Consultation Summary for the Draft Nunavut Polar Bear Co-Management Plan, revised as a result of input received through the NWMB Public Hearing

October 15 , 2016, Nunavut Inuit Wildlife and Environment Advisory Committee, Rankin Inlet

October 20, 2016, Kitikmeot Region Wildlife Board AGM, Cambridge Bay

October 26, 2016, Kivalliq Wildlife Board AGM, Rankin Inlet

November 7, 2016, Qikiqtaalik Wildlife Board AGM, Iqaluit

Department of Environment, Government of Nunavut
Iqaluit, Nunavut

Executive Summary

Government of Nunavut, Department of Environment (DOE) representatives conducted consultations with the three Regional Wildlife Organizations and the Nunavut Inuit Wildlife and Environment Advisory Committee (NIWEAC) between 15 October and 7 November 2016. The primary purpose of these consultations was to advise co-management partners of revisions to the draft Polar Bear Co-Management Plan that were made as a result of input received during the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board (NWMB) public hearing process.

Although there was significant consultation to develop the draft submitted to the NWMB for approval in the fall of 2015, relevant comments and edits received during the written public hearing held by the NMWB resulted in edits to the draft. The changes to the draft were largely organizational and for provision of further clarity. A high level review and explanation of what was changed and why, as well as changes that were suggested and not made, were considered by the working group. The Regional RWOs Annual General Meetings were an appropriate venue for those consultations, as well as the NIWEAC fall meeting, as this meeting was instrumental in formulating the original working draft in 2014.

This report attempts to summarize the comments made by participants at the meetings and how those comments were addressed.

Preface

This report represents the Department of Environment's best efforts to accurately capture and translate all of the information that was shared during consultation meetings with the RWOs and NIWEAC.

The views expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of the Department of Environment or the Government of Nunavut.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary i

Preface ii

Table of Contents iii

1.0 Summary Purpose and Structure 1

2.0 Purpose of Consultations 1

2.1 Format of Meetings 1

2.2 Meeting Participants 1

3.0 Consultation Summary 1

4.0 Conclusion- Next Steps 2

Appendix A- Presentation used during consultation meetings 4

1.0 Summary Purpose and Structure

This summary is intended to summarize comments, questions, and concerns raised during consultation meetings held with the RWOs and the NIWEAC on the Draft Polar Bear Co-Management Plan (PBMP). Although there was significant consultation to develop the draft submitted to the NWMB for approval in the fall of 2015, relevant comments and edits received during the written public hearing held by the NMWB resulted in edits to the draft. The changes to the draft were largely organizational and for provision of further clarity. A high level review and explanation of what was changed and why, as well as changes that were suggested and not made, were considered by the working group.

2.0 Purpose of Consultations

The primary purpose of the consultations was to engage the RWOs in a dialogue on the current status of the draft PBMP and to present revisions to the draft that were made as a result of comments received during the NWMB's written public hearing. This approach was advised by the NWMB. It is important to note that any revisions to the draft were only considered if they were consistent with what was heard from communities, and what was said to communities, during consultations.

2.1 Format of Meetings

The consultations were held during the AGMs of the three RWOs and the fall meeting of NIWEAC. All meetings were chaired by the respective Board Chairperson. A DOE representative was on the agenda to present the information at DOE's request. The presentation (Appendix A) lasted approximately 45 minutes with questions following ranging from 30-45 meetings per meeting. The translations were conducted simultaneously during the meetings.

2.2 Meeting Participants

All meetings were attended by Board members at each of the three RWOs and Chaired by the respective RWO Chairman. Additional participants were from the Nunavut Inuit Wildlife Secretariat, NWMB, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Environment and Climate Change Canada, and Nunavut Tunngavik Inc. The representative from DOE was Chris Hotson.

3.0 Consultation Summary

The development of the PBMP has been lengthy with community consultations on the draft occurring in the winter of 2014, and regional follow up meetings occurring in the spring of 2014. It was determined that consultation with stakeholders (e.g. RWOs) was appropriate to inform them of the current status of the PBMP and to advise what changes had occurred to the draft PBMP since its submission to the NWMB for approval in 2015. Presenting to the RWO AGMs and the NIWEAC fall meeting was considered appropriate stakeholder consultation to allow for advice and input on the process and to allow for further dissemination to Hunters and Trappers Organizations through their participation on the RWO Boards. The PowerPoint presentation as well as the current draft PBMP was also sent to each HTO for information following the AGMs. This approach to disseminating the information enabled those Board members who were in attendance at the AGMs to update their respective HTO Boards.

