

# NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD

## MINUTES: MEETING NO. 22

16-20 May 1999

IKALUKTUTIAK, NT

### Members and Staff Participating:

Ben Kovic	Chairperson
Harry Flaherty	Member
Pauloosie Keyootak	Member
David Alagalak	Member
Gordon Koshinsky	Member
Makabe Nartok	Member (except first day)
Joan Scottie	Member (last three days only)
Kevin McCormick	Member
Johnny Peters	Member for Makivik (by teleconference)*
Jim Noble	Executive Director (first three days only)
Michelle Wheatley	Director of Wildlife Management
Todd Roche	Regional Liaison Officer, Kitikmeot
Michael d'Eça	NWMB Legal Advisor
Juliana Boychuk	Interpreter

---

\*Johnny Peters participated for Agenda item 8F only

### Not Available:

Meeka Mike	Member (with cause)
------------	---------------------

### Guests and Other Participants (at various times):

Isaac Klengenberg	Chairperson Kitikmeot HTA
Lynn Siegersma	DFO Land Claims Liaison Officer, Iqaluit
Jack Mathias	DFO, Winnipeg
Alden Williams	Wildlife and Fisheries DSD, Iqaluit
Glenn Williams	Wildlife Consultant to NTI, Iqaluit

Several other presenters and members of the public at large

**Sunday, 16 May 1999**

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

The Chairperson Ben Kovic convened the meeting at 1:40 p.m. in the Zinc Room of the Yellowknife Inn at Yellowknife. David Alagalak led the opening prayer. Ben welcomed the NWMB Members to this the 22nd regular meeting of the Board. He noted the unusually short time interval since the previous meeting and congratulated the staff for getting the preparations completed.

## **2. Agenda**

Members reviewed the agenda for the meeting. Jim Noble noted that a few changes would be required, most of them of a housekeeping nature:

- DSD will be represented by Alden Williams rather than Joe Tigullaraq.
- The update on the Implementation Review will be verbal only.
- There is an additional donation request.
- The Legal Advisor will be reporting on a meeting of CMAC.

The agenda was accepted with the noted amendments. **(Resolution 2000- 001)**

## **3. Minutes**

The Minutes for Regular Meeting No. 21, held on 23-26 March 1999, were not yet available for consideration. The Resolutions that were passed at the Meeting were available to serve as an outline of the decisions that were made.

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

### **4.A Interim Year-End Financial Report (as at 31 March 1999)**

Jim Noble tabled the interim financial report for the 1998/99 fiscal year and provided an overview of the major variances. A large negative variance is attributed to Conservation Education; this stems from a major re-coding of items that were previously assigned to Donations. An overall over-expenditure of \$119,732 is currently projected. The report is now in process of being audited.

There was some discussion, but no decision, about whether to tender the audit for 1999/2000. The Board currently pays about \$12,000 for its annual audit.

The Board decided to accept the interim financial report for 1998/99 as it was presented. **(Resolution 2000- 002)**

#### **4.B Financial Report to 30 April 1999**

Jim Noble tabled an overview of the NWMB financial situation to 30 April 1999. Members noted that the format of the report was much different from recent editions and expressed considerable dissatisfaction with the changes. Jim explained that the changes were linked to a different accounting program now being used. Members refused to consider the report in the manner in which it was formatted. They requested that future presentations be tailored more closely to the previous format, even if it meant constructing the tables manually.

#### **4.C Funding Arrangement with DIAND: Update**

Jim Noble advised that a meeting of the IPGs with DIAND officials is scheduled for June 8 in Ottawa. It has been agreed by all parties that the purpose of the meeting will be to work towards mutually acceptable wording for the annual funding agreements.

### **5. Chairman, Staff, and Member Reports**

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

Ben Kovic noted that material pertaining to many of the items on his list of trips and meetings is included under other topics in the briefing binders. He elaborated briefly on his meeting with the Minister for Sustainable Development for the new Nunavut Government. Ben interpreted that Mr. Kilabuk has a priority focus on economic development, and also that he has a good understanding of the role and operations of the NWMB.

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

Jim Noble noted that most of the items in his list of tasks completed are also on the meeting agenda under different headings.

#### **5.C Director of Wildlife Management Report**

Michelle Wheatley referred the Members to her list of work completed and major tasks underway since the last Board meeting. She reported that all successful candidates for NWRT funding were simultaneously advised about the rigorous time frames that will henceforth pertain to project and financial reporting.

Kevin McCormick suggested that when the Arctic co-management boards meet together with one government department (as is scheduled with DFO at the end of May), it might be worthwhile to at least explore meeting with other government departments concurrently. Michelle advised that a measure of that is already happening: the “Western Co-management Boards” have arranged to meet with RWED (GNWT) in conjunction with the late-May meeting with DFO.

Harry Flaherty remarked on the proliferation of Working Groups, and wondered if time and effort was being or could be saved by modelling them on one another or even by appointing the same people to serve. Michelle replied that similar formats were being used, but that the issues being addressed tended to be community- as well as species-specific, and thus were best served by individualized membership. Harry expressed concern that these Working Groups might be getting assigned too much of the role of the RWOs. David Alagalak reported that some members of the Narwhal Working Group have felt marginalized because the Working Group met only once and then saw the process go forward without them. Michelle explained that it was the purpose of the Narwhal Working Group, as it was initially set out, to develop and recommend a framework that could then be implemented, but that it was never expected that the Working Group per se could or would take this framework into the field. It is anticipated that the Narwhal Working Group will be convened again in the fall, to evaluate the new management system. In this sense the Working Group is in the business of recommending overall policy rather than implementing specific action. It was agreed that terms of reference for Working Groups need to be clearly defined and well understood at the outset. If pertinent, their advisory roles should be clearly enunciated.

#### **5.D Director of Finance and Administration Report**

The Director of Finance and Administration was not present to elaborate on his activity report for the period. The financial material already presented reflects some items in that report. Jim Noble noted that the Director is exploring the subject of insurance coverage for Board Members.

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

Michael d'Eça tabled a comprehensive briefing note on his activities for the period. Michael noted that the new Nunavut Department of Sustainable Development (DSD) is showing a strong and genuine interest in fisheries development, in response to which he prepared a briefing note outlining relevant legislation and other matters. He also reported that the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage has released its report regarding Bill C-48 (*Marine Conservation Areas Act*), taking very positive account of the NWMB input.

#### **5.F Fisheries Advisor's Report**

Michelle Wheatley referred the Members to Ray Andrew's activity report contained in the briefing binder.

### **Monday, 17 May 1999**

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, re-convened the meeting at 2:30 p.m. at Ikaluktutiak. Board Member Makabe Nartok joined the meeting at this point. Pauloosie Keyootak offered an opening prayer.

#### **5.G Members' Reports and Concerns**

David Alagalak expressed concern about the workload of staff members who are involved in the senior administrative and wildlife management aspects of the NWMB program. He suggested that the Assistant Director of Wildlife Management position could probably be made more relevant and productive. David also urged a more forward-looking approach in dealing with the HTOs. He suggested that concerted research be done on the contentious issues that remain unresolved between the NWMB and these organizations, including the matter of defining adequate funding and the creation of new HTOs.

Harry Flaherty echoed David Alagalak's concerns about staff workloads. He suggested that it would be worthwhile for the Board to sponsor more training workshops for Members and staff. He also suggested that the Board should try to make better advance preparations for community attendance and participation, especially when it meets for the first time in a community.

Joan Scottie reported that administration of the Harvest Study continues to be a problem at Baker Lake. She cited lack of proper office accommodation as a contributing factor. She suggested that the Study needs to be promoted more aggressively and with more innovation to encourage better hunter participation.

Makabe Nartok urged that NWMB minutes and other informative documents be circulated with greater regularity to the HTOs in his region, as well as to the RWO and the RIA.

Kevin McCormick reported that shared waterfowl species are the subject of emerging discussions between CWS staff and officials from Greenland. Among the waterfowl receiving specific attention are harlequin ducks (considered by Canada to be at risk, but harvested in Greenland), and eider ducks (few of which nest in Greenland, but many of which are harvested there). Greenland officials have indicated enthusiasm for joint research on these two species, and the matter will likely require future attention by the NWMB.

## 6. Completion of Assignments and Resolutions from Last Meeting

Jim Noble referred the Members to the Task List with status notations included in the briefing binder.

All of the identified tasks arising from the last meeting were completed or are well under way. More problematical are some of the items brought forward from previous meetings, including many that are of rather long standing. These items were examined individually and the following decisions were made in respect to those that have not yet been completed or are not yet substantially underway:

- Item 17: Draft a policy paper on the NWMB/NMC position pertaining to Canada's Oceans Strategy. Discussion: In view of existing workloads of staff and Advisors, it might be just as well to wait for the next DFO initiative and respond to it. Decision: Delete the item.
- Item 18: Reactivate the process to develop a database inventory for all NSA fish and wildlife stocks. Discussion: Outlines for such an inventory were prepared and circulated previously. Decision: The Director of Wildlife Management to convene a conference call with the aim of motivating the three government agencies to initiate action.
- Item 21: Review NWMB obligations to the RWOs and HTOs under the NLCA and Implementation Contract, with the particular aim of identifying obligations that remain to be addressed. Discussion: An important matter, believed to have several significant components. Decision: The Legal Advisor, with input from David Alagalak, to prepare an outline of what to cover and how to proceed.
- Item 23: Negotiate and clarify working arrangements with DSD for a shared Conservation Education position. Discussion: DSD has just filled their Director of Conservation Education position, which is pertinent to the shared position as it has been envisaged. Decision: The Executive Director to address the matter in consultation with Executive Committee.
- Item 24: Prepare a recommendation with respect to inviting co-management partners to contribute material to next NWMB annual report. Discussion: Some debate about who in fact are the NWMB's co-management partners. Any input from them would have to be confined to their actions and observations regarding the co-management process. Decision: Following further consideration, it may be appropriate to invite the participation of the four pertinent government agencies, along with the three RWOs, the three RIAs, and NTI.
- Item 25: Prepare a general framework for HTO hunting and enforcement rules, with specific application to new management regimes. Decision: Adopt a wait-and-see approach, pending outcome of the present new management initiative with respect to narwhal. Meanwhile, ensure that HTOs have at least minimal rules in place to accommodate any new stock management regimes approved by the NWMB.

