably contained caribou or muskoxen, in contrast to areas that contained no animals of either species. This information was used to guide helicopter transects in the conduct of an intensive survey from which the total population estimates are being derived. HTO members also conducted a ground-based survey, the findings from which will provide minimum counts for comparison with the population estimates of both species.

There are plans to continue and expand this work. DSD researchers will meet with the Resolute and Grise Fiord HTOs next month to prepare detailed plans for a similar joint survey of caribou and muskoxen on Cornwallis and western Devon Islands, along with an overall research strategy for both species throughout this area. The work being done or planned is consistent with what is called for in the draft National Recovery Strategy for Peary Caribou and Arctic-Island Caribou.

## **9.F Thelon Wildlife Sanctuary Management Plan: Update**

Stephen Atkinson reviewed the history of efforts to develop and finalize this plan. No substantive changes have been made to the draft recently, but there has been considerable effort to refine and update certain aspects of the wording. The plan is now undergoing legal review by the two Territorial Governments. The Government of Nunavut aims to present the plan to the NWMB for its consideration in November.

Michelle Wheatley noted that KIA is currently obtaining legal advice on the draft. There are some indications that several changes are being contemplated. One issue that apparently remains unsettled is whether Inuit have or will continue to have harvesting rights in the Sanctuary. The Plan as now written does allow for fishing but is silent about other wildlife. Stephen mentioned that certain boundary issues are also still on the table. DSD considers these to be matters for resolution in the course of implementation. Some might eventually require public hearings.

Joan Scottie expressed concern that KIA is taking initiatives without consulting with Baker Lake. Michael d'Eça once again cautioned that the NWMB can only establish harvesting restrictions if they are based on defensible conservation concerns. He also noted that the approval process as referenced in the briefing material is not quite accurate. As set out in the NLCA, NWMB approval with respect to the NSA component of the Sanctuary is the final step before going to the DIAND Minister.

## **9.G Report on the Recent IUCN Polar Bear Meeting**

Stephen Atkinson reported on the recent (June) meeting of the Polar Bear Specialist Group of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) in Nuuk. The Group meets every five years in one of the countries that manages polar bears. Ian Stirling led this year's Canadian delegation. Each country provides a status report on polar bear populations in its jurisdiction, along with a synopsis on research programs. Ideas for collaborative research are examined. Management issues are discussed only in broad and general terms.

Items discussed of particular interest to the Canadian perspective included:

- New concepts and methods for inventorying populations;
- Possible Canadian loopholes in offshore jurisdiction;
- The current lack of quota management by Quebec;
- Dealing with populations shared with Greenland.

Delegates expressed concern that contaminants might be impacting polar bears. They called for the initiation of another circumpolar study of this matter.

## **9.H Canada / Greenland MOUs for Polar Bear Management: Update**

Stephen Atkinson reiterated that there was some discussion of this matter at the IUCN meeting in Nuuk. The Canadian delegation met with their Greenland counter-

parts to consider how new inventory data for the Baffin Bay and Kane Basin populations could be used to develop inter-jurisdictional management agreements.

In Greenland, polar bears are managed by the Department of Industry. There is no trophy hunting, and the government seems to have no interest in promoting it. Only full-time hunters can take polar bears, and they must report their previous year's catch in order to get a new licence. Reporting is probably not completely accurate. Mothers with cubs are protected in some areas; bears less than 24 months old (not mothers) are protected in other areas. The season is closed in July and August. Greenland tried on an earlier occasion to introduce polar bear quotas but the initiative failed. They are moving to try again, and have started community consultations to that end. They are also planning to ban the use of lances and spears on the grounds that they are too dangerous for the hunters. Until a quota system is implemented, there is no real basis for negotiating joint management agreements. There is interest in promoting ongoing interaction among hunters.

### **9.1 Miscellaneous DSD Initiatives: Updates**

Stephen Atkinson reported briefly on the activities of the Department in respect to:

- Continuing the production of materials for conservation education. The Department has recently produced a number of posters, including ones pertaining to:
  - Research on and management of Peary caribou;
  - Abnormalities and disease in wildlife;
  - Handling effects on polar bears; and
  - Research on Arctic wolves.
- Completing the IQ study on climate change with the participation of several Kivalliq communities. The study report will soon be available.
- Overseeing the contract for an atlas of polar bear movements. The atlas includes a separate map for every bear that was ever collared in Nunavut. The atlas has now been translated and will soon be available for distribution.
- Completion of a booklet on abnormalities and diseases in wildlife. The Department continues to encourage the submission of samples to the animal-testing program if people have concerns about parasites or disease.
- Continuing to work with elders on determining ways to enhance the ability to differentiate the gender of polar bears at a distance by sight in the field.
- Continuing to conduct a number of programs in support of harvesters.

