



# Nunavut Consultation Report

Consultations on the Proposed Listing of  
Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under  
the federal *Species at Risk Act*

Submitted to the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board on November 5<sup>th</sup> 2021

Prepared by:  
Canadian Wildlife Service  
Hayley Roberts 867-222-0112  
Michael Svoboda 867 667 3939  
Northern Region  
November 2021





## Table of Contents

Summary .....	5
1. Introduction.....	8
2. Consultation Procedures.....	10
Pre-consultation .....	10
Round 1 (January 2018 - February 2019) .....	11
Round 2 (March 2019 - May 2021) .....	11
Post-consultation.....	12
3. Consultation Dates and Attendance.....	13
4. Summary of Feedback.....	16
A. Written responses received .....	16
B. Core Comments and Concerns .....	18
C. Additional Comments and Concerns.....	19
D. Short Meeting Summaries .....	22
Pangnirtung .....	22
Qikiqtarjuak.....	22
Clyde River .....	22
Pond Inlet/Mittimatalik.....	23
Arctic Bay/Ikajutit .....	23
Cape Dorset/Aiviq.....	23
Hall Beach .....	24
Igloodik .....	24
Iqaluit.....	25
Kimmirut .....	25
Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board .....	26
Kugluktuk.....	26
Ekaluktutiak/Cambridge Bay and Burnside/Bathurst Inlet (Qinqaut) and Omingmaktok/Bay Chimo .....	26
Spence Bay/Taloyoak.....	27
Qutairuruaq/Kugaaruk .....	27
Gjoa Haven/Usqsuqtuuq.....	28
Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board .....	28
Kitikmeot Inuit Association .....	29
Aqiggiag/Rankin Inlet/Kangiqtinig .....	29
Arviat .....	29

Issatik/Whale Cove .....	29
Aiviit/Coral Harbour.....	30
Arviq/Naujaat .....	30
Aqigiq/Chesterfield Inlet.....	30
Baker Lake .....	31
Kivalliq Wildlife Board .....	31
Kivalliq Inuit Association .....	31
Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated .....	32
Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board .....	32
Government of Nunavut.....	33
E. Accommodations.....	33
Additional Meetings .....	33
Providing Detailed Responses to Questions .....	34
Adapting Presentations.....	34
Inviting Experts .....	34
Delayed Submission to NWMB .....	35
Appendices.....	36
Appendix A. Consultation Materials.....	36
Appendix B. Full Meeting Notes .....	37
Baffin Region Full Meeting Notes.....	37
Kitikmeot Region Full Meeting Notes .....	37
Kivalliq Region Full Meeting Notes .....	37
Appendix C. HTO Response Forms and Letters Received .....	39
Appendix D. Public Response Forms and Letters Received.....	40
Appendix E. Organizations – Letters Received.....	41
Appendix F. Schedule of Consultations in Other Regions .....	42
Appendix G. Raw Consultation Feedback .....	43

# Summary

Barren-ground Caribou was assessed as a Threatened species by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC) in November 2016 because of steep population declines. According to the COSEWIC criteria, Barren-ground Caribou could have been assessed as Endangered but were downgraded due to existing co-management efforts by governments, wildlife management boards and communities, and because Barren-ground Caribou do not appear to be facing imminent extinction at this time. Most Barren-ground Caribou herds have shown large declines since 1990. Across Canada, Barren-ground Caribou have declined from around 2 million individuals in the early 1990s to about 800,000 in 2016 - a 56.8% decline over three generations (between 1989 and 2016). Recent abundance surveys, since the COSEWIC assessment, have shown further declines in some populations, including the Bluenose-East, Bathurst, and Beverly herds. A Threatened species is likely to become Endangered unless threats are addressed. Potential threats to Barren-ground Caribou include: climate and weather changes affecting forage availability, predation, parasites and diseases; industrial exploration and development; fragmentation of habitat in their winter range from forest fires and increasing human presence; increased human population and an increased demand for caribou meat.

Under the *Species at Risk Act (SARA)*, the federal Minister of the Environment must consult relevant provinces, territories and wildlife management boards before making a recommendation to the Governor in Council on whether to accept COSEWIC's assessment and add Barren-ground Caribou to SARA as a Threatened species. It is important to note that no decision regarding the SARA-listing proposal has been made to date. To inform the federal Minister's recommendation regarding the SARA-listing proposal, Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) consulted Hunter and Trapper Organizations, Regional Wildlife Organizations, communities, and other organizations (i.e. Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, Regional Inuit Associations, Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board) in Nunavut from 2018 to 2021. The purpose of the consultations was: 1) to explain the COSEWIC assessment, the SARA-listing process, and the implications of listing Barren-ground Caribou as a Threatened species under SARA; 2) to gather comments, other information, and formal positions from implicated parties regarding the SARA-listing proposal, to inform the federal Minister's recommendation to the Governor in Council; and 3) to address questions and concerns raised.

Under the *Nunavut Agreement*, ECCC consults Hunter and Trapper Organizations (HTOs), Regional Wildlife Organizations (RWOs), Nunavut communities, and other organizations before seeking a decision from the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board (NWMB). Prior to initiating consultations, ECCC presented its consultation plan to NWMB and sought feedback from NWMB on the proposed consultation approach (December 2017). Information updates were presented periodically to NWMB during the consultation process (March 2019 and March 2020), and ECCC worked closely with the Government of Nunavut (GN) and Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated (NTI) to improve the consultation approach following the first round of consultations. Throughout the consultations, ECCC worked collaboratively with partner organizations in Nunavut, and staff from partner organizations (NWMB, NTI, Regional Inuit Associations, RWOs, etc.) were invited to attend ECCC's consultation meetings, and attended when able. To help build capacity for Inuit engagement regarding the SARA-listing proposal, ECCC also developed a funding agreement with NTI to facilitate internal dialogue amongst Inuit communities and organizations on caribou management and conservation.

On January 25, 2018, written consultation materials were distributed to communities and partners outlined in the consultation plan. ECCC held the first round of consultation meetings from February 2018 to February 2019 in the Qikiqtaaluk, Kivalliq and Kitikmeot regions. As HTOs are the local authority for wildlife management in each community, ECCC consulted the HTO for each Nunavut community within the Barren-ground Caribou range. ECCC's consultation meetings with HTOs were held with the HTO members and if requested, a public meeting was also held during the first round of consultations. At each meeting, ECCC presented information to explain the COSEWIC assessment, the SARA-listing process, and the implications of listing Barren-ground Caribou as a Threatened species under SARA.

Following the first round of consultations, ECCC worked closely with GN and NTI to modify the consultation approach and review presentation materials, in order to respond to questions and concerns that were raised during the first round. Presentation materials were adapted to provide additional information and emphasis put into addressing outstanding concerns and clarify common misconceptions and questions about the proposed SARA-listing. Additional information was included and emphasis put on the summaries of previous consultation feedback; COSEWIC's assessment process and the SARA-listing processes; the role of IQ and Inuit involvement; Inuit harvest rights and wildlife management processes under the *Nunavut Agreement*; the potential benefits of listing Barren-ground Caribou under SARA; and local herd information. Through discussions with NTI and the GN, ECCC developed a plan to consult with the regional wildlife boards at their fall 2019 annual general meetings (AGM), in order to provide an update on consultations to date and seek guidance on the need for further consultations in each region. ECCC attended the Kivalliq and Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board AGMs in the fall of 2019, but was unable to attend the Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board AGM in 2019 due to the federal election. At the Kivalliq Wildlife Board AGM, it was suggested that additional meetings in the Kivalliq region were required, and a second round of in-person meetings was held with HTOs in the Kivalliq region in February 2020. Through discussions with KRWB's Regional Coordinator, it was suggested that additional meetings in the Kitikmeot region were also required. Due to Covid-19 restrictions, only virtual meetings were conducted with all but one of the Kitikmeot region HTOs from January 2021 to June 2021. ECCC also attended the Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board AGM in March 2021 to provide a brief update on the current status of consultations in the Kitikmeot, which were ongoing at the time. There was no request for additional meetings from the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. Consultation meetings with additional organizations (i.e. NTI, Regional Inuit Associations, Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board) were also held between 2018 and 2021.

Over the course of the consultations, ECCC adjusted its approach and provided a number of accommodations in order to better address the concerns, feedback, and requests raised by Inuit communities and organizations. These accommodations included having additional meetings, providing detailed responses to all questions received, altering and adapting presentations based on feedback received, inviting experts to meetings, collaboration with partners, and delaying the timing of the submission to NWMB for decision.

## **Results**

During each consultation meeting, ECCC staff had open discussions during which board members and attendees asked questions, voiced opinions, and shared knowledge about caribou in their area. Attendees were invited to provide comments, other information or a formal position on the SARA-listing proposal. After each meeting, ECCC prepared meeting summaries, and HTOs were provided an opportunity to review and validate the summaries before they were finalized. A range of common comments and concerns were received during the consultations. Core concerns shared by at least 50%

of the communities across all regions included that caribou distribution is always changing; that predation is the main threat or cause of decline; the need for Inuit involvement in all stages of the *SARA* process and the importance of including IQ in all stages of the *SARA* process; that caribou populations undergo natural fluctuations; the need for herd-level assessments; that caribou are not declining; potential prohibitions on harvesting rights; and a limited understanding of the *SARA* process. Additional input that was shared by less than 50% of the communities and usually not by all regions, included disagreeing with the survey methodology; disagreeing with the current regulations, restrictions or quotas; the need for more information to support decisions (both western science and IQ); observed increases and decreases in local herds; concerns about scientists disturbing caribou; and that Inuit harvest is done properly.

Results can be seen below, with more detailed tables available in Section 4 Summary of Feedback. Those parties who have not submitted a response are not included below but can be seen in Section 4.

