

NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD

MINUTES: REGULAR MEETING NO. 10

20 - 22 FEBRUARY 1996
IKALUKTUTIAK, NT

Members and Staff

Ben Kovic	Chairperson
David Igutsaq	Member
Gordon Koshinsky	Member
Joannie Ikkidluak	Member
David Aglukark	Member
Kevin McCormick	Member
Meeka Mike	Member
Marius Tungilik	Member
Jim Noble	Executive Director
Dan Pike	Director, Wildlife Management
Pierre Chartrand	Director, Finance and Administration
Michael d'Eça	NWMB Legal Advisor
Mary Nashook	Interpreter
Tommy Angotitauruq	Interpreter

Absent

Malachi Arreak	Member (with cause)
----------------	---------------------

Guests and other participants

Wilfred Wilcox	Mayor, Ikaluktutiak
James Eetoolook	Second Vice President NTI
Laurie Pelly	NTI, Ikaluktutiak
Gordon Spence	A/Wildlife Manager, NTI
George Angohiatok	Chairperson, KHTA
Brenda Jancke	JP, Ikaluktutiak
Robert Moshenko	DFO Winnipeg
Gary Weber	DFO Iqaluit
Kevin Lloyd	DRR Yellowknife
Ron Graf	DRR Yellowknife
John Stevenson	DRR Coppermine
Glenn Williams	DRR Iqaluit
Bruce Ashley	DRR Iqaluit
Eric Finlayson	Kennecott Canada Inc.

Tuesday, 20 February 1996

1. Call to Order and Opening Prayer

The Chairperson convened the meeting at 9:10 A.M. David Aglukark led the opening prayer. Ben Kovic welcomed the Mayor of Ikaluktutiak, Board members and guests to the 10th meeting of the NWMB. Ben welcomed and introduced Meeka Mike, the new/incoming Board member, appointed on the advice of DIAND in consultation with the GNWT. Ben noted that Meeka was originally from Pangnirtung, now resides in Iqaluit, and brings both technical and traditional knowledge to the Board.

2. Greetings from Community Representatives

His Worship Wilfred Wilcox, Mayor of Ikaluktutiak, welcomed the Board to his community. The Mayor thanked the Board for the invitation to speak and expressed his pleasure that the Board chose Ikaluktutiak for this meeting. The Mayor noted that community facilities were available, such as the curling club, tourist centre, arena, etc. The Mayor stated that renewable resources are very important to this region. The new meat/fish plant will provide a good solid opportunity for employment. Non-renewable resources such as mining are also important to the area, but must be exploited in harmony with the environment. The Mayor encouraged Board members to visit the new meat plant which is expected to open soon.

John Stevenson offered to make the arrangements if the Board was interested in touring the new meat plant.

3. Approval of Agenda

Jim Noble referred the Board to the new format for the meeting binders, with material arranged by numbered tabs.

It was agreed that the agenda be approved with the following amendments:

- Item 9.3.B deleted
- Item 9.1.E to follow 9.1.B
- Item 10 deleted as no Makivik representative present
- Item 9.6.C moved to Wednesday session
- Item 8. requested that polar bear biologist be present for this item
- Item 8. noted that item open to all members
- Item 9.4.H. deleted as Jerry Ell unable to attend **(Motion 96-073)**

4. Approval of Minutes

4.A,4.B,4.C It was agreed that the minutes of the Rankin Inlet meeting of 14 - 16 November 1995 and minutes of conference calls of 30 November and 18 December 1995 be accepted with noted corrections. **(Motion 96-074)**

5. Financial Reports

The Chairperson introduced Pierre Chartrand, the new Director of Finance and Administration for the Board. The addition of Pierre to the Administration Division has significantly freed up Jim Noble and Isabel Simpson for other work.

5.A Financial Statement: 31 January 1996

Pierre Chartrand reviewed the 31 January 1996 financial statement. He noted that DIAND approved the \$300,000 carryover to 1996/97 as requested by the Board. The 31 January 1996 financial statement was approved as presented. **(Motion 96-075)**

5.B TAL Investment Update

Pierre Chartrand provided a briefing note and statement on the Wildlife Research Trust Fund. Pierre noted that he had been requested to review the Trust and service charges for the Board. Pierre felt that there was a very good return on the Fund, with its emphasis on security. He noted that the TAL service fees were approximately \$40,000 per year, and felt that this was reasonable. Members questioned other items regarding the Fund and its operation. Kevin McCormick suggested that the Board consider the February and August meetings as appropriate times to hold Trustee's meetings concurrently.

5.C Wildlife Trust Registration/Policy Update

Pierre Chartrand provided a brief status report on the registration of the Trust and development of a policy, noting that these items were being finalized with Michael d'Eça's assistance. Pierre undertook to provide all Board members a signed copy of the Trust Deed.

5.D FIDDIPI

Pierre Chartrand provided a briefing note and work sheet to describe the FIDDIPI. He noted that the adjustment was smaller for FY 1993/94 because the contribution agreement was calculated for the period 9 July to 31 March, a total of only 275 days. Kevin McCormick questioned whether the Harvest Study

shortfall of \$1,376,000 had been committed in any way. Gordon Koshinsky noted that the carry-over is already decreasing by more than a million dollars per year and this should be discussed in a “strategic planning” context. Pierre Chartrand noted that the figures include a one-time special RWO/HTO payment in 1995/96. Pierre projected a \$3,241,000 carry-over for the 1995/96 fiscal year.

5. E 1995/96 Staff Salary Adjustment Schedule

This item was moved to an in camera session.

5. F 1996/97 Budget Review/Approval

Pierre Chartrand reviewed the 1996/97 preliminary budget proposal which totalled \$4,999,821. Marius Tungilik suggested that there should be more training emphasis in the budget. Gordon Koshinsky suggested the communications plan will need its own budget. Jim Noble advised that two of the RWOs have asked for bigger budgets for 1996/97, and asked if the Board would consider these requests. Kevin McCormick suggested that the Board maintain the status quo on RWO funding until after the Strategic Planning Workshop. In light of these additional expenses the Board decided to approve the 1996/97 budget at \$5.3 million, this to be the basis for the 1996/97 contribution agreements. **(Motion 96-076)**

5.G Strategic Financial Planning

Pierre Chartrand indicated that the Board will have to make some important decisions on various items before proper budgeting can occur. Because the budget is the organizational plan expressed in dollars, the Board will need to develop good sub-plans for such matters as communications, training, and research. Pierre suggested that this would be appropriate material for a “Strategic Planning” workshop. Marius Tungilik agreed that this workshop should focus on a few such items, and should be held sometime in April. An outside facilitator might be able to identify approaches and items that the Board had not considered. Gordon Koshinsky suggested that it might be useful to revisit the January 1994 “White Binder” provided by the Implementation Panel. David Aglukark favoured a workshop format for strategic planning, similar to the earlier Lake Harbour and Winnipeg workshops. Ben Kovic noted that the Department of Renewable Resources has requested a workshop similar to that held previously with DFO. Perhaps this could be included with a more general strategic planning workshop. David Aglukark suggested that he would like more interaction with the Board’s legal advisor, possibly during the proposed workshop.

The Board discussed the possibility of holding the workshop in Winnipeg but finally decided to hold it in Yellowknife the week of April 15. **(Motion 96-077)**

6. Incoming/Outgoing Mail

Mail logs for incoming and outgoing were provided along with the mail binders.

7. Chairperson and Staff Reports

7.A Chairperson's Report

7.A.1 Canada Greenland Joint Commission Meeting

Ben Kovic noted that this was his first meeting as a CGJC Commissioner. Greenland is trying very hard to introduce more protective management measures. The Scientific Working Group is concerned that High Arctic beluga may be overharvested. The Commission (both countries) tends to concur. Greenland has banned some drive-hunting, but too late for 1995. The NWMB needs to decide if they are going to reduce High Arctic beluga hunting by pursuing community consultation, etc. There is less concern about narwhal in the High Arctic. There was some discussion on whether walrus should be brought under the Commission's mandate. No Commission meeting is planned for 1996; this will allow time for the proposed work/studies on High Arctic beluga. Kevin McCormick questioned whether a beluga management plan is being considered. It was noted that the question of stock discreteness must be resolved first. Marius Tungilik questioned whether the Scientific Working Group takes account of Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK). Ben Kovic replied that Greenlanders recognize the value of TEK, but that Canada may be ahead of Greenland in collection and utilization of this information. Dan Pike added that some specific studies of TEK have been conducted. Gordon Koshinsky suggested that the NWMB should request that Dan Pike be made a permanent member of the Scientific Working Group. Marius Tungilik added that the Board should consider requesting the Commission to create a Traditional Ecological Knowledge Working Group.

7.A.2 Fisheries Resource Conservation Council Meeting

Ben Kovic attended this meeting as an observer. Ben was asked to speak on traditional fishers' knowledge. Interest was expressed, incidentally, in HTO and RWO roles and how they operate, perhaps with a view to establishing something similar "down south." Ben was asked if the NWMB might consider becoming a full member of FRCC; a letter of invitation is expected.

Marius Tungilik suggested that the pros and cons of FRCC membership should be seriously evaluated before accepting. The Board might dilute its position by

becoming a full member of such bodies. Michael d'Eça referenced NFA 15.3.2: the NWMB... "shall appoint appropriate representation"..depending on how FRCC is interpreted. Membership would not affect NWMB's jurisdiction. Robert Moshenko noted that DFO is looking for advice from NWMB on who/how to consult on commercial fisheries: is it the Board or is it the fishing industry? Michael d'Eça suggested that NFA 15.3.4 may be relevant. Gary Weber suggested that the Board would be concerned with fishery management but is not necessarily the agency to represent industry.

