



ᓄᓇᓂᓂᓂ ᐸᓇᓂᓂᓂ
Nunavunmi Parnaiyiit
Nunavut Planning Commission
Commission d'Aménagement du Nunavut

Nunavut Planning Commission

2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan Public Hearing Transcript South Baffin Region



**November 14 to 19, 2022
Cadet Hall
Iqaluit, Nunavut**

Participants

Community Delegates			
Solomon Awa, Mayor	City of Iqaluit	Loasie Alikatuktuk	Qikiqtarjuaq
Kyle Sheppard, D.M.	City of Iqaluit	Ahmie Nauyavik	Qikiqtarjuaq
Paul Quassa	City of Iqaluit	Juilie Koksiak	Qikiqtarjuaq
Jetaloo Kakee	Amaruq HTO	Lizzie Natsiapik	Qikiqtarjuaq
Ben Kovic	Amaruq HTO	Jonah Keyootak	Qikiqtarjuaq
Noah Alookie	Amaruq HTO		
Archie Angnakak	Amaruq HTO	Johnny Mike	Pangnirtung
		Jamie Evic	Pangnirtung
Maliktoo Lyta	Kimmirut Hamlet	Lazarusie Ishulutaq	Pangnirtung
Mary Lyta	Kimmirut Hamlet	Jaco Ishulautak	Pangnirtung
Mikidjuk Kolola	Kimmirut HTO		
Jawlie Akavak	Kimmirut HTO	Eli Kavik	Sanikiluaq
		Alex Ippak	Sanikiluaq
Ejetsiak Ejetsiak	Kinngait Hamlet	Lucy Appaqqaq	Sanikiluaq
Kumaarjuk Pii	Kinngait Hamlet	Dinah Kittosuk	Sanikiluaq
Adamie Numa	Kinngait HTO		
Simigak Suvega	Kinngait HTO	Jackusie Ittukallak	Puvirnituk
Oqituq Ashoona	Kinngait HTO	Adamie Angiyou	Puvirnituk
		Aisa Surusilak	Puvirnituk
George Auksaq	Igloolik Hamlet	Simon Irqumia	Puvirnituk
Lloyd Idlout	Igloolik HTO		
Natalino Piugattuk	Igloolik HTO	Simiunie Ohaituk	Inukjuak
Jacobie Malliki	Igloolik HTO	Anna Ohaituk	Inukjuak
		Shaomik Inukpuk	Inukjuak
Jopie Kaerner.	Sanirajak Hamlet	Johnny Kasudluak	Inukjuak
Ammie Kipsagak	Sanirajak HTO		
Abraham Qammaniq	Sanirajak HTO	Adamie Saviadjuk	Salluit
		Adamie Kaitak	Salluit
Eli Angiyou	Akulivik Mayor	Adamie Kenuajuak	Salluit
Eli Aullaluk	Akulivik Council	George Kakajuk	Salluit
Jusi Aliqu	Akulivik Council		
Adamie Alayco	Akulivik HTO	Adamie Mangluk	Ivujivik
		Ali Qavavauk	Ivujivik
		Paulusi Tarriasuk	Ivujivik

Nunavut Planning Commission

NPC: Nunavut Planning Commission – Commissioners & Staff	
Andrew Nakashuk	Chairperson
Shawn Lester	Vice Chair
Joshua Arreak	Commissioner
Patricia Enuapik	Commissioner
Dorothy Gibbons	Commissioner
Abraham Keenainak	Commissioner
Simon Mikkungwak	Commissioner
Darrell Ohokannoak	Commissioner
Charlie Arngak	Commissioner - Makavik
Sharon Ehaloak	Executive Director
Nowdlak Kelly	Executive Assistant to Directors & Managers
Jonathan Ehaloak	Assistant Executive Director & Manager of IT
Brian Aglukark	Director of Community Engagement & Translations
Jonathan Savoy	Director of Policy & Planning
Goump Djalogue	Manager of Planning and Implementation
Solomon Amuno	Senior Planner
Adrian Gerhartz	Planner, GIS Technician
Audrey Mainville	HR Officer
Annie Ollie	Interpreter-Translator & Regional Planner
Tommy Owlijoot	Interpreter-Translator
Maxence Jaillet	Interpreter-Translator
Natalie Labossiere	Interpreter-Translator
Jacob Peter	Interpreter-Translator
Abraham Tagalik	Interpreter-Translator
Alan Blair	Legal Counsel
David Livingstone	External Advisor
Beth Gorham	Communications & Media Advisor
Willi Puerstl	Videographer, Director of Skyline Productions
Chris Hellig	Audio Technician
Leena Evic	Iqaluit Support Staff
Brad Aliqatuqtuq	Iqaluit Support Staff
Darren Arreak	Iqaluit Support Staff
Kevin Kullaalik	Iqaluit Support Staff

Signatory Parties

Government of Canada	
Terry Audla	Regional Director General, CIRNAC
Kim Pawley	Manger, CIRNAC
Spencer Dewar	Director of Resource Management, CIRNAC
Jeff Hart	Manager of Land Use Planning, CIRNAC
Janice Traynor	Policy Coordinator Sustainable Development, CIRNAC
Michelle-Claire Roy	Environmental Policy Analyst, CIRNAC
Nathalie Lowry	Environment and Climate Change Canada
Abby Menendez	Environment and Climate Change Canada
Anita Gudmundson	Transport Canada
Jaideep Johar	Transport Canada
Karen Petkau	Parks Canada
Greg Matthews	Department of National Defence
Neil Modi	Justice Canada
Simon Gruda-Dolbec	Justice Canada

Government of Nunavut	
Henry Coman	Assistant Deputy Minister for Dept. of Environment
Daniel Haney	Manager of Land Use & Environment
Diane Lapierre	Manager of Environmental Assessment & Regulation
Michele LeBlanc-Havard	Director of Environment
Drikus Gissing	Director, Wildlife Management
John Ringrose	Wildlife Biologist, Department of Environment
Annie Cyr-Parent	Department of Ec. Development & Transportation
Eamonn Carroll	Legal Counsel

Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated	
Aluki Kotierk	President
James Eetoolook	Former Vice President
David Ningeongan	Executive Director
Paul Irngaut	Vice President
Chris Kalluk	Land Administration Planning & Management
Burt Dean	Department of Wildlife and Environment
Hannah Uniuqsaraq	Director of Self Determination
Naida Gonzalez	Consultant
Marie Belleau	Legal Counsel

Registered Participants & Other Guests

Esteemed Guests & Nunavummiut Participants	
P.J. Akeeagok	Premier
David Akeeagok	Minister of the Environment
Lori Idlout	Member of Parliament
Meeka Mike	City of Iqaluit
Olayuk Akshuk	Cape Dorset
Paul Idlout	Igloolik HTO
Ian Imakpa	Elder

Qikiqtani Inuit Association	
Levi Barnabas	Secretary-Treasurer & Vice President
Solomon Awa	Director of Inuit Qaujjimajatuqangit and Engagement
Rosanne D'Orazio	Assistant Executive Director, Operations and Benefits
Leo Maktar	QIA Registered Participant

Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board	
James Qillaq	Chairman
Kolola Pitiulak	Executive Director
Mike Ferguson	Senior Advisor, Wildlife Management

Makavik Corporation	
Adamie Alaku	Vice President
Laurie Beaupré	Assistant Director

Baffinland	
Lou Kamermans	Senior Director of Sustainable Development
Mike Settingerton	Wildlife Biologist, Environmental Dynamics Inc.

De Beers	
Sarah McLean	Environment and Permitting Manager
Mark Lincoln	Project Manager, Chidliak & Diamond FutureSmart Initiative

World Wildlife Fund Canada	
Erin Keenan	Manager, Arctic Marine Conservation
Brandon Laforest	Senior Specialist, Arctic Species & Ecosystems
Jason Harisimo	Senior Specialist, Arctic Species & Ecosystems
Paul Okalik	World Wildlife Fund

NWT & Nunavut Chamber of Mines	
Priya Sharma	General Manager

Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers	
Paul Barnes	Director, Atlantic Canada and Arctic

Friends of Land Use Planning	
Paul Crowley	Representative of Friends of Land Use Planning, Iqaluit

Nunavut Water Board	
Assol Kubeisinova	Technical Advisor
Sergey Kuflevskiy	Technical Services

Nunavut Marine Council	
Colleen Parker	Representative of NMC

***Other attendees at the meeting are not included above, only those presenting or at the panel of presenters. A more fulsome list of all attendees can be obtained upon request.**

Table of Contents

Topic	Page
Introductions & Opening Remarks	9
Overview of the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan:	16
Chapter 1: Land Use Designations	20
Chapter 2: Protecting and Sustaining the Environment	23
Key Migratory Bird Habitats	23
Caribou Habitat	24
Polar Bear Denning Areas	26
Walrus Haul-outs	26
Whale Calving, Cod Lakes, Polynyas & Marine Areas of Importance	27
Transboundary Considerations	27
Climate Change	27
Chapter 3: Encouraging Conservation Planning	29
Parks Awaiting Full Establishment & Proposed Parks	29
Proposed National Marine Conservation Areas	29
National Wildlife Areas and Migratory Bird Sanctuaries	30
National & Territorial Historic Sites	30
Canadian Heritage Rivers	31
Wildlife Sanctuaries and Marine Protected Areas	31
Chapter 4: Building Healthier Communities	32
Community Areas of Interest	32
On-Ice Travel Routes	32
Regional Community Areas of Interest	33
Community Identified Priority Areas & Use and Occupancy Maps	33
Transboundary Considerations	34
Areas of Equal Use & Occupancy and Unincorporated Communities	34
Community Drinking Water Supplies	35
Priority Contaminated Sites	36
Military Facilities	36
Alternative Energy Sources & Aerodrones	37
Chapter 5: Encouraging Sustainable Economic Development	38
Mineral Potential & Oil and Gas Potential	38
Terrestrial Transportation & Communication	39
Marine Shipping	39
Commercial Fishing Areas	40
Chapter 6: Implementation Strategy	40
Existing Mineral Rights	41
Minor Variances, Plan Amendments & Periodic Review of the Plan	42
Other Mapping Considerations & Inuit Owned Lands	44
Questions and Answers Regarding Overview of the 2021 Draft Land Use Plan	46-57

Presentations	Page
Presentation by the City of Iqaluit	58
Presentation by Amaruq HTO	64
Presentation by the Hamlet of Kimmirut	70
Presentation by Mayukalik HTO	71
Presentation by the Hamlet of Kinngait	76
Presentation by Kinngait HTO	78
Presentation by the Hamlet of Igloolik	80
Presentation by the Igloolik HTO	81
Presentation by the Hamlet and HTO of Sanirajak	85
Presentation by the Hamlet and HTO of Qikiqtarjuaq	88
Presentation by the Hamlet and HTO of Pangnirtung	122
Presentation by the Hamlet of Sanikiluaq	101
Presentation by the Northern Village of Inukjuak	105
Presentation by the Northern Village of Puvirnituq	108
Presentation by the Qikiqtani Inuit Association	112
Presentation by the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board	134
Presentation by the Northern Village of Akuvilik	148
Presentation by the Northern Village of Ivujivik	155
Presentation by the Northern Village of Salluit	159
Presentation by Makavik Corporation	164
Presentation by Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated	175
Presentation by the Government of Canada	203
Presentation by the Government of Nunavut	255
Presentation by Baffinland	314
Presentation by World Wildlife Fund Canada	331
Presentation by De Beers	339
Presentation by the NWT & Nunavut Chamber of Mines	346
Presentation by the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers	354
Closing Remarks	359

DAY 1: NOVEMBER 14, 2022

INTRODUCTIONS & OPENING REMARKS

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Ulaakut. Good morning. We can proceed with the hearing. If you require translation, Channel 1 is Inuktitut. Channel 2 is in French. There is an English channel. You can select channels on the receiver for the language. We will proceed with the hearing. Joshua Arreak will lead us in prayer.

Joshua: *(Opening Prayer)*

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Joshua. Welcome to all of you, delegates and guests from all around. Please be welcome, also you from outside of Nunavut. There were some who could not make it in due to weather, like Sanikiluaq could not travel. They are not here. Before we start, Iqaluit Mayor, Solomon Awa will welcome the guests.

Solomon: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. I would like to thank the Nunavut Planning Commission, Commissioners, and staff for welcoming us here today. I am thankful to represent at these meetings. It is good to see many familiar faces in the room representing communities. Let me welcome you to this meeting. I'm sure you have relatives here, to our wonderful city. I believe the work that we will do in this room will help the Land Use Plan for our future generations. We as Inuit will be at the forefront of the protection and promotion of the wellbeing of the residents and communities for this Land Use Plan. There will be balances for environmental, social, and economic potential for the future. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik too. If you have your cellphone, please turn those off. We don't want to hear cellphones ringing. It is a distraction, so silent mode your phone please. I am asking to remind you of that. Sharon is going to speak, Sharon Ehaloak.

Sharon: Good morning, everyone, and welcome to our fifth of our five public hearings. My name is Sharon Ehaloak. I am the Executive Director for the Nunavut Planning Commission. Before we start our meeting, I have a number of housekeeping items to go through for the week. First of all, we will be starting our meetings at 9:00 a.m. every morning and going to 11:45, breaking for lunch, and coming back at 1:15 to 4:30. The Chair will determine each day whether or not we will be doing an evening session. If we require an evening session, we will be going from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

We have three Northern Quebec communities that did not arrive last night. They will be arriving today. For the delegates that did not go through the preparation session, we will be doing a preparation session right after we finish today with Brian. If you did not do the preparation session in your community about the public hearing, then we would ask you to stay and see Brian afterwards.

The Legion has offered to let everyone go for lunch. You do not need to be a Legion member, but you do need to show these if you are not a member, to go in for lunch over right beside us. We are grateful for that.

As Chairperson Nakashuk said, please put your phones on silent while you are at the meetings. These hearings are being recorded live, and our mics are very sensitive. They do pick up all the chatter, so that is a heads up. We are live streaming with Uvagut TV, Facebook, and YouTube in English and Inuktitut.

We will be taking two 15-minute breaks, one in the morning and one in the afternoon. It will be as close to 10:15 to 10:30 and between 2:30 and 3:00 depending on where we are at with the presentation. For all the registered participants, it is very important that when you come in, you scan your nametag. For the community delegates, it is very important. It records your attendance as well for your per diem and your honoraria. We also need to know how many are in the hall for the Chief Medical Health Office who is attending. So, please, they will remind you in the back when you come in to scan. Please do not take these out of the hall when you go out for a smoke, sorry health break. If you are leaving, please leave them in the hall.

We have a very heavy agenda this week, as everyone can see. We want to ensure that every community, organization, and group has their voice heard. So, it is very important that we are respectful to each other and that we follow the time on the agenda. When you are speaking, please because we are also transcribing these meetings, introduce yourself: your name, your organization, and the community that you represent. We do have interpreters, so we also ask that you remember to please speak slowly. There will only be one person speaking at a time, and that person will be recognized by Chairperson Nakashuk.

We will be sticking to the agenda, which I will be reviewing the overview for the week. We ask you to please again be concise, be respectful, and remember that everyone's voice and comments, we do need to hear them. We ask that you don't interrupt a participant. Everyone's views are important, and the Commission is here to listen.

We have coffee, tea, water, snacks. Please help yourself. The waters are where you come in to the hall adjacent to the hallway. The fire exits: We have fire exits on the left side. Sorry. Well, it depends on if you are looking at me, but this side of the hall, at the front and rear, and then the entrance that you came in.

Face masks are optional. If you want to wear a face mask, please feel comfortable to do so. If you are not feeling well, we ask that you be respectful of others. Advise us that you are not feeling well and do not attend in person but watch via the livestream. If you have any questions for the community delegates or anything, we have staff at the back table, as well as our staff. Please let us know if you need anything or if you have any concerns that need to be addressed.

Once again, I would like to welcome you to the public hearings here with the Commission. I would like to introduce first, the Chair with the Commissioners, and then our team so everyone knows who is here. I will turn it back to you, Mr. Chair, for the introduction of the Commissioners.

Abraham: *(Translated):* Abraham Keenainak. I am a Commissioner. I am also an Elder on the Commission.

- Joshua: (Translated): Joshua Arreak, Commissioner.
- Patricia: (Translated): Good morning. Welcome. Patricia Enuapik from Whale Cove. I am a Commissioner.
- Andrew: (Translated): Ulaakut. Andrew Nakashuk. I am the Chairman.
- Shawn: Good morning. Shawn Lester, Vice Chair.
- Dorothy G: (Translated): Good morning. Ulaakut. Dorothy Gibbons. I am a Commissioner.
- Darrell: Ulaakut. Darrel Ohokannoak, Commissioner.
- Simon M: (Translated): Ulaakut. Simon Mikkungwak from Baker Lake. Commissioner.
- Charlie: (Translated): Charlie Arngak, Nunavik. I represent Makavik. I am from Kangiqsujaq. Welcome, everyone.
- Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director of the Nunavut Planning Commission. I am going to introduce the Commission staff and support staff. I will just ask the staff to stand as I call your name, please.

Brian Aglukark is our Director of Community Engagement and Translations.

Jonathan Ehaloak, Assistant Executive Director and Manager of IT. He is getting more headsets right now, so he is not currently in the hall.

Jonathan Savoy, Director of Policy and Planning.

Goump Djalogue, our Manager of Planning and Implementation.

Solomon Amuno: Senior Planner.

Adrian Gerhartz: Planner, GIS Technician. Adrian is our map expert. The maps that you see around the hall are a product of his work.

Tommy Owlijoot: Tommy is Interpreter-Translator and Mapper. He is in the booth with his hand up.

Annie Ollie: Annie is Interpreter-Translator, and Annie is also a mapper.

Maxcence Jaillet, French interpreter.

Natalie Labossière, French translator.

Nowdlak Kelly. Nowd is our Executive Assistant, Office Administrator.

Alan Blair, our legal counsel.

David Livingstone, External Advisor.

Jazz Adkins, our stenographer.

I would like to recognize the local support team, Leena Evic at the back. Supporting us with Leena is Kevin Kullaalik, Darren Arreak, and Brad Aliqatuqtuq. They will be here and providing support if you need anything.

We would also like to recognize our audio, which is Willi Puerstl. Chris stood up for Willi. Chris and Beth Gorham.

I would now like to ask each of the organizations just to stand up as we recognize you. In no particular order, I am just going in the order that we have it written.

- The Government of Canada
- The Government of Nunavut
- Nunavut Tunngavik
- Makavik Corporation
- Qikiqtani Inuit Association
- Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board
- Nunavut Water Board
- Nunavut Marine Council
- The Nunavut Marine Region Planning Commission
- The City of Iqaluit
- Amaruq Hunters and Trappers Organization
- Hamlet of Kimmirut
- Kimmirut Hunters and Trappers
- Hamlet of Kinngait
- Kinngait Hunters and Trappers
- Hamlet of Igloolik
- Igloolik Hunters and Trappers
- Hamlet of Sanirajak
- Sanirajak Hunters and Trappers
- Hamlet of Qikiqtarjuaq
- Qikiqtarjuaq Hunters and Trappers
- Hamlet of Pangnirtung
- Pangnirtung Hunters and Trappers
- Sanikiluaq Hunters and Trappers
- Hamlet of Sanikiluaq
- Hamlet of Puvirnituk
- Hamlet of Inukjuak
- Hamlet of Salluit. They are not here yet. They will be arriving later today.
- Hamlet of Ivujivik
- Hamlet of Akulivik, not here yet.
- The NWT and Nunavut Chambers of Mine
- Baffinland
- De Beers

- The Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers
- World Wildlife Fund
- Friends of Land Use Planning

I am now just going to do an overview of the agenda, so everyone knows how the week is going to unfold. For today, we are going to have a presentation from Jonathan Savoy to do an overview of the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan and answer questions that were written in for the communities. That will be part of the presentation.

For tomorrow, we will be starting with the City of Iqaluit as the first presenter, working through the agenda. Should we finish the presentation today, it all depends on the number of questions that participants have, we may be proceeding moving up the presentations.

I would like to note that for all of the presenters, with the exception of the Government of Canada, the Government of Nunavut, NTI, and Makavik, all presentations are limited to 30 minutes with 20 minutes for questions. Should there be more questions that we do not get to, we will come back in the evening session and address the questions. For the signatory parties, their presentations will be 60 minutes with 30 minutes for allowance for a question period.

For Wednesday, November 16th, we will continue on with the hamlets and the HTO presentations. As such, for Thursday, Northern Quebec hamlets and then Nunavut Tunngavik will be presenting. On Friday, we will be starting with the Qikiqtani Inuit Association and concluding with the World Wildlife Fund, as outlined in the agenda.

On Day 6, we are starting with the Nunavut Marine Council and any public members who are not registered that wish to make presentations. There is a signup sheet at the back, and you will have your time. You will be allowed to make your presentation and do comments. We will be doing closing remarks, which the signatory parties including Makavik will have 15 minutes. Then each community and each HTO will have three minutes, and all registered participants. With that, Mr. Chair, I will turn it back to you. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Sharon. We will have a film presentation.

(NPC Video shown introducing the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan)

<https://youtu.be/8bFYz5g0bpY>

Qujannamiik. Good morning. Welcome. Before we proceed, I have a few words about what the proceedings will be in the next few days. Each of you will be given time to do your presentation. We as a Commission are here to listen to your concerns.

We have a busy week ahead of us. We are here to concentrate on Nunavut planning, and we don't want to deviate too much from this topic. So, I will be conducting this meeting properly. For those of you who want to make a presentation or ask questions, keep it short and come to the point.

I would like to recognize Aluki Kotierk, Chair and President of NTI. I would like to recognize her for being here. Welcome, Aluki.

I will ask each of you to stick to why we are here. We have governments, federal and territorial, and NTI. They have interest into what we are doing. Before we proceed, I know there will be a lot of questions to these governments and organizations. We ask that you stick to NPC questions. Stick to the point. I do not want you to deviate to other topics. If you could keep it to the topic, I would appreciate that. NTI is here to ask questions. If you have concerns with other governments, you can talk to them privately during our breaks.

Just for your reminder, we have interpreters sitting at the booths. Sometimes when presenters get excited, they get carried away and do a Speedy Gonzales speech, so slow down. Be mindful of the interpreters. State your name properly, your organization. Be clear and concise. As Sharon has mentioned, we are being livestreamed, so knowing who you are is very important.

I am going to read in English from my presentation: First, I want to touch on the larger context and relevance of land use planning in Nunavut. Land use planning is about understanding the integrated environmental, economic, and social-cultural context within which a plan is to be developed, the possible alternatives for land uses, and the selection of the best option in the circumstances given the best information we have at the time.

Across the North and across Canada, land use planning processes have experienced many different challenges. Those challenges are often due to diverse interests and the range of their environmental, economic and social conditions. Our experience in Nunavut can be even more challenging than other planning processes because of the size of Nunavut, the varied interests, often from region to region, as well as within regions.

We often have different views on the overall vision for land use planning in Nunavut and the scope and content of a first-generation plan, as well as disagreements over the necessary resources for planning and how hearings should be conducted.

We must also address the unprecedented size of our planning area which further increases the number and complexity of the issues. No other jurisdiction in the world has attempted this at such a scale.

Regardless of the challenges identified, land use planning is essential. It matters to Nunavummiut, to our communities, to governments, various organizations, and industry. It matters to the land and all those that rely on the land, all living things. It matters to all of us collectively as we seek to protect the environment and develop resources responsibly and sustainably in the short term and for future generations.

Article 11 of the *Nunavut Agreement* sets out the principles that guide land use planning in Nunavut, and I will quote some key sections:

- The primary purpose of land use planning in the Nunavut Settlement Area shall be to protect and promote the existing and future well-being of those persons ordinarily residents and communities of the Nunavut Settlement Area, taking into account the interests of all Canadian. Special attention shall be devoted to protecting and promoting the existing and future wellbeing of Inuit and Inuit Owned Lands.

- The planning process shall ensure land use plans reflect the priorities and values of the residents of the planning regions.
- The objective of the planning process shall be to prepare land use plans which guide and direct resource use and development in the Nunavut Settlement Area.

Land use planning is much more than drawing lines on a map. It is about setting and achieving goals, identifying, and living within limits of acceptable economic, environmental and social change. We must ensure the future is more than the result of a series of decisions about individual projects and activities. This Plan – your Plan - provides an opportunity through the inclusive process to meaningfully address and have essential conversations about difficult things.

There are several reasons why a supported and approved Nunavut Land Use Plan matters:

- It will support decision making with respect to environmental stewardship, sustainable resource and economic opportunities, and social benefit.
- It will serve as a filter and an entry point into the Nunavut regulatory system, and by doing so avoid single project-by-project reviews in the absence of a regional context.
- It will provide a structure and process to identify what is important, and confirm why it's important, in a larger sense, not just on a single proposed project.
- It will set out a framework for public and private investment, resource and environmental management, and progress as Nunavummiut define it.

Planning needs to be understood as a continual process that has to be monitored and reconsidered over time as circumstances, needs, and opportunities change and when new information becomes available.

There is no magic formula for creating a land use plan. It is always a question of achieving an acceptable balance among differing views, values, and visions. Understanding and knowing comes in different forms. Both Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit and western science acknowledge the importance of experience, wise judgement, and intuition.

Compromise by all parties is essential. No one party will get everything it wants but all parties should achieve enough to be satisfied with the outcome. The planning process is both a challenge and an opportunity. We are challenged to see and understand the different views, values, and priorities from all perspectives.

This gives us the opportunity to see things through others' perspectives; build a bridge and reach a consensus; find some balance; and adapt and improve the plan over time as circumstances and new information become available.

The Nunavut Planning Commission's decision-making framework presented in the 2021 Draft Plan and the *Options and Recommendations* document, is disciplined and transparent. The process is

framed by considering options and trade-offs. Final decision-making relies on a combination of information, values, experience, and professional judgment.

The Nunavut Land Use Plan will be a living document. The 2021 Draft Plan incorporates ongoing monitoring and periodic reviews and amendments of the Plan, a continued commitment to achieve and maintain balance.

The Plan will be adapted to meet changing circumstances and events including:

- Community population changes,
- Wildlife population and habitat changes,
- Mineral and hydrocarbon demand and supply, and
- Impacts of climate change on the land and its use.

We Commissioners are committed to making all efforts to ensure that balanced decision-making remains at the core of our discussions. We will continue to rely on the best available information – Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit and western science - for the analysis of facts and consideration of values.

The last 15 years of Plan development have consumed resources and placed demands on communities, regional organizations, and other planning partners. Now is the time for our collective efforts to come together and complete the Nunavut Land Use Plan. It is time for us to see issues from each other's perspectives to understand and commit to the compromises necessary. Working together, we will finalize a plan for Nunavut that reflects the priorities, values, and vision of Nunavummiut and our communities.

(Translated): Qujannamiik. Before we proceed, we will take a 15-minute break.

BREAK

Overview of the 2021 Nunavut Land Use Plan Jonathan Savoy, NPC Director of Policy & Planning

Chairperson: *(Translated):* Qujannamiik. We have just a short announcement. I think we forgot some introductions: Abraham Tagalik and Jacob Peter, contractors. We forgot to introduce them initially. Audrey Mainville. She is over there playing with her cellphone there. That is her. The receivers, when there is a person speaking, when you are hearing English translation, Inuktitut translation and not on a channel, just add it to the dial. You can hear other languages as well, so we will proceed now. Jonathan Savoy will be leading us through most of the day introducing the work that we have been doing for this coming week. You may proceed now, Jon.

Jonathan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. This is Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. As Andrew mentioned, I will be taking several hours likely to provide an overview of the content of the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. We will focus our discussion on areas and issues of most

importance here in the South Baffin region. So, some of the slides in the presentation we will pass over more quickly. In addition, I will attempt to incorporate responses to some common questions that have come up over the last year or so in discussions of this Draft Plan.

We will go through the document chapter by chapter. There are a number of maps included in the presentation. We do understand that the scale is often not great for seeing the details of these mapped areas, but I do encourage participants here today to review the larger-format maps that are on the wall at the back of the community hall here today.

To start off with just a bit of background, the Nunavut Planning Commission is of course, an Institution of Public Government established in 1993 under the *Nunavut Agreement*. The Planning Commission has the responsibility to develop, implement, and monitor land use plans that are intended to guide and direct resource use and development in the Nunavut Settlement Area. The Planning Commission is the entry point into Nunavut's regulatory system. That means we are the front door of the regulatory system and the first point of contact for project proponents that are coming into Nunavut looking to conduct activities out on the land or in the waters.

We currently have two existing approved regional land use plans, one in the Keewatin, or of course now the Kivalliq region, as well as the North Baffin Regional Land Use Plan. It is important to note that these land use plans were originally prepared in the 1980s and approved in the early 1990s. They then went through a review and amendment to make them more compatible with the *Nunavut Agreement* and were approved in their current state in the early 2000s. So, it has been quite some time since these two regional land use plans were developed. No other regional land use plans have been approved within Nunavut. The Nunavut Land Use Plan, once approved, will replace these two existing regional land use plans, and cover the remainder of Nunavut, including here in the South Baffin, for the very first time.

The current land use planning process for the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan really began in 2007, almost exactly 10 years ago, sorry 15 years ago, on November 10, 2007. The Commission approved what we call the *Broad Planning Policies, Objectives, and Goals* for land use planning in Nunavut. This document was prepared in close collaboration with the Government of Canada, the Government of Nunavut, as well as Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. This is a requirement of the *Nunavut Agreement* that sets the foundation or the framework for how land use planning in Nunavut is to occur.

In the mid-2000s, the Commission worked closely with the Government of Nunavut, the Government of Canada, as well as Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated to jointly develop these *Broad Planning Policies, Objectives, and Goals*. This document forms the foundation or the framework for the Nunavut Land Use Plan, and this is kind of the marching orders of what this Plan needs to accomplish as a direct extension of the requirements included in the *Nunavut Agreement* itself.

After achieving that milestone in 2007, the Commission began work to identify priority issues for consideration in the Nunavut land use planning process. That work led to a first Draft Plan being released in 2012 and further Draft Plans being released in 2014, 2016, and most recently in July of 2021. At every step of this process, the Commission has consulted broadly with communities as well as other interested participants through community workshops, technical meetings, attendance at different forums, as well as through written consultations.

We would just like to quickly emphasize the importance of community involvement in this planning process. Under the *Nunavut Agreement*, it is of primary importance that the Commission consult and engage with community members, not only within Nunavut but also in some transboundary or cross-border areas, including the folks with us today from Nunavik. There are five communities in Northern Quebec that have interest in lands and waters within Nunavut, as well as communities in Northern Manitoba and Saskatchewan that we have also consulted with.

Community members have participated in extensive mapping exercises to identify how community members are using the land. We will talk about all of this in more detail throughout the day. We have also identified many areas of importance to communities, again through group participatory mapping. We have, of course, reviewed the content of the different drafts of the Plan with community members to solicit feedback on the accuracy of the information, whether the identified issues are of priority to community members, and whether they support the proposed management approaches in the Draft Plans themselves. Of course, that continues here today with the community members that have been flown in to fully participate in this hearing where Commissioners throughout the course of the week will hear directly from you on your views on the Land Use Plan.

Another bit of background we want to note is that the Land Use Plan itself, we do have some copies available. They have been, of course, mailed to each community. There is a relatively short document, but it is supported by a much longer *Options and Recommendations Document*, which is not part of the formal Land Use Plan but provides background and detail on what information was considered by Commissioners in the preparation of the 2021 Draft Plan, and the rationale or the reasoning behind the recommended decisions that are included in the Land Use Plan itself.

Over the last 15 years, there has been a great deal of information collected. A lot of different perspectives from different participants have been received by the Commission. This is all compiled, analyzed, and presented in a consistent and transparent manner within the *Options and Recommendations Document*.

For the 2021 version of this background document, the Commission undertook a significant overhaul or revision to the *Options and Recommendations Document* in response to concerns from participants that it was not sufficiently detailed or transparent. So, part of the overhaul or revision to this document included developing a consistent and transparent set of rating criteria, as an example, for each and every issue that is identified in the document.

I just want to briefly outline the criteria that were used and how they were used to inform different decisions within the Land Use Plan itself. The first consideration that was made was to the overall importance of a given issue. We have been using the example that through the planning process, many participants identified the importance, for example, of caribou to people of Nunavut, as well as in other jurisdictions. That was clear that was a very important issue for the Land Use Plan to address. In comparison to that, there was relatively little call from participants to have the Land Use Plan to address muskox habitat. This is not to say that muskoxen are not important to the people of Nunavut, but it was of less importance than caribou, just as an example. For each issue, that factor was considered.

The next criterion was on defining geographic boundaries and how confident the Commission was within those boundaries. In some cases, the boundary can be very precisely known, so the example of a community drinking water supply watershed. It is based on topography, and that can be

measured with relatively high precision, whereas other areas including migratory wildlife habitat that can move over time, may be less certain. That was considered, again, for each and every issue.

The next criterion was the environmental and cultural importance of the issue. In the first example, I noted that caribou was broadly identified as being of great importance to the planning process. Within the third criterion, we were then able to distinguish between different types of caribou habitat for example. The Commission heard clearly that caribou calving areas were of very high importance, and perhaps other areas including fall habitat or rutting areas were somewhat less important than caribou calving areas or freshwater crossings, as an example.

In addition, under Number 4, the Commission also considered the nonrenewable resource transportation and linear infrastructure potential. So, we have identified these areas as having great environmental and cultural importance. There is also a need to consider what other values may be within these areas. So, things like mineral potential were considered for each and every area, as well as the potential for transportation. That can include on-land transportation or marine transportation.

The fifth factor was the sensitivity to impacts. All of these areas have some sensitivity to impacts from human use, other types of land uses that the Land Use Plan would manage. This allowed the Commission to distinguish between things like walrus haul-outs where the Commission heard very clearly that these areas are extremely sensitive to disturbance, and walrus are very vulnerable to things like stampedes if disturbed on their haul-outs. Again, this could be contrasted to things like walrus feeding areas where they may be less sensitive to disturbance.

Finally, Number 6: The Commission also considered what other regulatory tools are currently being used to manage a given issue. The Land Use Plan is not intended to duplicate management that other agencies are already providing. A good example is the issue of ballast water. Ships that enter Nunavut come in with ballast water within their hulls. Through existing regulations and international obligations, there are areas where ballast water needs to be exchanged based on federal and international regulations. When that issue was raised in the Nunavut planning process, it was determined that the Land Use Plan would not need to identify things like ballast water exchange zones because it was already being addressed. Of course, there are many other issues where there is not currently as robust a system in place. These are the areas where the Nunavut Land Use Plan is able to provide the most value.

We just wanted to spend some time here today to provide an overview of the approach that was taken by Commissioners when making the decisions in the current Draft Land Use Plan, only to emphasize that all of this is available in the *Options and Recommendations Document*. The Commission is very open to comment and feedback on this approach, but we recognize that it is beyond the scope of most participants to review all of this information in detail. We just wanted to provide an overview to note that it does exist. If you are interested in more detail on a specific issue, it can be found in that *Options and Recommendations Document*. For now, we will move that aside and focus on the Land Use Plan itself.

The 2021 Draft Plan, as with all previous versions of the Draft Plan, have six chapters. One is an introduction, which we will be going through shortly. Chapters 2 through 5 correspond to different goals from that 2007 *Broad Planning Policies, Objectives and Goals* document, and there is a

concluding Chapter 6, which is an Implementation Strategy required by the *Nunavut Agreement* to outline how the Land Use Plan will be used once it is approved.

On the right-hand side of this slide, you can see the large format poster map that is also, as I indicated earlier, on the wall at the back of the hall here today. This Map A is a key component we will be reviewing in detail that shows where different proposed rules would apply within the Draft Plan. Slide 10 and I think 11 in Inuktitut, provide a little more detail on these chapters. I would also just note that at the back of the Land Use Plan document itself, there is also a series of maps called Map B that talk about Valued Components, which we will discuss shortly, as well as different tables and appendices of additional information that are important to the functioning of the Plan. We won't be going through all of those in detail today, but if there are any questions, we would be happy to discuss those as appropriate.

Chapter 1 Overview:

Chapter 1, as I mentioned, serves as an introduction to the Land Use Plan. There is a lot of detail on process and history that I have sort of covered already, but there are a few key concepts within this chapter that we would like to highlight for participants here today to make sure that we are all on the same page and have a common understanding of some of the terminology and concepts that we will be referring to throughout the week.

We would first like to emphasize the jurisdiction of the Nunavut Planning Commission and the Nunavut Land Use Plan. The first point we want to emphasize is that the Land Use Plan will not apply to community or subsistence land use or harvesting. As community members, none of the proposed rules or Plan requirements as we say, would apply to your use of the land, waters, harvesting activities, camping, and things like that.

These Plan requirements are meant to guide how others use your land, so things like mineral exploration or tourism activities, whether that is a lodge or a cruise ship, would need to follow the requirements of this Land Use Plan. Also, things like scientific research that may be going on or different military exercises and training activities, again would need to follow these requirements, but not community members conducting traditional activities.

The map on this slide shows the Nunavut Settlement Area, which is defined in the *Nunavut Agreement* and differs importantly from the territory of Nunavut. The area highlighted on this map represents the Nunavut Settlement Area where the Commission has jurisdiction. You will note that it does not include all of Canada's waters within Baffin Bay, for example, out to the border with Greenland. Within Baffin Bay, there is a dark blue shaded area known as the Outer Land Fast Ice Zone, also defined in the *Nunavut Agreement*. The Commission's jurisdiction is extended a little bit within this area.

In addition, you will note that it does not include large portions of Hudson Bay and Hudson Strait. Again, these are territorial waters but not within the Nunavut Settlement Area itself. In addition, on this map you will see a number of areas shown in green. Of course, these are established parks. It is also important to note that the Nunavut Planning Commission does not have jurisdiction within established parks, as they are subject to their own planning processes.

Additionally, the Nunavut Planning Commission does have jurisdiction within municipal boundaries but only for certain uses. Here within the City of Iqaluit, for example, the Commission does not have authority to review things like new subdivisions and community infrastructure generally like new buildings or the new aquatic center that was built recently. That is not subject to the Nunavut Planning Commission's requirements, but some activities like quarries are reviewed by the Nunavut Planning Commission and would need to follow the requirements of the Nunavut Land Use Plan. In addition, things like the bulk storage of fuel or the deposit of waste by the city or municipality are reviewed by the Nunavut Planning Commission. For example, we did review the proposals for the new port facilities here and in other communities as well.

The last point I would like to make on jurisdiction is that the Land Use Plan does apply to both Crown lands as well as Inuit Owned Lands, both surface and subsurface. We have heard in previous hearings and through written submissions a number of concerns and recommended approaches for treating Inuit Owned Lands differently than Crown lands. The Commission is hearing those concerns and suggestions, and that will come up again likely through the week. It is clear, and everyone does agree, that the Land Use Plan does apply to both Crown and Inuit Owned Lands. The specific management of those different areas will be something that we will be hearing about throughout the week.

As I mentioned earlier, Map A identifies what we call Land Use Designations. We will be talking about that terminology again here in a few minutes. This map with the different coloured areas such as red areas, appreciating it is a little hard to see on the screen here, yellowish-orange areas, and more of a tan colour, set out different parts of the Nunavut Settlement Area where different types of management approaches are being proposed.

In this version of the Draft Plan, because there are so many different types of areas being identified, the Commission made the choice to split this Map A that we will spend so much talking about, into three different maps themselves. One provides an overview of the different land use designations. Map A2 provides an overview of just Limited Use designations, and Map A3 highlights the Conditional Use Areas. These are all folded up at the back of the Land Use Plan. If you have a copy, you can unfold those and see things at a better scale than on the handouts and on the screen.

There are three different types of land use designations included in the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. The terminology has changed somewhat over the years, but in the 2021 Draft Plan, the red areas on the map are known as Limited Use designations. They are the most restrictive type of land use designation, and they include at least one type of land use that is prohibited or not allowed at any time of the year. That is the strongest type of restriction that the Land Use Plan can provide. Certain activities are just not appropriate at any time of year in certain areas. There can also be other types of Plan requirements in these areas, but if it is a red Limited Use Area, then there is a prohibition or a restriction on certain activities.

The second type of land use designation is known as Conditional Use Areas. These areas provide a more flexible management approach. They include Plan requirements, such as seasonal restrictions. So, rather than having a restriction applying all year round, it would just be for a portion of the year, or things like setback requirements. A setback is just a minimum distance that a land user would need to stay away from an important feature. So, we have things like walrus haul-outs or migratory bird colonies where the Plan can require users stay a certain distance away from a shoreline, for

example. If there are those types of requirements for a given area, it is a Conditional Use Area under the framework of this Draft Plan.

The third type of land use designation is known as Mixed Use. Within these areas, all types of land use would be supported. So, there are no prohibited uses that would apply year-round, as well as no other Plan requirements such as those seasonal restrictions or setbacks.

However, it is important to note that over this 15-year planning process, the Commission has collected a great deal of information on all areas of Nunavut and has identified many areas of importance that are not reflected on Map A as a Limited Use or a Conditional Use Area. However, the Plan does include all of these additional areas as what we call Valued Components. That is what is shown in Map B, the smaller inset maps at the back of the main document.

We will be talking about these again throughout the week, but the basic function of identifying these Valued Components throughout the territory is not to provide specific direction on land users but to identify them and have that information be provided to project proponents looking to conduct activities for their use in the design of their projects, as well as to identify these values to other regulatory authorities who also have a mandate to review these projects in more detail.

I mentioned that the Nunavut Planning Commission is the entry point or the front door to Nunavut's regulatory process. Once the Planning Commission completes its review of a given project proposal, we pass that review on to other regulatory authorities, including some of our sister Institutions of Public Governments like the Nunavut Impact Review Board and the Nunavut Water Board, but also the landowner, whether that is the federal government or Regional Inuit Association or other authorizing agencies within government, for example different wildlife permits that may be needed or archeological access permits. So, having the Land Use Plan identify all of these additional values could be a helpful start to other regulatory authorities for further review of a given project proposal.

Through the planning process, a number of participants have expressed interest in the percentage of which land use designation is applying across the whole territory or within certain areas. This slide is a high-level overview of those area percentages. Later this afternoon, we will be going through a more detailed table, in particular highlighting different breakdowns of percentages for the Qikiqtaaluk region.

For now, I will just highlight that in the 2021 Draft Plan, over 65% of Nunavut is included in the Mixed Use land use designation. Again, this is the most flexible land use designation where all uses would be supported. Over 9% are included in the Conditional Use designation. Again, in these areas, no uses are outright prohibited, but there would be different Plan requirements that would need to be followed. A little over 22% of the territory is included in Limited Use designations, the most restrictive red area shown on Map A. Finally, a little over 3% are included in areas outside the Planning Commission's jurisdiction, for example within established parks.

A final note from Chapter 1 is that I mentioned several times the idea of seasonal restrictions being an important part of the Land Use Plan, in particular in Conditional Use Areas as well as some Limited Use Areas. We just wanted to note here that in Chapter 1, there is a framework for the Commission's reliance on the six traditional Inuit seasons that are more appropriate to the environment here in Nunavut for guiding these seasonal restrictions in the Land Use Plan. In addition, there is a table at the back of the Land Use Plan that adjusts the calendar dates for each

of these seasons for different areas of Nunavut. We have used the example that freeze-up would occur earlier in Grise Fjord than it would in Sanikiluaq. Those calendar dates appropriate to each of the six seasons are set out in a table at the back of the Land Use Plan.

That concludes a fairly quick overview of Chapter 1. Chapter 2 is the first...

Chairperson: Jonathan, before you go to the next chapter, we will take a quick 10-minute break to get some coffee and tea.

Break

Chapter 2 Overview:

Jonathan: *(Audio recording for the first portion of Chapter 2 is not available. The following is an approximation):*

Chapter 2 is on Protecting and Sustaining the Environment. You can see listed on the screen here the different topics that are considered within this chapter. I will go through each of them in turn, again focusing on those of greatest interest to those of us gathered here today.

Key Migratory Bird Habitat Sites

The first subsection of Chapter 2 deals with key migratory bird habitat sites. The Commission has collected a great deal of information on migratory bird habitat throughout the territory. The vast majority of this information has been provided initially by the Canadian Wildlife Service with Environment and Climate Change Canada. They had initially identified a variety of different bird habitats across the territory and provided specific recommendations on the importance of each of these areas.

The Commission has chosen to break this information down into three different classes of migratory bird habitat sites. Class 1 locations are shown on the left-hand side of this slide in red. Within these Class 1 migratory habitat sites, the Draft Plan proposes a number of uses to be prohibited or not allowed. That includes industrial uses such as mineral exploration and development, oil and gas exploration and development, as well as things like quarrying of granular resources, as well as hydroelectric power generation and large-scale wind turbines.

In addition to these prohibited uses, the Draft Plan also identifies detailed setback requirements or minimum distances that land users need to stay away from, particularly important areas within the larger Limited Use designation. For example, nesting areas on cliffs or bird colonies have proposed setbacks. Those are different for each type of land use, so there is aerial or altitude restrictions for aircraft, whether airplanes or helicopters, as well as different distances for boats or marine vessels that would come close to coastal habitats, and also land-based setbacks for land users who would be approaching from the land side of any of these locations.

Again, all of these restrictions would not apply to community land users going out to harvest birds, for example. This would not apply to those users. But for example, tourism would be permitted in these Limited Use Areas, and any tourist vessels or lodge activities would need to abide or follow these setbacks.

(Audio begins mid-sentence): ...approach, in particular, those raised by Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated along with the Regional Inuit Association about restrictions being proposed on Inuit Owned Lands, as well as requirements for Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements to be negotiated for some of these locations.

On the right-hand side of this slide, we can see Class 2 migratory bird habitat sites shown in orange colour. A large area near Iqaluit out in Frobisher Bay leading into Baffin Bay has been identified as a largely marine area where setbacks would apply from key features. Again, this a Conditional Use Area with no outright prohibitions but a number of setback requirements.

In addition, we can see an example of Class 3 migratory bird habitat sites, which is identified as a Valued Component. In this case, near the Community of Pangnirtung in Cumberland Sound, there is a large yellow-coloured area on the south and western shores of Cumberland Sound that is identified as being important for migratory birds but does not include detailed setback requirements or any prohibited uses. It is included as a Valued Component for consideration by project proponents and other regulatory authorities.

Caribou Habitat

The next subsection of Chapter 2 deals with the very important issue of caribou. Throughout the planning process, this has been a key part of the discussions, and there are several different types of caribou habitat identified in the 2021 Draft Plan. On Slide 24, we can see both caribou calving and post-calving areas identified as Limited Use designations with the year-round prohibition on several types of land uses, similar to what I mentioned previously for the migratory birds. They would come with restrictions on mineral exploration and production, oil and gas, all-weather roads, quarries, and again large-scale turbines, wind turbines, as well as hydroelectric power generation.

For these types of caribou habitat, it is important to note that the Government of Nunavut provided a very detailed analysis of caribou habitat throughout their seasonal ranges throughout the year, but on Baffin Island and within the islands of Nunavut generally, the Government of Nunavut did not have sufficient caribou collaring information to conduct the statistical analysis they relied on for the mainland caribou herds.

The Government of Nunavut has been the primary provider of much of the Commission's information on caribou, but here in the South Baffin, you can see some large yellow shaded areas on these maps. They were identified by the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board who worked directly with the Hunters and Trappers Organizations for all communities in the region. This submission was in response to the 2016 Draft Plan, so these are new additional areas that have been included in this Draft Plan for the first time. It is a good demonstration of the Commission giving equal weight to both the scientific information as provided by the Government of Nunavut for the mainland, along with Traditional Knowledge or Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit on Baffin Island, giving great weight to both those types of information.

As with many issues in the Draft Plan, the subject of caribou and caribou habitat has been extensive, and there have been a variety of different perspectives on how the Land Use Plan should manage these areas. We have noted that some participants support the proposed approach in the Draft Land Use Plan of providing Limited Use designations with year-round prohibitions. Some other participants have recommended that a seasonal restriction would be more appropriate for caribou calving, post-calving areas. Again, there have been concerns expressed about year-round restrictions on Inuit Owned Lands and the need for an alternative approach to be taken on them.

In addition, I would note that for the information provided by the Government of Nunavut on again the mainland caribou herds, there were very detailed dates for when caribou were relying on these different types of habitats. That has been incorporated into the Land Use Plan as well, but for the information provided by the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board who worked with the Hunters and Trappers Organizations, those detailed dates were not provided and were not available to the Commission when preparing this Draft Plan.

So, there is a bit of a gap in the Land Use Plan right now where the Commission is proposing both year-round prohibitions on caribou calving grounds as well as seasonal restrictions on other types of land use that may be appropriate in the area and would conform, but the Commission does not currently have for caribou calving and post-calving within the herds on Baffin Island, for example.

Slide 25 identifies caribou key access corridors, which are important parts of caribou migration that were identified by the Government of Nunavut, again based on collaring data. We note that none of those areas have been identified within the Qikiqtaaluk region. In addition, the Commission has identified many caribou freshwater crossings that are used by caribou during their migration. Again, none of these locations have been identified within the Qikiqtaaluk region. Both of those are also include as Limited Use Areas in the Draft Plan.

On Slide 26, we have caribou sea ice crossings shown on the left-hand side of the slide. There are a few identified near Igloolik and Sanirajak, for example. These areas are included in the Draft Plan as Conditional Use Areas with seasonal restrictions on shipping during the frozen water seasons in order to allow caribou to continue to cross the sea ice during their migration.

On the right-hand side, we also have shown important Peary caribou areas. Of course, this is relevant to the communities of Resolute Bay and Grise Fjord, so I will just quickly note here today that they are also included as Limited Use Areas in the Draft Plan.

We also have on Slide 27 caribou winter ranges. In some instances, on the mainland for example, they are included as Valued Components, as those habitats were considered to be of less importance than some other types of habitats on the mainland. On the islands, caribou winter habitat was identified as often being very important, and some of these areas are included as Limited Use designations as well.

On the right-hand side of the slide, we also have caribou migration corridors. These areas are identified as Valued Components, again those being identified for participants gathered here today, just in the communities of Igloolik and Sanirajak.

The final slide on caribou identifies caribou summer and late summer areas, as well as caribou rutting areas of the right-hand side. Again, this information was provided by the Government of Nunavut but was not available for the Qikiqtaaluk region. They are identified as Valued Components generally.

Polar Bear Denning Areas

Slide 29 identifies on the left-hand side polar bear denning areas. These areas have been identified by a number of different sources, including Commission's direct consultations with community members, information provided with the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board who worked with the Hunters and Trappers Organizations of the region, as well as information provided by the Government of Nunavut and World Wildlife Fund.

This is an example of a fairly unique Plan requirement where polar bear denning areas are assigned a Conditional Use designation with seasonal requirements. In this case, during polar bear denning season, project proponents that are proposing to conduct earth-moving activities or something that would disturb the snow that the bears are denning in such as drilling, blasting, or the use of heavy equipment, would first need to have a polar bear monitor conduct a survey of the area they are looking to conduct those activities in.

If the polar bear monitor identifies any dens or suspected active polar bear dens, they would then need to implement a 1-kilometre setback from the area that was identified until the polar bear monitor confirms that the bears have left the dens and the general area. So, rather than a specific hard stop on activities seasonally, this would only apply to some activities that would have the potential to disturb or damage the dens. There is a requirement for a procedure to take place, in this case a survey conducted by a polar bear monitor.

The feedback to this approach has generally been positive, and most participants have expressed support for this approach, but as with all issues, the Commission remains very much open to feedback on whether this is an appropriate approach or if it can be improved.

Walrus Haul-Outs

The right-hand side of Slide 29 shows identified walrus haul-outs. These, of course, are areas along the shore where walrus haul themselves out of the water during open water months. As I mentioned earlier in a previous example, many participants identified the high degree of sensitivity to walrus when they are gathered together at these locations.

Information again was collected from a variety of sources, including the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board, NPC's direct community engagements, as well as a very detailed study provided by World Wildlife Fund Canada.

For these areas, the Draft Plan proposes a Limited Use designation with year-round restrictions on a number of land use activities, but also very detailed setback requirements for other activities. So, depending on the size of ships or boats approaching the walrus haul-outs sites, there are different

minimum distances that the vessels would need to stay away from these locations that would apply to things like film crews or tourism activities, but again importantly, not to community vessels.

There are also different setbacks for land-based activities as well as different types of aircraft that would be flying over these important locations. This is another example of an area where feedback on the Draft Plan has generally been positive. We look forward to hearing any further thoughts from participants during this hearing on the management of these areas.

Whale Calving Areas and Atlantic Cod Lakes

Slide 30 identifies beluga and narwhal calving areas. A lot of this information is newly included in the 2021 Draft Plan. It is important to note that a different approach was taken for each of these types of whale calving habitat depending on the location and extent of the identified calving areas. This will also apply to bowhead calving areas, which are on the next slide.

In some instances, for example, in Clearwater Fjord near the Community of Pangnirtung, the beluga calving areas are Limited Use with restrictions on activities and vessels from entering these areas during calving season. Of course, Clearwater Fjord is a relatively small fjord or inlet separated from major shipping routes within the territory. The impact of restricting shipping in these areas was considered by the Commission to be acceptable. However, as you can see, some of the larger areas identified on these maps overlap significantly with the areas used within Nunavut for shipping.

This is an example of the Commission relying on the potential for nonrenewable resources, transportation, and linear infrastructure to directly influence the recommended approach for the management of these areas. So, where the identified areas are larger and include significant overlap with shipping areas, the Commission has recommended a Valued Component identification for these areas rather than Limited Use. Again, this same approach was taken for beluga, narwhal, and bowhead calving areas shown on Slide 31.

The right-hand side of Slide 31 shows some small Atlantic cod lakes. Sorry, Goump, can we switch the slide? Thanks. These are a handful of unique locations where populations of Atlantic cod have evolved within coastal or tidal lakes. So, within these very small locations, there are unique populations of Arctic cod that live in these lakes that are I guess of some interest and importance due to their uniqueness.

Throughout the planning process, the Commission has been made aware of these areas, but there was very little support for including specific land use designations for these small lakes. As a result, the Commission has chosen in this version of the Draft Plan to identify them as Valued Components without specific management requirements beyond that.

Polynyas, Other Marine Areas of Importance, and Transboundary Considerations

Slide 32 shows a few different types of marine areas that have generally been identified. On the left-hand side we see what are called Ecologically and Biologically Significant Areas. That, of course, is a bit of a mouthful, but it basically refers to important marine areas that have been identified by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans for their importance to a variety of species.

These areas were identified in the land use planning process but did not come with specific recommendations on how the areas should be managed through the Nunavut Land Use Plan specifically. The Commission has chosen to include these areas in the Draft Plan as Valued Components for consideration.

On the right-hand side of the slide, we also see polynyas or areas that are frequently open water during the winter months. They can be very important habitat and feeding areas for a variety of wildlife. In the 2021 Draft Plan, the Commission has recommended that they generally be included as Valued Components, but it is important to note that some polynyas have been treated differently, for example, some of those associated with migratory bird habitat sites.

On Slide 33, we also see on the right-hand side the North Water or Savarjuaq Polynya near Grise Fjord that is considered for joint management by the Inuit of Nunavut and Inuit of Greenland. In this case, the Commission has proposed a Conditional Use designation to seasonally restrict ship traffic from entering the small portion of the area that overlaps with the Nunavut Settlement Area.

