

NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD

MINUTES: REGULAR MEETING No. 11

14 - 17 MAY 1996
IQALUIT, NT

Members and Staff

Ben Kovic	Chairperson
David Aglukark	Member
Malachi Arreak	Member
David Igutsaq	Member
Joannie Ikkidluak	Member
Gordon Koshinsky	Member
Kevin McCormick	Member
Meeka Mike	Member
Marius Tungilik	Member
Johnny Peters	Member (Makivik)
Jim Noble	Executive Director
Dan Pike	Director Wildlife Management
Keith Hay	Bowhead Study Coordinator
Carol Churchward	Harvest Study Coordinator
Tom Demcheson	Baffin Regional Liaison Officer
Pierre Chartrand	Director, Finance and Administration
Michael d'Eça	NWMB Legal Advisor
Mary Nashook	Interpreter
Titus Arnakallak	Interpreter

Guests and Other Participants

Natsiq Kango	Secretary Treasurer, Nunavut Tunngavik Inc.
Zack Novalinga	Chairperson, Sanikiluaq HTO
Kirt Ejesiak	President, Uqsiq Communications
Peter Kilabuk	President, Cumberland Sound Fisheries Ltd.
Henry Copestake	Principal Consultant, Co-Pro Ltd.
Gary Weber	A/Area Manager Eastern Arctic, DFO
Bas Oosenbrug	Assistant Director Wildlife Management, DRR
Glenn Williams	A/Superintendent Baffin Region, DRR
Bruce Ashley	Fisheries Advisor, Baffin Region, DRR
Dr. Peter Usher	P.J. Usher Consulting Services, Ottawa

Several members of the public at large.

Tuesday 14 May 1996

1. Call to Order and Opening Prayer

Chairperson Ben Kovic convened this the eleventh meeting of the NWMB at 09:00. He called on David Aglukark to offer an opening prayer. He noted that this was the first meeting of the Board in this boardroom, adjacent to the Board's new offices in the Parnaivik building. Introductions were made between Board members and visitors. The Chairperson announced that the Board will host a social in its offices the evening of May 16, and all members, staff, guests, and community representatives are invited to attend.

2. Greeting from Community Representative

Natsiq Kango, Secretary Treasurer of Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, welcomed the Board to Iqaluit. Ms. Kango observed that the two agencies (NTI and NWMB) were now housed in the same building, and the NTI looked forward to a close and productive working relationship. On behalf of NTI, Ms. Kango congratulated the Board for clearing the way for a bowhead whale hunt in 1996, and offered the full support of NTI for this endeavour.

3. Agenda and other Preliminaries

- 3.1 The agenda was approved, with the following additions:
- Additional Member's concern (M. Arreak: Agenda Item 8)
 - Provision for Chairperson of Sanikiluaq HTO to address the meeting (B. Kovic: Agenda Item 8)
 - Forthcoming meeting of Wildlife Board Chairmen, NWT Land Claims (K. McCormick: Agenda Item 11).

The probability was recognized that some Agenda Items would need to be deferred to another meeting. **(Resolution 97- 008)**

3.2 Swearing-in New Member for Makivik

Commissioner for Oaths Peter Baril of Iqaluit conducted the swearing-in ceremony for Johnny Peters of Kuujuaq. Mr. Peters replaces Jackie Koneak, Second Vice President of Makivik, as a member of the Board. Chairperson Ben Kovic welcomed Mr. Peters to the Board, and looked forward to his valuable and forceful input.

4. Approval of Minutes

- 4A. Consideration of the Minutes of the Ikaluktutiak Regular Meeting of 20 - 22 February 1996 was deferred.
- 4B. Minutes of the Conference Call of 06 March 1996 were accepted with corrections (**Resolution 97-009**).
- 4C. Minutes of the Iqaluit Special Meeting of 15 April 1996 were accepted with corrections (**Resolution 97-010**).

5. Financial Reports

5A. Preliminary 1995/96 Financial Statement

A draft statement, prepared by the auditors (MacKay Landau), was reviewed. The following questions and concerns were posed for explanation and/or elaboration in the final statement:

- By Kevin McCormick: The need to reconcile the year-end valuation of the Research Trust Fund.
- By Gordon Koshinsky: The need to rationalize titles and preferably to amalgamate (by agency) the list of research contributions.
- By David Aglukark: The need to clarify status of the grant to Pauktuutit Inuit Women's Association (repaid, repayable, or ongoing?).
- By Kevin McCormick: The probable need (as per the Trust Deed) for a fully independent Financial Statement for the Wildlife Research Trust.
- By Meeka Mike: The need to have a description for the line item now termed "Bank charges" so that it signals the inclusion of management fees paid in respect to the Research Trust Fund.
- By Michael d'Eça: The need to indicate (Note 5) that the Wildlife Research Fund was established under the Implementation Contract, not through an Act of Parliament.

5B. Wildlife Research Fund Investment Update

- Pierre Chartrand advised that the 1995/96 FY-end valuation of the fund was \$13,432,151. This represents a 22% increase over the original allocation of \$11,000,000.
- Pierre Chartrand advised that an “Application for income tax registration for a Canadian charity” was submitted in April but is unlikely to be actioned for at least 3 months. Pierre also advised that a draft “Statement of Investment Policy and Guidelines” will be available for the August meeting of the Board.
- Gordon Koshinsky cautioned that while the present valuation of the fund appears to indicate very favourable growth, at least half of the increase is represented by capital gains which have not been realized and are in fact vulnerable. Capital appreciation beyond face value is automatically lost on bonds which are held to maturity.
- It was noted that the Trust Deed calls for at least two meetings of the trustees annually, with the next (first) meeting to take place in conjunction with the August meeting of the Board.
- It was decided to invite a TAL investment representative to the August meeting, to discuss investment strategy and to examine options which would give the Trustees more flexibility in administration of the Board’s Wildlife Research Fund. Participation by the Fund is currently tied to the most conservative of TAL’s investment products, namely their “Short Term Bond Pooled Fund.”

6. Chairperson and Staff Reports

6A. Chairperson’s Report

6A1. Canada - Greenland negotiations: turbot and shrimp allocations

Ben Kovic reported on a consultation meeting on 25 March in Ottawa, preceded by a meeting of the Canadian delegation the previous day. Ben referred to a briefing note prepared by Michael d’Eça. Under consideration was management in NAFO Areas O and I. With respect to turbot, Canada took the position that the overall harvest

should be reduced, but in accordance with the historical (70% Canada, 30% Greenland) split. Greenland takes the position that a 50/50 split is more appropriate, and that eliminating gillnetting (in favour of longlining) is more important than reducing the harvest. With respect to shrimp, Canada pointed out that in 1995 Greenland alone exceeded the total combined TAC (both countries) by 20-25%; and took the position that Canada's historical share (17%) is appropriate. Greenland contends that it can only reduce its harvest gradually, and that Canada's realistic share is 3.3%. Canadian research is required, on matters such as shrimp stock distribution and turbot inshore/offshore relationships.

6A2. Canadian Code of Conduct for Responsible Fishing Operations

Ben Kovic noted that the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board has been participating, on the invitation of DFO and with the concurrence of NWMB, in meetings and correspondence to develop this Code. A meeting in Montreal March 27-29 (attended by Ben) was further to that purpose. The DFO objective seems to be to get commercial fishermen to assume a broader range of responsibilities in their fishing operations, an objective which appears grounded in the various DFO downsizing initiatives, and has a target completion date of June 30. Dan Pike interpreted that the Code would be administered as a contract: fishermen would need to sign on in order to get a licence, and could expect that their licence would not be renewed if they failed to comply with the Code. Malachi Arreak noted that Inuit fishermen recognize the need to fish responsibly in order to conserve the resource, about which they appear to be more adept than their southern Canadian counterparts. It was concluded and agreed that:

- This initiative, while it might be appropriate in southern Canada, did not seem appropriate for the NSA in general. Structures in the NSA for which equivalents are generally lacking in southern Canada (e.g. NWMB, HTOs) already promote responsible fishing operations.
- The initiative may have relevance and value in respect to the offshore fishery in NAFO Zone O, including for vessels on contract to Inuit enterprises.
- There is not time to conduct reasonable consultation with Nunavut fishermen before June 30, and in any event this consultation would seem to be the responsibility of DFO as the initiating agency.