7.A.3 Bowhead Workshop

Ben Kovic advised that the Bowhead Workshop was conducted 9-11 January 1996. The workshop was very successful, educational and historical. At the time of the workshop it was not known if the DFO Minister would accept the Board's TAH decision for harvest of a bowhead whale. There was also some concern on account of the recent change in Ministers. Ben invited the three Inuit Associations (only one attended), plus the RWOs, DFO and the NWMB to the workshop. The workshop appointed a Hunt Planning Committee. Two possible areas (Foxe Basin and Cumberland Sound) were considered for the hunt. It was decided that Foxe Basin would be the area of the first (1996) hunt. It was then decided that the extreme southwest corner of Foxe Basin (Duke of York Bay) would be the actual location. Repulse Bay was identified as the alternate location, depending on weather and ice conditions. The information from the Bowhead Knowledge Study was reviewed and discussed. Kitikmeot delegates participated in the decision-making process. It was agreed that the first strike would be made with traditional methods. The first strike will be to mark the bowhead, and to declare a re-claiming of the traditional activity. Consideration was given to killing the whale with lances, however this was repudiated in the end, as not sufficiently humane. Ben noted that there will be mandatory requirements for safety and survival.

David Aglukark noted that some local elders (Coral Harbour and Repulse Bay) have different ideas than were expressed in Iqaluit regarding the location and first strike methodology. David suggested that the Board wait for the first meeting of the Hunt Planning Committee before making a decision on the location of the hunt. David Igutsaq and Joannie Ikkidluak disagreed, stating that it is the Board's responsibility to announce the hunt location as all of Nunavut has an interest/stake in the hunt. Public interest in the matter is high.

Swearing-in Ceremony for Meeka Mike

Commissioner for Oaths, Brenda Jancke of Ikaluktutiaq, conducted the swearing-in ceremony for Meeka Mike. Chairperson Ben Kovic officially welcomed Meeka to the Board. Ben noted that Meeka will be working for the people of Nunavut and does not represent DIAND or any one organization.

7.A.4 Makivik's Offshore Negotiation Workshop

Ben Kovic advised that he had attended the Makivik Offshore Negotiation Workshop in Montreal during January. Michael d'Eça, Lois Leslie and Gordon Spence also attended. There was so much frustration against DIAND that effective negotiation was not possible. Makivik negotiators consider it possible that without a claim, the federal government will pass authority for them to the Nunavut Government (and/or that the NWMB might be given authority in northern Quebec up to the high-water mark). David Aglukark questioned whether there is a negotiation process underway, with specific items. Michael d'Eça noted that Makivik wants something like the NWMB, but the Government is very reluctant due to funding cutbacks and restraint measures. David Aglukark warned that Nunavut must ensure that Article 40 is not re-opened to NWMB's disadvantage. Michael d'Eça noted that for overlap areas, it will get opened up if/when Makivik gets an offshore agreement. Marius Tungilik questioned the role of the NWMB at the workshop, and whether the NWMB is to be a party to the negotiations. Ben Kovic replied that the NWMB is not really in a position to negotiate, except in respect to overlap areas. Ben felt the Board was invited more on account of its experience. Marius Tungilik suggested that the Board should be careful not to get involved in something for which the Board is not prepared. Marius questioned how the Board would relate to NTI on this issue. Ben Kovic noted that Lois Leslie (NTI) was with him throughout the meeting, apparently to the considerable surprise of DIAND. Gordon Koshinsky suggested the Board be cautious about taking on extra work without extra resources.

7.A.5 Minister's Response to Bowhead Quota

While waiting for the response from the Minister, Ben Kovic canceled going to the Kuujuaq Hunters and Trappers Annual General Meeting. The Minister finally responded on the 59th day. The letter accepted the allocation of one bowhead, and also posed some questions, mainly on the location of the hunt.

7.A.6 Area 0 - Turbot/Shrimp Conference Call

Ben Kovic noted that a conference call was held with DFO officials to discuss items for the upcoming meeting (25 March 1996 in Ottawa) with Greenland officials regarding turbot and shrimp quotas.

It was suggested that Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board (Jerry Ell) might be the group to represent Nunavut Inuit. The NWMB however will retain its over-riding status. Michael d'Eça noted that NFA 5.9.2, 15.3.5 and 15.4.1 deal with Inuit representation in such meetings.

7.B Executive Director's Report

7.B.1 Staffing Actions

Jim Noble advised that interviews for the three Regional Liaison Officer positions will be conducted the week of 26 February in Iqaluit. Nine candidates will be interviewed for the three positions.

7.B.2 RWO/HTO Policy and Procedures

Jim Noble informed the Board that Michael d'Eça had provided a draft Policy and Procedures Manual to the three RWOs. The QWB had reviewed the material and provided all HTO chairmen with a copy to review in their respective communities in Baffin. KWF and KHTA should be responding shortly.

7.B.3 Meetings

Jim Noble noted that he had met DIAND (Implementation Branch) officials with Pierre Chartrand and Michael d'Eça to discuss Board operation and budgeting. Jim Noble and Carol Churchward had attended a Keewatin Wildlife Federation meeting in Rankin Inlet and provided a report on Board activities and an update on the Harvest Study.

7.C Wildlife Management Director's Report

Dan Pike advised that he had been supervising the Harvest Study and Bowhead Traditional Knowledge Study. Dan assisted the Chairperson in preparing for and conducting the Bowhead Workshop in Iqaluit. The first meeting of the SEBB Committee was held in Iqaluit with Dan's assistance. Dan also attended the Polar Bear Technical Committee meeting in Quebec City 31 January through 2 February.

Dan advised that he had continued to work on the Igloodik walrus sport hunt and referred to Agenda item 10.E. Attention was directed to dealing with Atlantic fisheries issues, especially the role of the Board further to the workshop with DFO. Dan advised that he has drafted a process for setting the basic needs levels for beluga, narwhal and walrus (Agenda item 10.D). Assistance was provided in preparation and conduct of interviews regarding the three Regional Liaison Officer positions.

Dan noted that he will start work on a new "Open File System" for data as per NFA 5.2.3.7 and 5.2.3.8. He also proposes to work on a method for establishing research priorities and a process for research licensing in conjunction with the Nunavut Science Institute. Finally, Dan mentioned that he will start to develop a proposal for a Traditional Knowledge Study for SEBB. Kevin McCormick asked if there was a need to streamline the process for research proposals. Dan replied that only one proposal was received by the due date and suggested that the Board will have to be more firm about this in future. Gordon Koshinsky suggested that a warning should be incorporated in

the letters which will be going out to advise Departments of the status (acceptance/rejection) of current proposals. Marius Tungilik suggested that the Board be hard-nosed about this matter. The Chairperson and Executive Director suggested that a similar rule should apply to “all” submissions to the Board. Michael d’Eça suggested that the Board may want to include an “out” for unusual circumstances.

8. Member’s Reports/Concerns

8.A David Igutsaq

8.A.1 Polar Bear Management Agreement Meetings

David Igutsaq questioned why the Polar Bear Biologist had not visited Taloyoak as promised. David suggested that the M’Clintock Channel/Gulf of Boothia Polar Bear Zone boundaries run too close to the communities of Taloyoak and Pelly Bay. This boundary is causing hard feelings with the GNWT and between the communities. David also noted that the communities are expecting sport hunters this spring. John Stevenson replied that Polar Bear Biologist Mitch Taylor is planning to consult in these communities during March. David Igutsaq responded that the end of March would be too late. David also noted that there is a lingering concern that Government is not being responsive to the people.

8.A.2 Polar Bear Cub Regulations

David Igutsaq noted that many hunters have seen many polar bears with cubs. The communities would like to use some tags for cubs and this issue will need to be considered by both DRR and the NWMB.

8.A.3 Muskox Hunting Zones

David Igutsaq stated that Pelly Bay would like to pursue a subsistence muskox hunt at Sheppard Bay. There are hardly any muskox in the currently-designated muskox-hunting zone and David questioned if the zone regulations could be changed.

John Stevenson replied that a regulation change has been submitted to move the current zone eastward to include part of Sheppard Bay and that this regulation should be in effect shortly.

8.A.4 Sheppard Bay Area Survey Reports

David Igutsaq stated that reports from the July/August caribou/muskox surveys of the Sheppard Bay area had not been reported to all communities. John Stevenson replied that he had briefing notes with him at the (present) meeting,

which outlined the results of the surveys. These results are currently being presented to the communities.

8.A.5. Boothia Peninsula Muskox Quota Increase

David Igutsaq advised that Taloyoak hunters are concerned about the increasing numbers of muskox in the area. David noted that the HTA has requested (DRR, KHTA, NWMB, MLA) for five additional tags because the hunters know that when muskox increase, the caribou decrease. John Stevenson replied that DRR introduced a quota on Boothia a couple of years ago, without survey information. Last year's survey reported eighty animals and it seems likely that a request for additional tags could be supported if it were formally brought forward. Michael d'Eça noted that virtually all the concerns David Igutsaq identified fall within the jurisdiction of the NWMB, although liaison with DRR is clearly appropriate and necessary.

9. New Business

9.1 Canadian Wildlife Service (DOE)

9.1.A Migratory Bird Sanctuary Permits

Kevin McCormick asked for the Board's opinion on CWS past policy for permitting entry into migratory bird sanctuaries. Kevin asked whether it was appropriate for CWS to continue issuing these permits. Michael d'Eça questioned whether this would fall into the domain of NIRB and/or NPC when they become fully established. Dan Pike questioned whether it was a function of the NWMB even to recommend on a matter of this type.

Kevin McCormick stated that CWS brought this topic forward on the supposition of needing to consult the NWMB on legislation globally, similar to what was done in respect to the Canada Oceans Act and the Endangered Species Protection Act.

Gordon Koshinsky supported the continuation of such a permitting process, but questioned how and by whom it should be done. Ben Kovic noted the process should incorporate a consultative aspect. The Board decided to endorse the concept of continued permitting by DOE for access to Migratory Bird Sanctuaries. **(Motion 96-078)**

9.1.B Queen Maud Bird Sanctuary

Kevin McCormick noted that protection against mining was a driving factor for establishing the Queen Maud Bird Sanctuary in 1961. In 1990 a document was produced which reviewed the status of all sanctuaries in the NWT. CWS is now

recommending decreasing the boundaries of this sanctuary; this would require NWMB approval. The Board decided that the matter would be pursued more appropriately in an overall land-use-planning context. Kennecott Canada Inc. was issued an exploration permit in part of the area last year. CWS indicated (then) that a mine would not be appropriate. Discussion ensued around the concept of changing the sanctuary into a National Wildlife Area. Gordon Koshinsky stated that he was prepared to support re-designation, pending local consultation. The Board decided to endorse the concept of re-designating the Queen Maud Bird Sanctuary as a National Wildlife Area. **(Motion 96-079)**

9.1.C Endangered Species Legislation

Kevin McCormick noted that the draft Endangered Species legislation was under review and the NWMB has opportunity to present its views regarding the NWMB role and interest in the proposed legislation. It was agreed that Michael d'Eça will take the lead in preparing a submission to reflect the NWMB perspective.