This is an example of a transboundary consideration or an area that goes across borders. I just want to note that the Areas of Equal Use and Occupancy, as they are known between the Inuit of Nunavut and Nunavik that we will be talking a great deal about this week, are not included in this section in Chapter 2. They could be, but the Commission has chosen to include that particular area of overlap in Chapter 4 on Building Healthier Communities. We will be reviewing those areas this afternoon.

Climate Change

The final note in Chapter 2, and we don't have a slide for it, but the topic is addressed in Chapter 2 on climate change. The Commission is aware of different concerns arising due to a changing climate and the accelerated effects here in the Arctic. While there are no specific land use designations or Plan requirements at this time associated with climate change, we do want to note that it was a consideration in the Commission's assessment of all of the different areas and issues included in the Draft Plan.

We point to some examples, including the effects of climate change on caribou that are making them more vulnerable, including things like increased icing events. This makes it more difficult for caribou to access their forage through the snow, and now thicker layers of ice during the winter. As well, there is increased insect harassment in the summer months due to a warming climate, and also the effects of increased numbers of forest fires in the southern portions of the range in other regions.

In addition, the Commission considered the effects of climate change on polar bear, for example, due to declining periods of stable sea ice. Again, although there are no specific designations or Plan requirements, the impacts of climate change on species within Nunavut was a consideration in the Commission's decisions to include management approaches in the Draft Plan for these species.

That concludes the overview of Chapter 2. The next chapter, I believe we will get to this afternoon. I will stop and turn it back to the Chair. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik, Jonathan. We are heading towards lunchtime. We can take a break and start again at 1:15. Be back here at 1:15. If you want to go for lunch, bring your nametag, and you can go into the Legion. The same thing is for this evening. If you want to go for supper at the Legion, just bring your pass. You can have access. That is good. We will see you this afternoon.

Lunch Break

Chairperson: We can proceed once again. Jonathan Savoy is still going through the introduction.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. This is Jonathan Savoy again with the Nunavut Planning Commission. I hope everyone had a nice lunch break and made it back.

Chapter 3 Overview:

We are going to continue our review with Chapter 3 on the goal of Encouraging Conservation Planning. As I noted this morning, the Nunavut Planning Commission does not have jurisdiction within fully established national and territorial parks, as well as fully established national marine conservation areas, but we still do have jurisdiction within those areas as they are going through the process of being established, as well as still having jurisdiction within established conservation areas, including things like national wildlife areas and migratory bird sanctuaries.

This chapter is about encouraging this goal of Encouraging Conservation Planning, and we will similarly go through each topic in turn with the associated maps.

Parks Awaiting Full Establishment, Proposed Parks & National Marine Conservation Areas

The first subsection on Slide 35 is for future national and territorial parks. It is important to note that many of Nunavut's territorial parks in particular, are not yet fully established. Many of these areas have signage and websites, and many people think they are fully and finally established, but there is still outstanding paperwork and agreements to be reached.

Many of the yellow dots shown on the left-hand side of the slide correspond to relatively small territorial parks that are not yet fully established. They are all included in the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan as Limited Use Areas with year-round prohibitions on several, mostly industrial activities, including mineral exploration and production, oil and gas, as well as things like hydroelectric power generation, and quarries.

The most significant area within the Southern Baffin region is of course Katannilik Territorial Park along the Soper River south of Iqaluit and north of Kimmirut. There are some proposed territorial parks within the region further north, including the Aggutinni Territorial Park near Clyde River, as well as the Fossil Forests on Axel Heiberg Island that are considered as being potential territorial parks. Those are also included as Limited Use designations in the current Draft.

There are currently no proposed national parks within Nunavut, but there are small portions that are still awaiting full incorporation into existing national parks. The right-hand side of this slide shows the proposed national marine conservation area in Lancaster Sound and the surrounding areas, or Tallurutiup Imanga National Marine Conservation Area. This important area, once it is fully established, will also no longer be within the jurisdiction of the Nunavut Land Use Plan, but at this time, that agreement is not yet finalized, and it is included as a Limited Use designation in the Draft Plan.

National Wildlife Areas and Migratory Bird Sanctuaries

Slide 36 shows on the left-hand side national wildlife areas. These are established conservation areas managed by Environment and Climate Change Canada. There are a few of these areas in the region, in particular around the Community of Qikiqtarjuaq. They are included as Limited Use designations in the Draft Plan with year-round prohibitions on that same list of industrial activities, as well as setback requirements around some important features within the existing wildlife areas.

Similarly on the right-hand side of the slide, we see migratory bird sanctuaries throughout the territory. In particular, north of Kinngait, there is a large bird sanctuary. These are also included as Limited Use designations with year-round prohibitions as well as setback requirements from important bird habitat.

This is another area of the Land Use Plan where there has been some disagreement on the recommended approach for the Land Use Plan in dealing with the areas. Commissioners chose to include the Limited Use designation as supported by some participants. Others have noted that the inclusion of year-round prohibitions in the Draft Plan in a Limited Use designation may go beyond what was contemplated in the existing Inuit Impact and Benefits Agreements and that this is inappropriate, and the Land Use Plan should instead pass all of these project proposals onto the existing area co-management committees for their consideration. As with all issues, the Commission looks forward to any further feedback on this and other topics.

National and Territorial Historic Sites

Slide 37 deals on the left-hand side with historic sites. We would like to point out that this by no means represents the extent of historic or cultural sites within the territory, but in this chapter, we are only referring to national historic sites as well as territorial historical sites that are established under legislation.

There are several of these locations shown as green dots. They are generally smaller locations not able to be seen at this scale, but they are included in the Draft Plan, again as Limited Use designations with year-round restrictions on many activities.

Canadian Heritage Rivers

The right-hand side of this slide shows Canadian Heritage Rivers. Again, this is not representative of all rivers of cultural significance in the territory, but only those identified under the Canadian Heritage River system.

Here in the Qikiqtaaluk region, there is one Canadian heritage river. That is the Soper River near Kimmirut. In this case, we talked about Katannilik Territorial Park being centered around the Soper River, but we would like to note that in the case of the management plan for the Soper River, it identifies the importance of the entire watershed, or areas that collect water that flow in the Soper River. The Commission has chosen to identify the portion of the Soper River Watershed that lies beyond Katannilik Territorial Park as a Limited Use designation with those same sorts of prohibited uses.

Once again, there is a range of views on this area, including support for a Limited Use designation as well as concerns that the inclusion of this Limited Use Area goes beyond what was contemplated with the Canadian Heritage River Management Plan, which does not have what we call regulatory teeth or effect. So, land users in the area are not required to follow any particular guidance.

Nonetheless, the Commission has heard from participants of the importance of these rivers and has proposed different management approaches depending on the management plan for each river. So, I won't go through the other heritage river approaches in the other regions, but they are different depending on the guidance provided in their respective management plans.

Wildlife Sanctuaries and Marine Protected Areas

On the next Slide 38, we have the Thelon Wildlife Sanctuary in the Kivalliq and Kitikmeot. That is included as a Limited Use designation. I'll just note that for reference.

On the right-hand side of the slide, we have Marine Protected Areas that are being proposed or considered under the *Oceans Act*. These are particular conservation areas that are able to be established by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. There are currently none within Nunavut, but there are two initiatives underway.

One is more advanced off the northern shore of Ellesmere and Axel Heiberg Island, sometimes referred to as the Last Ice Area. This area is included as a Valued Component, and discussions are still ongoing regarding the future management of this area. In addition, more recently, the area around Southampton Island in the Kivalliq region has been identified as a study area. That is also included as a Valued Component for consideration by project proponents and other regulatory authorities.

That concludes Chapter 3, Encouraging Conservation Planning. I think some of the more relevant areas here in the Southern Baffin region would be the Katannilik Territorial Park and some historical sites, as well as the Soper River Watershed.

Chapter 4 Overview

Chapter 4 is a very important part of the Land Use Plan that supports the goal of Building Healthier Communities. *(Mic went off; Came in mid-sentence)* ...agreement generally, as well as the concerns within Chapter 2, conservation areas in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 focuses on areas identified by communities as Community Areas of Interest.

(Audio unavailable for several minutes. The following is an approximation):

Community Areas of Interest:

The first subsection is entitled Community Areas of Interest. This is a term included in the Draft Plan referring to areas identified by communities for their importance for community use and wellbeing.

On-Ice Travel Routes

The first component of Community Areas of Interest applies Nunavut-wide. This is for community on-ice travel routes. As mostly coastal people, all communities rely on the sea ice for travel during the winter, both to harvesting and camping areas, as well as between communities. There is clear concern about potential shipping during the ice-covered months disrupting the ability of communities to travel and potentially creating safety concerns for community members who are already out and encountering ship tracks through sea ice.

The 2021 Draft Plan proposes a new approach to managing these areas through a Conditional Use land use designation that would require project proponents that are interested in conducting shipping through ice to first contact all municipalities through both the Municipal Council as well as the Hunters and Trappers Organizations within 300 kilometers of any point of intersection between the mapped community travel routes and the proposed ship track.

In this case, it is another fairly unique example of a Plan requirement, sort of like the polar bear conditions I mentioned. Those were a little bit different in that it is not an outright seasonal restriction or something like a setback that is most commonly used in the Draft Plan in Conditional Use Areas.

In this case, the project proposals would conform to the Plan as drafted, but these project proponents looking to conduct the activities would then need to get in contact with the Municipal Council and Hunters and Trappers Organization and discuss potential solutions to address the concern about ship traffic and on-ice travel.

I think there are a few reasons for this general approach from the Commission's perspective, in part because there are so many community on-ice travel routes, as shown on the map, and so many different scales of project proposals, from a single one-time transit up to a project that could include multiple transits every day or week or month.

The Commission did not recommend specific requirements that would need to be followed by project proponents, but this more general requirement for communication and consultation has

been proposed in the 2021 Draft Plan. We have heard from a number of participants some concern with this approach that it does not go far enough towards restricting shipping activities during the winter months and that other alternatives should be considered in the development of the Draft Plan.

I should also note that the collection of these on-ice travel routes yet again has relied on a number of different information sources. A major contributor to this information here in the Qikiqtaaluk region was the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board, again providing very detailed submissions after working with the Hunters and Trappers Organizations in the region. In addition, some on-ice travel routes were identified through existing documentation prepared through the Department of Fisheries and Oceans for the Northwest Passage in particular. As of the 2021 Draft, there is a fairly detailed record of these routes throughout the region.

Regional Community Areas of Interest

(Audio resumed mid-sentence): ... things like mineral exploration, oil and gas, hydroelectric development, quarries, and large-scale wind turbines. Moving a bit further south again, on the right-hand side of the slide, we see the area around Nettling Lake shown in a lighter green colour. This area for many years has been identified by several communities in the region as being of great importance to community use and harvesting, as well as different wildlife values that exist. For example, community members from Pangnirtung, Iqaluit, and Cape Dorset, all highlighted the importance of this area during community consultations. It is again included as a Limited Use designation with year-round restrictions on many activities.

I will note that these community areas of interest are not entirely comprehensive or reflective of the full scope of information that has been provided to the Commission directly by communities. There are a few more in other regions that I will skip over at this time.

Community-Identified Priority Areas & Use and Occupancy Mapping

I will go to Slide 45, which is admittedly challenging to read or interpret, but it is important to recognize that these two maps represent a great deal of information that the Commission has collected from community members. This information has been incorporated in other parts of the Land Use Plan including the Community Areas of Interest we just discussed. All of this information collectively is included in the Draft Plan as Valued Component for consideration by project proponents and other regulatory authorities.

On the left-hand side of this slide, this is an attempt to illustrate some indication of the scope of information that has been provided, but I can tell you that there are over 3,000 individual areas included in that map for which the Commission has specific comments on why the community values each particular area. Some of them are at a very fine scale, very precise, and some of them are broader and more general.

All of that information the Commission considers to be helpful to project proponents when they are designing their specific projects and to other regulatory authorities when they conduct further reviews of the specific project proposals. Including this information in the Nunavut Land Use Plan

will ensure that the information provided by community members over the last 15 years is maintained and presented to the relevant parties in the regulatory process, which will hopefully prevent community members from having to endlessly repeat themselves at different consultations in the future as these project proposals are reviewed in their areas.

In addition, the right-hand side of this slide shows what we call Use and Occupancy Mapping information. This was collected by our staff members, led by Brian and including Annie and Tommy who are translating here today for us. They travelled to communities and conducted one-and-one interviews with land users in the community to record very precisely how they have used the land within living memory.

As with the other areas we just discussed, this information has generally been considered in the evaluation of different options for each area that has been identified, but it is also collectively included in the 2021 Draft Plan as a Valued Component. These different individual point locations can also be summarized for use by project proponents and other regulatory authorities. Currently this map of information represents over 10,000 individual locations.

Transboundary Considerations

I will quickly note on Slide 46 that the Commission has a mandate and a requirement to engage with the Denesųliné of Northern Manitoba and Saskatchewan. As you may know, negotiations are underway for the agreement of rights and interests of the Dene within portions of the Southern Kivalliq. Those negotiations are ongoing. At their conclusion, it is anticipated that our Commission will have two alternate Denesųliné members, similar to the way we have alternate members appointed by Makavik representing the region of Nunavik. Those areas are included in the Draft Plan as Valued Components.

Areas of Equal Use and Occupancy and Unincorporated Communities

On Slide 47, we turn to a similar issue but more relevant to our discussions here today. The areas shown in orange on the left-hand side of this slide are the Areas of Equal and Occupancy. These of course, are areas identified under the *Nunavut Agreement* as being equally used by the Inuit of Nunavut and the Inuit of Nunavik who are mostly here with us today. Hopefully the remainder will be arriving soon.

These areas are within the Nunavut Settlement Area and within the Nunavut Planning Commission's jurisdiction, but there are structures in place to provide the Inuit of Nunavik to have an important role in the management of these areas. That includes having our friends with us today from communities in Northern Quebec, as well as Charlie with us today as part of the Commission.

Through our consultations, the Commission identified a wide variety of values on these islands and marine areas. In previous versions of the Draft Plan, they had actually proposed what would be the equivalent of a Limited Use designation for these areas in recognition of the importance placed on them by community members. However, in response to the 2016 Draft Plan, there was very little support for including these areas as Limited Use designations with year-round prohibitions. Notably, the representative organizations of Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated as well as Makavik

Corporation were strongly opposed to having these designations included in the Land Use Plan. In consideration of those concerns, the Commission has adjusted the 2021 Draft Plan to identify the areas as Valued Components with no specific Plan requirements.

However, it should be noted that there are instances of land use designation being applied within these Areas of Equal Use and Occupancy for other values discussed throughout the Plan. I did not point them out specifically, but there are polar bear denning areas, for example within the Areas of Equal Use and Occupancy. There are walrus haul-outs within these areas designated respectively as Conditional Use for the polar bear denning and Limited Use for the walrus haul-outs, as well as portions of key migratory bird habitat sites with year-round restrictions as well as setback requirements.

Additionally, there are also community on-ice travel routes that overlap with these Areas of Equal Use and Occupancy. Again, we look forward to hearing from all participants this week on the management of these areas through the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan and emphasize that the overall areas have been changed from Limited Use in 2016 to a Valued Component in this Draft Plan, but there are some other overlapping values that have been designated in some cases.

The right-hand side of this slide shows what are called Unincorporated Communities. I will just mention in passing that these are Limited Use designations as well and are only applicable to the communities of Bathurst Inlet and Umingmaktok within the Kitikmeot region. These are not outpost camps, for example. They are not fully established municipalities but are rather considered to be Unincorporated Communities that do not have government support for example. Again, that only applies to those two communities in the Kitikmeot, so I will quickly pass over that.

Community Drinking Water Supplies

Slide 48 on the left-hand side shows community drinking water supply watersheds. I will note that each community has an approved and implemented community land use plan. That applies to all of your communities within municipal boundaries. They all have measures in place to manage your drinking water supplies.

In some cases, which applies to most of the communities gathered here today, the community drinking water supply is entirely contained within your municipal boundary, and your community plan manages land use in those areas. However, some communities, and the Community of Pangnirtung is a great example, the drinking water is drawn from a river that flows into the community from further up in the mountains. In this case, for that portion of the community's drinking water supply or the watershed, the area that catches the water that you use for your community's drinking, goes beyond municipal boundaries where the community itself does not have jurisdiction.

This is a great example of how the Nunavut Land Use Plan can support community planning and community wellbeing by extending those management approaches to areas outside of your jurisdiction. As I said, with the Community of Pang, that is the case. The other communities within this region are entirely contained within the municipal boundary. I will note for here in the City of Iqaluit, which has had very prominent concerns with its drinking water supply in the last several

years, there has been a secondary drinking water supply that has been identified that does extend beyond your municipal boundary. That is not included in this current Draft.

However, the Government of Nunavut has provided the Commission with information on the extent of this watershed that goes beyond the city boundaries and has recommended that this secondary water supply be included as a Valued Component. So, once the record closes, Commissioners will be giving full consideration of how to incorporate this area into the revised Nunavut Land Use Plan. We do welcome feedback, in particular, from the City of Iqaluit on their preferred management of this area, again beyond municipal boundaries.

I should also note that for the areas within municipal boundaries, the Draft Plan does identify these areas as Valued Components, so that would be considered by any project proponent or regulatory authority, and any activities would still need to apply with the approved land use plans of each community.

Priority Contaminated Sites

On the right-hand side of this slide, we see priority contaminated sites. Just like heritage rivers or historic sites, this is not meant to reflect the full extent of contaminated or waste sites within the territory.

The federal government maintains a detailed inventory of contaminated sites across the territory, and they have done work to assess and remediate many of these locations. They have sort of ratings or rankings assigned to the different contaminated sites that are known across the territory.

In the 2021 Draft Plan, it has been proposed that the Planning Commission identify what are called priority sites that would be particular harmful to human health and wellbeing and include Limited Use designations for those priority sites of most concern until they are remediated, and potentially after remediation to also maintain restrictions on some of these areas including for example on landfills and things that could potentially be harmful into the future as well, if inappropriate uses were conducted in those areas.

Military Facilities

Slide 49 identifies military facilities. Of course, there are many different facilities and installations across the Arctic, including within Nunavut. You can see very prominently the former DEW Line or North Warning System sites that span the full width of the territory. There are also other military facilities, including the port now at Nanisivik as well as further north with things like Alert and Eureka, and different communication facilities linking those two.

Across all of these facilities, there is a common concern about other land users impacting on this existing infrastructure and having interference from different types of activities on things like radar installations, as an example. So, for these existing military facilities that are outside of municipal boundaries, the Commission has proposed a Limited Use designation with year-round restrictions on activities considered to be incompatible with the infrastructure at these sites.

Similar to the drinking water supplies, the Commission has taken the approach of just identifying facilities within municipal boundaries as Valued Components for consideration. For example, in Sanirajak, we know that there is a facility within municipal boundaries. The Commission's Land Use Plan is not proposing to interfere with the existing management framework for the military facility and municipal infrastructure.

Alternative Energy Sources

The last section here in Chapter 4, on the left-hand side you see alternative energy sources. At this time, the only alternative energy sources that were considered as part of this planning process were for potential hydroelectric power generation. The Qulliq Energy Corporation several years ago conducted studies of the Kivalliq region generally as well as options for the City of Iqaluit.

One particular location is included in the Draft Plan for the City of Iqaluit near Jaynes Inlet to the south of the city. Previous versions of the Draft Plan had included designations that would restrict other potential activities in these areas in order to maintain their potential for future development. However, during consultations during the previous 2016 Draft Plan, again there was very little support expressed for this approach. In response, in the 2021 Draft Plan, the Commission revised the recommendation and included a Valued Component identification for these sites, including the location at Jaynes Inlet. This in no way indicates that these projects will be developed. It just flags these locations as potential opportunities for future development.

Aerodrones

Lastly, this slide also identifies aerodrones, which is basically a funny word for the area around each community's airport. When this planning process began, not all communities had approved Transport Canada regulations for the management of land uses around the airports. Since that time, all Nunavut communities have had approved regulations to manage this very important issue. At this time, the Draft Plan simply identifies these areas as Valued Components for consideration by proponents and other regulatory authorities. The existing regulations would apply to any project proposals within these areas around each community's airport.

Chairperson: Jonathan, before you go on to the next chapter, I would just like to acknowledge the Premier P.J. Akeeagok. Welcome to the proceedings. Welcome.

(Applause)

Go ahead, Jonathan.

Chapter 5 Overview

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission, and a warm welcome to the Premier.

The next chapter is on the goal of Encouraging Sustainable Economic Development. If you recall, we went through different environmental concerns, and Protecting and Sustaining the Environment. We then touched on conservation initiatives under Chapter 3: Encouraging Conservation Planning. We then covered areas of importance to communities and community wellbeing under Chapter 4: Building Healthier Communities. Now we turn to Chapter 5, the important goal of Encouraging Sustainable Economic Development. There are four different subsections in this chapter. As with others, we will go through them in turn.

Mineral Potential & Oil and Gas Potential

The first subsection is on mineral exploration and production. Throughout the planning process, discussion around economic development has in large part been driven by mineral exploration and development, and many participants in this planning process have emphasized the importance of this industry to the territory and its economic wellbeing.

Through the planning process, the Commission has long sought information on mineral potential within the territory. When the 2021 Draft Plan was being prepared, the Commission largely relied on information provided by the federal government that was given to us with the title of *Areas with Evidence for Mineral Potential*. This was a single layer shown on the left-hand side of this slide in a lighter orange colour. It is kind of a presence or absence indicator. In these lighter shaded orange areas, you can see large portions in Southern Baffin Island as well as Sanikiluaq are identified as Areas with Evidence for Mineral Potential.

Also shown on this slide are a darker orange colour, indicating areas with existing mineral rights. I will note that all of this information was considered for every other individual topic considered in the Land Use Plan. I mentioned this morning in the *Options and Recommendations Document*, there is a subsection for each issue on nonrenewable resource potential and transportation potential as well.

This information, both the areas with evidence for mineral potential and the existing mineral rights, which we will talk about more in the next chapter, were considered every time the Commission made a recommendation, whether that was for caribou habitat, Community Areas of Interest, or community drinking water supplies.

There are no specific designations for any of this mineral exploration and production information, but this generalized layer of areas with evidence for mineral potential is included in the Draft Plan as another Valued Component, again for consideration by project proponents and other regulatory authorities.

As I indicated previously, there will be a more extensive discussion on existing mineral rights and the unique approach to managing those areas in Chapter 6: The Implementation Strategy that we will get to shortly.

The right-hand side of this slide shows oil and gas exploration and production areas. In this case, there is no known information in the Southern Qikiqtaaluk region. The information considered in this subsection is for existing oil and gas significant discovery licenses. You can see these in blue north of Resolute Bay, for example in the Sverdrup Basin. In these areas, back in the '70s and '80s, there was drilling and extraction, and some significant discoveries were made. Those rights are still in place. The Draft Plan identifies those locations as Valued Components.

Terrestrial Transportation and Communications

The next subsection deals with terrestrial transportation and communication. A number of different approaches were taken in the 2021 Draft Plan to managing the existing and potential linear infrastructure, which is a term we use to refer to things like all-weather roads or railways or pipelines, things that are long and straight in nature that are on the land.

Many of these areas are included as Valued Components, again flagged as information for project proponents and regulatory authorities, including the proposed routing from here in Iqaluit to the Chidliak Diamond Project to the north. However, there are some areas that are included as Limited Use designations with restrictions on certain activities, including existing and proposed infrastructure associated with the Mary River Project to the north. This was largely carried over from the amended North Baffin Regional Land Use Plan and incorporated into the 2021 Nunavut Land Use Plan.

In addition, I will just mention that in the Kivalliq region, there is longstanding interest in developing a permanent link between the Kivalliq and Northern Manitoba. This potential corridor has been identified in the Draft Plan as a Limited Use designation that intends to protect this area for future development of the initiative. The Commission has heard a great deal of support from communities in the region and other participants, as well as of course, some concern as well. That is a significant part of how the Draft Plan has been prepared in the Kivalliq region, that I just mentioned in passing.

Marine Shipping

The next subsection is on marine shipping. In this case, what we are showing here on this slide and what is included in the *Options and Recommendations Document* are draft areas that are being considered through the Northern Marine Transportation Corridor Initiative being led by Transport Canada, the Coast Guard, and other partners. This work is ongoing to establish shipping corridors within the marine environment, including within the territory of Nunavut.

When this information was provided to the Commission as part of this planning process, the provider made it very clear that this information was in draft form and should not be incorporated directly into the Land Use Plan itself, but the information has been considered throughout the development of the Plan. As I mentioned this morning, in terms of the different types of whale calving areas, this information was relied on to evaluate the nonrenewable resource and

transportation potential of given areas. It has impacted the form of the Land Use Plan in some ways, but this information is not directly included in the Land Use Plan itself.

Commercial Fishing Areas

The final subsection of Chapter 5 is on commercial fishing areas. On the left-hand side, we see in larger, gray-shaded areas, Arctic Char Areas of Abundance. This is generalized information that just indicates an increased abundance of Arctic char in the areas, including here around the City of Iqaluit. These areas are all included as Valued Components in the Draft Plan for consideration.

The small dots that are included on the left-hand side indicate waterbodies that have been evaluated and assessed quotas under the Fishery Regulations. These dots do not indicate that they are currently being commercially fished or maybe fished in the future, but again just indicate a potential for commercial fisheries in the areas. They are also identified as Valued Components for consideration.

On the right-hand side of Slide 55, we see a number of different types of turbot fishing areas along the Baffin Coast in particular. Many of these areas are identified as Valued Components, but I would highlight the importance of Cumberland Sound in particular, to the Community of Pangnirtung, which has been discussed throughout this planning process as being particularly important to that community. In recognition of those comments and concerns, the Draft Plan is proposing a Limited Use designation for Cumberland Sound with year-round prohibitions on things like oil and gas, for example.

Chapter 6 Overview:

Chapter 6 is the final chapter. As I previously noted, this is a requirement of the *Nunavut Agreement* to have a strategy or a plan for how the Land Use Plan itself will be implemented once it is approved. There is a lot of important information in this chapter, and there are a few key topics we wanted to highlight for participants here today before we begin our discussions.

The first point is just a reminder again that all of the different Land Use Plan requirements we have discussed would not apply to community land use and harvesting. I really want to emphasize that point. In addition, the Land Use Plan in Limited Use Areas identify specific uses that are proposed to be prohibited or not allowed. I have mentioned multiple times those types of uses, including mineral exploration, oil and gas exploration or development, quarries, or all-weather roads.

If a use is not included in that list, then it would be permitted or supported by the Land Use Plan, if you don't see tourism or scientific research or military exercises listed to conform to the Land Use Plan provide it met any other Plan requirements.

Another important detail is that many of the Limited Use Areas, especially on the land, prohibit what we call linear infrastructure, but in the definition of linear infrastructure, it does not include seasonal or temporary winter roads. So, in some cases, the Limited Use Areas would not allow a permanent all-season road to be constructed, but those areas would allow a winter road to be used to access or supply a particular location.

Existing Mineral Rights

I indicated in Chapter 5 that the subject of existing mineral rights was an important aspect of this Draft Plan. There are a few slides here to try and provide an overview of the approach that is being proposed in the current Draft Plan to deal with this.

The first point we want to emphasize is of course that mineral exploration and development occurs in stages. As you know, when exploration companies go out on the land for the first time, they are not able to propose a full-blown operating mine. It takes time and effort to establish the resources that are present and how they may be extracted appropriately.

There is a problem that comes up. When a change is made to a project called a significant modification, a new review by the Nunavut Planning Commission is required. So, in many cases, significant investment has been made by exploration companies in certain properties that are now within the proposed Limited Use Areas in the Draft Plan that would prohibit their further development.

The Commission recognizes this concern. In order to support economic development in the territory, the 2021 Draft Plan proposes that projects with existing mineral rights within Limited Use Areas that would prohibit further mineral exploration would be exempt from any prohibitions when they undergo these significant changes or modifications.

So, if a company has already begun work and the Nunavut Land Use Plan is approved, this Draft is proposing that when they undergo a change or propose a new activity that requires another review by the Planning Commission, it would need to conform to or be supported by the approved Nunavut Land Use Plan, but the Plan itself is proposing that there would be an exemption from that specific requirement of the prohibition within the Plan.

This can be confusing, but it is important to also note that other requirements of the Plan would continue to apply. So, if there are setback requirements or seasonal restrictions, or requirements for polar bear denning, those would continue to apply to these projects that are being modified. It is just that prohibition would not be applied in those specific cases.

Over the last year and a bit, there have been many questions about this approach and many concerns expressed. We have had some very helpful discussions with different participants in the meantime. We wanted to clarify here today, and this was issued in a *Questions and Answer Document*, but we did want to highlight the approach the Commission took to identifying all of these projects with existing mineral rights within Limited Use Areas.

The first step was to download all of the mineral rights data from both the Government of Canada as well as from Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. This information came in the spring of 2021 when the Commission was preparing the current Draft Plan. The Commission then selected only active projects that had active mineral rights. We do note that some participants have expressed concern with these selection criteria, and the Commission will be giving full consideration to potentially revising this approach following the close of the record.

We next only selected those existing rights that overlap with proposed Limited Use designation in the 2021 Draft Plan that would prohibit mineral exploration and development. We then further refined the list by only selecting projects that have been previously reviewed and approved by the Nunavut regulatory system. We did this by searching through the public registries maintained by the Planning Commission ourselves, as well as information from the Nunavut Impact Review Board and Nunavut Water Board.

This process led to a specific list of projects that were included in Appendix A of the Draft Plan. The Commission does appreciate the concerns and comments that have been provided by several participants in how this list was established.

Slide 60 shows a simple overview of some of these projects, including their names and the company responsible for them, along with an inset map of where these projects occur. Here in the Southern Qikiqtaaluk region, the primary if not only example, is the rights associated with De Beers Chidliak Project north of Iqaluit that in the 2021 Draft Plan overlapped with identified caribou habitat that was flagged by the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board and included as a Limited Use designation in the 2021 Draft Plan.

Just to further clarify, the concept is that if and when these projects undergo modifications in the future that would require a new review, Commission staff would review that proposal in these Limited Use Areas against the map in Appendix A to establish that these are continuations of existing projects and would not apply the prohibition on mineral exploration in these areas. So, the effect of that is that any project with existing rights including the Chidliak Project, would be able to continue to the rest of the regulatory system in these areas and would not be prevented by the Nunavut Land Use Plan from advancing for further consideration by other regulatory authorities.

We are nearing the end here. Thank you for bearing with me.

Chairperson: (Translated): Qujannamiik, Jonathan. We can take a break, a 15-minute coffee break.

Break

Chairperson: Jonathan is ready again. Jonathan, whenever you are ready, go ahead and start.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. We are very close to the end of this presentation.

Minor Variances, Plan Amendments & Periodic Review of the Land Use Plan

The final note from Chapter 6 is on different ways in which the Plan can be changed following its approval. Land use plans are often described as living documents, which is meant to imply that they can change or evolve over time in response to changing circumstances or new information.

The first and easiest way to make a change to an approved Land Use Plan is called a Minor Variance. This is another technical term that refers to a small change to an applicable Plan requirement, such

as a setback or a seasonal restriction. For example, if there was a requirement in the Plan for certain uses to stay 1-kilometre away from a river but based on the circumstances the proponent wanted to go within 800-metres of the river rather than a kilometer, they would be able to request a minor variance to reduce the setback requirement, or a seasonal restriction as another example. Under the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act* and the *Nunavut Agreement*, the Commission has the ability to consider that request through a very short public process.

In this case, we would receive notice that someone has requested to reduce one of these requirements. We would post notice and allow interested persons to object to the granting of that variance and would consider the feedback before either granting or not granting the requested variance. There is no requirement to engage with the signatories of the Land Use Plan itself. This process is built into the Land Use Plan and can be done fairly efficiently.

A minor variance is not appropriate for a larger change to the Land Use Plan. For example, if a company wanted to conduct a prohibited use within a Limited Use Area, that could not be considered through a brief minor variance process. For a change of that type, a Plan Amendment would be required.

Plan amendments can be proposed by a project proponent looking to change a requirement of the Land Use Plan in a more significant way, or it could be used to respond to new information. A good example is if another community besides the City of Iqaluit identified a secondary drinking water supply and wanted to include management of that area in the Nunavut Land Use Plan. They could propose this Plan amendment to include that area in the Plan.

Because these are more significant changes to the content of the Land Use Plan, a more detailed public review may be required to consider those changes. Also, approval by the Government of Canada, the Government of Nunavut, and Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated would be required for any of these Plan amendments that would be considered.

The Commission does have the flexibility to scope the public review of a proposed Plan amendment as it feels it is appropriate. So, if this is a serious change to the Plan that requires input from all participants, that could be a longer and more costly process. However, if the required Plan amendment or the recommended Plan amendment is of a smaller scope, for example, a new park is established and the Commission no longer has jurisdiction within the area, the Commission would be able to conduct a more streamlined version of a public review post-notice that the Plan is being considered to be amended. In this case, it is a jurisdictional matter of which the Commission has really no choice, but that could go through a much simpler process. So, Plan amendments can vary depending on the circumstances of the request.

In addition to ongoing minor variances or small adjustments to some Plan requirements and Plan amendments to respond to either project proponents or other interested participants based on new information, the *Nunavut Agreement* requires that the Commission's land use plans be reviewed completely, but the timeframe is not specified. It is called a Periodic Review, or a full review from time to time.

In response to previous drafts of the Land Use Plan, many participants expressed concern with the lack of certainty regarding when such a review would take place. In the 2021 Draft Plan, the Commission included a new proposal or commitment that the Nunavut Land Use Plan would begin

a complete review within 7 years of its approval, and that complete review would be finished within 10 years of the Plan's original approval. Given that this planning process has just entered its 15th year, the Commission considered this 7-to-10-year period of review as being a reasonable compromise between some of the timeframes that different participants had suggested.

We will note that this periodic review would be a public process and require full engagement and participation of all communities that are affected, as well of course as governments, Regional Inuit Associations, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, industry, non-governmental organizations, all over again.

It is also worth noting that this periodic review would also go back and consider the 2007 *Broad Planning Policies, Objectives, and Goals* document that has formed the foundation of this planning process. That will be a significant undertaking on behalf of the Commission, and the hope is by identifying this 7-to-10-year timeframe for the completion of this review, it will assist both the Commission in our work planning and budgeting with our partners at the federal government, and also allow other participants to prepare for their involvement in this detailed periodic review.

Other Mapping Considerations

As I mentioned, there are a number of important concepts within the Chapter 6, the Implementation Strategy. We have chosen to highlight a few of them here today to help inform our conversations throughout the week. We will conclude our overview of Chapter 6 on that note. As a final portion of this presentation before we move to any questions, we would just like to provide an overview of Map A1, the different land use designations in the area, and then conclude with an overview of the different area calculations.

On Slide 66, we can see the Southern Qikiqtaaluk region including Sanikiluaq as a separate inset map here. As a reminder, the red areas are the Limited Use designations. Sorry, Goump, it's 66. Thanks. The red areas are those Limited Use designations where there are year-round prohibitions on multiple activities.

Starting near Igloolik and Sanirajak, you can see those red areas in the northern Foxe Basin. All of those larger areas are the different Community Areas of Interest. In addition, there are some smaller red locations within that region corresponding to different military facilities. Coming down through Foxe Basin, you also see a large red Limited Use Area identified for key migratory bird habitats in the area. These again have year-round restrictions on certain activities as well as setback requirements.

Moving down onto Baffin Island, you can see Netling Lake more in the center of the island, another Community Area of Interest that moves into a series of different migratory bird habitats, including a migratory bird sanctuary that then turns into further south an important caribou habitat that was identified by the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. All of these areas along that coast are included as Limited Use Areas.

Jumping up back near Qikiqtarjuaq, the red Limited Use Areas there correspond to the different national wildlife areas and additional key migratory bird habitats surrounding the national wildlife areas. Down near Cumberland Sound and the Community of Pangnirtung, we have the turbot fishing

area, as well as different whale habitats and drinking water supplies near the community that are included as Limited Use Areas.

Out along the coast, there are some smaller red dots corresponding to different walrus haul-outs sites that we have discussed today. Moving down south of the Cumberland South, we also see additional red areas as Limited Use, which is additional caribou habitat, again identified by the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. On this map, you can see a portion of the Chidliak Diamond Project that overlaps, shown in a black outline on the peninsula. Again, there are more walrus haul-outs towards Baffin Bay.

Then near Iqaluit, we again have more caribou habitat to the west along with the Katannilik Territorial Park and the Soper River Watershed that extends beyond. Additionally, between Kimmirut and Kinngait, we have another key migratory bird habitat site.

Moving onto the inset map near Sanikiluaq, there are extensive Limited Use Areas within the Belcher Islands. The largest areas are identified for key migratory bird habitats. Within those areas that are hard to see on this map, there are also additional walrus haul-out sites.

Moving on to Conditional Use Areas, we do note that much of the coastal orange areas are due to polar bear denning, including in the area of Equal Use and Occupancy around Salisbury and Nottingham Islands, which are identified as polar bear denning habitat. The additional large Conditional Use Area at the mouth of Frobisher Bay is coming from a key migratory bird habitat site where only setback would apply.

So, at a very high level, I have just tried to summarize some of the key land use designations that apply within this region. I will now skip back to Slide 63, which has the area calculations broken down, not only for the whole territory but based on a regional distribution. These are calculated for the Qikiqtaaluk region generally, although we don't have all communities of the Qikiqtaaluk here with us today, having previously met with us in Pond Inlet with the five North Baffin communities. We do just have the overall three regional breakdowns provided.

Also, are area calculations for overlap with existing mineral rights and Inuit Owned Lands, both surface and subsurface. You will recall 65% of the entire territory was Mixed Use; 9% Conditional Use; and 22% Limited Use. Within the Qikiqtaaluk region generally, there is slightly more Mixed Use Areas, closer to 70% rather than 65%. You can see the breakdowns for both terrestrial and marine areas within the Qikiqtaaluk region.

In terms of mineral rights, you can see that Nunavut-wide, about 37% of existing mineral rights are within Limited Use Areas, again where those exceptions from prohibitions would apply based on Appendix A. That moves to about 33% here in the Qikiqtaaluk region.

Inuit Owned Lands

The bottom section of this table identifies overlaps with Inuit Owned Lands, both surface and subsurface. You can see from a surface perspective, 31% of Inuit Owned Lands are within a Limited Use designation, but that significantly drops to only 12% here in the Qikiqtaaluk region. During our previous hearings, the Commission has heard prominent concerns about the overlap of Limited Use

designations with Inuit Owned Lands. We just highlight the reduction in the amount of overlap here in the Qikiqtaaluk region compared to other regions of Nunavut.

Likewise for subsurface lands, which the Commission understands were primarily selected for economic potential, Nunavut-wide, the overlap with Limited Use sits at close to 43%, but here in the Qikiqtaaluk, a little over 25%.

Again, there is a lot of detail included here. The Commission has released this information through *Question-and-Answer* documents. Different participants have different interests. We hope that these consistently calculated area percentages have been helpful to participants in their review of the 2021 Nunavut Land Use Plan.

At this point, I will stop our overview of the Draft Plan and turn it back to our Chairperson. Hopefully we can respond to any questions that you may have for us today. Thank you very much.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Jonathan. Once there has been a presentation, the communities tend to ask questions. Raise your hands to ask a question. After the questions, Nunavik will have an opportunity. When they are done, other members, signatories to the hearing will have comments or questions, and then from the public, if there are public comments. First, raise your hands, and we will write your name down.

(Pause)

Qujannamiik. We will go through the list of names. State your name and your organization, who you represent. Mention who you are here with. Currently, we can ask two questions. If we finish early, we can go to more questions if you have more questions. If we have not gone through the materials, we can meet in the evening from 6:00 to 9:00. First of all, Jetaloo wanted to ask a question.

Jetaloo: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. I am Jetaloo Kakee from Iqaluit, Amaruq Hunters and Trappers. I am an Elder now. We often want to speak with the opportunity. My question is in the red Limited Use, where does that come from and the setback of a kilometer? If you present an example, I don't quite understand the setback. I would like more clarification on my two questions. If it is designated red, that is protected, whether the Limited Use category? Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you very much for your questions. The red Limited Use Areas, as we have said, are the most restrictive type of land use designations included in the Land Use Plan. For each issue that was identified whether it was walrus haul-outs or polar bear denning areas or any other issue, the Commission very carefully considered all of the different factors that related to the management of those areas and then considered which option would be most appropriate for a given issue.

So, Limited Use Areas require the year-round prohibition or restriction of a given activity. In some areas like caribou calving habitat, the Commission chose an option that would restrict or not allow certain activities throughout the whole year. When they considered the sensitivity and value of caribou calving habitat, they chose a Limited Use designation to prohibit activities all year round.

In other cases, like polar bear denning, the interest or value was there seasonally, and it was thought that activities could occur outside of denning season safely. So, it was a seasonal restriction that Commissioners preferred. Under the framework of the Land Use Plan, that made it a Conditional Use Area. It is not all year round.

So, for each topic, Commissioners carefully considered what information was available and how land use could be managed to respond to concerns about those different values. In some cases, they landed on Limited Use with year-round restrictions, sometimes as Conditional Use with maybe seasonal restrictions, and sometimes as a Valued Component where there was no specific guidance. In terms of where the Limited Use designations came from, it was all dependent on the information the Commission had on hand as to the value of the area and the different options that were considered for how to manage land use within those areas.

For your second question on setbacks, a good example are the walrus haul-outs. A setback is a minimum distance that you need to stay away from certain features. Here in the city, your house or a shed or a garage may need to be set back from the road. You can't build a house right on the road. It has to be a certain distance from the road. That is called a setback. So, we have used the same concept throughout all of Nunavut, not for houses and roads, but for other types of land use and different values.

On a walrus haul-out, the Commission received very detailed information that aircraft, for example, the noise can startle walrus that are hauled out on the land. In general, an aircraft can fly over a walrus haul-outs, but they have to stay very high, so that is a form of a setback or a minimum altitude. We also heard that boats of different sizes approaching a walrus haul-out could also startle or disturb the animals when they are grouped together on the shoreline.

Depending on the size of the ship, there are different setbacks or distances that the ship has to stay away from the haul-out. For example, if a large cruise ship was coming near, it would have to stay a larger distance away, but then they could launch smaller zodiac-style inflatable boats, for example, that could come closer but still not right up to the shore. So, those setbacks are the term we use for how far away different types of land uses would have to stay from the value, in this case the shoreline where the walrus are grouped together. Thank you.

Chairperson: (Translated): Qujannamiik. Sharon is going to add something. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Sharon Ehloak, Executive Director, Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you for your questions. I just want to ensure that everyone knows that the land use designations do not impact Inuit rights or Inuit hunting rights. As outlined in the *Nunavut Agreement*, all those rights stay the same. They are not impacted at all. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: (Translated): Qujannamiik. To add, the walrus haul-outs, any Inuk can approach, but it relates to tourists and outsiders. Inuit rights would not be affected in any way, even if it is red, as stated in the *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement*. Thank you. Jacobie?

Jacobie: Qujannamiik. The question was can you put the boundaries on... Sorry, Jacobie Malliki. I am Secretary Manager of the HTO in Igloolik. He was asking who put the boundaries on the red areas. That is his question. And variance, how far is a kilometer or a mile? Why you mention those areas

like a kilometer? How far is that? Can you point that out because he does not know kilometers or miles.

My question is I have a map, which was done by the Igloolik HTO board. I would like it to be included with this Draft or whatever. I don't know who to give it to. We would like to have this included in the Nunavut Land Use Plan, the Nunavut Plan. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. Jacobie, thank you for your comments. With your presentation, when it comes up to the HTO for Igloolik, you will be able to do your presentation and do your submission, both orally and in writing. It will become part of the record. It is not just at these hearings but if you have more submissions or information that any community member would like to provide, after the public hearing, you can do so again up until January 10th. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for your question.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan, you want to clarify?

Jonathan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you for clarifying the previous question. I did not understand the question about where the boundaries came from. In general, the Commission has relied on the best available information to set all of the different boundaries in the Draft Plan.

As I indicated through some of the presentation, that information often came from the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board who worked directly with the Hunters and Trappers Organizations of the region, for example the community on-ice travel routes, the caribou habitat information. That came from Hunters and Trappers through the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. Some boundaries came from the Canadian Wildlife Service with Environment and Climate Change Canada for key migratory bird habitat sites. Some information the Commission prepared itself, including things like community drinking water supplies. We mapped those ourselves.

So, everyone's input was considered, and the Commission relied on the best information it had, whether that was individual community members, Hunters and Trappers Organizations like the map that you have brought here with you, or with government agencies that conduct their own work. So, the Commission has relied on all of that information to inform how these boundaries were drawn.

Regarding the one kilometer, I use that as an example. Some setbacks are different. I am not very good in miles, but I think it is like 1 kilometer is about two-thirds or 60-some percent of a mile. I am not sure how helpful that is, but thanks.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon, do you want to add something?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. Also, with regards to how the red zones came about, we also have done since 2003, Use and Occupancy Mapping. Brian and his team over the years have gone in and collected from individual Inuit throughout the communities the information. That is also recorded and collected on the datasets.

As Jon said in his presentation, there are over 10,000 datasets that have been collected and included directly from Inuit within the communities and Elders. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik, Sharon. Johnny Mike?

Johnny M: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. Johnny Mike, Pangnirtung Hunters and Trappers. I have two questions. As we are aware, economic opportunities through fishing, turbot or char, that was mentioned. I think there are four communities that are affected. The four communities that have worked turbot and shrimp, the Hunters and Trappers Association is part of this. I don't see it here. I understand it is only for the Nunavut Settlement Area and this might be outside. First, I want to understand. That is the first question. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan, go ahead.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thanks, Johnny for your question regarding commercial fisheries. The Commission is aware of different areas that are being used by communities and industry in general for commercial fishing. We have attempted to include those generally as Valued Components for consideration by others. As you note, many of those areas are outside of the Nunavut Settlement Area and are not shown on our maps, but the area of Cumberland Sound in particular was included as a Limited Use Area for its importance to your community's fishery.

I just wanted to take the opportunity to add that the Nunavut Land Use Plan does not have the ability to restrict or provide any requirements for commercial fisheries in general. That is the responsibility of the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board. Our consideration of commercial fisheries is in identifying areas that are important fishing areas and providing management for other uses that may also be occurring in the area in order to protect the future sustainability of the fisheries. That is just an extra clarification I wanted to make. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead, Johnny.

Johnny M: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Johnny Mike, Pangnirtung Hunters and Trappers Organization. I too was part of the discussions. We have been going through this process with communities as community reps. I just want to note the communities and how when you look at shrimp and turbot from Pangnirtung, we heard within the hamlet boundaries, within the municipality, the land that had already been designated otherwise where the Anglican Church and the Hudson Bay and the police owned land. That preceded the *Land Claim*, and this is still in effect under Section 11 of the *Land Claim*. 11.2 seems to be related to this.

The NPC doesn't have the jurisdiction, but we cannot purchase land now, although we have been here and within the hamlet for a long time. Only those organizations that I mentioned own land within the municipality. It seems that when we started negotiations to the *Land Claim*, we did mention these lands through the *Land Claim* under Article 11 regarding the Nunavut Planning Commission. I feel we have some avenues on this. We are told that this issue would be discussable through the process of Land Claims to date, that issue I bring forward.

I live in Pangnirtung. I mention their private lands. We are short of building space for houses. We have limited land available around the community. We saw it in Pangnirtung to try and access those

lands. Mr. Chairman, I know it was mentioned it was outside of your jurisdiction, but looking at Section 11, there is a clause there. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan, go ahead.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you very much, Johnny. We understand your concern with land ownership within the municipality, in particular from the Anglican Church, Hudson Bay, as well as the RCMP and its potential restrictions on the community's ability to further develop.

It is our understanding that is not something that the Nunavut Planning Commission can address, and we do note that there are other agencies here today, including the Government of Nunavut with their Community and Government Services that may be able to provide some options for how to address this, but yeah, I don't think that is something that is within our mandate. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. You will have an opportunity in your community presentations to speak to whatever issue you want to bring up. Regarding today's presentation, Paul? State your name.

Paul Q: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Paul Quassa from the City of Iqaluit, City Councillor. My question is military facilities and priority contaminated sites left by the military. Those are identified, and we know where they are. We know Iqaluit here was a base that they have gone through the process of remediation and clean up. The same thing happened here in Iqaluit, but it is not identified. It too has been contaminated towards the upper base. I used to work up the hill up there. Their buildings are gone. We know that there is contamination there, but I notice it is not listed here. I will just note that. What is the status of this? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you very much, Paul for your question. I don't have all of the details in front of me as to the current status of that particular location, but I do note that the Commission has made attempts to limit the impacts of its land use designations within municipal boundaries. It is possible that the areas may have been removed that were within municipal boundaries, but I am speculating and maybe offer to follow-up on that particular location, not having the specific details in front of me right now. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Ben?

Ben: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. I have questions. You have mentioned in your presentation, Nunavut Planning Commission once this process is over and once approved as discussed by Nunavut population, it says that it will become a law. How will you be able to regulate with so many proponents? As you have mentioned in the maps today, they are so numerous with many concerns. So, how will you be able to regulate? I would like to know what procedures have been set for future regulation that you will keep for the proponents. Tell us as we sit at the table.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you very much, Ben for your question. The requirements of the Nunavut Land Use Plan as you say, will be law once it is approved. Now, the Nunavut Planning Commission as I have noted, serves as the

front door or the entry point into Nunavut's regulatory system. The Land Use Plan requirements are a first layer of requirements that proponents need to follow.

I also noted that we pass our decisions on to all other regulatory authorities that have a mandate to authorize the project. So, the enforcement and implementation of the requirements of the Land Use Plan is somewhat of a shared responsibility with other regulatory authorities as well. If the Nunavut Land Use Plan includes setbacks or seasonal requirements, then those details get passed on to other regulatory authorities that actually issue licenses, permits, and other authorizations, whether that is the Nunavut Impact Review Board through their screening decisions or project certificates, whether that is a Nunavut Water Board license, a land use permit issued by the landowner, or perhaps even something from the Government of Nunavut like a wildlife observation permit. So, for a setback around a walrus haul-outs, that could be incorporated into the wildlife observation permit that the Government of Nunavut's Department of Environment may issue.

All of these requirements trickle down and get incorporated as the base level of requirement into other organization's authorizations. They, of course, can add additional requirements based on their own review of the project, but the requirements of the Land Use Plan must be incorporated by those other agencies.

Now that addresses how they get implemented, but enforcement and inspection and monitoring is a different process and layer to the system. Right now, the Commission does not have inspectors, for example, on staff. We don't do site visits to verify that these requirements are being followed, but other regulatory authorities do. So, under the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act*, the federal government has a primary role in monitoring and inspection and enforcement. They would be conducting their assessment of the project, keeping in mind the requirements of the Land Use Plan. Likewise, the Nunavut Impact Review Board for major projects does inspections as well.

The Commission does understand that there is currently a lack of inspection officers and regular site visits for many projects across the territory. They do take place, but community members regularly inform the Commission that it is not adequate. We often hear from community members that they have seen activities taking place that were not appropriate, for example.

One of our priorities once we complete this Nunavut Land Use Plan is to develop a more robust communication protocol with communities in order to inform them of activities that have been authorized in the territory and what requirements those projects are under and provide a point of contact at least for community concerns relating to activities they have observed that they do not feel are appropriate.

I apologize for a bit of a longwinded answer, but in general, it is kind of a shared responsibility, and the Planning Commission plays an important role, but we can't do any of this by ourselves. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Ben, do you have another question?

Ben: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Ben Kovic, Amaruq HTO. Thanks for the longwinded answer. I will accept that.

(Translated): The other question I have relates to, I don't think you are responsible for freshwater responsibilities or the islands along the bay, for instance. I don't think that is your responsibility. I fail to understand you there. To bird sanctuaries, I don't think that is a responsibility I just want clarifications. For instance, you are in Iqaluit. You have heard from us the Power Corp have planned to do some dam building for power. We have heard many things, and it is up to the public, the population, to determine if a dam should be built for cheaper power. Underwater power source is possible. I don't believe you have any powers related to that second project that the Power Corp has in mind. Are you responsible for only land surface? I have one more question.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you for your second question. I would like to clarify that the Nunavut Planning Commission through our land use plans do have jurisdiction within waters as well, both freshwater lakes and rivers as well as marine areas. Although the Nunavut Water Board, for example, has the responsibility for managing the use and deposit of waste in fresh water, the Planning Commission does have jurisdiction over these areas as well.

So, within fresh water and the marine environment, that is all subject to the Nunavut Land Use Plan. A hydroelectric, like a dam for power generation, that is something that would need to conform to or be supported by the Nunavut Land Use Plan if it is approved. I noted many of the Limited Use designations proposed to prohibit or not allow hydroelectric power generation, so those projects would be reviewed against an approved Nunavut Land Use Plan. In the marine environment, I gave those examples of setbacks from a walrus haul-out or different requirements for whale calving areas. Those areas are subject to the jurisdiction of the Nunavut Land Use Plan. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. As I mentioned, I am going to allow two questions per person. Later on, if we have time, I am going to get back to you. I am going to ask delegates from Nunavik to see if you have a question. We have one.

Johnny K: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Johnny Kasudluak, Inukjuak, Nunavik. I will try to keep my question short. Due to climate change, I don't see much discussion today to this particular project. It gets worse, and it has affected animals in our land. The problem appears to be getting worse, and the mammals are starting to suffer. For instance, we have been seeing species that are not residents to our community lately, perhaps due to climate change.

I think it should be part of your program, your planning session and the people. Inuit need to practice their survival for wildlife. I don't see anything in your discussion today, your presentation. I would like clarification that will be in protection of animals. It is going to get worse if they are not protected one way or the other. I didn't hear this in your presentation today. We need to hear how safeguards would be in place.

The organizations who represent in our society today, the Land Use Plan that you have presented today, it looks very good on paper. There is one word that we have not heard today to see if there was a conflict today. I have seen your website. So, what preparations have you done in order to ensure that your presentations are carried through?

I need to know how everything will progress in your Draft Land Use Plan. When it becomes a reality, how the public, the way of life of Inuit people, is it a priority in your Draft Land Use Plan? What safeguards are there to preserve Inuit culture? What about companies who will expend a huge amount of money, and should they take priority? The Inuit way of life perhaps would be put in the backburner, perhaps even Nunavut wildlife. We need to speak on what our priorities are. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you, Johnny for your questions that you have raised today. On the first topic of climate change, I do note that although there are no specific slides within the presentation we have provided today, there is a section in Chapter 2, Section 2.9 of the Draft Plan that does discuss climate change and how it was considered throughout the development of the Land Use Plan.

I gave examples of the impacts of a changing climate on caribou and polar bear as examples of how the increased sensitivity or vulnerability of these species was considered by Commissioners when making the strong recommendations to protect different habitats for those species in particular.

I would like to note that the Commission has heard a great deal about the changing climate and different environmental factors that are affecting people but also wildlife in the territory, changing distributions of species. Grizzly bears, for example, are moving further into Nunavut and are now interacting more and more with polar bears. These types of issues the Commission could expect to continue, and that fits in well with the idea of land use plans being living documents that change over time in response to new information or new circumstances.

