

# NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD

## MINUTES: MEETING No. 15

9-15 AUGUST 1997  
IQALUIT, NT

### Members and Staff Participating:

Ben Kovic	Chairperson
Malachi Arreak	Member
David Igutsaq	Member
Gordon Koshinsky	Member
Kevin McCormick	Member
Meeka Mike	Member
Harry Flaherty	Member
David Aglukark	Member
Johnny Peters	Makivik, Alternate Member
Jim Noble	Executive Director
Dan Pike	Director, Wildlife Management
Rebecca Mike	Assistant Director, Wildlife Management
Keith Hay	Biologist, Bowhead Knowledge Study
Pierre Chartrand	Director, Finance and Administration
Johnny McPherson	Harvest Study Coordinator
Michael d'Eça	NWMB Legal Advisor
Mary Nashook	Interpreter
Blandina Tulugardjuk	Interpreter

### Not Available:

Joannie Ikkidluak	Member (with cause)
-------------------	---------------------

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

Gary Weber	DFO, Iqaluit
Robert Moshenko	DFO, Winnipeg
Brian Wong	DFO, Ottawa
Gilles Chantigny	DFO, Laurentian Region
Stephen Atkinson	RW&ED, Iqaluit
David Mablick	NTI, Manager Wildlife/Environment
Stas Olpinski	Makivik, Head, Renewable Resource Devt
Timut Qamukaq	QWB, Vice-Chairperson
Joanasie Akumalik	QWB, Executive Director

Marc Allard	Seaku Fisheries, General Manager
Lorraine Brooke	Makivik Advisor
Mark Papigatuk	HFTA Nunavik
Yves Bosse	Parks Canada, Pangnirtung
Tim Fleming	Icy Waters Inc., President
Paul Motz	Icy Waters Inc., Chairman

Several other presenters and members of the public at large

### **Saturday, 9 August 1997**

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

The Chairperson Ben Kovic convened the meeting at 9:35 a.m. David Aglukark led the opening prayer. Ben welcomed Members to Iqaluit. He noted the very large Agenda, due in part to the cancellation of the May meeting.

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

Members reviewed and approved the agenda with no specific changes. A need was identified to deal with the turbot allocation issue expeditiously, in view of the response deadline from the DFO Minister. **(Resolution 98-016)**

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

##### **3.A Regular Meeting No. 14, Pangnirtung, 21-27 February 1997**

The Minutes were adopted as presented. **(Resolution 98-017)**

##### **3.B Conference Call No. 28, Conducted 24 March 1997**

The Minutes were adopted as presented. **(Resolution 98-018)**

##### **3.C Conference Call No. 29, Conducted 04 April 1997**

The Minutes were adopted as presented. **(Resolution 98-019)**

##### **3.D Conference Call No. 30, Conducted 07 April 1997**

The Minutes were adopted as presented. **(Resolution 98-020)**

##### **3.E Conference Call No. 31, Conducted 08 May 1997**

The Minutes were adopted as presented. **(Resolution 98-021)**  
**3.F Conference Call No. 32, Conducted 29 May 1997**

The Minutes were adopted as presented. **(Resolution 98-022)**

**3.G Conference Call No. 33, Conducted 08 July 1997**

The Minutes were adopted as presented. **(Resolution 98-023)**

### **3.H Implementation of Resolutions: Progress Report**

Jim Noble reported verbally with respect to progress on implementing Resolutions 97-135 through 98-015, developed at or subsequent to the last Board meeting.

Progress on implementing Resolutions and/or on subsequent action or response was deemed appropriate, acceptable, and/or as expected, with four exceptions requiring additional follow up as identified below. In a few cases (not all noted here) events overtook some of the Resolutions which accordingly were not or could not be actioned precisely as was initially intended.

- 97-143: Challenge to DIAND on 1994/95 operating surplus taking new form
- 97-144: Declaration on lead sinkers and jigs awaiting firm indication from DOE
- 97-145: Standardized presentation for use in public meetings: not yet actioned
- 97-156: Nunavut Sivuniksavut TFN Training Program report: not yet received.

## **4. Financial Business**

### **4.A 1996/97 Audit Report**

Malachi Arreak advised that Executive Committee had reviewed the Audit Report and would be advising the Board on this matter later in the Agenda. Jim Noble noted that the auditors had indicated a job well done, and the Board offered its congratulations to Pierre and Isabel.

### **4.B Interim Financial Statement**

The Financial Report to June 30 was accepted as presented. **(Resolution 98-024)**

### **4.C TAL Investments Report (NWRT)**

Pierre Chartrand referred to his briefing note of July 22. He confirmed that the funds earmarked for the Research Trust had been transferred out of the NWMB accounts.

Pierre noted that the market dropped by 5% just after TAL executed the new Investment Policy, but has more than recovered since. He advised that TAL planned to send a representative to the November Trust Meeting.

Gordon Koshinsky observed that the total of funds identified in the briefing note for transfer from the Trust Fund to pay for 1997/98 research by agencies exceeded the amount that the Board had approved at the Pangnirtung meeting. Pierre agreed to investigate and report. Gordon asked if a separate account had been established to enable transferred Trust funds to be administered separately from Board funds; Pierre replied that this had been done.

### **Sunday, 10 August 1997**

The Chairperson reconvened the meeting at 2:00 p.m.

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

Malachi Arreak, Chairperson of Executive Committee, reported by way of tabling and reviewing the Minutes of EC Teleconference No. 2 (28 July).

On the matter of entrenching a process for annual staff salary adjustments, Harry Flaherty asked what would be the consequence if the FIDDIPI were ever to decrease due to deflation. Malachi agreed to take the question under advisement to Executive Committee.

After some additional discussion the Board passed the following Motions:

- Approving the 1996/97 Audited Financial Statement (**Resolution 98-025**)
- Adopting a system of annual staff salary adjustments (**Resolution 98-026**)
- Approving advisory letters to staff on employment status (**Resolution 98-027**)

#### **6. Chairman and Staff Reports**

##### **6.A Chairman's Report**

Ben Kovic reviewed his activity highlights since his last report. He referred Members to his reports on meetings attended, provided in the briefing materials.

With respect to executing his office as a Commissioner with the Canada-Greenland Joint Commission for the Management of Narwhal and Beluga, Ben noted that the

other Canadian Commissioner was not as communicative or helpful as was her predecessor.

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

Jim Noble presented his activity report. There were no significant reactions.

## **6.C Wildlife Management Director's Report**

Dan Pike presented his report and invited questions.

Kevin McCormick noted that he had earlier proposed that a stock data base inventory be prepared, and had provided a possible outline. He asked whether such an inventory might be ready for the next workshop on research priorities. Dan replied that the inventory could not be completed that soon.

Malachi Arreak referred to Dan's participation in a research project to radio-tag char at Nettilling Lake. He questioned if radio-tagging could be successful in view of short battery life. Dan advised that the batteries now in use are guaranteed to last a full year and usually last a little longer. In a preliminary phase of the Nettilling Lake study, 18 of 21 radio-tagged char were subsequently located. It has also been learned that the fish apparently do not go to the same locations every year. Discussion ensued on the size of the radio tags being used. Dan cited his (and others') operational "rule of thumb", that such tags not exceed 5% of the fish body weight. Malachi accepted the utility of such studies, but advised that some still view tagging as harassment. Harry Flaherty supported the work.

Harry Flaherty asked if there had been progress on developing a polar bear management agreement with Greenland. Dan acknowledged that he had been assigned to this task along with Helen Klengenber; however she had since taken a new position. Dan noted that he subsequently began discussions with Ian Sterling of CWS; they are trying to find someone from Greenland to work with them on this matter.

Gordon Koshinsky asked if any of the Land Use Permit applications that were reviewed warranted the attention of the Board. Dan replied that few if any of the applications reviewed were of a crucial nature. Dan advised that he will be developing criteria to decide on which applications the NWMB should intervene.

## **6.D Finance and Administration Director's Report**

Pierre Chartrand tabled his report and invited questions.

Michael d'Eça asked if it would be useful and appropriate for the 1996/97 NWMB Annual Report to contain a "legal" section. It was agreed that staff will keep this or alternative provisions in mind when making final adjustments to the Report.

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

Michael d'Eça presented his activity report for the period March 1 – July 18.

With respect to the proposed formation of a Nunavut Marine Council, Kevin McCormick suggested that, on the face of it, there seems to be considerable potential for overlap, particularly with the mandate of the NWMB. Perhaps some less formal course of action could capture the positives while avoiding the negatives. Michael suggested that the momentum and expectations of the other IPGs on formation of a formal Council will be difficult for the NWMB to counter or ignore. Malachi Arreak explained that the Nunavut Marine Council was negotiated into the NLCA to provide a means of access to marine issues which were only just emerging or contemplated at that time, and which therefore could not realistically be negotiated explicitly into the NLCA. The Council was viewed as a kind of fall-back jurisdictional vehicle, which would be stronger than any individual IPG could hope to be on still undefined jurisdictional issues. Albeit advisory only, the Council would be better than nothing.

The Board decided that the Executive Director should advise the NPC's Legal Advisor that the NWMB will not be able to respond on the matter of formation of a Nunavut Marine Council by the requested deadline. Kevin requested that, in the meantime, Michael research and define, for NWMB consideration, the value-that-would-be-added from formation of the Council.

