ᑲᑐᑎᓗᒍ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᐱᕈᖅᐸᓪᓕᐊᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ
Building Nunavut Together
Nunavuliuqatigiingniq
Bâtir le Nunavut ensemble

DOCUMENTING *INUIT QAUJIMAJATUQANGIT* (IQ) AND OBSERVATIONS OF THE SOUTHAMPTON ISLAND BARREN-GROUND CARIBOU (*Rangifer tarandus*) HERD, 2025

Government of Nunavut
Department of Environment

Andrew N. Kadykalo, PhD

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCHER, WILDLIFE RESEARCH DIVISION

Department of Environment, Iqaluit, NU

The views expressed in this report reflect the voices and experiences of Inuit subsistence harvesters, Elders, and Hunters and Trappers Organization (HTO) members who participated in interviews. They do not necessarily reflect the views or positions of the Government of Nunavut, Department of Environment. While the interviewer and author strived to remain impartial and analyze the data with care, some interpretive bias may persist due to factors such as transcription, translation, and thematic coding. These biases are considered minimal and do not detract from the integrity of participants' contributions.

Summary

The Southampton Island barren-ground caribou (*Rangifer tarandus groenlandicus*) are an ecologically and culturally significant sub-population that has undergone dramatic fluctuations since their reintroduction in 1967 following extirpation in the 1950s. After nearly three decades of rapid growth and subsequent commercial harvesting, the herd declined sharply through the 2000s and early 2010s, largely due to brucellosis outbreaks, severe winter icing events, and hunting pressure. In recent years, population surveys and Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit (IQ) observations suggest that the herd has stabilized and begun to recover. This study respectfully gathered insights from and with IQ through semi-structured interviews with Elders, subsistence harvesters, and members of the Aiviit Hunters and Trappers Organization (HTO) in Coral Harbour, Nunavut, to document Inuit knowledge, values, and perspectives on caribou abundance, health, distribution, and management.

Fifteen interviews were conducted in May 2025, including a group discussion with the Aiviit HTO board and individual interviews with key knowledge holders. Participants consistently reported increasing caribou abundance since the 2010s, noting greater numbers near Coral Harbour and improved body condition across all seasons. Participants described calves as numerous and healthy. While participants described disease prevalence to have declined, emerging concerns include growing numbers of wolves and wolverines and the effects of freezing rain and ice layers in winter, which can restrict forage access and affect calf survival.

Inuit participants emphasized the enduring importance of traditional stewardship, sharing practices, and community-based management guided by IQ. Many supported ongoing monitoring and adaptive management, suggesting modest increases in household tags and stronger community enforcement to ensure compliance and long-term herd health. Findings underscore the value of integrating IQ with scientific monitoring to inform collaborative management under the Nunavut Agreement. The results also highlight the Aiviit HTO's leadership in regulating harvests and preventing off-island commercial sales, demonstrating how Inuit-led decision-making continues to sustain the herd, community, and culture.

Key words: *Commercial harvest, barren-ground caribou, caribou, Rangifer tarandus, Southampton Island, Coral Harbour, Kivalliq, disease, Brucellosis suis, Nunavut, Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit (IQ), semi-structured interviews, human dimensions, conservation social science.*

.

ᑎᑎᕋᖅᐸᓪᓕᐊᓂᖅ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᑐᖃᖏᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᓴᓪᓖᑦ ᕿᑭᖅᑕᖓᓂ ᓇᐹᖅᑐᖃᙱᑦᑐᒥ

ᑐᒃᑐᐃᑦ (ᐊᔾᔨᐅᙱᑦᑐᑦ ᑐᒃᑐᕗ) ᑐᒃᑐᐃᑦ, 2025

ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ
ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ

ᐋᓐᑐᕉ N. ᑲᑎᑲᓗ, ᓘᒃᑖᖅ ᐃᐅᓯᓇᔭᐅᔪᓄᑦ

ᐃᓅᖃᑎᒌᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑎ, ᐆᒪᔪᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑐᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ

ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ, ᐃᖃᓗᐃᑦ, ᓄᓇᕗᑦ

ᓇᐃᓈᖅᓯᒪᔪᑦ

ᓴᓪᓖᑦ ᕿᑭᖅᑕᖓᓂ ᓇᐹᖅᑐᖃᙱᑦᑐᒥ ᑐᒃᑐᐃᑦ (*ᖃᓄᐃᑦᑐᑐᐃᓐᓇᑦ ᑐᒃᑐᕋ*) ᐆᒪᔪᑦ ᓇᔪᒐᖏᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓯᖏᑦ ᐱᒻᒪᕆᐅᔪᑦ ᓇᓄᐃᑦ ᐊᓯᔾᔨᖅᑕᕐᔪᐊᖅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᑕᐃᒪᙵᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᑕᐅᒃᑲᓂᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ 1967–ᒥ ᐱᑕᖃᕈᓐᓃᖅᑎᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ 1950–ᖏᓐᓂ. ᐊᕐᕋᒍᑦ 30 ᐊᓂᒍᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᓱᒃᑲᓕᔫᒥᒃ ᐱᕈᖅᐸᓪᓕᐊᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᑭᖑᓂᐊᒍᓪᓗ ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐅᕋᓱᖕᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᖑᓇᓱᒃᑕᐅᕙᒃᖢᑎᒃ, ᑐᒃᑐᐃᑦ ᐅᓄᕈᓐᓃᖅᐸᓪᓕᕐᐊᓚᐅᖅᐳᑦ 2000–ᖏᓐᓂ ᐊᒻᒪ 2010 ᐱᒋᐊᓕᕌᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ, ᐱᔾᔪᑕᐅᓪᓗᐊᑕᖅᖢᓂ ᓇᒡᒍᐊᕐᓗᓐᓂᖅ, ᐅᑭᐅᒃᑯᑦ ᓯᑯᕐᔪᐊᖃᑦᑕᕐᓂᖅ, ᐊᖑᓇᓱᖕᓂᕐᒧᓪᓗ ᐊᒃᓱᐴᑕᐅᕙᒃᑐᑦ. ᐊᕐᕌᒍᓂ ᐊᓂᒎᖅᑐᓂᒃ, ᖃᔅᓯᐅᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᓯᓃᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᓪᓗ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᑐᖃᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐅᔾᔨᕆᔭᐅᔪᑦ ᐃᒪᓐᓇᐅᕐᑯᔨᕚᑦ, ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᑐᒃᑐᐃᑦ ᓱᕐᕋᓗᐊᑉᐸᓐᓃᖅᓯᒪᓕᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐅᑎᖅᐸᓪᓕᐊᓕᖅᖢᑎᓪᓗ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓂᖅ ᐃᒃᐱᒍᓱᑦᑎᐊᖅᖢᓂ ᑲᑎᖅᓱᐃᓚᐅᖅᐳᖅ ᖃᐅᔨᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᑕᐃᑲᙵᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᑐᖃᖏᓐᓂᓪᓗ ᐊᐱᖅᓲᑎᖃᖅᑲᐅᔪᑦ ᐃᓐᓇᓂᒃ, ᓂᕿᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᖅᑎᓂᒃ, ᐃᓚᒋᔭᐅᔪᓂᓪᓗ ᐊᐃᕖᑦ ᐊᖑᓇᓱᒃᑐᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᓐᓂ ᓴᓪᓕᓂ, ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ, ᑎᑎᕋᖅᓯᔪᒪᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᑐᖃᖏᓐᓂᒃ, ᐊᓐᓂᖃᓱᖏᓐᓂᒃ, ᑕᐅᑐᖅᑰᖅᑕᖏᓐᓂᓪᓗ ᑐᒃᑐᐃᑦ ᐅᓄᕐᓂᖃᓱᖏᓐᓂᒃ, ᖃᓄᐃᙱᑦᑎᐊᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ, ᓇᒧᙵᐅᕙᓪᓕᐊᕙᖏᓐᓂᒃ, ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᕙᒃᑲᓂᖏᓪᓗ.

15–ᓂᒃ ᐊᐱᖅᓱᕐᓂᖅᑕᖃᓚᐅᖅᐳᖅ ᒪᐃ 2025–ᒥ, ᐃᓚᒋᔭᐅᓪᓗᓂ ᑲᑎᙵᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐅᖃᖃᑎᒌᖕᓂᕆᔭᐅᔪᑦ ᐊᐃᕖᑦ ᐊᖑᓇᓱᒃᑐᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔩᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᓛᒃᑯᖅᑐᓂᓪᓗ ᐊᐱᖅᓱᕐᓂᕐᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᓪᓗᐊᑕᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᑎᒍᒥᐊᖅᑎᐅᔪᓂᒃ. ᐃᓚᐅᔪᑦ ᐅᖃᐃᓐᓇᖃᑦᑕᓚᐅᖅᐳᑦ ᐅᓄᖅᓯᕙᓪᓕᐊᓯᒪᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᑐᒃᑐᐃᑦ ᑕᐃᒪᙵᑦ 2010–ᖏᓐᓂ, ᐅᔾᔨᕆᔭᖅᖢᑎᒃ ᐅᓄᖅᓯᕙᓪᓕᐊᓯᒪᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᓴᓪᓕᐅᑉ ᖃᓂᒋᔮᓂ ᐊᒻᒪ ᑎᒥᖓᑦ ᐱᐅᓯᕙᓪᓕᐊᓯᒪᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᕐᕌᒍᓕᒫᒥ. ᐃᓚᐅᔪᑦ

ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᓚᐅᖅᐳᑦ ᓄᕐᕋᐃᑦ ᐅᓄᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᖃᓄᐃᙱᑦᑎᐊᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒡᓗ. ᐃᓚᐅᔪᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᕋᓱᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐋᓐᓂᐊᕆᔭᐅᓕᖅᐸᒃᑐᓂᒃ ᐅᓄᕈᓐᓃᖅᐹᓪᓕᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ, ᓴᖅᑭᑉᐸᓪᓕᐊᔪᑦ ᐃᓱᒫᓘᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᐃᓚᖃᖅᐳᑦ ᐅᓄᖅᓯᕙᓪᓕᐊᑐᐃᓐᓇᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᒪᕈᐃᑦ ᖃᕝᕕᓘᕐᔪᐃᓪᓗ ᐊᒃᑐᖅᓯᓂᕙᒃᑕᖏᓪᓗ ᓂᓚᒃᑐᒧᑦ ᒪᕐᑯᒃᐸᖕᓂᖕᒐᓄᑦ ᓯᑯᖃᖅᐸᖕᓂᖕᒐᓄᓪᓗ ᐅᑭᐅᒃᑯᑦ, ᑕᒪᓐᓇᓗ ᐊᔪᖅᑎᑦᑎᓕᖅᐸᒃᕗᓂ ᓂᕿᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᕈᓐᓇᕐᓂᒥᒃ ᐊᒃᑐᖅᓯᓗᓂᓗ ᓄᕐᕋᐃᑦ ᐊᓐᓇᐅᒪᕙᓐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ.

ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᖃᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᐅᔾᔨᕐᓇᖅᓯᑎᑦᑎᓚᐅᖅᐳᑦ ᐱᒻᒪᕆᐅᓂᖓᓂᒃ ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓯᑐᖃᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᒪᔭᐅᓂᕐᒥᒃ, ᐊᒥᖅᑳᖃᑎᖃᖅᐸᖕᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᕙᒃᑐᓂᒃ, ᓄᓇᓕᖕᓂᒃ–ᑐᙵᕕᓕᖕᒥᒃ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᕝᕕᖃᖅᐸᖕᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᑕᓯᐅᖅᑕᐅᓪᓗᓂ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᑐᖃᖏᓐᓄᑦ. ᐊᒥᓱᑦ ᐃᑲᔪᖅᑐᐃᓚᐅᖅᐳᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᐃᓐᓇᕐᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᐊᒻᒪ ᓱᕐᕆᐅᑎᕙᓪᓕᐊᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᓂᕐᒥᒃ, ᐅᖃᖅᕗᑎᒃ ᐅᓄᖅᓯᕚᓪᓕᕐᑯᔨᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐃᓪᓗᒥᐅᖃᑎᒌᑦ ᓂᕕᙵᑖᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᒻᒪ ᓴᙱᓂᖅᓴᒥᒃ ᓄᓇᓕᖕᓂ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᓂᒃ ᐊᑐᖅᑎᑦᑎᕐᑯᔨᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᒪᓕᑦᑎᐊᕋᓱᐊᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐊᑯᓂᐅᔪᒃᑯᑦ ᑐᒃᑐᐃᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᙱᑦᑎᐊᕐᑯᓪᓗᒋᑦ. ᖃᐅᔨᓴᐅᔪᑦ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓯᕗᑦ ᐱᒻᒪᕆᐅᓂᖓᓂᒃ ᐃᓚᓕᐅᔾᔨᓂᖅ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᑐᖃᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑎᓄᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᐸᓪᓕᐊᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᑐᓴᖅᑎᑦᑎᔪᒪᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐱᓕᕆᖃᑎᒌᖕᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᐊᖏᕈᑎᐅᑉ ᐊᑖᒍᑦ. ᖃᐅᔨᓴᐅᔪᑦ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓯᕆᕗᑦ ᐊᐃᕖᑦ ᐊᖑᓇᓱᒃᑐᓕᕆᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᓯᕗᓕᖅᑎᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᖑᓇᓱᒃᑕᐅᕙᒃᑐᓂᒃ ᐊᒻᒪ ᕿᑭᖅᑕᐅᑉ ᓯᓚᑖᓂ ᓂᐅᕐᕈᑕᐅᖃᑦᑕᙱᓪᓗᑎᒃ, ᑕᑯᒃᓴᐅᑎᑦᑎᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐃᓄᖕᓄᑦ–ᐊᐅᓚᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᓕᐅᕈᑎᑦ ᑲᔪᓯᑎᑦᑎᕙᓪᓕᐊᖏᓐᓇᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᑐᒃᑐᓂᒃ, ᓄᓇᓕᖕᓂᒃ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓯᕆᓴᐅᔪᓂᒃ.

ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᓪᓗᐊᑕᖅᑐᖅ: *ᑮᓇᐅᔭᓕᐅᕋᓱᖕᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᖑᓇᓱᖕᓂᖅ, ᓇᐸᖅᑐᖃᙱᑦᑐᒥ ᑐᒃᑐᐃᑦ, ᑐᒃᑐᐃᑦ, ᐊᔾᔨᐅᙱᑦᑐᑦ ᑐᒃᑐᕝ, ᓴᓪᓕᖅ, ᓴᓪᓕᖅ, ᑭᕙᓪᓕᖅ, ᐋᓂᐊᖅ, ᓇᒡᒍᐊᕐᓗᙳᐊᖅ, ᓄᓇᕗᑦ, ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᑐᖃᖏᑦ, ᐃᓚᐃᓐᓇᕐᓗᒍᑦ ᐊᐱᖅᓲᑎᑦ, ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐊᖏᓂᖏᑦ, ᐱᐅᖅᓯᐊᕐᓂᖅ ᐃᓅᖃᑎᒌᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓂᖅ.*

ᑕᐅᑐᖅᑰᖅᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑐᑦ ᑕᕝᕙᓂ ᐅᓂᒃᑳᒥ ᑕᑯᒃᓴᐅᑎᑦᑎᔪᑦ ᓂᐱᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᑐᖅᓯᒪᔭᖏᓐᓂᖓᓄ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᓂᕿᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᖅᑎᓄᑦ, ᐃᓇᕐᓄᑦ, ᐊᖑᓇᓱᒃᑐᓕᕆᔨᓄᑦ ᐃᓚᒋᔭᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᐊᐱᖅᓱᖅᑕᐅᖃᑕᐅᔪᓄᑦ. ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᖏᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᑕᑦ ᐅᕙᓂ ᐊᔾᔨᒌᙱᑦᑐᐊᓘᖅᑐᑦ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᓯᓇᓱᒃᑐᑦ, ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᓚᕝᕕᒃᑯᓂ. ᐊᐱᖅᓱᖅᑎ ᐊᒻᒪ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᑎ ᐊᔾᔨᐅᑉᐱᖅᑎᑦᑎᓇᓱᒃᑲᓗᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑎᑦᑎᓇᓱᒃᑲᓗᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ, ᐃᓚᖏᑦ ᑐᑭᓯᓂᐊᖅᑕᖏᑦ ᓈᒻᒪᖕᓂᖅᓯᐅᑎᑦ ᐱᑕᖃᐃᓐᓇᑐᐃᓐᓇᓇᐊᖃᖅᐳᑦ ᐱᑕᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᓗᕐᒍ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᑕᐅᓂᖏᑦ, ᑐᑭᓕᐅᖅᑕᐅᓂᖏᑦ, ᐊᒻᒪ

ᓇᓄᓇᐃᒃᑯᑦᑎᖅᓱᐃᓂᖅ. ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᓈᒻᒪᙱᓕᐅᕈᑎᑦ ᒥᑭᑦᑑᓂᕋᖅᑕᐅᕙᑦ ᒥᒃᓯᒋᐊᖅᑎᑦᑎᙵᕐᓗᑎᒡᓗ ᐅᒃᐱᕆᔭᐅᑦᑎᐊᕐᓂᕐᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᓚᐅᔪᑦ ᐃᑲᔫᑎᒋᕙᒃᑕᕐᒋᑦ.

Table of Contents

Contents

Summary....................3

ᓇᐃᓈᖅᓯᒪᔪᑦ....................5

Table of Contents....................8

Introduction....................10

Methods....................16

Results and Discussion....................19

- Caribou Harvesting on Southampton Island: Summary....................19
- Geographic Constraints and Southampton Island Ecology....................20
- Historical Trends in Caribou Abundance....................21
  - Commercial Harvest — Abattoir....................21
  - Commercial Harvest — Past Intra-Territorial Meat Sales....................23
  - Brucellosis Outbreak....................24
  - Coats Island and Its Role in Southampton Caribou History....................25
- Recent Trends in Caribou Abundance....................27
  - Proximity to Coral Harbour....................28
  - Hunting Effort....................29
  - Seasonal Hunting Patterns....................29
- Range and Movement....................29
- Observed Changes in Caribou Behaviour....................30
  - Wolves and Wolverines....................30
- Environmental and Weather Changes Affecting Caribou....................31
- Caribou Health....................32

Body Condition 33
Calf Abundance and Survival 34
Brucellosis Recovery and Present-Day Observations 35
Observations of Crabby Eye in Caribou Meat 35
Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit: Historical and Cultural Observations of Caribou 36
Management and Total Allowable Harvest 37
Perspectives on Total Allowable Harvest 37
Community Perspectives on Current Caribou Management 38
Intra-Territorial Meat Sales via Social Media 40
Harvest by Off-Island Communities 41
Inuit Cultural Norms of Sharing and Community Food Distribution 42
Management Recommendations 43
Conclusions & Recommendations 44
Acknowledgements 45
Literature Cited 46
Appendix A. Interview Guide 49
ᑎᑎᖅᑲᙵᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔪᖃᖏᑦ (IQ) ᐊᒻᒪ ᖁᙱᐊᖅᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᓴᓪᓕᕐᒥ ᑐᒃᑐᐃᑦ 53
Appendix B. Participant Consent Form 57
ᑎᑎᖅᑲᙵᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔪᖃᖏᑦ (IQ) ᐊᒻᒪ ᖁᙱᐊᖅᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᓴᓪᓕᕐᒥ ᑐᒃᑐᐃᑦ 61
Appendix C. Codebook and Thematic Framework 66

Introduction

For thousands of years, caribou (*Tuktu* in Inuktitut; *Rangifer tarandus*) have been central to Inuit livelihoods, emotional wellness, cultural identity and continuity, community well-being, and nutrition (Borish et al., 2021). Across Inuit Nunangat (homeland), they are harvested for subsistence food, clothing, and income. This is especially true for Nunavummiuq (Inuit Nunavummiut) on Southampton Island who rely heavily on the Southampton Island barren-ground caribou (*Rangifer tarandus groenlandicus*) herd (Meis Mason et al., 2008a). In the Kivalliq region, caribou contribute up to 11% of the total diet and are the primary source of key nutrients such as iron, zinc, copper, riboflavin, vitamin B12, and protein (Kenny et al., 2018a). Nutrition surveys consistently confirm their importance: the 2007–2008 Inuit Health Survey identified caribou as the top country food consumed in Nunavut, with 39.3% of recall surveys reporting consumption (Kenny et al., 2018b); and the 2014–2015 Foodbook study found 57.2% of Nunavut respondents had eaten caribou in the previous seven days (Morton et al., 2021).