While the current Draft Plan does not have land use designations or Plan requirements directly related to climate change, it has been a factor in the development of this Plan, and it can be considered in the future through Plan amendments or those periodic 7-to-10-year reviews that I had also mentioned.

Regarding how this process will progress and the priority given to Inuit way of life, I will note that all of the information that has been received already and that is being heard through this final hearing, will all be given great weight and consideration by Commissioners when they revise the current Draft Plan in 2023.

All of these hearings, written submissions, oral comments will all be used to directly inform revisions to this Draft of the Land Use Plan that will then make up a recommended Land Use Plan that will be submitted to the Government of Canada, the Government of Nunavut, as well as Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated for consideration.

Finally, on the importance of the Inuit way of life and cultural priorities, I note that under the *Nunavut Agreement*, the Commission is mandated to give great weight to the views of communities of the planning region and to give full consideration, for example, to Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit in addition to western science.

In this Draft Plan, the Commission has demonstrated a commitment to ensuring the wellbeing of Nunavut and adjacent communities going forward, through in particular things like the Community

Areas of Interest that have been identified as supporting community health and wellbeing, in addition to managing important habitat for species that are of great cultural importance. This includes of course, caribou, fish, marine mammals, polar bear. All of the efforts in the Draft Plan to protect and manage land use in these areas important to these vital species were arrived at in consideration of the strong views of communities in this planning process that these species are important to community health and wellbeing now and into the future. Maybe I will stop there and turn it back to the Chair. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. I have no more names. Are there any questions from the registered participants? Anyone from the public? Step up to the microphone. State your name, and you have two questions.

Leo: *(Translated)*: Can you hear me? Okay. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Leo Maktar, Qikiqtani Inuit Association. I work at Lancaster Sound, the wildlife watchers. I am also taking a course. Thank you for the opportunity, and my fellow students are here. I will try not to go too fast. Thank you for the work leading up that has been made public to us and available.

My question: In terms of the *Land Claims Agreement*, sea mammals, white whales, bowhead whales are a priority, but it does not list bowhead whales as a priority. I would like the Nunavut Land Use Plan to include bowhead whales as a priority animal. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you for the comments. I would like to note that in this most recent version of the Draft Plan, bowhead calving areas have been included. In previous drafts, we only had information included on beluga calving areas, and in 2021, this section of the Draft Plan, 2.5 has been expanded to include both narwhal and bowhead calving areas in particular. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead if you have another question.

Leo: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq and thank you for the response. I was referring to killer whales or orcas if they were going to be included in the final summary of the Plan. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Apologies. I heard bowhead as the species through interpretation. Yes, so far in this process, orcas or killer whales have not been identified as a priority. We certainly do appreciate your feedback. Following up from the previous question on climate change, we do understand that they are becoming more common in Nunavut waters each year. That is something that the Commission will be giving consideration to moving forward. Thank you that and apologies for the confusion.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. I have no more hands from the floor. Ben? Sorry, there is a speaker.

James: *(Translated)*: James Qillaq, Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. Regarding the presentation, the hamlet governments have rights following the *Land Claims*, the HTO and NTI. Which weight do you give the hamlet rights where they cannot go beyond the municipal boundaries? How about for the HTO?

How do you weigh the two differences when you are talking about rights? That is my question. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you for the question. I understand the concern to be around differences between municipal rights and jurisdiction as compared to Hunters and Trappers Organizations, for example. I want to note that the Nunavut Planning Commission itself does not have the authority or ability to limit the municipal or hamlet rights in terms of their jurisdiction.

I made reference a few times today perhaps to hamlets or municipal councils having jurisdiction within municipal boundaries and not having jurisdiction outside of them in the context of community drinking water supplies as an example. That extent of jurisdiction is not set by the Nunavut Planning Commission. We have heard repeated requests from municipalities, for example, to expand their municipal boundaries, and again I will note that is not something the Commission has authority over.

In terms of Hunters and Trappers Organization's rights, again I would note that the Nunavut Planning Commission has no authority to impact or reduce harvesting rights, for example, that extend to other areas. As we have said multiple times today, the requirements of the Land Use Plan are specifically not intended to apply to community land users and Hunters and Trappers Organizations, both in terms of jurisdiction and limiting harvesting in any way, or through anything like quotas or those sorts of measures that are handled by the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board.

Perhaps I have misunderstood the question, but I just want to note that the Planning Commission does not have the ability to limit the extent of jurisdiction of hamlets or Hunters and Trappers Organizations in general. Thank you.

Chairperson: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. Just to add, we are here to listen from all of you. We will consider your comments, the community's comments, comments from the governments and various organizations that come to speak. We are here to listen. We will have to discuss these issues as the Commission. It is also understandable. Are there additional questions? Do you want to ask a question? Go ahead.

Mike F: Mike Ferguson, Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. I have two questions. Goal 2 of the land use planning effort is to help protect the critical importance of sustainability of Nunavut's communities and Inuit culture. Wildlife harvesting by Inuit has been sustainable arguably for 3,500 years, but we know that the resources around any given community are different. They differ over time. Accessibility of those resources to the Inuit also vary between communities and over time.

One of the criteria is what I think Jonathan referred to earlier. The first criterion is the overall importance of an issue that has been identified. You have used the example where caribou had been identified as an issue for many communities, but muskoxen had not been. Therefore, my understanding is that muskoxen were not dealt with fully, if that is the right word, in the Nunavut Land Use Plan.

In the North Baffin communities, Grise Fjord especially raised issue with that. When QWB did its review, it identified quite a few areas as what we called Multiple Value Areas. These are areas where there are sufficient resources of different species in a geographic area that make that area very important to the local community, but the specific species varied between each area depending on what was there.

I am wondering if the Nunavut Planning Commission is willing to rethink their very first criteria about trying to only deal, apparently mainly deal with issues that are common among many communities and not focus on how important the resources or an area is to a given community. You may miss protecting a lot of areas for quite a few communities, because each community is unique in the resources it has available.

Chairperson: Jonathan, go ahead.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you, Mike for the comments and questions. I think it is fair to say in response to the direct question that of course, the Nunavut Planning Commission is willing to reconsider all aspects of the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan in response to the feedback that is being received and has been received.

On the specific subjects you mentioned, I would note that the very detailed submissions provided by the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board were really instrumental in informing revisions to the 2016 Draft Plan, and many of the submissions have been directly incorporated into the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan.

Some areas that have been identified in those 2018 submissions were not fully incorporated through land use designations into the current 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan, and in some cases that was based on a lack of fulsome discussion and consideration throughout the entirety of the record. Areas like caribou calving habitat that had been identified were incorporated into a much broader discussion that had been ongoing for 15 years. In some cases, areas that were identified in 2018 by the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board were not able to be incorporated into an existing fulsome discussion and consideration in the same format as the remainder of the issues in the *Options and Recommendations Document*.

So, in general, the Commission has required to go through this similar exercise of evaluating these six criteria, evaluating the preferred options. In some cases, the information at the time of the drafting of the 2021 Draft Plan was not sufficient to allow a fulsome and consistent analysis as with other issues. As we have said, we are of course willing to reconsider all of that information on the basis of new and additional feedback that is being received.

I would also indicate the interest in addressing what we have called priority issues, going back from 2007 and 2008 up to today. So, while there is that offhand example that I gave of having caribou feature prominently in the Land Use Plan but not muskoxen, or having polar bear fully incorporated but not grizzly bear, that is on some level a practical reality of preparing a first-generation Nunavut Land Use Plan that is not capable of responding to all issues.

So, there will be topics that are raised through this planning process that may not be addressed in this first-generation Land Use Plan, but the Commission has attempted to identify those areas and

values in the *Options and Recommendations Document* as areas of future work. There is an ongoing commitment to continue land use planning discussions and exercises with communities and participants across the territory and beyond once this first-generation Plan is approved.

Yeah, maybe I will stop there and note that we do appreciate all of the detailed information that has been provided. It has been very helpful in the development of the Plan, and all of it will be reconsidered following the close of the record in January of 2023. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. I would like to recognize the time. If you have a question, please do ask a question and make sure you make your question to the point and short.

Mike F: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq, and thank you, Jonathan. This one is more specific. It is regarding on-ice travel routes, and I am just maybe misreading this. It says in the summarized document that on-ice travel routes will not be destroyed in the seasons of Upingaksaaq and Upingaaq and without consultation with the hamlet councils, HTOs, etcetera.

I find that a little confusing. In my reading of that, it means that if a proponent is going to destroy or break ice during spring and late winter, they need to talk to the HTOs and councils, but if they propose to break ice earlier in the winter, the core of the winter, Ukiaqsaaq, Ukiaq and Ukiuq, my understanding is that they would not need to talk to the councils and the HTOs. Is that my correct reading of this clause?

Chairperson: Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Yes, Mike, I believe you are reading the clause correctly. If that approach does not meet the expectations or requirements of the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board, that is a great example of where feedback can be provided, and Commissioners will give full consideration to that following the close of the record. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Any more questions? Thank you for your time. Qujannamiik, Jonathan for your presentation.

(Applause)

Qujannamiik. We are almost through. Sharon has a comment.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just a couple of housekeeping items: We will be starting again tomorrow morning at 9:00 a.m. We won't be having an evening session. However, for the community delegates, if you could just stay behind and see Brian for a few minutes, that would be appreciated. Thank you very much.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. We will start again tomorrow at 9:00 a.m. Qujannamiik.

End of Day 1

DAY 2: NOVEMBER 15, 2022

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: It is time to proceed again with the agenda. Sharon has some meeting notes.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning. Sharon Ehloak, Executive Director with the Nunavut Planning Commission. To all the delegates and registered participants and members of the public, welcome back to Day 2 of the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan's fifth and final public hearing.

Just a couple of housekeeping items: Please, if you have a phone with you, please put it on mute and be respectful to the people who are speaking. We are recording live and livestreaming, as well as transcribing. So, it is on Uvagut TV, Facebook, and YouTube. The emergency exits: There is one at the front here, at the side, and the rear. Washrooms are in the rear as you come in. Coffee, tea, snacks, please help yourself. We will be taking again, two 15-minute breaks today, one in the morning and the afternoon. Chairperson Nakashuk will advise mid-afternoon whether or not we will be having an evening session.

Please don't forget to scan in. You don't need to scan out, but please scan in so we have a record of attendance. When you are speaking, please speak slowly and state your name every time you are speaking and your organization. We are going to follow Day 2's agenda, and we will be starting with the City of Iqaluit. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. As we do our hearings, our staff will first ask questions. Then we will open it up to the floor from the communities. The rest of the delegates on the floor will get a chance to ask questions. We will go with that process. Right now, it is the City of Iqaluit. After will be the Amaruq Hunters and Trappers Organization. You can proceed.

Presentation by the City of Iqaluit

Kyle Sheppard, Deputy Mayor

Paul Quassa, Councillor

Kyle: Good morning, Commissioners, South Baffin Community representatives, and all delegates present here today. My name is Kyle Sheppard, and I am the Deputy Mayor of the City of Iqaluit. I am also joined by Councillor, Paul Quassa who has a long history of involvement in this land planning process that brings us here today.

The City of Iqaluit and our residents have a deep and wide-ranging interest in the management, use, and protection of the land surrounding our community and supports the Nunavut land use planning process that will ensure protection of our important lands and waters, while also providing for the economic growth of our territory.

Today, we will present on a few key issues identified as being specifically under the jurisdiction of the municipal corporation of the City of Iqaluit and leave discussion on the Land Use Plan's impacts on the majority of the adjacent lands and their use to the Amaruq Hunters and Trappers Organization and the Qikiqtani Inuit Association.

The primary issue of concern to the City of Iqaluit is the current and future drinking water supply and the protection of the watershed that feeds into it. The City of Iqaluit has been struggling to provide an adequate water supply to meet the needs of our residents today and well into the future for several years. A great amount of work has been done to plan for the expansion of our water supply to address the current situation and to put in place an expanded supply to provide for our community and its growth for many decades to come.

Federal funding has now been secured to move these plans forward into reality. Through the planning work that has been done over the past two years, we have recently determined that to meet our city's water needs for the next 40 years, we will need to rely on the entirety of the Apex River Watershed to supply an adequate amount of water for our residents. Significant portions of this watershed lie outside the municipal boundary. Yet, in the current version of the Land Use Plan, there is no designation or acknowledgement of this fact.

With nearly all of the land surrounding Iqaluit currently proposed as Mixed Use with few limitations, it is important for our municipality and for industry and potential future project proponents that this area is clearly defined as being critically important to our city and our residents. As such, we would request that the Commission work with City administration and the relevant engineering firms that the city utilizes to accurately identify the scope of the Apex River Watershed and to provide it with a designation of a community water source watershed, and to include this area in your Map A2 with ID 90 as per section 4.5.2-1 of the proposed Land Use Plan.

Given how recently this information was determined, it is no surprise that this area is not yet covered by the Plan, but through this process here today, we hope to be able to move forward using the most relevant and up to date information available to ensure adequate protection is provided for this critically important water resource. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If you do not mind, I would like Councillor Paul Quassa to speak to our additional issues this morning.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Paul: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. My name is Paul Quassa. I am a member of City Council in Iqaluit. First of all, thank you to the Planning Commission for holding your hearings in our city. Welcome to all the other communities around Iqaluit that we see here, and also, we share with Nunavik in our communities. Welcome.

I am grateful I was part of this process. When we looked at planning, land use 2006 to 2021, and it has been a long process. We have been expecting that the Land Use Plan be completed as stated in the *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement* with the requirement to establish a land use plan. My comments for the future of our city are the growth of the city and the feel in this area that even our communities are growing and becoming larger.

In Iqaluit, our Deputy Mayor just noted the future needs of the residents as water is a priority, and he outlined it clearly. We see water as an issue now, not just here. For our future growth of our communities, we have to consider the communities have boundaries. Based on our growth, we will have to enlarge the municipal boundary for the city under the *Land Claims Agreement*.

We are growing. We have to be conscious of the boundary issue for the city. It is clearly stated under Article 11 regarding the communities. 11.7.2 states that when you are planning land use that they consider the growth of the communities. It is stated clearly in the *Land Claim*. Also, 11.7.3 states the communities, municipality concerns and knowledge have to be considered when they are planning land use. I see we are seeing that here today.

Also, in Nunavut, we have a young population. Many are then the adults. The demographics show that we have a young population that is also going to age. We will have to clearly include that in the Land Use Plan.

Yesterday, we discussed a bit of the military sites that used to be the base here in Iqaluit. It is clearly identified where their buildings and equipment were. In the 1940s, the military came to Frobisher Bay, and we see some of their old buildings still. We know Ukivik residents, the military presence, I note that these DEW line sites are contaminated sites or abandoned sites or sites that require cleaning. To include under Article 11 for facilities outside of communities, but they are also right in our community here in this. It needs to be noted as based on the former military bases. I need to note that we should note that on the map in the Land Use Plan.

One more: We know as communities, in Iqaluit there are Inuit Owned Lands within the municipal boundaries. There are a few communities like that. We did negotiate it from communities that have Inuit Owned Lands within the municipal boundaries. The Inuit Owned Lands had been selected within the city. We can see the Inuit Owned Lands. That big hotel is on Inuit Owned Land.

Also, within Inuit Owned Lands within municipal boundaries where buildings and other related municipal rules, there must come to an agreement for that land use. I wanted to mention that we have to follow properly the Inuit Owned Lands within municipal boundaries. I will just note that perhaps it too will be identified or noted, Inuit Owned Lands.

In Iqaluit, there is a park adjacent to the city starting from the river, Iqaluit River. It is a territorial park. It is also within municipal boundaries. Perhaps it can be noted by others. I wanted to bring it up that we have a park within the city boundaries. There is a territorial park, but it might be who is responsible, the city or the Nunavut Government in terms of the direction or what happens in the park within the city boundaries? That is another issue. I don't know if we can get answers, but I wanted to note that the Nunavut Government might speak to this issue. These were our comments from the City. Hopefully it was clear. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

(Applause)

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there are questions from our staff? Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you to the representatives from the City of Iqaluit for your presentation today. At the beginning of your presentation, you noted the secondary drinking water supply for the Apex River Watershed that extends beyond municipal boundaries. You indicated that it should be included as ID Number 90 in the Land Use Plan.

I just wanted to clarify for Commissioners and other participants and seek confirmation from you, that would be a Limited Use designation that would prohibit a number of industrial activities within

this area. We just note that some other participants have identified the boundary itself and suggested a Valued Component identification would be sufficient. Just to seek confirmation that you are in support of a Limited Use designation with prohibitions on certain industrial activities. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Kyle: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We would be requesting Limited Use for that area as defined for a community watershed area with the restrictions proposed by ID 90.

Chairperson: Are you done?

Johnny M: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Johnny Mike from the Hunters and Trappers Association. I want to ask Paul Quassa. He probably knows the *Land Claim* better than anybody. On the Inuit Owned Lands in Iqaluit and across the territory, in the South Baffin negotiation (*inaudible*), and now we are using these lands. It wasn't the city back then when we were negotiating. Now it is designated as a city. We want to understand (*inaudible*). I was at NPC back then. On Inuit Owned Land use within the city, we wondered how do you work with the Inuit on Inuit Owned Lands within the municipality when you have a tax base for the city, but not necessarily on the Inuit Owned Lands, whether they pay tax or not? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can proceed.

Paul Q: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Quassa, City Councillor, Iqaluit. Perhaps someone can answer you from the Qikiqtani Inuit Association as the landowners. It is clearly identified that Inuit Owned Lands within the city in terms of economic or development if we are going to put anything on those lands. As we have a tax base, they too become part of the tax base as within the city boundaries. That is the way it works. It is also stated clearly in the *Land Claim*. If there is going to be development, then the municipal rules would apply to Inuit Owned Lands. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jacobie?

Jacobie: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jacob Malliki, Hunters and Trappers in Igloolik, Manager. From the way I understand it, the federal government has rights with the municipality. Is that the way I understand it under the *Land Claim*? That is my question to Paul. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Perhaps if you want or don't want to answer. Sharon, go ahead.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for your question. The Commission, as Chairperson Nakashuk said, is here to hear the presentations relevant to the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. If you can focus the questions to the presenters that are relevant to the Land Use Plan, then that is what we would be asking. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can proceed if you want. More questions?

Jacobie: (*Translated*): Jacobie Malliki, Igloolik Hunters and Trappers Organization Manager. Your comments, the way it is set up under the Nunavut Land Use Plan, some aren't finalized too from our community, if we can include those. How can we get that information to you?

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. We are here in Iqaluit to hear from you. You will have a chance to comment really. We are listening as the Commission. You can also write your comments until January to the Commission. For those of you that are here in our hearings, you represent the communities. You are free to speak your mind, and we will consider your comments under the *Land Claim Agreement* that Inuit will be consulted through science and through Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit. As Inuit, even if you just do verbal presentations that too is taken as a real presentation. I wanted just to note that for you. Perhaps you guys don't answer the question. Jetaloo?

Jetaloo: *(Translated)*: Ulaakut. Jetaloo Kakee, Amaruq Hunters and Trappers Organization. I know we will have time not now, but I want to ask in Iqaluit, we were grown here. I want to ask the Inuk... *(Interpreter interjected that he did not quite understand the speaker's statements)*

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed.

Kyle: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Kyle Sheppard, Deputy Mayor, City of Iqaluit. The issue with our water has been longstanding. For the last 10 years or so, it has been known that we are running short of water. It became critical within the last six or seven years, and even more so with specific shortages over the last four.

The work to supply a new water supply has been ongoing for the last five years or so, culminating with the federal government providing the funding that was announced last year to allow us to expand that water supply. Wide-ranging consultations will still be done on what that plan will finally look like, and all community groups will be consulted. We are hoping to get that area protected in the Land Use Plan now.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Jetaloo: *(Translated)*: I want to note beyond in the spring in March, we almost ran out of water, a water shortage. Iqaluit is our community. We know it. We would all like to have a good water source in our community. We never thought that we would hit the problems that we have, like boiling water and otherwise. We have problems with our water.

In a number of years, we are conserving water. They were flying water into our city because of contaminated water. There were the old residents of Iqaluit, I hear Elders. I will just try to note this that the smell of gas was noticeable. We were thinking of where it was coming from. It was hard to ask who to ask or who knew. Perhaps it was the water source where it was contaminated. This we know that the work has to go into securing good water. It is just that we can hit emergencies related to water in any community seems to be a growing concern. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there more comments related to the presentation? Nunavik, questions to Iqaluit City Council? *(Pause)*

There are none. Are there questions from registered participants for the City of Iqaluit? *(Pause)*.

Hearing none, are there any from the public? Proceed.

Meeka: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Meeka Mike. I am from Iqaluit. I have been here a while now. I have two questions. The land CLRCs in Iqaluit from 1991, I worked before that too. The research that was done, Terry that would be CIRNAC now and the Department of Environment. In 1995, there was a land use plan for smaller communities. The river, they work with the Inuit Organization when the glaciers have melted and the snow on the hillsides on top of Baffin Island, whether Inuit water and people there was a way to plan communities that they knew and they have built on Inuit Owned Lands. Through the municipal planning process, I wonder if related to the land in the city, we always got water from the river.

Caribou calving grounds are being noted, and to see these maps, we were consulted by your staff on the planning process that we were looking only at the South Baffin where we know further north that there was a boundary put close to here that they were concentrating on. The Elders that were planning Nunavut that it was noted 13 or 14. There is more that were following the communities.

The City, Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit they are really hard to talk to about that subject as an Inuk or an Elder. If Elders want to speak, there aren't many Inuit at the City. It seems like I am the only one that is going to comment on their behalf of Elders. That is a great concern. We seem to be saying the same things. Out there the cabins that Inuit owned are all gone on the beach. They didn't want vehicles because they didn't want to contaminate the environment. Those cabins were homes for the homeless...

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Meeka? Meeka? We are limited for time. If you can ask your questions related to the presentation and be concise, clear. The work that we are doing, if you have questions, please ask your questions related to the presentation. There will be other opportunities from the public to comment. You will also have a chance, but for the Commission work that we are hearing right now, we will also face the government, and NTI will have a presentation. They too will be open for questions or comments, or even during a coffee break you can meet up with people. But for the work of the Commission, we are trying to keep it focused to the presentation. I understand. Perhaps if you shorten your question. Thank you.

Meeka: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. I am just wondering, what I mentioned whether they are included, whether they will be included in the Plan. We are waiting 20 years for development that it was supposed to proceed. That is my question. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Paul or Kyle, go ahead.

Paul: *(Translated)*: Thank you, Chair. I don't think I clearly understood the question, but I will try my best to answer. CLRC, there is an organization called CLRC. They are responsible for people who have municipal land concerns or in their vicinity. They have offices in every community. First, I know the city should start participating to work with these organizations. It is just a matter of question who we appoint to belong to this organization.

Another matter from the City Council, we are a diverse group. We have an Elder member, and Simon Nattaq is our Elder. He consults us on IQ. I think I will just mention these things for now. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Are there further questions from the registered participants and the public? *(Pause)*

It appears there is none. Jaco Ishulautak has a question. Please keep your questions short and your comments. State your name and organization.

Jaco: *(Translated)*: Jaco Ishulautak, Pangnirtung Hamlet. I have a question about the water problems. You have a water reservoir. It is a little different from other communities where some of ours are constructed. You have a natural reservoir. I would like to mention your watershed for your water reservoir from lakes or from rivers. When the icecaps, when the land starts drying, the rivers will perhaps drop in water. What plans have you had for eventuality? I would suggest that not only the City but that we all be prepared for this eventuality of water shortages because of icecaps being changed and melting. I just wanted to mention this general comment.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. I will take this as a general comment, not a question to the City. Thank you for your presentation.

(Applause)

Amaruq Hunters and Trappers Organization is up next. Please proceed.

Presentation by the Amaruq Hunters and Trappers Organization

**Ben Kovic
Jetaloo Kakee
Archie Angnakak
Noah Alookie**

Ben: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Ben Kovic, Amaruq Hunters and Trappers Organization member. My two colleagues will have a presentation as well. We have a long presentation, but it has been condensed to a shorter form. We will have a shorter presentation. We don't want to take too much time.

First of all, thank you, Nunavut Planning Commission for allowing us as a Hunters and Trappers Organization to make a presentation. COVID-19 has been creating havoc to organizations, so we have just been getting active again. During COVID-19, we did not do a whole lot. To the past members and to the current members, they wanted to do some work and activities that were important to us, but we were not able to.

So, my presentation, first of all Amaruq HTO and other HTOs who work with us, we thank you Nunavut Planning Commission. You said you are in your final stages of your process. We have 4,000 in membership and growing. As you know, Iqaluit is the hub of everything in Nunavut, and people who are in our membership have been urged to do some harvesting as well. When you look at 4,000 in membership, it is very hard to do anything and to harvest. Perhaps that is our major problem.

Thank you, NPC, that you have been working with us, that you appeared to not abandon our concerns. We appreciate that, especially when it is related to land and harvesting. Some are saying that some species are endangered and have to be looked at further. I would like to say the signatories that signed in 1993, that was in the *Land Claims Agreement*. It says that the Amaruq HTO with a membership of 4,000 have rights under Article 5.2. Especially in Part 5, it says. It has become important under 2.1 in the *Land Claims Agreement*. Amaruq has a membership of about 4,000 who are entitled to the rights under the *Land Claims Agreement*.

In our new territory, there appears to be many important factors that were not considered. So, as Inuit harvesters, we have lost a great deal. Those of us who are HTOs in Nunavut, we have so many items that were not discussed and excluded in the *Agreement*. We should have participated when the *Land Claims Agreement* was signed, our 4,000 memberships under the *Land Claims Agreement*.

In English, we call it a conditional agreement. In the *Land Claims Agreement*, as a member to the *Land Claims Agreement*, Amaruq HTO, it states in Article 5 that seven outpost camps. Under Article 5, it states very clearly about outpost camps. Many, many people have come into communities from outpost camps. It is under the *Land Claims Agreement*.

The *Land Claims Agreement*, I think there is an amending formula to Article 5. It needs to be improved considerably to serve such as our organization. It should be paid attention to by the signatories including both levels of government. 8.4.9 Parks, same thing. Should there be any renewal to negotiate, Amaruq HTO has a desire to have a say, because we have a territorial park in the city limits. For those of us, we have some disagreements in this Article.

The planning has to recognize what the problems are, what has been omitted to service us. Article 5 as it is written should be paid attention to. It is within our hearts as it was signed. In Part 9, Article 5 shall apply, it says to international or domestic inter-jurisdictional *Agreement* relating to the wildlife management of Zones 1 and 2 as it is. There are a lot of concerns within our lands, surface and subsurface, and surrounding waters. It appears we are heading towards dangerous grounds for the public harvesters and our wildlife. So, when it comes to that situation, what priorities do we have, people or wildlife?

I have been involved in wildlife most of my life. I take wildlife as a priority, and humans are secondary. If we don't have any wildlife legislation within the *Land Claims Agreement*, we would be assured lacking something precious. Article 11, the Nunavut Planning Commission were in the process. Now it has been ongoing for some time. I especially appreciate having to participate in the land planning process because of our wildlife.

There was a question from Igloodik. We have indicated parts of the land that were precious to us. Our recreational areas, if they were ever adhered to in the Article under *Land Claims*, there is not much evidence of anything being done to it. Marine and sea mammals, we spoke of it briefly yesterday. I asked a question if Nunavut Planning Commission has any authority on saltwater areas and what their powers will be in implementing if regulation should ever become a reality. We were made to understand that we have authority on marine life.

Travelling on icebreakers, we have floe edges when we travel. Each of you in the communities probably have concerns about floe edge. I think some of you will answer or understand me, perhaps others not. If regulations were not to pay attention to this, we would have problems. For instance,

the Land Fast Ice Zone has to be important as it states in the *Land Claims Agreement*. These agreements that we are facing today are even important to Canada, for instance Land Fast Ice Zone. I think it is of help to Canadian sovereignty.

Sometimes I consider people who negotiated the *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement* full of wisdom at the time. Even including a Land Fast Ice Zone was negotiated, so it is important. As I mentioned earlier, I will have a shorter presentation.

Amaruq HTO under the *Land Claims Agreement*, we were given responsibility, and it should be clear to us, giving us authority to do our tasks. Land, marine, when you work on these two items, HTO of Nunavut should be a priority consideration to the Nunavut Planning Commission, to the people you are working with both levels of governments and other regulators within the Nunavut area who set policies and expect to be able to do their work. It is like perhaps dancing. Regulations are irregular. It is like dancing where you shake hands and do your dances and leave it there. I think governments are in that situation. It is just shake hands and dance a bit with partners.

As it is with the *Agreement*, the planning process has been in the works for a long time. It is time consuming progress. It will be ongoing. The situations we face when you walk out of this hall, don't consider it finished. I applaud you, Nunavut Planning Commission, for caring enough to give us a presentation and participating in a land process. We could talk all day, but we are not going to do that. I will give my colleague, Jetaloo and Archie Angnakak to give their presentation, perhaps to add to my comment and give their own opinions. Thank you, Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Archie: (*Translated*): Archie Angakak, Amaruq HTO member. Ben's comments and concerns are true. He mentioned the *Land Claims Agreement*. There are many, many things and items in Article 5 that we are concerned with today as it is written in the *Land Claims Agreement*. Although it clearly states and they are precise articles, but 5.7.18 talks about military bases. In 5.7.18, it says to our membership, the Inuit, it gives us free hand in every part of the land for hunting, harvesting, sea and land. It states that clearly in the *Land Claims Agreement*.

That clarifies to me that with Inuit rights, Inuit cannot be removed from land and sea. That includes all categories of land holders: federal, territorial, Inuit lands, proposed parks, parks, local governments. Chair, I just want to clarify that Amaruq HTO, and our 4,000 membership have rights. Their rights should be considered as you plan the Land Use Plan. Work under the Article. It has given us the right in the *Agreement*, including in the parks and regardless of who owns the land.

The City of Iqaluit and other communities, Amaruq and our membership, we want to state according to our rights under the *Land Claims Agreement* whatever it is regulated to land and marine. It is our rights, and we want to state that we have rights to every parcel of land: fishing areas, harvesting, wildlife.

Last week, I was happy just a few weeks ago that we are able to make this presentation. I know what our rights are, and we practice it. So, in your planning process for Nunavut land use, we want to be included. We want to be part of you, your planning process. It should be clear so our children and our future can understand exactly what the land planning process was.

Amaruq HTO has a lot of rights under the *Land Claims Agreement*, especially harvesting rights. We are Inuit, able to practice subsistence living. Under wildlife organization, regardless of what it is, it is our right to harvest. We will hunt. We will harvest, and we want this privilege to be included to our future people in this territory. It is the HTO's responsibility to ensure that these rights are followed. So, Chair, I just wanted to stress what is important to us and that our concerns are part of your planning process.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Jetaloo: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. I don't think I mentioned Brian Aglukark who has been to us and done a lot of work to get this planning process together. We are here, but thanks to all of you for the great work you have done.

(*Applause*)

We as Elders, it was the only way to survive when we had blubber to heat our igloos. Now, today, we use fossil fuel. For those of us who are Elders 60 and over, we know how to survive at the time in harsh conditions. There were no agreements in those days. It was communal living, so we know how we lived in those days. Many have passed on, passing on their knowledge of how to survive.

Now, for instance myself, in Igloolik they pass through, traveling and consulting through the whole region. The travels to each community were related to dog slaughtering at the time. It appears to me at the time, it does not relate to my problems. The Prime Minister of Canada even had to apologize for the past things that were done to us. We didn't ask for it. We didn't expect anything from it. Look, now we have a say. Sometimes it is really hard to hear what your discussions are. The building is not equipped, so I miss quite a few discussions.

We know the marine, the shores with high tides and low tides, where they are and how we use it and harvest. We know the ice conditions, lost seals. We know how to retrieve from the bottom of the water to get our harvesting back, our wildlife. So, saying this, governments should be able to understand how everything is in this community as we know our lakes and waters. For instance, individual hunter harvesting in all forms: land, marine, harvesting caribou and walruses and other mammals, this is what Inuit do. They harvest. The hunters are like this.

Chair, if you don't understand what I am presenting, that is fine. We still know what our people did, seal, blood, bone. This is what we survive on. You may not be aware of what we did in the past to survive and parts of the animals that we all ate. We used to have a lot of caribou herds, sometimes as close as the general hospital. Our caribou in the past were so close, but now they appear to have disappeared. This is our fact of life.

I am glad to talk as an Elder. I have no qualms, and I know what I had to do in the past to survive. So, people like me who are not given the opportunity to make a presentation, I have taken this opportunity to express what I did. So many of us now do not have their mother or father, especially the younger people who ask us for advice. Some even come and ask where can I find polar bear, polar bear denning area? That advice that they gave is the calving areas in this area, the post-calving area. What part of the months do they come in? What part of the months would be best to harvest? So, we give advice to particular species. For instance, March is the time when polar bear and cubs emerge.

I am not the only knowledge keeper of the past, but there are many. I was born in 1934 and there was my older brother. He tells me what parts of the year where I should harvest different species. He is a trapper, fisherman, polar bear hunter in the Pangnirtung area and the surrounding area. At the time, Iqaluit and Pangnirtung had no polar bear, but they are now here. My knowledge when I speak of it in the past, we did not have these species. Now under my knowledge today, we have all of these species around us.

I was born in Pangnirtung. There was a man coming in from Pangnirtung. He came and looked around for many species. I was surprised that we have all forms of animals up here. He uses his telescope for all the species that he sees that he did not expect to see up here. These were the chores that men did. Women had different chores to do. This we know from the past what tasks were given to us.

We asked where are there walrus haul-outs? So few now know where these spots are, and a few of us know now of these areas where haul-outs are, parts of Pang towards the coast going further north. We knew of walrus haul-outs, but this knowledge is known by few people now. These are our past practices.

Now, seal pups are born near Qikiqtarjuaq and a few other areas up the coast near the community, north of the community where these calving areas are. They travel south to mature, and these are the ones that we now hunt. Now everybody is harvesting the seals. Some people now harvest them for recreational purposes, even on the floe edge. There are a few who practice recreational harvesting, but these were essential skills that we had in the past. We hunt on land. We harvest from marine life. We know where the dens are. The harvesters who could read the weather pattern are long gone, who knew the land.

We now understand many policies we have to follow now. Today's main concern now is to make money, and that is the practice many people are taking now. At the time, money did not matter. Right now, the conditions you are working under with the *Land Claims Agreement* appears to be ruling everything, paperwork. This is what we were not used to in the past, having to work under policy conditions, paper conditions that are dictated to us today.

My new colleagues have explained well what we are facing today. I have knowledge of the past as an Elder. We know now what we knew then, and I still wish that it would be implemented today. We have QIA. We have NTI. We have Regional Inuit Associations that I rarely have knowledge of but had to follow because they are imposed on me. We did not know these organizations existed at the time. Sometimes I even think that some of these policies are so unbelievable, so inconsistent. At times, it seems silly.

When we don't follow, what are you doing now? It says this is how we do things. In the past, we didn't have these safeguards over us. Thank you. Thank you, Nunavut Planning Commission. As an ordinary Elder, you are allowing me to sit at this table to give my thoughts and my beliefs to you. I hope when you are planning for the future that it will be useful. Your staff will probably understand.

When people, organizations come into Iqaluit, we have to follow many, many things by law such as RCMP and other lawmakers. It is even hard now to walk to your boat when you want to hunt. When you want to go out, it is not simple now just to carry your rifle from home to the shore. There are

so many policies regulating us. Our knowledge, our practice from the past is normal to me. I am now over. Thank you.

(Applause)

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. That concludes your presentation. We are going to take a break. We will get into the question-and-answer session after that. We will take a 15-minute break.

Break

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Now we can proceed. We will give our staff the first chance to ask questions. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. This is Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you to the Amaruq Hunters and Trappers Organization for your presentation. I have one question about caribou habitat in the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. The 2021 Draft Plan was updated to include a number of caribou calving and post-calving grounds areas that were identified by the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board as Limited Use designations with year-round prohibitions on several industrial activities. I am wondering if the Hunters and Trappers Organization has any comments on how the Draft Plan is proposing to manage these caribou habitats near the City of Iqaluit. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Ben: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Ben Kovic, Hunters and Trappers Organization, Iqaluit. Regarding caribou habitat, from what we have noted before, we ask Amaruq for...we don't enforce. The Department of Environment is responsible for policing. We have opportunities to comment regarding the areas where caribou are. We have a chance to comment. The Nunavut Government is responsible for the management. In terms of Jonathan's comment with the caribou calving areas, we have to work with the government on caribou habitat. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Hopefully I answered your question.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are you done? Okay, Qujannamiik. Are there questions from around the table?

Noah: *(Translated)*: We mentioned 4,000 members. The membership is free for Iqaluitmiut. The HTO is first available to members only at a reduced price. You can purchase. If you are not a member, you cannot purchase materials from our store. It is a free membership. I just wanted to note that in Iqaluit, you have to be a resident here for six months. Thank you.

Chairperson: Can you state your name, please?

Noah: I am also from Amaruk. Noah Alookie.

Chairperson: The other name I have is Laosie.

Laosie: *(Translated)*: I just wanted to say when Jetaloo was speaking, I can relate to him about the wildlife comments that he had when he was speaking. I too, lived in the old days that we hunted bears and

walrus. I can relate to what Jetaloo was saying. We too will have an opportunity, but I just wanted to thank you for your knowledge and their comments. We will have an opportunity tomorrow. I can relate to Jetaloo very much on wildlife. I will have an opportunity tomorrow. I too, will be presenting.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Paul, did you have a question? No? Those are the names we have around the table. Nunavik, do you have any questions to the presentation? *(Pause)*

Any questions from the registered participants? *(Pause)*

Go ahead, James. State your name and organization.

James: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Related to caribou, in the Baffin in Iqaluit, we too want to go. If I want to go caribou hunting from Clyde River, I bring a tag. Can I hunt down here near Iqaluit? What are the rules on caribou hunting? I would like some clarity. We know that there is work done on wildlife management in the South Baffin. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. That is not related to the agenda or the presentation. That is more a matter for Amaruq. You can ask them directly. We will stick to the topics. Are there any questions from the registered participants? *(Pause)*

From the general public, are there any questions? *(Pause)*

Hearing none, thank you, Amaruq.

(Applause)

Kimmirut Hamlet your HTO or Hamlet may have a separate presentation or have a joint presentation if you want. Please state your name, your organization. You may proceed with your presentation now. Please be mindful of the interpreters who may not keep up.

Presentation by the Kimmirut Hamlet

Maliktoo Lyta

Mary Lyta

Maliktoo: *(Translated)*: We don't have a lot of presentation. The Community of Kimmirut has a problem. We are concerned about a water source. Once we run low of our water source, our watershed is quite far, so it is a major concern to us. The funding is always a problem. Our sewage lagoons as well, we have problems within the municipality. We have no land available to build further.

Yesterday we heard many concerns related to community problems. The smaller communities appear to always be on the bottom of the priority list within the territory. We have a lot of problems, and the smaller communities will agree with me that the capital is always short of funding. My

colleague will perhaps have her say as well. We have the same name. Mind you, she is not my daughter. She is my sister. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Please state your name.

Mary L: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Mary Lyta. I have been a Councillor for some time. I am just happy to be here to listen to the other community concerns, similar to mine. I don't have many topics to discuss. I just want to say thank you for allowing us to hear what the concerns are in our region.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Are there questions? Are there questions from the table? *(Pause)*

There appears to be none. Nunavik delegation, do you have any questions? *(Pause)*

There appears none. Registered participants? Public? *(Pause)*

There appears none. Thank you for the presentation.

(Applause)

Next is the Mayukalik HTO. Please state your name and organization. You may proceed when you are ready.

Presentation by the Mayukalik HTO

Mikidjuk Koala

Jawlie Akavak

Mikidjuk: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Mikidjuk Kolola, Mayukalik HTO in Kimmirut. I don't have a long presentation. I have a short presentation that I would like to pass on to you. Like other communities, we have caribou, mammals, walrus, whales. These are all essential food sources for Inuit people, and we want protection all around for each species that I have mentioned. Their habitat should be protected and are of paramount importance to us.

Too much disturbance is starting to happen to walrus haul-outs and caribou habitat. You probably have heard that caribou shortage is in Baffin, but our land in our vicinity has an abundance of caribou. We have a lot of waterfowl that come in each spring and stay in their own sanctuary. We are all aware of bird sanctuaries. They are importance us. Disturbance is always a problem. For instance, some bird sanctuaries where they converge in the fall have migrated elsewhere. So, we have these problems. Some islands where birds used to be, have gone and moved on to other areas as well.

So, we want no further disturbance from activities on our lands so our children may enjoy what we are enjoying today. Our future needs this abundance we have. The hunting and harvesting areas we have should be protected. The bird sanctuaries where they do their eggging in spring should be protected, not only the birds but as mentioned earlier, they are all important. Migrating whales in spring and summer are important to us. We have very few animals that stay here year-round and at our floe edge. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik.

Jawlie: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jawlie Akavak, Kimmirut HTO. I am a Councillor there. I have looked at your maps and their numbers. I will just refer to them for a short time. I don't have a long presentation. First one, 27 says winter caribou habitat. They are year-round in our community, and you appear to have skipped that they are in the community and vicinity year-round. I would like that corrected. Their wintering grounds is not registered within your maps.

Map on page 28 says caribou summer habitat. The caribou habitat for the summer is not clearly marked on your documents, especially on your map. They have habitat near the community, south of the community where they spend their summer habitat. There are a lot of caribou in our area. It is not marked, and I would like to have that included on your maps where the caribou habitat is for year-round habitation.

On page 29 on the map, walrus calving grounds, south of Kimmirut they have a calving ground. It appears that you have not identified that in your map. This is where it is a calving ground. I just wanted to notice what you have omitted in your maps.

I think at 12, 15 [2012, 2015?] to the best of my memory, we had a lot of caribou restrictions starting around that time on Baffin Island. At that time, we were told that caribou have disappeared altogether. This is a source coming in from the government. They implemented that the caribou are so few now that they implemented a quota system and allowable harvest. At that time, we were told that caribou have disappeared.

When we start harvesting caribou, the allowable harvest quota system was implemented and imposed by the government. Although we had caribou, we were very short of caribou. Hunting was very limited, and that was very inconvenient to us when the quota system was used up in our community, especially during the winter. We were told that your quota has been used up, so that was devastating to us, as if caribou disappearance was our fault, which it is not.

The harvesting caribou restriction imposed on us by a quota system was a hardship for us as we all know. When the caribou quota system is gone, although few hunters in our community were harvesting caribou as if they were poaching. The regulators did not understand what our situation was. They were not diligent in their research where the caribou was plentiful in our region. Now we like to harvest caribou from the winter stock.

The regulation that was imposed upon us has to change. It does not suit us. We have a lot of caribou in South Baffin. As people, we are very happy with the abundance of caribou, and your quota system has to change to our region. From the past when we start interfering and when we over-harvest, they practice well. They had abundance, and this is our practice today regardless of what regulators are imposing on us, which is a lack of knowledge on their parts. Harvesters are not consulted.

With a lot of responsibility, the knowledge should be heard from the HTOs when it comes to our life. So, just to advise you that you lack some facts on the maps. January 10, 2023 is so close. Perhaps if you could extend, even by one month. Two months would be nice so we can properly respond to the proceedings that you are carrying on so we could have a proper time to respond, a time to make

proper judgments before the submission date. Could you possibly perhaps extend that deadline a bit? This would be most helpful to us. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Are there questions from the table? Jonathan?

Jawlie *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. I have a hard time hearing sometimes, so I am sorry for speaking again. I just want to make a clarification. There are so many boats coming in from the city to our community, our fishing areas. They come in through by boats. Our community does a lot of whale hunting and mammals in this region where heavy traffic is coming in from the city. They come into our area. They are all over the coast, the valleys. It is a very good hunting ground. A lot of disturbance is also created by people coming into self-stone quarries. I just wanted to clarify these problems we are facing.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Thank you to the representatives for your presentation. This is Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. We appreciate the comments on some of the areas that are missing from the current Draft. I would note as well that in addition to the areas that are mapped on the large format poster-sized maps, we do also have extensive mapped information from the Community of Kimmirut that was collected many years ago that is part of the Land Use Plan but not shown so easily on the map.

We do recognize the request for an extension. The Commission has not granted an extension beyond January 10th, and we do encourage you to provide any additional information you are able to before that January 10, 2023 deadline.

I would also like to clarify in regard to your comments on quotas, in particular, that the Commission does not have a mandate to establish or adjust any harvesting quotas. That is the jurisdiction of the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board and the Government of Nunavut, but in terms of caribou, the Draft Plan as you know, can provide management for other land uses within caribou habitat. We would be curious to hear your thoughts on how the Draft Plan should manage these other land uses in important caribou habitat. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Do you want to comment? It was mostly just answering some concerns you brought. Do you want to respond?

Jawlie: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jawlie Akavak, Kimmirut HTA. My hearing... I did not take my hearing device. Sorry, I did not understand what you were saying. I don't want to mistake the answer, so I won't say anything. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Yes, that is understandable. Those that are here, sometimes you are asked a question. Sometime later on if you want to answer or in written format, we can take your comments. Sometimes when they put you on the spot, it is hard to come up with the proper timely answer, so written submissions are welcome if you did not include any of your comments that you want to include. If you want to answer that following the sessions, you can as well. Brian, go ahead.

Brian: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Brian Aglukark, Nunavut Planning Commission. Just to clarify, if you did not understand what he was saying, the wildlife habitat is not on one map. They are on

various maps that the Commission has. The deadline of January 10th is not flexible, but it could possibly be thought about or discussed now that you have raised it. The wildlife habitat is the Wildlife Management, but we also want to hear. You have until January 10th just for clarification, Mr. Chairman.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there questions from around the table? Ben? Proceed.

Ben: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. We just want to show our support to Kimmirut. As an Elder, we look at the maps. It is still that more work needs to be done before we finalize all these maps that we want to include. The wintering downs of caribou, fish, polar bear denning, there was work done by the Commission in researching maps around Iqaluit, but looking at the maps, I do not see the detail that we provided. I think I understand what Jonathan is saying that there will be changes. January 10th is very close, and only through written presentations currently before January 10th.

The Hunters and Trappers hear the work that you did in the communities on the maps. I would like to see more detail on the maps that include everything. We have worked hard to plan. Let's work together. I want to support. It is like we are square dancing, and we meet again. We have to support each other.

We are heading toward the end of this process. Whether the maps done in communities like Amaruq, we were asked by the Commission around the Iqaluit area about wildlife issues and various sites. We did mark maps. We did map work. I thought I would see some of the maps. We don't see that. So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see some of the detail that we expect of what we worked with. I support Kimmirut. They too marked maps. From then to today, there have been changes in wildlife. There is a difference. Before January 10th let's *(translator did not complete the sentence)*. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. I did not hear a question. Are there questions around the table to the presentation? *(Pause)*

Nunavik, do you have questions to the presentation? *(Pause)*

Hearing none, are there questions from the registered participants regarding the presentation? Go ahead. You can ask.

James: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. James Qillaq, Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board Chairperson. The presentation about caribou habitat routes, to support the caribou, I would like the caribou habitat routes if you don't have it as Mayukalik. They said they were marking maps related to caribou habitat and want it included as part of this. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: To Mayukalik, do you guys want to answer? Did you understand? I did not understand. *(Interpreter indicated he also did not understand what he said, presumably regarding the comments of James Qillaq)*. Sorry, perhaps you can come up and ask your question again.

James: *(Translated)*: I want it to be clear. The calving grounds, how are they protected? Have they been set aside? As Inuit, we know the caribou routes and the water crossing areas and the routes that caribou have. I just wanted to know what they have noted in this area. How can we protect the caribou

habitat, calving grounds? How is that structured at Mayukalik related to caribou? That is what I wanted to understand. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jawlie?

Jawlie: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jawlie Akavak, Mayukalik Hunters and Trappers Organization. The maps that I said need more clarification, even I can't answer right away, but we will provide a written comment from here. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. That is okay. Are there more questions from the registered participants?
(Pause)

I don't see any hands. Any questions from the public? Go ahead.

Oqituk: *(Translated)*: Oqituk Ashoona, Kinngait. Caribou from North Baffin arrive to Kinngait through Netsilik River, 20,000 to 30,000. Mr. Ferguson and Ben Kovic are aware when the caribou came down. I want to ask Kimmirut from the Qikiqtaaluk south side, whether the caribou are moving north or northwest. It is hard to tell the routes now. It seems there will be an agreement or a deadline of January 10th. My question about caribou from South Baffin near Kimmirut, which way are they going? They don't stay still. Four-legged creatures go all over the place.

Which way are they migrating, whether you understand? On January 10th for wildlife management in our future, we who are here and the way we understand, we are writing for the future. My question of Kimmirut, Mayukalik regarding the wildlife, which way are they going? Caribou that arrive from North Baffin in 1996 and whether they have gone up. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jawlie?

Jawlie: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jawlie Akavik, Mayukalik Hunters and Trappers Organization. From what we are seeing about caribou, in 1993 you mentioned there were not that many. Now I noted there are more caribou. We don't literally count them, but we know and understand that this year and in 2021, caribou between Iqaluit and Kimmirut by snowmobile, our trail has been cut by caribou tracks. They are more inland of the community. This past winter, still we saw more tracks. They seem to be travelling towards Kinngait. They are not as numerous as they used to be. We can see by the tracks, but we know in South Baffin on Melville Peninsula that they have been hanging around there year-round. That is my response. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon will add regarding the 10th of January.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for the questions and the comments. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. To address the timeline of January 10th, 2023, the land use planning process has been in the works for almost 20 years, and this is a first-generation Plan. While we know that the Plan includes the data that we have to date, including the submissions since the Plan was released in 2021, all presentations both oral and written are on the record and will be accepted until the 10th of January.

Again, it is a first-generation Plan, and that means it is the Plan that will go forward to the parties, including the evidence that is submitted until that time. It is a living document, and going forward,

it can be amended and changed. So, as new datasets and new information on migrations and the climate, development, economic opportunities, as all of that information becomes available, amendments can be done once the Plan is in place and approved, at any time.

So, I thank you for identifying that there is additional work that needs to be done. The Commission remains committed to working with all communities and all organizations and parties to ensure that by January 10th we have the most accurate information for the *Options and Recommendation Document* for the Commissioners to consider, and to decide the content of that Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan going forward. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik for the clarification. I have no more names. Any more questions? *(Pause)*

Not Identified: *(Translated)*: I have one. You mentioned where would you place the boundary? For example, wildlife, the law that was going to be used. We have not heard. What are you talking about? What do you mean it is a living document? How is it alive?

Chairperson: Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you for your question. I know that when we translate, it is difficult for the translation sometimes. When we say it is a living document, the meaning is the document can be changed and amended once it is in place. So, it is never a document that is passed and stays as it is. As we go forward and we have new information, it can be added and changed. I hope that answers the question of how we term it as a living document. It is a document that can go forward and change. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Is that good? You understand? Thank you. I have no more names, and we are coming close to lunchtime. Thank you, Kimmirut HTO.

(Applause)

Qujannamiik. We will take a lunch break and be back at 1:15. We will see you this afternoon.

Lunch Break

Presentation by the Hamlet of Kinngait

Ejetsiak Ejetsiak

Kumaarjuk Pii

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: We will hear from the Kinngait Hamlet first. The HTA will go after them. If they can come up. Just a reminder: Don't forget to silence your phone. Shut the ringer off for respect to the speakers. Please note your name and your organization first before you proceed. You can proceed if you are ready.

Ejetsiak: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. We come from the Hamlet of Kinngait. Ejetsiak Ejetsiak. As

the hamlet, I was not too aware, but I want to note that we live off the animals of the land and the sea. Clams and fish in the summer are a big part of our diet while it is open water season.

I want to note the sewage flow that flows out. We have a lot of mountains in our area, and there is limited space for the sewage lake. We end up pouring downstream into a lake, even in the wintertime. I want to bring this forward to the Commission. The sewage is affecting. It was built but it has not been used. It has been finished. There is some kind of issue related that it might drain into a lake nearby to the water source of the community. It was constructed, and we have not used it. The road to there was blasted. That is how major the construction was. Now we aren't currently using it.

Perhaps the Commission might consider waste from Kinngait. There are clams and fish that we catch, and the sewage is running into the ocean. This is not very acceptable. I want to bring this forward. I mention the sewage.

There is an issue that provides lots for buildings. The floors get ruined because the land is moving. In winter and in spring, there is a lot of land shifting. It is probably not just in Kinngait. That is part of our problem. Even the floors start cracking. The arena in Kinngait, the floor always has to be repaired, because it is moving from underneath. This should be considered.

We live off the wildlife. We also go walrus hunting a lot throughout the whole year. In spring, summer, winter, we hunt walrus year-round. It is our food source, and the sewage might be affecting our wildlife. I wanted to bring that as a concern. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. My partner here will also speak. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed.

Kumaarjuk: (*Translated*): Kumaarjuk with the Hamlet of Kinngait. I am a Councillor. First, I want to thank you all, the Commissioners for the opportunity. We are also grateful that we value Inuit culture. I am grateful that you are representing our views as Inuit. It too must be difficult for you as Commissioners. I wish my father was here. I had a father who knew Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit. He would be grateful for the work that you are doing. I think he would have honoured the work that you are doing, representing Inuit.

I encourage you that we too want the opportunity. Sometimes we don't always speak up. I too, have been a Councillor for a while. I am learning to understand the procedures of meetings. I hope I am making sense. We have adult children with grandkids that hunt a lot. They know from their grandfather, from my father. They grew up learning and knowing how to hunt. They hunt for me today.

As a mother, we are concerned about our children. When they hunt, it is a worry, a concern of safety-related issues. Also, our community Sikusiilaq where it did not ice up, there are lots of wildlife. All the wildlife and the birds that fly go through here. As a community, that came out based on wildlife that animals could enjoy the area. We know we won't go back to the old ways. We are relying on you to represent us.

Our food, our culture are our strengths today. My parents, my mother and father, they shared in every way, as it is the culture. Today, if my boys got a caribou, we try not to share. We share just

the smallest little piece with even the closest neighbor. That is not Inuit culture. We need improvements. Somebody, keep me a piece of caribou meat.

Inuit Elders as we age ourselves, those that came before us that know Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, I encourage you to search, record. I want to note Achiak from our community, and I approached him as well. He states that the wildlife goes up and down in numbers and they change and transform. Based on Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, they know these things. Search them out. Seek their knowledge.

I seem to be just talking away here. We did not plan that much. I just want to note I understand English, but how the processes work, I am still trying to figure things out. We did have an opportunity in our community, but we have been going through some difficult times losing family. We are burying our kids. I just want to say my regrets for not being ready, but I could not comment on any of the maps. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. No, you don't need to have regrets. Are there questions? Nunavik, are there questions? *(Pause)*

Same. Okay, from the registered participants, are there any questions? *(Pause)*

How about the general public from Iqaluitmiut? *(Pause)*

Thank you for your presentation.

(Applause)

The HTO from Kinngait, you can come up. State your name, organization, and who you represent before you speak. When you are ready, you can proceed.

