

## **NORTHERN HUDSON BAY NARWHAL TOUR – WHAT WE HEARD**

### **CONTEXT**

The narwhal 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 (RWOs), and Hunter and Trapper Organizations (HTOs), in accordance with the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement (NLCA), the *Fisheries Act* and its regulations, and in some communities, by local HTO hunting rules.

Co-management organizations work together on an on-going basis to provide for the conservation of narwhal stocks and populations and facilitate the implementation of a management regime consistent with the NLCA to demonstrate sustainable harvesting activities.

In March 2011, DFO invited representatives from the Hunters and Trappers Organizations (HTO) in all of the narwhal hunting communities and RWOs to attend one of six central consultation meetings to discuss our collective understanding of narwhal populations (using both Inuit and scientific information) and the process related to DFO's responsibilities under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) with respect to issuing export permits for narwhal tusks and products. These meetings occurred in late May 2011, in the communities of Clyde River, Pond Inlet, Arctic Bay, Resolute Bay, Igloolik, and Qikiqtarjuaq. HTO delegates from Pangnirtung and Hall Beach attended the meetings in Qikiqtarjuaq and Igloolik respectively.

In subsequent meetings, representatives of NTI, NWMB, Government of Nunavut (GN) and DFO agreed that in order to demonstrate sustainable narwhal harvest levels and effective management practices are in place, both domestically and internationally, an approved narwhal Management Plan needs to be developed and in place prior to January 2013 in preparation for the next meeting of the Conference of Parties to the Convention in the March 2013. The Management Plan, developed jointly with Inuit, will summarize the main objectives for sustainable narwhal co-management in the NSA, and the measures that will be used to achieve these objectives. The Management Plan will also set out the role of each of the co-management partners in ensuring that narwhal harvest levels are sustainable, and that products destined for export comply with both domestic and international trade requirements.

In August 2011, representatives of NTI, NWMB, GN, the RWOs and DFO met to discuss narwhal management issues and identified milestones for finalizing the Management Plan by January 2013. Partners agreed that to achieve this deadline, a Management Plan would be drafted over the coming months. The Management Plan would also include recommendations from co-management working groups tasked with addressing specific narwhal management issues. The draft Management Plan was discussed in December 2011 and February 2012 with co-management partners, and formed the basis of community consultation meetings held in March 2012.

Between March 19-31, 2012, officials from DFO, members of the three respective Regional Wildlife Organizations, along with observers from the GN-DoE, the NWMB, and NTI visited nine Nunavut communities on two concurrent tours (Baffin Bay Tour - Pangnirtung, Qikiqtarjuaq, Clyde River, Pond Inlet, Arctic Bay, Iqaluit; Northern Hudson Bay Tour - Repulse Bay, Kugaaruk and Grise Fiord) from. In addition, Hall Beach and Igloodik Hunters and Trappers Organization (HTO) delegates attended meetings in Kugaaruk and Repulse Bay. Cambridge Bay, Gjoa Haven, and Taloyoak HTO delegates attended meetings in Kugaaruk; Kimmirut and Cape Dorset delegates attended meetings in Repulse Bay. Although invited, due to inclement weather conditions, delegates from Resolute Bay, Arviat, Whale Cove, Rankin Inlet, Baker Lake, Chesterfield Inlet and Coral Harbour HTOs could not attend the meetings.

The primary objectives of the consultations were to:

- 1) Explain the increased national and international interest in how the narwhal fishery is managed and discuss the need to strengthen narwhal management and develop an Integrated Fisheries Management Plan (IFMP);
- 2) Discuss management issues in the narwhal fishery; proposed changes to narwhal management, as outlined in the draft IFMP; and operational procedures to implement the proposed changes, such as harvest reporting and tusk certification procedures;
- 3) Seek comments, perspectives, and traditional knowledge/expert opinions from Inuit harvesters and community members on narwhal management and the draft IFMP; and
- 4) Promote relationship-building and continued engagement between DFO and Inuit communities to be better prepared for the CITES meeting slated for the spring of 2013.

Three presentations were provided to each community. The first presentation was for the HTO Board, the second presentation was for the community members at large and the third was geared towards what the hunters needed to know. In some communities, it was agreed to combine the latter two meetings. Participants in all meetings were encouraged to share their views, provide comment, express any concerns they may have and share expertise related to the topics discussed.