In Nunavut, caribou are co-managed by the Government of Nunavut, the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board (NWMB), and other partners (e.g., Regional Wildlife Organizations [RWO] and Hunters and Trappers Organizations [HTO], using the best available knowledge that draws on both *Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit* (IQ) and Western science. IQ is a shared worldview—though with regional differences—by Inuit across the circumpolar world (Karetak et al., 2017). It refers to the traditional, current, and evolving body of Inuit knowledge, laws, values, beliefs, and practices, encompassing "all aspects of Inuit culture including worldview, language, social organization, and life skills," as well as relationships with the environment—land, water, wildlife, and people—i.e., "*what Inuit have always known to be true*" (Karetak et al., 2017; Wenzel, 2004; PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2006). Since the late 1990s, the term IQ has been adopted to replace the narrower idea of "traditional knowledge," which was often interpreted as static or belonging only to the past with limited value and relevance to modern life. By contrast, IQ emphasizes that Inuit knowledge is a living, dynamic system of understanding, inseparable from an ethical framework for living a good life and ways of being (Karetak et al., 2017). In practice, IQ contributes timely, place-based insights that can be spatially and temporally more complete than written records, supporting nimble and responsive conservation decisions (Ferguson et al., 1998; Hanke et al., 2021). Both IQ and Western science are needed together through the approach of *Two-Eyed Seeing*—learning to see from one eye with the strengths of Indigenous

knowledge and from the other with the strengths of Western science—to support effective, adaptive wildlife management across Nunavut and the broader North (Thomas & Schaefer, 1991; Bartlett et al., 2012; Reid et al., 2021).

Southampton Island is a large Arctic Island located at the entrance of Hudson Bay, in the Foxe Basin, and is part of the Kivalliq Region in Nunavut, Canada (Fig. 1). It is one of the larger members of the Arctic Archipelago and is Canada's ninth-largest island, covering an area of approximately 41,214 km^2, making it the largest in or near Hudson Bay.

Southampton Island has been inhabited by Inuit for thousands of years due to its abundant resources. Until the early 20th century, it was home to the Sallirmiut, believed to be the last of the Thule Inuit, who were wiped out by a 1902 epidemic. The island was later re-populated by Inuit families from Naujaat, Chesterfield Inlet, and Baker Lake, many arriving through ties with the Hudson's Bay Company and missions after a trading post was established at Coral Harbour in 1924. Today, the Inuit of Coral Harbour are descendants of these families, maintaining strong cultural traditions of hunting, fishing, and community life.

The island's only settlement is the hamlet of Coral Harbour (Inuktitut: *Salliq*), meaning "large flat island in front of the mainland." Its English name was given by Captain George Comer, who noted the presence of unusual red coral in the area (Comer, 1910). According to the 2021 Canadian Census, Coral Harbour has a population of 1,035, a 16.2% increase since 2016, with approximately 95% of residents identifying as Inuit. According to the 2005 Nunavut Wildlife Management Study, Coral Harbour had 283 registered hunters over a five-year period (2001–2006) (Meis Mason et al., 2008b). Of these, 28 were classified as intensive (regularly providing country food to the household), 104 as active (short but intensive hunting in a limited number of activities), and 94 as occasional (daytrips or weekend outings for occasional hunting activities). The community lies about a 90-minute flight from Rankin Inlet, and local employment is largely supported by hunting and seasonal work with mining and exploration companies.

Figure 1. Southampton Island and Nearby Islands, Nunavut, Canada (Base map from Esri, TomTom, Garmin, FAO, NOAA, USGS, © OpenStreetMap contributors).

Barren-ground caribou (*Rangifer tarandus groenlandicus*) on Southampton Island were once described as “plentiful” by Captain Henry Toke Munn, a British Army officer, adventurer, and sportsman who organized expeditions to the island between 1916 and 1918 (Munn, 1919). Although these caribou were never formally described by scientists, George Comer, a whaling captain who worked closely with Inuit in the early 1900s and documented their knowledge of the region, wrote that they “differ in size somewhat from those of the mainland” (Comer, 1910). The herd is unique in that it does not migrate, with the island serving as a natural barrier (Meis Mason et al., 2007; 2008b). Wolves (*Canis lupus*) were also common on the Island until the early 1900s (Heard & Ouellet, 1994). Following the arrival of whalers and fishing boats, and later commercial hunters, wolves were extirpated from Southampton Island by 1937, and caribou became rare by 1935 and soon followed into extirpation by 1953 (Heard & Ouellet, 1994; Meis Mason et al., 2007) or 1955 (Parker, 1975). At the request of the Inuit of Coral Harbour, 48 caribou were reintroduced on Bell Peninsula of Southampton Island in 1967 by the Northwest Territories Game Management Service and the Canadian Wildlife Service (CWS) by air-lifting them from neighbouring Coats Island in the Kivalliq Region of Nunavut (Parker, 1975; Ouellet et al., 1993; Heard & Ouellet, 1994; Meis Mason et al., 2007; Campbell & Boulanger, 2024).

Since their reintroduction, Southampton Island caribou were protected from harvest until 1978, when estimates suggested the herd had recovered to over 1,000 animals and could once again support limited subsistence harvest (Kraft, 1978; Campbell & Boulanger, 2024). Ongoing assessments of this unique herd since 1978 suggest large fluctuations in abundance and distributional changes since its re-establishment across Southampton Island (Campbell & Boulanger, 2024), a pattern common among many caribou herds (Ferguson et al., 1998; Gunn, 2003; Kenny et al., 2018a; Parlee et al., 2018; Bongelli et al., 2020; St. John, 2022). In the absence of predation or high human harvest, food availability largely regulates caribou population abundance on Southampton Island (Ouellet et al., 1996). However, numbers can fluctuate markedly from year to year because inter-annual variation in weather conditions affects forage accessibility, particularly during winter. Without natural predators, the herd grew very rapidly after 1978, and a commercial harvest abattoir was approved and formally introduced in the early 1990s primarily to control herd size, as the population was believed to have exceeded the island’s carrying capacity (Ouellet et al., 1993; Meis Mason et al., 2007, 2008b). Early estimates placed the carrying capacity near 40,000 caribou (Parker, 1975), but this was later revised to around 15,000 based on forage availability and actual seasonal distribution of the

herd (Heard & Ouellet, 1994; Ouellet et al., 1996). Herd numbers continued to rise in the 1990s, peaking near 30,000 animals by 1997 (Mulders, 2013; Campbell, 2015; Campbell & Boulanger, 2024). Commercial quotas rose quickly from 250 animals in 1992 to 1,000 in 1993, 5,000 in 1994, and 6,000 by 1997, with annual commercial harvests continuing through the 2000s before the commercial harvest abattoir was ended in 2009 (Junkin, 2003; Meis Mason et al., 2007, 2008b; Campbell & Boulanger, 2024). The commercial harvest also created 68 seasonal jobs, training opportunities, and new income for Coral Harbour, including work for hunters, skinners, packers, and maintenance staff, and provided an important source of local income alongside subsistence harvesting (see Meis Mason et al., 2007, 2008b). These increasing harvests, with over 6,500 animals by 2006–2007, reduced the herd to the island's estimated carrying capacity of about 15,000 but later raised concerns about pushing numbers too low for sustainable subsistence harvests (Campbell & Boulanger, 2024).

However, after nearly three decades of rapid growth, the population declined sharply through the 2000s and early 2010s, dropping to fewer than 8,500 in 2011 and 7,300 by 2013; an average annual decline of roughly 9% between 1997 and 2013 (Campbell, 2015; Campbell & Boulanger, 2024). Co-management partners, the Aiviit Hunters and Trappers Organization (HTO) in Coral Harbour and the Government of Nunavut, agreed to suspend the commercial harvest after 2009 to help stabilize the declining population and maintain numbers sufficient to support subsistence harvesting. With the formal commercial harvest already halted, the Aiviit HTO and GN had limited options and implemented a Total Allowable Harvest (TAH) in 2012 to regulate subsistence harvests and address the growing sale of caribou meat, particularly to Baffin communities through social media (Campbell, 2015; Campbell & Boulanger, 2024). A locally reported and genetically supported winter immigration event of mainland barren-ground caribou between 2013 and 2015 contributed to a subsequent increase (Paetkau, 2015), and since about 2015 the herd has remained relatively stable at 12,000–13,000 animals, including the most recent survey in 2023, which estimated 12,651 (Campbell, 2015; Campbell & Boulanger, 2024). While the herd has shown relative stability from 2015 to 2023 (Campbell & Boulanger, 2024), it remains below historic levels (Ouellet et al., 1993; Heard & Ouellet, 1994).

The decline of the Southampton Island caribou starting in the 2000s has been primarily driven by disease, harvest, and winter weather conditions (Campbell & Boulanger, 2024). Low genetic diversity following reintroduction from Coats Island caribou made the herd susceptible to disease. The reproductive disease *Brucella suis* Type IV (Brucellosis) spread rapidly after first

being detected in 2000 (1.7% prevalence), peaking at 58.8% in 2011 (Campbell, 2015). Over the same period, pregnancy rates fell from a high of 93.1% in 2001 to a low of 37% in 2011 (Campbell, 2015). High infection rates raised concerns both for human health and for the herd's ability to sustain and recover under substantial commercial and subsistence harvesting pressures. Severe winter conditions, especially icing events, limited forage access and likely drove year-to-year fluctuations; notably, extensive icing during the winters of 2010 and 2011 reduced food availability, leading to poor body condition, reduced reproductive success, and widespread reports of starving and dead caribou (Tyler, 2010; Campbell, 2015). More recent observations (2015–2023) suggest disease prevalence is decreasing, with improved calf survival, indicating that harvest and winter conditions should now be the primary focus for management and monitoring, alongside improved tracking of both subsistence and commercial harvests (Campbell & Boulanger, 2024).

In addition to disease and weather, a new but unregulated form of commercial harvest, social media sales of caribou meat, emerged as a dominant threat to the long-term sustainability of the Southampton Island herd (Campbell & Boulanger, 2024). While subsistence harvest remains essential for Inuit food security, this new pressure developed rapidly in 2010 in the form of social media sales of caribou meat off-island. A lucrative market opened on Baffin Island, where communities were struggling with declining caribou populations, and demand for Southampton Island caribou grew quickly. In the first eight months of sales alone, 24,764 kilograms of caribou meat, representing an estimated 710 caribou, were shipped off the island (Campbell & Boulanger, 2024). Although airline data that allowed tracking of these exports was cut off in January 2012, evidence suggests that harvest levels during 2011–2012 exceeded subsistence needs, particularly as buyers often paid premiums for fat animals, most of which were pregnant females in winter and spring (Campbell & Boulanger, 2024). The unanticipated commercial harvest and sale of caribou meat through social media was protected as a right under the Nunavut Agreement, leaving the Aiviit HTO and the Government of Nunavut with little option but to apply a TAH to curb these pressures. Despite efforts to manage the issue, Campbell and Boulanger (2024) report that attempts to control intra-territorial meat sales via social media have been largely ineffective under the current management regime through 2023, though their consultations at the time with Kivalliq HTOs suggested that a legislative approach to addressing these sales could be mutually supported. Since then, however, the results presented herein indicate that the Aiviit HTO has intervened to regulate this practice, deciding at an Annual

General Meeting to halt off-island exports and instructing Calm Air, the primary airline serving Southampton Island, not to transport caribou for commercial sale.

Harvesting on Southampton Island is governed under Nunavut's wildlife co-management system, in which the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board (NWMB) makes final decisions based on recommendations from the Government of Nunavut's Department of Environment and Inuit organizations. At the community level, harvesting is overseen by the Aiviit Hunters and Trappers Organization (HTO), which plays a central role in implementing and supporting management within Coral Harbour and on Southampton Island. The HTO plays a central role in coordinating and supporting harvesting practices, allocating community quotas, maintaining harvest records, and promoting locally beneficial economic initiatives. While the HTO does not enforce quotas, it supports compliance through community oversight, guidance, and communication with members. The current management strategy, co-developed by the Government of Nunavut and the Aiviit HTO, combines regular aerial surveys with an extensive health monitoring program. The sharp decline recorded in the 2011 and 2013 aerial surveys led to a reduced TAH: 1,000 for 2012–2013 and 800 for 2014–2015 (Campbell, 2015). A rise detected in 2015 briefly raised the TAH to 1,600 in 2016, but when numbers fell again in 2017, it was brought back down to 1,000 (Campbell & Boulanger, 2024). With surveys in 2019 and 2023 indicating herd abundance stability, the TAH has since remained at 1,000 animals to support herd recovery while ensuring continued current and future access for Inuit subsistence and limited commercial harvesting (Campbell & Boulanger, 2024).

Methods

This project was designed to respectfully gather insights from and with *Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit* (**IQ**: Inuit knowledge, values, and perspectives) and to help mobilize this knowledge in ways that support collaborative and informed caribou management planning for the Southampton Island herd. To achieve this, we spoke with subsistence harvesters, Elders, members of the Aiviit HTO, and other key knowledge holders in Coral Harbour to gather IQ about Southampton Island caribou. We took a qualitative social sciences research approach, using open-ended, semi-structured interviews that followed a scripted guide while leaving space for discussion and elaboration; this approach encouraged participants to explain their positions and knowledge freely, while also allowing for precise, sometimes sensitive information to emerge (Axinn &

Pearce, 2006; Creswell & Creswell, 2022). A local interpreter was hired to provide Inuktitut–English translation for participants who spoke Inuktitut or were more comfortable using their first language. In total, 15 semi-structured interviews were conducted in-person in Coral Harbour between May 14 and 21, 2025. Seven of these were conducted as a group interview with the Aiviit HTO board during a board meeting, while the remaining eight were individual interviews. The 14-question interview guide (Appendix A) was used to gather IQ and perspectives on Southampton Island caribou, focusing on abundance, condition, distribution, cultural significance, changes over time, and current management policies such as the Total Allowable Harvest (TAH). This knowledge will help inform future decisions by the Government of Nunavut and the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board, supporting stronger management that respects and includes IQ in decision-making.

These interviews shared ecological and cultural experiences and observations about caribou spanning many decades, covering the community of Coral Harbour, all of Southampton Island, and neighbouring Coats and White Islands (Fig. 1). We began by interviewing members of the Aiviit HTO (chairperson, manager, and board members). From there, additional participants were recruited through a snowball approach, where interviewees voluntarily referred others who could share valuable (IQ) knowledge. While we did not ask participants their age, respondents ranged from young adults (20s–30s) to Elders. In Inuit communities, 'Elder' often refers to individuals around 55 or 60 years and older, but the term is based less on age than on community-recognized cultural knowledge, experience, and respect. Importantly, Elders are identified by others, not typically by self-designation. All interview participants were male. Some interview participants elected to remain anonymous while others released their identities. Although some interviewees granted permission to use their names, all quotes shared in this article are attributed anonymously to protect identities. Interviews lasted between 10 min and 1 and half hours, depending on the level of detail provided by the respondent.

Participation in this study was completely voluntary. Participants could choose not to answer any question, stop the interview at any time, or withdraw from the study without consequence. The research was registered with the Nunavut Research Institute (NRI) as *Documenting Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit (IQ) and Observations of the Southampton Island Caribou Herd*, under its database of projects exempt from full licensing under the *Nunavut Scientists Act*. This exemption was granted because the work supports internal Government of Nunavut (GN) policy, programs, and services, provided it is minimally impactful and ethically sound (personal

communication with Jamal Shirley, Director, Innovation and Research at NRI). The researcher committed to upholding Inuit Nunavummiut self-determination in research and to following established principles of ethical, respectful engagement with Inuit communities. The project was guided by the *National Inuit Strategy on Research* and the *OCAP® principles of Ownership, Control, Access, and Possession* as a framework for IQ data governance, and importantly, free prior informed consent was sought before each interview. All participants gave informed consent to participate in the study. With participant permission, interviews were also audio-recorded. Participants received an honorarium for their participation, in accordance with the Government of Nunavut Honorarium Rates Schedule (FAM 810, Appendix A); HTO/HTA Katimaji/members could receive up to $175 per half day, and Elders serving as Uqaqtittiji (Chair) could receive up to $250 per half day. A copy of the consent form is in Appendix B.

Interview transcripts were transcribed from audio to text using Otter.AI. Qualitative interview data were analyzed using NVivo 15.2.1 (Lumivero, 2023). We applied a combination of inductive ("bottom-up") and deductive ("top-down") coding, iteratively cycling between reading, coding, and refining the codebook to ensure consistency and rigor in theme identification (Thomas, 2006; Adu, 2019; Saldaña, 2021; Charmaz & Belgrave, 2012). Deductive themes were based on interview question topics (e.g., abundance, health and recruitment, behaviour, range and movement, management), while inductive themes emerged through repeated reading, reflection, and comparison across transcripts. Responses were initially read to identify key words, which were compiled into a list of potential codes. Similar codes were then grouped into broader themes. Transcripts were read a second time, and responses were sorted under these themes to assess their prevalence, measured both as the number of interviewees mentioning a theme and the overall frequency of mentions across all transcripts. Individual responses could be assigned multiple thematic codes if warranted. All coding was performed by the first author. The codebook is available in Appendix C. In this report, we use terms such as *most*, *many*, *some*, and *few* to summarize participant perspectives. These labels provide a general sense of how commonly a theme was raised while protecting individual anonymity. Broadly, *most* refers to the largest share of respondents, followed by *many* (more than *some*), and *few*, which reflects the smallest number.

Results and Discussion

We interviewed 15 Inuit harvesters, elders, and members of the Aiviit Hunter and Trappers Organization (HTO; hereafter "HTO" or "the HTO") in Coral Harbour, who shared their extensive knowledge and personal experiences of caribou harvesting on Southampton Island and the nearby Coats and White Islands.

Caribou Harvesting on Southampton Island: Summary

Interview participants described a long history of caribou harvesting on Southampton Island, shaped by changes in population abundance, regulations, and technology. Several elders recalled that caribou were extirpated mid-1900s and reintroduced from Coats Island in the late 1960s or early 1970s, with about 50-60 animals to start. For 15 years following reintroduction, harvest was prohibited to allow the population to grow. When hunting resumed, it was initially restricted to one animal shared between two households, later increasing to one, two, and eventually four animals per household.