9.1.D Nunavut Updates

A draft Eider Research Strategy was tabled for information.

9.1.E Kennecott Canada Inc.

Eric Finlayson, Exploration Manager for Kennecott Canada Inc., explained that Kennecott conducted an exploration program in Queen Maud Bird Sanctuary in 1995 and would like to continue in 1996. They believe that specific portions of the sanctuary can be explored without compromising wildlife. Nickel-copper mineralization in the Perry River area has been known since the 1940s. The sources of the nickel-rich rocks which have been found remain unknown. Kennecott surveyed the area in 1995 for three weeks (after the nesting season) and confirmed high copper/nickel potential.

Exploration permits have already been granted by DIAND for the 1996 season but they still need an entry permit from CWS. Kevin McCormick explained that exploration activity can probably be adequately managed, but a mine at the end of the process would not likely be so manageable. David Aglukark noted that the area being explored by Kennecott is not in the area which DOE wishes to re-zone. Marius Tungilik suggested that NIRB would have a role in this development. Eric Finlayson suggested that this would come later as the current work is non-intrusive. Michael d'Eça indicated that if it can be considered a project proposal, then NIRB, NPC, etc. will be involved when they become official bodies. Michael noted that habitat protection is a legitimate part of the NWMB's jurisdiction, but not in a leadership sense. Marius Tungilik questioned if there had been any regional/local consultation to this point. Kevin replied that

there had been no consultation yet. The NPC Transition Team want to do all the consulting in the context of overall land-use plan development. Kevin advised that the present CWS position is to not issue an access permit to Kennecott for 1996.

9.2 Department of Fisheries and Oceans

9.2.A Sport Derby Licensing

The NWMB letter to Roger Peet, DFO A/Area Manager (18 December 1995) has had a reply. DFO will, effective this coming spring, delete the requirement for sport derby licensing of Inuit. There may be some revenue-loss implications for the GNWT.

9.2.B Licensing - General

Gary Weber noted that some articles in the NFA seem contradictory. DFO is proposing to take the matter to their legal advisors, in order to develop an overall, comprehensive, legal approach. Whatever position results, DFO will need to have concurrence of NTI and the NWMB prior to implementing. David Aglukark questioned what articles of the NFA are contradictory. Gary explained that NFA 5.6.1 allows an Inuk "to harvest ...to the full level of his/her needs." The question is, what is "full level of needs"? Section 5.6.4 mentions that any restriction in place stays in effect until changed by the NWMB. However, many Fisheries Act applications are being challenged, even though they were in effect when the NFA was signed. Another example is Section 5.7.30 which states that an Inuk has the right "to dispose freely of any wildlife legally harvested." This item conflicts with the requirement for licenses expressed elsewhere in the NFA.

David Aglukark noted that in the Inuit point of view, support of the family is the key consideration, not (for example) support for 60-foot longliners. The primary perspective of the Agreement is self-subsistence, not money-making. Ben provided the example that, under NFA 5.6.1, a fisherman might be able to go to Resolution Island and fish 100 MT of shrimp within the 12-mile zone for economic purposes, then fish another 100 MT for cultural purposes. David Aglukark reiterated that Inuit negotiators approached this only in the context of providing for household needs.

Michael d'Eça noted that the NFA 5.6.1 does identify some restrictions, e.g. any restriction or quota which was in place stays in place (until changed by NWMB), and binds Inuit, and there are also "laws of general application". Section 5.6.4. is straight forward. Section 5.7.26 provides that there will be no licence, permit, fee or tax. Michael suggested that DFO should proceed cautiously on this clarification exercise. Others (e.g. NTI) may want to retain certain ambiguities. It may not be DFO's business to seek clarification of items such as Section 5.6.4.

Ben Kovic noted that NTI is developing I.D. cards for Inuit. Gary Weber noted that people are catching fish and selling them without a commercial licence. Crown prosecutors are not taking such cases on. Some beneficiaries are challenging the law on the basis of interpreting the focus of the NFA differently than David Aglukark does.

9.2.C Turbot Allocation/Summary of Harvest

Gary Weber announced that 1995 was the first year in which some of the 1,000 MT Inuit inshore allocation was used outside the Pangnirtung winter fishery. Broughton Island fished 109 MT. Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board had two allocations; one fished by a Japanese vessel landed 63 MT while Russian and Faroese vessels landed 343 MT. The Pangnirtung winter fishery landed 285 MT for a 1995 combined total of 800 MT. Ben Kovic noted that the 1996 allocation will depend on Canadian negotiations with Greenland.

9.2.D Integrated Management Plans for Fisheries

Robert Moshenko advised that DFO is committed (Nationally) to the process of management plans. This concept is not new to the Central and Arctic Region. The NWMB has most of the management jurisdiction in this area. Management plans are one component of sound management technique. Robert noted that the work of DFO in the NSA is basically to help the NWMB to manage wildlife and to respond to NWMB needs and priorities. DFO is committed to compiling information for these proposed management plans by 31 March 1996. (See letter to NWMB, 28/12/95). Approximately seventy-one requirements for management plans have been identified across the NWT. DFO is developing a Fishery Management Plan Background Document for each. Robert noted that the Inuvialuit and G'wichyn are happy about this initiative. Kevin McCormick noted that the NWMB is mandated to approve management plans, not to develop them as suggested by DFO.

Kevin sees it as an endorsement process, rather than a hands-on process, as per NFA 5.2.34(d). In actuality, even approving management plans is listed as a discretionary function of the Board under the NFA, albeit the NWMB has decided to take it up. Robert suggested that if the NWMB is of this opinion, it should so indicate in its response to the DFO letter of 28 December. Robert further advised that by the year 2000, there will be 40% less DFO staff/resources active in the Nunavut area. Marius Tungilik noted that he liked the management planning initiative, but could not see the NWMB participating very actively in development of such plans.

9.2.E Nunavut Fishery Updates

DFO provided a summary of departmental activities in the NSA. Kevin McCormick and David Aglukark stated that these summaries are very helpful and requested that DFO continue to provide them.

Wednesday, 21 February 1996

Joannie Ikkidluak led in the Opening Prayer.

9.3 Department of Renewable Resources

9.3.A Nunavut Updates

Ron Graf noted that the Minister had accepted an award from Safari International for polar bear management work being conducted in the NWT.

9.3.B Cornwallis Island Muskox Harvest

Ron advised that a harvest permit was issued, with 5 of 10 tags filled. Animals harvested were in poor physical condition. Ron noted that a recent request had been made for 10 more tags for a small island south of Cornwallis Island.

9.3.C Wolverine Studies

This project was partially funded by the NWMB. Radio collar tags applied "in the wild" last year did not work. More testing will have to be completed on captive animals before a second attempt is considered. Other work continues on this project.

9.3.D Thelon Game Sanctuary

Ron noted that Lutsel K'e withdrew its participation in the negotiations, an unfortunate turn of events.

David Aglukark suggested that a letter should be drafted to DRR, suggesting that negotiations carry-on without Treaty 8 representation.

9.3.E Qamanirjuak Commercial Caribou Tags

Ben Kovic noted that the BQ Caribou Management Board is deferring the Chesterfield Inlet request for commercial tags because it expects two more communities to make similar requests. There was some discussion on how the

two Boards (NWMB and BQCMB) will mesh their caribou management activities.

9.3.F Southampton Island Caribou

Ron noted that there will be a commercial harvest during the spring of 1996.

9.3.G Canine Distemper at Gjoa Haven

Ron noted that 30 dogs had died in Gjoa Haven. Vaccine was distributed for both distemper and rabies, and most dogs have been vaccinated. Hopefully the outbreak has been stopped, much earlier than previous outbreaks.

9.3.H Bear Gall Bladders/Paws Issue

Ron noted that it is legal to sell bear gall bladders in the NWT as long as the bear has been harvested legally and has a tag. Two other provinces still allow this also; however many jurisdictions are totally against this trade continuing.

9.3.I Protecting Caribou Calving Grounds

Ron noted that a meeting was held in Yellowknife to discuss methods of protecting caribou calving grounds.

9.3.J Request for Sport Hunt of Caribou - Southampton Island

Ron noted that a regulation change was requested by Coral Harbour to permit sport hunting of caribou. The Board decided to support this request.

Motion 96- 080

9.4 Nunavut Wildlife Management Board

9.4.A Donations Policy

Marius Tungilik read his discussion paper on a draft Donations Policy.

Ben Kovic advised that Malachi Arreak had suggested an amount of \$50,000/annum for all donations combined. Kevin McCormick suggested that donations are considered as small amounts; larger amounts would be considered grants. In this context approval for donations could be delegated to the Executive Director. David Aglukark noted that other agencies (e.g. ITC) provide scholarships. As an Institution of Public Government, NWMB scholarships would need to be open to anyone. Michael d'Eça suggested that it might be best to break donations into categories with different guidelines for

different amounts. The policy might need to include a listing of different types of projects that would be considered. Board members were requested to review the draft policy and submit their comments to Marius by mid March.

9.4.B Communications Plan/Policy

Gordon Koshinsky tabled a draft Communication Plan. David Aglukark noted that there is a lingering question regarding Board members attending HTO meetings. Many HTOs/RWOs are complaining that the NWMB is not attending their meetings. Ben Kovic noted James Eetoolook's statement that NTI appointee(s) to NWMB are not answerable to NTI. Ben questioned whether this would be the same for other DIO members. Michael d'Eça referred to Section 5.2.3 which states that an appointing DIO has the right to send a technical advisor to NWMB meetings. Presumably such advisors would have a role to report back to the appointing agency. Kevin McCormick suggested that the Procedures Manual covers it off in terms of policy. The question arose whether the items in the draft policy are operationally feasible. Marius Tungilik noted several areas of concern in this regard. As an institution of public government, the Board must keep all records open to the public. The Board should be reviewing press releases before they are released. Michael d'Eça noted that "Press Releases" are covered in the Procedures Manual. Meeka Mike questioned whether there is a need for recognition of third-party communication obligations (e.g. by researchers). The Board decided that all members should review the draft and provide comments to Gordon Koshinsky by mid March.