Presentation from the Kinngait Hunters and Trappers Organization

Adamie Numa, Chairman

Simigak Suvega

Adamie N: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Adamie Numa, Chairman of the HTA. Thank you for bringing us together. We heard from our fellow Kinngaitmiut. In the months, we were burying people daily, sometimes two people. It was difficult. We could not even keep up with the loss of family and relatives. We couldn't get together. I just want to note that it has been hard times, and it is still going. We were not able to put a presentation together.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: If you want to speak, proceed.

Simigak: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Simigak Suvega, Kinngait HTO. With the process that has been going on, we are aware over time with Nunavut and our community. Our wildlife that we harvest from communities that hunters hunt that our ancestors lived on, today we know and have seen the communities are affecting the animals, the wildlife.

For example, not just the hunters, there is an accumulated impact on the wildlife that move and travel. Those that are moving to Nunavut to do production or work and want to undertake activities that affect animals, and animals will travel. They have routes. The marine animals are seasonal, and the geese come and go from the south. The animals and the marine should have the least amount of impact or industrial impact possible. It is not just from hunters now that they are feeling the impact. They feel the effects of shipping and airplanes.

Kinngait, the location is a route that they pass through our community. They come pretty close when they go around that bend. Our representatives perhaps related to the sea that we have some influence, for example the marine animals that migrate or are coming further. The land around Kinngait needs some kind of protection so that we can use not just for the community.

We look at maps. It looks small as the footprint, but the area on Baffin Island when we talk about Baffin Island, we have to be able to defend the animals, the terrestrial animals that live on the land and also that our ancestors knew where to look for. Up at Netsilik Lake, we support the protection of that lake. We have mentioned that a number of times that it needs to be protected. When it comes to wildlife in our area on Baffin Island, they too need support and protection.

Under the *Land Claims Agreement*, we have rights, but we need to understand in the context of wildlife when we talk about the ocean that we have a say. We are concerned about the animals, the management, the government regulations and laws, research issues that the government undertakes related to wildlife. The maps are numerous, and many notes are on the maps related to wildlife. Which is the priority? What do we protect?

But sometimes as communities, we have little impact. When the government runs when you look at Nunavut that we work with you and to seek agreements with this process. Within the government regulations, there is the right to represent, the right to speak and to seek agreements, not just now but in the future.

When we think of the youth that are coming behind us, it is the animals that we will always rely on. Even the young people love to hunt today and to be included in hunts. I know it won't stop as a community that we represent them as well in what the community wants. Wildlife management, I know we keep speaking about this. I tried to shorten my comments, but I think we are aware about our community of what we are doing. That is it. I tried to make it short, Mr. Chairman, if that is understandable. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Don't have any regrets. We understand exactly what you are saying. Communities go through difficult times. We understand. We support you. We support our Elders. It is difficult. We come to listen, and that is why we are here to give you the opportunity to speak. Do not worry about your comments. We go through hard times. I will ask from the floor if there are any questions, first from the table?

Solomon: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Solomon Awa, Mayor of the City of Iqaluit. I want to hear from Kinngait to the Netsilik Lake area.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: You can answer if you want.

Adamie N: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Adamie Numa, HTO Kinngait. If I understood your question, north there is a bird sanctuary from Netsilik River. It is a large area that geese, ducks, guillemots, and cranes have eggs. They fly over Kinngait in the spring. They are around for a while, but their nesting grounds once the snow is ground, they pass on further. Then they pass back through in the fall. Also, toward Netsilik Lake has been identified activity based on wildlife. Hopefully that answered your question.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. I think you answered it. No more questions at the table? *(Pause)*

Hearing none, are there any from the registered participants? *(Pause)*

Hearing none, are there any from Iqaluit? Proceed.

Meeka: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Meeka Mike. I want to ask, and I asked before three years about the caribou routes, whether there were a lot before the white man. I would like to hear the old rules that there are three inlets for caribou, for the caribou routes and their migration routes. I ask whether you know. If you don't answer me right now, it is good. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Do you want to answer?

Adamie N: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Adamie Numa from the Hunters and Trappers Organization, Kinngait. The issue you asked about, there are people that might be better able to answer your question. I could possibly ask around and find an answer.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. No regrets. No problem. You can answer later on if you want, even if you don't answer now. Are there any other questions? Are we good? *(Pause)*

I have no more names. Thank you.

(Applause)

Next is the Hamlet of Igloolik. You can proceed at any time. Your name, please.

Presentation by the Hamlet of Igloolik George Auksaq

George: *(Translated)*: George Auksaq, Hamlet of Igloolik. I would like you to do your work. I will try to do my best to give you directions, since we conceived Nunavut years back, the *Nunavut Agreement* for all of Nunavummiut. We have concerns about exploration companies. There is no land use plan to guide us, to help guide us to negotiate with the companies coming up. As you know, we live on an island. The little island is a municipal land in its entirety. The only control we don't have as a hamlet is the sea surrounding us.

When we have problems, municipal problems, the hamlet is responsible for all of the land that we live in. I have a very short presentation. Outside the municipal boundaries will be discussed by the Igloolik HTO. They are more of a support to us because they have a responsibility beyond our

municipal land. I just want you to continue your important work. It is a long process, and I hope it will be approved. I am going to hand this presentation to the HTO. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Are there questions from the delegates? *(Pause)*

There appears none. Nunavik? *(Pause)*

Registered delegates? *(Pause)*

Qujannamiik. There appears none. Public from Iqaluit? *(Pause)*

There appears none. Thank you for your presentation.

(Applause)

The HTO of Igloolik, please. Please state your name before you proceed. You may start.

Presentation by the Igloolik Hunters and Trappers Organization

Jacobie Malliki, Secretary Manager

Natalino Piugattuk

Lloyd Idlout

Jacobie: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Jacobie Malliki, HTO Secretary Manager. We will take turns to our presentation. To my question today to the City of Iqaluit, I realize now that I should direct it to Nunavut Planning Commission and to both levels of government, NTI, QIA, and to you in general.

We need to sort, implement, and see what the regulations would be once approved. We will need to know who to deal with. Who will be directly responsible for the policies that will emerge?

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Is that a general question to the Nunavut Planning Commission? Jonathan perhaps? Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you for the question. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. If I understand the question correctly, the questions are once the Plan is approved, who is responsible for the regulations and the implementation. Correct? Thank you.

Once the Land Use Plan is approved, the Commission will continue with the implementation of the Nunavut-wide Nunavut Land Use Plan. All regulators that are landowners or users of the land, any that issue licenses, authorizations, or permits will also be compelled and obligated to implement and follow the Land Use Plan.

The varying levels of government, they are here. They will be doing their presentations, and they will be speaking to their pieces of their regulations, as well as the Inuit Organization and NTI. So, in

general, all of the regulators that carry the legislation for monitoring and enforcement, including the Commission for the ongoing implementation and conformity determinations, we are all responsible and have an active part in continuing forward.

With regard to the Commission specifically, we do have two plans that are in effect, and they will continue to be in effect and implemented until the Nunavut-wide Land Use Plan is approved. It will replace the two existing regional land use plans. I hope that answered your question. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Jacobie: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. Jacobie Malliki, HTO Igloolik, Secretary Manager. The Nunavut Planning Commission as of now, I don't think you will have any jurisdiction. Will you have that title?

Chairperson: Go ahead, Sharon.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for your question. The Commission's jurisdiction, once the Plan is approved, will continue. The Commission is not only tasked for developing the Land Use Plan and putting it forward to the parties for their approval or rejection. Once the Plan is approved, the jurisdiction continues, and the Commission will continue to implement and monitor the Plan.

Depending on the terms that are agreed upon in the approved Land Use Plan, we will continue to review the Plan going forward and process any amendments, as well as any conformity determinations on the terms and conditions of anyone who wants to come into the territory to use the land. They are required to follow those terms and conditions, and the jurisdiction of the Commission will continue with regard to doing conformity determinations and our mandate as outlined in the *Nunavut Agreement* and the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act*. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you for the question.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Jacobie: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. Jacobie Malliki, HTO Igloolik, Secretary Manager. Thank you for the answers.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You may proceed with your presentation.

Natalino: (*Translated*): Natalino Piugattuk from Igloolik HTO. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Long ago, DEW lines were built in the 1950s. I just want to speak generally to that aspect. There was a time when I was on a cleaning up team. That was 10 years ago. The land they occupied was six miles away from our community.

There is a hill near that area during the spring. It creates a lot of problem during the spring thaw, especially to the bridge that was leading to the DEW line. The river was then at one point. During the cleanup, we didn't realize there was a dam there. It was problematic to wildlife, and we don't know what the conditions are of that old site to date. I don't think anybody has done anything to clean it up.

Now for the community, the island nesting area surrounding our community or nearby areas, today they are areas where walrus haul-outs are. When it is ice-free, the islands are now occupied and have walrus populations. I don't know what regulations are. We were aware of walruses on icebergs, but now for the summer habitation of these walruses, things have changed a lot.

When I was a youngster, we used to hunt walrus way out in the icefields because of the melting earlier. We are now hunting on land for walruses. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Lloyd: *(Translated)*: Thank you, Chair and Commissioners, and you communities at the table, and all the delegates who came in. I am glad to be able to participate. We are not all that well prepared. We appreciate people who gave us a rundown of what to expect. These were the people from the Nunavut Planning Commission. Your preparation was very helpful of what to expect at this proceeding.

We don't have much mapping to do in the Igloolik area. When we work with NPC delegates, we were involved along with the hamlet council. We were advised at one point that we will be able to participate this process, looking at the maps to determine what was important to us. Along the way, we have neglected that advice. So, we are ill-prepared.

At the same time, we are very much aware and concerned about an area outside of Igloolik. There was a question that there should be monitors to control whatever activity is going on, someone neutral for companies coming in to monitor the kind of work they are doing and perhaps to see if the land is being misused or damaged. So, it is important that anyone who comes up to Nunavut to do some construction and other work, as a community we always have concerns on what was going on, the kind of work that is going on. I would like to express myself clearly, so I am doing my best.

The other thing I would like to see is an organization where we could plead our case if something was wrong with companies who are doing some work in our area, perhaps your organization. There is at times a lot of damage to the land being used. We need a lot of cleanups in our area as well. Will this be the NPC responsibility as well?

For now, I just want to thank you for this opportunity to give our views. We did a little bit of mapping and were advised that this would be important to this process, both to land and marine. We are not quite done yet, and your deadline for January 10th is so close. The timeframe is bothersome to us. As an Igloolik representative, I would like to see one of your people to come up to Igloolik as an advisor so we can do the work properly, designate land maps in our surrounding areas properly, how we want it designated. I ask if someone could come to our community before the January 10th deadline to work with us. I will leave it at that.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for your presentation and your comments. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. With the waste site identification, the Commission does have within the mandate under Article 11.9.1: Waste Site Identification. With regard to the responsibility for the clean-up, that lies between the federal government and the jurisdiction with the Government of Nunavut, and they can speak to that.

To work with your community prior to January 10th, you have the Commission's commitment. Can we get there in person? No, we don't have the budget or the resources, but in saying that, we will work with you. There is Zoom, and we have worked with many of the communities to assist them to understand the data that we have collected to date. We will work with you to ensure that you have the support to get your submission in by the 10th of January. I thank you, Mr. Chair, and I thank you for your comments.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. *(Response not translated)*

Ben: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Ben Kovic, Amaruq HTO, Iqaluit. It is not much of a question. It is just a remark to your general comment. I started to worry. It talks about you having to work on maps. Don't worry about it. Don't worry about doing your maps. You don't have to do everything as you are told. You don't have to do the full work as requested. You can mark as little as you want. It will have to be utilized and put into use by NPC people, their employees.

Just go ahead and do what you have to do with the map, as in Iqaluit we were in that same situation. I think we were in the same situation where we did work very late. Of course, COVID-19 was obstructive as well for the work that we wanted to do. You as an HTO, if you have not done your mark, you have time. January 10th is still quite a way off. Planning Commission staff, work with them as suggested.

We went through the same situation. We were assisted, and we were able to accomplish something. As they said, they will assist you. What we want is a final product that could assist how this process is going to be. Don't worry who to ask. I don't think it was clarified to you who to talk to. Many community HTOs go through a lot of time due to lack of resources at times, but according to the NA, the signatories including NTI, they should be able to assist you. They are our parent company.

Don't worry of their reaction. They should be able to assist you. If they cannot answer your questions, look to and talk to other organizations, not just NPC. This is just a general comment so NPC can further think how they should assist and what your needs are especially to what you said of the maps. Don't belittle yourself. Just do your work. This is a big process. It is no small matter. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. I don't see any other questions from the table. Nunavik, questions? *(Pause)*

There appears none. Registered participants? *(Pause)*

There appears none. General public? *(Pause)*

There appears none. Thank you for your presentation. Give them a hand please.

(Applause)

Qujannamiik. I think we will proceed next to the Hamlet of Sanirajak. The Hamlet and HTO will do a joint presentation. Please state your name, your organization before you proceed. Whenever you are ready, go ahead.

Presentation by the Hamlet and HTO of Sanirajak

Jopie Kaernerker, Hamlet
Abraham Qammaniq, HTO
Ammie Kipsagak

Jopie: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Jopie Kaernerker, Hamlet of Sanirajak. I am sorry to say that we were not very productive for this meeting, but at the same time I am happy to be here. We have heard quite a bit about the Nunavut Planning Commission since the *Nunavut Agreement* was signed. At that time, I thought everything would go at full speed to the organizations and our concerns in general in Nunavut. So, I am happy that you are trying to produce something.

Sometimes we are late in our responsibilities and tasks we have to do. Little communities as mentioned before, are always last to be concerned with by larger bodies, government or otherwise. We are a little late here, but regardless, I am happy that you are here conducting your proceedings and all the concerns that our community is concerned with.

Exploration companies are a great concern to us. We appear to be surrounded by mineral explorations, and this will have to be resolved so we know what is going on. We are, after all, living in Nunavut, but still, we are never informed of what is going on in the immediate vicinity with ships, cargo ships, mining exploration, and other organizations in our lands.

Things are a little different today. It appears now that our waterfowl have gone from our area, especially eider ducks, lesser geese, and other fowl species. Walruses and walrus haul-outs near our community where they used to congregate as a species have gone this summer. There are none. Their traditional habitation is empty. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. We will continue.

Abraham: *(Translated)*: Abraham Qammaniq, HTO of Sanirajak. I will do a presentation. We are at the edge of Baffin Island just bordering to the Kivalliq. Many times, being so close to the border creates problems for us, perhaps due to different jurisdictions. One Kivalliq community sometimes when they are approved to do some work, they infringe on our area because the border is so close. It is defined, but it is not defined to the people who are doing the work. There should be a proper definition of the border, the Kivalliq area caribou herd sometimes being so close to the border.

A comment was made that our community has been neglected many times due to its size. We have to understand. We have to be informed. Companies working outside the Qikiqtaaluk region, if they are approved in other regions, sometimes they have to be told that you cannot cross this border. You were not approved to work in this region, so they have to be told that this regional border is important.

Sometimes mineral explorations are not only disturbing but create a mess as well. If it is exploration on nonrenewable resources, oil exploration, a mess or disturbance will be created. We have to know what jurisdiction responsibility rules are so we can tackle them and understand. Sometimes we are

just surprised that something has come up. There is no way to react in such a short notice when something emerges to work.

Although we are from Baffin Island, I think for the last two years, Baffin Island appears to have run out of caribou species. In our area, there are caribou herds. People from the high Arctic usually spend huge amounts of funds to come down. In one winter alone, the communities from North Baffin came down and harvested over 500 caribou. This was devastating to our harvesting area and our caribou herd. This is a very bad practice. These mammals are very, very valuable resources to us. Sometimes some confrontation has appeared, and this is not very comfortable.

The migration of herds seems to have changed a lot, perhaps due to climate change. We have heard from the presenters that they are running out of caribou herds. The migrations of other species appear to have altered. Sometimes there are times when we don't know where our walruses have gone to. Across the other side, it used to be so full of ice where you cannot navigate even in the summer. Now the icebergs have all gone, perhaps due to climate change. I am just telling you what our immediate vicinity is like.

Perhaps it is not your responsibility. I don't know. The Northwest Passage is becoming an ice-free zone. It is going to be congested with traffic, and the world is starting to see it is a route we can take. I would like to leave it at that for now. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Staff? Are there questions from the delegates? Jetaloo?

Jetaloo: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Thank you, Sanirajak. Us over here, we feel for you. The wind, the weather, the patterns that we know from the northwest and between Greenland and Canada, the ice that moves in the Arctic. The work of the mine is affecting the ice. We feel for you through the wind and the weather movements. Also, Pangnirtung, Cumberland Sound, and Frobisher Bay have a lot of current, but we feel what we are going to regarding to wildlife. We will have an opportunity.

I want to note to the Commission that those of us over here are a mix of people. When we talk about the whales, they talk about the same population as Pangnirtung. Men used to live out on the ice. When they talk about community issues, it is a different population that goes to Pangnirtung, so we lose opportunity for the ones that go through Iqaluit. But we know from over here that it is not the case. They come depending on their migration, through Kimmirut, then through Kinngait.

Something that keeps the economy going is not right. If we are going to bow to that kind of progress, Nunavik will be affected. I was talking about, the way I understand it, there was a man from Labrador that went by boat to Nunavik. The current out of Hudson Bay has a current. You have to go 20 miles out to avoid the current. That is the way it is when we talk about whales and ducks and the wildlife that are like that.

My question has gone overboard. Perhaps I was losing some points. Also, from up there to somewhere through Nunavik, through the floe edge, through the coast of Salluit that we expect. I don't know if I have a question. We feel for you over here, those of us from South Baffin. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. That was just a comment. Solomon, go ahead.

Solomon: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Solomon Awa, City of Iqaluit Mayor. It was asked and not answered. I just want to note. Up towards Pond Inlet, the Planning Commission had hearings about the high Arctic from Arctic Bay, Pond Inlet about Lancaster Sound and the Northwest Passage. The marine sanctuary designation is in the works. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. That was another comment. Johnny?

Johnny M: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Johnny Mike, Pangnirtung HTO. Caribou, you have got caribou. I am here regarding caribou on the Baffin Island side and on the islands that there is a die-off of caribou on the islands. Perhaps you guys are the closest. Whether this is true, if this happened, that is my question.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. That is not really related. Perhaps we can get an answer.

Abraham: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Abraham Qammaniq, Sanirajak Hamlet. In a number of years, there is a die-off due to climate change. As we start to cool off in the fall in October, November, we are getting a lot of rain that covers the land and makes it icy, very icy. That was probably why they died off over the winter. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there questions from Nunavik? Questions to the presentation? *(Pause)*

Hearing none, are there questions from the registered participants? *(Pause)*

Hearing none, are there any from Iqaluit, the public? *(Pause)*

We will go back to Jonathan. Jonathan has a question.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. This is Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you to the members here today for your presentation. I just had a question about some of the Community Areas of Interest that are included in the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan.

In February 2017, the Hunters and Trappers Organization identified three separate Community Areas of Interest for the Commission to consider in response to the 2016 Draft Plan. They are labeled as Number 80 on the screen, Roche Bay to the south of the community, a larger marine area to the east, as well as a circular area on the western side of Melville Peninsula. You identified a number of values for these areas, including wildlife, archeological sites, and different community uses.

The Commission implemented that recommendation and included these three areas as a Limited Use designation in the Draft Plan with year-round prohibitions on mineral exploration, oil and gas exploration and production, as well as hydroelectric power generation. We would confirm from previous mapping exercises done in 2013 that these areas were entirely consistent with previous comments from the Community of Sanirajak. Just for the record here today, I was wondering if you could provide any comments on whether you continue to support the inclusion of these three areas in particular in the Draft Land Use Plan as Limited Uses Areas. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Abraham: *(Translated)*: Yes. With the areas identified, we still feel the same way. We haven't changed our opinion. That circle side has lots of bears. The inlets have seals, baby seals. The east side that we go down to the ice where there are walruses on the ice, we feel it should be like that. Was that good?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik, yes. I have no more questions. Thank you to the representatives of Sanirajak.

(Applause)

Before we go to the next one, we will take a 15-minute coffee break.

Break

Presentation by the Qikiqtarjuaq Hamlet and HTO

Jonah Keyootak, Hamlet

Lizzie Natsiapik, Vice Mayor

Loasie Alikatuktuk, HTO Chariman

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: How you want to do your presentation is okay. You can do it together if you want with the HTO. If you are ready, Qikiqtarjuaq Hamlet and HTO, go ahead. State your name and your organization first. You may proceed.

Jonah: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Jonah Keyootak, Qikiqtarjuaq Hamlet. Thank you, Chair, for bringing us here and to the Commissioners. In Qikiqtarjuaq, we live on an island. The water source is a concern. As we are on an island, we don't have a lake. Due to the change in climate, the snow on the hillsides is melting. We will run out of water, as we don't have a lake. We rely on the snowfall. We would be out of water due to climate change. That is a legitimate concern that we need a water source.

There is on the outer side. It is hard to get there if we ran out of water due to climate change. We also want to plan forward for a good water source. Our water lake is close. When the wind is blowing from the north, the dump goes into the drinking water lake. This too, is affecting our water source in Qikiqtarjuaq. I am coming from the hamlet.

Also, I have heard the water, the marine routes, we are aware that they should not be throwing their garbage into the ocean. They are throwing their garbage into the ocean. This needs to stop. I too was not totally prepared. We managed to make it here, but those were my concerns as we live on an island. Those of you that live on the big island, we need a good and better source for water. Our community is growing. The children that will eventually have children, we need to plan for them to have a good water source. I don't have too much more. I maybe will wait as well. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can add.

Lizzie: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Lizzie Natsiapik. I am a Hamlet Councillor, Vice Mayor. I too don't have too much, but I want to ask who the contact person would be if we want to find out more before

January 10th. We don't have good access through the internet, but not everyone has internet access. Will there be some kind of contact information before that date? Thank you.

Chairperson: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. Can you state your name, please?

Loasie: Loasie Alikatuktuk.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you for the questions. Sharon Ehloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. Our staff, our leads on the file would be Jon Savoy, our Director of Policy and Planning, and Brian Aglukark, our Manager of Community Engagement and Translations. So, you can speak to them after, and they can give you the contact information to follow-up with them. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Can you state your name please?

Jonah: (*Translated*): Jonah Keyootak, Hamlet of Qikiqtarjuaq. We are on an island. We are concerned. We are very close to the ocean. In the fall when the wind blows, the houses are almost reached by the ocean. It is getting worse. It is just getting worse all the time. The houses are too close to the beach, and they even get splashed by the ocean spray. We are on an island. We would want that in the planning process before an emergency happens. I would present that.

Our metal dump needs (*did not finish sentence in translation*). If we had an incinerator, I think that would help. If we had an incinerator, maybe you should plan that as well. We want to see improvements. That is it from me. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for your comments. If I understand your comment and question correctly with regard to the changing of the tides and the coastal erosion, you are looking for direction or assistance of relocating your houses. Is that correct?

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Jonah: (*Translated*): For the hamlet, the houses that are close to the ocean, in the fall we want this planned for the future, for the upcoming years before the ocean gets the houses. We know living there, the houses that are too close to the beach can be moved. I would be happy. Our community is growing, and the houses are too close to the ocean. This needs to be planned. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. Thank you for the clarification. The Government of Nunavut Community Government Services would be the department, I believe, that you would talk to, not the Planning Commission. The Government of Nunavut is here. The federal government is also here. I am not sure what responsibility they may have or assistance they could provide, but they will be presenting. They are listening. Have a conversation with them to see if you could get some support or direction. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Jonah: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Jonah Keyootak, Hamlet of Qikiqtarjuaq. Thank you for the response. As to where, when we try to ask, when we go there, then they can't answer my question. Perhaps maybe if you go somewhere else. You run out of places as communities. I understand clearly what you are saying, but when we go there, we don't get the responses. Maybe perhaps if you go somewhere else to ask questions. It becomes confusing. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Understandable. Loasie?

Loasie: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Loasie Alikatuktuk, Nattivak Hunters and Trappers Organization, Chairman. I am the beautiful Chairman. My comments from Nattivak are first, in the winter where we go fish, there is a quota. They have one quota for the winter fishery. Even though there are nine lakes, there is one quota for our fishing sites. Some fishermen in our community, the quota is limited with the number of large lakes where we go fishing to the south and to the north. They have one quota for the lakes, although they have different lakes for fish.

Chairperson: Proceed.

Loasie: *(Translated)*: It was the winter fishery. Hopefully, it said an 8,000 pound quota for the winter fishery. It is not when they are in the ocean. A little bit of food, and they make money from fishing off the quota, that used the quota. That was mentioned. The lakes have 8,000 pounds, although some of the lakes we don't even fish in fill in that quota. That was one of the comments I was asked to bring up regarding the fish.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. We don't deal in quotas. We are not dealing with any kind of quotas here. The federal government and the Government of Nunavut might be listening. Those are the agencies to talk about. Even when we are on a break, you can speak with them. We don't deal with quotas. We are about a land use plan. We don't deal with quotas. Qujannamiik.

Loasie: *(Translated)*: Yes, but that was one of the comments that we had. I know we need to understand better as part of this process. Also, I will ask the wildlife agency in the community, bears, walrus, whales. What Jetaloo was speaking about earlier today, walrus haul-outs and bear denning, those are the walrus haul-outs, the old walrus haul-outs. The walrus used to haul-out on some of the islands, not 50 islands. Walrus are moving the coast. All the way south has walrus in the summer and spring. Our walrus, we would like to age our walrus meat as well. I just wanted to mention that bears and walrus.

The walrus is a major food source for Elders, and our Elders are disappearing. Maybe I am getting old. I used to be young. I used to be a hunter. I followed my father about hunting bears and walrus. Just to note what Jetaloo said, I understood him. He is my uncle. Walrus in the summertime, they don't stay in the same area. They have gone to different locations. The ice melts faster now. They don't hang out in the same areas anymore. We noticed the change. That is just a comment. Walrus are changing, or maybe they are going after a different food source. What Jetaloo said, I understood him.

Polar bears are a major part. We always had bear. We worked Qikiqtarjuaq 90 miles. I know that better to the south. That is where we grew up, my parents and grandparents. Walrus were my grandmother's favourite. My grandmother would say I would like to find a walrus crawling on the ice. To date, I have never seen a walrus crawling on the ice. My grandmother loved the walrus. So do Inuit.

Our seals, as we get more open water, they are shedding fur. Our seals are coming from the north, but once the ice goes, their fur is shedding. It wasn't like that. Now there is open water earlier. Their fur is not sellable. Somehow, we need to be concerned about this. Maybe they will seek support. The climate is changing and warming in the spring. I can't tell if it is getting warmer, but the ice does not form right away. I hope I am understandable.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Questions from the communities? *(Pause)*

None? Nunavik, do you have questions or comments to the presentation? *(Pause)*

Hearing none, from the registered participants and the public? *(Pause)*

Hearing none, thank you, Qikiqtarjuaq.

(Applause)

Next is the Hamlet of Pangnirtung and then the HTO. Before you proceed, it just under practice now. State your name and your organization. Whenever you are ready, proceed.

Presentation by the Hamlet and HTO of Pangnirtung

Jamie Evic, Hamlet SAO

Jaco Ishulutak, Hamlet

Johnny Mike, HTO

Lazarusie Ishulutaq, HTO

Jamie: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jamie Evic. SAO, Hamlet of Pangnirtung. I may be too young to do a presentation, so I will let my Elders talk. It is my first time in proceedings like this. First of all, thank you for hosting this proceeding. You staff has been to Pangnirtung. They were most helpful. Just for your information, they warned us what to anticipate when this proceeding comes about. They were very helpful answering our questions and suggesting how we should proceed.

As the Hamlet of Pangnirtung, we don't have any gravel pit and quarry sites. Jonathan was aware that we need these items. He said we are partly responsible in planning for this sort of need. We are very much in need of land space. We don't have space due to mountainous areas surrounding us. We will see how the planning process goes and what the future holds.

Jonathan gave us a good briefing. He also even spoke of watersheds and reservoirs. We were pretty much aware of what the problem we are facing in terms of water supply. We are in need of funds

to plan for a water source and other community needs. Your process is very important. I am a young man. I don't have the experience that my colleagues here do. Over the years, I have seen them doing their work, and I respect that. They have been great mentors to my work. So, I have to watch what I am saying, not to contradict their needs. I will do my best to do a short presentation.

Our community traditional names, Pangnirtung, Qikiqtarjuaq, the names are all traditional. We are eager to name new species that we see, some food sources and some not. I just want to be able to sit here and work with these Elders. In our Cumberland Sound area, turbot fishing is very important, and it has been for a long time. These are the community leaders who guide us through times economically and otherwise, especially in preservation and looking after our animals, our surrounding lands. I just want to say I respect what you are doing. Your work is honourable. Your proceedings are important. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. Before we proceed, Jonathan, can you answer some of their questions while we are at it? He had a question. He will rephrase it.

Jamie: Jamie Evic, Pangnirtung Hamlet. You mentioned about the quarries yesterday. So, what is your role on that? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you, Jamie, for the question. The Commission's role in regard to quarries, in particular within municipal boundaries, is not necessarily to plan for them. That is under the jurisdiction of the community working with Community and Government Services within the GN to identify aggregate or gravel sources throughout the community and develop proposals to use that material.

Where the Nunavut Planning Commission comes in is that those types of activities, industrial uses including quarrying of material within municipal boundaries, is something that would need to be supported by the Nunavut Land Use Plan. Once we have an approved Nunavut Land Use Plan, if you were to develop a new quarry, that would need to be submitted to the Nunavut Planning Commission for review against the requirements of the Nunavut Land Use Plan. I will just note that in the current Draft, there are no restrictions or requirements on the establishment of new quarries within your community. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Did you receive your answer?

Jamie: Jamie Evic, SAO, Hamlet of Pangnirtung. Thank you, Jonathan, for your answer. If everything works well, how would we proceed? What would the procedure be? Is there such a thing, so not to delay what our community needs in these areas? Who would say nay or yay to this proposal? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. The first step to developing a new quarry within your municipality would be to submit that proposal to the Nunavut Planning Commission. We would review it against the requirements of an approved Land Use Plan. Currently, of course, there is not one in the southern portion of the Qikiqtaaluk region, or a future Nunavut Land Use Plan for which the current Draft would support such a development.

Once we complete our review, we then forward that project proposal on to the remainder of the regulatory system. For industrial activities such as quarries within municipal boundaries, the next step would be the Nunavut Impact Review Board, and they would conduct a screening of the proposal and assign terms and conditions to manage that use. Then other regulatory authorities may also have a role to play, but it would first be submitted to us, and we would then hand it on to the Nunavut Impact Review Board for further consideration. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any further comments?

Jamie: *(Translated)*: Jamie Evic, SAO, Hamlet of Pangnirtung. Thank you for your answers. As I mentioned, we are moving into the directions that we have concern with. We need a gravel supply as well. I just wanted to understand how we should proceed before we start the progress and work. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Other delegates may proceed. Go ahead, please.

Jaco: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Jaco Ishulutak, Hamlet of Pangnirtung. I appreciate the question put forward by the SAO. As hamlet councilors, our main priorities for our community and its population, we are not well prepared. I am the late replacement, so I am not quite prepared for a presentation to this group, but I just so much appreciate being here with other communities who may have similar concerns.

Back in 2022, we had a hard year as a family, my wife, my children. I had a hard year. So, it is my daughter now that we are facing personal problems within my family. It was hard. I just wanted to mention to my colleagues about why I am a late replacement. Our daughter who was grievously ill has fully recovered.

Despite that, there are these problems. Now I have another problem of my younger brother, another cancer in the family. He was given six months to live. We have just been told another one recovered from this disease, so he is just waiting for an airline now to get home. It is a joyous occasion for me just to mention this to you the personal problems we have faced as a family. I am thankful for that.

Our SAO has spoken truthfully. We are encroached by the mountains. The land is scarce. For those of you who have been to Pangnirtung, it is a problem. I don't think many of you would be able to sit on an airplane with me because of huge turbulence during high winds. It is not a plane ride that many can take due to the mountains and lack of land to plan.

The airfield is just safe enough for planes to be landing. It runs right to the community. This is always an ongoing problem that we discuss as Councillors. Sometimes it appears to be fine, but it is problematic at the best of times. We have done everything we can to research how we could improve these problems. Mostly lately, it has been spoken as a problem. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. I am pretty much aware of your topics. I understand you fully. The HTO organization may proceed.

Johnny M: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Johnny Mike, HTO of Pangnirtung. During the negotiations of the *Land Claims Agreement*, I was a Pangnirtung representative. I think there were four of us who were

appointed. When I started and up to today, Pangnirtung land selection is now clear. The people who have done this work before us have long gone. The land selection, *Land Claims*, was very important to us. I am the only one left of the original group who participated in the *Land Claims Agreement*. So, we are now speaking today because of their work. I had intimate knowledge of what they went through. Some of you who are sitting here probably have gone through the same things during the *Land Claims* negotiations. I recognize some of you.

Other groups, you are here. We were together, Johnny Akiluaq. Some of them are gone. If these people were to be aware, or the communities on South Baffin including Sanikiluaq, if the negotiators were doing their work, the work that we have that we are here discussing their work. So, I am happy to participate. As I mentioned, I was a youngster to that group coming in from Pangnirtung. I think I was just a teenager. I was mature though.

At that time, I was a youngster participating in a huge task, looking back. I was appointed, and I participate now as a hamlet Councillor. I was pretty much aware of what Elders needed when it was Norman Qumuaqtuq and Hunters and Trappers Organization Chair, Jacopie Akpalialuk. Because of their mentoring, I am able to participate in this proceeding. Regardless, I want to say that people of Pangnirtung eagerly participated on land selection. There were only 81, but they were eager to participate. Not everybody was interested. We negotiated.

South Baffin parks are emerging and becoming a reality. Some have been there now for some time. Some have been hard work. The fishing industry was very hard to set up. There was a lot of work involved, especially when it comes to land like Netsilik. This area is also a valuable source of land to Cape Dorset. We both agreed at the time that we should say it is a valuable piece of land that is between Pang and Cape Dorset. Netsilik is a special area, and we want it preserved.

We would like to show you, and as you have planned there. I agree with it. However, we still have comments on it. This is only a recommendation. As the HTO, we met on it and discussed it more than once. Netsilik was a very important topic, and it is a unique area. It should be treated as such. Inuit have been living in that area for many years with animals, mammals, fish, land mammals, and others, even seals. This area of Cape Dorset, Kinngaitmiut have intimate knowledge of this area as well like we have.

We have discussed this over time, and these are traditional lands that we plan to present to NTI and even mention that the land should be used and worked on carefully. You appear to be planning the use of it in your planning.

I would like to go back to the early negotiations in South Baffin, the size of land selection, Kivalliq, Kitikmeot, Baffin Island South. It only has 18% of Inuit Owned Land. Although it is bigger up north, which is 22.2% Inuit Owned Land, that is the biggest chunk we have yet to date. During negotiations, as I mentioned looking back, and Paul Quassa is probably thinking back, they were instrumental. When we discuss this process, I look back. It was a lot of work, but we continued. We named lands.

We want to keep this land, but the federal government appears to be wanting it and taking it back. Today, we speak of the past. We tend to keep it. Regardless, the *Nunavut Agreement* is not much in discussion. I wonder why. Quassa has intimate knowledge of this booklet. He said the *Nunavut Agreement* will one day be valuable. It was an evolving *Agreement*. This is the strength of our discussion.

Even as government personnel, we need to discuss mammals such as caribou. I would like to say to each level of government that the *Agreement* will have to mean something according to the *Nunavut Agreement*. It is there. This is our way of life today. We can't be restricted, because the *Land Claims Agreement* will not allow us to have restrictions and access what we need. It is like this.

Pangnirtung, Cumberland Sound, has saltwater surrounding it. It was very important to us. We didn't want to give it up. That was not the only important thing to us. We put it away for a while, and it will be discussed in the future when land claims are settled, when organizations, IPGs start emerging from the *Nunavut Agreement*, such as the Water Board. So, the time is here to discuss these areas, the seas that were important to us. It was not negotiated at the time.

For an example, there were bowhead whales in 1998. The Hamlet and HTO of Pangnirtung started a proposal to regulators to harvest a bowhead whale. We were denied. We were denied because the *Land Claims Agreement* was not completely negotiated in that area. It was unclear. Someone, according to his culture, he wanted to harvest a bowhead whale, a man named Iktorat (*spelled phonetically*). Even at that time during the controversy, NA has become a reality. We had a lot of negotiations on fisheries. They were within our rights to make revenue, this land owned by Inuit. It was not fully discussed on NA, but it has now become a reality.

I just want to say and approve. Your Plan is completely approved to me. There are many areas that you have included, such as wildlife in all the sites of Baffin. We want to see this process coming to a conclusion. Caribou areas, when I was with the government, there were three ideas, and one of them is this that is now happening. Mayukalik's land, I think even Baker Lake said they had three herds. You have plenty here. They are everywhere. Baker Lake herds are well cared for. They are well looked after. I am envious of the territory, and because you look after your herds, you have plenty.

As HTOs, we would like to see the same conclusion happening over there in Baffin Island. If we could have three herds here, it would be just ideal. Included in your land process, we would like to see this coming to pass. I agree with Jawlie Akavak from Kimmirut, and I agree with his request to delay the deadline of January 10th.

Our area of the Cumberland Sound is huge. It has plenty of wildlife, and there appears to be no real restrictions to date except for the cargo ships. Cruise ships are the problem. It should be regulated that the captain of the ship should be well aware and told what the regulations are. We would like to see this as a regulated industry, something that can make work, a regulation with teeth.

The same thing with wildlife in our Cumberland Sound area: It was good, but now it is starting to have less and less whales. There was discussion on beluga whale. We totally agree what was mentioned yesterday, narwhal. Near Pangnirtung, Nunataq is what the place is called, there are areas where beluga whales gather together in the spring. That area should be well protected. People know where they were in the past when they were plentiful. It is a calving area.

There should be a protection area for that calving area and be understood by regulators what we are asking what we discuss. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans seems to not understand what our needs are. They are not aware that it is a calving area. Here in the Plan, it is precise and clear. Pangnirtung populations depends much on beluga whales and other mammals.

We have known all along that there are two different families of whales, the Iqaluit area. Some from this area come and mix with our stock up there. Kimmirut and Iqaluit whales, our stock is much stockier but smarter too. It is not mentioned in this process. They have different manners as well. That is how we know where these whales come from.

As I mentioned, our Cumberland Sound is teeming with mammals, whales, walruses, polar bears, and their calving areas. As even mentioned in these recommendations, we will accept what is written. We spoke of cruise ships coming in with their cameras and nothing else. They are the ones that we are really concerned with for interruptions. For tourism, nothing is really regulated, and sometimes this causes problems for the HTO in Pangnirtung.

At times, we are interested in making revenue. Because of that, I will talk about cod for a while. It is one of the things that we do in Pangnirtung. We have a quota of 500 tonnes, and 100,000 pounds are caught. For Pangnirtung, it is a good source of revenue. It is good for the economy. Cod fishing, each one earns about \$50 thousand dollars for three months of work. The HTO is largely responsible and concerned with Cumberland Sound. We should protect it. What regulations are good for us? It creates work, and it is good for the economy of the community.

We are shipping out a lot of cargo of these species. They load up with cod, and they are so limited with their weight scale going out. But still, it helps a lot. For those who buy the cod in Cumberland Sound, whenever they are shipped to America or elsewhere, they appreciate its delicacy. Because of that, this fishery is real to us. It is important we should protect the fishing industry.

As we look at the economy, one time whaling and seal industry selling skins was destroyed. It does not work anymore, so we had to find ways to create an economy in the community. Cod came, and one of them who is with the Amaruq HTO was instrumental in the creation of cod fisheries. It is a reality now. The Cumberland Sound is full of wildlife, not just fish but waterfowl, cod that we can sell to create an economy for the community. It has been our lifestyle for some time now.

The Cumberland Sound is very clearly stated how we think as an HTO. How it is worded is quite accurate. It is the boundaries. If any problem ever comes or emerges regarding boundaries, how would we handle this? This would jeopardize our future economy.

There are some problems, minor, that HTO has concerns. Iqaluit, Kimmirut, Pond Inlet, Qikiqtarjuaq, Clyde River, they have a joint venture of three fishery ocean-going vessels. They create an economy. They bring in about \$70 million dollars worth of fishery as a joint venture. Pangnirtung HTO has not really come to the conclusion of what else if any problem arises, how do we deal with offshore if it was to encroach on the Cumberland Sound? This is one of our worries.

Still, it is good for economy. I will use my community, Pangnirtung as an example. It has been good to us. I think each community involved in this venture can say the same thing. So, we want to work on the economy. Because of these ventures, we have been able to buy ships. We are now working on a fishing hut where they can be used in the winter to the fisheries that they can use year-round. Pangnirtung HTO needs a lot of lumber so we could manufacture these and sell them to the fisheries, to the public.

We use revenues from the cod fishing. We have been able to use this revenue to create other ventures. This Sound is real to us, especially with the fishery section. Chair, I gave you a brief description as the HTO in the Pangnirtung Community. The Cumberland Sound is important, not just part of it but the whole bay in general. What we allow into the Cumberland Sound will be important. We know what that is.

The national parks, these are regulated by the federal government. It is their land, and they are solely responsible for it, Parks Canada. It is fine. We like what they are doing. This area is becoming very important to the public. There are areas where overnight camping is, and people should know where these are. Even in parks, we are allowed to do harvesting in these areas. So, sheds are created, but it is regulation. We don't mind how it is run and operated.

Chair, I just wanted to briefly discuss with you what we do as the HTO, but let's go back a bit to the caribou. When I was a Minister of the Environment, something came to my desk from the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board that came to my attention when the caribou source was starting to disappear, especially in my area and the land between here and there, up to the Netsilik area.

For instance, in 2008, my sons and I with two other boats, we used to travel feely to an area where there were animals. In 2008, it was all gone. Disappeared. Netsilik area, a faraway place when we travel to harvest caribou, three of us travel to harvest. In 2011, Netsilik used to be teeming with caribou. It occurred to me that this area alone was where we harvest caribou. In 2011 where we traditionally hunt caribou, none were there. So, we travelled a little further southeast towards Iqaluit, and we saw tracks all heading in this direction toward Cape Dorset and the South Baffin area. We saw this and where the caribou were disappearing to.

As a Minister, I had a lot of expectations for answers, even from Baffin Wildlife Board. This organization came and told us to do something, get something done. See what the problem is. Listen to the people. I just wanted to say that I have heard even as a government minister, I was sensible enough to take advice. I was not there all alone giving authority and dictating. I listened. I listened about Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit. This organization, the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board advised me to use Inuit IQ. It is just gone somewhere else.

So, the quota that was placed at the time should be open. Iqaluit knew that hunting was open to any citizens here regardless of race, but during the prohibition when the quota system was set up, we took a lot of advice from the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. When they agreed to know what their advice was, they gave us advice according to IQ that they were not depleting. They were moving elsewhere.

As a head of government in a certain department, I took advice from the people. I respected my executives that they were able to take advice from Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, but traditionally I was criticized for deviating from their priority as senior bureaucrat. Their advice was not adhered to when caribou mobility is involved.

Once as a youngster when 12 in 1940, the Pangnirtung area was full of caribou herds across the bay. They would migrate so nearby. They were so numerous that year. Since then, she told me that she has not seen that many herds. That was a time when the herds started to vanish, long after my mother was long gone. The Pangnirtung caribou started to come back. Again, they were

disappearing. It is a pattern. It is pattern to all species of wildlife. There is no set pattern, but it is a pattern. It is how it works.

Chair, I think I have spoken long enough. I think I said I was on the second period stage. So, I would like the Minister of the Environment to understand how it is important to follow advice. So, the playoffs would not be that much exciting as a second desk, but this one would be exciting if the Minister was to pay attention to traditional advice.

This document is important, and we will hear eventually as I mentioned earlier. I would like to see a document that follows the knowledge of Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit, made by Inuit for Inuit through QWB and other wildlife organizations. As it is, we notice that if this document ever becomes a regulated policy, I think as we heard throughout the world, the United Nations, world organizations even one time they said Indigenous people, their knowledge was very important. So, the *United Nation Declaration on Indigenous Rights* was spoken, including reconciliation. This came directly and put forward to the Prime Minister's office and hence, apologies.

Here in this document, it says conformity determination process. Will you consider my ideas, my presentation, when you do your conformity determination? Will you include that? We would all like to see our ideas become a reality. Will the Minister accept it or not? Two important presentations that I have mentioned, if what we want to see in this process, if they are ignored again, it would be contrary to the United Nations Declaration, and the Government of Canada should be ashamed if they do not adhere to these planning sessions again. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You are correct. Lazarusie, proceed.

Lazarusie: (*Translated*): Lazarusie Ishulutaq from the Hamlet of Pangnirtung. My comments for you today: When we were an outpost camp and everyone lived separately, there were 18 separate camps. When the store came, my mother was born around 1926. When the store came, the Hudson Bay building, as children we would follow, and we were not allowed to go in the store. Let me explain.

My father would tell these stories. They could not get caribou or were not allowed to get caribou. In 1931, they were not allowed to catch caribou. At that time, we were controlled by white people for a long time. Back then, Qallunaat were after our land, back in 1917. Here as communities, Simona Alekna used to go on VHF radio that the Qallunaat wanted their islands. I would never agree when they wanted the islands.

Today, we are here from the hard work of our parents, our mothers, our fathers. Are we just going to agree? Are we just going to say yes to the government when they tell us what to do? What I mentioned, that seems just like a story, but it has a reason. As we are learning as Elders, in the old days, Pangnirtung inland used to be all white. It used to be a glacier. It is black when you have seen it on TV. The path due to the melting, the rivers flowing made the route impassable. This is the work of Qallunaat. We are saying we have a lot to say, but I am trying to be brief.

Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit gets mentioned by Qallunaat. They are not in any way used in Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit. It is just a story to make artifacts. We are hunters. I am a hunter. We know the land. We used to paddle towards Iqaluit. I have tracks between here and Pangnirtung. Thank you.

Chairperson: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. We will go the same route. Brian?

Brian: (Translated): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Brian Aglukark, Nunavut Planning Commission. I want to ask Johnny Mike to try and make it clear. In September in Rankin Inlet, we also had hearings. It was mentioned a lot about Inuit Owned Lands and how they were selected. You mentioned that you were part of the negotiation and land selections. Can you explain a bit why you selected those lands that you selected, if you can remember? That is my question. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Johnny.

Johnny M: (Translated): Your system is very hard on the hearing. Some of it I did not hear. My hearing device is over there. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Do you want to explain, Brian?

Brian: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. In September's public hearing in Rankin Inlet, there was a lot of discussion about Inuit Owned Land from the public as well as community delegates who participated in the hearing. There was really no answer to how the Inuit Owned Lands were selected by the communities. You had mentioned in your presentation that you were one of the negotiators for the selection of IOL for Pangnirtung. So, I am wondering if you can remember why the IOLs were selected for the Pangnirtung area. Qujannamiik, if that is understandable.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Johnny?

Johnny: (Translated): Yes, thank, you. As before, I mentioned for Pangnirtung, selection of lands that they wanted to select, we looked towards Iqaluit, around Netsilik Lake, including the park and the sea ice, a large parcel. There were 81 people there. It was brought forward to NTI as lands that we valued. We found then and understood that negotiations will proceed on an agreement in principle on land selections that the Inuit had selected.

We had to go down to 18% as agreed to. We were at approximately 60% before the actual percentage of the land was selected or negotiated. There was no other way around it. During negotiations with the federal government, it was further reduced down to 18%. There was a lot of disagreement on the South Baffin. There was 18% in the South Baffin, including Sanikiluaq. We selected 22.6%.

Perhaps the park that you see there that is set aside is not Inuit owned. It was going to become Crown land. So, during the creation of the park, we lost some land. The agreement in principle that explains how the lands were going to be selected in terms of guidelines for selecting lands, we were concerned about it. Thank you, Brian.

Chairperson: (Translated): Qujannamiik. Brian?

Brian: (Translated): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Brian Aglukark, Nunavut Planning Commission. What did you want to do with the land? What purpose would you value those pieces? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed.

Johnny: *(Translated)*: Johnny Mike, Hunters and Trappers Organization, Pangnirtung. The whole South Baffin is valuable. We value the whole land. Our ancestors, for example, Netsilik Lake from Pangnirtung area, even from Killiniq Island down on the east coast of Frobisher Bay would also, and from Kinngait, Sikusiilaq and from Igloolik area. Amiktuk used to be a gathering place for Inuit. It was a site where Inuit gathered, attached to our culture where you might go anywhere on the land. There is Inukshuk and different kinds of stone markers. They are absolutely everywhere.

We know that is the way Inuit have occupied this land. That is why we value it. We value the wildlife, the berries, the animals, the abundance of bird life. Those were some of the criteria they used to select land. That is what it was based on, the cultural component. We wanted to claim the whole area. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan? No? From the communities, are there questions to the presentation? *(Pause)*.

Hearing none, Nunavik, are there any questions to the presentation? *(Pause)*

Hearing none, are there any questions from the registered participants? *(Pause)*

From the public, any comments? *(Pause)*

Thank you to the Pangnirtung team.

(Applause)

Qujannamiik. I am not quite sure. Archie? You have a question?

Archie: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Archie Angnarkak. Moses told me he was a bit too tired. He had to leave. He left. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: He wanted to speak, and we were agreeable to him, but he left. Based on our clock, we have had a full day. We shall proceed again tomorrow at 9:00 a.m. Thank you.

End of Day 2

DAY 3: November 16, 2022

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Good morning. We had a bit of difficulty this morning. On the agenda is the Hamlet of Sanikiluaq. I would like to apologize for the late delay and thank you for all being here. Most of you are always on time, so I appreciate that very much. Perhaps a few are late due to illness, and we have been notified of whom. Thank you for coming in on time to stick to the schedule. Before we proceed, Sharon has some housekeeping items.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair and good morning, everyone. Welcome to Day 3 of our fifth public hearing here in Iqaluit. Just the regular housekeeping items: First of all, if you have a phone, please put it on

mute. Again, we are recording the hearings and transcribing them. We are streaming live on Uvagut TV, Facebook, and YouTube. We will be doing two 15-minute breaks, one this morning and one this afternoon. Chairperson Nakashuk will be advising whether or not we will be doing an evening session later today.

Emergency exits: There is one at the front here and one at the side, where you came in. Coffee and tea and snacks, please help yourself. Washrooms are at the entrance of the building where you came in. Again, if you are presenting or speaking, please state your name, your organization, who you are representing, and be respectful to all the presenters. There is one person at a time speaking, and they will speak through the Chair.

As we are a bit ahead of schedule, which is unusual in these public hearings, we have changed the order of the presentations for today. We are going to be completing Sanikiluaq Hamlet today. The HTO will not be presenting today, as a member that is attending is ill. If they get better, they will be presenting later this week.

We will be continuing on with the villages from Northern Quebec, and we have two that are present. Three will be arriving at 1:30. After they arrive, they will be doing their presentations. So, we are moving up the Qikiqtani Inuit Association, the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board for today as well, the Nunavut Impact Review Board, and the Nunavut Marine Council. So, those are the changes for today. We will progress with each of those presentations and see where we get to by 4:45. With that, Mr. Chair, again welcome everyone. Let's have another wonderful, exciting day. Thank you.

Chairperson: (Translated): Qujannamiik. The changes have been agreed to, so that is what it will be today. Hamlet of Sanikiluaq, please proceed whenever you are ready. As always, please state your name and organization. You may proceed whenever you are ready. Qujannamiik.

Presentation by the Hamlet of Sanikiluaq

**Lucy Appaqqaq, Mayor
Dinah Kittosuk**

Lucy: (Translated): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq, Commissioners, staff. Thank you for having us to do a presentation here. I am with the Hamlet of Sanikiluaq, Mayor. I have with me a hamlet Councillor. Thank you all. Most of you have similar problems throughout Nunavut. We face the same throughout the territory. We have respect for people who have guided us through the years to where we are today, especially to the Commission who brought us here to prepare a presentation of what our community is concerned with.

Today, the problems are many in our community but are being resolved slowly. January 10th, as you have mentioned, is a deadline for written submissions. I was worried about that. We have a lot of work to do for this Land Claims process, but it is manageable. We have heard that it is not a negotiable date. Listening to the other communities, I would like to voice my concerns as well.

Climate change is hitting us very badly. Our species, mammals are changing. Where they used to be, they are not there anymore. It has been our concern for the last few years. There appears to be no solution in sight to these problems. For the hamlet council, some of our councillors are involved

in many small committees, on climate change for example. So, I listen with an interest when I am updated on situations.

There are a lot of things that worry me, especially wildlife. We are seeing new species that we have never seen before. For those who have authority over us, their wishes are still our desire. Their concerns are still with us. Waterfowl and bird sanctuaries in our areas have been discussed. It appears to be of concern in this Land Use Plan, and Community Areas of Interest also appear to have been addressed. I would like to try to keep to the point.

I have worries. People who are trying to live according to traditional ways are at the same time dealing with authorities that appear to be impossible to work with. This has to be resolved. Especially authorities who are able to listen and act upon the needs of the communities. The Nunavut Planning Commission has indicated and categorized each land, especially geared towards land users, hunters, harvesters, and people who exclusively use the land in their areas. Sometimes these needs are heard and not acted on.

Another concern from our community, the hamlet and HTO concerns, Sanikiluaq have wishes that probably will not emerge. We are very much concerned about our environment, especially where we are. Hamlet concerns are great as well for the entire vicinity of ours. We work closely with HTOs and QIA. We are categorized to Baffin Qikiqtani Inuit Association. Many times, we try to work closely with his organization. When we have to meet and discuss our problems, we usually try to work closely to express our concerns.

What we need most, and we understood it has been mentioned that smaller communities are always neglected, we need small craft harbours, fiberoptics. That appears to be happening in larger communities, and we want to be part of this process. We need it just as anybody else in the other communities. The land use planning process will perhaps enable us to achieve these needs.

These are my concerns from my community. Just a short note: We need to work as communities. We need to work together. I think it is the only way that our needs will be achieved. Although each of us have municipal councils, it is not enough sometimes to meet our requirements. As a group, larger group, we can perhaps achieve and get what our community needs. Today, we should really be concerned with our community needs. I had so much wanted to say something, but I say thank you right now.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik.

Dinah: *(Translated)*: I am from the Hamlet of Sanikiluaq. I just want to support her, on our way here to include us. I love that you are speaking Inuktitut. It seems we were caught by surprise. Our mayor would have been here. He was not able to be here. That was part of the conditions for which we got selected to come. We have a lot of thoughts on the whole process.

Thank you for the opportunity to be here. I like what I am hearing. It sounds like you have caribou. We only have reindeer on Sanikiluaq. They are quite far from our community. We hardly ever have caribou meat. I even said that I want some caribou meat. The reindeer was brought in around 1970 and the 1980s. They were brought onto the island, as we have no caribou. We do crave caribou very much. Those of you that have caribou, you are lucky. The reindeer are not the same. Maybe they are good for Santa Claus. That is what I say. Even though we want them, we can't shoot them either.

With walrus hunting, when we catch walrus, we have to age the walrus. Perhaps it needs to be tested for trichinosis. Those who have testing facilities, you are lucky. For seals, fish, and the wildlife, ducks: It was not a good year for ducks. The duck hunters were having a hard time, maybe due to the change in the weather. Those are some of my comments.