Stephen drew the attention of the Board Members to a binder in which these and other Departmental work activities pertaining to wildlife are summarized.

### **Thursday, 20 September 2001**

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, re-convened the meeting at 08:35 a.m.

## **10. NWMB Internal Items: Issues / Decisions**

### **10.A Nunavut Wildlife Harvest Study: Update**

Heather Priest referred the Members to her comprehensive briefing note in the Meeting binder. She noted that the Harvest Study Committee met on Tuesday, and that a few refinements had been made to her goals for the upcoming period.

Heather advised that the main database has now been converted from FoxPro 2.6 to MS Access 2000. Data verification is now completed through December 2000. Verification of the 2001 data is well underway but cannot be completed while data continue to be received.

In June, Josée Galipeau moved from her position as Database Manager into the new position of Wildlife Management Assistant, and thus has been mainly lost to the Harvest Study. This prompted the hiring of Lee Ann Pugh as the new Database Manager for the Study. Lee Anne is concentrating on data verification. She has training from the Canada-Nunavut Geoscience Office in the use of ArcView, a GIS software package. It is planned that Lee Ann will use this software to display and verify geographic data from the Harvest Study.

The Nunavut Implementation Panel was informed in May that the Harvest Study will not yield five full years of harvest data in the case of three of the Nunavut communities. In informing the Panel, a plan for dealing with these shortfalls was also conveyed. The Panel has concurred with the approach that was proposed.

A wrap-up survey was developed to obtain socio-economic information about the Harvest Study participants. The survey also provides opportunity for the participants to offer comments and feedback about the Study. Completed survey questionnaires are being returned to the NWMB office in Iqaluit, and arrangements have been made with the Nunavut Bureau of Statistics to enter the data and provide some analyses. The HTOs were formally advised about the survey before it began.

Interim community reports on the Harvest Study have been completed for all Regions and were presented at the recent AGMs of the three RWOs. Feedback is being solicited. Data collection with respect to the most recent periods is almost complete, albeit with ongoing problems at Iqaluit, and with some data still missing for Kimmirut and Qikiqtarjuaq.

Immediate goals for the Study include completing final data entry, reporting to the communities on the full five years of data, visiting the communities to get feedback, and starting to draft the methods section of the final report.

In concluding this portion of her presentation, Heather proceeded to demonstrate:

- the Access version of the database; and
- application of the ArcView GIS software.

Joan Scottie reported that fieldworkers in her community invariably had difficulty keeping up with their work. Some of them did not always appear to be very competent. She wondered if the fieldworkers were appointed by the HTOs, and if nepotism might sometimes have been a factor. The HTOs in some communities have operational problems, and when they go down financially the fieldworkers tend to go down with them. Heather acknowledged that there were problems with fieldworkers in some communities. The HTOs were involved in the hiring because, according to the agreements governing the Study, they need to be involved in the administration. These problems need to be addressed if data gathering continues.

Michael d'Eça noted that completion of the Harvest Study will have important wildlife management implications for the NWMB. It will herald the beginning of the BNL / TAH / Available Surplus management system. It would be appropriate to begin preparing for this. It could be the subject for a future meeting or workshop.

Heather went on to summarize the findings of the contractors who were retained to assess the feasibility of continuing to gather harvest information after the current Harvest Study ends. Four options were identified and elaborated:

- Continue with the present basic model, but add a socio-economic dimension and possibly collect information on harvesting effort as well;
- Continue with the present basic model with no additions, but with better streamlining and tailored to specific needs based in part on a review of the complete results of the current Harvest Study;
- Conduct occasional annual surveys, to collect information to be determined. This model involves surveying only selected communities, only in selected years, and only on one occasion per year. The model has been deployed successfully by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. It does not provide details of time and place in which harvesting occurs, and depends on annual recall on the part of hunters with respect to a full year's harvest;
- Do nothing, i.e. do not continue any collection of harvest information.