- Item 26: Urge RIAs to submit questions to NWMB in advance of their Regional AGMs. Discussion: Most questions asked at AGMs are truly spontaneous. It is important for Board Members attending to be generally briefed in advance. Decision: Delete the item.
- Item 28: Confirm that NTI is preparing a discussion paper on payment of compensation for polar bear defence kills. Discussion: This matter will need input from HTOs/RWOs. It hinges on a decision regarding who or what entity can be interpreted to own the polar bears. The value of bears being assigned under the IIBAs for new national parks might be a starting point. Decision: Remind NTI of their staff commitment to assess this matter and bring forward recommendations.
- Item 30: Develop a set of Policies and Procedures for the Nunavut Wildlife Research Trust. Decision: Those who were assigned this task should endeavour to complete it prior to the next meeting of the NWRT.
- Item 31: Re-establish contact with proponents (Suvaq) and with other interested parties regarding the charr stock development proposal. Discussion: Jim Noble advised that he was in contact with Suvaq officials when he transmitted the Board's earlier decision to them verbally. Decision: Delete the item; consider the matter closed.
- Item 33: Investigate options for protecting NWMB funds for the conduct of Public Hearings. Discussion: It is difficult to see how funds can be set aside, let alone protected, under a system of annual appropriations. Yet, Public Hearings would represent an unforeseeable and unpredictable cost. Decision: Flag the matter by way of the 5-year independent review.
- Item 34: Complete the formatting of NWMB Minutes for incorporation into the NWMB Web Site. Discussion: A list (roster) of all Resolutions that are contained in the Minutes has been prepared and is a vital step to reconciling and formatting the Minutes. Decision: Maintain the item in the Task List on an ASAP basis.
- Item 36: Prepare an analysis of NWMB responsibilities and assignments existent in current Polar Bear Management MOUs. Discussion: The MOUs are soon due for re-negotiation. This process will be led by new staff at DSD. Decision: Delete the item from active consideration.
- Item 37: Update the draft paper on the NWMB/DFO operating relationship. Discussion: Some of the most pertinent and contentious points of interface, such as shrimp allocations, access to turbot, and experimental char fisheries, are in a state of flux and rapid evolution. Decision: Delete the item from active consideration.
- Item 38: Organize a workshop to define roles and set a common course of action for participating agencies and other interested parties in the management and development of the Nunavut offshore fisheries. Discussion: Ray Andrews and Henry Copestake have been developing background materials for such a workshop. Decision: Maintain the item as an ongoing task.

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

## 7.A Proposal for Peregrine Falcon Delisting in the USA

Kevin McCormick advised the Board that three subspecies of peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus*) are native to North America. These are *F.p.pealei* on the northwest coast, *F.p.anatum* breeding south of the treeline, and *F.p.tundrius* breeding north of the treeline, including in the NSA. The various subspecies were for some time or still are designated as being “at risk”.

The US delisted *tundrius* peregrines in 1994. US authorities have recently determined that the population of the *anatum* subspecies is at or near target levels set out in the (their) recovery plan. On this basis they are proposing to delist this subspecies (as per their own jurisdiction) as well. This would automatically permit falconers once again to capture falcons to be trained in the pursuit of their sport. In anticipation of this, US biologists are trying to establish a biological basis for such a falcon harvest. The inclination of the US biologists is to:

- Confine any harvest area to the Texas-to-Florida coastal zone;
- Restrict the harvest to the September-October migratory period; and
- Permit the capture of no more than 250 birds per year.

The US authorities anticipate that such provisions would facilitate a sustainable harvest of primarily the *tundrius* subspecies, believed to be the most robust of all the North American peregrine falcon populations. The focus of the expected captures would thus be expected to include birds that breed in Nunavut. Some birds of the *anatum* population breeding north of about 53° N would inevitably be harvested concurrently. The birds do mix to at least some extent in migration, and the different populations are hard to distinguish at this stage in any event.

Actual or potential concerns from the Canadian perspective would/might include:

- That an annual harvest of 250 birds would be unrealistically high;
- That there would be active selection for females (because they are larger);
- That although most of the harvested birds would be from the *tundrius* subspecies, some *anatum* falcons will be taken inadvertently;
- That the harvest and its impact would be very difficult to monitor; and
- That there should be provision for benefits to Canada in respect to any harvest of Canadian-bred birds that are taken on migration in the USA.

This matter, if it develops further, will eventually have to come to the CWS for a formal Canadian response. If and when that happens, the NWMB will be asked for input. A response might be built around proposals such as:

- For a smaller harvest (much fewer than 250 birds per year);
- For diversion of harvesting attention away from females (say a 50:50 ratio);
- For accrual of benefits to Canada (since the target birds breed here);
- For an aggressive program of research, to address such questions as:
  - Precise pin-pointing of the source of harvested falcons.



- Number of over-wintering birds harvested in Mexico or farther south
- Number of birds killed by toxins in Central and South America.

Preliminary reaction to the proposal to delist the *anatum* subspecies in particular, and especially to any renewed harvest that a further delisting of falcons would enable, has been decidedly negative in Canada.

## **7.B Judicial Review of Special Harvesting Regulations for Snow Geese**

Kevin McCormick reminded the Board about concerns that rapidly expanding snow goose populations are negatively impacting their breeding habitats. The Canada/Mexico/United States Trilateral Committee for Wildlife and Ecosystem Conservation and Management has designated the mid-continent populations of lesser snow geese and greater snow geese as over-abundant, and has agreed that it would be appropriate for each country to take special measures to increase harvests. In response, Canada proposed to introduce special goose hunting regulations for the spring of 1999. The proposed regulations were challenged by a coalition of animal-welfare and other interests.

The proposed regulations were upheld in the ensuing judicial review, on the basis that there is provision in the Migratory Birds Convention for harvesting birds in special ways in extraordinary circumstances. However the judge ruled that the regulations could/would not automatically extend to the harvesting of Ross' geese (in spring), since Ross' geese are not claimed to be overabundant. This does pose a practical problem, since it is almost inevitable that some Ross' geese would be harvested inadvertently in any spring hunt for snow geese.

### **Tuesday, 18 May 1999**

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, re-convened the meeting at 8:40 a.m. David Alagalak led the opening prayer.

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

### **8.A DFO Research Supported by Nunavut Implementation Funds, 1999/00**

Lynn Siegersma tabled a summary report pertaining to DFO research projects that were approved for support from the Nunavut Implementation Fund (NIF) for 1999/00. These funds are provided to the Department to address incremental costs stemming from the NLCA. According to the terms under which these funds were negotiated, they are meant to provide support for stock assessment and closely related research

ventures. The funds are administered out of DFO's Iqaluit office. The research priority listing developed by the NWMB is a major factor in deciding allocations.

Of the 15 projects approved for 1999/00, nine pertain to marine mammals and six pertain to fish. The assigned NIF funding totals \$327,000. Most of the approved projects are also being supported through the NWRT or by the NWMB directly. All have DFO support, most notably by way of salaries and equipment.

Ben Kovic noted that at least one of the projects pertains to assessment of Arctic char stocks in Cumberland Sound. He hoped that this work would soon yield tangible results, since the Pangnirtung HTO has been calling for the completion of char stock assessments that have been underway in that area for a considerable length of time. Harry Flaherty questioned whether Pierre Richard could realistically do all the projects (total of four) that are attributed to him. Lynn replied that although Pierre was identified as the leader on the four projects, he did enjoy substantial staff assistance.

## **8.B Southeast Baffin Beluga Management Committee**

Michelle Wheatley tabled the full report from the November 1998 meeting of the Committee in Winnipeg. The report includes Appendices devoted to:

- The Co-Management Plan recommendations as developed in 1994;
- The current status of the Co-Management Plan; and
- A list of Action Items stemming from the meeting.

The Meeting Report from November contains a number of recommendations to the NWMB pertaining to research and management. The research item pertains to the need to conduct a beluga survey in Cumberland Sound this (1999) summer as set out in the original (1994) Co-Management Plan. Plans and resources are in hand for this work. The management recommendations pertain to the future of the Committee and the production of educational materials pertaining to the importance and use SE Baffin beluga.

Michelle estimated that a video of the type envisaged by the Committee would cost around \$250,000. Much preliminary thought and work would need to be devoted to such a venture. The Board decided that the Committee should remain operational at least until the 1999 survey is completed and the results are assessed. The Board also directed staff to give further preliminary consideration to the cost and other implications of producing the video.

## **8.C DFO Oceans Strategy and Related Issue**

Dr. Jack Mathias gave a presentation on Canada's emerging Oceans Strategy. By the terms of the new Canada *Oceans Act*, which came into force in early 1997, the DFO Minister is required to collaborate with Canadians to develop a national Oceans

Strategy for the management of estuarine, coastal and marine ecosystems. The Strategy will be based on the principles of sustainable development, the integrated management of ocean activities, and the precautionary approach. The Strategy will encompass a number of program elements to be developed, including:

- Integrated Oceans Management (A pilot area that is under active consideration is the Manitoba coastal area of Hudson Bay).
- Marine Protected Areas (Five such areas have already been designated on the east and west coasts).
- Marine Ecosystem Health.

DFO is in the process of developing a white paper to assist Canadians to come to grips with these concepts and provide their input. It is envisaged that a Panel will be constituted to tour the country to talk to Canadians about these matters, probably about mid winter. Michael d'Eça suggested that the Department consider having Arctic representation on the Panel.

Jack also told the Board that DFO is preparing to offer the services of a resource person to the Nunavut Marine Council (NMC) to assist the Council in:

- acquiring research and other information about marine legislation and other marine-related initiatives by the federal government;
- developing an Oceans Policy for Nunavut;
- responding to Canada's Oceans Strategy being developed by DFO; and
- co-ordinating its efforts with those of the Canadian Marine Advisory Council.

As envisaged by DFO, this would be a three-year commitment, with the possibility of extension. Line reporting would be through Jack, but operational reporting would be to the NMC. Workplans would be established annually by all the IPGs in concert. Work assignments and conduct would be designed to avoid duplication or interference with the mandates and ongoing work of the IPGs. For fiscal reasons the position would have to start out being headquartered in Winnipeg, but transfer to Nunavut is anticipated within the first year.

Jack invited the NWMB to provide guidance to DFO in designing a consultation strategy on oceans programs in the NSA, and also to respond to DFO's impending offer of staffing assistance for the NMC.

## **8.D Anticipated Shrimp Exploratory Fishery in SFA 2 North of 63°**

Michelle Wheatley advised the Board that DFO has indicated an intention to establish a new exploratory fishery of 3500 metric tonnes of shrimp in Shrimp Fishing Area 2, north of 63°, for 1999. The NWMB was advised of this during an April 7-8 meeting with DFO officials in Iqaluit. Officials acknowledged the departmental obligation to consult with the NWMB with respect to allocation, since the Area in question occupies Zone I (except for the inshore component, which is in the NSA per se). Subsequently (on April

15) DFO officials telephoned to say that the NWMB had less than one day to state its position.

The Board responded under protest (since there was no opportunity to consult the Members), putting forward the recommendation that 80% of the proposed fishery should be allocated to the adjacent fisheries of Nunavut, and that the remainder should be allocated to the members of the Northern Coalition. There has been no response from DFO as yet (now over a month later) to this NWMB recommendation that DFO first indicated was needed on an urgent basis.

