

## **BAFFIN BAY NARWHAL TOUR – WHAT WE HEARD**

### **CONTEXT**

The narwhal fishery in the Nunavut Settlement Area (NSA) is co-managed by Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO), the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board (NWMB), Regional Wildlife Organizations (RWOs), and Hunter and Trapper Organizations (HTOs), in accordance with the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement (NLCA), the *Fisheries Act* and its regulations, and in some communities, by local HTO hunting rules.

Co-management organizations work together on an on-going basis to provide for the conservation of narwhal stocks and populations and facilitate the implementation of a management regime consistent with the NLCA to demonstrate sustainable harvesting activities.

In March 2011, DFO invited representatives from the Hunters and Trappers Organizations (HTO) in all of the narwhal hunting communities and RWOs to attend one of six central consultation meetings to discuss our collective understanding of narwhal populations (using both Inuit and scientific information) and the process related to DFO's responsibilities under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) with respect to issuing export permits for narwhal tusks and products. These meetings occurred in late May 2011, in the communities of Clyde River, Pond Inlet, Arctic Bay, Resolute Bay, Igloolik, and Qikiqtarjuaq. HTO delegates from Pangnirtung and Hall Beach attended the meetings in Qikiqtarjuaq and Igloolik respectively.

In subsequent meetings, representatives of NTI, NWMB, Government of Nunavut (GN) and DFO agreed that in order to demonstrate sustainable narwhal harvest levels and effective management practices are in place, both domestically and internationally, an approved narwhal Management Plan needs to be developed and in place prior to January 2013 in preparation for the next meeting of the Conference of Parties to the Convention in the March 2013. The Management Plan, developed jointly with Inuit, will summarize the main objectives for sustainable narwhal co-management in the NSA, and the measures that will be used to achieve these objectives. The Management Plan will also set out the role of each of the co-management partners in ensuring that narwhal harvest levels are sustainable, and that products destined for export comply with both domestic and international trade requirements.

In August 2011, representatives of NTI, NWMB, GN, the RWOs and DFO met to discuss narwhal management issues and identified milestones for finalizing the Management Plan by January 2013. Partners agreed that to achieve this deadline, a Management Plan would be drafted over the coming months. The Management Plan would also include recommendations from co-management working groups tasked with addressing specific narwhal management issues. The draft Management Plan was discussed in December 2011 and February 2012 with co-management partners, and formed the basis of community consultation meetings held in March 2012.

Between March 19-31, 2012, officials from DFO, members of the three respective Regional Wildlife Organizations, along with observers from the GN-DoE, the NWMB, and NTI visited nine Nunavut communities on two concurrent tours (Baffin Bay Tour - Pangnirtung, Qikiqtarjuaq, Clyde River, Pond Inlet, Arctic Bay, Iqaluit; Northern Hudson Bay Tour - Repulse Bay, Kugaaruk and Grise Fiord) from. In addition, Hall Beach and Igloodik Hunters and Trappers Organization (HTO) delegates attended meetings in Kugaaruk and Repulse Bay. Cambridge Bay, Gjoa Haven, and Taloyoak HTO delegates attended meetings in Kugaaruk; Kimmirut and Cape Dorset delegates attended meetings in Repulse Bay. Although invited, due to inclement weather conditions, delegates from Resolute Bay, Arviat, Whale Cove, Rankin Inlet, Baker Lake, Chesterfield Inlet and Coral Harbour HTOs could not attend the meetings.

The primary objectives of the consultations were to:

- 1) Explain the increased national and international interest in how the narwhal fishery is managed and discuss the need to strengthen narwhal management and develop an Integrated Fisheries Management Plan (IFMP);
- 2) Discuss management issues in the narwhal fishery; proposed changes to narwhal management, as outlined in the draft IFMP; and operational procedures to implement the proposed changes, such as harvest reporting and tusk certification procedures;
- 3) Seek comments, perspectives, and traditional knowledge/expert opinions from Inuit harvesters and community members on narwhal management and the draft IFMP; and
- 4) Promote relationship-building and continued engagement between DFO and Inuit communities to be better prepared for the CITES meeting slated for the spring of 2013.

