

## **2014 Atlantic Walrus Integrated Fisheries Management Plan Consultation Summary**

### **May 28-June 4, 2014; October 20-24, 2014; 2014 and 2015 Regional Wildlife Organizations Annual General Meetings**

The walrus fishery in the Nunavut Settlement Area (NSA) is co-managed by Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO), the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board (NWMB), Regional Wildlife Organizations (RWO's), and Hunter and Trapper Organizations (HTO's), in accordance with the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement (NCLA), the *Fisheries Act* and its regulations, and in some communities, by local HTO hunting rules.

Walrus Working Groups, made up of members of local HTOs, RWO, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated (NTI), NWMB and DFO, were established for the High Arctic and Foxe Basin to initiate the development of an Integrated Fisheries Management Plan (IFMP or Management Plan) for Atlantic walrus in the Nunavut Settlement Area. Between 2007 and 2013, eight walrus working group meetings were held to develop the Management Plan. In February and March 2011, community consultations were held in Hall Beach, Igloolik, Pond Inlet, Arctic Bay, Resolute and Grise Fiord to share research results, determine community support for the development of a walrus Management Plan and determine the most important walrus management issues. Through these meetings, agreement was reached to develop a walrus Management Plan, the format of the Management Plan, the important management issues and objectives to be included, and important research goals. As a result of the Walrus Working Group meetings and community consultations, a draft Management Plan was developed in November 2013.

A consultation process was undertaken to obtain the views of Inuit, co-management organizations, interested stakeholders and the general public on the draft Management Plan. Public consultations had both an in-person and a written component:

- Changes to the current walrus management regime are proposed for four walrus stocks where there is new science advice. In-person consultations were held May 28-June 4, 2014 with Igloolik, Hall Beach and Pond Inlet, and October 20<sup>th</sup>-24<sup>th</sup>, 2014 with Arctic Bay, Grise Fiord and Resolute;
- There are no changes currently being proposed to the walrus management regime for the South and East Hudson Bay or the Hudson Bay-Davis Strait stocks, as there is no recent science advice. The Management Plan simply consolidates the existing measures used to manage the Atlantic walrus fishery in the Nunavut Settlement Area. Therefore, a written consultation process was used for the communities that harvest walrus from the

Hudson Bay-Davis Strait and South and East Hudson Bay stocks, along with other interested stakeholders and the general public.

Consultations focused on the following main areas:

- The need to improve walrus management;
- The draft Integrated Fisheries Management Plan (IFMP);
- Recent DFO Science Advice on walrus abundance estimates;
- Proposed walrus Management Units;
- Proposed changes to walrus management where there is science advice, in particular, the establishment of Total Allowable Harvest (TAH) levels and operational procedures to implement the proposed changes such as harvest reporting and walrus harvest tags;
- Seek the views and comments from Inuit harvesters and community members on walrus management;
- Relationship-building and continued engagement between DFO and Inuit communities.

During the in-person consultations, presentations were provided to each community. In some cases, two presentations were provided; one specifically designed for HTO board members, and the second for community members. Participants in all meetings were encouraged to share their views, provide comments, express concerns, and share expertise. Community members and the HTOs were encouraged to review and provide comments on the draft Management Plan. Copies of the draft Management Plan and the presentations were provided to the HTOs in advance of the meetings.

Written consultations packages were provided to Nunavut walrus harvesting communities where no changes are currently being proposed to the management of walrus. A package that included a summary of the draft Management Plan and a questionnaire to obtain their views on specific issues was provided via mail and email. A web site that included the consultation material was established and information on how to access that website was provided to communities involved in both the written and in-person consultation process. Presentations on the draft walrus IFMP were provided to the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board, Kivalliq Wildlife Board, and the Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board at their respective Annual General Meetings in 2014 and 2015. Table 1 identifies the consultation process that was undertaken in relation to the IFMP for walrus in the NSA.

Overall, communities have expressed support for a Management Plan for walrus, but consensus was not reached on some of the proposed changes (e.g. recommended sustainable harvest levels). Recommendations were made to have the IFMP in place prior to TAHs being established.