9.4.C Southeast Baffin Beluga Management Committee

Joannie Ikkidluak advised that the Committee met for the first time 7-8 February 1996. It was aimed to have the same people participating as participated in the former committee. Joannie noted that the meeting went well, but not all recommendations are easy to implement. Hunters still consider this a very high priority issue. A press release was issued after the February meeting. Dan Pike noted that this Committee is deemed as a subcommittee of the NWMB. Dan noted that the quota adjustments should be submitted for legislation change.

DFO has done quite a bit of recent research, especially on stock discrimination. The Committee wants to focus on research for the next meeting. They would also like to see more TEK done. A summary/poster would be useful, as an educational tool. David Aglukark noted that TEK has consistently indicated that the stock is not declining. DFO still seems to indicate the opposite, and that quotas are needed. Joannie noted that the problem started in/at Pangnirtung, however DFO brought in Iqaluit and Kimmirut automatically. Hunters are happy with the present situation and quotas. David Aglukark questioned DFO's plans: would the quotas remain at 35? Dan Pike advised that DFO is on the Committee, and that the quota is no longer 5 per community. However by the

present process DFO has to vary the quotas, on advice from the NWMB, on an annual basis. Gordon Koshinsky noted that certain tasks identified in the original committee's report have to be completed by 1999. Ben Kovic suggested that research required on this stock should be a priority of the Board. A motion was passed to have the Fisheries Regulations on beluga quotas amended for Pangnirtung, Iqaluit and Kimmirut. **(Motion 96- 081)**

9.4.D Canada - Greenland Joint Commission: High Arctic Beluga

Ben Kovic advised of a possible requirement to consult with the High Arctic communities regarding possible beluga quotas in the future. David Aglukark suggested that the NWMB should wait to see how/what Greenland does/succeeds before the Board considers discussing this with Nunavut communities. Kevin McCormick noted that a first step would be to resolve whether one or two stocks are involved. Beluga seem to be declining in the Greenland area but perhaps not in Canada. Marius Tungilik suggested that there may be a need to better separate NWMB and Commission perspectives. Michael d'Eça noted that there is a role for the NWMB with the Commission (Section 15.3.2; fulfilled by Ben's appointment). NFA 15.3.4 states that Government has to seek advice, despite Ben's position on the Commission. In summary, the Government has to seek advice of the NWMB and has to consider NWMB recommendations in making Government decisions. The NWMB may also want/need to consult with High Arctic communities in this particular case.

Dan Pike noted that DFO is planning a very major beluga survey in this area this summer. DFO would do public consultation as part of the work. The NWMB may wish to wait for DFO to hold meetings. Robert Moshenko advised that a survey this summer is not definite, because funding is not yet assured. Robert also noted that DFO views this work as primarily a Greenland initiative. The Board decided to proceed slowly on this issue.

9.4.E Canada Oceans Act

Jim Noble advised the Board that Michael d'Eça had worked hard to represent the Board in negotiations for changes to the draft Oceans Act. Michael's work was made more difficult because the Board was meeting in Rankin Inlet and attending a workshop in Inuvik during this period. Michael reported that this was an exciting exercise. He and Lois Leslie presented the NWMB paper to the Standing Committee on behalf of the Board. The Oceans Act deals with matters that fall in the NWMB jurisdiction, but were not flagged as such initially. Thirteen changes were eventually requested by NWMB, including eight that the Board felt particularly strongly about. Seven of these were granted; one (pertaining to Section 35) was not. A new paragraph in the preamble (new 2.1) is a standard clause that can probably be used for all future legislation preambles. Sections

29, 31, 32, 33 and 36 were changed. The Standing Committee picked up the NWMB/NTI recommendations and passed them on to DFO.

9.4.F Research Permitting 1996/97

Jim Noble noted that the NWMB has a large role under the NFA regarding research permitting. The Board essentially stepped out of the process for 1995; deferring to the Nunavut Research Institute (NRI). Dan Pike noted that the NRI forwards all applications to the Board office, at which time he does a cursory review. Currently there is no process whereby NRI has to get input from the NWMB. Dan noted that this is not something the Board should take on lightly. Kevin McCormick suggested that the Board maintain the status quo, for now. Robert Moshenko noted that with regard to DFO scientific licensing, direction had been requested back in May 1994. DFO does such licensing only when there is actual removal of organisms. The NWMB advised DFO at that time to just deal directly with HTOs/RWOs. This process has been followed to date except for one contentious item at Resolute Bay, which was brought to the Board. Robert noted that there is a possible contentious item for 1996: an individual wants to attach cameras to walrus at Igloolik. Although the local HTO supports this project, DFO has some concerns:

- proposal includes using antibiotics
- possibility exists that the walrus may die
- project is headed up by a non-Canadian

Glenn Williams noted that the project leader is a private film maker who does underwater and surface photography. He is planning to make his own documentary film. He hopes to film the walrus feeding by means of a camera attached to a tusk. Several Board members expressed concerns with this project. The consensus was to get confirmation from the Igloolik HTO that this project is really something that they want to support.

Marius Tungilik suggested that the letter to the HTO should state the Board's concerns and reservations.

9.4.G Assignment of Harvesting Rights

Jim Noble reported that Michael d'Eça had provided a discussion paper on this topic. Copies were forwarded to all RWOs for comment, but only QWB has responded to date. Michael d'Eça noted that this is actually a responsibility of the RWOs/HTOs; the NWMB's role is only to guide the process. At issue is the role that HTOs have in restricting individual assignments. NTI is in a bind, since it represents both individuals and communities. Kevin McCormick suggested that this might be a job for NTI's new Wildlife Manager, and that the Board might eventually be able to hand this off.

9.4.H Turbot Gillnetting in Area O

Jim Noble and Dan Pike advised that small boats (less than 65 feet) may be gillnetting turbot (illegally) in northern waters. Some organizations are suggesting that DFO ban all gillnetting in this area. Nets (now) are not marked, do not have to be lifted at any particular interval, and are not restricted as to numbers. Shrimp trawls have picked-up unattended gillnets during hauls. There are no observers on these small vessels and there is no provision/need to account for gillnets. Longlining (not gillnetting) is actually what is prohibited (except by specific permit). FRCC recommends limitation on the number of gillnets per vessel, etc. Hanging twine should be biodegradable. It was suggested that the NWMB can (should) make a non-quota limitation recommendation to DFO. It was decided that a letter be written to DFO. **(Motion 96- 082)**

9.4.I Bowhead Hunt/Licensing

Ben Kovic asked whether a letter application for a licence (to DFO) would be appropriate and whether some particular format was required. Robert Moshenko asked who would be the licensee, where would the hunt be conducted, and under what conditions. David Aglukark suggested that the hunt location was not yet confirmed yet. David questioned if the licence application had to specify an exact location. Ben Kovic offered that possibly KWF or the Bowhead Hunt Planning Committee could be the licensee.

David Aglukark suggested that neither the elders nor younger hunters are comfortable with Duke of York Bay as the hunt location: there is too much current and the area can fill with ice very quickly.

This area can stay ice-bound for a considerable length of time and a struck bowhead could be lost to the ice and currents. David advised that other locations suggested by the elders might be:

1. Coral Harbour area: Southeast tip of Southampton Island during Mid-August to the end of September (but wind could be a factor during this period).
2. Repulse Bay (near community) might be a better location; there would also be more choice of whales.

Joannie Ikkidluak suggested that Duke of York Bay is far from communities and would be costly to access. Joannie noted that a twin-otter aircraft can land at Duke of York Bay, but that it would be much more cost-effective at Repulse Bay and that he favoured the Repulse Bay location. David Igutsaq agreed, and felt that Repulse Bay has more inlets and would be a better location all-around. Ben Kovic noted that boat owners have offered to assist with the Duke of York Bay location, even for little or no cost. In light of this, transportation expenditures may

not be too high. Kevin McCormick suggested that it might be best to re-submit these ideas to the Bowhead Hunt Planning Committee. Joannie Ikkidluak suggested it would be better for the NWMB to make the decision, since it was promised that the decision would be made at the present meeting. A vote was conducted on whether to send the decision back to the Planning Committee. The decision was 4 to 3 against sending it back to Committee. Numerous motions were tabled and rescinded in the effort to develop acceptable wording. It was eventually agreed that the Board would approve that the hunt be conducted in the Repulse Bay area in the summer of 1996 and that the alternate location would be at Leyson Point on Southampton Island near Coral Harbour.
(Motion 96-083)

9.5 NWMB-Funded Projects and Contributions

9.5.A Wildlife Research Trust (Funding/Applications)

General parameters were discussed. Kevin McCormick reminded members that the Board agreed last year to fund research out of Operating Funds as long as possible, and he saw no reason to discontinue this. Kevin also suggested that only one annual review of applications might be appropriate, probably at the February meeting. Kevin also suggested that there be no change in funding allotment until after the Strategic Planning Workshop. Marius Tungilik agreed, except that the governments will need notice of a change to once-per-year review of applications. Joannie Ikkidluak also agreed.

Gordon Koshinsky suggested that there may need to be some provision for entertaining winter proposals.

Many such are unlikely this year, so the Board can probably be somewhat generous/optimistic with respect to approving 1996 summer funding. It was agreed to proceed with a target allocation of \$500K, to continue funding from the operating budget, to move to a once-per-year funding allocation, and to allocate \$500K to 1996 summer projects since few winter applications are expected. **(Motion 96-084)**

Deadlines for submission to NWMB meetings were discussed. There was consensus not to extend the present two-week deadline, but rather to enforce it strictly. Gordon Koshinsky suggested that there needs to be some flexibility, but at the discretion of the Board, not of the agencies.

Dan Pike provided a binder of research applications, briefing notes and summary sheets, which he briefly introduced to the Board. Gordon Koshinsky suggested that the Board start from the assumption that the Board had a proposed package (top-ranked items 1-9 inclusive). Kevin McCormick agreed, but suggested the Board should still review all the proposals briefly.