I agree with what she was saying with the Inuit movement and the work that has been done for Sanikiluaq and their involvement. We know and hear the January date. Thank you. I am partly understanding what is going on. It is kind of overwhelming with all the information. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there questions? Jonathan, do you have a question for their presentation, with regard to January 10th deadline, fiberoptic, windmill, solar panels, and stuff like that? Would they need to be approved by the NPC? I believe that was the question to NPC.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Those types of activities including fiberoptic cables and large-scale windmills or solar farms, would require a review by the Nunavut Planning Commission before they would enter the remainder of the regulatory system. The Planning Commission would be the first point of contact once a proposal was prepared for any of those activities. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. That is good. Are there any other questions from the staff? *(Pause)*

Are there comments from the floor, from the communities? *(Pause)*

Are there questions from the Nunavik delegation? *(Pause)*

Seeing none, are there questions from the registered participants to the presentation? *(Pause)*

Hearing none, how about the Iqaluit general audience, questions to the presentation? *(Pause)*

Do you want to speak again?

Lucy: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Lucy Appaqqaq, Hamlet of Sanikiluaq. I wanted to note because I forgot the wildlife locations. As she mentioned, in the 1980s, the reindeer were brought and have been close. They are trying to grow the reindeer population in numbers. So, we have reindeer meat. On the map, it might require the federal government or the Nunavut Government to include the reindeer where they are currently located. It was not marked on the map.

When we meet on wildlife issues, they are not here. They would have brought their concerns. I wonder how the reindeer in Sanikiluaq can be identified as a species that needs protection.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan, go ahead.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. As with all information included in the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan, the Commission remains open to receiving additional information that will be considered in the upcoming revisions to the Draft Plan.

I will note as well that we have received information from community members back in 2013 on important reindeer areas in the Belcher Islands. In the current Draft, the majority of the Belcher Islands are already designated as a Limited Use Area with year-round prohibitions. Those designations come from key migratory bird habitat sites as well as walrus haul-outs. The areas are largely protected or managed in the same way that the Commission would for caribou or reindeer population. I just wanted to note that, but if there were additional information that you would like to provide, again that January 10th deadline would apply. Thank you.

Chairperson: (Translated): Qujannamiik. To add, this process on the verbal presentations, we are here to listen. Even though you are speaking from the heart, we will include your comments. We note in written format, January 10th is the deadline, but we want to hear your voices. They are powerful to us during the hearings. We weigh it the same as written format. The *Claim* notes that we must give equal strength to verbal presentations. We do have a deadline of January 10th if you happen to remember something that you want included in the presentation. Qujannamiik. I asked earlier if there were questions from the floor, and there is a question from the floor.

Mike F: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. My name is Mike Ferguson. The question that has arisen regarding the reindeer and the current migratory bird classification for most of the Belcher Islands raises an issue that applies to other communities as well. That is, I am wondering if, for example, if the Nunavut Planning Commission has a way of dealing with Multiple Species Values in the same area.

For example, the Belcher Islands, most of it is protected as a migratory bird sanctuary, but in a submission that the QWB and the HTO submitted in 2018, reindeer areas are also included in one of those submissions for the Belcher Islands around Sanikiluaq. When there are multiple species present, migratory bird sanctuaries may have protection for things relevant to migratory birds, but that classification may not give protection for some land use activities that communities may be concerned about relative to other species that are also present.

So, in written submissions, how do we present that so added values and added potential protections to the same area can apply? How do we go about doing that?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. His question is not really directed to the delegation currently presenting. QWB will have an opportunity to do a presentation here. Jonathan, perhaps you want to answer that question now? It did not address to their presentation, but go ahead, Jonathan.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Yeah, since it has come up now, I will provide a brief response. In general, the Commission has considered all of the available information for all of the areas within Nunavut. When there are multiple values identified for a particular area, the Commission has chosen in this 2021 Draft Plan to allow for overlapping land use designations where the proposed management approach is meaningfully different.

So, if there are walrus haul-outs that overlap with polar bear denning areas or something like that, the areas can overlap if the management structure is different. In areas where there are multiple overlapping values and the proposed management approach of the additional values does not add different Plan requirements, the Commission has retained that information as Valued Components that are identified.

Looking at Map A, that is one isolated version of information that the Plan contains that is very important and provides the specific Plan requirements applicable to that area, but there are also many other Valued Components that overlay this information. So, when a project proposal is submitted, Map A is used to identify what requirements of the Plan apply, but other Valued Components can overlay that. As I have already said, if the proposed management approach is different, the designations are able to overlap in the current Draft. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. I don't think there are any more questions to the presentation. Thank you to the Sanikiluaq delegation.

(Applause)

Inukjuak is here. If they can come up, they can do a presentation. Likewise, say your name and organizations that you are representing. You may proceed.

Presentation by the Northern Village of Inukjuak

Johnny Kasudluak, Mayor

Simiunie Ohaituk

Anna Ohaituk, HTO

Johnny K: *(Translated)*: Johnny Kasudluak, Mayor of Inukjuak from the Community Council. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. I don't want to say Chairman. Thank you for the opportunity to be here. We are very welcomed at the meeting and in Iqaluit. It has been really nice to meet people here. I will try and be brief. We are mostly here to listen for the jurisdiction of other Inuit and the laws that we are divided.

We are one nation, but we are divided by provinces and jurisdictions that have borders. As we are wholesome people as Inuit, there are no boundaries to the water and the land. If we are affected, then we are all affected together. I also want us to remember the islands and the waters that we use in our communities in Northern Quebec and the Hudson Bay and the Hudson Strait. Oceans are just as valuable through Agreements that we have. Their management, we agree to surface and subsurface and the bottom of the ocean, and also on top.

The animals, marine and from the land animals, we value them all. When they are affected and activity happens nearby, we want to be involved based on Inuit customs and culture where it may affect. We need to know and understand the structure and the way that we are here and the participation that we have, keeping us informed in the process. We have to work together and go forward. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed.

Anna: *(Translated)*: Chairman, members, I am Anna Ohaituk with the HTO in Inukjuak. Inuit travel everywhere and anywhere. They traded goods, and they harvested wildlife, caribou. Where there

were no caribou, they would trade with people from the islands for walrus tusks that they would use on their qamutiks for runners. I mention this important trading work with other Inuit and supporting each other. We supported each other. Thank you for this.

As many stated, the wildlife that we rely on, our food source, we too do also live off the land and the oceans. We need to support them and protect them regarding the islands. We hunt a lot on those islands, as wildlife are seasonal. I have arranged so when we want to go walrus hunting, whale hunting, or we wish just to go down to the islands to camp in the summertime, that was their favorite destinations to go during the summer. There are all kinds of animals that we hunt around the islands near our community.

We have to work together as Inuit. I see that happening here this morning. As an Inuk, our food source is valuable, our original food source. Our hunting grounds are valuable. The island, we feel welcome to hunt on those islands and also for the future. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Simiunie, go ahead. State your name.

Simiunie: (*Translated*): Simiunie Ohaituk, Inukjuak from Quebec. I have been here before. I can understand a bit better now. When I came the first time, I could not quite understand before. Thank you for the opportunity. To take part in hearings like this is good as we are talking about wildlife and the protection. Even for the Quebec side, we work together with those that need to be part of the discussion from Makavik are included.

Wildlife issues on the island, even from Sanikiluaq, we have worked together in areas of cooperation and agreements. That is good. The work on the island-related issues, we also think that that is good work. Regarding the cooperation with Inuit, they are good to deal with. We hunt not so freely anymore from the old days. Research has raised values for those of us from Quebec where we were always Inuit. We lose to science. We have a hard time gaining back our power as Inuit regarding the wildlife management, for example.

The rivers are important. We rely on almost all rivers. We have lost some rivers that affect our life, changes our life. We have seen it. With the dam, the river is diverted. It changes the conditions where there is no more river that used to be there. They divert rivers to dams, and that is what they have done. You have to consider when they talk about dams that you too, will be affected. As Inuit, we don't run these dams. When you look at the future, that is what I am talking about.

Thank you regarding the cooperation between Nunavik and Nunavut. That is good to see. We are talking from Inukjuak, a long way down. All the way up here, there are walrus. We even come up here close to Nunavut when we are walrus hunting. On our walrus hunts, we have walrus that have trichinosis close by, so we go further to hunt other walrus. Why are they becoming like that? Why do they have so much trichinosis now? Why is this happening to our wildlife?

Perhaps there are diseases coming that are invading the northern species in the North. It could be the fish. It could be the creatures on the bottom of the ocean. That is a concern that I was given comments to comment upon. Thank you. That is it.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. In the same way, are there questions from the staff? Johnny Mike has a question.

Johnny M: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Johnny Mike, Pangnirtung Hunters and Trappers Organization. The last speaker, I want to ask about the dam. There is work of damming rivers in Northern Quebec that has been done. This diverts rivers, and we know there is wildlife that might have seen changes in their migration or other issues. How are the wildlife affected when the dams are put in? How are the animals affected? Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can comment.

Anna: *(Translated)*: He did not quite understand this question. I will perhaps answer for him. The work of damming rivers really does affect wildlife. It affects the marine mammals, seals, whales, fish. They are all affected. When you affect a river, the animals in the ocean are greatly affected.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Okay, he said he could comment.

Simiunie: *(Translated)*: What I said was what we have gone through from before. The trees and Indian community have been greatly affected. There are different effects to walrus, whales, from when they first started. There was no damage at all to the wildlife before the dam started. Now we have no more seals.

I blame the damming of the rivers. When the rivers are flooded, when there are trees, they give off mercury. That is what we were told. We see effects on animals downstream from those dams. Where there used to be rivers, there are no more. We have been greatly affected. Our sea mammals, we have lost a lot of resources in the ocean. There are no more seals. They greatly changed when this came in. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jetaloo?

Jetaloo: *(Translated)*: Good morning. It is really a comment. We don't quite understand the context of the whole thing, and those that are watching online that are affected in different ways. I wonder from the way...maybe I understand it as an Inuk. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. It is a comment for thought. We cannot deal with that right now. Are there questions or comments from the floor, communities? *(Pause)*

Hearing none, are there any from the Nunavik delegation? *(Pause)*

Seeing none, are there any questions from the registered participants to the presenters? *(Pause)*

There are none. Questions from Iqaluit, general audience, to the presentation? *(Pause)*

Seeing none, Thank you. Let's thank them once again for their presentation.

(Applause)

To continue, Puvirnituq can come up. State your name, and your organization. You may proceed.

Presentation by the Northern Village of Puvirnituk

Adamie Angiyu, Deputy Mayor

Jackusie Ittukallak, HTO

Aisa Surusilak

Adamie A: (Translated): Adamie Angiyu. I am a Councillor. You guys say hamlets over here. I am the Deputy Mayor. I am also a member of the Hunters and Trappers Organization. First of all, getting invited here, we didn't totally understand what it was we were here for. We were curious and came. We understand the work that you have done. I love it. When we discuss issues brought onto us by the government in our history, now you have an opportunity planned, the process of laying out the groundwork.

I like what you are doing here as Inuit, to see the protection of wildlife habitats. The wildlife has been given to us to manage for future generations. We now understand that some of the work that Jonathan is doing, I really like what he was talking about, and I really want to understand more. To see the work that you are doing, it is good.

There are two issues for me. As a hunter, (*inaudible*) from Akulivik and Inukjuak were gathering places for our ancestors, hunting grounds. There was great cooperation from the regions. This continues today, and I encourage that to continue for the future generations. regarding the islands that are close to Nunavut.

I didn't understand before the process. I understand better the parameters for which we meet to discuss issues related to wildlife. Thank you for this. My partners here have some comments. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Next, please proceed.

Jackusie: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jackusie Ittukallak, Puvirnituk. I am from the Hunters and Trappers Organization. Thank you. We are very grateful for the invitation to this meeting, when we meet Nunavut and Nunavik Inuit. I want to say something about some of the laws that we have about the management of wildlife. We manage from our own organizations.

Where there is shared jurisdiction regarding the management of those wildlife, we look at ways to cooperate. Even outside of government laws, we give consideration as Inuit laws that we can enact that we could give some thought to. That's why I mention it.

The islands that we are concerned about, we know that we have been divided in the 1950s when we were brought to communities. The various islands were given away without our knowledge, so we are grateful for the shared management of those islands. We were brought to a location base past on wildlife on the islands have been where we survived. Based on Inuit customs on the islands, Inuit are cooperative even though they come from great distances. I miss that.

Also, the whole Hudson Bay is being affected by change. Since there is a lot of mud and silt coming into the bay now, it has changed the conditions. It has affected the migration of mammals that migrate. I mention that because we see it. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead. State your name and organization.

Aisa: *(Translated)*: Aisa from Puvirnituk HTO. I am a member there. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have comments. The river affects our area considerably. If you have this in mind, if you allow it in the future, it is going to really affect your territory. It has affected us a great deal. From the James Bay area, their water source has deteriorated considerably. Seals have virtually gone from that area.

There is so much mud and silt now. This is what you are going to face, as we have experienced it in our area, especially Inukjuak and great whale rivers nearby are really bad now. Climate change does not help the clarity of the freshwater coming out. It is a new problem. Where we used to hunt, the beluga and walrus have gone. If you allow that, you are going to see huge changes. We are speaking from experience, what we have seen affecting our area. Even the caribou migration will change.

We give advice with caribou. We advise you that you will see a great deal of changes to caribou populations if this was allowed. At times, they come to high grounds where there are less mosquitos, to calve. Even the sanctuary to caribou has gone, so calving for caribou has become very difficult. They have no safe place anymore to calve.

The other problem is sports hunters who are concentrating on harvesting bulls only. This bull has mated with many female calves to keep the population healthy. This sporting of caribou is not helping. We have to be mindful, as you have, on which species of caribou that we harvest. Many of these new ventures are catching us by surprise in every aspect of mammals.

We are now travelling so far, for instance for walrus. We have many rules for safeguarding the healthy population. We have to be careful which species we hunt. We try not to disturb walrus haul-outs near Akulivik. There are healthy walrus species, and they have healthy walrus haul-outs to date. I think they are starting to come into our area from healthy areas. As Inuit, we need to be mindful and be careful how we use our land and our animals. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any questions from the staff? (Pause)

Are there any questions from the communities?

?: *(Name not stated)*: Outside, it is flowing. It is not within our territory. We are seeing now the effect of your dam, rivers in your area. There is nothing we can do. How will this be resolved? The federal government, provincials up here appear not to be doing anything. A dam and generating electricity are more important to southern Canada. It has affected our Hudson Bay in general, and perhaps Churchill River, National Park. I think there are also dams in Manitoba. How will this affect us? Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: This is directing your comment to the group, or is it a question? Jonathan, can you speak? Can you repeat it in English?

?

(Name not stated): The damming of the rivers, the Inukjuak River, the damming of it, basically, the biologically degrading mass reaching the freshwaters going into Hudson Bay is impacting Nunavut waters. It is out of our jurisdiction along with the Churchill River. Lake Winnipeg is probably full of agriculture stuff that is contaminating Hudson Bay. Is there anything that can be done or part of the Plan? Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you for the question and the clarification as well. The issue of transboundary impacts or impacts that cross borders is an important issue that the Land Use Plan attempts to address in some cases for project proposals within the Nunavut Settlement Area impacting other jurisdictions.

So, within Nunavut, we can attempt to provide some guidance for activities that have impacts outside of the territory. What you are referring to is projects that are occurring outside of Nunavut that are having impacts within the territory. I don't have the exact references on hand, but I know that the Nunavut Impact Review Board, for example, is able to engage and participate in review processes for projects outside the territory that can have impacts within Nunavut. That is an example of a potential opportunity for Nunavut and Nunavut's regulatory system to engage in projects that are occurring outside of the territory that are having impacts here at home. Thank you.

Chairperson: (Translated): Qujannamiik. That is a comment. We have a member from Nunavik sitting amongst us, and whenever we discuss joint management of some land, he is allowed to sit with us. For example, South Baffin is the matter at hand. There are usually two members from Makavik. The other one, unfortunately, has passed. We have one now, and when it affects your area, we always have a member from Nunavik sitting with us, so your concerns are always heard.

Jetaloo: (Translated): Good morning, Chair. Jetaloo Kakee, Iqaluit HTO and Elder. I have a question. You have mentioned diverted rivers often. It has not happened yet in our Nunavut, but there is talk of such coming up in the future. My question is, the provinces who dam areas, we have no knowledge of what you are going through now. I don't think we could understand your dire situation right now.

We expect that waterfowl and shore mammals would be greatly affected, your food source like whales. You have mentioned that there are grievous dangers to dams on shores in your area, and it has affected you considerably. That is my question.

Aisa: (Translated): Aisa Surusilak, Puvirnituk, HTO member. The damming of our area was constructed before I was born. It has affected all the species you have mentioned, including ptarmigan and other food sources that we depend on for food. Waterfowl used to come in to lay eggs, say a sanctuary. Now some of these bird sanctuaries that we knew in the past are now underwater. It has affected our community so much. It is hard to even gauge the depth of the damage.

Animals that used to be so accessible to us nearby, trees, tundra, and other areas that we used to travel to harvest, now they are gone. Ptarmigan, for instance, have special little birches that they feed. This is now underwater, and their food source is gone. Even Arctic char who spawn upriver are affected. We used to have a lot of char in the Puvirnituk area. To me, it is just a story now.

Before I was born, these dams were established and built. I only know of a situation today. I have heard that there is so much cargo vessel traffic now as well. We have a river nearby. There is so much disturbance from the cruise ships coming into the area without our knowledge, compounding

the problems to animals that are in dire straits. So, water everywhere, whatever it may be including the wastewater being drained to our areas, the water balance in the use in our area, we are very concerned about. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jetaloo, is your question answered?

Jetaloo: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. In addition to my question, when I was a child, it was serene. It was good. It was like a different world from today. My question to you is mammals depend on shoreline like clams. We used to harvest them. My mother used to gather these clams from the high tide line. I know what she was going through. My question was your gatherings on high tide areas, how are they affected? There used to be a lot of clams and scallops. How are they on your affected shorelines on high tide areas? I am still used to having this in my area. How about your area?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You may answer.

Aisa: *(Translated)*: Aisa Surusilak. High tide areas, we don't have many high tide areas in our area. We don't gather so much in a high tide area. We only had a foot, maybe two feet of it, unlike here. We don't really gather food sources from high and low tide areas. Sometimes people gather clams and scallops with underwater diving apparatus. I don't know too much about your questions, the practice you had on gathering from high tide areas. Sometimes I don't understand what the questions are. I will try my best to understand.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Jetaloo: *(Translated)*: No, it is fine. We are both trying to understand each other and our customs. The people that are not here behind me are listening. We have to ask for them sometimes. In the context of being an Elder, you don't quite understand what is going on. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. I envy the young people being involved. When we were young, we were told not to. We could not even say anything as children. I envy the involvement in youth in all of this process. Thank you for your comments.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Paul wants to question.

Paul: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Quassa, City of Iqaluit, City Councillor. To hear their comments regarding the islands, when we talk about the management of wildlife in the Land Claims process and negotiations, we have to seek agreements with the Inuit of Northern Quebec as to the location and the use from both sides. That is spelled out in the *Agreement* with the Inuit of Nunavik for their rights to hunt anywhere in the Nunavut Settlement Area based on their traditional hunting routes and grounds.

The islands are identified and notified for use. That is already spelled out. The islands that we share hunting grounds between Nunavut and Nunavik will be managed by both organizations. I just wanted to note that when we are talking about the planning process that they are included, and the islands are included. My question is whether there are issues from Northern Quebec from Makavik in terms of the *Agreement* and the shared work of managing wildlife, as they are here at the hearing. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Any of you may answer.

Adamie A: I am Adamie Angiyou from Puvirnituq. I am a Deputy Mayor. I am also on the Hunters and Trappers Organization. To Paul's question, I have not heard of any bad kind of situations, but for those that hunt on the islands, they used to meet on Resolution Island in the 1940 before airplanes. They used to meet on the islands, people from Kinngait. They met on those grounds in the winter during walrus hunting season. I have not heard anything bad at all about the relationship with Inuit from Nunavut. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. I don't have any more names. Are there any from Nunavik? Proceed.

Johnny K: Johnny Kasudluak, Inukjuak. It was raised about damming rivers. I just want to note the Inukjuak River when it was dammed for hydro purposes, when the damming work was completed on the Inukjuak River, flow would remain the same. They noted that it would stay the same, that it would be a small lake that was dammed upriver. Once the lake was filled, the flow of the river would be returned. Talk about the run of the river.

But from the work that proceeded with damming the river, it affected the river that they claimed would not affect the water flow of good quality water that comes through the hydro process. They claimed it would be returned to the same level that reaches the ocean. I just wanted to state that. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. That is a comment. Are there any questions from the registered participants? *(Pause)*

Hearing none, are there any from the general Iqaluit public? *(Pause)*.

Seeing none, thank you very much, Puvirnituq.

(Applause)

We will have a coffee break of 15 minutes.

Break

Presentation by Qikiqtani Inuit Association

Levi Barnabas, Secretary Treasurer & VP for Board of Director Executive Committee

Solomon Awa, Director of Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit and Engagement

Rosanne D'Orazio, Assistant Executive Director, Operations and Benefits

Chairman: We have QIA at the table. They are ready for their presentation. You may proceed whenever you are ready. Thank you for allowing us to change our scheduling. Proceed, please whenever you are ready with your name and organization.

Levi: *(Translated)*: I think we are prepared. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq, first. We have a few items that we will discuss. When I was an MLA, one time I was asked where Santa Clause was going to. I was told it was on its way to Sanikiluaq. I think that is happening again. First, my name is Levi Barnabas. I am the Secretary Manager, Vice President for the Board of Director Executive Committee for the Qikiqtani Inuit Association. We have with us our staff. To my right is Solomon Awa, Director of Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit and Engagement. Rosanne D’Orazio is Assistant Executive Director, Operations and Benefits.

Today, we will be providing you with an overview of the Qikiqtani Inuit Association’s review and comments on the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. The Qikiqtani Inuit Association is responsible for advancing the rights and benefits of Qikiqtani Inuit through protection and promoting our social, political, economic, and cultural interests, while also safeguarding the land. We are responsible for land, water resources sustaining our communities. Our mandate aligns well with the purpose of the Draft Land Use Plan.

We are also responsible managing nearly half of all Inuit Owned Lands in Nunavut and are accountable to Inuit beneficiaries in the Qikiqtani region. We are the Qikiqtaaluk’s Regional Inuit Association, and we are a Designated Inuit Organization under Article 39 of the *Nunavut Agreement*.

We recognize that the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan is an important step forward and many have worked hard to arrive to this point. However, we have identified several concerns, which must be addressed to achieve the principles and objectives of Article 11 of the *Nunavut Agreement*. The Qikiqtani Inuit Association’s key concerns include:

1. Caribou: We feel there is not enough caribou habitat proposed for protection.
2. Inuit Owned Lands: There are too many constraints placed on Inuit Owned Lands by Limited Use designations.
3. Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements: There are designations that affect areas where Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements apply now or will be in the future to our children and grandchildren. In many cases, the Plan requirements for these areas interfere with legal obligations and will influence future negotiations for our children and grandchildren. These negotiations can be affected.
4. Vessel traffic and marine shipping is not sufficiently restricted under the 2021 Draft Plan. We don’t have a clear statement on where we stand on this. This is in relation to the 2021 Draft Plan.

I will give the presentation to Solomon.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Solomon: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Qujannamiik, Levi for your presentation and introduction. Thank you for being in our city. Welcome to the communities. I am glad to see we are well represented. Levi has briefly mentioned some wildlife and caribou in Baffin Island are the way of life for Inuit people. Caribou are essential to the Inuit culture and wellbeing. Because of this, it is our priority to protect them.

As in the Kivalliq and other regions, they migrate towards Sanirajak and the Repulse Bay area. We have a small herd coming in from the high Arctic of Peary caribou. Sanikiluaq also had concerns this morning with reindeer herds, a Christmas symbol. They are of concern to us as well as a Regional Inuit Association.

As mentioned before, we are a barren land in this region, Baffin Island. We have to understand the caribou habitation, their migration route, and how different it is from the mainland. It clearly indicates that there is a difference. It is different in Baffin Island. Their habitation and protection of caribou is very important. It is unlike mainland Nunavut. Baffin Island caribou, we find this inland. Their migration route is very short, unlike other regions. They travel a short distance to calve and to other areas as well.

Our Elders have concerns. They told us that there is a period of 40 to 70 years where they travel from region to region and appear to have disappeared. Even now, we know there are a few caribou out there. According to Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit, the herd will always return to our area. Caribou is of concern, and we are concerned.

Overall, we support the 2021 Draft Plan that limits development in important caribou habitats. For example, through Limited Use designation and prohibitions in areas such as mineral development. However, we do not believe that enough habitat has been proposed for protection. For example, the map on this slide shows movement corridors designated as Valued Ecosystem Components.

According to Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit, there are always at second thought looking at components in orange, compared to our Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit movement corridors data in yellow. As you can see, there are many, many gaps. In review of the available Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit and western science databases, the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board has made submissions. There are concerns about aircraft, walrus haul-out areas, and other bird sanctuaries. There should be a limit as well, including caribou calving grounds.

The Qikiqtani Inuit Association and Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board have a shared interest in caribou and working together to ensure strong protection measures are included in the final Plan. Between October 11 and 13, we had a workshop with caribou experts from the Hunters and Trappers Organization in our region. The goal of this workshop was to identify highly sensitive and important areas for caribou that must not be disturbed and compare these with the proposed habitat production.

Based on these workshops, the Qikiqtani Inuit Association and Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board are working on developing a joint submission on caribou protection to the Nunavut Planning Commission for caribou protection in the Qikiqtaaluk region for inclusion in the final Nunavut Land Use Plan. In the next slide are the primary results of this workshop. However, they still need to be refined and verified with participants. We have a plan to do this in early December.

For caribou calving and post-calving habitat, we support the proposed Limited Use designation, but not enough habitat has been protected. The big blue polygon near Netsilik Lake and southcentral Baffin, which was submitted by Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board in 2018 includes important caribou habitat. It is a particularly concerning gap. In addition, there are several areas in the Northeast Baffin

where little habitat has been proposed for protection by the comparison to our Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit database.

For caribou winter range, we support the proposed Limited Use designation, but only a very small area of winter range in the northwest region of Baffin Island was identified. This is enough. We note that the Nunavut Planning Commission did not accept any of the winter habitat identified by the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board in 2018, which leaves a gap in protection, especially areas where winter ranges are to be protected, including South Baffin, northwest mountain high Arctic, and Sanikiluaq.

Our perspective is that all movement corridors should be considered together. Whenever caribou are crossing land or freshwater or ice, they are all corridors that support movement patterns of caribou. Movement of the corridors of the land are generally identified as Valued Ecosystem Components in the Qikiqtaaluk region. We recommend that at least some of the major corridors are protected as valued Limited Use with appropriate buffers on the other side.

Sea ice crossings are identified as Conditional Use because they only apply when the ice is frozen, but some important ones were missed in the 2021 Draft Plan. There were no freshwater crossings identified in the Qikiqtaaluk region in the 2021 Draft Plan. Many important crossings were included as part of this large blue polygon near Netsilik Lake in the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board submission, and these need to be protected.

Continuing, the Qikiqtani Inuit Association and Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board's joint submission will include a summary of areas proposed for protection under the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan that we support, maps of additional areas that should be protected, and additional recommendations on Plan requirements. We recognize that not all areas can be protected, so this joint submission will reflect those that are most important rather than an exhaustive list.

Another concern for us with the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan is how the Plan treats Inuit Owned Lands. As a Designated Inuit Organization, we in collaboration with Inuit in our region have a right to determine which activities are allowed to proceed on Inuit Owned Lands.

Under the 2021 Draft Plan, 42% of our land with surface rights and 57.91% of these with subsurface rights are affected by either Limited Use or Conditional Use designations. This represents a significant percentage of land on which our decision-making authority would be constrained. Article 11.8.2 of the *Nunavut Agreement* states that the Nunavut Land Use Plan must take into account Inuit goals and objectives for Inuit Owned Lands.

However, Inuit goals and objectives for Inuit Owned Lands in the Qikiqtaaluk region are not set in stone. As a result, we cannot provide the Commission with parcel-by-parcel recommendations on which land use designation should apply. It is important that we retain the flexibility and authority to make decisions about Inuit Owned Lands. We should keep our Inuit population informed.

The Qikiqtani Inuit Association recommends the Commission develop a unique approach to land use planning on Inuit Owned Lands that adequately respects and protects QIA's right to manage and determine acceptable uses through the existing governing system. For example, we have an established land use registry and a permit application process to ensure that any proposed land uses are reviewed and carried out in accordance with QIA standards.

Impact on Inuit, we are also concerned that the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan interferes with Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements, including both existing and future agreements. For example, for the existing national wildlife areas and migratory bird sanctuaries, Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements has allowed the Qikiqtani Inuit Association to build an ecotourism lodge, a research facility, a twin otter airstrip, and dock facilities on Inuit Owned Lands within the Ninginganiq National Wildlife Area. However, this area has been designation Limited Use with prohibited uses and prohibited quarries, which may be required to build these facilities. Therefore, a Limited Use designation will interfere with the obligations of this Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement.

Continuing with Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements, we are also concerned about the influence of this Draft Plan on future Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements negotiations. Looking at the left side of the map, we are looking at proposed parks north of us. This would apply as an Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement if this had gone through. National parks, we have to negotiate with Nunavut Government. We have to have this negotiation complete. There would be an area where Qikiqtani Inuit Association would ensure impact into Inuit rights including the rights to pursue desired land use is minimized.

Continuing, we also have concerns about the Class 1 key migratory bird sanctuaries. I think it says where it should be sanctuaries where they migrate to our land. It will impact Inuit rights as outlined in the Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement for national wildlife areas and migratory bird sanctuaries. The Government of Nunavut and Designated Inuit Organizations must negotiate an agreement for all new migratory bird sanctuaries that overlap Inuit Owned Lands.

Under the 2021 Draft Plan, Class 1 key migratory bird habitats will still receive a similar level of protection to migratory bird sanctuaries, but with no clear directive for Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement negotiations. As proposed in the 2021 Plan, these Class 1 migratory bird habitat sites overlap with 37 Inuit Owned Land parcels, and a total of 4,726.32 km. I don't think Jetaloo will understand this, but it is huge. An example of these overlaps is shown on the maps to the right.

There is no acceptable amount of constraint on our decision-making authority on Inuit Owned Lands. Continuing with the Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements with these concerns in mind, the Qikiqtani Inuit Association makes the following recommendations:

First, the Commission must acknowledge all existing Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements and ensure that land use designations and Plan requirements such as those applying to conservation areas are consistent with legal obligations outlined and are being followed.

The Nunavut Planning Commission must also ensure that Limited Use designations do not apply to areas that are subject to the reasonably foreseeable future Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement negotiations, such as those applying to future parks and Class 1 migratory bird habitation sites.

Tallurutiup Imanga, Lancaster Sound has been asked and various topics discussed on this. We also do not agree with Limited Use designation applied to Tallurutiup Imanga in the Draft Plan with the Interim Management Plan. Specifically, the Plan does not specify the role of the Interim Management Plan in management of acceptable uses of the proposed national marine park conservation area. The decision-making authorities of these boards should be clearly outlined in the Plan.

Additionally, there are no measures to restrict vessel traffic or icebreaking within Tallurutiup Imanga in the 2021 Plan. Tallurutiup Imanga includes important marine mammal areas and are areas for Inuit use and harvesting, which must be protected from disruptive activities such as vessel traffic and icebreaking. We heard this message loud and clear from community representatives during the Pond Inlet regional public hearing. To help to address this concern, we will submit further comments to the Commission on specific areas in the Tallurutiup Imanga that should be protected from fishing and icebreaking activities.

With vessel traffic and icebreaking, Tallurutiup Imanga is not the only area in the Qikiqtaaluk marine region that includes important marine mammal areas and sensitive areas for Inuit use and harvesting. We believe that stronger restrictions should occur with vessel traffic and icebreaking in the Plan overall.

The 2021 Draft Plan is considerably weaker than the preexisting protections outlined in the North Baffin Regional Land Use Plan. Examples of these measures include requiring that all ships stay away 10 kilometers from the shoreline and 20 to 25 kilometers from the coast on highly sensitive areas; implementation of corridors for marine shipping; and many more. At the minimum, we recommend that the Nunavut Planning Commission adopt these restrictions into the Nunavut-wide Land Use Plan. In addition, we will submit further comments to the Commission on specific areas where vessel traffic and icebreaking should be prohibited.

In response to the concerns that we have heard from these communities at these hearings, we plan to submit further recommendations on areas of icebreaking and vessel traffic, including different types of cruise ships and yachts and friendly passage ships. Project-related ships and community resupply vessels should be restricted under the Plan. Thank you, Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any questions from the staff? Brian?

Brian: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Brian Aglukark, Nunavut Planning Commission. Just to speak for Jetaloo, from here to Akulivik is 1 kilometers and (*inaudible*) is 5 kilometers.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. That is just a clarification. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you very much for the presentation and the recommendations. We note that we do very much look forward to the recommended caribou measures to be included in the Draft Plan and recognize that is a significant component of the Land Use Plan in this region.

On the subject of Inuit Owned Lands, you have indicated again the preference for a unique approach on Inuit Owned Lands. On Slide 11, you have indicated that Inuit goals and objectives are not set in stone and the Qikiqtani Inuit Association is not able to provide a parcel-by-parcel recommendation to the Commission.

I am wondering if there are any exceptions to that. Are there Inuit Owned Lands parcels within the region where the Qikiqtani Inuit Association is confident of Inuit goals and objectives? I am thinking of areas like the Inuit Owned Lands around Nettling Lake where we have heard so much over the years from community participants about its importance, both culturally and to wildlife. Just to

summarize, are there exceptions where you do have a confident understanding of Inuit Owned Lands at this time? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can proceed.

Solomon: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Thank you, Jonathan for the question. When we spoke in Pond Inlet on this issue, there was a question. The Inuit Owned Lands as a whole, there are separate parcels. Each parcel from a community that selected it had their own reasons for selecting those lands. Some wanted the preservation for animals. Some wanted it for hunting ground, and some thought for economic purposes.

Now we know with Baffinland, there is a major economic boost from the mine. To Jonathan and the Commissioners, the Inuit Owned Lands cannot have a blanket policy. Some are open for mineral purposes, and some are slated for protection. I just wanted to clarify. I hope I answered the question. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan, go ahead.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you for the response to the question. I had another question on Inuit Owned Lands and their management in the Draft Plan. In your presentation, you noted the need for a unique approach on Inuit Owned Lands and in your written submissions have proposed that in some cases, Limited Use designations could be appropriate and be applied with a special clause where prohibited activities could proceed on Inuit Owned Lands with a letter of support from the Qikiqtani Inuit Association and perhaps the Regional Wildlife Board as well.

I am just wondering if you could expand on that proposed approach here today for the Commissioner's consideration. Also, do you have any thoughts on a letter of such a support could relate in some way to the equivalent of a ministerial exemption that is provided for in the *Nunavut Agreement* and the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act*, whereby projects that do not conform to one of the Commission's land use plan are able to apply for an exemption from the requirements to the responsible minister. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Rosanne: Thank you for that. This is Roseanne here. I will try and answer portions of your question.

Chairperson: Please state your name. Thank you.

Roseanne. Sorry. Rosanne D'Orazio with QIA. So, the current position is that it could be possible that certain portions of Inuit Owned Lands could be included in these Limited Use designations, but what we are looking for is a consistent approach to all Inuit Owned Lands. At the moment, as we have mentioned, we do not have a parcel-by-parcel indication of what that is. We want that flexibility, and that is why we have not provided that parcel-by-parcel breakdown.

If we were going to provide options for Inuit Owned Lands within certain designations, we would want that to follow the current governance process that exists. Some are aware of the Community

Lands and Resource Committees that exist in communities. We are proposing that that unique approach that currently exists would apply to Inuit Owned Lands within designations.

We would have to look at specifics, and you mentioned Nettling Lake. Maybe in our caribou protection measures, additional unique approaches for those IOL parcels may be applied within those protection measures. Those are still being developed as we speak. So, that is kind of what we were envisioning for a unique approach to Inuit Owned Lands.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead, Jonathan.

Jonathan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you for your response and expansion on that proposal. Just to follow-up, the idea of relying on the existing management approach with the Community Lands and Resource Committee, can you clarify in regard to this proposal for a letter of support, whether something like that process with the Lands and Resource Committee would take place before a project proposal is submitted to the Nunavut Planning Commission, or whether that would take place following the review by the Commission. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Roseanne: Thank you. Roseanne D'Orazio. QIA. We have not looked at those exact specifics, but I believe the decision would have to be made at the same time. So, the two processes could be happening in parallel, but that decision to influence the final conformity determination. So, we would have to outline those specifics with the Planning Commission in what this approach would look like on Inuit Owned Land.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. We certainly appreciate those details may not be ironed out yet, and I guess rather than continuing this back-and-forth here, we would encourage you to perhaps contact us, and we can work together before the January 10th deadline to have a supportable solution developed. Thank you very much.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there questions from the floor? Johnny?

Johnny M: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Johnny Mike, Pangnirtung Hunters and Trappers Association. I want to comment on your presentation. I am hearing some stuff for the first time. I have not heard the reports related to my community, as I see concerns. I want to note that in your presentation about caribou, I did not hear or see in the Baffin region for caribou purposes.

There are 10 affected communities on the caribou ban. Those high Arctic caribou, the Peary caribou is separate. Those communities, Igloolik and Sanirajak are affected by the ban, on the islands that I am talking about when we have been talking about caribou. The Pangnirtung HTO is part of the process when they talk about caribou. Perhaps there are two or three herds on Baffin Island. The Government of Nunavut I know was responsible in this area.

I want to hear more, whether we can get support. There will be a North Baffin caribou herd and a South Baffin caribou herd, and a third herd destination. I was told to mention this, so I bring that

up. As the QIA, it is a bit more complex. The planning process between here and Pangnirtung, there is possibly a diamond mine identified possibly for this area. For those in the North Baffin that were affected by the mine, Inuit were wanting to create their own Inuit association in the North Baffin. We are looking to get royalties.

When I was a member of the legislative assembly, Pond Inlet members too wanted to create their own Inuit association for the North Baffin. It had mostly to do with the benefits that supposedly were coming from the IIBA. They did not seem so happy from the benefits of the agreement. That seems to be an area that we need to discuss. There is no said plan. What will happen? What do we want to see between here and Pangnirtung? Is there any way to bypass the IIBA for Iqaluit and Pangnirtung? Can the project proceed for the Commission that you are presenting? I am using this as an example. Is there a way to bypass the Inuit of Pangnirtung and Iqaluit for their own benefit negotiations? That is my question. There is that one.

We have been talking through the United Nations, the rights of Inuit being identified through a Declaration of Indigenous rights. I wonder how the QIA thinks in terms of the land planning process affecting Inuit. What sort of discussions have you had? I know we are losing some rights, but we are not hearing whether these initiatives are just talk or whether they are real. Are they part of your discussions? Are they talked about in Canada? Are they the same way?

Those when you are watching from the outside, there is concern. The *Agreement* states that the Commission will determine the impact. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can proceed with an answer.

Solomon: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Thank you, Johnny. I am Solomon Awa, Qikiqtani Inuit Association. That is a good question. Regarding caribou, if you look up on the map, it has been suggested by the Inuit that we are trying to follow the desires of the Inuit that feel that it is a separate herd from North and South Baffin. The caribou migration, Inuit have made informed comments, but when caribou migrate, there is a local population that stays in the South Baffin. In our view, we see them as separate herds based on Inuit Qaujimagatugangit.

Your other question affecting Inuit and benefits from the IIBA, we at QIA to the Commission, we are requesting that we do not want to be excluded where Inuit impact happens for future projects. We do not want to limit, because we will have work to do in the future. The question you asked, whether we can bypass the IIBA, I cannot answer that. We cannot work from the outside.

The third question, perhaps Levi can comment. I just want to add that it is concerning that at the last mining symposium that we had here, it was concerning to see the work that they are doing. The protection of Inuit lands is a concern with industry. I just wanted to note that. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Looking at the clock, we are coming towards lunch. We will take a break. I still have names. We will proceed once again. We can have them back at the table. At 1:15, we will proceed again, and we are adjourned for lunch.

Lunch Break

Chairperson: *(Audio began mid-sentence)*... to the agenda. One of the members has another appointment, so the other two are still here. They will try to answer questions as well. We can proceed once again. I have a list of names from earlier, but first, there are some new delegates from Nunavik. Welcome.

(Applause)

We have started and are underway. We will give you an opportunity to absorb the day-to-day and present tomorrow. You can see the process that we are going through. Feel welcome. It was Johnny who had questions. Proceed.

Johnny M: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Johnny Mike, Pangnirtung Hunters and Trappers Organization. There are no Pangniks for a long time there now. If I recall correctly, I was not really answered with my question. We are members of QIA, and they are presenting their thoughts representing us. For what they are presenting, it is the first time we are seeing it. That is what I noted. I shall proceed.

The Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements have been challenged by the high Arctic communities wanting to create their own Inuit association, wanting to separate. That was my question. It was not answered. Will we have any flexibility on the Inuit Owned Lands? Each Inuit Owned Land has separate plans, and in terms of the IIBA for the impact and benefits to Inuit, is that the only route? Can communities have other ways of dealing with this issue without going into an IIBA process? Can you clarify that yes, we can or no we can't, and the reason for that? That is my question, Mr. Chairman.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. That relates more to QIA's operation. It does not relate to the issues related to the hearings from the presentation QIA presented. I know there are questions you might have of them, but we need to focus on the Land Use Plan. You can ask if there are questions related to the presentation. For the project between Iqaluit and Pangnirtung, that is a question to QIA that have other avenues. The impact related to QIA or other issues or to the government, there are other avenues, but our focus as the Commission is to focus on the presentations. Do you want to answer, Levi?

Levi: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. In part, but I cannot answer the whole issue related to the laws that we have to follow and the process we are in with the *Land Claims*. We will take the question as noticed, and we will come with a response personally regarding his question. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Paul?

Paul Q: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Quassa, City Councillor of Iqaluit. I have a few questions for QIA. First, the Inuit Owned Land issue: They were saying regarding the Inuit Owned Lands, those are identified by the communities, not just by NTI but not QIA. These lands were selected by the communities when they talk about Inuit Owned Lands being in a particular way.

Regarding Inuit Owned Lands, my question is, have you heard these issues in your communities on the issues you are presenting on Inuit Owned Lands, as communities have selected these lands? The purposes they selected those lands, and I seem to notice that QIA is not quite aware of the lands and the purposes for which they were selected. That is my first question.

Perhaps the communities dictating what they want with those Inuit Owned Lands, did we hear that today, Mr. Chairman? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed.

Levi: *(Translated)*: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Levi Barnabas, QIA. Thank you. That is a good question. We heard that in Pond Inlet the purposes related to the Inuit Owned Lands selections. We have the information, but also in part the lands that Inuit have selected within the Nunavut Settlement Area, we have easier process dealing with lands when it is our own lands. We have been asked to further review the Inuit Owned Lands that communities have selected. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Paul?

Paul Q: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Quassa, City Councillor of Iqaluit. The other question in terms of the IIBA Johnny was asking about, the Commission outlining the different categories such as Limited Use, I did not understand that for the IIBA. How would they be affected if there was a Limited Use for that land?

For example, in the *Land Claims*, Article 26, the categories under the IIBA process are spelled out. It does not state in there that if the parameters don't state anything about the planning when you start to mention Limited Use for the purpose of the IIBA it might affect the potential of the IIBA. The IIBAs can be when there if progress negotiated. That is the only way that a project can proceed. If there is no IIBA, the project cannot proceed. That is spelled out in the *Land Claims*. My question is how will the Limited Use category title affect those lands? Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Roseanne: Roseanne D'Orazio with QIA. I just want to make sure I understand the question. I think there were two different parts to it. There was a question from Johnny Mike about the IIBAs that I believe was slightly outside of the scope of what we are talking about right now, and the IIBAs needing to be negotiated for projects on Inuit Owned Land. You also mentioned Limited Use.

In our presentation, we talked about IIBAs needing to be negotiated for Limited Use designations in the Land Use Plan that land on Inuit Owned Lands. I just wanted to make sure if that is what your question is regarding, as I can provide a response to QIA's comments with respect to why we believe IIBAs should be required for those Limited Use designations.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. You can clarify if you want to. Can you clarify more, please, for the IIBA? Perhaps we do not use the abbreviation and use the Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement so that we are not trying to figure out the acronyms.

Paul Q: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Quassa, City Councillor of Iqaluit. *(Something said in Inuktitut, not translated)*.

(English): Concerning the Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements, if I understood clearly, you said that Limited Use status on Inuit Owned Land, I just didn't quite understand how that would affect Inuit Impact and Benefits negotiations if there has to be. But we all know that according to the *Nunavut*

Land Claims Agreement, Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements can only happen if there is major development. If there is no development, you don't negotiate IIBAs, and I could not quite understand how you would say if there were a status of Limited Use for a certain land that it would affect your Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement.

Maybe I did not quite understand what you were saying, but that was the question. How can it affect Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements on any Limited Use Areas, when in fact, under the *Nunavut Agreement*, Article 26, it states very clearly that any major development cannot happen without IIBA, and you can only negotiate IIBA if there is a major development happening. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Roseanne: Qujannamiik. Thank you very much for that clarification. So, this is an issue that was brought up jointly by NTI...

Chairperson: Can you state your name please?

Roseanne: Oh, sorry. I will start over. Roseanne D'Ozario with QIA. This was an issue that was brought up jointly by NTI and the three RIAs with the issue regarding the need to follow the process outlined in the *Nunavut Agreement* for negotiating Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements for the creation of protected areas. So, you mentioned IIBAs as a requirement for development. IIBAs are also required in the case of creating a protected area under a legislated process.

What QIA, and I will let NTI get into this more in the presentation, but by putting a Limited Use designation, which at times covers Inuit Owned Lands, that provides restrictions equivalent to that of a protected area. It is circumventing a process that currently exists for negotiating Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements for the creation of protected areas. We are saying that creating a Limited Use designation in these areas, it is not allowing for that process as outlined in the *Nunavut Agreement*.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do you have more?

Paul Q: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Quassa, City Councillor, Iqaluit. I kind of understand, but I also quite don't understand. I kind of wanted to move on to another subject. On the Inuit Owned Lands that were selected by communities, I recall going to communities under negotiations for the *Land Claims Agreement* and for land selections.

It was all the communities that knew which lands they wanted to select. Under that condition, the lands that the Commission had conditioned as Limited Use for the communities that selected those lands for protection, most of them were for that reason. When you have the category of Limited Use, it seems to be from the top down and not from the community side. You claim to represent communities, and you don't follow what the communities want.

That is a disconnect about Inuit Owned Lands that were selected for protection. They have different issues related to land selection. Have you asked the communities on those Inuit Owned Lands whether they should be in this category? Have you asked what the Inuit thought in the communities before coming here to the Planning Commission hearings? Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Please proceed.

Levi: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Levi Barnabas from Qikiqtani Inuit Association. Under the *Land Claims Agreement*, we have been designated to handle Inuit Owned Lands in the region. When considering any work on selected Inuit Owned Lands, we represent the Inuit. We consult the communities. The parameters within my own issues related a number of years that we live in different times now. We have to review and update whether communities understand and whether we understand the issue properly. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Ben?

Ben: *(Translated)*: Ben Kovic, Amaruq Hunters and Trappers Organization, Iqaluit. My questions seem to have faded. My cousin was stating that he started laughing, but I will proceed. We have reindeer. I would like the one, Paul Idlout. He is the one that was chasing caribou in his Santa Clause outfit. He is the one we need to blame for all these caribou problems.

Just a thank you to QIA for your presentation and comments. Part of what Paul Quassa was mentioning, I was thinking that we seem to be hearing some of this stuff for the first time. When we claim they don't own us, that we own them, I did not hear too much outside of caribou issues related to wildlife, whether the communities that are far from the caribou herds or that go through their tags, the options that they hunt. QIA did not seem to state too much that we need to protect.

For me, I think the seal probably needs the greatest protection. Those that don't have caribou near their communities eat a lot of seal, seal meat and products. I want the QIA to push the issue of conservation on behalf of the Inuit that they represent. In the planning process and in the hearings, we see issues related to seal habitat protection.

Us as the Hunters and Trappers Organizations have spoken to many issues and have been consulted numerous times on many subjects. The representation that we provide, we have to be given information ahead of time and to be given thought to the questions or issues at hand. I wonder whether though the Land Use Plan that they will be included between Sanirajak and Igloolik. They were told not to mark too much land. We too, were told not to select too much. Don't limit the economic opportunity.

Have you heard this message and whether outside of caribou, seal should be included, along with ships, sonar sounds, and various aspects of the ocean? That was mainly my question. Perhaps if you don't answer me right away, you can answer to Amaruq through a letter in written format. I know there are a lot of discussions going on.

We are in a rush. January 10th is coming. We will get a slim chance to review when we get back home and less opportunity to include things by January 10th. If we don't see each other, the issues that might be written, we are seeing in the process here what people are thinking. QIA claims it was theirs, not ours, the use of the wording for the Inuit that they represent, not as the QIA. I don't want to point my fingers too much, but to see and hear the presentation, you can't keep up fast enough to hear the information, especially when you try to read in English. That is the way it is. I don't want to go on too long, Mr. Chairman. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Levi?

Levi: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Thank you, Amaruq HTO for your question. Levi Barnabus, Qikiqtani Inuit Association. I know we have a limited time, but related to sea mammals, the Qikiqtani Inuit Association and the Wildlife Department, we are working with them before the January 10th date and the other related issues.

Right now, I can say that Lancaster Sound has been progressing. We have a Nauttiguqtiit Community Monitoring Program related to Inuit research. The watchers that we have created, if we can model that and use it in communities, then Inuit can monitor the sampled wildlife that is captured and other related research issues about animals and the climate. I will mention that.

QIA has sought agreements with NTI related to issues about wildlife management, not just caribou that will support the different delineations of animals. QIA will work towards the concerns related to sea mammals as well at our next meeting. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jetaloo?

Jetaloo: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jetaloo, Amaruq Hunters and Trappers Organization Elder. I have a question. I am sure others do too. I ask for the Inuit outside of this room that are not here. I have two questions. I understood finance regarding caribou. I was asking for Elders who are not capable to get a tag. We have not caught a caribou in about 7 years. I am asking for the way I understood it, in Pond Inlet to Clyde River, the high North Baffin area, the person who gets the IIBAs. The Elders, have they been thought about, who have not caught a caribou in a long time? Can we get funding to support our children and grandchildren that come through airplanes, airfare to hire a hunter? I am thinking modern-day situation.

I am worried myself about January 10th. It seems I need to gather a lot more information from the community, but we don't have time anymore. Can we expect a request for extension on the date?

The issue related to sea mammals: We are having a harder time catching seals around here. The ice takes a long time to form in the fall. You cannot go down 30 miles. We can go on new ice, but once it breaks off, then we can't access that ice again and have to go on the land. We are having more difficulty accessing hunting sites around Iqaluit. We have a lot of rock and mountains. It is hard to make trails and on the land towards Pangnirtung and north. It is becoming a concern from Iqaluit that we need access through the land if we are going to access the ocean.

The land fast ice is disappearing. I am kind of wondering on my question for the lack of understanding the context of some of the issues we can ask and some of the issues we can't ask. I am asking those listening and those watching, what kind of response are we going to get? I will be told that is an operational question, and they will not be allowed to answer it. I am trying to be aware of that. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Levi: *(Translated)*: Levi Barnabus, QIA. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Thank you, Jetaloo for the question. The caribou problem situation of the quota system has been a learning process. It has affected many people in Baffin Island. There are a lot of harvesters in Baffin Island that are affected. It is also inconvenient to the communities when the quota system is put up.

We need to revisit your question. It is quite true. Your concerns are well meaning. We have to find a solution to the problems that we are interchanging. We keep everything in mind. We try to listen to Elders. Many people depend on the Elders for a country food source. This cannot be ongoing. The traditional food is changing from caribou to mammals. Chair, will you allow me to answer this short question?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Roseanne: Roseanne D’Orazio with QIA. Thank you very much for that question. I just wanted to add that QIA has been working with the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board to develop caribou protection measures. It is actually on that slide that is up there. One of the priorities was to protect the habitat and protect caribou habitat. So, that is one thing that we are focusing on within the scope of this Land Use Plan, to make sure that there is enough habitat protected so that caribou can increase their numbers again.

In a similar respect, we are also working with the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board to present similar submissions to the Planning Commission with respect to marine mammals and marine wildlife. We are currently still working on this. We have been working on the caribou protection measures for many months, and it will probably take us more time to develop submissions to the Planning Commission on the protection of marine mammals and sensitive areas in the marine areas. So, it would be helpful to have a bit of additional time to be able to do that, but that is what we are hoping to bring forward to the Planning Commission as well for marine areas. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do you have any questions?

Jetaloo: (*Translated*): Thank you for your answer, but I truly don’t get your question. Those of us who are harvesters, the area is ours. We don’t have the same environmental concerns of those who are not Inuit. You have mentioned that you have these concerns on your agenda. Inuit Knowledge has to be utilized by your organization.

It is impossible for us. If we can hand these problems over to people who have authority over us, as you mentioned. That is true. Back in 1965, we were waiting for what is really happening with Inuit Knowledge and who can do work on Inuit Knowledge. What are we now? It appears to be put aside when the knowledge of wildlife is required. I would like to pass this on to you, QIA.

Amadjuaq and Netsilik, we know these areas very well. There are many areas to get to this area. A lot of aircraft have flown into that place. It has been controlled by Inuit, on Inuit concerns, Inuit conditions on Inuit land. I think we need to change this. This is not the past anymore. We have to be able to help ourselves.

If an exploration was to come by, say any company, even if it is 1% of the land being used for proponents to work around this area that I have mentioned. We have Nuluyait, Mary River. The percentage of IIBA is not enough. Suppose the mine was to shut down, who will do the cleanup of the closed mine? It is impossible with the damage. There won’t be enough money to pay Inuit benefits because of the mess that has been created by this company. I don’t think it is my place to criticize, but this is a planning process meeting, so we are discussing what we would like to do. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Levi: (Translated): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Jetaloo, thank you for your question. Levi Barnabas, QIA. QIA is pretty well aware. When it is not written in the *Agreement*, sometimes it is very hard to follow. Many people do not trust verbal agreements anymore as a group of body in a body. There are many problems that have emerged on agreements. We had a problem in Iqaluit, and we are now hearing concerns.

All the concerns are being recorded. We keep a record of what concerns we hear, and we try to act on what was needed on the concern. Some are written in stone. Some are not. We try not to deviate from our organizational concerns. We not only listen to Elders. We have many interested parties who have concerns with how we work. I am not trying to have more knowledge than you do, but we try to work to the best of our public in the Qikiqtaaluk. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Next on the list is Natalino.