	Response Type		
	Do Not Support	Support	Indifferent
Wildlife Boards	Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board	-	-
BQCMB	-	X	-
Government of Nunavut	X	-	-
Hunters and Trappers Organizations	Iqaluit, Kimmirut, Spence Bay, Qutairuruaq, Issatik, Aiviit, Arviq, Baker Lake	-	Clyde River, Cape Dorset
Community Responses	Aiviq (Cape Dorset) (8). Naujaat (Arviq) (1)	Kimmirut (1)	Clyde River (1)

Although not all organizations and HTO's submitted a formal position, ECCC still received extensive comments, questions and feedback during consultation meetings, which provide insight into Inuit views regarding the *SARA*-listing proposal. Inuit organizations engaged in open, thoughtful dialogue with ECCC to express their ideas and views on the proposal.

The following report and appendices summarize the results of the Nunavut consultations. This document is being submitted to NWMB for its decision on the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the federal *Species at Risk Act (SARA)* as per the *Nunavut Agreement* s.5.2.34 (f) and 5.3.16-5.3.23.

# 1. Introduction

Barren-ground Caribou was assessed as a Threatened species by the Committee on the Status of the Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC) in November 2016 because of steep population declines. According to the COSEWIC criteria, Barren-ground Caribou could have been assessed as Endangered but were downgraded due to existing co-management efforts by governments, wildlife management boards and communities, and because Barren-ground Caribou do not appear to be facing imminent extinction at this time. Most Barren-ground Caribou herds have shown large declines since 1990. Across Canada, Barren-ground Caribou have declined from around 2 million individuals in the early 1990s to about 800,000 in 2016 - a 56.8% decline over three generations. Abundance surveys that have occurred since the COSEWIC assessment have shown further declines in some populations, including the Bluenose-East, Bathurst, and Beverly herds. A Threatened species is likely to become Endangered unless threats are addressed. Potential threats to Barren-ground Caribou include: climate and weather changes affecting forage availability, predation, parasites and diseases; industrial exploration and development; fragmentation of habitat in their winter range from forest fires and increasing human presence; increased human population and an increased demand for caribou meat.

Under the *Species at Risk Act (SARA)*, the Minister of the Environment must consult relevant provinces, territories and wildlife management boards before making a recommendation to the Governor in Council on whether to accept COSEWIC's assessment and add Barren-ground Caribou to SARA as a Threatened species. It is important to note that no decision regarding the SARA-listing proposal has been made to date. To inform the federal Minister's recommendation regarding the SARA-listing proposal, Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) consulted Hunter and Trapper Organizations, Regional Wildlife Organizations, communities, and other organizations (i.e. Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, Regional Inuit Associations, Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board) in Nunavut from 2018 to 2021. The purpose of the consultations was: 1) to explain the COSEWIC assessment, the SARA-listing process, and the implications of listing Barren-ground Caribou as a Threatened species under SARA; 2) to gather comments, other information, and formal positions from implicated parties regarding the SARA-listing proposal, to inform the federal Minister's recommendation to the Governor in Council; and 3) to address questions and concerns raised.

Under the *Nunavut Agreement*, ECCC consults Hunter and Trapper Organizations (HTOs), Regional Wildlife Organizations (RWOs), Nunavut communities, and other organizations before seeking a decision from the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board (NWMB). Prior to initiating consultations, ECCC presented its consultation plan to NWMB and sought feedback from NWMB on the proposed consultation approach (December 2017). Information updates were presented periodically to NWMB during the consultation process (March 2019 and March 2020), and ECCC worked closely with the Government of Nunavut (GN) and Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated (NTI) to modify the consultation approach following the first round of consultations. Throughout the consultations, ECCC worked collaboratively with partner organizations in Nunavut, and staff from partner organizations (GN, NWMB, NTI, Regional Inuit Associations, RWOs, Parks Canada)) were invited to attend ECCC's consultation meetings, and attended when feasible. To help build capacity for Inuit engagement regarding the SARA-listing proposal, ECCC also developed a funding agreement with NTI to facilitate internal dialogue amongst Inuit communities and organizations on caribou management and conservation.



This report summarizes the results of the Nunavut consultations and is being submitted to NWMB for its decision on the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*.

As Barren-ground Caribou are a national species, ECCC has also undertaken consultations in other provinces and territories and with other wildlife management boards that have responsibility for the management of Barren-ground Caribou populations. A summary of the status of consultations in other regions is available in Appendix F.

## 2. Consultation Procedures

### Pre-consultation

In March 2017, ECCC briefed NWMB on COSEWIC's upcoming assessment of Barren-ground Caribou. In November 2017, ECCC submitted the Terrestrial Issues Flagging document to GN and NWMB for input on developing a consultation plan, to identify which communities and partners to engage throughout the consultation process. Subsequently, ECCC presented a proposed consultation plan to NWMB on December 5, 2017 and asked for NWMB's recommendations on the proposed approach. It was decided that ECCC would consult with all communities in or near the range of Barren-ground Caribou on the SARA-listing proposal for Barren-ground Caribou by holding in-person consultation meetings. Only three Nunavut communities, Grise Fiord, Resolute and Sanikiluaq, would not be consulted as they are outside the range, and hunters from these communities don't encounter Barren-ground Caribou regularly. Consultations

ECCC consulted HTOs, RWOs, the GN, communities, NTI, Regional Inuit Associations and the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board in Nunavut from 2018 to 2021. The purpose of the consultations was: 1) to explain the COSEWIC assessment, the SARA-listing process, and the implications of listing Barren-ground Caribou as a Threatened species under SARA; 2) to gather comments, other information, and formal positions from implicated parties regarding the SARA-listing proposal, to inform the federal Minister's recommendation to the Governor in Council; and 3) to address questions and concerns raised.

Throughout the consultations, ECCC worked collaboratively with partner organizations in Nunavut, and staff from partner organizations (NWMB, NTI, Regional Inuit Associations, RWOs, etc.) were invited to attend ECCC's consultation meetings, and attended when feasible (see Table 1 in Section 3). To help build capacity for Inuit engagement regarding the SARA-listing proposal, ECCC also developed a funding agreement with NTI to facilitate internal dialogue amongst Inuit communities and organizations on caribou management and conservation. The HTOs in each community provided logistical support to ECCC, including help to ensure that meetings were well advertised and the materials could be shared with, and collected from, the public after the community meeting took place.

The consultation team was comprised of an ECCC biologist who led the presentations and responded to questions, one or more ECCC staff to manage the administration, logistics and recording (audio and written), an interpreter, and occasionally, when available, representative(s) from the GN, NTI, the Regional Wildlife Organization, and NWMB (see Table 1 in Section 3).

During each consultation meeting, ECCC staff had open discussions during which board members and attendees asked questions, voiced opinions, and shared knowledge about caribou in their area. Attendees were invited to provide comments, other information or a formal position on the SARA-listing proposal. Responses and comments from HTOs and the public were collected in the form of comments at the meetings, which were noted and recorded. Public response forms were distributed at the public meetings and were also left at the HTO offices after the meetings to collect written responses. HTOs were invited to submit an official written response following the meetings and HTOs and the public were also invited to submit written responses in the form of letters. Many HTO's expressed wanting to discuss the proposal amongst themselves in subsequent meetings.

## **Round 1 (January 2018 - February 2019)**

Written consultation materials were distributed to communities and partners in January 2018. The written consultation materials (Appendix A) contained information on the proposed listing, including a letter, a factsheet, a PowerPoint presentation (narrated and in print), and a questionnaire in English and Inuktitut. ECCC held the first round of consultation meetings from January 2018 to February 2019 in the Qikiqtaaluk, Kivalliq and Kitikmeot regions. As the local authority for wildlife management in each community, ECCC consulted the HTO for each Nunavut community within the Barren-ground Caribou range. ECCC's consultation meetings with HTOs were held with HTO members and directors and if requested, a public meeting was also held during the first round of consultations. At each meeting, ECCC presented information to explain the COSEWIC assessment, the SARA-listing process, and the implications of listing Barren-ground Caribou as a Threatened species under SARA. Key points from ECCC's presentations included:

- The assessment of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened was conducted by COSEWIC, not by the government, using available information.
- No decision has been made yet regarding the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou under SARA (i.e. Barren-ground Caribou are not currently listed under SARA); the federal Environment Minister must now consider whether or not to take COSEWIC's advice and recommend that Barren-ground Caribou be added to SARA as Threatened.
- Consultation is required with GN, NWMB, HTOs and other organizations before any decision is made on the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou. Inuit input in the consultations is critical and ECCC is committed to seeking Inuit input into the SARA-listing proposal.
- The purpose of the consultations is: 1) to explain the COSEWIC assessment, the SARA-listing process, and the implications of listing Barren-ground Caribou as a Threatened species under SARA; 2) to gather comments, other information, and formal positions from implicated parties regarding the SARA-listing proposal, to inform the federal Minister's recommendation to the Governor in Council; and 3) to address questions and concerns raised.
- The *Nunavut Agreement* takes precedence over SARA. SARA's prohibitions do not apply to Inuit exercising harvest rights under the *Nunavut Agreement*. If Barren-ground Caribou were listed under SARA, harvest management decisions would still be made according to the processes established by Article 5 of the *Nunavut Agreement*, and existing wildlife management bodies and processes would remain in place. The current roles and responsibilities of HTOs, RWOs, NWMB, and GN in caribou management in NU would not change;
- If Barren-ground Caribou were listed under SARA, a national recovery strategy would need to be developed cooperatively with all key wildlife management partners, and critical habitat would need to be identified;

## **Round 2 (March 2019 - May 2021)**

In March 2019, ECCC provided an update on consultations in Nunavut to the NWMB. The initial consultation package, meeting notes and meeting summaries from each community were included in the submission. To accommodate concerns shared by several communities and to ensure their questions were addressed, it was decided that ECCC would conduct further consultations in Nunavut.