### **8.E Walrus Management Plan: Update**

Lynn Siegersma reported that a fifth draft of the Walrus Management Plan has now been prepared, incorporating NWMB and internal DFO comments with respect to Draft No. 4. It is anticipated that the present draft will form the starting point for discussions of the Walrus Working Group when it convenes this fall. Comments from the Working Group will be used to finalize the document, which will then need to be approved by the NWMB.

### **8.F Walrus Sport Hunting Allocations**

Michelle Wheatley referred Members to the briefing binders for copies of the proposals for walrus sport hunting that were received, along with her analyses of the proposals.

In addition, Michelle tabled two newly-prepared documents with the Board:

- One document setting out a proposed interim policy for dealing with walrus sport hunting applications for 1999; and
- The other document setting out recommendations for 1999 allocations, based on that proposed interim policy.

The interim policy as proposed embodied five criteria:

- That there are no conservation concerns;
- That hunter and public safety are not compromised;
- That harvesting methods are humane;
- That the whole animal will be used; and
- That the developing industry is healthy and will deliver a quality product.

David Alagalak suggested that provision be made in future to involve the RWOs to a greater extent in matters of this nature. Harry Flaherty suggested that the HTOs should have a role in authorizing any sport hunting activity. There was general agreement that tallies of animals struck-and-lost should be submitted annually for all approved hunts. There was also agreement that proponents should be asked to submit their requests

for next year's walrus sport-hunting allocations in conjunction with providing their reports on animals struck-and-lost.

In respect to making walrus sport-hunting allocations for 1999, the Board agreed **(Resolution 2000- 003)** to structure its debate and decisions around the five criteria as set out in the interim policy. On this basis the Board considered and decided as follows:

1. In respect to Igloolik (Twelve walrus sport hunts requested by the HTO, and four requested by a private operator – Igloolik Outdoor Adventures, or IOA):

Background: This community has had a relatively long (four years) and successful (walrus taken each year) history of walrus sport hunting. There is no walrus quota in effect for the community. Sport hunting is accommodated through assignments. It is not clear whether the HTO is aware of the IOA request or if the HTO has factored the IOA request into their own proposal.

Discussion: The IOA proponent is not an Inuk, and his participation would require an assignment of harvesting rights from his wife.

Decision: To approve **(Resolution 2000- 004)** a total of twelve walrus sport hunts for the Igloolik HTO for the 1999 season and two additional walrus sport hunts for Igloolik Outdoor Adventures (IOA) subject to the NWMB's request that the assignment of the right to harvest each walrus be made in writing, and to the following conditions:

- That IOA obtain and demonstrate the approval of the Igloolik HTO as to the location of the sport hunts and the meeting of the condition on total harvest as outlined below;
- That the total walrus sport harvest for both organizations, combined with all other walrus harvests by the community of Igloolik in 1999, will not exceed the average annual number of walrus harvested by the community during the years 1994 to 1998;
- That both organizations agree to provide to the DFO, upon completion of the 1999 season, full reports on all walrus struck and landed or lost; and
- That the hunt must be conducted according to the hunt plan provided.

2. In respect to Salluit (Eight walrus sport hunts requested by Willie Keatainak):

Background: This request pertains to the Nottingham/Salisbury Islands region, in the Area of Equal Use and Occupancy. Despite earlier approvals, last year was the first that a walrus sport hunt actually took place (one walrus was apparently taken). Johnny Peters provided harvest study data indicating that the average annual walrus harvest by the community from this Area over the six-year period 1990 through 1995 was 13 animals.

Discussion: The request represents a large increase from the one animal that was harvested last year. It is also a large fraction of the community's total historical harvest. Johnny Peters suggested that approving half the amount requested would not pose any particular inconvenience or hardship to the proponent.

Decision: To approve (**Resolution 2000- 005**) a total of four walrus sport hunts for Willie Keatainak of Salluit (Nunavik) for the 1999 season, subject to the following conditions:

- That these hunts will take place in the Area of Equal Use and Occupancy around Nottingham and Salisbury Islands;
- That the walrus sport harvest, combined with all other walrus harvests by the community of Salluit in 1999, will not exceed the average annual number of walrus harvested by the community in that Area during the years 1990 to 1995;
- That Mr. Keatainak agrees to provide to the DFO, upon completion of the 1999 season, full reports on all walrus struck and landed or lost; and
- That the hunt must be conducted according to the hunt plan provided.

3. In respect to Coral Harbour (Fifteen sport hunts requested by the HTO):

Background: The community has taken one walrus by sport hunting in each of 1996 and 1998. The community has an annual quota of 60 walrus.

Discussion: The existence of an overall quota eliminates any conservation concern posed by a sport hunt, at least in theory. The proponents have included some unique provisions in their hunt plan, that the Board might consider incorporating as general specifications for walrus sport hunting. Examples are the prohibition against butchering animals at haul-out sites, the permitting of only one strike per hunter, and the requirement to carry flares in the boats. David Alagalak noted that it is a traditional condition of walrus hunting never to butcher animals on multi-year ice.

Decision: To approve (**Resolution 2000- 006**) a total of fifteen walrus sport hunts for the Coral Harbour HTO for the 1999 season, subject to the condition that the HTO agrees to provide to the DFO, upon completion of the 1999 season, full reports on all walrus struck and landed or lost; and that the hunt must be conducted according to the hunt plan provided.

4. In respect to Cape Dorset (Five walrus sport hunts requested by the HTO):

Background: Although one sport hunt was approved for 1998, the community has never conducted such a hunt. No walrus quota is in effect for the community. Sport hunting is accommodated through assignments. The hunt plan that was provided with the application is rather sketchy.

Discussion: Some members expressed the opinion that the application does not demonstrate sufficient maturity to warrant approval of the full request. It is important that any new tourism venture get off to a smooth start.

Decision: To approve (**Resolution 2000- 007**) a total of five walrus sport hunts for the Cape Dorset HTO for the 1999 season, subject to the NWMB's request that the assignment of the right to hunt each walrus be made in writing, and to the following conditions:

- That the HTO improve its hunt plan;

- That the walrus sport harvest, combined with all other walrus harvests by the community of Cape Dorset in 1999, will not exceed the average annual number of walrus harvested by the community during the years 1994 to 1998;
- That the HTO agrees to provide to the DFO, upon completion of the 1999 season, full reports on all walrus struck and landed or lost; and
- That the hunt must be conducted according to the improved hunt plan.

5. In respect to Hall Beach (Three walrus sport hunts requested by the HTO):

Background: No walrus quota is in effect for the community. Sport hunting is accommodated through assignments. The community harvested over 100 walrus for subsistence purposes last year.

Discussion: The application does not make it clear who will provide the necessary insurance coverage.

Decision: To approve **(Resolution 2000- 008)** a total of three walrus sport hunts for the Hall Beach HTO for the 1999 season, subject to the NWMB's request that the assignment of the right to harvest each walrus be made in writing, and to the following conditions:

- That the walrus sport harvest, combined with all other walrus harvests by the community of Hall Beach in 1999, will not exceed the average annual number of walrus harvested by the community during the years 1994 to 1998;
- That the HTO agrees to provide to the DFO, upon completion of the 1999 season, full reports on all walrus struck and landed or lost; and
- That the hunt must be conducted according to the hunt plan provided.

### **In-Camera Session**

The Board decided to go *in-camera* in order to:

- Hear a report from Isaac Klengenber, Chairperson of the Kitikmeot Hunters and Trappers Association. It was understood that Mr. Klengenber would be bringing forward information deemed to be of a confidential nature in respect to financial matters under the purview of the RWO.
- Discuss the ongoing litigation between NTI and DFO concerning Davis Strait turbot allocations.

No decisions were made *in-camera* that required subsequent referral to the open Board Meeting.

Resolutions were passed in connection with this *in-camera* session as follows:

- To go *in-camera* **(Resolution 2000- 009)**
- To close the *in-camera* session **(Resolution 2000- 010)**

## **Tuesday, 18 May 1999; Evening Session**

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, re-convened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

### **8.G Implementing New Management System for Narwhal**

Michelle Wheatley introduced this Agenda item. She reminded Members that, on the advice of the Narwhal Working Group, the NWMB has implemented a new narwhal management system available to any community wishing to participate, provided that certain basic requirements are met. In essence, communities qualify for the removal of any existing narwhal quota restrictions if they establish local rules that address three basic concerns. These rules are subject to review and approval of the NWMB, and must demonstrate that the community has in place:

- An effective and credible system for reporting all narwhal that are struck and landed or lost;
- A realistic system for administering the narwhal hunt through a process involving use of individual tags; and
- A system of local rules designed to ensure conservation, promote humane harvesting, maximize hunter safety, prevent wastage, and foster relevant training and education in respect to hunting narwhal.

Michelle explained that the NWMB has focussed its initial attentions on assisting four pilot communities that have expressed interest and for which narwhal hunting is currently constrained (at least in theory) by existing quotas. These communities are Pond Inlet, Broughton Island, Repulse Bay, and Arctic Bay. These four communities, the latter three assisted by the NWMB and its associates, have developed and submitted materials in efforts to demonstrate conformity with the requirements as identified above. The Board has these materials at hand (in the briefing binders), and must now decide if they meet the terms for participation in the new narwhal management system. Where they do, the NWMB will remove the existing narwhal quota for that community. The DFO Minister has already agreed to such an arrangement.

The Board moved to a detailed consideration of the material submitted by the four communities. This material was accompanied by the assessments and recommendations of the Director of Wildlife Management working in concert with the NWMB Legal Advisor, along with an identification and interpretation of legal considerations pertaining to implementation of the new management system (prepared by the Legal Advisor). In addition to the material submitted by the four communities that have been the primary focus of the exercise to date, proposals were also at hand from the communities of Hall Beach and Igloolik. Glenn Williams, an active participant in the process up to now through a working understanding with NTI, was available to take part in the discussion.

Harry Flaherty expressed surprise to see no evidence of involvement by the RWOs in developing the material at hand. Michelle explained that the RWOs were represented



on the Working Group that developed the concept now being implemented. Glenn Williams added that since the HTOs have control over local hunting and hunters, it must fall to the HTOs to establish local rules. The RWOs must come into play when there is overlap between community hunting areas or movement of hunters from one community area to another. Such situations do exist and are matters of current attention by the RWOs.

On the basis of the briefing given and the materials provided, the Board considered and decided as follows:

1. In respect to Pond Inlet (Material prepared/submitted by Mittimatalik HTO):

Background: As noted previously, the Mittimatalik HTO developed its material independent of direct outside assistance.

Discussion: The material submitted by the Mittimatalik HTO is very comprehensive and its scope goes well beyond the immediate requirements of the present exercise. On the other hand, some important concerns do remain to be addressed.

