

# NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD

## MINUTES: MEETING No. 23

NAUJAAT (REPULSE BAY), 24 - 26 AUGUST 1999

### Members and Staff Participating

Ben Kovic	Chairperson
Gordon Koshinsky	Member
Makabe Nartok	Member
Joan Scottie	Member
Kevin McCormick	Member
Moses Koonoo	Member
Johnny Peters	Member for Makivik (by teleconference)*
Michelle Wheatley	Director of Wildlife Management
Gordon Tomlinson	Director of Finance and Administration
Johnny McPherson	Harvest Study Coordinator
Keith Hay	Bowhead Study Coordinator
Michael d'Eça	NWMB Legal Advisor
Mary Nashook	Interpreter
Leetia Janes	Interpreter

\*Johnny Peters participated for Agenda item 11.D only

### Not Available

Harry Flaherty	Member (with cause)
Meeka Mike	Member (with cause)
David Alagalak	Member (with cause)
Jim Noble	Executive Director (with cause)

### Visitors and Other Participants (at various times)

Gary Weber	DFO Area Manager, Iqaluit
Sue Cosens	DFO, Winnipeg
Patrice Simon	DFO, Iqaluit
Glenn Williams	NTI, Iqaluit
Bert Dean	NTI, Rankin Inlet
Raymond Ningeocheak	2 <sup>nd</sup> Vice President, NTI, Rankin Inlet
Stephen Pinksen	DSD, Iqaluit
Ian Ellsworth	DSD, Arviat
Joani Kringayark	DSD, Repulse Bay
Peter Katorka	NSRT
Donat Milortok	Mayor, Hamlet of Repulse Bay
Andreasi Siutinar	President, Repulse Bay HTO

Several other unidentified visitors and members of the public at large

**Tuesday, 24 August 1999**

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

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, convened the meeting at 9:10 a.m. Ben called on Joan Scottie to lead the opening prayer.

Ben welcomed the NWMB Members to this the 23<sup>rd</sup> regular meeting of the Board. He especially welcomed Moses Koonoo from Arctic Bay, recently appointed to a four-year term as a Member of the NWMB. Ben noted that it would be necessary for Moses to be sworn in, as the first item of Board business at this meeting.

**Swearing-in Ceremony**

Ben Kovic called upon the NWMB Legal Advisor, Michael d'Eça, to swear-in Moses Koonoo as the new Nunavut Wildlife Management Board Member appointed by the Qikiqtani Inuit Association. After the swearing-in, all present offered their congratulations and best wishes to Mr. Koonoo on his appointment.

After the swearing-in ceremony, Ben Kovic introduced Donat Milortok, the Mayor of Repulse Bay. Mr. Milortok welcomed the NWMB to the community. He acknowledged the mandate and the work of the Board with respect to matters that are of vital interest to the people of Nunavut. He offered the services and facilities of the Hamlet office to meet any incidental requirements of the Board in the course of its meeting. He suggested that Board Members take the opportunity to mingle in the community, and indicated that Members should not be surprised to receive offers to partake in maktak in the course of any visits made to private homes.

Ben Kovic next introduced Andreasi Siutinuar, President of the local HTO. Mr. Siutinuar welcomed the Board to Repulse Bay. He indicated that it was an honour for the community to be hosting this meeting. He expressed regret that his schedule would not permit him to attend all of the meetings, and noted that the HTO Chairman was also unavailable. However the HTO intended to have continuing representation present. Mr. Siutinuar invited the Board to visit the HTO office, and to consult with the HTO Secretary at any time. He also indicated that country food would be supplied for the Board's coffee breaks.

Ben Kovic thanked the local dignitaries for their kind remarks and for their offers of hospitality. He announced plans to have a public meeting on Wednesday evening, and issued an invitation for community members to come prepared to ask questions of the Board.

## **2. Agenda: Review and Approval**

In reviewing the Agenda, it was noted that the Executive Committee was lacking a quorum. It was accordingly decided that the Board as a whole would deal with the most urgent items on the Executive Committee's agenda. A need was expressed for an *in-camera* session to discuss some matters of a sensitive nature; this session was scheduled for the first evening. It was noted that Johnny Peters had expressed a desire to participate in the Agenda item pertaining to overlap issues with neighbouring jurisdictions; it was decided that arrangements would be made to accommodate this via teleconference.

The Agenda per se was accepted as presented. **(Resolution 2000- 037)**

## **3. Minutes: Review and Approval**

### **3.A Regular Meeting 21, Iqaluit**

The Minutes for Regular Meeting No. 21, held on 23 – 26 March 1999, were adopted with minor adjustments. **(Resolution 2000- 038)**

### **3.B Regular Meeting 22, Ikaluktutiak**

The Minutes for Regular Meeting No. 22, held on 16 – 20 May 1999, were adopted with minor adjustments. **(Resolution 2000- 039)**

### **3.C Conference Call No. 43**

The Minutes for Conference Call No. 43, conducted on 30 June 1999, were adopted with minor adjustments. **(Resolution 2000- 040)**

Some discussion ensued stemming from the Minutes. Ben Kovic questioned the adequacy of provisions for enforcing conditions periodically set out by the Board with respect to certain of its decisions. He expressed particular concern about enforcing conditions that are deferred, and referred by way of example to the Board's recent (Regular Meeting 22) decisions to approve walrus sport hunts "subject to the condition that the HTO agrees to provide...full reports on all walrus struck and landed or lost". Michael d'Eça noted that it was the responsibility of government agencies (in this case, DFO) to implement the Board's decisions, including ensuring that the Board's conditions are met. Kevin McCormick asked whether government agencies in fact had all the powers and authorities needed to accomplish this task. It was acknowledged that all the necessary mechanisms have not yet been fully worked out. It was noted that the matter is related to the question of conformity of agencies' legislation with the NLCA. The Board decided to direct its staff to prepare a briefing note in order to better inform the Members on this subject. Gordon Koshinsky pointed out that Members who opposed particular Motions or who abstained from voting on them were identified in the most recent records of Board Resolutions. He noted that this had not been a matter of consistent practice

previously, and suggested that the Board adopt a specific policy on the matter. Members agreed that it was appropriate for the record to show the identity of those who opposed or abstained from voting on particular Motions.

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

##### **4.A Audit Report for 1998/99**

Gordon Tomlinson tabled the report of the Board's auditors for the past fiscal year. He noted that the auditors had given the Board (including the Nunavut Wildlife Research Trust) a "clean opinion" with respect to financial accounting. The auditors did, however, make three observations pertaining to operating procedures. The substance of these critiques was as follows:

- That the financial transactions of the Trust should be recorded in the organization's books and records as they occur, and should be reconciled with bank statements on a monthly basis;
- That the Board should prepare and administer an inventory of fixed assets, as well as a formal policy on the disposition of these assets;
- That the Board should follow (or else should modify) its policy for Vacation Travel Assistance to employees.

With respect to these critiques, Gordon noted that the first item poses practical difficulties in that TAL does not provide monthly reports. Work is underway to address the second and third items.

The Board decided to accept the Audit Report with respect to the financial statements for 1998/99, as prepared by MacKay Landau. **(Resolution 2000-041)** The Board also directed that staff take all practical steps to address the concerns raised by the auditors as matters of priority.

The Chairperson directed attention to the need to appoint auditors for the current fiscal year. In response to questions from Members, Gordon Tomlinson advised that MacKay Landau charged about \$11,000 for this function last year, and that this cost that has been on a slight upward trend. There is no indication of how, precisely, the firm rationalizes or justifies its audit fee. Some Members asked about the feasibility of tendering for annual audit services. Gordon noted that the RWOs are considering contracting regionally (in conjunction with the HTOs) for their audit services.

The Board decided to appoint Mackay Landau as auditors for the fiscal year 1999/00. **(Resolution 2000- 042)** The Board also directed staff to explore the tendering option for consideration in subsequent years, and also to request MacKay Landau to provide details on the derivation of their audit fees.

#### **4.B Financial/Variance Report to 31 July 1999**

Gordon Tomlinson provided an overview of the NWMB financial situation to 31 July, including a detailed variance report. A negative variance of \$66,755 is currently projected to fiscal-year-end. The Board accepted the report in the context of an information item.

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

Michael d'Eça briefed the Board on the outcome of the June 8 meeting between representatives of DIAND and of the IPGs concerning the long-standing efforts to put in place an appropriate funding instrument for the IPGs. The meeting was called to develop a concrete plan for arriving at a mutually acceptable funding arrangement. It is once again becoming urgent, as has been the case at corresponding times in each of the past several years, to get this matter finally resolved prior to the expiry of the current "provisional" funding arrangement at the end of the fiscal year.

From the perspective of the IPGs, the issue is motivated by the power of the DIAND Minister, under the current arrangement, to terminate funding to the IPGs at his discretion, as well as to require repayment of "surplus" funds at the end of the fiscal year. The IPGs consider that these provisions are contrary to the NLCA. DIAND officials at the meeting indicated that these two provisions were not negotiable by them. However, they also indicated that they themselves did not have ultimate negotiating authority on behalf of the Department. It is worth noting that the previous DIAND Minister went on record as fundamentally supporting the position of the IPGs.

The IPGs have subsequently written (jointly) to the appropriate ADMs in DIAND to press these issues further, and specifically to request the intervention of the ADMs in the matter. The letter declares that the NWMB Legal Council will contact the ADMs personally if a response is not received by the end of August.

### **5. Chairperson, Staff and Members' Reports**

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

Ben Kovic focussed his report on his recent meeting with the KHTA. It is apparent that this RWO is not performing to the level that could be hoped. It has been questioned if adequate funding is being provided, especially by the NWMB as per the responsibility set out in the NLCA. However there would seem to be a more basic question that needs to be considered, namely whether the quality of RWO performance derives from the level of funding, or whether poor performance leads to funding problems. The NWMB needs a mechanism for evaluating the performance of the RWOs and the role of funding in that performance. If more funds were somehow made available, it would be necessary to ensure that the

membership benefited and not merely the office operations. Ben suggested that it might help if RWO reporting was made a mandatory feature of NWMB (Board) meetings. Kevin McCormick pointed out that ensuring the effectiveness of the RWOs is far from the sole responsibility of the NWMB, and that providing more funds from whatever source will not necessarily solve their problems.