Following the first round of consultations, ECCC worked closely with GN and NTI to modify the consultation approach and review presentation materials, in order to respond to questions and concerns that were raised during the first round. Presentation materials were adapted to provide additional information and emphasis put into addressing outstanding concerns and clarify common misconceptions and questions about the proposed SARA-listing. GN regional biologists were invited to

attend meetings to provide information related to local herds and topic areas related to GN's mandate (see Table 1 in Section 3). Additional information was included and emphasis put on the summaries of previous consultation feedback; COSEWIC's assessment process and the *SARA*-listing processes; the role of IQ and Inuit involvement; Inuit harvest rights and wildlife management processes under the *Nunavut Agreement*; the potential benefits of listing Barren-ground Caribou under *SARA*; and local herd information.

Through discussions with NTI and GN, ECCC developed a plan to consult with the regional wildlife boards at their fall 2019 annual general meetings (AGM), in order to provide an update on consultations to date and seek guidance on the need for further consultations in each region. ECCC attended the Kivalliq and Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board Annual General Meetings in the fall of 2019, but was unable to attend the Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board AGM due to the 2019 federal election. At the Kivalliq Wildlife Board AGM, it was suggested that additional meetings in the Kivalliq region were required, and a second round of in-person meetings was held with HTOs in the Kivalliq region in February 2020. A second update on the consultations, including a summary of feedback received, was provided to NWMB in March 2020.

Through discussions with KRWB's Regional Coordinator, it was suggested that additional meetings in the Kitikmeot region were also required. A second round of in-person meetings with HTOs in the Kitikmeot region was not possible due to Covid-19 restrictions, but virtual meetings were held with all but one of the Kitikmeot region HTOs from January 2021 to June 2021 with the assistance of GN biologists. ECCC also attended the Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board AGM in March 2021 to provide a brief update on the current status of consultations in the Kitikmeot, which were ongoing at the time. Staff from GN, RWOs, Regional Inuit Associations, NTI, and NWMB were invited to attend the virtual meetings in the Kitikmeot region, and attended when available (see Table 1 in Section 3). There was no request for additional meetings from the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. Consultation meetings with additional organizations (i.e. NTI, Regional Inuit Associations, Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board) were also held between 2018 and 2021.

Appendix A contains samples of materials used during consultations.

## **Post-consultation**

After each meeting, ECCC prepared meeting summaries, and HTOs were provided an opportunity to review and validate the summaries before they were finalized.

In the cases when feedback and positions were not provided by attendees at the meeting, ECCC followed up with HTOs to request their official written position on the proposed listing either by email or through the provided questionnaire. Members of the public were able to submit public response forms or letters directly to ECCC or via the HTO after the meetings. ECCC also followed up with the Qikiqtaaluk, Kivalliq and Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Boards, Kivalliq and Kitikmeot Inuit Associations, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, the Beverly Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board, and the Government of Nunavut to obtain their position on the proposed listing. Qikiqtani Inuit Association stated early on that they did not want to be engaged in the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou.

# 3. Consultation Dates and Attendance

Table 1: Summary of consultation meetings on the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou held in each community between 2018 and 2021.

Region	Community	Meeting Group	1st Round of Meetings							2nd Round of Meetings						
			Public meeting	HTO meeting	Number of attendees from community	Dates	Organizations in attendance			Public meeting	HTO meeting	Number of attendees from community	Dates	Organizations in attendance		
							NWMB	GN	Others					NWMB	GN	Others
Qikiqtaaluk	Pangnirtung	Pangirtung HTA	Y	Y	Unknown <sup>2</sup>	2018-12-03	N	N	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Qikiqtaaluk	Qikiqtarjuaq	Qikiqtarjuaq HTA	Y	Y	24	2018-10-23/24	Y	N	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Qikiqtaaluk	Clyde River	Clyde River HTO	Y	Y	23	2018-10-18	Y	N	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Qikiqtaaluk	Mattimatalik (Pond Inlet)	Pond Inlet HTO	Y	Y	11	2018-10-17	Y	Y	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Qikiqtaaluk	Ikajutit (Arctic Bay)	Arctic Bay HTO	Y	Y	23	2018-10-16	Y	N	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Qikiqtaaluk	Aiviq (Cape Dorset)	Cape Dorset HTO	Y	Y	34	2019-01-23	Y	N	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Qikiqtaaluk	Hall Beach	Hall Beach HTA	Y	Y	24	2018-09-26	N	N	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Qikiqtaaluk	Iglolik	Iglolik HTO	Y	Y	52	2018-09-25	N	Y	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Qikiqtaaluk	Iqaluit	Iqaluit HTA	N	Y	7	2018-10-22	Y	Y	Parks Canada, Nunavut Tunngavik Inc.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Qikiqtaaluk	Kimmirut	Kimmirut HTO	Y	Y	50	2019-01-24	Y	N	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kitikmeot	Kugluktuk	Kugluktuk HTA	N	Y	9	2018-02-27	N	Y	Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board	N	Y <sup>1</sup>	8	2021-03-31	Y	Y	Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, Kivalliq Inuit Association
Kitikmeot	Cambridge Bay (Ekaluktutiak) Bathurst Inlet (Qinqaut) Bay Chimo (Omingmaktok)	Ekaluktutiak HTA Burnside HTA Omingmaktok HTA	Y	Y	29	2018-02-26	N	N	Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board	N	Y <sup>1</sup>	10	2021-01-07 <sup>3</sup>	Y	Y	Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, Kivalliq Inuit Association

Kitikmeot	Taloyoak (Spence Bay)	Spence Bay HTA	Y	Y	58	2019-02-26	N	Y	-	N	Y <sup>1</sup>	10	2021-02-03 <sup>3</sup>	Y	Y	Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, Kivalliq Inuit Association
Kitikmeot	Kugaaruk	Qutairuruaq HTA	N	Y	8	2018-03-02	N	N	-	N	Y <sup>1</sup>	7	2021-02-03 <sup>3</sup>	Y	Y	Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, Kivalliq Inuit Association
Kitikmeot	Gjoa Haven (Usqsuqtuuq)	Gjoa Haven HTA	N	Y	7	2018-03-01	N	N	-	NA	NA	NA	NA	-	-	-
Kivalliq	Rankin Inlet (Kangiqtiniiq)	Aqiggiag HTO	N	Y	4	2018-03-05	N	N	Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated	N	Y	5	2020-02-07	N	Y	Kivalliq Wildlife Board, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated
Kivalliq	Arviat	Arviat HTO	N	Y	6	2018-03-07	N	Y	-	N	Y	Unknown <sup>2</sup>	2020-02-27	N	Y	Kivalliq Wildlife Board
Kivalliq	Whale Cove (Issatik)	Issatik HTO	N	Y	3	2018-03-06	N	N	-	N	Y	6	2020-02-13	N	Y	-
Kivalliq	Coral Harbour (Aiviit)	Aiviit HTO	Y	Y	28	2019-01-22	Y	N	-	N	Y	10	2020-02-10	N	Y	Kivalliq Wildlife Board
Kivalliq	Naujaat (Arviq)	Arviq HTO	Y	Y	24	2018-09-27	N	Y	-	N	Y	10	2020-02-08	N	Y	-
Kivalliq	Chesterfield Inlet (Aqigiq)	Aqigiq HTO	N	Y	5	2018-03-09	N	Y	-	N	Y	13	2020-02-06	N	Y	-
Kivalliq	Baker Lake	Baker Lake HTO	N	Y	7	2018-03-08	N	Y	-	N	Y	9	2020-02-05	N	Y	-

<sup>1</sup>Meeting held virtually. <sup>2</sup>Presentation delivered by GN staff, ECCC attendance by phone. <sup>3</sup>Joint virtual meeting (multiple HTOs in attendance)

*Table 2: Summary of meetings on the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou held with each organization between 2018 and 2021. The Government of Nunavut and Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated were met with on multiple occasions throughout the entire process.*

Organization	1st Meeting	2nd Meeting
	Date	Date
Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board	November 17 2019	N/A
Kivalliq Wildlife Board	October 23 2019	N/A
Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board	March 23 2021	N/A
Nunavut Wildlife Management Board	March 2019 *	March 2020
Beverly Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board	May 9 2018	April/May 2019
Kivalliq Inuit Association	February 7 <sup>th</sup> 2020	N/A

\*ECCC first met with NWMB in 2017



Figure 1: Range of Barren-ground Caribou in Nunavut and the communities consulted on the proposed listing. Note that Bathurst Inlet and Umingmaktok are not permanent settlements but are seasonal camps and HTOs for these locations were consulted in Cambridge Bay where they are based when not on the land.

## 4. Summary of Feedback

Note that even though formal positions were not received from all organizations consulted, ECCC still received extensive comments, questions and feedback on the SARA-listing proposal during consultation meetings, and Inuit organizations engaged in open, thoughtful dialogue with ECCC to express their ideas and views on the proposal.

### A. Written responses received

A number of formal written responses or positions were received from some but not all consulted parties (Appendix C). Written responses from the HTOs include eight HTOs that oppose the SARA-listing proposal, two HTOs that are “indifferent”, and 14 HTOs did not provide a formal response or position (Table 3). The BQCMB supports the proposed SARA-listing. The GN and the Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board provided a written response of “does not support” the proposed SARA-listing. No other formal responses or positions were received from the other RWO's, or the RIA's or NTI (Table 4). Written responses from members of the public included nine people who oppose the SARA-listing proposal, one person who supports the SARA-listing proposal, and one “indifferent” response (Table 5).