Natalino: (Translated): Qujannamiik. Natalino Piugattuk, Igloodik HTO. I think I heard that QIA has a Wildlife Department. They are pretty much aware of the wildlife situation in this region. I just want clarification for those of us who are in the high Arctic. The Hunters and Trappers Organizations, even on a monthly basis, we meet with this mining company, the high Arctic HTOs and their concerns towards this mine. It has affected the Inuit employees at the mine. When we have concerns about this as a body HTO, the mine keeps telling us that even though we have concerns as a North Baffin organization, QIA is your spokesman. We have to check with them on what their thoughts are on our concerns.

Although we are members to your organization, you should be able to speak on our behalf. They come directly with high Arctic concerns to you directly, not to HTOs up there. After each meeting, our concerns are never met. So, the high Arctic HTOs have not been able to communicate with QIA. Sometimes communication is the worst at the best of times. We are just now hearing from your organization that you are on a different page altogether. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. We are not concerned with the Mary River Project. Please stick to the point of this meeting.

Levi: (Translated): Levi Barnabas. We try to represent every community on every aspect, even when it comes to concerns of the mine and community concerns. Sometimes communicating is very hard to be had. Because of this, sometimes our programs and projects are not passed on to the communities.

Sometimes we discuss important issues at our Annual General Meetings. Our employees are diligent to do their work. I fail to see where the misunderstanding in communication came from. We try our best to pass on information either through the CBC or other forms of media.

Chairperson: (Translated): No more questions from the table? Nunavik, do you have a question to the presentation? (Pause)

It appears none. Registered participants, are there questions to the presentation? Go ahead.

Archie?: (Translated): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Amaruq HTO. I just wanted to clarify that this is the *Land Claims Agreement* booklet. It has been approved and negotiated with the federal government. It has passed, and this is why you are here. I just want to clarify, for those of you who are in the planning process, under the *Nunavut Agreement*. This is how you work.

Inuit needs have to be met. Your concerns will be heard. We cannot deviate from this *Agreement*. It is firm. Lastly, you said we could do a written submission before the deadline. I just want to say that the Amaruq membership is around 4,000. We will pass on the information that needs to be passed on with our concerns to the Nunavut land use process. You as Nunavut beneficiaries, our concerns are based in Article 5 and Article 7.

For those of us in the Hunters and Trappers Organizations, their harvesting rights are a right. Inuit Owned Lands outside of Iqaluit, all have to be included. Amaruq membership has stated on Limited Use and other categories related to the land, and we as a membership of Amaruq in Iqaluit, let's not forget this is a signed *Agreement*. You are working under this *Agreement* on the land use process. We cannot deviate in the *Agreement* between the federal government. Inuit have to be adhered to. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: (Translated): I will take that as a general comment. Qujannamiik. Are there any other questions from registered participants? (*Chairperson's further comments not translated*).

Paul I: (Translated): Qujannamiik. Paul Irngaut, Iqaluit resident. I have a question to QIA. You have mentioned that you will ask and keep the communities informed on Inuit Owned Lands. It appears that you are running out of time. The January 10th deadline is just around the corner. Information will be hard to come by from QIA.

Going back to the question that we are not discussing, bird sanctuaries, walrus haul-outs, waterfowl sanctuaries. All those were mentioned. Every day, we need to harvest seals and fish. I want to know where QIA stands on concerns that I have mentioned just a while ago with seals and mammals. How will you do your work before the January 10th deadline?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Levi: (Translated): We just want to notify that we have compiled information. We have listened to Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit. Once we complete and put the information together, we will make a submission on what community concerns are on sanctuaries where you have mentioned, such as walrus haul-outs. We will work in relation to Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit. We know we are out of time, and we will do our best to accomplish to the need of the communities. We have a department working on Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit, and we will utilize that department to do our work.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any questions from the public? (*Pause*)

Meeka: (Translated): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Meeka Mike, Iqaluit resident, Pangnirtung born. I have a question. I need to have a clarification and answer. On Inuit Owned Land parcels, why is it difficult for QIA to identify and clearly give information on these parcels? I have asked questions in the past. That was discussed in the South Baffin about caribou migration herds. If you will, include these important caribou migration areas in the South Baffin.

When Amaruq was doing the mapping process, I did not participate. I have discussed this with Elders and asked their opinion. For instance, my grandfather used to tell me where the migration routes are. On the other note, we have a *Land Claims Agreement*. It goes back many, many years, to 1,000 years. We will keep this going even to five generations from the present.

We have to keep in mind what our Elders have taught us, and many wildlife organizations have said they have concerns with wildlife. So, why is it difficult to work with QIA to properly identify Inuit Owned Lands parcels? This is the topic. Too much of that is going on with organizations. We have worked in the South Baffin area. Many of us volunteer to assist in the land use designations.

Many who are doing the work for us are just up here working. They have no firm roots. We are being directed with how we should live and work with caribou with people who are directing us with no firm roots up here. We try to discuss this. Iqaluit HTO has very good land designations with Inuit Owned Lands. Many areas have been designated as Crown land where companies would be most helpful to them. You get tired of seeing this. I would like to understand why QIA has been reluctant to work with this region with Inuit Owned Lands.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Levi: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Levi Barnabas. QIA has worked with other organizations that they represent, not only with the HTOs, but with other groups as well. We know what the concerns are of this region. For us to work with organizations and the communities, we try to listen to the communities in this region. I will just stop there.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Roseanne: Roseanne D'Orazio with QIA. I just wanted to add very quickly that QIA has done a lot of work with communities to collect Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit, but also to understand the reasons why Inuit Owned Land parcels were collected. We do have information as to why the Inuit Owned Land was chosen from each community.

The position that we have taken in this presentation with the Land Use Plan is because we want to maintain those rights with Inuit in the communities to make those decisions. We want the governance structures that exist currently to maintain and to be used consistently in making those decisions. That is why we have said that Inuit Owned Lands should be dealt with uniquely within this Land Use Plan. So, we do understand why the IOL parcels were initially chosen, but we want to maintain that flexibility and the right that Inuit have to make the decisions on them.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any more questions from the public?

Meeka: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Meeka Mike, Iqaluitmiut. I will state this in English. My question is why is the plan for QIA to keep the Inuit Owned Land closed or limited and not included in this Plan? That is the question. That was not answered. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Roseanne: Roseanne D'Ozario with QIA. Once again, this is a position that NTI and the three Regional Inuit Associations have put a joint submission to the Nunavut Planning Commission on. We will be discussing, there will be opportunities to discuss this, again in these hearings. But to provide a response, the Inuit Owned Land will remain within the Plan. What we are proposing is that the right for Inuit to make decisions on that land remain. That is the difference and the uniqueness that we are requesting remain within Inuit Owned Lands.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Last question, Meeka.

Meeka: Meeka Mike, Iqalummiuk. When Inuit governance decided to pursue to negotiators for the *Nunavut Agreement*, they had requested that Pierre Elliott Trudeau and Chrétien to prove that they are committed to Inuit. So, there was requested five amendments to the corporate act to include Tunngavik. They also included IIBA and implemented amongst archeology and Inuit Heritage Trust. Those were five based on the Inuit implementation responsibilities form 1980s.

So, those people who implemented responsibilities that the Elders governance or the Inuit governance created, each time they met was for Inuit people to implement. It did not matter if you were a hunter or taking on a new way. Those who implemented more than two things out of five implementation responsibilities and duties had a choice to make an implementation duty, but also gain benefits. Usually, one was implemented back then. He gained land, much similar to my great grandfather Vivi that I inherited. That is my Inuit right. Yet, those are not included in these plans.

The *Mining Act* was also amended by Umkumiut before the negotiations, but Inuit governance had already begun that negotiation. So, where do I go? I have been trying to do this with QIA so many times. Where is my inherent right of those lands that belong to Vivi given to me when I was 3 years old? Multiple times, we have attempted. I have attempted to meet with presidents. How is that going to fit into respecting other implementation duties created?

The *Land Claim* does not cut off those people, but it is created that way or tried to be implemented that way. It is as though us Inuit have less Inuit rights. I would like an answer and know at the time that Umkumiut amended the *Mining Act of Canada* of staking. They put in stone, Stonehenge and cairns in there. There were only stakes before to recognize those areas, not only of jurisdiction, but also it becomes private ownership. Umkumiut also created BRIA to follow through those, implement those. That has to be defined more and respected more. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. (*Portion not interpreted*). I will ask one more time if there is a question from NPC staff. Jonathan, please proceed.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. I would like to follow-up on some of the discussion on Inuit Owned Lands again. Throughout this 15-year planning process and again here this week, Commissioners heard from community members on the importance of Nettling Lake, for example. We again heard from representatives from Pangnirtung, Kinngait, and Iqaluit that this area was an important area, and that they supported a Limited Use designation for the area.

In the Qikiqtani Inuit Association's June 2022 written submission, you have identified that "all Inuit Owned Lands that overlap the Nettling Lake Community Area of Interest have been designated by

QIA and Inuit communities as open to development on a case-by-case basis.” This seems to be at odds with what the Commission has heard in its planning process, including here this week.

In addition, you identified that Inuit Owned Lands parcels within the Sanirajak Community Areas of Interest are also open to development on a case-by-case basis, and we heard again this week that they continue to support Limited Use designations for these areas.

I would be curious when the Qikiqtani Inuit Association determined that these particular Inuit Owned Land parcels should be open to development on a case-by-case basis and whether they Qikiqtani Inuit Association conducts active and ongoing assessments of these requirements, and whether the feedback heard during the Commission’s planning process factors into Qikiqtani Inuit Association’s determinations regarding Inuit Owned Land parcels. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik.

Roseanne: Roseanne D’Orazio with the Qikiqtani Inuit Association. Thank you, Jonathan for that question. What we are describing in our submission is the request for communities to maintain the right through the governance process that exists currently to determine and make decisions as to what happens on Inuit Owned Land or not. That is consistent with the position that we have put forward. We would want that decision-making role to remain with Inuit for Inuit Owned Lands. QIA has in the past gone into communities and held consultations about the original intent for choosing Inuit Owned Land and the current use of certain Inuit Owned Land parcels. We don’t necessarily use the terms open or closed, because we want to maintain that case-by-case basis.

So, I would say the position that we have put forward to the Planning Commission is to maintain the case-by-case basis for Inuit in communities to make those decisions.

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you for your response. Just to clarify, regardless of the discussions through the planning process and the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission to conduct planning activities on Inuit Owned Lands, the Qikiqtani Inuit Association would like to retain the ability to review all projects on a case-by-case basis, regardless of what concerns may have been noted by communities and what other priorities may exist on those lands. Correct?

Chairperson: Atigo. Go ahead.

Roseanne: Roseanne D’Orazio with the Qikiqtani Inuit Association. Once again, the position that has been put forward by NTI and the three RIAs in our joint submission discusses this topic that we are talking about on Inuit Owned Lands currently. But yes, the desire is for the decisions to be taken by communities and Inuit in communities on Inuit Owned Land.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are you done? Go ahead.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you again for your response. I would like to switch to the subject again of Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements, following-up on some of the questions that Paul had asked earlier. I refer to Slide 15

of your presentation. Under Point 2 on that slide, you indicate that the Planning Commission must also ensure that Limited Use designations do not apply to areas subject to future Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement negotiation. Then you include e.g., or for example, future parks or Class 1 key migratory bird habitat sites.

Could you please clarify whether that list is exhaustive or whether this recommendation would also apply, for example, to caribou habitat or Community Areas of Interest. Basically, is that recommendation specific to these two categories of areas or not? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Atigo.

Roseanne: Roseanne D’Orazio with the Qikiqtani Inuit Association. I am not going to say that the list is exhaustive, because there may be other things that trigger future IIBAs, but the point is if there are areas subject to future IIBAs that the Limited Use designations do not conflict with those potential areas.

Chairperson: Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much. I appreciate the clarification that it may not be exhaustive. The examples of caribou habitat or Community Areas of Interest, does QIA expect that Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements would need to be negotiated for those two categories of designation?

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Roseanne: Roseanne D’Orazio, Qikiqtani Inuit Association. As this is something that has been brought up by NTI and the three RIAs, I am going to allow that to be answered at a future time so that the response is consistent amongst all parties.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any other questions? Go ahead.

Jetaloo: (*Translated*): From Amaruq. I just wanted clarification. It is not a question. Iqaluit, Pangnirtung, and Kinngait are not the only ones who depend on sea mammals. Every community in this region is dependent on seal and other mammals like whales for subsistence. In the whereabouts of the Netsilik area, there is a cabin established quite a way back, just for your information of our utilization of land.

Paul Q: (*Translated*): Paul Quassa. Thank you, Chair, for allowing me to ask, just repeating the question, which has not been answered, even now. Inuit Owned Lands has been discussed. I have heard NTI and QIA are partly responsible on Inuit Owned Land allocations. These parcels are selected by the communities. They wished to have these lands designated by them as well. Have you taken that authority to speak for each community on their behalf? Are you now a total authority on community land selections? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Levi: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul, thank you. QIA, before COVID problems started, we had consultations with every community. We are continuing this consultation in the future. We have not completed consultation on Baffin Island. We will consult with the communities.

Paul, as you know, and other members from the communities know, when land selection was taking place, it has changed a bit from the original selection. I think it was discussed in 2016 and even 2021. We still have to consult with the communities. We were in the process of travelling but have not yet started the consultation process.

Chairperson: Johnny?

Johnny M: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Johnny Mike, Pangnirtung, Hunters and Trappers Organization, Fisheries. when you mentioned Netsilik Lake, Pangnirtung when we were starting, the area was heavily used by Pangnirtummiut. We commercial fish in that area. That is quite active from the community. There is a cabin at the fishing site. We used this for economic activity for Arctic char, as there is a large supply of Arctic char there. Not all of it has been explored. It is a large lake.

When we start saying Limited Use and protection, those terms, it changes in Inuktitut. You are aware that when we start hearing QIA mention issues related for the Commission's consideration, as I stated earlier, I am seeing this for the first time as they were presented. Pangnirtummiut have done a lot of work in the Netsilik area. I just note that so that there is no confusion for Pangnirtung. We do a lot of commercial fishing in the ocean and in the lakes, and Netsilik is part of that fisheries. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. I have no more names. Thank you to QIA.

(Applause)

We will take a break, but Sharon will comment first.

Sharon: Thank you. Simone standing at the back, we just want to recognize that it is his birthday today. So, everybody, say happy birthday.

(Applause)

Chairperson: Happy Birthday. Let's take a 15-minute break.

Break

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: We will proceed. As with all presenters, state your name and organization. We are recording the proceedings. Please shut off the ringers on your cellphone to silent mode. You can start when you are ready.

Presentation by the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board

James Qillaq, Chairman

Kolola Pitsiulak, Executive Director

Mike Ferguson, Senior Advisor, Wildlife Management

James Q: I think you can hear us. Thank you for the opportunity. I am James Qillaq, Chairman. I have two of my employees here with me. Thank you all for the opportunity to take part. I have been the Chairman, but I am more like the slave of the organization, though I enjoy the work. The mandate that we are given to manage wildlife in the region, we rely on the Hunters and Trappers Organizations. You guys, I'm sure, like my hat from Montreal. We were told to smile. We have delegates from Northern Quebec. When they claim (*inaudible*), it means they are scared and not happy. Mike will do most of our presentation. I will pass it out.

Chairperson: You may proceed when you are ready.

Mike F: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Thank you, James. We will not go through...We have presented many submissions. Oh, Mike Ferguson, QWB. The QWB after working with the HTOs have presented many submissions to the Nunavut Planning Commission in 2018. We do not have time today to go through all the issues with those, but I will make a presentation that is overall about the issue of land use, which the major land use that we believe exists in this region is wildlife harvesting by Inuit.

I will try and provide some rationale for that statement. Ben this morning, and several communities followed up by stating, if I can paraphrase what he said, that if we lose areas that are important for wildlife harvesting in the region, we will be in trouble. That is the theme that we will follow. I am going to try and describe in ways that are probably not necessary for Inuit because they know how important harvesting is, but it may help others who are not as familiar with Inuit harvesting.

The QWB is an Inuit Regional Wildlife Organization established under 5.7 of the *Nunavut Agreement*. The QWB is composed of the chairpersons of 13 HTOs or Hunters and Trappers Organizations in the region plus a Chairperson, James right now. A five-member executive committee sets the priorities for the QWB throughout the year.

The QWB is responsible for issues affecting wildlife harvesting among Inuit by Inuit among two or more of the 13 communities. Each HTO is responsible for addressing wildlife harvesting issues. The QWB executive and staff collaborate closely with the boards of affected HTOs on specific issues. The QWB also assists individual HTOs on local issues at the request of the HTO.

Other land uses may impact both wildlife populations and wildlife harvesting by Inuit. As a result, the QWB and the HTOs have responsibilities for land use planning just as Inuit have had for millennia. Inuit and their ancestors have managed harvesting of wildlife and other land uses in the Qikiqtaaluk region for at least 3,500 years.

Inuit Qaujimagatugangit related to wildlife and the environment have been derived from active sustainable wildlife harvesting by Inuit. Inuit systems of wildlife management recognized in Article

5 of the *Nunavut Agreement* and Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit are continuously updated 365 days a year in the communities across the region.

In 1981 and 1982, the QIA Harvest Study found that wildlife harvesting employed 20% of the region's Inuit. From 1998 to 2001, the NWMB Harvest Study found that wildlife harvesting employed 24% of Inuit. This would be self-employment, both part-time and full-time employment. Inuit harvesting actually employed a greater proportion of the population while the Inuit population increased by 68%. As the little table shows, the Inuit population in 1981 was about 7,000 Inuit. In 1999, that increased to just less than 12,000 Inuit.

Wildlife harvesting self-employment kept pace with that and actually grew a little bit faster. So, it is an important source of employment in the region. In 1998 to 2001, Qikiqtaaluk Inuit obtained nutrition by harvesting at least 45 different species. In total, wildlife by harvesting provided at least 1.6 million kilograms of food each year, for an average of 139 kilograms per Inuk through self-employment. That in turn, yielded about 380 grams of meat daily to every Inuk in the region on average.

The *Canada Food Guide* recommends only 225 grams of meat to the average Canadian. So, wildlife harvesting by Inuit in this region is very nutritious and very productive, and also adaptive to increasing populations of Inuit.

Economic studies of Indigenous harvesting usually assess the replacement costs of food, but there are also values provided through other resources such as skins, eider down, ivory, and sport hunts. We have not included those latter items in this review that we are providing.

From 1998 to 2001, the QWB has estimated that the annual replacement costs of food alone in this region for Inuit was \$59 million dollars annually. That is the value of this activity or land use. Inuit harvesting by Inuit has been the most valuable adaptive and sustainable land use in the Qikiqtaaluk region probably for at least 3,500 years. Through the *Nunavut Agreement*, the QWB and the HTOs have been specifically mandated to manage wildlife harvesting by Inuit. The QWB requests that the Nunavut Planning Commission formerly recognize wildlife harvesting by Inuit as the most sustainable form of economic development and land use in the Qikiqtaaluk region.

The QWB and HTOs conducted land use planning workshops in all 13 communities during 2017 and 2018. In 2018, the QWB and HTOs submitted 43 written submissions to the Nunavut Planning Commission, which has already been mentioned. Some aspects of the submissions were included in the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan, but important aspects are completely absent, and some are inadequately reflected in the current Draft Plan.

The complex responses of wildlife population to disturbance are well known among Inuit through IQ, while science provides only limited insights. During the 2017-18 workshops, HTO boards were asked if and where temporary land use restrictions could protect the main wildlife areas of concern. All of the HTOs independently responded that if a major new development occurred, it is highly unlikely that the affected wildlife would return to any given seriously disturbed area in the future.

Prohibitions requested in each submission were clear and carefully considered by the HTOs and the QWB. The QWB is deeply concerned that the nutritional, employment, and economic values of wildlife harvesting by Inuit have not adequately guided decision-making in development of the 2021

Draft Land Use Plan. The final Land Use Plan should carefully consider wildlife harvesting by Inuit as the most valued and actively sustainable land use, which it actually is.

Recognizing and valuing wildlife harvesting by Inuit is needed for the wellbeing of Qikiqtaaluk residents and communities. Reflecting back to several statements by the communities, we will be in trouble if wildlife harvesting by Inuit is not protected. Inuit society and values will adapt and evolve in the future, but it is unknown exactly how and when those changes may or may not occur.

The QWB recommends the NPC implement protections for wildlife harvesting by Inuit that are being advanced by the HTOs and the QWB, and to periodically revise the Plan every 10 years in line with any changing Inuit values. We are beginning to work very cooperatively with the QIA, and we thank the QIA today for acknowledging that and discussing it, so I will not go into those descriptions of the joint work we are doing.

Since the Draft Land Use Plan is a Draft Land Use Plan, I would suggest that there should be an entire chapter in the Plan devoted to the wildlife harvesting by Inuit. It is a land use. It is extremely valuable. It employs people at their own expense, and it provides a large amount of nutrition for Inuit in this region. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Is there more? Qujannamiik. Are there any questions? Okay, go ahead. Proceed.

Kolola: (*Translated*): I am a bit late. Sorry. My name is Kolola Pitsiulak. I work for the board of the QWB. I am the Executive Director of the organization. We talk about going linear, but it is not always linear. We are glad to be here with other organizations talking about concerns and things we want to see. You have provided the context for what we are trying to do for the future.

The Qikiqtani Inuit Association, we are cooperatively working with them on issues currently. Many difficult issues arise over time, and COVID was part of that struggles. The HTOs and the communities are struggling to function. We as an organization as well, the funding we always feel is inadequate to do the things we need to do within the *Land Claims Agreement*. The work that we have to do in wildlife management, the funds don't follow the amount of work required.

Many employees of the HTO we are constantly losing and having to hire managers for the associations. I just state that not to complain, but to explain the context of where the Hunters and Trappers Organizations are functioning. We are here during the hearings. It will affect Nunavut and will be a resource that we will rely on.

I won't go into too much detail in the work that we do to manage wildlife. We want protection for wildlife. I want to say we are cooperatively working on best practices that we can come up with. We have good expectations.

In conclusion, we have a limited time, because we are almost into December. Christmas is coming and the holiday season will be upon us. Then trying to get the gears going in January will be a struggle. It seems like the deadline is tomorrow. The Commission and the Commissioners, if you have any leeway to extend it by a month, it will go a long way to give you what you need. In thinking about some of the decisions and the things we are hearing from the federal government this week, if we can, request to the federal government to extend the deadline. I wanted to be brief. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. This is Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you to the members of the panel for their presentation today. I have a few points of clarification. In your presentation, you mentioned the \$59 million-dollar annual value of harvesting. Could you confirm when that number was calculated and if it is reflective of current 2022 values with inflation and things changing regularly. I am just curious when that was estimated. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead. You may go ahead.

Mike F: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Thank you for the question. I am Mike Ferguson with the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. The volume of wildlife meat produced was determined from the 1998 to 2000 period of the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board's Harvest Study. The edible weight of animals was found from various published records.

There was sophisticated economic modeling produced for the Beverly Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board some years ago. They estimated that 50% of caribou is high-grade meat, and 50% of the caribou is low grade meat. They made that relationship to ground beef versus steak. So, I searched advertised prices at North Mart for ground beef and steak and found retail prices advertised by them from October 2022 and June 2022. The dollar value is estimated from this year. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan, proceed.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you for that clarification, Mike. We are aware of the ongoing collaborative work that the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board is doing with the Qikiqtani Inuit Association and understand that there may be upcoming discussions taking place to prepare submissions for this planning process. I am wondering if the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board would be open to having Nunavut Planning Commission staff attend any future meetings in order to participate in those discussions. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can respond.

James Q: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Yes. We are totally open. If you want to join us, we are open and available. We want to cooperate with you and with the Qikiqtani Inuit Association. They are recognized as an agency that we have to work with. Our mandate comes from Article 4 on wildlife management issues. Outside of that, we have to go with the Inuit Association if that is understandable.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. State your name and organization. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you for the response and openness to working together on this. My final question is in regard to the balance within the Land Use Plan between conservation or restrictions on land use activities and supports for economic development opportunities. In your submission, you noted that the current Draft Land Use Plan has included many of the areas identified by the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board but does not include many others and expressed some concern about this.

I am just wondering if you can provide any suggestions on how the Nunavut Planning Commission can reconcile the different perspectives that it is hearing, in particular calls from organizations like yourselves to increase the amount of Limited Use Areas and other measures in the Nunavut Land Use Plan compared with other organizations, notably the Government of Nunavut, for example, that finds the current level of restrictions being proposed in the Draft Plan to be unacceptable.

We have also heard significant concerns from Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated and all of the Regional Inuit Associations on the level of restriction placed on Inuit Owned Lands. So, we do see that there are differences of opinions and wondering if you have any recommendations on how to proceed to achieve this balance that we are all seeking. Thank you.

Chairperson: You can proceed.

Mike F: Mike Ferguson, QWB. On the first part of your question regarding governments, it was actually their response to some questioning at the North Baffin hearings, which led to the analysis that we have engaged in the last two weeks or so since that hearing. Most of the response that we heard from the Government of Nunavut was about economics and about employment, although we did not hear many specifics.

So, we engaged in a common practice of replacement cost analysis for Indigenous harvesting to put a value on it, and that generated the \$59 million dollars a year, back some years ago. Demand would have increased, so my expectation is that the current demand and the current value is higher than \$59 million dollars a year.

Then the question of employment, even though the population of Inuit almost doubled from the early '80s to the late 1990s, the proportion of Inuit who were involved in wildlife harvesting kept pace or actually outpaced the growth. So, we believe until given evidence to the contrary that wildlife harvesting by Inuit can keep pace with the growing population. It seems to be evident.

A reliance on other industries, which may...These numbers are entirely Inuit employed. It is Inuit that are producing food for Inuit. They are largely paying the cost to produce that food, whereas other industries may have a lower proportion. It won't be 100% Inuit employment that there is in Inuit harvesting by Inuit. There is a difference there. Also, if Inuit harvesting can keep pace, we have not seen evidence that mining will keep pace with the Inuit population growth.

In terms of different points of view from Inuit organizations, we are aware that can be an issue, especially like a group like the Nunavut Planning Commission, and that is why we are now actively engaged with the QIA. Hopefully, if the QWB, the HTOs, and the QIA can resolve those apparent, well maybe those conflicts really don't exist at all. If we can resolve this and come up with joint positions, then it should make NPC's job easier. We are just starting on that. It will be very hard for us to go through all the steps by January 10th, but we are trying.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. From the table, communities, Ben?

Ben: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Ben Kovic, Amaruq HTO, Iqaluit. The QWB and QIA working together, that is good. Those of us from the communities, we encourage you to work hard together. I want to ask the QWB whether the Hunters and Trappers Organizations to go back a bit, different

organizations that are not Wildlife Organizations that submit their own written proposals. I know you speak about the HTOs that you support, but I want to understand better as Hunters and Trappers Organizations.

QWB, have you seen the maps that we worked on with the Commission? Have you seen these maps? I seem to sense that you have never seen them. That is my question. When we are trying to cooperate with the Commission and submit positions, we are putting ourselves through a difficult time, and we are working on our own. QWB and QIA will be working together. We are left on the outside.

The Chairman, James, consider the Hunters and Trappers Organizations in the complicated process. When representatives come from the communities representing wildlife management, I would not want to see right by the deadline that we don't have any maps that we have presented. We only see the marked maps, the calving grounds, water crossings, the routes. I still have not heard here. Maybe they don't believe me. With the QWB, I want your support to materialize the maps. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Perhaps a response?

Mike F: Qujannamiik, Ben. I will try...

Chairperson: Your name?

Mike F: Oh, sorry. Mike Ferguson. Thank you, Ben, for your question. It was passed to me. If you are referring to maps produced by NPC over the years, we became more actively engaged in land use planning after the March 2017 hearing in Iqaluit. Several communities from the region, HTOs – actually not several but we canvased all of the HTOs - they asked to assist them in writing final submissions. That is why we had the workshops in every community. Every community provided us with their maps in 2017 and 2018. That produced the 43 written submissions.

If any HTO has produced further maps since 2018, we would like to have copies of those so that we can incorporate them into our final submission. We can do that joint with the HTOs or independently. We invite you to send us any more recent maps. It would be very good to receive them.

Our other plan is to review as a whole at the AGM, which is scheduled for December 9. That's the caribou. Our AGM, in which all of the HTOs would be represented is scheduled for December 5 to 8. And then on December 9 and 10, we will have a special session with QIA on caribou issues. We are going to review everything during the AGM and the caribou with all the HTOs chair hopefully present. You can bring forward everything from all the communities at that time, but we would like to have the maps and any other substantive things in advance of those two meetings. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon will make an addition to the comment.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. Just for clarity on the record, the Commission does have the maps from the Iqaluit HTO, and they are in evidence. We have received them. Any further work that they want to do with those maps, the Commission will also take them in for consideration for submissions. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Ben?

Ben: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. My next submission kind of thing, yes, it is in the hands of NPC, the maps we did. It is not just Iqaluit. It is other communities also, probably in their hands. But if you want specific communities, the latest version of our mapping project for this particular Planning Commission hearing, they have the maps, the latest ones. So, you can work with us or any HTO to request the map for that particular community. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Paul?

Paul Q: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Quassa, City of Iqaluit Councillor. I will speak in English.

(English): I just wanted a clarification on what you said there. You mentioned, and it was on the chart there, any animals or wildlife would not come around as they did to the area where the major development is. I just wanted clarification. Is that what you said? *(Translated)*: I will make further comment after. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Mike F: Yes, that is approximately what I said, but I can clarify more. The response of wildlife to disturbance is very complicated, and what I said was stuck into a very brief presentation and did not cover all of the nuances about wildlife and the responses to disturbance. We can get into more detail about that if you wish.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Don't forget to say your name.

Mike: Mike Ferguson, sorry once again.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Paul?

Paul Q: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Quassa, City of Iqaluit. I will respond in English.

(English): If we look at the other developments taking place in Nunavut, for example in Baker Lake, Qamani'tuaq, we do see a lot of caribou there roaming around when development is taking place. Even outside of Meliadine River outside of Rankin Inlet, you see caribou migrating nearby. In fact, all those developers in the Kivalliq area do have obligations as to what they have to do when caribou are crossing near their development area.

So, I did not quite understand what you mean by that, because if we look at the existing major developments taking place in Nunavut, we do see caribou roaming around that area. I don't know how you came to that conclusion, but I just wanted to make that point, that in fact major development, not in Kivalliq but Kitikmeot and everywhere else in the circumpolar world, you see wildlife returning to the area that they have always been, even if there is a major development taking place. I just wanted to make that point.

Maybe Mike Ferguson can elaborate a little bit more on that, how they came to that conclusion, because we have not seen that yet in our area. I just also wanted to make a few points here, Mr.

Chairman, if you don't mind, that it seems having sat here since Monday and listening to organizations, various organizations that are making submissions such as yourself, it seems that we are hearing organizations that seem like they are just starting.

In fact, this project has been going on for 20 years. Every time there is a hearing, everybody seems to be just starting. This whole work could have been done way back I think. I am saying this because since we have been sitting here, the communities have been commenting that we can't wait any longer for a Nunavut Land Use Plan. Everybody is looking for certainty, and I think that is what the communities, and certainly myself as a community, that is what I am looking for. We cannot wait forever.

That is one point that I wanted to make. Just going back on the first point that I made, how did you come to that conclusion? Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can respond.

Mike F: Qujannamiik. Mike Ferguson, QWB. Your comparison with caribou responses to disturbance in other areas may not be entirely applicable in this region at this time. However, in the early 1980s, caribou were living in downtown Kinngait. In the early 1990s, caribou were living in downtown Mittimatalik. In the mid-1990s, caribou were living in downtown Iqaluit. There were issues in Iqaluit about sewage trucks colliding with caribou.

So, Inuit Elders have explained that difference or that sort of situation with the current situation by explaining that when caribou are in large abundance, they go wherever they please. They are very hard to disturb. However, the current caribou population on Baffin Island and in the high Arctic has been through a long period of decline, very significant decline in general.

The population on Baffin Island is starting to recover, but it is going to probably be slow, as it was in the past in the 1950s and 1960s. Elders teach us that when caribou are small in number and few in number, they are very sensitive to disturbance. They will not return to places where they are disturbed. The HTOs' description of what may happen going forward has to do with that context and their understanding of how caribou respond to human disturbance at different times in their population cycle. We are at the low point of the caribou population cycle on Baffin Island.

As mentioned earlier by Solomon, it is approximately 70 to 90 years for a population cycle. That is how I understand it. That is how I was taught by Inuit, and that is how I interpret and appreciate their information. I believe that the population of caribou in the Kivalliq, I don't know the number specifically, but they are much higher than is currently the case probably on Baffin Island. That is why I suggest the situation around Baker Lake may not be entirely comparable to what is happening on Baffin Island in the next 10 years.

The Nunavut Planning Commission has a 10-year revision schedule built into it. So, in 10 years, the situation with caribou may be different. The opinions of Inuit may be different. The reliance on harvesting may be different. Therefore, the Land Use Plan in this region could be changed. The parameters of the Land Use Plan in the Kivalliq, I would suggest should probably fit the situation that is there, whereas the parameters for the Qikiqtaaluk Plan should fit what is happening here. That seems to be what the HTOs are asking for and what QIA is asking for. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Solomon?

Solomon: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Thank you to QWB. You are here to make a presentation. Solomon Awa. I will change hats for a while away from the City to QIA. I would like to say to Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board, we met with QWB. It was a comprehensive meeting. We spoke about the caribou population. Some HTOs were also present. You mentioned that you will meet on December 10, 11, 12 for the AGM, and specifically the last two days to discuss caribou population.

The mapping that you have marked will be analyzed in detail. As we work on the map together, QIA and QWB, the detailed map will be submitted to Nunavut Planning Commission. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. It is a general comment. Nunavik, do you have any questions? We have more delegates coming in.

Adamie: Adamie from Salluit regarding caribou. There is a large population that goes through Salluit through the mountains. Some cross onto Nunavut. Do they cross over here?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

James Q: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. James Qillaq, Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board Chairman. That is a good question. We have seen in the Kivalliq caribou that have just been on the sea ice. Some we have seen by plane. But to know exactly where they are going, I have no idea. Perhaps researchers might have seen or collared caribou. Mike, any data in this area?

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Mike F: Mike Ferguson, QWB. The Government of the NWT and Nunavut had caribou collared on South Baffin Island from 1987 to 1995. None of those collared caribou crossed to Northern Quebec. I know based on work that I have seen or have seen the results of the work from Quebec biologist. I have seen no evidence from them that Quebec caribou have crossed over to Baffin Island.

One piece of information that I have been able to witness myself luckily, comes from Inuit Elders. Generally speaking, Baffin Island caribou are recognized by the fact that they have no eyelashes, whereas mainland caribou from mainland of Nunavut are recognized for having eyelashes.

I have only seen one caribou out of hundreds and thousands of caribou that I have handled with Inuit on Baffin Island. I have only seen one caribou with eyelashes on Baffin Island, and that happened to be an island that looked quite different than other caribou that I shot for my personal use, near Pond Inlet back in the 1990s. So, I have seen a caribou with eyelashes, only one out of thousands on Baffin Island. I don't know. It would be interesting to learn if Quebec caribou have eyelashes or not.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Was that good? Questions?

Ali: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. Ali Qavavauk, Ivujivik. You count caribou. We count caribou in Nunavik and support each other in counting caribou.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Paulusi: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. Paulusi Tarriasuk, Ivujivik. First, thank you for inviting us here. (*Inaudible*) was my father who was a real hunter. The caribou, I would like our caribou assessed due to the rivers overflowing in the spring with very high current. The caribou get caught in the current. Those that were caught on the river were on the banks. They had no fur. They were water soaked and drowned in the river. We need to assess these situations that cause caribou to die off due to the extreme conditions for the wildlife that changes with the river systems. They died off due to the conditions that they experienced. Thank you.

Chairperson: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. If you want to comment, I think that is probably outside of the scope of the hearings. I didn't get your name. I am not aware of your name. Raise your name until you get the microphone. Try to keep it focused to their presentation. Thank you.

Eli: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Eli Aullaluk from Akulivik. For the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board regarding caribou research that they have done, we too assess our population. The men standing doing the presentation, we also deal with outside of their jurisdiction in our home. When it comes to Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit, as stated regarding caribou, they go up and down. The populations go in a boom and not cycle.

It has been noted in the past that caribou will wane and disappear. Then they will come back and be numerous again. They don't totally disappear, but it is more difficult to come up to those big numbers they used to have. This is Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit. You probably have Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit from the QWB or the Planning Commission. You were asking about Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit and whether you are gathering information in this area for future use on Inuit wildlife management. I am asking. Thank you.

Chairperson: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. That is a good comment. It is understandable, your question. I want to just note that we are as a Commission here to listen. Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit is equal. Even if it is a verbal presentation, we weigh the values equally. It might seem just as a verbal presentation, but we give it equal weight to western science. We have a deadline of January 10th that we keep noting. We keep Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit equal to western science, as stated in the *Land Claims Agreement*. In our deliberations, we have to use that. Thank you. Are there any more questions from the Nunavik delegations?

Adamie K: (*Translated*): Adamie Kaitak, Salluit. Just to clarify on what I said, the caribou coming and going in numbers as our Elders would say, the ones going through Salluit, there used to be a lot of caribou. The whole hillsides looked like they used to be moving. Those finally came back to our community this spring. They came back in numbers, and then they disappear. Perhaps they are going to the islands. That is why I was asking whether you are aware of caribou from Nunavik going to the islands. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Perhaps you might want to comment to the question. Proceed.

Mike F: Thank you. I believe I answered that as best I could earlier. Based on past telemetry work, both from Northern Quebec and from Southern Baffin Island, I am not aware of any evidence of caribou moving across Hudson Strait between those two areas. That is the science side. I have not heard from Inuit on Baffin Island.

We did an Inuit knowledge study looking at the Inuit Knowledge of changes in abundance and distribution of caribou, which because of the age of the Elders, we were able to track that back from about 1910 until 1993. None of the Elders reported evidence of caribou movement between Baffin Island and Northern Quebec. That is all I can say to it. Thank you.

Chairperson: State your name please.

Mike F: I did it again. Mike Ferguson. Sorry.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Hopefully, you got your response. Questions? *(Pause)*

Seeing none, are there any questions from the registered participants to the presentation? Go ahead.

Archie: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Archie Angnakak, Amaruq Hunters and Trappers Organization, Iqaluit. Just to note, with QIA and the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board, I want to note in our written submission that it will be included. Both have identified. Also, with Amaruq, under the *Land Claims Agreement*, Mike spelled it out related to activities around Iqaluit, Amaruq is included as a Hunters and Trappers Organization managing wildlife in this area.

My comment is in our presentation to the membership. If we want to create an outpost camp, Amaruq HTO would be the only ones to approve. That is not the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. If an outpost camp is requested, we are the only ones who can deal with this issue. That, I want to note, will be in our comments to you for the future, if we want to request outpost camps. That is what I wanted to note. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Another question from the floor?

Simiunie: *(Translated)*: Simiunie, Inukjuak from Quebec. When you are talking about caribou, I am going to state that we too talk about caribou. In Northern Quebec, we have a wildlife organization. When we have no caribou, they come back again. We value caribou. We fear they are going to disappear. It is a concern. We have a lot of wolves, and they hunt a lot of caribou. If you don't control the wolves, although we have caribou, the wolves are quite numerous right now and affecting the caribou population. They consume a lot of caribou. There are a lot of wolves, and we are competing for this food source.

We thought to put a quota on wolves. We were going to put a quota for the protection of the caribou. We have been thinking about this for the wolf control in Northern Quebec that is consuming a lot of caribou. When you have to discuss wolves, when you are talking about caribou management, this too is brought up in meetings in Northern Quebec. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik, as well. Are there any questions from the registered participants? *(Pause)*

Are there any from the Iqaluit general public to the presentation? *(Pause)*

Seeing none, thank you. Let's thank the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board.

(Applause)

Interpreter: For the record, he had a really ugly cap, okay?

(Lots of laughter from the interpreter booths)

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Looking at the clock, we are almost at ending time, but also, there has been a presentation from the general public to speak. Annie Petaulassie, you may proceed

Annie: *(Translated)*: I am Annie Petaulassie. I am from Kinngait, but I have lived a long time now in Iqaluit. My question for the Planning is that we should include youth. They know how to work on the computer and the Internet. We have students. I have worked at Nunavut Sivuniksavut. I am taking a year off, but I teach there. They deal with a lot of government relations and deal with a lot of issues dealing with the governments and the history of Inuit as part of the curriculum. We have to involve the youth. David Joanase is a graduate. He is a member of the legislative assembly and is a leader. P.J. Akeegok has gone through the Nunavut Sivuniksavut program as a student.

The youth need to be involved in communities. I only see one young person around the table that we have seen. The same faces, it is still the same people. It is the Elders. I think we need an influx of young people. Let's rely on the youth. They are capable. I also want to note finally that Elders are a base of knowledge, and they know. When working together with the youth that can deal with the computers, Internet, technology, and with Traditional Knowledge mixing in with discussion with the Elders. I honour the Elders. I want to see more young people.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik.

(Applause)

Qujannamiik. Before we conclude, Jonathan had a couple of more comments. Jonathan?

Jonathan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Throughout the day and the week, we have heard a number of comments about mapped areas that are not included on Map A of the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. I have just been asked to provide a few comments on some of the additional mapping that has been identified as part of the Land Use Plan through Valued Component identification.

On the right-hand projector screen up here, we can see a slide that we reviewed on Day 1. This is an overview of both areas that have been identified through the planning process by communities directly in Nunavut Planning Commission mapping exercises, as well as Use and Occupancy mapping conducted through one-on-one interviews with community land users.

I noted on Day 1 that all of this information has been considered by the Commission throughout the development of the Land Use Plan, and some of the areas have been directly incorporated into areas designated as Limited Use or Conditional Use on Map A. However, not all of this information can be included on Map A with associated Plan requirements.

Just speaking quickly on the left-side of that map, I point users to an interactive map available on our website that includes some areas identified by communities through group mapping sessions

with Planning Commission staff over the years. This map includes several thousand individual areas with associated comments from communities.

Looking at this, if you could possibly scroll over to the area of Nettling Lake... Oh, you can actually see it on the top left-hand corner. You can see here. It was identified many, many times by community participants, and that was a significant factor in identifying that lake and surrounding areas as a Community Area of Interest.

Of course, there are many other areas and values identified through this planning process that you don't see on Map A, but nonetheless are part of the Land Use Plan as Valued Components that would be identified to project proponents at the beginning of the regulatory process to assist in their design of the project proposal and could be passed on to other regulatory authorities for their consideration.

In addition to the thousands of areas shown on this map, the Commission has also received many hundreds of areas identified by both individuals and Hunters and Trappers Organizations. We talked about the Sanirajak of Community Areas of Interest. Those have been considered at great length in Chapter 4 and are included in some cases as Limited Use designations in the current Draft Plan.

However, there is also a section in the *Options and Recommendations Document*, 4.1.8 that identifies yet more additional areas that have been identified by communities, but full analysis of the options for these areas is kind of put on hold or paused pending further information and consideration by participants in this planning process, as well as by Commissioners.

So, all of the information that has been provided to the Commission is being captured and retained in the Land Use Plan, at least as a Valued Component. Some of those areas of the thousands, have been included in Map A, but we just want to emphasize that this information still forms an important part of the Land Use Plan.

Separately to these individual areas with their own values being identified, the Commission has also conducted very detailed Community Use and Occupancy Mapping studies, where our staff members conduct one-on-one interviews with individual land users to record factual information about where they have harvested wildlife or berries, or had camp sites within their living experience. That information, as well, forms part of the Plan as a Valued Component and has also been considered in the recommended option for all of the other areas in the Land Use Plan. So, I will stop there and turn it over to my colleague, Brian, for additional discussion on the Use and Occupancy Mapping, in particular. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Brian, proceed.

Brian: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Brian Aglukark, Nunavut Planning Commission. Zoom in a little bit, please. To show as the Commission, we have gathered map information from communities that want to participate. We have mapping sessions, and those that want to participate take part. We go on two weeks before arriving to go on local radio to search for Inuit to discuss maps around their community.

The map we see here, 2006 to 2010, we gathered this information. We have gone to each community two or three times now in the territory. This was identified in Arctic Bay for Use and Occupancy Mapping. When we deal with maps, we discuss an interview.

We record who they are and their age and how long they have been in the actual community before they moved there. We also take their picture. We record their comments and the use for the Arctic Bay community. You can see there are 25 Inuit that have been interviewed on this map that you see here, 25 individual people from Arctic Bay. The smaller maps, 100,000 to 250,000, and they also note the Inuit land use around Arctic Bay. There are over 3,000 sites that are identified here. This is the work we do from 2006 and 2010 in our visits to the community.

Those that wanted to participate take part. We only deal with those that come out. When we look at the holistic approach, if you can see this, the Inuit of Arctic Bay, you can see the Mittimatalik (*Interpreter started speaking Inuktitut*). I mentioned in Arctic Bay that there are 800 residents there. This map shows, I just wanted to show you this as an example where we interview those that want to be interviewed.

We have come here a number of times to Iqaluit. There are over 4,0000 members with the Hunters and Trappers Organization for Iqalummiut. We have interviewed seven that have come forward and over 1,000 locations around the community. That is part of the process of collecting data from communities and what comes out on a Use and Occupancy Map for your information. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. I think we are pretty much concluded. We seem to be ahead of schedule. We will be done for the day. Thank you for participating. We will start again at 9:00 in the morning. Brian wants to meet the Northern Quebec delegates that just arrived if you guys can meet before going out. Thank you.

End of Day 3

DAY 4: November 17, 2022

Chairperson: (*Translated*): We will start to proceed for the day. We will follow once again our agenda. We will have Akulivik come up first to the table, the Northern Village of Akulivik. As they get ready, you can set your cellphone ringer off, please. Like all speakers, say who you are and who you represent before you proceed. The floor is open when you want to proceed.

Presentation by the Northern Village of Akulivik

Eli Angiyou, Mayor, HTO Chairman

Adamie Alayco, Akulivik Wildlife Association, HTO

Eli Aullaluk, Akulivik Council

Jusi Aliqu, Akulivik Council

Eli Angiyou: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. I feel like I am at a trial here. Eli Angiyou, Akulivik. I also go on CBC Radio to do the community report from there. I am the Mayor of Akulivik and on the Hunters and Trappers Organization, and I am the Chairman. We will first state who we are.

Adamie A: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, fellow Inuit. First thank God to be in Nunavut to see you. I am Adamie Alayco from Akulivik Wildlife Association.

Eli Aullaluk: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. We don't quite have the same dialects, but we do understand each other. Good morning. Thank you for the opportunity. I am from Akulivik. I have been on the Council for a long time. I will speak when I have to.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You didn't state your name.

Eli Aullaluk: Eli Aullaluk.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed.

Jusi: *(Translated)*: Jusu Aliqu, Akulivik. I am on the local Town Council. Thank you for the opportunity.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik.

Eli Angiyou: *(Translated)*: I think you guys say hamlets over here. That is who we are representing. We don't have too much to add. Where we share Nottingham Island and Salisbury Island, we share jurisdiction on those islands. From time immemorial, Inuit has used those, Ivujivik, Akulivik, Salluit Inuit. Just to restate that these have been our walrus hunting grounds. We used to have a lot of walruses before I was born, but they have left further down to the islands, so we head down to the islands to hunt walrus.

Those islands that we know and use, we have no problem. Sometimes we want to be notified too when they are going to be hunting there. We claim those islands as our own. Through agreements with the government, we have claimed jurisdiction and negotiated that. We would like notification.

We want no mineral activity on those islands. They are the homes of wildlife. There are hunting grounds, and we collect down from ducks. We claim these islands for your information. To the Planning Commission, I will use an example. We had COVID, and everything stopped around the world, even in Inuit country. The flow of goods from the south was affected and slowed everything down. Everything was affected. We felt it. I hope you realize the world will affect us and that we have to be ready.

We hear water issues around the world, droughts happening. We have been told a lot of Qallunaat will come to our communities. I am still expecting an influx of people in our communities. We have to protect our communities, but we don't know the future. We will get an influx of people someday, and we have to be ready for that. The happenings around the world that we see, it is not just our communities. We have to look beyond our communities and be aware. This is what I want to say.

This will be my comments for now. Our delegation, if they wish to speak can speak as well. Adamie?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed.

Adamie: *(Translated)*: Adamie Alayco, Manager of Akulivik Hunters and Trappers Organization. Thank you, Brian and the Commissioners here. You guys are well prepared. We are glad to be here. We see you as brothers and kin. Even though we don't speak the same dialect, we are eating the same food. That is how we are.

Our parents used to go to all these islands that we see. They used to meet on those islands once they started getting boats that they used to use. I am glad for your planning process that Inuit work together. We have to do it in that way. We have to be accommodating with our life up here, our culture.

There are a lot of outsiders in the world out there. As Inuit, our language, our food source is precious. We share that with you. Our parents helped us, and we too will have descendants when we are gone. I want to welcome you to Akulivik if you ever come. There are a lot of food sources. We don't have quotas in our community.

With Inuit customs, we really don't have outside influence in our community, when the western science does not match the Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit. I also want to state our youngest member here, I liked what he said that the older generation from our community will welcome them no matter who they are with food and whatever items. Thank you for your comments.

In conclusion, the islands should have no mineral activity on them and should be protected. As Inuit, we would like it to be a protected area, even if it is a park. We want to protect our food source as an Inuit custom. This is a shared jurisdiction that Inuit control. The rocks are okay, but they are not better than the land. I defend land from mining. Communities get ruined by mining. The water is affected. I don't wish that on any community. If we protect those islands, let there be no exploration. They are a secure food source that we need to protect. Those are my comments. I love the freedom of this. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed.

Eli Aullaluk: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. I won't be saying too much. They said most of what we need to say. We go walrus hunting on Tujjaat and Akulliq, the two islands. I have gone on trips many times to those islands. I have not gone in a while, maybe because I am an Elder now. What I heard, we want protection, as they are our hunting grounds for Inuit. I just want to note that what I heard is true. We don't want any exploration on those islands.

Ships are a concern too. When you see the ships, when you see their films, they are close to the islands. It could be various animals that they approach very closely. The cruise ships are a concern to protect the islands. They should not come too close to the islands.

I was a member of the Marine Management Committee with Charlie Inuarak who was also a member. It was the Nunavik Impact Review Board work. The committee had external members from Nunavut there. We try to protect Nunavut hunting grounds as well, so they are not affected and are protected. We are grateful to you for the discussions we are hearing. Yesterday, I really wanted to comment about caribou. I had to bite my tongue yesterday. Can I speak about caribou, Mr. Chairman?

Chairperson: You can proceed.

Eli Allualuk: (*Translated*): Our caribou herds are different in Northern Quebec. Your caribou in Nunavut are different herds. Your caribou are beautiful up here. Our caribou are skinnier and bigger. In our community, I caught a caribou. It wasn't too big. I saw that it was not part of our herd. There is a difference in the herds that migrate around Northern Quebec. We are trying to understand their patterns.

On the islands, Nottingham Island and Mansel Island, those also have caribou. Can we get caribou? There are caribou there, and there has been caribou there. Can we catch caribou there? That is something we would like to know. Has there been any research done on the island for caribou? Thank you. We protect the hunters and their rights, and we need to set those as a priority. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon will add a comment, and then Solomon.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair and good morning. Sharon Ehloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. With regard to the question on the hunting rights, I cannot really comment on that, but you do have equal rights as outlined in Article 40 and Article 41 on the transboundary areas. I think I would defer to possibly NTI or Makavik to give further clarification on the hunting agreements that are in place for the transboundary Areas of Equal Use and Occupancy. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Solomon wants to comment.

Solomon: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Thank you for the question. We mentioned it that it is there in the *Agreement*, Article 40, for those external Inuit outside of Nunavut. They have rights to hunt in Nunavut. They can hunt in Nunavut, as per the *Agreement*. You are free to come into Nunavut and hunt. You are our fellow Inuit. That is the way the *Agreement* is spelled. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik for the clarity. Are you done? The young one on the end?

Jusi: (*Translated*): Jusi Aliqu from the Hunters and Trappers Organization. I wanted to ask. I was thinking too, can we hunt caribou at Coats Island? It is good to hear we can hunt anywhere in Nunavut. Thank you.

Chairperson: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. We will go through the same process. Staff? One more comment? Go ahead.

Eli Aullaluk: *(Translated)*: I wanted to add that we are walrus hunters to the islands, Tujjaat and Akulliq. We have seen in the past the walrus. Baby walruses are taken. They have a zoo. They take the baby walrus that was captured from there to the zoo. We don't want any kind of activity like that happening to our wildlife. Zoos are not acceptable, what you call zoos. I oppose any capture of wildlife. When I see them in zoos, I feel sorry animals in those zoos that come from our community. To see them captured like that is something that we need to prevent from happening. It is not right. You probably feel the same way. That was something I wanted to mention. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Staff and those around the table, questions? Ben?

Ben: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Ben Kovic, Amaruq Hunters and Trappers Organization. I have been dealing with wildlife issues and management. The questions about the rights of being able to hunt on the islands, through the *Land Claims*, there is an Equal Use and Occupancy section that we share these resources.

Those outside the *Agreement*, you mentioned Coats Island. It is not part of the Equal Use and Occupancy agreement. Baffin Island, near Kinngait, if you tried to go hunting, you would not be able to. That is the *Agreement* that I understand, unless someone else can say. Maybe NTI can explain. The hunting issue, it is not totally open.

The question about capturing for zoo purposes, in Nunavut from what I understand, it is closed to capture animals for zoo purposes like that. Bear cubs that don't have a mother or a father looking after them, you can determine what to do with that little bear. That is the only freedom we have on bears. For example, if you tried to capture a baby walrus on a haul-out, you cannot do that in Nunavut. You would only be able to do that through the Nunavut Government and through the Wildlife Boards, and through Fisheries and Oceans. You would have to seek agreements for capturing for those purposes.

That is what I wanted to clarify. I am not trying to limit your rights, but maybe our government, Makavik, or other organizations can clarify. I don't know if they do that in Quebec, Ontario, or Newfoundland. If they do that, maybe that would be why they are not in Nunavut. That probably could happen too that we don't see any. We were never notified, and they would take bear cubs from the provinces. We have a different setting today, and we have a *Nunavut Agreement*.

The boards that manage the resources within the *Agreement* is spelled out. But the islands you mentioned, it was mentioned yesterday, they are Limited Use with no mineral exploration, no drilling, no work in that area for those islands. The Commission, maybe you mentioned it for those islands that we have Equal Use and Occupancy agreements. They want it protected, to not be approached, protected sites that we would like. Maybe Jonathan could speak with you during coffee as to how that could be done.

I am trying to support what you are saying. I want to say that I support you as well. Those islands have to be managed and protected for Nunavut and Nunavik, as we both use those islands. We have to protect them. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. I did not hear a question. Just to note, the lands identified, Makavik and NTI might be better agencies to answer those questions. It is outside of our jurisdiction. Thank you. Jetaloo?

Jetaloo: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Good morning, guests from Northern Quebec, Nunavik. From Amaruq Hunters and Trappers Organization, I call myself the Elder. I sometimes am there to make quorum. I am grateful the community votes me to represent them. That is what I have been doing, and I do speak on their behalf. Sometimes it seems I shouldn't be speaking, but I do want to speak.