Following reintroduction from Coats Island, participants described a period of rapid caribou population growth, reaching estimates of around 30,000 animals, followed by concerns about overpopulation and subsequent declines. Commercial harvest (including the abattoir and past intra-territorial export sales of meat) and disease were mentioned as contributing factors to the decline.

Harvesting practices vary seasonally: bulls are typically hunted in fall, while in winter hunters target females without calves to support population growth. Some participants hunt weekly or biweekly to maintain a steady meat supply, with more intensive harvesting in the fall when animals are fatter. Others noted hunting in August for hides suitable for clothing.

Technological changes have influenced harvesting: dog teams were used in earlier years, replaced by snowmobiles and ATVs from the 1970s onward, making caribou more accessible across the island. Participants reflected on their personal harvesting histories, which were generally extensive, ranging from a couple of decades to lifelong harvesting (40+ years) for some. While we did not specifically ask for age, respondents likely included individuals as young as their 20s–30s up to elders, with skills and knowledge gained through both family mentorship and personal experience.

Geographic Constraints and Southampton Island Ecology

Southampton Island's geography — relatively small, isolated, and without migration routes to the mainland — shapes nearly every aspect of its caribou population, including abundance, movement, body condition, and management. As several harvesters noted, the island "is not very big… you can go to the edge of it in a day" by snowmobile, and even during summer, rough terrain slows travel but much of the island can still be reached in a single trip. Caribou are "kind of locked in" with "nowhere else to go," moving seasonally between rocky uplands and flatter gravel areas, but never leaving the island.

Because the herd cannot easily disperse beyond the island, abundance and distribution are tightly linked to food availability. Harvesters noted that distribution can be highly uneven, with "a lot more" caribou in some areas but "absolutely nothing" in others, as animals often concentrate in particular feeding grounds (see *Range and Movement* for further discussion).

Harvesters also stressed the important need to "find the right balance": avoiding overabundance, which can lead to overgrazing, hunger, and disease, and low numbers that limit harvest opportunities. An elder explained, when hunters recognized how abundant the herd had become, they began calling for renewed harvesting, noting that "when they're over abundant, some will just die from sickness… this island isn't too big." Overcrowding has, in the past, prompted management actions such as large-scale harvests to reduce the herd by thousands (see *Commercial Harvest – Abattoir* and *Brucellosis Outbreak*); as one participant explained, "the island can't hold so many caribou… they run out of food really quickly."

An HTO board member/harvester noted that "the caribou should be at around 15,000; right now, they are at around 13,000. We would eventually like to see an increase in the TAH [Total Allowable Harvest]" referencing the island's hypothesized carrying capacity of approximately 15,000 caribou (Ouellet et al., 1996). Body condition reflects these constraints, and while some caribou are found near the community, many hunters travel farther into hillier or rockier terrain in search of "healthier" or "fatter" animals (see *Hunting Effort*).

Modern vehicles make these areas more accessible, though travel remains limited by weather and terrain, reinforcing the link between movement patterns, feeding grounds, and physical condition. On a small, closed island, caribou abundance and movement are inseparable from careful local stewardship and management decisions.

Historical Trends in Caribou Abundance

Interview participants' knowledge confirmed abundance trends reported by Campbell and Boulanger (2024), including the mid-1900s extirpation of caribou from Southampton Island, the subsequent reintroduction from Coats Island, a 30-year period of population growth during a harvest abstinence through the 1990s, followed by a return to subsistence harvest and the opening of a commercial harvest and then a rapid decline.

> "I don't remember the exact year caribou were introduced from Coats Island, maybe 1968. 20 years later I remember there were some on the Island, but we weren't allowed to hunt them. Eventually, harvest limits increased from one per two families, to one per household, then up to four. I remember them reaching about 30,000 animals around 20 years ago. Now I'm hearing it's closer to 13,000."

> "I'm from Northern Quebec but moved here when there were hardly any caribou. They were reintroduced from Coats Island. I remember each household receiving half a caribou. The population somewhat exploded—over 30,000."

The subsequent decline starting in around the early 2000s was attributed to both commercial harvest (including the abattoir and off-island intra-territorial meat sales) and disease (e.g., brucellosis):

> "For the past five years, we've seen the caribou decrease because of caribou selling. That's why the HTO decided to pause sales for a few years, to see if the population can recover."

> "I've been here 29 years, and we've seen the decline in numbers. The bulls especially, after 2011, their numbers and size crashed."

Commercial Harvest — Abattoir

Four interview participants described the commercial harvest, referring to the "abattoir" (slaughterhouse) that operated from 1993 until its closure in 2009. The establishment of the large-scale commercial harvest on the Island was associated with concerns about overpopulation and high caribou abundance:

> “Overpopulation. They were numbered at 30,000 plus. That’s when the caribou abattoir was introduced to the island to control the caribou.”

Conversely, as indicated, the abattoir was also implicated in the herd’s subsequent decline:

> “After that abattoir was carrying on, the number of caribou decreased, of course. There was some sort of a population crash, also from brucellosis, sickness, so that decreased the number.”

> “Caribou harvesting went on for about eight or nine years until the population started to decline. I was one of the hunters at the time, and I remember the caribou numbers dropped suddenly. Cut in half.”

This in turn led to the implementation of a tag-based total allowable harvest management system (see *Management and Total Allowable Harvest*).

> “After about a year, we started using caribou tags. At first, we were given six tags. But the numbers kept declining. So, each household was only allowed to harvest four caribou per year. That's the limit we still have now, as far as I know.”

For roughly 5–11 years, guided recreational (sports) hunting by non-local hunters also continued until the HTO implemented a pause to allow the caribou population to recover and reach a sustainable size.

One elder/harvester familiar with the time period of the abattoir operations noted that population data or harvest records were not well-tracked or shared during this time:

> “We didn't get the numbers from the caribou harvesting. How many caribou were harvested that time from the caribou harvesting or commercial caribou harvesting, we weren't allowed to get the numbers that time. I don't know why, though.”

Since the closure of the commercial harvest abattoir participants described the situation as stable with minor fluctuations: “The caribou rotation is abundance, increase, decrease. It’s circular.” Such cycles of abundance and scarcity are widely recognized as a natural feature of caribou populations across the Circumpolar North (Ferguson et al., 1998; Gunn, 2003; Kenny et al., 2018a; Parlee et al., 2018; Bongelli et al., 2020, St. John, 2022).

Commercial Harvest — Past Intra-Territorial Meat Sales

Nearly all participants (12 of 15) commented on the intra-territorial sales of caribou meat on social media “a new form of commercial harvesting protected as a right under the Nunavut Agreement, that began in 2010 and reached levels believed to have exceeded the subsistence harvest over the 2011/2012 harvesting season” (Campbell & Boulanger, 2024). Over the past several years, caribou numbers have declined, partly due to intra-territorial commercial sales of caribou over social media before the HTO paused the practice. At the time, the HTO sold caribou tags ($25 each, around 200 tags), allowing buyers to sell the meat freely. The practice was partly driven by high demand from outside the community, particularly in larger Baffin communities, resulting in large volumes—“like 40,000 pounds in less than a year”—being exported by plane and prompting complaints from transport agents. As one participant recalled, “going back now like five years ago, it was hard to catch them after so many people selling to Baffin.”

Several participants described widespread frustration with the scale of intra-territorial caribou meat sales and the perception that existing management tools were insufficient to address the issue. While interviewees did not focus on specific enforcement mechanisms, they emphasized that unchecked sales, particularly those facilitated by air transport, were undermining conservation efforts and community trust. This frustration contributed to strong community support for halting the shipment of caribou meat out of Coral Harbour, reflecting a collective desire to “step up” in the face of conservation concerns and ensure that caribou would remain available for future generations.

A former board member while working at First Air Cargo witnessed the scale of the trade: “they were sending like 2,000 pounds a day, every day, for the past four to six months.” Upon joining the HTO board, he pushed to stop caribou sales to allow the population to recover, reasoning, “if we want to keep hunting these caribou, we need to stop the caribou selling. We need to step

up.” He highlighted the long-term, intergenerational importance: “When you want our grandkids, or great-grandkids, to keep hunting caribou, like if we don't take care of our caribou, we may not even see them over the years.” Eventually, the HTO intervened to regulate the practice. He and others advocated halting sales “for at least a few years to see if the caribou population are going to go back up,” stressing that while Inuit have the right to sell, “when you have a conservation concern… we can step up and control the caribou.”

Although the proposal drew some disagreement at the Coral Harbour Annual General Meeting (AGM), “a lot more people” supported it, and the decision to halt intra-territorial commercial sales that relied on air transport “turned out pretty good”.

As one harvester/HTO board member noted, “Yeah, I'm sure there were a few guys that lost some money, but the numbers were going down too quickly… it had to be stopped.” Calm Air, the main airline serving Southampton Island, was advised by the HTO not to transport any caribou: “If they [Calm Air agents] see a box cracked, if they see it's caribou, they'll stop it. Some people will still try to smuggle it out.” Thus, currently, harvesting is tightly regulated, with community members no longer allowed to sell or export caribou meat. One elder recalled the success of this management decision, noting that “when they started managing that and stopped exporting them, we saw a big difference in terms of increasing the population of caribou right after that” highlighting how historical sales affected populations and setting the stage for ongoing discussions about intra-territorial sales, management, and cultural perspectives (see *Intra-Territorial Sales of Caribou Meat on Social Media* below)."

Brucellosis Outbreak

In addition to harvest pressures from the abattoir and intra-territorial sales, disease also played a significant role in past population declines. The most notable was an outbreak of *Brucella suis* (brucellosis), first detected in the caribou herd around 2000 and peaking in 2011 at infection rates of nearly 60% (Campbell & Boulanger, 2024). Eight participants described how widespread the disease became:

> “There was a period of a few years when a lot of caribou were infected with brucellosis.”
>
> “Like every other caribou had it or something… It was bad, really bad.”

Symptoms of infected animals included green coloration in the joints, fluid-filled cysts, large visible swellings on the legs and reproductive organs, and in some cases, internal discoloration:

> “We were shooting caribou, and we had to leave it… Brucellosis. Green on the joints and liquid on them.”

> “They used to have big balls; you could even see them with binoculars. That's how ugly they were.”

In a few rare cases, humans contracted brucellosis from infected meat. One harvester described being medevaced to Winnipeg and hospitalized for three months:

> “I had brucellosis from it. I was hospitalized for three months. It was crazy… They weren’t sure what was wrong with me until one doctor asked what I ate. When I told him caribou, they finally figured it out.”

An elder expressed concern about young or inexperienced hunters unknowingly catching infected caribou and exposing their families to risk.

Some participants speculated that the disease spread when mainland caribou migrated to the island via ice, mixing with previously healthy herds (see also *Coats Island and Its Role in Southampton Caribou History* and *Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit* for related accounts of ice-bridge movements).

Coats Island and Its Role in Southampton Caribou History

Coats Island has played a pivotal role in the history and management of Southampton Island’s caribou. It served as both a source herd for reintroduction starting in 1968 after local extirpation in the mid-1900s and a fallback hunting ground during periods when Southampton harvests were restricted. Today, it remains an important reference point for discussions about abundance, body condition, and the risks of overgrazing in an isolated island ecosystem.

When harvesting on Southampton Island was prohibited from 1968–1978 (Campbell & Boulanger, 2024) to support herd reintroduction, some community members described travelling

to Coats Island to hunt, sometimes walking long distances on foot. For some, Coats Island was where they harvested their first caribou.

As described in the Introduction, caribou were reintroduced to Southampton Island from Coats Island in the late 1960s after the local population was wiped out. Participants described animals captured by helicopter flown over several at a time by Twin Otter aircraft, with landings made on the part of Southampton closest to Coats Island as well as in central areas. Around 50 animals were transferred in total, and the population slowly rebuilt over the following decades.

Experienced harvesters and elders pointed to Coats Island as a cautionary example of the risks of overabundance and overgrazing, which in the past led to starvation and sickness. They recalled seeing ribs protruding from starving caribou and noted that the population there has gone through repeated cycles of abundance, decline, and recovery.

> "I've seen a lot of caribou starve to death on Coats Island because they overgrazed and ran out of food. You could see them everywhere, with their ribs showing through their hide. I haven't seen that happen here yet, which is a good thing."

Echoing this, an elder emphasized that because Southampton caribou have nowhere else to go, overabundance raises real risks of overgrazing, hunger, and sickness, concerns he felt "should be really heard" (see *Geographic Constraints and Southampton Island Ecology*).

In the past, the community organized harvesting trips to Coats Island to provide a backup food source for Southampton Island residents, particularly when local hunting was restricted. Hunters were sometimes hired for these efforts, which not only supplied meat but also created income and helped offset the high cost of living. Travel was often without ATVs, requiring hunters to carry caribou back on foot and sometimes overnight on the land. Tags, up to 200, were set aside for such activities, and in earlier times up to 300 animals could be taken for distribution. These organized hunts reflected long-standing Inuit cultural norms of sharing country food within the community and across regions (see *Inuit Cultural Norms of Sharing and Community Food Distribution*), and elders suggested that reinstating or resuming such a program could once again benefit the community by ensuring food security while reducing expenses for bullets, gas, and equipment.

Today, Coats Island caribou are widely regarded by interview participants as fattier and better tasting than those on Southampton Island. This result corroborates other accounts in which Coats Island caribou were some of the heaviest recorded specimens of barren-ground caribou in Canada (Parker, 1975; Ouellet et al. 1997), though interview participants emphasized that this condition varies by year, reflecting the highly cyclical, boom-and-bust dynamics of island caribou populations.

Participants noted that in earlier decades, Southampton Island caribou descended from Coats Island stock were generally healthy and had high-quality fat, particularly in the years following reintroduction when forage was abundant. Over time, as herd size increased and ecological conditions shifted, participants noted body condition became more variable.

Several participants described multiple ice-bridge events occurring at different times, allowing caribou to move between the mainland and Southampton Island. Some recalled ice bridges forming in the mid-1980s (though there is no direct western scientific evidence to support this – Campbell & Boulanger, 2024), when mainland caribou crossed onto the island for short periods and were described as "very fat" and healthy before disappearing again after one or two years. Others described later ice-bridge movements, including confirmed events in 2014 (Campbell & Boulanger, 2024), which were associated with increased mixing among caribou herds.

Importantly, participants expressed diverse interpretations of ice-bridge movements. Some associated crossings from the mainland with periods of improving herd health and productivity, while others linked ice-bridge events to the movement of predators, wolves and wolverines (see *Wolves and Wolverines* below) and to the emergence of disease on the island (see *Brucellosis Outbreak* above).

> "Back in the 1980s, all the caribou on this island came from Coats Island and were healthy, with very good quality fat. That was the case until long ago, when ice formed between the mainland and the island, allowing other caribou to cross over."

Recent Trends in Caribou Abundance

Most interview participants who spoke directly about recent trends indicated that caribou numbers are increasing (8 of 9, or 89%):

> “The numbers are going up, not drastically, but they're going up... they're steadily climbing I find. The numbers are rising.”

> “I think the caribou population is starting to grow again, slowly.”

> “A couple years ago, we had to really look for them, but now they're almost everywhere—right around town. Seems to have doubled in a couple of years.”

> “We were informed after the caribou survey that the estimate was around 12 to 13,000, but I’m pretty sure it's more than that.”

> “There's more now, like five years ago, six years ago, it was less. It’s finally, slowly coming back.”

One elder, however, perceived a decline over the past few years based on personal hunting experience and community reports. They also pointed out that occasional unexpected sightings make it difficult to track trends precisely.

Proximity to Coral Harbour

As reflected above, seven participants described increased sightings of caribou near Coral Harbour, sometimes even “right around town”, as a key indicator of population growth.

> ”We can go for a smoke break and go catch one there. So, you probably saw some caribou coming in.”

> “I could walk this year. Last year I had to drive.”

> “I think they're bouncing back, because we're seeing them in town now again.”

> "Nowadays, it's a lot easier. Even we can see caribou from town. I've seen a lot of posts on Facebook where people are surprised to see them so close by. When the numbers were declining, we didn't see caribou nearby for about three years."

Hunting Effort

Most participants said caribou are currently easy to access (i.e., locate and harvest), often close to town, enabling hunting by ATV or even on foot. Some choose to travel farther to find fatter, healthier animals or simply for the enjoyment of being on the land. A few noted seasonal or annual variations in effort, such as the later arrival of bulls in some years or summer challenges due to rough terrain. Compared to periods of scarcity, current hunting generally requires less travel. Several participants linked the proximity of caribou to possible wolf presence (covered in the section *Wolves and Wolverines* below), while others emphasized that movement patterns remain variable and can still require longer trips to locate desired animals.

Seasonal Hunting Patterns

Fall is preferred for harvesting fatter animals and obtaining quality skins, with bulls specifically targeted at this time. In some years, bulls arrive from the hills later than usual. Summer hunting can be more challenging due to rough, rocky terrain, slower ATV travel, and more dispersed animals. In contrast, winter often brings caribou closer to town in larger groups, making them easier to harvest, and females without calves are taken during this season to support herd growth. Spring proximity can vary. Some animals come very close to town and others stay farther away and are more wary of snowmobiles.

Range and Movement

Participants observed that caribou movements are largely driven by food availability and predator presence, leading to shifts in where herds gather over time (see *Geographic Constraints and Southampton Island Ecology* and *Wolves and Wolverines*). One harvester noted that hunger can influence behaviour, with "some caribou… are totally hungry, and they don't even care [about] a snowmobile passing by or not even running away from them", while lingering in areas with abundant vegetation (see *Environmental and Weather Changes Affecting Caribou* and *Body Condition* for further discussion). A few participants reported no noticeable changes in caribou travel patterns compared to previous years. Overall, caribou were described as mobile and responsive to environmental conditions rather than remaining in fixed locations.

Observed Changes in Caribou Behaviour

Interview participants did not notice any significant changes in how caribou behave, how they move, travel or react to people, with the only exception being behaviour changes linked to perceived predators (wolves, wolverines).

Wolves and Wolverines

Six participants explicitly discussed perceived increases in wolves (once a common predator on Southampton Island, Heard & Ouellet, 1994), and to a lesser extent wolverines, and felt that recent encounters with these predators had made caribou more “skittish”, particularly in areas where predators had been observed.”

> “There are a few known predators on the island, like wolves, and more wolverines have been caught recently. Let’s say I go to one area for caribou hunting, if a wolf or a wolverine has been there, the caribou are very skittish. They’ll run off for miles. But in a different area, it’s different. They won’t run right away.”

> “In some areas, I think we’re starting to hear more people say that wolves are chasing off the caribou, and a few have even seen wolves chasing them. I’ve noticed that whenever you see caribou, even from a far distance, they start to run.”

> “They seem to run away faster. There are wolves and wolverines on the island now, and [caribou] seem to be more alert. They're running from predators. Sometimes we don't even see them and they're already running.”

> “Yes, I’ve seen a few posts on Facebook about caribou being killed by wolves. On this island, wolves killed two caribou just like that, and it seemed like only the tongue was taken. I have a nephew in Naujaat who’s a wolf hunter, and he told me that sometimes wolves only go for the best parts, sometimes just the tongue, and leave the whole carcass. That’s happened out here before.”

Some participants believed wolf numbers have increased in recent years:

> “Yeah, I have noticed changes, because when I’m approaching a caribou even from pretty far away, they’ll run off like crazy. I figure a wolf must have been chasing them

before or something. We've had wolves here for over three years now, and I'm pretty sure their numbers have increased over time."

This increase was sometimes linked to the formation of an ice bridge between Southampton Island and the mainland (see also *Coats Island and Its Role in Southampton Caribou History*):

> "A couple of years ago, there was an ice bridge from our island to the mainland, and wolves and wolverines got across. A couple of wolverines were caught this winter, and hunters saw some wolf tracks too. So, they're probably getting a lot of caribou somewhere on the island."