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

Jim Noble referred the Board to Ray Andrews' activity report for April 15 – July 15

Gordon Koshinsky asked if anyone could offer an interpretation of next-quarter item B in Ray's report. Michael d'Eça suggested that Ray might be urging the NWMB to consolidate its gains from the recent Federal Court decision on turbot allocations, by bringing the NWMB's relationship with DFO better in line with the NLCA, and (perhaps) by urging government to establish the "structure or structures" to promote coordinated management of migratory marine species as per NLCA 15.3.1. It is realistic to read "DFO" for "Government" in this Article.

## **Monday, August 11 and Tuesday, August 12**

The Board went into a Special (Joint) Meeting with representatives from Makivik Corporation, with participation also by other interested agencies.

## **Wednesday, 13 August 1997**

### **7. Member's Reports and Concerns**

#### **7.1 David Igutsaq**

David asked if any progress had been made on reviewing remuneration for conference calls. Malachi Arreak acknowledged that this issue had been referred to Executive Committee but that no decision had been made to date.

David reiterated his concern about ravens possibly contaminating the Taloyoak water supply, and repeated his request for clarification of authorization to cull. Michael d'Eça suggested that culling could not be separated from harvesting, which would make this a matter for NWMB jurisdiction under NLCA 5.6.4. Kevin McCormick suggested that dealing with a nuisance problem was indeed distinct from harvesting and repeated his earlier contention that dealing with nuisance ravens would need to be worked out with DRWED. The Board directed staff to research the matter and develop an advisory for DRWED on appropriate protocols and procedures.

David requested advice and clarification on the appropriateness of husband and wife serving together on the Board of an HTO. This has emerged as an issue in his home community.

David reminded the Board about the ongoing request from communities in his Region for more narwhal tags.

David reported on his exploratory fishing effort for turbot last winter. All the uncharted ice-covered waters examined proved to be too shallow for turbot.

#### **7.2 Malachi Arreak**

Malachi suggested that compensation to Members should be adjusted in the event of meeting at night and in other overtime situations.

From his High Arctic vantage, Malachi felt marginalized by DRWED in the current debate about rescue action for Peary caribou.

#### **7.3 Harry Flaherty**

Harry identified, by way of briefing notes to the Board, three items of ongoing concern and attention by him:

- Promotion of the International Agreement on Humane Trapping Standards
- Lobbying against US restrictions on importation of seal products
- Creation of a Canadian market for seal pelts.

## **8. New Business**

### **8.A Canadian Wildlife Service (DOE)**

#### **8.A.1 Snow Goose Population Concerns**

Kevin McCormick provided an oral update on the perceived need to reduce populations of lesser snow goose, and especially the population summering in the Central Arctic, by up to two-thirds. Management of public opinion will pose a major challenge. Key opinion-makers are (this week) being exposed to this issue, by way of an on-the-ground tour of summer habitat near Churchill, Manitoba. Kevin gave assurance that there is no intention to usurp or end-run any of the NWMB's management jurisdiction.

A similar planning exercise is underway with respect to greater snow geese in the High Arctic; a report is expected by early winter and NWMB will be consulted on the basis of that report. Malachi Arreak asked if greater snow geese in such locations as Bylot Island are actually damaging their habitat. Kevin indicated that while there is no firm evidence of such damage in the High Arctic, the goose population is trending notably upward. There is clear habitat impact along the St. Lawrence River. Michael d'Eça asked if Inuit are being consulted about potential goose management measures in the Arctic, which would eventually have to come to the NWMB for decision. Kevin replied that such consultation has not occurred since there is no real basis yet on which it could be based. Meeka Mike called for the development of plans that are more concrete than what has been communicated to date by Kevin.

David Aglukark noted that he, and his parents and grandparents before him, once lived under constant threat of prosecution with respect to harvesting geese "out of season". People often went hungry, amidst an abundance of geese. We seem to have come full circle and it will be difficult for people to make the adjustment from an attitude of full protection to an attitude of culling.

Harry Flaherty asked if the 1997 Arviat goose hunt had taken place. Kevin McCormick advised that he presumed that it had occurred or was about to, although no report has yet been received from the Arviat HTO. Kevin noted that DRWED did not come to the NWMB about this matter this year. The request went to DOE, in expectation of obtaining a Ministerial permit. Legal advice was that such a permit could not be issued. The best and simplest course in the circumstances was deemed to be for the 1997 hunt to carry on without a permit. In future, however, NWMB endorsement would greatly assist DOE in this and related endeavours

pertinent to the Migratory Birds Convention. Michael d'Eça suggested that DOE advise DRWED of the process that will be required in future.

#### **8.A.2 Cape Dorset Bird Sanctuary De-Listing Update**

Kevin McCormick reminded Members that the Board approved de-listing of this sanctuary in 1995. This recommendation has not been actioned to date. Kevin suggested that it might be useful for the Board to remind DOE of its decision.

#### **8.A.3 CESPAs Update**

Kevin McCormick explained that the new Endangered Species legislation died on the Order Paper with the recent Federal election. DOE plans to revive this legislation even though it encountered considerable resistance which was not completely erased by the numerous last-minute changes that were made.

#### **8.A.4 Migratory Birds Convention**

Kevin McCormick advised that amendments have been negotiated and agreed to by the Americans. The legislation is, or very soon will be, before the US Congress. Progress has been complicated by parallel initiatives with Mexico. Michael d'Eca stated that the amendments, once passed, would permit aboriginal people to hunt birds or take eggs anytime, but birds or eggs so taken would only be able to be offered for trade or sale within or between aboriginal communities as provided for in relevant land claims agreements. Kevin explained that amendments to the MBC will first need to be reflected in Canadian legislation before there will be any tangible benefits.

#### **8.A.5 Regulations to Ban Lead Shot**

Kevin McCormick noted that DOE has encountered considerable provincial opposition. The regulations may be delayed for another year.

### **8.B Department of Fisheries and Oceans**

#### **8.B.1 Hudson Bay/Hudson Strait Walrus Management Plan**

Johnny Peters joined the table at this point.

Robert Moshenko noted that Draft 1 of the Walrus Management Plan was distributed a year ago. Draft 2 was completed for the May NWMB meeting. The plan is being developed to accommodate all types of hunting, including sport. The aim is to have it completed, for NWMB consideration and approval, by spring. The plan at that point will actually be only a framework, to which community hunt plans can be appended as they are developed by HTOs and approved by NWMB and/or by Makivik. Community consultations will be integral to the development of the community hunt plans, which HTOs presumably and correctly interpret as the operational core of any management plan. It would be useful and appropriate to involve the RWOs in the development of the framework.

Michael d'Eça expressed concern that the protocol for developing management plans is evolving by default rather than in any consistent and orchestrated fashion. Kevin McCormick agreed that a consistent set of principles would be the minimum requirement.

Dan Pike noted that DFO had been asked to develop options for regularizing the management of walrus sport hunting. Gary Weber replied that it was the aim to make a presentation on this at the Board's November meeting. Ben Kovic urged the Department to explore the subject with the two interested RWOs at their fall meetings.

Some Members voiced specific criticisms on the form and content of the Draft 2 plan which had been tabled. Malachi Arreak suggested that Inuit organizations would be more appropriate candidates than NWMB for completing item 3. Stas Olpinski noted a fundamental lack of any Makivik perspective. Kevin McCormick pointed out that if the NWMB becomes actively involved in developing or promoting the plan it will be in conflict when it comes to approving it. It was agreed that anyone having specific concerns will forward them to DFO by October 1. DFO will reconcile any conflicting advice or concerns it receives, and will have another draft of the Walrus Management Plan for the November meeting.

### **8.B.2 Proposal for Chesterfield Inlet Char Quota Revision (Fish Bay Area)**

Gary Weber explained the nature of the request, which originated with the Aqigiq HTO in Chesterfield Inlet. The community proposes reduced quotas on some of its more distant char fisheries, and higher quotas on some of the closer ones.

Dan Pike observed that allowable harvests must ultimately be governed by considerations of resource productivity rather than harvester convenience. Results from tagging studies indicate that the char run at Saqvaqjuaq could be impacted by any substantial increase in harvest in the Fish Bay area. The Board decided to approve a modest increase, to 6000 kg annually, for the Fish Bay commercial char

quota for the next three years (**Resolution 98-028**). The Board did not approve any change to quotas for adjacent areas. Gordon Koshinsky requested that the presenters be complemented on the quality of their document.

### **8.B.3 Request for Narwhal Quota Increase, Pond Inlet**

Gary Weber explained that the Mitimatalik HTO at Pond Inlet had requested NWMB to allocate 50 additional narwhal tags to the community for 1997. The HTO proposed that the allocation take the form of a transfer of unused tags from neighbouring communities. NWMB had requested a recommendation and analysis from DFO.

Gary noted that numerous similar requests have been received in the past, and there have been some instances of narwhal quota transfers. However the Department has generally resisted the concept of quota transfers, in recognition of the possibility that the present narwhal quotas might only be sustainable due to the fact that not all communities take their full allotments every year. While the present total actual harvest probably is sustainable, transferring unused quotas would be sure to increase the total catch. The Canada-Greenland Joint Commission has urged that the total harvest not be increased. Michael d'Eça noted that the NLCA does contemplate regional TAHs, presumably to be accompanied by regional BNLs. Dan Pike advised that regional BNLs for narwhal will indeed be a product of the BNL-setting exercise now underway. However this process will not create any additional narwhal.

Malachi Arreak observed that narwhal do seem to be increasing, but so is the population of hunters. It would not be advisable to increase the total harvest without more information on productivity and better harvesting protocols. The loss of struck animals remains poorly quantified, and is a concern.