- Michael d'Eça and Dan Pike will review the available material in the context of NWMB interest and jurisdiction, and draft a response to DFO.

6B. Executive Director's Report

6B1. New office space

Jim Noble advised that the move from the Arnakallak Building to the Parnaivik Building was now completed. The Board's Wildlife Management Division will be occupying its new offices on the main floor shortly.

6B2. Staffing actions

Jim Noble advised that the three Regional Liaison Officers are now working, on location. The next staffing action which might be considered could be for a Communications Officer.

6B3. Shadow trainee positions

Jim Noble reminded the Board of its earlier declared intention to hire shadow trainees e.g. in respect to the Executive Director position and the Director of Finance and Administration position. Kevin McCormick counseled that taking on trainees, if done properly and effectively, would pose a net drain on managerial time and effort. David Aglukark suggested that the primary prerequisite for on-site training initiatives was to have highly qualified staff in place, as he deemed the Board now does. Kevin McCormick suggested that if the Board wishes to train Nunavut people to occupy key positions on staff, it might be more effective to encourage and support external training programs. David Igutsaq noted the responsibility of communities and individuals to promote/obtain basic (school) training, in order to provide a pool of qualified candidates.

Marius Tungilik questioned whether the Board has staffing policies in place pertaining to affirmative action, and if so whether these policies are being applied and are effective. Kevin McCormick noted that such policies are included in the Board's Procedures Manual. Meeka Mike stated that there are concerns in the communities that the composition of the Board's staff may not reflect the Nunavut population. Gordon Koshinsky suggested that a format be developed whereby every staffing action is concluded with a written self-evaluation (to file) documenting the success or failure to "hire locally."

It was decided to commission an independent review of the Board's past staffing actions, in order to document the Board's record in implementing its staffing policies with reference to reflecting the ethnic and gender composition of the NSA, and to obtain advice for improvement. **(Resolution 97- 011)**

6C. Wildlife Management Director's Report

Dan Pike referred to his Information Note listing topics that have received his attention since the last Board meeting, and matters anticipated for his attention in the coming months.

On the matter of developing an NWMB Resource Centre, Dan noted that other Boards under the NFA are similarly directed as per the Implementation Contract (IC). Michael d'Eça pointed out that the IC declares the assumption that the Nunavut Planning Commission will "establish and maintain a resource centre including a Geographic Information System covering the NSA available for use by the other institutions of public government". Kevin McCormick urged that if the NPC's resource centre, including particularly the GIS component, was going to be used extensively by the NWMB (e.g. in respect to the Harvest Study), it was important to make the NWMB's specific requirements known early.

7. Mail

Incoming and outgoing correspondence binders were on hand for members to examine at their convenience. Gordon Koshinsky applauded the newly-adopted process whereby incoming mail logs are faxed to Board members weekly, and requested a similar process for outgoing mail. It was noted that the development of an effective process to track the handling of incoming correspondence and to link incoming and outgoing files was not yet finished.

8. Members Concerns

8A. David Igutsaq informed the Board of several concerns from his region:

- Coppermine is pursuing a capelin quota, to accommodate a fall fishery at the community. This would be for local consumption and perhaps for inter-settlement trade.
- Coppermine is concerned about possible negative effects of mining activity on drinking water quality and fish in the Coppermine River. They would like to have some baseline work done before any mining activity proceeds.

- Taloyoak would like to see test fisheries for charr on the Boothia Peninsula, to determine if commercial fishing is feasible. Testing would be expensive, and funding is required.
- Pelly Bay is concerned about the possibility of a declining polar bear population in the area. Dens were surveyed about 6 years ago and they would like this survey repeated, either by themselves (with funding) or by DRR.
- A defence-kill situation involving a polar bear has been outstanding for two years at Taloyoak, pending a decision by DRR whether charges will be laid. This needs to be cleared up. The uncertainty makes people reluctant to defend themselves against bears. Michael d'Eça referred to the basic authorization for such action which is embodied in NFA 5.6.52 and 5.6.53.
- Taloyoak and Pelly Bay are concerned about a recent change in the boundary between the Gulf of Boothia and M'Clintock Channel polar bear management zones. The change causes considerable inconvenience, and friction between the communities because:
 - There are different harvesting regulations in the two zones, and
 - Pelly Bay hunters can no longer hunt near Taloyoak (without the special concurrence of Taloyoak hunters), and furthermore
 - Taloyoak hunters, although having access to both zones, can no longer transfer their hunting effort between the zones in response to ice conditions.

On this latter issue, David stated that local hunters do not agree with the integrity of these two zones as currently established. They believe that bears migrate extensively between them, and that the boundary should be moved farther west, to the vicinity of Gjoa Haven. Bas Oosenbrug noted that neither population had been censused recently, nor have there been good recent studies on stock delineation. This information is needed before further changes can be considered. Ben Kovik urged Mr. Igutsaq to bring forward his concerns and proposals (all items) in clear written format.

8B. Gordon Koshinsky apprised the Board of several items:

- The Centre for Indigenous Environmental Resources (CIER), an organization recently created by Canadian First Nation Chiefs in partnership with the University of Manitoba, is offering an Environmental Assessment, Protection and Education program to aboriginal students. Gordon distributed a brochure outlining

the program. Although it will be of greater interest to entities such as the Nunavut Impact Review Board, the goal of having at least one trained environmental field worker in every Nunavut community could also serve the NWMB very well in a number of areas. Examples might include facilitating and participating in research projects (both scientific and traditional), and assisting with the Harvest Study.

- Whale Cove HTO would like to create a local bylaw to prohibit netting for charr within a certain distance of the Wilson River mouth, and are requesting advice on how to proceed in order to be effective. Although it is not the purview of the NWMB to write local bylaws, the Board has considerable interest in ensuring that HTOs adopt effective procedures. It was agreed that Dan Pike and Michael d'Eça will work with the HTO to accomplish its purpose, and to do so in a way that will serve as a model.
- The Hamlet of Arviat, and subsequently the Arviat HTO, have written to complain about the reduction in commercial charr quota for Ferguson River from 13,600 kg to 3,000 kg. While requiring response, this also poses the question of how the quota came to be changed. Dan Pike advised that the change was enacted by DFO commencing in 1995, following appropriate studies and community consultations, on the premise that “the Board does not yet have the staff or resources to take on this responsibility, and they have told DFO to let HTAs make decisions about fish quotas in their areas for the present time”. Michael d'Eça offered that quotas can only be implemented or varied through explicit decisions of the Board, and that any such instances previously enacted except in this context could be challenged unless now rendered legitimate by the Board. Dan Pike noted that there were several such instances and that the process is still ongoing (although DFO was recently advised that NWMB wants/needs to participate explicitly in quota adjustments). Dan also queried whether the same stipulations applied to varying a commercial quota (as per this situation) and establishing a TAH (the universally recognized purview of NWMB). Gary Weber queried whether, for purely local matters, HTOs may be assumed to have “de facto delegation of authority” from the Board. Michael suggested that the Board can act on the basis of HTO advice, but it cannot delegate actual quota-setting authority to an HTO. David Aglukark cautioned that the Ferguson River is not a purely local matter, since three communities fish it. It was decided that Dan Pike and Michael d'Eça will work through the issue for presentation at the next Board meeting. The concern expressed by Arviat will be appropriately acknowledged by correspondence.