Table 1. Consultation process for the Integrated Fisheries Management Plan for Atlantic Walrus in the Nunavut Settlement Area.

Population	Stock	Management Unit	Nunavut Walrus Harvesting Communities	Type of Consultation Process
High Arctic	Baffin Bay	AW-01	Grise Fiord	In-person (October 2014)
	West Jones Sound	AW-02	Grise Fiord	In-person (October 2014)
	Penny Strait- Lancaster Sound	AW-03	Resolute Bay	In-person (October 2014)
			Arctic Bay	In-person (October 2014)
			Pond Inlet	In-person (May 2014)
Central Arctic	Northern Foxe Basin	AW-04	Igloolik	In-person (May 2014)
	Central Foxe Basin		Hall Beach	In-person (May 2014)
	Hudson Bay-Davis Strait	AW-05	Clyde River Qikiqtarjuaq Iqaluit Pangnirtung Arviat Cape Dorset Chesterfield Inlet Coral Harbour Kimmirut Rankin Inlet Respulse Bay Whale Cove	Written (June 2014)
Unknown	South and East Hudson Bay	AW-06	Sanikiluaq	Written
			Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board; Kivalliq Wildlife Board; Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board	Formal letter with draft IFMP to executive; Presentations at the fall 2014 and 2015 AGMs

**Atlantic Walrus Draft Integrated Fisheries Management Plan**  
**DRAFT Consultation Summary- Foxe Basin stocks (Proposed Management Unit AW-04)**

Consultations in Foxe Basin on the draft Management Plan took place on May 29-30, 2014 in the communities Igloolik and Hall Beach. Two meetings were held in each community; one with the HTO Board, and the other open to the public. The purpose of the consultations was to determine support for the draft management plan in general terms, to obtain specific local knowledge to help in the refining of the draft management plan to include HTO and community input and concerns. These specifics included potential management unit boundaries, sustainable harvest levels for the establishment of a TAH, harvest reporting and monitoring procedures, and the use of walrus harvest tags.

All meetings lasted over two hours and were well attended. In general terms, there appears to be support for a management plan for walrus, but there was no support for establishing a TAH based on Total Allowable Landed Catch (TALC) recommendations from recent DFO science advice. The participants expressed a great deal of interest in further involvement and will work with their local HTO Walrus Working Group member, their Regional Wildlife Organization and Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated during this process.

**Igloolik, May 29, 2014**

HTO Meeting- afternoon; Public meeting- evening

Walrus Working Group representatives: Joshua Kango (QWB; co-chair); Allison McPhee (DFO; co-chair); Paul Irngaut (NTI); Danica Crystal (NWMB); Richard Moore (DFO, Iqaluit); Lianne Postma (DFO, Science).

At both meetings, PowerPoint presentations were given (attached) that introduces the management plan, the history of the initiative, the purpose of the plan and an overview of the content. This was followed by discussion and feedback.

Specific discussions took place around the following issues:

1. Support for a Walrus Management Plan?
  - Discussed the growing national and international attention being given to how Canada manages the walrus fishery and some pressures (e.g. CITES and possible request to up-list walrus, COSEWIC). Communities not supportive of international organizations' involvement in local walrus management.
  - Need to further harmonize walrus management with the NLCA (section 5.6.25 and increased role for HTOs/RWOs in walrus management).