*Table 3: Summary of written responses received from the HTO boards in response to the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou.*

Region	HTO (Community)	Response Type		
		Do Not Support	Support	Indifferent
Qikiqtaaluk	Pangnirtung HTA	-	-	-
Qikiqtaaluk	Qikiqtarjuaq HTA	-	-	-
Qikiqtaaluk	Clyde River HTO	-	-	X
Qikiqtaaluk	Pond Inlet HTO (Mittimatalik)	-	-	-
Qikiqtaaluk	Arctic Bay HTO (Ikajutit)	-	-	-
Qikiqtaaluk	Cape Dorset HTO (Aiviq)	-	-	X
Qikiqtaaluk	Hall Beach HTA	-	-	-
Qikiqtaaluk	Igloodik HTO	-	-	-
Qikiqtaaluk	Iqaluit HTA	X	-	-
Qikiqtaaluk	Kimmirut HTO	X	-	-
Kitikmeot	Kugluktuk HTA	-	-	-
Kitikmeot	Ekaluktutiak HTA (Cambridge Bay)	-	-	-
Kitikmeot	Burnside HTA (Bathurst Inlet/Qinqaut)	-	-	-
Kitikmeot	Omingmaktok HTA (Bay Chimo)	-	-	-
Kitikmeot	Spence Bay HTA (Taloyoak)	X	-	-
Kitikmeot	Qutairuruaq HTA (Kugaaruk)	X	-	-



Kitikmeot	Gjoa Haven HTA (Usqsuqtuug)	-	-	-
Kivalliq	Aqiggiag HTO (Rankin Inlet/Kangiqtinig)	-	-	-
Kivalliq	Arviat HTO	-	-	-
Kivalliq	Issatik HTO (Whale Cove)	X*	-	-
Kivalliq	Aiviit HTO (Coral Harbour)	X	-	-
Kivalliq	Arviq HTO (Naujaat)	X	-	-
Kivalliq	Aqigiq HTO (Chesterfield Inlet)	-	-	-
Kivalliq	Baker Lake HTO	X**	-	-

\* Disagrees with Threatened assessment, believes it should be Special Concern.

\*\*Position provided verbally over the phone

Table 4: Summary of written responses received from regional organizations and others in response to the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou.

Board/Association	Response Type		
	Do Not Support	Support	Indifferent
Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board	-	-	-
Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board	X	-	-
Kivalliq Wildlife Board	-	-	-
Qikiqtani Inuit Association*	-	-	-
Kitikmeot Inuit Association	-	-	-
Kivalliq Inuit Association	-	-	-
NTI	-	-	-
BQCMB	-	X	-
Government of Nunavut	X	-	-

\*Does not want to be engaged

Table 5: Summary of written responses received from members of the public in response to the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou. We have only included communities where a response was heard.

Region	Community	Response Type		
		Do Not Support	Support	Indifferent
Qikiqtaaluk	Clyde River	-	-	1
Qikiqtaaluk	Aiviq (Cape Dorset)	8	-	-
Qikiqtaaluk	Kimmirut	-	1	-
Kivalliq	Naujaat (Arviq)	1	-	-

## B. Core Comments and Concerns

Table 6 summarizes the core topics, comments, and concerns (hereafter referred to as “input”) expressed during consultation meetings. This input is considered core as it is shared by at least 50% of the communities and was shared in all regions, though there is regional variability in the prevalence of the input (Table 1). For example, all communities in the Kitikmeot shared that predators are a threat and the main cause of decline for caribou, but this was not shared by all communities in the Qikiqtaaluk and Kivalliq. Overall, the main input received from communities included that caribou distribution is always changing; that predation is the main threat or cause of decline; the need for Inuit involvement in all stages of the SARA process and the importance of including IQ in all stages of the SARA process; that caribou populations undergo natural fluctuations; the need for herd-level assessments; that caribou are not declining; potential prohibitions on harvesting rights; and a limited understanding of the SARA process. Appendix G contains the raw or unconsolidated input.

*Table 6: Summary of core input (concern, knowledge, comment etc.) received during consultation meeting. Core input was shared by at least 50% of communities and was shared in all regions (Qikiqtaaluk, Kivalliq, and Kitikmeot).*

Input (Topics, concerns and comments)	All Communities	Qikiqtaaluk	Kitikmeot	Kivalliq
Caribou distribution is always changing, they use different areas/are found in different places	86%	80%	100%	86%
Predation is the main threat or cause of decline; increase in predator population a threat	77%	70%	100%	71%
Concerns about the lack of Inuit participation and traditional knowledge in the assessment process.	64%	80%	100%	14%
Caribou populations undergo natural fluctuations	64%	90%	40%	43%
Concerned over the way COSEWIC established the Barren-ground Caribou designatable unit, want individual herd assessments	59%	60%	40%	71%
Caribou are not declining/not at risk or threatened	59%	60%	60%	57%
Concerned that listing will impact harvest rights (even though quotas are not implemented by SARA, there could be shifting opinions that could affect harvest)	59%	90%	20%	43%
Traditional Knowledge/IQ needs to be incorporated/valued; elders and hunters have a lot of applicable knowledge/information	59%	90%	20%	43%
Lack of understanding of the COSEWIC process and the methodology of the assessments	55%	50%	60%	57%
Inuit want to be involved in the SARA process including drafting recovery documents and identifying critical habitat.	55%	50%	80%	43%
Climate change is causing negative impacts	55%	40%	40%	86%

## C. Additional Comments and Concerns

Table 7 summarizes the additional topics, comments, and concerns (hereafter referred to as “input”) expressed during consultation meetings. This additional input was shared by less than 50% of the communities and usually was not shared in all regions (Table 1). For example, many communities in the Qikiqtaaluk and some in the Kivalliq shared that they do not agree with the methodology used to survey caribou, but this concern was not shared in the Kitikmeot. The main additional input included disagreeing with the survey methodology; disagreeing with the current regulations, restrictions or quotas; the need for more information to support decisions (both western science and IQ); observed increases and decreases in local herds; concerns about scientists disturbing caribou; and that Inuit harvest is done properly. Appendix G contains the raw or unconsolidated input.

*Table 7: Summary of additional input (concern, knowledge, comment etc.) received during consultation meeting. Additional input was shared by less than 50% of communities and usually not in all regions (Qikiqtaaluk, Kivalliq, and Kitikmeot).*

Input (Topics, concerns and comments)	Proportion			
	All Communities	Qikiqtaaluk	Kitikmeot	Kivalliq
Don't agree with the survey methodology	45%	80%	0%	29%
Disagree with current regulations, restrictions, or quotas	45%	70%	0%	43%
Need more herd information to make decision (science and IQ)	41%	30%	80%	29%
Population is increasing (regionally)	36%	40%	40%	29%
Caribou are declining/threatened (regionally)	36%	30%	40%	43%
Concerns about caribou being disturbed by scientists, research is a threat	36%	70%	0%	14%
Overharvesting/Harvest is not a threat; Inuit harvest is done responsibly	36%	40%	20%	43%
Does not support the proposed listing (verbal comments)	32%	70%	0%	0%
Inuit and their rights need to be a priority	32%	50%	0%	29%
Mining is a threat to caribou	32%	40%	0%	43%
Diseases are a threat (e.g. Brucellosis), there have been observations of disease/parasites	32%	20%	0%	71%
Want to see greater management of wolves, including incentives	32%	50%	0%	29%
Caribou are an important resource (food, clothing, culture) for Inuit	32%	70%	0%	0%
Caribou experts needed in consultation meetings/reporting and all stakeholders need to attend meetings	27%	50%	20%	0%
Herds are changing and/or mixing	27%	10%	80%	14%

Want to be responsible for the management of their herds	27%	30%	0%	43%
Caribou need to be harvested responsibly to maintain numbers	27%	50%	0%	14%
Threat from competition with other species	23%	0%	20%	57%
Need more communication around survey results, either no communication or not frequent enough	23%	10%	20%	43%
Want a collaborative approach to recovery and protection	23%	30%	0%	29%
Supports the use of quotas or restrictions to manage populations	23%	40%	0%	14%
Population is stable/healthy	18%	0%	20%	43%
Caribou migration routes have changed over time	18%	10%	20%	29%
Need more surveys/more frequent surveys	18%	30%	0%	14%
Community is already taking measures to protect caribou	18%	30%	20%	0%
Education, especially for the younger generations, is needed to ensure responsible harvest	18%	20%	0%	29%
Want additional monitoring to inform assessment, management, and recovery	18%	20%	0%	29%
Listing could provide greater influence over land use decisions	14%	10%	20%	14%
Don't want to discuss herds that are not their own, don't feel they can make decisions on other herds	14%	10%	0%	29%
Climate change is not a threat	14%	20%	0%	14%
Climate is changing	14%	0%	0%	43%
Overharvesting is a threat	14%	20%	20%	0%
Too many animals leads to disease and die-offs	14%	20%	0%	14%
Need more research on non-Inuit/harvest-related threats	14%	10%	20%	14%
Concerns about what caribou are eating/drinking	14%	0%	0%	43%
Concerned about SARA's prohibitions	14%	0%	20%	29%
IQ should be included in research	14%	20%	0%	14%
The community would like to be involved in the scientific research.	14%	30%	0%	0%
Feel the data may be inaccurate	14%	0%	0%	43%
Management and recovery plans are in progress, these should be included in national plan	14%	0%	0%	43%
Hunting is expensive and assistance programs are insufficient	14%	30%	0%	0%
Not enough funding	14%	10%	0%	29%
Support for the proposed listing (verbal comments)	9%	10%	20%	0%
Concerns over lack of surveys to inform assessment	9%	0%	40%	0%
Concerned about caribou recovery	9%	10%	0%	14%
Mines are impacting caribou migration	9%	10%	0%	14%
Unregulated sale of caribou meat is a threat	9%	10%	0%	14%
Concerns about how listing will affect industry	9%	10%	0%	14%
Survey methodology is not clear.	9%	20%	0%	0%