The Board decided to deny any request for a narwhal quota increase or transfer, pending the setting of BNLs and TAHs, along with development of a new and improved management system for this species. (**Resolution 98-029**)

### **8.B.4 Charr Stocking Proposal: Kugluktuk HTO**

Gary Weber explained that the Kugluktuk Angoniatit Association (HTO) is seeking approval to stock charr fingerlings in a small local lake. The fingerlings, from the original Tree River stock, are the property of the community and the GNWT and are currently housed at the Icy Waters aquaculture facility in Whitehorse. It has come to light that the proposed recipient lake is not land-locked as was initially assumed, and

on this basis the DFO-GNWT Aquaculture Review Committee has reversed its original decision to endorse the proposal.

Gordon Koshinsky asked how far the proposed lake is from the Tree River estuary. Gary estimated the distance at 90 miles, certainly close enough to ensure historical mixing of the respective gene pools. Dan Pike saw little or no risk of any kind in the venture, and wondered how anyone could have presumed that the lake was a closed system. Michael d'Eça indicated that NLCA 5.2.34(d) gave the Board authority to act in this matter. Jim Noble advised that the HTO recently became defunct financially, and would be unable to cover any costs.

The Board decided to approve the proposal (**Resolution 98-030**), subject to the following conditions:

1. That as many of the fish as possible be adipose-fin-clipped prior to release into the lake.
2. That there be no cost to the NWMB.

#### **8.B.5 Nunavut Updates**

This regular DFO contribution was received by the Board with appreciation but without comment.

#### **8.B.6 Turbot Allocation Controversies**

Brian Wong reviewed the chronology of recent events leading up to the judicial review and its aftermath to date. The Minister's reply to the NWMB letter of August 11 is being finalized. An overriding consideration now, in view of the late date, is to get the fishery opened again.

Dan Pike suggested that everyone involved should consider if there might be an alternate approach that would be more productive and less adversarial than the current one. Michael d'Eça asked if DFO recognized that in fact there had to be a change in the system of allocating turbot in Davis Strait. The NTI/NWMB argument is supported in law and by common sense, yet apparently does not prevail with DFO. Brian acknowledged that political considerations often dominate a situation such as this in the short term, but if the NWMB feels secure in its arguments it should continue to advance them. For his part, he was coming away reassured and gratified that the NWMB continued to be dedicated to the concept and principles of co-management, including with DFO

#### **8.B.7 Northern Quebec Beluga Whale Management Plan**

The Board agreed to bring this item forward into the Fisheries and Oceans Agenda from its previous position as item 8.D.1.

Dan Pike reminded the Members that DFO presented its 5-year (1996-2000) management plan for northern Quebec beluga to the NWMB for approval last February. Numerous deficiencies have been identified in the plan from the perspective of the NWMB's management authority, and the plan would impose what could be interpreted as unjustified hardship on beluga hunters at Sanikiluaq. The Department has conducted no evident meaningful consultation with that community in respect to development of this plan. Michael d'Eça observed that the present impasse underlines the need for a clear protocol for the development of management plans.

Dan advised that the focus of disagreement pertains to the extent, if any, to which Sanikiluaq hunters harvest beluga from the depleted Eastern Hudson Bay stock. The available evidence, albeit not complete, suggests (to him) that they harvest mainly and perhaps almost exclusively other whales. Officials from DFO Laurentian Region disagree, and the management plan is based on their premise.

Gilles Chantigny noted that all remaining stock identification samples from the Sanikiluaq hunt are now being analysed in Winnipeg, with completion expected by Christmas. He suggested that some fairly mild restrictions on the Sanikiluaq hunt, such as cessation of hunting during certain specified periods of the year, would probably suffice to protect the Eastern Hudson Bay stock. Johnny Peters disputed the interpretation that the Eastern Hudson Bay stock is depleted. In his view these whales have merely moved to different areas on account of noise pollution near shore and in the estuaries.

The Board agreed to respond to the Department's request for approval of the management plan by identifying the deficiencies and disagreements that prevent such approval.

### **Insert**

Local (Iqaluit) elder Celistine Erkidjuk requested and was granted permission to offer a few comments after attending most of the meeting to this point. Mr. Erkidjuk noted that:

1. When he came to Iqaluit in 1961, charr in the area were many and large. This situation did not last. Later, during his tenure as Chairman of the local HTA, the Sylvia Grinnell fishery was closed for two years. The charr got bigger.

2. Many Inuit, including even some elders, no longer know the traditional laws for conservation, e.g. that whales must be harpooned before they are shot. It is the act of harpooning, not the subsequent shooting, which constitutes the taking of the whale.

### **Wednesday, 13 August, Evening**

#### **Special Presentation on Peary Caribou: Dr. Anne Gunn**

Dr. Gunn gave an oral presentation in support of a written submission by DRWED to the Board on the status of the Peary caribou population in the western High Arctic Islands, as well as on current plans for assisted recovery. (See also Agenda item 8.C.5.)

Dr. Gunn reviewed the history of studies on this issue, up to and including the July aerial surveys funded in part by NWMB. The Department estimates there are approximately 1,100 Peary caribou left in the western High Arctic Islands, and less than 2,000 in the total High Arctic. Severe winter conditions appear to have contributed to high mortality again in 1996/97, and there was virtually no calving this year in the area surveyed.

Dr. Gunn reminded Members that in an effort to mitigate against possible extinction of the species the Department sought support from NWMB (and others) last year to capture 25 caribou from Bathurst Island and transport them to Calgary Zoo for captive breeding and (hopefully) eventual return to the High Arctic. The NWMB (and others) provided conditional funding, but poor weather prevented the capture effort from taking place.

Dr. Gunn presented the Department's most recent Peary caribou management and recovery plan, for which the approval of the Board is sought. The plan has four elements:

1. Capture 25 animals (this time from Melville Island) for transport to and captive breeding at Calgary Zoo.
2. Identify areas that would be suitable for transplants in the High Arctic, for possible interim rearing as well as future range expansions and/or re-introductions.
3. Support hunters in their efforts to stop hunting Peary caribou and to find alternate caribou meat sources and hunting opportunities.
4. Conduct an aerial survey of caribou in the eastern High Arctic Islands in 1998.

A long discussion ensued. David Aglukark was fundamentally offended by the concept of moving caribou out of the Arctic for reproduction, but recognized that it might become necessary to save the species. Malachi Arreak and other Members cited the strong migratory tendencies of caribou and suggested that a substantial number of animals may simply have relocated. Harry Flaherty reported that an influx of Peary caribou, in good condition, has recently appeared on Devon Island. David Igutsaq and other Members cited the fluctuating tendencies of caribou populations as substantiated by the long-term observations of elders who are aware that caribou cycles are synchronized with vegetation cycles. According to this view, the present Peary caribou decline may not be particularly unusual or threatening. Malachi asked if disease had been considered as a factor contributing to the present situation. Dr. Gunn replied that there are no disease incidence reports from hunters (the usual first source of such information) with respect to Peary caribou; however there has been very little recent hunting activity. It is perhaps instructive that muskox populations have also notably declined in the High Arctic without evidence of disease, suggesting common environmental factors.

Gordon Koshinsky asked about the significance of failed reproduction as an indicator of caribou habitat deterioration. Dr. Gunn replied that it was very significant: the experience has consistently been that no calves are born after a bad year. This is the second year on Bathurst Island with no calves. However if cows are able to put on enough fat in summer they will go back to having calves.

Dan Pike suggested that the underlying catastrophe may have happened 25 or 30 years ago, and that we may be looking at the inevitable last gasps of a relict population. Alternatively, if it is reasonable to interpret that High Arctic caribou have recently gone extinct in some parts of their range but not in others, perhaps this might constitute a parallel situation and ease the cause for concern. Dr. Gunn acknowledged that the winter of 1973/74 was particularly devastating for Peary caribou, but was not prepared to accept the broader argument(s).

Malachi Arreak proposed that the existence of Peary caribou in the High Arctic indicates that they have evolved to survive in very unique habitat conditions quite unlike those in southern Alberta. He suggested that Peary caribou would be unable to adapt to conditions in Calgary, and even if they did, might be "spoiled" as far as being suitable for transfer back. Meeka Mike noted that captive caribou she had seen (at Peterborough Zoo) had lost most of their hair and appeared far from normal. Dr. Gunn suggested it was equally possible that Peary caribou is a particularly resilient species that tolerates High Arctic conditions and hence one that might also adapt very well, in the absence of competition and predation, to conditions elsewhere. While Peary caribou have apparently never been held in captivity, other Arctic caribou have, successfully. None have ever been returned to the Arctic, but all were allowed to habituate to people. This would be carefully avoided at Calgary. Behaviour, such as to avoid predation, would be expected to remain inherent through many caribou generations.

David Igutsaq noted that on the warmest days Arctic caribou tend to stand on residual snow or seek out cool streams. He wondered how Peary caribou could possibly survive Calgary temperatures. Dr. Gunn referred to their probable resilience, and advised that shade and flowing water will be available.

Malachi Arreak and Harry Flaherty stated that a High Arctic refugium would be far more palatable, and probably more successful, than a transfer to Calgary. Dan Pike asked if this was out of the question for 1997. Dr. Gunn replied that the more cautionary approach was considered to be to make use of the very large body of expertise at the Calgary Zoo. A facility in the Arctic would surely be very expensive to build and operate, but consideration would be given to moving some of the captive animals back to such a facility in the Arctic quite soon.

Meeka Mike asked if the intention was to ensure that intact groups of animals would be transferred, complete with leaders. Dr. Gunn replied that it was considered more important to leave the group leaders in the field, to assist survival of the residual animals. Group leadership should not be so important an issue in the protected confines of Calgary Zoo.