Three presentations were provided to each community. The first presentation was for the HTO Board, the second presentation was for the community members at large and the third was geared towards what the hunters needed to know. In some communities, it was agreed to combine the latter two meetings. Participants in all meetings were encouraged to share their views, provide comment, express any concerns they may have and share expertise related to the topics discussed.

Consultation meetings were well attended. Community members shared Inuit and local knowledge and expertise related to narwhal management and harvesting. The report summarizes “what we heard” during the consultation meetings.

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
Reasons to Make Changes to the Current Narwhal Management System	<p>-need to strengthen narwhal co-management consistent with Nunavut Land Claims Agreement (NLCA) provisions, available science and Inuit knowledge, and sustainable harvesting and international trade requirements (e.g. CITES)</p> <p>-development of an IFMP important to demonstrate sustainable harvesting prior to CITES export permits being issued, and in advance of the spring 2013 CITES meeting</p> <p>-DFO providing information on proposed changes to current narwhal management system; seeking Inuit views on current management issues, proposed changes to the narwhal management system and the development of an IFMP for narwhal in the Nunavut Settlement Area (NSA).</p> <p>-co-management organizations agree to jointly develop the IFMP</p>	<p><b>PANGNIRTUNG:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- General acceptance from the HTO that a management plan is needed for narwhal to defend the international trade of tusks.</li> <li>- There were many questions from community members about the role of CITES and their influence on the management process</li> </ul> <p><b>QIKIQTARJUAQ:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- General acceptance from the HTO and community that a management plan is needed for narwhal. Concerns with the IFMP related to old abundance estimate and not knowing how many whales the community will actually be able to harvest.</li> <li>- HTO members stressed the importance of harvesting for food; not for selling the tusk</li> <li>- Communities members were willing to work towards a better/good plan/ system because CITES meeting is fast approaching; some individuals would not like to have a plan until there is new surveys and accurate information</li> <li>- Several people indicated that hunting for food was more important than selling the tusks</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
		<p><b>CLYDE RIVER:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The HTO indicated that the current system manages whales well but, there is a willingness to develop a management plan.</li> <li>- The community indicated that whales are harvested mainly for sustenance, not for profit, and that not all tusks are sold</li> </ul> <p><b>POND INLET:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- General acceptance from the HTO that a management plan is needed for narwhal.</li> <li>- Discussion around the Community Based Management plan that was developed and how it served a similar purpose, locally</li> <li>- There were concerns and discussion that the IFMP presented seemed rushed</li> <li>- There were questions and concerns raised that CITES does not take IQ into consideration when making decisions.</li> <li>- There was discussion on how NDF decisions were made and how this affected trade of narwhal tusks</li> <li>- Community members indicated narwhal are important for food, but also as a source of income.</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
		<p><b>ARCTIC BAY:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was general agreement from the HTO on the need to manage narwhal and to develop a management plan. Community members indicated narwhal hunting practices have changed because now narwhal hunted not only for food, but to sell the tusks</li> </ul>