- 8C. Malachi Arreak apprised the Board of a concern expounded by BRIA, via formal resolution, about the effects of research (handling, drugging, tagging, collaring) on health of polar bears and on wholesomeness of polar bear meat. BRIA is requesting the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board and the NWMB to develop an independent study of this matter, for reporting to Inuit. Malachi noted that a collared polar bear was found dead near Pond Inlet this winter, and another collared bear was observed eating a whole seal (instead of just the blubber), perhaps indicating extreme hunger. Joannie Ikkidluak reported that polar bears with missing ear tags (indicating capture and handling on at least two occasions: once to implace the tags and once to remove them) are often underweight, i.e. bears sedated more than once seem unable to retain normal weight. Such bears are generally inedible, although the hides shout no ill effects. Many Inuit, in any event, are reluctant to eat the meat of bears that have been previously sedated, although the biologists insist that the drugs dissipate quickly and completely. Bas Oosenbrug noted that 1995/96 was a difficult winter for bears, and may have been the key contributor to some unusual observations on mortality, condition and behaviour.

It was decided to request GNWT DRR and DOE to compile and evaluate existing information on effects of research on polar bears, to inform the Board and to serve as a prelude to possibly commissioning an independent study. **(Resolution 97-012)**

- 8D. Ben Kovic introduced Zack Novalinga, Chairperson of the Sanikiluaq HTO, to elaborate certain concerns from that area. Johnny Peters, NWMB Board member for Makivik, replaced David Igutsaq at the Board table for this presentation and discussion.

Mr. Novalinga focused on concerns about walrus hunting. Sanikiluaq has an annual quota of 10 walrus, but hunters from Nunavik are not restricted in this manner, are highly mobile, and have harvested as many as 20 walrus in some years. The North Belcher Islands walrus stock has become badly depleted, and it is now necessary to hunt at the Sleeper Islands. Even there, walrus are much less numerous than they used to be. The problem has been discussed with DFO Quebec Region, but it is clear that consultation needs to occur with the northern Quebec communities.

Johnny Peters acknowledged that this was a problem of long standing, and one that extended also to beluga whales and polar bears. The human population is growing, hunting technology is improving, and the wildlife is vulnerable. Harvest controls are

necessary and subsistence harvesting must have priority over outfitting.

It was agreed that Mr. Kovic will write to the heads of the various agencies with jurisdiction for wildlife management in Nunavut and Nunavik in order to initiate a consultation process pertaining to the areas of overlapping interest. Agencies will be invited to evaluate problems and propose solutions in respect to co-management of walrus, beluga whales and polar bears. See also Agenda Items 9.2B and 9.6A. **(Resolution 97-013)**

Wednesday 15 May 1996

At the request of the Chairperson, Joannie Ikkidluak offered an opening prayer.

9. New Business

9.1 Environment Canada (DOE)

9.1A Banning of lead shot for bird harvesting

Kevin McCormick reminded the Board that the DOE declaration banning lead shot for the harvesting of migratory birds was discussed at previous meetings. There had been no consultation by DOE with users in the ordinary sense. Michael d'Eça advised that this could be interpreted as a type of non-quota limitation, and hence was the purview of the Board. Joannie Ikkidluak asked if there had been research to show whether guns could withstand steel shot. Kevin McCormick replied that considerable work had been done. Only very old (softer-barreled) guns, or guns which are exceptionally heavily choked will pose a problem; hunters no doubt will also have to make adjustments in respect to shot size, critical distances, etc. David Igutsaq supported the ban on the grounds that birds taken at Taloyoak sometimes contain lead shot in healed-over wounds, posing a health hazard to consumers. It was decided to approve the proposed ban on lead shot for harvesting migratory birds in the NSA. **(Resolution 97-014)**

9.1B Mineral development in the Queen Maud Bird Sanctuary

Kevin McCormick reminded the Board that at the last regular meeting the Board had approved in principle a change in designation of the

Sanctuary to a National Wildlife Area, but had deferred to the land-use-planning process on the matter of reducing the size of the area designated. Community consultations pertaining to re-designation are scheduled for this fall. Meanwhile, and despite DOE objections, DIAND has issued a 5-year approval (starting in 1996) to Kennecott Canada Inc. for mineral exploration in the Sanctuary. DFO is very reluctant to issue the required access permits, but wishes to have the advice of NWMB. Board members in general expressed disapproval of the Kennecott/DIAND initiative(s); Marius Tungilik preferred to defer the matter to the Nunavut Impact Review Board and the Nunavut Planning Commission, both of which will soon be coming on stream. In the end, the Board decided to proclaim its opposition to further mineral exploration on the grounds that a mine (the only apparent objective for exploratory activity) would be incompatible with wildlife values in the Sanctuary. **(Resolution 97-015)**

9.2 Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO)

9.2A Bowhead management plan

Gary Weber referred to an outline and a draft for a bowhead management plan which had been presented in connection with the initial hunt planning workshop in January. Considerable discussion ensued regarding the draft document; no Board members could recall having seen it previously. David Aglukark noted that the material in it, had it been available, would have been of considerable use to the Hunt Planning Committee in its recent deliberations. Gary Weber noted that, whatever the circulation of the document to date, there were certain items (blanks) in it that could only be addressed by the Board (and/or by the Hunt Planning Committee). Michael d'Eça noted that some of the legalistic language in the draft would require revision from the Board's perspective. There was extensive debate on whether a management plan was actually needed, although it was generally acknowledged that the remaining requirements were not onerous. Gordon Koshinsky stated that his support for the bowhead allocation carried the assumption that a management plan would be completed prior to the hunt. David Aglukark argued that the Board should not jeopardize its cooperative reputation and international profile by stalling on this matter. In the end the Board agreed that NWMB staff and Michael d'Eça will work with DFO to complete the draft management plan prior to the next meeting of the Hunt Planning Committee on 18 June, but with the final management plan subject to Board approval as per NFA 5.2.34(d)(i). This will require translation, and review by all Board members.

9.2B Eastern Hudson Bay beluga

Gary Weber referred to the fact that while Quebec communities harvest beluga under a quota system, Sanikiluaq hunters do not operate under beluga quotas. It is not clear to what extent the two groups harvest the same beluga stock, although it is generally assumed that Sanikiluaq harvests Western Hudson Bay beluga to a considerable degree. An extensive genetic sampling program this summer aims to clarify this matter. The present management plan for Eastern Hudson Bay beluga does not cover Sanikiluaq. Malachi Arreak made reference to the NWMB jurisdiction in the matter, pending completion of the Makivik offshore claim; Michael d'Eça interpreted that jurisdiction to extend onshore only to the 12-mile limit.

9.2C DFO Management Renewal

Gary Weber referred to DFO's recent (April) discussion paper on this subject, with particular reference to Central and Arctic Region. The document suggests that the Department is to transform its emphasis from a "doing" agency to an "enabling" agency in respect to fishery management, "while at the same time strengthening DFO's capability to ensure conservation and sustainable utilization of fishery resources." Regional A-Base budgets for Fisheries Management Directorate are expected to be reduced by about 30% from 1994/95 levels. More recently the Department has announced plans to reduce its Arctic Science Program by about 25% within the present fiscal year. The Department is anxious to discuss these downsizing initiatives with the Board.

Malachi Arreak expressed doubts about the ability of DFO to meet its obligations under the NFA in the face of such reductions. Kevin McCormick detected a divergence in points of view about the respective roles of DFO and NWMB.

It was decided to write to the DFO Minister, expressing grave concerns about the Department's downsizing, agreeing that a meeting was necessary, and requesting more detail and analysis of implications specific to the NSA and to the NWMB.

9.3 Department of Renewable Resources (DRR)

9.3A Consolidation of Government Departments

Marius Tungilik presented the discussion paper "Consultation on Consolidation" (6 May 1996). Three Departments are involved, with

an April 1997 target date for completion. The GNWT hopes to save \$5 million over the first year of implementation.