- General agreement that a management plan is a good idea.
2. DFO Science advice:
    - Concerns that the survey coverage was not complete and that not all animals were counted. Do not agree with the population abundance estimates.
    - The Total Allowable Removal estimates are too low.
    - There should be more local involvement in the surveys.
    - Surveys need to be completed in all seasons before a TAH is established.
    - Walrus population size is stable and healthy.
  3. Sustainable Harvest Level Recommendations/ TAH:
    - The community does not support the Total Allowable Landed Catch (TALC) recommended by DFO. The numbers presented are too low. This will cause hunters to harvest quicker every year (with more wastage), it will cause fighting between communities that harvest from the same Management Unit, hunters won't accurately report their harvests and they won't report struck and lost.
    - The numbers presented will not provide for the current local demand.
    - The current quota of 4 walrus/ Inuk/ year should remain.
    - If a TAH is established, it should be based on how many walrus are needed by the community and set by the community.
    - The TALC is too low to support the growing inter-settlement trade in walrus meat.
    - Concerned that if a low TAH is established, it will stay at that level even if there is new information to support a higher TAH.
    - Some concerns were raised about the amount of walrus meat that is currently wasted. It was suggested that some hunters are harvesting more for the ivory than the meat.
  4. Are the proposed Management Unit boundaries correct?
    - The boundary for AW-04 should be further south.
    - There was no consensus on where exactly the boundary line should be. Need to ensure TEK is included.
  5. What is an appropriate Struck and Lost Rate to use?
    - Community has the most experienced walrus hunters and therefore the struck and lost rates are very low.
    - More struck and lost by ship traffic.
    - Need to improve training to reduce s/l and teach the younger generation.

6. Harvest Reporting and the proposed Walrus Harvest Tag
  - Agreement that having accurate reporting is important.
  - Concerns with requiring animal sex data, as this will lead to more restrictions on harvesting.
  - No agreement or disagreement with using a Walrus Harvest Tag (not a licence) to assist with the allocation, monitoring and reporting of harvests if a TAH is established. No other options/ideas were suggested.
  
7. Harvest Allocation and monitoring
  - There were no concerns raised with the allocation of the TAH/BNL within a Management Unit (following the NLCA);
  - There were no concerns raised with the walrus fishery being closed once the TAH/harvest level is reached;
  - No concerns were raised with developing Information Booklets for hunters.
  
8. Other issues
  - Community monitoring would be problematic as reporting on other hunters is not encouraged.
  - Should use community hunt rules.
  - Rules for tourism, ship traffic and exploration need to be put in place.
  - It is important to include IQ and traditional knowledge in all aspects of management and decision-making.
  - Further consideration needs to be given to how the TAH could be carried over between years if the harvest level is not reached in one year.

### **Hall Beach, May 30, 2014**

HTO Meeting- afternoon; Public meeting- evening

Walrus Working Group representatives: Joshua Kango (QWB; co-chair); Allison McPhee (DFO; co-chair); Paul Irngaut (NTI); Danica Crystal (NWMB); Richard Moore (DFO, Iqaluit); Lianne Postma (DFO, Science).

At both meetings, PowerPoint presentations were given (attached) that introduces the management plan, the history of the initiative, the purpose of the plan and an overview of the content. This was followed by discussion and feedback.

Specific discussions took place around the following issues:

1. Support for a Walrus Management Plan?

- Discussed the growing national and international attention being given to how Canada manages the walrus fishery and some pressures (e.g. CITES and possible request to up-list walrus, COSEWIC).
- Need to further harmonize walrus management with the NLCA (section 5.6.25 and increased role for HTOs/RWOs in walrus management).
- Agreement that a management plan is a good idea.
- The Management Plan needs to include the most current and up-to-date information.

## 2. DFO Science advice:

- The survey coverage was not complete and not all animals were counted. Do not agree with the population abundance estimates.
- The Total Allowable Removal estimates are too low.
- There should be more local involvement in the surveys.
- Surveys need to be completed in all seasons and over a number of years before a TAH is established. Surveys are not recent enough.
- Walrus population size is stable and healthy.
- Studies on other habitat interactions and migrations between stocks should be completed.

## 3. Sustainable Harvest Level Recommendations/ TAH:

- The community does not support the Total Allowable Landed Catch (TALC) recommended by DFO. The numbers presented are too low. This will encourage hunters to not report, or falsely report. It will also cause fighting between communities that harvest from the same Management Unit.
- The numbers presented will not provide for the current local demand.
- The current quota of 4 walrus/Inuk/year should remain.
- If a TAH is established, it should be based on how many walrus are needed by the community and set by the community.
- The sport hunt allocation should be a separate allocation.
- The TALC is too low to support the growing inter-settlement trade in walrus meat.
- Concerned that if a TAH is established too low, it will stay at that level even if there is new information to support a higher TAH.
- Suggested that a TAH allocation for Hall Beach of 75-100 could be a reasonable number.
- The enforcement of the TAH will be important.