Kevin McCormick noted that the Department had earlier identified a population estimate of 400 animals as the threshold for mounting a captive-breeding program. He asked why the threshold concept had apparently been abandoned in the light of a current population estimate somewhat higher than 400. Dr. Gunn replied that more recent thinking was that at the low population levels which prevail, the rate of decline is more important than any artificial threshold as a trigger for action. She interpreted the rate of decline as very alarming.

Malachi Arreak asked about the significance of 25 animals as the target number for transfer. Dr. Gunn explained that a rule of thumb in genetic science is that 20 unrelated animals will account for 75% of the variation that defines the species. This is a common target for such ventures. The extra five animals would be just for insurance.

A big concern voiced by several Members with the captive-breeding proposal is the possibility of transmitting disease. Dr. Gunn advised that extreme precautions have been carefully planned.

Dan Pike questioned the philosophy of the proposed project: was it considered to be a last resort or a form of insurance against a last resort? Dr. Gunn suggested that it was impossible to place a precise line between the two. She suggested that when such rescue operations failed in the past the most common reason was that people waited too long. Habitat conditions this coming winter can only be discussed in terms of very imprecise probabilities.

Kevin McCormick asked what criteria would trigger re-introductions. Dr. Gunn was unwilling to speculate about such criteria at this stage of planning. Gordon Koshinsky noted that other captive-breeding programs, for purposes of re-introduction, have generally stemmed from decline of the species through such tangibles as over-hunting or habitat destruction. In the present case, which presumably stems from a more insidious form of habitat degradation, it would be very difficult if not impossible to determine if/when the habitat had recovered. If climate change is at the root of the problem, as seems likely, it is also very difficult to imagine that the problem will be rectified within any reasonable time frame. In most situations the ecological matrix would be too complex to have much hope of recovery from such a broad-based insult. The High Arctic ecosystem may be simple enough to give hope that this could happen, and thus would be a uniquely useful situation for experimentation. At minimum, the project would provide opportunity to observe Peary caribou under new conditions and thereby learn more about their adaptive make up.

Michael d'Eça enquired about ownership of the transported animals. Dr. Gunn replied that the hope was to set up a partnership agreement between the zoo, the Resolute HTO, and the GNWT, to run initially to 1999. It had not been planned to make reference to ownership in the agreement.

Michael d'Eça indicated that the transfer would be a harvest that would need to be explicitly decided by the NWMB under the NLCA. Stephen Atkinson challenged the basic interpretation, since the aim would be to take the animals back. Michael was not persuaded, since animals would be captured.

Ben Kovic asked who was expected to pay the costs of the project. Dr. Gunn replied that the Department will cover the costs of the capture. It is hoped to develop partnerships with NGOs to cover incremental operating costs at Calgary, estimated at about \$25,000 per year. The Arctic islands will continue to be monitored as part of the Department's ongoing program, with assistance anticipated from NWMB and other agencies for such high-cost components as periodic aerial surveys.

### **Thursday, 14 August 1997**

#### **8. New Business, continued**

#### **8.C Department of Resources, Wildlife and Economic Development**

#### **8.C.1 Polar Bear Management Agreements**

Stephen Atkinson advised that the Western Hudson Bay MOU is the most recent of these Management Agreements to be completed, with two yet remaining. In accordance with previous procedures, the Agreement requires the approval of the NWMB before the regulatory changes can be enacted or given effect. An important

unique element of this Agreement is that it makes provision (albeit unlikely to be exercised) by another jurisdiction: Manitoba.

Michael d'Eça acknowledged that these MOUs have emerged as a generally satisfactory procedure, but noted a few minor technical errors in the current document. Michael also reminded the Board that the procedure was developed in considerable haste in an effort to satisfy an American demand for evidence of effective management. It might be prudent now to revisit the whole protocol, especially since it is starting to be used as a model for other initiatives such as a polar bear co-management agreement with Greenland. Dan Pike referred to articles in the Agreement(s) which call on NWMB to do certain things, not all of which may still be appropriate, relevant or feasible. Stephen offered that the HTOs and individual hunters are becoming more and more favourable to these Agreements, and further that the American administrators of polar bear import regulations are starting to be favourably influenced by them as well.

The Board decided to approve the Western Hudson Bay Polar Bear Management MOU, with certain minor wording changes to be communicated by staff. **(Resolution 98-031)** Staff were also directed to revisit the protocol as set out in these MOUs and report back to the Board for any recommended actions.

### **8.C.2 Polar Bear Quota Changes for 1997/98**

Stephen Atkinson advised that the first season under the flexible quota system of polar bear management was finished last spring. To complete the process of implementation it will be necessary to reduce 1997/98 quotas for those communities that exceeded their 1996/97 quotas or reported excess females in their kill ratio, combined with having inadequate access to offsetting credits. In the final analysis no population (except Kane Basin) was harvested beyond the sustainable yield level, although some communities did over-harvest females.

According to the formulas that are incorporated in the MOUs, reduced quotas are in store for several communities for 1997/98. In the case of the Kane Basin population (Grise Fiord) the Department is recommending departure from the MOU to the point of nil harvest next year, on account of a serious over-hunting situation perpetrated by Greenland. Communities have been informed of the results and calculations, and there have been no negative responses to date. The Department does not claim to have consulted intensively, certainly not to the point of having the concurrence of the actual hunters. However the MOUs would lose much of their relevance if the formulas were not implemented, and in that case efforts to increase the export of polar bear trophies into the United States could be seriously undermined.

The Board agreed to assign staff to review this matter, including the calculations, and to prepare a detailed recommendation for the Board by early September. Ben

Kovic undertook to contact some of the key or most-affected communities to obtain local reactions. Gordon Koshinsky cautioned Ben to avoid giving the impression that the Board was assuming a formal consultative or advocacy role in the matter. It must remain the responsibility of the proponent agencies to conduct the formal consultations in specific management issues and to provide assurance of having done so to the Board. To that end, the Board urged further directed consultative effort by the Department in this matter.

### **8.C.3 Aquaculture Development Proposal, Arctic Charr: Suvaq Inc.**

Gary Weber introduced Tim Fleming, President of Icy Waters International Inc. Mr. Fleming introduced company Chairman Paul Motz, along with his son Cameron Fleming.

Mr. Fleming announced that Suvaq has been incorporated with the intention of enlarging it into a partnership made up of Icy Waters, the University of Guelph, and various Inuit groups, for the purposes of developing a superior hybrid strain of arctic charr, culturing and maintaining a brood stock from that strain, and exclusively marketing the progeny as sterile eggs in the aquaculture trade. Opinions were cited that arctic charr is probably the best freshwater fish for cold-water aquaculture, and further that the Canadian gene pool of arctic charr contains many uniquely superior attributes.

A unique aspect of the proposal is the offer of a defined equity position in the new company for communities (HTOs) that agree to provide a small amount of charr genetic material, to be derived from six fish per local population. It is envisaged that material for cross-breeding will include (possibly among others) the Nauyuk Lake stock (now owned by Icy Waters), the Tree River strain (now owned by the Kugluktuk Angoniati Association), fish from the Holman region in the Inuvialuit Settlement Area, and, it is hoped, fish from at least three locations in the NSA. The donor communities will retain individual ownership of the original pure stocks, but Suvaq Inc. will own the hybrid stock.

The Holman HTC, the Resolute HTO, and the Kugluktuk Angioniatit Association have given their approval and support and the relevant government agencies have provided their endorsements. Guelph University has received NSERC funding for development of the hybrid strain and for adaptation of a triploidizing process to enhance the growth performance of the fish.

David Aglukark declared that he was solidly opposed to the farming of arctic charr. His perception is that competition from cultured charr will, and indeed already did, severely impact the indigenous charr fisheries. Mr. Fleming acknowledged that this is a common perception, but expounded the view that the wild-caught charr fisheries can only benefit from increased exposure to the species among the consuming

public. The wild-fish volume on its own is too small to support the aggressive marketing required for such a specialty product.

Kevin McCormick asked if it was planned to market fingerlings as well as eggs. Mr. Fleming replied that for culture purposes only eggs would be marketed, and that the eggs would be shocked (sterilized) prior to sale to ensure that the progeny would be infertile.

Gordon Koshinsky asked if any genetic transformation was planned. Mr. Fleming replied that only crossing and selection were planned, to pursue hybrid vigour and to enhance environmental tolerances. The proponents expect that the research will have collateral benefits for the management of wild stocks as well.

The Board discussed the proposal further following the departure of the proponents. Philosophical opposition and concerns for impact on wild-stock fisheries were reiterated. Not all Members were comfortable with this, due to the fact that some communities had already registered support. It was suggested that the proposal might be interpreted as an opening offer, and that it might be possible to negotiate better or more secure terms, perhaps including linkages to related matters of concern such as marketing of wild-caught charr.

The Board decided that it could not support the proposal at this time, but was prepared to entertain another submission after additional consultations by the proponent with Inuit, and with further information and clarification especially in regard to the business aspects of the proposed venture and possible linkages to related matters. The Board decided to alert NTI to the initiative, since the safeguarding of Inuit interests could be an issue. **(Resolution 98-032)**

#### **8.C.4 Qamanirjuaq Caribou: Request for Commercial Quota Increase**

Stephen Atkinson advised that Arviat HTO has requested an increase of 150 animals (to 220 total) in their commercial caribou quota. The community harvests from the abundant Qamanirjuaq herd, and the increase will help optimize the operation of their new meat processing facility. The Beverly/Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board has requested that all caribou harvesting in the Keewatin be monitored, and the Department is now doing this.