Kevin McCormick suggested that the Board should head-off any perception in GNWT that the Board is available to accept offloading of workloads. It was decided to develop a position paper on the matter, to state the Board's interpretation of respective jurisdictions. This will be communicated to the GNWT, to serve as the foundation for a meeting hopefully in June.

It was also decided to write to the GNWT Minister of Renewable Resources to express the Board's interest in and concerns about the consolidation initiative, and to seek a June meeting. **(Resolution 97 - 016)**

9.3B Transfer of Grants and Contributions

Maruis Tungilik referred to the GNWT draft Contribution Agreement to "transfer administrative responsibility and accountability for the allocation of funding" to RWOs and HTOs within the DRR Grants and Contributions Policy, from DRR to NWMB.

There was continuing positive response from Board members to the concept of streamlining funding to RWOs and HTOs, thereby reducing their administrative and accountability requirements. However, there was dismay about the impracticality of several of the requirements set out in the draft Contribution Agreement (CA), and the onerous implications for NWMB. It was observed that the draft CA was not "customized" to the particular realities of the situation. Kevin McCormick reminded everyone that the Board had never agreed that a transfer should be pursued, but had on a few occasions requested a discussion paper from GNWT.

It was decided that the Board will develop a counter-proposal to the DRR draft Contribution Agreement, and advise DRR that this is underway. The counter-proposal will call for 3-year guaranteed funding, a simple grant framework for accountability, and compensation to NWMB for incremental costs.
(Resolution 97-017)

9.3C Canadian Endangered Species Program

Bas Oosenbrug reminded the Board that the federal government is developing an Endangered Species Protection Act, expected to be tabled in the fall of 1996. The NWMB has commented extensively on the drafting of this legislation.

Because of jurisdictional constraints, the new federal legislation will not in fact address the majority of Canadian species-at-risk. For this reason, the federal, provincial and territorial governments are attempting to develop a companion "National Framework for Endangered Species Conservation" which will hopefully cover the full range of jurisdictions. It is proposed that the agencies sign an Agreement of Intent to implement such a Framework. The NWMB is invited to provide comment.

Kevin McCormick expressed concern that the wildlife management boards established under land claims are referred to only very obliquely in the draft Framework and in the draft Agreement. Certainly their specific jurisdictions are not acknowledged. Possibly the Boards should be signatories (assuming they approve). The item was deferred, on the likelihood that it will be explored at the meeting of wildlife management board chairpersons in June (Agenda item 11C).

9.3D Wildlife Management Issues (GNWT)

9.3D1 Trade in (Polar) Bear Gall Bladders

Bas Oosenbrug noted that the NWT is one of the few Canadian jurisdictions that still permits this trade (re: polar bears). There is some concern that this may negatively affect the NWT profile and reputation in a general sense, in that it may be seen to jeopardize international efforts to protect endangered bear species. More specifically, conclusion of arrangements with the USA regarding export of polar bear hunting trophies will probably require certification that the gall bladder was destroyed in each individual case. Field procedures would need to be developed.

It was agreed to request a more substantive briefing on this matter from DRR as a prelude to serious consideration.

9.3D2 Disposal of Emergency - Killed Polar Bear Parts

Bas Oosenbrug referred to NFA 5.6.55, that "Valuable parts of wildlife killed (in an emergency situation) shall be disposed

of by the NWMB to the appropriate RWO.” Obviously DRR Officers will need to be involved, as in the past, because they are on-site. A protocol needs to be established to define the process and to identify the polar bears parts to which it will apply.

Michael d’Eça noted the following pertinent planning assumptions in the Implementation Contract (Schedule I, Article 5, Page 12):

- NWMB will determine what parts are valuable and provide a list to (DFO and) DRR.
- NWMB and RWOs will establish a process for disposal of valuable parts.

Malachi Arreak stated that in his experience Inuit prefer that present provisions remain in place. According to this arrangement:

- Defense - killed bears are seized by the investigating officer;
- The meat is immediately turned over to the local HTO; and
- The hide and other valuable parts are turned over to the appropriate HTO upon completion of the investigation.

It was concluded that NWMB staff will initiate appropriate work pertaining to this matter. **(Resolution 97- 018)**

9.3D3 International Constraints on Polar Bear Hunting

Bas Oosenbrug noted that in connection with the (1973) International Agreement on the Conservation of Polar Bears:

1. A Resolution was signed to protect females with cubs, cubs alone, and any bears in dens or moving into denning areas.
2. Canada declared (unilaterally) that an (undefined) “token” proportion of the subsistence harvest could be allocated to Inuit-guided sport hunting.

Bas added that:

1. Protection of cubs per se is no longer regarded as a conservation issue in Canada, since cubs are included in quotas.
2. In the process of making provision for the importation of polar bear parts, the US Fish and Wildlife Service seeks to define “token” as 15% of TAH.

Bas noted that some communities:

1. Seek to harvest cubs for cultural, social and culinary reasons.
2. Are concerned that a 15% “token” restriction will prohibit Inuit from optimizing their use of one of their resources.

Michael d’Eça stressed that the International Agreement has to be taken into account (cannot be ignored). Gordon Koshinsky observed that the US process of developing requirements to complement importation of polar bear trophies from sport hunts seems to be very onerous, and wondered if agreement can ultimately be achieved. Bas Oosenbrug invited the Board to work with the GNWT to develop appropriate responses and interventions.

9.3D4 Compensation for Polar Bears Killed by Non-Inuit

Bas Oosenbrug noted that a polar bear killed by a non-Inuk in defense of life of property, or killed incidental to a scientific or industrial activity, represents a lost income opportunity for Inuit. Some individual compensation agreements have been put in place (e.g. by specific industries), but there is no general/consistent agreement, although an underlying policy has been drafted. Malachi Arreak noted that not all communities value a bear in the same way (e.g. as a sport-hunting opportunity?), and circumstances may differ (were all parts recovered for the community?). Michael d’Eça advised that it is the Board’s purview to decide whether such a kill is to be interpreted as part of the TAH, and more fundamentally to decide whether the Board wants to participate in this issue.

The Board decided that it will give further consideration to this matter if and when DRR comes forward with a policy

proposal which has benefited from consultation. It would be the Board's role to approve such a policy.

9.3D5 Caribou Mortality in the Kimmirut Area

Item deferred to next meeting.

9.3D6 Experimental Harvest of Snow Geese at Arviat

Bas Oosenbrug reminded the Board of the international goal (Arctic Goose Joint Venture) to reduce the numbers of lesser snow geese before they inflict further damage on their summer habitat. The Arviat HTO has agreed to be contracted by the DRR for an experimental harvest of 500 geese. The project will be assessed for its potential to be a business venture.

Michael d'Eça interpreted this as an item for decision by NWMB, as per NFA 5.6.4. Kevin McCormick pointed out that the Migratory Birds Convention has no provision for such an undertaking, although that could perhaps be overcome. Gordon Koshinsky was concerned lest the project comes to be seen as a return to market hunting of birds.

A majority of Board members decided to approve the project (**Resolution 97- 019**, with abstentions).

9.3D7 Quality of Caribou Meat at Gjoa Haven

Item deferred to next meeting.

9.3D8 Muskox Population Abundance, Queen Maud Gulf Area and Adelaide Peninsula.

DRR provided an update of most recent population estimates, and tabled plans to conduct a survey west of Chantrey Inlet in June 1996.

9.3E Request for Increase in Muskox Quota at Taloyoak

Bas Oosenbrug advised that Taloyoak HTO has requested that the muskox quota in Zone 13/3-2 be increased from 5 to 10, effective immediately. David Igutsaq stated that the reason was to slow the colonization by muskoxen from Somerset and Prince of Wales Islands, since muskoxen are detrimental to the (preferred) caribou.