Heather noted that the budget proposal for the next 10-year planning period has provision that would accommodate either the second or the third of these four options. A fifth possibility might be some combination of options two and three.

The most fundamental question, of course, is whether there are needs for the ongoing collection of harvest information that are commensurate with the projected costs. If the matter of cost is set aside, virtually everyone involved in the feasibility study expressed ongoing needs for such information, and even for an expanded scope. There is also strong support for the NWMB maintaining a primary role in the funding stream, and certainly in managing the program and administering the work.

Heather reiterated that until the results of the current Study are fully analysed, the best option for continuation cannot be identified in detail. Strengths and limitations revealed over the past five years will have a marked bearing on how data collection might best be continued. Karen Ditz suggested that another "feasibility study" with

respect to continuation of data collection, this time on a smaller scale, might be appropriate once the present Harvest Study is fully completed.

Kevin McCormick suggested that the feasibility study did not provide much useful guidance or backup with respect to negotiating the workplan and budget for the next planning period. He was especially concerned about how the NWMB might prepare to address challenges to its presentation with respect to this subject. Michael stated that it was almost certain that a budget for continuation of harvest data collection will be established (or denied) before the present Harvest Study is fully completed. Kevin expressed the hope that the analysis-in-progress would yield information to assist in the making of informed decisions. Moses Koonoo stated that the main thing was to have at least some continuation, at least of core data collection. He stressed that one of the most important operational requirements will be to pay adequate salaries to employees. Account would also need to be taken of the special difficulties inherent in doing the work in the larger communities. Gordon Koshinsky noted that there would not be the same NLCA constraints in designing a continuation project that pertained initially. In other words, it should be easier to tailor a continuation project to whatever funds might be made available.

#### **10.B Big Game Guides Working Group: Update**

Michelle Wheatley reported that the recommendations of the Working Group were presented to the AGMs of the three RWOs. All three passed resolutions of support. Michelle said that she planned to bring a full report to the next Board meeting, at which time the Members will need to decide on an implementation approach.

#### **10.C Walrus Working Group: Update**

Michelle Wheatley reported that three options for a walrus management system were presented to the AGMs of the three RWOs. All three RWOs passed resolutions about the matter. All the resolutions incorporate positive wording but the explicit intent is not clear in two of the cases. Efforts are underway to clarify this. Michelle also noted that inclinations seem to lean towards retaining the walrus management system that is currently in place, this despite the fact that the exercise was initiated in response to a perceived need for fundamental changes.

Michael d'Eça asked if the Working Group addressed the requirement as per Article 5.6.25 of the NLCA, charging the NWMB to establish basic needs levels for walrus (and also for beluga and narwhal). He noted that the matter was formally in abeyance for beluga and narwhal pending conclusion of the pilot project on community-based management, but the matter did need to be put to rest for all three species. Michelle replied that the Working Group did not deal with this matter.

Michael asked if the Nunavut Regulatory Review Committee had been kept informed about the activities of the Working Group. Michelle replied that DFO was represented at all of the Working Group meetings.



#### **10.D Nunavut Resource Centres Coalition: Update**

Michelle Wheatley advised that a contribution agreement is being circulated for signatures among the five members of the Coalition, in order to secure funding for the current year. Yvonne Earle has just been hired by DSD as a full-time librarian, with duties to include oversight of acquisitions and cataloguing of Coalition holdings. Utu Maurice resigned his position as Resource Centre Technician Trainee in order to participate in the Nunavut Sivuniksavut program. The position was subsequently advertised, and candidates will be interviewed this week.

#### **10.E Wildlife Priorities Workshops: Report**

Michelle Wheatley reported briefly on workshops that have been held in conjunction with the recent KWF and QWB AGMs. These workshops are part of the new format providing, among other things, guidance to the NWMB in calling for and reviewing wildlife research and study proposals.

#### **10.F Revolving Quota System for Narwhal: Demonstration for Consideration**

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Members that she had previously introduced a different concept for managing narwhal, and had been asked by the Board to elaborate the concept more fully at some future opportunity. Michelle referred to her briefing note in the Meeting binder, which explains the concept in more detail. The system, which is potentially applicable to any long-lived wildlife species, would involve setting quotas for any particular year by reference to the rolling total harvest for the previous 3-year or a 5-year period.