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

In the absence of Jim Noble from the meeting, Ben Kovic referred Members to the Executive Director's report contained in the briefing binders.

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

Michelle Wheatley referred Members to her activity report for the period since the last Board meeting. She noted that most of her major activity items had specific places in the agenda for the present meeting.

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

In addition to the financial reports he had already provided, Gordon Tomlinson advised of work underway to upgrade the Board's computer systems, revamp the filing system, streamline personnel management policies, and complete the annual report. A complete re-write of the Board's Operating Procedures Manual is under consideration.

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

Michael d'Eça tabled his usual comprehensive, albeit streamlined, report on his work for the Board over the preceding three months. Highlights included the preparation of major briefing documents with respect to initiating the new narwhal management system, assessing the Draft Management Plan for the Thelon Wildlife Sanctuary, and negotiating with DIAND for a more acceptable permanent funding instrument. In addition and among other things he drafted a submission to the Five - Year Independent Review of the NLCA and helped draft a submission to DFO's Atlantic Fisheries Policy Review.

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

Michelle Wheatley referred Members to Ray Andrews' letter of July 15. In it he elaborated his recent lobbying and educational efforts with DFO on behalf of Nunavut fishing interests in respect to the Atlantic Policy Review, the exploratory shrimp allocation in SFA 2, and the June meeting of the Federal-Provincial Atlantic Fisheries Committee Working Group.

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

Joan Scottie drew the attention of the Board to continuing problems being encountered with the community freezer in Baker Lake. It keeps breaking down, and the contents are thereby thawed and lost. It is not clear who is to blame, but the community is exploring avenues for seeking compensation.

Makabe Nartok signalled that the community of Pelly Bay is interested in seeking a TAH for a bowhead whale to be harvested by that community.

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

Ben Kovic referred the Members to the Task List with status notations included in the briefing binder. It was noted that the vast majority of the identified tasks arising from the last meeting were once again completed or are well under way. Two of the items generated some discussion, namely:

- Item 4: Negotiate and clarify working arrangements with DSD for a shared Conservation Education position. Stephen Pinksen reported that some of the preliminary arrangements have been worked out. However the matter is in abeyance from the viewpoint of DSD; they want to assess the output from the one position for this kind of work that they have already staffed unilaterally. They (DSD) may not even be interested in pursuing additional staffing.
- Item 22: Reactivate the process to develop a database inventory for all NSA fish and wildlife stocks. Michelle Wheatley reported that she had had some preliminary discussions with officials in DSD. She undertook to track down and attempt to motivate the pertinent individuals in the three relevant Departments.

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

### **7.A Peregrine Falcon De-listing in the USA**

Kevin McCormick updated the Board on the status of this initiative. In recognition of Canadian concerns about the biological criteria for the harvesting of these birds in the USA pursuant to their de-listing within the US jurisdiction, the Canadian Peregrine Falcon Recovery Team has prepared 12 recommendations for imminent presentation to the Canadian Wildlife Service for its consideration and attention. The first of these recommendations is to the effect that no harvest of falcons originating in Canada be permitted until the other eleven issues have been adequately addressed. Those other issues pertain primarily to harvesting protocols, allowable harvest levels, and establishing commitments and making provisions for research and monitoring.

CWS is aware that northern co-management Boards, such as the NWMB, must be consulted on the development of any formal Canadian position in respect to this harvest.

## **7.B Proposal for a Spring Season for Snow Geese in the Canadian Arctic**

Kevin McCormick reminded the Board about ongoing concerns regarding the burgeoning population of North American snow geese and the negative effects of these high densities on their Arctic breeding habitats. As one measure of response, special spring hunting seasons for snow geese were established in Manitoba and Quebec in 1999. Both the GNWT/RWED and GN/DSD have informally expressed interest in having spring hunting seasons as well.

The prospect of a special spring hunting season for snow geese in the Canadian Arctic poses a number of questions, including:

- Is the concept fundamentally acceptable?
- If so, what precise dates would be most appropriate?
- Would there need to be different seasons for different zones?
- Would the use of electronic calls be appropriate and acceptable?
- Should any such season be restricted to Canadian sport hunters?
- What should the daily and possession limits be, if any?

The matter is at a very preliminary stage of consideration. There would have to be formal consultations with the NWMB and the RWOs, among others, before the initiative could proceed in the NSA. One probable imperative would be to avoid harvesting or interfering with birds that were in the process of actually nesting. This might entail a certain amount of zoning (with different season dates) within Nunavut, given the large latitudinal range of the Territory.

## **7.C Ban on Possession and Use of Lead Shot for Hunting Migratory Birds**

Kevin McCormick advised the Board that effective 1 September 1999, the possession and use of lead shot for the hunting of migratory birds will be prohibited throughout Canada. The ban will be actively enforced but is expected to be mainly self-administering, through the drying-up of sources of supply.

Glenn Williams noted that there are many shotguns in circulation that cannot safely accommodate steel shot. He wondered if hunters had been adequately warned about this. Kevin replied that a great deal of educational material had been distributed, but that it was impossible to be sure that everyone who needed to know had become aware.



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

### 8.A Walrus Sport Hunts: Update

Gary Weber reported the following tentative walrus sport-hunting results for 1999:

- Igloodik: 11 hunts (10 of which were successful); four cancellations
  - Three hunters from southern Canada
  - Six hunters from the United States
  - One hunter from Germany
  - One hunter from Sweden
- Salluit: Two American hunters (both successful); two more booked
- Hall Beach: No hunting this year (no clients)
- Cape Dorset: No hunting this year (no clients)

### 8.B New Narwhal Management System: Update

Gary Weber tabled a report on the 1999 narwhal hunt (to date) in the four communities that are operating under the new non-quota management system. The report included preliminary numbers (as at August 1) of narwhal landed, wounded but escaped, and killed but lost, all tabulated according to the type of hunt: floe-edge or open-water. Gary also provided a more up-to-date set of data, prepared by Patrice Simon, as follows:

	<u>Landed</u>	<u>Wounded/escaped</u>	<u>Killed/lost</u>
Arctic Bay	17	2	3
Pond Inlet	96	6	9
Qikiqtarjuaq	5	3	0
Repulse Bay	128	67	30

Gary noted that the narwhal quotas previously (before 1999) in place for these communities were as follows: Arctic Bay 100, Pond Inlet 100, Qikiqtarjuaq 50, and Repulse Bay 25. Tags this year were distributed in these four communities on demand. Ordinarily, Qikiqtarjuaq would be the only one among these four communities to conduct substantial narwhal hunting after the present date.

Gary drew the Board's attention to the 1999 narwhal harvest at Repulse Bay, which has been much higher than in previous years; in fact landings to date have matched the combined landings over the entire preceding 10-year period. The last population estimate for this (Hudson Bay) narwhal stock was conducted in 1984 and estimated 1355 animals "on the surface of the water". Doubling that estimate as a first-order correction for submerged animals, and applying a maximum sustainable removal rate of 4%, would indicate a maximum sustainable annual harvest of 108 narwhal. The Department reckons that a precautionary harvest rate of 2%, or 54 animals, would be more appropriate as a long-term goal. The current situation is certainly unique; the average annual harvest at Repulse Bay previously, under a quota of 25, was 17 narwhals. The Department did not expect that the harvest

would or could increase so dramatically under a no-quota system. The Department is flagging the 1999 harvest as a potential conservation issue.

Gordon Koshinsky asked if there had been further narwhal hunting at Repulse Bay since the latest numbers were compiled, and if still more hunting could be expected. Patrice suggested that the number landed is now probably in the range of 140-150. If past seasons are any guide, the hunt should be pretty well finished. One very positive aspect of the new management system has been the excellent reporting by hunters of their strikes and landings.

Kevin McCormick asked if some special set of circumstances has contributed to the situation. Gary referred to reports that there has been an unusually active interaction between killer whales and narwhals in the area this summer, with the killer whales presumably making the narwhals more vulnerable to local hunters. The key factor in the size of the harvest appears to be hunting opportunity. Glenn Williams noted that the long-term average annual harvest of 17 narwhals at Repulse Bay has been less than half the estimated allowable removal, even using the precautionary basis of estimation. He suggested that this could be viewed in terms of a built-up credit.

Michael d'Eça noted that the NLCA has provision for the Minister, in urgent and unusual circumstances, to modify harvesting at his own discretion. This provision has never been used, and it would be an unfortunate development if it were. Presumably the NWMB can be counted on to work in the interests of conservation to preclude any such unilateral action by the Minister. Gary gave assurance that the Department wished to deal with the matter in a co-managerial context. Direction from the NWMB is requested on how to proceed.

Ben Kovic channelled the attention of the Board to deciding a course of action. He noted that the narwhal hunting season is nearly, if not fully, completed; and that the new management system contains its own requirement for a post-season review. Gordon Koshinsky suggested that it was important to obtain input from the community before making any decision for action or otherwise. Ben noted that HTO officials have privately expressed some concerns, but there has been no indication of the viewpoint of the community as a whole. It was decided to defer further consideration of the matter until later in the Board Meeting, and more specifically until after the community meeting tomorrow.

### **8.C Legislation Changes: Update**

Gary Weber reported that the Department anticipates completing a draft of new Marine Mammal Regulations by the end of the calendar year, for consideration by the NWMB and others. These (Marine Mammal) Regulations will be national in scope. Once that draft is completed, work will commence on drafting new Sport Fishing Regulations; these will be specific to Nunavut. No imminent need is anticipated to open or change the *Fisheries Act* on these accounts.