These predators are believed to be concentrated in the northern part of Southampton Island:

> "From what I've seen, there are very few wolves, but they've been here longer than the wolverines, mostly up towards the north end of the island."

As reflected above, wolves may also be influencing caribou distribution, with some participants suggesting this could explain their increased presence near Coral Harbour:

> "Now they're very close. I believe they are staying away from the wolf."

Environmental and Weather Changes Affecting Caribou

Several participants noted no observed environmental impacts on caribou, such as changes in vegetation or insect activity, but seven identified winter rain and subsequent freeze-up, most often in December or January, as the most significant factor. Rain falling on snow creates an ice layer that makes it difficult for caribou to dig for food, sometimes leading to die-offs.

As one harvester explained:

> "Rain during the winter… puts a layer of ice on the snow, and that makes it very difficult for the caribou to dig for the food to eat. That's when you'll start seeing some die-offs here and there."

Another recalled that calves struggled to access forage while bulls could dig more effectively:

> “One January we had a freezing rain… three to four inches thick. Blowing snow went on top of the ice… calves started to have a problem digging to the ground. Bulls could dig better, but it was still hard.”

Older harvesters specifically remembered a major disturbance to the caribou population in the late 1980s:

> “There was a freeze up rain during the winter months, and soon after there was a big snowfall, and it dwindled the number of caribou due to those natural causes.”

A few also described signs of possible food scarcity, such as skinnier animals or vegetation taking longer to regrow, and noted that hunger can make caribou less wary of snowmobiles (see *Range and Movement*). Rain or freezing rain in spring or fall was said to prompt caribou to move in search of better feeding areas.

Elders cautioned that if caribou numbers became overly abundant, such icing events could trigger large-scale starvation by depleting food resources, as has happened in the past (see *Geographic Constraints and Southampton Island Ecology* and *Coats Island and Its Role in Southampton Caribou History a*bove).

A less frequently mentioned observation came from two participants, who described increasing summer dryness, sometimes mentioned alongside forest fires on the mainland. They noted that this has caused some lakes to partially or completely drain, with one suggesting that thawing permafrost may also be contributing to changes in caribou habitat and food availability.

Caribou Health

Participants expressed no major concerns regarding the overall health of caribou today. They described caribou as healthy and recovering well from past issues such as brucellosis. Observations related to body condition and calf survival were generally positive, and several noted a noticeable decline in sightings of sick (brucellosis-infected) animals compared to a decade ago.

> “Way less sick caribou now [compared] to like ten years ago.”

> "I think the caribou [are] going back to being healthy."

Inuit caribou harvesters also pointed out that sick animals are now rarely encountered or reported on social media, a change from earlier years when diseased caribou were more frequently seen and shared.

> "Nobody's been posting lately on the diseased caribou or anything like that, which is good news… we haven't seen those kinds of posts much this year, this winter."

Body Condition

Five participants (representing 86% of those who commented on body condition) described the caribou as currently "healthy and fat," particularly in the fall and early winter months. Experienced harvesters explained that caribou are typically fat from August through March but become leaner by spring as fat reserves deplete, a pattern considered normal:

> "The caribou are fat for like about eight months of the year, like from August through March, kind of thing. And right now, they've depleted their reserve. They're pretty skinny right now [spring], and they'll be skinny for the next few months. They still have a good layer of fat in the summer and fall. They might be a little less fat than what they used to be before big numbers came up [i.e., when caribou populations were smaller], but generally they still have good fat on them."

> "They get fat during the fall and start getting skinny around this time of the year [spring]. I haven't really noticed any real skinny Caribous."

Another noted that animals found farther from town or at higher elevations tend to be fatter:

> "Pretty much, yeah" [in response to whether higher elevation or more distant caribou are generally healthier or fatter].

Once participant described caribou as skinnier in recent years, possibly due to food scarcity (covered in *Environmental and Weather Changes Affecting Caribou*) or predator pressure (covered in *Wolves and Wolverines*):

> "They're running from predators, or their food… takes a long time to grow."

As also noted in *Environmental and Weather Changes Affecting Caribou* and *Range and Movement*, hunger may affect behaviour, with some caribou becoming less wary of snowmobiles when food is scarce. Another participant further noted that food scarcity may also be influenced by the island's small size or delayed plant growth (see *Geographic Constraints and Southampton Island Ecology*).

Another mentioned that "past couple years, they barely got fat," but noted a return to more normal conditions in 2025.

Calf Abundance and Survival

All ten interview participants who commented on calf abundance and survival expressed no concerns, consistently describing high numbers of calves and successful overwintering.

> "This year we've seen a lot of good calves, so I think that's a good sign."

> "Whenever I go hunting, I've seen a lot of calves. I think that's a pretty good sign."

Several noted frequent observations of calves with their mothers or in small groups. While many viewed this as encouraging, these observations reflect perceived conditions rather than confirmed measures of calf survival or recruitment.

> "Every time you go out here, [you're] pretty much sure to see some calves out there, with the mother… it's not too bad right now."

> "This winter when we [were] caribou hunting, there were calves in groups, four or five calves around here… another group of calves over there… To me, that seems to be a good sign."

Some also linked this positive trend to responsible harvesting practices. One participant credited local rules and hunter cooperation, particularly avoiding harvest of females with calves, for contributing to the apparent growth:

> “Ever since we started to… let [the population] grow… HTO made some rules… as much as possible, they can leave the female along with the calves… hunters are listening… I've seen quite a bit of calves with a mother.”

Brucellosis Recovery and Present-Day Observations

As described in the *Brucellosis Outbreak* subsection of *Historical Trends in Caribou Abundance*, a major brucellosis outbreak affected Southampton Island caribou between 2000 and 2011, peaking at infection rates of nearly 60% in 2011 (Campbell, 2015; Campbell & Boulanger, 2024). While the outbreak contributed to earlier population declines, most participants reported that the disease is now much less common and that the herd’s overall health has improved:

> “We had brucellosis for quite a number of years… and they're not that way anymore. They're healthier now.”

> “I think the caribou are starting to get healthy again.”

Harvesters today are more cautious, checking joints and meat carefully before consuming or sharing it. As one participant explained:

> “Every time I shoot one, I check how the joints are before I cut them open. So, if they’re bad, I leave them. I wouldn’t want to go back to being sick with brucellosis.”

Observations of Crabby Eye in Caribou Meat

Two participants mentioned a condition referred to locally as “crabby eye,” described as small white marks found in the meat of some caribou. While the cause is unknown by participants who mentioned it, it was thought by some to indicate sickness. We understand *crabby eye* to be a colloquial term used by hunters to describe tapeworm cysts found in the muscle or organs of caribou, likely referring to their round, eye, or marble-like appearance. Although no formal testing was done, these cysts are most often the larval stages of the tapeworm *Taenia krabbei* or, less commonly, *Echinococcus granulosus* (also known as *Echinococcus canadensis*). Harvesters typically removed and discarded the affected portions. One participant noted they had not seen “crabby eye” in quite some time, suggesting it may no longer be common.

Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit: Historical and Cultural Observations of Caribou

Participants shared a range of historical, cultural, and personal observations about caribou, drawing on Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit and lived experience on the land. These accounts included stories passed down through generations, recollections of unusual events, and teachings about respectful hunting practices. Together, they provide important cultural and ecological context for understanding changes in caribou populations and behaviour over time.

An older harvester recalled a childhood discovery of remnants from the original Southampton Island caribou (i.e., the native herd before reintroduction from Coats Island). He described spending time exploring an old habitation site with his uncle, where he found “a very, very thick” caribou antler unlike any he had seen on the island before. His uncle explained that these antlers belonged to the first caribou that once lived on the island, before they were “wiped out”. This artifact serves as a tangible link to the island’s original native caribou population and traditional knowledge passed through generations.

The same older harvester recalled times when ice bridges formed between the mainland and Southampton Island, allowing caribou to “walk out from the island” or “walk in” from elsewhere. On rare occasions, this included what he described as Peary caribou, which he remembered arriving in the mid-1980s when “the ice used to form to this island from the mainland.” These animals were distinct from the local herd—“healthy, short legs and very fat”—and were seen on the island for only “maybe two years” before disappearing again. Such movements were described as occasional and dependent on sea ice condition are also noted in discussions of disease (see *Brucellosis Outbreak*) and predators (see *Wolves and Wolverines*).

An elder shared important Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit related to caribou movement and sustainable harvesting, describing how large caribou herds are observed moving across the Kivalliq region through areas such as Arviat, Rankin Inlet, Baker Lake, and Naujaat. Drawing on this knowledge, he noted that, from an Inuit knowledge perspective, migrating caribou are often understood as moving in large, ordered groups, with leading animals guiding those behind: “the first of the herd are leading the ones behind them, and they're in big numbers.” He emphasized that “it was always told and known by Inuit to never hunt them, because the first of the herd is routing the others behind them where to go.” Hunting this first group of the migrating herd, he warned, could cause “the migration [to] be disturbed” as the caribou might reroute. This IQ

traditional knowledge highlights a sustainable practice aimed at protecting the migration patterns and health of the caribou populations.

A story was shared of a hunter from Cape Dorset (Kinngait) who once caught a caribou with three eyes, the third believed to be on the lower part of its face. People from Cape Dorset often come to hunt caribou on the east side of the island, but local residents said they are not notified when this happens (see *Harvest by Off-Island Communities*).

Management and Total Allowable Harvest

This section summarizes community perspectives on caribou management and Total Allowable Harvest (TAH) on Southampton Island, highlighting how local observations of herd abundance, body condition, and movement inform decisions about quota limits, hunting practices, and stewardship. Participants reflected on both the effectiveness of current management strategies and opportunities for adjustment, emphasizing the balance between sustainable harvesting, cultural traditions, and ongoing monitoring.

Perspectives on Total Allowable Harvest

Of the ten participants who commented on the current Total Allowable Harvest (TAH) of 1,000 animals, or four quota tags per household, two thought the current level was adequate: “what’s given is working right now” (20%). The remaining eight suggested the harvest could be increased: “it could be higher,” “they could be harvested more,” and “being our main source of food, to put on the table I think it’s too low” (80%).

Many participants linked the perceived increase in caribou numbers over the past four years to opportunities for higher harvests:

> “Caribou numbers have been climbing over the past four years. We currently get four tags a year, but I think it should be increased by maybe two more: make it six per year, like we did in the past.”

At the same time, one harvester and HTO board member emphasized that the current quota, though sometimes viewed as too low, was intentionally designed to support herd recovery:

> "I believe it's a work in progress. Like, it feels too low, but at the same time it's helping to keep the caribou numbers growing. Over time, we're open to see an increase in the harvest, and also an increase in the herd."

Others elaborated on the idea of increasing tags further, noting both compliance challenges (see *Community Perspectives on Current Caribou Management* and *Management Recommendations* below) and abundance concerns:

> "I agree with increasing the number of tags from four to six. Personally, if I were given 10 tags, I might not catch all of them, but it would be a good idea. Some people follow the four-tag limit, others don't, so having flexibility could help."

> "If this island becomes abundant or overabundant with caribou, I'd like to see tags increase. People recognize that caribou have nowhere else to go here, so we need careful management, monitoring the quota and surveying the herd to ensure it doesn't become overabundant. This has been discussed many times on the island."

Overall, these perspectives reflect a balance between local observations of rising caribou numbers, the importance of caribou as a primary food source, and the need for thoughtful stewardship to maintain herd health.

Community Perspectives on Current Caribou Management

Of the eight participants who commented on whether the current caribou management approach is working well for Southampton Island, 75% expressed a positive view, while 25% were negative. Those with positive responses emphasized rising caribou numbers and appreciated ongoing monitoring and management efforts:

> "The current plan is not the best right now, but it's working. The numbers are rising."

> "Current management sure seems to be doing good. I'm glad you guys come around and check up on things."

Negative responses focused on frustrations about harvest limits, non-compliance with regulations (see also *Perspectives on Total Allowable Harvest* and *Management Recommendations*), and concerns about health monitoring:

> “A tag system... forget that. In my opinion, I think no one follows that tag system. Even I don't. I get eight or nine a year or something, maybe more. If that tag system just dropped…HTO can be a bitch about it… If there's going to be another change, like in less allowable harvest, it's gonna stir up BS in town.”

As detailed in the *Brucellosis Outbreak* section, an elder voiced strong concern that “the community should better manage their hunt” and “carefully watch” the caribou for sickness such as brucellosis, which had previously caused illness in families. He stressed that when concerns arise, “people should look into those concerns and take action, especially through HTO,” underscoring the importance of the HTO’s active role in overseeing both health and hunting management. He also noted that community hunters “are always aware of where the caribous are” and about their condition. Reflecting on the recent winter, he observed that “the people caught caribou with fat in them” and concluded that “they’re healthy because they’re eating well out there.” He emphasized the value of sharing this knowledge so the community can recognize when caribou are healthy and abundant, and when they are not, urging hunters to “watch what you hunt, because you carry the information from what you see.”

Similar to the negative perspective above, other respondents acknowledged that some harvesters do not fully follow the current management system, particularly the tag allocation system limiting harvest to four caribou per year:

> “I'm pretty sure some people don't really follow it, but I'm pretty sure most people try and follow what's given.”

Others expressed gratitude that most harvesters respect the HTO and hunting regulations, despite their inherent Inuit rights under the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement (NLCA):

> “I'm very happy that hunters are respecting the HTO even though hunters have power in the NLCA Nunavut land agreement, and they still managed to listen to the HTO. That's very good news to hear.”

A harvester also reflected on the complex and nuanced balance between sustainable caribou populations and community livelihoods:

> "It works both ways, I guess. It's good for the herd, but not good for the hunter, because it costs a lot of money to go hunting, or we could sell. There's a lot of people that are willing to buy it that don't have hunters in the home."

Intra-Territorial Meat Sales via Social Media

As noted above, intra-territorial sales of caribou meat via social media emerged around 2010 (Campbell & Boulanger, 2024). While the Southampton Island herd is managed under a Total Allowable Harvest (TAH), these sales occur largely outside the mechanisms used to track and regulate harvest and are therefore difficult to manage through existing tools. Current regulations *attempt* to limit such practices, but participants consistently emphasized that enforcement remains challenging and uneven. While unrestricted sales are no longer allowed, it was noted a small amount of managed local meat sales continues under HTO oversight. Five participants, including all interviewed elders, expressed opposition to intra-territorial commercial harvest and sales, although several acknowledged, "It's not an issue right now. It's not a big issue right now in the community. Not much of that happening here right now."

For example, a community harvester explained:

> "Our community's caribou numbers were getting lower because people were selling to other communities. Too many were sending any kind of caribou they caught, even ones that weren't fat."

An elder emphasized concerns about profit-driven harvests by youth:

> "I don't support selling caribou locally for profit, especially by young people focused on income. I think that's where the decline suddenly came from because people were not listening to the quota the HTO set. But it's a different story when someone is hungry and you want to give them food."

Two participants, however, supported limited sales, highlighting its value as an income source:

> “If we're allowed limited tags and we're able to sell, that would make a lot of difference.”

> “We used to sell caribou to Baffin. It was a good source of income. Wish that could happen again.”

Relatedly, several participants expressed a desire to send caribou meat to relatives in other communities that do not have access to caribou, framing this more as food-sharing than commercial sale:

> “That’s pretty hard right now” (see *Inuit Cultural Norms of Sharing and Community Food Distribution*).

Harvest by Off-Island Communities

Nine participants described hunters from off-island communities, namely Cape Dorset (Kinngait) and Repulse Bay (Naujaat), travelling by boat to Southampton Island and nearby Coats and White islands to harvest caribou (and sometimes whale). Some accounts suggested these harvests were opportunistic, occurring during trips targeting marine species (“They go Narwhal hunting and if they see caribou on that island, they’ll just go for it”), while others described them as regular and intentional, such as annual summer visits to White Island by Repulse Bay hunters “guaranteed all the time.” Participants expressed concern that these harvests are not consistently recorded and could unknowingly reduce local populations. These concerns were framed not as an absence of management authority, but as an enforcement and monitoring gap within the existing co-management system, particularly at the community and inter-regional scale. This misalignment was seen as undermining local management efforts and, at times, creating tensions between regions (e.g., Baffin/Qikiqtaaluk vs. Kivalliq, Southampton Island vs. mainlanders).

> “I was boating up there one time ago, I seen myself quite a few hunters looking for caribou on that White Island. I'm sure there are a lot of caribou being taken out without a tag… that's the reason why Coral Harbour and Repulse Bay people are against each other because of that island.”

> “Cape Dorset, in the summertime, they come over to our island and harvest some caribou, and I don't like that… with the tags allowed and whatnot, they're coming over to our island…”

> “Cape Dorset, they travel over here by boat. The only concern is they're not recorded, how many they catch, so they could be decreasing the number unknowingly… it’s a big concern. What should you do? What can they do?”

Despite frustrations with the lack of regulation, some participants expressed no objection to the harvests themselves:

> “Doesn't bother me. They welcome us on their land too.”

> “As for Cape Dorset and Naujaat people, it's not that we don't want them to catch caribou, but us here on the island, we're using a tag system… if they’re stranded and need food, I don’t mind, but otherwise they catch whatever they want. That’s the only thing we’re concerned about.”

Inuit Cultural Norms of Sharing and Community Food Distribution

While concerns about unregulated caribou harvesting by off-island visitors were common, several participants emphasized the deep-rooted Inuit cultural values of sharing country foods across communities. One elder reflecting on Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit (IQ), underscored that animals and food have always been shared among Inuit as a fundamental survival strategy. He cautioned against framing the issue as exclusion or territoriality, noting that “if we say, ‘don’t come hunt on this island,’ it could backfire on our culture and the caribou abundance.” He expressed compassion for hunters from Baffin and Naujaat, emphasizing that “it’s our animal” collectively, and sharing food is a key part of Inuit heritage.

Participants also recalled historical and ongoing practices of sharing caribou meat with family and friends living outside their communities, sometimes over great distances, highlighting the cultural importance and necessity of this tradition. For example, at a recent Annual General Meeting (AGM), community members requested the ability to send meat to relatives in places like Rankin Inlet and Arviat, reflecting the need to maintain food-sharing ties despite logistical challenges.

Earlier community hunting programs, such as organized trips to Coats Island for meat distribution, embodied these sharing values while addressing food security needs. As noted in the *Coats Island and Its Role in Southampton Caribou History* section, some participants suggested that reviving such initiatives could once again help reduce costs and ensure equitable access to subsistence food.

However, some participants also observed that contemporary social changes have affected sharing practices, with concerns that sharing and mutual care have declined compared to the past, when neighbors would readily share food and resources to ensure community wellbeing.

Management Recommendations

Several participants recommended stronger monitoring and enforcement measures to improve caribou management on Southampton Island. One suggestion shared by several was to establish vehicle patrols by community members to actively track herd numbers and ensure harvest limits are respected:

> “We should get caribou patrol (vehicles). Our own guys...”

Concerns were raised about some families exceeding the four-tag limit (see *Perspectives on Total Allowable Harvest* and *Community Perspectives on Current Caribou Management*), with calls for stricter enforcement and record-keeping:

> “Each family is given four and it's obvious that a family doesn't follow through, they go more than four tags… people… pick it up, come back and not record what they caught… maybe better management over that area.”

Additionally, participants emphasized the need for clearer more consistent implementation of existing legislation and permit requirements for off-island communities harvesting Southampton Island caribou. These harvests were viewed as contributing to population declines when not effectively monitored or enforced, particularly given limited operational capacity.