Dan Pike led the review; his comments and the accompanying discussion are summarized in an Attachment to these Minutes. Marius Tungilik noted that most of the DFO proposals identify no DFO funding. Robert Moshenko responded that DFO project leaders do not yet have their confirmed budgets. Marius asked whether any funds to DFO for NWMB-approved projects would be returned after DFO sorted this out. Gary Weber suggested it was possible in some cases, but he could not confirm. There was discussion of possible ways to force DFO's hand, with the object of freeing up Trust Funds to support more projects. Marius mentioned Project Priority 10 as a good candidate. Ben Kovic noted that Project 10 had generally weak support from other Board members (see Attachment). Marius voiced general concern about government agencies maneuvering to input no funding of their own to research projects. Kevin McCormick noted that resource inputs by agencies were/are a factor in project evaluation. Meeka Mike suggested that in future she would like to see more support for university training for Nunavut students included in these projects. Marius Tungilik suggested that intellectual property rights should also be taken more into account in future evaluations. Pierre Chartrand indicated that a copyright clause could be included in the contribution agreements.

The Board decided to support the nine top-ranked research proposals as set out by Dan Pike and as listed below, in the total amount of \$499,700 for 1996/97. Recipient agencies are to be advised that future year's funding for ongoing projects will hinge on annual assessments, and are also to be advised that their own funding input continues to be a factor.

(Motion 96 - 085)

<u>Listing of approved projects</u>	<u>1996/97</u>
0. Charr stock delineation techniques	\$ 13,500
1. Walrus population studies	85,000
2. Polar bear studies, Lancaster Sound	101,000
3. Beluga movements and behaviour, Baffin Bay	25,000
4. Charr fishery monitoring, Keewatin Coast	27,000
5. Bowhead habitat selection, behaviour, size, FB/NHB	70,000
6. Charr fishery monitoring, Baffin Region	73,200
7. Caribou herd identification/movements, Bathurst Inlet	30,000
8. Wolverine movements and productivity, SGP	24,000
9. Marine mammal population delineation techniques	<u>51,000</u>
	\$ 499,700

9.5.B NWMB-Funded Projects: Research

9.5.B.i Ikajutit Narwhal Photo ID Project

Dan Pike reported that only half the 1995/96 funds for this project were utilized. Ikajutit HTA is requesting carryover to 1996/97. Meeka Mike questioned how far along the HTA is with its objectives. Dan advised that they had photographed over 700 narwhal and are now in the process of matching up the photos. The plan is to continue photographing/matching in 1996, and to try to develop a mark-recapture estimate. The project was under-spent due to early break-up and poor weather conditions. It was decided to support the request to carryover funding to the new fiscal year.

(Motion 96-086)

9.5.B.ii Baffin Bay Polar Bear Inventory

Ron Graf noted that Mitch Taylor was delayed in getting the project started; he was however very successful in capturing and collaring a large number of animals. The population estimate from the current work is almost identical to the previous year's figure.

Ron noted that some communities feel that the bear population estimates are low and that another year of work is required. They feel that the surveys are inordinately missing females. A denning survey might help address this concern. The entire \$100K allocated to the project has been spent.

9.5.C NWMB-Funded Projects: Non-Research

9.5.C.i.a Birds of Nunavut Book

Ben Kovic reported that work is still progressing on the Birds of Nunavut Book, for which the NWMB provided funding. Some translation work is still outstanding. Ben tabled a briefing note on this item.

9.5.C.i.b Polar Bear Management Agreement Consultation Meetings

Glenn Williams advised that some zones were recently found not to be harvesting bears within sustainable yield, which is of special concern to U.S. authorities in respect to importation of trophies. Resolute Bay, Grise Fiord and Pond Inlet have over 30 sport hunts per year as a combined total. In January 1996, community meetings were held to review Polar Bear Management Agreements signed in 1992. The initial meetings had representation from each community of a zone. For the current round of negotiations, meetings were conducted in each of the communities of the 6 zones, which proved to be much more successful. Six agreements were drafted and approved in principle. Flexible quotas based on sex ratio in the harvest were discussed and agreed to.

Boundaries were adjusted, and a 30 km buffer (overlap area) was established between zones (both directions). Hunters agreed to full protection of polar bear family groups. It was noted that 80-90% of bear/human interactions occur in the Clyde River/Broughton Island area. Defense kills come off the quotas, via unsuccessful sport hunt tags (as long as they last). The HTOs want the NWMB to address compensation, and to provide direction on the matter of defense kills by non-beneficiaries (referable to Section 5.6.5). Renewable Resources is no longer concerned about taking (hunting) of cubs as it is not a management issue. Renewable Resources is also interested in re-visiting the definition of a “token” number of sport hunts; if possible it should not be restrictive. Another item which is under the mandate of the NWMB is the disposal of valuable parts from defense kills. The flexible quota system was described at length for the Board. The plan is to continue the community consultation meetings (moving westward), with a completion goal by the end of March. Glenn noted the six agreements had been approved and signed by the HTO Chairpersons. The HTOs and Renewable Resources are now requesting that the NWMB also approve and sign the Agreements before the GNWT Minister of Renewable Resources approves them. Michael d’Eça stated that the Minister should sign the Agreements before the NWMB, as the NWMB is the main instrument of wildlife management.

Glenn Williams provided a summary of the discussion in his perspective:

1. Flexible quotas and a sex-ratio harvesting system have been generally accepted by the HTOs that have been consulted, because these measures maximize harvest possibilities. The Agreements will include a clause ensuring revisitation within 5 years.
2. Management zone boundaries have been adjusted, based on satellite telemetry of females.
3. Disposition of valuable parts from emergency kills will continue as per the current process.
4. Compensation for legal defense kills has to be addressed by the NWMB, under Section 6 of the NFA.
5. “Political issues” (not management issues) include:
 - a) Request of beneficiaries to harvest cubs in some situations (e.g. at the request of elders for social occasions); concern about “optics”.
 - b) Concerns about sport hunting being confined to a “token 15%” (it is already near 30%).
 - c) Sale of gall bladders (of particular concern to outside agencies).
6. Process for co-management. DRR, DFO, and NWMB often seem to operate from different concepts. It would be very good to have clearer processes in place.

David Igutsaq noted that the management agreements are very hard for HTOs to understand, and they need the polar bear biologist to come/explain. David also

called for a study of contaminants in polar bears. Ron Graf suggested some such work has been done and promised a briefing note for the next meeting. Joannie Ikkidluak expressed concern about compensation (and/or fines) for defense kills. Kevin McCormick urged DRR to provide discussion/decision papers before proceeding on these matters. Glenn Williams agreed that such homework is required, and that today's discussion was merely to flag items for later attention. Jim Noble suggested that previous work on a compensation package could be incorporated.

9.5.C.ii New Non-research Applications for Funding

9.5.C.ii.a Bowhead Hunt Planning Committee (BHC)

Dan Pike advised that the Committee requires funds for initial operations. Ben Kovic noted that the next Committee meeting is planned for March in Coral Harbour. Ben estimated that a charter would be more economical than regular fares. HTOs have been requested to pay honoraria for delegates and to arrange billets. Kevin McCormick asked about the costs of the actual hunt. Ben replied that identifying such costs (and possible sources) is a job of the Planning Committee. David Aglukark noted that the local secretary (HTO) will take minutes of the meeting. Gordon Koshinsky stated that the meeting must be held in March, as there is much planning work to complete. It was agreed that up to \$28,000 will be provided to assist with the meeting. **(Motion 96-087)**

9.5.C.ii.b Mural (Wall Painting) Project - Iqaluit

Jim Noble advised that he had been approached by Economic Development and Tourism (GNWT) for a donation for local artists to paint a mural on the exterior wall of the Iqaluit Northern Store. Kevin McCormick suggested that this project was not wildlife-related and should not be funded by the NWMB. He is also of the opinion that the Executive Director could be authorized to make decisions of this nature.

9.5.C.ii.c Marcel Lake River Improvement

Dan Pike advised that this is a three-year project for \$32,775, with \$10,000 being requested from the NWMB. Glenn Williams noted that the lake is very locally-accessible; in fact it is the water source for Arctic Bay. Dan suggested that the project is potentially worthwhile; similar projects have been attempted at Clyde River and in Northern Quebec. Information from this project could be used for setting TAH for charr. The harvest monitoring component may not be needed as we (will) already have the NWMB Harvest Study. Dan suggested that the HTO should put concurrent limits on harvesting (via a HTO Fishing Plan), so that benefits from the project are not dissipated. David Igutsaq noted that his

community does this type of work without asking for funding assistance. Ben Kovic noted that removing rocks and boulders could affect the water level in the lake and that this aspect should be monitored. Gordon Koshinsky felt the project had potential, but required further thought and planning. Marius Tungilik noted that the first year is essentially for feasibility, as currently proposed. Marius suggested that assurance should be obtained from DFO, that they will serve as a resource for the project. It was agreed to support the project with certain conditions. **(Motion 96-088)**

9.5.C.ii.d Research on Inuit Traditional Knowledge - Coral Harbour

Dan Pike noted that the proposal was difficult to follow. Dan suggested that the proposal could not be approved as submitted and that the Board needs to develop guidelines for such proposals. Kevin McCormick agreed with this evaluation.