4. Are the proposed Management Unit boundaries correct?
  - The boundary for AW-04 should be further south.
  - There was no consensus on where exactly the boundary line should be. Need to ensure TEK is included.
  
5. What is an appropriate Struck and Lost Rate to use?
  - Experienced walrus hunters in Hall Beach and therefore the struck and lost rates are very low.
  - The struck and lost rate should be set after a TAH is established.
  - Need to improve training to reduce s/l and teach the younger generation.
  
6. Harvest Reporting and the proposed Walrus Harvest Tag
  - Agreement that having accurate reporting is important.
  - No agreement or disagreement with using a Walrus Harvest Tag (not a licence) to assist with the allocation, monitoring and reporting of harvests if a TAH is established. No other options were suggested. A tagging system works for other species and it could work for walrus.
  
7. Harvest Allocation and monitoring
  - There were no concerns raised with the allocation of the TAH/BNL within a Management Unit and/or between HTOs (following the NLCA);
  - There were no concerns raised with the walrus fishery being closed once the TAH/harvest level is reached;
  - No concerns were raised with developing Information Booklets for hunters.
  
8. Other issues
  - It is important to include IQ and traditional knowledge in all aspects of management and decision-making.
  - There should be management measures in place to reduce/eliminate wastage, particularly in sport hunts;
  - Communities should try to organize community hunts to reduce wastage, improve sharing, and improve reporting.
  - Inuit and local communities need more involvement in the surveys: the design, conducting the survey, reviewing results, analyzing the results, and making decisions based on those results.

**Consultation Summary- High Arctic stocks**  
**Baffin Bay (BB), West Jones Sound (WJS) Penny Strait – Lancaster Sound (PS-LS)**  
**(Proposed Management Units AW-01, AW-02, AW-03)**

**Pond Inlet; June 4, 2014**

HTO Meeting- afternoon; Public meeting- evening

Walrus Working Group representatives: Joshua Kango (QWB; co-chair); Allison McPhee (DFO; co-chair); Paul Irgaut (NTI); Danica Crystal (NWMB); Richard Moore (DFO, Iqaluit); Lianne Postma (DFO, Science).

At both meetings, a PowerPoint presentation was given that introduced the management plan, the history of the initiative, the purpose of the plan and an overview of the content. This was followed by discussion and feedback.

1. Support for a Walrus Management Plan?

- Discussed the growing national and international attention being given to how Canada manages the walrus fishery and some pressures (e.g. CITES and possible request to up-list walrus, COSEWIC).
- Not too involved in the harvest – more opportunistic hunting because they do not depend on the harvest anymore.
- Understand the need to manage numbers, but need to balance hunts with diet, so the plan has to address this concern with more IQ input at the beginning and end decisions.
- Need to further harmonize walrus management with the NLCA (section 5.6.25 and increased role for HTOs/RWOs in walrus management).
- General agreement that a management plan is a good idea.

2. DFO Science advice:

- Aerial surveys do not capture the whole picture – other ways to count walrus - perhaps small boats would be a better method.
- There should be more local involvement in the surveys.
- Surveys would provide a better picture if done over all the seasons- or pick a season and do multi-year counts with local involvement.

3. Sustainable Harvest Level Recommendations/ TAH:

- TAH is a good number if it is to be set somewhere from 12 to 24 for them because they share with Arctic Bay and Resolute Bay. Satisfied with number because not getting the walrus we used to.
- How will TAH be divided between the three communities – what percentage will they get?
- Wish sport hunts to be separate with own TAH and tracking method. Greenland hunts should be regulated closer – they come into our waters to hunt.
- Subsistence hunting should be left open to hunt for food using the existing management methods.
- Need a review process in place so numbers can be adapted if needed – 5 year plan.