Concerned about the risks to caribou from collaring	9%	10%	0%	14%
Hunting practices are changing	9%	10%	0%	14%
Difficulty understanding the presentation because of translation.	9%	20%	0%	0%
Funding could provide increased capacity for research	9%	20%	0%	0%
Consultation presentation should address what the impacts/benefits to Inuit are (including economic gain).	5%	10%	0%	0%
Caribou have declined in the past	5%	0%	20%	0%
Low numbers mean easier to damage herds	5%	0%	0%	14%
Caribou use scent to follow previous migration routes	5%	0%	0%	14%
Concerns about insects and parasites	5%	0%	0%	14%
Climate is causing changes to animal distribution	5%	0%	0%	14%
Sport hunting is less of a threat than predation	5%	0%	20%	0%
Modern hunting methods lead to greater hunting success	5%	0%	0%	14%
SARA-listing could encourage protection and better land management for caribou	5%	0%	0%	14%
Concerned with the impact of critical habitat protection on Inuit lands	5%	0%	20%	0%
Calving grounds are moving - difficult to define what to protect	5%	0%	20%	0%
Distrust of the government	5%	0%	0%	14%
Support the use of collars to collect data	5%	0%	0%	14%
Generational differences may affect management (i.e. elders and youth have different approach)	5%	10%	0%	0%
Difference in opinion between GN and Inuit	5%	0%	0%	14%
Need proper funding/training to be a part of this (capacity building, wildlife-monitoring, mapping)	5%	0%	0%	14%
Indifferent on proposed listing (verbal comments)	0%	0%	0%	0%

## D. Short Meeting Summaries

The following are brief summaries of the consultations meetings in each community.

### Pangnirtung

Pangnirtung HTA did not provide a position on the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. Interest in having a GN caribou biologist attend consultations was emphasized. They indicated that there are more caribou today than in the past. Community members indicated that caribou are always moving, therefore being missed by the surveys or being scared away by the survey helicopters or planes and would like IQ to be used during research and decision-making. They expressed concerns about impacts to harvest rights. Participants also expressed that communities without quotas should be assessed and given a quota. Predation from wolves was identified as a threat. They also indicated that training on how to identify male and female caribou is needed in order to follow the male/female ratio of quotas.

### Qikiqtarjuak

Qikiqtarjuak HTA did not provide a position on the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. HTA board members expressed their concerns about the harvesting restrictions and mentioned they want to collaborate to see the caribou population increase again. The HTA and community members mentioned the helicopters from mining companies were an important threat to the caribou. The wolf population is also an important threat to consider. Some strongly believe the caribou will come back on their own and that they migrate long distances and undergo natural cycles of population density.

### Clyde River

In the response form it submitted, Clyde River HTO indicated that it is “indifferent” to the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. The reasons for their response included that there was a lack of consultation, and that the quota system should be continued until a permanent plan is in place. They also want Inuit to have a permanent seat in the plan for management. One community member also filled in a questionnaire indicating their position as “indifferent” to the proposed listing. On the questionnaire, the community member stated that there are always declines and rises of every species but climate change causing the predatorial species to come up might be an issue. They also expressed that if you only hunt males, there won't be enough to mate with females, which could be a reason for decline. During the meeting, the HTO and community members expressed strong concerns about the lack of Inuit participation and traditional knowledge in the assessment of Barren-ground Caribou and the decision-making process. They would like to see more local management and are concerned about their harvest rights. They would also like the different kinds of Barren-ground Caribou to be assessed separately. Potential causes of the decline that were brought up include the natural cycle of the population, migration, predation by wolves, female:male ratio allowed for hunting (meaning females won't have a chance to breed), and the use of snowmobiles which scare the caribou away. There were concerns about caribou being further away, and therefore more difficult to hunt, resulting in community members not eating caribou as often. Concerns were expressed about people drowning because they are wearing clothes that

they buy at the store instead of wearing caribou skins, which are warmer. They also indicated that there needs to be more education of youth from elders.

### **Pond Inlet/Mittimatalik**

Pond Inlet HTO did not provide a position on the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. Community and HTO members expressed strong concerns about the lack of Inuit participation in the assessment of Barren-ground Caribou and decision-making. They would like to see more local management. There were some doubts regarding the caribou population estimates and the survey methodology, and some participants thought that the population estimate of 2 million in the 1990s might be an exaggeration. People believed the caribou population is going through a natural cycle and will eventually come back on its own. However, one person asked for a further investigation on the actual causes of decline of the Baffin herd. Questions were raised about the impacts to Inuit harvest rights if the species is listed and people pointed out that Inuit harvest is not to blame for the decline of caribou, noting that Inuit do not take more than they need and that caribou also die from disease and starvation. Participants objected to all the herds being combined together for the assessment, and to caribou being managed as one group.

### **Arctic Bay/Ikajutit**

Arctic Bay HTO did not provide a position on the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. Participants had concerns about survey methods used to count the caribou, and thought that caribou were being missed in the surveys. Concerns were raised about male-only harvests, noting that females cannot breed if there are no males. Participants also indicated that the low caribou numbers are a temporary fluctuation and that the caribou have migrated to the mainland and will return as they have in the past. Participants pointed out that Inuit harvest is not to blame for the decline of caribou, noting that caribou have other predators, like wolves, that are also responsible for their decrease. They reported seeing more wolves now than in the past. Hunting wolves was suggested as a method of helping caribou. The HTO is working on plans to manage the caribou and want the decision on whether to list caribou to be delayed by a number of years. Participants were worried about their harvest rights, food security and way of life. They felt that listing would have an indirect effect on harvest quotas, which are too small and restrictive. The community members in attendance were unanimously against listing Barren-ground Caribou as threatened at this time.

### **Cape Dorset/Aiviq**

In the response form it submitted, Cape Dorset HTO indicated it is “indifferent” to the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. The reason for their response was that caribou would come back when their food comes back. Eight community members filled in questionnaires indicating that they do not support the proposed listing. Their reasons included that Inuit hunt limited tags and there should be more tags, the need for wolf hunters, the need for caribou meat and that Inuit have hunted caribou their whole lives. A few community members filled out in their response form that hunting only male caribou means no female can have calves and expressed a desire to hunt both males and females. During the meeting, participants questioned the accuracy of the range of Barren-ground Caribou herds shown on the maps and some were concerned that the caribou are not surveyed often enough. Participants indicated that populations will move to other

locations once they have eaten all of the vegetation in one spot and that they are not threatened, they have just moved to another area with food. Others were not sure that caribou populations will cycle up and down as they have in the past because of all the things that have changed. They were concerned about the effect of the mines on caribou and want to find ways to protect the caribou from mining. Participants were also concerned about predation from wolves, and suggested wolf control. Others were concerned about harassment of caribou by helicopters and airplanes. The importance of Inuit Qaujimajungit was stressed. Participants also expressed concerns about the possible impact on Inuit harvesting from SARA-listing.

## **Hall Beach**

Hall Beach HTA did not provide a position on the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. Community members expressed strong concerns about the lack of Inuit participation and traditional knowledge in the assessment of Barren-ground Caribou. Community members spoke about the importance of caribou to Inuit. They talked about how caribou is their main source of food, that they depend on caribou for food, clothing and survival, and how they have always existed together with caribou. There were significant concerns about their harvest rights, food security and way of life. Many community members indicated that they believe the caribou population is going through a natural cycle and will eventually come back on its own. Participants noted that the caribou have other predators, like wolves, that are also responsible for their decrease, that fires have had a big impact on caribou, and that disturbance from small planes disrupts caribou migrations. Some people expressed that animals should not be surveyed and that saying anything negative about the animals (like that the population is declining) will cause them to go away. Participants indicated that Inuit know about the land and the caribou, and expressed concern about outsiders interfering with their wildlife management. One community member expressed concern about the new practice of selling meat through social media. Another community member expressed concern about having multiple communities harvesting the same herd, and indicated that the harvest needs to be regulated in order to coordinate between communities.

## **Iglolik**

Iglolik HTO did not provide a position on the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. Community members spoke about the importance of caribou to Inuit. They talked about how caribou is their main source of food and that they depend on caribou for clothing, tradition, and survival. They spoke of the hardship they suffer when they cannot harvest enough caribou. Participants were worried about their harvest rights and food security; they see this proposed listing as an additional hardship for their community and traditional way of life. It was emphasized that Inuit do not take more than they need. Community and HTO members expressed strong concerns about the lack of Inuit participation and traditional knowledge in the assessment of Barren-ground Caribou and believe that the caribou population is going through a natural cycle and will eventually come back on its own. The caribou also follow the food and move to other locations once they have eaten all of the vegetation in one location. Participants indicated that Inuit know about the land and the caribou, and expressed concern about outsiders interfering with their wildlife management. They want the herd to be managed locally, instead of having outsiders getting involved. Participants also objected to all the herds being combined together for the assessment and being managed as one group. There was a lack of understanding as to why the caribou was assessed as Threatened before Special Concern. Some people expressed that the population numbers were not trustworthy. Participants also commented that the scientific information



does not go back far enough. Mining was brought up as a problem for caribou and concerns were raised about male-only harvests, noting that males are needed to make calves. One community member talked about how, according to traditional knowledge, it is not good for animals when people talk about the animals too much.