<p>Summering Stock Approach, Current Abundance Estimates, and Total Allowable Landed Catch (TALC) Recommendations</p>	<p>-DFO Science advice, which incorporates Inuit knowledge, to manage narwhal based on known summering areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- importance of managing at the smaller “stock” level</li> <li>-the need for updated abundance estimates for some stocks identified as a management issue in the fishery.</li> <li>-current abundance estimates and TALC recommendations for each stock/population.</li> </ul>	<p><b>PANGNIRTUNG:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Community participants did not express strong views on managing by summering stocks. There were some views that they should not need to be concerned about how many whales other communities within a management unit are harvesting.</li> <li>- HTO members expressed views that they would like a survey to be done right away and not wait until 2015. They wanted to see the survey plans based on different seasons and areas so that quota will not be lower.</li> </ul> <p><b>QIKIQTARJUAQ:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- HTO delegates agreed that the migratory information that DFO provided was accurate</li> <li>- The HTO and community members indicated Home Bay should be considered separate stock so that a quota could be established for those whales. Home Bay whales look different.</li> <li>- There was a view that Greenland hunters also harvest from many of</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
		<p>the same stocks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There were many views that the surveys are too old and the abundance estimates are wrong ; whale numbers are increasing; there is a need for more surveys; the TALC of 122 for East Baffin Island Management Unit is too small</li> <li>- There were several questions on how IQ is used in the surveys. Several people indicated that surveys should include Inuit participation and more IQ; the community would have liked the DFO science people to be at the meeting.</li> </ul> <p><b>CLYDE RIVER:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The HTO recognized that there were several stocks of narwhal that migrate past Clyde River in the spring and fall.</li> <li>- Community members indicated that narwhal may not migrate south as far as Iqaluit, mostly offshore and that more dark whales are seen by hunters</li> <li>- The HTO would like to see the surveys done in the wintertime when whales are in the polynyas and that Home Bay numbers need to be determined.</li> <li>- The HTO would like to see their quota increase.</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The community provided information around calving and calving areas; narwhal can calve anywhere and become pregnant any time.</li> </ul> <p><b>POND INLET:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was agreement for the need for updated abundance estimates</li> <li>- There were concerns expressed by HTO members that some decisions for the management plan are based on old scientific data. There was a recommendation that new research should be completed before recommending harvest levels</li> <li>- There was discussion by the HTO and the public that there are different stocks of narwhal that go by Bylot Island. There are separate stocks in Admiralty Inlet and Creswell Bay and Separate stocks go to Devon Island and Parry Channel Others thought that Clyde River and Pond Inlet are different stocks; there are “three or four” stocks in the High Arctic</li> <li>- It is generally understood that whales summering in Eclipse Sound are harvested elsewhere at different times of the year</li> <li>- The HTO and community generally thought there were fewer whales these days, and that the whales were different from previous years. A number of reasons were cited such as retreating sea ice, killer whales and development activities.</li> <li>- The HTO would like to see science surveying the High Arctic (Grise</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
		<p>Fiord) area</p> <p><b>ARCTIC BAY:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was a lot of discussion on narwhal management being based on surveys that are small snapshots which could be influenced by weather and other conditions/events</li> <li>- Participants agreed there are several stocks of summering whales but there were several comments stating that not all whales stay in the summering areas identified; there is some summer movement between areas;</li> <li>- There were a lot of questions on survey designs, and locations and the need for careful local input from the appropriate elders and narwhal experts.</li> <li>- There was a suggestion that Inuit elders should be included in the survey process to the fullest extent possible.</li> <li>- The community discussed a variety of factors that could impact the results of a survey such as the presence of killer whales, weather, natural variation, shipping traffic and exploration. The community encourages DFO to consider these factors in design and analysis.</li> </ul>



Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
Management Unit Boundaries and Communities within each Management Unit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- based on known summering areas for each narwhal stock/population, described six Management Units and their geographic boundaries</li> <li>-communities within each management unit and RWOs’ role</li> </ul>	<p><b>PANGNIRTUNG:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No specific issues were raised.</li> </ul> <p><b>QIKIQTARJUAQ:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Several people indicated the concept of boundaries is not part of the Inuit way and want to be able to hunt anywhere they want.</li> </ul> <p><b>CLYDE RIVER:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Community members raised concerns that harvesting will be restricted because hunters can only harvest within their management unit; Inuit should be able to harvest anywhere in Nunavut</li> <li>- Boundary limits could be established further north and not include Pangnirtung and Iqaluit because they harvest fewer whales.</li> </ul> <p><b>POND INLET:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No specific concerns related to proposed boundaries were identified by the HTO or the public</li> </ul> <p><b>ARCTIC BAY:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There were concerns about the migration map and that identifying boundaries does not follow IQ; animals do not stay within specific areas. Community members were against the establishment of boundaries.</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
Implementing Total Allowable Harvest (TAH), Basic Needs Level (BNL) and Community Harvest Limits, including harvest allocation model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-changes to strengthen harmonization with NLCA</li> <li>-harvest allocation under NLCA; from TAH, BNL and community harvest limits, including harvesting from mixed stocks and the need for seasonal harvest limits and conditions in some Baffin Bay communities</li> <li>-increased roles of RWOs and HTOs in harvest allocation</li> <li>-Harvest Allocation Model to inform decisions when harvesting from mixed stocks in spring and fall migratory periods to ensure that the total catch from each Baffin Bay stock does not exceed the sustainable harvest level.</li> <li>-overharvest of community quotas (some communities, some years) that could jeopardize conservation and ability to demonstrate sustainable harvesting is identified as a management issue</li> <li>-until a TAH is set the regulatory community quotas remain in effect.</li> </ul>	<p><b>PANGNIRTUNG:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Community members raised concerns that since Pangnirtung harvests from migrating whales, they may be issued fewer tags to harvest than the current quota once TAH is set.</li> <li>- The HTO indicated that with the current quota system, the community does not annually reach their quota. There is a system in place i.e. draw system when only a few tags left. The current quota system in Pang is working. Aware of over harvest in other communities but Pang manages its hunt well.</li> </ul> <p><b>QIKIQTARJUAQ:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Many community members recognized they were harvesting for several stocks</li> <li>- Some individuals were concerned that the quotas would be reduced by using the Harvest Allocation Model; they were not sure of the concept of sharing migratory whales from several stocks</li> <li>- Questions were raised on whether the community could harvest whales if another community harvests all of the allocation for that management unit.</li> <li>- Some members suggested that if hunters in some areas did not reach their quota, that Qik may want to hunt there.</li> <li>- There was discussion around how the seasons will established</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
		<p>including the effects of weather and the ability for hunters to go out.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some individuals said that sometimes overharvest occur because it is hard to control hunters without radios, but there was a recognition that it needed to be done.</li> </ul> <p><b>CLYDE RIVER:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The HTO indicated that the community hunt plan already divides whale harvest into spring and fall migratory quotas, and a summer quota.</li> <li>- HTO members were concerned that the TALC for East Baffin Island Management Unit would result in a quota reduction for their community.</li> <li>- The HTO indicated that the proposed changes, because of the mixed stock harvesting, is confusing.</li> <li>- Concern that sharing stocks may have one community harvest the full allocation before sharing communities has a chance to harvest.</li> <li>- There was discussion that if there is a quota set then the community should harvest until the quota is done. No need for colored tags.</li> </ul> <p><b>POND INLET:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Community members wanted clarification on how the allocation will</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