Michael d'Eça urged the Department to engage the NWMB and probably NTI in discussions at the outset of this exercise. There are many considerations of a fundamental nature that should properly be taken into account when making regulatory changes in this context. The exercise should not proceed without a definition of guiding principles, and the process and time frame for arriving at the end point should be identified and agreed to before actual drafting commences. Gary noted that the Department had circulated a concept paper (including to the NWMB and to NTI) about a month ago that touched on such considerations. The Department considered that preparation of a draft would be the most effective way to move forward on the new Marine Mammal Regulations, in view of their intended Canada-wide application.

Glenn Williams suggested that making the Marine Mammal Regulations national in scope, but not so the new Fisheries Regulations, perhaps represented the kind of unilateral decision/assumption by the Department that the NWMB (and NTI) were concerned about. Gary replied that making the Marine Mammal Regulations national in scope did not preclude addressing regional issues and concerns.

It was agreed that the NWMB would respond to the DFO concept paper, at the same time identifying issues of mandate and protocol that need to be addressed.

#### **8.D Bowhead Stock Status Report: Hudson Bay – Foxe Basin Population**

Sue Cosens briefly described DFO's two-year-old Regional Advisory Process (RAP). The Process brings together traditional and scientific knowledge and harvest data in the production of status reports on particular fish or marine mammal stocks. Sue reminded the Board that the NWMB had requested the production of such a report for the Hudson Bay – Foxe Basin population of bowhead whales. Sue said that Stock Status Reports are interpreted as management documents, for use in making resource-management decisions.

The Department initiated the process by producing a first-draft document. Then, with the assistance of the NWMB, the Department convened a workshop in Iqaluit in June, with representation from DFO, NWMB, NTI, the RWO, and the pertinent HTOs. The workshop yielded major changes and additions to the draft document, and resulted in the version being tabled by DFO at the present time. The current package also includes a report on the proceedings of the actual RAP session, with both documents available in English and in Inuktitut. The present version has been sent to the workshop participants as well as to an external reviewer. Once their comments and advice are received, a final document will be prepared. This will be sent to the various participants in the process, as well as to the Canadian Stock Assessment Unit in Ottawa. The target completion date is mid October. The document will eventually be Internet-accessible.

Makabe Nartok asked about the nature and reliability of the boundaries that are assumed to separate bowhead harvesting regions. Sue replied that the information for separating Canadian Arctic bowhead stocks is not yet complete. The information

now available would be consistent with the existence of at least two stocks: one summering in the Northern Hudson Bay / Foxe Basin area, and the other in the North Baffin / Davis Strait area. It seems most likely that the bowheads summering in Northern Hudson Bay / Foxe Basin are the same stock.

Makabe persisted in knowing more about the real or presumed boundaries that separate bowhead whales summering in the Kitikmeot region from those summering in other areas. Sue acknowledged that there is no direct information pertaining to the relationship, if any, between bowhead whales in Northern Foxe Basin and those in the Gulf of Boothia. It is generally assumed that bowheads in the Gulf of Boothia are part of a Davis Strait stock, but this is not known with certainty. The Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study has not turned up evidence of migrations of bowhead whales through Fury and Hecla Strait.

Sue also noted that the distribution of marine mammals in her general study area seemed abnormal this year. Very few bowheads were sighted north of Igloodik, for instance, and it is not known where they were instead. She also noted that only part of the population uses Northern Foxe Basin; that area appears to be a nursery based on the preponderance of young animals. A substantial number of the older animals evidently do not summer in that immediate area. Kevin McCormick suggested that it should be possible to develop an independent estimate of total stock abundance from the numbers represented in the first few cohorts, assuming a normal kind of cohort distribution.

Ben Kovic asked if the ice-breaker passage through Fury and Hecla Strait this summer could have affected whale distributions. Sue acknowledged that this was an interesting possibility. She noted that marine mammal sightings were recorded in the course of the ship's passage, and undertook to obtain this information.

Sue noted that the various estimates of sustainable harvest contained in the RAP document depend on whether the stock is considered to be endangered, threatened, or increasing. Since these bowheads are currently listed (by COSEWIC) as endangered, the appropriate sustainable harvest estimate is one animal every two years. However, one of the recommendations stemming from the workshop was to have COSEWIC conduct another status review. In view of information from the Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study (IBKS) and other sources, the designation of "endangered" may no longer be appropriate. Kevin asked whether a COSEWIC review could be expected to add anything of value. Sue replied that approaching COSEWIC was a matter of proper protocol.

Raymond Ningeocheak expressed concern about the tardiness in completing the IBKS. Ben advised that the IBKS is a separate agenda item.

It was decided that Michelle, working with Keith Hay, would respond on behalf of the Board to DFO's draft stock status report on the Hudson Bay / Foxe Basin bowhead, this to be completed by 24 September. Other Board Members were free to respond separately if they wished.

## 8.E Administration of Experimental Commercial Fishing Licences

Michelle Wheatley summarized the briefing note that she and Michael d'Eça had prepared on this matter for the benefit of the Board. The essence of the proposal is that the Board approve a long list of temporary experimental quotas for species and waterbodies that DFO, albeit without due authority in the view of the NWMB, has already been administering as experimental fishing licences. This would permit DFO to continue to issue such licences for these species and waterbodies, this up to the temporary quota approved by the NWMB, but without further reference to the NWMB in each separate instance.

Michael d'Eça pointed out that the whole matter of commercial harvesting by Inuit under the terms of the NLCA is not well understood, and urged that the Board devote some attention to clarifying this subject. The Board assigned Michael to draft an NWMB position paper on this subject for the next Board Meeting.

Gordon Koshinsky asked if DFO was prepared to implement the new system for administering experimental commercial fishing quotas, if this new system was adopted by the Board in all the dimensions that are being proposed. Michelle replied that DFO staff had indicated their readiness to do so.

Glenn Williams noted the requirement as proposed for commercial fishers to comply with certain sampling and reporting protocols to facilitate further management decisions at the end of the five-year experimental period. He urged that consideration be given to compensating fishers for such efforts.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 043**) to approve experimental fishing quotas on a temporary basis for particular species in particular Nunavut waterbodies as set out in the document, *Temporary Commercial Quotas for Freshwater and Marine Species and Waterbodies in the NSA identified as at August 1999*, this to provide the basis for DFO to issue experimental fishing licences to individual fishers or to groups of fishers without the need to make individual representation to the NWMB. The Board further agreed that administration of these temporary composite experimental quotas would be subject to the following conditions and constraints:

- These composite quotas will be for the period ending 31 March 2004;
- DFO will issue experimental fishing licences to individual fishers only within the limits of these composite quotas;
- DFO will issue experimental fishing licences to individual fishers only with the concurrence of the appropriate HTO(s);
- Each fisher allocated a portion of any composite experimental commercial fishing quota will need to meet requirements for sampling and reporting to be set out by DFO;
- New applications for experimental licences, for different waterbodies and/or for different species than those approved herewith, must be brought to the attention of the NWMB for review and decision;

- Any request for an increase in a temporary quota previously approved, or for the setting of a permanent quota, must be brought to the attention of the NWMB for review and decision;
- Neither an increase in a temporary quota nor the setting of a permanent quota for the species/waters approved herewith will be considered if the sampling and reporting requirements have not been met or if the species in that waterbody has not been harvested at or near the temporary quota over the previous five-year period; and
- Additional non-quota limitations may be established by the NWMB.

## **8.F Requests for Access to the NSA to Fish for Shrimp**

Michelle Wheatley reviewed the history of this matter. She noted that since 1998, and in addition to a 500-metric-tonne (MT) allotment of striped pink shrimp reserved exclusively for Nunavut interests, the NWMB has had authority to allocate 500 additional MT in the NSA to one or more of the 17 permanent licence holders. Those 17 licence holders are currently aggregated into two groups, the Canadian Association of Prawn Producers (CAPP) and the Northern Coalition (NC). Both of these groups have requested the NWMB to grant access to them to fish this 500-MT Total Allowable Catch (TAC) in the NSA in 1999.

After considerable discussion, the Board decided that it was unwilling to establish the precedent of granting access to other-than-Nunavut fishery interests to pursue this component of this shrimp fishery at the present time. The Board accordingly decided (**Resolution 2000- 044**) to grant the request for access brought by the Northern Coalition, and to deny the request brought by CAPP. It was agreed to notify CAPP how they might make such a request more attractive to the Board in a subsequent year, such as by partnering with Nunavut interests in the north or demonstrating benefits to Nunavut interests in the south.

In light of the fact that the Shrimp Management Plan is scheduled to be renewed after the current fishing season, the Board also decided to raise again with the DFO Minister the matter of the Board's dissatisfaction with how he (the Minister) had interpreted the Board's advice in the course of establishing this special 500- MT TAC for striped pink shrimp in the first place.

### **Tuesday, 24 August 1999; Evening Session**

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, re-convened the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

#### **In-Camera Session**

The Board decided to go *in-camera* in order to discuss three items having confidential implications.

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

- To go *in-camera* (**Resolution 2000- 045**)
- To close the *in-camera* session (**Resolution 2000- 046**)

### **Wednesday, 25 August 1999**

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, re-convened the meeting at 8:40 a.m. He called on Joan Scottie to offer an opening prayer.

Ben directed the attention of the Board to the three matters discussed *in-camera* last night that required further treatment by the Board in open forum.

On the matter of the impending advisory from the Nunavut Implementation Panel (NIP) to the IPGs pertaining to protocols for any re-allocations of funding among the IPGs, the Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 047**) to indicate to the NIP, if possible in concert with the other IPGs, support for a more formalized approach and a willingness to try to develop the work plans and financial forecasts contemplated by the NIP.

On the matter of out-of-pocket personal expenditures incurred by the Executive Director in connection with his recent medial emergency, the Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 048**) to cover these costs by way of an NWMB donation, and further that the NWMB develop a policy pertaining to coverage (or not) of expenditures made for compassionate purposes by or for Board and staff members.