Remaining concerns:

- It is not clear if/how the HTO intends for hunters to register their intent to hunt narwhal before actually setting out to do so: by picking up tags, by a simple declaration or some other method, or not at all. (The intended procedure needs to be stated explicitly.) It is understood that the HTO plans to use up existing tags left over from previous years.
- The HTO is indicating intent to constrain the disposition of the narwhal harvest. (That intent may be *ultra vires* NLCA 5.7.30.)
- The HTO is proposing rules that would bind members of other HTOs, as well as rules that would govern narwhal harvest in overlap areas. (It seems clear that such rules would require the involvement and approval of the RWO(s).)
- The HTO is proposing a system of penalties for infractions. (Some elements of that system seem to be beyond the authority of the HTO to enforce.)
- Some of the rules being proposed by the HTO may be more appropriately embodied elsewhere.

Decision: To approve **(Resolution 2000- 011)** removal of the narwhal quota for members of the Mittimatalik HTO on the basis of the narwhal harvesting rules that were submitted by the HTO as per the new narwhal management system, and to communicate to the HTO the Board's remaining concerns about these rules as they are currently drafted.

2. In respect to Broughton Island (Material submitted by Nattivak HTO):

Background: The HTO is very interested in introducing the new narwhal management system on a trial basis. The HTO took full advantage of the assistance provided by the NWMB and others to prepare their proposal.

Discussion: Harry Flaherty questioned the rationale and interpretation of Rule No. 9, which calls for hunters to dispose of narwhal carcasses in deep water. Glenn

Williams explained that the Broughton Island hunters interpret “carcasses” to mean “unusable parts”. Most of the narwhal hunting in this location is done in open water near the community. The intent of the Rule is to prohibit the abandonment of unusable narwhal parts where they could attract polar bears to the vicinity of the community. Gordon Koshinsky remarked on the prohibition (Rule No. 11) against using narwhal calves to lure older narwhal. Glenn confirmed that this has sometimes been used as an effective hunting procedure: a calf that is harpooned without killing it will bring other narwhal into easy proximity regardless of other distractions.

Remaining concern:

- Training has not yet been specifically addressed.

Decision: To approve **(Resolution 2000- 012)** removal of the narwhal quota for members of the Nattivak HTO on the basis of the narwhal hunting rules that were submitted by the HTO as per the new narwhal management system, with the requirement that the HTO develop and submit, to the NWMB, rules to address hunter education and training within the next year.

3. In respect to Repulse Bay (Material submitted by Arviq HTO):

Background: The HTO has been enthusiastic and positive in developing the material for this exercise. They have worked closely with the resources provided by the NWMB and others to prepare their proposal.

Discussion: It is understood by the community that removal of the narwhal quota will pertain only to the members of the Arviq HTO. Glenn Williams explained that a hunter from elsewhere would require an assignment from a Repulse Bay beneficiary in order to participate in the new system. With such an assignment, that hunter would be subject to the Repulse Bay hunting rules. Without such an assignment, such a hunter would need to bring narwhal tags with him/her from his/her home community in order to hunt narwhal in the Repulse Bay area. David Alagalak predicted that only Rankin Inlet hunters were likely to want to hunt narwhal in the Repulse Bay area, and they would bring their own tags with them. David suggested that the NWMB urge HTOs, under the auspices of their RWO, to negotiate and formally designate community hunting areas for narwhal and other species.

Remaining concerns:

- Rule No. 16 ii) is not valid as it is currently written, since an HTO can bind a hunter from another community only if there is a written assignment.
- Without a functional replacement for Rule 16 ii), co-ordination of narwhal hunting in what is essentially a shared hunting area could be seriously compromised.
- Any interface with hunters from other communities will need to be very closely monitored.

Decision: To approve **(Resolution 2000- 013)** removal of the narwhal quota for members of the Arviq HTO on the basis of the narwhal hunting rules that were submitted by the HTO as per the new narwhal management system, and to

communicate to the HTO the Board's remaining concerns about these rules as they are currently drafted.

4. In respect to Arctic Bay (Material submitted by Ikajutit HTO):

Background: The HTO has produced a complete and satisfactory proposal.

Discussion: No comments.

Remaining concerns: None.

Decision: To approve **(Resolution 2000- 014)** removal of the narwhal quota for members of the Ikajutit HTO on the basis of the narwhal hunting rules that were submitted by the HTO as per the new narwhal management system.

5. In respect to Hall Beach and Igloolik (Material submitted by the Hall Beach HTO and by the Igloolik HTO respectively):

Background: These two communities developed and submitted proposals on their own initiatives, to participate in the new narwhal management system. While narwhal quotas are currently in effect for both communities, these quotas are reached only in exceptional circumstances, i.e. when there are winter narwhal entrapments. The existing quotas thus cannot be interpreted to be particularly limiting to narwhal hunting at Hall Beach and Igloolik.

Discussion and concerns: The materials that were submitted are pertinent and constitute credible efforts, but do not address all of the requirements that have been identified by the NWMB. This is not surprising, since the materials were developed without benefit of the assistance that was made available to the four pilot communities. Igloolik has introduced the interesting concept of "narwhal hunt supervisors" who would have specific assigned responsibilities and powers. Both communities should be applauded for their initiatives to date and encouraged and assisted to further refine their submissions.

Decision: Not to approve **(Resolution 2000- 015)** removal of the narwhal quota for members of the Igloolik and Hall Beach HTOs on the basis of the narwhal hunting "by-laws" submitted by these HTOs as per the new narwhal management system, and to communicate to these HTOs the Board's concerns about these "by-laws" as currently drafted; and to encourage these HTOs to revise and refine their materials in order to address these concerns.

The Board considered that since the DFO Minister has already approved the new narwhal management system, these NWMB decisions need not be conveyed to him in the ordinary context of NLCA 5.3.17. However in view of the pioneering nature of the initiative, the Board agreed that it would be appropriate to keep the Minister fully informed.

**Wednesday, 19 May 1999**

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, re-convened the meeting at 8:30 a.m. Pauloosie Keyootak led the opening prayer.

## **8.H Turbot Allocations for 1999: NAFO Sub-Area 0**

Michelle Wheatley advised that under the terms of the five-year groundfish management plan currently in place, the Board has 1500 metric tonnes (MT) of turbot to allocate in Division OB for 1999. In addition, the Board has 50-60 days of fishing effort to allocate in Division OA. The Division OB quota includes 500 MT nominally allocated for inshore fishing. The Pangnirtung winter fishery receives first consideration for this inshore quota (about 30 MT has already been accounted for on the basis of the winter just passed), and the residual amount traditionally has been amalgamated with and harvested as part of the offshore fishery. The OA enterprise is a continuing exploratory fishery. In addition to whatever fishing they choose and are able to do for economic gain, operators participating in the exploratory fishery are also required to fish in a standardized manner at a series of sentinel sites. The Board has received nine applications to participate in these Sub-Area 0 fisheries.

Michelle referred the Members to the briefing material and recommendations that she had prepared. David Alagalak reiterated his preference to see the actual applications in the course of resource allocation exercises such as this one in future. Gordon Koshinsky cautioned that the potential effects on fishing operations and viability of not allocating to the full amounts of requested tonnages should be taken into account in the evaluation process. Gordon also noted that Aqviq Marine appeared to be the only applicant with a stated intention to use long lines in this fishery. This may be an environmentally-preferable fishing method that should possibly be encouraged by the NWMB.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 016**) to approve the allocation of turbot quotas and turbot fishing effort for NAFO Sub-Area 0 for 1999 as follows:

- For Division OA (exploratory fishery), a total of 57 fishing days as follows:
  - Cumberland Sound Fisheries: 28 days
  - Nattivak HTA: 17 days
  - Clyde River HTO: 6 days
  - Mittimatalik HTO: 6 days
- For Division OB, a total of 1500 metric tonnes (MT) as follows:
  - Cumberland Sound Fisheries: 720 MT
  - Nattivak HTA: 320 MT
  - Qikiqtaaluk Corporation: 280 MT
  - Clyde River HTO: 40 MT
  - Kabva Marine: 40 MT
  - Mittimatalik HTO: 40 MT
  - Aqviq Marine Limited: 30 MT
  - Pangnirtung winter fishery 30 MT

The Board also decided that in conjunction with submitting these decisions to the DFO Minister, to also apprise the Minister that:

- The NWMB is very dissatisfied with the turbot allocation available to Nunavut interests under the present five-year management plan; and
- That the NWMB is distressed by the lack of positive response to the request for access by Nunavut interests to recently increased turbot quotas in more southerly Canadian waters.

## **8.I Shrimp Allocations for 1999: Nunavut Settlement Area**

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Board that in 1998 the Minister of DFO accepted a decision by the NWMB to establish a 500 metric tonne (MT) quota for striped pink shrimp in the NSA. This fishery is focussed on the inshore waters near Resolution Island. Allocations for 1998 had to be made hurriedly and without benefit of the formal NWMB allocation policy that was subsequently put in place.

Five applications have been received for participation in the 1999 shrimp fishery. Michelle referred the Members to the briefing material and recommendations that she had prepared. Harry Flaherty noted that Mittimatalik HTO is the only applicant that does not present a long-term plan. Michelle pointed out that Mittimatalik has a long-term agreement with Clearwater Fine Foods Ltd. to fish their allocations for them. Harry expressed some curiosity and concern about the ultimate disposition of the resource rents that the primary recipients of these allocations receive from their fishing partners.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 017**) to approve the allocation of the 500-metric-tonne striped pink shrimp quota for the waters of the Nunavut Settlement Area for 1999 as follows:

- |                                      |        |
|--------------------------------------|--------|
| • Cumberland Sound Fisheries:        | 150 MT |
| • Qikiqtaaluk Corporation, with QWB: | 150 MT |
| • Quliruaq Incorporated:             | 100 MT |
| • Mittimatalik HTO:                  | 50 MT  |
| • Nunavut Imaq Incorporated:         | 50 MT  |

## **8.J Turbot Litigations: Review and Update**

Michael d'Eça reviewed the history pertaining to this matter. The third Judicial Review initiated by NTI in this series of court actions, this time against the DFO Minister's 1998 turbot allocation decisions pertaining to Davis Strait, is scheduled to be heard at the end of June. It seems likely that the loser will appeal the decision to the Federal Court of Appeal. A considerable amount of new material has been uncovered pertaining to the development of this fishery. The development program that was put in place was clearly geared to help address the problems of groundfishers from the

Atlantic provinces, particularly Newfoundland. It would appear that the selection criteria that were used made it nearly impossible for Nunavut fishers to qualify.

#### **8.K Turbot Survey in NAFO Sub-Area 0: Update**

Lynn Siegersma tabled a status report on this project prepared by Margaret Treble. She confirmed that the project will commence this summer. The required vessel will be leased from Greenland via Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board for \$180,000. The NWMB contribution will flow via the QWB.

#### **8.L Sam Ford Fiord Char: Request for Quota Increase**

Lynn Siegersma reviewed a request from the Clyde River HTO for an increase in the commercial fishing quota for Arctic char for Sam Ford Fiord, from 4500 kg to 6800 kg. The fishery targets the Walker Arm River stock. Estimates of the domestic harvest from this stock vary substantially; the Nunavut Wildlife Harvest Study indicates that this component could be as high as 8500 kg per year.