When we are talking about land on the main Baffin land, perhaps in the future minerals and animals that we know that there is of interest. There is a place near Pangnirtung that I just state there are lots of minerals. I am not afraid. I feel that, and from when I was young, I used to live past Pangnirtung in a really, really isolated area. I state that the police had a boat, the medical services had boats. Today, you can reach the water in a day. Nobody seems to know we were hidden from everybody.

Down there, we had a baby bear taken. There was someone that wanted a bear in the area. The baby bear was going to be taken to Pangnirtung. I have no idea where that went, but it probably went to a zoo that adopts animals. We hear of such places. Sometimes like I said, I help make quorum at meetings. I am grateful.

I want to ask things that they have not mentioned to pull and extract information from them. I am happy like that, but our ears are not enough. We seem to be in a can in here with different dialects going around the room. We are gathered and don't understand each other. The sound is hard to hear. From Nunavut to Nunavik, for the soul, you talk about creatures come from here that speak to go down there and breathe easily. I envy that and not only that but the desires of meetings trying to explain things to us. I understand these situations now. We feel that.

To go back, the economy, the movement of money, we never knew it was going to be a big item in our lives that we are financially dealing with things today. I just wanted to mention that. I said that I helped to make quorum at meetings. I don't have an agenda, but it is okay. I don't overheat when I speak now. I used to really sweat when I spoke. I find the comments that I make seem very real, but maybe they are not understandable to you as I am speaking. That guy is speaking. I don't know what he is saying. Thank you for the guests that are here. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik for your comment. Johnny?

Johnny M: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Johnny Mike, HTO Pangnirtung. I am in a similar situation, only I am out of Pangnirtung. Over the past years, I have been in politics for some time representing my community. During the Land Claims negotiations, it was very hard to go through the process. The land selection problem related to land was tedious. Through the experience and as I sit here, I reflect back to the time we did some work during negotiations for the good of our people, the good of Baffin Island, wildlife.

Solomon spoke on Article 40, South Baffin, probably Kinngait, Kimmirut, Iqaluit. They were so close to Nunavik. I have a very good understanding what you have on Tujjaat, Akuliq, Mansel Islands. During negotiations to Makavik, the islands are joint management between us regarding wildlife and other related to the land. During the negotiations, Article 40 contains and relates to wildlife,

land, islands. They were a hot topic at the time. Discussions were passionate. We negotiated especially on behalf of South Baffin – Kinngait, Kimmirut, Iqaluit when it comes to shared joint lands, although we base our negotiation on Inuit tradition and culture.

I just want to mention that Number 40 should be brought to the attention of Makavik and NTI and both levels of government. It has been agreed up on by Inuit. I just wanted to clarify what Item 40 is. It has to be clarified to both parties to see what it really means. I just wanted to briefly mention Coats Island. It is under the jurisdiction of the Kivalliq community, and most of you probably have been to that area. You probably have proper knowledge of that area being so close in proximity to the island. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Same. It is not a question. It is a general comment. Are there any more questions to the table?

Jetaloo: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Just briefly to mention to the islands, I have omitted to say what I wanted to say. For those of us who are in Nunavut, Nunavummiut have a joint management of these islands. We have that knowledge. Each of us are claiming these areas. There have been some discussions in the past, and I took part in discussions of these islands when it comes to polar bears. From that time, I understood this.

During the discussions on these joint islands, the Nunavut delegation were also concerned about polar bears on these islands. They say that Coats Island is also part of Nunavik joint management. The Nunavik delegation mentioned that most of their polar bear hunts are taking place on Coats Island. Despite the jurisdiction differences, as Inuit we should have no concerns about whose jurisdiction it is.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. This is a general comment, not a question. Paul?

Paul Q: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Quassa, City of Iqaluit. I have a question to the table and generally to NPC, more or less. The islands in discussion you have shown on the map, we are discussing these land masses now. I know I should know. I have been sitting here for a few days listening to the discussions. The islands in question, how do you categorize the land. Is it Limited Use? Could someone from NPC categorize this to us for clarification?

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Jonathan? Jon will turn the page to a proper map.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. This is Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. We will shortly bring Map A – there we go – up on the screen. As we noted in the presentation on Day 1, the Areas of Equal Use and Occupancy have generally been identified as Valued Components in the 2021 Draft Plan. It is important to note that in previous versions of the Draft Plan, these areas were included as the equivalent of Limited Use based on the feedback from communities, both in Nunavut and Nunavik.

However, there were significant concerns raised by Makavik and Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated along with the Qikiqtani Inuit Association that this was unnecessarily restrictive and could impede other activities from proceeding in these areas. So, the Commission followed this updated recommendation from the representative Inuit Associations to remove the prohibitions in these areas.

However, this version of the Draft Plan does include some overlapping designations in these areas. For example, both islands are identified as polar bear denning in their entirety, so this is a Conditional Use designation with seasonal requirements for activities that would disturb the earth or snow. In addition, there are some identified walrus haul-outs within the Areas of Equal Use and Occupancy that are designated Limited Use. Further to the south in the area north of Sanikiluaq, we also have some walrus haul-outs as well as key migratory bird habitat sites designated as Limited Use along with some Conditional Use designations for community on-ice travel routes.

So, there is a mixture of approaches in these areas, and again, the Limited Use designation that applied in previous drafts to the entirety of the areas has been removed to largely replace it with a Mixed Use with a Valued Component identification on the basis of recommendations from Makavik and Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Paul, proceed.

Paul Q: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Quassa, City of Iqaluit. The Nunavik delegation have concerns about these islands. I know how valuable they are to your territory as well. We are pretty much concerned, and it was mentioned time and time again that these should be restricted to a Limited Use Area where exploration would not be allowed. This should be the case where no exploration should ever take place. This is the concern of both jurisdictions.

We know the land is very fragile, as mentioned, and I am in full support of the Nunavik delegation on your concerns. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. I don't think we have any more questions from the table. Are there questions from the Nunavik delegation?

Annie: *(Translated)*: I don't have a question. Annie Ohaituk, Inukjuak. I am a member of the HTO in our community. To my recollection, from Broughton Island, Pangnirtung, there were times when missionaries were coming from your region, and we welcomed them wholeheartedly. They were welcomed even as to become local harvesters. Makavik, we are members of that organization. When they started their holidays, they came back under new rules that they were no longer allowed to hunt anymore. These people were going through hardships at times. It is not a question. For a long time, they moved back to Nunavut and lived under the Nunavut jurisdiction harvesting-wise.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: It is just a comment. It is not related to what Nunavut Planning Commission is holding these proceedings for. You can discuss your concerns with anyone that you want to speak with. It is not part of the discussion. Are there any questions related to the table? *(Pause)*

There appears none. Registered participants? *(Pause)*

There appears none. Questions from the general Iqaluit public? *(Pause)*

There appears none. Thank you. Give them a hand, please.

(Applause)

We are taking a 15-minute break.

Break

Presentation by the Northern Village of Ivujivik

Adamie Mangluk, Ivujivik Councillor

Ali Qavavauk, HTO Chairperson

Paulusi Tarriasuk, HTO

Chairperson: As always, state your name, your organization, and community please. Whenever you are ready, you can proceed.

Adamie M: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Adamie Mangluk, Municipality Councillor on the regional board where I sat. I have a short presentation. My colleagues will have more to say. Just briefly, the ones leading up to the Land Use Plan, the Nunavut and Nunavik islands that we share, they have English names. We know you are doing a Land Use Plan, and you are dealing with maps. We would like the traditional names. The islands are noted in English.

There are two islands: Saaqqayaaq and Qikirtasiit in Inuktitut, and in English it is Digges Islands. Nottingham Island, Tujjaat. The names of the islands need to be identified between Nunavut and Nunavik. They should not just have English names to the islands. In the old days of sailing, they used to name islands, so they named a lot of these islands English names when they have Inuktitut names. It should be brought back. Another is Tasiujaq in Inuktitut for Nunavut and Nunavik.

Hudson Bay, there is currently no oil drilling in Hudson Bay. The oil and gas industry, they can drill basically anywhere in the ocean, and these are important waters in Hudson Bay. Near Ivujivik, the closer island, the Auk eggs off the coast of Ivujivik, 20 minutes from our community by canoe, we worry about cruise ships. The tourist ships visit the islands looking at the wildlife in July, August, September, open water. The season, we don't want disturbance when they are nesting. They will flee in fear, so we want them protected. There are a lot of auks on those islands.

Oil and gas currently are not being explored, but if it were to open, we have to understand that we have done research at Ivujivik and the work that they are doing in gathering Traditional Knowledge. Also, in Nunavut, along Baffin Island coast, on the islands, those two are sea bird colonies. Those are my comments. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can add if you wish.

Ali: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. Ali Qavavauk, Ivujivik from the Hunters and Trappers Organization, Chairperson. Thank you. We feel very welcome. Good to see fellow Inuit. We feel the same way. When you come to our communities, you are totally just as welcome. When we talk about Tujjaat, Nottingham Island, for Ivujivik, that is a major hunting ground for us. Our ancestors have also used this site. We want it protected. We don't want to misuse those islands. I wanted to note that first.

We want our grandchildren and beyond to be able to enjoy those resources. We gather down as well on those islands. We gather to the different islands. My partner too will also speak. I am passing it over to him.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. You too, state your name and origination. Qujannamiik.

Paulusi: *(Translated)*: Paulusi Tarriasuk, Ivujivik. We have a population of 449. I grew up there. I have been appointed on the Hunters and Trappers Organization. When I speak about Tujjaat, Nottingham Island, I don't want cameras placed on walrus haul-outs. We saw a camera that was put up. There was nothing there. They did not go there. They were scared of the camera, a research camera on the walrus haul-outs. This is disturbance. That is their home. It was not good to see that the walruses were not happy with the camera. The walruses did not haul out for a whole 30 days on the island.

Tujjaat for 100 years and more, we have been using it. We are the closest community to the island. Tujjaat has three currents. In 1997 when we were down there, we were hit by a tsunami. We lost a bit of our stuff. We had to try and survive. There was another one last year at Tujjaat. I saw also last year that there had been a tsunami there due to the high current that the island is in. We are at the major point of Northern Quebec. There is a lot of current around our community.

You mentioned the bird colonies. They are affected by planes. Auks nest in the spring. The shipping route is also straight through there. They should try to stay as far away from the island as possible, especially in July. Once the damming started, it affected our wildlife. Airplanes and boats, their feeding grounds have been affected. The bird colonies were also affected. They have been affected. They are not as fat as they used to be. We are affected even though we are quite a distance from the locations of the dam.

Also, there was 45 gallons. 21 drums were spilled where it is full of wildlife in our inlet. When there was a spill, it would be good to see the effect of the spill on the local bottom dwelling fish, scalping. They can smell like fuel. It was a spill five years ago. The spill, I was out six miles. I could smell the fuel from the spill in Ivujivik by Hydro Quebec. Thank you for the opportunity to come here. We are well looked after. Thank you and thank you also to my colleagues here.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do you want to add more? Go ahead.

Ali: *(Translated)*: Ali Qavavauk, Ivujivik, Hunters and Trappers Organization Chairperson. The islands that we hunt at, if there is caribou there, it could be a location for caribou, Tujjaat and Akulliq. I just note that it would change that we hunt down there. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. A reminder that we are here to listen as the Commission. The comments you make, it might seem you are just doing a verbal presentation, but we will consider it in our deliberations. Like western science and knowledge, we too Inuit have our own Traditional Knowledge that we include. Qujannamiik. I just wanted to note that. Are there questions from around the table? A question over here?

Adamie N: *(Translated)*: Adamie Numa, Hunters and Trappers Organization Chairperson from Kinngait. Thank you. When you talk about caribou, we too would like caribou planted on those islands. Thank you. I support you. When we talk about counting bears, those three islands have a lot of wildlife. There

is ample food for caribou on those islands. I support you that I too would like caribou planted on those islands. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there questions? Solomon?

Solomon: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Thank you for the presence too from Northern Quebec. Solomon Awa, Iqaluit City Council, Mayor. I spoke a few days ago to welcome. I also welcome you once again to the City of Iqaluit. We are glad you are here. My chairman wanted to remind you that you are welcome to Iqaluit. We know that our fellow Nunavummiut too are welcoming as well.

I want to show our support in Nunavut that there is an organization, the Inuit Heritage Trust. There is an organization in Nunavut. They are collecting names of places, traditional place names. Through the computer, you can access these sites with Inuktitut names. Maybe they can speak to you guys regarding the names of the islands you mentioned. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. That was a comment. Go ahead.

Ali: *(Translated)*: I just want to state that we are close to Nunavut. You will feel welcome at our community as well if you want to come and visit to Ivujivik. I just wanted to state that. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. I have no names. Nunavik, to the report, do you have any questions?

Johnny K: *(Translated)*: Johnny Kasudlauk from Inukjuak. It is not really a question. You mentioned ships. I did mention it to our Makavik representative for food for thought. The ship routes that go through the various places, you can see through the satellite the movement of ships. You can follow them online to see where they are. There is data where and when they are going, so we can monitor as Nunavik and Nunavut and check the islands and their travels. This will help monitor what is happening around the islands. I just wanted to mention that.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed.

Eli Angiyu: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Eli Angiyu, Akulivik. When we talk about caribou, I would like to see caribou planted on the islands. There is a lot of food source for caribou. There has been caribou there before. We used to hunt caribou on the islands, but they seem to have left the islands. Caribou are no longer on the island. Perhaps we would like to see caribou back at those islands. It would be a worthy project to plant caribou. The smaller caribou are better. Nunavut caribou are better. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. That was a comment. Are there questions from the registered participants?

Mike: Qujannamiik. Mike Ferguson, QWB. The reported observation about cameras causing disturbance to walrus, we are trying to compile information like that, because research in Nunavut is an activity that potentially could be restricted. I would ask the Northern Quebec communities to provide the QWB with more information on such observations. That is my question or request to Northern Quebec communities.

The other thing is, QWB is working with QIA to develop a joint presentation on marine waters. If Northern Quebec...There are proposals existing for year-round ship traffic through Hudson Strait. If

Northern Quebec communities could send us any areas or concerns that they may have for year-round shipping, that would be winter as well, through Hudson Strait area, it would be very helpful to the QWB. Those are my requests to the Northern Quebec communities. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Paulusi: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Paulusi Tarriasuk. Tujjaat, I have been going to the island for pretty much over 40 years. As mentioned earlier, the cameras on the shores were so much of a problem to the mammals. As the Ivujivik HTO, we were quite upset with this research going on without our knowledge. The planting of these tripods was troublesome to the walrus herd. We do not want any more of this activity near the walrus haul-outs, and many are doing research without proper consultation.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Ali: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Ali Qavavauk, Ivujivik, HTO Chair. His response I think was the work of a Nunavut company, a Nunavut organization. They have undermined Nunavik authorities under the joint management agreement that there were no consultations in relation to the research camera.

Aside from that, the caribou count is an ongoing project in Nunavut. The recordings and proceedings of these programs are sort of confidential. We don't normally know what the results are of these projects. So, when you do your caribou count, the answer from people doing these projects is always saying that caribou is decreasing in numbers.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: I just want to clarify. Mike asked you a question. He was looking for a working relationship with your organization regarding the research cameras that were mentioned. You can talk to him. You can talk to him in private. That was his concern when he asked a question to you. Are there any more questions? *(Pause)*

There appears none. How about from the public? *(Pause)*.

There appears none. Thank you. Give them a hand.

(Applause)

We have next on the agenda, Salluit. As always, state your name and organization. Please proceed whenever you are ready.

Presentation by the Northern Village of Salluit

Adamie Kaitak, HTO Chair

George Kakajuk, Salluit Council

Adamie Saviadjuk, Landholding Association Chair

Adamie Kenuajuak, HTO Manager, Hunting Fishing Trapping Association, Nunavik Regional Board

Adamie Kaitak: (*Translated*): Adamie Kaitak, HTO Chair. We do our hunting to these islands mentioned for walrus. We would like to continue this tradition. We do our walrus hunting from Salluit. We travel to these islands to do harvesting. The herds on these islands are very healthy. It has been our tradition for a long time to utilize these islands for harvesting purposes.

George: (*Translated*): George Kakajuk. I belong the organization. I am a member of the municipal Council. Thank you for the invitation. We feel welcome in Iqaluit. Thank you, Nunavut, for inviting us to the proceedings. I haven't much to say. The discussions throughout the morning have been concentrating on these islands.

Our forefathers including my father, had a Petehead, and my grandfather as well. He also had a Peterhead vessel. He travelled a lot to these two islands to harvest wildlife. As a youngster, I was part of the hunting party many times when they went to hunt walruses. We still hunt today, and many of you might know my father. His name is Kakiyuq (*spelled phonetically*) from Salluit. He has travelled considerably to distances, even to Kivalliq. He used to travel here as well by Peterhead coming in from Salluit.

He is a mariner, hunter, harvester. He hunted considerably to these two islands. He hunted a lot of walruses. It was his lifestyle. He never said these islands belong to this jurisdiction or to us. There were no differences. He did not differentiate these islands belonging to a certain jurisdiction. It is just now that this jurisdiction has been applied by two parties.

For instance, my father travelled a great deal. He has gone through many communities and never had any claim to any land. He looked at these lands as his hunting grounds. He travelled to where he pleased. He never differentiated the jurisdiction of these lands. It is a good custom that we should practice today. We could work on a joint management peacefully on these two islands.

Every year, we come to these islands to harvest mammals. The walrus species is our major source of our community, especially during spring. We have seen harvesters from Kinngait coming in from Nunavut. We used to meet them. I have relatives in this part, in Kinngait, Kimmirut. I have some relatives as far as Kivalliq. They are scattered all over the place.

We are in unity. I do not recognize jurisdictions. I just wanted to briefly mention that these islands are important to us. It is a western custom that there are divided jurisdictions. You stay off my side of the fence, and you mind this boundary. Because of this idea, there are conflicts, even right now in Ukraine and Russia because of jurisdictional problems, claiming this land is mine.

I just wanted to say briefly that I don't want to be in a situation with my fellow Inuit. We are according to today's modern society, we are from different jurisdictions, but this is not the case with us. Thank you. You are always welcome to our land, as you have welcomed us. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Comments please?

Adamie S: *(Translated)*: Adamie Saviadjuk, Landholding Association. I am the Chair. I have been asked by this delegation to participate, and you are welcoming to our delegation. Thank you. My grandfather from our area was transported to Salluit and dropped off to the shore. From there, they utilized these two islands during the Great War. They used to live on these islands.

From Salluit, I travelled to these islands. I travelled considerably through Nunavik due to many, many relatives. Tujjaat is an important land piece to us. We hunt there. We harvest walrus. We fish. The only lacking mammal is caribou where they used to be. Now all have gone. We are in full support for the past 20 years that some caribou should be implanted there to produce a population. That is our desire that caribou can survive there.

It is a good place for caribou feeding as a habitat. It is where we used to hunt caribou in the past. In our immediate vicinity, we don't have too many islands, perhaps five. These two islands are our hunting, harvesting areas for polar bear, seal, fish, whale. They are all plentiful. They are on these islands. This is why we harvest and travel there. We want it to be recognized that we use these islands and would like to continue to do so. We would like to be full party in the joint management of these lands. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik.

Adamie Ken: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Adamie Kenuajuak, Salluit. HTO Secretary Manager, Hunting Fishing Trapping Association, Nunavik Regional Board. I am part of this group. I have been in many departments to this organization as part of staff who work in many different areas and manager to HTO. Adamie Kaituk has been our Chair, so I am their Secretary Manager to the HTO.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there additional comments?

Adamie Kaituk: *(Translated)*: It has become very easy to travel in all modes of transportation. Distance does not really mean anything anymore. We don't want any disturbance that could be harmful to wildlife because we still travel to Nunavut, and we cross this strait to do hunting. Restrictions by boundaries is inconvenient. This should not be the case, especially with our fellow Inuit, regardless of which jurisdiction they are from. This should be the case in the future, cohesive joint management.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Any questions from the staff? *(Pause)*

Johnny M: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Johnny Mike, Pangnirtung HTO. I am not a Chair, just a regular member to the organization. You have mentioned beluga whales. It is always a topic when we talk of marine mammals. I know it is a concern when it comes to beluga, especially when there are restrictions imposed. So, for Pangnirtung, more than once and I keep explaining that there are different species of beluga whale, some larger and some smaller. I think your population is smaller of the whales. I am not quite sure. Once perhaps we will be notified which species you harvest down in your area.

For those of us who are from Nunavut HTOs, we are aware that belugas are very mobile, and sometimes it is confusing what species we are harvesting from. So, it comes to my mind when you mention belugas in that part of the islands. I want to know your population is in the Salluit area and the planning process taken into consideration where the wildlife habitats are. You are in a different jurisdiction, but you are still part of the planning process.

Narwhals are becoming abundant everywhere. I don't know if my comment is clear. I am saying that you have different species as well where you are.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. You may answer or perhaps you may not. It is outside of our planning process. I will take it as a general comment.

Adamie Kaitak: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. There used to be buildings on these islands during World War II. It has been cleaned up since from these buildings. They will be demolished. If you want to set up safety huts in that area, we would like to see that on these islands, or there could be cabins set up for safety purposes.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. I will take it as a general comment. It is nothing related to our land use planning process. NTI and Makavik perhaps can do something about this. Both of their managers, presidents are here at this particular meeting this morning, but what you request is not related to land use planning. Jawlie?

Jawlie: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jawlie Akavak, Kimmirut HTO Councillor. I have a question to the delegation at the table. I wanted to ask questions to the presenters previous to you, so I will ask now to you. Our morning discussions, the two islands you have mentioned that they used to be full of caribou, what would be the cause of the disappearance? Perhaps caribou food source has depleted. What is it? Perhaps they cross over to the mainland on the ice, ice barrier. How could we understand? Who would know why the caribou have disappeared on these islands?

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Jawlie, this is a general comment. It is not part of the land use planning process. I don't think it can be answered right now. There are other organizations responsible for what you have asked.

Jetaloo: *(Translated)*: I just wanted to say, I could not keep quiet, so I am going to ask what I really need to know. Just from the past what I heard about belugas, do you have any knowledge of how many whales you have and the Nunavut whale population? There are different species. You can tell just by looking at the body shape of the whales.

I truly believe your comments. You have mentioned that many of your people were mariners. One of the islands is part of Nunavut, and many people have utilized these areas as well. If I could hear properly that utilizes as well, so I am just generally speaking to what you have presented. It may not concern us in many areas, but we are here just having a general discussion with joint management of these lands.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. I will take this as a general comment, not a question. Solomon.

Solomon: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq, and thank you delegation for your presentation to the Nunavut Planning Commission. Perhaps I can direct this to the Commissioners of the Nunavut Planning Commission. Caribou has been of much discussion over the days. Perhaps the Commission can create a task where it could specifically look at the caribou herd. I think we can ask the Nunavut Planning Commission who can specifically listen to what the caribou population is through Makavik and other organizations in Nunavut who can do a joint management to get clarification to see what the real population is of caribou. This appears to be an important topic in the Nunavut planning process.

Chairperson: Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you Solomon for your comments. The Commission responsibility with this regard is to look at the submissions and the evidence that is provided. In saying that, the Government of Nunavut, Northern Quebec, Inuit organizations, or others that want to provide the data on the caribou, the Commission accepts all the data as well as the QWB and the other Regional Wildlife Boards.

There is an opportunity under the Nunavut General Monitoring Program for anyone that wants to apply to do research. The Nunavut General Monitoring Program is led by the Nunavut Planning Commission, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, the Government of Canada, and the Government of Nunavut. That is also a program there to enhance the datasets for the Nunavut Land Use Plan, so there may be an opportunity to look at a proposal under the Nunavut General Monitoring Program for joint management if Northern Quebec, Makavik, or the Qikiqtani Inuit Association if they were interested in doing that. I hope that answers your question. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

(Pause)

Thank you, and the Chair has asked me for further clarification under the Commission's jurisdiction. The Commission does not have jurisdiction as to whether or not caribou can be relocated and populated on the islands. That would be under the mandate of other organizations. However, all the organizations are here and listening. When they do their presentations, hopefully they can possibly comment on that. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Solomon?

Solomon: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Solomon Awa, City of Iqaluit Mayor. Thank you, Sharon, for the response. We know regarding this issue that we are talking about. Perhaps not now, and if you don't answer me, maybe at coffee break. Sanikiluaq too, would it be like that?

Chairperson: Next.

Adamie Numa: *(Translated)*: Adamie from Cape Dorset. I just want to comment regarding the islands we are talking about this morning. Those were used by our ancestors, my grandfather. From Kinngait, we have not gone down that way, as they don't have caribou anymore. I am sure if there were caribou, we would be going down there to hunt caribou as well. It would be nice to have caribou planted on those islands. My grandfather used to go walrus hunting there, Akulliq and Tujjaat.

When they used to go walrus hunting over to that area, they would meet Inuit from other regions, having games and stories that we used to hear at the islands. If there were caribou, we would be going to those islands. As descendants, we are not using those islands as much as our ancestors. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. That was not a question. I have no more names. Proceed.

George K: *(Translated)*: George Kakajuk, Salluit. Thank you. From a long time ago, Inuit know places of wildlife abundance. Our parents, our grandparents have long, we did not know there was caribou. Our ancestors, there was a caribou spotted in the 1980s, but my grandfather used to know there was caribou on those islands. He used to say that his grandmother when they would travel there on the sea ice that the caribou are laying on the sea ice. There were lots of caribou.

They will be back, she would say. They'll be back, with confidence they will be back. Sure enough, they were back. I have seen caribou in the 1980s, 30 to 40 years ago. I am an Elder. I was an adult when I first saw caribou there. They do say they will be back. With Traditional Knowledge, that is the way it has been. There will be nothing, and then there will be caribou. It could take many years. That's how it is. This is part of Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit. It is true. It does not seem true at times. It makes you wonder how they know. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there questions from Nunavik?

Adamie Kaitak: *(Translated)*: Adamie Kaitak. When I heard about the camera that was on the walrus haul-out, it would be nice to find out who, Nunavut or Nunavik, or whether it was an outside agency. I would like to find out more about that. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: That is not related to our work, but there are people listening that might be able to help you out. It is not part of our work. Are there questions from Nunavik to the presentation? *(Pause)*

Seeing none, any questions from the registered participants to their presentation? *(Pause)*

From the floor, you may speak.

Adamie A: *(Translated)*: Adamie Alaku, Makavik Corporation. The question about the camera, it was put up by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. When we found out, we complained and wanted it removed. DFO put the camera at the walrus haul-outs. It was right away felt by the walrus, so we asked the federal government to remove it.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. That is clear now. Are there questions from the registered participants? From the general audience in Iqaluit? *(Pause)*

Seeing none, thank you for your presentation.

(Applause)

We can proceed with the Makavik Corporation. Like all speakers, state your name and your organization. When you are ready, you can proceed.

Presentation by Makavik Corporation

Adamie Alaku, Vice President

Laurie Beaupré, Assistant Director

Adamie A: (Translated): Qujannamiik. We feel that we are welcome. I am Adamie Alaku. I am Vice President of Makavik Corporation. I am in charge of environmental issues. Lori Beaupré is here with me, Assistant Director. She works within the departments I am responsible for. Thank you for welcoming us. I see Charlie Arngak who is keenly aware of issues related to implementation and the work of communities, and the voice of communities. He wanted to make sure that Nunavik voices were heard in the process that you are going through.

We see these islands are part of our jurisdiction too with our agreements. When we claim to own islands, it really does not mean that much. It is like your mother and your father. Neither of them can own you more, your mother or your father. They both own you as your parents. One parent does not own you more than the other parent. When we talk about those islands, I feel the same way.

I want you to understand as Inuit, we are affected in our hunting areas, in the environment. We speak holistically. Perhaps we deal a lot with your Wildlife Organizations too. That affects us. From Nunavik communities, from Kiglinik to Akpatordjuark, Akulliq, Tujjaat, all the sites he mentioned, we hunt and use those islands. When the Lord came and designated Rupert's Land, Kugluktuk was claimed, and they did not claim any of the islands. This is the situation we struggle with.

After that in agreements with you and for your *Land Claim* as well with us for our claim for the islands, the Nunavik Inuit Land Claims Agreement and the *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement*. That is where we come from, where we gain our strength. We have to have a voice regarding the management of those islands. We have an Equal Use and Occupancy Agreement to share those islands.

I want to thank you. You have been very open to all aspects of the audience. We are grateful in Nunavik for the opportunity. Partly we don't always think alike with the desires of communities and to represent Inuit and their desire. Through the work of Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, we have agreements on those islands to be open. We want to protect them. We value those islands, as they are a food source. We gather down on those islands. We camp. We hunt walrus. As Inuit, we are open.

We see the category of Mixed Use that they are designated, that if anything is going to happen, we have to be as Inuit open to the discussion. We value those islands, but we want economic opportunity as well that Inuit can benefit from this opportunity. There are aspects of economic development that we have undertaken for the future generations, benefits that we do not want to tie our hands related to those islands as an economic opportunity.

There is a lot of discussion related to wildlife restrictions. As Inuit, this is our food source that we value these animals. For us, we are going beyond our own culture we have taken on. When she spoke that we welcome different people that can hunt, but when we come here, we cannot hunt.

We have limited rights, and that is not the way of Inuit. This is not Inuit culture. You can't go fishing. You are not a member. We don't say that as Inuit. That is not our culture. We welcome.

I push cooperation, especially through Canada, Alaska, Inuvialuit, all the way to Labrador and Greenland that we should be open as Inuit in terms of hunting rights. We do not restrict other Inuit. This is a complicated issue, and it is outside of your mandate, how it will be felt when we talk about maps and marine issues.

I just want to state as a member of Makavik, I am an alternate member to the Nunavut Planning Commission, Putulik Papigatuk's position, and Charlie is appointed. I have many hats. At Makavik, I am the Vice President. It is part of the work. I want to push cooperation as Inuit. We are relatives. We share the same blood. I see this that we have become protectionists of our hunting areas, and this is a major issue when we hear things like that. It is our food source.

I know it is the work of the wildlife boards, and you were given a lot of wildlife issues to think about. This is an ongoing concern with Inuit. We have activities that we do on the islands. I also wanted to thank you that we are working with you in cooperation. It is not an easy process to identify lands for what purpose they will have. It can be scary. Will it change things? Will it make it better? Will it be open? Will it be closed?

These are issues that during the hearings, Inuit and Nunavik Inuit are happy for the opportunity. We should defend Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated's work. They want to work with us to benefit economically for Inuit. We understand the economic opportunity, but the wildlife issues and protection of the environment is paramount. The waters that we are talking about, it is becoming a major route, and the ice is going sooner in the spring. Shipping will only increase, and our northern waters, the outsiders will come into our waters.

There is a mine. It goes through the northern route, and they ship to China. They were the first to go through that route. The icebreaking and the spills from the ballast water are not mentioned. When we talk and hear about Baffinland and the effects it had on the land, we too feel that under mineral exploration and work in our communities. That is a major concern where we value islands.

I am grateful. I am trying to be as brief as possible. I want to work cooperatively and seek opportunities to work with Nunavut Inuit. We agree on the same issues: our environment, our waters, our wildlife. The same issues we both face. Mother and father both own the child, and that is the way. I want it understood that we should work together and cooperate. That is my message today. Thank you for this opportunity.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Are you going to speak? Go ahead.

Laurie: Thank you. It will be brief. We have a third *(inaudible)* observation and conclusion during the land use planning exercise conducted in 2017.

Chairperson: Will you state your name for the record, please?

Laurie: Oh yes. Laurie Beaupré, Makavik Corporation. So, as explained this morning during the session, the Nunavut Planning Commission at the time recommended to have the Areas of Equal Use and

Occupancy be placed under the protected areas category. At the time, we proposed to have these areas assigned the Mixed Use designation to try and balance the various Inuit objectives and needs, present and future.

We express today our satisfaction to see that the Nunavut Planning Commission has heard our comments and proposed a Valued Socioeconomic Component designation. We support the rationale for promoting this Option 4 category, which is based on the importance of these areas for the residents, but also the latest land use management approach suggested by the landowners.

This proposed designation would respond to the past and current consideration...oh, I speak too fast. That is a classic. Thank you. This proposed designation would respond to the past and current consideration expressed by the nearby users and by the co-owners. We believe that the joint management regime devolved to Makavik and NTI in their *Land Claims Agreements* offers the level of conservation to maintain the sustainability of these areas.

Although this management regime is not yet established by NTI and Makavik, this designation of Valued Socioeconomic Component would be compatible with its establishment. We want to say that Makavik remains committed to working towards this establishment of the joint management regime. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. As is our procedure, we will have our staff ask questions first.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you to the representatives for your presentation. We understand the position of Makavik regarding preferred Mixed Use designation with a Valued Component identification for the areas generally.

Can you provide any comments on some of the designations that have been included in the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan, including the polar bear denning areas as Conditional Use Areas, the walrus haul-outs within the Areas of Equal Use and Occupancy as Limited Use designation, and I believe one contaminated site as well?

There are some overlapping designations with these areas as shown on Map A, and we are just curious if you have any comments on those that have been included. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Adamie A: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. Adamie Alaku, Makavik. Your questions, we don't have much say on this, although it is quite well with us. It has a lot of wildlife. Whatever the conditions may be imposed on that, we don't have much say on it. We don't really have much to say to the Nunavut Planning Commission. We know these islands will be well protected by a conservation-minded organization. We don't want too many conditions. We still go with Mixed Use conditions. We just don't want this category to be ongoing.

We know that the islands provide and sustain harvesting. For instance, cellphones and other technologies as they are used by the world and prospecting, we are pretty much against that because we need to have wildlife protection. If we can have an amended formula in the future, we don't pretty much mind the category it is put in.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you for your response to that question. I have another question on the management regime for the Areas of Equal Use and Occupancy. You indicated that there is a commitment to establish a management regime between both Nunavut Tunngavik and Makavik, I presume on the Inuit Owned Lands in particular in the area.

I would note that under the *Nunavut Agreement*, the current management approach for these Areas of Equal Use and Occupancy was intended to be a temporary measure until the conclusion of a *Nunavik Land Claim Agreement* as well. However, in 2007 when the *Nunavik Agreement* was finalized, that management structure was not adjusted with the finalization of that *Agreement*, and it was agreed that the temporary approach would continue.

In addition, the *Nunavik Agreement* identified that legislation may set out the ability for the Nunavik Marine Regional Planning Commission and the Nunavut Planning Commission to cooperate on the discharge of their duties in the Areas of Equal Use and Occupancy. I am wondering if you could provide an update on the status of any discussions or efforts to establish a more permanent management regime for the Areas of Equal Use and Occupancy, as indicated in the *Nunavik Agreement*. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Adamie A: (*Translated*): Adamie Alaku, Makavik Vice President. Your question I think is going to be an ongoing discussion for a long time, like the Nunavik Marine Planning Commission, the Marine Impact Review Board, Nunavik Marine Wildlife Board. Our government has no say on marine areas beyond the high tide area on surface or the bottom of the ocean.

The Nunavut Government has a lot to say on how we manage our marine. Your government has a lot to say. For instance, Institutions of Public Government should be involved of how we can progress. There appears to be some disagreements. For instance, Quebec has not given us any jurisdiction over the water matters, so we work with you. We would like to come to an agreement with you on marine areas where Nunavut has most of the jurisdiction.

Nunavik Marine Planning Commission and Nunavut Planning Commission should work together, as mentioned earlier. How we teach our children and how we treat them, it should be in that sentiment. Although the *Agreement* is in place before we receive our own government, so we rely on your jurisdictional in marine lands in our areas when you were NWT. When you became Nunavut, all the water jurisdiction was taken over by your government. As a result, we have to work with you. You will have to have consideration of all the aspects, including *Nunavut Fisheries Act*.

Yes, we would like to work together. We want our concerns to be addressed. We need to work with you to get what we need from our resources.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan? Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Adamie for your comments. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. I am wondering if Makavik could provide some guidance and just

clarity. In the previous version of the 2016 Plan, the islands were designated Limited Use. Based on the recommendations from Makavik, QIA, and NTI, it was changed to Mixed Use.

You have stated that you are working on a joint management regime, and it is not in place yet. We have also heard overwhelmingly from the communities that this is important, and the Commissioners are listening, that they don't want any development. They want it designated Limited Use. So, I am asking, is there an interim solution or is there some guidance that Makavik could provide to the Commission to find an option that is workable in the interim until there is a joint management regime in place to support the designations that the communities are asking for and to meet the satisfaction of the signatory organizations. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Adamie A: *(Translated)*: Adamie Alaku, Makavik Vice President. What you have heard from us and our community members, it is really up to you to create joint management. We have laid down before you what our needs are. You have the best interest of this to the conclusion at the Nunavut Planning Commission.

We don't want too much restriction, a proper plan. We both need to work, and we expect something from your organization to establish a reasonable plan for us. We want you to hear what our communities have concerns with, what the Plan is. We have discussed this for many years to see what the solution would be to these areas. Some of the islands we should also consider economic ventures, so we would suggest that we don't have too many restrictions on these areas of concern.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. We have come to almost lunchtime. We will have you again after the lunch hour sit at the table. We will take a break until 1:15.

Adamie A: *(Translated)*: Thank you for welcoming us.

Lunch Break

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: We can proceed again from where we left off this morning with Makavik Corporation, if you can come back up again. We will proceed. Qujannamiik. As our process, if there are questions, we will do it first around the table to the presentation. *(Pause)*

Okay, none from around the table. From Nunavik? There is a hand up back here.

Eli: *(Translated)*: Eli Angiyou, Akulivik, Chairman of the Hunters and Trappers Organization. Adamie spoke about this morning if there is open opportunity, if there is economic opportunity from the islands that we don't close to the door to that for the future. Both Makavik and the communities sometimes have opposing views.

What Adamie spoke about if there is going to be opportunities in the future, either development or economic opportunity, I would like to say once again that we should totally close it, opposing what Makavik said. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do you want to comment?

Adamie: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. Adamie Alaku, Vice President, Makavik Corporation, Environment, Wildlife, and Research. Thank you, Eli. What you are saying, I just to say, we value what we also cherish on those islands that we hunt from, that we collect down from, the activities that we need to defend these rights.

But there should be a provision if there is opportunity, economic wise. There are a lot of islands, and we shouldn't completely tie possibly some form of economic opportunity. That is what I am trying to ensure. I too, value those islands and the wildlife on those islands. I have no desire to see them ruined, but perhaps there are things that require the functioning of the cellphones and the computer.

I am talking about a small mining operation. We are even concerned about drilling for gas. I too, am concerned about that, and we are not ready for that. If they had a spill, we would see that we are not ready to deal with those kinds of things that happen.

So, I too, want to protect and to understand that those are hunting grounds, but I just don't want to tie our hands when or if we found on any of the islands within our *Agreement* area, perhaps there might be resources. We have mineral rights to subsurface, so I just don't want to limit the future opportunity as Inuit, Nunavut, Nunavik, to benefit from some kind of opportunity. I am not saying there is one. I am just saying if there is that chance, we should have the flexibility.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Hopefully that answered your concern. Nunavik, questions? Jetaloo at the table.

Jetaloo: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jetaloo, Amaruq Hunters and Trappers Organization. It is not really a question. From Amaruq, I am a board member as an Elder. I want to ask first. I feel I am aware under Makavik wildlife area that you are responsible for, from the ocean towards Nunavut, is it hard to deal with marine issues? That is my question to you, and I might ask again after. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Adamie: (*Translated*): Adamie Alaku, Makavik Vice President. I don't quite understand what you are asking about wildlife. I am sometimes not understandable. Sometimes people don't understand my thought process, so you are not the only one.

Jetaloo: (*Translated*): Under Makavik, you are responsible for wildlife? That is what I am saying. And in that role representing Nunavik on marine issues, how or what kind of limitations do you face, when I hear this, whether it is difficult to deal in terms of getting support on the marine issues.

Adamie: (*Translated*): Adamie Alaku, Makavik Vice President, Environment, Wildlife and Research. The cooperation that we have with Nunavut Tunngavik where James Eetoolook was responsible for the same areas, we saw the work that we wanted to do on wildlife. We needed to see a larger picture of the North, and we need to work cooperatively when we face each other.

The governments are going to make us face each other as opponents at the negotiating table talking bowhead whales, bears, and the wildlife. So, we are placed on opposite sides, even though we as

Inuit are like that but with the governments, we start fighting over the same resources. As Inuit we should know to work cooperatively.

Let's say polar bears with the federal government, and Nunavut Tunngavik supported us. The Nunavik wildlife organization and your wildlife organization, when we have problems, I would call James Eetoolook and tell him we need help in this area. I just want you to be aware that we are put on opposite sides regarding issues, but for the larger picture when you are an Inuk, the base is that we share resources. We share animals, and everybody should benefit, and those that need to benefit should benefit.

But if it is limited resources, let's say Sanikiluaq bears and communities of Inukjuaq, Umiujaq, and Kuujuaq topics. When the governments have opposing views, we also face each other from the work of the governments that represent us and the government process that we are thrown into. It is not our process. Through the base of Inuit culture and to deal with animals, we have to go back to us as Inuit. With Greenland and Alaska, our governments restrict what we manage ourselves. Based on Inuit culture, we can do this. I hope I answered your question.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Yes, proceed.

Jetaloo: *(Translated)*: Just to add, from the wildlife management, there is a separation of responsibilities. For example, when we have Qallunaat that want to *(portion not translated)*. That is my example. There is something in the way that we are tied down. Those of us for a long time, that is the issue of wolves over here. When we are short of caribou, it comes up currently and, in the coming years.

In the old days, the fur, you would bring it. They would mark it, and you would get a bounty. I understand that. Bowhead whale hunting and the right to hunt the bowhead whale negotiations, whether to Alaska, they cannot support that. They can explain if you approach them, but if you go, they want to protect their whales too.

Furs from the Kivalliq, when we were still with the NWT, there was a trapper to teach not too many. It was part of it, he shared with his own equipment on his own. That was my question and you answered it. *(Portion not translated)* It is a general comment. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do you want to comment?

Adamie A: *(Translated)*: Adamie Alaku, Makavik Vice President. Thank you. As Inuit, we are becoming wiser. Our forefathers were experts in wildlife. They knew dangerous ice. Some of this, we are now using the courts and negotiations processes that we realize others that hunt as a food source, whales, narwhals, bowhead whales, from around the world where they are protected. But we can hunt whales.

When you relate issues on the land, the animals, it is all part of it if we are dealing with land, if we are dealing with water. We have to talk about the marine animals that are interconnected, and the issues related to wildlife management. I know we are here to talk about the lands, but we are getting wiser to the world. If we don't speak, then we won't proceed or identify priorities that we need to bring up.

The government limits our ability to hunt whales in Hudson Bay, and you guys have freedom. It is the other way too sometimes, with bears. We might have different systems where you don't have quotas and we don't have quotas, so it is based on negotiations and trying to defend Inuit with the government process. That is the number one thing when we as Inuit work together.

We realize that you know you have a government in Nunavut now. We envy that. As communities, we have tried to have our own regional government. We want legislative power and to include regional government, wildlife management, the issues related to maps and how things are going to affect us.

So, we see the similarities. We see the concerns. We have to speak and be open to each other. We have to survive economically in the North. That is what I want, the freedom in that zone to have the flexibility. We need opportunities and still preserve wildlife, further down in 100, 200 years if they choose to do something on those islands that we provide them the flexibility. That cooperation is the largest thing we have as Inuit. We share the same blood. We live separately, but we want to work with you on this thing that I want to pass on.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Paul?

Paul Q: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Quassa, City Councillor, Iqaluit. Yes, we hear different issues, and it is good. The communities say one thing, and the organizations say another thing. We watch these opposing views that happen. It gets confusing in a way. Are they really representing us as Inuit? It makes you wonder. There is that factor. The ones that represent Inuit and Inuit desires from communities, it becomes confusing.

We also understand under Article 11 in the *Nunavut Land Claims*, this process is spelled out. The Land Use Plan that we are working on is not a closed-for-business document. We know that we will be able to change things in the future as a living document what is fixed today and requested. Regarding the islands, which want Limited Use from communities, they know in the future that things might change. In 50, 100 years, it might be different. Article 11 states that we can change this Land Use Plan and it is open as a living document. I just wanted to say that. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. I did not hear a question. Do you want to comment?

Adamie A: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Paul. I agree with you. Since we had a mine, asbestos mine, there is iron. The world wants iron. Maybe it might be carbon fiber in the future with the way the world is going. Things can change, and we have to be able to adjust, considering that we don't make a perfect Plan right at the beginning. The changes and the discussions, we can agree to improve things.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Questions from Nunavik to Makavik's presentation from this morning? (*Pause*)

Okay, any questions from the registered participants? (*Pause*)

I don't see any. Are there any from the general Iqaluit public? Okay, go ahead. State your name.

Paul O: (*Translated*): Paul Okalik. The presenters, make them absolutely welcome. When we lose to economic issues and money making, as an Inuk, it does not sound good. Perhaps does he understand our *Agreement* in there that if in the future the Plan needs to be adjusted, it can be

changed if the Inuit so desire. So, if there were resources that were found on an island, we can adjust the classification or conditions. I would like to see the desires of the communities followed. That is something for that purpose, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Adamie A: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Thank you, Paul. I spoke that the Commission has heard our positions, oral presentations, and the community desires have been heard. Our presentation seems to oppose that, but for the Inuit, I do not want to limit any opportunity that might be available and open to Inuit in the best way of making it happen, that we do not tie their hands.

I know we are trying to protect the resources where the animals are. That is a major priority. Don't misunderstand us. We totally agree about hunting and animals and the protection of these lands. We are talking about we totally value that resource. I am saying that if there is opportunity, economically or through development for Nunavut or Nunavik, that opportunity should not be excluded.

I know there are mines. We are affected by mines in Nunavik. You probably are too in Nunavut. We hear the effects of mining from Inuit. We are the same way. We are affected in Northern Quebec. The best process we can do, you are the ones to make the determination. That is why it seems to be opposing views. Those that want the opportunity and those that want Limited Use, you have come to hear. We are trying to defend the communities but also provide the opportunity.

If opportunity does come around, it certainly would be reviewed through the process, the planning process, the review process. Commitments would happen before anything. The Minister just recently believes, the board made a decision, and he supported that decision. So, we will rely on you. You've come to hear our comments. Community desires should be listened to, and us too should be listened and have the opportunity if it is available in the future.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Paul?

Paul O: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. 11.6.1, maybe you should underline that clause. An Inuk organization wishes to open a section that has a closed category can ask the Minister to open. That is the process. We have fast approval from the government in that route. Perhaps that can be the process that we have it closed for food purposes. If there is opportunity in the future, we could see that in the future. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. That was not a question. Do you want to comment?

Adamie A: *(Translated)*: Yes. Adamie Alaku, Makavik Corporation Vice President. What the communities said and want to see is that they want protection. That is good. We support that, but us if there is a chance that in the future of hearing both sides, the weight and the difference that we come from, I am not opposing any protection. We value those islands. If that is okay, if it is like that, we won't cry over it once you make your decision. It will be in place, and we can review it in the future. I won't dispute that.

Not everyone will get what they want. The majority wins. We all want things, but it always come down to the majority vote of those who are responsible. No matter what it may be, if there is a

decision made, we will support the majority. If the majority of communities say they want protection in that area, then we are not trying to change. We just want the opportunity that we have an opening in the future. We seem to be going in circles right now, but you are the ones to make the discrimination in this process. If there is a chance for Inuit to benefit, we want that.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. From the public, questions? Meeka, proceed.

Meeka: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Meeka Mike, Iqaluit. My question is I know from South Baffin, they implement things very well at Makavik. They follow the traditions. Since I was a child, Charlie Watt, Mark Gordon, went to Pangnirtung as their Elders told them. They had another person with them, another native from that area. The islands in question from our fathers, forefathers, Sikusiilaq, Inukjuak, and Pangnirtung, I understand the desire to have an opportunity. I understood that we have a process. We have a government. I never knew we had jurisdiction off the coast of Quebec. To include from South Baffin, it was a priority the damming of the rivers.

In the *Land Claims Agreement* that we have, the majority would proceed through their government. It was a priority or done too fast. My question from South Baffin Management Plan following your traditions that the organizations manage, wildlife has not met. We used to meet through the negotiation process. The wildlife agencies seem to be together for the first time here, even from Northern Quebec. They should be working cooperatively, whether it is funding. Perhaps we might get a comment from Makavik. Thank you.

Chairperson: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. This is outside of our jurisdiction and mandate. We are dealing with the work of the Land Use Plan and the work of the Commission. Adamie, you may want to speak with her directly. I want to proceed with our agenda regarding the Land Use Plan if that is understandable. I understood your question. Yes, they are together as the wildlife organizations between Nunavik and Nunavut, but that is not the purpose of the meeting, whether it did continue or not. If you want to ask regarding the presentation, go ahead.

Meeka: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. The division has never been done between communities and wildlife when we have hearings, not just here. The islands in question, you as the Commission and the Commissioners, what opportunity do you have regarding those islands under the *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement*? That is my question. Thank you.

Chairperson: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. That is the purpose of the hearings, to seek opinions on issues for what we are doing. We are here to include those islands where they too are affected. Even with the work that we are doing, we have a committee member from Northern Quebec that deals with issues related. We include not all the time, but when we deal with issues related to Nunavik and Nunavut, he is included under the *Agreement*. That is the purpose of why we are here. The comments and opinions we are hearing, we are here to listen. We are hearing your comments. I wanted to remind you and thank you. Johnny?

Johnny K: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Johnny Kasudluak, Inukjuak. I just want to make a comment of Paul Okalik's statements and Nunavik delegation concerns. We are concentrating on harvesting areas for the communities closest to these regions who have very much concern. I just want to see a conclusion that this document you are producing will be a living document and will be looking at future amendments on land selection areas. I just wanted to support what was being mentioned today.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Iqaluit public, any questions? *(Pause)*

Eli: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Eli Angiyou. I have been listening to the proceedings. I just want to say as a person of Nunavik, we also had concerns yesterday and today about the dammed river.

Chairperson: *(Statement not translated)*

Eli A: *(Translated)*: I have intimate knowledge of what happened to our lands. I want this proceeding to go the proper way and come to a solution. Wildlife will be most affected if something was not done properly. Sometimes we have to deal with mammals, wildlife having disappeared somewhere. Sometimes they come to our areas because of this damming and pollution to the water. We have seen dead seals on the shores and some just floating. This is not human inflicted. This is from the pollution, especially in our area.

The seals are suffering a great deal. We are concerned with our seals because of these rivers being diverted and dams being constructed. It has a very bad effect on sea mammals, fish, and other species. Where will this solution be to the concerns we have now and what we are facing today? We are experiencing what we never expected before, especially those of us in the Inukjuak community.

The mammals used to be plentiful nearby. They are no longer there. As it is, before construction of these mega projects, we had plenty of animals. I just want to remind what we are facing today. We need to have our concerns heard, not just speaking, not just talking about it. It has affected even further North communities. Our hunting grounds are becoming further and further each year. How will the solution be solved to the problems we are facing today? We are trying to come to some conclusions on this matter.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: It appears to be a general comment. There are no more further questions to the group. Qujannamiik.

(Applause)

Qujannamiik. We have Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated on the schedule. As always, please state your name and your organization for the record. Qujannamiik. You may proceed when you are ready.

Presentation by Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated

Aluki Kotierk, President
James Eetoolook, Former Vice President
David Irngaut, Vice President
David Ningeongan, Executive Director
Chris Kalluk, Sr. Advisor Land Administration Planning & Management
Burt Dean, Assistant Director, Department of Wildlife and Environment
Hannah Uniuqsaraq, Director of Self Determination
Marie Belleau, Legal Counsel
Naida Gonzalez, Consultant

- Aluki: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Aluki Kotierk, NTI. I have a delegation here with me. They will introduce themselves.
- David N: *(Translated)*: Good afternoon, Chair. David Ningeongan, NTI Executive Director.
- Hannah: *(Translated)*: Good afternoon. Hannah Uniuqsaraq, NTI Iqaluit Office.
- Marie: *(Translated)*: Good afternoon. Marie Belleau, Legal Counsel for NTI.
- Naida: Naida Gonzalez, Consultant with Nunavut Tunngavik.
- Chris: Chris Kalluk, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated.
- Burt: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Burt Dean with NTI's Department of Wildlife and Environment. Thank you.
- Aluki: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Aluki Kotierk, NTI. I would like to thank the Commission for holding your proceedings here on the public hearing. I am glad to be part of this process. Welcome communities from South Baffin. We are happy to have you here.

Welcome, Nunavik. Although we have different jurisdictions, it is nice to have you here. Makavik Vice President who gave a presentation, thank you for your presentation and welcome to our Nunavut. For those of us from this area, we are always welcoming the Nunavik area. It is very nice that this delegation is here in this hearing.

(Applause)

Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, we have participated in public hearings at the Nunavut Planning Commission. We were there in Cambridge Bay, Rankin Inlet, Pond Inlet, Thompson Manitoba, and now here. I would like to acknowledge the community representatives. You play a very important part in the creation of the Nunavut Land Use Plan. We would like to hear from you. Your concerns and your worries are heard. Better solutions are sought to produce this Land Use Plan.

We are listening to the communities who should fully participate and say what they want to say. When we participate in public hearings, we hear your concerns, and we document and try to proceed with what your concerns are in our work. The land use planning in progress, some of your concerns are our concerns as well.

We are expecting a well-planned Land Use Plan, and we understand this will be accomplished in this final hearing for the whole of the territory. As it is, you Commissioners for the Nunavut Planning Commission, we applaud you. We respect you. You have undertaken the hard task on this process.

Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated has aspirations to see all these Articles in the *Nunavut Agreement* come to pass, and we are concerned. We listen to what the public is requesting to be heard. The Article states that the public Inuit in Nunavut have to participate how the land will be planned and how the land will be designated. I said previously to welcome you, but also at the same time, I am seeing that you are part of this process, and your concerns are very important.

We listen and try to support your concerns at each hearing. We listen to your knowledge and what your needs are to the Planning Commission. It has designated the Nunavut Planning Commission to come to a conclusion where the land is fully planned and protected, especially in wildlife areas so people in Nunavut can continue to harvest and sustain their way of life, and also that the communities are well looked after and well planned under this Plan.

Nunavut Tunngavik has actively participated in all the Commission's land use planning steps, including meetings and public hearings. We want to see what we want to see in your planning process, and we will advise you on where we stand when you are doing your land use planning process and what can be included in your finished product.

Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated is working closely with the territory and federal government, because these two are the other signatories, and they will need to approve what has been planned for the entire planning area. Once we analyze what the Plan looks like, it will be a tedious task to ensure that Inuit concerns are fully included and incorporated into this Plan.

As we here, we have been satisfied so far that Inuit concerns are included. Areas where we could improve are being looked at. The Land Use Plan is very important. Once it is finished, we will see what the contents are. It is approved by NTI, and we take this task seriously. The Plan once approved and signed, will be used to guide us how we should look at the Nunavut land in general. This would be helpful to the population of Nunavut and the communities.

Many of us who have heard, talked, and presented in this public hearing want to see that this Plan is aligned with the needs of the population. We have worries, but at the same time, if we do our parts, we will be able to come to a plan. The concerns that people have in Nunavut will have to be priorities in your final document before it is presented for approval.