Consultation meetings were well attended. Community members shared Inuit and local knowledge and expertise related to narwhal management and harvesting. The report summarizes “what we heard” during the consultation meetings.

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge – “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
Reasons to Make Changes to the Current Narwhal Management System	<p>-need to strengthen narwhal co-management consistent with Nunavut Land Claims Agreement (NLCA) provisions, available science and Inuit knowledge, and sustainable harvesting and international trade requirements (e.g. CITES)</p> <p>-development of an IFMP important to demonstrate sustainable harvesting prior to CITES export permits being issued, and in advance of the spring 2013 CITES meeting</p> <p>-DFO providing information on proposed changes to current narwhal management system; seeking Inuit views on current management issues, proposed changes to the narwhal management system and the development of an IFMP for narwhal in the Nunavut Settlement Area (NSA).</p> <p>-co-management organizations agree to jointly develop the IFMP</p>	<p><i>Kugaaruk</i><sup>2</sup>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was general acceptance of the need for an IFMP; however, there was no clear objection or acceptance to the current IFMP draft.</li> <li>• There were many concerns raised about the lack of understanding about the narwhal harvest by some environmental organizations and many of the countries that are part of CITES.</li> </ul> <p><i>Repulse Bay</i><sup>3</sup>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was general acceptance of the need for an IFMP; however, there was no clear objection or acceptance to the current IFMP draft.</li> <li>• The QWB delegate pointed out the importance of recording and documenting narwhal management practices for our global neighbours.</li> <li>• Many meeting participants did not think that DFO would get support for the current IFMP draft from the Northern Hudson Bay communities until the TALC recommendation (57) was changed.</li> <li>• There were many concerns raised by meeting participants about the international export ban on tusks from communities that harvest from the Northern Hudson Bay population. They were disappointed that they had to read about the export ban in the news without any advance notice.</li> </ul> <p><i>Grise Fjord</i><sup>4</sup>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was general acceptance of the need for an IFMP and many aspects of the current IFMP draft, with a caveat that the plan would</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> See copies presentations for more details.

<sup>2</sup> Note: approximately 40 people attended the public meetings in Kugaaruk at various times.

<sup>3</sup> Note: approximately 50 people attended the public meetings in Repulse Bay at various times.

<sup>4</sup> Note: approximately 15 people attended the public meetings in Grise Fjord at various times.