Very little information is available with respect to this stock. Samples taken recently show no indications of over-fishing, but the sample sizes have been very small. DFO recommends that the commercial quota not be increased, and interprets that an increase to 6800 kg would pose a high risk to the population.

Michelle Wheatley noted that the quota was 3600 kg prior to the 1995/96 season. There is no record of NWMB playing a role in the decision to increase the quota at that time. Considerable dissatisfaction was expressed about the quality of the data on which the Board is being asked to make a decision this time. The problem includes major discrepancies in the estimates of domestic harvest. Gordon Koshinsky suggested that there was time to try to reconcile some of these problems since this was apparently a winter fishery. Gordon also suggested that the Board should lead in developing a standardized format for use by proponents in bringing forward these types of requests.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 018**) to approve an increase in the Arctic char quota for Sam Ford Fiord (near Clyde River) from 4500 to 5500 kg, this subject to verification of support on the part of the HTO and also subject to assurance that DFO will conduct appropriate and timely studies to ensure that the higher commercial harvest is sustainable.

#### **8.M Administration of Experimental Fishing Licences**

Michelle Wheatley referred to the briefing note that she had prepared on this matter. In the interest of expediency, DFO currently (as in the past) issues experimental fishing licences to interested applicants in respect to bodies of water that have not been commercially fished previously and for which an applicant wishes to determine fishery

viability. Experimental licences are generally for a specific species and for a specific weight, and invariably for a particular period of time. They are also renewable. By the conditions of such licences, data are obtained on the basis of which formal quotas and other fishing criteria can subsequently be established.

The concern is that experimental fishing licences represent de facto (albeit temporary) quotas, and that they also impose other limitations all of which are the proper purview of the NWMB. Many such applications sometimes arrive in a very short period, and hundreds of them are extant at any given time. By their very nature and to be effective for their intended purpose, they require rapid turn-around. As currently administered they are not realistically amenable to individualized attention from the Board. Michelle presented a policy recommendation whereby the Board would delegate to its staff the authority to review and approve, within pre-determined parameters, applications for experimental fishing licences.

Michael d'Eça suggested that Michelle's recommendation was operationally reasonable, but observed that the task of setting harvest quotas was at the very heart of the Board's mandate. From a legal and jurisdictional perspective, he was not comfortable to see the Board in any way marginalized in this process. David Alagalak asked whether experimental licences could be aggregated. Michelle stated that this would not be productive since each such licence has very specific terms. Gordon Koshinsky asked if the whole process could be treated as an aggregated research project. Michael acknowledged that this might be possible but was not very realistic. Gordon cautioned against devising any solution that would jeopardize the kind of sensitivity and rapid turn-around that the NWMB was established in part to foster.

The Board decided **(Resolution 2000- 019)** to have its Director of Wildlife Management investigate further the long-standing practice whereby DFO issues experimental licences to test the feasibility of establishing new commercial fisheries, with the understanding and intention that – should this practice be found to be detracting from the NWMB jurisdiction – the NWMB will commence to exercise that jurisdiction as soon as it is feasible to do so, and that in the interim DFO should continue to administer the system that is currently in place.

## **9. GNWT Wildlife (DSD): Issues/Decisions**

### **9.A Study of Handling Effects on Polar Bears**

Treatment of this Agenda item was deferred.

### **9.B Population Status of Arctic Wolf: Update**

Alden Williams reported that, during their last meeting in April, COSEWIC decided to defer its decision on formally designating the Arctic wolf as "Vulnerable" or

“Threatened”. (It is currently listed as “Indeterminate”.) COSEWIC uncertainty pertains to the range and occurrence of the Arctic subspecies, the validity of which is also a matter of some debate. Work is underway to collect sample materials (skulls and tongues, for morphometric and genetic analyses respectively) in order to resolve these questions. DSD is paying hunters for their extra work in preparing and submitting these materials. Mr. Williams stated that these payments are clearly intended as reimbursements, and definitely not as bounties.

### **9.C Population Status of Peary Caribou**

Treatment of this Agenda item was deferred.

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

Alden Williams reviewed the evolving history of the Management Plan including the sequence of revisions based on input from the interested agencies that resulted in the present draft. The NWMB is among those who provided input, this on more than one occasion. The KIA aims/hopes to put the matter to rest (from their perspective) at their forthcoming (June) board meeting. Following adoption by KIA, the Plan would come to the NWMB for approval and would thereafter be submitted to the appropriate Ministers. The KIA will deal with it in June only if all the participating parties have expressed their concurrence.

DSD recognizes some continuing problems with the present draft as prepared by NTI. Not all of the revisions that have been made are internally consistent. Nor do they all appear to be congruent with the directions agreed by all parties when they last met together to consider this matter last fall. The Board undertook to submit its comments on the present draft to DSD within the next few weeks.

### **9.E Availability of Atlantic Groundfish Licences to Nunavut Fishers**

Alden Williams referred to the DSD briefing note on this subject in the briefing binder. There are no Atlantic Groundfish licences issued to Nunavut interests at present, and DFO has a moratorium on new licences. Transfer of existing licences is permitted, but no offshore or midshore licences are for sale except at prohibitive prices. Inshore licences (for vessels under 65 feet) are available, but are not ordinarily permitted for transfer by DFO out of their issuing Region. DFO is amenable to granting exceptions to their transfer prohibition, especially in situations involving aboriginal applicants. DSD is working with DFO officials to establish the groundwork for such transfers to Nunavut fishing interests. The support of the NWMB for this initiative is solicited. It is important for all agencies to co-ordinate their efforts in seeking to obtain access to



licences for Nunavut interests, along with the allocation of groundfish resources to support them.

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

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

Michelle Wheatley advised that negotiations are still underway to assemble a team to conduct a technical review of the Study. Baker Lake has continued to be a problematical community for the Study. A decision was recently made to abandon the stratified-sampling design for Baker Lake and move to a census of all hunters instead. Two new field workers have started work there, and the situation seems to be improving.

It has become clear that more than one year (as is budgeted at the present time) will be required to write up the Study at the end. The Harvest Study Co-ordinator has prepared a re-profiled budget, essentially adding a year (to conclude at the end of 2002/03), but with the same total cost. The Board considered and endorsed the re-profiled Harvest Study budget, subject to annual allocations. **(Resolution 2000-020)**

### **10.B Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study: Update**

Michelle Wheatley reported that good progress is being made on the write-up of this Study. Both of the writers working on the project continue to be productive. A good draft of the full report is expected in time for the August meeting of the Board.

### **10.C Nunavut Wildlife Resource Centre: Update**

Michelle Wheatley reminded Members that the purpose of this project is to catalogue, into a single database library, materials held by NWMB, DSD, DFO and NRI that focus on wildlife, fisheries or other natural resources of Nunavut, and to make this database accessible on the Internet through the NWMB website. The project is managed and executed by a full-time contract librarian. It is hoped to have Internet access operational by September.

Participating agencies have signed off on cost-sharing arrangements to keep the project going full speed in 1999/00. The main effort this year will be to catalogue the DSD collection. The combined catalogue already lists over 4,000 items. NWMB recently took possession of the DIAND regional library which contains much important and relevant material. Consideration needs to be given to identifying and consolidating resources to maintain and update the system after all the initial cataloguing and data entry is completed.

## **10.D World Wildlife Fund Project Funding: Update on Collaboration**

Michelle Wheatley reminded Members that the WWF earlier approached the NWMB to request assistance in identifying projects that might be candidates for WWF support under one of their two Arctic funding programs. The Board had requested assurance and clarification regarding some concerns that Members expressed about engaging in this type of co-operation.

Michelle subsequently discussed these concerns with Pete Ewins, Director of the WWF Endangered Species Program. She reported that WWF considers itself to have operating parameters similar or identical to those of most other research-funding agencies. In particular:

- They provide funds for projects that they consider have the potential to produce results that could have application in wildlife conservation.
- They will provide project funding only on a cost-shared basis, in conjunction with (in this case) northern partners.
- They have no interest in raw data, other than that they recognize basic data to be indispensable to the production of desired outputs.
- They do not attempt to influence how the investigators interpret the data.
- They require a commitment to the production of accessible reports.

WWF sees at least two non-exclusive options for how the relationship they are seeking with NWMB might be implemented:

- The NWMB might distribute information about WWF priorities and funding availability along with its own calls for proposals.
- The NWMB might suggest to applicants for NWMB/NWRT funding that they in turn might consider the WWF as an alternative funding source, if that seemed potentially to be a reasonable fit.

In either case, it would be up to the proponent to decide whether to actually apply for WWF funding. It was the consensus of the Board Members that WWF represents a worthwhile opportunity to “stretch” funds available for research on Arctic wildlife, and as such the Board pledged to co-operate in promoting WWF funding programs in the manner(s) proposed.

## **10.E Establishing Qualifications for Big-Game Hunting Guides**

Michael d'Eça referred the Board to the comprehensive decision paper (contained in the briefing binder) that he and Michelle Wheatley had prepared on this subject. He reminded the Members that the report titled *An Assessment of Big Game Hunting Guide Qualifications for Nunavut* that the Board had commissioned earlier identified three general options for the NWMB:

- Do nothing (maintain the current processes); or
- Develop and set guide qualifications and standards; or

- Establish local certification boards to develop and set guide qualifications and standards specific to communities.

Michael referred to the three recommendations that he and Michelle had developed (contained in the decision paper) for the consideration of the Board, namely (in summary) that the NWMB:

- Establish and publicize a number of voluntary interim qualifications, to be recommended to all persons who guide big game hunters within Nunavut, and to be used by all HTOs in approving guides for non-resident big game hunters.
- At the earliest opportunity, establish a Big Game Hunting Guides Working Group.
- Charge the Working Group to consider, develop and within one year recommend mandatory qualifications to be established by the NWMB, along with related considerations, in respect to big game hunting guides operating in the NSA.

Observations, questions and suggestions that came forward in the ensuing discussion included the following:

- Joan Scottie asked how previous graduates from guide training programs (such as from Arctic College) would be accommodated. David Alagalak noted that guide training received previously has not always been useful or effective. Glenn Williams stated that funding conditions attached to previous guide training programs sometimes led to inferior curricula and often led to selection of trainees for reasons other than genuine aspirations to pursue careers in guiding. Gordon Koshinsky argued that some consideration would still have to be given for previous training, and certainly for previous experience.
- Glenn Williams observed that DFO has declared that they have no interest in the subject of big-game hunting, qualifications for big-game hunting guides included. Michael d'Eça suggested that DFO may not have understood that walrus is a big-game species under the NLCA.
- Harry Flaherty noted that certification boards are already in place or are being established for trades and other occupations. He suggested that these boards might be able to deal with guiding also.
- Kevin McCormick suggested that it would cause confusion to establish "interim voluntary" qualifications as is proposed in the briefing material, and that it would be better to have a single comprehensive initiative.
- Gordon Koshinsky wondered how mandatory qualifications would be enforced in practice. Michael d'Eça explained that if the NWMB made a decision to establish qualifications for guides, then the onus would be on government to implement them.
- Glenn Williams noted that outfitting licences, such as for polar bear and caribou, are usually held by HTOs or by agencies endorsed by HTOs.