Dan Pike noted that there was not sufficient information for him to make a recommendation in respect to altering the TAH. Kevin McCormick suggested that, in view of the concern about effects of muskoxen on caribou (which has been more or less validated in other locales), this might be viewed more as a population control issue than a population conservation (or TAH) issue. Gordon Koshinsky asked whether the baseline population is such that an increased harvest of 5 might be acceptable from a conservation perspective, if the population control argument is not taken into account. Bas Oosenbrug replied that the population probably is adequate, but good estimates are not available.

The Board decided to increase the quota, from 5 to 10. **(Resolution 97 - 020)**

9.4 Nunavut Wildlife Management Board, New Business

9.4A Atlantic Fisheries Issues

Henry Copestake presented a briefing paper on a number of issues, with recommendations:

- Federal-Provincial Atlantic Fisheries Committee
 - Made up of Deputy Ministers, including GNWT
 - Recent focus: outlining historic shares of commercial fishery resources between provinces. This exercise is potentially contrary to interests in the NSA where the history of commercial fishery exploitation is short and relatively minor.
- Commercial Fisheries Licencing Policy
 - Designed to restrict access to “Core” fishermen
 - Undisclosed special provision for Baffin Inuit.
 - In fact, no commercial groundfish licence has ever been issued to a Baffin enterprise. Even the well-established Pangnirtung winter turbot fishery is still conducted under an experimental permit.
- Fisheries Resource Conservation Council
 - NWT has ex-officio observer status
 - Advises the Minister on harvest levels including for turbot, and to some degree for arctic shrimp and seals

- Has a new Chairperson.
- Northern Shrimp Advisory Committee
 - Nunavut interests are represented by NWMB, GNWT, Qikiqtaaluk Corporation, and Unaaq Fisheries
 - Nunavut licence holders fish south to Newfoundland, and southern licence holders fish north into Davis Strait
 - Stocks are currently strong, but pressure for more licences (from southern Canada) is intense.
- Canada/Greenland negotiations on turbot and shrimp allocations
 - See also Agenda item 6.A1
 - Greenland is arguing that the international boundary in part of Davis Strait should be moved nearer to Canada.
- Seal hunt (1996)
 - First year in many that the TAH was taken
 - pelts to Norway
 - oil to Canadian drug companies
 - meat to China.
- Turbot allocation
 - Baffin Inuit have been allocated 1500 MT for 1996
 - Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board has passed a resolution recommending distribution of quota.
- Use of gillnets in the turbot fishery
 - At present gillnets are the gear of choice of most of the licence-holders fishing the 1500 MT Canadian Competitive Groundfish Quota
 - The gillnet fishery operates in an essentially unregulated manner.
 - Gillnetting is probably a very wasteful and destructive fishing method
 - The need for controls is deemed urgent.

Mr. Copestake's recommendations for NWMB included:

- Accept invitation to participate in Federal-Provincial Atlantic Fisheries Committee and Working Group.
- Encourage and support Nunavut groundfish licence applications.
- Participate in FRCC.
- Discourage issuance of new shrimp licences for southern Canadians to fish in the Arctic.
- Monitor and participate in discussions with Greenland on TAH and allocations.
- Request a comprehensive report from DFO on the 1996 seal hunt.
- Support the QWB resolution on turbot allocations.
- Work with QWB to lobby for controls on Davis Strait gillnetting.

The following points were raised in the ensuing discussion:

- Mr. Copestake suggested that DFO would probably be receptive to proposals for exploratory turbot fishing in NAFO Area OA, north of Cape Dyer. Such activity, while aimed primarily at confirming the existence of viable stocks, could also be used to entrench the rights of Baffin enterprises to future access.
- Malachi Arreak expressed fundamental opposition to use of gillnets. Dan Pike noted that the Board had already (11 March 1996) written to the DFO Minister making some recommendations for control of gillnetting. Henry Copestake indicated that shrimp trawlers often pick up lost turbot gillnets. Such occurrences are recorded in Captains logs, but not generally in fishing logs seen by fishery enforcement officers.
- Henry Copestake noted that the shrimp fishery generates \$1.5 million annually in wages for Nunavut participants. The turbot fishery has similar potential.

9.4B Policy for NWMB-Funded Research

Item deferred to next meeting.

9.5 NWMB - Supported Projects and Contributions

9.5A Wildlife Research Trust Fund Projects

Dan Pike advised that most interim progress reports for 1995/96 projects have been received, but only DRR submitted interim financial reports by the due date (31 March). Reminders have been sent. There was discussion about withholding research funds for 1996/97 to agencies which do not comply with reporting requirements. It was decided that Dan will remind agencies once more, and to suggest funding jeopardy to delinquents.

9.5B NWMB - Funded Research Projects

i) Administrative update

Dan Pike reminded the Board that this category pertains to projects funded outside the Trust. All reporting requirements to date have been met, except that no interim financial report has been received for the Hudson Bay Traditional Ecological Knowledge and Management Systems (TEKMS) study. Program administrators in that case have advised that they are awaiting an audited financial statement.

ii) Results update

Kevin McCormick tabled the final report on DOE's study on Population Monitoring and Assessment of Polar Bears in Western Hudson Bay.

iii) Funding request: Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd.

Dan Pike advised the Board of a proposal from AECL to study levels, sources and effects of metals and radionuclides in caribou in the Kimmirut area. Cost of the study to NWMB would be \$74,882.

Joannie Ikkidluak stated that research on caribou in that area is definitely needed. Unusual mortality and impaired quality of meat were observed this winter (Agenda item 9.3D5). More recently (during snow melt) more carcasses have been found, many of them "curled up like dogs". This is an unusual mortality posture; dead caribou are usually found simply lying on their sides. Malachi Arreak suggested that south Baffin caribou are different

from north Baffin caribou in many ways (e.g. are smaller and darker), and cited suspicions of genetic influence from an imported group of reindeer which escaped in the area between Cape Dorset and Kimmirut in the early 1900s. Jim Noble advised that DRR has been studying incidence and effects of brucellosis in the area for the past three years, as part of a broader assessment of caribou health.

The Board concluded that , while it would be of interest, the proposed project was not quite “right” for the perceived problem(s), and was also very expensive mainly in respect to analytical costs. Thus the proposal was “sympathetically rejected.” **(Resolution 97- 021)**

9.5C NWMB - Funded Non-Research Projects

This entire section of the Agenda was deferred to the next meeting.

Thursday 16 May 1996

9.6 Other New Business

9.6A Makivik Interests and Concerns

New Board member Johnny Peters gave an overview of the most pressing wildlife management issues among Inuit in northern Quebec which pertain to NWMB.

i) Walrus sport hunting (Makivik)

Johnny reminded the Board of the request which is outstanding from the community of Salluit to conduct a pilot sport hunt for walrus in the Nottingham-Salisbury Islands. This is one of the Areas of Equal Use and Occupancy set out in the NFA. Dan Pike noted that arrangements are well underway for another pilot year of walrus sport hunting at Igloodik, under a series of conditions which have already been agreed by the community. Gary Weber noted that the current regulations do not distinguish between NWT residents and Quebec residents for purposes of walrus hunting, i.e. a general restriction (or effective quota) of four walrus per hunter per year applies. Provisions under

the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement do not apply to the marine area. Michael d'Eça advised that in these circumstances an assignment-of-existing-harvest-rights could be used, without introducing new conservation issues, as was/is done at Igloolik, and that the NWMB has complete jurisdiction. Under NFA 40.2.4, "the Inuit of Northern Quebec have the same rights respecting the harvesting of wildlife in the marine areas and islands of the Nunavut Settlement Area traditionally used and occupied by them as the Inuit of Nunavut...", with certain exceptions (which do not pertain in this case). Joannie Ikkidluak reminded the Board of an outstanding request from the community of Cape Dorset for authorization to engage in walrus sport hunting in this same area. Gordon Koshinsky indicated that he could support the Salluit proposal only if Cape Dorset was given equal consideration, and that all this would have to be set out in the context of a comprehensive management plan. Dan Pike noted that the assignment-of-existing-harvest-rights method of accommodating walrus sport hunting under the existing "quota" of four walrus per hunter is unrealistic for the longer term.