## **Iqaluit**

In the response form it submitted, Iqaluit HTA indicated it “does not support” the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. The reasons for their response included that they are not sure that their caribou are Barren-ground Caribou, as their caribou are Baffin Caribou, and even if their caribou are declining they are still working to bring them back. Additionally, they suggested that the caribou in Nunavut should be listed as “Not at Risk” because we need better survey information on those herds. During the meeting, community and HTO members expressed strong concerns about the lack of Inuit participation and traditional knowledge in the assessment of Barren-ground Caribou and the decision-making process. They would like the consultation presentation to address what the impacts and benefits of listing would be to Inuit. The survey methodology is not clear to them, and they believe a herd-by-herd assessment would be much more relevant. They believe the caribou populations are going through natural cycle and will eventually go back up on their own. Many were worried about their harvest rights and would like to see investigation on other threats like predation, industry and impact of research. One community member indicated that Inuit should receive compensation when there is a restriction or a ban, because they lose a source of food and income in some cases.

## **Kimmirut**

In the response form it submitted, Kimmirut HTO indicated it “does not support” the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. The reasons for their response included that they already have a quota in the Baffin communities, and they believe the caribou population in south Baffin has increased. One community member filled in the questionnaire indicating that they “support” the proposed listing, because there are less caribou everywhere due to global warming, mining, hunting and other reasons that they do not know about, they also suggested it could be a cycle. Additionally, they stated that it would not be a good thing if they had no more caribou and if Barren-ground Caribou are listed it would be appropriate to give them wolf traps and put a bounty on wolves. This is because wolves are the main predator of caribou, and it is thought that they kill more caribou than humans. During the meeting, HTO members expressed strong concern regarding the listing of all Barren-ground Caribou herds as one unit. They believe South Baffin and North Baffin populations should be considered separately. Several HTO and community members do not believe the South Baffin population is in decline. They believe caribou undergo natural cycles of population density. When populations are too abundant the numbers drop, but increase again when vegetation grows back. Some community members do believe caribou populations on South Baffin Island are in decline, support the listing, and believe more survey efforts are required. Some community members do not wish to discuss herds other than their own. Participants also indicated that they already have a quota system that is respected. Community members expressed concern related to methods used to survey caribou (e.g. helicopter use), and suggest using less intrusive methods. Community members identified parasites and wolves as threats, and expressed an interest in better understanding how parasites (e.g. ticks) have arrived and how they impact the caribou. HTO and community members expressed concern about

their harvest rights and the lack of Inuit participation in the listing process. They also indicated that animals do not belong to us, they belong to themselves. Nobody owns them; they are a part of the world.

### **Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board**

Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board has not provided a position on the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. In November 2019, ECCC presented at the QWB AGM with new material aimed at addressing concerns expressed during the first round of consultations and further clarifying concerns about the proposed listing. Following the presentation, ECCC staff had an open discussion during which board members and attendees asked questions, voiced opinions, and shared knowledge about caribou in their area. Following the discussions, ECCC staff asked board members if they required any follow-up consultations in their communities. We did not receive any such requests or indications of interest. We followed up with QWB staff person Dr. Michael Ferguson in February 2020, and received additional questions about the implications of the proposed listing. ECCC responded to these questions in May 2020, and followed up in June 2020 asking if there were any more questions and to see if further consultations were required. We did not receive a response. In February 2021, ECCC staff spoke with Dr. Ferguson and followed up by email asking if further consultations were required with the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board or the Baffin HTOs, but ECCC staff did not receive a response.

### **Kugluktuk**

Kugluktuk HTA has not provided a position on the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. ECCC met with the HTA on two occasions to discuss the proposed listing. During the first meeting, members expressed strong concerns about the lack of Inuit participation and traditional knowledge in the assessment of Barren-ground Caribou and the decision-making process. They expressed a preference for assessments at the herd level, and were concerned about impacts of SARA's prohibitions on Inuit harvesting rights and the application to local management. Members of the HTA raised concerns over increasing wolf and wolverine populations. During the second meeting, the HTO highlighted the management actions already taken to support local herds including restricted commercial and sport harvest and that the HTA is encouraging other sources of country food, such as moose and muskox. They noted that there is traditional knowledge indicating signs of herd recovery including more twins, more calves and overall healthy caribou. There were concerns expressed that the listing would affect the management of Inuit lands and how lands will be protected given devolution. The HTA expressed interest in multiple approaches to protecting critical habitat including non-stationary options like mobile protection areas, since calving areas etc. change locations.

### **Ekaluktutiak/Cambridge Bay and Burnside/Bathurst Inlet (Qinqaut) and Omingmaktok/Bay Chimo**

Ekaluktutiak HTA has not provided a position on the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. Omingmaktok HTA and Burnside HTA have also not provided a position on the proposed listing. ECCC met with the three HTOs based out of Cambridge Bay on two occasions and met with the public on one occasion to discuss the proposed listing. During the first meeting, HTA members expressed strong concerns about the lack of Inuit participation and traditional knowledge in the assessment of Barren-ground Caribou and the

decision-making process. They also want to be involved in the drafting of the recovery strategy. HTA and community members would appreciate a herd-by-herd assessment and in their opinion, their herd is doing fine. HTA and community members have noticed increased predation and would like to see an incentive for wolf harvest. HTA and community members also expressed concern for their income from both subsistence and income hunting. During the second meeting, few concerns were raised about the proposed listing. Questions were asked about how the assessment was completed (i.e. criteria used by COSEWIC) and about the importance of collared caribou in calculating estimates. One member was interested in having surveys completed on the wintering grounds to better understand herd composition when herds overlap. A representative from the Kitikmeot Inuit Association attended the meeting and asked for clarification around funding for Barren-ground Caribou once the species is listed.

### **Spence Bay/Taloyoak**

In the response form it submitted, Spence Bay HTA indicated it “does not support” the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. The reasons for their response included that they need more up-dated information, that Barren-ground Caribou benefits them economically, culturally, spiritually and environmentally and that they do not plan to kill, harm or harass Barren-ground Caribou. Additionally, they stated that they are in the process of protecting Boothia from mining and exploration, that all species are impacted by the ecosystem and that they are one ecosystem with the environment and wildlife. ECCC met with the HTA on two occasions and held a public meeting once to discuss the proposed listing. During the first round of meetings, HTA members did not agree with the delineation of the herds as described in COSEWIC’s assessment. The HTA indicated that the Boothia Peninsula herd extends south of Taloyoak and mixes with caribou to the south that the COSEWIC assessment describes as a separate herd (Beverly/Ahiak herd). The HTA considers caribou in the area as all belonging to a single herd, not separate herds as indicated in the COSEWIC report. HTA and community members identified both wolves and muskox as threats to the herd and expressed an interest in establishing a harvest incentive program for wolves. HTA members were interested to know more about threats and impacts on herds. HTA and community members expressed concerns about their harvest rights and acknowledged that a growing human population will increase harvest pressure and that it is necessary to work together to ensure caribou are conserved. HTA and community members wanted more concrete survey data and caribou population data before providing a position on the listing. During the second meeting, HTA members had questions around the lack of data for herds in their area and had concerns about the assessment given the lack of caribou population data for their area. They expressed concern about disease and an increased muskox population causing declines in caribou. There were concerns about harvesting rights and the establishment of a Total Allowable Harvest limit (TAH) after listing. HTA members raised concerns about mining and how to protect caribou habitat, and wondered whether SARA could assist with habitat protection.

### **Qutairuruaq/Kugaaruk**

In the response form it submitted, Qutairuruaq HTA indicated it “does not support” the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. The reasons for their response included that Barren-ground Caribou are abundant in Nunavut therefore they do not feel they are threatened, and there is not enough scientific data on the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou that supports Inuit knowledge. The HTO also stated in their response that Barren-ground Caribou have been a source of survival for Inuit for thousands of years and still is, that Inuit

knowledge is being passed down, and that they don't over harvest or harass any wildlife. They also stated that if Barren-ground Caribou were listed it would greatly impact their way of living and asked us to consider Inuit knowledge on the importance of caribou. ECCC met with the HTA on two occasions to discuss the proposed listing. During the first meeting, HTA members expressed strong concerns about the lack of Inuit participation and traditional knowledge in the assessment of Barren-ground Caribou and the decision-making process. They would appreciate a herd-by-herd assessment and were not aware of any studies completed in their region. They expressed concern about harvest restrictions and food security. They also mentioned various reasons why they are currently seeing less caribou, including increased predation from wolves, more muskox, mining and associated effects (i.e. chemical, planes/helicopters), climate change causing more icing events, the natural population cycle of the caribou and disease. During the second meeting, which was virtual and also held with the Spence Bay HTA, the HTA did not raise any concerns or comments.

### **Gjoa Haven/Usqsuqtuuq**

Gjoa Haven HTA has not provided a position on the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. ECCC met with the HTA on one occasion to discuss the proposed listing. During the meeting, HTA members expressed strong concerns about the lack of Inuit participation and traditional knowledge in the assessment of Barren-ground Caribou and the decision-making process. They expressed concerns about caribou declining, as the species is critical for their way of life and food security. They are interested in collaborating to help the species recover. They mentioned various reasons why they are currently seeing less caribou, including increased predation from wolves, wolverine and grizzly bear, more muskox, and from climate change because it makes caribou more vulnerable to migration on thin ice. They also want to improve youth education around hunting practices.