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge – “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
		<p>be updated as more information becomes available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were many concerns and questions raised by meeting participants about the international export ban on tusks from Grise Fiord narwhal. Grise Fiord focused on looking towards the future and developing a plan that would remove the ban.</li> </ul>
Summering Stock Approach, Current Abundance Estimates, and Total Allowable Landed Catch (TALC) Recommendations	<p>-DFO Science advice, which incorporates Inuit knowledge, to manage narwhal based on known summering areas</p> <p>-importance of managing at the smaller “stock” level</p> <p>-the need for updated abundance estimates for some stocks identified as a management issue in the fishery</p> <p>-current abundance estimates and TALC recommendations for each stock/population</p>	<p><i>Kugaaruk:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The general consensus among HTO delegates and the Kugaaruk public and hunters was support for the current science information regarding TALC (532) for the Somerset Island management unit.</li> <li>Most people understood that if the current science information was used that it would result in an increase of tags for the Somerset Island communities.</li> <li>Some meeting participants/delegates raised concerns about using satellite tags on narwhal.</li> </ul> <p><i>Repulse Bay:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The HTO delegates and Repulse Bay public and hunters did not support the current science information regarding TALC (57) for the Northern Hudson Bay management unit. They thought that the recommendation was far too low.</li> <li>There were many concerns raised about past aerial surveys (2000 and 2008). Some specific concerns included problems with ice, killer whales, and the temporal scale of the survey. Suggestions were made to conduct future aerial surveys during the entire summer (June to September) in the Repulse Bay area.</li> <li>The community and Repulse Bay HTO were supportive of using a boat-based survey in summer 2012 to compliment the population estimate that will be produced from the latest 2011 aerial survey.</li> <li>Repulse Bay HTO said that it is important to use traditional knowledge and employ local people during research surveys.</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge – “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People understood that if the current science information was used that it would result in a decrease of tags for the Northern Hudson Bay communities.</li> <li>• Some meeting participants/delegates raised concerns about using satellite tags on narwhal.</li> </ul> <p><i>Grise Fiord:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Grise Fiord HTO delegates and public/hunters understood that there was no science information that could be used to recommend TALC for the Parry Channel, Jones Sound, Smith Sounds management unit.</li> <li>• The HTO has agreed to work with DFO to conducting stock assessment studies. The HTO also agreed to help by documenting traditional knowledge, collecting photos and video, and collecting biopsy samples.</li> <li>• The Grise Fiord HTO would like to see an increase in the number of narwhal harvested based on their traditional knowledge. The HTO will be requesting an additional 15 narwhal during the first year of a research program and an additional 20 narwhal during the second year of a research program.</li> <li>• Some meeting participants/delegates raised concerns about using satellite tags on narwhal; however, there was also a lot of willingness to work with science to develop a plan that would allow for a better understanding of the narwhal that visit Grise Fiord.</li> <li>• An action item was put forward to request a priority science survey on narwhal in this management unit.</li> </ul>
Management Unit Boundaries and Communities within each Management Unit	-based on known summering areas for each narwhal stock/population, described six Management Units and their geographic boundaries	<p><i>Kugaaruk:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hall Beach and Igloodik HTO suggested that their communities should be part of both the Somerset Island and Northern Hudson Bay management units.</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
	-communities within each management unit and RWO’s role	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some members of the Kugaaruk public voiced their concerns about setting boundaries for narwhal. They did not think that this was appropriate because animals move all over the place.</li> <li>Some HTO delegates asked for copies of the maps to take back to their communities for discussion.</li> </ul> <p><i>Repulse Bay:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hall Beach HTO suggested that the northern boundary for the Northern Hudson Bay management unit should be further north.</li> <li>Hall Beach HTO also pointed out that the current boundary that was drafted is causing friction between the Baffin and Keewatin regions that should not exist.</li> <li>There was a lot of discussion about Lyon Inlet among the Repulse Bay, Hall Beach and Igloodik HTO delegates. Lyon Inlet is in the current boundary for the Northern Hudson Bay management unit.</li> </ul> <p><i>Grise Fiord:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grise Fiord HTO made a point that narwhal summer near Grise Fiord from July to September. The community has received reports that Resolute Bay is still harvesting narwhal at the same time as Grise Fiord and therefore, suggested that Resolute Bay harvests different narwhal.</li> </ul>
Implementing Total Allowable Harvest (TAH), Basic Needs Level (BNL) and Community Harvest Limits, including harvest allocation model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-changes to strengthen harmonization with NLCA</li> <li>-harvest allocation under NLCA; from TAH, BNL and community harvest limits, including harvesting from mixed stocks and the need for seasonal harvest limits and conditions in some Baffin Bay communities</li> </ul>	<p><i>Kugaaruk:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was general support to use the current science advice to set a TAH for the Somerset Island management unit.</li> <li>There was general support for the KRWB to allocate narwhal tags for the Somerset Island management unit.</li> <li>There were generally no concerns raised with respect to HTOs notifying the RWOs and DFO when the community harvest limits and total harvest limits are reached for each community and</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge – “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
	<p>-increased roles of RWOs and HTOs in harvest allocation</p> <p>-Harvest Allocation Model to inform decisions when harvesting from mixed stocks in spring and fall migratory periods to ensure that the total catch from each Baffin Bay stock does not exceed the sustainable harvest level.</p> <p>-overharvest of community quotas (some communities, some years) that could jeopardize conservation and ability to demonstrate sustainable harvesting is identified as a management issue</p> <p>-until a TAH is set the regulatory community quotas remain in effect</p>	<p>management unit, respectively.</p> <p><i>Repulse Bay:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no support to use the current science advice to set a TAH for the Northern Hudson Bay management unit.</li> <li>• There were generally no concerns raised with respect to HTOs notifying the RWOs and DFO when the community harvest limits and total harvest limits are reached for each community and management unit, respectively.</li> </ul> <p><i>Grise Fiord:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is support to collect scientific information and traditional knowledge in support of stock assessment for the Parry Channel, Jones Sound, Smith Sounds management unit.</li> <li>• There were generally no concerns raised with respect to HTOs notifying the RWO and DFO when the community harvest limits and total harvest limits are reached for each community and management unit, respectively.</li> </ul>
Marine Mammal Tags	<p>-existing management measures (regulatory provisions) outlined</p> <p>- new management measures needed to address management issues and implement proposed changes</p> <p>- most communities would retain All-season Marine Mammal Tags; four communities would have seasonal Marine Mammal Tags (Summer and Migratory Marine Mammal Tags); HTOs to establish seasonal harvest dates; Marine Mammal Tags can only</p>	<p><i>Kugaaruk:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many HTO delegates were concerned that hunters would lose tags if they took them with them while hunting. There were also concerns raised about getting hunters to return unused tags prior to the end of the season. Some alternative suggestions to the “tag-in-hand” approach included using a deposit system and/or getting hunters to pick up tags prior to hunting when a limited number of tags remained for the season.</li> <li>• HTO delegates seemed to be of the general opinion that each HTO would be able to develop and/or continue best practices for their own community.</li> <li>• One suggestion that had a lot of support was to add a section to the</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
	<p>be used in the management unit they were issued for</p>	<p>tags for double tusks and double tusk lengths.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some meeting participants/delegates said that using a tag on a tuskless narwhal was new to them.</li> <li>There was no discussion about seasonal marine mammal tags because they are not applicable to the communities that harvest from the Somerset Island management unit.</li> </ul> <p><i>Repulse Bay:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many HTO delegates were concerned that hunters would lose tags if they took them with them while hunting.</li> <li>Some HTO delegates thought that new and younger hunters would need to understand how to attach tags.</li> <li>Members of the Repulse Bay public stated that they have no problem filling out tags and recommended that they use the procedures that have always been used. They like working through the HTO and do not think that they have time to get tags before the hunt starts.</li> <li>There was no discussion about seasonal marine mammal tags because they are not applicable to the communities that harvest from the Northern Hudson Bay management unit.</li> </ul> <p><i>Grise Fiord:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HTO delegates were concerned that hunters would lose tags if they took them with them while hunting. There were also concerns raised about getting hunters to return unused tags in a timely manner. Another related concern included the possibility of missing out on a harvesting opportunity because no tag was in hand.</li> <li>Grise Fiord HTO put forward the idea of harvesting some additional narwhal during the next two summers for the sole purpose of using them within the community (i.e., no tusks or <i>maqtaaq</i> would be sold from these narwhal).</li> </ul>



Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge – “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was no discussion about seasonal marine mammal tags because they are not applicable to Grise Fiord.</li> </ul>
Reducing Loss Rates	<p>-the need for reducing struck/loss rates is identified as a management issue in the fishery; sustainable harvesting concerns</p> <p>-existing management measures (regulatory provisions) to promote sustainable harvesting outlined</p> <p>-DFO asked whether other measures exist, such as community hunt rules, to reduce struck and lost narwhal</p>	<p><i>Kugaaruk:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were no specific concerns voiced about struck and lost narwhal during the meetings.</li> <li>There was some general discussion and support for a proposed upcoming co-management workshop to reduce struck and loss rates. Cambridge Bay HTO was very supportive of the workshop, given that they are new to narwhal harvesting.</li> <li>There was some discussion about harpooning a whale prior to harvesting it and the fine line between pain and limiting struck and loss rates. Some arguments suggested that reducing struck and loss rates are more important in this type of situation.</li> <li>Hall Beach HTO said that their community would switch to harpooning first during the upcoming summer’s narwhal harvest.</li> <li>There was general consensus that corresponding firearm calibres should be matched to the appropriate foot/pounds per second identified in the Marine Mammal Regulations s. 19.</li> </ul> <p><i>Repulse Bay:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were no specific concerns voiced about struck and lost narwhal during the meetings; however, the Repulse Bay HTO did say that they had not reported struck and lost whales to DFO for the past couple of years because they did not agree with what was done with the information.</li> <li>Repulse Bay hunting bylaws include the requirement to harpoon first, prior to harvesting narwhal during open-water hunts. The Repulse Bay HTO and public mentioned that this is an effective method to ensure that narwhal are not lost.</li> <li>There was a lot of praise and support for the current Repulse Bay</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
		<p>HTO bylaws during the meetings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The process for narwhal hunting in the Repulse Bay area by hunters from other communities was discussed. The Repulse Bay HTO is notified and they provide copies of their hunt bylaws.</li> <li>• Some of the public comments assured that high-powered rifles were used during narwhal harvests.</li> </ul> <p><i>Grise Fiord:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grise Fiord specifically stated that there are no problems with struck and lost whales in their community.</li> <li>• In Grise Fiord whales are chased to shallow water prior to harvesting; thus, if a whale is sunk the hunter can usually still collect it. Some of the older public meeting participants mentioned that there are oral hunting rules that have been passed down from their elders.</li> <li>• Grise Fiord HTO mentioned that narwhal harvesters should take their time and not hunt too quickly, or the loss rate would increase.</li> <li>• Some comments suggested that revisions should be made to Marine Mammal Regulations s. 19 regarding the firearm restrictions.</li> <li>• There was general consensus that full metal jacket bullets are more deadly than soft-tipped bullets.</li> </ul>
Marine Mammal Tag Transfers	<p>-purpose and importance of Marine Mammal Tag transfer policy outlined</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 3 phase approach</li> <li>-phase I details and community specific information provided (ie: Marine Mammal Tag transfers allowed within a management unit within a year for harvesting when stocks are not mixed,</li> </ul>	<p><i>Kugaaruk:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was general support for DFO and KRWB to continue to work together to distribute narwhal tags.</li> <li>• There seemed to be general support for tag transfers among communities that harvest from the Somerset Island management unit. Tags were transferred as recent as 2011 to Cambridge Bay to allow the harvest of narwhal in their community.</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
	upon RWO pre-approval	<p><i>Repulse Bay:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There seemed to be general support for the continuance of tag transfers among the communities that harvest from the Northern Hudson Bay management unit. The current procedure that is used is consistent with Phase I of the new Tag Transfer Policy.</li> </ul> <p><i>Grise Fiord:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was little discussion about tag transfers during the Grise Fiord meetings. Tag transfers are not applicable to Grise Fiord under the current or proposed management regime.</li> </ul>
Harvest Reporting and Operational Procedures	<p>-timely accurate harvest reporting is essential and is identified as a management issue in the fishery</p> <p>-existing management measures (regulatory provisions) outlined</p> <p>-new operational procedures for reporting of harvested narwhal (without tusk, and with tusk); roles of HTO and RWO in harvest reporting</p>	<p><i>Kugaaruk:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The HTOs recognized the need for accurate and timely harvest reporting.</li> </ul> <p><i>Repulse Bay:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The HTOs recognized the need for accurate and timely harvest reporting.</li> <li>Repulse Bay HTO specifically pointed out that they have a very good HTO that keeps the community well informed and when the quota is reached all hunting stops. The Repulse Bay HTO secretary manager puts in voluntary hours to ensure that the quota is not exceeded.</li> </ul> <p><i>Grise Fiord:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The HTO recognized the need for accurate and timely harvest reporting.</li> <li>Grise Fiord HTO stated that the community occasionally harvests one or two extra narwhal; however, it was pointed out they follow rules and regulations closely and that the full quota is not even harvested in many years.</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge – “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