The concept is seen as an alternative to the system of fixed annual quotas or “pseudo-quotas” that are currently in effect for narwhal. Rather than being preoccupied with the harvest in any particular year, this alternative system would aim to ensure that the aggregate harvest over some sequence of years did not exceed a pre-determined aggregate amount. Such a system would allow hunters to take advantage of unusually high availability of narwhal in certain years, while simultaneously controlling the overall number taken within a longer time frame.

Michelle listed numerous advantages of this concept as she saw them. She noted that the concept was presented as a possible alternative not only to ordinary management-by-quota, but also to community-based or “non-quota” management. The latter, in its pilot application, has generally resulted in more narwhal being harvested than had been anticipated by managers.

The Board took the presentation on advisement, withholding decision on whether to try it or promote it until the pilot project on community-based management has run its course and has been fully assessed.

## **10.G Demonstrations / Workshops on Wildlife Management**

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Members that they had requested that periodic demonstrations or workshops be organized to better acquaint them with the methodology and mechanics of wildlife management including research. The first such demonstration, with respect satellite and radio telemetry, was planned for the present Meeting (Agenda item 8.K); however the scheduled presenter was unable to be here. There was some discussion of possible topics for such events in future.

## **10.H Policy Development: Live-Capture and Export of Animals from Nunavut**

The Board decided to defer consideration of this item.

## **10.I Training Policy: Review**

Jim Noble noted that the Board has struggled with the matter of developing a comprehensive training policy for several years. Okalik Eegeesiak had requested that the Board review the status of this long-standing effort, with the aim of bringing it to a satisfactory conclusion. Jim referred to the collection of materials that were assembled in the Meeting binder in an attempt to facilitate such a review.

Jim observed that training is just one item that is subject to or that warrants an operating policy. In reality the entire NWMB policy/procedures manual is in need of serious attention and updating. The exercise was delegated to the Executive Committee, but the Committee has been unable to come to grips with it in a comprehensive way. Perhaps the question of what to do about NWMB policies and procedures should be explored at a workshop. An obvious approach would be to hire a consultant to develop a complete policy and procedures manual. This could be expected to entail an expenditure of up to \$50,000.

Okalik Eegeesiak observed that it would not be necessary for a consultant, or for anyone working on the matter, to start from scratch. What is needed is to update the current material. That should not be too difficult. Perhaps staff could look into it further and brief the Board on what exactly needs to be done, with some firmer cost estimates. The longer we leave it the greater the cost is likely to be.

Gordon Koshinsky suggested that there is an important distinction to be made between NWMB policies and Board operating procedures. There is a tendency to talk about policies, when what we really have in mind is working principles to guide operational procedures, or even just the operational procedures per se. Most of the operational procedures are really administrative. The NWMB has policies for such matters as allocating shrimp or turbot quotas, and perhaps implicitly for how to treat staff in very general terms.

Kevin McCormick stressed that a manual of operating procedures needed to be short and focussed, and formatted for easy updating. Its purpose would be to provide operational guidance on specific matters such as training. Statements of

purpose and principles are probably not needed in such a document. Kevin suggested that the best solution for drafting it would be to contract it out.

#### **10.J Board Governance Model: for Consideration**

Jim Noble drew the attention of the Board to the Carver Policy Governance Model for non-profit organizations contained in the Meeting binder. The model is touted as “a conceptually coherent paradigm of principles and concepts ... to ensure that organizations achieve board-stated goals and conduct themselves with probity”. The model is described as being universally applicable. The material was included for consideration by the Board for its possible relevance to the NWMB.

Jim noted that in general this Board has been quite effective, and may not need to look elsewhere for advice or models on how to operate. On the other hand, it seems appropriate to have some familiarity with the best prevailing thinking on this subject. Okalik Eegeesiak was suspicious of devoting undue focus to matters of procedure. She summed up her view with the oft-cited admonition, “If it’s not broken, don’t fix it”. The Board decided to take the material under advisement.

#### **11. NTI Wildlife Division: Issues / Decisions**

Bert Dean requested permission to defer discussion of the NTI perspective on M’Clintock Channel polar bear management as per the agenda. He proposed instead to brief the Board on progress in developing the RWO/HTO workplan and funding proposal for the next planning period. He proceeded to do so by way of a Power Point presentation. Bert stated at the outset that the presentation was still a draft and needed some further work.

Substantial progress has been made towards standardizing the central elements of workload identification and budgeting among the RWOs as well as among the HTOs. The aggregated 10-year budget as currently estimated is about \$80 million.