### **Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board**

In the response form it submitted, the Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board indicated it “does not support” the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. The reasons for their response included that the information ECCC provided was not enough for KRWB and the HTOs to make an informed decision and that ECCC did not provide sufficient evidence that the proposed listing is relevant for all herds (e.g., some are declining while others increasing). Additionally, they stated that biological surveys reporting abundance estimates and trends are herd specific and that the reliability of trend data on each herd varies, with herds being managed individually. KRWB also stated that it is unclear how the proposed listing incorporates or considers Inuit traditional knowledge, Inuit *Quajimajatuqangit* and/or socioeconomic impacts in the Kitikmeot region, and that consultations with Inuit traditional knowledge holders and elders were inadequate (did not include all affected Kitikmeot communities). Finally, they also stated that it should be made clear how the proposed listing and SARA affects or at a minimum influences Inuit rights to hunting and relationships to caribou. In March 2021, ECCC attended the KRWB AGM to present on the proposed listing, collect feedback and communicate next steps and timelines for submission to the NWMB. Unfortunately, due to connection issues, the KRWB was not able to connect to Zoom and ECCC was not able to present virtually to the board. Instead, ECCC gave a brief update on the current status of consultations with HTOs in the Kitikmeot, which at the time were ongoing, and ECCC indicated its intent to make a June 2021 submission to NWMB for a

decision on the SARA-listing proposal. It was communicated by KRWB members attending the AGM that ECCC should continue to meet at the HTO level for consultations.

### **Kitikmeot Inuit Association**

Kitikmeot Inuit Association has not provided a position on the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. ECCC did not meet with KIA individually, but did invite them to attend meetings within the region. Kikitmeot Inuit Association attended the second meetings that ECCC had with Kugluktuk HTA, Ekaluktutiak HTA, Omingmaktok HTA, Burnside HTA, Spence Bay HTA and Qutairuruaq HTA.

### **Aqiggiag/Rankin Inlet/Kangiqtiniaq**

Aqiggiag HTO has not provided a position on the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. ECCC met with the HTO on two occasions to discuss the proposed listing. During the first meeting, HTO members asked if IQ was included in the COSEWIC report and asked how the COSEWIC committees are formed. They would also appreciate a herd-by-herd assessment and they were not aware of any studies done in their region. The HTO expressed seeing an increase in predation, with more wolves and grizzlies being seen than before. Additionally, they want to be involved in drafting the recovery strategy and expressed that management plans already in place in some regions should be recognized. Some members also agreed to the listing of the Barren-ground Caribou. During the second meeting, we heard from the HTO members that they are very worried about potential harvest restrictions and that they are very apprehensive of losing control over the management plan of their own herd. They believe they have a good management plan in place and that it is enough for now. The HTO desired to have a third meeting with ECCC, however the meeting had to be cancelled and was unable to be rescheduled.

### **Arviat**

Arviat HTO has not provided a position on the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. ECCC met with the HTO on two occasions to discuss the proposed listing. At the first meeting, members expressed various reasons why they have observed less caribou than before including: sport hunting south of Arviat, migration routes changing, increased predation (wolves, grizzly bears, and wolverines), moose habitat range extending into their region and changing hunting practices. Due to scheduling challenges for the second meeting, Mitch Campbell (Government of Nunavut regional caribou biologist) presented ECCC's presentation on ECCC's behalf, and ECCC staff participated by phone. There were concerns about helicopters disturbing caribou, the lack of wolf hunting, the sport hunting of large bulls and a desire to protect calving areas and migration corridors.

### **Issatik/Whale Cove**

In the response form it submitted, Issatik HTO indicated it "does not support" the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. The reason for their response is that the HTO disagrees with the COSEWIC assessment of Threatened, and believes it should be Special Concern. ECCC met with the HTO on two occasions to discuss the proposed listing. During the first meeting, they mentioned various reasons why they see less caribou than before: increased

predation (eagles, wolverines), more muskox, increased disease (Brucellosis), increased mining, and the natural cycle of caribou populations. During the second meeting, the HTO members expressed the need to coordinate Inuit responses to ECCC to coordinate input and information. The members also expressed that the wolves are learning to use the Meadowbank road to hunt caribou more intensively and the HTO would like collars to measure the effects of the road on caribou.

### **Aiviit/Coral Harbour**

In the email ECCC received, Aiviit HTO indicated it “does not support” the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. ECCC met with the HTA on two occasions to discuss the proposed listing. During the first meeting, which was a joint public and HTA meeting, both community members and the HTA were concerned about mining activity and identified industry as one of the main threats to caribou. Community members also identified climate change as an on-going threat to caribou. Some community members believe caribou numbers increase and decrease, but will always come back. Community members also expressed interest in knowing current local caribou numbers, particularly on Coats Island. There was a concern expressed that the lag time between caribou surveys and results is too long. The community members and HTA would like to be informed of the health of the herds more quickly, so they can better manage their harvest. Community and HTA members expressed interest in knowing how caribou herds across Canada were doing, and how they were being managed. Additionally, HTA and community members expressed that they were taught how to manage and respect caribou. During the second meeting, which was only with the HTA, the members expressed that IQ says caribou populations naturally go up and down. They also expressed that sport hunts should be regulated more closely and that the Southampton herd is a great example of a good management plan.

### **Arviq/Naujaat**

In the response form it submitted, Arviq HTO indicated it “does not support” the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. One community member filled in the questionnaire indicating that they “do not support” the proposed listing, because there is a good population with the Wager Bay herd, and that other populations are at risk. They also stated that this recommendation should be considered by populations that are at risk, not populations that are doing well. ECCC met with the HTO on two occasions to discuss the proposed listing. The first meeting was a joint public and HTO meeting. Community members wanted to see local management of the herd. They did not like having their caribou lumped in with other herds across Canada as part of the assessment of Barren-ground Caribou or in future recovery plans. Some people expressed that the population numbers and survey methodology are not trustworthy, and that the range maps may not be correct. Some people indicated that the caribou in the area are currently doing well and are not declining. People were also worried about their harvest rights and food security. The second meeting was only with the HTO and they expressed that they see changes in their herds (migration timing and routes) but that their herd is healthy.

### **Aqigiq/Chesterfield Inlet**

Aqigiq HTO has not provided a position on the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. ECCC met with the HTO on two occasions to discuss the proposed listing. During the first meeting, HTO members asked if IQ was included in the

COSEWIC report and asked how the COSEWIC committees are formed. They mentioned that caribou have other predators, like wolves, grizzlies and wolverines that are also responsible for their decrease. They expressed concern about their harvest rights and some have noticed the caribou have recently started to increase in the area. At the second meeting, the HTO expressed interest in seeing GN's 2018 survey data, and they indicated that they would need to discuss the issues further on their own before providing comments to ECCC.

### **Baker Lake**

Baker Lake HTO verbally communicated that they do not support the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. ECCC met with the HTO on two occasions to discuss the proposed listing. During the first meeting, the HTO members expressed strong concerns about the lack of Inuit participation and traditional knowledge in the assessment of Barren-ground Caribou and the decision-making process. They would like to see an Inuit representative on the COSEWIC committee. They also expressed concerns about their harvest rights and food security. HTO members expressed not seeing the Qamanirjuaq herd for a long time, and mentioned potential causes of the caribou decline, including changing migration routes, natural cycle of the caribou population, forest fires, and increased predation. They want the recovery strategy to be developed cooperatively with all implicated jurisdictions, and expressed that there should be extra attention to protect migration routes. During the second meeting, the HTO members indicated that community members should be more involved through the use of training and capacity building. There were questions about the recovery planning process, and how coordination would occur between all co-management partners across the entire Barren-ground Caribou range. HTO members expressed appreciation for the time to reflect on and understand the issues prior to making a decision. There were also some concerns about the harvest restrictions. Past negative experiences with caribou harvest quotas and Polar Bear made HTO members very apprehensive of the impact that listing could have on their harvest rights.

### **Kivalliq Wildlife Board**

Kivalliq Wildlife Board has not provided a position on the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. In November 2019, ECCC presented at the KWB AGM with new material aimed at addressing outstanding concerns, to further clarify concerns about the proposed listing, and to seek guidance on the need for further consultations. Following the presentation, we had an open discussion during which board members and attendees asked questions, voiced opinions, and shared knowledge about caribou in their area. Following the discussions, we were told that additional meetings in the Kivalliq region would be needed. Kivalliq Wildlife Board attended the second meetings ECCC had with Aqiggiag HTO, Arviat HTO and Aiviit HTO.

### **Kivalliq Inuit Association**

Kivalliq Inuit Association has not provided a position on the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. ECCC met with the Kivalliq Inuit Association on February 7<sup>th</sup> 2020. Kivalliq Inuit Association has completed many consultations and analyses, as demonstrated by the comments they have collected. Their detailed reports are a good record of caribou management in the region. We heard from Kivalliq Inuit Association that many Inuit rely on caribou to eat, it is one of their main sources of food. We also heard that the use of traditional

knowledge is very important, rather than just using consultations and that ECCC needs to make sure to use it properly. It was noted that harvest pressure has increased in the Kivalliq due to meat sales to regions with harvest quotas. Kivalliq Inuit Association suggested that mobile protection measures are required for caribou and that density analyses could indicate where the herds are which would allow for temporary road closures so caribou can cross. Kivalliq Inuit Association also stated that hunting is not a major threat, because it is logistically challenging and requires capacity (skidoo, sled, fuel, etc.) that many Inuit can not afford and it means only one or two caribou can be carried back. They also expressed that the government needs to put more resources into investigating the causes of decline, especially on the impact of mines and other developments on caribou populations. In a follow up conversation in March 2021, Kivalliq Inuit Association noted that they cannot provide a position on the proposed listing and that ECCC should contact Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated.

### **Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated**

Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated has not provided a position on the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. ECCC worked closely with NTI following the first round of consultations to modify the consultation approach and review presentation materials, in order to respond to questions and concerns that were raised during the first round. To help build capacity for Inuit engagement regarding the SARA-listing proposal, ECCC also developed a funding agreement with NTI to facilitate internal dialogue amongst Inuit communities and organizations on caribou management and conservation. ECCC invited NTI to attend meetings and they were able to attend the meetings with Iqaluit HTO and Aqiggiag HTO in the first round of meetings, and Kugluktuk HTA, Ekaluktutiak HTA, Omingmaktok HTA, Burnside HTA, Spence Bay HTA, Qutairuruaq HTA and Aqiggiag HTO in the second round.