On the matter of the Board's contract with its Fisheries Advisor, the Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 049**) to seek to extend this contract, incorporating increases of \$50 per day for consulting work and \$25 per month for administrative allowance; and further that the NWMB attempt to negotiate this contract extension to the end of the current planning period.

## **9. Government of Nunavut Wildlife (DSD): Issues and Decisions**

### **9.A Subsistence Harvest of Snow Geese at Arviat**

Stephen Pinksen tabled the final report on the 1999 project, prepared by Wildlife Officer Joe Savikataaq. Twenty hunters participated in the harvest of 1000 snow geese just north of the McConnell Bird Sanctuary. The birds were distributed to various communities in Nunavut. DSD considers that this kind of hunt makes a useful contribution to controlling the population of these birds. DSD also supports the concept of a spring sport hunt for snow geese in Nunavut and will be so advising the CWS.

## 9.B Polar Bear Quotas for 1999/00

Stephen Pinksen tabled polar bear harvest data for the 1998/99 season, along with the Department's quota recommendations for 1999/00.

Based on its analyses and in accordance with the provisions of the existing polar bear management agreements (MOUs), the Department is recommending four quota changes for the coming season as follows:

- Clyde River (Baffin Bay population): increase from 8 to 21;
- Coral Harbour (Foxye Basin population): increase from 34 to 39;
- Igloodik (Foxye Basin population): increase from 2 to 4; and
- Taloyoak (Gulf of Boothia population): decrease from 15 to 6.

Makabe Nartok requested explanation for the substantial quota reduction being recommended for Taloyoak. Stephen pointed out that the quota for 1998/99 was ten males and five females, but the actual harvest was six males and nine females. The quota reduction being recommended for 1999/00 stems from the over-harvest of four females, and was calculated according to the formulas in the MOU. This has been explained to the community. Female polar bear credits are available in other communities that share the Gulf of Boothia population, and the community of Taloyoak has tried to obtain the loan of such credits but without success. Makabe noted that communities apparently want to conserve their own credits in case they might need these credits themselves in a later year.

Ben Kovic asked if it was possible that some areas simply had markedly more female polar bears than males. He suggested that data from the mark-and-recapture program could be used to determine this. If it was shown to be the case, it might be appropriate to adjust the sex-ratio aspects of the quotas according to the sex-ratio characteristics of particular populations. Bert Dean expressed concern that the current polar bear management system tends to pit communities against each other. He suggested that the harvest characteristics (notably the sex ratio) for an entire polar bear population should be taken into account before quota reductions are levied against any particular community. Bert also noted that there is some expert opinion to the effect that the present system may be leading to the over-harvest of male polar bears in some areas.

Gordon Koshinsky observed that quota adjustments are the natural outcome of an active wildlife management system. The process that has been established and that is enshrined in the MOUs is fairly routine and mechanical. Until and unless the MOUs are changed - which may or may not be advisable - it is only reasonable to adhere to the formulas that the MOUs contain.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 050**) to approve the changes in polar bear quotas recommended by DSD for the 1999/00 season. The Board recognized, however, that there is considerable dissatisfaction with the flexible quota system that is currently in use, and that many credible suggestions have come forward for



modifying the system. The Board urged the Department to give credence to these ideas and concerns in its forthcoming evaluation.

### **9.C. Study of the Effects of Capturing and Handling on Polar Bears**

Stephen Pinksen advised that the contracted study has been completed, and referred to the Executive Summary contained in the meeting binders. The study reviewed eight years of data collected by federal and territorial government agencies as well as universities. All aspects of the techniques used to capture and handle polar bears were examined, including drugging, ear-tagging and radio-collaring. The study concluded that while there may be short-term effects on individual animals, there do not appear to be significant long-term effects. Stephen had no indication of the Department's official reaction to the report.

Moses Koonoo noted that the conclusions as outlined were at variance with the perceptions of hunters in his area. Hunters believe that this kind of handling weakens a bear, causes loss of fur, and decreases the quality of the meat making it soft. Moses also noted that the results from the kinds of studies that utilize these approaches are not being communicated adequately to the hunters/communities. Stephen expressed surprise that there still were problems with the flow of research results to communities. He gave assurance of an ongoing commitment by the Department to make its research findings known to the people who stood to be affected by them.

Ben Kovic expressed disappointment that there is no mention, at least not in the Executive Summary, about the implications for people who consume the meat from polar bears that were previously tranquilized. Kevin McCormick referred to some earlier studies that examined the quality of meat from bears that were previously drugged, and he offered to find and table those publications.

Glenn Williams reported a concern among local hunters that some polar bears in the vicinity of Resolution Island are still carrying radio collars that should have been removed by now. Glenn asked when it was proposed to remove them. Stephen replied that he thought that the Department, in conjunction with Coast Guard, planned to recover these collars in September.

The Board decided to direct its staff to review the consultants' report and draft an appropriate response.

### **9.D Manitoba / Nunavut MOU re Western Hudson Bay Polar Bears: Update**

Stephen Pinksen reminded the Board that an agreement between Manitoba and Nunavut for the management of the shared polar bear population in Western Hudson Bay is in the process of being developed. He referred the Board to the current draft of this agreement, which has been included in the meeting binders.

The agreement will primarily formalize protocols that are already being followed on an informal basis. A new provision being sought by Manitoba is to establish a no-sport-hunting zone in the marine region east of Manitoba as defined in the NLCA. It is hoped to have a final version of the agreement available for the consideration of the NWMB by early next year. DSD considers that the main input from the NWMB will be in respect to quotas and non-quota limitations.

Michael d'Eça took issue with the marginal role that DSD portrays for the NWMB in this matter. He interpreted the NWMB to have a significant jurisdiction, and urged that the parties involve the NWMB more intimately in the process of developing the agreement.

The Board decided to ask the Director of Wildlife Management, with the participation of the Board's Legal Advisor, to review the current draft of the agreement and recommend an appropriate course of action.

### **9.E Completion of Thelon Wildlife Sanctuary Management Plan: Update**

Stephen Pinksen reported that DSD is working with KIA, NTI, and the NWMB to arrange a meeting to resolve final concerns. The matter of Inuit harvesting rights within the Sanctuary seems to require further attention.

Michael d'Eça expressed reservations about assuming at the outset that such a meeting would be final. He urged a conference call as a background to the meeting in order to identify and clarify the scope of remaining issues and establish a meeting agenda.

### **9.F Wildlife Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit (IQ): Proposal for an Advisory Group**

Stephen Pinksen advised the Board that the RWO Executive Directors are examining a proposal to establish an advisory group to provide a vehicle for promoting and ensuring that the knowledge and values of Inuit elders and hunters are documented, developed and taken into account by agencies exercising research and management responsibilities pertaining to wildlife in Nunavut. DSD, for its part, is determined to take a more systematic approach in integrating IQ into its wildlife research and management programs. It is anticipated that the NWMB could provide pertinent advice on if/how to proceed.

Michelle Wheatley noted that the RWOs have agreed to explore the concept but have not yet committed to actually developing or supporting a formal advisory group. Kevin McCormick was interested to know what deficiencies have been identified in present arrangements that such a body would be expected to address.

## **9.G Protection of Caribou Calving Grounds**

Stephen Pinksen reminded the Board that DIAND has been leading an initiative to develop protocols for the protection of caribou calving habitat in the face of industrial activity. The primary motivation is to end up with a policy setting out how the Department will conduct environmental reviews of development projects that are proposed to take place on caribou calving grounds.

Given its role in the management of caribou in Nunavut, the DSD will be participating in the development of these protocols. Before proceeding further, DIAND and DSD would like to an indication of whether the NWMB supports the initiative and would be prepared to participate in its development.

Kevin McCormick applauded the intent to protect caribou calving grounds, but he questioned the role that DIAND appears to be identifying for itself in the matter. A role such as that implied would seem to be at variance with the provisions of the NLCA, and clarification is warranted. Michael d'Eça agreed that it may not be appropriate to develop a policy for DIAND to exercise a jurisdiction that is the proper domain of the NIRB and the NPC. He suggested that the NWMB not commit to the initiative without exploring the matter in some detail with NTI, NIRB, NPC, and the RWOs, as well as trying to obtain more clarification from the two government agencies that are spearheading the initiative.

The Board decided to seek more information from DIAND, DSD and NTI before attempting to prepare a response.

## **9.H New Nunavut Wildlife Act: Update**

Stephen Pinksen reported that DSD, NTI and NWMB officials met on July 26 to discuss the DSD report setting out the proposed process for developing this new legislation. The NWMB has provided written comment. The meeting participants are being constituted into an ongoing working group. Next steps include:

- Obtaining formal Cabinet approval to begin a legislative process,
- Securing the necessary funding, and
- Developing a consultation plan.

## **9.I Polar Bear Population Studies: Status and Outlook**

Ben Kovic tabled a report that had been prepared by Mitch Taylor, concerning the status of polar bear research projects in Nunavut. A considerable number of studies are listed under "data collected, but analysis and writing not completed". Ben asked about the outlook for these projects, considering the recent departure of Mr. Taylor. He noted that NWMB funding had most likely supported much of this work.

Stephen Pinksen suggested that the Board formally approach the Department with these concerns. The Board decided that this would be done.

## **9.J Request for Commercial Caribou Quota Increases: Rankin/Chesterfield**

Michelle Wheatley referred the Board to the recent recommendation from the Beverly Qamanirjuac Caribou Management Board that the commercial caribou quotas for Rankin Inlet and Chesterfield Inlet be increased by 105 and 100 animals respectively. The BQCMB has advised that, based on current estimates of the size of the Qamanirjuac herd and assuming a 5% sustainable harvest, the unallocated portion of the available harvest is about 3500 caribou.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 051**) to approve the increased commercial caribou quotas from the Qamanirjuac population for the two communities as recommended by the Beverly Qamanirjuac Caribou Management Board.