		<p>be shared between communities harvesting from the same Management Unit. They wanted to see the outputs from the allocation model. There were concerns from the public related to not knowing how many narwhal could be harvested at the time of the meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-</li> <li>- There were mixed views on whether quota changes were desired; some elders thought the current quota was adequate to meet community needs, while others thought a higher quota was needed.</li> <li>-</li> <li>- Questions were raised related to over-harvesting and how it would be dealt with.</li> <li>- There is recognition of a seasonal harvest, however there is concern with making decisions and setting limits ahead of time because the floe edge/open water split varies annually and ice conditions are changing. May not know enough at the time the decision is made to make well-educated decisions.</li> </ul> <p><b>ARCTIC BAY:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The HTO has a system in place for hunting, which sets out spring and summer hunts, and the allocation of Marine Mammal Tags.</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was general disagreement with the proposed seasonal component of the proposed management regime; there were concerns that the system of deciding dates ahead of time could be either dangerous by encouraging hunting in the fall if tags are left over or that hunters may lose the opportunity to hunt if conditions are bad. Both the HTO and community members would like to leave the system as is and leave the process to the HTO to open the spring hunt, and then the summer hunt</li> <li>- Some HTO members expressed satisfaction with the current quota because the quota meets the needs for the size of the community without promoting wastage or the need to export; others in the community would like to see increased harvest.</li> </ul>
Marine Mammal Tags	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-existing management measures (regulatory provisions) outlined</li> <li>- new management measures needed to address management issues and implement proposed changes</li> <li>- most communities would retain All-season Marine Mammal Tags; four communities would have seasonal Marine Mammal Tags (Summer and Migratory Marine Mammal Tags); HTOs to establish seasonal harvest dates; Marine</li> </ul>	<p><b>PANGNIRTUNG:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was little discussion on seasonal tags as this would not affect Pangnirtung</li> <li>- Some individuals did not support using the two tag system, and that it would burden the system</li> <li>- The HTO representative did not agree that hunters needed to be in possession of a Marine Mammal Tag prior to hunting. This would limit hunters’ ability to hunt opportunistically. There were also concerns with tags getting lost if hunters took them with them.</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
	<p>Mammal Tags can only be used in the management unit they were issued for.</p>	<p><b>QIKIQTARJUAQ:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There were several questions from community members on the seasonal tags, including whether summer tags could be used in the migratory period, and whether migratory tags could be used in both spring and fall.</li> <li>- Discussion of how will seasons will be set for communities with two color tags.</li> <li>- Several community members expressed concerns with the seasonal harvest limits and the two tag system; they would like to harvest more whales using the same tags that are used now. Changing to a seasonal harvest (open and closed times) may be problematic for hunters.</li> </ul> <p><b>CLYDE RIVER:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The ability of the community to harvest whales if another community harvests all of the allocation for that unit.</li> <li>- There was discussion on whether tags could be transferred between seasons.</li> <li>- Several community members expressed concerns with the seasonal harvest limits and the two tag system; they would like to harvest more whales using the same tags that are used now.</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
		<p><b>POND INLET:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some community members indicated that the current system works well now with spring and fall tags, and they didn’t think it needed to be changed; some thought it would be hard for the HTO to control harvesting with summer and migratory season tags.</li> </ul> <p><b>ARCTIC BAY:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The HTO and public were not in favour of the coloured tag system, would like to keep the old system.</li> <li>- There was a discussion with the HTO where, prior to DFO issuing Marine Mammal Tags, hunters only harvested what was needed and since the introduction of Tags, there is more emphasis on reaching the limit than harvesting only what is needed.</li> </ul>
Reducing Loss Rates	<p>-the need for reducing struck/loss rates is identified as a management issue in the fishery; sustainable harvesting concerns</p> <p>- existing management measures (regulatory provisions) to promote sustainable harvesting outlined</p> <p>-DFO asked whether other measures exist, such as community hunt rules, to reduce struck and lost narwhal</p>	<p><b>PANGNIRTUNG:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The HTO representative indicated that community hunt rules were in place for beluga, but was unsure if there were community hunt rules for narwhal; suggested that the community was more likely to follow local hunting rules</li> <li>- The HTO indicated that there were no problems with hunters using the appropriate rifles and ammunition to harvest efficiently</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
		<p><b>QIKIQTARJUAQ:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The HTO indicated that community hunt rules were in place.</li> <li>- The HTO indicated that they were no longer using the Community Based Management procedures, such as reporting struck/lost.</li> <li>- Community members discussed that although a whale may be struck and lost, another hunter may harvest the same whale later. The whale then is counted as struck and then harvested (same whale).</li> <li>- There was some discussion about the various types of ammunition and what is effective to kill humanely.</li> </ul> <p><b>CLYDE RIVER:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The HTO indicated that community hunt rules were in place.</li> <li>- Understood the HTO’s need for better struck and lost reporting</li> </ul> <p><b>POND INLET:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The HTO indicated that community hunt rules were in place and that DFO has provided the HTO with Struck/Loss reporting booklets in the past.</li> <li>- There were comments regarding how hunters are often embarrassed to report losses and that an anonymous means to report would encourage accurate reporting</li> </ul>



Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The HTO indicated that losses were lower in the past because hunters had to wait until the whales got closer to be able to strike; that whales are hard to catch, kill and land. With better equipment available, hunters continue to do the best they can to minimize losses.</li> <li>- The HTO indicated there was a need for further discussion on how to minimize losses and to teach the younger generation, and pass on knowledge.</li> </ul> <p><b>ARCTIC BAY:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The HTO indicated that reducing hunting losses is a priority and that community hunt rules are in place.</li> <li>- The HTO indicated that there are very stringent rules, procedures and gear requirements for young and inexperienced hunters</li> <li>- The HTO has procedures in place for harvesting during entrapment events to minimize loss/wastage</li> </ul>
Marine Mammal Tag Transfers	<p>-purpose and importance of Marine Mammal Tag transfer policy outlined</p> <p>- 3 phase approach</p> <p>-phase I details and community specific information provided (i.e.:</p>	<p><b>PANGNIRTUNG:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The HTO was supportive of a tag transfer policy and looked forward to the possibility of carry-overs.</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
	<p>Marine Mammal Tag transfers allowed within a management unit within a year for harvesting when stocks are not mixed, upon RWO pre-approval.</p>	<p><b>QIKIQTARJUAQ:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Community members discussed the system to be used to share tags or get tags from another community. They would like to see unused tags from other communities in the management unit be given to Qik.</li> <li>- There was discussion about how weather may determine the ability of hunters to harvest narwhal and what happens to the tags for that season if whales cannot be harvested.</li> <li>- There was discussion around what happens to a community’s quota if another community in the same management unit overharvests.</li> </ul> <p><b>CLYDE RIVER:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was discussion by community members around carry forward unused tags to the following year as a possibility.</li> <li>- The ability of hunters traveling to Arctic Bay is affected because they are in a different management unit.</li> </ul> <p><b>POND INLET:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The general consensus is that the current tag transfer system takes too long; there is general support by the HTO that the proposed new policy will be quicker and left to the RWO to decide.</li> <li>- Community members wanted to know how tags could be transferred</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
		<p>and if hunting in other communities were possible.</p> <p><b>ARCTIC BAY:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No specific issues regarding the proposed MMT transfer policy.</li> <li>- The public had questions and concerns about the possibility of using a local Tag to harvest in another management unit</li> <li>- There were questions from the public about carrying-over un-used Tags</li> </ul>
Harvest Reporting and Operational Procedures	<p>-timely accurate harvest reporting is essential and is identified as a management issue in the fishery</p> <p>-existing management measures (regulatory provisions) outlined</p> <p>-new operational procedures for reporting of harvested narwhal (without tusk, and with tusk); roles of HTO and RWO in harvest reporting</p>	<p><b>PANGNIRTUNG:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The HTO representative indicated that the HTO always keeps track of the number of whales that are harvested and stops hunting when the quota is reached.</li> <li>- HTO should know how to issue tags because outside agencies do not monitor narwhal hunts.</li> <li>- Community hunting rules assist with monitoring hunt i.e. as using draw system nearing end of quota.</li> </ul> <p><b>QIKIQTARJUAQ:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The need for harvest reporting to HTO is recognized by the community.</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Even with the tag allocation system that is used in the community, there is recognition there is a need for improvements in harvest reporting</li> </ul> <p><b>CLYDE RIVER:</b></p> <p><b>POND INLET:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was little discussion around harvest reporting, however there was some discussion around previously provided harvest reporting booklets and if the booklets would still be used.</li> </ul> <p><b>ARCTIC BAY:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No specific issues related to operational procedures rose.</li> </ul>
Tusk Traceability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-compliance concerns that pose risk to continued domestic and international trade in tusks outlined, and identified as a management issue in the fishery</li> <li>- existing management measures (regulatory provisions) outlined</li> <li>-new operational procedures for tusk certification to address issues; includes new attachment device to permanently attach the Marine Mammal Tag to the tusk.</li> </ul>	<p><b>PANGNIRTUNG:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was general acceptance that a tusk certification process would be beneficial.</li> <li>- Some issues were raised with respect to a Fishery Officer or Wildlife Officer not being in communities often enough</li> <li>- Community members wanted clarification as to at what point does a tusk no longer require a tag.</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