The Board decided to approve a pilot sport hunt for up to four walrus by the community of Salluit in the Nottingham-Salisbury area in 1996, with several conditions. **(Resolution 97-022)**

ii) Polar bear management (Makivik)

Johnny Peters advised of interest in three northern Quebec communities to conduct guided sport hunts for polar bears. He noted that a management plan needs to be developed, and research is needed to underpin such a plan. Most polar bear research in the Makivik area is at least 25 years old. Makivik would like to participate in new polar bear research.

Ben Kovic foresaw difficulties in increasing the overall northern Canadian polar bear sport harvest, when the Americans consider that the present 15% "token" sport harvest is already too high. Marius Tungilik was enthusiastic about the prospects for joint polar bear research.

iii) Beluga management (Makivik)

Johnny Peters noted that beluga hunting is banned in the Ungava area, and is managed through community quotas elsewhere in northern Quebec. Absence of quota restrictions at Sanikiluaq is viewed unfavourably by northern Quebecers.

Marius Tungilik noted that the same sort of apparent disparity pertains between beluga management regions in Canada and Greenland. Dan Pike suggested that the situation may not be as irrational as it seems at first glance; the Eastern Hudson Bay beluga stock is clearly not numerous and the key question is whether Sanikiluaq is harvesting the same animals. (See also Agenda item 9.2B.) There will be a concerted effort by DFO this summer to collect the required evidence.

9.6B Review of Draft Strategic Plan for NWMB

Dr. Peter Usher lead the Board through the highlights of the draft Strategic Plan which he had prepared from input received from the Board plus his own analyses following the Strategic Planning Workshop in April. A summary of Dr. Usher's presentation and of the accompanying discussion is provided as an attachment to these Minutes.

It was decided that completing the Strategic Plan document should have high priority. The Plan will be a useful aid to discussions with GNWT and DFO which are expected in June regarding those agencies' consolidation and/or downsizing proposals. To that end it was agreed that members will send comments and suggestions to Dr. Usher, either directly or via the Iqaluit office, prior to the end of May.

The Board moved briefly to In Camera format, to consider some items deemed to be of a confidential nature. **(Resolutions 97- 023 and 97- 024)**

Friday 17 May 1996

Joannie Ikkidluak offered the opening prayer.

9.6C Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board Annual Report

Joannie Ikkidluak, QWB Chairperson, lead the Board through the QWB annual report for 1995/96 as tabled. Highlights of the presentation and discussion included:

- Joannie announced that Jerry Ell has resigned as Executive Director. His elected replacement is Joannasie Akkumaliq.
- Joannie emphasized that some HTOs in the Region cannot access their funding from the RWO because they are unable to provide financial reports. The QWB has allocated \$13,000 for training, but this will not be enough and matching funds are being sought. Jim Noble reminded the Board of Dr. Usher's observation that the NITC are mandated to provide services to other land claim agencies besides NWMB, so that NWMB funding should not necessarily be expected to cover total training costs. Kevin McCormick recalled that NWMB staff had been requested to scope out this problem and develop alternative solutions for consideration by the Board. He noted that although there may be a shared jurisdiction, it is uniquely in the NWMB's interest that HTOs and RWOs operate effectively. Ben Kovic advised that he will make this an item of agenda for his meeting with NTI on May 28. Jim Noble emphasized the seriousness of the problem. No financial statements from HTOs have in fact been received for 1995/96, and some are yet outstanding for 1994/95.
- Joannie reminded the Board of the QWB resolution concerning allocation of turbot quotas.

10. Old Business

All Agenda items in this section, except C and F, were deferred to the next meeting.

10.C Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study

Keith Hay provided a status report. Interviews have now been completed in 18 communities and workshops were held in 5 of them. A total of 54 interviews (out of 221 available) have been translated, transcribed and edited. Knowledge was gained of six bowhead whales killed by Inuit, and previously unrecorded, in the Foxe

Basin/Northern Hudson Bay area over the past 60 years. In light of an increasing bowhead population, the magnitude of previous harvests has a bearing on estimation of present sustainable yields.

Meeka Mike asked when it will be possible to put bowhead whale harvest planning on a longer-term footing. Keith interpreted that the Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study will first need to be completed, as well as studies underway by DFO.

Keith advised that the final report on the Study is scheduled for August 1998.

10.F Bowhead Hunt Planning Committee

David Aglukark reported on the meeting of the Committee on 26 - 27 March. Decisions reached concerning the hunt include:

- Precise location: Repulse Bay, as near as possible to the community; otherwise north towards Lyon Inlet or, if necessary, towards the tip of Southampton Island.
- Date: Late July; open until 30 September.
- Hunt Captain: Abraham Tagurnak.
- RWO representation: Four from each RWO invited.
- Hunt crew: To be selected from RWO representatives.
- Responsibility for making equipment: local HTO.
- Responsibility for ordering equipment: KWF.

David Igutsaq noted the importance of hunters having the appropriate knowledge to deal with the explosives technology to be used in the hunt. It has been 60 years since this technology was last used in this area, and if there is any doubt on this point arrangements should be made for training. Inuvialuit hunters who have recently hunted bowhead may be able to provide this.

David Aglukark noted that an expenditure of \$100,000 is anticipated for the hunt and its aftermath. The KWF has written to NWMB requesting a contribution of \$20,000 (Agenda item 9.5 C, deferred).

11. Other Business

11.A Cumberland Sound Fisheries Ltd.

The Board heard a presentation from Peter Kilabuk, President of CSF Ltd.

Mr. Kilabuk read from three documents which were tabled with the Board:

- Historical background document
- Letter to NWMB (1 May 1996) regarding inshore turbot allocation.
- Letter to NWMB (1 May 1996) regarding offshore turbot allocation.

Mr. Kilabuk pointed out that Cumberland Sound Fisheries has been a leader in the development of the Cumberland Sound ice fishery over the past 10 years. Though its participation in Pangnirtung Fisheries it now operates the only fish processing facility in the area. CSF Ltd. is seeking to entrench and expand its participation in the summer fishery in order to enhance its overall viability and to maximize returns to Inuit. In this context the 1995/96 winter turbot fishery was devastated by unstable ice conditions (60 MT caught, compared to the more usual 400 MT in recent years). Hopefully this situation will not recur.

More specifically, Cumberland Sound Fisheries Ltd. seeks the following turbot allocations for the summer of 1996:

- 400 MT out of the 1000 MT Nunavut inshore quota, and
- 400 MT out of the 1000 MT Nunavut offshore quota, and the combined allocation (800 MT) to be fished offshore as per dispensation from the DFO Minister.

Gordon Koshinsky noted that the NWMB is faced with competing bids, among Inuit, for the 1996 Nunavut turbot allocation. There was discussion about whether it was NWMB's mandate or inclination to make such allocations to specific resource users.

It was decided that NWMB staff will consolidate the 1996 Nunavut turbot allocation proposals and alternatives, for consideration and decision by the Board via conference call.

11.B Meeting Reports and Briefing Notes

This entire section of the Agenda was deferred to the next meeting.

11.C Upcoming Meetings and Events

- Ben Kovic referred earlier to an upcoming meeting with NTI on May 28.
- There is an invitation to attend a meeting of the Keewatin Wildlife Federation the week of June 10.
- The Board has been notified of an intention to bring together the Chairpersons of wildlife management institutions under NWT land claims in Yellowknife, also the week of June 10.