The Board decided to establish a Working Group to consider, develop and within one year to recommend mandatory qualifications to be established by the NWMB, along with related considerations, in respect to big game hunting guides operating in the

NSA. This Working Group is to be comprised of one representative from each of the NWMB, DFO, DSD and the three RWOs, with possible participation also from Makivik, Arctic College, Nunavut booking agents and/or Nunavut Tourism, along with the authors of the 1998 report titled *An Assessment of Big Game Hunting Guide Qualifications for Nunavut*. **(Resolution 2000- 021)**

#### **10.F Implementation of NWMB Strategic Plan: Update**

Consideration of this item was deferred pending the report from the Executive Committee later in the agenda.

#### **10.G Personnel Management and Administration**

Consideration of this item was deferred in view of the absence (with cause) of the Executive Director.

#### **10.H Policy for the Support of Projects from the NWRT Fund: Revision**

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Board that the previous Director had initiated this policy revision, but that there had not yet been opportunity for the Board to deal with it. Another set of applications for NWRT funding has been reviewed in the interim, and further draft revisions have been made to the policy document based on that experience. Michelle referred the Board to the major changes that have been made, as set out in her briefing document. Most elements of the Policy have been affected, mainly to streamline administration of the program. An important change pertains to the inclusion of criteria for considering proposals for multi-year funding. The purpose of the Fund, as set out in the Implementation Contract, remains to provide assistance to government agencies for research pertinent to the management of wildlife in the NSA.

Members posed a few questions and suggested a few minor wording changes. Kevin McCormick asked whether it was indeed reasonable to require candidates for multi-year funding to meet minimum criteria in each of the four areas of evaluation, as per the proposed policy revision. Michelle explained that this addition to the Policy did not preclude proponents from qualifying with lesser scores for one year at a time. Kevin remained uneasy about tying the Board's hands completely by reference to a system of scoring. Michael d'Eça suggested inclusion of a standard phrase to the effect that nothing in the Policy would ultimately preclude the Board from over-riding it. Members agreed that it would be useful and appropriate for all funding proposals to be covered by a letter from the sponsoring agencies. This would assure the Board that the agencies stood behind the aggregate of applications from their scientists.

The Board decided to adopt the revised Policy as presented, for inclusion in the Board's handbook of Operating Procedures, subject only to minor wording changes as identified. **(Resolution 2000- 022)**

## **10.I Policy for Support of Projects from the NWMB Study Fund: Revision**

Michelle Wheatley advised the Board of the decision taken to refer to the Board's internal source of support (for projects by other-than-government-agencies) to gather and/or interpret information, as the NWMB Study Fund. The revisions to the existing policy for this Fund that are being proposed once again focus on streamlining administration. Provision has also been added for the Board (staff) to provide assistance and feedback to proponents in the process of developing applications where such is requested or is deemed to be warranted.

The Board decided to adopt the revised Policy as presented, for inclusion in the Board's handbook of Operating Procedures, subject only to minor wording changes as identified. **(Resolution 2000- 023)**

## **10.J Policy for the Determination of Wildlife Research Priorities: Revision**

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Board of the requirement under the NLCA for the NWMB to "identify research requirements and deficiencies...", and explained how the Board had earlier decided to address this requirement by periodically and formally establishing and circulating lists of research priorities. The research priorities so established have a number of applications, including provision of guidance in the allocation of NWRT and NWMB Study funding.

Michelle noted that revisions have been incorporated in the policy document to make more explicit the fact that relevance to management will be a key factor in assigning research priorities. Gordon Koshinsky remarked on the lack of any specific acknowledgement in the document about the legitimate role for the NWMB itself in bringing forward items for consideration enroute to identifying NSA research priorities. He expressed the view that the NWMB has a unique and important perspective on the matter that should in fact be highlighted. He emphasised that this was not to detract from the roles of the resource users, the RWOs and HTOs, and the government agencies, in identifying research priorities. Gordon also questioned some of the definitions contained in the document, such as the definition of "Yield" as "The number of animals produced in the population each year". He suggested that this seemed more like a definition of production, and that "yield" carried connotations of harvest.

The Board decided to adopt the revised Policy as presented, for inclusion in the Board's handbook of Operating Procedures, subject to minor wording and other changes as identified. **(Resolution 2000- 024)**

## **10.K Five-Year Independent Review of NLCA Implementation**

Michael d'Eça advised that on the basis of earlier instructions from the Board he had started to draft a pre-emptive submission to the Review Panel in connection with the five-year independent review. He expected in this document to highlight the successes of the NWMB to date, and then to move to an elaboration of implementation concerns. He listed a number of such concerns that would seem to merit the attention of the Panel, including the ongoing struggle with DIAND officials to develop a satisfactory funding agreement, and the continuing unmet obligations of Government to bring legislation into conformity with the NLCA.

Members offered some additional suggestions for inclusion as implementation concerns. Kevin McCormick raised the matter of provision and/or protection of funds for the conduct of public hearings. Kevin also suggested that any references to agency shortcomings should be coined in very specific terms to eliminate the possibility of delinquent agencies being shielded by anonymity. Gordon Koshinsky suggested that the failure of the NLCA to mention any specific time frame by which a Minister had to respond to an NWMB final decision posed a potentially serious implementation problem.

The Board agreed that Michael should proceed to draft the submission to the Review Panel for the Board's consideration as soon as possible.

## **10.L Participation in Screening of Land-Use and Research Applications**

Michelle Wheatley referred to the briefing note prepared by Rebecca Mike. The NIRB currently forwards to the NWMB for review every land- or water-use application that is received. The number of such applications forwarded in 1998 was 65. The NWMB also reviews applications for research licences that are processed by NRI. There were 52 such applications in 1998. In addition, the NWMB reviews applications for research permits on behalf of DFO, and has recently started to do the same thing on behalf of DSD. All of this adds up to a substantial workload, albeit one that is founded in the provisions of the NLCA.

Staff have taken some concrete steps to streamline their part of the process. Using criteria they have developed themselves (as per briefing note provided), they decide whether a proposed project is likely to have low, medium, or high impact. This fundamental decision determines the amount of time and attention that staff will subsequently devote to any particular application.

Michelle suggested that as a minimum, it would be useful if the Board endorsed the criteria that are being used to make the primary screening decisions. More ideally, the forwarding agencies would conduct more preliminary screening and then forward only those applications that they deemed to genuinely merit NWMB attention, preferably along with brief summaries of the other items. This they (at least the NIRB) have so far refused to do. It would be very useful if the Board adopted a formal policy framework

on the matter, preferably one that reverted more onus for initial screening back to the forwarding agency.

The Board directed that NWMB staff consider the kinds of research proposals and land/water use applications that would not warrant or may not be appropriate for screening by the NWMB, and prepare a recommendation to be considered by the Board for transmittal to the permit-granting agencies. **(Resolution 2000- 025)**

## **11. Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated (NTI) Wildlife Division**

### **11.A Compensation for Polar Bear Defence Kills**

Glenn Williams reported in the absence of Bert Dean, who could not attend due to other commitments. Glenn advised that this item is still in process of being developed.

### **11.B Inuit Participation in Wildlife Management**

Glenn asked permission to introduce this topic to the meeting agenda. NTI aims to formally challenge government agencies to evaluate their past performance and identify their future plans in this area, with particular emphasis on training and participation in research that contributes to management. Glenn suggested that there was a need for the NWMB to put more emphasis on this as well.

David Alagalak noted that Inuit with appropriate training and experience to play meaningful roles in wildlife management and research are scarce. Everyone in a position to do so needs to promote and undertake the training of Inuit for these functions at every opportunity. Harry Flaherty observed that the Board has attempted to address this matter through its funding interactions with government agencies. Kevin McCormick urged that if NTI (or anyone) is going to make a useful critical contribution, that they be prepared to offer concrete suggestions. For example, an inventory of individuals interested and available for this type of employment and/or training would be very helpful. Kevin also noted that student availability generally does not correspond very well with the timing of biologically-oriented field seasons of research agencies. Perhaps it would be possible to adjust school-year calendars, or even to offer course credits for this type of student participation. Ben Kovic suggested that Arctic College might be amenable to such ideas, but in his experience the public school system was not very flexible. When he was a Resource Officer his offers to give talks in schools were rejected because “it was not in the curriculum”. Harry interpreted that this has changed, and suggested that the Board offer to address schools when it meets in communities.

## **12. Funding for Projects, and Donation Requests**

### **12.A Nunavut Wildlife Research Trust (NWRT) Funding: Summary**

Michelle Wheatley tabled a summary of NWRT funding commitments based primarily on decisions made at the last Board meeting. The Board now has commitments of just over \$1.5 million of NWRT funds on its books, \$942,400 of it for 1999/00. Michelle also explained some of the procedural changes that she has introduced in an effort to streamline interactions with the recipient agencies.

### **12.B Nunavut Wildlife Management Board Study Funding: Summary**

Michelle Wheatley tabled a summary of NWMB funding commitments for studies by HTOs and other non-government agencies. Thirteen such projects are underway, with a total commitment from the NWMB Study Fund for 1999/00 of \$329,240. The largest item on the list is the \$120,000 recently approved by the Board to support the Davis Strait turbot surveys, with the NWMB component flowing through the RWO for provision (via leasing) of the survey vessel. Gordon Koshinsky stated that item 262-98-1 for assistance to a DFO researcher to publish an item on beluga should be re-coded to Conservation Education.

### **12.C Donation Requests**

#### **12.C.1 World Wildlife Fund: Development of Bowhead Conservation Plan**

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Board of its earlier approval-in-principle for assistance to the WWF to develop a conservation plan for the Eastern Arctic population of bowhead whales. The project is now proceeding. Bob Moshenko, a former DFO employee, has been hired to co-ordinate the work. The anticipated completion date is February 2000.

Michelle noted that there are no direct funding implications to what the Board has already approved or to what the WWF expects. Rather, the request is for confirmation of access to information from the Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study and to other pertinent unpublished NWMB data, and also for assistance with translations and with production of the actual plan. If the Board gives its authorization to supply data, some care will need to be taken to prevent the WWF from pre-empting NWMB conclusions and to ensure proper accreditation.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 026**) to give substance to its previous approval-in-principle for the provision of support-in-kind to the World Wildlife Fund and



to DFO for the development of a Bowhead Conservation Plan, this support (as per the items requested by WWF) to have an estimated cash value of approximately \$7,500.