4. Are the proposed Management Unit boundaries correct?

- Penny Strait – Lancaster Sound (AW-03) extends further south towards Clyde River.
- Need to identify where walrus can be harvested; how many from each management unit. Which TAH would the harvest go against – the hunter's home or the walrus location? Should be the walrus location.

5. What is an appropriate Struck and Lost Rate to use?

- Struck/loss are very low compared to narwhal, so don't report it. Need training for the young to keep struck/loss low

6. Harvest Reporting and the proposed Walrus Harvest Tag

- Agreement that having accurate reporting is important.
- Ok with a tag system to monitor the catch data, but should not be a license. HTO should manage the tag system and the cut-off should be in the spring, not by calendar date.

7. Harvest Allocation and monitoring

- There were no concerns raised with the allocation of the TAH/BNL within a Management Unit (following the NLCA);
- There were no concerns raised with the walrus fishery being closed once the TAH/harvest level is reached;
- No concerns were raised with developing Information Booklets for hunters.
- Community wishes for HTO's and RWO's to allocate the quota (TAH) numbers

## **Arctic Bay, October 21, 2014**

HTO /Public meeting- evening

Walrus Working Group representatives: Allison McPhee (DFO; co-chair); Paul Irngaut (NTI; also representing QWB); Richard Moore (DFO, Iqaluit); and Lazurus Arreak as interpreter.

A PowerPoint presentation was given that introduced the management plan, recent science advice and possible sustainable harvest level recommendations, the history of the initiative, the purpose of the plan and an overview of the content. This was followed by discussion and feedback.

Specific discussions took place around the following issues:

### 1. Support for a Walrus Management Plan?

- Discussed the growing national and international attention being given to how Canada manages the walrus fishery and some pressures (e.g. CITES and possible request to up-list walrus, COSEWIC).
- Need to further harmonize walrus management with the NLCA (section 5.6.25 and increased role for HTOs/RWOs in walrus management).
- General agreement that a management plan is a good idea.
- Concerned it will restrict hunting.

### 2. DFO Science advice:

- Concerns that the survey coverage numbers and TAH will restrict hunters from hunting.
- The Total Allowable Removal estimates are more than harvest numbers, so ok with them.
- There should be more local involvement in the surveys.
- Surveys would provide a better picture if done over all the seasons.
- Walrus population size is stable and healthy.

### 3. Sustainable Harvest Level Recommendations/ TAH:

- The community seems to support the Total Allowable Landed Catch (TALC) recommended by DFO. The numbers presented are higher than they harvest.
- The numbers presented will provide for the current local demand.
- If a TAH is established, it should be allocated by the HTO/RWO.

4. Are the proposed Management Unit boundaries correct?
  - The boundary for AW-02 seemed to be accepted, except sometimes walrus are further down into Admiralty Inlet.
  
5. What is an appropriate Struck and Lost Rate to use?
  - Hunters do not record struck / lost numbers
  - More struck and lost by ship traffic.
  - Need to improve training to reduce struck /lost and teach the younger generation.
  
6. Harvest Reporting and the proposed Walrus Harvest Tag
  - Agreement that having accurate reporting is important.
  - Community feels they only need a tag system for sport hunting.
  - Concerned with how the quota would be allocated. Needs to have HTO/RWO involvement.
  - No agreement or disagreement with using a Walrus Harvest Tag (not a license) to assist with the allocation, monitoring and reporting of harvests if a TAH is established. No other options/ideas were suggested.
  
7. Harvest Allocation and monitoring
  - There were no concerns raised with the allocation of the TAH/BNL within a Management Unit (following the NLCA);
  - There were no concerns raised with the walrus fishery being closed once the TAH/harvest level is reached;
  - No concerns were raised with developing Information Booklets for hunters.
  - Community wishes for HTO's and RWO's to allocate the quota (TAH) numbers
  
8. Other issues
  - Community monitoring would be problematic as reporting on other hunters is not encouraged.
  - It is important to include IQ and traditional knowledge in all aspects of management and decision-making.
  - Some concerns were raised about the walrus meat that is currently used for dogs and disease it may cause to the dogs and humans, if they eat it.

