



DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

WMAC (NS) Quarterly Meeting

Whitehorse, YT • Canada Games Centre
Sept 20-22, 2008

Sept 20, 2008

Canada Games Centre, Whitehorse

Lindsay Staples Chair • **Danny C. Gordon** Inuvialuit Game Council (Member) • **Ernest Pokiak** Inuvialuit Game Council (Member) • **Doug Larsen** Yukon Government (Member) • **Christian Bucher** Parks Canada (Member) • **Dorothy Cooley** Yukon Government (Alternate) • **Michelle Christensen** (Secretariat) • **Jennifer Smith** (Secretariat) • **Stephanie Muckenheim** Yukon Government IFA Analyst (Guest)

A. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:15am.

B. Review and Approval of Agenda

The Chair went through the agenda highlighting the following items.

He explained that the Council is approximately half way through the year and thus needs to review the budget and determine the feasibility of continuing to employ Michelle and Jennifer between now and March. The Chair informed the Council that Michelle Sicotte would be returning from maternity leave to the office in December and has already started working from home a few hours per week.

The Chair provided an update on the draft Muskox Plan and explained that it needs further attention. He also discussed the Conservation and Management Plan and the involvement of John Reid and Michelle Sicotte in its updating.

Christian requested that the ecological monitoring workshop be put on the agenda, as Parks may have an interest in it.

Motion 08-09-01

To approve the agenda for the September 20-22, 2008 meeting, as revised.

Moved: Doug Larsen

Second: Danny C. Gordon

Motion Carried

C. Review and Approval of July 19-25, 2008 Minutes

Members reviewed the minutes of the meeting held July 19-25, 2008 in Inuvik and on Shingle Point.

Council members requested the following changes:

- Page 4: change to “Ernest **reported, based on a personal conversation that** the bear was shot in defence.”
- Page 23: change to “...and additional invitation letter to ENR,...”

The Council discussed the bear shooting at Shingle Point. Doug informed the Council that the shooting was not reported to the Aklavik HTC or to Yukon Government. The Chair mentioned that the incident was under investigation, and that he was questioned by a Dawson Conservation Officer about it. Danny informed the Council that the Aklavik HTC did have a meeting about the incident; the Aklavik Conservation Officer was there and he informed the AHTC about the rules around shootings: he said that it was illegal to burn a bear hide. Danny said the AHTC understood the situation as a defence kill and didn't take it any further than that. Members mentioned that the event was discussed openly at Shingle Point during the time of the meeting and there didn't appear to be anything to hide. The Council saw the issue as a case of people misunderstanding legal requirements. Ernest mentioned that educational posters which explain that hides must be turned are posted in Tuktoyaktuk and are quite effective.

The Council discussed jurisdictional issues with regard to enforcement between Yukon and NWT. Members were aware of situations where Yukon CO's patrolled in NWT and vice versa. Conservation officers should have the ability to enforce the Wildlife Acts across the border. The Council discussed possible policy changes which may have been implemented recently which could have had implications for enforcing bodies on both sides of the border.

Action Item 08-09-01: The Secretariat will check with responsible authorities to ensure the Council has been informed of any recent policy changes regarding cross border enforcement. The Secretariat will validate the WMAC (NS) enforcement factsheet and redistribute to members.

Motion 08-09-02

To adopt the minutes from the July 19-25, 2008 WMAC (NS) meeting, as revised.

Moved: Ernest Pokiak

Second: Doug Larsen

Motion Carried

D. Review of Action Items

The Council reviewed the status of ongoing action items:

Action 07-10-14: The Secretariat will send a letter of information to the Aklavik HTC requesting support for the proposed Porcupine Caribou Traditional Knowledge Project. **In progress.** Jen has been in contact with the AHTC over the phone and presented to the AHTC at the December meeting.

Action 07-10-16: The Council will request a briefing from the appropriate person (Norm Snow or Jon Reid) on the Regional Action Plan for the Beaufort Sea. **Deferred.** The Council will invite Norm Snow to the meeting in December.

Action 07-10-25: The Secretariat will draft a letter to Yukon Government recommending recommendation 2 and 3 regarding the research permitting and reporting process. As well, the Council will recommend rationalizing the two permit system within Yukon Government by combining Science and Explorers Permits with Wildlife Permits for natural science research projects. **In progress.** The Secretariat will look into the YESSA process in as it relates to requests for screening of research and include comments in the letter. .

Action 07-12-01: The Secretariat will contact WMAC (NWT) to set up a joint meeting in 2008 to discuss any relevant issues including the grizzly bear project, the muskox plan, and wildlife compensation issues. **In progress.** The Council attempted to meet with WMAC (NWT) in the fall, but they were unavailable.

Action 07-12-02: The Council will prepare a letter to the Minister responsible for Parks Canada concerning the need for new regulations for Ivvavik National Park to further the implementation of the revised National Parks Act, the Inuvialuit Final Agreement, and the management issues that require attention as outlined in the Park Management Plan and by the Council. **Retired.** The Chair said that a steering committee and working group have been created to put together all of the regulations from across the country and then decide how to proceed.

Christian said that he thinks it will be very unlikely for guides in parks that don't have polar bears to be granted permission to carry firearms. He said that if any allowances are made, it will likely be in parks with polar bears, of which Ivvavik does not have.

Christian informed the Council that if there were any other regulations they wanted addressed they could be brought forward.

The Chair concluded that at such time when there is something to comment on, we will review the options.

Action Item AHTC/WMAC (NS) 07-12-01: The WMAC (NS) Secretariat will work with the AHTC to plan a full day meeting to address all relevant issues, in 2008. **In progress.** The Council will endeavor to meet with the AHTC in Dec 2008 in Aklavik.

Action Item 08-03-03: The Secretariat will distribute Ramona Maraj's briefing note on polar bear management to partners and get sign off on it so that it may be filed as an information item. **Retired.** Ramona has been contacted about the process; the Council decided that sign off on the briefing note would be too lengthy and involved a process. The note is sufficient for Council purposes. The Secretariat will file the briefing note and make it available to members.

Action Item 08-03-04: The Secretariat will request jurisdictional maps from Yukon department of Energy Mines and Resources that delineate boundaries associated with oil and gas accords. **Complete.**

Action Item 08-09-04: The Secretariat will request a digital copy of the jurisdictional map from Perry Diamond; and get information on the two leases (indicated on the map) on the North Slope.

Action Item 08-03-06: WMAC will provide comments on Incidental Take to CWS before June 30, 2008. **Deferred.** Because of the federal election CWS' progress is stalled; the Council suggested dealing with this issue at the December meeting, at which time hunting regulations will also be discussed.

Action Item 08-04-02: Secretariat will draft a letter to the IGC and WMAC (NWT) expressing interest in meeting between now and December 2008 to discuss roles in polar bear management. **Complete.**

Action Item 08-04-03: Christian Bucher will locate a copy of EBA's denning habitat report and send it to Ramona. **Complete.**

Action Item 08-07-02: The Council will provide comment to Christian Bucher at Parks Canada on the proposed Sheep Creek Site Plan by early July 2008. **Complete.** The Council submitted comments on July 16, 2008. Parks was unhappy with the Plan as prepared by the hired contractor: they will collect comments and show it to the Council once complete.

New Action Items:

Action Item 08-07-01: The Secretariat will create a new system to keep track of action items and correspondence which captures the date letters go out and if and when responses are received. **Complete.**

Action Item 08-07-02: The Secretariat will locate the briefing note to the IGC on the withdrawal order and send it to all members. **Complete as of August.**

Action Item 08-07-03: The WMAC (NS) Secretariat will review the North Yukon Land Use Plan to see how the Council's final comments on the plan were addressed. **Complete.** Comments were included in the fall meeting binder.

Action Item 08-07-04: The WMAC (NS) Secretariat will contact Deanna Lemke from the PCMB to request a letter explaining PCMB's proposed work with Shawn Francis on the Porcupine caribou planning exercise. The Secretariat will request to see Shawn's proposal. **Complete.**

Action Item 08-07-05: WMAC (NS) will draft a letter to Parks Canada recommending that they adopt the Stokes Point fuel storage protocol for Shingle Point DEW line re-fuelling area. **Complete.**

Comments on Stokes & Shingle Point fuel storage protocol were included in the Stokes Point remedial action plan comments dated August 8, '08 to Parks Canada. WMAC(NS) should have made their recommendations to Yukon Government, not Parks Canada; the protocol for the Shingle Point airstrip needs to be developed and recommended to Yukon Government.

Action Item 08-07-06: WMAC (NS) will provide comment to Parks Canada on the Draft Site Investigation and Remedial Action Plan for Stokes Point BAR-B, Stokes Point, Ivvavik National Park, Yukon Territory by August 8, 2008. **Complete.**

Action Item 08-07-07: Nelson Perry will provide the Council with larger slide on page 9 (1) of his slideshow presentation for information. **Complete.** The map is included in the "Draft Site Investigation and Remedial Action Plan for Stokes Point BAR-B, Stokes Point" binder.

Action Item 08-07-08: Invite Michael Svoboda to the fall WMAC (NS) meeting to report on ABEKC. **Complete.**

Action Item 08-07-09: The Council members will look at Porcupine caribou report prepared by Don Russell before the fall meeting. **Complete.**

Action Item 08-07-10: Invite Wayne to the fall meeting to present his work. Schedule him for a half a day. **Complete.**

Action Item 08-07-11: The Secretariat will draft a contract and statement of work for the ecological monitoring report contractor. **Complete.**

Michelle Sicotte is currently gathering information in preparation for the drafting of a contract. The Chair explained that WMAC (NS) would like to sponsor a workshop to discuss ecological monitoring on the North Slope, but will hold off on the workshop until the next fiscal. The Borderlands review is partially driving the process; the Council is sensitive to ensuring utility of all information collected.

Action Item 08-07-12: Michelle will contact Ramona to look for another muskox specialist for the 2008 IFA funded research projects. **Complete.**

Michelle informed the Council that Kris wants to determine the genetic markers from Greenland muskox before working on the Yukon and NWT markers. The Council talked about extending the project to the NWT to include the Paulatuk and Banks populations, and if so, GNWT may be interested in becoming a funding partner. The Council is waiting for a statement of work form Kris.

Action Item 08-09-05: The Secretariat will work with Dorothy on the muskox genetics project proposal. The Secretariat will cc WMAC (NWT), GNWT, and YG on the project proposal.

Dorothy mentioned that Patricia Reynolds can provide samples in addition to ours.

Danny asked what this research will accomplish and sparked a discussion around the purposes of research. The Chair explained the potential issues around disease transfer and the mixing of two different genetic populations. Danny said that he thinks the populations have already mixed. He asked if they haven't mixed how you would stop them from doing so. The Council discussed options of controlled harvest.

Action Item 08-07-13: The Secretariat will ask Ramona if she needs more money for the grizzly bear project. **Complete.**

Action Item 08-07-14: The Secretariat will invite Ramona to the fall meeting to report on her field season and her budget. **Complete.**

Action item 08-07-15: The Secretariat will contact Dorothy Cooley to see if she requires extra funds for the production of a Herschel Island ecological monitoring report. **Complete.**

Dorothy will draft a proposal and present it at the December Council meeting.

Action Item 08-07-16: The Secretariat will check with the HMP Working Group if and when the IGC will be involved in the process. **Complete.**

The HMP Working group will be meeting with the IGC during their Whitehorse meeting.

Action Item 08-07-17: The Chair will draft a response to the HMP Working Group and circulate it to the Council by the end of August 2008. **In progress.**

Initial comments on the HMP have been drafted. WMAC (NS) will hear another presentation by the Working Group and finalize comments by end of September /early October.

Action Item 08-07-18: The Chair will discuss financials and staffing options with the Secretariat before the fall meeting. **Complete.**

Action 6-03-01: Dorothy will make a poster for the Aklavik HTC on what hunters should do with collared animals that are harvested. **In progress.** The Council reviewed the poster at the September meeting: GNWT comments have been incorporated.

Action 07-06-26: The Chair will re-draft the Muskox Management Plan and the Council will review it. **In progress.** The Chair has reviewed it; the Council will hold a teleconference to work through the Plan.

Action Item 08-07-19: The Secretariat will print and distribute the group photo on the elders newsletter to everyone in the photo, including their names on the back. **Complete.** Printed and mailed in August '08.

Action Item 08-07-20: The Secretariat will look into the Council's North Slope "atlas project" to locate past maps including the satellite image created by Jim Hawkings used on a WMAC (NS) poster. The Secretariat will draft a one page outline to describe the project and present it at the fall 2008 Council meeting. **Outstanding.** The Council informed the Secretariat about the mapping atlas project. The Secretariat will bring the map atlas to the next meeting that is in Whitehorse.

Action Item 08-07-21: The Chair will draft comments on the North Richardson Dall Sheep Plan and circulate them to the Council by Sept 15. **In progress.** Initial comments have been drafted. The final deadline has been extended to Nov 15.

Action item 08-07-22: The Secretariat will review John Reid's work on the Conservation and Management Plan to assess what work can be done in-house and which will have to be contracted. The Secretariat will bring this assessment to the next meeting. **In progress.** Michelle Sicotte has begun work on this project.

Action Item 08-07-23: The Secretariat will circulate copies of the Yukon North Slope Wildlife Conservation and Management Plan to the Council for them to review before the fall meeting. **Complete.** Copies were sent in the mail August '08.

Action Item 08-07-24: The Secretariat will send an additional invitation letter to EMR, YG, CWS to attend Co-management research day. **Complete.** Yukon College Renewable Resource Management Students were invited also.

Action Item 08-07-25: The Chair will contact Bob Bell at the FJMC to inform him of the DFO project at Philips Bay and concern over it - Chair to raise at the IGC meeting next week on September 27

Action Item 08-07-26 WMAC (NS) will draft a letter to Norm Snow regarding travel arrangements and provide a solution. **Complete.** Letter was sent August 27, '08.

The Council discussed the idea of tracking action items over time. It was decided that a searchable database of the minutes would serve as a tracking system. Minutes will be organized in approximately five year increments.

Action Item 08-09-06: The Secretariat will investigate ways to create a searchable database of Council meeting minutes.

Action Item 08-09-07: The Secretariat will create an excel spreadsheet to keep track of outgoing and incoming correspondence.

E. Correspondence

The Chair requested that the Council skip the review of correspondence.

F. Financial Report

Michelle walked the Council through the September budget. She explained that when she prepared the 2008/2009 budget in early March numbers were based on the estimation that the Council would carry over \$54,000 from '07/'08 to '08/'09: in April the books showed that the actual carry over amount was \$36,570. She re-adjusted spending through the categories to account for the change.

Michelle discussed the staffing options. Michelle explained that Council permitting, she would like to stay on staff until March 31, '09. Jennifer explained that she would like to see the Porcupine Caribou Traditional knowledge project mostly completed before she leaves, which will likely be in December.

The Council discussed the re-allocation of funds across the budget categories.

The Council agreed that a draft report on the Porcupine Caribou Traditional knowledge by March would be a desirable goal.

A Council member flagged the Wildlife Conservation and Management Plan updates as a project that may require a larger allotment than what it currently has.

Action Item 08-09-08: The Secretariat will update the 'Wildlife Conservation and Management Plan' section of the website with a modifier that explains that the Plan is being updated.

Christian commented on the legal standing of the Wildlife Conservation and Management Plan. The Chair explained that there was a point in time when the Council wanted federal and territorial ministerial sign off on the plan, but decided that the content of the Plan would have been heavily compromised in rendering it politically acceptable. The Council decided that the Plan should be recommended as a planning framework for wildlife management on the YNS.. The Plan is an element of the YNS conservation regime established by the IFA, just as the national and territorial Parks are.

The Council discussed the Ecological Monitoring workshop. The Chair reiterated the importance of the utility of information generated from monitoring work. A member stated that research should be included as well as monitoring. The Chair explained that before the Council holds a workshop it would be helpful to have a contractor review the

current state of ecological monitoring programs on the YNS. Michelle Sicotte is currently preparing such a status report.

Doug suggested that to be effective, the workshop should be a small group of knowledgeable people sitting down and designing an ecological monitoring program for the North Slope. Some considerations include a species-based versus ecosystem-based approach, funding limitations, how feasible it is to access information, etc. These are matters that a consultant should consider in evaluating the current status of ecological monitoring programs on the YNS.

In terms of references for ecological monitoring work being done there is an available body of information from Parks Canada, CWS, YTG, and IFA funded research proposals.

The Chair suggested leaving the reassigned amounts as they are for now and making adjustments as necessary in the December meeting.

Motion 08-09-03

To accept budget as revised

Moved by: Ernest Pokiak

Seconded by: Christian Bucher

Michelle presented information concerning the remaining, unallocated research funds. There is \$11,600 which still needs to be allocated. The Council agreed that this money should go towards either the grizzly bear work, a Hershel island report write up on ecological monitoring, or muskox genetics work.

Stephanie explained the surplus from YG from the last fiscal year. She would like to reallocate some of those funds, once she hears about the grizzly bear project's needs.

Michelle will work with Ramona and Dorothy to determine their funding needs.

Action Item 08-09-09: The WMAC (NS) will hold a teleconference in approximately three weeks at which time the surplus will be allocated.

Ramona Maraj joined the meeting.

G. Grizzly Bear Project

Ramona provided a quick update on the two Polar Bear research projects.

She first explained the Polar Bear coastal survey; the first week of the project has been completed. The results showed that no bears were found on the Yukon North Slope, 100 were found in Alaska. The next polar bear survey will be in March. The Polar Bear Traditional Knowledge project will begin in the fall.

Ramona presented her 2008 grizzly bear project field season results and reviewed the project's objectives. A hard copy of her slide show is available with the Secretariat.

She explained that most of the traditional and local knowledge work was done last year, and so the focus this year was on applying collars. GPS units were also deployed with hunters this summer in order to track hunting locations.

This season the goal was to apply 44 collars to bears in order to increase the sample size and obtain a more accurate population estimate. At the beginning of the field season there were 17 collars that had to be replaced and by the end of the season 35 had been applied. One of the applied collars dropped off which brought the total to 34. Hot weather stopped the crew from being able to apply the whole 44 collars. For the captures and other work that took place this summer, local community members were involved when it was possible.

Ramona mentioned that this year the crew was unable to locate two bears with collars on them. She suspects that one may be outside of the flight range, in Alaska and the other one may be in an area, like a canyon, where a signal does not transmit. She thinks there is a good chance they may be located next year.

She explained that only females are being collared and so when males are captured, they use a biopsy dart to collect DNA to find out if the bear is a new individual or if it has been previously collared.

A Council member asked where bears are most often found. Ramona talked a bit about the way bears use the landscape and explained that their movement is dependent on what else is happening in the ecosystem that year. The Firth River area is an area of high bear density.

Ramona explained the hair sampling aspect of the project. She described the hair sampling sites and reported that samples were collected in 2006 and 2007, and that analysis took place this year.

Of the fur that has been collected, Ramona will run a subset of them in the lab to test for DNA. For the guard hair sample, two hairs are used to deliver the DNA result; if only underfur was collected than, 5 hairs are needed to extract the DNA. There has been high success for the sampling of guard hairs and relatively low success for the underfur samples. She explained that there is an oily residue on most of these samples that is limiting the success of the DNA extraction. The lab technician explained that this is uncommon residue and its cause is unknown. Most of the samples that were collected are guard hair samples and about 20-30% are underfur samples.

Study results show that bears in this study area are eating a lot of marine nutrients and more marine signatures are showing up here than in the bears in the Fishing Branch River area. Stealth cameras were also set up this year to capture photos of bears using the sites.

Other preliminary results include: the population estimate should be approximately 180 individuals after the 2007 samples are analyzed and the population appears healthy. Ramona explained some interim recommendations: tags should be examined to see how we allocate them within the region keeping in mind spatial distribution of harvest pressure; there is a need to examine how we deal with unreported kills; determination of tag allocation among community members; development of a waste management plan and education program for Shingle Point; communication strategy for results; and development of a monitoring program for the population.

She informed the Council that the whole season ran very smoothly with the exception of fuel barging. Ramona explained that she spent an additional \$4000 to move fuel drums off the beach, where the barge dropped them, to the airstrip.

Ramona was optimistic that by the end of the study we will be coming out with top notch results, and will probably have one of the best population estimates in North America.

Next year she will finish the hair sample analysis, and analyze work on population size and density, movements, and density estimates for the entire North Slope. As well as indentifying gaps in local and traditional knowledge, conducting field interviews and a mapping exercise. By the end of the program collars will be retrieved, den surveys and monitoring work will be complete, as will education and communication work.

A Council member inquired about how many bears are in the population, Ramona explained that there are about 180 individual bears that visit the study area. Once she has mapped habitat types, she plans to project the population to the whole study area.

Christian inquired about how accurate the population estimate would be for the whole North Slope. Ramona explained that she will map all the habitat types encapsulated in the North Slope, and then she will rate high density bear areas from collar information. The habitat types that support high bear populations will be determined and projected across the North Slope. Ramona is making her own maps based on vegetation types, features and GPS locations. She knows of some real hotspots for bear activity within the area: these sites green up early, and have lots of ground squirrels and caribou coming through at the end of calving.

The Chair mentioned that some habitat maps exist that were created five years ago by Yukon Government. It will be interesting to compare the two maps once Ramona's are completed.

Danny informed Ramona that he took out a GPS unit and used it for his travels, but his tracks were not recorded. Ramona talked about difficulties in training for the use of GPS's as well as an issue with people going out without having the units switched on.

The Chair asked if Ramona would develop a project update for communities that we could send around in October.

Action Item 08-09-10: Ramona will prepare and distribute a short update on the grizzly bear project to distribute to communities. The update will include information about the project and report on this year's field season. The WMAC (NS) Secretariat will assist as necessary.

3:30PM Boyd Piper and Don Toews joined the meeting

H. Species at Risk Act

The Chair welcomed Boyd and Don, and explained that Don has recently joined the process for the creation of the Species At Risk Legislation. Boyd updated the Council that the legislation process has slowed down as a result of the comments received during the consultation process. It will now be recommended in either Spring or Fall 2009. He is hoping for a draft in mid December.

Boyd will update the Chair on the process after the meeting in Dawson next month.

Sept 21, 2008

Canada Games Centre, Whitehorse

Lindsay Staples Chair • **Danny C. Gordon** Inuvialuit Game Council (Member) • **Ernest Pokiak** Inuvialuit Game Council (Member) • **Doug Larsen** Yukon Government (Member) • **Christian Bucher** Parks Canada (Member) • **Dorothy Cooley** Yukon Government (Alternate) • **Stephanie Muckenheim** Yukon Government (Guest) • **Richard Gordon** Herschel Island Park Ranger (Guest) • **Michelle Christensen** (Secretariat) • **Jennifer Smith** (Secretariat)

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:05am.

I. Porcupine Caribou Traditional Knowledge Study

Jennifer provided the Council with an update of the project. The Council discussed how the report will be used to inform the Harvest Management Plan, in particular its educational component. The Council concluded that the study should be done well, as it may serve as a template for projects in other communities.

In terms of process the Chair suggested generating a full questionnaire and then having a technical review done of it; Dorothy, Doug, Christian and Danny could be involved. He also mentioned that we can use the grizzly bear TK study as a model.

Danny commented that traditional knowledge has changed over the last 20 years which has made local knowledge even more important. Danny said that 20 years ago there were no caribou on Herschel - these types of recent changes would be captured by local knowledge.

10:30AM Frank Pokiak, Marsha Branigan, Rob Gau, Donald Inuktalik, Jack Akhiatak, Larry Carpenter, Bruce Hanbidge and Deana Lemke joined the meeting.

J. Porcupine Caribou Harvest Management Strategy

Dorothy Cooley, Marsha Branigan, and Deana Lemke presented the Harvest Management Strategy on behalf of the Porcupine Caribou Management Board Working Group to the WMAC (NS) WMAC(NWT)

Dorothy presented the slideshow presentation prepared by the Working Group. She highlighted that this Plan affects five land claim agreements. She explained that the Plan was needed because the herd has been declining and has decreased by 50,000 animals in the last 12 years.

She explained that the Plan recommends that when the herd numbers are high, the herd can be used and harvested as per normal; when the herd is low, harvest would be limited. The protocol for the preparation of the HMS has been signed by eight parties, the same ones that are signatory to the Porcupine Caribou Management Agreement (PCMA).

She then explained the processes which uses a caribou calculator to generate an estimate of the current population in years where there is no census information available. Doug Urquhart has been the facilitator for the process.

The best estimate at this time is 100,000 animals. She explained that the PCMB would meet annually at a harvest meeting to re-assess management actions.

The WMAC (NS) Chair commented that it is ambitious to think that all the indicators will be available to the PCMB in time to make a yearly decision about the herd.

Dorothy explained that total allowable harvest has never been applied in the Yukon.

Lastly, she informed the Council that comments are due by October 31.

Both Councils engaged in discussion after the presentation.

Ernest inquired about whether the Alaskans had been contacted about the plan. Dorothy explained that on an operational level they have agencies cooperating. Dorothy explained that the Alaskan harvest accounts for about 15% of the total harvest. She also mentioned that many Alaskan users were present at the Gwitchin Gathering where the HMP was presented.

Frank Pokiak mentioned that communities like Paulatuk and Arctic Village don't think that there is a decline because more caribou are coming into their areas than before. Dorothy explained that there are misconceptions about what herd is what: often the ones coming in close to those communities are from other herds. Harvest information is missing from the Alaska side.

Frank said that traffic on the Dempster is turning caribou away from the highway. Dorothy explained some work that was done years ago with Dempster highway users in trying to identify the leaders, so that added protection could be placed on those animals. All classes of the herd were identified as leaders, including cows, calves, males, females, young and old.

The total caribou harvest off of the Dempster is about 60%.

Doug informed Working Group members and WMAC (NWT) about some of the Council's comments during the last discussion of the Plan.

- The Council recommends chart option four which includes a reduction in harvest by 50% as well as a mandatory bull's only harvest.
- The Council does not think that the discussion about opening the PCMA to amend it should be attached to this plan: it is a complex issue that could take away from the completion of the Plan and if it is to be included in the Plan then a thorough explanation from the Working Group for doing so should be described.
- Holding a PCMB meeting every year to re-assess the population is too frequent to be efficient in management, and may not be practical.

Dorothy displayed the graph with the population numbers and projections. Doug voiced that there is a conservation concern with the herd and that we should be taking as many measures as possible to protect it.

At one of the HMP community meetings, a community member noted that the population went up in the seventies, though it could not be credited to a management action.

Frank mentioned that herds disappear and comeback, as in the Bluenose herd for example.

Richard Gordon voiced concern about the highway issue. He also talked about plans for management of harvest in communities. He voiced that he didn't see monitoring plans for the communities and that children need education in communities. He asked if there would be any money for monitoring and enforcement in the Plan.

The Chair raised the issue of area closures. This would be temporary or multi-year harvest restrictions or no-harvest zones. In this management approach, an area like the Dempster highway could be shut down completely.

Another issue was closure of the hunt in specific seasons, such as the rut. Dorothy commented that unless seasons are reduced to very short periods it doesn't reduce overall harvest.

Doug brought up using a tag system to monitor harvest; there would be no limit, just a tag which would allow the harvest to be tracked.

Larry Carpenter raised the point that we have to be careful in our management actions as we don't want to make criminals out of hunters. This could happen if tags are brought in and people are caught hunting without a tag.

Dorothy reminded the Council's that this Plan is number-driven and takes a holistic approach across the whole herd.

Richard raised issues around community hunts, and how they will be managed. This issue could be addressed in the Native User Agreement.

Marsha Branigan asked the group under the IFA what the process would be to approve and sign this Plan. The WMAC (NS) Chair responded that when the PCMB has the final draft we will advise them of our comments. At the end of the process, if management authorities are not satisfied with it, it will not be implemented.

The Working Group explained that the protocol does not lay out the process after the HMP is recommended to the parties.

The Council discussed the stages in finalizing the Harvest Management Plan. A member inquired about whether for future if the Council should be signatory to the Plan.

The Council commented that the PCMB is not signatory to this Plan. Signatories to the plan are the parties in the protocol which are the same as the signatories to the PCMA.

The Chair thanked the working group representatives for their presentation.

Christian said that overall the Plan was well done and the color management scheme was a good idea as well as clear. He also said that the Dempster Highway needs more attention; hunting pressure and access go hand in hand. There should be an option to shut down the Dempster.

Dorothy explained that the Working Group is still seeking feedback on the Dempster highway issue in the Plan. She explained a bit about the history in dealing with the Dempster. She said that from 1993 to 1999, over six years recommendations were made to ministers about the PCMB regulations including the three month resident season on cows, the highway corridor, and "let the leaders pass". Charges were laid in recent years against Tr'ondek Hwech'in (TH) hunters and there were court challenges. Yukon lawyers

said that Yukon Government had not properly consulted. The laws are still on the books, they are just not being enforced.

Doug said that since 1999, the herd has been in decline. He thinks that the herd is in a crisis situation and we need to be looking further than just public safety issues, which some of the PCMB regulations were addressing. He voiced that shutting the Dempster down should be an option.

Dorothy brought the Council's attention to the four questions posed in the draft plan that request feedback on ways to deal with the Dempster.

Ernest voiced that there should be no hunting off of the Dempster highway. Dorothy asked for distance specifications and Ernest voiced that there should be no hunting period; it would be a subzone which is shut down. Alternatively it was suggested that there could be a no hunting zone 20km off each side which would effectively stop all hunting off of the Dempster. This management action would be for conservation purposes as opposed to public safety.

Ernest indicated that he thinks hunting pressure will increase on the Dempster in the future as a result of limits in other areas as well as uncertainty of the herd coming through certain communities.

The Council discussed options of closing hunting by geographic location. Dorothy voiced that the problem with that is that certain groups are limited and the Plan is meant to limit harvest across the range of the herd and equally for all users.

The Council talked about redistributing harvest pressure, for example with North Slope grizzly bear, the quota is higher the further west you go.

Christian raised the issue of the annual harvest determination process. He voiced that it would be a challenge to roll up all of the indicators into one color zone: he has experience with these types of indicators through Parks and has found it quite challenging. When you are dealing with both qualitative and quantitative indicators such as science-based and traditional knowledge and hunter assessments it is especially difficult to use these effectively together to come up with one color zone. One needs to be aware of how to weight the two knowledge types.

Dorothy commented that she sees the process as a risk assessment. It will be based on population estimates from the model and the census. Looking at the indicators is step one, the second step is determining which management action to take in that color zone; the board would have to meet often to make these decisions.

Doug explained his concern in assessing indicators on an annual basis: science based results often take years to produce good information.

Dorothy commented that the Plan is very science heavy and she would have preferred to see more local and traditional knowledge information incorporated. Currently this information could come from ABEKC and WMAC (NS)'s Porcupine Caribou Traditional Knowledge Project.

Dorothy explained that all indicators including things like forest fires and low calving rates, will be looked at together, and incorporated into a subjective annual risk assessment.

Concern was raised that the yearly indicator-based risk assessment relies heavily on many people, and is a large burden on the PCMB which reduces practicality of the process. Also the credibility of the Board would be constantly tested, which could have a negative result.

Doug said that every three to five years is probably more realistic except in the case of an extreme situation, for example, a census is completed, a major forest fire, or a disastrous calf year.

A comment was made that there could be a different suite of tools in each of the indicator zones.

Christian explained that the same system has been used in Parks, but there have been struggles. He said, the more indicators that you bring to the table, the more the decision becomes subjective; which is not an ideal situation when a population is in trouble.

Dorothy agreed that basing all the actions on the population estimate is challenging: she is worried that if the number is challenged, the whole system will be challenged.

Christian expressed concern about the enforcement of a mandatory bulls only harvest: such an action could require amendments to the Canada Parks Act. He provided the example that the Aklavik HTC could pass a bylaw for Aklavik residents about mandatory bulls only harvest, but the same residents could go into Ivvavik and shoot as many animals as they want. There is no mechanism right now for enforcement in Parks. Any changes to the Parks Act could take 5-10 years.

Doug voiced that all regulations made should be enforceable.

Ernest commented that it is governments' responsibilities to find bodies to enforce laws.

A member raised the concern that cross border enforcement is confusing.

Action Item 08-09-11: The Secretariat will validate the Council's factsheets on enforcement and send copies them to members.

Enforcement is a huge issue as it relates to the plan and it could be more strongly highlighted in the Plan.

The Chair asked Dorothy if there had been questions about the credibility of the model in community meetings. Dorothy explained that in all of the consultation process only one comment has been received about the model. She explained that when people saw how the model fits the general trend of the herd they are convinced that it is a good tool. Dorothy said at this point the model is one of the only options. Another option discussed was to get an estimate of the number of breeding females on the calving ground. This would involve a composition count during calving, which would mean taking a helicopter onto the calving grounds. They are not sure if they can get community and PCMB support to go into the calving grounds and the error would be larger than the photo census. If the error is too large, one may not be able to tell if the herd is declining; the confidence intervals would be large.

Dorothy cautioned that at the current harvest rate the herd could be in the yellow zone in six years and through the yellow in seven years.

Danny mentioned that he is apprehensive about using the current population estimate of the herd as we haven't had a census in seven years, he worries that the numbers are way off.

Ernest raised two points; he mentioned that there are issues with some counts as people are counting different herds together. He also doesn't have a lot of confidence that people report all of their harvest. He worries about the harvest reporting as a component of the model and population estimate. He mentioned that there is truth to natural herd fluctuations, but the reality is that we can harvest so much more easily now. Gas prices are up so people want to take more caribou at one time.

The Council discussed the precautionary principle as a guiding principle in the Plan; the Council suggested emphasizing it more.

Doug mentioned that the plan needs a good definition of conservation that speaks to long term viability.

Doug reiterated that the Plan's shortfall is its lack of emphasis on the precautionary principle.

Dorothy provided background on the four management option charts in the Plan and the Working Group's recommendations of options. She explained that it would have been difficult to prove that there is a conservation concern large enough to override aboriginal rights.

The Working Group is in support of option four, which is in line with the Council's choice.

The Council commented that the Porcupine caribou herd is the only herd in the Yukon that does not have a mandatory bulls-only harvest.

Richard affirmed that with any decision about bull only harvesting, there has to be education that goes along with it about not harvesting bulls in the rut. The Council also supports a bulls-only harvest with a training component.

The Council members were agreeable to moving to a bulls-only harvest immediately in addition to setting a TAH. The Chair clarified that the restricted bulls-only harvest is an easier management action than setting a TAH, meaning that the bulls-only harvest could be effective immediately, while the TAH practically speaking may take three to four years.

Danny said that when the census is done, we may find out that the herd is at 50,000-60,000 animals and we need to be prepared for that. Dorothy said that at that time, the PCMB would make an adjustment and the color zone would switch to the yellow or orange zone.

The Chair commented that law-based solutions come down to capacity and ability of all parties to come down with enforceable measures. Leadership has to be strong. He reminded the Council that HTC's have law making authorities and governments have tools to make laws.

Ernest discussed reducing harvest for resident hunters, Dorothy commented that the resident hunt in the Yukon on Porcupine caribou is very small. Ernest also mentioned that although people may not be happy with the enforced measures, he thinks that they will go along with them.

A Council member wondered how many people in communities practice bulls-only harvesting now: it was mentioned that Old Crow does and TH does and some Inuvialuit do.

Ernest brought up a point about meat wastage due to not packaging meat properly.

Dorothy suggested that the Council should think about any comments that they may have on the treatment of Herschel Island within the Plan: currently there are no provisions.

Dorothy reminded the Council that the herd is migratory and that all communities need to work together on reducing harvest..

Dorothy asked what the steps are for recommending the Plan.

The Council further discussed the process. The Chair commented that the PCMB would make the recommendation as it applies to the herd and the Inuvialuit have a seat on the Board. If the Council had an additional comment or recommendation the Council could send a letter to the minister.

Dorothy mentioned that the NWT minister is looking for a recommendation from this Council to the NWT government; GNWT won't proceed without a recommendation from the co management bodies (WMAC (NS), WMAC (NWT) and IGC).

A Council member mentioned that the PCMB is the chief instrument for management of the Porcupine Caribou herd and should be the primary co-management body.

The Council agreed that the recommendation letter should add views on how the Plan should proceed, and should also address enforceability of quotas within Parks.

Doug commented that recommendations from this Council tend to be taken quite seriously.

K. Dall Sheep Management Plan

Marsha discussed the protocol for the Dall Sheep Management Plan.

Danny commented he is not aware of people harvesting sheep in Aklavik, but that there is likely an unreported harvest. Danny said that because the population is so small, any harvest could easily effect the population.

Doug mentioned that he thinks harvest restrictions come in when the population drops below 300 hundred animals. Keeping track of this harvest is a challenge, though the tag system has proven to be effective - tags would be free. Council members raised that this can become a legal issue and it is not so simple.

L. Trap line Concessions

Stephanie informed the Council about pending amendments to the current trap line concessions; the plan is to move the concession boundary to the height of land in the ISR. The Council did not have any opposition and due to time constraints, decided to deal with the issue at a later date on the phone.

Aileen Horler joined the meeting

M. Communication Strategy

Aileen presented work that she has done on a communication strategy for the Council.

She began by explaining what a communication strategy is and how the Council would use it. She explained that it is a tool which provides guidelines for giving and receiving messages both externally and internally.

She explained that she would like to complete a communication inventory to find out what is currently in place. She will then evaluate how well these avenues are working. She also said that we need to look at outcomes, not just outputs.

Finally she will develop a strategy with a description of objectives and audiences. She will be asking, "who do you want to reach, how do you want to reach them, and who do you want to hear from?"

The Chair commented that the main question is “what are we doing now, and is it effective?” Aileen asked if the Council is getting good value for their investment in communications and requested feedback on the list of contacts she had prepared..

Doug asked Aileen if she looked at internal communications in YG. She explained that she looked at it in the context of how messages are transmitted. Many of the Council’s communication channels are informal or coincidental ie. Doug and Dorothy sit on the Council as well as on the PCMB.

The Chair provided an example of a tool that the Council could use to increase its internal communications: an FTP site (File Transfer Protocol) which is a website where you can store large data files that all members can access on the internet.

Aileen explained that she wants to focus on what is effective now. She posed a few questions: “what happens between meetings?”, “what is communication like with alternates?”, “what is the briefing process like for new members?”

The Chair explained that the Council has tried different methods in the past like sitting down with new members, but that they haven’t used the same system consistently over time.

The Chair suggested that we send an orientation binder to all new members with key documents and term reports.

Aileen concluded by telling the Council that she would be contacting them with more questions: she will have a draft ready for the December meeting.

Michelle Sicotte joined the meeting

Michelle joined the meeting to brief the Council on the work that she has started..

Michelle has been working on two projects: she has been updating the Wildlife Conservation and Management Plan as well as compiling information about ecological monitoring that is being done on the Yukon North Slope.

She began by talking about the Conservation and Management Plan and the work that John Reid completed. John looked at all areas of the Plan that were out of date and flagged them. Michelle commented that this work was very helpful. As she went through the work she found additional changes beyond John’s scope of expertise. She has gone through the Plan and identified further changes as well as implemented John’s minor changes. She looked for simple updates and identification of areas where management regimes have changed. She explained that she went through the whole Plan except for the economic development section.

Michelle made some general comments about the Plan. She said that the action items are still relevant, but the examples are out of date. She told the Council that the level of effort that goes into the Plan now should be a reflection of how closely the Council would like to work with the Plan. She commented that the first chapter is heavily reliant on the work of ABEKC to cover monitoring that is in the Council's mandate.

A Council member commented that the Plan is not very action oriented and that it would have to be rewritten to use it as an action plan.

The Chair said that the Plan was meant to be a strategic level plan. He mentioned that updating the Plan as it exists now is a far different process than rewriting the plan.

The Chair mentioned that the action items in the Plan have to be specific enough that there are teeth for it to apply across the YNS under the conservation regime.

The Chair commented that another big change is the current high level of development and industry interest in the offshore that may affect the North Slope.

Christian cautioned against creating a plan that duplicates other management plans. Between the Herschel Plan, Ivvavik Plan and the Conservation and Management Plan there is cross referencing to show an integrated approach across the landscape.

The Chair explained that there should be a volume 4, the implementation plan, but it was never completed.

Michelle discussed the ecological monitoring work that she has been doing. She explained that she will pull together all the information on monitoring on the Yukon North Slope.

The Chair commented that Hershel and Ivvavik both have monitoring work going on, and that we should also review work going on as part of a broader monitoring regime. From our Council's perspective, we need to rationalize the work as well as be aware of who else has a stake in the work.

Doug asked how Michelle is distinguishing between monitoring and research. Michelle informed the Council that she would compile a list or matrix of the types of information that she will collect and send it around for review.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:00pm.

Sept 22, 2008
Canada Games Centre, Whitehorse

Lindsay Staples Chair • **Danny C. Gordon** Inuvialuit Game Council (Member) • **Ernest Pokiak** Inuvialuit Game Council (Member) • **Doug Larsen** Yukon Government (Member) • **Christian Bucher** Parks Canada (Member) • **Dorothy Cooley** Yukon Government (Alternate) • **Stephanie Muckenheim** Yukon Government (Guest) • **Richard Gordon** Yukon Government Herschel Island Park Ranger (Guest) • **Michelle Christensen** (Secretariat) • **Jennifer Smith** (Secretariat)

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:10 am.

The Chair explained that the Council will have the chance to engage with Wayne when discussing the Borderlands Review. The Chair suggested that the Council pass on the review work to Borderlands in time for their end of October review.

N. Borderlands Review

Richard Gordon and Michel Svoboda (ABEKC) joined the meeting.

Wayne Wysocki connected by teleconference at 11:00am

The Chair introduced Wayne to the Council and asked him to provide an overview of his report: “A Review and Discussion of the Arctic Borderlands Ecological Knowledge Co-Op’s Community Monitoring Program Database”.

Wayne explained that in the beginning phases of the project he took a lot of time to become familiar with Arctic borderlands and with the data.. He realized that the work would not only involve looking at the data, but at the storage, utility, and value of the information to WMAC (NS).

Wayne explained that he would walk the Council through the sections of his report and mentioned that the absence of recommendations was deliberate, as he wanted WMAC (NS) to come up with their own recommendations.

Doug asked why the spatial data was not included in the analysis. Wayne explained that it was a budget issue; large efforts of time and logistics were consumed with the data extraction and limited the scope of work.

The Chair further explained that a decision was made at the outset to focus on three main areas of interest to query: caribou, general observations of change, and interviewee characteristics.

Doug noted that though the spatial data was not analyzed due to budgetary constraints and the complexity it would have involved, it is an important component should still be addressed. He explained that often the spatial and non-spatial data are linked and must both be looked at to answer questions.

Wayne commented generally, that in order to understand one answer one must look at the full set of questions, in part due to the subjectivity of responses and variety of interpretations possible.

Wayne continued with a brief description of the questionnaire. He commented that familiarization with the database and the questionnaire was frustrating; there was no good description of what the questionnaire consisted of and how and why questions were added over time.

He explained that there are 12 different sections in the questionnaire, some of which have changed in scope and depth over time (described in Appendix A of his report). He commented that the survey is very ambitious and places a large response burden on interviewees and interviewers. He noted that it would have been helpful to know why certain questions were asked and why others were not. In the original pilot project there were only six sections in the survey: many questions were added over the years.

The Chair explained that the original purpose of the program was to get a sense of change in the environment over time. The program has now evolved into a documentation of observations with no reference back through time. Thus the interpreters are limited to the timeframe of the questionnaires.

Wayne suggested that it would have been helpful for the ABEKC program to have taken a longer-lens approach to the questions and have held the survey question to a standard that answered “why is this important”. He suggested that a description of the importance of each group of questions should be written into the beginning of each section in the questionnaire to provide context.

The Chair commented on the process of question addition and deletion. He said that people were able to add questions on varying topics over time instead of looking at criteria and building questions around that.

Wayne walked the Council through the database. He explained the complexities in the database and the difficulty of navigating it in the absence of instructions. He claimed that only through trial and error can one figure it out. He noted that a report could be written in the future as a guide for those working with data.

One of the biggest problems he demonstrated was that questions are not linked to the answers in the database. He commented that one has to be very familiar with the questions and the database in order to make sense of it. He said that he couldn't have done the work without someone that knew the questions and database very well.

Another downfall of the database is loss of responses due to limited character entry for open-ended questions, which makes their analysis very difficult.

The Chair summarized by saying that three factors confound responses:

- The relationship between spatial and non spatial data.
- The understanding of responses in context of all questions asked.
- Can't see question tied to response – understanding of response diminished.

Wayne noted that every question should have had a unique code so that the interpreter would know what question the response was relevant to.

In light of the difficulties he experienced in extracting information from the database, Wayne recommended that the Council act quickly if they want to extract more information and employ the few people who are familiar with the database while they are still available. Writing a manual for using the database is another option, although it would almost certainly be very expensive and labor intensive or, alternately all the organizations with an interest in the data could be trained in data extraction.

The Chair agreed that the question the Council is faced with is: "are we interested in these responses and in putting in the effort involved to get them out of the database?"

Wayne added that he does not see value in continuing to enter data into the database until people get the existing data out.

A member raised the issue of misinterpretation of questions by interviewers and interviewees. The Chair concluded that in the first two years of the surveys, the opportunity was lost to validate the utility of questions and that the now after 10 years of surveys, this effort, if ever undertaken, would be compounded.

A Council member raised a point about the distinction between getting the information out (outputs) and analyzing it. The process is different, and Wayne explained that first information has to be extracted (outputs). Once the information is there; one has to analyze it for it to be meaningful. In the database, there are challenges in both of these steps.

Council members commented that the analysis of the data should have been completed every year after the interviewing; after ten years the task is onerous and information has been lost due to improper coding.

Wayne commented that it is more difficult to get a community-by-community analysis (response extraction) than an aggregate analysis. He said that most of the data is most meaningful on a community-by-community basis and not across the entire survey region.

Wayne explained his fortune in having a key person help him with the data extraction.

Wayne then provided an overview of the data that he extracted focusing on caribou, general observations of change, and interviewee characteristics.

Wayne presented the caribou data analysis: some of the results were contradictory. For example: caribou were less available to people in Aklavik, but more people indicated they were meeting their needs. Also, two different interviewees said that Shingle Point was both close and not close: in this instance, it would have made more sense to plot harvest data on a map rather than ask people in a way that results in a subjective response.

Wayne proceeded to go through issues with some of the questions he focused on:

- Time on the land: involved interpretation and analysis – some of data missing.
- Interviewee profile: responses could be changing over time because interviewees are changing.
- General observations of change: could provide a baseline for longer length of reference.

In the interviewee profile Wayne was looking for a percentage of people that would have been the same from year to year. He was not able to locate the information that links interviewee number assignments to names for the last five years and as a result was unable to determine the rate of turnover.

The ‘general observations of change’ question generated long responses and so most of them were not entered into the database. He suggested there should be a way to link them and widen the boxes to include longer responses.

There were some instances where it was clear that the question was misunderstood. For example: the differentiation of caribou calving numbers, so there is very little of that data that is useable.

Other issues that Wayne flagged included:

- some cells were left blank , which could mean no response or 0;
- some questions have to be cross referenced for understanding i.e. availability vs. location;
- interviewee turnover;
- looking at the comments associated with different questions is important – otherwise the interpreter could come to a different conclusion than was intended.

Doug raised the issue of sample size and whether or not these data can stand up to statistical rigor. Wayne suggested bringing the data back to the community for validation instead of constructing a proper sample size (challenging in a small community).

A member asked if it would be possible to have the communities validate the 10 years of data at this point. The Council commented that it is possible, but might not generate complete validation due to the time lapse.

Wayne explained the Appendices to the report.

Wayne commented that there are gaps in the digitization of the mapped data; there are about five years where data is missing.

The Council discussed the importance of reporting back to communities. Community people need to know that the information is important and is being used.

The Chair thanked Wayne for his time and his work on the database.

The Chair made some concluding comments. He said that the scope of the interview is ambitious. Wayne added that the monitoring program, in trying to be something for everyone, was too much.

The Chair asked Wayne what his views were with respect to getting a quality analysis. Wayne said that one would have to start with agreement on what analytical abilities the data was amendable to and to not stretch the data to fit something it was never intended to fit.

The Chair explained that the Council would have a discussion amongst themselves and pass along comments to Wayne.

Wayne disconnected from the teleconference

The Chair offered a few comments. He stated that Wayne's work is reflective of the Council's bigger interest in reviewing ecological monitoring work.

Wayne's work, although it did not provide recommendations, was a long overdue assessment of the database and where improvements can be made. The overarching question is does the ABEKC and its partners carry on the way they have been, or are changes needed, and if so what changes are needed?

The Council decided that they would draft a separate set of comments in response to Wayne's work, so that his work stands alone as that of an independent contractor. The Council's comments would be distributed as a separate document responding to Wayne's report.

Doug commented on the importance of having an indication of where the Council is prepared to go. He is interested in an assessment of the spatial data, especially the caribou, but likely no further assessment beyond that.

Michelle informed the Council that at the end of October Borderlands is undergoing its own review of the questions.

She asked the Council about their interest in sending someone or supporting someone from Aklavik to participate in that review. They are also looking for a list of priority questions from us.

The Council mentioned that they were not interested in supporting the Borderlands status quo. They mentioned bringing Wayne up to participate in the review meeting, though it may not be necessary. The Council discussed that Michelle attending the meeting, in combination with Wayne's report would be sufficient as a contribution.

The Council commented that they were not at a stage to participate in future annual community surveys in light of Wayne's conclusions.

Dorothy explained that funding for Borderlands has been an issue for getting analysis work done. A Council member suggested that maybe their review could piggy-back off of the Council's review, in effect reducing the cost and effort.

The Chair made a comment that in many ways, the current situation with ABEKC is not unlike what happened with the Inuvialuit Harvest Study. He explained that although it was a difficult circumstance that put many people out of work, the Inuvialuit Harvest Study stopped conducting interviews in order to produce synthesis results.

He commented that the ABEKC needs to know what the needs of the funders are.

Dorothy referred to Don Russell's report as the first review of data she has seen come out of the Co-op; she is currently sitting on the Board and wants to see more done with the data.

Council members commented that two and two and a half hour interviews are too long.. They should be ~45 min to an hour and narrow down what is really important.

The Chair discussed how the Council's contribution to the ABEKS program of work could be an in-kind one: the Wysocki report and the Council's response to it. Christian voiced that the Wysocki Report and Council views were a big contribution to other agencies (not just ABEKC) like Parks Canada.

The Council Conservation and Management Plan discusses and references an ecological monitoring program: the Council could assess whether ABEKC meets this need or not.

Ernest discussed the importance in adhering to timelines for reporting back to people that researchers got the information from.

Danny informed the Council about false answers and the tendency in communities to answer questions in a favorable way. For example, people don't like to say that they got a skinny caribou or were unsuccessful in their hunt.

Christian suggested bringing some of these problems back to the people interviewed (getting feedback) to see how they see us using it for what and where.

The Chair suggested producing a newsletter to inform people that we have taken the time to look at the information. It could be a one page plain language summary.

Action Item 08-09-12: The Secretariat will produce a one page plain language summary of WMAC NS's review of Arctic Borderlands' monitoring program.

The Council emphasized the importance of keeping the communication lines open and ensuring people are aware that we still have the intention to collaborate.

A summary of the big points to draft in our comments include: the burden on participation is huge, dependency on a couple of people is not sustainable, and the reiteration of the points that Wayne made in his report.

Action Item 08-09-13: The Council will draft comments and recommendations on Wayne's report that will be distributed with the report.

O. Other Business

The Chair discussed the work that the PCMB is doing with Shawn Francis to carry out a land use assessment across the range of the Porcupine caribou herd, where the herd is the primary value.

Christian informed the Council that he could provide an update from Parks Canada later.

The Chair explained that the North Slope Conference planning will begin pretty soon and that we will try to canvas IFA bodies on their opinions.

Richard provided a written Herschel Island work plan, and can be referenced in the Sept binder.

P. Upcoming Meetings

- Research Day is tomorrow, Sept 23.
- The IGC meeting is at the end of the week; Lindsay will be presenting.
- CARMA is meeting December 2-4, in Vancouver: once the agenda comes out we can look at it and decide if Danny will go.
- Arctic Change: Quebec City, would be a great one to attend, but we are not sure if the budget will allow for it.

- Regular Council meeting in Aklavik in December before the IGC meeting.
- 2020 North-January in Ottawa: the topic is climate change etc. The Council will look at the participation budget first.

The Chair commented that the Council needs a half day to deal with the muskox plan.

The Chair commented that there were many topics that we were not addressed in this agenda and the Secretariat will develop a work plan to identify what we can cover at the next meetings.

The Chair thanked everyone for coming. Christian commented that it would be helpful if he could get the binder ahead of time. Stephanie thanked the Council for inviting her to the meeting. The Chair especially thanked Dorothy Cooley and Richard Gordon for their attendance.

The Chair encouraged people to think about a theme for the next North Slope Conference, such as the state of co-management in Parks; the way forward and how can we improve.

Motion 08-09-04 to adjourn the meeting

Moved by: Ernest Pokiak

Seconded by: Christian Bucher

Motion Carried