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

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

Johnny McPherson advised the Board that the Technical Review of the Harvest Study has commenced. The senior investigator for the project, Bill Kemp, was recently in Iqaluit for familiarisation, and a good introductory meeting was held. Mr. Kemp's initial impressions appear to be positive. The report on the Technical Review is scheduled for completion prior to the next Board meeting.

From June 1996 to the end of July 1999, 84% of possible data have been collected and incorporated into the database. Of the remainder, 8% have been collected and are being processed, 5% are still being collected, and 3% are unrecoverable and will require project extensions in order to achieve five-year data sets. The response rate has been 85%.

Interim reports are now being produced, with a view to obtaining confirmation or corrective input from the HTOs. Production of and reaction to these interim reports will provide important insights for structuring the final report on the Study. These reports also help to motivate the Field Workers and to encourage participation by the hunters. Johnny distributed samples of these interim reports for review by the Board Members. Some of these reports have been distributed to communities already, and responses have been mostly positive.

Board Members expressed satisfaction with the progress of the Harvest Study, and enthusiasm about the interim reports. Moses Koonoo recalled that he was one of the members of the original Harvest Study Steering Committee, and declared that it was a matter of considerable satisfaction and pride for him to see the initial planning efforts leading to such good results. He understood the importance of having wildlife harvests in the NSA well documented.

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

Keith Hay referred Members to the status report in the meeting binders.

The primary database comprises text transcripts from 175 individual interviews (out of a total of 257 interviews) conducted in 18 communities, and from eight community workshops. Transcripts from interviews and from workshops were compiled on the basis of four regions (which may be indicative of bowhead stocks): Baffin Bay, Hudson Bay, Hudson Strait and Foxe Basin. Maps were also prepared, to show seasonal distribution and migration patterns of the whales.

After the four regional data sets were assembled, keyword searches were done to produce a compendium of quotations pertaining to two general subject areas: population ecology of bowhead whales, and cultural importance of the bowhead to Inuit. This compendium is referred to as the "Sourcebook of Quotations", and will be a companion volume to the final report. Referenced quotations from this compendium were next sorted (still on a regional basis) and according to designated sub-topics under the two primary topic headings. The analysis and summary of this final compilation is nearing completion and is the essence of the final report.

Keith distributed copies of the final report components to the extent that these have been drafted to date. The aim is to have a document ready for formal review by the end of September, with publication targeted for the end of January.

Keith asked for direction from the Board on the matter of getting the document reviewed. Over 200 individuals participated in the project and provided material for it in one way or another. It would not be practical to obtain comments or to take account of comments from all of these people individually. Nevertheless, some provision for review by or on behalf of Inuit generally, and by or on behalf of elders and hunters who contributed specifically, is clearly required. It would also be useful and appropriate to obtain reviews from one or more individuals who have specialized knowledge from the scientific/academic and the cultural/traditional perspectives. Keith also requested direction from the Board about if and how the IBKS Committee is to be further involved in any substantive way. He noted that the IBKS Committee played no role in directing the Study for the past two years, and only one of the current Committee members is a Board Member.

Ben Kovic noted that ideally, all persons quoted in the report should have the opportunity to go over it, with the help of an interpreter if necessary. However going back to all of them individually could equal or even exceed the time and effort involved in getting to the point we are now at in the process. Kevin McCormick asked if it would be feasible to have the HTOs lead in obtaining whatever review input they considered appropriate within each of the 18 communities. Ben stated that, for his part, he would be pleased to review the report, both as a Board Member and as someone with a cultural perspective. Gordon Koshinsky stated that he was very pleased to see the IBKS coming to a successful conclusion, and he offered to review the report if that would be useful. Ben suggested Dr. Milton Freeman as

someone who might provide input from the academic perspective, but he acknowledged that there were other possible candidates as well.

The Board concluded that it would be best if Keith referred the matter of planning the review process to the IBKS Committee. Board Members were encouraged to review the document when it was ready, and to provide their input to Keith.

Keith reminded the Board that the WWF is preparing a conservation plan for bowhead whales in Nunavut. The NWMB endorsed this initiative and agreed to provide support-in-kind. One element of that support is understood to be access by the WWF to the IBKS report, including in draft form. NWMB staff have agreed to provide WWF with a draft of the report when it is available. If the draft is made available prior to being reviewed, and if the review process turns out to be particularly long, there is a possibility that the WWF report might be completed and distributed prior to the IBKS report coming out. This would not be satisfactory from the point of view of those who worked long and hard on the IBKS, and would be disrespectful to the contributors.

The Board concluded that input from contributors should be considered as part of the preparatory process rather than as part of the reviews. The Board accordingly decided (**Resolution 2000- 052**) that the draft final report not be deemed ready for release until the input (if any) from the Inuit contributors has been received and taken into account.

Gordon Koshinsky urged that every effort be made at every stage in the process to get the final report published in a recognized journal or equivalent.

### **10.C Traditional Polar Bear Hunt: Noah Kadlak Proposal**

Michelle Wheatley reviewed the history of this matter for the Board:

- November 1997: The Board received an application from Noah Kadlak of Coral Harbour, requesting approval to conduct a polar bear hunt using traditional methods, and with the further expectation that the hunt would be the subject of a documentary film.
- February 1998: The Board reviewed the application in detail, recognized that there was no conservation issue, and concluded that the NWMB had no authority to deny the application unless it could make such a case based on public safety and/or humane harvesting considerations.
- May 1998: The Board agreed to allow the harvesting of a polar bear by an Inuk hunting in the traditional manner subject to a number of conditions. The Board further agreed to indicate to the Minister that the Board was prepared to endorse Mr. Kadlak's particular application to conduct such a hunt, subject to certain further conditions, if the Minister implemented the necessary revisions to the non-quota limitations.
- July 1998: The Minister disallowed the Board's decision.
- August 1998: The Board reaffirmed its initial decision.

- November 1998: The Minister advised that he intended to refer the matter to the incoming Government of Nunavut.

Michelle referred the Members to her briefing note for a more complete description of these events.

Gordon Koshinsky asked if there was any indication that Mr. Kadlak was indeed still interested in pursuing this matter, including the filming aspect. No one knew the answer, but Members agreed that this needed to be determined. Joan Scottie suggested that the next initiative should come from Mr. Kadlak.

Michael d'Eça considered that the Board had four options:

- Let the matter rest, unless/until revived by the proponent;
- Ask the proponent to confirm or deny his continuing interest;
- Forward the previous correspondence to the new DSD Minister; or
- Develop new correspondence for the new Minister.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 053**) to reiterate to the new Minister of Sustainable Development its earlier final decision with respect to this matter, subject to first verifying that Mr. Kadlak remains interested in pursuing this hunt.

#### **10.D NWMB Strategic Plan: Update on Implementation**

Gordon Koshinsky referred to the chart in the meeting binders: "Addressing NWMB Strategic Planning Objectives; Progress as at August 1999". Progress on this matter has been the subject of recurring presentations by the Executive Director at most NWMB meetings; this chart is a revised attempt to portray progress (or not) on specific items. The chart covers only short-term and medium-term objectives as set out in the original Strategic Plan document. The former items are/were to be substantially addressed in 1996/97; the latter in 1997/98 and 1998/99. Longer-term objectives as such have not yet been formally identified by the Board. Gordon suggested that shaded items in the chart were ones that the Board might wish to examine in particular.

Gordon also referred the Members to the "Report Card" that he had prepared in an attempt to demonstrate even more concisely the state of the Board's response to its strategic planning objectives.

Kevin McCormick observed that it would be difficult or impossible to conduct a meaningful review and/or update of the Board's Strategic Plan in the context of a meeting such as this. He suggested that the Board needed to commit some time specifically to such an effort, probably in the form of a workshop or retreat. Gordon noted that a self-evaluation workshop was in fact one of the unrealized items identified in the Strategic Plan. He suggested, however, that such an event would be productive only if extensive preparations were made for it.

The Board decided that it would be appropriate to conduct a workshop for the purposes of evaluating progress made by the NWMB to date and planning for the future. Such a workshop should form the basis for developing the planning and budgetary submission that is being requested by the Implementation Panel. It was also agreed that it would be appropriate to incorporate the "Report Card" in the Board's submission to the independent five-year review now in progress.

#### **Thursday, 26 August 1999**

The Chairperson, Ben Kovic, re-convened the meeting at 8:45 a.m. He called on Joan Scottie to lead the opening prayer.

#### **10.E Bluenose Caribou Management Agreement**

Michelle Wheatley advised the Board that a formal agreement for the management of the Bluenose caribou herd has been under development for some time. The idea was discussed at the May meeting of the Chairs of the various wildlife management boards, including the four that share this population. Michelle tabled the most recent version of the agreement, drafted by the (Inuvialuit) Wildlife Management Advisory Committee. Comment from the NWMB is requested.

Kevin McCormick wondered whether some of the provisions of the management agreement as proposed would yield actual gains. He especially questioned the need for a new stand-alone advisory body, since the authority of the Co-management Boards (including the NWMB) in this matter is quite clear. Kevin suggested that management issues for the herd could readily be addressed by the Chairs of the wildlife management boards at their regular meetings. In his view, if an agreement that went beyond the present informal arrangement was developed at this time it should focus on such matters as cost-sharing of research and apportioning of the harvest.

Comment: Revised wording as per comment from Kevin McCormick.

Michael d'Eça suggested that an MOU, developed in accordance with Article 40 of the NLCA, might be a more appropriate basis for action in this matter than a formal agreement. What seems to be needed is a framework for reaching decisions. Ben Kovic declared that he would like to discuss the matter with NTI.

The Board decided to defer decision on how to respond until its next meeting. In the meantime, Michelle and Ben will explore alternative concepts with the other wildlife management boards.

#### **10.F Bowhead TAH for 2000**

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Board of the new information now available that is pertinent to this matter, and which may not yet have been fully assessed:

- DFO has circulated a stock status report with respect to the Northern Hudson Bay / Foxe Basin bowhead population;



- Most of the elements of the Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study have been drafted; and
- The QWB has released its report on the 1998 bowhead hunt.