> “With the offshore visitors, some stronger enforcement or legislation”

> "The HTO committee had written a letter of concern to Repulse Bay and Cape Dorset committees about decreasing numbers… they're just coming in on the island and decreasing it."

> "I think it should be put into legislative… Or get a permit through the HTO to get that animal."

Conclusions & Recommendations

According to interview respondents, the Southampton Island caribou herd is showing clear signs of recovery following the population decline associated with the brucellosis outbreak of the early 2000s and the intra-territorial sales of caribou meat on social media in the 2010s. Harvesters report steadily increasing numbers of caribou across the island, with animals more frequently observed near Coral Harbour. The herd appears healthy, with respondents reporting few sick caribou and signs of disease, and strong body condition (i.e., fat) throughout fall and winter. Calf survival appears high, indicating a productive and resilient population said to be supported by responsible harvesting practices and effective local stewardship. However, Southampton Island remains a relatively closed and small ecosystem where caribou numbers must be carefully balanced to prevent overpopulation, overharvest, food shortages, or renewed disease outbreaks. Emerging concerns include the observed increase in wolves and wolverines, which may be influencing caribou behaviour and distribution, and the impacts of winter icing and freezing rain events that can reduce forage availability and affect calf survival. At the same time, nearly all participants identified intra-territorial caribou meat sales facilitated through social media as a major management challenge that undermines conservation efforts, confidence in the tag system, and trust in current management tools, noting that recent community-led measures to limit meat shipments function as a temporary stop-gap rather than a long-term solution within the formal co-management system.

Traditional Inuit stewardship, rooted in Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit (IQ), continues to play a vital role in maintaining balance between caribou, people, and the land. Participants emphasized the importance of sharing caribou across communities as an expression of Inuit values and as a means of sustaining food security and cultural continuity. Reviving organized sharing programs, alongside continued monitoring and adaptive management, was widely supported. Most

participants recommended ongoing close monitoring of herd size and health to ensure sustainable harvest levels as the herd continues to recover.

To support continued recovery and sustainable management toward safeguarding the herd's long-term health the following recommendations are proposed based on community input: **(1)** maintain current Total Allowable Harvest (TAH) levels while considering modest increases (e.g., from four to six household tags) in response to rising caribou abundance; **(2)** strengthen community-based monitoring and enforcement, including HTO-led patrols to monitor off-island hunting and improved tracking of subsistence and commercial harvests, to address enforcement and monitoring challenges within the existing co-management framework; **(3)** improve enforcement, monitoring, and consistent application of existing legislation and permit requirements for off-island harvesting, recognizing that current challenges stem from limited operational capacity rather than gaps in law; and **(4)** revive organized sharing programs that reflect Inuit cultural values and support food security across communities.

Ongoing integration of IQ with scientific monitoring will be essential to adaptively manage the herd within the constraints of Southampton Island's relatively closed ecosystem. Continued collaboration between the Aiviit HTO, Government of Nunavut, and the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board will ensure management decisions remain grounded in both IQ and scientific knowledge, supporting a sustainable future for caribou and the Coral Harbour community.

Acknowledgements

We thank the Aiviit Hunters and Trappers Organization, and especially Aiviit HTO Manager Noah Nakoolak, for their support of this project, their input during the planning process, and their involvement in the interviews. We are also grateful to Bobbie Saviajuk for providing Inuktitut-English interpretation and translation services during several interviews. Most importantly, we extend our sincere thanks to all interview participants—this work would not have been possible without their generous contributions. Funding for this project was provided by the Government of Nunavut, Department of Environment.

Literature Cited

Adu, P. (2019). *A step-by-step guide to qualitative data coding*. Routledge.

Axinn, W., and L. Pearce. 2006. *Mixed method data collection strategies*. Cambridge University Press.

Bartlett, C., M. Marshall, and A. Marshall, A. 2012. Two-Eyed Seeing and other lessons learned within a co-learning journey of bringing together Indigenous and mainstream knowledges. Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences 2(4): 331–340. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13412-012-0086-8

Bongelli, E., Dowsley, M., Velasco-Herrera, V.M., and M. Taylor. 2020. Do North American Migratory Barren-Ground Caribou Subpopulations Cycle?. Arctic 73(3): 326-346. https://doi.org/10.14430/arctic71029

Borish, D., A. Cunsolo, J. Snook, I. Shiwak, M. Wood, HERD Caribou Project Steering Committee, I. Mauro, C. Dewey, and S. L. Harper. 2021. "Caribou was the reason, and everything else happened after": Effects of caribou declines on Inuit in Labrador, Canada. Global Environmental Chage 68: 102268. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2021.102268

Campbell, M. 2015. The Long-Term Abundance Fluctuations of the Southampton Island Caribou Herd - 1978 -2015: Interim Report, 1. NWRT Project Number: 2-15-03. Government of Nunavut.

Campbell, M., and J. Boulanger. 2024. Long-term trends in abundance and spring distribution of the Southampton Island caribou herd: 1978 – 2023. Technical Report Series – No: KIV-01-2024. Government of Nunavut. Department of Environment.

Charmaz, K., and L. Belgrave. 2012.Qualitative interviewing and grounded theory analysis (Eds.) J.F. Gubrium, J.A. Holstein, A.B. Marvasti, K.D. McKinney (Eds.), The SAGE Handbook of Interview Research: The Complexity of the Craft, SAGE Publications, Inc., Thousand Oaks, California (2012), pp. 347-366.

Comer, G. 1910. A Geographical Description of Southampton Island and Notes upon the Eskimo. Bulletin of the American Geographical Society 42(2): 84-90.

Creswell, J.W., and J.D. Creswell. 2022. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Ferguson, M.A.D., R.G. Williamson, and F. Messier. 1998. Inuit Knowledge of Long-term Changes in a Population of Arctic Tundra Caribou. Arctic 51(3): 201–219. https://doi.org/10.14430/arctic1062

Gunn, A. 2003. Voles, lemmings and caribou - population cycles revisited?. Rangifer 23(5): 105–111. https://doi.org/10.7557/2.23.5.1689

Hanke, A.N., M. Angohiatok, L.-M. Leclerc, C. Adams, and S. Kutz. 2021. A Caribou Decline Foreshadowed by Inuit in the Central Canadian Arctic: A Retrospective Analysis. Arctic 74(4): 437-455. https://doi.org/10.14430/arctic73826

Heard, D., and J.-P. Ouellet. 1994. Dynamics of an Introduced Caribou Population. Arctic 74(1): 88-95. https://doi.org/10.14430/arctic1276

Junkin, L.B. 2003. The Past is The Future – A detailed examination of the Coral Harbour

caribou harvest. Department of Sustainable Development, Government of Nunavut, Rankin Inlet. 180 pp.

Karetak, J., F. Tester, and S. Tagalik. (Eds.). 2017. Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit: What Inuit have always known to be true. Fernwood Publishing.

Kenny, T.-A., M. Fillion, S. Simpkin, S. D. Wesche, and H. M. Chan. 2018a. Caribou (*Rangifer tarandus*) and Inuit Nutrition Security in Canada. EcoHealth 15: 590–607. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10393-018-1348-z

Kenny, T.-A., X.F. Hu, H.V. Kuhnlein, S.D. Wesche, and H.M. Chan. 2018b. Dietary sources of energy and nutrients in the contemporary diet of Inuit adults: results from the 2007–08 Inuit Health Survey. Public Health Nutrition: 21(7): 1319–1331. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980017003810

Kraft, P. 1978. The Status of Barren Ground Caribou on Southampton Island, N.W.T. N.W.T. Fish and Wildlife Service Report. Department of Natural and Cultural Affairs, Government of the N.W.T. 8 pp.

Lumivero. (2023). *NVivo (Version 15.2.1) [Qualitative data analysis software]*. https://www.lumivero.com/nvivo

Meis Mason, A., L.-P. Dana, and R. Anderson. 2007. The Inuit commercial caribou harvest and related agri-food industries in Nunavut. International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business 4(6): 785-806. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJESB.2007.014982

Meis Mason, A., L.-P. Dana, and R. Anderson. 2008a. Entrepreneurship in Coral Harbour, Nunavut. The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation 9(2): 111-120. https://doi.org/10.5367/000000008784489453

Meis Mason, A., L.-P. Dana, and R. Anderson. 2008b. Emerging Inuit Small Business from Caribou in Coral Harbour, Nunavut, Canada. ICSB World Conference Proceedings; Washington: International Council for Small Business (ICSB): 1-17.

Morton, V., A. Manore, N. Ciampa, S. Glass-Kaastra, M. Hurst, A. Mullen, and J. Cutler. 2021. Country food consumption in Yukon, Northwest Territories and Nunavut, Foodbook study 2014–2015. Canada Communicable Disease Report 47(1): 30–6. https://doi.org/10.14745/ccdr.v47i01a06

Mulders, R. 2003. A research update for the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board Re: 1997 Southampton Island Caribou Census. Draft Report, Government of the Northwest Territories, Department of Resources, Wildlife, and Economic Development. 17 pp.

Munn, H. T. 1919. Southampton Island. The Geographical Journal 54(1): 52-55.

Ouellet, J.-P., D.C. Heard, and S. Boutin. 1993. Range Impacts Following the Introduction of Caribou on Southampton Island, Northwest Territories, Canada. Arctic and Alpine Research 25(2): 136-141. https://doi.org/10.1080/00040851.1993.12002994

Ouellet, J.-P., D.C. Heard, and R. Mulders. 1996. Population Ecology of Caribou Populations without Predators: Southampton and Coats Island Herds. Rangifer 16(4); Special Issue No. 9: 17-26. https://doi.org/10.7557/2.16.4.1216

Ouellet, J.-P., D.C. Heard, S. Boutin, and R. Mulders. 1997. A comparison of body condition and reproduction of caribou on two predator-free arctic islands. Canadian Journal of Zoology 75: 11–17. https://doi.org/10.1139/z97-002

Paetkau, D. 2015. Project g1616 Nunavut caribou, re: Draft Southampton Island caribou

sample analysis and population genetics report to the GN ENV. Report # g1616, November 9, 2015. 6 pp.
Parlee, B.L., Sandlos, J., and D.C. Natcher. 2018. Undermining subsistence: Barren-ground caribou in a “tragedy of open access”. Science Advances 4(2): e1701611. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1701611
Parker, G.R. 1975. An investigation of caribou range on Southampton Island, N.W.T. Canadian Wildlife Service, Report Series Number 33: 83 pp.
PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP. 2006. Second Independent Five Year Review of the Implementation of the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement. Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. Retrieved from https://www.tunngavik.com/files/2010/02/second-five-year-review-of-the-nunavut-land-claims-agreement.pdf
Reid, A.J., L.E. Eckert, J.-F. Lane, N. Young. S.G. Hinch, C.T. Darimont, S.J. Cooke, N.C. Ban, and A. Marshall. 2021. “Two-Eyed Seeing”: An Indigenous framework to transform fisheries research and management. Fish and Fisheries 22: 243–261. https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12516
Saldaña, J. 2021. *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications
St. John, J.R. 2022. "Understanding Caribou Population Cycles". Undergraduate Theses, Professional Papers, and Capstone Artifacts. 355. https://scholarworks.umt.edu/utpp/355
Thomas, D.C., and J. Schaefer. 1991. Wildlife Co-management defined: The Beverly and Kaminuriak Caribou Management Board. Rangifer 11(4); Special Issue No. 7: 73-89. https://doi.org/10.7557/2.11.4.997
Thomas, D.R. 2006. A general inductive approach for analyzing qualitative evaluation data. American Journal of Evaluation 27(2): 237–246. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214005283748.
Tyler, N.J.C. 2010. Climate, snow, ice, crashes, and declines in populations of reindeer and caribou (*Rangifer tarandus L.*). Ecological Monographs 80(2): 197–219. https://doi.org/10.1890/09-1070.1
Wenzel, G. 2004. From TEK to IQ: Inuit Qaujimajatuqanginnut and Inuit cultural ecology. Arctic Anthropology 41(2):238–250. https://doi.org/10.1353/arc.2011.0067

Appendix A. Interview Guide

Documenting Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit (IQ) and Observations of the Southampton Island Caribou Herd

Southampton Island Caribou Semi-Structured Interview Guide

Introduction (spoken by interviewer)

Thank you for taking the time to speak with me today. My name is Andrew, and I'm working with the Government of Nunavut's Department of Environment on a study about Southampton Island caribou. We're hoping to learn from local harvesters, Elders, and knowledge holders about your observations and experiences with caribou over time.

The goal is to understand any changes in the population — like abundance, condition, and movement — and your perspectives on current management, including the Total Allowable Harvest. Your knowledge can help shape future decisions by the Government of Nunavut and the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board, and support stronger management that respects and includes Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit.

The interview will take around 45–60 minutes. If you're okay with it, I'd like to take notes and audio record the conversation so I don't miss anything. Your participation is voluntary, and you can skip any question or stop at any time.

Do I have your permission to record this conversation?

---

1. Opening question – Building rapport & broad context

- **Can you tell me a bit about your experience with hunting or observing caribou on Southampton Island?**
    - *(Prompt if needed: How long you've been harvesting, how often, where you usually go, etc.)*

---

2. Abundance, sightings, and effort

- **Have you noticed any changes in the number of caribou you see compared to past years?**
  - *(Prompt: Is it easier or harder to find caribou than it used to be?)*
  - (*Prompt: What was it like before the decline started in the early 2000s? What about around 2011 when the big drop happened? Any difference around 2013–2015 when things seemed to improve a bit? And now — how would you say it is these days?)*
- **Has the number of caribou you see per trip changed over time?**
  - *(Prompt: Easier or harder to find them now compared to before 2011? What about the last few years?)*
- **Has your hunting effort changed — like how long you have to travel, or how far?**
  - *(Prompt: Compared to the past, do you spend more time or go farther to find caribou?)*
  - *(Prompt: Any big changes in how far you go now vs. in the early 2000s or around 2015?)*

---

3. Health and recruitment

- **What have you noticed about the condition or health of the caribou you've seen or harvested recently?**
  - *(Prompt: Are they fatter or skinnier than before? Any signs of disease or injury?)*
- **Have you seen any changes in the number of calves, or how well calves are surviving?**

---

4. Behaviour, predators, and environment

- **Have you noticed any changes in how caribou behave — like how they move, travel, or react to people?**
- **Are there any new predators on the land, or have predator numbers changed?**
- **Have you seen changes in the environment or weather that you think might affect caribou survival or health?**
  - *(Prompt: Snow, ice, vegetation, insects, etc.)*
  - *(Prompt: Do you think any environmental changes (like snow, ice, weather) have made a difference — now or in earlier years, like after 2011?)*

---

5. Range and movement

- **Have the areas where caribou travel or gather changed in recent years?**
    - *(Prompt: Are they using different parts of the island now, or have they stopped going to places they used to?)*

---

6. Management and Total Allowable Harvest

- **What are your thoughts on the current Total Allowable Harvest (TAH) of 1000 animals?**
    - *(Prompt: Do you think it's too high, too low, or about right?)*
    - *(Prompt: What did you think when the TAH was changed — first increased after 2015, and then lowered again in 2017? Has it helped or hurt the herd?)*
- **Do you think the current caribou management approach is working well for your community? Why or why not?**

---

7. Export and social media sales

- **What are your thoughts on caribou meat being sold off the island or on social media?**
- **Do you think there should be rules or agreements to manage this?**
    - *(Prompt: Some communities have talked about possibly changing the legislation — what do you think about that?)*
    - *(Prompt: Have you seen or heard of caribou meat being sold online recently, like it was around 2011? Do you think anything has changed in how people sell or share meat?)*

---

8. Wrap-up

- **Is there anything else you'd like to share about caribou or how they're being managed?**
- **Do you have any recommendations for what should be done moving forward?**
- **Is there anyone else you think we should talk to — someone with good knowledge or experience about caribou on Southampton Island?**

Closing (spoken by interviewer)

Thanks again for your time and for sharing what you know. We'll continue speaking with people in the community, and your suggestions will help us make sure we're hearing from the right folks. If you have questions later or think of anything else, feel free to reach out. Once we've had a chance to listen and learn from everyone, we'll work on summarizing what we've heard and sharing it back in a format that works for the community — like a plain-language summary or poster. If you have any questions or want to follow up later, I'll always be available.

ᑎᑎᖅᑲᖑᕐᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᑐᖃᖓᑦ (IQ)

ᐊᒻᒪ ᖁᙱᐊᖅᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᓴᓪᓕᕐᒥ ᑐᒃᑐᐃᑦ

ᓴᓪᓕᕐᒥ ᑐᒃᑐᐃᑦ ᐊᕝᕙᓪᓗᐊᖏᑦ-ᐋᖅᑭᒃᓱᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᐊᐱᖅᓱᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔾᔪᑎᑦ

ᓇᓗᓇᐃᔭᐅᑎᑦ (ᐊᐱᖅᓱᖅᑎᒧᑦ ᐅᖃᓪᓚᒃᑕᐅᔪᖅ)

ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃ ᐅᓪᓗᒥ ᐅᕙᓐᓂᒃ ᐅᖃᖃᑎᖃᕈᓐᓇᖅᑲᐅᒐᕕᑦ. ᐋᓐᓄᓘ – ᖑᔪᖓ, ᐱᓕᕆᖃᑎᖃᖅᓱᖓ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᖏᑦᑕ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᖏᓐᓂᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓂᕐᒥᑦ ᓴᓪᓕᕐᒥ ᑐᒃᑐᖏᓐᓂᑦ. ᐃᓕᑦᑎᔪᒪᒐᓗᐊᖅᐳᒍᑦ ᓄᓇᓕᖕᓂ ᐊᖑᓇᓱᒃᑎᓂᑦ, ᐃᓐᓇᕐᓂᑦ, ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔩᓂᓪᓗ ᑕᑯᖃᑦᑕᖅᓯᒪᔭᕐᔪᓐᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᖃᑦᑕᖅᓯᒪᔭᕐᔪᓐᓂᓪᓗ ᑐᒃᑐᓂ ᖃᖓᙵᖅᐸᓪᓕᐊᑎᓪᓗᒍ.

ᑐᕋᓴᐅᔪᖅ ᑐᑭᓯᐅᒪᔪᒪᓂᐅᕗᖅ ᖃᓄᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐊᓯᔾᔨᕐᓂᕆᓴᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᑐᒃᑑᖃᑎᒌᓂ – ᓱᕐᓗ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐅᓄᖅᑎᒋᓂᖏᑦ, ᖃᓄᐃᓕᖓᓂᖏᑦ, ᓇᒧᙵᐅᕙᖕᓂᖏᓐᓄᓪᓗ — ᐃᓯᒪᒋᔭᕐᓂᓪᓗ ᒫᓐᓇ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᕙᖕᓂᕐᒧᑦ, ᐃᓚᒋᔭᐅᓪᓗᓂ ᑲᑎᕝᕙᒋᑦ ᖃᔾᔫᕈᓐᓇᖅᑎᑕᐅᓃᑦ. ᖃᐅᔨᒪᓃᑦ ᐃᑲᔪᕈᓐᓇᖅᑐᖅ ᐋᖅᑭᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᓯᕗᓂᑦᑎᓐᓂ ᐋᖅᑭᒃᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥᓗ ᐆᒪᔪᓕᕆᔾᔪᐊᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᖏᓐᓄᑦ, ᐃᑲᔪᖅᓱᕐᓕᓪᓗ ᓴᙱᓂᖅᓴᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᓃᑦ ᐃᒃᐱᒍᓱᑦᑎᐊᖅᑐᑦ ᐃᓚᐅᑎᑦᑎᔪᓂᓪᓗ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᑐᖃᖏᓐᓂᒃ.