The presentation reviewed what has been done to date and then explained specific changes that were made to the draft (e.g. splitting threats and challenges into two sections, splitting industrial activity and tourism into two threats, changing the wording of the roles of Parks Canada and ECCC, plus editorial fixing). It was explained that some comments received during the written public hearing were considered but not included when making edits to the draft as they would not have enhanced the quality or clarity of the draft (e.g. a comment that there are not more bears than in the 1960's, which did not correspond with what was heard during consultations).

The questions received during this round of consultations were similar to what was heard during initial consultations with HTOs and communities. Most were queries as to whether the plan was addressing issues that Inuit have stated are important throughout the consultations and development of the PBMP.

These questions are listed below along with an explanation of what was said at the time, or how the issue was resolved after the consultations.

- There are too many bears now - *this perspective has been adequately included in the draft as proposed.*
- Public Safety is a concern with the perceived higher concentrations of bears - *this has been covered in the draft and specific actions developed to help address this concern including: 1) improved education for bear safety; 2) improved training for polar bear monitors for communities; 3) better access to deterrent methods (bear bangers/ flares etc.).*
- Cabin /property damage is a problem and the compensation programs are difficult to access - *this has been addressed in the draft and actions developed to address this concern include reducing the complexity of forms and providing assistance in completing forms through Conservation Officers in the communities.*
- Negative and inaccurate public opinion about status of polar bears - *the concern is that world media misrepresents the status of polar bears while Inuit are experiencing high concentrations of bears and public safety concerns. Although negative public opinion and inaccuracies are beyond the scope of the PBMP, there is a strong message in the draft that: 1) bears pose a safety risk; 2) there are too many bears in some areas and other species (birds and seals) are being harmed; and 3) Inuit have been managing the species well.*
- Loss or damage to hides being held while under investigation for Defense Kills - *this concern is identified in the draft PBMP and actions to resolve investigations in a timely manner and to ensure no loss in hide value are identified.*
- A concern was raised about a recent event where an Inuk hunter was in a community other than his own and had a Defense of Life and Property Kill. The question arose regarding this incident and what community the tag was to come from - the hunter's home community or the community he was visiting - *A review of the previous Memorandum of Understanding's text and the current draft PBMP text was undertaken and the current draft was revised to remove the uncertainty in that situation.*

4.0 Conclusion- Next Steps

The Department of Environment considered the comments and suggestions received during the consultation meetings in finalizing the draft plan for resubmission to the NWMB Public Hearing Process.

Submission to the NWMB is expected in February 2017. The expectation is for the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement decision-making process to be completed, and for the PBMP to be implemented, on July 1, 2017.

Appendix A- Presentation used during consultation meetings

17/11/2016

ᐅᖃᓚᐅᑎᖃᒃᓱᖅᓈᕈᑎᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᖕᒐᓕᕐᓂᖕᒋᖅᓂᑦ ᓄᑖᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᓇᓄᕐᓂᒃ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐸᕐᓇᒍᑎᑦ ᐊᕕᒃᑐᖅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᐆᒪᔪᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᖕᒋᖅᓄᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐆᒪᔪᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᓗ ᐅᖃᐅᔨᑎᐊᖅᑎᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᖕᒋᑦ (IWEAC), ᐅᑭᐊᖑᖕᒐᓂ 2016

ᑯᓇᔅ ᕼᖕᓐ

Outline

- What have we done?
- What was the outcome of the NWMB Hearing?
- What were the changes to the draft plan?
- Next steps?

ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᑦᑐᐊᑕᕐᑐᓂ

- ᑭᓯᓂᒃ ᐱᓕᕆᓯᒪᓕᖅᐱᑖ?
- ᖃᓄᐃᑐᑎᒃ ᓴᕿᑎᕋᑎᓚᐅᖅᑕ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᐆᒪᔪᓕᕆᔨᕐᔪᐊᖃᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᖕᒋᑦ ᓈᓚᓴᓂᖃᑎᕋᑎᓂᖕᒐᓗ?
- ᑭᓯᓚᐅᖅᑕᑦ ᐊᓯᖅᑎᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᓱᕐᓚᓕᖅᑕᖅᓯᐅᑎ ᐸᕐᓇᒍᑎᑦ?
- ᐱᖃᑖᓂ ᐱᓕᕆᒋᐊᖃᖅ?