Dan Pike agreed that there is probably no reason for concern in terms of sustainability and conservation, but observed that the material presented did not provide an adequate basis for forming an opinion. Consequently he had no recommendation. Gordon Koshinsky urged that the advice of the B/Q Board be sought in the matter.

The Board decided, in the interests of expediency, to approve the request, subject to obtaining a statement of concurrence from the Beverly/Qamanirjuac Caribou Management Board. **(Resolution 98-033)**

### **8.C.5 Projects Funded by the NWMB Research Trust Fund: Progress**

Stephen Atkinson tabled progress reports on current DRWED projects being funded by the NWMB Research trust. Of these, only the Peary caribou survey was discussed; highlights (below) for the other projects are from the briefing material

#### **8.C.5.1 Peary Caribou Aerial Survey, and Recovery Proposal**

Stephen referred to the survey just completed of caribou in the western High Arctic Islands. As noted by Dr. Gunn yesterday, the survey was successful but few caribou were found.

Discussion resumed on the proposal elaborated yesterday evening by Dr. Anne Gunn, to capture 25 Peary caribou on Melville Island and transport them to Calgary Zoo for captive breeding. Discussion focussed on consultations, and on the advice and opinions of Inuit.

Ben Kovic noted that the HTOs of Grise Fiord and Resolute both have stated that they are opposed to the proposal, and the Inuvialuit Game Council has also declared its opposition. Malachi Arreak recognized the legitimate interest of the Inuvialuit since the west half of Melville Island is encompassed by their Land Claim. This undoubtedly forms part of the habitat of the caribou population from which it is proposed to take the animals for the project. Stephen Atkinson acknowledged these negative positions, but attributed them largely to the inadequate opportunity for in-depth liaison and consultation since the July aerial survey was completed. Resolute HTO, for example, participated in the survey and was apprised of the results but has not had real opportunity to digest the implications or to consider options.

Harry Flaherty stated that he was not unalterably opposed to the project, but could not support it at this time in the face of such unanimous Inuit opposition. He was also concerned that not enough thought had been given to the socio-economic aspects. Ben Kovic suggested that a population estimate for the eastern High Arctic islands would be very useful for formulating a decision. Most members shared these or related concerns. Malachi Arreak suggested that the matter might be an appropriate subject for Public Hearings. Kevin McCormick stressed that the Department should be urged to develop and provide a lot more planning documentation. Gordon Koshinsky suggested the proposal be returned to the Department for clarification of identified items, and especially for directed consultation with those agencies that

have registered opposition. This was the decision of the Board. **(Resolution 98-034)**

#### **8.C.5.2 Wolverine Ecology, Distribution and Productivity, Slave GP**

Work is progressing, but has been hampered by loss and turnover of staff.

#### **8.C.5.3 Caribou Population Ecology, Southampton Island**

An aerial survey in June estimated about 29,000 animals, excluding calves. The population is apparently still increasing.

#### **8.C.5.4 Polar Bear Population Inventory, High Arctic**

Problems with low numbers of polar bears are emerging in the Grise Fiord area.

#### **8.C.5.5 Bluenose Caribou, Seasonal Range Use and Herd Definition**

Work is progressing as planned.

#### **8.C.6 Other DRWED Updates**

Stephen tabled the outline of a process that the Department plans to adopt to identify and prioritize research projects to address knowledge gaps that hamper wildlife management.

### **8.D Nunavut Wildlife Management Board**

#### **8.D.1 Eastern Hudson Bay Beluga Management Plan**

For treatment of this subject, see Agenda item 8.B.7.

#### **8.D.2 Establishment of Qualifications for Guides**

Jim Noble noted the discretionary role of the NWMB under NLCA 5.2.34(h) to establish qualifications for Inuk guides to accompany sport harvesters, and the common public anticipation that this will be done. Complaints are starting to be received about guiding services, with reference being made to the role of NWMB.

Michael d'Eça advised that he has not yet been able to complete his review of the matter as was earlier assigned. He noted that this is a matter for NWMB decision, for review by the Minister pursuant to Part 3 Article 5 of the NLCA. The final decision would be legally binding.

The Board decided to hire a consultant to develop a set of qualifications for guides, to be cognizant of any legal imperatives to be communicated by Michael. **(Resolution 98-035)**

### **8.D.3 Walrus Sport Hunting Proposal: Hall Beach HTA**

Dan Pike advised that Hall Beach HTA has submitted a late application for approval to sport-hunt three walrus. Hunters are booked. There is no walrus quota for Hall Beach, so harvest control would have to be on the same basis as at Igloolik, i.e. assignment from the four-per-hunter subsistence allotments. The Hall Beach application further highlights the need for a more formal walrus management process. The timing now is such that it may be difficult for DFO to make the necessary preparations to monitor the hunts. This may be an important consideration since these would be the first such hunts at this community.

The Board decided to approve the Hall Beach application, with DFO being requested to monitor the hunt. **(Resolution 98-036)**

### **8.D.4 Operating Relationship with DFO**

Gordon Koshinsky reviewed progress on developing a paper setting out the framework of the NWMB-DFO operating relationship. Michael d'Eça commented extensively on the first draft, which should now be revisited in light of developments with respect to turbot allocations.

Ben Kovic requested guidance for participation or membership by the Board in such DFO-oriented organizations as the Federal-Provincial Atlantic Committee of Deputy Ministers of Fisheries and/or its working groups. Kevin McCormick urged caution in accepting indiscriminant appointments that might not be consistent with the Board's mandate. Dan Pike observed that the NLCA has provision for the Board to enjoy a wide range of appointments but cautioned lest the Board be co-opted into an advisory capacity where it already has decision-making powers. Michael d'Eça viewed this as an item for consideration in the overall context of NWMB/DFO. Gordon Koshinsky reminded Members that Sandy Lewis developed a pertinent analysis for the Board two years ago that could still serve as an interim guide in conjunction with the opinions of the Board's Fisheries Advisor.

Michael and Gordon agreed to prepare another draft of the NWMB-DFO operating relationship document for the next Board meeting.

#### **8.D.5 Arctic Wolf Status Report for COSEWIC**

Dan Pike and Stephen Atkinson tabled information setting out that:

- A draft status report to COSEWIC last fall proposed that the arctic wolf should be listed as “threatened”.

- NWMB (Dan Pike) responded that the information did not support this designation.

- COSEWIC has agreed to defer its decision until April 1998.

- All agencies concerned have been advised and presumably acknowledge that NWMB will have the final say in designation.

- The Nunavut Harvest Study will be asked to provide information.

The Board deferred further discussion on this topic.

#### **8.D.6 Thelon Wildlife Sanctuary Management Plan**

Dan Pike referred to a request from the Akiling Planning Committee for NWMB endorsement of the Committee’s Plan by September 15. Under the terms of the NLCA, the Plan must be submitted to the Minister of DIAND by July 1998.

The Board concluded that it was impossible to meet the present deadline for response. It was decided to so advise the Committee, and to assign staff to develop a response for consideration by the Board in November.

#### **8.E Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated**

Ben Kovic introduced David Mablick as the new Manager of Wildlife/Environment for NTI, replacing Helen Klengenber.

#### **8.F NWMB-Funded Items: Proposals**

##### **8.F.1 Research Items (Non-Trust Fund)**

Dan Pike noted that four new proposals for NWMB research funding have been received, in addition to the three funded previously. Only three of the new proposals contained the required information to permit evaluation.

#### **8.F.1.a Northeast Mainland Caribou Study Proposal (KWF)**

Dan reminded the Board that a similar proposal was considered previously and was turned back with three concerns identified. The proposal stems from reduced numbers of caribou in aerial surveys and some reports of animals in poor condition with disease. The new proposal does not address the Board's fundamental skepticism as previously stated about the relevance of disease incidence to perceived population decline. In response to a second concern, some DRWED funding has now been identified. The applicant responded to the Board's suggestion that more emphasis be placed on traditional knowledge by enlarging that aspect, but with very little explanation.

Dan suggested that the TEK component remains potentially the most useful: to explore whether the animals have perhaps simply moved; if there is a history of localized declines; if the incidence of disease has recently changed; etc. The Board decided to fund the TEK component of the study only, in the amount of \$14,000, and on condition that the methodology be better explained. **(Resolution 98-037)**

#### **8.F.1.b Sylvia Grinnell Fishing Strategy Dev'tment Proposal (Amarok HTA)**

Dan reminded the Board that the formerly spectacular Sylvia Grinnell River charr stock has been severely depleted for about 30 years, and that management efforts have generally failed because they lacked widespread support in Iqaluit. The proposal is to document public opinion through TEK and other surveys, build a consensus on goals and actions, and develop a plan for implementation. The proponents are seeking \$71,700 from the NWMB, but the budget is difficult to assess and seems excessive. The Iqaluit Sewage Overflow Fund has also been approached.

Gordon Koshinsky supported the project in principle but could not justify some of the proposed expenditures, particularly with respect to staffing. The project could benefit from the administrative participation of a sponsoring agency such as the RWO, a government department, or even the NWMB. Harry Flaherty urged the active participation of DFO. David Aglukark expressed concern that the RWO seems to have been bypassed altogether.