It was noted that the budget estimate represents about a four-fold increase from current levels. If this amount of funding materialized it would probably entail increased obligations for the NWMB, perhaps to the extent of warranting adjustments to the NWMB submission. Bert stated that the budget assumes that other agencies will cover their own incremental costs associated with implementing the RWO/HTO workplan. On the other hand it also assumes that block funding from other agencies, other than via the NWMB, will cease.

Board Members agreed that the presentation was generally impressive. Bert indicated that letters of support would be welcome when the time comes to take the package forward.

## **12. Matters of Funding: Status Reports on Programs**

### **12.A Status of NWRT Research Funding for 2001/02**

Michelle Wheatley updated the Board on its NWRT funding commitments for the current year. A total of \$700,500 in new funding was approved for the three participating Departments. In addition, a carry-forward of \$17,900 was approved for one continuing DFO project, and carry-forwards totalling \$15,700 were approved to wrap up three DFO projects that are not continuing. Contribution agreements have been or are about to be finalized with CWS and DFO, and an agreement is nearing completion with DSD. These agreements make way for the actual transfer of funds.

### **12.B Status of NWMB Study Funding for 2001/02**

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Board of its approval of \$107,000 for four wildlife studies by other-than-government agencies in 2001/02. Cheques totalling \$90,000 have been issued in respect to three of these projects. Funding conditions for the fourth project, pertaining to bowhead whales, have not been met. The applicant will be advised to submit a revised proposal next year.

## **13. Other Presentations**

### **13.A Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board**

Joe Tigullaraq referred the Members to the QWB report to the NWMB contained in the Meeting binder. Joe led the Board through an examination of this report.

Items pertaining to past and upcoming events and activities of the QWB, and those involving the internal administration of the organization, were seen to be quite straightforward. The Board spent some time examining the list of QWB issues and concerns, many of which are not new at the present time:

- The financial difficulties being experienced by many of the HTOs. Hopefully this will be mainly resolved in the next 10-year planning period. The problem is compounded by high turnover rates of HTO Board members and managers;
- The question of continuing support for outpost camps;
- The lack of clarity regarding the role of the QWB in community-based management. The QWB participated in the tour of communities last March and set out its observations and concerns in a letter to the NWMB. No response has been received as yet;
- The impaired objectivity of the QWB with respect to community-based management when it relies on the NWMB to absorb the costs of its participation;
- The pending expiry, at the end of December, of the terms of office of Executive Committee members. The need to implement replacement actions;
- The lack of adequate expertise, notably in certain categories, in the QWB office;

- The lack of information on the status of efforts to develop a new *Wildlife Act* for Nunavut. There does not seem to be any movement on this initiative;
- The inadequacy of QWB input on QIA appointments to the NWMB, and the controversy about the term of office of QIA appointees;
- The lack of clarity about how the QIA appointee to the NWMB is supposed to relate to the QWB and vice versa;
- The apparent lack of priority and inadequate provisions for involving the QWB as a real and legitimate co-management partner. For instance, the QWB was not informed in advance about the recent meeting of the Canada/Greenland Joint Commission on the Conservation and Management of Narwhal and Beluga;
- The lack of a clear path for the QWB to retain access to Tom Demcheson's services after the present arrangement (via the Harvest Study) expires.

On the matter of protecting QWB impartiality, Ben Kovic stressed that the NWMB absorbed the travel costs to enable QWB participation in the community tour last March not to jeopardize the objectivity of the QWB in any way, but rather to facilitate QWB input which was and is highly valued. On the matter of overcoming QWB feelings of marginalization with respect to its co-management partners, Ben agreed that there was room for improvement not only with respect to QWB but for all the RWOs. On the matter of the role of the QIA appointee to the NWMB, Moses Koonoo stated that his goal was to be as open and informative as possible. He noted that he signed an undertaking when he accepted his appointment, agreeing to work for all of Nunavut without favouring any community or region. Michael d'Eça stressed that NWM Board Members are not beholden to their appointing agency or to any other body. However Members should not feel constrained about informing legitimate interests about the work of the NWMB. In fact, a key priority for the next planning period must be to improve these kinds of communications.