12. Date and Place of Next Meeting

It was decided that the next regular meeting of the Board will be in Arviat the week of August 12. **(Resolution 97- 025)**

Meanwhile, since it was not possible to complete the Agenda for the present meeting, it was decided to re-convene in Yellowknife the week of June 10. Efforts will be made to arrange a meeting with the GNWT Minister of Renewable Resources and key staff during that time, and also to accommodate the meeting of Chairpersons of wildlife management institutions under NWT land claims.

13. Adjournment

It was decided to adjourn the meeting at 11:00 A.M. EDT.
(Resolution 97- 026)

Minutes Approved by: _____
Chairperson

Date: _____

NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD

ATTACHMENT TO MINUTES: MEETING 11

REVIEW OF NWMB DRAFT STRATEGIC PLAN

Contractor/Facilitator Dr. P. Usher

16 May 1996

1. Dr. Usher noted/suggested/interpreted by way of introduction as follows:
 - As an institution of public government, NWMB is not an agent of government. Accordingly it does not act on behalf of government, nor for that matter on behalf of any other particular agency or interest including Inuit per se.
 - NWMB not only oversees and implements Article 5 of the NFA, but is responsible to ensure that all agencies involved with wildlife in the NSA observe the principles of co-management.
 - Most, but not all, of this responsibility pertains specifically within the NSA.
 - Wildlife (co-)management in the Canadian Arctic does not have a strong commercial orientation overall. It is primarily a domestic/subsistence activity, but with substantial value. The annual realized value of wildlife probably approaches \$2,000 per capita, on average, in the NSA.
2. Dr. Usher identified seven core functions of the NWMB, and discussed the Board's role, timing and tasks with respect to each. He noted that the really major tasks are not particularly imminent, so that there is a window of opportunity to prepare for them and to get some of the supplementary functions out of the way, or at least underway.
 - Decisions of the Board that could be challenged require the Board to exert greatest care, and to be seen to be doing so. Information used to arrive at decisions will need to be of the highest standard and be fully taken into account. The Board will need to have technical staff who are competent to assess information. It must be remembered that the pertinent Minister has the prerogative to reject a Board

decision if all available information was not used in reaching that decision.

- The Board will have little control over the flow of material brought to it for approval according to its mandate. The incidence of such matters will increase as other institutions under the land claim come on stream. The Board will want to establish protocols for being approached, and will want to respond in a timely fashion.
- Some of the Board's advisory functions are stipulated in the NFA; most are not. Some are one-time functions (e.g. the requirement to evaluate the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation); most would be ongoing. Dr. Usher suggested that:
 - The Board should try to avoid situations where it (the Board) would be just one advisor among many advisors.
 - The Board should seriously weigh the degree of involvement it chooses to accept with respect to the offshore commercial fisheries. Political and economic considerations tend to predominate in such fisheries, and the Board's prescribed mandate is not strongly oriented in those directions. The workload potential here, however, is enormous.
 - The Board should not try to take the place of Inuit organizations for advancing the particular interests of Inuit as beneficiaries.
- The Board will have a core but relatively minor role in setting standards and guidelines. These will be mostly one-time items such as establishing trophy fees, and standards for guides. Most such matters are candidates for contracting out.
- A very important function of the Board pertains to its role in research. Three aspects of research are recognized:
 - The Board does research, e.g.
 - Harvest Study
 - Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study
 - The Board enables research, by
 - Funding,
 - Prioritizing,
 - Reviewing, etc.
 - The Board makes research findings publicly available. This will require protocols for access, confidentiality, cost recovery, etc.

- Other minor core functions of the Board pertain to:
 - Making appointments, e.g. to “structures” for coordinated management of migratory marine species.
 - Promoting and encouraging such matters as training and employment of Inuit.
3. The Board has a large number of supplementary functions which are generally not well spelled out in the NFA, but which need to be addressed to permit fulfillment of the core functions. In Dr. Usher’s view, these include:
- Communication. This requires a definitive Communications Plan. Besides the Board publicizing itself, it also needs to educate the public on how to address the Board. The Board must be aware of specific audiences needing to know specific things. It is probably worthwhile or even necessary to contract for development of the Communications Plan; it may be necessary to have the services of a communications officer, perhaps on a part-time basis, to implement it.
 - Consultation. This is implicit in much of what the Board does. It involves both consulting per se, and also ensuring/verifying that consultation is occurring (by others).
 - Coordination. This both requires and leads to comprehension of respective roles (of the Board and of its co-management and partner agencies). The biggest coordination challenge pertains to RWOs and HTOs. These are partners not only with NWMB, but also with other Boards under the NFA, with government agencies, etc. RWOs and HTOs are agents of Inuit, in a way that the NWMB is not. While the Board’s interest in capacity building among RWOs and HTOs is very strong, it is not unique. The Board may or may not have actual responsibility in this regard. The Board’s relationships with other agencies should be proactively developed, and on a timetable which does not simply follow events.
4. With respect to Board operations, Dr. Usher suggested that the Board needs to:
- Defend against agencies trying to use it as a single window, to take the place of their own consultations, etc.
 - Resolve respective Board/agency roles.

- Be selective in accepting arenas for active participation, compared with electing to make decisions based on provided results.
 - Develop a definitive evaluation protocol for its own operations, to complement ongoing feedback from constituents.
5. As developed by Dr. Usher in consultation with the Board, priorities for 1996/97 (current year) are seen to be as follows:
- Critical priorities. These really need to be achieved this year.
 - Harvest Study. Much hinges on this. It needs to get underway, even if it cannot be completely simultaneous everywhere. Contingency planning is needed, to deal with inevitable problems.
 - Relations with partners, co-managers and other agencies. Dr. Usher suggested that a Board Committee(s) be assigned to draft specific by-agency approaches, for earliest consideration and pursuit.
 - Desirable priorities. The Board would be well served if these were accomplished this year, but this is not absolutely critical. Items include (not a complete list):
 - Setting basic needs levels for beluga, narwhal and walrus.
 - Establishing relations with other management boards, such as the Beverly/Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board.
 - Developing a Communications Policy and Strategy.
 - Developing annual reports.
 - Completing various one-time tasks, such as:
 - evaluating FFMC
 - developing a framework for resource-loss compensation
 - Rationalizing workloads of senior staff members.
6. Priorities for the next two years (for the two years ending April 1999) would include:
- Completion of Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study
 - Substantial progress on Harvest Study

- Preparations for new Nunavut government, e.g. framework for a specific Wildlife Act.
- Development of compliance policies and procedures for such matters as conduct of NWMB-sponsored research.

NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD

RESOLUTIONS – MEETING No.11

IQALUIT, 14 - 17 MAY 1996

Resolution 97- 008

Moved that the agenda for the 14 -16 May 1996 agenda be adopted with noted additions.

Moved By: Malachi Arreak Seconded By: David Igutsaq
Carried Date: 14 May 1996

Resolution 97- 009

Moved that the Conference Call Minutes of 06 March 1996 be approved with noted corrections.

Moved By: Malachi Arreak Seconded By: Joannie Ikkidluak
Carried Date: 14 May 1996

Resolution 97- 010

Moved that the minutes of the Special Meeting (Iqaluit) of 15 April 1996 be approved with noted corrections.

Moved By: Joannie Ikkidluak Seconded By: Meeka Mike
Carried Date: 14 May 1996

Resolution 97- 011

Moved that the NWMB commission an independent review of its past staffing actions for the purpose of documenting success or failure by the Board to reflect the aboriginal and gender composition of the Nunavut Settlement Area in its present staff complement, and to recommend measures for improvement. This review will be undertaken with reference to the staffing policies of the NWMB.

