

NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD

MINUTES: REGULAR MEETING No.13

18-21 NOVEMBER 1996
PELLY BAY, NT

Members and Staff:

Ben Kovic	Chairperson
David Aglukark	Member
Malachi Arreak	Member
David Igutsaq	Member
Gordon Koshinsky	Member
Meeka Mike	Member
Jim Noble	Executive Director
Michael d'Eça	NWMB Legal Advisor
Pierre Chartrand	Director of Finance & Administration
Carol Churchward	Harvest Study Biologist
Dan Pike	Director of Wildlife Management
Mary Nashook	Interpreter
Nick Amautinuvar	Interpreter
Allan Angmarlik	Recording Secretary

Not Available:

Joannie Ikkidluak	Member (with cause)
Kevin McCormick	Member (with cause)

Guests and Other Participants

Robert Moshenko	DFO, Winnipeg
Ron Graf	RW&ED, Yellowknife
Glenn Williams	RW&ED, Iqaluit
Grant Gilchrist	Canadian Wildlife Service, DOE

Several members of the public at large.

Monday 18 November 1996 (Evening Session)

1. Introductory Matters

Ben Kovic convened the meeting at 7:45 p.m. at the Kajuaaluk Community Centre. David Aglukark led the opening prayer.

Members, staff and guests introduced themselves. Ben Kovic stated that the meeting would be open to the public throughout the week. He advised that Helen Klengenber and Joannie Ikkidluak could not attend due to other commitments. Helen has sent her report which will be distributed to the Members.

Jim Noble announced that Allan Angmarlik will be the recording secretary for the meeting.

2. Greetings from the Community

This item was identified for action tomorrow (November 19), as initially scheduled.

3. Approval of Agenda

Four additional agenda items were approved for attention at appropriate times in the meeting:

- Narwhal tags for Kitikmeot communities (David Igutsaq)
- PCB contamination at Resolution Island (Meeka Mike)
- Bill C-62: An Act Respecting Fisheries (Michael d'Eça)
- Format and content of Minutes (Jim Noble)

Jim Noble tabled the current draft of the NWMB composite annual reports for 1993/94, 1994/95 and 1995/96, and asked the Members to review for later discussion.

It was agreed to alter the order of treatment for some of the agenda items to accommodate the availability of participants and other considerations.

The agenda was approved, with noted changes (**Motion 96-099**).

4. Review and Approval of Minutes

4.1 NWMB Meeting No. 12; Arviat 26-30 August 1996

Item 5.A: David Aglukark asked whether uncertainties pertaining to disposition of the Board's \$15,000 contribution to Pauktuutit have been resolved. Jim Noble replied that Pauktuutit continues to seek additional funding for their project; if they do not succeed prior to FY-end the NWMB contribution will be returned.

Item 7.A.2: David Aglukark noted that hunters in Arviat are very concerned about progress on assignment of hunting rights. It was noted that NTI is

leading on this matter, and Helen Klengenber is the Board's best window to the NTI process.

Item 9.B.1: There was discussion on the need to establish walrus co-management agreements with Makivik. Dan Pike announced that Salluit did not conduct their planned walrus sport hunt in 1996. It is anticipated that DFO will have the draft walrus management plan completed for the Board's consideration well before next hunting season.

Item 9.C.4.b: At the request of Members, Michael d'Eça clarified the context of the reference to use of dog teams and snowmobiles for polar bear sport hunting. David Igutsaq mentioned that in his region, some dogteam outfitters must transport their teams by snowmobile due to the long distances to the hunting sites.

The Minutes for Meeting No. 12 were approved, with noted corrections. **(Motion 97-100)**

4.2 Conference Call No. 24; 01 October 1996

The Minutes for Conference Call No. 24 were approved as presented. **(Motion 97-101)**

4.3 Conference Call No. 25; 23 October 1996

David Igutsaq referred to the condition stipulated in the NWMB resolution (Motion 97-096) which encouraged cessation of all Peary caribou hunting on Bathurst Island. In his (David's) interpretation, Peary caribou are increasing in abundance as indicated by numbers (in excess of 2000) recently seen by hunters in the Kitikmeot area (near Taloyoak). Gordon Koshinsky stated his view that these are not the same caribou population.

The Minutes for Conference Call No. 25 were approved, with noted corrections. **(Motion 97-102)**

Tuesday 19 November 1996

1. Introductory Matters (continued)

Ben Kovic asked Members if they would like to move the meeting from the gymnasium to the Hamlet Council Chambers.

The concern was that guests will not be able to hear the proceedings due to echoes in the gymnasium. The majority of Members opted to move to the

Council Chambers. The interpreting equipment and other amenities were accordingly relocated.

The meeting was reconvened at 9:30 a.m. David Igutsaq led the opening prayer.

2. Address from the Mayor of Pelly Bay: Ovide Alakkanuak

The Mayor of Pelly Bay, His Worship Ovide Alakkanuak, welcomed the NWMB Members and staff to Pelly Bay. He expressed his pleasure that the NWMB was able to come. He wanted to do what he could to make the meeting productive and enjoyable, and asked to be advised of any problems. He mentioned that the residents of Pelly Bay will be restructuring themselves so that the younger generation can have a solid foundation in the community. The Elders want to ensure that the younger generation has a better future. He would like the members of the public to have a chance to voice their concerns to the Board. Residents have been informed that the meeting is open to the public.

Ben Kovic thanked the Mayor for his address. He also announced a public meeting on Wednesday night. The meeting will be advertised on local radio. Individual Board Members will be delegated to summarize various aspects of NWMB operations at the public meeting.

4. Examination of Minutes (continued)

Ben Kovic asked if Members were satisfied with the present format and content of Board Minutes. Should the Minutes be more summarized, or more detailed? Gordon Koshinsky suggested that the present form and content were about right. He considered it important to have a reasonably complete record of discussions, that is, more than a mere record of decisions. Material and opinions should generally be attributed to source, albeit with judgment applied in the recording of sensitive discussion. Gordon visualized that the content of Board Minutes would eventually be catalogued, for easy access and reference by subject matter. David Aglukark urged that the Minutes be adequate to meet any future requirements for legal reference. The NWMB must be able to fall back on the Minutes to defend its actions. Malachi Arreak preferred substantial details in the Minutes, but the format should not be overwhelming.

Meeting summaries should be developed as a matter of course, both for Members and for other interested parties. David Igutsaq expressed satisfaction with the present format, but the Minutes should be precise and accurate. Ben Kovic concluded the consensus was that the form and content of Board Minutes should remain basically unchanged.

5. Financial Business

5.A Financial Statement: 30 September 1996

Pierre Chartrand noted that if there are no further unanticipated expenditures, the NWMB could end the fiscal year with approximately \$567,135 for carryover to FY 1997/98. The main factors contributing to the projected \$567,135 positive variance are:

1. \$400,000 for “Public Hearings”, of which none are currently anticipated.
2. \$200,000 for “Wildlife Conservation Education”, over and above anticipated expenditures at this time.

There was considerable discussion of several line items in the report, particularly where substantial variances were projected. Pierre Chartrand provided explanations, and no revisions were indicated in respect to the FY 1996/97 year-end forecasts.

The Department of Indian and Northern Affairs Canada requires the Board to identify, by 26 November, how much of the current year’s contribution the Board intends to carry over. To that end, further 1996/97 unbudgeted (but anticipated) major expenditures were identified (by Pierre) and reviewed (by the Board) as follows:

Fisheries Advisor	\$50,000	(contract signed)
Communications Advisor	\$50,000	
Library/Database Development	\$65,000	
Bowhead Hunt Evaluation	\$35,000	(contract signed)
RWO/HTO Workshop	\$10,000	
Bowhead Knowledge Study Shortfall	\$40,000	
Traditional Knowledge Southeast Baffin Beluga	\$50,000	
Wildlife Conservation Education	<u>\$50,000</u>	
Total	<u>\$350,000</u>	

Pierre advised that the item designated “Miscellaneous Revenue” refers to sale by the Board of interpretation equipment.

Malachi Arreak suggested that each RWO conduct a hearing before any decision is made on where to allocate the next bowhead hunt. It would be necessary to make budgetary provision for such an exercise.