### **13.B Proposals for Hunting a Bowhead Whale in 2002**

Ben Kovic advise that it was necessary to defer this item, since the community representatives who had been identified to make presentations were not able to attend the NWMB Meeting in Iqaluit. Jim Noble pointed out the written proposal, in the form of a hunt plan, from the Igloodik HTO contained in the briefing binder.

### **13.C Request for support and collaboration: Pauti Arctic Research Institute**

Jim Noble advised that the Pauti Arctic Institute of Research at Pond Inlet is a newly-incorporated not-for-profit non-governmental agency that aims to conduct, support and promote environmental research relevant to Arctic residents. Pauti plans to approach a Canadian university (probably Trent) to apply for NSERC funding for a northern research chair to underpin this initiative. Pauti is seeking the support of the NWMB as it pursues this application, with ongoing implications for future co-ordination of efforts. Pauti has named Michael Ferguson as its candidate to occupy its research chair if it is successful in its application.

Kevin McCormick asked for clarification of the application process. Stephen Atkinson explained that NSERC is making six research chairs available for the Arctic. Only universities are eligible to apply, and they must commit to providing financial and other support if successful. Stephen was aware of a number of other applications that had already gone forward to NSERC including:

- One (from the University of Alberta) focussing on polar bears;
- Another focussing on caribou; and
- Another focussing on small mammals.

The Board concluded that it would be appropriate to encourage Pauti to work with Tent (or some other) University to complete an application for a research chair as described, and to wish them every success in this endeavour.

#### **14. Meetings, Workshops and Other Pertinent Events**

##### **14.A Past Events: Reports and Briefings**

Ben Kovic referred the Board to the four reports by himself and staff members with respect to events in which they participated on behalf of the NWMB since the last Board meeting:

- By himself, as one of the Commissioners: The eighth meeting of the Canada/Greenland Joint Commission on the Conservation and Management of Narwhal and Beluga, on August 29– 31 in Iqaluit;
- By Michelle Wheatley, as an observer: The first meeting of the Regional Shellfish Area Classification Committee for Nunavut, on June 21 in Iqaluit;
- By Jim Noble, as a member of the Nunavut Fisheries Working Group: A meeting with the DFO Independent Panel on Access Criteria, on June 28 in Iqaluit;
- By Josée Galipeau, with Heather Priest: The Annual General Meeting of the KWF, on August 29 – 30 in Arviat.

##### **14.B Upcoming Events: Review and Participation**

Ben Kovic declared that there were no matters of substance for the Board to consider with respect to participation at upcoming events.

#### **15. Date and Location of Next Meeting**

The Board decided (**Resolution 2001- 081**) to conduct its next (31<sup>st</sup>) Regular Meeting in Baker Lake the week of 26 November 2001. The Board also anticipated holding an orientation workshop for new Members in early January.

#### **16. Adjournment**

Ben Kovic thanked the Members for their participation. He once again acknowledged the work of staff in changing the meeting venue on short and difficult notice. He thanked the various presenters for their inputs, and especially acknowledged the assistance of the interpreters.

The 30<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the NWMB adjourned at 3:00 p.m. (**Resolution 2001- 082**)

Minutes Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson Date

---

## NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD

### RESOLUTIONS: MEETING No. 30

IQALUIT, 18-20 SEPTEMBER 2001

**Resolution 2001- 070:** Resolved that the NWMB accept the agenda for Meeting No. 30 as presented, with minor modifications as identified.

Moved by Kevin McCormick Seconded by Joan Scottie  
Carried Date: 18 September 2001

**Resolution 2001- 071:** Resolved that the NWMB adopt the minutes for Meeting No. 29 conducted at Ikaluktutiak on 5-6 June 2001, with minor revisions.

Moved by Kevin McCormick Seconded by Moses Koonoo  
Carried Date: 18 September 2001

**Resolution 2001- 072:** Resolved that the NWMB adopt the minutes for Conference Call No. 59 conducted on 31 July 2001, with minor revisions.

Moved by Joan Scottie Seconded by Kevin McCormick  
Carried Date: 18 September 2001

**Resolution 2001- 073:** Resolved that the NWMB accept the Variance Report for the period ending 31 August 2001, and to allocate the unexpended funds from 2000/01 as outlined in the Report.