Direction

- To develop a plan that better represents what Inuit see and believe in regard to polar bears
- To try and develop a plan that could be adopted under the Species at Risk Act (SARA)

ᑐᕋᒐᕆᔭᖕᒐ

- ᐊᖅᑭᓯᔪᑕᐅᓇᓱᐊᕐᓗᓂ ᐸᕐᓇᒍᑎ ᐱᐅᓂᖅᓴᖅᑯᑦ ᑭᓴᖅᑐᐃᓐᖅᓇᕐᑯᓗᒍ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑕᐅᑐᒐᖃᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐅᓐᓱᕆᔭᖃᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᓇᓄᕐᓇᕐᒪᖔᓂᒃ
- ᐊᖅᑭᓯᓇᓱᐊᕐᓗᓂ ᐸᕐᓇᒍᑎᒃ ᐱᑕᕈᑕᐅᔪᓇᕐᔪᖅᑐᒃ ᐅᑯᑎᒍᓇ ᓂᕐᔪᑎᑦ ᕐᑯᔪᓇᖅᑐᒥᑦᑕᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᖔᓂ (SARA)

What have we done?

- Formed a working group of stakeholders
- Prepared and reviewed an outline with IWAC in June 2014
- Developed a rough draft

ᑭᓯᓂᒃ ᐱᓕᕆᓯᒪᓕᖅᐱᑖ?

- ᐊᖅᑭᓯᓗᒍᑎᒃ ᐃᖃᓄᐃᔭᓗᒍᑎᒃ ᐱᓕᕆᖃᑎᒋᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᐱᖃᑎᒋᐅᖃᑕᐅᔪᓂᒃ
- ᐊᖅᑭᓯᐃᓗᓂ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᕿᒥᕐᔪᐅᓗᒍᑎᒃ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᓗᒍᑦᑐᐊᑕᖅᓯᒪᓂᖅᑦ ᐅᑯᓇᓂ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐆᒪᔪᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᓗ ᐅᖃᐅᔨᑎᐊᖅᑎᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᖕᒋᑦ (IWEAC) ᐋᓂ 2014-ᒥ
- ᐊᖅᑭᓯᓗᓂ ᐊᖅᑭᓯᖅᓯᒪᓗᐊᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅᑐᒥᒃ ᓱᕐᓚᓕᖅᑕᖅᓯᐅᑎᒥᒃ

What have we done?

- Consulted with all communities in the winter of 2015
- Revised and finalized a draft based on input
- Held regional meetings to review and improve draft and review management objectives in spring 2015
- An internal DoE review shortened and simplified

ᑭᓯᓂᒃ ᐱᓕᕆᓯᒪᓕᖅᐱᑖ?

- ᐊᐱᖅᓱᖅᑭᒃᓗᓂ ᐃᓗᓐᓇᓕᒻᒪᖔᑦ ᓄᓇᕐᓂᑦ ᐅᑭᐅᖕᒪᓂ 2015
- ᐊᖅᑭᓯᐊᓗᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐱᒃᓱᕐᓗᑦ ᓱᕐᓚᓕᖅᑕᖅᓯᐅᑎᑦ ᑐᖕᒪᓇᒋᓗᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᔭᐅᑦ
- ᐅᑦᑐᑦᑎᓂᖅ ᐊᒃᑐᖅᓯᒪᔪᒃ ᑲᑎᒪᑦᑎᓂᖅᒥ ᕿᒥᕐᔪᐅᓗᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐊᖅᑭᓯᖅᑕᐅᓗᑦ ᓱᕐᓚᓕᖅᑕᖅᓯᐅᑎᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᕿᒥᕐᓗᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᓗᑦ ᑐᕋᒐᓇᒋᔭᑦ ᐅᐱᖕᒪᖔᓂ 2015
- ᐃᖃᓄᐃᔭᖕᒐᓂ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᖅᑯᑦ ᕿᒥᕐᓗᑦ ᓇᐃᓕᑦᑎᖅᓯᒪᔪᒃ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐱᔭᖅᓂᖅᓱᑎᑦᑎᖅᓯᒪᔪᒃ