Tusk Traceability	<p>-compliance concerns that pose risk to continued domestic and international trade in tusks outlined, and identified as a management issue in the fishery</p> <p>-existing management measures (regulatory provisions) outlined</p> <p>-new operational procedures for tusk certification to address issues; includes new attachment device to permanently attach the Marine Mammal Tag to the tusk</p>	<p><i>Kugaaruk:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were some concerns about getting a tusk certified when the community Conservation Officer position is vacant or on leave. One suggestion included having a backup “designate,” such as a HTO secretary manager to certify or measure tusks in the absence of a Fishery or Conservation Officer.</li> </ul> <p><i>Repulse Bay:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were some concerns raised about the possibility of not being able to reach the Conservation Officer, especially after hours or on the weekend. There was general support to have the HTO secretary manager serve as a backup for tusk certification and/or measurement.</li> </ul> <p><i>Grise Fiord:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were not specific questions or comments from the community.</li> </ul>
Other Sections of the IFMP	<p>-other sections of the IFMP (ie: traditional knowledge, importance of the fishery, objectives, habitat issues, other management measures to promote sustainable harvest practices)</p> <p>-annual community information booklets</p>	<p><i>Kugaaruk:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was general agreement that humane harvesting is important to narwhal hunters.</li> <li>In relation to habitat and ecosystems, concerns were raised about global warming, lack of multi-year ice, increased ship traffic, and killer whales.</li> </ul> <p><i>Repulse Bay:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was general agreement that humane harvesting is important to narwhal hunters.</li> <li>Some HTO delegates said that harvesters do not harvest young calves and that they know which whales to harvest. On the other hand, it was pointed out that sometimes it is difficult to tell which</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
		<p>narwhal have calves when narwhal are travelling in a large group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In relation to habitat and ecosystems, concerns were raised about killer whales.</li> </ul> <p><i>Grise Fiord:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was general agreement that humane harvesting is important to narwhal hunters.</li> <li>• Some management measures based on traditional knowledge were brought up by meeting participants. No narwhal are harvested from the first group of whales that swim by the community. No narwhal with babies are harvested. Narwhal are not harvested from pods that contain a lot of calves. The Grise Fiord HTO also mentioned that hunters are selective and usually harvest males and non-producing narwhal.</li> <li>• In relation to habitat and ecosystems, concerns were raised about global warming and the range expansion of more species into northern waters.</li> <li>• Grise Fiord HTO mentioned that they had seen three different narwhal in Jones Sound during the past summer... ones from Baffin Bay, Norwegian Bay, and the common smaller whales that are found in Jones Sound. It is common for Grise Fiord to see at least two types of whales in Jones Sound; big ones with short tusks and slender ones with long tusks.</li> <li>• It was suggested that Hell’s Gate and/or Cardigan Strait were potential overwintering areas for narwhal. It was also mentioned that narwhal have been seen in the vicinity, even during the dead of winter near Craig Harbour, out at the floe edge.</li> <li>• There was some uncertainty in the number of narwhal in the area based on traditional knowledge; however, the general consensus between the HTO and community suggested that there are a healthy number of narwhal in Grise Fiord. Traditional knowledge estimates</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge – “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
		<p>of meeting participants ranged from 10,000 to 100,000 narwhal in the Grise Fiord area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grise Fiord meeting participants mentioned that past observations had included narwhal swimming by the community in a group about 1 km long and narwhal so thick that they surrounded people’s boats in Jones Sound.</li> </ul>
Other Inuit Knowledge and Views		<p><i>Kugaaruk:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inuit are taught by elders not to handle animals unless they are going to harvest them.</li> <li>Inuit’s ancestors did conserve and knew how to conserve wildlife, a lesson that has been passed down through the generations.</li> <li>People were warned that they should not fight over animals or they will go other places.</li> <li>Some meeting participants/delegates suggested that limits cause hunters to harvest narwhal as quickly as possible in order to reach the quota. These same people suggested that this would not be the case if limits were removed.</li> <li>Some meeting participants/delegates made the point that the narwhal harvest is not done just for money or commercial purposes, but that it is done for country food.</li> </ul> <p><i>Repulse Bay:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inuit are taught to respect and listen to their elders. Elders teach younger Inuit to only catch what is needed.</li> <li>Older calves are rarely harvested; however, their <i>maqtaaq</i> is much more tasty and soft, making them much more appetizing to elders.</li> <li>Some meeting participants/delegates suggested that limits cause hunters to harvest narwhal as quickly as possible in order to reach the quota.</li> <li>Iglolik HTO said that they have seen Northern Hudson Bay narwhal</li> </ul>