Moved by Kevin McCormick Seconded by Okalik Eegeesiak  
Carried Date: 18 September 2001

**Resolution 2001- 074:** Resolved that the NWMB accept the Audit Report for the fiscal year 2000/01 as presented.

Moved by Moses Koonoo Seconded by Kevin McCormick  
Carried Date: 18 September 2001

**Resolution 2001- 075:** Resolved that the NWMB appoint the firm MacKay Landau, Chartered Accountants, as auditors for the NWMB for fiscal year 2001/02.

Moved by Gordon Koshinsky Seconded by Joan Scottie  
Carried Date: 18 September 2001

**Resolution 2001- 076:** Resolved that the NWMB not approve the Recovery Strategy for Peary caribou as put forward by RENEW (the national recovery program established by the Wildlife Ministers Council of Canada), and in conveying this response, urge that:

- COSEWIC, as a first priority, update its status report for Peary caribou taking account of Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit and new scientific information;
- COSEWIC follow the protocols currently being developed for better communication with the wildlife management boards; and
- CWS follow the protocols for developing recovery strategies set out in the draft SARA legislation.

Moved by Kevin McCormick

Seconded by Joan Scottie

Carried

Date: 18 September 2001

**Resolution 2001- 077:** Resolved that the NWMB provide DFO with \$10,000 in support of a workshop being organized enroute to developing an objective-based management plan, on a pilot basis, for northern Hudson Bay narwhal.

Moved by Kevin McCormick

Seconded by Moses Koonoo

Carried

Date: 18 September 2001

**Resolution 2001- 078:** Resolved that the NWMB participate as a full and permanent member of the Regional Shellfish Area Classification Committee for Nunavut as part of the Canadian Shellfish Sanitation Program, being represented on the Committee by the Director of Wildlife Management.

Moved by Kevin McCormick

Seconded by Moses Koonoo

Carried

Date: 19 September 2001

**Resolution 2001- 079:** Resolved that, in accordance with requests brought forward by DFO on behalf of communities in the Kivalliq Region, the NWMB establish and allocate certain quotas for rockweed, dulse and kelp, and also for blue mussels and Iceland scallops, as follows:

- For Ingnirq Development Corporation at Whale Cove: 1 MT rockweed; 4 MT dulse and kelp; 1 MT blue mussels; 1 MT Iceland scallops;
- For Chesterfield Inlet HTO: 1 MT rockweed; 4 MT dulse and kelp; and
- For Arviat HTO: 1 MT rockweed; 4 MT dulse and kelp; and

Further resolved that all such harvesting must be accompanied by the collection and submission of catch and effort data, and biological samples as outlined by DFO in its recommendations to the NWMB; and

Finally resolved that in transmitting these decisions to the DFO Minister, the Minister be informed:

- That harvesting by the Ingnirq Development Corporation at Whale Cove is contingent upon clear evidence of support from the local HTO;
- That harvesting of rockweed, dulse and kelp at Whale Cove will proceed under the existing quota of 320 MT; and



- That the new Fishery Regulations (currently being developed) will need to address the management of new fisheries, specifically taking into account (as per the NLCA) that:
  - Establishment of any (new) total allowable harvest (TAH) must be grounded in a valid conservation purpose; and
  - In the absence of a TAH, Inuit are entitled to harvest up to the full level of their economic, social and cultural needs, subject to the terms of NLCA Article 5.

Moved by Kevin McCormick  
Carried

Seconded by Moses Koonoo  
Date: 19 September 2001

**Resolution 2001- 080:** Resolved that, in accordance with recommendations presented by DSD, the NWMB establish quota changes for polar bear harvesting for the 2001/02 season as follows:

- For Pangnirtung (Davis Strait polar bear population): An increase from 12 to 14 bears;
- For Sanikiluaq (Southern Hudson Bay polar bear population): An increase from 13 to 25 bears;
- For Kimmirut (Foxe Basin polar bear population): A decrease from 9 to 7 bears;
- For the M'Clintock Channel polar bear population: A decrease to 0 bears for all communities, as per the moratorium previously approved by the NWMB.

Moved by Kevin McCormick  
Carried

Seconded by Moses Koonoo  
Date: 19 September 2001

**Resolution 2001- 081:** Resolved that the NWMB conduct its 31<sup>st</sup> Regular Meeting in Baker Lake the week of November 26<sup>th</sup> 2001.