The NWMB Process

- Submitted to NWMB and they held a written hearing
- NWMB reviewed input received during written hearing and adjourned meeting
- Asked Minister to consider input received

ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᐆᒪᔪᓕᕆᔨᕐᔪᐊᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᖕᒋᓂᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖑᓂᖕᒋᑦ

- ᑐᓂᔭᐅᓗᑎᒃ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᐆᒪᔪᓕᕆᔨᕐᔪᐊᖃᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᖕᒋᓂᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐅᑦᑐᑦᑎᓚᐅᓂᖕᒋᓂᑦ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᓯᒪᔪᒃ ᐃᓚᓴᓂᖃᑎᑎᑎᓗᒍᑦ
- ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᐆᒪᔪᓕᕆᔨᕐᔪᐊᖃᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᖕᒋᑦ ᕿᒥᕐᓗᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᔭᐅᓯᒪᔪᒃ ᐱᔭᐅᓚᐅᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᓯᒪᔪᖅᒍ ᐃᓚᓴᓂᖃᑎᑎᑎᓗᒍᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᓄᖃᖅᒥᓗᒍ ᑲᑎᒪᓂᖅ
- ᒥᓂᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᓴᖅᑭᐅᑎᖃᓗᒍ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᔭᐅᓚᐅᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᐱᔭᐅᓚᐅᖅᑐᓂᑦ

1

Results of the review

- DoE reviewed all input
- Made some changes to text to reflect concerns
- Did not make other changes because it was contrary to what we heard and what we said

ᐱᔭᕇᕈᑎᖕᒋᑦ ᑭᒥᕐᕈᔭᐅᓂᖕᒋᑖ

- ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᕿᒥᕐᕈᓗᑎᒃ ᐃᓗᖅᓇᓕᒫᕐᒋᓂᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖅᓴᔭᐅᓚᐅᖅᑐᓂᑦ
- ᐊᓯᕈᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᑐᑦ ᑎᑎᕋᔭᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᑕᐅᕐᑯᓗᒋᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᓗᑕᐅᔪᑦ
- ᐊᔾᔨᒌᓂᑦ ᐊᓯᕈᐃᓚᐅᔾᔨᒌᑐᑦ ᐱᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ ᐊᕐᔫᑎᓚᐅᔾᔨᒌᒐᒋᑦ ᑐᔪᓚᐅᖅᑕᕐᑕ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᓇᓚᐅᖅᑕᕐᑕ

Changes to the draft

- Wanted more detail on climate change

ᐊᓯᕈᑕᐅᓂᖕᒋᑦ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᖅᐸᖅᓯᐅᑎᑦ

- ᐱᒃᑲᓂᕈᒪᓚᐅᕐᕿᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᒃᑐᓂᒃ ᓯᓚᐅᑦ ᐊᓯᔾᔨᕐᓂᖕᒪᓂᑦ

Changes to the draft

- Threats and Challenges is now two sections

ᐊᓯᕈᑕᐅᓂᖕᒋᑦ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᖅᐸᖅᓯᐅᑎᑦ

- ᓯᕗᕋᓇᕈᑎᔪᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᕆᓇᓱᒋᐊᓕᑦ ᒫᓐᓇ ᒪᕐᕈᐃᓕᖕᒐᓕᖕᒪᑕ ᑎᑎᕋᔭᓯᒪᓂᖕᒋᑦ

Changes to the draft

- Wanted industrial activity separated from tourism

ᐊᓯᕈᑕᐅᓂᖕᒋᑦ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᖅᐸᖅᓯᐅᑎᑦ

- ᐱᔪᒪᓚᐅᕐᕿᑦ ᓴᓇᕕᕐᑯᑎᕐᔪᐊᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᓂᖕᒋᓐᓂᑦ ᐊᕝᕗᑎᓯᒪᓗᑎᒃ ᐳᓚᕐᑐᓕᕆᓂᕐᒥᑦ