The financial report and forecast and the authorization to request rollover from DIAND were approved, through a combined resolution. **(Motion 97-103)**

5.B. TAL Investment Update

Pierre Chartrand referred to the report from TAL Investments pertaining to the Wildlife Research Trust (WRT). Pierre noted that a new investment philosophy document has been drafted and is being reviewed by the Executive Committee. The Board is projecting fees to TAL of \$44,000 for the current fiscal year.

Gordon Koshinsky expressed his concern that the investment philosophy by which TAL has been guided in its transactions on behalf of the WRT to date may have prevented taking better advantage of the 1995-1996 stock market surge. It might be advantageous to give TAL broader investment guidelines to enable the Board to obtain better value from the expenditure for TAL's services.

Pierre Chartrand noted that the next meeting of the WRT Trustees will be in February. The Trustees will presumably deal with the matter of investment philosophy at that time. Also requiring decision by the Trustees (no later than February) is the overall amount of funds which will be made available for research projects in 1997/98, along with clarification of funding treatment for multi-year projects.

6. Mail

Ben Kovic suggested that it is not necessary to include this item on the agenda in future. Copies of incoming and outgoing mail are made available at each meeting in binders, and Members are sent copies of mail logs on a weekly basis. Gordon Koshinsky noted that outgoing mail logs have not always been reliably distributed, and requested that a column be incorporated in the logs to clearly identify originators of correspondence.

7. Chairperson and Staff Reports

7.A Chairperson's Report

Ben Kovic reported attending three meetings since the last Board meeting. None implied any Board decisions. These meetings were as follows:

a) Meeting on West Hudson Bay Polar Bear Management Agreements:

The Memorandum of Understanding for West Hudson Bay expired last year. Some communities have not had time to review the proposed changes. Ben suggested that they be given more time for this.

David Aglukark stated that there is considerable opposition by hunters to certain polar bear management zone boundaries. The system of buffer zones is helpful, but does not completely solve the problem. The issue of sex-ratio-adjusted quotas remains contentious.

Ben Kovic noted that according to the present management zones, polar bears for Baker Lake come from the Hudson Bay quota. Baker Lake hunters must thus travel all the way to Chesterfield Inlet, coming out of their zone to track bears even if the hunters encounter tracks on their way out of Baker Lake. This is very difficult for Baker Lake hunters to understand. The hunters would like to be able to travel north to hunt polar bears. This was obviously a topic for discussion and negotiation among the HTOs and with DRWED.

Ben Kovic also noted that since York Factory now has a Land Claim Agreement in place and a Churchill Land Claim is being negotiated, there might be pressure from Manitoba to “retrieve” the 19 polar bear tags which they have “loaned” to the GNWT.

b) Arctic Environmental Sailing Directions

Ben Kovic reported on an October meeting, organized by Coast Guard. Ben advised that funds (\$600,000) which had been allotted for this project were totally expended in preparing the report. There were no funds left to publish the report, and all the participants were requested to chip in. The NWMB was among the agencies approached. The report shows detailed wildlife distributions, hunting patterns, camping areas, etc. The report will be available on the Internet but the general public will not be able to view it unless they are on line.

Ben Kovic further advised that the Board had been offered a seat on the Steering Committee which reviews and advises the federal government on marine shipping issues. It was agreed that the Board expects to provide its input on such matters through the Nunavut Marine Council, as per Article 15.4.1 of the NLCA. The other members of the Council have more direct interest in this matter than does NWMB.

c) Videoconferencing

Ben Kovic reported attending two meetings pertaining to videoconferencing. One was a ten-minute session with the Minister of Environment. The Federal Government is exploring the practicality of video conferencing. In Ben’s opinion the video quality as demonstrated was not very impressive. The audio aspect was in real time, but the video aspect was not.

The videoconferencing demonstration at the “Arctic Forever” exhibit sponsored by the Canadian Museum of Nature and the Centre for Traditional Knowledge at the IUCN World Conservation Congress in Montreal was more interesting. Students in Iqaluit and Montreal conducted an on-line educational project. They talked about polar bear populations and polar bear management.

7.B Executive Director’s Report

Jim Noble outlined recent highlights at the NWMB office. He offered to provide a regular reporting of this nature (at all meetings) if the Members so wished.

7.C Report from Director of Wildlife Management

- Dan Pike advised that the process for establishing Basic Needs Levels for beluga, narwhal and walrus is seriously delayed. His next task is to select a pamphlet and design from the alternatives available.

- Dan reported that NTI ended up doing their own phone-in show, leaving the other anticipated participants in the lurch. NWMB will need to consider doing our own phone-in show, for which contract assistance would be required.
- Dan reported on the recent beluga tagging project at Devon Island. This was to demonstrate whether there is interchange with Greenland. A total of twenty belugas have been tagged. Out of that number, only one went to Greenland. Only one of the tags is still operating; satellite tags on beluga are reliable for only about three months, after which they usually fall off.
- Gordon Koshinsky suggested that developing criteria for shrimp and groundfish allocations in Zones I and II should be a matter of highest priority. He proposed that the Board's Fisheries Advisor be instructed to draft material for consideration by the Board and staff.

8. Member's Reports and Concerns

8.1 Meeka Mike

- Meeka tabled her concern regarding the abandoned Dewline Site at Resolution Island (Tujjaat). The site is now under the jurisdiction of DIAND. It is one of the registered sites for storage of PCBs in Canada. Contaminants from the soil and the sewage may be leaching into the marine environment, possibly posing hazards for wildlife and for human users of the wildlife. DIAND has been conducting research at Resolution Island in conjunction with the Royal Military College.
 - Malachi Arreak noted that there are other contaminated sites in Nunavut besides the one at Resolution Island. While it may be appropriate to focus on Resolution Island, he would prefer to draw attention to other sites as well. Michael d'Eça pointed out that under Article 11.9.1 of the NLCA, the NPC is charged to identify and prioritize the requirements to clean up waste sites in the NSA. The NWMB decided to send a letter to appropriate authorities, expressing concern and requesting a status report.
- Meeka identified two matters regarding training, which she expects will be coming to the attention of the NWMB:
 - administrative training for secretary-managers, and
 - Outward Bound training (sponsorship) for two students.

8.2 David Igutsaq

- David identified a population explosion of ravens and gulls in his region. There seems to be a need for some control measures. Ravens are robbing people of their food. Gulls are stealing dried meat from unattended tents. Ravens have recently started nesting within community

boundaries, and the number of these birds at dump sites is very noticeably increasing.

-Malachi Arreak echoed the same problems in the eastern arctic. He suggested that an annual "raven day" be instituted to help control them. Ben Kovic wondered if birds might spread diseases out of sewage lagoons.

-Glenn Williams noted that gulls are protected under the Migratory Birds Convention Act. However there is a precedent for issuing permits to cull gulls in some southern communities/situations. Grant Gilchrist suggested that the numbers of these birds are artificially high due to the human presence and influence. This might provide a justification for control action. He committed his Department to look into the matter.

- David reported that Elders in his region are interested in harvesting snowy owls. The Kitikmeot Inuit Association and the Kitikmeot HTA were going to write to the NWMB on this matter. Charlie Evalik was supposed to phone the NWMB office.

-Ben Kovic noted that the NWMB has received no such communication.

- David expressed concern about a member of the Kitikmeot HTA missing meetings. He wished to see the organization functioning properly, and would like the NWMB to address the problem.
- David reminded the Board that the Kitikmeot HTA and the Kitikmeot Inuit Association have requested larger narwhal quotas for Kitikmeot communities.

9. New Business

9.A. Canadian Wildlife Service

9.A.1 Nunavut Updates

No report on this Agenda item.

9.A.2 National Accord for Protection of Wildlife from Extirpation/Extinction

Michael d'Eça reported that Bill C-65 has already gone through second reading and the government aims to pass it by December. There was no specific response to the NWMB submission made to the DOE Minister last spring, although it is clear that the submission was considered. It may be appropriate for the Board to submit to the Parliamentary Standing Committee. The Standing Committee is chaired by Charles Caccia, who has a protectionist reputation concerning wildlife. Jack Anawak is also a

member of the Committee. The Committee is currently conducting hearings; one is scheduled for Edmonton on November 26 with others in December. Provision exists for northern management Boards to submit via video-conferencing if they so wish.