Moved by Kevin McCormick  
Carried

Seconded by Joan Scottie  
Date: 20 September 2001

**Resolution 2001- 082:** Resolved that the 30th Regular Meeting of the NWMB be adjourned.

Moved by Kevin McCormick  
Carried

Seconded by Joan Scottie  
Date: 20 September 2001

# NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD

## RESOLUTIONS: MEETING No. 30

IQALUIT, 18-20 SEPTEMBER 2001

**Resolution 2001- 070:** Resolved that the NWMB accept the agenda for Meeting No. 30 as presented, with minor modifications as identified. Items 13B and 8K were deferred.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick      Seconded by: Joan Scottie  
Carried      Date: 18 September 2001

**Resolution 2001- 071:** Resolved that the NWMB adopt the minutes for Meeting No. 29 conducted at Ikaluktutiak 5-6 June 2001 with minor revisions.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick      Seconded by: Moses Koonoo  
Carried      Date: 18 September 2001

**Resolution 2001- 072:** Resolved that the NWMB adopt the minutes for Conference Call No. 59 conducted on 31 July 2001, with minor revisions.

Moved by: Joan Scottie      Seconded by: Kevin McCormick  
Carried      Date: 18 September 2001

**Resolution 2001-073:** Resolved that the NWMB accept the Financial Statement/Variance Report for the period ending August 31, 2001 and that unexpended funds from 2000/01 be allocated as recommended

Moved by: Kevin McCormick      Seconded by: Okalik Eejeesiak  
Carried      Date: 18 September 2001

**Resolution 2001-074:** Resolved that the NWMB accept the Audit Report for the 2000/01 fiscal year as presented.

Moved by: Moses Koonoo      Seconded by: Kevin McCormick  
Carried      Date: 18 September 2001

**Resolution 2001-075:** Resolved that the NWMB appoint the audit firm of MacKay Landau Chartered Accountants as auditors for the NWMB for 2001/02.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky      Seconded by: Joan Scottie  
Carried      Date: 18 September 2001

**Resolution 2001-076:** Resolved that the NWMB approve the following request for quotas of rockweed, dulse and kelp along with mussels and scallops in the Kivalliq Region with reference to Sec. 5.6.1 (commercial harvest):

Community	Species	Request	DFO Recommendation
Arviat HTO	Rock Weed	1 MT	With data collection as noted below
	Dulse and Kelp	4 MT	With data collection as noted below
Chesterfield Inlet HTO	Rock Weed	1 MT	With data collection as noted below

	Dulse and Kelp	4 MT	With data collection as noted below
Whale Cove (Ingnirq Development Corporation) (letter of support from HTO requested)	Blue Mussel	1 MT	With data collection as noted below
	Iceland Scallops	1 MT	With data collection as noted below
	Dulse and Kelp	4 MT	Should be harvested under 320 MT
	Rock Weed	1 MT	quota already set (dulse, kelp and rockweed)

*DFO has recommended that the harvesters collect information on time spent on each tow for harvesting, size of gear, weight of harvest, date and location of harvest, depth of harvest. This applies to plants and shellfish. Samples of shellfish, up to 50 from each location, should also be collected.*

Moved by: Kevin McCormick      Seconded by: Moses Koonoo  
Carried      Dated: 18 September 2001

**Resolution 2001- 077:** Resolved that the NWMB accept the Department of Sustainable Development's polar bear quota recommendations for the 2001/02 season as per the base allocations with one exception, that being a decrease from 9 to 7 bears for the community of Kimmirut.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick      Seconded by: Moses Koonoo  
Carried      Date: 18 September 2001

**Resolution 2001-078:** Resolved that the NWMB not accept the Peary Caribou Recovery Strategy and recommend to COSEWIC that they first update the designation based in part upon the work carried out to-date. Further that the process set out in SARA be followed thereafter. The first task will be to update and complete the status report.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick      Seconded by: Joan Scottie  
Carried      Date: 19 September 2001

**Resolution 2001-079:** Resolved that the NWMB approve the request from DFO to provide a contribution of \$10,000 for a workshop to discuss an "Objective-Based Fisheries Management Pilot Project for North Hudson Bay Narwhal."

Moved by: Kevin McCormick      Seconded by: Moses Koonoo  
Carried      Date: 19 September 2001

**Resolution 2001-080:** Resolved that the NWMB conducts the 31<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Board in Baker Lake the week of November 26<sup>th</sup>.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick      Seconded by: Joan Scottie  
Carried      Date: 19 September 2001

**Document as of 5 October 2001(JN)**