Gordon Koshinsky suggested that this project would require re-working rather than just clarification. The Board decided not to fund this project. It was agreed that Gordon Koshinsky would assist Dan Pike in drafting a response to Coral Harbour HTO, using the guidelines currently being developed **(Motion 96-089)**

9.5.C.ii.e TEK Project on Harp Seal

Bruce Ashley provided a brief review of the work of the GNWT Seal Strategy Committee. Small clothing products are being very well received. The Committee expected that harp seals would be harvested, but very few showed up. John Stevenson noted that the project is based in Iqaluit. Kits are assembled (cut) in Iqaluit and sent up-Island for sewing. David Igutsaq supported the project, noting that he would like to see some traditional tanning included, to promote greater ultimate self-sufficiency. He also questioned what eventual seal harvest was expected. Marius Tungilik asked what steps the Committee was taking to prevent wastage of meat. John indicated that a potential market for meat had been identified in Greenland. Gordon Koshinsky asked who the consultant was for the TEK project. Bruce replied that Mark Stevenson has been contracted. Jim Noble questioned if the Committee had received TEK funding from DFO, as part of their funding was ear-marked for that purpose. Bruce confirmed that DFO funding had been received, that other members of the Committee had also provided dollars for the TEK study component. Joannie Ikkidluak noted that Jerry Ell is involved in the project on behalf of QWB and that he would like NWMB to support the project. The Committee is primarily interested in what the communities have in mind vis-à-vis TEK. Gordon Koshinsky suggested that work towards a TEK protocol would be useful. Meeka Mike noted that TEK collected should be property of the communities, not of the consultant. John stated that this is one of the reasons for

making this a pre-feasibility study and why QWB would be the first filter. The Board decided to approve the funding requested. **(Motion 96-090)**

Thursday 22 February 1996

9.6.A Kitikmeot Regional Hunters and Trappers Association Report

George Angohiatok, Chairperson of Kitikmeot Hunters and Trappers Association, provided the Board with an update of RWO/HTO activities in the Kitikmeot Region. George noted that 1993/94 Special Funding was devoted to HTO office spaces, to ensure all had at least a place to meet.

Pelly Bay HTO was allotted \$232K for a 3-office building which is under construction. They have been very busy with the Harvest Study, Bowhead Study, working on trying to change the polar bear tag regulations, starting polar bear sport hunting, and commercial harvest of caribou for the Cambridge Bay meat plant. **Taloyoak HTO** purchased and renovated office space. They are commercial harvesting caribou and attempting polar bear sport hunts. **Gjoa Haven HTO** have purchased a fairly large boat, tested some charr streams, and tested for marine crabs, etc.

They have also done some commercial muskox harvesting and have constructed a cabin at the north end of King William Island for polar bear sport hunting. **Cambridge Bay HTO** has an ongoing CRIMP project to study charr which includes door-to-door community consultations. Voluntary banning of gill-netting across their area is showing good results. They are looking to expand their office facilities and have had a recent change of secretary/manager. The community is heavily involved in polar bear, muskox and caribou sport hunts. Funding assistance from GNWT(ED&T) has allowed construction of a new garage, which provides hunters a warm location to repair equipment. **Bay Chimo HTO** purchased and constructed a new 35'x 44' building, and purchased a chest freezer and radio equipment. **Bathurst Inlet HTO** recently put in a generator shack/repair shop. They are also building two cabins for sport hunters and general duty. Bathurst and Coppermine have had some dispute over the Pellet Bay area, especially with regards to polar bear sport hunts. **Coppermine HTO** renovated their office to provide space for the Harvest Study personnel. They are heavily into sport hunting ventures, and have also assisted a member to purchase a large boat.

KHTA's administration has been improved with the addition of their new finance clerk (since July 1995). Changeover to the new computer bookkeeping system has helped. All Associations being on the new payroll services system has assisted greatly. Three general meetings were held during the year, and funding for the Association was depleted by November. Consideration was

given to closing down the Association, but this was not possible with the Harvest Study fast approaching. The KHTA is estimating a short-fall of approximately \$100K for the year. David Igutsaq noted earlier indications that the auditors could not track the funding due to lack of records. David questioned whether this had been corrected. Jim Noble stated that the audited financial statement has been completed and that work is progressing on financial records for the 1995/96 audit. George noted that with the secondment of Alex Buchan, and the assistance of Pierre Chartrand, all audit observations are being dealt with.

Note: At this time, a bowhead packing doll was presented to the Chairperson, Ben Kovic, on behalf of the “ladies of Taloyoak”.

9.6.B Charr Management Report

Kevin Lloyd, Assistant Deputy Minister of Renewable Resources, noted that more than half the charr stocks in Nunavut are in decline. There is a need for an over-all plan for the management/recovery of these stocks. Kevin noted that ten groups have been looking at the future of the Rockwood Hatchery in Manitoba. DFO would like to divest this facility, hopefully by 1 April 1996. A group of joint-venturers assessing this facility includes: Sahtu Development Corporation, NWT Development Corporation, Nunasi, Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board and the GNWT (DRR/ED&T). Icy Waters International (USA) is another interested party; they deal in fish to high-end restaurants at \$70/kg. All interested parties do consider the hatchery to be a high-risk venture. Nunasi recently announced that they are withdrawing from the discussions. There is concern about hybridizing genetic material; and of charr farming as a whole. Part of the interest of the group is indeed to pursue hybridization, to improve growth, etc. Besides the Nauyuk Lake stock, the Rockwood Hatchery is holding “in trust for Nunavut” a stock from the Tree River (which is certified disease-free, for movement across borders). If some other group(s) take over ownership of the hatchery, it would still be necessary to determine what would happen to the Tree River genetic material. Canadian charr are deemed superior to charr from other countries, and all charr are deemed superior to salmon. Possible opportunities from having a hatchery include:

- profit for a northern company
- increased knowledge of charr markets
- training in aquaculture (probably via the University of Guelph)
- knowledge of charr genetics in Nunavut
- groundwork for possible charr aquaculture in Nunavut (in future)

Kevin McCormick noted that the information presented does not indicate a Board decision immediately, but the Board may be fast approaching having to make decisions regarding this issue. There were numerous questions from Board members on different aspects of this item. It was noted that there is some perception, not necessarily true, that farmed charr would ruin the markets for charr which are naturally produced.

9.6.C. NTI Proposal: Wildlife Coordinator

James Eetoolook made the presentation with Laurie Pelly and Gordon Spence also participating. James said that he was happy that the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board meeting is being held here (in Cambridge Bay) this week. James was pleased that Meeka Mike has been appointed to the Board. The Board is doing a good job. James noted that Article 5 is the longest and most important article in the NFA. Documents were presented to the Board outlining the purposes of NTI's proposed new Wildlife Coordinator position.

Marius Tungilik observed that he now has a better idea of what NTI is proposing: someone to represent Inuit interests vis-à-vis wildlife. But the title is confusing. NWMB is also hiring Wildlife Coordinators. Maybe what is in mind is an "Inuit Harvesters' Advocate" (or something like that). Also, NWMB does represent Inuit to at least some degree. Both groups must ensure that they avoid leaving the perception that the NWMB does not represent Inuit interests. Gordon Koshinsky was concerned that the new position may confuse the RWOs/HTOs. James Eetoolook felt there was no problem to change the title. James recognized that the NWMB does represent Inuit to a degree, but cannot give it enough specific emphasis as it (NWMB) is an institution of public government. Ben Kovic (from Malachi Arreak's letter) noted that there are some very strong feelings on this issue. The NWMB has worked very hard to be and work as a family with RWOs, HTOs and Inuit. Ben mentioned that the Government of Canada is currently negotiating with Greenland on turbot issues. The NFA requires Inuit representation in these matters. The NWMB asked QWB to represent Inuit interests; perhaps the Board should have asked NTI? Ben noted that the NWMB does have the management jurisdiction for turbot. James Eetoolook felt there was no concern with this decision. Ben also questioned whether there was any concern about him being Commissioner for the Canada-Greenland Joint Commission on Narwhal and Beluga. James Eetoolook suggested that "by the rules" the DIOs should be represented, but such matters can easily be worked out. Kevin McCormick suggested that there is a role for the new NTI position, but there could be lots of potential overlaps and problems and that this initiative should proceed with caution. David Aglukark urged a different title for the position. Ben Kovic questioned why an RWO could not perform this function just as well. The response was that every DIO is designated for specific Section(s) of the NFA. James Eetoolook summarized the discussion noting that it is agreed that development and staffing of this position should proceed, slowly and together.

10. Old Business

10.A Policy and Procedures Manual

Pierre Chartrand advised that he would have a good update for the May meeting.

10.B Harvest Study Update

Dan Pike advised that contracts with DIOs have been signed by two of the RWOs and he hopes that Kitikmeot will sign this week. Dan noted that the Study has been delayed, but that 1995/96 funds will be given out in advance. Interviews for Regional Liaison Officers are planned for next week in Iqaluit.

The Harvest Study Steering Committee has been converted to the Harvest Study Technical Advisory Committee. Dan noted that the Pilot Project is still planned and that the new estimated overall start date is July 1996.

10.C Bowhead Knowledge Study Update

David Aglukark reviewed the briefing note provided by Keith Hay. Rather than continuing to use a different interviewer in each community, the Committee approved using one (the same) interviewer for all settlements. David advised that he visited Coral Harbour and Repulse Bay with Keith. He noted that the approval for the harvest of one bowhead has improved enthusiasm to participate in the Study. Keith is worried that not all tapes are likely to get translated in the 5-year period of the Study. The budget for the first quarter of 1996/97 was reviewed by the Board. Gordon Koshinsky questioned the status of the overall budget. Pierre Chartrand advised that a \$200K shortfall is expected over the 5-year term. The Board approved the first-quarter budget as presented. **(Motion 96-091)**

10. D Basic Needs Levels, Beluga, Narwhal and Walrus

Dan Pike noted that all deadlines have come and gone. Dan advised that a letter was sent to the Implementation Panel requesting clarification of this task. The Implementation Panel responded, advising that BNL is only required for those stocks of these species which already have quotas. This is most of the communities where there are narwhal. Dan's suggestion is to approach each community, asking them what their needs are. The main disadvantage would be that communities would have no incentive to give a low or even a realistic number. Michael d'Eça agreed with Dan's approach and plan. Michael suggested that the Board should ask for a long enough extension so that the Board can actually meet the time frame identified. Michael suggested that the Board begin with its own definition of BNL, thus: "BNL reflects a proposed ideal or optimum harvest quota, exclusively available to Inuit, based on the relationship between historical supply and Inuit needs." Dan Pike's interpretation is that these three species were singled out in the NFA because they were (generally) the only species under quotas which are not presumed to be completely needed

by Inuit under Section 5.6.5. Dan suggested that harvest statistics cannot be used alone because these figures may be “artificially low” due to the quotas. Gordon Koshinsky suggested that these three species are not unique in terms of having harvests constrained (by quotas), so that neither are they alone in having harvest not indicative of “need”. He then presented his arguments as to why he considered it would be appropriate to establish basic needs levels (BNLs) for beluga, narwhal and walrus (i.e. to address NFA 5.6.25) simply by reference to existing harvest statistics, and why this flows logically from how the NFA is written:

- There are hundreds of stocks or populations of mammals, birds and fish in the NSA which are harvested. TAH has been identified for only a few.
- Beluga, narwhal and walrus make up only a small, albeit an important, fraction of these stocks or populations.
- The NFA devotes seven specific sub-sections (5.6.19 - 5.6.25: a full page) to the matter of establishing BNLs. The bulk of this material is devoted to rules for using harvest statistics for this purpose. At the end of this material the requirement is set out to “fast-track” BNLs for beluga, narwhal and walrus, but without mention of methodology.
- It does not seem reasonable to assume that a quantum different and more complicated methodology was envisioned for these three species, especially when they are singled out for attention five years earlier than all others. It has been common perception, which the NFA negotiators would certainly have shared, that the best harvest statistics in the NSA pertain(ed) to these three species. It does not seem reasonable to assume that the negotiators envisioned an entirely different methodology specifically for the three “fast-tracked” species which would, according to prevailing opinion, have been the easiest to address with the same basic methodology which is set out for all other harvested species.
- The proposed alternative approach, based on asking beneficiaries “what they think their basic needs are”, is sure to be difficult, raise false expectations, and ultimately cause bad will.