The Board decided to support the proposal up to an amount of \$30,000, on condition that the project be rationalized with respect to its methodology and budget, and that there be other funding contributors. **(Resolution 98-038)**

#### **8.F.1.c South Baffin Scallop Survey Proposal (QWB and Others)**

Dan advised that QWB, QC, and two of the regional HTOs have applied for \$60,000 NWMB funding towards an exploratory fishery for Iceland scallops in Hudson Strait

and Frobisher Bay. The aim is to charter a sophisticated vessel with the most modern fishing and navigational capabilities to conduct the study. The total budget for the project is \$245,000, and the status of concurrent applications to government funding agencies is not known.

Dan suggested that based on previous reconnaissance work in the eastern Arctic, the project is quite likely to find attractive scallop concentrations. However none of the previous finds have proven economic to fish. It is not known if the proponents have any novel processing or marketing strategies in mind.

Ben Kovic noted that the proposal was received very late in its own planning schedule, with a vessel departure date of August 15 (tomorrow) indicated. It is uncertain if the project could proceed even if funding was now approved. Gordon Koshinsky noted the magnitude of the project and costs, and suggested that NWMB in the past has avoided funding large developmental projects. Michael d'Eça indicated that the Board's mandate is clear only to the extent that it has full discretion to decide whether or not to participate. The consensus was that the Board will not provide funding for this project, and in general will not fund developmental work except on much smaller scales or in relation to improving existing local ventures. **(Resolution 98-039)**

## **8.F.2 Donation Request: World Council of Whalers**

Dan Pike reminded Members that the Board recently supported a funding request by this new organization to DIAND. That request was evidently denied, and other funding sources have not materialized as was hoped. The Council is now seeking funds from NWMB and other "fall-back" organizations in an urgent effort to remain operational past its startup period.

Meeka Mike noted that the Board's policy on donations is to give preference to residents of Nunavut and to activities which take place in the NSA. The Board decided not to fund the request. **(Resolution 98-040)**

## **8.G Other New Business**

### **8.G.1 Regional (RWO) Report: Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board (QWB)**

In the absence of QWB Chairman Joannie Ikkidluak, Timut Qamukaq and Joanasie Akumalik highlighted the contents of the QWB briefing note.

Joanasie advised that a Project Manager Trainee was recently hired for the purpose of managing QWB projects and coaching the HTOs. This position will be partially funded by DRWED. QWB is concerned about the meaning of NLCA 5.7.13 and would like the NWMB to provide a clear and precise interpretation of the concept of

“adequate funding” in this context. Concern was expressed that RT and Associates had not adequately consulted the QWB during development of the NWMB Communication Strategy.

Ben Kovic thanked Joanasie for a thorough and useful presentation.

### **8.G.2 World Wildlife Fund Presentation**

Ben Kovic introduced Monte Hummel, President of World Wildlife Fund Canada. Mr. Hummel introduced Arlin Hackman, Director Endangered Spaces Program, and Dr. Pete Ewins, Director Endangered Species Program.

Mr. Hummel outlined the nature of the organization, its mission and principles, and the history of its work in the Canadian Arctic. He stressed that WWF is *not* an animal rights group, but a group that strives to ensure that “the use of renewable resources is sustainable for the benefit of all life on earth.” The organization is keen to explore how it can help the NWMB in its work to achieve this and other common ends.

Mr. Hummel stated that WWF Canada aims to appoint a Director for the Eastern Arctic area and also to contract a local resident representative for each of the two Arctic regions. He invited the NWMB to suggest candidates for these positions. He proposed that NWMB and WWF seek ways to develop some joint initiatives in line with common goals. He specifically proposed joint efforts to:

- Accelerate designation of the Igalirtuuq National Wildlife Area, and to develop a long-term conservation, monitoring and harvesting strategy for the eastern Arctic bowhead whales.
- Re-establish markets for seal products and fur, in the context of sustainable use.
- Develop a systematic approach to identify and designate protected areas.

Dan Pike suggested that a significant way for WWF to assist NWMB is to inform and influence public opinion. Kevin McCormick detected a strong convergence of interest around bowhead whales, and suggested that resources might be pooled for a concerted research and educational effort. Michael d’Eça suggested that the two organizations might work together in helping to shape emerging federal legislation such as CESP.A.

### **8.G.3 Suvaaq Incorporated: Arctic Charr Aquaculture Proposal**

See Agenda item 8.C.3 for treatment of this subject.

#### **8.G.4 ICC Presentation: Biological Diversity**

Ben Kovic introduced Ms. Violet Ford, Environmental Coordinator for the Canada Office of the Inuit Circumpolar Conference.

Ms. Ford noted that the Convention on Biological Diversity came into force in 1993. Article 8(j) acknowledges the special role that indigenous peoples have in the sustainable use of biological diversity through their traditional practices and knowledge. The Convention, as per this Article, is accordingly of emerging interest to the ICC and presumably to agencies such as the NWMB. The Article is “exceptionally progressive” and has shifted the concern from one of achieving recognition for indigenous peoples in this initiative, to how they will be accommodated and how their knowledge will be used.

Ms. Ford referred to a forthcoming workshop (in Spain, in November) to begin the process of implementing Article 8(J). The workshop will be looking to Canada for leadership and guidance. Canadian preparations, including development of case studies, are scheduled to come together at a Working Group session in October. NWMB participation is invited for all stages and aspects. Dan Pike urged ICC to be sure to approach NTI on this matter also.

Ms. Ford advised that ICC has applied to Indigenous Survival International (Indigenous Knowledge Program) for funds to document traditional hunting techniques for marine mammals in the circumpolar Arctic. NWMB involvement in this study, if approved, would clearly be an asset.

#### **Friday, 15 August 1997**

### **9. Old Business**

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

Dan Pike introduced Johnny McPherson, who has assumed the position of Harvest Study Coordinator with the Board.

Johnny reported quickly recognizing serious gaps in the Harvest Study database and deficiencies in how data were being handled. Most of the problems have now been corrected and several improvements have been made.

Many of these pertain to the enormous logistics of accounting for over 5000 registered hunters on a monthly basis. There have already been numerous requests for data. For the most part these requests are being deferred until the database is fully up-to-date and reviewed by the communities. A big problem with the Study has

been the high turnover of Field Workers; efforts are being made to improve their working environment. For some communities it may be necessary to extend the Study in order to meet the 5-year collection requirement. According to current projections, the long-term funding allotment will be adequate.

Discussion ensued on some of the mechanics of the Harvest Study. Ben Kovic wondered why non-Inuit hunters were not being interviewed. Johnny replied that the central purpose of the Study as per the NLCA is to develop a basis for establishing basic needs levels as may be required in future, and this was a concern exclusively of Inuit. If non-Inuit hunters were interviewed the Study design would need to be made more complicated in order to keep their data separate. This is not to say that the harvests of non-Inuit are of no interest for management; however the bulk of non-Inuit harvests are recorded through other avenues. Malachi Arreak wondered why struck-and-lost data were not being collected since they would be invaluable for future stock management. Johnny replied that given the need to design the Study to accommodate its central purpose, the results would only be marginally useful for such secondary purposes as setting allowable harvest levels. This is not to say that it would not be desirable to have this information; however struck-and-lost data have proven notoriously difficult to collect and interpret even from dedicated studies.

Gordon Koshinsky expressed relief and appreciation for the dynamic way that Johnny had taken up the duties of the position. Gordon asked if there was anything in particular that the Board could do to facilitate the Harvest Study. Johnny suggested that the Board could help more by establishing an oversight committee, similar to the one that oversees the Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study. Gordon agreed that it was necessary for the Board to take a greater ownership interest in the Harvest Study, commensurate with the cost of the Study and with the importance of the results to the Board upon completion. Gordon considered it essential that the overall Board Membership come to a better understanding of what the Study is and what it is not, and how its results will and will not be used. The immediate and necessary application of such understanding would be to enable accurate and constructive promotion of the Study by Board Members in the field.

David Aglukark wondered why the Steering Committee for the Harvest Study is not fulfilling the role being identified. Gordon suggested that the Harvest Study Steering Committee, with one Board Member on it, fulfilled its function during Study design. While it might continue to have some periodic role in providing technical advice if the Study design needs to be changed, the Steering Committee could never be construed as leading the Study.

The Steering Committee is in fact analogous to the Planning Group that was originally established by the IBKS Committee to design and approve the questionnaire and methodology for the Inuit Bowhead Knowledge Study. That Planning Group ceased to function once its design mandate was completed. The continuing nominal existence of the Harvest Study Steering Committee seems to have had the perverse effect of isolating the Board from the Harvest Study.

Kevin McCormick suggested, and the Board agreed, that Gordon and Jim develop a proposal for how the Board can more actively and effectively assist the Harvest Study.

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

Keith Hay advised that data collection and community interactions have now been completed. Target date for the final report is 31 March 1998. In accordance with the suggestions of many of the HTOs and in conjunction with DFO, Keith has started to develop a research plan for estimating the number and relative size/sex composition of bowhead whales inhabiting Nunavut waters.

### **9.C Communications Strategy: Review**

Ben Kovic gave the floor to Mr. Robert Trudeau of RT and Associates. Mr. Trudeau acknowledged the participation in the project by Rebecca Mike, now an NWMB employee, and referred to her presence with him here today.

Mr. Trudeau declared that communication is too important for a new and active organization such as NWMB to leave unmanaged or subject to the initiative of others. If an organization is favourably and aggressively reflected in its early communications, other agencies will be more inclined to interpret and take it seriously. Networks built now will serve as pipelines later.