## **Grise Fiord, October 23, 2014**

HTO / Public Meeting- Noon

Walrus Working Group representatives: Allison McPhee (DFO; co-chair); Paul Irngaut (NTI); Richard Moore (DFO, Iqaluit); and Lazurus Arreak as interpreter.

At the meeting, A PowerPoint presentation was given (attached) that introduces the management plan, the history of the initiative, the purpose of the plan and an overview of the content. This was followed by discussion and feedback.

Specific discussions took place around the following issues:

### 1. Support for a Walrus Management Plan?

- Discussed the growing national and international attention being given to how Canada manages the walrus fishery and some pressures (e.g. CITES and possible request to up-list walrus, COSEWIC).
- Agreement that a management plan is a good idea.
- The Management Plan needs to include the most current and up-to-date information.

### 2. DFO Science advice:

- Wished to know why AW-01 and AW-02 was not all one management unit. They feel it is all one stock that migrates up and down the area.
- The Total Allowable Removal estimates are fine, but wish to use the higher number.
- There should be more local involvement in the surveys.
- Walrus population size is stable and healthy.
- Studies on other habitat interactions and migrations between stocks should be completed.

### 3. Sustainable Harvest Level Recommendations/ TAH:

- The community does support the Total Allowable Landed Catch (TALC) recommended by DFO. The numbers presented are fine.
- With all the added work of the new system, need to consider that extra resources to the HTOs will be required.
- Need to consider that once a TAH is established, if it's too low, it may cause hunters to go out quickly and harvest that amount.
- Who will enforce the TAH ? The HTO does not want the enforcement role. There is no Conservation Officer or RCMP in the community. DFO Fishery Officers do not visit on a regular cycle.

- Will there be credits if you do not reach your TAH? Can you transfer credits to other communities?
4. Are the proposed Management Unit boundaries correct?
    - The boundary for AW-02 should be further northeast to Greenland.
    - AW-01 and AW-02 should be all one unit.
    - There was no consensus on where exactly the boundary line should be. Need to ensure TEK is included.
  5. What is an appropriate Struck and Lost Rate to use?
    - Experienced walrus hunters in Grise Fiord and therefore the struck and lost rates are very low and not tallied.
  6. Harvest Reporting and the proposed Walrus Harvest Tag
    - Agreement that having accurate reporting is important.
    - No agreement or disagreement with using a Walrus Harvest Tag (not a license) to assist with the allocation, monitoring and reporting of harvests if a TAH is established. No other options were suggested. A tagging system works for other species and it could work for walrus.
  7. Harvest Allocation and monitoring
    - There were no concerns raised with the allocation of the TAH/BNL within a Management Unit and/or between HTOs (following the NLCA);
    - There were no concerns raised with the walrus fishery being closed once the TAH/harvest level is reached;
    - The HTO has concerns on resources for the monitoring and enforcement of the system.
  8. Other issues
    - It is important to include IQ and traditional knowledge in all aspects of management and decision-making.
    - Additional funding is required. However, the community will work in good faith and continue to work together on co-management..

## **Resolute Bay, October 23, 2014**

HTO / Public Meeting- evening

Walrus Working Group representatives: Allison McPhee (DFO; co-chair); Paul Irngaut (NTI); Richard Moore (DFO, Iqaluit); and Lazurus Arreak as interpreter.

At the meeting, A PowerPoint presentation was given (attached) that introduces the management plan, the history of the initiative, the purpose of the plan and an overview of the content. This was followed by discussion and feedback.

Specific discussions took place around the following issues:

### 1. Support for a Walrus Management Plan?

- Discussed the growing national and international attention being given to how Canada manages the walrus fishery and some pressures (e.g. CITES and possible request to up-list walrus, COSEWIC).
- Need to further harmonize walrus management with the NLCA (section 5.6.25 and increased role for HTOs/RWOs in walrus management).
- General agreement that a management plan is a good idea.