Joannie Ikkidluak suggested that hunters will not know how to respond to the questionnaire being proposed. David Aglukark said it is time that communities start identifying their basic needs levels. Kevin McCormick suggested that the rationale/logic of NFA 5.6.25 has always escaped him. If the Board must implement it, then it should get on with it, to the minimalist extent possible.

Michael d’Eça noted that even John Merritt does not know why this Section was put in the Agreement. Robert Moshenko suggested that the Board ask for an interpretation from the negotiators. His own explanation for this Section is that there are few stocks of these three species and fairly good harvest data were already available.

The Board agreed to proceed with the plan developed by Dan Pike. Gordon Koshinsky noted that he would have to abstain, unless the motion to proceed is restricted to the first (consultative) step of the plan as outlined, in order to provide opportunity to gauge whether a subsequent questionnaire would be fruitful. **(Motion 96-092)**

10.E Walrus Pilot Sport Hunt Plans for 1996

This item was deferred to the May meeting.

11. Other Business

11.A Upcoming Meetings/Events

1. ITC Environmental Workshop - Ben Kovic to attend.
2. NAMMCO Meeting - No NWMB participation
3. Nunavut Implementation Panel - Ben Kovic and Pierre Chartrand will attend.
4. National Marine Mammal Workshop - Gordon Koshinsky to participate
5. Bathurst Caribou Management Plan - George Angohaitok will input
6. Polar Bear Management Agreement Meetings - David Igutsaq and Joannie Ikkidluak will participate
7. WKSS Workshop - Kevin McCormick will attend
8. DFO Kitikmeot Tour - David Igutsaq will participate

11.B Meeting Reports

Briefing notes were provided on various meetings attended as follows:

1. Northern Shrimp Advisory Committee Meeting - Sandy Lewis
2. Contaminant Experts Workshop - Keith Hay
3. DIAND Budget Meeting - Ottawa - Jim Noble/Pierre Chartrand
4. Fisheries Resources Conservation Council Meeting - Ben Kovic
5. Polar Bear Technical Committee Meeting - Dan Pike
6. Keewatin Wildlife Federation AGM - Jim Noble/Carol Churchward
7. Makivik Wildlife Workshop (Off-Shore) - Ben Kovic/Michael d'Eça

11.C Bowhead Press Release

Joannie Ikkidluak noted that many people on a radio phone-in show spoke against Duke of York Bay as the location for the 1996 bowhead hunt as it would be too expensive and inaccessible. Marius Tungilik understood that Duke of

York Bay was just a nomination to the NWMB from the Hunt Planning Committee. Ben Kovic suggested that he talk to two elders and one younger person from each community on conference call. Michael d'Eça questioned what would occur if the vote from the conference call(s) is for Duke of York Bay. Marius Tungilik suggested that NTI, the HTOs and Mayor of Coral Harbour should be kept informed. David Igutsaq noted that the primary reality is that the hunt is for all of Nunavut. It was decided that Ben Kovic will consult the two communities of Coral Harbour and Repulse Bay, to be followed by a press release. **(Motion 96-093)**

11.D Incamera Session

Moved that the NWMB move to an in camera session. **(Motion 96-094)**

Moved that the NWMB move out of in camera session. **(Motion 96-095)**

11.E. Motion From Incamera Session

It was decided to stabilize the Kitikmeot Regional Hunters and Trappers Association's financial situation. **(Motion 96-096)**

12. Date And Place Of Next Meeting

It was decided that the next regular meeting of the NWMB will be in Iqaluit the week of 13 May 1996. **(Motion 96-097)**

13. Adjournment

It was decided to adjourn the meeting. **(Motion 96-098)**

Minutes Approved by: _____
Chairperson

Date: _____

NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD

ATTACHMENT TO MINUTES: MEETING 10

REVIEW OF PROPOSALS TO NWMB RESEARCH TRUST

Review Leader: Dan Pike

21 February 1996

Project Priority 0 - Charr stock delineation techniques (\$13.5K for 1996/97): Funds already committed. Will be testing techniques developed in 1995. Expect to use samples already in freezer.

Project Priority 1 - Walrus population studies (\$85K for 1996/97): Primarily stock ID. Also explore satellite tagging methodology. Relevant to walrus sport hunts. Tagging component a bit problematic (some risk). Some communities don't like such work, would require letters of support from HTOs. Would approve complete (multi-year) profile, but take some account of progress reports.

Project Priority 2 - Polar bear studies Lancaster Sound (\$101K for 1996/97): This is a continuation of last year's mark-recapture studies for the Lancaster Sound, Norwegian Bay and Kane Basin populations. The information is needed to estimate sustainable yield.

Project Priority 3 - Beluga satellite telemetry (\$25K -1996/97): Relevant to the concerns of the Canada-Greenland Joint Commission. Some downside with respect to handling/tagging. Considerable funding from Greenland. No call (yet) for funding beyond 1996/97. Robert Moshenko noted that the Scientific Working Group of the Joint Commission will come into play. Marius Tungilik asked about TEK for this project. Dan Pike advised that there had been previous work done on TEK.

Project Priority 4 - Charr fishery monitoring, Keewatin (\$27K for 1996/97): Community consultation component. Data collection carried out by local people; program successful to date. Robert Moshenko noted DFO funding stated at nil, but really just not available at this point due to present budget uncertainties. Marius Tungilik questioned why this project was rated higher than the Coppermine charr study. Dan Pike responded that the Harvest Study will presumably preclude this requirement at Coppermine. Robert Moshenko noted this project will be going into its 4th year.

Project Priority 5 - Bowhead studies, Foxe Basin and northern Hudson Bay (\$70K -1996/97): Photographs of bowheads provide population structure; individual identification can substitute for mark-recapture in population estimates. Distribution of bowheads will be compared with habitat features. There will also be work on behavior, including diving. How sightings reports will be obtained is not clear. Ben Kovic questioned where this work will be published. Dan Pike explained that this work goes to scientific journals; however scientists should also be encouraged to report more effectively to the communities. A CRIMP project is photographing bowheads in the Igloodik area. Marius Tungilik noted that the proponent is only putting a token amount into the project. Robert Moshenko replied that a commitment of DFO funds is impossible until budgets are finalized. Salary dollars will be committed, probably some A-Base funds also, and most likely some implementation dollars.

Project Priority 6 - Charr fishery monitoring, Baffin Region (\$73.2K - 1996/97): This project is similar to #4. Would be able to relate Harvest Study information to health of the fishery. Best success last year was with the TEK component. Fishery data gathering is in winter (January - March). Some budgetary surplus is anticipated from 1995/96. Robert Moshenko indicated that a surplus is expected and if so, they will adjust the 1996/97 requirement. Meeka Mike questioned the 20% administration cost. Dan Pike replied that the HTOs demanded that percentage last year.

Project Priority 7 - Caribou herd identification and movements, Bathurst Inlet (\$30K - 1996/97): There is controversy about where the Bathurst caribou calve. Mineral development is a consideration. About 30,000 - 40,000 caribou are likely involved. Meeka Mike questioned if 5 collars are enough to determine movement patterns. Ron Graf suggested that 5 would be enough if the animals stay together. Ron noted that satellite collars are very expensive to purchase and operate.

Project Priority 8 - Wolverine biology (\$24K - 1996/97): This is not a high priority species or location for NWMB. However it is a well-designed project, with wide-ranging support. It remains clear that NWMB funding is year-to-year.

Project Priority 9 - Marine mammal population delineation techniques (\$51K - 1996/97): This project is similar to the first year of work previously done on beluga. Proponents' record of reporting in the past has not been very good, but this work is not easy to report, and maybe the onus should be more on the managers rather than on the researchers in this regard. This is a methods development proposal, and thus has a discrete life span.

Project Priority 10 - Snow goose eggs (\$65K - 1996/97): This project was rejected by the Board last August. Clarifications were requested, and provided

by DRR. Egging is a relatively minor subsistence activity. This is not a conservation/management issue at present because geese are overpopulating their breeding grounds. Ron Graf suggested that few opportunities such as this present themselves for experimental management. David Aglukark recalled that egg picking used to be a ticket to jail. David suggested it is better to “kill the parents” (harvest more geese). The more eggs that get picked, the more the geese lay. Gordon Koshinsky suggested that if that is true, it would be good to prove it, to take the heat off egg picking in other areas. Ben Kovic noted that according to TEK, up to a considerable point, geese will continue laying eggs. John Stevenson noted that all DRR proposals, including this one, are community-driven. Ben Kovic suggested that much could be learned from existing egg-picking. David Igutsaq suggested that this item had been discussed enough. The final note was that there is an inter-community trade factor to this project.

Project Priority 11 - King eider biology (\$20K - 1996/97): This is the only CWS proposal . There is some indication (other information) that the species is declining.