### **12.C.2 DFO: Travel of Community Representatives to Bowhead Workshop**

Michelle Wheatley advised the Board that DFO is planning to hold a meeting in Iqaluit as part of their Regional Advisory Process in working towards a revised stock status report on the Hudson Bay / Foxe Basin population of bowhead whales. This report is due for submission to the NWMB for its consideration in August. The Department has requested funding assistance from the NWMB to support the travel of Keewatin community representatives to this event.

Board Members expressed concern that the amount budgeted by DFO for honouraria is probably not sufficient. Despite this problem and in anticipation that it can and will be resolved, the Board agreed to provide a \$4,500 contribution toward the travel costs of up to three HTO representatives to attend this workshop. **(Resolution 2000- 027)**

### **13. Other Presentations**

Isaac Klengenberg addressed the Board on behalf of the Kitikmeot Hunters and Trappers Association. As the RWO Chairperson, he welcomed the Board to the Region and expressed appreciation for the Board's funding and other support.

Mr. Klengenberg advised that the seven HTOs in the Region have put new procedures in place to co-ordinate their operations and to provide mutual assistance, including through regularly-scheduled conference calls. In a major effort to reduce its operating costs the RWO recently changed the by-laws defining its makeup. Henceforth there will be only one (cf. previously two) members from each HTO. Meeting costs for the RWO had been running as high as \$45,000 per meeting and this was simply not supportable.

Todd Roche advised that all of the HTOs have new EDP equipment and all are now connected to the Internet. All but one have submitted their audited financial material for 1998/99. The Cambridge Bay HTO is experiencing significant financial difficulties. Current indications are that the HTO has a deficit of about \$200,000, half of which is claimed by Revenue Canada for payroll deductions that have not been forwarded. Most of the problem seems to originate in the business side of the operation rather than from the routine roles of the RWO. Paramount was a financially disastrous commercial muskox harvest last fall.

The Board expressed its usual dismay about the kinds of financial revelations that are emerging in this particular case. Such revelations, albeit becoming less frequent, do continue to constitute a major and unproductive challenge to the energies and morale of NWMB staff. It is well acknowledged that the Board is responsible under the NLCA

to provide operational funding for the HTOs. However the HTOs are fundamentally Inuit organizations and the Board does not have the mandate or the authority, and certainly does not have the manpower or the resources, to ensure their effective administration. Participation of the HTOs in commercial ventures brings an added dimension to the problem. It is apparent that efforts cannot be abandoned to encourage and to work with NTI, and with the particular HTO and the RWO, to try to develop immediate and long-term solutions to this problem.

#### **Thursday, 20 May 1999**

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, re-convened the meeting at 9:00 a.m.

#### **14. Executive Committee Report and Recommendations**

Gordon Koshinsky reported to the Board in his capacity as Chairperson of the Executive Committee. Gordon advised that the Committee had met the evening previous (May 19). The Committee had identified five items for presentation to the Board. Discussion highlights and decisions made by the Board in respect to these items were as follows:

- **Documenting Progress on Implementation of Strategic Plan:** Gordon reminded Members that the Board had requested the Executive Committee to try to improve the format of the Executive Director's regular/periodic progress report on the Strategic Plan, to make it more meaningful to an outside reader. A key motivation was to have a document appropriate for inclusion in the proposed submission to the Five-Year Independent Review that is now underway. Gordon tabled copies of the draft document that was produced.

Members reviewed the draft document in some detail. A number of specific suggestions for improvements were made, but the ultimate conclusion was that the draft could not serve as the basis for an inclusion in the submission to the Five-Year Review. Michael d'Eça suggested that a "snap-shot report-card" format might be more effective and appropriate, and the Board agreed that the Executive Committee should pursue such an approach. Michael also suggested that it would be useful for the Board to devote some attention to identifying and documenting its longer-term goals and objectives. Gordon agreed, noting that the Strategic Plan as currently constituted is silent on NWMB objectives beyond 1998/99. This might be made the focus of some form of a retreat, since coming to grips with it would require the concerted attention of the Board.

- **Totus Consultants Contract on Human Resource Management:** Gordon reminded the Board of the contract that is underway to evaluate and, if deemed appropriate to help upgrade, the Board's personnel management systems. The Executive Committee had flagged this as an initiative about which the Board should start making itself more familiar. This would facilitate the making of implementation decisions when the contractor's recommendations are received.

- **Staff Workloads and Related Concerns:** Gordon reminded those present that the Executive Director was evacuated to Yellowknife in the course of the present Board meeting, with a recurring heart problem. The Executive Committee agreed to recommend that the Board take steps to lighten or even to re-assign Mr. Noble's workload to facilitate a full recovery. The Board agreed that this would be appropriate.

- **Staff Appraisals for 1998/99 and Calculation of Performance Rewards:** Gordon advised that performance appraisals for 1998/99 were now effectively completed and the Board needed to either re-affirm its processes for determining staff promotions, bonuses, and cost-of-living adjustments or alternatively declare an intention to await the completion of the current contract that is reviewing the Board's personnel management systems. Michael d'Eça advised that the Board should not contemplate procedural revisions of this nature without reference to the details of employee contracts that are in place. The Board decided to continue to follow the same procedures for rewarding employees for performance in 1998/99 and for determining the current cost-of-living adjustment as were used last year, and to advise employees that the system might be changed for 1999/00 and beyond. **(Resolution 2000- 028)**

- **Executive Committee Membership:** Gordon reminded the Board that a replacement for at least one of the Executive Committee members would have to be appointed shortly. He then transmitted the Executive Committee recommendation that the Committee be dissolved and that an election be held for all four of the ordinary Executive Committee positions.

The Board agreed, and proceeded to hold such an election forthwith. The election was conducted by secret ballot. Following the vote, the Board formally reconstituted its Executive Committee with Harry Flaherty, Meeka Mike, Gordon Koshinsky and David Alagalak as the appointed Executive Committee members, and with the NWMB Chairperson continuing as an *ex officio* Committee member. **(Resolution 2000- 029)**

The Board then decided that the ballots pertaining to the election just held for Executive Committee members should be destroyed. **(Resolution 2000- 030)**

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

## **15.A Recent Events: Attendance and Briefings**

Ben Kovic referred the Members to the notes contained in the briefing material pertaining to five events that Board Members and/or Staff/Advisors attended since the last Board Meeting in March. These items were:

- DFO et al. Workshop on Fisheries in Davis Strait, April 7-8 in Iqaluit: Ben Kovic, Jim Noble, Michelle Wheatley and Becky Mike attended.
- Nunavut Institutions of Public Government Meeting, April 13-14 in Ottawa: Ben Kovic, Jim Noble and Michael d'Eça attended.
- Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans Hearings, April 14 in Ottawa: Ben Kovic, Jim Noble and Michael d'Eça attended.
- Canadian Marine Advisory Council National Meeting, May 4-6 in Ottawa (portion only): Michael d'Eça attended.
- Sealing Strategy Workshop, May 8-9 in Iqaluit: Harry Flaherty attended.

## **15.B Upcoming Events: Attendance and Participation**

Ben Kovic led the Board through the tabulation of forthcoming events as at May 17, with additions. The following decisions were reached regarding attendance:

- BQCMC Annual General Meeting, May 18-19 in Arviat: Joan Scottie and/or Michelle Wheatley to attend.
- Meeting of Co-Management Boards and DFO, May 27-28 in Yellowknife: Ben Kovic and Michelle Wheatley to attend.
- IPGs meeting with DIAND, June 8 in Ottawa: Ben Kovic and Michael d'Eça to attend.
- Baffin Fisheries Council AGM, June 8-9 in Iqaluit: Becky Mike to attend.
- DFO-FPAFC Working Group meeting, June 8-9 in Ottawa: Ray Andrews to attend.
- DFO Workshop on Hudson Bay / Foxe Basin bowhead whales, June 17-18 in Iqaluit: Keith Hay to attend.
- DFO Science Advisory Council meeting, June 22-23 in Mont-Joli: Gordon Koshinsky to attend.
- Council of Canadian Administrative Tribunals conference, October 10-12 in Vancouver: Michael d'Eça to attend.

## **16. New List of Tasks to be Undertaken**

Ben Kovic declared his expectation that a preliminary list of tasks arising from this meeting would be distributed within the next couple of days.

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

It was decided (**Resolution 2000- 031**) to hold the next (23<sup>rd</sup>) regular meeting of the NWMB at Repulse Bay the week of 23 August 1999. David Alagalak noted the relative proximity of Repulse Bay to Wager Bay, and suggested that there might be opportunities to acquaint the Board with some of the wildlife features at Wager Bay that were integral to the proposal to establish a national park. Ben Kovic undertook to provide advance notice to the community and to the RWO of the scheduled meeting.

The 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the NWMB adjourned at 10:15 a.m. (**Resolution 2000- 032**)

37

# NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD

## RESOLUTIONS: MEETING No. 22

IKALUKTUTIAK, 16-20 MAY 1999

**Resolution 2000-001:** Resolved that the agenda for NWMB Meeting No. 22 be accepted with minor amendments along with additions identified by Jim Noble.

Moved by: Harry Flaherty                      Seconded by: Kevin McCormick  
Carried    Date: 16 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-002:** Resolved that the 1998/99 Interim Year-end Financial Statement and Variance Report be accepted as presented.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky                      Seconded by: Harry Flaherty  
Carried    Date: 16 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-003:** Resolved that the NWMB accept the Interim Policy for the Assessment of Proposals to Conduct Walrus Sport Hunts as presented.

Moved by: David Alagalak                      Seconded by: Harry Flaherty  
Carried    Date: 18 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-004:** Resolved that the NWMB approve a total of twelve walrus sport hunts for the Igloolik HTO for the 1999 season and two additional walrus sport hunts for Igloolik Outdoor Adventures (IOA) subject to the NWMB's request that the assignment of the right to harvest each walrus be made in writing, and to the following conditions:

- That IOA obtain and demonstrate the approval of the Igloolik HTO as to the location of the sport hunts and the meeting of the condition on total harvest as outlined below;
- That the total walrus sport harvest for both organizations, combined with all other walrus harvests by the community of Igloolik in 1999, will not exceed the average annual number of walrus harvested by the community during the years 1994 to 1998;
- That both organizations agree to provide to the DFO, upon completion of the 1999 season, full reports on all walrus struck and landed or lost; and
- That the hunt must be conducted according to the hunt plan provided.

Moved by: Harry Flaherty                      Seconded by: Pauloosie Keyootak

Carried

Date: 18 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-005:** Resolved that the NWMB approve a total of four walrus sport hunts for Willie Keatainak of Salluit (Nunavik) for the 1999 season, subject to the following conditions:

- That these hunts will take place in the Area of Equal Use and Occupancy around Nottingham and Salisbury Islands;
- That the walrus sport harvest, combined with all other walrus harvests by the community of Salluit in 1999, will not exceed the average annual number of walrus harvested by the community in that Area during the years 1990 to 1995;
- That Mr. Keatainak agrees to provide to the DFO, upon completion of the 1999 season, full reports on all walrus and landed or lost; and
- That the hunt must be conducted according to the hunt plan provided.