The Board decided to defer further consideration of this matter to a Conference Call. Michelle was asked to update her briefing note, to take full account of the new information that is now available.

### **10.G Proposal to Extend New Narwhal Management System: Pelly Bay**

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Board that, at its previous meeting, it had approved the removal of narwhal quotas for four communities based on narwhal management and/or hunting rules submitted by those communities to meet the requirements of the new narwhal management system. In anticipation of participating in this new system as early as this year, and acting on their own initiative, the Pelly Bay HTO has submitted a proposed set of narwhal hunting rules for their community. The rules that were submitted by Pelly Bay rules are based on those submitted earlier by Repulse Bay. The HTO has declared itself amenable to make the revisions that the Board has required of Repulse Bay, most notably pertaining to their current Rule 16 regarding governance of hunters from other communities. The Board has maintained that this Rule as now written cannot be enforced until the RWO has laid the necessary groundwork, and the Board has accordingly suggested alternate wording.

Gordon Koshinsky asked about the nature of the narwhal hunt at Pelly Bay and how much participation there normally was from other communities. Patrice Simon advised that narwhal at Pelly Bay are most likely part of the Baffin Bay stock, estimated to number 18,000 animals. The narwhal quota for Pelly Bay is ten. The average harvest over the past 20 years has been two, with narwhal actually taken in only six of those years. Recent harvests have been five in 1995, seven in 1996, and fifteen in 1997. Harvest data for the past two years are not readily available. Makabe Nartok explained that narwhals do not migrate in the vicinity of Pelly Bay every year. There is no floe-edge hunt. The community wants to avoid any repercussions from occasionally going over limit. Hunters from Gjoa Haven, who have a small quota of their own, occasionally participate in narwhal hunting around Pelly Bay.

Patrice Simon stressed the role and responsibility of the HTO in managing narwhal hunting in the interests of conservation under a no-quota system. He referred to the HTO's proposed Rule 14, that "The Board of Directors of the HTO may temporarily reduce or stop narwhal hunting by members" in the interests of "effective management and conservation....and/or the safety of the members". Gordon urged that the word "may" be changed to "shall" in this Rule as a condition of NWMB approval. He considered that clarifying the onus of the HTO was a stepping stone to fostering its growth and development.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 054**) to approve the removal of narwhal quotas for members of the Pelly Bay HTO on the basis of the narwhal hunting rules submitted by the HTO, this subject to a number of conditions including certain revisions to the wording of some of the rules.

## **10.H Screening of Land-Use and Water-Use Permit Applications**

Michelle Wheatley referred to the briefing note on this matter prepared by Rebecca Mike. She noted that the NLCA lists among the NWMB's discretionary functions the provision of advice (including to the NIRB) "regarding mitigation measures and compensation to be required from commercial and industrial developers who cause damage to wildlife habitat". At the present time, reviewing applications for land-use and water-use permits takes up a significant amount of NWMB staff time. Staff suggest that it would be appropriate to try to streamline or reduce the NWMB's participation, perhaps limiting it to a few specific categories of projects for which the NWMB has a particular interest, and particularly in situations that the NIRB is not well prepared to address. Staff have found the *Canada Environmental Assessment Act* (CEAA) and other existing legislation and regulations to be very useful references for screening, and would encourage NIRB to use these same resources if they are not already doing so.

Gordon Koshinsky suggested that the NLCA wording seems to make way for after-the-fact participation by the NWMB, rather than for treatment of applications prior to development taking place. On the other hand, early involvement with a project would better equip the NWMB to provide advice on mitigation or compensation if ever called upon to do so. Michael d'Eça noted that the weight of legal opinion in NTI and in NIRB is that the CEAA does not apply in the NSA; however that would not preclude adapting its provisions.

Gordon asked if NIRB was prepared to differentiate its permit applications, in order to refer only certain categories of applications to the NWMB. Michelle replied that they had indicated their willingness to do so, if clearly and formally requested by the Board.

The Board agreed that staff should request that NIRB delete the NWMB from its review-loop for permit applications in situations where NIRB has definitive screening guidelines in place pertaining to the type and scope of development under consideration. However the NWMB wishes to continue to see all of the permit applications, and to respond in particular to those pertaining to wildlife research.

## **10.I Big-Game Hunting Guides Working Group: Update**

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Members that this Working Group was established by the Board to provide advice on establishing qualifications for big-game hunting guides in the NSA. All the necessary membership nominations have been received and an information package is being finalized to enable the Group to begin its work.

#### **10.J Walrus Working Group: Update**

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Board that this Working Group was established last year to develop a new Walrus Management Plan for Nunavut. The first meeting of the Working Group is scheduled for September. The latest draft of DFO's document on this subject will be the basic working document for the meeting.

#### **10.K Wildlife Research Priorities Workshop**

Michelle Wheatley advised the Board that the workshop to guide the evaluation of research proposals over the next two years will be held in Iqaluit the week of October 18. Preparations for the workshop are well in hand. The Board decided that Meeka Mike and/or Harry Flaherty will participate as Board Members.

#### **10.L World Wildlife Fund Bowhead Conservation Plan**

Michelle Wheatley reminded the Board that the WWF is working to develop a conservation plan for eastern Arctic bowhead whales. Michelle advised that she recently participated (as a substitute for Ben Kovic, who was unavailable) in a conference call of the expert / advisory group that the WWF has established to steer development of the plan. The conference call was entirely devoted to matters of administration and scheduling. As part of the process, the WWF plans to hold a workshop in November, and has asked the NWMB for assistance in identifying stakeholders to participate.

Moses Koonoo questioned why the NWMB was even involved with this project. Ben Kovic outlined the history and rationale of the Board's participation. Joan Scottie noted the participation of the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board, which she considered to be essential. She suggested that the greatest possible number of those communities with an interest in this bowhead population be involved as well. Other candidate sources of participation would be the Qikiqtaaluk Bowhead Hunt Committee, and perhaps even NTI. The Board left the matter of responding to the WWF request to the initiative of the Board's representation on the advisory group.

#### **10.M Transboundary Polar Bear Management Agreements: Western Arctic**

Michelle Wheatley reviewed with the Board the transboundary nature of the Viscount Melville Sound and North Beaufort Sea polar bear populations. The distributions of both populations extend across both land-claim boundaries and (now) territorial boundaries. Michelle advised the Board of an initiative that is underway, led by the Wildlife Management Advisory Committee (WMAC, for the Inuvialuit) and the GNWT, to update the existing Management Agreements that govern the harvest of these trans-boundary polar bear populations.

Tentative consensus was reached on a number of matters pertinent to these Management Agreements at a meeting in Inuvik in June, but not all matters were resolved. The Kitikmeot HTA subsequently documented (by way of a letter to the NWMB) a number of concerns with both the process and the direction of the discussion to date, including:

- The four tags currently allotted for the Viscount Melville Sound population are too few to be meaningfully shared on an annual basis between communities under two different land claims in two different territories;
- Any changes to this allotment are dependent upon completion of the analysis of population data by the DSD, and are proceeding slowly;
- Some provision needs to be made for hunters from one land claim region to use tags legitimately in their possession in the other region;
- The method of calculating and administering quotas is an issue;
- The treatment of defence kills is an issue;
- Complete exclusion of Nunavut hunters from access to the Southern Beaufort Sea population would be an issue, since the range of this population includes part of the traditional hunting area of Nunavumiut;
- Future discussions should have provision for better and more effective representation by Nunavut interests, including adequate translation service and a co-chairing arrangement.

The Board agreed to formally advise WMAC of the concerns identified by the KHTA, and to lobby for these concerns to be addressed.

## **11. NTI Wildlife Division: Issues and Decisions**

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

Bert Dean stated the obvious: that this issue has been around for a very long time. Anyone who goes out on the land in a coastal area has the potential to be the perpetrator of a polar-bear defence kill; this includes community members, Federal, Territorial, or University researchers, park employees, tourists and/or their guides, industry workers, and others. There is also the related matter of bears that are inadvertently killed in the course of research on the bears themselves, other than in the context of defence. Different agencies and interests have made different arrangements to address this problem over the years. Many different rates and formulas for paying compensation have evolved, with reported payments ranging from \$1,500 up to \$15,000 (unconfirmed) per animal. There is a clear need for uniform guidelines. The Inuit Impact and Benefit Agreements for the National Parks contain some language that might serve as a template.

NTI recommends that a working group be established to develop recommendations for a compensation process and for levels of payment all of which are clear, consistent and reasonable, and that can be readily communicated to all who have an interest. Such a working group should have representation from the hunters and communities, governments, industry, tourism interests, and possibly others.

Gordon Koshinsky congratulated NTI for having given serious thought to this matter. He asked what particular role if any that NTI had in mind for the NWMB. Bert advised that NTI is seeking the Board's early input and suggestions, but anticipated that any working group would best be formed and operated under NWMB auspices.

Kevin McCormick acknowledged the need to come to grips with the inconsistencies that prevail in how defence kills are treated at the present time. However he questioned the advisability of creating a working group, at least as a first step. He suggested contracting for someone to develop a discussion paper that brought together the relevant material and that proposed an approach to the matter. Such a contract could/should incorporate wide consultation, and the need for a workshop may emerge if there are issues that cannot be resolved in any other way.

Ben Kovic asked if NTI would share the cost of such a contract. Bert suspected that they would (this would need to be confirmed), but in any event the cost should not be very high. Most if not all agencies participating, either as part of a working group or in providing input to a consultant, would be expected to cover the costs of their own participation. Raymond Ningeocheak declared that he would support such a concept, including the cost-sharing aspect, as a Board Member of NTI. Bert suggested that NTI staff might be able to draft the discussion paper, if they could count on the direct assistance of the NWMB. It might be possible to make some progress on this in conjunction with the forthcoming Research Priorities Workshop.