ᐊᐱᖅᓱᕐᓂᖅ ᐊᑯᓂᐅᑎᒋᓂᐊᖅᑐᖅ 45 ᒥᓂᑦᓯᓄᑦ ᐃᑲᕐᕋᓖᒧᑦ ᑎᑭᓪᓗᒍ. ᖃᓄᐃᒃᓴᙱᒃᑯᕕᑦ, ᑎᑎᕋᕈᒪᒐᒪ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᓂᐱᓕᐅᕐᓗᒋᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᕚᖅᑐᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᔪᓕᒫᑦ ᑐᓴᖃᑕᐅᓂᐊᕋᒃᑭᑦ. ᐃᓚᐅᔪᒪᓃᑦ ᐃᓯᒪᖅᓲᑕᐅᕗᖅ, ᐊᓪᓗᐃᔾᔪᓐᓇᖅᐳᑎᓪᓗ ᖃᓄᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑕᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᓄᖅᑲᐃᓐᓇᕐᓗᑎᓪᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᖃᖓᐃᓐᓇᑦᑎᐊᖅ.

ᐊᖏᖅᐱᙵ ᑎᑎᕋᕐᓂᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᙵ ᑖᒃᑯᓇᓂ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᔭᑦᑎᓐᓂᒃ?

---

1. ᐱᒋᐊᓕᕈᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎ – ᐃᓪᓗᕐᔪᐊᒥᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖅᑲᕐᓂᖅ ᐃᓗᓕᖅᑯᓯᖏᓐᓂᓪᓗ

- **ᐅᖃᐅᑎᔪᓐᓇᖅᐱᙵ ᐊᑐᖅᓯᒪᔭᕐᓂᒃ ᐊᖑᓇᓱᙱᕐᒥᒃ ᐅᕙᑐᓐᓃᑦ ᑐᒃᑐᓂ ᓴᓪᓕᕐᒦᑦᑐᓂᑦ?**
    - *(ᑭᐅᒋᐊᖅᑲᖅᐸᑦ ᑭᐅᓗᒍ: ᖃᓄᖅ ᐊᑯᓂᐅᑎᒋᔪᖅ ᐊᖑᓇᓱᒃᑕᖅᓯᒪᕕᑦ, ᖃᓄᖅ ᐊᑯᓪᓚᐃᑎᒋᔪᖅ, ᓇᒧᙵᐅᓚᔪᒃᐱᑦ, ᐊᓯᖏᓪᓗ)*

2. ᖃᓄᖅ ᐅᓄᖅᑎᒋᓂᖏᑦ, ᑕᑯᓯᒪᔭᑎᑦ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᐱᓇᔪᖕᓂᕆᔭᑦ

- **ᐅᕝᕗᓘᒃᓯᒪᕙᑦ ᐊᓯᕝᕕᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᖃᕝᓯᐅᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᑐᒃᑐᐃᑦ ᑕᑯᕙᒃᑕᑎᑦ ᐊᕿᒡᔪᓂ ᐊᓂᒍᕚᖅᑐᓂ?**
  - *ᑭᐅᔪᒍ: ᐊᔪᕐᓇᙱᓐᓂᖅᓴᐅᕙ ᐊᔪᕐᓇᕐᓂᖅᓴᐅᕙᔫᓐᓃᑦ ᑐᒃᑐᓯᐅᕆᐊᒃᓴᖅ ᑐᒃᑐᓯᐅᕈᑕᐅᕙᓚᐅᖅᑐᑐᑦ?)*
  - *ᑭᐅᔪᒍ: ᖃᓅᓚᐅᖅᐸᓕ ᐅᓄᕈᓐᓃᖅᐸᓪᓕᐊᔪᓐᓃᓚ ᐅᙱᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ 2000 ᐱᒋᐊᕚᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ? 2011-ᒥᓕᑭᐊᖅ ᐅᓄᕈᓐᓂᕆᐊᕐᔪᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ? ᐊᕝᕕᒌᙱᓐᓂᖃᖅᐸ 2013–2015-ᒥ ᖃᓄᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐱᐅᓯᕚᓪᓕᓚᐅᑲᒃᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ? ᒫᓐᓇᓗ — ᖃᓄᖅ ᐅᖃᕋᔭᖅᐱᑦ ᐅᓪᓗᒥ?)*
- **ᐅᓄᕐᓂᖏᑦ ᑐᒃᑐᐃᑦ ᑕᑯᔭᑎᑦ ᐊᐅᓪᓚᕐᓂᑕᓖᑦ ᐊᓯᕝᕕᖅᐸᓪᓕᐊᖏᓐᓇᖃᑦᑕᖅᐸᑦ ᖃᖓᙳᖅᐸᓪᓕᐊᑎᓪᓗᒍ?**
  - *ᑭᐅᔪᒍ: ᓇᓂᔭᕐᓇᕐᓂᖅᓴᐅᓕᖅᐸᑦ ᓇᓂᔭᒃᓴᐅᔪᓐᓂᖅᐸᓪᓗᓐᓃᑦ ᒥᒃᓴᐅᕐᓗᒋᑦ 2011-ᓕᓴᕐᓄᑦ? ᐊᕿᒡᔪᓂᓪᓕᑭᐊᖅ ᐊᓂᒍᕚᖅᑐᓂᒃ?)*
- **ᐊᖑᓇᓱᓪᓗᓱᖕᓂᕆᔭᐃᑦ ᐊᓯᕝᕕᖅᓯᒪᓕᖅᐸ – ᓃᕐᓗ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐊᑯᓂᐅᑎᒋᔪᖅ ᓄᒃᑕᕆᐊᖃᖅᐱᑦ, ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐅᖓᓯᒃᑎᒋᔪᒧᑦ?**
  - *ᑭᐅᔪᒍ: ᑭᖑᓂᖔᑦᑎᓐᓄᑦ ᒥᒃᓴᐅᕐᓗᒍ, ᑐᒃᑐᓕᐊᖅᓗᓯ ᐅᖓᓯᒃᑐᓕᐊᕐᓂᖅᓴᐅᖃᑦᑕᓕᖅᐱᓯ?)*
  - *ᑭᐅᔪᒍ: ᐊᓯᕝᕕᕐᔪᐊᖅᑐᖃᖅᐸ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐊᑯᓂᐅᑎᒋᔪᖅ ᐃᖏᕐᕋᑎᒋᓕᕐᒪᖔᖅᐱᑦ 2000 ᐱᒋᐊᓕᕚᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ 2015–ᓗᓚᖕᒥᓪᓘᓐᓃᑦ?)*

---

3. ᐋᓂᐊᖃᕐᓇᙱᑦᑐᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᓇᐃᔭᖅᑎᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᕐᓂᕐᒧᓪᓗ

- **ᑭᓱᓂᒃ ᐅᕝᕗᓘᒃᐱᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᖓᓂᖓᓂᒃ ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᙱᑦᑎᐊᕐᓂᖓᓂᒃ ᑐᒃᑐᐃᑦ ᑕᑯᕚᖅᑕᕙᑦ ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐊᖑᓇᓱᒃᑕᕙᑦ?**
  - *ᑭᐅᔪᒍ: ᕿᐃᓂᓂᖅᓴᐅᕙᑦ ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᓴᓪᓘᓂᖅᓴᐅᕙᑦ? ᐋᓂᐊᖅᑐᖃᕐᒪᖔᑦ ᐃᓕᙵᒃᓯᒪᔪᖃᕐᒪᖔᓪᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐅᕝᕗᕐᓇᖅᑐᖃᖅᐸ?)*
- **ᑕᑯᓯᒪᕚᑦ ᐊᓯᕝᕕᖅᑐᓂᑦ ᖃᕝᓯᐅᓂᖏᓐᓂᑦ ᓄᕋᐃᑦ, ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᖃᓄᖅ ᓄᕋᐃᑦ ᐋᓇᒃᓯᒪᖕᒪᖔᑕ?**

---

4. ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓯᖏᑦ, ᓂᕿᑐᖅᐳᑦ, ᐊᕙᑎᖓᓗ

- **ᐅᕝᕗᓘᒃᐱᑦ ᖃᓄᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐊᓯᕝᕕᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᖃᓄᖅ ᑐᒃᑐᐃᑦ ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓯᖃᕐᒪᖔᑕ – ᓃᕐᓗ ᓇᒨᖓᐅᕙᓪᓕᐊᖕᒪᖔᑕ, ᑕᒡᔪᐊᕐᒪᖔᑕ, ᖃᓄᐃᒋᔭᖃᕐᒪᖔᑕᔫᓐᓃᑦ ᐃᓄᖕᓄᑦ?**
- **ᓄᑖᓂᒃ ᓂᕿᑐᖅᑎᑕᖃᓕᖅᐸ ᓄᓇᒥ, ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᓂᕿᑐᖅᐸᒃᑐᑦ ᖃᕝᓯᐅᓂᖏᑦ ᐊᓯᕝᕕᖅᓯᒪᕙᑦ?**
- **ᑕᑯᓯᒪᕚᑦ ᐊᓯᕝᕕᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᐊᕙᑎᒥᒃ ᓯᓚᒥᔫᓐᓃᑦ ᐊᒃᑐᐃᓂᐊᕋᓱᒋᔭᕐᓂᒃ ᑐᒃᑐᐃᑦ ᐆᒪᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᙱᑦᑎᐊᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ?**
  - *ᑭᐅᔪᒍ: ᐊᐳᑦ, ᓂᓚᒃ, ᐱᕈᖅᑐᐃᑦ, ᖁᐱᕐᕈᐃᑦ, ᐊᓯᖏᓪᓗ)*
  - *ᑭᐅᔪᒍ: ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᖃᖅᐱᑦ ᖃᓄᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐊᕙᑎᐅᑉ ᐊᓯᕝᕕᕐᓂᖓᓄᑦ (ᓃᕐᓗ ᐊᐳᑎ, ᓂᓚᒃ, ᓯᓚ) ᐊᓯᕝᕕᖅᓯᓯᒪᓇᓱᒋᕙᐅᒃ — ᒫᓐᓇ ᐱᒋᐊᓕᕚᖅᑐᓂᔫᓐᓃᑦ ᐊᕿᒡᔪᓂ, ᓃᕐᓗ 2011 ᐊᓂᒍᖅᓯᒪᓕᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ?)*

5. ᓇᓅᓐᓂᖏᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐊᐅᓚᓂᖏᑦ

- **ᐃᓂᐅᔪᑦ ᑐᒃᑐᐃᑦ ᓇᒧᙵᐅᕙᖕᓂᖏᑦ ᑲᑎᕝᕕᒋᕙᒃᑕᖏᓪᓗᓐᓃᑦ ᐊᓯᔾᔨᖅᓯᒪᕙᑦ ᐊᕿᒍᓂ ᐊᓂᒎᖅᑐᓂ?**
    - *ᑭᐅᓗᒍ: ᐊᑐᖅᐸᑦ ᐊᔾᔨᙱᑦᑐᓂᒃ ᐃᓚᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᕿᑭᖅᑕᒥ ᒫᓇ, ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐅᐸᖃᑦᑕᓚᐅᖃᓗᐊᖅᑕᑎᒃ ᐅᐸᖃᑦᑕᕈᓐᓃᖅᐸᖏᑦ?)*

6. ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᓂᖅ ᐊᒻᒪ ᑲᑎᕐᓗᒋᑦ ᐊᖑᔭᐅᔪᓐᓇᖅᑐᑦ

- **ᖃᓄᖅ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᖅᐱᑦ ᒫᓇ ᑲᑎᕐᓗᒋᑦ ᖃᔅᓯᖀᕈᓐᓇᖅᑎᑕᐅᔪᓂᒃ (TAH–ᒥᒃ) 1000–ᓂᒃ ᓂᕐᔪᑎᓂᒃ?**
    - *ᑭᐅᓗᒍ: ᖁᑦᑎᓗᐊᕋᓱᒋᕙᐅᒃ, ᐊᑦᑎᓗᐊᕋᓱᒋᕙᐅᒃ, ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᓈᒻᒪᓱᒋᕙᐅᒃ?)*
    - *ᑭᐅᓗᒍ: ᖃᓄᕐᓕ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᓚᐅᖅᐱᐅᒃ ᑲᑎᕐᓗᒋᑦ ᖃᔅᓯᖀᕈᓐᓇᖅᑎᑕᐅᓂᖅ ᐊᓯᔾᔨᖅᑕᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ – ᓯᕗᓪᓕᖓ ᐅᓄᖅᓯᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᑐᑎᒃ 2015–ᖑᐊᓪᓚᓚᐅᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ, ᐊᒻᒪᐃᓛᒃ ᐃᓄᐃᓴᒃᓯᕆᐊᖅᑕᐅᒃᑲᓐᓂᖅᑐᑎᒃ 2017–ᒥ? ᐃᑲᔫᑎᖃᖅᑯᖅᐸ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᓯᓯᒪᕗᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᑐᒃᑑᖃᑎᒌᓂᑦ?)*
- **ᒫᓇ ᑐᒃᑐᓂᒃ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᔾᔪᓯᖅ ᐃᖏᖅᑫᑦᑎᐊᕋᓱᒋᕙᐅᒃ ᓄᓇᔾᔨᓐᓄᑦ? ᖃᓄᐃᒻᒪᒃᑭᐊᖕᖓᐃ?**

7. ᐊᐅᓪᓚᖅᑎᑦᑎᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐃᓄᖕᓄᑦ ᑐᓴᐅᒪᔪᓕᕆᔾᔪᑎᓄᑦ ᓂᐅᕿᑕᐅᔪᑦ

- **ᖃᓄᖅ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᖅᐱᑦ ᑐᒃᑐᐃᑦ ᓂᕿᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᓂᐅᕿᑕᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᕿᑭᖅᑕᕐᒥ ᐃᓄᖕᓄᓪᓗᓐᓃᑦ ᐱᕝᕙᓪᓕᐊᓕᔫᒃᑯᑦ?**
- **ᐃᓱᒪᕚᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᖅᑕᖃᕋᕐᒪᖔᑦ ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᑕᖃᕋᕐᒪᖔᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᑕᒪᑐᒥᖓ?**
    - *ᑭᐅᓗᒍ: ᐃᓚᖏᑦ ᓄᓇᓖᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᖃᑦᑕᖅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᐊᓯᔾᔮᑐᐃᓐᓇᕆᐊᖃᕐᓂᒥᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒥᒃ – ᖃᓄᕐᓕ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᕙᐅᒃ?)*
    - *ᑭᐅᓗᒍ: ᑕᑯᓯᒪᕕᑦ ᑐᓴᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᕕᓪᓗᓐᓃᑦ ᑐᒃᑐᕕᓂᐅᑉ ᓂᕿᖓᓂᒃ ᓂᐅᕕᐊᖑᔪᖃᑦᑕᖅᓯᒪᖕᒪᖔᑦ ᖃᕆᑕᐅᔭᒃᑯᑦ, ᓱᕐᓗ 2011-ᒥᓚᐅᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ? ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᖅᐲᑦ ᖃᓄᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐊᓯᔾᔨᖅᓯᒪᓕᕐᓂᖕᖓᓂᒃ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᓂᐅᕿᑎᖃᖅᐸᖕᒪᖔᑕ ᓂᕿᑖᖅᑎᑦᑎᕙᖕᒪᖔᑕᓘᓐᓃᑦ?)*

8. ᐱᐊᓂᒃᐸᓪᓕᐊᓂᖅ

- **ᐅᖃᐅᓯᒃᓴᖃᒃᑲᓐᓂᖅᐹᑦ ᑐᒃᑐᐃᑦ ᒥᒃᓵᓄᑦ ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐊᐅᓚᑕᐅᖕᒪᖔᑕ?**
- **ᐱᖁᔨᕗᖕᖔᓕᐅᖅᓯᒪᕕᓯ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᐅᕆᐊᖃᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᓯᕗᒧᐊᖅᐸᓪᓕᐊᓗᑕ?**
- **ᑭᓇᑐᐃᓐᓇᑦᑎᐊᒥᒃ ᐅᖃᓪᓚᖃᑎᖃᕈᓐᓇᖅᓯᒪᕕᓯ – ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᖅᑐᒥᒃ ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᓂᕗᔪᒥᒃ ᑐᒃᑐᐃᑦ ᒥᒃᓵᓄᑦ ᓴᓪᓕᖕᒥ?**

ᒪᑐᑎᓪᓗᒍ (ᐊᐱᖅᓱᖅᑎᐅᓵᖅᑐᖅ ᐅᖃᓪᓚᒃᑎᐅᓗᓂ)

ᖁᔭᓐᓇᒦᒃᑲᓐᓂᖅᐸᕐᓯ ᐱᕙᖃᕋᓱᕐᓯ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᕐᓯᓐᓂᓪᓗ ᑐᓵᖅᑎᑦᑎᓵᕐᓯ. ᐅᖃᖃᑎᖃᐃᓐᓇᕐᓂᐊᖅᑐᒍᑦ ᐃᓄᖕᓂᒃ ᓄᓇᓕᖕᓂ, ᐃᒪᓐᓈᖅᑐᕈᑎᑎᓪᓗ ᐃᑲᔪᕐᓂᐊᖅᑐᑦ ᐅᕙᑦᑎᓐᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᓯᐊᕐᓗᑕ ᑐᓴᕐᓗᐊᕐᒪᖔᑦᑕ ᑐᓵᕙᓯᓯᐊᖃᖅᑕᑦᑎᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᓄᖕᓂᑦ. ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒃᓴᖃᒃᑲᓐᓂᕈᕙᑦ ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐊᓯᐊᓂᒃ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᖃᕈᕙᑦ, ᖃᐅᔨᓯᐊᖃᑦᑕᒻᒪᕆᐊᓗᖕᓂᐊᖅᐳᓯ. ᓈᓚᒍᓐᓇᖅᓯᒍᑦᑕ ᐃᓕᑦᑎᔪᓐᓇᖅᓯᒍᑦᑕᓗ ᑭᒃᑯᓕᒫᓄᑦ, ᐱᓕᕆᓂᐊᖅᐳᒍᑦ ᓇᐃᓈᕐᓗᒋᑦ ᑐᓴᓚᐅᖅᑕᕗᑦ ᑐᓵᖅᑕᕗᑦ ᑐᓴᖃᑎᒌᓪᓗᑕᓗ ᓄᓇᓕᖕᓄᑦ ᐋᑎᖃᖅᑐᒥᒃ – ᓲᕐᓗ ᑐᑭᓯᓇᖅᑐᓂᒃ–ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕐᓂᒃ ᓇᐃᓈᖅᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐊᑭᓐᓇᕐᒥᐅᑕᓂᒃ. ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒃᓴᕈᓯ ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᖃᖁᒃᑲᓐᓂᖅ ᖃᐅᔨᓯᐊᒃᑲᓐᓂᕈᒪᓐᓂᕈᓯ, ᐊᑐᐃᓐᓇᐅᖕᓂᓐᓇᕐᓂᐊᖅᐳᖓ.

Appendix B. Participant Consent Form

Documenting Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit (IQ) and Observations of the Southampton Island Caribou Herd

Consent Form

Title of the Study: *Documenting Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit (IQ) and Observations of the Southampton Island Caribou Herd*

Who is conducting the research? This research is led by Dr. Andrew Kadykalo, a social science researcher with the Department of Environment, Government of Nunavut. Andrew has experience working in partnership with Indigenous communities and is committed to respectful, reciprocal research grounded in Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit (IQ). His role is to help document and mobilize IQ in support of Nunavummiut self-determination in research and wildlife management. Andrew aims to act as an ally, advocate, and knowledge broker—helping elevate and connect community voices to decision-making processes, by tabling the results of his work to the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board (NWMB).

This project seeks to respectfully gather and help braid IQ into caribou management planning for the Southampton Island caribou population. The results will support the Government of Nunavut, Department of Environment in its decisions, priorities, and efforts related to caribou management. They may also inform submissions to the NWMB, and if so, overall conclusions may be made publicly available through a report on the NWMB website as part of the public decision-making process. No names or identifying information will be shared publicly.

Researcher Contact:

Andrew Kadykalo
Social Science Researcher
Department of Environment
Government of Nunavut
Tel.: 867-222-6342
AKadykalo@gov.nu.ca

Purpose of the Study: The goal of this study is to gather Inuit perspectives on the Southampton Island caribou population—particularly knowledge about caribou abundance, distribution, changes over time, cultural significance, and ideas for effective management. This information will be used to support Inuit involvement in caribou management and to include IQ in decision-making processes.

We are inviting members, harvesters, and elders of Aiviit Hunters and Trappers Organization (HTO) to participate in this study.

What Participation Involves: If you choose to participate, we will schedule an in-person interview at a time and place that works best for you. The interview will take about 45–60 minutes. With your permission, it will be audio-recorded and transcribed to make sure your words are accurately represented.

We will ask about topics such as:

- Your observations and knowledge of caribou abundance and distribution
- Cultural importance and human-caribou interactions
- Views on caribou management policies (e.g., total allowable harvest)

You are free to skip any questions or stop the interview at any time. If you choose to withdraw, your information will not be used and will be securely destroyed.

Anonymity and Confidentiality: You may choose to:

- **Remain anonymous**, in which case the researcher commits to keeping your identity in strict confidence and your name will not appear in any reports or publications; or
- **Be named**, if you wish your knowledge to be directly attributed to you.

However, you should be aware that even if you choose anonymity, people may sometimes be able to guess your identity based on your statements. You may also ask for specific comments to remain anonymous.

If you choose anonymity, your name will be removed from interview transcripts, and we will use a respectful, non-identifying reference (e.g., general descriptor or pseudonym) to protect your anonymity.

Data Storage and Security: Andrew will make sure that all information is stored safely and handled with respect. Audio recordings and paper copies will be kept in a locked office. Electronic files will be password-protected and can be shared with the Aiviit Hunters and Trappers Organization if they are interested. Only the researcher will have access to the full data. Records will be kept for at least 10 years and possibly up to 40 years, following GN policy.

Voluntary Participation: Your participation is completely voluntary. You can refuse to answer any question, stop the interview at any time, or withdraw from the study with no negative consequences. If you withdraw, all your data will be removed and not included in the research. You may ask me any questions at any time during the interview.

Benefits and Risks: This study is intended to benefit your community by:

- Helping ensure IQ is meaningfully included in wildlife management
- Supporting co-management of caribou on Southampton Island
- Elevating the voices of Inuit harvesters, knowledge holders, and elders

We do not anticipate any harm or risk from participating in the study. However, some topics may bring up strong feelings. If you feel uncomfortable, you are not required to answer. Please let us know if you'd like to stop or take a break.

IQ Data Management, Ownership, and Research Approach

The researcher is committed to upholding Nunavummiut self-determination in research and to following established principles for ethical, respectful engagement with Inuit communities. This includes aligning with the Government of Nunavut's research requirements and the Nunavut Research Institute (NRI) licensing process, which help ensure research is minimally impactful and ethically sound. The project is also guided by *the National Inuit Strategy on Research* and the OCAP principles—Ownership, Control, Access, and Possession—as a framework for Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit (IQ) data governance.

Although there is no formal data-sharing or research agreement in place at this time, all data collected through this project will be considered the collective intellectual property of the participating communities. This includes IQ, knowledge, perspectives, lived experiences and oral histories shared during interviews or group discussions with community members and harvesters. The researcher acknowledges that this knowledge belongs to the people who share it and their communities, not to the Government of Nunavut or the researcher.

The role of the researcher is to respectfully document and help mobilize this knowledge in ways that reflect the wishes of participants and their communities. Participants will be involved in decisions about how their contributions are used, how results are shared, and how the final research products are returned to communities. Efforts will be made to ensure results are communicated in accessible and meaningful formats (e.g., plain-language summary, infographic/poster).

Participants may choose to remain anonymous, or to be named, depending on their preference. Throughout the project, the researcher will maintain a respectful and reciprocal relationship with communities. The data will be stored securely and used only for the purposes of this study, as approved by the appropriate territorial and institutional ethics review processes. If community members or the Aiviit Hunters and Trappers Organization (HTO) wish to revisit or clarify any aspect of the project, the researcher will remain available and responsive throughout.

Agreement to Participate: Please select your preferred option. You may change your preference at any time:

☐ I choose to remain anonymous

☐ I choose to have my name appear in subsequent publications

If you have any ethical concerns regarding your participation in this study, you may contact Jamal Shirley Director, Innovation and Research at Nunavut Research Institute (NRI) Tel: 867 979-7290 or Jamal.Shirley@arcticcollege.ca.

There are two copies of this form—one for you to keep.

By signing below, you agree to participate in this study. You understand that your participation is voluntary and that you can withdraw at any time.

Participant Name (Printed): ___________________________________

Participant Signature: ____

Date: ___________________

Researcher Signature: _______________________________________

Date: ___________________

ᑎᑎᖅᑲᖕᒍᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᑐᖃᖏᑦ (IQ)

ᐊᒻᒪ ᖁᖖᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᓵᓪᓕᕐᒥ ᑑᒃᑐᐃᑦ

ᐊᖏᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᑕᑕᑎᕆᐊᓕᒃ

ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᔪᖅ ᑕᐃᔭᐅᓂᖓ: ᑎᑎᖅᑲᖕᒍᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᑐᖃᖏᑦ (IQ) ᐊᒻᒪ ᖁᖖᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᓵᓪᓕᕐᒥ ᑑᒃᑐᐃᑦ

ᑭᓇ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᐸ? ᑖᓐᓇ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓂᖅ ᓯᕗᓕᖅᑕᐅᔪᖅ ᔫᒃᑖᖅ ᐋᓐᓄᔫ ᑲᑎᑲᓗᒧᑦ, ᐃᓅᖃᑎᒌᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑎ ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᓐᓂ, ᓄᓇᕘᒥ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᓐᓂ. ᐋᓐᓄᔫ ᐱᓕᕆᖃᑎᖃᖃᑦᑕᖅᓯᒪᕗᖅ ᓄᓇᖃᖅᑳᖅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᓄᓇᓕᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐱᓕᕆᔪᒪᓪᓚᑦᑖᖅᓯᒪᓪᓗᓂ, ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑎᑦᑎᔪᒪᓪᓚᑦᑖᖅᖢᓂ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᑐᖃᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᑐᙵᕕᖃᖅᑐᓂᒃ. ᐱᓕᕆᐊᒃᓴᖃᖅᐳᖅ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᐸᓪᓕᐊᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐃᖏᕐᕋᓯᑎᑦᑎᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᑐᖃᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᑲᔪᖅᑐᐃᓪᓗᓂ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥᐅᓂᒃ ᓇᖕᒥᓂᖅ–ᐱᔪᒪᓂᖃᕐᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐆᒪᔪᓂᒃ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᓂᕐᒥᒃ. ᐋᓐᓄᔫ ᑐᕌᒐᖃᖅᑐᖅ ᐃᑲᔪᖅᑎᐅᔪᒪᓪᓗᓂ, ᑭᒡᒐᖅᑐᐃᔾᔪᐅᔪᒪᓪᓗᓂ, ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔾᔭᑕᐅᓗᓂᓗ -ᐃᑲᔪᕐᓗᒋᑦ ᖁᕝᕙᓯᒋᐊᕈᓐᓇᕐᓗᒋᑦ ᑲᔾᔮᑎᔪᓐᓇᕐᓗᒋᓪᓗ ᓄᓇᓕᖕᓂᑦ ᓂᐱᖏᔭᐅᔪᑦ ᐃᓯᒪᓕᐅᕈᑎᓄᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᔾᔪᓯᕐᓂᑦ, ᓴᖅᑭᐸᒃᓱᒋᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᖓᓕᕐᓂᖏᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖏᓐᓂᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᐆᒪᔪᓕᕆᔨᕐᔪᐊᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᖏᓐᓄᑦ (NWMB).

ᑖᓐᓇ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖅ ᕿᓂᖅᐳᖅ ᐃᒃᐱᒍᓱᑦᑎᐊᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᑲᑎᖅᓱᐃᓗᑎᒃ ᐃᑲᔪᕐᓗᒋᓪᓗ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᑐᖃᖏᑦ ᑑᑐᓂᒃ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐸᕐᓇᐃᓂᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᓵᓪᓕᕐᒥ ᑑᒃᑐᖏᓐᓂᒃ. ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕈᑎᖏᓐᓂᑦ ᐃᑲᔪᖅᑐᐃᓂᐊᖅᑐᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᖏᓐᓂᑦ, ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᓐᓂᑦ ᐃᓯᒪᓕᐅᕆᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ, ᓯᕗᓪᓕᐅᔾᔭᒃᓴᖏᓐᓂᑦ, ᐱᓇᓱᐊᖕᓂᖏᓐᓂᓪᓗ ᑑᒃᑐᐃᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᑕᐅᓂᖏᓐᓂᑦ. ᑐᓴᖅᑎᑦᑎᔪᓐᓇᕐᒥᔪᑦ ᑐᓂᖅᑯᑕᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᐆᒪᔪᓕᕆᔨᕐᔪᐊᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᖏᓐᓄᑦ, ᑕᐃᒪᐃᑉᐸᓪᓗ, ᐊᑕᖏᕐᓗᒍ ᐋᖅᑭᒃᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᑭᒃᑯᐃᓐᓇᓄᑦ ᒪᓂᒪᑎᑕᐅᑐᐃᓐᓇᕆᐊᖃᖅᐳᑦ ᐅᓂᒃᑳᑎᒍᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᐆᒪᔪᓕᕆᔨᕐᔪᐊᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᖏᑕ ᐃᑭᐊᖅᑭᕕᖓᓄᑦ ᐃᓚᒋᔭᐅᓗᓂ ᑭᒃᑯᐃᓐᓇᓄᑦ ᐋᖅᑭᒃᓯᒪᓕᖅᑎᑦᑎᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᑲᔪᓯᓂᕆᔭᐅᕙᒃᑐᒧᑦ. ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓯᔾᔪᑎᓂᒃ ᑐᓴᖅᑎᑦᑎᔪᖃᒃᔾᔮᙱᑦᑐᖅ.

ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑎᒧᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒋᐊᕐᕕᐅᔪᓐᓇᖅᑐᖅ:

ᐋᓐᓄᔫ ᑲᑎᑲᓗ

ᐃᓅᖃᑎᒌᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑎ

ᐊᕙᑎᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ

ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᖓᑦ

ᐅᖄᓚᐅᑎᖓ: 867-222-6342

AKadykalo@gov.nu.ca

ᖃᓄᐃᒻᒪᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᒋᐊᖃᕐᒪᖔᑦ: ᑐᕌᕆᐅᔭᖅ ᑕᒪᑐᒪᓂ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓂᕆᐅᔭᒥ ᑲᑎᖅᓱᐃᔭᒪᓂᐅᕗᖅ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᑕᐅᑐᖅᑰᖅᑕᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᓴᓕᕐᒥ ᑐᒃᑐᐃᑦ ᖃᔅᓯᐅᓂᖕᒪᖗᑕ—ᐱᓗᐊᖅᑐᒥᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᓂᕆᔭᐅᔪᑦ ᑐᒃᑐᐃᑦ ᖃᓄᖅ ᐅᓄᖅᑎᒋᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ, ᓇᓃᑉᐸᓐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ, ᐊᓯᔾᔨᕐᓂᕆᔭᐅᔪᑦ ᖃᖓᙳᖅᐸᓪᓕᐊᑎᓪᓗᒍ, ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓯᑐᖃᕐᓄᑦ ᐅᔾᔨᕐᓇᕐᓂᕆᔭᐅᔪᑦ, ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᐅᔪᓪᓗ ᑲᔪᓯᓂᖃᑦᑎᐊᖅᑐᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᕚᖃᕐᓂᐊᕐᓗᓂ. ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᑐᑭᓯᒋᐊᒐᒃᓴᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᓂᐊᖅᐳᑦ ᐃᑲᔫᑕᐅᓗᑎᒃ ᐃᓄᖕᓄᑦ ᐃᓚᐅᓂᕆᔭᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᑐᒃᑐᓂᒃ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᐃᓚᓕᐅᔾᔨᓗᑎᒡᓗ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᑐᖃᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᓱᒪᓕᐅᕆᓕᖅᐸᑕ.

ᖃᐃᕐᑯᔨᔪᑦ ᐃᓚᒋᔭᐅᔪᓂᑦ, ᐊᖑᓇᓱᒃᑎᓂᑦ, ᐃᓐᓇᕐᓂᓪᓗ ᐊᐃᕖᑦ ᐊᖑᓇᓱᒃᑐᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᖏᓐᓂᑦ ᐃᓚᐅᖁᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓂᐊᖅᑐᑦ.

ᑭᓱᓂᒃ ᐃᓚᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᐃᓚᐅᔾᔨᖕᒪᖔᑕ: ᐃᓚᐅᖃᑕᐅᔪᒪᒍᕕᑦ, ᐋᖅᑭᒃᓯᓂᐊᖅᑐᒍᑦ ᐅᐸᒍᑎᓗᑎᑦ ᐊᐱᖅᓱᖅᑕᐅᔭᖅᑐᕐᓗᑎᑦ ᖃᑯᒍᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᓇᓂᓗ ᐃᓕᖕᓄᑦ ᐊᑲᐅᓕᓇᔭᒃᑯᑦ. ᐊᐱᖅᓱᕐᓂᖅ ᐊᑯᓂᐅᑎᒋᓂᐊᖅᑐᖅ 45 ᒥᓂᑦᓯᓄᑦ ᐃᑲᕐᕋᓕᒫᒧᑦ ᑎᑭᓪᓗᒍ. ᐱᔪᓇᖅᑎᑕᐅᒍᕕᑦ, ᓂᐱᓕᐅᖅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᑕᐅᓗᑎᒃ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖅᑕᑎᑦ ᑕᒻᒪᖅᓯᒪᙱᒃᑲᓗᐊᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᑭᒃᑲᖅᑐᖅᑕᐅᑦᑎᐊᕐᑯᓪᓗᒋᑦ.

ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒋᓂᐊᖅᑕᕗᑦ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒃᓴᑦ ᓱᕐᓗ:

- ᑕᑯᓯᒪᔭᑎᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᑎᓪᓗ ᑐᒃᑐᐃᑦ ᐊᒥᓲᓂᖏᑦ ᓯᐊᒻᒪᒃᓯᒪᓂᖏᓪᓗ
- ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓯᒃᑯᑦ ᐱᒻᒪᕆᐅᓂᖏᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ–ᑐᒃᑐᐃᑦ ᐊᒃᑐᐊᖃᑦᑕᐅᑎᓂᖏᑦ
- ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᐅᔪᑦ ᑐᒃᑐᓂ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᑐᐊᒐᕐᓂᑦ (ᓲᕐᓗ, ᑲᑎᖕᓗᒋᑦ ᐊᖑᓇᓱᒃᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᖅᑐᑦ)

ᐃᓱᒪᖅᓱᖅᑐᑎᑦ ᐊᓪᓗᐃᔭᕆᐊᒃᓴᖅ ᓇᓕᐊᖕᓂᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᒃᓴᓂᒃ ᓄᖃᕐᓗᑎᓪᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐊᐱᖅᓱᖅᑕᐅᑎᓪᓗᑎᑦ ᖃᖓᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ. ᓄᖃᕈᒪᒍᕕᑦ, ᑐᑭᓯᒋᐊᕈᑎᑎᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᔾᔮᙱᑦᑐᑦ ᓱᕋᒃᑕᐅᑦᑎᐊᕐᓂᐊᖅᖢᑎᓪᓗ.

ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᒋᐊᖃᙱᑦᑐᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᑲᙳᓇᖅᑐᑦ: ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᑐᙵᕕᒃᑯᑦ ᓂᕈᐊᕈᓇᖅᑐᑦ ᐃᒪᐃᓕᐅᖁᔨᓗᑎᒃ:

- **ᑭᓇᐅᖕᒪᖕᒫᑦ ᓇᓗᓇᕐᓗᑎᑦ**, ᑕᐃᒪᓕ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑎ ᐊᖏᖅᓯᒪᓗᓂ ᑭᓇᐅᖕᒪᖕᒫᖅᐱᑦ ᐃᓕᓴᕐᓇᐅᑎᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᔭᐅᑎᙱᑦᑎᐊᕐᓗᒍ ᐊᑏᓪᓗ ᓴᖅᑮᔮᙱᕐᔪᓂ ᐅᓂᒃᑳᓂᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᑕᐅᕙᓂᒡᓘᓐᓃᑦ; ᐅᑯᓘᓐᓃᑦ
- **ᐊᑎᖅᑕᐅᓂᖅ**, ᖃᐅᔨᒪᓂᕆᔭᐃᑦ ᐃᓕᖕᓄᑦ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᑕᐅᕐᑯᒫᐅᒃ.

ᑭᓯᐊᓂᓕ, ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔨᐊᖃᖅᑐᑎᑦ ᓂᕈᐊᕋᓗᐊᕈᕕᑦ ᑭᓇᐅᓂᕐᓂᒃ, ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐃᓛᓐᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᓇᓚᐅᑦᑖᕈᓐᓇᖃᑦᑕᕐᒪᑕ ᑭᓇᐅᖕᒪᖕᒫᖅᐱᑦ ᒪᓕᒃᑯᒋᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᕆᔭᑎᑦ. ᐊᐱᕆᔪᓐᓇᕐᒥᔪᑎᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᒃᓴᓂᒃ ᑭᓇᐅᖕᒪᖕᒫᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᔭᐅᕐᑯᙱᒃᑯᕕᑦ.

ᑭᓇᐅᖕᒪᖕᒫᖅᐱᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᔭᐅᙱᓐᓇᕋᒪᒍᕕᑦ, ᐊᑏᑦ ᐋᖅᑕᐅᓂᐊᖅᐳᖅ ᐊᐱᖅᓱᖅᑕᐅᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ, ᐊᑐᕐᓂᐊᖅᑯᑕᓗ ᐃᒃᐱᒋᔭᖅᑎᑦᑎᐊᖅᑐᒥᒃ, ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓯᙱᑦᑎᐊᖅᑐᒥᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᒋᐊᕐᕕᐅᔪᓐᓇᖅᑐᒥᒃ (ᓲᕐᓗ, ᑭᓱᐃᓐᓇᓂᒃ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓯᔾᔪᑎᓂᒃ ᐅᑯᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᓂᐱᓕᐅᖅᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ) ᑭᓇᐅᖕᒪᖕᒫᖅᐱᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᔭᐅᙱᓐᓇᕋᒪᒍᕕᑦ.

ᑐᑭᓯᒋᐊᕈᑏᑦ ᑐᖅᑯᖅᑕᐅᓂᖏᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐊᑦᑕᓇᐃᖅᓯᒪᓂᖅ: ᐋᓐᓄᓘ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔨᐊᕐᓂᐊᖅᑐᖅ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᔭᐅᑎᓕᒫᑦ ᑐᖅᑯᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᑦᑎᐊᕐᒪᖕᒫᑕ ᑲᒪᒋᔭᐅᑦᑎᐊᕐᓗᑎᓪᓗ ᐃᒃᐱᒋᔭᐅᑦᑎᐊᕐᓗᑎᒃ. ᓂᐱᓕᐅᖅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᑎᑎᕋᕐᕕᒃᓴᒃᑯᑦ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᑕᕐᕋᖕᒋᑦ ᑮᒃᑕᖅᑐᒥᒃ ᑎᑎᕋᕐᕕᖕᒥᑎᑕᐅᖃᑦᑕᕐᓂᐊᖅᐳᑦ. ᖃᓇᑕᐅᔾᔭᒃᑯᑦ ᑎᑎᖅᑲᑦ ᐃᓯᕈᓐᓇᐅᑏᑦ ᐃᓯᖅᑕᐅᓂᐊᖅᑐᑦ–ᓴᐳᔾᔨᐅᓯᒪᓗᑎᒃ ᑕᑯᔭᐅᔪᓐᓇᖅᑲᐅᑎᓪᓗ ᐊᐃᕚᑦ ᐊᖑᓇᓱᒃᑐᓕᕆᔾᑯᖏᓐᓂᑦ ᐱᕝᕙᐅᔪᒪᒃᐸᑕ. ᑭᓇᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑎ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐱᔪᓐᓇᕐᓂᖅᑲᕐᓂᐊᖅᑐᖅ ᓂᐱᓕᐅᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᒥ. ᑎᑎᖅᑲᕐᑯᑎᒋᔭᐅᔪᑦ ᐱᓯᒪᔭᐅᖃᑦᑕᕐᓂᐊᖅᐳᑦ ᐅᑭᐅᓄᑦ ᕿᓕᐸᓗᖕᓄᑦ 40–ᓄᑦ ᐅᑭᐅᓄᑦ ᑎᑭᐅᑎᔪᓐᓇᖅᐸᑕ ᑕᐃᒪᓐᓇ ᐊᑯᓂᐅᑎᕆᔪᖅ, ᒪᓕᒡᓗᒍ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᖓᑕ ᐊᑐᐊᒐᖓᑦ.

ᐃᓱᒪᖅᓱᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᐃᓚᐅᔪᓐᓇᖅᑐᑦ: ᐃᓚᐅᔪᒪᙱᒃᑯᕚᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᖅᓲᑎᒋᓂᐊᖅᑕᑦ. ᑭᐅᔪᒪᙱᑦᑐᓐᓇᖅᑐᑎᑦ ᖃᓄᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᓂᒃ, ᓄᖅᑲᖅᑎᑦᑐᓐᓇᖅᑕᑦ ᐊᐱᖅᓱᖅᑕᐅᓂᖅ ᖃᖓᑐᐃᓐᓇᒃᑯᑦ, ᓄᖅᑲᕐᓗᑎᓪᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕈᑎᒥᒃ ᐱᐅᙱᑦᑐᓂᒃ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᔾᔪᑎᖃᙱᓪᓗᓂ. ᓄᖅᑲᕈᕕᑦ, ᑎᑎᖅᑲᓕᒫᑎᑦ ᐱᖅᑕᐅᓂᐊᖅᑐᑦ ᐃᓚᓕᐅᔾᔭᐅᙱᓪᓗᑎᓪᓗ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ. ᖃᖓᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐊᐱᕆᔪᓐᓇᖅᑕᕐᒪ ᐊᐱᖅᓱᖅᑕᐅᑎᓪᓗᑎᑦ.

ᐃᑲᔫᑎᑦ ᐊᑦᑕᕐᓇᕈᓐᓇᖅᑐᓪᓗ: ᑖᓐᓇ ᓄᓇᕐᔪᐊᓂ ᐃᑲᔫᑕᐅᓇᓱᒃᐳᖅ ᐃᒪᓐᓇ:

- ᐃᑲᔪᕐᓂᖅ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓯᓂᕐᒥᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᑐᖃᖏᑦ ᐃᓚᒋᔭᐅᑎᑦᑎᐊᕋᓗᐊᕐᒪᖕᒫᑕ ᐆᒪᔪᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᓂᕐᒥᑦ
- ᐃᑲᔪᖅᓱᐃᓂᖅ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᖃᑎᒌᖕᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᑐᒃᑐᓂᒃ ᓴᓪᓕᕐᒥ
- ᓂᐱᖅᑯᖅᑐᓯᒋᐊᕐᓗᒋᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐊᖑᓇᓱᒃᑎᑦ, ᖃᐅᔨᒪᓂᖃᖅᑐᑦ, ᐃᓐᓇᑐᖃᐃᓪᓗ

ᓂᕆᐅᕆᔭᖃᙱᑦᑐᒍᑦ ᖃᓄᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐋᓂᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᑦᑕᕐᓇᑐᐃᓐᓇᕆᐊᓕᖕᒧᓪᓗᓐᓃᑦ ᐃᓚᐅᖃᑕᐅᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓂᕐᒥ. ᑭᓯᐊᓂ, ᐃᓚᖏᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᔪᑦ ᓴᙱᔪᓂᒃ ᐃᒃᐱᖕᓂᕈᑕᐅᑐᐃᓐᓇᕆᐊᓖᑦ. ᐃᓅᕐᓇᙱᒃᑯᕕᑦ, ᑭᐅᔭᕆᐊᖃᙱᑦᑐᑎᑦ. ᖃᐅᔨᑎᓐᓂᐊᖅᐸᑦᑎᒍᑦ ᓄᖃᕈᒪᒍᕕᑦ ᐅᕝᕙᓗᓐᓃᑦ ᓄᖃᖓᑲᐃᓐᓇᕈᒪᒍᕕᑦ.

ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᑐᖃᖏᑦ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᑕᐅᔪᑦ, ᓇᖕᒥᓂᖃᖅᑎᑦ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᔾᔪᓯᑦ

ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑎ ᐊᖏᖅᓯᒪᓂᖃᖅᑐᖅ ᐱᓯᒪᒃᓴᕐᓂᕐᒥᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥᐅᓂᑦ ᓇᖕᒥᓂᖅ-ᐱᔭᒪᓂᖃᕐᓗᑎᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓂᕐᒥᑦ ᒪᓕᖕᓂᕐᒥᓪᓗ ᓴᖅᑭᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᓂᑦ ᑐᙵᕕᐅᔪᓂᑦ ᐱᓇᓱᐊᑦᑎᐊᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ, ᐃᒃᐱᒍᓱᑦᑎᐊᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐃᓚᐅᑎᑦᑎᓂᕐᒥᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᓄᓇᓕᖕᒋᓐᓂᑦ. ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐃᓚᖃᖅᐳᖅ ᐊᑕᐅᑦᑎᒃᑰᖃᑎᖃᕐᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᖓᑕ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᑐᓇᖃᖅᐸᒃᑕᖏᓂᒃ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᓯᓂᕐᒧᓪᓗ ᐃᓂᕆᔭᐅᔪᒧᑦ (NRI–ᒧᑦ) ᓚᐃᓴᓐᓇᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᑲᔪᓯᓂᓇᔭᐅᕙᒃᑐᒥᒃ, ᑕᒪᓐᓇᓗ ᐃᑲᔪᖅᐸᒃᓱᓂ ᓇᓗᙱᑦᑎᐊᕐᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓂᓇᔭᐅᔪᖅ ᒥᑭᓛᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᒃᑐᖅᓯᒐᓗᐊᕐᒪᖔᑦ ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓯᑦᑎᐊᓇᖕᓂᒃᑯᓪᓗ. ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖅ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔾᑕᓇᔭᐅᓗᑎᒃ *ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐃᓄᖕᓄᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᐅᕈᑕᐅᔭᒪᔪᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ* ᐊᒻᒪᓗ OCAP ᑐᙵᕕᖏᑦ-ᓇᖕᒥᓂᖃᕐᓂᖅ, ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᓂᖅ, ᐱᔪᓐᓇᕐᓂᖅ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᐱᓯᒪᒃᓴᕐᓂᖅ—ᑐᙵᕕᐅᓗᓂ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᑐᖃᖏᓐᓄᑦ (IQ) ᑎᑎᖅᑲᓂᒃ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᓂᕐᒧᑦ.

ᐱᑕᖃᙱᒃᑲᓗᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ–ᑐᓴᐅᒪᖃᑎᖃᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓂᕐᒧᓪᓗᓐᓃᑦ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎᒥᒃ ᒫᓐᓇᒃᑯᑦ, ᑕᒪᕐᒥᑦᑎᐊᖅ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᓯᒪᔭᕐᑯᑎᒋᔭᐅᔪᑦ ᑲᑎᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᑕᕝᕙ ᐱᓇᓱᐊᕐᒍᔭᑎᒍᑦ ᐃᓯᒪᒋᔭᐅᓂᐊᖅᐳᑦ ᑲᑐᔾᔨᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐱᕐᑯᑎᒋᔭᐅᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᓚᐅᔪᓂ ᓄᓇᓕᖕᓂ. ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐃᓚᖃᖅᐳᖅ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᑐᖃᖏᓐᓂᒃ, ᖃᐅᔨᒪᓂᓇᔭᖏᓐᓂᒃ, ᐃᓱᒪᕆᔭᐅᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ, ᐃᓅᓂᓇᔭᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᓂᑯᓂᒃ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᒃᑯᓪᓗ ᐅᓂᒃᑲᐅᓯᕐᓂᒃ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᖃᑦᑕᖅᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ ᐊᐱᖅᓱᖅᑐᖃᕐᓂᖕᓂ ᐱᓕᕆᖃᑎᒌᒃᑐᓂᓪᓗᓐᓃᑦ ᐅᖃᖃᑎᒌᒃᑐᓂᓪᓗ ᓄᓇᓕᖕᒥᐅᓂᒃ ᐊᖑᓇᓱᒃᑎᓂᓪᓗ. ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑎ ᐃᓕᓴᖅᓯᒪᔪᖅ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓂᓇᔭᐅᔪᖅ ᐱᕆᔭᐅᓂᖓᓂᒃ ᐃᓄᒃᑐᓄᑦ ᑐᓴᐅᒪᑎᑦᑎᑉᐸᒃᑐᓄᑦ ᓄᓇᓕᖕᒥᐅᓄᓪᓗ, ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑎᓄᓪᓗ.

ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑎᐅᑉ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᒃᓴᖕᒐ ᐃᒃᐱᒍᓱᑦᑎᐊᕐᓗᓂ ᑎᑎᕋᖅᑕᑦᑕᕐᓗᓂ ᐃᑲᔪᕐᓗᓂᓗ ᐊᐅᓚᔾᔭᒃᑎᕆᐊᕐᓗᒍ ᑖᓐᓇ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᓂᖅ ᐊᑐᕐᓗᒍ ᐊᔾᔨᖃᕐᓗᓂ ᐱᔪᒪᔭᖏᓐᓂ ᐃᓚᐅᖃᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᓄᓇᓕᖏᓪᓗ. ᐃᓚᐅᔪᑦ ᐃᓚᐅᓂᐊᖅᐳᑦ ᐋᖅᑭᒃᓯᒪᓕᖅᑎᑕᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᖃᓄᖅ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐃᑲᔪᕐᓂᓇᕙᒃᑕᖏᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᕙᕐᒪᖔᑕ, ᖃᓄᖅ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᐅᓕᖅᑐᑦ ᑐᓴᐅᒪᖅᑎᕇᒍᑕᐅᕙᕐᒪᖔᑕ, ᖃᓄᕐᓗ ᑭᙳᓕᖅᐹᒥᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᓯᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᕙᒃᑐᑦ ᐅᑎᖅᑎᑕᐅᕙᕐᒪᖔᑕ ᓄᓇᓕᖕᓄᑦ. ᐱᓇᔪᖕᓂᐊᖅᑐᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑐᑦ ᑐᓴᐅᒪᑎᑕᐅᑦᑎᐊᕐᑯᓗᕆᑦ ᐊᑐᐃᓐᓇᐅᔭᒃᑯᑦ ᑐᑭᓯᑦᑎᐊᖅᑐᒃᑯᓗ ᐋᖅᑭᒃᓯᒪᔭᒃᑯᑦ (ᓱᕐᓗ, ᑐᑭᓯᓇᖅᑐᑦ–ᐅᖃᐅᓯᑦ ᓇᐃᓈᖅᓯᒪᔪᑦ, ᓄᓇᙳᐊᑦ/ᐊᑭᓐᓇᕐᒥᐅᑕᑦ).

ᐃᓚᐅᖃᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᓂᕈᐊᕈᓐᓇᖅᑐᑦ ᑭᓇᐅᓪᓚᕆᙱᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᔭᐅᔪᒪᓪᓗᑎᑦ, ᐊᑦᑎᖅᑕᐅᔪᒪᓪᓗᑎᓪᓗᓐᓃᑦ, ᒪᓕᒃᓗᒍ ᐱᔪᒪᔭᖓ. ᐱᓕᕆᐊᒃᓴᓕᒫᒥ, ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑎ ᐃᒃᐱᒍᓱᑦᑎᐊᕐᓂᓪᓚᕆᓐᓂᐊᖅᐳᖅ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐃᓅᖅᑎᑦᑎᓂᐊᖅᐸᓗᓂ ᓄᓇᓕᖕᓂ. ᑎᑎᕋᖅᓯᒪᔪᑦ

ᑐᖅᑯᖅᑕᐅᑦᑎᐊᕐᓂᐊᖅᐳᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᓗᑎᒡᓗ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕈᑕᐅᔪᑐᐊᓄᑦ, ᐊᖏᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᓗᑎᒃ ᓈᒻᒪᒃᑐᓄᑦ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐱᓕᕆᕝᕕᖕᓂ ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓯᑦᑎᐊᕙᖕᓄᑦ ᕿᒥᕐᕈᔭᐅᔪᓄᑦ. ᓄᓇᓕᖕᒥᐅᑦ ᐊᐃᕖᑦ ᐊᖑᓇᓱᒃᑐᓕᕆᔾᒃᑯᓪᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᑕᑯᒋᐊᒃᑳᓂᑭᒪᒃᐸᑕ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᔭᐃᔪᒪᒃᐸᑕᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᑦᑐᑐᐃᓐᓇᕐᓂᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᒥᑦ, ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑎ ᐊᑐᐃᓐᓇᐅᖏᓐᓇᕐᓂᐊᖅᑐᖅ ᑭᐅᓴᕋᐃᓪᓗᓂᓗ.

ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑎ ᐃᓚᐅᓂᐊᕐᓗᓂ: ᓂᕈᐊᕐᓗᑎᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖅᑕᕆᔪᒪᔭᕐᓂᑦ. ᖃᖓᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐊᓯᔾᔨᕈᓐᓇᖅᑕᑦ:

☐ ᑭᓇᐅᖕᒪᖔᕐᒪ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖓᓇᕈᒪᔪᖓ

☐ ᐊᑎᕋ ᓴᖅᑭᑎᑦᑐᒪᔭᕋ ᑭᖑᓂᐊᒍᑦ ᐅᖃᓕᒫᒐᒃᓴᙳᖅᑎᑕᐅᔪᓂᒃ

ᖃᓄᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᓈᒻᒪᒃᑐᒧᑦ ᐃᓱᒫᓘᑎᖃᕈᕕᑦ ᐃᓚᐅᓂᕆᓂᐊᖅᑕᕐᓄᑦ ᑕᒃᑯᓂ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓂᕆᔭᐅᔪᒥ, ᖃᐅᔨᒋᐊᕐᕕᒋᔪᓐᓇᖅᑕᑦ ᔮᒪᓪ ᓲᓕ ᑐᑭᒧᐊᖅᑎᑦᑎᔨ, ᐃᓱᒪᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᑦᑎᐊᖅᓯᒪᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓂᕐᒨᓗ ᓄᓇᕗᒻᒥ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑐᓕᕆᔾᒃᑯᓐᓂ (NRI−ᒥ)
ᐅᖄᓚᐅᑎᖓ: 867 979-7290 ᐅᕝᕙᓘᓐᓃᑦ Jamal.Shirley@arcticcollege.ca.

ᒪᕿᙵᓂᒃ ᑖᔅᓱᒪ ᑕᑕᑎᕆᐊᓕᐅᑉ ᐊᔾᔨᖓᓂᒃ ᐱᑕᖃᖅᐳᖅ−ᐊᑕᐅᓯᖅ ᐱᓯᒪᐃᓐᓇᕐᓂᐊᖅᑕᑦ.

ᐊᑖᓂ ᐊᑎᓕᐅᕈᕖᑦ, ᐊᖏᖅᐳᑎᑦ ᐃᓚᐅᓂᐊᕐᓂᕐᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᔪᓂᒃ. ᑐᑭᓯᕗᑎᑦ ᐃᓚᐅᔪᒪᓃᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᖅᓰᑎᒋᕚᐅᒃ ᖃᖓᑐᐃᓐᓇᑦᑎᐊᒃᑯᓪᓗ ᐃᓚᐅᔫᓂᕈᓐᓇᖅᐳᑎᑦ.

ᐃᓚᐅᔪᑉ ᐊᑎᐊ (ᓴᖑᐃᐱᓗᙱᓪᓗᒍ): ______________________________

ᐃᓚᐅᔫᑉ ᐊᑎᓕᐅᕈᓯᐊ: ______________________________

ᐅᓪᓗᖅ: _________________

ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑎᐅᑉ ᐊᑎᓕᐅᕈᓯᐊ: ______________________________

ᐅᓪᓗᖅ: _________________

Appendix C. Codebook and Thematic Framework

Name
Abattoir
Abundance
Decline in the past
Declining
Increasing
Behaviour
Snow Machines
Uncertain_No Observation
Wolf
Caribou Harvesting
ATVs_Sleds
Experience (Years)
Firearms
Frequency
Period of No Hunting
Change in Hunting Effort
Easier_Closer
Longer
No
Spring
Winter
Yes
Change in Sightings Over Time
Fluctuating
More seen than before
No
Coats Island
Environment
Dry
Food
Ice_Rain_Freezing
No Changes
Export & Social Media Sales
Don't Like or Support
Health
Body Condition (Observed)
Changes Over Time
Fat

Name
Normal
Thin
Brucellosis
Calf Abundance and Survival (Observed Change)
No concerns
Uncertain_No Observation
Crabby Eye
No concerns
IQ_Historical
Management
Mixed
Negative
Working
Other Communities_Offshore Visitors
Peary Caribou
Proximity to Community
Range and Movement
Selling Off-Island_Caribou meat sales
Against
In-Favour
Would still like to ship
Sharing
Small Island
Sports Hunting
TAH_Harvest
Could increase
It's ok
Visibility and Availability
Easier than Before