Moved by: Johnny Peters

Seconded by: Pauloosie Keyootak

Carried

Date: 18 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-006:** Resolved that the NWMB approve a total of fifteen walrus sport hunts for the Coral Harbour HTO for the 1999 season, subject to the condition that the HTO agrees to provide to the DFO, upon completion of the 1999 season, full reports on all walrus struck and landed or lost; and that the hunt must be conducted according to the hunt plan provided.

Moved by: Joan Scottie

Seconded by: David Alagalak

Carried

Date: 18 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-007:** Resolved that the NWMB approve a total of five walrus sport hunts for the Cape Dorset HTO for the 1999 season, subject to the NWMB's request that the assignment of the right to hunt each walrus be made in writing, and to the following conditions:

- That the HTO improve its hunt plan;
- That the walrus sport harvest, combined with all other walrus harvests by the community of Cape Dorset in 1999, will not exceed the average annual number of walrus harvested by the community during the years 1994 to 1998;
- That the HTO agrees to provide to the DFO, upon completion of the 1999 season, full reports on all walrus struck and landed or lost; and
- That the hunt must be conducted according to the improved hunt plan.

Moved by: David Alagalak

Seconded by: Makabe Nartok

Abstained: Harry Flaherty and Gordon Koshinsky

Carried

Date: 18 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-008:** Resolved that the NWMB approve a total of three walrus sport hunts for the Hall Beach HTO for the 1999 season, subject to the NWMB's request that the assignment of the right to harvest each walrus be made in writing, and to the following conditions:

- That the walrus sport harvest, combined with all other walrus harvests by the community of Hall Beach in 1999, will not exceed the average annual number of walrus harvested by the community during the years 1994 to 1998;
- That the HTO agrees to provide to the DFO, upon completion of the 1999 season, full reports on all walrus struck and landed or lost; and
- That the hunt must be conducted according to the hunt plan provided.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky                      Seconded by: Pauloosie Keyootak  
Carried    Date: 18 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-009:** Resolved that the NWMB meet *in-camera*.

Moved by: Joan Scottie                              Seconded by: Pauloosie Keyootak  
Carried    Date: 18 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-010:** Resolved that the *in-camera* session be closed.

Moved by: Pauloosie Keyootak                      Seconded by: Gordon Koshinsky  
Carried    Date: 18 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-011:** Resolved that the NWMB approve the removal of the narwhal quota for members of the Mittimatalik HTO on the basis of the narwhal harvesting rules submitted by the HTO under the new narwhal management system, and that the Board's concerns about these rules as currently drafted be communicated to the HTO.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick                      Seconded by: Harry Flaherty  
Carried    Date: 18 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-012:** Resolved that the NWMB approve the removal of the narwhal quota for members of the Nattivak HTO on the basis of the narwhal hunting rules submitted by the HTO under the new narwhal management system, with the requirement that the HTO develop and submit, to the NWMB, rules to address hunter education and training within the next year.

Moved by: David Alagalak                              Seconded by: Pauloosie Keyootak  
Carried    Date: 18 May 1999



**Resolution 2000-013:** Resolved that the NWMB approve the removal of the narwhal quota for members of the Arviq HTO on the basis of the narwhal hunting rules submitted by the HTO under the new narwhal management system, and that the Board's concerns about these rules as currently drafted be communicated to the HTO.

Moved by: David Alagalak                      Seconded by: Makabe Nartok  
Abstained: Gordon Koshinsky and Harry Flaherty  
Carried    Date: 18 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-014:** Resolved that the NWMB approve the removal of the narwhal quota for members of the Ikajutit HTO on the basis of the narwhal hunting rules submitted by the HTO under the new narwhal management system.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick                      Seconded by: Harry Flaherty  
Carried    Date: 18 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-015:** Resolved that the NWMB not approve the removal of the narwhal quota for members of the Igloodik and Hall Beach HTOs on the basis of the narwhal hunting "by-laws" submitted by these HTOs under the new narwhal management system, and that the Board's concerns about these "by-laws" as currently drafted be communicated to these HTOs and that they be encouraged to revise and refine these "by-laws" in order to address these concerns.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky                      Seconded by: Kevin McCormick  
Carried    Date: 18 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-016:** Resolved that the NWMB approve the allocation of turbot (Greenland halibut) quotas and fishing effort for NAFO Sub-Area 0 for 1999 as follows:

- For Division 0A (exploratory fishery), a total of 57 fishing days as follows:
  - Cumberland Sound Fisheries: 28 days
  - Nattivak HTA: 17 days
  - Clyde River HTO: 6 days
  - Mittimatalik HTO: 6 days
- For Division 0B, a total of 1500 metric tonnes (MT) as follows:
  - Cumberland Sound Fisheries: 720 MT
  - Nattivak HTA: 320 MT
  - Qikiqtaaluk Corporation: 280 MT
  - Clyde River HTO: 40 MT
  - Kabva Marine: 40 MT

- Mittimatalik HTO: 40 MT
- Aqviq Marine Limited: 30 MT
- Pangnirtung Winter Fishery 30 MT

Moved by: David Alagalak                      Seconded by Gordon Koshinsky  
 Abstained: Harry Flaherty and Pauloosie Keyootak  
 Carried    Date: 19 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-017:** Resolved that the NWMB approve the allocation of striped pink shrimp quotas (total of 500 metric tonnes) for the inshore waters of the Nunavut Settlement Area around Resolution Island for 1999 as follows:

- Cumberland Sound Fisheries: 150 MT
- Qikiqtaaluk Corporation, with QWB: 150 MT
- Quliruaq Incorporated: 100 MT
- Mittimatalik HTO: 50 MT
- Nunavut Imaq Incorporated: 50 MT

Moved by Gordon Koshinsky                      Seconded by Harry Flaherty  
 Abstained: David Alagalak  
 Carried    Date: 19 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-018:** Resolved that the NWMB approve an increase in the annual commercial fishing quota for Arctic char for Sam Ford Fiord (near Clyde River) from 4500 to 5500 kg, this subject to verification that the HTO supports the quota increase, and to the requirement that the fish population will be monitored to ensure that such an increased harvest is sustainable.

Moved by: David Alagalak                      Seconded by: Joan Scottie  
 Abstained: Gordon Koshinsky  
 Carried    Date: 19 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-019:** Resolved that the NWMB Director of Wildlife Management, in view of the issues that have been identified, investigate further the long-standing practice whereby DFO issues experimental licences to test the feasibility of establishing new commercial fisheries, with the intention that – should this practice be found to be detracting from the NWMB jurisdiction – the NWMB will commence to exercise that jurisdiction as soon as it is feasible to do so, and that in the interim DFO will continue to administer the system that is currently in place.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick                      Seconded by: Harry Flaherty  
 Carried    Date: 19 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-020:** Resolved that the NWMB adopt the re-profiled budget for the Nunavut Wildlife Harvest Study as presented to incorporate an additional year (2002/03), this with no increase in the total multi-year budget amount and subject to annual allocations.

Moved by David Alagalak                      Seconded by Makabe Nartok  
Carried    Date: 19 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-021:** Resolved that the NWMB establish a Working Group to consider, develop and within one year recommend mandatory qualifications to be established by the NWMB, along with related considerations, in respect to big game hunting guides operating in the NSA. This Working Group to be comprised of one representative from each of the NWMB, DFO, DSD and each RWO, with possible participation also from Makivik, Arctic College, Nunavut booking agents and/or Nunavut Tourism, and the authors of the 1998 report on *Big Game Hunting Guide Qualifications*.

Moved by Kevin McCormick                      Seconded by Harry Flaherty  
Carried    Date: 19 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-022:** Resolved that the NWMB adopt the *Policy for the Support of Projects from the Nunavut Wildlife Research Trust Fund* as revised (May 1999), subject only to minor wording changes as identified.

Moved by: David Alagalak                      Seconded by: Pauloosie Keyootak  
Carried    Date: 19 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-023:** Resolved that the NWMB adopt the *Policy for the Support of Projects from the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board Study Fund* as revised (May 1999), subject only to minor wording changes as identified.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky                      Seconded by: Makabe Nartok  
Carried    Date: 19 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-024:** Resolved that the NWMB adopt the *Policy for the Determination of Nunavut Wildlife Research Priorities* as revised (May 1999), subject only to minor wording changes as identified.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick                      Seconded by: Joan Scottie  
Carried    Date: 19 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-025:** Resolved that NWMB staff consider the kinds of research proposals and land/water use applications that would not warrant or may not be appropriate for screening by the NWMB, and prepare a recommendation to be considered by the Board for transmittal to the permit-granting agencies.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick      Seconded by: Pauloosie Keyootak  
Carried      Date: 19 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-026:** Resolved that the NWMB give substance to its previous approval-in-principle to provide support-in-kind to the World Wildlife Fund and to DFO for the development of a Bowhead Conservation Plan, this support to have an estimated cash value of approximately \$7,500.

Moved by: David Alagalak      Seconded by: Kevin McCormick  
Carried      Date: 19 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-027:** Resolved that the NWMB provide a contribution of up to \$4,500 toward the costs of a DFO Regional Advisory Process meeting pertaining to the Foxe Basin / Hudson Bay stock of bowhead whales, this contribution to assist in meeting the travel costs of community representatives from Igloolik, Hall Beach and Repulse Bay.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick      Seconded by: Harry Flaherty  
Carried      Date: 19 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-028:** Resolved that the NWMB continue to follow the current system as described in the Employee Manual for rewarding employees for performance in 1998/99 as well as for determining the current cost-of-living adjustment, and to advise employees that the system is subject to change for 1999/00 and beyond.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick      Seconded by: Joan Scottie  
Opposed: Harry Flaherty and David Alagalak  
Carried      Date: 19 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-029:** Resolved that the NWMB, following a vote by the Board Members, reconstitute its Executive Committee with Harry Flaherty, Meeka Mike, Gordon Koshinsky and David Alagalak as the appointed Committee members, and with the NWMB Chairperson continuing as *ex officio* Committee member.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick      Seconded: Pauloosie Keyootak  
Carried      Date: 20 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-030:** Resolved that the ballots pertaining to the vote for Executive Committee members be destroyed.

Moved by: Makabe Nartok                      Seconded by: Harry Flaherty.  
Carried    Date: 20 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-031:** Resolved that the next (23<sup>rd</sup>) regular Meeting of the NWMB be conducted in Repulse Bay the week of 23 August 1999.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick              Seconded by: Makabee Nartok  
Abstained: Harry Flaherty  
Carried    Date: 20 May 1999

**Resolution 2000-032:** Resolved that the 22<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the NWMB be adjourned.

Moved by: David Alagalak                      Seconded by: Kevin McCormick  
Carried    Date: 20 May 1999

---