		<p><b>QIKIQTARJUAQ:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was general acceptance that a tusk certification process would be beneficial.</li> <li>- Community members raised a number of questions about the process for found tusks and whether or not a tag from the community allocation will be used and whether or not the tusk could be sold.</li> <li>- There was discussion about certification for tusks attached to the skull.</li> <li>- The HTO asked about the certification for tusks from entrapped whales.</li> </ul> <p><b>CLYDE RIVER:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was general acceptance that a tusk certification process would be beneficial.</li> <li>- Discussion about the process for found tusks and whether or not a tag from the community allocation will be used and whether or not the tusk could be sold.</li> </ul> <p><b>POND INLET:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was discussion around the issue of who will certify tusks when officers are not present in all communities</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was discussion around the possibility of the HTO having authority to certify tusks.</li> <li>- There was discussion about the process for found tusks and tusks harvested from an entrapment.</li> </ul> <p><b>ARCTIC BAY:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The community and HTO have an issue with respect to not having a Fishery Officer or Wildlife Officer in the community and that an alternative would need to be found</li> <li>- General agreement that a certification process would be beneficial</li> </ul>
Other Sections of the IFMP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-other sections of the IFMP (i.e.: traditional knowledge, importance of the fishery, objectives, habitat issues, other management measures to promote sustainable harvest practices)</li> <li>-annual community information booklets</li> </ul>	<p><b>PANGNIRTUNG:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monitoring by community is a challenge because if someone reports on another hunter, it is not viewed well.</li> </ul> <p><b>QIKIQTARJUAQ:</b></p> <p><b>CLYDE RIVER:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- HTO/community hunting rules keep hunters informed</li> </ul> <p><b>POND INLET:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The HTO currently manages the existing quota between the flow edge and open water. The hunt will be closed based on either number of whales harvested or safety.</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Shipping traffic and exploration activities are scaring narwhal away.</li> </ul> <p><b>ARCTIC BAY:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Shipping traffic and exploration activities are scaring narwhal.</li> </ul>
Other Inuit Knowledge and views		<p><b>PANGNIRTUNG:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Members expressed the view that Inuit hunting traditions, past and present, emphasize the principle of harvest what you need.</li> <li>- Harvest as quick as possible without more harm to the animal</li> <li>- Community knows their stock of whales.</li> <li>- If community is to enforce laws and or bylaws funding should be made available to cover those costs.</li> </ul> <p><b>QIKIQTARJUAQ:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There tends to be a focus on hunting bulls because of recommendations made by DFO.</li> <li>- Discussion around the fact that DFO recognizes IQ</li> </ul> <p><b>CLYDE RIVER:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Based on hunter’s experience, when there are too many whales, they</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
		<p>will fight each other for food.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Shipping traffic is possibly pushing narwhal further south from Pond Inlet.</li> <li>- Hunters see a lot of wounded narwhals coming from the Pond Inlet area</li> <li>- Ice development takes longer than before.</li> <li>- Handling narwhal is contrary to Inuit values.</li> <li>- Some narwhal have infections from tagging.</li> <li>- Discussion around mining and oil exploration and the effect on wildlife.</li> </ul> <p><b>POND INLET:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Community members felt that increase shipping traffic from mining and resource exploration is scaring animals away.</li> <li>- Handling narwhal/scientific tagging is contrary to Inuit ways.</li> <li>- The use of sonar scares animals away i.e. Milne Inlet. Both seals and whales left Milne Inlet</li> <li>- Discussion around what permits need to be in place to use sonar. HTO should be informed of such permitting. Consequences should be in</li> </ul>



Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
		<p>place if no permits are in place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Discussion around how Greenland manages their narwhal and whether it’s similar to Canada.</li> <li>- Discussion around Baffinland mining and the effects on wintering areas.</li> <li>- Concern that narwhal will go the way of the EU response to the seal hunt.</li> </ul> <p><b>ARCTIC BAY:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There were many comments about the process for development in the north; mining &amp; oil, exploration. Inuit do not want to risk animals for oil.</li> <li>- There were many comments around the use of sonar and the effects on narwhal.</li> <li>- There were many comments around the changing climate and how the ice is changing and hunters having to travel further from their known hunting areas to catch narwhal.</li> <li>- There were many comments about various narwhal stocks, including those that are shared with Greenland – differences in appearance, and distribution</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
	<sup>1</sup> see copies of presentations for further detail	