Mr. Trudeau referred to his report, which was submitted to the Board in April. He acknowledged that he/they did not obtain input from as many HTOs as would have been desirable, and did not interview any of the staff reporting to Jim. He then conducted a brief review of the key findings and recommendations, and suggested that the greatest need in the present introductory period was a comprehensive series of community workshops. Such workshops need to be very well organized, with use of all available communication aids, and with incentives for attendance. Radio is extremely cost-beneficial for disseminating crisp messages anytime.

The Board referred the Communications Strategy report to Executive Committee for review and development of recommendations for implementation.

### **9.D Traditional Knowledge Study: Southeast Baffin Beluga**

Keith Hay stated that the field work is completed and the report exists in first draft. Dan Pike brought the attention of the Board to a brochure that was recently completed on the Southeast Baffin Beluga Co-Management Plan.

## **9.E NWMB Bylaws: Review**

The Board deferred consideration of this matter.

## **9.F Effects of Polar Bear Research Methods**

Dan Pike reminded the Board that this item stemmed from a Resolution of the Qikiqtaani Inuit Association over a year ago, raising concern about the use of immobilizing drugs. The Board made certain requests and enquiries pursuant to that Resolution, and Dan gave an update on subsequent and pending responses by government agencies. The question remains whether an independent review is required.

Gordon Koshinsky suggested that an independent review is unlikely to provide anything better than DOE and DRWED researchers will ultimately deliver, and in any event a review was initially conceived as a possible response to, rather than as an alternative for, an assessment by government agencies.

The Board decided not to contract for an independent assessment at this time, but rather to clarify reporting expectations with DOE and DRWED and to encourage early report delivery.

## **9.G Narwhal Management**

Discussion followed from the earlier treatment of Agenda item 8.B.3. Dan Pike also referred Members to the briefing material that he had prepared on this subject, including a present-situation summary prepared by DFO staff. Dan expressed confidence that adequate information exists to improve the present system of management.

The Board agreed that work should be initiated with DFO to draft a reformed management system for narwhal, to take account of new and emerging realities such as requests for quota increases and transfers. The Board committed up to \$17,000 to support the establishment and initial deliberations of a working group. **(Resolution 98-041)**

## **9.H Auyuittuq National Park Reserve: Ecosystem Conservation Plan**

Yves Bosse provided an overview of the content and status of the "Ecosystem Conservation Plan" for Auyuittuq National Park Reserve. Yves noted that this Plan (and others like it that will soon be forthcoming) require the approval of the NWMB.

Approval has been hung up at the RWO level for over a year for apparently minor reasons, and Parks Canada is looking for ways to streamline the approval process. Fifteen concerns have been identified and ranked, with respect to having this initiative approved. Approval of the Plan will significantly increase access to funding.

Dan Pike noted that the Plan is very general, merely stating that Parks Canada will have to work with the NWMB when implementation of the Plan has implications for wildlife management. In that context, the Plan should not require specific RWO approval. Michael d'Eça suggested that some of the wording conveys impressions not fully consistent with the NLCA; the necessary changes could easily be made. Malachi Arreak requested that all such Plans be designated "interim" until an IIBA is completed.

Gordon Koshinsky suggested that the NWMB write to the HTOs (Broughton Island and Pangnirtung) and to the RWO, indicating:

- That the NWMB is working with Parks Canada to finalize the wording of the Plan with respect to concerns which have been identified, and also:

- That on the understanding that the HTOs already endorse the Plan, the NWMB intends to approve it unless concrete objections are forthcoming.

The Board adopted this course of action, along with Ben Kovic's suggestion that the RWO and HTOs be given one month to respond.

## **9.I DEW Line Site Cleanup: Pelly Bay and Resolution Island**

Dan Pike reminded the Board that he had been directed to obtain a progress report on these cleanup initiatives. Dan referred to an update received some time ago from DIAND via the Nunavut Planning Commission. The update merely affirms that pre-cleanup work is proceeding on schedule.

## **9.J Establishing Basic Needs Levels for Beluga, Narwhal and Walrus**

Dan Pike provided an update on this ongoing subject. He noted that the NIP has not yet responded to the Board's most recent request for a time extension.

Dan indicated that the alternative approach adopted by the Board in January for making these determinations seems to be gaining acceptance. The Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board has not yet given its endorsement, and individual HTOs are slow in responding to draft calculations for their communities.

Dan recommended, and the Board agreed, to stay on the present course, with stepped-up consultations in the Baffin Region.

Michael d'Eça suggested that the NWMB should consider whether to make the total allowable harvests of the stocks in question equal to their basic needs levels. If the total allowable harvests end up being higher than the basic needs levels, then a surplus will automatically be created and the NWMB will have to allocate that surplus according to the terms of the NLCA.

### **9.K Davis Strait Turbot Allocations: Court Decision and Aftermath**

Michael d'Eça led an overview of events to date. In his estimation the decision of the Federal Court gives the NWMB a strong status and standing in the matter, but there are no real indications yet that DFO has come to share that view. It now appears that DFO will likely:

- Appeal the decision of the Federal Court, and
- Revert to the 1996 allocations.

Throughout the exercise NWMB has maintained a consistent attitude of fairness and coherence; it will be useful to maintain that presentation and posture.

Gordon Koshinsky stressed that in its responses and negotiations the Board must always be careful not to demand more with respect to immediate licences and quotas than can be accommodated or utilized. Jim Noble gave assurance that this was consistently considered. Ben Kovic advised of contact made by Labrador officials, supporting the NWMB in its actions and requesting that the Labrador situation be taken into account so as not to delay or compromise their fishery. Surprise and concern were expressed about the reluctance or inability of DFO to adopt a planning time frame longer than one season for resolving the allocation issue. It was noted that Groundfish Management Plans are developed for only one year at a time.

Michael noted that if DFO reverts to the 1996 allocations, consideration would need to be given to whether another judicial review should be sought. Kevin McCormick suggested that the NWMB profile could shift in that event. Michael agreed that the Board's interest in the matter could become more central, depending upon the Minister's reply to the Board. In such a situation it might be appropriate for the Board to intervene directly. Kevin wondered if a case could be made for setting aside or at least augmenting the legal approach by appealing to the media. Malachi Arreak favoured taking a more aggressive stance with the Department.

### **9.L Planning for the 1998 Bowhead Hunt**

The Board deferred discussion on this subject.

## **10. Other Business**

## **10.A Upcoming Meetings and Events**

Jim Noble led the Board through the listing that was tabulated as at August 13. The following amendments and additions were decided:

- NAFO, 1-6 September: Will try to attend; representation to be decided
- Marine Institute, 3-5 September: Decision pending NAFO participation
- NIP, 10-11 September: Ben and Pierre to attend
- CIAJ, 10-12 September: Md'E to investigate further; attend if appropriate
- NAFO, 15-19 September: Ben and Ray to attend
- AHT, 23-25 September: HF to attend
- NTI, 27-30 October: BK or alternate to attend
- NAMMCO, 25-27 November: DP to attend if available.

## **10.B Meeting Reports and Briefing Notes**

Jim Noble referred the Members to the notes in the briefing material. The following matters drew further elaboration or comment:

### **10.B.1 Pauktuutit Workshop on Inuit Women's Harvesting Rights**

Meeka Mike attended, and reported a good discussion. Michael d'Eça advised that he assisted NTI draft two forms for declaring harvesting right assignments; these will be coming to the NWMB for review.

### **10.B.5 B/Q Caribou Management Board Meeting, Wollaston Lake**

Gordon Koshinsky advised that the B/Q Board has taken notice that the Federal Government plans to withdraw from the B/Q Caribou Management Agreement under which the Board is constituted in 1999, and the B/Q Board is recommending that the incoming Nunavut Government sign on by that time.

David Aglukark emphasized the importance of solid joint management among the different groups of people who share these caribou stocks.

### **10.B.6 KHTA Annual General Meeting**

Jim advised that administrative and accounting procedures with this RWO are now stabilized. There is a new secretary-manager, funds are flowing, and charges are pending. However the HTO at Coppermine is now in a similar position to what the RWO was in a year ago.

## 10.C “To-do” and Other Assignment Lists: Review and Update

Jim Noble led an examination of assignments and progress with respect to:

- The to-do list from the previous regular meeting of the NWMB: February.
- Priority items arising out of the NWMB Strategic Plan.
- Tasks of the NWMB Legal Advisor.

## 10.D Strategic Plan

Jim Noble advised that systematic implementation of the Strategic Plan continues to be one of his priorities.

### **In-Camera Session**

The Board decided to go *in-camera* to consider some items referred by Executive Committee. Resolutions were passed in connection with this session as follows:

- To go *in-camera*: **Resolution 98-042**
- To emerge from *in-camera* session: **Resolution 98-043**
- To advise DIAND that the Board interprets itself to be under no obligation to pay back the \$26,236 under-expenditure recorded for Fiscal Year 1994/95: **(Resolution 98-044)**

## 11. Next Meeting

It was decided to hold the next (16<sup>th</sup>) regular meeting of the NWMB in Coral Harbour the week of 17 November 1997. **(Resolution 98-045)**

## 12. Adjournment

The 15<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the NWMB adjourned at 12:00 noon. **(Resolution 98-046)**

Minutes Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson Date

# RESOLUTIONS

**NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING No. 15  
IQALUIT, NT  
9 – 15 AUGUST 1997**

**Resolution 98-016**

Resolved that the agenda for NWMB Regular Meeting No. 15 be accepted as presented.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky      Seconded by: David Igutsaq  
Carried                                  Date: 09 August 1997

**Resolution 98-017**

Resolved that the minutes of NWMB Regular Meeting No. 14 conducted in Pangnirtung, 21-27 February 1997 be approved as presented.