Moved By: Malachi Arreak Seconded By: Gordon Koshinsky
Carried Date: 14 May 1996

Resolution 97- 012

Whereas, Inuit have often expressed concern about the effects of research procedures on polar bears, as exemplified by a recent resolution of the Baffin Region Inuit Association;

Whereas, this matter is of continuing interest and concern to the NWMB in its role in the formulation, direction and conduct of research;

Whereas, it will be necessary for the NWMB to have access to the existing available information on this matter for purposes of conducting an independent evaluation;

Therefore moved, to request the GNWT Department of Renewable Resources and the Canadian Wildlife Service (as appropriate) to compile and summarize existing information, both scientific and traditional, on the effects of mark/recapture and telemetry studies and associated research techniques and procedures with respect to polar bears, and further that these agencies identify studies underway or contemplated and suggest further work which might be possible and appropriate on this matter.

Moved By: Gordon Koshinsky
Carried Date: 15 May 1996

Seconded By: Kevin McCormick

Resolution 97- 013

Whereas, harvesting of marine mammals in the overlap areas is a great concern of Nunavik and Nunavut residents;

Therefore, moved that the NWMB Chairperson write to the Chairpersons of Makivik Corporation, NTI, and QWB to initiate discussions concerning overlapping interests pertaining to wildlife harvesting in the overlap areas.

Moved By: Malachi Arreak Seconded By: David Aglukark
Carried Date: 15 May 1996

Resolution 97- 014

The NWMB, having reviewed the DOE initiative to ban lead shot for the harvesting of migratory birds, has deemed this to be a “non-quota limitation” pursuant to Section 5.6.48 of the NFA, and approves the proposed ban on lead shot for harvesting migratory birds within Nunavut.

Moved By: David Igutsaq Seconded By: Joannie Ikkidluak
Carried Date: 15 May 1996

Resolution 97-015

Moved that the NWMB make clear to Government, Inuit, the Nunavut Planning Commission (NPC) , the Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB), and Kennecott Canada Inc. that it is opposed to further mineral exploration in the Queen Maud Gulf Bird Sanctuary on the grounds that a mine would be incompatible with the protection of wildlife and wildlife habitat within the sanctuary.

Moved By: David Igutsaq Seconded By: Joannie Ikkidluak
Carried Abstention: 1 Date: 15 May 1996

Resolution 97-016

Whereas the Government of the Northwest Territories has given notice of intent to consolidate its Departments of Renewable Resources, Economic Development and Tourism, and Energy Mines and Petroleum Resources; and,

Whereas the Canada Department of Fisheries and Oceans has given notice of intent to “renew” its Fisheries Management Program and to significantly reduce its capacity to conduct fish and marine mammal research in the Arctic; and,

Whereas these two initiatives are of fundamental concern to the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board in its role as partner with these agencies in fish and wildlife research and management;

Therefore, moved that the NWMB contact the respective Ministers responsible for these agencies:

1. To convey the Board’s concern that any substantial reduction in the fish and wildlife research and management capabilities of these agencies would imperil the effective co-management of fish and wildlife resources in the Nunavut Settlement Area (NSA).
2. To remind them that implementation funding for the agencies and operating and research resources for the NWMB were negotiated in the context of agency capabilities which were identified at the time and were assumed to be ongoing.
3. To express the hope that these agencies will meet their consolidation and renewal objectives without running contrary to the spirit and reality by which the Nunavut Final Agreement (NFA) was negotiated and is now being implemented.

4. To urge those agencies not to take steps which would effectively abrogate their ultimate responsibilities for fisheries and wildlife management under Section 5.2.33 of the NFA.

5. To request further, more detailed information and analysis on the impacts which these agencies foresee on their capacities for program delivery to meet their obligations under the NFA.

6. To offer/request to meet and/or to otherwise further consult and communicate in order to ensure that the potential pitfalls are avoided.

Moved By: Kevin McCormick
Carried Date: 17 May 1996

Seconded By: Gordon Koshinsky

Resolution 97-017

Moved that the NWMB reject the draft contribution agreement for the transfer of Grants and Contribution Funding for the RWOs and HTOs as presented by GNWT (DRR), but indicate to GNWT (DRR) that the NWMB is prepared to consider an agreement that meets the following conditions:

1. The level of funding will be guaranteed for a period of three years;
2. The funds will be transferred to the NWMB as a grant, requiring only an "annual audited statement";
3. The NWMB will be adequately compensated should it incur an added administrative burden.

Moved By: David Aglukark
Carried Abstention: 1

Seconded By: Malachi Arreak
Date: 15 May 1996

Resolution 97-018

Moved that the NWMB, in conjunction with the RWOs, determine which parts of polar bears are deemed "valuable" and provide a list to the GNWT Department of Renewable Resources; and further, that the NWMB in conjunction with the RWOs develop a process for the disposition of such "valuable parts" from emergency-killed polar bears.

Moved By: Malachi Arreak
Carried Date: 15 May 1996

Seconded By: David Aglukark

Resolution 97-019

Moved that, pursuant to the proposal dated 09 May 1996 from the Department of Renewable Resources, Wildlife Management Division; that the NWMB agree to a one-time experimental harvest of 500 lesser snow geese from the Arviat area during the spring of 1996, for distribution to communities within the Keewatin Region.

Moved By: David Aglukark
Carried Abstained: 3

Seconded By: Marius Tungilik
Date: 16 May 1996

Resolution 97- 020

Moved that the NWMB increase the quota for muskoxen in Muskox Zone B/3-2 from 5 to 10 animals in response to Taloyoak community concerns that expanding muskox populations are forcing caribou populations out of the region.

Moved By: Kevin McCormick
Carried Date: 17 May 1996

Seconded By: David Igutsaq

Resolution 97- 021

Moved that the research proposal submitted by Atomic Energy Canada Ltd. (AECL) for a study of toxins in caribou from the Kimmirut area (\$74,882.00) not be approved.

Moved By: David Aglukark
Carried Date: 15 May 1996

Seconded By: Kevin McCormick

Resolution 97- 022

Whereas, the NWMB has for consideration a request sponsored by Makivik Corporation for authorization of a sport-hunting operation for walrus by residents of Salluit at Nottingham and Salisbury Islands, and;

Whereas, the NWMB is understood to have the jurisdiction in this matter at the present time, and;

Whereas, the hunt can be accommodated without increasing the overall harvest, that is, without new implications for conservation;

Therefore moved that that the NWMB authorize a walrus sport hunt by the community of Salluit for 1996 with the following provisions:

1. The hunt be on a pilot-project basis, without prejudice beyond 1996.
2. The hunt be restricted to a maximum of 4 landings and/or 6 strikes for 1996.
3. The sport harvest be accommodated by formal assignment of rights to

harvest in the same amount by particular Salluit walrus hunters.

4. A management plan be in place prior to the hunt proceeding, with reference to all participants in walrus hunting in the Nottingham-Salisbury area.

Further moved that:

1. The community of Cape Dorset be invited to re-state their interest in walrus sport hunting in this context, with the prospect of favourable consideration by the NWMB.
2. That the NWMB move to a more concrete system of regulations to govern overall walrus harvests in future.

Moved By: Gordon Koshinsky
Carried Date: 17 May 1996

Seconded By: Johnny Peters

Resolution 97- 023

Moved that the Board move to an incamera session.

Moved By: Marius Tungilik
Carried Date: 16 May 1996

Seconded By: Malachi Arreak

Resolution 97- 024

Moved that the Board move out of incamera session.

Moved By: Marius Tungilik
Carried Date: 16 May 1996

Seconded By: Malachi Arreak

Resolution 97- 025

Moved that the next meeting of the NWMB be held in Arviat the week of August 12 - 16, 1996.

Moved By: David Aglukark
Carried Date: 17 May 1996

Seconded By: Meeka Mike

Resolution 97- 026

Moved that the meeting be adjourned.

Moved By: Malachi Arreak
Carried Date: 17 May 1996

Seconded By: David Aglukark