Topic	DFO Information – “What We Said” <sup>1</sup>	Inuit Knowledge - “What We Heard” (separated by the community in which it was heard)
		<p>as far north as Igloodik, as recent as September 2009.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some meeting participants/delegates made the point that there are many unemployed people in Repulse Bay and that the tusk is a source of additional income. It was pointed out that the extra income can be used to buy things like milk for children and pay bills.</li> </ul> <p><i>Grise Fiord:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The importance of conservation was mentioned by many of the meeting participants. The importance of leaving the same things that the people of Grise Fiord enjoy today for their future generations was also mentioned.</li> <li>Past teachings from elders includes harvesting in a conservative manner, being selective, and taking only what is needed.</li> <li>Some of the HTO and public highlighted the importance of the vitamins contained within <i>maqtaaq</i> for their health and well-being, especially during the dark season (4 months of the year). <i>Maqtaaq</i> can be the best medicine, it is a nutritious food, and it is rich in iron.</li> <li>The kittiwakes are a sign that the narwhal are coming.</li> <li>People were warned that they should not fight over animals or they will go other places. When there is confrontation it is important to not talk badly about wildlife because they can hear you.</li> <li>Some meeting participants/delegates suggested that limits cause hunters to harvest narwhal as quickly as possible in order to reach the quota.</li> <li>Grise Fiord HTO delegate mentioned that the money made from tusks is helpful, but that it is not very much.</li> </ul>