### **Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board**

In the written response we received, BQCMB indicated it “supports” the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. BQCMB came to this decision as a result of discussions with ECCC and its decision is in part based upon the assurance that the listing would not infringe on Indigenous harvesting rights and that there would be a legal Duty to Consult if any infringement of harvest rights is contemplated in the future. Their expectation is that full and meaningful consultation would be undertaken prior to any impact to harvest rights. BQCMB expects the Recovery Strategy to incorporate Indigenous Knowledge and to focus on outlining measures required to reduce threats to Barren-ground Caribou and their habitat, identify critical habitat, develop stewardship and education objectives, and use existing caribou conservation plans and strategies. They also wish to be involved in the recovery planning process. ECCC held two in-person meetings with BQCMB in May 2018 and May 2019. BQCMB staff presented updates to the Board at its November 2018 and November 2019 meetings. BQCMB submitted questions to the Species at Risk Public Registry in January and October 2019, and submitted an update directly to ECCC staff in December 2019. ECCC provided a 19-page written response, addressing questions on the implications of listing on harvesting rights, consultation and recovery planning. BQCMB representatives were also in attendance at the Kivalliq Wildlife Board AGM on October 23, 2019, and Kivalliq HTO chairs also sit on the BQCMB. Representatives from the BQCMB were supportive of the approach and the material that was presented at the Kivalliq Wildlife Board AGM in October 2019.



## Government of Nunavut

In the written response we received, the GN indicated it “does not support” the proposed listing of Barren-ground Caribou as Threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*. The reasons for their response included that caribou populations are cyclical, and many herds are known to be near or at the low point of their cycle, and being at the low point of their cycle does not mean they are at risk. Additionally, the potential threats to caribou populations include harvesting, habitat loss and climate change, however, the COSEWIC assessment does not present evidence that these potential threats are the cause of the decline in population size. Finally, the GN states that existing legal and other management tools and initiatives in Nunavut can adequately address the declines and recovery of the Barren-ground Caribou herds. ECCC did not have a consultation meeting specifically with only the GN; however, ECCC has worked closely with GN staff and has been in constant communication with them throughout the consultation process. ECCC worked closely with GN following the first round of consultations to modify the consultation approach and review presentation materials, in order to respond to questions and concerns that were raised during the first round. Although the GN was only able to attend the meetings with the Pond Inlet HTO, Igloolik HTO, Iqaluit HTO, Kugluktuk HTA, Spence Bay HTA, Arviat HTO, Arviq HTO, Aqigiq HTO and Baker Lake HTO in the first round, they were able to attend all meetings in the second round of consultations.

## E. Accommodations

During its consultations in Nunavut on the proposed SARA-listing of Barren-ground Caribou (2018-2021), ECCC has endeavoured to accommodate the concerns, feedback, and requests raised by Inuit communities and organizations, in a number of ways that are highlighted below.

### Additional Meetings

During the first round of consultations, a number of common questions and concerns about the proposed listing were raised by communities and HTOs, which indicated that further consultation meetings may be warranted. To accommodate these concerns and to ensure that questions were adequately addressed, it was decided that ECCC would conduct further consultations in Nunavut. Through discussions with NTI and GN, ECCC developed a plan to consult with the regional wildlife boards at their fall 2019 annual general meetings (AGM), in order to provide an update on consultations to date and seek guidance on the need for further consultations in each region. This led to ECCC presenting at the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board and Kivalliq Wildlife Board AGMs in the fall of 2019, and an additional round of meetings within the Kivalliq (2020) and Kitikmeot (2021) regions, including a meeting with the Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board (2021). ECCC worked closely with GN and NTI to modify the consultation approach and review presentation materials, in order to respond to questions and concerns that were raised during the first round. Presentation materials were adapted to provide additional information and emphasis to address outstanding concerns and clarify common misconceptions and questions about the proposed SARA-listing. This meant additional, meaningful consultations, and the ability to answer any outstanding concerns and questions.

## **Providing Detailed Responses to Questions**

Through the consultation process, three organizations (Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board, the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board and the Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board) posed detailed questions about the listing process and what would happen if Barren-ground Caribou were listed as Threatened under SARA. ECCC was able to provide detailed answers all of the questions posed. In the case of the BQCMB, there was a back-and-forth dialogue to clarify BQCMB's questions and to provide a clear response. This dialogue led to both parties becoming more informed, and led to the BQCMB being able to determine their position on the proposed listing. In addition, during each consultation meeting, ECCC staff had open, in-depth discussions during which board members and attendees asked questions, voiced opinions, and shared knowledge about caribou in their area.

## **Adapting Presentations**

During the first round of consultations, it became clear that ECCC's presentation materials needed improvement to anticipate and address key questions and concerns raised by HTOs and communities (e.g. implications for Inuit harvest). Before our second round of meetings, ECCC worked closely with NTI and GN to create a more clear and understandable presentation. Presentation materials were adapted to provide additional information and emphasis to address outstanding concerns and clarify common misconceptions and questions about the proposed SARA-listing. Additional information and emphasis was included regarding summaries of previous consultation feedback; COSEWIC's assessment process and the SARA-listing processes; the role of IQ and Inuit involvement; Inuit harvest rights and wildlife management processes under the *Nunavut Agreement*; the potential benefits of listing Barren-ground Caribou under SARA; and local herd information. This meant a more focused and individualized presentation for each community and led to a more meaningful discussion of the SARA-listing proposal.

## **Inviting Experts**

During the first round of consultations, HTOs and communities were interested in hearing specific, herd-related information beyond ECCC's mandate that ECCC staff were unable to answer. For subsequent consultations, GN regional biologists were invited to attend ECCC's meetings to provide information related to local herds, survey data and methodology specific to the area, and other topic areas related to GN's mandate, and to help to explain the respective management roles of GN and ECCC. This accommodated the requests for herd specific information that ECCC received and led to a more meaningful discussion in which HTO members could discuss a more complete picture of caribou management, beyond just ECCC's mandate for SARA.

## **Collaboration with Partners**

Throughout the consultations, ECCC worked collaboratively with partner organizations in Nunavut, and staff from GN, NWMB, NTI, Regional Inuit Associations, RWOs, Parks Canada, were invited to attend ECCC's consultation meetings, and attended when feasible. In addition, ECCC developed a funding agreement with NTI to facilitate internal dialogue amongst Inuit communities and organizations on caribou management and conservation in an effort to help build capacity for Inuit engagement regarding the SARA-listing proposal.

### **Delayed Submission to NWMB**

Due to the need for additional consultation meetings in Nunavut, the initial consultation period for the SARA-listing proposal, ending October 2018, was extended significantly. The extension of the consultation period allowed for more in-depth engagement with HTOs and other partners to occur. Similarly, ECCC delayed its submission to NWMB on this topic for a decision, to allow adequate time to address concerns and questions, and to allow partners sufficient time to develop their views and positions on the SARA-listing proposal. This allowed more time for HTOs and other organizations to engage and determine their position with their constituents.

# Appendices

## **Appendix A. Consultation Materials**

See attached.

## **Appendix B. Full Meeting Notes**

See attached.

### **Baffin Region Full Meeting Notes**

Pangnirtung

Qikiqtarjuak

Clyde River

Pond Inlet/Mittimatalik

Arctic Bay/Ikajutit

Cape Dorset/Aiviq

Hall Beach

Igloolik

Iqaluit

Kimmirut

Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board - DNE

### **Kitikmeot Region Full Meeting Notes**

*Round 1:*

Kugluktuk

Ekaluktutiak/Cambridge Bay and Burnside/Bathurst Inlet and Omingmaktok/Bay Chimo

Spence Bay/Taloyoak

Qutairuruaq /Kugaaruk

Gjoa Haven/Usqsuqtuuq

*Round 2:*

Kugluktuk

Ekaluktutiak/Cambridge Bay and Burnside/Bathurst Inlet and Omingmaktok/Bay Chimo

Spence Bay/Taloyoak and Qutairuruaq /Kugaaruk

### **Kivalliq Region Full Meeting Notes**

Aqiggiag/Rankin Inlet/Kangiqtinig

Arviat

Issatik/Whale Cove

Aiviit/Coral Harbour

Arviq/Naujaat

Aqigiq/Chesterfield Inlet

Baker Lake

Kivalliq Inuit Association

## **Appendix C. HTO Response Forms and Letters Received**

See attached for Questionnaires and Letters.

Clyde River – Indifferent

Aiviq – Indifferent

Amaruk (Iqaluit) – Do Not Support

Mayakalik – Do Not Support

Spence Bay (Taloyoak) – Do Not Support

Kurtairojuark – Do Not Support

Issatik (Whale Cove) – Do Not Support (Consider Special Concern, not Threatened)

Coral Harbour – Do Not Support

Arviq – Do Not Support

## **Appendix D. Public Response Forms and Letters Received**

See attached for Public Response Forms and Letters Received.

Clyde River – 1 Indifferent

Aiviq – 8 Do Not Supports

Kimmirut – 1 Support

Naujaat – 1 Do Not Support



## **Appendix E. Organizations – Letters Received**

See attached for Letters Received.

Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board – Support

Government of Nunavut – Do Not Support

Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board – Do Not Support

## **Appendix F. Schedule of Consultations in Other Regions**

See attached for Schedule of Consultations in Other Regions .



## Appendix G. Raw Consultation Feedback

See attached for Raw Consultation Feedback.