Project Priority 12 - Muskox disturbance / movement (\$16.5K - 1996/97): Numerous design questions were raised with respect to this proposal. The methodology itself would cause substantial disturbance, and effects (if any) would likely be immediate (5-year monitoring not needed).

Project Priority 13 - Pollutants in snow (\$48K - 1996/97): While there was considerable interest, members generally felt that this application was outside the scope of NWMB. Kevin McCormick noted that some work was already being done on this matter. Ben Kovic questioned how \$25K A-Base funding could be contributed to this project. Gordon Koshinsky indicated this was probably the proponent’s entire A-Base. He regarded it as a good project, but probably more relevant to a different land claims board.

Project Priority 14 - Marine resource planning, Cumberland Sound (\$4.46K - 1996/97): This project was considered more appropriate to NPC, NIRB, etc.

Project Priority X - Charr stock size, Coppermine (\$5K - 1996/97): The tagging component is not necessary as this information will be collected by the NWMB Harvest Study. John Stevenson agreed, provided that the Harvest Study is running by October 1996. Dan Pike noted that the Harvest Study will probably be operating by August, and if not the Board could entertain the project again.

NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD

RESOLUTIONS - MEETING No. 10

IKALUKTUTIAK, 20 - 22 FEBRUARY 1996

Resolution 96-073

Moved that the agenda be accepted with noted amendments.

Moved By: Joannie Ikkidluak Seconded By: Gordon Koshinsky
Carried Date: 20 Feb. 96

Resolution 96-074

Moved that the minutes of the Rankin Inlet Meeting, 14 -16 November 1995 and minutes of Conference Calls, 30 November 1995 and 18 December 1995 be accepted with noted corrections.

Moved By: Joannie Ikkidluak Seconded By: Kevin McCormick
Carried Date: 20 Feb. 96

Resolution 96-075

Moved that the January 31, 1996 interim financial statement be accepted as presented.

Moved By: Marius Tungilik Seconded By: Kevin McCormick
Carried Date: 20 Feb. 96

Resolution 96-076

Moved that the NWMB develop a budget in the total amount of \$5.3M for fiscal year 1996/97 for submission to the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, subject to review at the forthcoming Strategic Planning Workshop.

Moved By: Gordon Koshinsky Seconded By: Joannie Ikkidluak
Carried Date: 22 Feb.96

Resolution 96-077

Moved that a Strategic Planning Workshop for the NWMB be held in Yellowknife, NWT, the week of April 15, 1996

Moved By: Marius Tungilik Seconded By: David Igutsaq
Carried Date: 22 Feb. 96

Resolution 96-078

Moved that the NWMB endorse the concept of continued permitting by DOE for access to Migratory Bird Sanctuaries, with ongoing provisions for appropriate and effective consultation regarding applications for access in all cases.

Moved By: Gordon Koshinsky Seconded By: Marius Tungilik
Carried Date: 22 Feb. 96

Resolution 96-079

Moved that the NWMB supports the concept of re-designating the Queen Maud Gulf Bird Sanctuary as a National Wildlife Area, this subject to local and regional consultation and concurrence.

Moved By: Gordon Koshinsky Seconded By: Marius Tungilik
Carried Date: 22 Feb. 96

Resolution 96-080

Moved that the NWMB support the recommendation of the Keewatin Wildlife Federation to support the Coral Harbour HTA's request for regulation changes regarding Southampton caribou as follows;

1. The request for an additional 50 sport hunting tags for the herd.
2. The request for an additional 500 commercial tags for 1995/96 and 1996/97 only, and that the sustainability of the quota should be re-evaluated in 1996 before any extension of the increase is approved.

Moved By: Gordon Koshinsky Seconded By: David Aglukark
Carried Date: 21 Feb. 96

Resolution 96-081

Whereas the Co-management Plan for the Southeast Baffin Beluga Management Committee recommends quotas for beluga for the communities of Iqaluit, Pangnirtung and Kimmirut, and;

Whereas the Co-management Plan has been approved by the NWMB and accepted by DFO;

Therefore be it resolved that community quotas for Southeast Baffin beluga be as follows:

1. 35 for Iqaluit
2. 35 for Pangnirtung
3. 20 for Kimmirut between June 1 - September 30, with no quota for the remainder of the year.

Moved By: Kevin McCormick Seconded By: Gordon Koshinsky
Carried Date: 21 Feb. 96

Resolution 96-082

Moved that the NWMB write to the Minister of DFO, suggesting the following non-quota limitations in the offshore areas of Area 0:

1. That number of gill nets per vessel be limited.
2. That hanging twine in gillnets be biodegradable.
3. That use of longlines be encouraged, not prohibited.

Also moved, that the same restrictions be drafted for application within the marine waters of the NSA.

Moved By: Kevin McCormick Seconded By: Gordon Koshinsky
Carried Abstention: 1 Date: 21 Feb. 96

Resolution 96-083

Moved that the Bowhead Hunt be conducted in the Repulse Bay area in the summer of 1996 and that an alternate location be at Leyson Point on Southampton Island near Coral Harbour.

Moved By: David Igutsaq Seconded By: Joannie Ikkidluak
Carried Abstention 1 Date: 21 Feb. 96

Resolution 96-084

With respect to management and funding of research proposals by agencies pertinent to the Wildlife Research Trust Fund, moved:

1. That a target allocation of \$500,000 be continued in support of research by agencies for 1996/97.
2. That this research continue to be funded from the NWMB operating budget for 1996/97.
3. That the NWMB move to a once-per-year funding allocation (February meeting), following appropriate notice to agencies and

with provision for exceptions according to initiatives and priorities of the Board (not of the agencies).

4. That in recognition of present earnings in the Research Trust Fund, and in anticipation of few proposals for winter (1996/97) research by agencies, that up to the full allocated amount of \$500,000 be potentially available to support summer research proposals.

Moved By: Gordon Koshinsky Seconded By: Kevin McCormick
Carried Abstention: 1 Date: 20 Feb. 96

Resolution 96-085

Moved that the NWMB provide funding support for the top nine-ranked research projects listed in the summary table (attached) in the total amount of \$499,700 for 1996/97. Advisories to agencies in receipt of funds for multi-year projects to indicate that funding beyond 1996/97 is contingent on annual re-assessment by the NWMB. Agencies also to be advised that the percentage contribution by them to overall project funding will be an important consideration in evaluations of proposals by the Board.

Moved By: Gordon Koshinsky Seconded By: David Aglukark
Carried Date: 22 Feb. 96

Resolution 96-086

Moved that the NWMB support the request by Ikajutit Hunters and Trappers Association to carry-over unused funds of \$33, 698.44 for the Narwhal I.D. Project to the 1996/97 fiscal year.

Moved By: Gordon Koshinsky Seconded By: Joannie Ikkidluak
Carried Date: 22 Feb. 96

Resolution 96-087

Moved that the NWMB provide up to \$28,000 towards the costs of holding the first meeting of the Bowhead Hunt Planning Committee, on the understanding that the meeting be targeted for March 1996 and that HTOs be encouraged to fund the honouraria and meals/accommodations of their representatives.

Moved By: Kevin McCormick Seconded By: Gordon Koshinsky
Carried Date: 22 Feb. 96

Resolution 96-088

Moved that the NWMB support the Marcel Lake/River Improvement Project proposed by the Ikajutit HTA through a one-time contribution of \$10,000. The contribution will be subject to the following conditions:

1. DFO must confirm they will provide advice, sample and data analysis, and assist with reporting.
2. The proponent provide the NWMB annual and final reports.
3. The budget be modified to reflect the DFO monitoring program.
4. That a fishing plan be developed for the river system.

Moved By: Kevin McCormick Seconded By: Meeka Mike
Carried Date: 22 Feb. 96

Resolution 96-089

Moved that the NWMB not support the Aiviit Hunters and Trappers Association's application for funding to document and re-enact traditional lifestyle.

Moved By: Kevin McCormick Seconded By: David Igutsaq
Carried Date: 22 Feb. 96

Resolution 96-090

Moved that the request for funds for a Traditional Knowledge Study on harp seals presented by Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board and the Baffin Seal Strategy Committee be approved for \$13,500 and that the information gathered from the study, remain the property of the QWB.

Moved By: Kevin McCormick Seconded By: Gordon Koshinsky
Carried Date: 22 Feb. 96

Resolution 96-091

Moved that the Bowhead Knowledge Study Budget for April 1 - July 31/96 be adopted as presented.

Moved By: Kevin McCormick Seconded By: Marius Tungilik
Carried Date: 22 Feb. 96

Resolution 96-092

Moved that the NWMB staff be instructed to implement a plan (attached) to enable the NWMB to establish BNLs for communities subject to a quota for any or all beluga, narwhal and walrus.

Moved By: Marius Tungilik Seconded By: David Aglukark
Carried Abstention 1 Date: 22 Feb. 96

Resolution 96-093

Moved that a press release be prepared on the location of the 1996 Bowhead Hunt.

Moved By: Kevin McCormick Seconded By: Joannie Ikkidluak
Carried Date: 22 Feb 96

Resolution 96-094

Moved that the NWMB move to an incamera session.

Moved By: Marius Tungilik Seconded By: Joannie Ikkidluak
Carried Date: 22 Feb. 96

Resolution 96-095

Moved that the NWMB move out of incamera session.

Moved By: Joannie Ikkidluak Seconded By: David Igutsaq
Carried Date: 22 Feb. 9

Resolution 96-096

Moved that the NWMB take the necessary steps to stabilize the Kitikmeot Regional Hunters and Trappers Association's financial situation and to obtain all available information pertaining thereto, to provide bridge-funding which may be required in the interim (for future funding recovery). None of the above will preclude the NWMB bringing any further actions which may subsequently be deemed appropriate in this situation.

Moved By: Kevin McCormick Seconded By: Marius Tungilik
Carried Date: 22 Feb. 96

Resolution 96-097

Moved that the next meeting of the NWMB be held in Iqaluit the week of May 13, 1996.

Moved By: David Iqutsaq Seconded By: Marius Tungilik
Carried Date: 22 Feb. 96

Resolution 96-098

Moved that the meeting be adjourned.

Moved By: Marius Tungilik Seconded By: Joannie Ikkidluak
Carried Date: 22 Feb. 96