### 2. DFO Science advice:

- Concerns that the survey coverage was not complete and that not all animals were counted. Do not agree with the population abundance estimates.
- Surveys are outdated; would like to see new surveys; there have been changes in the walrus populations due to ship traffic.
- The Total Allowable Removal estimates are too low. The real population is much higher than 727.
- There should be local involvement in the surveys.
- Surveys need to be completed in all seasons before a TAH is established.
- Walrus population size is stable and healthy.

### 3. Sustainable Harvest Level Recommendations/ TAH:

- The community does not support the Total Allowable Landed Catch (TALC) recommended by DFO. The numbers presented are too low. Hunters won't accurately report their harvests and they won't report struck and lost.
- If a TAH is established, it should be based on how many walrus are needed by the community and set by the community.
- How will the TAH be divided amongst the communities? Wish for equal numbers (4 for Arctic Bay, 4 for Pond Inlet, 4 for Resolute Bay).

4. Are the proposed Management Unit boundaries correct?
  - The boundaries are a little conservative. Go further in all directions due to migration.
  - There was no consensus on where exactly the boundary line should be. Need to ensure TEK is included.
  - Need more comprehensive surveys to determine management units because the walrus migrate long distances
  
5. What is an appropriate Struck and Lost Rate to use?
  - Community has the most experienced walrus hunters and therefore the struck and lost rates are very low.
  - More struck / lost by ship traffic than hunters.
  - Struck / lost from other should not affect the hunter numbers (TAH)
  - Hunters/HTO do not record struck/lost
  
6. Harvest Reporting and the proposed Walrus Harvest Tag
  - Agreement that having accurate reporting is important; but should be done at the local level which is circulated once a year to authorities.
  - There is no need to send tag with tusks, so no need of a tag system to track the harvest.
  - No other options/ideas were suggested.
  
7. Harvest Allocation and monitoring
  - There were no concerns raised with the allocation of the TAH/BNL within a Management Unit (following the NLCA);
  - There were no concerns raised with the walrus fishery being closed once the TAH/harvest level is reached;
  - No concerns were raised with developing Information Booklets for hunters.
  - No concerns with authorities taking the lead, but should utilize Inuit resources more often.
  - Community based monitoring is possible, but should be done discreetly because hunters do not wish to involve other hunters because it will divide the community.
  
8. Other issues
  - Rules for tourism, ship traffic and exploration need to be put in place.
  - It is important to include IQ and traditional knowledge in all aspects of management and decision-making.

- Further consideration needs to be given to how the TAH could be carried over between years if the harvest level is not reached in one year.
- Greenland rules and numbers should not affect our Canadian numbers.
- Need local walrus meat testing facilities.
- Need marine protected areas for feeding and calving grounds, and haul-out areas. Inuit access only, unless HTO agrees to allow access.

## Written Consultation Summary

The IFMP is formatted in such a way that it enables co-management organizations to demonstrate, in one document, how the walrus fishery in the NSA is managed. This is very important given the increased national and international interest in how walrus is managed in Canada, for example, the *Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora* (CITES). The IFMP identifies the management regime under two scenarios: (1) where a TAH has been established; and (2) where a TAH has not been established. In-person consultation occurred with communities that harvest walrus from stocks or management units where there is existing information to propose TAHs be established and are summarized in the preceding section.

For stocks or populations where a Total Allowable Harvest (TAH) *has not* been established and there is currently not enough information to recommend establishing a TAH, the IFMP identifies the existing management measures that apply to the walrus fishery through the *Fisheries Act*, the *Marine Mammal Regulations*, and the *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement*.

For communities that harvest walrus from stocks where no changes are currently being proposed, written consultations on the draft IFMP occurred in the summer of 2014, and presentations were given to the three Regional Wildlife Organizations at their Annual General Meetings in 2014 and 2015. To date DFO has not received any formal response on whether the HTOs or RWOs support the Walrus IFMP.

**It is important to note that DFO would conduct in-person consultations if changes to walrus management, such as TAH, were proposed in the future.**