Changes to the draft

- Wanted changes to the wording of role of ECCC and PC

ᐊᓯᕈᑕᐅᓂᖕᒋᑦ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᖅᐸᖅᓯᐅᑎᑦ

- ᐱᔪᒪᓚᐅᕐᕿᑦ ᐊᓯᕈᓂᖕᒋᓐᓂᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖅᑕᖕᒋᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖕᒋᑦ ᐊᕐᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᓯᓚᐅᑦ ᐊᓯᔾᔨᖅᐸᓪᓕᐊᓂᖕᒐᓂᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ (ECCC) ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᒥᕐᖑᐃᖅᓯᕐᕕᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ (PC)

Changes to the draft

- Wanted references included

ᐊᓯᕈᑕᐅᓂᖕᒋᑦ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᖅᐸᖅᓯᐅᑎᑦ

- ᐱᔪᒪᓚᐅᕐᕿᑦ ᓇᓂᕐᑎᓯᖕᒋᑦ ᐱᖃᓯᐅᔭᐅᓯᒪᕐᑯᓪᓗᒋᑦ

1

Changes to the draft

- Wanted actions section more robust

ᐊᓯᕈᑕᐅᓂᖕᒋᑦ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᖅᐸᖅᓯᐅᑎᑦ

- ᐱᔪᒪᓚᐅᕋᑦᑕ ᐱᓕᕆᒋᐊᕈᑎᒃᓴᑦ ᑎᑎᕋᒃᓯᒪᓂᖕᒋᑦ ᓴᖕᒋᔫᓗᑎᒃ

Sample Action Table

Management Action	Priority	Timeline
Undertake a review of the sustainable removal rates for females	high	5 years
Tie revisions to the flexible quota system to ensure they are administratively feasible (revisions will switch to a 1:1 reduction in TAH the following year for overharvest, i.e. if one female is overharvested the reduction will be only one female the following year (if a female overharvest cannot be accommodated through credits or from the following year's TAH then regular flex quota reductions will apply; were male credits will go into the bank as opposed to being automatically available)	high	2 year
Expand and increase harvest biocharacteristics reporting (year, year review of research objectives	high	5 year
Improve handling of hides (aim: no 20.0% to ensure no loss in hide value	high	Ongoing
Ensure harvest reporting and sample submission in adequate to achieve goals	high	Ongoing
Develop a training program for Inuit in communities to establish an Inuit data collection program for hunter-killed and interviews and collection of polar bear bio characteristics	moderate	5 years

Changes to the draft

- Hired editors to reduce duplication and improve the draft for better reading

ᐊᓯᕈᑕᐅᓂᖕᒋᑦ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᖅᐸᖅᓯᐅᑎᑦ

- ᐃᖃᓇᐃᔭᓕᖅᑎᕋᑎᓗᑕ ᑎᑎᕋᒃᓯᒪᔪᓕᕆᔨᒋᒃ ᒥᑭᓂᖅᓴᐅᕋᓗᒋᑦ ᐊᔾᔨᒌᓗᐊᓂᖕᒋᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐱᐅᓂᖅᓴᐅᓕᖅᑎᒋᐊᕐᓗᒍ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᖅᐸᖅᓯᐅᑎ ᐅᖃᓕᒫᒐᕐᑎᐊᕙᐅᓂᖅᓴᐅᕋᓗᒍ

What we did not change

- Wanted more supporting science

Ldᓂᖕᒐᓕ ᐊᓯᕈᐃᓚᐅᖅᒋᓚᒍᑦ

- ᐱᔪᒪᓚᐅᕋᑦᑕ ᐃᑲᔪᖅᓯᐃᓂᖅᓴᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓇᓱᐊᑎᐅᓂᕐᒧᑦ

What we did not change

- Wanted more supporting science

Ldᓂᖕᒐᓕ ᐊᓯᕈᐃᓚᐅᖅᒋᓚᒍᑦ

- ᐃᓱᒫᓗᑕᐅᔪᓂᒃ Ldᓂᖕᒐ ᓂᕿᒃᓴᓂᒃ ᕿᒃᓂᒋᔭᐅᔪᑦ ᐊᑲᐅᖕᒋᓕᐅᕈᑕᐅᓂᖕᒋᓐᓂᑦ

What we did not change

- The fact that people see more bears in almost all areas

Ldᓂᖕᒐᓕ ᐊᓯᕈᐃᓚᐅᖅᒋᓚᒍᑦ

- ᓇᓗᓇᖕᒋᓐᓂᖕᒐᓄᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑕᑯᖃᑦᑕᓂᖅᓴᐅᓕᕐᒪᑕ ᓇᓄᕐᓂᒃ ᓇᒥᑐᐃᓐᓇᑲᔭᕐᑎᐊᖅ ᓄᓇᓂ