Moved by: David Igutsaq                  Seconded by: Malachi Arreak  
Carried                                  Date: 09 August 1997

**Resolution 98-018**

Resolved that the minutes of NWMB Conference Call No. 28 conducted 24 March 1997 be approved as presented.

Moved by: Malachi Arreak                  Seconded by: Meeka Mike  
Carried                                  Date: 09 August 1997

**Resolution 98-019**

Resolved that the minutes of NWMB Conference Call No. 29 conducted 04 April 1997 be approved as presented.

Moved by: Malachi Arreak                  Seconded by: David Igutsaq  
Carried                                  Date: 09 August 1997

**Resolution 98-020**

Resolved that the minutes of NWMB Conference Call No. 30 conducted 07 April 1997 be accepted as presented.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky      Seconded by: Malachi Arreak  
Carried                              Date: 09 August 1997

**Resolution 98-021**

Resolved that the minutes of NWMB Conference Call No. 31 conducted 08 May 1997 be accepted as presented.

Moved by: David Igutsaq              Seconded by: Gordon Koshinsky  
Carried                              Date: 09 August 1997

**Resolution 98-022**

Resolved that the minutes of NWMB Conference Call No. 32 conducted 29 May 1997 be accepted as presented.

Moved by: Malachi Arreak              Seconded by: Gordon Koshinsky  
Carried                              Date: 09 August 1997

**Resolution 98-023**

Resolved that the minutes of NWMB Conference Call No. 33 conducted 08 July 1997 be accepted as presented.

Moved by: Malachi Arreak              Seconded by: David Aglukark  
Carried                              Date: 09 August 1997

**Resolution 98-024**

Resolved that the NWMB 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Financial Statement be accepted as presented.

Moved by: Malachi Arreak              Seconded by: Harry Flaherty  
Carried                              Date: 09 August 1997

**Resolution 98-025**

Resolved that the 1996/97 Audited Financial Statement be accepted as presented.

Moved by: Malachi Arreak                      Seconded by: Gordon Koshinsky  
Carried    Date: 09 August 1997

**Resolution 98-026**

Resolved that the NWMB adopt the “Final Domestic Demand Implicit Price Index” (FDDIPI) as the basis for providing annual cost of living adjustments for staff.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick                      Seconded by: Malachi Arreak  
Carried    Date: 09 August 1997

**Resolution 98-027**

Resolved that letters be sent to all staff regarding employment status as per the recommendation of the Executive Committee.

Moved by: Malachi Arreak                      Seconded by: David Aglukark  
Carried    Date: 09 August 1997

**Resolution 98-028**

Resolved that the NWMB approve a modest increase, to 6000 kg annually, for the Fish Bay (Chesterfield Inlet) commercial charr quota for the next three years.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky                      Seconded by: Malachi Arreak  
Carried    Date: 13 August 1997

**Resolution 98-029**

Resolved that the NWMB deny any request for a narwhal quota increase or transfer, pending settlement of BNLs and TAHs, along with development of a new and improved management system for this species.

Moved by: Harry Flaherty                      Seconded by: Kevin McCormick  
Carried    Date: 13 August 1997

### **Resolution 98-030**

Resolved that the NWMB approve the proposal of Kugluktuk Angoniatit Association (HTO) of Kugluktuk to stock charr fingerlings in "S" Lake subject to the following conditions:

1. That as many of the fish as possible be adipose-fin-clipped prior to release in "S" Lake.
2. That there be no cost to the NWMB.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky      Seconded by: Malachi Arreak  
Carried                              Date: 13 August 1997

### **Resolution 98-031**

Resolved that the NWMB approve the Western Hudson Bay Polar Bear Management MOU, with certain minor wording changes to be communicated by the staff of the NWMB to the DRWED.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky      Seconded by: Harry Flaherty  
Carried                              Date: 14 August 1997

### **Resolution 98-032**

Resolved that the NWMB not support the Aquaculture Development Proposal submitted by Suvaq Incorporated at this time, noting however that the NWMB is prepared to entertain another submission subject to the following:

1. That Suvaq Inc. conduct additional consultations with Inuit on the proposal, and demonstrate a broader base of Inuit support, including that of the Regional Wildlife Organizations.
2. That Suvaq Inc. provide additional information and clarification regarding business aspects of the proposed venture, along with possible linkages to development and safeguarding of the wild charr fisheries.

Moved by: Harry Flaherty              Seconded by: David Aglukark  
Carried                              Date: 14 August 1997

### **Resolution 98-033**

Resolved that NWMB approve the request of Arviat HTA to increase their commercial quota of Qamanirjuaq caribou by 150 animals to a total of 220, subject to the concurrence of the BQCMB.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick      Seconded by: David Aglukark

Carried                      Date: 14 August 1997

### **Resolution 98-034**

Whereas the NWMB shares the concerns of the Department of Resources, Wildlife and Economic Development (DRWED) about the status and fate of the Peary caribou in the Arctic Islands, and

Whereas the NWMB believes that maintenance of a captive breeding herd may well be feasible, and might confer a number of benefits and advantages for the conservation and management of Peary caribou, the NWMB is skeptical about the practical feasibility of reintroducing a large mammal that has been extirpated from its natural range by factors operating on a global scale, such as is probably the case in this instance, and

However, the NWMB notes the current recorded opposition to the proposal from the Resolute Bay and Grise Fiord HTOs and from the Inuvialuit Wildlife Management Advisory Council, who share this caribou resource, and

Whereas the NWMB believes that the risk of delaying concerted action for one more year is acceptable and manageable,

Therefore the NWMB does not approve the application to capture and transport 25 caribou from the High Arctic to the Calgary Zoo at this time, but urges DRWED to:

1. Continue to study the matter in all its aspects: biological, social, economic, etc.
2. Consult locally, regionally, and with the Inuvialuit, with the object of obtaining concurrence and building a consensus on action to be taken.
3. Explore options for developing a Peary caribou refugium in the Arctic.

The NWMB further notes that if Inuit concurrence and support can be obtained soon, the NWMB is prepared to reconsider the matter promptly.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky      Seconded by: David Aglukark

Carried                      Date: 14 August 1997

### **Resolution 98-035**

Resolved that the NWMB hire a consultant to develop a set of qualifications for guides as per NLCA 5.2.34(h), and that the NWMB Legal Advisor be involved in development of these qualification requirements.

Moved by: Malachi Arreak                      Seconded by: Kevin McCormick  
Carried    Date: 14 August 1997

### **Resolution 98-036**

Resolved that the NWMB approve the proposal submitted by the Hall Beach HTA to sport-hunt three walrus in 1997, with the condition that DFO monitor the hunt.

Moved by: Harry Flaherty                      Seconded by: Malachi Arreak  
Carried    Date: 14 August 1997

### **Resolution 98-037**

Resolved that the NWMB approve the TEK component of KWF's "Northeast Mainland Caribou Study Proposal" in the amount of \$14,000, on the condition that the methodology be better developed and explained.

Moved by: Harry Flaherty                      Seconded by: Malachi Arreak  
Carried    Date: 14 August 1997

### **Resolution 98-038**

Resolved that the NWMB provide funding support to the Amarak HTA's "Sylvia Grinnell Fishing Strategy Development Proposal" up to an amount of \$30,000, on the condition that the project be rationalized with respect to its methodology and budget.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky                      Seconded by: David Igutsaq  
Carried    Date: 14 August 1997

### **Resolution 98-039**

Resolved that the NWMB not support the "South Baffin Scallop Survey Proposal" from QWB and others because:

- Large-scale fisheries development projects are not a high priority for NWMB research
- Scallop fisheries have not proven commercially viable in other areas of the Arctic.

Moved by: Gordon Koshinsky                      Seconded by: Kevin McCormick  
Carried                      Date: 14 August 1997

### **Resolution 98-040**

Resolved that the NWMB not approve the donation request from the World Council of Whalers.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick                      Seconded by: Harry Flaherty  
Carried                      Date: 14 August 1997

### **Resolution 98-041**

Resolved that the NWMB in conjunction with DFO, RWOs and HTOs initiate a process for reforming the management system for narwhal, to take account of new and emerging realities such as requests for quota increases and transfers.

Further resolved that the NWMB commit up to \$17,000 to support the establishment and initial deliberations of a working group to focus on this matter.

Moved by: Malachi Arreak                      Seconded by: Gordon Koshinsky  
Carried                      Date: 14 August 1997

### **Resolution 98-042**

Resolved that the NWMB go in-camera.

Moved by: Malachi Arreak                      Seconded by: Kevin McCormick  
Carried                      Date: 15 August 1997

### **Resolution 98-043**

Resolved that the NWMB move out of in-camera.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick      Seconded by: Malachi Arreak  
Carried                              Date: 15 August 1997

**Resolution 98-044**

Resolved that the NWMB advise DIAND that the Board interprets itself to be under no obligation to reimburse DIAND the \$26,236 under-expenditure recorded by the NWMB for FY 1994/95.

Moved by: Kevin McCormick      Seconded by: Gordon Koshinsky  
Carried                              Date: 15 August 1997

**Resolution 98-045**

Resolved that the next regular meeting of the NWMB be conducted in Coral Harbour the week of 17 November 1997.

Moved by: Malachi Arreak              Seconded by: David Igutsaq  
Carried                              Date: 15 August 1997

**Resolution 98-046**

Resolved that the 15<sup>th</sup> session of the NWMB be adjourned.

Moved by: Malachi Arreak              Seconded by: Gordon Koshinsky  
Carried                              Date: 15 August 1997