Kevin asked if the Surface Rights Tribunal (SRT) had a role in this matter. Bert interpreted the SRT to be more of an arbiter or judge; it would come into play if problems emerged with implementing a certain approach. But the approach per se would need to be developed by others.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 055**) to work with NTI, including in respect to sharing costs that might be incurred, to develop a discussion paper on alternative approaches to dealing with compensation for polar bear defence kills. The Board recognized that it might be necessary to obtain some contract assistance to expedite this work. In that event, NTI staff will draft the necessary administrative documents.

## **11.B Polar Bear Management Agreements**

Glenn Williams reminded the Board that MOUs for the management of polar bears were established in 1996 for all polar bear populations in Nunavut except Viscount Melville Sound and Western Hudson Bay. These MOUs were signed by the HTOs, RWOs and the GNWT, and were approved by the NWMB. Several new initiatives were introduced in these MOUs. New management initiatives included control of the hunting season by the HTOs, and a flexible quota system with emphasis on male-selective harvesting. The new MOUs also recognized the need for:

- Development of a compensation policy in respect to defence kills;
- Greater participation by Inuit in polar bear research;
- Collection and archiving of Inuit traditional knowledge; and
- Better methods to deter polar bears from people and from property.

The new management initiatives are being followed to the letter (if not more so), and have in some situations have had a rather serious affect in communities. On the other hand, most or all of the other (government) commitments are not being met. If these matters are not addressed there will be a negative impact on the development of future agreements between the communities and the management agencies. NTI has not taken these issues to the DSD specifically, but the Department has been at HTO and RWO meetings where these matters were raised.

NTI believes that the NWMB, in approving these MOUs, has some oversight responsibility regarding their implementation. NTI accordingly recommends that the NWMB take steps to:

- Ensure that DSD fulfils the commitments made in these agreements;
- Identify funding for RWOs to work with HTOs in addressing the issues in the MOUs that require change or clarification.

Glenn noted that the MOUs are five-year agreements that are currently in their third year. They contain provision to be opened earlier, but the HTOs do not have the resources to do this effectively. Funds are needed, among other things, to enable the HTOs to consult with each other since it is unrealistic and improper to expect them to prepare their cases in isolation, especially in respect to shared polar bear populations. Raymond Ningeocheak reported that he identified to the DSD Minister that the Department ought to provide funding to the HTOs for this purpose, and DSD is certainly aware of these issues.

Moses Koonoo and Joan Scottie expressed support for the recommendations brought by NTI. In particular, the Board should strongly encourage DSD to meet its obligations. Joan noted that the MOUs were developed and signed in some haste.

Michael d'Eça clarified that there is no tidy provision in the MOUs regarding date of expiry. They do embody the presumption of being re-examined within five years, but not a firm requirement to be re-negotiated. However it is true that they can be reviewed/revised at any time. The agreements were developed and signed in haste to meet some deadlines that had their origin in the US Marine Mammal Protection Act. That haste is apparent in the agreements. The NWMB raised concerns at the time, but ended up going with the flow.

Gordon Koshinsky recalled that the MOUs also call for certain actions on the part of the NWMB, and suggested that the Board should be prepared to examine its own record in addressing these items. Kevin McCormick suggested that the Board should focus as a first step on urging DSD to identify and address its obligations as per the agreements. If that were done to satisfaction it might eliminate the desire or need for further urgent action on the part of the HTOs.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 056**) to convey to the Minister of DSD the concerns raised by NTI with respect to the polar bear management agreements, and in particular to urge the Department to address its obligations contained in those agreements.

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

Glenn Williams followed up on this subject that he introduced at the last NWMB meeting. The NLCA specifies that there is a need for an effective role for Inuit in all aspects of wildlife management, and charges the NWMB to “promote and encourage training for Inuit in the various fields of wildlife research and management.” Glenn noted the very substantial expenditure of effort and funds by government agencies in the NSA, much of it supported by the NWMB and by the Nunavut Wildlife Research Trust. This seems like fertile ground for a much more concerted effort to hire and train Inuit. There are many prospective candidates among the Inuit population. Glenn tabled three resumes to demonstrate this point

Glenn reported that the Manager of Human Resources and Career Planning for the GN Department of Education confirmed his strong interest in assisting government departments and the NWMB to contact students interested in and available for summer employment. Glenn also noted that there are programs to assist agencies to hire and train northern students. He tabled documentation in respect to DIAND’s Northern Scientific Training Program. This Program supports Canadian universities in providing scientific training pertinent to the Canadian North, and is not being accessed to anywhere near its capacity.

Glenn, on behalf of NTI, identified a need for a co-ordinated approach to increasing the participation of Inuit in wildlife research and management. NTI recommends that the NWMB, DFO, DSD and CWS review their departmental policies on Inuit participation in wildlife research in particular. NTI also proposes that a workshop be held with representation from these same agencies along with the Department of Education, NITC and DIAND, to develop a strategy for hiring more Inuit summer students and developing local capacity for field research assistants. On the latter subject, there appears to be a real need for field assistants who have traditional knowledge and land skills: important considerations for field research. Another aim might be to develop and maintain a list of individuals who would be available for training and employment in relation to wildlife research.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 057**) to support the efforts of NTI to increase the participation of Inuit in wildlife research in the NSA.

### **11.D Overlap Issues: Update**

Bert Dean noted the existence of a number of overlap issues between the users of wildlife in the NSA and their neighbours in (variously) the Inuvialuit Settlement Region, Nunavik, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Greenland. Issues and/or initiatives

that are paramount at the moment are with Makivik concerning reciprocal hunting rights, with the Inuvialuit concerning management of shared polar bear populations, and with Manitoba concerning a formalized arrangement for the sharing and management of polar bears in Western Hudson Bay.

Raymond Ningeocheak elaborated on the issue regarding Makivik. There is considerable movement of people back and forth between Nunavut and Nunavik. Much of this movement, although not all of it, is for simple visitation since so many of the people are related. When Inuit from Nunavut go to Northern Quebec they are allowed to hunt for subsistence purposes. Not so for non-resident Inuit who come to Nunavut: they are not allowed to harvest any animals. Even if they hunt only for subsistence, they are breaking the law. It is the Territorial wildlife legislation that is at fault and that needs to be changed. Within Nunavut, the communities of Cape Dorset, Kimmirut and Coral Harbour are those most affected. Members of those communities, and of course their friends and relatives in Nunavik, would like to see Inuit from Nunavik being able to harvest for subsistence purposes when they are in Nunavut. The QWB is on record, along with NTI in supporting such an adjustment.

Bert Dean identified a need to catalogue all the overlap issues that are outstanding, and to develop a plan to address them in a prioritized manner. It would also be very useful to standardize the process for arriving at agreements in these matters, as well as a format for the ensuing agreements themselves. Questions of protocol also need to be clarified and put on a consistent footing. The Sanikiluaq HTO has been invited to participate in a meeting in Northern Quebec later this year to discuss the sharing and management of beluga whales. The HTO cannot afford to send a large delegation on its own, and is at a loss on how to proceed in terms of negotiations.

Johnny Peters, the NWMB Member for Makivik, joined the meeting by teleconference at this point. Raymond Ningeocheak reiterated the overlap issue with Makivik in respect to reciprocal harvesting.

Johnny readily concurred that Nunavik beneficiaries should be able to harvest for subsistence when they are in Nunavut. He considered this to be a priority issue. The Nunavut/Nunavik boundary is artificial to Inuit traditions and familial relationships. Inuit from Northern Quebec do not lose their needs (or their skills) for subsistence harvesting just because they move for a time to Nunavut. Raymond and Johnny agreed that this was fundamentally an issue to be resolved by NTI and Makivik coming to terms on what needed to be done by the Nunavut Government.

The Board decided (**Resolution 2000- 058**) to assign NWMB staff and advisors to work with NTI to prepare an options paper with the aim of developing standardized protocols for negotiating agreements on overlapping wildlife management issues between Nunavut beneficiaries and their neighbouring jurisdictions. It was also agreed that resolving the issue of reciprocal harvesting rights with Inuit from Northern Quebec would take high priority in the application of these protocols.



## **12. Funding Programs: Reviews and Decisions**

### **12.A Nunavut Wildlife Research Trust Fund**

Michelle Wheatley advised that all 20 of the Government research projects that were approved for NWRT funding this year have met their various conditions, and funds have been or are being disbursed to the three participating agencies. The contribution to DSD will be paid in three instalments since their research activity is widely spread across the fiscal year. The total anticipated disbursement (to all agencies combined) will be \$909,650. Of this amount, \$751,000 pertains to new funding allocations for 1999/00.

### **12.B NWMB Study Fund**

Michelle Wheatley presented a summary table showing the current status of each of the 13 projects by HTOs and other non-government agencies that were approved by the Board. The total funding approved for these projects was \$329,240. About half of the projects have not yet met their funding conditions or have been delayed for a variety of reasons.

### **12.C Donation Request: Clyde River HTO**

Gordon Tomlinson presented a proposal from the Clyde River HTO for a donation of \$10,000 to enable the purchase of a trailer to provide office space. After some discussion the Board decided to defer consideration of this request to a later date.

## **13. Other Business**

The Board reverted to a discussion of the local (Repulse Bay) narwhal harvest, in light of discussions at the public meeting last night. The Board decided to prepare a press release on the subject, and to explore the possibility of issuing it as a jointly with DFO and the HTO. The Director of Wildlife Management and the Board's Legal Advisor were assigned to prepare a draft for the Board's consideration.

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

There was no report from the Executive Committee. The Committee did not meet in the course of this NWMB session due to not having a quorum.