Ron Graf noted that as originally drafted the legislation would have applied only to federal lands, or 4% of Canada. By including the NWT as per the current draft, inclusion is increased to 60%.

Michael led the Board through a brief review of potentially contentious items in the Bill. Among the points which were raised:

- The NWMB's primary interest in the proposed legislation pertains to the designation of species and the consequences thereof.
- There is virtually no reference in the Bill to wildlife management boards; a major oversight given the provisions of the NLCA.
- The references in the Bill to "residence" rather than to "habitat" of biota pose a weak and unsatisfactory scope for implementation.
- There is inadequate provision in the Bill for effectively taking account of traditional knowledge.
- Management of designated species such as polar bear (vulnerable) and Peary caribou (endangered/threatened) would transfer from the territorial to the federal government while the species remained so designated. This, if implemented, would have serious administrative implications since it is the territorial government which has the operational staff and infrastructure "on the ground". If the GNWT was led to view its capacities as potentially redundant, there would be internal pressures to reduce or eliminate them.
- The legislation as proposed would substantially increase the potential for litigation, similar to the situation in the USA.

There was some discussion on the designation and content of the term "traditional knowledge". Should it be traditional, or indigenous, or local, or something else? David Aglukark noted that the other circumpolar nations tend to use the designation "indigenous knowledge". He himself prefers the designation "traditional", because it carries the concept of long standing. Ben Kovic saw merit in the term "community knowledge", which made room for the legitimate input of everyone present. It was concluded that for the purposes of the draft legislation at hand, the term "traditional knowledge" will be satisfactory.

It was agreed that Michael d'Eça will finish drafting a submission to the Standing Committee on behalf of the NWMB, based on the Board's discussion and in consultation with NTI's legal advisors. [See also Page 22 (these Minutes)]

9.A.3 Compensation for Defence-Killed Polar Bears

Grant Gilchrist reminded the Board that wildlife researchers sometimes find it necessary to kill polar bears in self-defence. Despite the best of intentions to compensate, it is actually difficult to do so in practice, and almost impossible to do so quickly. DOE proposes to establish a compensation fund, hopefully to be managed by and through the NWMB, to facilitate such payments.

Malachi Arreak asked about the historic frequency of such incidents. Grant replied that there had been such an incident in DOE about every five years. The last time was in 1993, on Coburg Island. Sea-bird and shore-bird researchers are the ones most likely to have interaction with polar bears.

Michael d'Eça advised that the NLCA does not obligate the NWMB to participate in the administration of compensation; however there is nothing to prevent the Board if it wishes to do so in the interests of cooperative expediency. Administration would have to be through the Wildlife Research Trust, which has the necessary legal provisions. A compensation agreement might be established at the outset, with the Board (i.e. the Trust) simply making payouts upon instruction without participating in any negotiations, etc.

Dan Pike agreed that it is reasonable that compensation be paid in such instances because the opportunity for economic gain by Inuit is diminished through loss of the bear. However, it should also be recognized that there is no definitive obligation to pay compensation if the research project has the appropriate approvals.

There was considerable discussion, but no consensus, on the "value" of a polar bear. There might be different implications if the bear died accidentally as a result of research activity, or if it was purposely killed. It was concluded that there can be no single, simple answers, and that NWMB should not get drawn into such debate.

Gordon Koshinsky proposed that the matter be referred to the Wildlife Research Trust, with the aim of developing an outline for how administrative assistance might be provided in the matter of paying compensation for polar bear defence kills.

In-Camera Session

(Motion 97-104) For the Board to proceed into in-camera session (3:55 p.m.)

(Motion 97-105) For the Board to revert to regular session (6:10 p.m.)

Wednesday 20 November 1996

The meeting was reconvened at 8:45 a.m. David Aglukark led in the opening prayer.

9. New Business

The Chairman called for motions in respect to decisions made in-camera.

- ***Comprehensive Computer Purchase Policy and Acquisitions***
Decision to develop and implement. **(Motion 97-106)**
- ***Nunanet Website***
Decision to approve. **(Motion 97-107)**

RWO/HTO Workshop

Decision to approve in principle. **(Motion 97-108)**

Ben Kovic stated that the NTI, NITC and NWMB will share the costs of this workshop. David Aglukark stated that he expected the workshop to be very useful. Meeka Mike asked if NWMB Board Members would be involved. Ben Kovic anticipated that Board Members would be present, and that there would be opportunity to conduct some Board business during the course of the workshop.

9.B Department of Fisheries and Oceans

9.B.1 Nunavut Updates:

Robert Moshenko highlighted the following items:

- CITES: The next meeting is in June. There is no indication yet of any proposal to uplist walrus. It would not be unexpected if the NGOs began promoting this.
- Eastern Hudson Bay beluga: NWMB has written to the DFO Minister advising of the intent to have a workshop with Kativik Regional Government or Makivik on transboundary wildlife management issues. DFO Science (Laurentian Region and Central and Arctic Region) has embarked on a major 3-year stock identification project. Gordon Koshinsky noted that preliminary information on stock delineation suggests that most beluga harvested by Sanikiluaq hunters are not from the Eastern Hudson Bay stock. If this is proven correct, it would not be appropriate to include Sanikiluaq in the beluga management plan currently being implemented for Northern Quebec. Robert agreed that a separate beluga management plan is probably needed for Sanikiluaq. He also explained that the Laurentian Region of DFO manages the Hudson Bay stock.

- International Whaling Commission: The USA may “certify” Canada, a step prior to application of trade sanctions, in response to Canada allowing the 1996 bowhead hunt. The American aim would be to encourage Canada to join the IWC. Malachi Arreak characterized the American position as hypocritical. David Aglukark noted that NAMMCO represents a very good alternative to joining IWC.
- Baffin Bay beluga: Twenty were satellite-tagged in Canadian waters; one of these has turned up off Greenland. This suggests that most of the beluga which summer in the Canadian High Arctic stay in or near Canada. This would be good news for Canadian beluga hunters and managers, but inconvenient for Greenland. Only one tag (in Canadian waters) is still transmitting; the other tags have fallen off.

9.B.2 Whalebone Carvings: Export from Canada

Robert explained that the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) lists small whales such as narwhal and beluga in Appendix II - which allows commercial trade of parts with an export permit. Large whales such as bowhead are listed in Appendix I and parts cannot be traded for commercial purposes.

Whalebone carvings have been exported from Canada under declaration that the bone is Pre-Convention (from animals dead before July 1975). Under this policy and interpretation the species identity of the bone was inconsequential. Application of the policy was restricted to small carvings; larger pieces were referred to Appendix I (not tradable for commercial purposes).

This procedure is now coming under question. The authorities consider it impossible, or at least impractical, to confirm the species identity or the age of whalebone material after it is carved. The basis for the concern is to prevent commercial trade in material from recently-killed large whales. This matter might evolve to the point where Canada could not or would not issue export permits because importing countries would not or could not issue import permits for any whalebone material destined for commercial use.

Canada is currently assessing whether any procedures exist or could be developed for confirming species origin and age of material in whalebone carvings. Complications include the fact that the weathering/aging of whalebone can be accelerated by such treatments as boiling.

Malachi Arreak advised that most carved material is in fact bowhead from the commercial whaling era. This is becoming notably more scarce. Whalebone is not entirely homogeneous; some portions contain hard and polishable surfaces. Nonetheless, the species of origin is readily apparent (to Inuit) from uncut material, and even the age of the material can be reasonably estimated (from the colour). Malachi suggested that a solution to the problem might be to require carvers to

photograph their uncut material, in its source location, prior to commencing to carve it.

Michael d'Eça pointed out that the NWMB is not required under the NLCA to exercise any authority in this matter. He suggested that NTI be advised and updated.

9.B.3 Walrus Sport Hunting

Robert reported that comments on the draft management plan have been received. Their target for completion is April. Regarding the 1996 hunts:

- Igloodik conducted two hunts (successful; two were approved). One hunter was American; the other was from Calgary. Both hunters used rifles although one arrived under the impression that he could use bow and arrows.
- Coral Harbour conducted one hunt (successful; five were approved). A large male was taken.
- The hunts approved for Salluit did not take place. Several hunters have preliminary arrangements for 1997; they will need to reapply.

9.B.4 DFO Program Review

Robert reported that nothing conclusive has happened yet. It is known that there will be reductions in operating budgets and some staff will be leaving.

9.B.5 DFO Science Advisory Council: Representation by Co-management Boards

Robert Moshenko reminded Members that Regional DFO staff had suggested that all NWT and Quebec Co-management Boards jointly nominate one person for the new Science Advisory Council. The DFO Science ADM is expected to announce the appointments very soon. The Council will consist of scientists and non-scientists from across Canada. Precise terms of reference are not available. Appointments will be for two years and the Council will meet three times per year.

Daniel Pike advised that Makivik has indicated, via Stas Olpinsky, that they will defer to NWMB to make an appropriate selection and nomination.

Dan also noted that Ben Kovic has already been recommended as a possible candidate. Malachi Arreak proposed that Gordon Koshinsky be nominated. Malachi Arreak reminded Members that the NWMB appointee will have to represent all of the interests in the Arctic, including those of Makivik. It was decided to nominate Gordon Koshinsky (**Motion 97-109**)

9.B.6. Wearing of Sidearms by DFO Fishery Officers

Considerable dissatisfaction and concern was expressed about the recent DFO policy requiring Fishery Officers on duty to wear sidearms. DFO has described this

policy as being nation-wide, “to facilitate mobility and interchange of Officers”. Dan Pike noted that there are only two Fishery Officers stationed in the NSA, and in any event exceptions have already been granted for some parts of Newfoundland and Quebec. Michael d’Eça noted that the policy was put in place without consultation, and that this seems contrary to Article 15.4.1 of the NLCA. Malachi Arreak suggested that it would be an extremely exceptional and remote set of circumstances that would warrant Fishery Officers carrying sidearms while discharging their duties in the NSA. He noted that when a citizen sees a gun on a person in authority he adopts an entirely different attitude to that person: an attitude which tends to be inconsistent with the precepts of wildlife co-management. Malachi wondered if sidearms are considered necessary because wildlife poses a threat to Officers. Gordon Koshinsky suggested that at the very least there should be local discretion in implementing the policy. Implementation might be on a case-by-case basis with community input, perhaps analogous to the way search warrants are currently sought and issued.

Robert Moshenko agreed to transmit the Board’s concerns to DFO. He implied that the Department was already considering some kind of adjustment to the policy as it affects the NSA.

9.B.7 Narwhal Quotas, Kitikmeot Region

David Igutsaq reported that narwhal appear only rarely in the Kitikmeot Region. The communities of Taloyoak, Gjoa Haven and Pelly Bay would like to have larger narwhal quotas, to take better advantage of those rare occasions when narwhal appear. A letter from the Kitikmeot HTA is to be expected.

Robert Moshenko advised that the total combined narwhal quota for all NWT communities is currently about 550. Two stocks are believed to be contributing. Some 300-400 narwhal are harvested every year. Sustainable harvest of narwhal is a matter of ongoing attention by the Canada-Greenland Joint Commission. The Commission is of the opinion that the present harvest is probably sustainable but in the absence of further studies would not advocate an increase. If the total quota were actually harvested, that would represent a substantial increase. Gordon Koshinsky offered that rarity of wildlife occurrence is not ordinarily interpreted as a signal to establish larger quotas.

Dan Pike stated that narwhal quotas are of rather wide-ranging concern in the NSA. The Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board recently passed a resolution urging development of narwhal management agreements similar to those in place for polar bears. Their aim is to establish a basis for larger harvests.

Malachi Arreak expressed concern regarding potential wastage of narwhal through improper killing and meat-handling methods by young and inexperienced hunters. Any move toward larger harvests would need to be balanced by a program of instruction in these regards. Ben Kovic agreed that the education of young hunters in appropriate and traditional hunting and handling techniques was a necessary

prerequisite. Elders have repeatedly offered their expertise and services, and this source of knowledge needs to be more fully tapped. Gordon Koshinsky agreed that this was an area in which the role of traditional knowledge was indispensable and could not be questioned.

It was agreed to request DFO to develop a status report on narwhal productivity, harvest and quotas for the next meeting of the Board.

9.B.8 New Fisheries Act (Bill C-62)

Robert Moshenko explained that Bill C-62 is essentially an update of an earlier aborted attempt (Bill C-115) to amend the Fisheries Act. When passed, it will constitute the first comprehensive re-write of the Fisheries Act since 1868. The Bill has gone through first reading. After second reading it will be the subject of hearings (Standing Committee) across the country. Iqaluit may be on the itinerary. The government hopes to pass the Bill by spring. The Bill aims to provide a simplified, streamlined, flexible, user-friendly legislative framework for sustainable fisheries into the next century.

Robert summarized highlights of the Bill from the perspective of the NWMB:

- Will have minimal real impacts in the Arctic.
- Leaves ultimate responsibility for conservation and protection with the Minister.
- Is heavily oriented to the commercial fishing sector, with the aim of providing long-term stability and promoting viability.
- Provides a framework for partnering, for those who wish to do so. (NWMB is already a partner.)
- Provides for Sanction Tribunals, to operate outside the criminal justice system: one for the Pacific and one for the Atlantic. There will be boards, to hear licence appeals, etc.
- Provides for greater control over international fishing of Canadian stocks.
- Provides for agreements with the provinces on habitat management.
- Fines will be increased.
- Regulations will be condensed and made more flexible.
- Management Orders will be actionable within Regions.

Malachi Arreak interpreted parts of the Bill to be inconsistent with or infringing upon the authority of the NWMB. The new legislation also seems to infringe upon Inuit rights to fish for subsistence. He suggested that the Bill be carefully examined in the context of the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement.

Michael d'Eça suggested that many aspects of the new legislation will be welcomed by the NWMB. However he interprets from the current version that DFO is largely ignoring the need and opportunity to clarify in legislation its relationship with the management boards (such as NWMB), and is unnecessarily setting the stage for

future acrimony and misunderstandings. The Board is not asking for any new powers, but only for clearer definitions and setting. The bulk of a submission (to the Standing Committee) already exists, and the Board will need to decide if and how it will be put forward.

9.C Department of Resources, Wildlife and Economic Development

9.C.1 Nunavut Updates

Glenn Williams reported that:

- The GNWT will be filling its vacant position on the NWMB very shortly.
- DRWED is working to establish a Nunavut headquarters to mesh with NWMB.
- DRWED wishes to reintroduce discussion on their contribution proposal at the next Board meeting. The ADM has indicated interest in delegating such matters.

9.C.2 Polar Bear Management MOUs: Update

Glenn Williams requested clarification regarding the “noted corrections” referred to in NWMB Resolution 97-068. It was agreed that Dan Pike and Michael d’Eça will work with Glenn to develop acceptable wording.

Glenn noted that polar bear management has interjurisdictional and international aspects which would benefit from co-management agreements. One example pertains to Greenland. The polar bear harvest in Greenland, as indicated by a recent skull-purchase program, appears greater than was expected. The Greenlanders are not considering introduction of quotas at the moment, but might be amenable to protecting polar bear family groups in a co-management context.

Glenn requested any advice or input that the NWMB might offer on the protocol and content for pursuing any such co-management initiatives. Who should be talking to whom, where and when?

It was suggested that the forthcoming (February) meeting of the Polar Bear Technical Committee (in Edmonton) might be an opportunity to start ground-breaking discussions with Greenland. No harm was foreseen in anybody who was available participating in discussions at this early stage. A working group may be the answer. Dan Pike noted that there is an organization in Greenland called KNAPK made up of fishermen and hunters which may wish to be involved. There have been certain agreements developed in the past between Inuit organizations without the involvement of their respective governments. This procedure may have legal shortcomings, but it has proven workable.

9.C.3 Peary Caribou

Glenn Williams reported that the attempt to capture Peary caribou on Bathurst Island had to be called off because blizzard conditions and lack of light precluded air

support. It might have been possible to capture a few caribou on Cornwallis Island, but not the 25-30 needed for a serious relocation attempt.

Glenn asked how strenuously the Board wished to pursue the fifth condition in its Resolution 97-096, which called for cessation of all Peary caribou hunting on Bathurst Island. The Resolute hunters have taken strong initiatives on their own to conserve this population, but they object to a total ban. They would like to be able to harvest one or two caribou when they visit Bathurst Island in the spring, and in any event they cannot understand why Bathurst Island was singled out. Malachi explained that Bathurst Island has the best habitat, and if the Peary caribou are going to survive anywhere it is most likely to be here. Ben Kovic wondered if the Board was on firm ground in advocating a prohibition on hunting without having any firm population information. Glenn advised that the Resolute hunters recently harvested four caribou on Cornwallis Island and found them to be in very good condition. It was agreed to revisit this matter at the next Board meeting.

9.C.4 Downlisting of Gyrfalcons: CITES Appendix I

Ron Graf reported that the USA will likely propose that the gyrfalcon be removed from Appendix I of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species. This is expected to be on the agenda of the forthcoming CITES meeting in January. Canada has been asked to support the desisting initiative.

Ron advised that the species really never was under threat in North America, but was listed on account of a look-alike situation in respect to genuinely rare birds in Greenland. Tagging studies have now shown that there is no interchange between Canada and Greenland. Downlisting would reopen the possibility of renewed trade in Canadian gyrfalcons, although this was much less financially attractive now than previously. Gyrfalcons used to sell for up to \$30,000 per bird; the current price would be nearer \$5,000. Dan Pike observed that under the NFA there is a presumption of 100% Inuit need for raptors in the NSA. This means that any harvest opportunities would automatically accrue to Inuit. Malachi Arreak proposed that Canada make desisting conditional on proper documentation of stock status and abundance. David Igutsaq stated that gyrfalcons are poorly regarded in his Region because they prey on ptarmigan.

The Board agreed to support a downlisting initiative for gyrfalcon. **(Motion 97-110)**

9.C.5 Trade in Bear Gall Bladders

Ron Graf noted that the Northwest Territories, along with Quebec, Ontario and Nova Scotia, are the only jurisdictions in Canada in which bear gall bladders can be legally sold. A bear gall bladder sells for about \$100. The GNWT is under considerable pressure to amend its legislation to prohibit the sale of bear parts in order to provide protection for genuinely threatened bears in other parts of the world.

The Nunavut Land Claims Agreement confirms the right of beneficiaries to trade parts from legally harvested bears. The NLCA states that an Inuk may require a permit to transport wildlife out of the Nunavut Area. The DRWED, as a designated Canadian CITES Management Authority, can issue CITES export permits for legally harvested bear gall bladders.

Malachi Arreak wondered whether it might be possible to differentiate bear species on the basis of bile chemistry. Polar bears must surely have a very distinctive diet among bear species, including consumption of seaweed in summer. Grant Gilchrist agreed that bear gall bladders could almost certainly be identified to species by stable isotope analysis; however the procedure was expensive and was not considered practicable.

Ron Graf presented three options, as follows: (1) Status quo; (2) Inform and consult more broadly with user groups; and (3) Immediately restrict the trade. The Board selected the second option, with consultations to be carried out quickly. Glenn Williams stated that his department will undertake the consultations.

9.C.6 Caribou Calving Grounds Protection and Legislation

Ron Graf reminded the Board of the earlier workshop in Yellowknife on this subject. More recent attention has been triggered by Canadian/American exchanges regarding protection for the Bluenose calving grounds in Alaska in the face of petroleum interests there. President Clinton was successful in obtaining this protection, and in essence has challenged Prime Minister Chretien "to match in Canada what he had requested the USA to do in Alaska".

Ron invited the NWMB to make its input on this subject by February. David Aglukark mentioned that human activity of any kind, including harvesting, is not allowed on the caribou calving grounds in the Keewatin from May 15 to July 15. Ron Graf confirmed that under the 1978 Caribou Protection Measures, developers are prohibited from entering the calving grounds in the Keewatin during that interval. Michael d'Eça suggested that the Board might want to work closely with NPC and NIRB on this matter.

9.C.7 Effects of Research Methods on Polar Bears

Glenn Williams made reference to the 04 July letter from NWMB requesting an update on this topic. Glenn reported that there had been two handling deaths (in 1994 and in 1996) out of 2,000 bears captured and drugged. The drug used to immobilize bears (telazol) is undetectable after three days. Agriculture Canada has declared that bears are safe to eat one year after exposure to this drug. Dr. Ian Stirling is undertaking an analysis of all bear handling data in Canada but it is not yet clear when the results will be available. Meeka Mike cautioned against extrapolating results from the "dump-dwelling" bears at Churchill. Dan Pike noted

that the University of Saskatchewan has offered to provide an independent analysis if requested by the Board.

David Igutsaq suggested that bears are more susceptible to the effects of handling when temperatures are very low. He would prefer to see such work done during the off season. Malachi Arreak cited Inuit observations that there are effects after a second capture. Cubs also tend to be smaller if the mother has been drugged previously. Not all polar bears are identical; those farther north seem to be more physiologically active and may respond differently. Malachi also questioned the possibility of behavioural changes from handling: perhaps it could make the bears meaner. Inuit are very strong in their belief that animals should only be handled respectfully. David Igutsaq stated opposition to drugging bears during the hunting season. Glenn stated that DRWED did not want to tag or handle bears during a sport hunt, and will consult with the communities prior to the forthcoming Gulf of Boothia survey in order to avoid such an overlap.

Glenn Williams noted that the controversies about handling and tagging animals are not confined to polar bears. All wildlife management agencies need to be constantly seeking alternative methods. Ron Graf mentioned that he has heard about work to determine if the genetic composition of animal hair could be adapted as a kind of mark-recapture technique for estimating populations. Gordon Koshinsky cited work being supported by NWMB on photo-identification of individual whales.

9.C.8 Biodiversity Strategy

Ron Graf reported that Canada has been working to develop a national response to the Convention on Biological Diversity introduced at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro three years ago. The resulting Canadian Biodiversity Strategy has now been signed by all Canadian jurisdictions. The strategy is comprised of over 100 strategic recommendations for how Canadian governments, organizations and individuals should act to protect the diversity of wild species in Canada. DRWED will be developing an action plan for implementing this strategy in the NWT.

Meeka Mike expressed her strong support for this initiative. She accompanied an Elder from Pond Inlet to Arizona last winter to make a presentation on this subject. Malachi Arreak stated that Inuit are adamant that they are integral to the ecosystem and a component of its biodiversity. Michael d'Eça advised that if an outcome of the exercise is a management plan involving the NSA, the approval of the NWMB will be required.

9.C.9 Thelon Wildlife Sanctuary Management Plan

Ron Graf reminded the Board that under Article 9.5.2 of the NLCA, a management plan for the Thelon Wildlife Sanctuary must be developed based on recommendations from the affected communities and the DIO. The Akilliniq Planning Committee has released a draft management plan. The plan contains recommendations which warrant review by the NWMB. Once the territorial and

federal governments approve the plan, plans for the Sanctuary can only be changed following public review by the NWMB. The draft plan is based on extensive consultation at the local level and has been overseen by the Kivalliq Inuit Association.

David Aglukark wanted opportunity to see the management plan before it is sent to the Ministers. Malachi Arreak suggested that restrictions on hunting in the Sanctuary may conflict with the NLCA in the absence of a bilateral agreement. An IIBA will thus have to be negotiated. Gordon Koshinsky asked whether the land parcel mentioned in NLCA 9.5.1 is still part of the Sanctuary; the consensus opinion was that it is not.

Thursday 21 November 1996

The meeting was reconvened at 8:45 a.m. David Igutsaq led the opening prayer.

9. Continued (New Business)

9.D Nunavut Wildlife Management Board

9.D.1 Relationship of NWMB to other Co-management Boards

Malachi Arreak reported on his briefing paper about the relationship between NWMB and the other institutions of public government (IPGs) under the NLCA. Malachi reviewed the history of land claims development across the Canadian Arctic. Different historical backgrounds, as well as different aspirations among the various aboriginal groups, are reflected in the different natures of the land claims agreements. In the Eastern Arctic, Inuit dreamed about being masters in their overall territory. Next to the territorial imperative, genuine decision-making power in respect to wildlife was the first priority of this Inuit aspiration.

A co-management framework was negotiated to deal specifically with wildlife, and this is the basis for the NWMB. This co-management framework was then extended, through negotiation, to cover the broader aspects of the Inuit relationship with their environment. This relationship extends to lands, waters, and non-renewable resources and is the basis for the other IPGs under the NLCA, and for the differences in mandates among them.

9.D.2 Should Canada Join NAMMCO?

Dan Pike reported that DFO has requested a recommendation from the NWMB and other pertinent organizations on whether or not Canada should join the North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission (NAMMCO). The NAMMCO was established in 1992 by Norway, Iceland, Faroe Islands and Greenland. It is a regional international organization with the objectives of conservation, rational management and study. Joining NAMMCO could be seen as an alternative to joining IWC.

Some concern has been expressed that if Canada joins NAMMCO it may be perceived as associating itself with commercial whaling nations. Gordon Koshinsky spoke of having attended a NAMMCO meeting, and finding the organization to be competent, credible and refreshing. The USA, however, is definitely opposed to Canada joining NAMMCO. Malachi Arreak stated that he would be in favour of Canada joining NAMMCO if they will give a higher profile to traditional knowledge. The Board decided to register its support for Canada to join NAMMCO. **(Motion 97-111)**

9.A.2 NWMB Submission to Standing Committee on Bill C-65

This item was revisited; see also Page 9. Michael d'Eça briefed the Members on the draft submission which he had completed. A few additional minor adjustments were agreed upon. The Board approved the document for transmission to the Standing Committee. **(Motion 97-112)**

9.D.3 DFO Science Advisory Council: see 9.B.5

9.D.4 DFO Fishery Officers Wearing Sidearms: see 9.B.6

9.D.5 NWMB/DFO Working Relationship

Gordon Koshinsky explained that he had accepted the challenge to prepare a discussion paper on this subject at the recent DFO workshop in Winnipeg. Gordon understood that he would be doing this in the context of NWMB specifically, although he was aware of some expectation now that his treatment should also cover the other Arctic wildlife co-management boards. Gordon felt that his treatment might serve as a guide or outline for the other Boards, but he was not prepared to try to interpret their Agreements for them. He requested that the Chairman absolutely clarify this matter at his forthcoming meeting with the other Boards.

Michael d'Eça cautioned against creating another document with another interpretation of the NLCA. At the very least, this should not be attempted without legal counsel. It would probably be appropriate to obtain the view of all the signatories to the NLCA before embarking on such an exercise. Dan Pike interpreted the requirement as something rather informal, more in the nature of a listing of functional expectations. Any suggestions that contracts were to be defined or interpreted were probably unrealistic if not inappropriate. Dan agreed that the exercise, if undertaken, should be confined to NWMB/DFO.

9.D.6 Establishing a Total Allowable Harvest for Bowhead Whales

Dan Pike reminded the Board that it had previously expressed its intention to give formal consideration to establishing a total allowable harvest (TAH) to accommodate another bowhead hunt or hunts in 1997 or beyond. The 1996 DFO status report on bowhead whales indicated that harvest levels of one every 3 years from Hudson Bay/Foxe Basin, and one every 19 years from Baffin Bay, would probably be sustainable.

Malachi Arreak noted that there were many problems with the bowhead hunt in 1996. He felt that any future bowhead hunt should be preceded by public hearings. It should be left up to the hunters/communities if/where/when/how to proceed. Hunters would need to be much better trained than was evident this year. Proper planning, training and preparation for another hunt would probably require a couple of years.

Jim Noble advised that a contract had been let for an independent review of the 1996 hunt, and the report is expected by January. Both the QIA and QWB have passed resolutions supporting the harvest of a bowhead whale in the Baffin Region in 1997. The NTI has also indicated support, but recognizes the jurisdiction of the NWMB for making the decision. David Igutsaq suggested that the Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study should be completed before another hunt is considered. Malachi conveyed the observation of Elders that celebrations before and during the 1996 hunt were premature and inappropriate, and their opinion that this behaviour was a major reason why there were problems. Some people think that the next hunt should be really traditional; others would prefer the use of whaling-era methods. Ron Graf reminded the Board that the USA is considering trade sanctions against Canada on account of Canada's position with respect to aboriginal bowhead hunting and the IWC. The importation of polar bear hides should not be overlooked as a possible candidate area for American attention in this regard.

Gordon Koshinsky suggested that it was important to find out if a TAH would be allowed (by the Minister) before making any further plans. Just because a TAH was established would not mean that a hunt would actually have to take place. Dan Pike suggested that if Cumberland Sound was considered a candidate area for the next hunt, this location should be specified when a decision on TAH is conveyed to the Minister. The Board agreed to establish a TAH of one bowhead whale from the Baffin Bay stock for 1997 or 1998. **(Motion 97-113)**

9.D.7 New National Parks: Wager Bay and Bathurst Inlet

Dan Pike advised that the Prime Minister, in October, announced the creation of new national parks at Wager Bay and Bathurst Inlet. Lands have been withdrawn under the *Territorial Lands Act* for this purpose. This means there can be no new development or staking of mineral claims for a period of three years. There will probably be a role for NWMB in this overall process.

It was noted that, despite the Prime Minister's announcement, neither of these parks has yet been created. A process has been started, and the government hopes to proclaim the parks in 3-4 years. That may be an optimistic time frame.

Malachi Arreak noted that a park cannot be created without an Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement (IIBA). No such agreements yet exist for these proposed parks. Wildlife issues will be central, and wildlife management plans will need NWMB approval. Helen Klengenberg has flagged this matter to the attention of NWMB on behalf of NTI. Michael d'Eça advised that there was no obligation for NWMB to lead in the matter.

9.D.8 Production of a Book on Fish and Marine Mammals of Nunavut

Dan Pike provided an update on this matter. It stems from the recent availability of funds as the result of a fine imposed on the territorial government following a sewage lagoon break at Iqaluit. The GNWT gave \$100,000 to DOE to be used for the benefit of fish and wildlife and their habitats. Production of a book on “The Fish and Marine Mammals of Nunavut” has been proposed. There are some expectations that NWMB might lead.

Dan declared that there was no possible way that he or his unit could play any significant role in such an undertaking. Gordon Koshinsky observed that it was hard to be against any initiative that would promote conservation education. But the “Birds of Nunavut” book now nearing completion was not exactly a confidence-builder as to what could be easily accomplished. Why not use the funds for something that really needs to be done? An example would be to document traditional hunting and handling methodologies (e.g. for narwhal) in order to provide the background material needed to develop a course or other training aids to help reduce or eliminate wastage. This was identified earlier (e.g. 9.B.7, this Meeting) as a major consideration in any move to increase narwhal quotas.

The Board decided to defer consideration of the matter to a later date.

9.E Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated: Updates

Helen Klengenber was unable to attend the meeting but did provide a report.

9.F NWMB-Funded Projects and Contributions

9.F.1 Wildlife Research Trust Fund Projects

9.F.1a Establishment of Priorities

Dan Pike reminded the Board that the WRT was established to assist the government departments to conduct research projects which were appropriate to NWMB priorities. Departments can be expected to submit research project proposals, in response to priorities set out by the NWMB, for the February meeting. It is desirable to make the priority-setting process more reliable and transparent, with less onus on a single person (i.e. himself). The key is to develop/have rational and objective criteria.

Dan presented two options for achieving this, either one needing to be completed by the Board well before the end of January: (1) By means of a workshop, with representation from the government departments and the RWOs; or (2) Through an internal process, led by the Director of Wildlife. Dan made it clear that he favoured the first option.

Gordon Koshinsky had no problems with a transparent process, but reckoned that NWMB was ultimately responsible for its research criteria. He suggested that it will also be appropriate to revisit the overall amount of funding being made available,

and that the funding stream for ongoing research projects needs to be better clarified. Stock status reports, if and when completed by the departments, would be a very key input to priority setting. Dan observed that DOE was really the only department which has finished stock status reports. Glenn Williams heartily endorsed a workshop format and process for priority setting, based on recent experience in his department. The Board decided in favour of the first option. **(Motion 97-114)**

9.F.2 NWMB-Funded Projects: Funding Requests

9.F.2a Harvest Risk Management: Development of Software (RISKMAN)

Dan Pike described this University of Saskatchewan proposal. Development is well underway, and this proposal is for finishing touches. The software was developed with respect to bears, and is especially applicable to species not much affected by factors other than hunting. It allows wildlife managers to go beyond consideration of a single TAH, to examine the risk for the population inherent in other hypothetical harvests.

Objections raised against the proposal included:

- There are no other wildlife species in Nunavut comparable to polar bears in terms of volume of population information available for use in the model and predominance of hunting as a mortality factor.
- Other software packages are already available which do more or less the same thing.
- Development of this package has for most intents and purposes already been completed.
- Developmental work of this nature is the proper domain of universities and governments.

The Board decided not to fund the proposal. **(Motion 97-115)**

9.F.2b Southeast Baffin Beluga: Documentation of Inuit Knowledge

This project would be co-ordinated by Keith Hay. It is expected that research on the belugas themselves will be done by DFO in cooperation with the three communities, as per the Southeast Baffin Beluga Co-management Plan which was completed in 1994. This is a high-priority stock. The Inuit Knowledge Study would complement the scientific work. The study would involve interviewing community experts identified by the HTAs. It is expected that the study would be finished in about a year.

David Aglukark observed that the Southeast Baffin Beluga Co-management Project is very highly regarded in other jurisdictions (Greenland, Inuvialuit Settlement Area, etc.). The Board decided to support the proposal. **(Motion 97-116)**

9.F.2c Milne Inlet Exploratory Fishery: Cost Recovery

Dan Pike referred Members to a proposal for funding from Charlie Enuaraq pertaining to exploratory fishery work undertaken by him in 1995 and 1996. He got off to a very good start, but was defeated by the cessation of airline service to the Pangnirtung fish plant in the second year. Glenn Williams attested that while the fishery was in progress the fish was judged to be of the best quality ever delivered to the Pangnirtung plant. Charlie also introduced some important innovations, such as packing his fish in glacier ice.

Dan noted that the project came under the Exploratory Fishery Program run by the DFO. This Program allows commercial fishermen to access areas that do not have commercial quotas, while gathering biological data for stock assessment. Fishermen are given funding to sample fish and keep track of their catch. Charlie harvested about 2,000 kilograms of char, but lost money on the operation. Demonstration (or not) of economic viability is meant to be part of the "exploration". It would be a unique precedent for the NWMB to fund work retroactively. There is also a question of whether NWMB should be considering financial support for what was/is really a commercial venture.

The Board decided that the work had not accumulated the kind of data that the Board could justify funding retroactively for its management purposes. The Board decided to deny the funding request. **(Motion 97-117)**

9.G Other New Business

9.G.1 Bowhead Knowledge Study Steering Committee: Membership

The Board decided to appoint Meeka Mike to the Committee, to replace Mr. Theriault. **(Motion 97-118)**

10. Old Business

10.A Operating Procedures Manual

Pierre Chartrand noted that two sections of the Operating Procedures Manual, pertaining to personnel and financial procedures, had been approved previously. Pierre presented one new section for Board approval: the Employee Manual. Pierre noted that this item had been reviewed by Executive Committee. He also advised that all job descriptions for NWMB positions will be standardized. The Board approved the Employee Manual. **(Motion 97-119)**

10.B NWMB Annual Report for 1993/94, 1994/95 and 1995/96

Ben Kovic asked for comment on the composite annual report draft, prior to sending it to the printer. Gordon Koshinsky asked about verification of the audit statement. Pierre Chartrand replied that he had checked the numbers and that the auditors had also reviewed them. Ben Kovic thought that the pictures did not correspond very well with the text. He would like to see a map of Nunavut included. He would also prefer portrait-type pictures of himself and of the Executive Director in their respective Reports. In the Wildlife Harvest Study section, he would like to have a picture of people butchering a seal rather than a polar bear. The section on

the Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study should have a picture of a bowhead whale. David Igutsaq wished to commend the Inuinnaqtun translator for the accuracy of his/her work.

10.C Wildlife Harvest Study

Carol Churchward reported that a total of 27 Field Workers were hired and trained in July. A number of them have since resigned. Iqaluit and Gjoa Haven have emerged as the most difficult communities for the Study to date.

Carol identified two Study items which required the attention of the Board:

- Harvest Study Calendars

Carol presented a draft 1997 calendar for Members to review. There are in fact three separate calendars, one for each region/dialect. Board policy requires that the calendar project be tendered on account of its cost (about \$50,000); however there is no longer enough time to do this while meeting the Study schedule. The Board approved a streamlined procurement process for the 1997 Harvest Study calendars. **(Motion 97-120)**

- Field Worker Salaries

Carol advised that the salary being paid was posing some problems for recruitment and retention of Field Workers. Meeka Mike stated that she has met a Field Worker who complained about the pay. She felt that they should get better wages considering their workload. They can do a lot to promote the Study besides merely doing their interviews. Ben Kovic asked whether hunters could do more to record their own harvests, perhaps eliminating the need for interviews. Carol explained that the interviews serve many function, including getting the map coordinates for harvest sites. Malachi Arreak stated that Inuit use a very detailed and intricate repertoire of place names. It would serve a number of useful purposes if Field Workers became familiar with them.

David Aglukark mentioned that the importance of the Harvest Study is generally realized, but the process is not very well understood in some communities. He suggested that NWMB Members take a more active role in explaining the rationale behind the Study. Perhaps the Field Workers should be handing out pamphlets.

10.D Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study: Update

David Aglukark presented an outline of the Study through to the end of March. A total of 16 communities have been visited, and 257 individuals were interviewed. Workshops prior to March 31 are planned for Arctic Bay and Pond Inlet. A funding shortfall of \$77,000 is projected to the end of this fiscal year. David outlined three options for dealing with the funding shortfall: 1) settle for an unfinished product with the existing funds; 2) Provide enough additional funds to conduct the two workshops and continue transcribing tapes; or 3) provide full funding for the Study up to July 1999. David recommended the third option.

The Board decided to approve interim funding up to 31 March 1997. Further budgetary needs will be discussed during the February meeting. **(Motion 97-121)**

10.E Donations Policy

Malachi Arreak tabled the policy document which he had undertaken to draft. The utility of an annual deadline for considering applications was questioned, but the policy document was approved by the Board. **(Motion 97-122)**

10.F Strategic Plan Implementation: Update

Jim Noble presented a progress report on implementation of the Strategic Plan. Some of the items have already been done by the staff. Others are delayed for various reasons.

10.G “To Do List”: Review and Update

Jim Noble reviewed the ‘to do list’ developed after the last meeting. Progress was generally regarded as satisfactory. Some items on the list were updated. Jim requested that the Board periodically vet the Legal Advisor’s assignment list.

10.H Communications Policy and Plan

Jim Noble referred the Board to the draft Request for Proposal regarding development of this item. He noted that the Executive Committee had already reviewed the draft. There was some discussion on where to advertise the Request, and on how to ensure that preference is given to Inuit-owned businesses. The Request was approved, with some revisions. **(Motion 97-123)**

11. Other Business

11.A Upcoming Meetings and Events

Board Members reviewed upcoming meetings and events, and decided on participation and attendance.

11.B Meeting Reports and Briefing Notes

See Agenda item 7 (Pages 6-8), this Meeting.

12. Public Meeting: Community Hall

See Agenda item 2 (Page 4), this Meeting.

13. Next Meeting: Date and Place

It was agreed that the next meeting of the Board will be in Pangnirtung the week of 24-28 February 1997. Staff were instructed to attempt to coordinate a tour of the Cumberland Sound turbot fishery for those Board Members who were interested. The deadline for submissions for the meeting was set at 03 February.

14. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m. November 21. **(Motion 97-124)**

Minutes Approved By: _____
Chairperson

Date: _____

NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD

RESOLUTIONS: MEETING No. 13

PELLY BAY, 18-22 NOVEMBER 1996

Resolution 97-099

Resolved that the agenda for Meeting No. 13 be accepted with noted changes:

- Item 8 - Add Members' concerns on Resolution Island PCBs
- Item 9B - Add Item 5 (Requests for increased narwhal quotas at Pelly Bay, Gjoa Haven, and Taloyoak)
- Add Item 6 (Fisheries Act update)
- Item 9D5 (Tab 71) - Note; verbal presentation (No handout)
- Item 9G1 (Tab 77) - Note; Item deferred (No handout)

Moved by: Malachi Arreak Seconded by: David Aglukark

Carried Date: 18 November 1996

Resolution 97-100

Resolved that the minutes for NWMB Regular Meeting No. 12 conducted at Arviat in August 1996 be adopted with noted corrections.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky Seconded by: David Aglukark

Carried Date: 18 November 1996

Resolution 97-101

Resolved that the minutes for NWMB Conference Call No. 24 conducted on 1 October 1996 be adopted as presented.

Moved by: Malachi Arreak Seconded by: David Igutsaq

Carried Date: 18 November 1996

Resolution 97-102

Resolved that the minutes for NWMB Conference Call No. 25 conducted on 23 October 1996 be adopted with noted corrections.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky Seconded by: Malachi Arreak

Carried Date: 18 November 1996

Resolution 97-103

Resolved that the financial forecast to the end of the 1996/97 fiscal year be accepted, and that Indian and Northern Affairs Canada be advised that NWMB will request to roll over \$500,000 of operating funds from the current Contribution Agreement.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky Seconded by: Malachi Arreak
Carried Date: 19 November 1996

Resolution 97-104

Resolved that the meeting move to *in-camera* session.

Moved by: Malachi Arreak Seconded by: Gordon Koshinsky
Carried Date: 19 November 1996

Resolution 97-105

Resolved to close the *in-camera* session.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky Seconded by: David Igutsaq
Carried Date: 19 November 1996

Resolution 97-106

Resolved that a comprehensive strategy for computer acquisition be developed to meet the needs of NWMB staff and Board members over the next couple of years, and further;

That this strategy take account of the needs for the Resource Centre that is now being created, and provide for the purchase of laptops for Board members as may be appropriate.

Moved by: Malachi Arreak Seconded by: David Igutsaq
Carried Date: 20 November 1996

Resolution 97-107

Resolved that the NWMB approve the proposal from Nunanet to design a website for the NWMB in order to make information on the NWMB's mandate, structure and functions accessible through the internet.

Moved by: Malachi Arreak Seconded by: Gordon Koshinsky
Carried Date: 20 November 1996

Resolution 97-108

Resolved that the NWMB approve in principle the concept of conducting a workshop in conjunction with NTI and NITC in order to assist HTOs and RWOs to meet their obligations and responsibilities under the NFA, and further;

That funds be set aside for the expected costs of such a workshop, contingent on details to be worked out with NTI and NITC.

Moved by: Malachi Arreak Seconded by: Meeka Mike
Carried Date: 20 November 1996

Resolution 97-109

Resolved that the NWMB nominate Gordon Koshinsky to represent Nunavut on DFO's new Science Advisory Council.

Moved by: Malachi Arreak Seconded by: David Igutsaq
Carried Date: 20 November 1996

Resolution 97-110

Resolved that the NWMB approve the removal (down-listing) of gyrfalcons from CITES Appendix I, subject to tabling by GNWT with the Board of appropriate background information pertinent to down-listing, including a population estimate.

Moved by: David Igutsaq Seconded by: Malachi Arreak
Carried Date: 20 November 1996

Resolution 97-111

Resolved that the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans be advised of the NWMB's desire to have Canada join NAMMCO, with the request that NAMMCO recognize and incorporate Traditional Knowledge in providing advice on particular stocks, and in proposing management measures for their management.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky Seconded by: David Aglukark
Carried Date: 21 November 1996

Resolution 97-112

Resolved that the proposed response to Bill C-65, an *Act Respecting Protection of Wildlife Species in Canada From Extirpation or Extinction*, be accepted, with noted wording changes, for submission to the House of Commons Standing Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development, and further;

That the submission be copied to the Minister of DFO and also to the Chairperson of the Labrador Inuit Association.

Moved by: Malachi Arreak Seconded by: Gordon Koshinsky
Carried Date: 21 November 1996

Resolution 97-113

Resolved that the NWMB establish a Total Allowable Harvest (TAH) of one (1) bowhead whale from the Baffin Bay stock, and further;

That the period of the hunt be for the open-water periods of 1997 and 1998, and;

That the hunt allow for two (2) strikes and one (1) landing of a bowhead whale.

Moved by: Malachi Arreak Seconded by: David Igutsaq
Carried Date: 21 November 1996

Resolution 97-114

Resolved that the NWMB conduct a strategic planning session in early January to develop research priorities for 1997/98.

Moved by: David Aglukark Seconded by: Meeka Mike
Carried Date: 21 November 1996

Resolution 97-115

Resolved that the funding proposal submitted by Dr. Francois Messier of the University of Saskatchewan for development of "Harvest Risk Management (RISKMAN) Software: A Tool To Evaluate Sustainable Yield", not be approved.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky Seconded by: David Igutsaq
Carried Date: 21 November 1996

Resolution 97-116

Resolved that the NWMB support the request for funding assistance from the Southeast Baffin Beluga Management Committee for a beluga traditional knowledge study in the amount of \$47,000.

Moved by: David Aglukark Seconded by: Malachi Arreak
Carried Date: 21 November 1996

Resolution 97-117

Resolved that the funding proposal "Milne Inlet Exploratory Fishery, 1995 and 1996", submitted by Charlie Enuaraq of Pond Inlet, not be approved.

Moved by: David Aglukark Seconded by: Meeka Mike
Carried Abstained: Malachi Arreak Date: 21 November 1996

Resolution 97-118

Resolved that Meeka Mike be appointed to replace Andre Theriault on the Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study Committee.

Moved by: Malachi Arreak Seconded by: Gordon Koshinsky
Carried Abstained: Meeka Mike Date: 21 November 1996

Resolution 97-119

Resolved that the Employee Manual as recommended by the Executive Committee be approved, and that the manual come into effective immediately.

Moved by: Malachi Arreak Seconded by: Gordon Koshinsky
Carried Date: 21 November 1996

Resolution 97-120

Resolved that the Harvest Study Co-ordinator be authorized to obtain three bids for production of the "1997 Harvest Study Calendar", and further;

That due to the shortness of available time, the Co-ordinator be authorized to select the supplier for the calendars without formal tendering.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky Seconded by: Malachi Arreak
Carried Date: 21 November 1996

Resolution 97-121

Resolved that the Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study report, and the Study budget of \$158,150 for the period October 1996 to 31 March 1997, be approved as presented, and further;

That the Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study Biologist be assured that the NWMB, during its February budget session, will review the budgetary shortfall that is currently projected for completion of the Study.

Moved by: Malachi Arreak Seconded by: Gordon Koshinsky
Carried Date: 21 November 1996

Resolution 97-122

Resolved that the "Donation Guideline Policy" be accepted as presented, for incorporation into the NWMB Operating Procedures Manual.

Moved by: Meeka Mike Seconded by: David Igutsaq
Carried Date: 21 November 1996

Resolution 97-123

Resolved that the draft call for proposal for development of a "Communications Plan/Policy" be approved, but;

That the rating system for bidders be changed to show 15% consideration for Inuit-owned businesses, and;

That the "Call For Proposal" be advertised concurrently in the North and South.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky Seconded by: Malachi Arreak
Carried Date: 21 November 1996

Resolution 97-124

Resolved that the 13th Regular Meeting of the NWMB be adjourned.

Moved by: Malachi Arreak Seconded by: David Igutsaq

Carried

Date: 21 November 1996