1

What we did not change

- The tone and intent, to develop a plan that better represents what Inuit see and believe

ᒪᑯᓂᖓᓕ ᐊᓯᕈᐃᓚᐅᖕᒋᓚᒍᑦ

- ᑐᑭᓯᓇᕐᓂᖓ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐱᓕᕆᔨᑕᐅᓇᓱᐊᕐᓂᖓ, ᐋᖅᑭᒃᓱᑯᓗᒍ ᐸᕐᓇᒍᑎᒥᒃ ᐱᐅᓂᖕᒐᒃᑯᑦ ᑭᒡᒐᖅᑐᐃᓗᓂ ᐃᓄᖕᓂᑦ ᑕᐅᑐᒐᕆᔭᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐅᒃᐱᕆᔭᐅᔪᓂᒃ

What we did not change

- Wanted more supporting science
- Concerns about meat caching as
- The fact that people see more bears in almost all areas
- The tone and intent, to develop a plan that better represents what Inuit see and believe

ᒪᑯᓂᖓᓕ ᐊᓯᕈᐃᓚᐅᖕᒋᓚᒍᑦ

- ᐱᔪᒪᓚᐅᕐᕿᑦ ᐃᑲᔫᖅᓱᐃᓂᖅᓴᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓇᓱᐊᕐᑎᐅᓂᕐᒍᑦ
- ᐃᓱᒪᓗᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᓂᕈᖅᓴᕆᔭᐅᓗᑎᒃ ᕿᓂᔭᐅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᐃᒪᒃᓇᐅᓗᓂ
- ᓇᓗᓇᕐᓂᖅᓴᓄᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑕᑯᕐᕿᑦᓂᖅᐅᓚᕐᒪᑕ ᓇᓄᕐᓂᒃ ᓇᒥᑐᐃᒃᓇᑲᔪᑎᐊᖅ ᓄᓇᓂ
- ᑐᑭᓯᓇᕐᓂᖓ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐱᓕᕆᔨᑕᐅᓇᓱᐊᕐᓂᖓ, ᐋᖅᑭᒃᓱᑯᓗᒍ ᐸᕐᓇᒍᑎᒥᒃ ᐱᐅᓂᖕᒐᒃᑯᑦ ᑭᒡᒐᖅᑐᐃᓗᓂ ᐃᓄᖕᓂᑦ ᑕᑐᒐᕆᔭᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐅᒃᐱᕆᔭᐅᔪᓂᒃ

Next Steps

- Ensure that the draft reflects what we heard and what we said during consultations
- Resubmit to the NWMB for approval
- Implement for the 2017-2018 Season

ᐱᖃᑖᓂ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖑᔭᕆᐊᓖᑦ

- ᑕᒪᒃᓇ ᓱᐅᓪᓕᖅᐸᖅᓱᐅᑎ ᓴᕿᑎᕿᑎᖑᓗᒍ ᑐᓴᓚᐅᖅᑕᕐᕿᑎᒃᓂᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᓚᐅᖅᑕᕐᕿᑎᒃᓂᑦ ᐊᐱᖅᓱᓂᖃᕿᑎᒃᓗᑕ
- ᑐᓂᔭᐅᖃᒃᓂᓕᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᐅᒪᔪᓕᕆᔨᓴᕐᓴᐅᖅᑯᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᓴᕐᓂᓄᑦ ᐊᕐᓴᖅᑕᐅᓴᑯᒃᓗᑦ
- ᐊᑐᓕᖅᑎᑕᐅᓗᑎᒃ ᑕᐅᕙᓂ 2017-2018-ᒥ ᐅᕈᐅᖅᑕᕐᓕᐊᖑᓂᖅᓴᓂ

Questions?

ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑏᑦ?

Thank you/ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒥᒃ