
**SUMMARY REPORT ON
THE INFORMAL HEARING
HELD BY THE NUNAVUT
WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD
ON NOVEMBER 15 – 17, 2005**

**REGARDING PROPOSED TOTAL
ALLOWABLE HARVESTS AND NON-QUOTA
LIMITATIONS UNDER THE DRAFT WILDLIFE
REGULATIONS AND ORDERS MADE
PURSUANT TO
THE NUNAVUT *WILDLIFE ACT***



Prepared for:

Prepared by:



MARCH 30, 2006

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. PURPOSE OF INFORMAL HEARING..... | 2 |
| 2. PARTICIPANTS | 3 |
| 3. PROPOSED TOTAL ALLOWABLE HARVESTS AND NON-QUOTA LIMITATIONS REVIEWED AND DISCUSSED | 5 |
| 4. VIEWS EXPRESSED AT INFORMAL HEARING | 8 |
| 5. SUMMARY CHART OF PROPOSED TOTAL ALLOWABLE HARVESTS AND NON-QUOTA LIMITATIONS AND VIEWS EXPRESSED..... | 22 |

1. PURPOSE OF INFORMAL HEARING

The Nunavut Wildlife Act was assented to on December 5, 2003 following a series of extensive community, regional and pan-Nunavut consultations. The Act was last modified on May 10, 2005.

Over the past two years, Government of Nunavut (GN), with advice from a Working Group established with representation from the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board (NWMB), the Regional Wildlife Organizations (RWOs) and Nunavut Tunngavik Inc. (NTI), has developed a set of proposed regulations and orders to accompany the Act. In October and November 2005, the Working Group, led by the GN, held several meetings at the regional level in order to consult with Hunters and Trappers Associations (HTAs) in reviewing the proposed regulations and orders.

In addition, in November of 2005 the NWMB held an informal hearing in Iqaluit of HTA representatives drawn from all communities across the territory, and a review and discussion were carried out regarding all the proposed Total Allowable Harvests (TAHs) and a number of the proposed Non-Quota Limitations (NQLs) during a 3-day plenary session. Aarluk Consulting was asked to assist with the informal hearing and James Arreak, an Aarluk Consulting Associate – with assistance from Terry Forth - facilitated the discussions, which took place for the most part in Inuktitut.

The informal hearing was held at the Anglican Church Parish Hall over a three-day period – November 15-17, 2005. In attendance were representatives of the HTAs, the three RWOs, NTI, the NWMB and the GN.

The meetings opened and closed each day with a prayer.

On the first day the Chair of the NWMB, Joe Tigullaraq gave a welcome to participants and made some opening comments. After this, facilitators (James Arreak and Terry Forth) were introduced and then all participants introduced themselves – see Section 2 for a complete list of those in attendance.

On the first morning, Joe Tigullaraq and Michael d'Eça (NWMB legal counsel) provided background information regarding TAHs and NQLs under the *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement* (NLCA). The proposed TAHs and NQLs – and the draft Regulations and Orders in which they are found – that were reviewed and discussed are listed in Section 3.

At the end of the afternoon of the first day Jack Anawak, Canada's Circum-Polar Ambassador spoke to participants and the afternoon of the second day Simon Awa, Deputy Minister of the Environment brought greetings to the meeting from the Minister of the Environment, Olayuk Akesuk.

The remaining time was devoted to a discussion of the proposed TAHs and NQLs for various species under the draft Regulations and Orders. Joe Tigullaraq and Michael d'Eça introduced each section and provided explanations as required. Open discussions then took place. The results of the discussions are summarized in Section 4 of this report.

2. PARTICIPANTS

Workshop Participants

| Name | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | Community | ᑭᑦᑭᑦ | Organization |
|-------------------|-----------|----------------|------|--------------|
| Abraham Qaunaq | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | Hall Beach | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | NWMB |
| Agatha Ekwalak | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | Whale Cove | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | HTA |
| Apak Qaqasiq | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | Clyde River | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | HTA |
| Gideon Qitsualik | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | Gjoa Haven | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | HTA |
| Harry Sala | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | Sanikiluaq | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | HTA |
| Hugh Nateela | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | Baker Lake | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | HTA |
| Isak Killiktee | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | Pond Inlet | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | HTA |
| Jack Angoo | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | Whale Cove | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | HTA |
| Jayko Aooloo | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | Pond Inlet | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | WG |
| Jaypetee Akeegrok | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | Grise Fiord | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | HTA |
| Jerome Tatuinee | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | Rankin Inlet | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | HTA |
| Joannie Ikkidluaq | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | Kimmirut | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | NWMB & QWB |
| Koalie Kuniliusie | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | Qikiqtarjuak | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | HTA |
| Laimmiki Malliki | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | Repulse Bay | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | HTA |
| Larry Adjun | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | Kugluktuk | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | HTA |
| Makabe Nartok | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | Kugaaruk | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | NWMB |
| Moses Nakashuk | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | Pangnirtung | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | HTA |
| Nathan Qamaniq | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | Igloodik | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | HTA |
| Paul Pemik | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | Arviat | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | NWMB |
| Percy Pikuyak | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | Hall Beach | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | HTA |
| Peter Qayutinuak | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | Taloyoak | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | HTA |
| Phillip Kadlun | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | Kugluktuk | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | RWO/WG |
| Qabaroak Qatsiya | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | Cape Dorset | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | HTA |
| Sam Kapolak | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | Bathurst Inlet | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | HTA |
| Sammy Josephie | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | Iqaluit | ᐅᑦᑭᑦ | HTA |

| Name | ᐅᓂᓴ | Community | ᓄᓇᓴᓴ | Organization |
|-------------------|------------|---------------|------------|--------------|
| Sandy Akavak | ᓇᓂᓂ ᐅᓂᓴᓴ | Kimmirut | ᓄᓴᓂᓴᓴ | HTA |
| Simon Idlout | ᓇᐅᓴᓴ ᐅᓴᓴᓴᓴ | Resolute Bay | ᓴᓂᓴᓴᓴᓴᓴᓴ | HTA |
| Sytukie Joamie | ᓴᐅᓴᓴ ᓴᓂᓴ | Iqaluit | ᓴᓴᓴᓴᓴᓴ | HTA |
| Thomas Ubluriak | ᓴᓴᓴ ᓴᓴᓴᓴᓴᓴ | Arviat | ᓴᓴᓴᓴᓴᓴ | HTA |
| Tommy Tattatuapik | ᓴᓴᓴ ᓴᓴᓴᓴᓴᓴ | Arctic Bay | ᓴᓴᓴᓴᓴᓴᓴ | HTA |
| Wendy Avalak | ᓴᓴᓴᓴ ᓴᓴᓴᓴᓴ | Cambridge Bay | ᓴᓴᓴᓴᓴᓴᓴᓴᓴᓴ | HTA |
| Willie Nakoolak | ᓴᓴᓴ ᓇᓴᓴ | Coral Harbour | ᓴᓴᓴᓴᓴ | HTA |
| Zachary Oogark | ᓴᓴᓴᓴ ᓴᓴᓴᓴ | Kugaaruk | ᓴᓴᓴᓴᓴᓴ | HTA |

Resource Personnel

| | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Mark Pimlott | Legislation and Compliance | GN DOE – Iqaluit |
| Patrick Orr | Legislative Counsel | GN – DOE |
| Steven Pinksen | Director of Policy | GN – DOE |
| David Lee | Biologist | NTI – Rankin Inlet |
| Glenn Williams | Wildlife Advisor | NTI – Iqaluit |
| Gabriel Nirlungayuk | Director of Wildlife | NTI – Rankin Inlet |
| Joe Tigullaraq | Chairperson – Chief Executive Officer | NWMB |
| Michael d'Eça | Legal Counsel | NWMB |
| Jim Noble | Chief Operating Officer | NWMB |
| Tom Demcheson | Director Finance and Administration | NWMB |
| Joe Justus | Director Wildlife Management | NWMB |
| Erin Calder | Wildlife Management Biologist | NWMB |
| James Arreak | Facilitator | Aarluk Consulting |
| Terry Forth | Facilitator | Aarluk Consulting |

3. PROPOSED TOTAL ALLOWABLE HARVESTS AND NON-QUOTA LIMITATIONS REVIEWED AND DISCUSSED

The following Proposed TAHs and NQLs were reviewed and discussed:

1. PROPOSED TAHs FOR FALCONS
2. PROPOSED TAHs FOR ALL OTHER BIRDS OF PREY - EXCEPT SNOWY OWL
3. PROPOSED TAHs FOR GRIZZLY BEARS
4. PROPOSED TAHs FOR MUSKOX
5. PROPOSED TAHs FOR PEARY CARIBOU
6. PROPOSED TAHs FOR WOLVERINE
7. PROPOSED PROHIBITIONS ON HARVESTING RAVENS AND PORSILD'S BRYUM (HARVESTING REGULATIONS, S. 10 & 23)
8. PROPOSED TAH RULES (HARVESTING REGULATIONS, S. 20 & 22)
9. PROPOSED TAH RULES FOR POLAR BEARS (HARVESTING REGULATIONS, S. 21(3), (4) & (5))
10. PROPOSED NQLs: TRAPS (CERTIFIED TRAPS ORDER, S. 1 & 2)
11. PROPOSED NQLs: TRAPS (HARVESTING REGULATIONS, S. 6)
12. PROPOSED NQLs: USE OF DOGS (HARVESTING REGULATIONS, S.7)
13. PROPOSED NQLs: PROHIBITED TRAPS AND WEAPONS (HARVESTING REGULATIONS, S. 8(1))
14. PROPOSED NQLs: SMALL GAME (HARVESTING REGULATIONS, S. 8(2))
15. PROPOSED NQLs: BIG GAME (HARVESTING REGULATIONS, S. 8(3)(B) – ((J))
16. PROPOSED NQLs: USE OF PASSIVE WEAPONS FOR BIG GAME (HARVESTING REGULATIONS, S. 8(3)(A) & 8(4))
17. PROPOSED NQLs: AMMUNITION (HARVESTING REGULATIONS, S. 8(5))

- 18. PROPOSED NQLs: RESPECT FOR IQ PRINCIPLES (HARVESTING REGULATIONS, S. 9)
- 19. PROPOSED NQLs: BIRDS OF PREY (HARVESTING REGULATIONS, S. 11 (2) & (3))
- 20. PROPOSED NQLs: POLAR BEARS (HARVESTING REGULATIONS, S. 13(2))
- 21. PROPOSED NQLs: GRIZZLY BEARS (HARVESTING REGULATIONS, S. 14)
- 22. PROPOSED NQLs: BY-CATCH (HARVESTING REGULATIONS, S. 17(1))

Proposed Non-Quota Limitations Not Reviewed

There was not enough time during the informal hearing to review the following NQLs. However, each participant was provided with a written description in Inuktitut and English of all the proposed NQLs (and TAHs) in the draft Regulations and Orders. In addition, the GN offered to conduct further community consultations if requested by communities.

PROPOSED NQLs: LIVE POSSESSION LICENCE (LICENCES AND TAGS REGULATIONS, S. 21(2) & 21(3))

PROPOSED NQLs: WILDLIFE SANCTUARIES (CONSERVATION AREAS MANAGEMENT ORDER, S. 1)

PROPOSED NQLs (GAME HARVESTING AND POSSESSION LIMITS ORDER, S. 1 - 4)

PROPOSED NQLs: EMERGENCY KILLS (HARVESTING REGULATIONS, S. 15)

PROPOSED NQLs: HUMANE KILLS (HARVESTING REGULATIONS, S. 16)

PROPOSED NQLs: TRAPS (HARVESTING REGULATIONS, S. 5)

PROPOSED NQLs: TAGS (LICENCES AND TAGS REGULATIONS, S. 43(2))

PROPOSED NQLs: BIRDS OF PREY (HARVESTING REGULATIONS, S. 11(1))

PROPOSED NQLs: POLAR BEARS (HARVESTING REGULATIONS, S. 12(1), 12(2), 12(3) & 13(1))

PROPOSED NQLs: LICENCE APPLICATIONS (LICENCES AND TAGS REGULATIONS, S. 3(1) (C), (E), (G) & (I))

PROPOSED NQLs: PROJECT OUTLINES (LICENCES AND TAGS REGULATIONS, S. 5(1) (A), (F) & (H))

PROPOSED NQLs: SPECIES AUTHORIZATION TAGS (LICENCES AND TAGS REGULATIONS, S. 44(1) & 46(1))

PROPOSED NQLs (MUSKOX MANAGEMENT AREAS REGULATIONS, S. 2(1))

PROPOSED NQLs (OPEN SEASONS ORDER, S. 1)

PROPOSED NQLs (GAME HARVESTING AND POSSESSION LIMITS ORDER, S. 1, 2, 3 & 4)

PROPOSED NQLs: BIRDS OF PREY (PRESCRIBED MATTERS REGULATIONS, S. 4)

PROPOSED NQLs: RAVENS (PRESCRIBED MATTERS REGULATIONS, S. 5)

PROPOSED NQLs: ALL TERRAIN VEHICLES (PRESCRIBED MATTERS REGULATIONS, S. 8)

PROPOSED NQLs (WOLVERINE MANAGEMENT AREAS REGULATIONS, S. 2)

4. VIEWS EXPRESSED AT INFORMAL HEARING

4.1. PROPOSED TAHs FOR FALCONS

The following are the GN's proposed limitations for Falcons:

TAH OF 5 GYRFALCONS FOR THE KITIKMEOT REGION.

TAH OF 5 GYRFALCONS FOR THE KIVALLIQ REGION.

TAH OF 10 GYRFALCONS FOR THE QIKIQTAALUK REGION.

IN ALL REGIONS A TAH OF 0 PEREGRINE FALCONS.

4.2. PROPOSED TAHs FOR ALL OTHER BIRDS OF PREY - EXCEPT SNOWY OWL

IN ALL REGIONS, A TAH OF 0 FOR: SHORT-EARED OWL, BALD EAGLE, GOLDEN EAGLE, ROUGH-LEGGED HAWK, HARRIER AND OSPREY

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:

Note- Both 4.1 and 4.2 were discussed at the same time. Concerns raised during the discussion can be summarized as follows:

- Possibility of adding at least one bald eagle to the TAH.
- Gyrafalcons and Peregrine Falcom have a substantial value and by establishing a TAH – Inuit will benefit – if birds are sold alive.
- With respect to other birds of prey, in the October-November consultations, people did not express an interest in harvesting them, except for snowy owls.
- Concern that birds are referred to by different Inuktitut names in different regions and communities e.g. Bald Eagle and Golden Eagle are the same word in Kivalliq
- Clarification also needed regarding eggs. – are they included – advice given suggested that eggs would have to count as part of the harvest – but uncertainty of level that one egg would count.
- After caucusing, each region came up with the following proposed TAH estimates. Kitikmeot: 7 Gyrfalcon, 2 Peregrine, 7 each of Bald Eagle, Golden Eagle and Rough-legged Hawk. Kivalliq: 2 Peregrine, 1 Bald Eagle, 1 Golden

Eagle, 2 Rough-legged Hawk. Qikiqtaaluk: 13 Peregrine, 13 Gyrfalcon, 5 Bald Eagle.

- Even at these levels there was concern as to how the RWO's would allocate to each community. It should be up to communities as to how they use their allocation – e.g. through a sports hunt or taken alive, harvesting of eggs, etc.
- The proposed TAH numbers were originally set by the GNWT when communities expressed an interest in a commercial harvest.
- Sometimes birds get caught in traps and there was concern that these could get included in the TAH.
- Several communities would like to see a TAH for Peregrine falcons and have reported a greater population of this species in their area than Gyrfalcons.
- Noted that in some communities Bald Eagles are increasing in number e.g. Coral Harbour, Arviat and Whale Cove – and the HTAs want to see a Nunavut TAH level for this species – even a small number.

Other observations:

- NTI believes the TAH of zero on all other birds of prey except the snowy owl places an unreasonable restriction and government has not demonstrated a conservation reason for this restriction. Gov't has indicated that reason for restriction is due to lack of information. In NTI's view the GN's position on Snowy Owls is inconsistent since there is also a lack of information about Snowy Owls.
- It was noted by the GN that if Inuit believe that certain species (such as Gyrfalcons) should be allocated a TAH because of commercial market potential then NWMB should listen and bring a revised number forward for consideration. NTI takes the position that Inuit have a right to harvest unless there are recognized restrictions placed on a harvest by the NWMB and Government.

4.3. PROPOSED TAHs FOR GRIZZLY BEARS

The GN wishes to recognize four Grizzly Bear populations within Nunavut with proposed TAHs for each as follows:

A TAH of 8 for GB/01 (WEST KITIKMEOT).

A TAH OF 6 FOR GB/02 (SOUTH-EAST KITIKMEOT).

A TAH OF 6 FOR GB/03 (EAST KITIKMEOT, KIVALLIQ AND QIKIQTAAALUK).

A TAH OF 0 FOR GB/04 (NORTH-WEST KITIKMEOT).

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:

There was general concern that the levels set are too low and may not be based on up to date population information. Biologists may be setting levels which are too conservative and that the level for GB/04 (North-west Kitikmeot) should at least be increased to 6 from 0.

A further concern was related to Article 40 of the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement – since Article 40 harvesters may harvest Grizzly Bears in Nunavut; and, Grizzly Bears travel to zones outside Nunavut and agreements with other Aboriginal groups may be appropriate.

NTI wanted the GN to consult with the communities on management objectives for Grizzly Bears before proposing TAHs. In addition, NTI expressed the view that the GN has no authority to limit grizzly bear harvests because of the operation of s.24 of the *Nunavut Act*.

The GN indicated that these numbers are only for Nunavut harvesters, not Article 40 harvesters, and that the conservation justification is set out in the GN paper entitled, *Recommendations on Total Allowable Harvest (TAH) Rates for Terrestrial Wildlife Populations in Nunavut* (April 11, 2005).

4.4. PROPOSED TAHs FOR MUSKOKX

There are 13 GN-proposed Population groups divided between MX-1 TO MX-13.

A TAH OF 5 (2 FEMALES) FOR MX-1 (ALLOCATED TO RESOLUTE BAY).

A TAH OF 0 FOR MX-2.

A TAH OF 70 FOR MX-3 (ALLOCATED TO GRISE FIORD).

A TAH OF 21 FOR MX-4 (ALLOCATED TO GRISE FIORD).

A TAH OF 6 (3 FEMALES) FOR MX-5 (ALLOCATED TO GRISE FIORD).

A TAH OF 14 (7 FEMALES) FOR MX-6 (ALLOCATED TO GRISE FIORD).

A TAH OF 4 (2 FEMALES) FOR MX-7 (ALLOCATED TO QIKIQTAALUK REGION).

A TAH OF 0 FOR MX-8.

A TAH OF 32 FOR MX-9 (ALLOCATED BETWEEN KITIKMEOT AND QIKIQTAALUK REGIONS).

NO TAH ESTABLISHED FOR MX-10. – Inuit may take the full amount they require.

A TAH OF 348 FOR MX-11 (ALLOCATED TO KITIKMEOT REGION).

A TAH OF 20 FOR MX-12 (ALLOCATED TO KITIKMEOT REGION).

A TAH OF 106 FOR MX-13 (ALLOCATED BETWEEN KITIKMEOT AND KIVALLIQ REGIONS).

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:

The following is a general consolidation of comments on the proposed TAHs for Muskox:

Further discussion and consultation is warranted in terms of the allocation for MX-1. This seems too low since both Resolute Bay and Arctic Bay hunt in this zone. The same applies to MX-2.

With regard to zones Mx -3-6 – all proposed for Grise Fiord, there was a feeling that the HTA should be allowed to manage the areas themselves – in particular so that they can hunt closer to home. It was noted that Arctic Bay hunters occasionally travel to MX-5 and they support lifting restrictions. In other areas (MX-7 and MX-8 and MX-9) an increase was also proposed, particularly establishing some levels for MX-8 other than 0.

There are similar issues with zones in the west. Some increases for MX-12 should be considered with Inuit able to hunt closer to home and an increase in the TAH from 106 to 120. MX-13 can be considered one population area with Inuit being allowed to decide between the Kivalliq and Kitikmeot regions.

NTI argued that the GN needs to visit the communities to get their input, that the GN must rely upon IQ in proposing TAH numbers, and that a number of management zones could be combined.

4.5. PROPOSED TAHs FOR PEARY CARIBOU

A TAH OF 14 FOR BATHURST ISLAND (ALLOCATED TO RESOLUTE BAY)..

A TAH OF 0 FOR SOMERSET, PRINCE OF WALES AND NORTH DEVON ISLANDS.

A TAH OF 2 FOR WEST DEVON ISLAND (ALLOCATED TO QIKIQTAALUK REGION).

A TAH OF 50 FOR ELLESMERE/AXEL HEIBERG ISLANDS (ALLOCATED TO GRISE FIORD).

NO TAH ESTABLISHED FOR OTHER QUEEN ELIZABETH ISLANDS.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:

There is concern from hunters about listing Peary Caribou as endangered. In Bathurst Island, an increase from 14 to 60 is recommended by the Resolute Bay HTA. For Somerset, Prince of Wales and North Devon Islands it was felt a TAH of 40 should be established – many caribou are now being killed off by wolves regardless of TAH restrictions for Inuit. More consultations and studies are required. Recognition needs to be given to HTAs in these areas that they have been managing these herds.

Similar concerns were raised regarding West Devon Island where a TAH of 2 is not considered high enough. There were no comments regarding the 0 TAH for other Queen Elizabeth Islands.

NTI was of the view that the affected communities needed to be further consulted, and their agreement secured for any proposed TAH.

4.6. PROPOSED TAHs FOR WOLVERINE

There are three GN-proposed Wolverine populations:
W/01, KITIKMEOT AND KIVALLIQ REGIONS;
W/02, KITIKMEOT, KIVALLIQ AND QIKIQTAALUK REGIONS;
W/03, QIKIQTAALUK REGION.

The following TAHs have been proposed by the GN for each population group.
A TAH OF 200 FOR W/01 (ALLOCATED TO KITIKMEOT AND KIVALLIQ REGIONS).

A TAH OF 65 FOR W/02 (ALLOCATED TO KITIKMEOT, KIVALLIQ AND QIKIQTAALUK REGIONS).

NO TAH ESTABLISHED FOR OTHER QUEEN ELIZABETH ISLANDS.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:

There are difficulties trying to share TAHs for Wolverine between the Kivalliq and Kitikmeot regions. There appeared to be a general feeling that harvesting limits are too low, and perhaps should even be lifted for this species.

NTI's position was that the GN needs to consult with the communities, and to work out the TAH numbers with them,

4.7. PROPOSED PROHIBITIONS ON HARVESTING

S.10, HARVESTING REGS: NO PERSON SHALL HARVEST A RAVEN.

S.23, HARVESTING REGS: NO PERSON SHALL HARVEST PORSILD'S BRYUM (A MOSS GROWING IN QUTTINIRPAAQ NATIONAL PARK, ELLESMERE ISLAND).

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:

There was no discussion of S. 10, because the GN announced that it is withdrawing this proposed prohibition from the *Harvesting Regulations*.

The general conclusion regarding restrictions on harvesting of Porsild's Bryum was that the restriction should only apply to the Quttinirpaaq National Park.

4.8. PROPOSED TAH RULES (HARVESTING REGULATIONS)

S.22: IF A MEMBER OF A SPECIES WITH A TAH IS HARVESTED IN A LOCATION OUTSIDE ANY AREA RECOGNIZED FOR A POPULATION OF THAT SPECIES,

THE WILDLIFE IS DEEMED TO BE HARVESTED FROM THE CLOSEST POPULATION.

S.20(1): THE RWO DECIDES WHICH ALLOCATION OF THE TAH SHOULD BE USED WHEN:

(A): WILDLIFE IS HARVESTED BY SOMEONE WITH NO ALLOCATION;

(B): THERE IS NO SURPLUS FOR THE SPECIES; AND

(C): THE STOCK OR POPULATION IS ALLOCATED TO MORE THAN 1 COMMUNITY OR ABORIGINAL GROUP IN THE REGION.

S.20(2): IF THE RWO DOES NOT MAKE A DECISION, THE HARVESTED WILDLIFE IS TAKEN FROM THE TAH ALLOCATED TO THE COMMUNITY OR ABORIGINAL GROUP NEAREST THE PLACE WHERE THE WILDLIFE WAS KILLED.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:

There were generally no concerns raised about the rules described in S. 22 and 20(1). Further discussions and consultations are required with respect to any compensation to be paid related to S.20 (2) and how the RWO will manage this between two or more communities. It was recognized that prior agreements with respect to compensation should be in place with companies undertaking exploration work in areas where Polar Bear may be killed by non-Inuit.

4.9. PROPOSED TAH RULES FOR POLAR BEARS (HARVESTING REGULATIONS)

S.21(3): IF A FEMALE POLAR BEAR IS HARVESTED WHEN ACCOMPANIED BY ANOTHER BEAR UNDER 3 YEARS OF AGE, THE OTHER BEAR IS DEEMED TO BE HARVESTED AT THE SAME TIME.

S.21(4): A POLAR BEAR DEEMED HARVESTED UNDER S.21(3) IS COUNTED AS ½ A DEAD BEAR IF:

(A): LESS THAN 2 YEARS OLD; AND

(B): THE FEMALE BEAR WAS KILLED TO PRESERVE A HUMAN LIFE, PROTECT PROPERTY OR PREVENT A PERSON'S STARVATION.

S.21(5): EVERY DEAD POLAR BEAR IS CONSIDERED TO HAVE BEEN HARVESTED, UNLESS:

(A): IT DIED FROM NATURAL CAUSES; OR

(B): IT WAS KILLED FOR HUMANE REASONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REGULATIONS.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:

While there were general concerns about including the above sections in the regulations, and there was considerable discussion on this item, no firm conclusions were reached. Further consultations may be required in order to clarify whether and how the regulations could replace or help clarify the implementation of the MOU.

4.10. PROPOSED NQLs: TRAPS (CERTIFIED TRAPS ORDER)

UNDER THE *WILDLIFE ACT* S.82, UNLESS A TRAP IS CERTIFIED, ITS USE IS PROHIBITED.

S.1: A LIST OF TRAPS CERTIFIED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE *AGREEMENT ON INTERNATIONAL HUMANE TRAPPING STANDARDS*.

S.2: A LIST OF TRAPS CERTIFIED AS HUMANE AND SAFE THAT ARE NOT SUBJECT TO THE *AGREEMENT ON INTERNATIONAL HUMANE TRAPPING STANDARDS*.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:

It was made clear that S.82 of the *Wildlife Act* has not yet come into force. Until this happens, the two lists of certified traps will not be in place (S.1 and S.2). There was general agreement that establishing these lists and communicating what is allowed through written and pictorial means is important.

4.11. Proposed NQLs: Traps (Harvesting Regulations)

S.6(1): NO PERSON SHALL USE A JAW-TYPE LEG HOLD RESTRAINING TRAP TO HARVEST BEAVER, OTTER, MARTEN, FISHER, MUSKRAT OR BADGER.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:

It was noted that these animals lie closer to the southern Nunavut boarder (therefore, Article 40 needs to be considered). No major concerns registered.

S.6(2): NO PERSON SHALL USE A CONVENTIONAL STEEL-JAWED LEG HOLD RESTRAINING TRAP TO HARVEST COYOTE, WOLF, BOBCAT, LYNX OR RACCOON.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:

There were no general concerns expressed

S.6(3): A PERSON USING A LIVE-CAPTURE TRAP TO HARVEST FURBEARERS SHALL INSPECT THE TRAP AT LEAST ONCE EVERY 72 HOURS AND, SUBJECT TO BY-CATCH RULES (S.17), REMOVE ANY ANIMAL IN THE TRAP.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:

There was considerable discussion about the 72 hour restriction and a general feeling that this was probably too short a period and it would be preferable to change wording to something like, "Check Live-Capture Traps regularly". Some participants indicated they would respond further to this in writing following the meeting.

4.12. PROPOSED NQLs: USE OF DOGS (HARVESTING REGULATIONS)

Slides 63,64

S.7(1): SUBJECT TO S.7(2), NO PERSON SHALL USE A DOG TO KILL OR OTHERWISE HARVEST GAME

S.7(2) A PERSON MAY USE A DOG TO CHASE, DRIVE, FLUSH, ATTRACT, PURSUE, WORRY, FOLLOW, SEARCH FOR OR RETRIEVE SMALL GAME, A BEAR, [A MUSKOX?] OR A WOLVERINE, AND MAY USE DOGS TO PULL A SLED AS TRANSPORTATION.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:

There were views expressed by some participants that S. 7(1) should be deleted.

With regard to S7(2) there was general support and a majority agreed that Muskox should also be included in the list.

4.13. PROPOSED NQLs: PROHIBITED TRAPS AND WEAPONS (HARVESTING REGULATIONS)

S.8(1): NO PERSON SHALL HARVEST GAME WITH:

- (A): A SHOTGUN WITH A GAUGE NO. OF 8 OR LESS;
- (B): A TRAP WITH METAL TEETH OR SERRATION ON ITS JAWS;
- (C): A FOOTHOLD TRAP WITH A SPRING POLE;
- (D): A TRAP NOT IN A MECHANICALLY FIT CONDITION;
- (E): A TRAP NOT SECURELY FASTENED TO AN ANCHOR OR DRAG;
- (F): A HANDGUN;
- (G): ANYTHING REGULATED UNDER S.84 OF THE *CRIMINAL CODE* AS A RESTRICTED FIREARM OR PROHIBITED FIREARM, WEAPON, DEVICE OR AMMUNITION; OR
- (H): A WEAPON OPERATED BY REMOTE CONTROL FROM ANOTHER LOCATION.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:

Following general discussion and explanations of some of the terminology there was general agreement to leave wording in each of the sub-clauses unchanged.

4.14. PROPOSED NQLs: SMALL GAME (HARVESTING REGULATIONS)

S.8(2): NO PERSON SHALL HARVEST SMALL GAME WITH A CROSSBOW, OTHER THAN A COMPOUND CROSSBOW, WITH A PULL OF LESS THAN 55KG AT FULL DRAW.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:

After some discussion the majority agreed that S.8(2) should be included.

4.15. PROPOSED NQLs: BIG GAME (HARVESTING REGULATIONS)

S.8(3): NO PERSON SHALL HARVEST BIG GAME WITH:

- (B): A MUZZLE-LOADER OF LESS THAN .44 CALIBRE;
- (C): SHOTGUN AMMUNITION WITH PELLETS SMALLER THAN 00 BUCK OR SSG;
- (D): A CROSSBOW, OTHER THAN A COMPOUND CROSSBOW, WITH A PULL OF LESS THAN 68 KG AT FULL DRAW;
- (E): A COMPOUND CROSSBOW WITH A PULL OF LESS THAN 45 KG AT FULL DRAW;
- (F): A CROSSBOW QUARREL WITH A BROADHEAD LESS THAN 2.22 CM AT ITS WIDEST POINT;
- (G): A CROSSBOW QUARREL WEIGHING LESS THAN 16.2G;
- (H): A SNARE MADE OF BRASS OR STAINLESS STEEL WIRE;
- (I): A SNARE MADE OF A SINGLE STRAND OF WIRE; OR
- (J): A SNARE WITHOUT A LOCKING DEVICE THAT PREVENTS THE SNARE FROM LOOSENING ONCE THE ANIMAL IS CAUGHT.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:

There was general discussion about the lack of familiarity participants had with the crossbows included on this list and it was understood that they are being included in the regulations because of sports hunters.

A majority voted in favour of including them.

4.16. PROPOSED NQLs: USE OF PASSIVE WEAPONS FOR BIG GAME (HARVESTING REGULATIONS)

S.8(3)(A) & S.8(4): EXCEPT FOR AN INUK OR AN ASSIGNEE OF THE RIGHT TO HARVEST USING A TRADITIONAL WEAPON, NO PERSON SHALL HARVEST BIG GAME WITH A NON-PROJECTILE (PASSIVE) WEAPON, OTHER THAN A TRAP.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:

There was considerable discussion about these sections, but it was clarified that this applies only to non-Inuit. There was relative satisfaction with these provisions.

4.17. PROPOSED NQLs: AMMUNITION (HARVESTING REGULATIONS)

S.8(5): NO PERSON SHALL USE AMMUNITION LESS THAN 6 MM OR .243 CAL TO HARVEST A BEAR, MOOSE OR MUSKOX.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:

A majority were in favour of this section – but there were some objections from both Pangnirtung and Qikiqtarjuaq representatives.

4.18. PROPOSED NQLs: RESPECT FOR IQ PRINCIPLES (HARVESTING REGULATIONS)

S.9(1): NO PERSON SHALL HARVEST GAME WITH AN INTENTION THAT CONTRAVENES THE IQ PRINCIPLE OF ILIIJAQSUITTAILINIQ/KIMAITAILINIK.

S.9(2): NO PERSON SHALL HARVEST GAME IN A MANNER THAT CONTRAVENES THE IQ PRINCIPLE OF SIRLIQSAAQTITTITAILINIQ/NAKLIHAAKTITIHUILUHI.

S.9(3): NO PERSON SHALL TREAT GAME IN A MANNER THAT CONTRAVENES THE IQ PRINCIPLE OF IKPIGUSUTTIARNIQ NIRJUTILMAANIK/PITIAKBUGIT NEKYUTIT.

S.9(4): EVERY PERSON HARVESTING GAME SHALL FOLLOW THE IQ PRINCIPLE OF PILIMMAKSARNIQ/AYOIKYUMIKATAKHIMANIK WITH RESPECT TO HIS OR HER HUNTING SKILLS.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:

It was pointed out that a number of IQ principles are included in the Act. These references have been included in the Regulations to ensure that these harvesting methods are being used appropriately. There was recognition that Conservation Officers unfamiliar with traditional practices could be challenged (and this might apply to younger Inuit officers as well). Assurance was made by the GN that enforcement would never be taken by an officer on his own, but would involve considerable consultations with the community and elders as well as senior members of the Department of Environment. Also, operational guidelines will be developed for the Conservation Officers. Therefore these particular regulations will be implemented carefully and sensitively and primarily by Inuit staff within the department.

Participants were invited to send in any further comments in writing to the NWMB.

4.19. PROPOSED NQLs: BIRDS OF PREY (HARVESTING REGULATIONS)

S.11(2): NO PERSON SHALL HARVEST A LIVE BIRD OF PREY, OTHER THAN A SNOWY OWL, THAT IS MORE THAN ONE YEAR OF AGE.

S.11(3): NO PERSON SHALL CAPTURE A LIVE BIRD OF PREY WITH A TRAP, UNLESS THE TRAP IS CONSTANTLY ATTENDED BY A QUALIFIED FALCONER.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:

There were some concerns expressed about this regulation based in part on the difficulty of predetermining the age of a Bird of Prey and also the lack of certainty as to how these regulations will be applied and what standards will be put in place in terms of defining a qualified falconer for example. NTI would like to know the conservation reason for the cut-off of one year in 11(2). No conclusions were reached.

4.20. PROPOSED NQLs: POLAR BEARS (HARVESTING REGULATIONS)

S.13(2): NO GUIDE SHALL ASSIST A HUNTER BY USING A VEHICLE OR OTHER CONVEYANCE TO LOCATE, SPOT, CHASE, DRIVE, FLUSH, ATTRACT, PURSUE, WORRY OR FOLLOW A POLAR BEAR, BUT MAY USE IT TO RETRIEVE A HARVESTED POLAR BEAR.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:

There is a requirement to correct some of the translation in this section. No other concern raised.

4.21. PROPOSED NQLs: GRIZZLY BEARS (HARVESTING REGULATIONS)

S.14(1): NO PERSON SHALL HARVEST A GRIZZLY BEAR UNDER TWO YEARS OF AGE.

S.14(2): NO PERSON SHALL HARVEST A FEMALE GRIZZLY BEAR ACCOMPANIED BY A BEAR THAT IS OR APPEARS TO BE UNDER TWO YEARS OF AGE.

S.14(3): NO PERSON SHALL HARVEST A FEMALE GRIZZLY BEAR THAT IS IN A DEN OR THAT IS CONSTRUCTING A DEN.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:

Concerns were expressed by some that Management Plans are not yet in place. Generally, it was felt that Grizzly Bears are a problem, and can be aggressive and destructive. If they are bothersome, Inuit want to be able to harvest them. However, delegates were relatively comfortable with the restrictions concerning two-year olds. NTI again raised the concern over s.24 of the *Nunavut Act* (see 4.3 above).

4.22. PROPOSED NQLs: BY-CATCH (HARVESTING REGULATIONS)

S.17(1): IF BY-CATCH IS ALIVE WHEN DISCOVERED BY THE PERSON IN CONTROL OF A TRAP, THE PERSON SHALL:

- (A): RELEASE IT IF THAT WOULD RESULT IN A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SURVIVAL AND LITTLE OR NO DANGER TO THE PERSON RELEASING IT;
- (B): KILL THE BY-CATCH WHERE THERE IS LITTLE LIKELIHOOD OF SURVIVAL IF RELEASED;
- (C): KILL IT IF A CONSERVATION OFFICER SO AUTHORIZES; OR
- (D): KILL IT IF THERE WOULD BE MORE THAN A LITTLE DANGER TO THE PERSON IN RELEASING IT AND THERE IS LITTLE LIKELIHOOD OF IT SURVIVING THE TIME IT WOULD TAKE FOR A CONSERVATION OFFICER TO COME AND RELEASE IT.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:

There were a number of questions raised about the above section based largely on the difficulty in many cases of interpreting such language as "...more than a little danger..." No conclusions were reached, although there appeared to be general agreement with the intention of this section.

4.23. PROPOSED NQLs: LIVE POSSESSION LICENCE (LICENCES AND TAGS REGULATIONS)

S.21(2): THE SUPERINTENDENT SHALL NOT ISSUES A LIVE POSSESSION LICENCE FOR A BIRD OF PREY UNLESS SATISFIED THAT THE CAPTURE (AND POSSESSION) WILL BE DONE BY A FALCONER WHO:

(A): HAS DEMONSTRATED THE EXPERIENCE OR ABILITY TO CAPTURE (AND CARE FOR) THAT SPECIES OF BIRD OF PREY; AND

(B): HAS NOT BEEN CONVICTED OF AN OFFENCE RELATED TO THE HARVESTING (OR POSSESSION) OF WILDLIFE WITHIN THE LAST 5 YEARS.

S.21(3): ANY TRAP USED FOR THE CAPTURE MUST BE CONSTANTLY ATTENDED BY THE FALCONER REFERRED TO IN S.21(2).

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS:

This section was introduced but not discussed due to time constraints and a requirement to close the meeting due to the Parish Hall being required for an evening Church service.

Discussions with the Deputy Minister

When the meeting was reconvened on Thursday afternoon after lunch, Simon Awa – Deputy Minister of DOE was invited to speak on behalf of the Minister of the Environment who was not available. Mr. Awa invited HTA representatives to provide comments regarding the regulations and noted that, if requested, the Department's Wildlife Officers would be ready to meet with them in their communities for further consultations. He also pointed out that the regulations and orders can be amended efficiently and relatively quickly in the future, since the Minister has authority to amend TAHs and NQLs based on accepted decisions of the NWMB. Any questions can be addressed to the Renewable Resources personnel in the communities.

5. SUMMARY CHART OF PROPOSED TOTAL ALLOWABLE HARVESTS AND NON-QUOTA LIMITATIONS AND VIEWS EXPRESSED

| Order or Regulation and Section Number(s) | Species Affected | GN-proposed Limitations | Comments/Concerns Raised | Consensus HTA Positions |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 1. FALCON TAH ORDER | FALCONS | TAH OF 5 GYRFALCONS FOR THE KITIKMEOT REGION. TAH OF 5 GYRFALCONS FOR THE KIVALLIQ REGION. TAH OF 10 GYRFALCONS FOR THE QIKIQTAALUK REGION. IN ALL REGIONS A TAH OF 0 PEREGRINE FALCONS. | (note 1 and 2 discussed together) Possibility of adding at least one bald eagle to the TAH. Concern that birds are referred to by different Inuktitut names in different regions. Regarding eggs. – are they included? | A general feeling that the proposed TAHs for all birds of prey are too low. |
| 2. BIRDS OF PREY TAH ORDER | OTHER BIRDS OF PREY - EXCEPT SNOWY OWL | IN ALL REGIONS, A TAH OF 0 FOR: SHORT-EARED OWL, BALD EAGLE, GOLDEN EAGLE, ROUGH-LEGGED HAWK, HARRIER AND OSPREY | sports hunt or taken alive, harvesting of eggs – community allocations? Birds caught in traps included in TAH? | |

| Order or Regulation and Section Number(s) | Species Affected | GN-proposed Limitations | Comments/Concerns Raised | Consensus HTA Positions |
|---|------------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| 3. GRIZZLY BEAR TAH ORDER | GRIZZLY BEARS | A TAH of 8 for GB/01 (WEST KITIKMEOT). A TAH OF 6 FOR GB/02 (SOUTH-EAST KITIKMEOT). A TAH OF 6 FOR GB/03 (EAST KITIKMEOT, KIVALLIQ AND QIKIQTAALUK). A TAH OF 0 FOR GB/04 (NORTH-WEST KITIKMEOT). | General feeling from HTAs where Grizzlies are present that populations are on the increase and TAH levels are set too low and Increases recommended Concern related to Article 40 of NLCA: hunters in areas outside Nunavut may harvest Grizzly Bears and inter-Aboriginal Agreements may be appropriate. | The TAH levels proposed are too low. |
| 4. MUSKOX TAH ORDER | MUSKOX | A TAH OF 5 (2 FEMALES) FOR MX-1 (ALLOCATED TO RESOLUTE BAY). A TAH OF 0 FOR MX-2. A TAH OF 70 FOR MX-3 (ALLOCATED TO GRISE FIORD). A TAH OF 21 FOR MX-4 (ALLOCATED TO GRISE FIORD). A TAH OF 6 (3 FEMALES) FOR MX-5 (ALLOCATED TO GRISE FIORD). A TAH OF 14 (7 FEMALES) FOR MX-6 (ALLOCATED TO GRISE FIORD). | Further consultation warranted re allocation for MX-1 - both Resolute Bay and Arctic Bay hunt in this zone also applies to MX-2. Re zones MX -3-6 – belief that the HTA should be allowed to self-manage these areas so that hunting closer to home possible. Arctic Bay occasionally hunt MX-5. | |

| Order or Regulation and Section Number(s) | Species Affected | GN-proposed Limitations | Comments/Concerns Raised | Consensus HTA Positions |
|---|------------------|---|--|-------------------------|
| | | <p>A TAH OF 4 (2 FEMALES) FOR MX-7 (ALLOCATED TO QIKIQTAALUK REGION).</p> <p>A TAH OF 0 FOR MX-8.</p> <p>A TAH OF 32 FOR MX-9 (ALLOCATED BETWEEN KITIKMEOT AND QIKIQTAALUK REGIONS).</p> <p>NO TAH ESTABLISHED FOR MX-10. – Inuit may take the full amount they require.</p> <p>A TAH OF 348 FOR MX-11 (ALLOCATED TO KITIKMEOT REGION).</p> <p>A TAH OF 20 FOR MX-12 (ALLOCATED TO KITIKMEOT REGION).</p> <p>A TAH OF 106 FOR MX-13 (ALLOCATED BETWEEN KITIKMEOT AND KIVALLIQ REGIONS).</p> | <p>Increases proposed for other areas (MX-7 and MX-8 and MX-9) an increase was also proposed, particularly establishing some levels for MX-8 other than 0.</p> <p>There are similar issues with zones in the west. Some increases for MX-12 should be considered with Inuit able to hunt closer to home and an increase in the TAH from 106 to 120. Consider MX-13 as one population area.</p> | |
| 5. PEARY CARIBOU TAH ORDER | PEARY CARIBOU | <p>A TAH OF 14 FOR BATHURST ISLAND (ALLOCATED TO RESOLUTE BAY)</p> <p>A TAH OF 0 FOR SOMERSET, PRINCE OF WALES AND NORTH DEVON ISLANDS.</p> <p>A TAH OF 2 FOR WEST DEVON ISLAND (ALLOCATED TO QIKIQTAALUK REGION).</p> <p>A TAH OF 50 FOR ELLESMERE/AXEL HEIBERG ISLANDS (ALLOCATED TO GRISE FIORD).</p> | <p>Concern about listing Peary Caribou as endangered.</p> <p>In Bathurst Island, an increase from 14 to 60 is recommended by the Resolute Bay HTA.</p> <p>For Somerset, Prince of Wales and North Devon Islands a TAH of 40 recommended.</p> | |

| Order or Regulation and Section Number(s) | Species Affected | GN-proposed Limitations | Comments/Concerns Raised | Consensus HTA Positions |
|---|--------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | NO TAH ESTABLISHED FOR OTHER QUEEN ELIZABETH ISLANDS. | More consultations needed. Recognize that HTAs playing management role In West Devon Island a TAH of 2 not considered high enough. | |
| 6. WOLVERINE TAH ORDER | WOLVERINE | A TAH OF 200 FOR W/01 (ALLOCATED TO KITIKMEOT AND KIVALLIQ REGIONS). A TAH OF 65 FOR W/02 (ALLOCATED TO KITIKMEOT, KIVALLIQ AND QIKIQTAALUK REGIONS). NO TAH ESTABLISHED FOR OTHER QUEEN ELIZABETH ISLANDS. | Difficulties trying to share TAHs for Wolverine between the Kivalliq and Kitikmeot regions. | There appeared to be a general feeling that harvesting limits are too low, and perhaps should even be lifted for this species. |
| 7. S.10, HARVESTING REGS: S.23, HARVESTING REGS | RAVENS, PORSILD'S BRYUM | NO PERSON SHALL HARVEST A RAVEN. NO PERSON SHALL HARVEST PORSILD'S BRYUM (A MOSS GROWING IN QUTTINIRPAAQ NATIONAL PARK, ELLESMERE ISLAND). | There was no discussion of S. 10, because the GN announced that it is withdrawing this proposed prohibition from the <i>Harvesting Regulations</i> . | General consensus that restrictions on harvesting of Porsild's Bryum should only apply to the Quttinirpaaq National Park. |

| Order or Regulation and Section Number(s) | Species Affected | GN-proposed Limitations | Comments/Concerns Raised | Consensus HTA Positions |
|---|--------------------------|---|---|---|
| 8. S. 22; 20(1); and 20(2) | SPECIES SUBJECT TO A TAH | <p>S.22: IF A MEMBER OF A SPECIES WITH A TAH IS HARVESTED IN A LOCATION OUTSIDE ANY AREA RECOGNIZED FOR A POPULATION OF THAT SPECIES, THE WILDLIFE IS DEEMED TO BE HARVESTED FROM THE CLOSEST POPULATION.</p> <p>S.20(1): THE RWO DECIDES WHICH ALLOCATION OF THE TAH SHOULD BE USED WHEN: (A): WILDLIFE IS HARVESTED BY SOMEONE WITH NO ALLOCATION; (B): THERE IS NO SURPLUS FOR THE SPECIES; AND (C): THE STOCK OR POPULATION IS ALLOCATED TO MORE THAN 1 COMMUNITY OR ABORIGINAL GROUP IN THE REGION.</p> <p>S.20(2): IF THE RWO DOES NOT MAKE A DECISION, THE HARVESTED WILDLIFE IS TAKEN FROM THE TAH ALLOCATED TO THE COMMUNITY OR ABORIGINAL GROUP NEAREST THE PLACE WHERE THE WILDLIFE WAS KILLED.</p> | <p>Generally no concerns about the rules described in S. 22 and 20(1).</p> <p>Further discussions and consultations are required with respect to any compensation to be paid related to S.20 (2) and how the RWO will manage this between two or more communities</p> | <p>Generally recognized that prior agreements with respect to compensation should be in place with companies undertaking exploration work in areas where Polar Bear may be killed by non-Inuit.</p> |

| Order or Regulation and Section Number(s) | Species Affected | GN-proposed Limitations | Comments/Concerns Raised | Consensus HTA Positions |
|---|------------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| 9. S.21(3); S.21(4); S.21(5) | POLAR BEARS | <p>S.21(3): IF A FEMALE POLAR BEAR IS HARVESTED WHEN ACCOMPANIED BY ANOTHER BEAR UNDER 3 YEARS OF AGE, THE OTHER BEAR IS DEEMED TO BE HARVESTED AT THE SAME TIME.</p> <p>S.21(4): A POLAR BEAR DEEMED HARVESTED UNDER S.21(3) IS COUNTED AS ½ A DEAD BEAR IF: (A): LESS THAN 2 YEARS OLD; AND (B): THE FEMALE BEAR WAS KILLED TO PRESERVE A HUMAN LIFE, PROTECT PROPERTY OR PREVENT A PERSON'S STARVATION.</p> <p>S.21(5): EVERY DEAD POLAR BEAR IS CONSIDERED TO HAVE BEEN HARVESTED, UNLESS: (A): IT DIED FROM NATURAL CAUSES; OR (B): IT WAS KILLED FOR HUMANE REASONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REGULATIONS.</p> | <p>General concerns about including these sections in the regulations. No firm conclusions reached.</p> <p>Further consultations may be required in order to clarify whether and how the regulations could replace or help clarify the implementation of the MOU.</p> | |

| Order or Regulation and Section Number(s) | Species Affected | GN-proposed Limitations | Comments/Concerns Raised | Consensus HTA Positions |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| 10. S.82, <i>Wildlife Act</i> , S.1 and S.2 | SPECIES THAT CAN BE TRAPPED | S.82, UNLESS A TRAP IS CERTIFIED, ITS USE IS PROHIBITED. S.1: A LIST OF TRAPS CERTIFIED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE <i>AGREEMENT ON INTERNATIONAL HUMANE TRAPPING STANDARDS</i> . S.2: A LIST OF TRAPS CERTIFIED AS HUMANE AND SAFE THAT ARE NOT SUBJECT TO THE <i>AGREEMENT ON INTERNATIONAL HUMANE TRAPPING STANDARDS</i> . | It was made clear that S.82 of the <i>Wildlife Act</i> has not yet come into force. Until this happens, the two lists of certified traps will not be in place (S.1 and S.2). | There was general agreement that establishing these lists and communicating what is allowed through written and pictorial means is important. |
| 11. S.6(1); S.6(2); S.6(3) | BEAVER, OTTER, MARTEN, FISHER, MUSKRAT, BADGER, COYOTE, WOLF, BOBCAT, LYNX, RACCOON | S.6(1): NO PERSON SHALL USE A JAW-TYPE LEG HOLD RESTRAINING TRAP TO HARVEST BEAVER, OTTER, MARTEN, FISHER, MUSKRAT OR BADGER. S.6(2): NO PERSON SHALL USE A CONVENTIONAL STEEL-JAWED LEG HOLD RESTRAINING TRAP TO HARVEST COYOTE, WOLF, BOBCAT, LYNX OR RACCOON. S.6(3): A PERSON USING A LIVE- | It was noted that these animals lie closer to the southern Nunavut boarder (therefore, Article 40 needs to be considered). No major concerns registered. There were no general concerns expressed. There was considerable | |

| Order or Regulation and Section Number(s) | Species Affected | GN-proposed Limitations | Comments/Concerns Raised | Consensus HTA Positions |
|---|-------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | CAPTURE TRAP TO HARVEST FURBEARERS SHALL INSPECT THE TRAP AT LEAST ONCE EVERY 72 HOURS AND, SUBJECT TO BY-CATCH RULES (S.17), REMOVE ANY ANIMAL IN THE TRAP. | discussion about the 72 hour restriction and a general feeling that this was probably too short a period and it would be preferable to change wording to something like, "Check Live-Capture Traps regularly". | |
| 12. S.7(1); and S.7(2) | GAME ¹ Use of Dogs | S.7(1): SUBJECT TO S.7(2), NO PERSON SHALL USE A DOG TO KILL OR OTHERWISE HARVEST GAME S.7(2) A PERSON MAY USE A DOG TO CHASE, DRIVE, FLUSH, ATTRACT, PURSUE, WORRY, FOLLOW, SEARCH FOR OR RETRIEVE SMALL GAME, A BEAR, [A MUSKOX?] OR A WOLVERINE, AND MAY USE DOGS TO PULL A SLED AS TRANSPORTATION. | There were views expressed by some participants that S. 7(1) should be deleted. | With regard to S7(2) there was general support and a majority agreed that Muskox should also be included in the list. |

¹ "Game" means big game, furbearers and small game (*Wildlife Act*, s.2).

| Order or Regulation and Section Number(s) | Species Affected | GN-proposed Limitations | Comments/Concerns Raised | Consensus HTA Positions |
|---|------------------|---|--------------------------|---|
| 13. S.8(1) | GAME | <p>S.8(1): NO PERSON SHALL HARVEST GAME WITH:</p> <p>(A): A SHOTGUN WITH A GAUGE NO. OF 8 OR LESS;</p> <p>(B): A TRAP WITH METAL TEETH OR SERRATION ON ITS JAWS;</p> <p>(C): A FOOTHOLD TRAP WITH A SPRING POLE;</p> <p>(D): A TRAP NOT IN A MECHANICALLY FIT CONDITION;</p> <p>(E): A TRAP NOT SECURELY FASTENED TO AN ANCHOR OR DRAG;</p> <p>(F): A HANDGUN;</p> <p>(G): ANYTHING REGULATED UNDER S.84 OF THE <i>CRIMINAL CODE</i> AS A RESTRICTED FIREARM OR PROHIBITED FIREARM, WEAPON, DEVICE OR AMMUNITION; OR</p> <p>(H): A WEAPON OPERATED BY REMOTE CONTROL FROM ANOTHER LOCATION.</p> | | Following general discussion and explanations of some of the terminology there was general agreement to leave wording in each of the sub-clauses unchanged. |

| Order or Regulation and Section Number(s) | Species Affected | GN-proposed Limitations | Comments/Concerns Raised | Consensus HTA Positions |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14. S.8(2) | SMALL GAME – Use of CrossBows | S.8(2): NO PERSON SHALL HARVEST SMALL GAME WITH A CROSSBOW, OTHER THAN A COMPOUND CROSSBOW, WITH A PULL OF LESS THAN 55KG AT FULL DRAW. | | After some discussion the majority agreed that S.8(2) should be included. |
| 15. S.8(3) | EQUIPMENT USED IN THE HARVEST OF BIG GAME | S.8(3): NO PERSON SHALL HARVEST BIG GAME WITH: (B): A MUZZLE-LOADER OF LESS THAN .44 CALIBRE; (C): SHOTGUN AMMUNITION WITH PELLETS SMALLER THAN 00 BUCK OR SSG; (D): A CROSSBOW, OTHER THAN A COMPOUND CROSSBOW, WITH A PULL OF LESS THAN 68 KG AT FULL DRAW; (E): A COMPOUND CROSSBOW WITH A PULL OF LESS THAN 45 KG AT FULL DRAW; (F): A CROSSBOW QUARREL WITH A BROADHEAD LESS THAN 2.22 CM AT ITS WIDEST POINT; (G): A CROSSBOW QUARREL WEIGHING LESS THAN 16.2G; | There was general discussion about the lack of familiarity participants had with the crossbows included on this list and it was understood that they are being included in the regulations because of sports hunters. | A majority voted in favour of including crossbows in the regs. |

| Order or Regulation and Section Number(s) | Species Affected | GN-proposed Limitations | Comments/Concerns Raised | Consensus HTA Positions |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| | | (H): A SNARE MADE OF BRASS OR STAINLESS STEEL WIRE; (I): A SNARE MADE OF A SINGLE STRAND OF WIRE; OR (J): A SNARE WITHOUT A LOCKING DEVICE THAT PREVENTS THE SNARE FROM LOOSENING ONCE THE ANIMAL IS CAUGHT. | | |
| 16. S.8(3) & S.8(4) | BIG GAME: USE OF PASSIVE WEAPONS | S.8(3)(A) & S.8(4): EXCEPT FOR AN INUK OR AN ASSIGNEE OF THE RIGHT TO HARVEST USING A TRADITIONAL WEAPON, NO PERSON SHALL HARVEST BIG GAME WITH A NON-PROJECTILE (PASSIVE) WEAPON, OTHER THAN A TRAP. | Considerable discussion about these sections. Clarification provided that this section applies only to non-Inuit. | There was relative satisfaction with these provisions. |
| 17. S.8(5) | BEAR, MOOSE, MUSKOX | S.8(5): NO PERSON SHALL USE AMMUNITION LESS THAN 6 MM OR .243 CAL TO HARVEST A BEAR, MOOSE OR MUSKOX. | Some objections from both Pangnirtung and Qikiqtarjuaq representatives. | A majority were in favour of this section Exceptions: Pangnirtung and Qikiqtarjuaq |

| Order or Regulation and Section Number(s) | Species Affected | GN-proposed Limitations | Comments/Concerns Raised | Consensus HTA Positions |
|--|------------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| 18. S.9(1); S.9(2); S.9(3); & S.9(4) | GAME | <p>S.9(1): NO PERSON SHALL HARVEST GAME WITH AN INTENTION THAT CONTRAVENES THE IQ PRINCIPLE OF ILIJAQSUITTAILINIQ/KIMAITAILINIK.</p> <p>S.9(2): NO PERSON SHALL HARVEST GAME IN A MANNER THAT CONTRAVENES THE IQ PRINCIPLE OF SIRLIQSAAQTITTITAILINIQ/NAKLIHAAK TITIHIULUHI.</p> <p>S.9(3): NO PERSON SHALL TREAT GAME IN A MANNER THAT CONTRAVENES THE IQ PRINCIPLE OF IKPIGUSUTTIARNIQ NIRJUTILMAANIK/PITIAKLUGIT NEKYUTIT.</p> <p>S.9(4): EVERY PERSON HARVESTING GAME SHALL FOLLOW THE IQ PRINCIPLE OF PILIMMAKSARNIQ/AYOIKYUMIKATAKHIM ANIK WITH RESPECT TO HIS OR HER HUNTING SKILLS.</p> | <p>A number of IQ principles are included in the Act to ensure that harvesting methods are being used appropriately. Recognition that Conservation Officers unfamiliar with traditional practices could be challenged (and this might apply to younger Inuit officers as well).</p> <p>Participants invited to send in any further comments in writing to the NWMB.</p> <p>Assurance provided by the GN that enforcement would involve consultations with the community and elders, as well as senior members of the Department of Environment.</p> | |

| Order or Regulation and Section Number(s) | Species Affected | GN-proposed Limitations | Comments/Concerns Raised | Consensus HTA Positions |
|---|------------------|---|--|-------------------------|
| 19. S.11(2); & S.11(3) | BIRDS OF PREY | S.11(2): NO PERSON SHALL HARVEST A LIVE BIRD OF PREY, OTHER THAN A SNOWY OWL, THAT IS MORE THAN ONE YEAR OF AGE. S.11(3): NO PERSON SHALL CAPTURE A LIVE BIRD OF PREY WITH A TRAP, UNLESS THE TRAP IS CONSTANTLY ATTENDED BY A QUALIFIED FALCONER. | Some concerns that regulation based in part on the difficulty of predetermining the age of a Bird of Prey and also lack of certainty as to how they will be applied and what standards will be put in place in terms of defining a qualified falconer for example. No conclusions were reached. | |
| 20. S.13(2) | POLAR BEARS | S.13(2): NO GUIDE SHALL ASSIST A HUNTER BY USING A VEHICLE OR OTHER CONVEYANCE TO LOCATE, SPOT, CHASE, DRIVE, FLUSH, ATTRACT, PURSUE, WORRY OR FOLLOW A POLAR BEAR, BUT MAY USE IT TO RETRIEVE A HARVESTED POLAR BEAR | Requirement to correct some of the translation in this section. No other concern raised. | |
| 21. S.14(1); S.14(2); & S.14(3) | GRIZZLY BEARS | S.14(1): NO PERSON SHALL HARVEST A GRIZZLY BEAR UNDER TWO YEARS OF AGE. | Concerns expressed that Management Plans not yet in place. Generally, it was felt that Grizzly Bears are a problem, and can be aggressive and destructive. Inuit want to be able to harvest if bothersome. | |

| Order or Regulation and Section Number(s) | Species Affected | GN-proposed Limitations | Comments/Concerns Raised | Consensus HTA Positions |
|---|------------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>S.14(2): NO PERSON SHALL HARVEST A FEMALE GRIZZLY BEAR ACCOMPANIED BY A BEAR THAT IS OR APPEARS TO BE UNDER TWO YEARS OF AGE.</p> <p>S.14(3): NO PERSON SHALL HARVEST A FEMALE GRIZZLY BEAR THAT IS IN A DEN OR THAT IS CONSTRUCTING A DEN.</p> | | Relative comfort with restrictions governing two year olds |
| 22. S.17(1) | GAME | <p>S.17(1): IF BY-CATCH IS ALIVE WHEN DISCOVERED BY THE PERSON IN CONTROL OF A TRAP, THE PERSON SHALL:</p> <p>(A): RELEASE IT IF THAT WOULD RESULT IN A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SURVIVAL AND LITTLE OR NO DANGER TO THE PERSON RELEASING IT;</p> <p>(B): KILL THE BY-CATCH WHERE THERE IS LITTLE LIKELIHOOD OF SURVIVAL IF RELEASED;</p> <p>(C): KILL IT IF A CONSERVATION OFFICER SO AUTHORIZES; OR</p> | <p>Questions raised about difficulty in many cases of interpreting such language as "...more than a little danger..."</p> <p>No conclusions were reached,</p> | General agreement with the intention of this section. |

| Order or Regulation and Section Number(s) | Species Affected | GN-proposed Limitations | Comments/Concerns Raised | Consensus HTA Positions |
|---|------------------|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| | | (D): KILL IT IF THERE WOULD BE MORE THAN A LITTLE DANGER TO THE PERSON IN RELEASING IT AND THERE IS LITTLE LIKELIHOOD OF IT SURVIVING THE TIME IT WOULD TAKE FOR A CONSERVATION OFFICER TO COME AND RELEASE IT. | | |