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

### **15.A Reports and Briefings: Past Events**

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

- Meeting of Arctic Wildlife Co-Management Chairs, May 26 in Yellowknife: Ben Kovic attended, with Michelle Wheatley.
- Meeting of DFO staff with Arctic Wildlife Co-Management Chairs, May 27 in Yellowknife: Ben Kovic attended, with Michelle Wheatley.
- Beverly Qamanirjuac Caribou Management Board Meeting, May 28-30 in Arviat: Michelle Wheatley attended.
- Interjurisdictional Polar Bear Management Meeting, June 15-16 in Inuvik: Michelle Wheatley attended.
- Baffin Fisheries Council Annual General Meeting, June 16-17 in Iqaluit: Ben Kovic and Becky Mike attended.
- DFO RAP Meeting on Hudson Bay / Foxe Basin Bowhead Whale Stock Status, June 17-18 in Iqaluit: Ben Kovic attended
- Kitikmeot HTA Annual General Meeting, June 21 -22 in Cambridge Bay: Ben Kovic attended.
- Workshop on DFO Science Orientation for the Next Millennium, June 22-23 in Mont Joli: Gordon Koshinsky attended (on behalf of Ben Kovic).
- WWF Conference Call on Developing Bowhead Conservation Plan, July 27: Michelle Wheatley participated (on behalf of Ben Kovic).

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

Ben Kovic led the Board through the tabulation of forthcoming events as at August 23, with additions. The following decisions were reached regarding attendance:

- FPAFC Working Group Meeting, Sept 7-8 in Halifax: Ray Andrews to attend.
- NPC Public Hearing, Sept 8-9 in Iqaluit: Becky Mike to attend.
- DIAND/Environment Caribou Workshop, Sept 9-11: Participation pending.
- NTI Review of Nunavut Organization Infrastructure, Sept 14-16: Ben to attend.
- FJMC Beaufort Sea 2000, Sept 15-18 in Inuvik: Michelle to attend (tentative).
- NRI/DIAND Contaminants Committee, Sept 29- Oct 1 in B.C.: Michelle to attend.
- NAMMCO Annual Meeting, Oct 5-8 in Iceland: Participation pending.
- Cdn Council Admin Tribunals, Oct 10-12 in Vancouver: Michael to attend.
- DFO / Co-Managers Mtg, Oct 12-14 in Winnipeg: Michelle to attend.
- BQCMB General Meeting, Nov 26-28 in Winnipeg: Joan Scottie to attend.
- CMAC Regular Meeting, Nov 17-18 in Churchill: Michael to attend (tentative).





**Resolution 2000- 043:** Resolved that the NWMB approve experimental fishing quotas on a temporary basis for particular species in particular Nunavut waterbodies as set out in the document, *Temporary Commercial Quotas for Freshwater and Marine Species and Waterbodies in the NSA identified as at August 1999*, this to provide the basis for DFO to issue experimental fishing licences to individual fishers or to groups of fishers without the need to make individual representation to the NWMB. Administration of these temporary composite experimental quotas will be subject to the following conditions and constraints:

- These composite quotas will be for the period ending 31 March 2004;
- DFO will issue experimental fishing licences to individual fishers only within the limits of these composite quotas;
- DFO will issue experimental fishing licences to individual fishers only with the concurrence of the appropriate HTO(s);
- Each fisher allocated a portion of any composite experimental commercial fishing quota will need to meet requirements for sampling and reporting to be set out by DFO;
- New applications for experimental licences, on different waterbodies and/or for different species than those approved herewith, must be brought to the attention of the NWMB for review and decision;
- Any request for an increase in a temporary quota previously approved, or for the setting of a permanent quota, must be brought to the attention of the NWMB for review and decision;
- Neither an increase in a temporary quota nor the setting of a permanent quota for the species/waters approved herewith will be considered if the sampling and reporting requirements have not been met or if the species in that waterbody has not been harvested at or near the temporary quota over the previous five-year period; and
- Additional non-quota limitations may be established by the NWMB.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick      Seconded by: Joan Scottie  
Carried                              Date: 24 August 1999

**Resolution 2000- 044:** Resolved that the NWMB approve access by members of the Northern Coalition to fish for shrimp, *Pandalus montagui*, in the waters of the NSA up to the total catch limit of 500 metric tonnes in 1999; and further that the NWMB deny the members of CAPP their request for the same access.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky      Seconded by: Moses Koonoo  
Carried                              Date: 24 August 1999

**Resolution 2000- 045:** Resolved that the NWMB meet *in-camera*.

Moved by: Makabe Nartok                      Seconded by: Moses Koonoo  
Carried    Date: 24 August 1999

**Resolution 2000- 046:** Resolved that the *in-camera* session be closed.

Moved by: Makabe Nartok                      Seconded by: Kevin McCormick  
Carried    Date: 24 August 1999

**Resolution 2000- 047:** Resolved that, in respect to the “Advance Copy” (27 July 1999) letter from the Nunavut Implementation Panel (NIP) pertaining to proposed protocols for future funding re-allocations among IPGs, the NWMB indicate to the NIP, preferably in concert with all the other IPGs:

- support for the more formalized approach being proposed;
- new and ongoing concerns on the matter;

and further that the NWMB undertake to develop, as soon as is reasonably possible:

- a work plan for the remainder of the current planning period, and
- an outline for a financial forecast and work plan for the next planning period.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick                      Seconded by: Joan Scottie  
Carried    Date: 25 August 1999

**Resolution 2000- 048:** Resolved that NWMB cover, by way of a donation, the out-of-pocket personal expenditures incurred in connection with the Executive Director’s recent medical emergency; and further that the NWMB develop a policy pertaining to coverage (or not) of expenditures made for compassionate purposes by or for Board and staff members.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick                      Seconded by: Moses Koonoo  
Carried    Date: 25 August 1999

**Resolution 2000- 049:** Resolved that the NWMB extend its contract with its Fisheries Advisor, incorporating increases of \$50 per day for consulting work and \$25 per month for administrative allowance; and further that the NWMB attempt to negotiate this contract extension to the end of the current planning period.

Moved by: Moses Koonoo                      Seconded by: Gordon Koshinsky  
Carried    Date: 25 August 1999

**Resolution 2000- 050:** Resolved that the NWMB approve changes in polar bear quotas as recommended by DSD for the 1999/00 season as follows:

- For the community of Clyde River, for hunting the polar bear population known as Baffin Bay, to increase the quota from 8 to 21.
- For the community of Coral Harbour, for hunting the polar bear population known as Foxe Basin, to increase the quota from 34 to 39.
- For the community of Taloyoak, for hunting the polar bear population known as Gulf of Boothia, to decrease the quota from 15 to 6.
- For the community of Igloodik, for hunting the polar bear population known as Foxe Basin, to decrease the quota from 9 to 4.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky      Seconded by: Kevin McCormick  
Abstained: Makabe Nartok and Joan Scottie  
Carried                                  Date: 25 August 1999

**Resolution 2000- 051:** In response to the recommendation of the Beverly-Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board, resolved that the NWMB approve increases in commercial caribou quotas for the Qamanirjuaq caribou population as follows:

- The addition of 105 tags for Rankin Inlet, and
- The addition of 100 tags for Chesterfield Inlet.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick      Seconded by: Moses Koonoo  
Carried                                  Date: 25 August 1999

**Resolution 2000- 052:** Resolved that the NWMB not release the draft final report on the Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study until final inputs from Inuit contributors have been received and incorporated.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick      Seconded by: Joan Scottie  
Carried                                  Date: 25 August 1999

**Resolution 2000- 053:** Resolved that the NWMB reiterate, in writing to the Minister of DSD, its earlier final decision in respect to Noah Kadlak's request for approval to conduct a traditional polar bear hunt, this subject to:

- The conditions previously identified for the hunt; and
- Confirmation that Mr. Kadlak is still interested in pursuing this venture.

Moved by: Moses Koonoo              Seconded by: Makabe Nartok  
Carried                                  Date: 25 August 1999

**Resolution 2000- 054:** Resolved that the NWMB approve the removal of the narwhal quota for members of the Kurtairojuark (Pelly Bay) HTO on the basis of the narwhal hunting rules submitted by the HTO under the new narwhal management system, provided that the HTO:

- makes certain changes to the wording of these hunting rules as currently drafted;
- confirms that the HTO membership is in agreement with these rules (as revised); and
- undertakes to implement appropriate by-laws to ensure that these rules have full authority.

Moved by: Moses Koonoo                      Seconded by: Joan Scottie  
Carried    Date: 26 August 1999

**Resolution 2000- 055:** Resolved that the NWMB work with NTI, including in the matter of sharing costs, to develop a discussion paper on alternative approaches to dealing with compensation for polar bear defence kills.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick              Seconded by: Makabe Nartok  
Carried    Date: 26 August 1999

**Resolution 2000- 056:** Resolved that, in respect to the management agreements (MOUs) with the HTOs pertaining to polar bears, the NWMB convey to the Minister of DSD that DSD needs to:

- Meet its various commitments as spelled out in the MOUs; and
- Provide funding for the re-negotiation of these agreements.

Moved by: Joan Scottie                      Seconded by: Kevin McCormick  
Carried    Date: 26 August 1999

**Resolution 2000- 057:** Resolved that the NWMB support the efforts of NTI to increase the participation of Inuit in wildlife research in the NSA.

Moved by: Moses Koonoo                      Seconded by: Makabe Nartok  
Carried    Date: 26 August 1999

**Resolution 2000- 058:** Resolved that NWMB staff and advisors work with NTI to prepare an options paper with the aim of developing standardized protocols for the negotiation of agreements on overlapping wildlife management issues between Nunavut and its neighbouring jurisdictions.

Moved by: Joan Scottie                      Seconded by: Kevin McCormick  
Carried    Date: 26 August 1999



**Resolution 2000- 059:** Resolved that the next (24<sup>th</sup>) regular Meeting of the NWMB be conducted in Cape Dorset the week of 22 November 1999.

Moved by: Moses Koonoo                      Seconded by: Kevin McCormick  
Carried    Date: 26 August 1999

**Resolution 2000- 060:** Resolved that the 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the NWMB be adjourned.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky                Seconded by: Kevin McCormick  
Carried    Date: 26 August 1999

---

Document as at 09 November 1999