The Plan that you have produced is ongoing. We need to further look at how it will be structured and how it will look at other areas such as wildlife in general, and the Inuit population, again will need to be looked at. Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated is a representative, and we need to see that this Plan is in accordance the *Nunavut Agreement*, for instance. I think it will be most useful to the public, wildlife, its habitation, Inuit harvesters, and harvesting that they pursue to sustain their way of life.

Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit will have to be incorporated in this Plan as well. Inuit will have to be in charge of their land, their vicinities, as it is their aspiration. According to the Plan, they have to participate in preparation. Inuit way of life and their selection of their vicinity land parcels will have to appear well in the final stages of your land use planning process, such this last public hearing.

Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated recognizes what the important things are with Regional Wildlife Organization concerns, Nunavut Water Board in Nunavut, and other Institutions of Public Governments in the Nunavut area. Each of these organizations have huge concerns with the wildlife population, and it is healthy and sustainable to the general Nunavut public.

Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated has a vision with the organizations that I have just mentioned, and they are working in unison with each other for the betterment of the wildlife and other concerns they are dealing with. They are all in tune with the *Nunavut Agreement*, especially the care of Inuit Owned Lands in our Nunavut.

There are many concerns by organizations, especially the Nunavut Water Board on Baffin Island and the Qikiqtani Inuit Association, as well. We are aware of their concerns, and we listen and look for solutions of what their concerns are for the betterment to be included in this Plan. I just want to say the Draft Plan in front of you, the planning process you have, many parts of this we support. You have come to good conclusions on walrus haul-outs and polar bear denning areas, for instance. You also have made very good plans on migratory birds, waterfowl coming in annually to Nunavut. Many of these areas are on Inuit Owned Lands.

Caribou habitats, briefly, we realize that they are important, and they are of concern in each region. There is concern of what might be happening to these species, especially in Baffin Island. The Nunavut Water Board is also concerned, and they should be entrenched to the Nunavut planning process. Despite that, we still expect that the caribou management will be a priority, and a solution should be found for further protection of these species in the future.

Speaking of Inuit Owned Lands, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated and the Regional Inuit Associations have concern about Inuit Owned Lands and its rights according to the *Nunavut Agreement*. What we are able to do is very important to Inuit who are the landowners. It also clearly states in the *Nunavut Agreement*. So, we can say that Inuit Owned Lands, there are many effects to this as it appeared in 2021 and how the land use planning selection took place.

For instance, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated as an organization is a landholder of 1.8% only at the subsurface, landowner of Inuit Owned Lands for their benefits. It appears and it is written, and it will be used that part of the land use planning process. For instance, almost have 43% will be affected on Inuit Owned Lands. Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated as a body, we would like to see something concrete, a properly planned process on Inuit Owned Lands.

We don't want a deviation on what the *Nunavut Agreement* says to Commissioners. It appears that land selection category would reduce Inuit Owned Lands considerably. Inuit, NTI we can do a lot more for wildlife and its habitats in Nunavut, a proper care, especially the size to Inuit Owned Lands that seems to be shrinking in the planning process.

Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated looks at a reality if this land planning process comes to reality. Governments with their regulations, approving agencies will understand how land use planning will benefit Inuit. We do not want to deviate from the *Nunavut Agreement* too much. Inuit would then be impacted, and their needs have to be really looked at so they would benefit from the *Nunavut Agreement*.

We are happy today to make a presentation considering that we work closely with both levels of government. To the Commissioners, we will be making a presentation to the Commissioners and further saying impact on Inuit. The federal government, Inuit Owned Lands, especially Inuit Owned Lands will have to be protected. The federal government as part of the global population is pretty much in agreement with the world and stating globally that their waters and lands will be protected. For us as an organization, we also have concerns how to protect these mentioned, the elements I have mentioned.

Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated is also very concerned before this final product is made and approved. The land use planning process is a good tool to Inuit. It will impact Inuit and how they would benefit according to the *Nunavut Agreement*. If we are not doing it right, if it is not proper according to the *Nunavut Agreement*, I think we would have done something wrong to the *Nunavut Agreement*. We need to negotiate. We have to agree with each government on this planning process.

Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated believes that the Nunavut Land Use Plan, as we say, we are looking forward to the final product of this planning process. Other concerns will be looked at. As I mentioned, wildlife should be protected. Inuit Owned Lands should be governed properly by Inuit organizations in the region. The Nunavut Planning Commission, I would advise you and ask that you refine your Land Use Plan. The wildlife population is always there, because Inuit harvesters have to sustain their way of life based on harvest work with Regional Inuit Association, and work on Inuit Owned Lands with these, I have concerns. We don't always agree but through talks, we can achieve what we are proceeding with.

In conclusion, I just want to briefly say people from the communities, your concerns, your opinions are very important. You are participating in a very important document. From listening to you, this land use planning process will only be enriched. Community representatives, you are voicing your concerns, voicing your problems to the delegation here conducting this process.

I also have heard from you either verbally or through submissions, for instance this public hearing in Iqaluit, I have heard from different communities. There was a request to defer the closing date of January 10th, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated to the Commission, to see if you could listen what the communities have requested on that on the closing date of January 10th. Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated would also be pleased, and I am sure as we work with both levels of government that we would be able to do something to solve these problems, for instance, Inuit Owned Lands as I said in my presentation.

Vessel traffic is becoming a lot each summer in Nunavut waters, and both levels of government are pretty much aware of that, and we can work with both levels of government on this. Inuit are impacted that their concerns are addressed. It would be best for all of us, and a better land use plan process would emerge. I know you are looking for a fine finished product. That is your wish, and I

agree with that, but at the same time, a request to defer the closing date. Thank you for allowing NTI to do a short presentation. Your questions are welcome.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. We will go through the same process. Staff first. Brian?

Brian: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Brian Aglukark, Nunavut Planning Commission. I will try and make sense of my question. My first question if I may, I am wondering if the Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated can provide a rough timeline or an estimate of a time and how long it takes for a potential conservation area to the completion of the Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements process. From start to end, about how long would that take? Six months? One year? Two years? Three years? Would you guys have an idea of how long that would take? Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Who would like to answer? Go ahead.

Hannah: Qujannamiik. Hannah Uniuqsaraq, NTI. Brian, we had this conversation with some government representatives this week. We know the Nunavut Planning Commission would like to have an approved Land Use Plan sooner rather than later. We know the Government of Canada has conservation targets, which is a huge motivator to negotiate Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements sooner rather than later.

We are hoping that we can come to some kind of an agreement based on community needs and wants, government budget cycles, that it can be done quicker than other conservation area IIBAs have been negotiated. The advantage of Canada signing on to international targets is that they put a significant amount of money aside to reach their commitments. It is a huge motivator, and we are hoping that it won't take too long. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Brian, do you have a follow-up?

Brian: Thank you. Can you confirm the 152 subsurface Inuit Owned Lands of the 952 surface parcels? Two Articles: 41, Inuit Owned Lands and 72, Municipal Parcels, of all those parcels, how many are tagged for a current IIBA process? Qujannamiik. I hope that makes sense.

Chairperson: Brian, for the record, your name.

Brian: Brian Aglukark, Nunavut Planning Commission. My apologies.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

David N: David Ningeongan, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. We will submit our response in writing. We don't have that information right now, so we will submit our answers in written form if that is okay. Thank you, Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Brian, do you have a follow-up Go ahead.

Brian: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. Brain Aglukark, Nunavut Planning Commission. Aluki, you mentioned that under the *Land Claims Agreement*, I think you just mentioned it, they will give the voice to the people in the planning process. Since September in Ikaluktutiak, Rankin Inlet, Mittimatalik, and here

in Iqaluit, we have included Inuit in the discussions of the things they desire to see, whether it is the location of caribou to be defended.

We have heard based on the mandate we are given under the *Land Claims Agreement* that we hear from the people. But, when we hear, it seems to be different voice, a difference from the communities. What is your position on this? Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can proceed with an answer.

Aluki: (*Translated*): Aluki Kotierk, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. The difference in opinion comes from the positions we represent. For example, when I am a resident of the city, it might be different from the thoughts or the work of the city. The Government of Nunavut might have different issues. Although they are our organizations, their priorities and the work that is set out in representing the Inuit is based on the work to Nunavut Tunngavik and the Inuit Associations.

The concerns brought forward by the Inuit, I am trying to find the best solution using the *Land Claims Agreement* and trying not break Inuit rights. So, sometimes we seem to have differing voices, but what you mentioned, the voices of the Wildlife Organizations and the affairs of the NTI and the Inuit Associations have a different role.

Even though we hear different issues and different things, concerns have to be listened to. That is very important for us. We hear the concerns of the Inuit, and we feel or see improved suggestions when we had hearings in Pond Inlet. They were concerned about the muskox. We didn't include it, but once we heard that from the community, we now include it as improvements in the differences that we seem to hear. Hearings are crucial in seeking improvements. David wants to add.

David: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. David Ningeogan, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. There are many Inuit Owned Lands in the different regions. Inuit have selected, and the selection was based on different criteria: hunting, camping, wildlife areas. There were various reasons why they were selected. We as Inuit Organizations, we want to be part of the management process.

Almost half of the Inuit Owned Lands are going to be impacted as they were selected by communities and Inuit and the selections that made on those lands. Through the planning process, it will put restrictions on Inuit Owned Lands, but we are listening to the people when they mention wildlife and the management of wildlife, calving grounds, and various areas, water crossings, areas like that. We in Nunavut are the largest landowners owned by Inuit.

Some of the land selected, the caribou numbers have gone down, but food security and having country food is very important. We have to have the opportunity to make decisions as the desires of the Inuit. I just wanted to add that. It is the management of wildlife, and that process is a priority under the *Land Claims Agreement*. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do you have another question, Brian?

Brian: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. Brian Aglukark, Nunavut Planning Commission. If I have a chance once everyone asks, I might have another opportunity. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan? Go ahead.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thanks again to the representatives from Nunavut Tunngavik for your presentation today. I first want to talk about Inuit Impact and Benefits Agreements. You indicated in your presentation that land use designations included in the Land Use Plan that achieve long-term conservation goals would require the negotiation of an Inuit Impact and Benefits Agreement.

During the Qikiqtani Inuit Association's presentation, they gave the examples of key migratory bird habitat sites and future parks. I would ask them if there were other examples of other land use designations that would, in their view, require the negotiation of an Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement.

I will ask you guys the same. Do you ask that a specific list of land use designations included in the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan that in your view would require the negotiation of an Inuit Impact and Benefits Agreements, or is it generalized to Limited Use designations that may prohibit activities? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed.

Naida: Naida Gonzalez, Nunavut Tunngavik. Jonathan, I can't speak and look at you at the same time, but there is not a specific list. The concept is based on the fact that if the government is looking to achieve long-term conservation goals through Limited Use Areas, and those are considered to meet the criteria for international targets that whatever those are, should have an Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement associated with them.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. So, in effect, if the Land Use Plan provides a Limited Use designation for a community drinking water supply or a Community Area of Interest like Nettling Lake or the Sanirajak areas, if the government chooses to count those towards their international commitments, then Nunavut Tunngavik would be of the view that those designations that provide benefits to communities that would be responsive to their views would require the negotiation of an Inuit Impact and Benefits Agreement. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Naida: Naida Gonzalez, Nunavut Tunngavik. Those are the types of issues that are under discussion currently with the governments. We are entering without prejudice, discussions on those details, but that is something that the parties are working on, making some progress on. There is reason to think that we can come to a joint position on that.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed, Jonathan.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you very much for the clarifications. On a different issue related to Inuit Impact and Benefits Agreements, for all currently established conservation areas that have Inuit Impact and Benefits Agreements in place, you indicate that the Land Use Plan must ensure that government can meet

their legal obligations in these areas. Can you be more specific as to what role the Nunavut Land Use Plan would have in these areas?

In effect, are you asking for those areas to be identified sort of as a Mixed Use Area where all uses would conform to the Plan, and then other authorities would meet their legal obligations after the Commission has reviewed the project proposal, or do you have a more detailed suggestion? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed.

Marie: Qujannamiik. Marie Belleau, Nunavut Tunngavik. I think the principle that we have expressed is that the Nunavut Land Use Plan, whatever shape or form it takes, cannot prevent current legal obligations in the contract between parties to be able to occur. I think that is a fairly straightforward concept and I am sure a lot of parties would agree to.

I believe in our written submissions, we have highlighted some examples where the Land Use Plan the way it is currently drafted does prevent certain activities or other uses that are already agreed upon within a current Inuit Impact Benefit Agreement, but if it might be helpful, we could try to provide a bit more detail in terms of specific Inuit Impact Benefit Agreements and specific provisions that are currently in conflict if that is not readily available right now to the Nunavut Planning Commission.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thanks again for that clarification and commitment to provide additional clarification just for additional context. I'm sort of thinking of some of the Limited Use designations on existing conservation areas include a combination of prohibited uses as well as setback requirements, for example. I am just trying to get a sense of whether any of that is agreeable to Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. Thank you.

Throughout this planning process, and in particular in response to the latest Draft Plan, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated and the Regional Inuit Associations have advocated for the ability to make decisions on Inuit Owned Lands and not to have the Land Use Plan interfere with your own management obligations.

Throughout these hearings, we have heard different suggestions from each Regional Inuit Association on their preferred management approach. For example, here in the Qikiqtani region, there is indicated support for Limited Use designations but a request for a sort of exemption; if the Qikiqtani Inuit Association would support a particular activity, then some type of letter could accompany a project proposal in order to allow it to conform to the Land Use Plan.

I am wondering if Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated supports all three of the Regional Inuit Associations in their different proposals for how to manage Inuit Owned Lands or if you have any additional comments on the different management approaches that have been recommended. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can proceed.

David N: (Translated): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. David Ningeogan, Nunavut Tunngavik. That is a good question. The Regional Inuit Associations have obligations under the *Claim*. To date, they work with our organization and are part of NTI. We will continue working with them, but in the planning process, we hear the different desires, and we see that. The Commission and Commissioners will have the opportunity to make decisions, but as an organization, the main *Land Claims* organization, and there is a new Land Claims Act, we have to ensure implementation and the obligations are met within the Claims on behalf of Inuit. We want to ensure that the voices of Inuit are heard under this process. This is what I wanted to add. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you, again, for your response. I would like to switch to discussion on the Areas of Equal Use and Occupancy. During Makavik's presentation, I noted the anticipated temporary management structure for land and resources within the Areas of Equal Use and Occupancy under the *Nunavut Agreement* and note that under Section 40.2.15 of the *Nunavut Agreement*, a more permanent structure was to be established with the finalization of the *Nunavik Land Claims Agreement*.

Unfortunately, that did not occur as part of the finalization of that *Agreement*. Under 6.4.20 of the *Nunavik Agreement*, it identifies the potential for legislation to set out the manner in which both the Nunavut Planning Commission and the Nunavik Marine Regional Planning Commission could cooperate. I am wondering if Nunavut Tunngavik has any update on the status of discussions surrounding a more permanent management regime in these Areas of Equal Use and Occupancy or if there are any intentions to engage in such discussions. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

David N: (Translated): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Clarity first of where things are. We will provide an answer for you once we get it. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You forgot to mention your name.

David N: David Ningeogan, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. I do have one more question, but just to supplement the last issue, effectively there is a bit of a conflict where both the Nunavut Planning Commission and now the Nunavik Marine Regional Planning Commission are mandated to prepare land use plans for these areas. This situation creates a bit of uncertainty, and it would be helpful to have some input from yourselves as well as other levels of government on the matter.

Within the Areas of Equal Use and Occupancy, the Commission heard feedback, primarily from Makavik as well as yourselves for a preference for a Mixed Use designation for these areas, in part due to the uncertainty regarding the current and future management of the areas.

As you have seen, the Commission has generally followed that recommendation but has included some land use designations within the areas, as we have noted throughout the week, including some polar bear denning areas, walrus haul-outs, and community on-ice travel routes, for examples. Does NTI have any feedback on this approach in the Nunavut Land Use Plan? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed.

Marie: Qujannamiik. Marie Belleau, Nunavut Tunngavik. As of now in our written submissions, our most recent ones, we have not highlighted any particular concerns about that, but before the close of the record, we will just make sure, if ever that could be helpful, to make sure we highlight anything. As of now, it is not a major issue that we have highlighted in our recent submissions, but we will definitely take another look and share if there are any concerns. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are you good? Okay, looking at the clock, we will take a 15-minute coffee break. We will get to questions from the communities when we come back.

Break

Chairperson: (*Translated*): Sometimes it takes a while to get coffee. Let's start to proceed once again. Before we start, I want to remind you that the Minister is here, David Akeeagok. Welcome. We will start where we left off with the communities at the table. You can ask.

Paul Q: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. I am Paul Quassa from the City of Iqaluit, City Councillor. It is good to hear the voices of the community and the support NTI has. In the land planning process, the voices of Inuit need to be heard, and we hear that sentiment in here that we need a Land Use Plan. We have been working on it for a long time, even before the *Land Claims Agreement*. Twenty years later after the *Nunavut Agreement*, it is still in the works. It needs to be done right.

It was good to hear Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated president say that the desires and the wants of the Inuit have to be respected when they make decisions on the Land Use Plan. That is a true statement. We are here now facing the communities, and you no doubt have seen all the communities yourselves.

I also wanted to mention about the Inuit Owned Lands and the negotiation process and land selection. I was there, and many were there that are here around the table. Perhaps some of you were not involved, but be aware that the land selection in communities, it was from these varied communities here, 25 of them. They selected those lands on what is important to them and the use they traditionally have had and for the protection of those lands. They were selected for different reasons.

Yes, we are aware, but for protection of those sites that Inuit Owned Lands were selected from communities, currently they have a Limited Use. The Land Use Plan will be a living document, not like us, but we will be able to change it in the future. My question is the community voices that you have heard on the Inuit Owned Lands that have been selected, do you not value them anymore?

Do we want them open? Perhaps they will be able to be opened even after we are gone, but currently, the Inuit voices on the Inuit Owned Lands, they want those protected. The question from

the communities, what have you heard regarding those Inuit Owned Lands? Have you heard from communities? I know that Inuit Owned Lands, the Regional Inuit Associations also hold title to land.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the communities have not talked too much about Inuit Owned Lands. I have not heard Inuit talk about their Inuit Owned Lands. As an Inuk in the communities, they are not of concern those were selected. That is the reality.

I often wonder as a community member, those Inuit Owned Lands, are they being cared for properly? Who can have access on Inuit Owned Lands? Who can walk on Inuit Owned Lands? That is spelled out for the Inuit Owned Lands. They should describe the operations of those lands to Inuit. I have not heard anything related to those lands. I'll stop here. In conclusion, with the Inuit Owned Lands, have you heard from communities stating it should be a certain way? Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can respond.

Aluki: *(Translated)*: Aluki Kotierk, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. As I recall, even before I was born, you were in negotiations on land selection for Inuit Owned Lands. From what I understand, it was not just preservation. I have not been a negotiator. I am explaining what I understand. Part of it is preservation. Part of it is for economic opportunity. Part of it is for cultural reasons. There are different reasons and categories selected Inuit Owned Lands before I was born, and Inuit will manage and own these lands.

When the Qikiqtani Inuit Association was on, they also stated that. We are open regarding Inuit Owned Lands preservation, if that is what we want. We are not saying that we don't want them protected, but we have to give Inuit the freedom to choose. As individuals, we don't know a lot of things, but the organizations that work on the behalf of Inuit, they provide structure to represent Inuit to the associations, so the desires and the rights of Inuit are met through the *Land Claims Agreement*. Inuit voted. Inuit selected those lands based on different reasons.

Article 17.1.2, the communities will determine the designation, not through the Planning Commission. This is so the Inuit can make their own decisions. What Johnny Mike said that we have been recognized at the United Nations with Indigenous rights. We represent Inuit rights and not to break those rights.

You mentioned 25 communities, but they all have Inuit Owned Lands. When they selected which lands that they wanted protected, which lands had economic value, which were cultural sites, with those objectives they selected those lands for us. The following generations, we must work for the following generations. We are not trying to slow things down.

The Inuit Owned Lands near communities, if they need to be supported, the community must work with us and the governments to seek an agreement for the benefit of Inuit. If Inuit are impacted, there is a foundation in place. David wants to add.

Chairperson: Atigo.

David: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. David Ningeonan, Nunavut Tunngavik. That was mentioned through the planning process determination, through the hearings across Nunavut. We hear the issue of Limited

Use in red and around Nunavut. We will have limited options. We won't be able to put a road. We won't be able to make hydro projects. We won't be able to quarry sand in those red dots. If you can show us a map with those red categories of Limited Use, we must be able to determine the outcome of our own Inuit Owned Lands.

If you want to limit the activity on those Inuit Owned Lands, we should not limit ourselves as Nunavummiut. Let's say there is a hydro project line from the Manitoba to the Kivalliq, the problem will exist if you look at that now. There is a red line coming north of Manitoba. Half of those selected lands will have restrictions from the Land Use Plan if they get that title or classification. That will limit the ability of Inuit in self-determination of our own lands.

The work of the Commission will limit us to roads. Various hydro projects will reduce the cost of living. We can improve health services inside Nunavut. If we get a hydro line, we could save energy costs. If you look at the red category of Limited Use, that limits the ability that we want. For those that are listening and listening online, we are putting limitations on Inuit Owned Lands.

The Inuit Owned Lands are not just for conservation. Some were selected for mineral potential I have heard. I, too, was not part of the negotiations. Some of the communities have selected smaller amounts where there is more mineral potential in the Kitikmeot. We want economic opportunities for our own benefit that we are aware. It is not just for conservation, not just for hunting, not just for wildlife the Inuit Owned Lands were selected. To us that is a concern under the planning process.

When you look at those red areas in Nunavut, we are going to limit roads between communities or other potential economic activities or development that will be limited, with all the limitations being put in place. If Inuit want their Inuit Owned Lands closed, they can do that through the Inuit Association. There is an avenue in the place for that to happen.

In the Land Use Plan, there are too many restrictions that Nunavut could benefit from. I want you guys to understand that we need to plan for the future, for our descendants. We have to think of both. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Paul? Johnny?

Johnny M: *(Translated)*: I am glad I am hearing these discussions. Johnny Mike, Pangnirtung, Hunters and Trappers Organization. We were going to do this very discussion that we are having here. We have planning for so long. I have been part of the process, your father. When they are getting ready to go hunting for caribou in May and June, in those months, as soon as I would see my father, he wanted me to catch my first caribou in the calving season. We also would get caribou meat for drying. I got my first caribou due to his good planning for our spring camping site.

That is the way Inuit were going to be. We have been guided to the end of this process. We have been waiting for a long time. This is for the benefit of Inuit. I am thankful for NTI and others that have spoken before us. We all have spoken.

The Inuit Owned Lands, they have limitations in size. We always enjoy more funding. Inuit Owned Lands are for our benefit. We are still waiting for the Land Use Plan. The different organizations will benefit from the clarity. My question is whether NTI can clarify. I would like more understanding of what the president spoke about.

The Planning Commission from the desires of Inuit Owned Lands from NTI with goals not met regarding Inuit Owned Lands, but also the Commission will determine. They like in general the Land Use Plan if we cannot totally control the Inuit Owned Lands with limited opportunities through the planning. In part, you give the Commission the right to do this, and now you also state. I will also have a follow-up question.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

David N: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. David Ningeogan, Nunavut Tunngavik. Thank you, Johnny for the question. The issue we mentioned earlier in the presentation, we want to totally control the Inuit Owned Lands and determine through the work we have already done on the Inuit Owned Lands parcels that have been selected in Nunavut.

As you are aware, in the land selection process, the reasons they had for selecting those lands, Inuit knew that they wanted to be part of the economic process, and we still see that, but when you look at the work and you see the marking on the maps, there is too much area limited, whether it is fish. It is not just the lake, but then they encircle a larger area. There is no thought process to the Inuit Owned Lands that are already set in process for the management of those lands.

We hold meetings in communities. If we hear a certain lake needs a designation, they select a larger selected parcel. It has restricted our rights. This will limit our rights. If this was to proceed, this would limit our potential through fishing, oil, and gas in the future. The future can determine their own economic opportunities: oil and gas, mineral exploration, tourism.

How will these be spelled out? We want opportunity. It is hard to get employment up here, and we have to think of this. Government and the mines are not the only parts of the economy that we can do. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Brian?

Johnny: *(Translated)*: I am not finished.

Chairperson: *(Statements not translated)*

Brian: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Brian Aglukark, Nunavut Planning Commission. I have two comments. In response to your questions is the first one. David, you have mentioned linear infrastructure, the Kivalliq-to-Manitoba highway. For those of you who are listening in this hall, these maps are real. These are marked as real. You said this infrastructure will hinder the growth, and other marks of Limited Use would be a hinderance as well.

Slide 61, the Nunavut Planning Commission, as Jonathan mentioned on, I think Monday, discussed how this process can be amended. Here, anyone, anyone – an Inuk organization, government, if they wish to make an amendment, here it says. Monday, Jonathan whoever they may be, an organization, government, exploration companies, if they are a hinderance to do their work according to the Plan if it is approved, just to say there is an amending formula to the plan.

17.1.3 was mentioned by Aluki. They say this is not our responsibility. You, the NTI along with three Regional Inuit Associations have to work for the population. At the hearings in Cambridge, Rankin Inlet, and here, you as a delegation have not come and attended to tell us how the Plan is progressing.

Chairperson: David? Once David responds, we will get back to you, Johnny.

David N: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. David Ningeogan, NTI. The map that you have shown, the Kivalliq-to-Manitoba proposed road, I would like this to include, for instance, on Inuit caribou crossing. You have to be aware of that. Inuit have concerns as we were at the meeting in the Kivalliq. There is a flaw to this. We are there to do some amendments, what is best for the Inuit in that region, because this Plan has to work for the whole population.

The world is looking at this progress. The world is paying attention of how well we can plan our huge territory. We don't want to see a flawed Plan. We can do this. I can say this because we have our own NA already approved.

Chairperson: Johnny?

Johnny M: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Johnny Mike, Pangnirtung, HTO. Your answer, it appears you have set your mind. You may not approve of NPC planning. It seems to be going to that direction. Now we know from your responses. Chair, I want to point this out. Our concerns are said. We have concerns with the Plan.

NPC seemed to be judged for consultation. You as NTI are saying that the Plan is flawed. If I keep talking, I will continue to repeat this. Paul had a good point in his comment for you today to oppose this. It is a reality now. When we started years ago to come to this point, it is now a reality. 11.2.1b says you have designated the Nunavut Planning Commission, this organization to do this planning process in the Nunavut Settlement Area. This will govern. They will have to produce something to the best of their knowledge for the people.

For Nunavut communities and in Nunavut in general under the *Land Claims Agreement*, it says also it will have to benefit Canadians and Canada in general. It says special attention will have to be there. It is unique. The Nunavut Planning Commission is unique. Their work is unique. They are doing their best, which is a good progress to produce something on behalf of the Nunavut population.

Where are we now? What are we doing? What is important to us, the organization that governs over us? Here you are not doing your job. You are coming short. This has to be adjusted. It has to be corrected. You seem to have sidetracked the process. According to the *Nunavut Agreement*, Inuit concerns, who are the landowners in general, have to have unique attention, Inuit Owned Lands, according to Article 11.

As for me, I wanted to point out and thank you. What you thought of the Nunavut Planning Commission process, it appears you have fallen short of that expectation. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Jawlie?

Jawlie: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jawlie Akavak, Kimmirut HTO. Recently, I mentioned it, and I just wanted to mention it again. January 10th, 2023, I asked for an extension to further delay. I have a reason for that. In our community, and I am sure not only us but other communities as well, organizations in each community will have their Annual General Meetings this time of year. Many of them will have AGM before December, especially in our community anyway.

December is a busy month. Christmas activities and holidays will be a priority to the end of the month. QWB has mentioned they will have an Annual General Meeting in early December. I think it was on December 8, 9, and 10. I wanted to make a submission to QIA with the maps that we have worked on. We have seen maps as well, which are numbered. They were clearly identified in our area, south of us. We wanted to do some further work.

I mentioned that before. There is a lot of wildlife in an area we want to mark. In my community, we want to work on this. January 10th, 2023, I still would say again that we should delay the deadline for this file to be closed. Who will be able to precisely decide on this date? It is something that we can think of.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Solomon?

Solomon: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Thank you, NTI for your presentation, your work, and your concerns of where you stand. I have no questions to that aspect. As a member of QIA, Solomon Awa of Iqaluit, a statement was made by a Kimmirut delegate. We had meetings last time strictly on caribou, and we met for three days in October. The maps that we worked on you will see on December 10th. For your information, it will be discussed, and some of you will be participating in that Annual General Meeting. Just for your information that it is not forgotten, and we will discuss it.

Another matter to the comment he just made and to the Nunavut Planning Commission, Qikiqtani Inuit Association is in support of NTI and Baffin communities. Perhaps I will just say a comment. There has to be information given to us on what your intentions were on the dates and specific things.

At the Cambridge Bay public hearing, I listened to the proceedings on TV. Like us, there weren't well prepared on their submissions, and I support now NTI and Kimmirut delegation that this date, this submission deadline should be deferred. When you go back home, I think you will have to write a letter to the Commissioners.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. I don't see any more hands. I will go to Nunavik. Johnny?

Johnny K: *(Translated)*: I think Eli will ask a question after me. Two Elis will ask. Johnny Kasudluak. I have no questions to NTI, but I just wanted to say where you are, where you stand, and the information in the presentation you have given, I felt strongly on the first day that Nunavut Planning Commission's employees were informing us of how it is progressing.

The Plan that you are working on, the Land Use Plan, much of this information is not available to us. Not everybody has a computer, and not everybody understands what land use planning is. You said that it is a living document. For instance, today in our communities in Nunavik, the organization that represents our views are not always agreed upon. So, we ask.

When organizations are working on certain things such as yours, we are given advice on how to proceed, how to accomplish. It will always be the case whatever the work may be. How will you finish? How will you plan? Who will participate? Who can participate for future use if the Plan is well prepared? We are a laptop generation today, and the process should be clearly available to all of us on the Nunavut Land Use Plan. Is the world understanding what the process is? It is just a comment.

Chairperson: That was a general comment. Atigo.

Eli Aullaluk: (*Translated*): Eli Aullaulk, Akulivik, a person. I wouldn't want to give you a direction of what my opinions are. I just want to encourage what you are doing. Makavik, now NTI are giving presentations. These are the people that we will have to work with in the future, so I am happy what they are saying, with their presentation.

We will work with them. This process is giving ideas to our organization and organizations in general, so the presentations are worthwhile. The presentations appear to be concentrating on what the public really mean.

I just said earlier I am just a person. I am here today, and the only food I had growing up was country food. Now everything is available to me, all sorts of food, but I still value my country food. They sustained me in youth, and I want these species, wildlife protected.

Today's climate is really a problem to our wildlife. It is on the news everywhere. Climate change and warming temperatures appear to be a problem. In the planning process, I don't see much of this what the concerns are of the population, because it will be affecting wildlife in our communities. So, when you plan and do the process, with climate change, how much of a topic is it? How much priority is it given? For instance, today it is such a warm winter. Long ago, this would be a really cold time at this time of year. The weather has been affected. Regardless of what your opinions, Makavik and NTI, this will have to be addressed. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can pass the mic.

Eli Angiyu? (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. I am the Chairman of the Kiggaviit Hunters and Trappers Organization. I am glad for them welcoming us and including us. Thank you to the president for her comments. I am grateful and thank you. For the Inuit whose views they represent, I really enjoyed hearing that. That is the way it should be. Makavik also does this work for us.

Through the planning process and the considerations that NTI seems to be saying that limits the options on Inuit Owned Lands, it should state the desires of the Inuit should be the priority. I just wanted to say that about this issue to NTI. Thank you for this opportunity. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are we okay? From Nunavik, questions? (*Pause*)

Seeing none, are there any questions from the registered participants? Go ahead.

Archie: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Archie Angnakak, Amaruq Hunters and Trappers Organization board member. First, South Baffin, not in the Kivalliq, I have not heard from South Baffin about

those red dots. The other one, under the *Land Claims* it states Nunavut Tunngavik will work under the *Land Claims Agreement* through a democratic process by Inuit. We are using the customs of Canadians whether we can dedicate the land red or yellow based on the laws of the Canada and the democratic process we are working through.

So, Inuit rights have been clarified, and some rights taken away. We can voice our opinions here. We value the lands, fish, our ancestor's old camping grounds, home. The HTOs have given the process of management and control in the hands of the Inuit from our ancestors in running our affairs through the Claim. The red dots or the yellow dots on the map, that is the rights that we have, the new rights that we have.

Outpost camps, there are outpost camps that we deal with. There will be requests for outpost camps that will be based on the map. Will they be red or yellow? I just wanted to state this. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. I did not hear a question. Do you want to comment?

David N: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. David Ningeogan, Nunavut Tunngavik. Thank you for reminding that we are not in the Kivalliq. It was an example. Looking at the map of the South Baffin, the deadline is looming on the 10th of January.

Calving grounds in the Baffin, water crossings and post-calving grounds, have they been, because we know in the Kitikmeot and in the Kivalliq, caribou have been collared. With that information the government presents the hunters, but there is no, because this was mentioned in the Pond Inlet hearings.

We see as we start to conclude, the caribou are a major concern in the Baffin region. I, too, am concerned coming from Nunavut Tunngavik. The animals and their routes, calving grounds, the post-calving grounds, the caribou are of concern. The habitat, the crossings, the post-calving, calving grounds have to be, or are they properly protected on Baffin Island. I just wanted to add that. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any questions from the registered participants? Go ahead.

Archie: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Just so you are aware, through the *Land Claims*, the Wildlife Board investigated caribou. Mike beside me ran the project. Caribou habits on Baffin Island on all the communities, our Elders, he was able to, as our ancestors used to go far for caribou where there was always caribou. When they are numerous or when they are not numerous caribou, the words or our Elders, they are written down.

From that research, we asked him to do this work on the Caribou Harvest Study. We did a Caribou Harvest Study. He is a caribou biologist using western science and Traditional Knowledge. It is available. Those categories might be red or yellow on the map. The communities in South Baffin have noticed those.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. I did not hear a question. Questions? Go ahead.

Mike F:

I want to thank Archie for his introduction to some of the past work I did with Inuit. Mike Ferguson, QWB. I started my career in this region a few years ago working for the Government of the NWT and later the Government of Nunavut. Archie introduced some of the work that I did.

I still have copies of some of the data. However, when I started working with the QWB, the QWB applied to the Government of Nunavut for permission to use much of that data for our submissions to the Nunavut Planning Commission. Government of Nunavut requested revisions to those, the first data shared agreement. That would give legitimate use of the QWB to the data.

There were tagging studies that Archie himself participated in Netsilik. The picture of the caribou that we showed yesterday was actually two caribou that were swimming across Netsilik. You've heard a lot about Netsilik caribou.

The data from the Harvest Study, the telemetry data that was done from 1987 to 1995, the Government of Nunavut did not give the QWB permission to use the data in the submissions that we made to the Nunavut Planning Commission. That is why those submissions are entirely dependent upon Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit. We did not have permission. The government did not provide permission to the QWB to use data that the government has.

That is one of the major reasons why we have been so slow to fill in many of the details of dates. I know when the post-calving season ends. However, the QWB does not have permission to use that information. I know when caribou on Baffin Island give their calves. I will tell you unofficially, it is from roughly June 13th through July 7th.

It is a much longer calving period on Baffin Island than elsewhere in Nunavut, but the Government of Nunavut has not given permission to the QWB to use that information. That is a major obstacle still today to finalize good submissions to the Nunavut Planning Commission. That is just a comment. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: That was a comment. Are there any other questions from the registered participants? Go ahead.

Meeka: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. I will direct this to NTI. I am happy this is now being discussed. I always had concerns in surrounding areas near Palliq. I have never been up there before. I have seen in it on pictures. There are many cabins now made by researchers and private cabins. People have asked me who owns these cabins in the Palliq area. There is a concern that these cabins are being constructed on traditional grounds. Kivalliq people are called Palliq.

It just reminds me for some reason, that area is a beautiful area. It has a lot of animals, old tracks, everything. That and Akullipaaq was not a recreational place. It has its purpose. It has three coves. I think the Akulivik representative was concerned. When caribou was plentiful, the men of Pangnirtung, there used to be occasions and call to the community when they were harvesting.

My grandmother and people were usually aware that caribou during 9-11, the planes were all grounded at that time in 2019, 2021. From that time when there was less traffic on land, the caribou feeding grounds improved. I have seen that in our land. The ground grows very slowly. It takes time. I am in agreement with NTI on protection of the ground.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: It is not a question. It is not directed to anyone. It is a general comment. Looking at the time, it is almost 4:30. I have a question, and our staff have some more questions. We don't have to come in tonight. I know it is almost 4:30. Your comments, please keep it short. Your questions, keep them short. Are there any more questions from the Iqaluit public? Go ahead.

Olayuk: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Olayuk Akshuk, Cape Dorset. Thank you, former MLAs for those who have negotiated the *Nunavut Agreement*. It has allowed us to have a large tract of land, the biggest in the world. It seems to be improving gradually. The maps that we have seen, the markings that we are looking at, the federal government also have selections in this territory.

As we work on the land selection process, I want to ask NTI what expectations you have in the land selection in land use planning. What better expectations do you have? It is a lot of work to do what is going on right now. It will be impacting many people. What better land use plan are you looking at? What is the purpose? Why are you suggesting that January 10th be delayed? Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Marie: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Marie Belleau, Nunavut Tunngavik. I will answer you in English.

(English): It is a good question. In our presentation by our president, she indicated that NTI has been an active participant in all of the steps for many years now in fact. We try to contribute, and we have put in a lot of work to put in written submissions or contribute to public hearings here. In the submissions, we put a roadmap or suggestions to the Nunavut Planning Commission as best as we can to let them know what would be most agreeable to Nunavut Tunngavik.

We also work with the Regional Inuit Associations very closely, and if and when we can, we do produce joint submissions. However, each Regional Inuit Association has their own specific regional issues and concerns. They also put in their submissions to the Nunavut Planning Commission.

As we have mentioned as well, we are currently working on a lot of other issues. Some of them involve directly governments, in particular on the issue of Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements that was mentioned earlier. These are agreements and arrangements between Nunavut Tunngavik, the Inuit Organizations, and governments, depending on what the topic is.

So, we understand that it might not be entirely within the Nunavut Planning Commission's mandate to sort these things out. They are very complex. Although tied into the land use planning process, they also have their own separate processes. So, we are doing what we can now to facilitate that process and to assist the Nunavut Planning Commission.

I think your question, Olayuk, was a bit quite broad in terms of what Tunngavik sees as what would make for a good land use plan, if I understood correctly. Our main focus has been really tied into the *Nunavut Agreement* itself and the rights that Inuit have very strongly negotiated for all of us as Inuit. These are rights that we cannot ignore. We do not want to ignore them. We want to make sure that those rights are preserved for all of us Inuit as a collective.

So, those are the areas we are most focused on, and those rights so to speak, are numerous. They touch upon many different issues. In Tunngavik, as a treaty holder, we want to make sure all of

those are respected in a balanced way on behalf of all Nunavut Inuit. I hope I answered at least a little bit, Olayuk.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there further questions from the public? *(Pause)*

There appears none. I think we will take a 15-minute break.

Break

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Let's proceed. I will get back to the agenda. Jonathan Savoy from the Nunavut Planning Commission will be first to ask questions. We have three signatures from the table.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. I have two points I wanted to follow up on based on the additional questions that have been asked here this afternoon. The first one is in response to some of the comments about limitations and restrictions on activities within Limited Uses Areas and sort of the unacceptable limits on economic opportunities in these areas. Reference was made to things like roads and fiber optic lines, and mineral exploration and development.

As part of this hearing, we also heard from the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board on the economic value of wildlife harvesting, for example. They included an estimate of a value of I believe \$59 million dollars from harvesting as a source of nutritious food. I am wondering how NTI, or has NTI considered economic opportunities of land uses that would conform to the Land Use Plan in Limited Use Areas, including both subsistence and commercial harvesting of wildlife as well as tourism opportunities and things of that nature? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can answer when you are ready.

Marie: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Marie Belleau, Nunavut Tunngavik. I am not actually sure I understand your question, Jonathan, in terms of what role it refers to between NTI and the Planning Commission. I'm really sorry. I don't quite understand the question.

Chairperson: Go ahead, Jonathan.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much. I was referring to comments that seem to imply that Limited Uses designations would have an undue impact on economic opportunities. I was wondering how NTI has considered economic opportunities of land uses that would conform to Limited Use designations, such as wildlife harvesting by community members, commercial fisheries, for example, or tourism activities. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can proceed.

Hannah: *(Translated)*: Hannah Uniuqsaraq, Nunavut Tunngavik. Thank you for your question, Jonathan. NTI is currently negotiating right now Nunavut Fishery Regulations, which may provide renewable economic opportunities in Limited Uses Areas. NTI is working with and consulting with HTOs, NWMB, Makavik, and others on the Nunavut Fishery Regulations. I think that is one example of a

renewable economic opportunity that could be applied to Limited Uses Areas. That is just one example. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan? Do you have another question?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you for your response. I will switch to a final topic. In following up on some comments that Mr. Johnny Mike had made earlier on the Nunavut Planning Commission and its establishment under the *Nunavut Agreement*, I would note that on page 1 of the *Nunavut Agreement*, it is identified that there are a number of objectives to the *Nunavut Agreement*, and one of them is to provide for certainty of rights for Inuit to participate in decision making concerning the use, management, and conservation of land, waters, and resources.

As we all know, there are a number of Institutions of Public Government established under the *Agreement* that are intended to provide Inuit with a role in decision making on how lands and waters are used within the territory. Some of the Institutions of Public Government including the Nunavut Impact Review Board and the Nunavut Water Board focus their mandate on reviewing project proposals on a case-by-case basis.

However, the Nunavut Planning Commission has been established with a broader mandate to look at different scenarios in advance of projects being proposed and prepare land use plans that guide and direct resource use and development in the territory as part of Nunavut's integrated regulatory system.

I am wondering if you are able to comment on the value or benefit of the Nunavut Planning Commission's land use plans to Inuit and how the role of the Planning Commission positively contributes to the goal of having Inuit participate in decision making for land and resource management in the territory. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Hannah: Hannah Uniuqsaraq, Nunavut Tunngavik. Institutions of Public Governments like the Nunavut Planning Commission play a vital role in allowing Inuit to participate in decision making. Inuit Organizations nominate and appoint Inuit members to the Commission, to the other Institutions of Public Government.

For project proposals, renewable or nonrenewable, they submit to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission will reach out to affected communities. Depending on where the proposal is coming from, again renewable or nonrenewable, we see much value in that. We understand that the NPC takes very seriously the comments and concerns that Inuit express on a given proposal.

So, in that sense, NPC plays a very important role in Nunavut's co-management regime. NTI values the work that NPC does, its Commissioners, and the outreach that it does to the communities. I am not sure if that is the answer you are looking for. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan, another question?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you for your response, but I would like to clarify that the Nunavut Planning Commission does not consult with communities on individual project proposals. We do this through our Plan development process.

This 15-year process that we have been undertaking is our way of providing Inuit input into decision making on how lands and resources are used in the territory and is a potential way to provide some certainty for Inuit participants and other proponents and regulatory authorities on what the preferred uses of land in the territory are.

I was trying to distinguish between the value of case-by-case project-specific reviews of project proposals that both the Nunavut Impact Review Board and the Nunavut Water Board undertake with this more high-level proactive planning process that consults broadly and tries to identify a preferred way forward for the territory.

So, I was wondering if there were any comments on the value Nunavut Tunngavik may see in that process, which was of course, negotiated for as a benefit under the *Nunavut Agreement* contrasted with the remainder of the regulatory system. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Marie: Qujannamiik. Marie Belleau, Nunavut Tunngavik. I think we are all aware the *Nunavut Agreement* was negotiated by Inuit. There were many elements that were negotiated, including creation of certain bodies. The Nunavut Planning Commission was a creation of the *Nunavut Agreement* for Inuit to be able to appoint members on commissions, the boards, other Institutions of Public Government.

Government as well appoints members to commissions. I think as a creation of the *Nunavut Agreement* in serving a very important role in obviously land use planning, which is the main focus of the Nunavut Planning Commission, it is also important to ensure that the role and the work of the Nunavut Planning Commission infringes the least amount as possible on other, like on certain Inuit rights.

Again, I am not sure I fully understand the question or the value that is being asked of NTI. If it is a general commentary about the importance of the Nunavut Planning Commission, obviously, we think it is very important. We think that it is all the more important for Inuit rights and interests to be fully reflected in the work and the ultimate outcome of this, which will be a Nunavut Land Use Plan.

These aspects are totally already enshrined within the *Nunavut Agreement*. These relationships are already clearly defined in the *Nunavut Agreement*, meaning that it is in the *Nunavut Agreement* that the Land Use Plan has to give special attention to Inuit Owned Lands. As we see right now, there is only one very short paragraph that refers to Inuit Owned Lands within the current Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. There is one paragraph in Chapter 1.

That is one of the reasons why, this is one aspect that we want to make sure that it is clear to the Planning Commission that there needs to be more consideration for Inuit Owned Lands, because that is clearly defined in the *Nunavut Agreement*. So, that is where the various roles intertwine and

should be given adequate deference and respect, which I know is the intention. That is why it is something that we strongly advocate for on behalf of all Inuit.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. I think he is done. Jetaloo?

Jetaloo: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jetaloo Kakee, Amaruq Hunters and Trappers Organization, Elder. The work has not been done on Baffin Island related to caribou. This we have not looked at, because we have not seen them. People were collected from the outside of the community from the beginning in the 1940s, 1950s. The traditional caribou hunting grounds, we did not catch them here. When that had become history, I arrived.

We don't go too far, nor are we taught by the locals where the caribou cross. We are not given that information by locals. There is a river between here and Pangnirtung. Perhaps some of those larger lakes are not reachable from here. In the summertime, we might know of crossings, and we would be able to describe them if we had seen them, as we did not catch them in the past. We have lost that knowledge.

I would say it is unfinished work, but there is little opportunity now for us and our descendants. Today, our hunters also don't go up that way very much. The restrictions we are thinking about, as it seems like unfinished work. We don't know where the caribou cross as we know of the big lake where there was a mine. The area maybe from people on the land. I wanted to identify that because it is not good to not say anything. I wanted to say that.

I don't know what restriction is making us slow down. Me, myself, I am going to be happy. When we change months, then we will have a new year. Those will be considered. We are not thinking about those things. Others will be concerned about them, Tunngavik and the Planning Commission and the governments that we rely on. They too will decide, and we will listen.

It seems like I am thinking about the red dots now that were mentioned. Perhaps for hydro purposes, the red areas would be in the way of progress and others. Maybe there are caribou crossings, and I kind of understood about the road. When you are categorizing lands, you are coming from the sunny side where the Qallunaat run affairs. We believe that.

As a hunter, the first time I heard about those things, the *Agreement*, when there was caribou here. Now being now, maybe they would have marked something else. The traditional hunting grounds might be related to caribou and the markings on the map that I have seen. For example, so you will believe, the community from down the bay past Pangnirtung, has not been touched by anybody. It has been touched by somebody, but maybe it is marked on a map. The islands have names and places of hunting where routes are, where we survived in the wintertime. Windy spots are known.

Our fathers, our mothers, we left that area. We left our berries. We left our walrus. We left our seals. We left our fish. We left our berries. We left the land. We lost our way of life. The only things we took were the clothes we could take on the plane. That was it. No one is going to know that area now. Like for me, if I pass, that area will not be known anymore. It's just an example. We do not know the caribou crossings, because we did not catch them, and we were not in that area when we were young.

I am going beyond my discussion points here. I wanted to say something instead of not saying anything. We also left our bears. We left our foxes. The beauty of the land, we left, and the cliffs that we like, the beauty that we left down there. We just arrived purely as human beings to Pangnirtung not knowing that we were going to survive. I would get homesick. I was not an Elder back then. It was good. It must have been hard for the Elders that had to live in a different community. I just wanted to note this instead of not saying anything.

As we have guests that are here, we have to speak. Once you are gone, we will be speaking at home. That is how we are. As we know, I am giving you my thoughts, and I am thankful that you are here. You that did not exist before, your parents never saw this. Your dad never saw this. They would have never seen you in these clothes. Thank you for looking after us. We want to be consulted.

This process we are going through here as an ordinary Inuk, currently I am sitting with various people of different educations, leaving my family and the animals. I am here with you. We had a world like that, and we have a different reality today. The Traditional Knowledge we have lost. We rely on schools and English. We are like that, thankful.

As a plain old Inuk, we are the originals. We are just glad we can breathe too and try and do a bit of work based on the Knowledge that we know. I know I don't make sense. We are trying to do confusing things here.

(Applause)

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Lazarusie?

Lazarusie: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Lazarusie Ishulutaq, Hamlet of Pangnirtung. I have questions for people at the table. Jetaloo, I was living with you at the time. Before I was born, we ran out of caribou seals. I was born in 1948. We were still not allowed to harvest waterfowl. We see geese, lesser geese. I began to understand that if I were to shoot these geese and other waterfowl, I would be fined \$300.00. At that time, when we lived in the outpost camps, we were free to do what we want.

The *Agreement*, I started hearing about this during the early negotiations. When I heard what was going on, this turned out to be the *Nunavut Agreement* as I read it. The military come in without notifying the communities, and the *Agreement* says communities have to be informed if the surrounding community is occupied by non-Inuit. That is how it is.

When the military came, I wrote to them. Here is the *Nunavut Agreement* because it was there, so I wrote to them. I gave it to them and passed it on stating what it says in the *Nunavut Agreement*. I briefly mention what was going on. Whatever the activities that they were carrying on, it has proven to me that the *Nunavut Agreement* works.

When I was young, this *Agreement* was signed by people who understood what the needs were in Nunavut, so I am happy that NTI is now guiding us as a general population in Nunavut. I have been ruled by transients coming into Nunavut telling me how I should and should not harvest, which species. That is gone. I am now very happy to be living longer because this *Agreement* has done something for me.

Work together and to the people who are asking for information on the Land Use Plan, whatever it may be, Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, but it has to be meaningful.

(Applause)

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. That is a general comment that does not require an answer. Jaco Ishulautak is the last one on the list.

Jaco: *(Translated)*: Jaco Ishulautak, Hamlet of Pangnirtung. I just wanted to make a further comment to my brother here. Thank you for frank discussions. Over the past summer, my brother and I experienced in relation to caribou. The Nunavik delegate said today that there was a huge caribou harvested one time. Not too far from Iqaluit, we grew up together. We lived in that area where the caribou herd was plenty. We lived on that. We used to see caribou at that time. There were huge herds. Their antlers have nothing to compare it with.

When they start coming in closer to the communities migrating north, the caribou herd we came across first ran away. I have no idea where they went, so this summer, my brother and I were being filmed for educational purposes in relation to caribou and how much caribou there were in our vicinity. This was a very big herd. We were told by our parents to carefully look at what species there are. We learned, and we were taught that the only thing you throw away from the caribou is the kidney.

During the filming of this documentary, it was the first time we saw this previously huge herd there again. We saw this. When it starts migrating the direction of the north, you can tell that it has been walking for a long. It was kind of tired and the first time too in our area, a caribou of old emerging again. Here we are planning for our future. They will be useful in the future. I just wanted to mention this generally.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. That was a general comment. We have Paul.

Paul Q: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Quassa, City of Iqaluit Councillor. I don't think it is a question, just a general comment. I just want to say that the planning process has to continue. It is in place because of the *Nunavut Agreement* clause. All of us who are here know this. NPC now has intimate knowledge of how it should progress. They are a good organization to make this Plan comes through.

NTI became an organization, and I was there in its conception of how they should operate. They were leaders. They did not deter any progress of any organizations. Communities have encouraged this planning process, and I know for myself that the Nunavut Land Use Plan will have to be completed. NTI, it is your responsibility to participate fully to its progress.

I have heard this comment from NTI, is this organization only now working on caribou? Are they turning into wildlife activists? In Baffin Island, there are organizations, even the Qikiqtani Wildlife Committee will say that this organization is doing honourable work.

Perhaps a last comment: The Nunavut Planning Commission has been in progress pretty much over 20 years. Now are we going to wait another 20 years? The communities are tired. The progress of the project has to proceed. Are you listening to your communities? Are the communities being

listened to? Are we following what was negotiated for us, those of us who say we are here for our population. That is my comment, Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Would you like to comment?

Aluki: (*Translated*): Aluki Kotierk, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. I do not really agree with your comment. When we first fought your comment, you said you mentioned that you don't appear to care as NTI. No, we are not like that. We care for the communities. We are not that sort of organization. We are not halting or putting pressure to this process to stop.

We know it is in the *Nunavut Agreement*. Our concern is that you proceed, and you come up with a proper Plan. I don't envy your task. Your work is hard, tedious, and there are many opinions to collect information. In your heart, the best interest is that you do proper work for Nunavut. You said this progress has been over 20 years. No, we are not going to go for another 20 years.

We are just doing an analysis of how it is being structured and planned. We talk about this to both levels of government. We talk with wildlife organizations, HTOs. I just want to clarify that your comments are not called for.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Paul?

Simigak: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. It is just a general comment. Simigak Suvega, HTO Cape Dorset. I just want some clarification for the two islands that were discussed today, Tujjaat, Akulliq. The people of Nunavik, we share those land masses together. What has your organization done so we could understand what the progress is down there? These islands are our lands as well.

There was mention of these islands being populated with caribou. If in fact this is going to happen, then hearing this, I think we should start negotiating. If the population of caribou is going to continue, South Baffin and Nunavik should both be concerned. Clear statements should be made so we can understand what is proposed here. We represent our community in this concern. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Burt: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Burt Dean with NTI Wildlife and Environment Department. I am not aware of any discussions that have happened in recent years. Quite a few years ago, there had been meetings back and forth between Nunavik and Nunavut communities, but it is something we can follow up on and communicate with the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board and the local Hunters and Trappers. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairperson: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. I have no more names. I do apologize for going overtime. Okay, we have Ben.

Ben: (*Translated*): I'm just growing old here in my seat, so I thought I would make a comment. It is something in the past three days of the discussions of what is going on, what is proposed towards this land use planning process. Some have said the deadline to close this file is January 10th. I would like to say that it is not all that inconvenient. January 10th or other dates are fine with us.

For those of you who are proposing to delay the date, where? Why? I have no idea. We are here today. The meeting is almost over. I have not heard that this request to move January 10th to further it, I have not heard any responses to that. For those of us who are HTO and general public, we have worked hard to finish our work as we head to the deadline.

For those of you who think you will not have time, just don't talk about it. Find someone to work with you. Yes, the date that you are requesting, January 10th, it is just a date. February 3rd, March 30th, but I have to have a very good reason for that. You are just saying delay, delay. It is like taking a long sleigh ride and the end is never there.

For those of you in authority, what will you say? You as authorities, will you say something so that it will be delayed, it will be firm? Why are you asking for a delay? What areas are you behind? Talk to the governments and to the organizations who are able to assist you.

Your reason is it is December. Christmas season is just around the corner. I know. You have people who can work on this. Push them. Make them show results. Why do you want it deferred? What date are you really thinking of? Why? Why do you want an extension of the deadline? It is just a matter of sitting down together and getting to work. We have heard what the problems were at this proceeding.

Tell us. Tell us a date. Give us a reason why you want this date extended. Perhaps the Nunavut Planning Commission has their reason for a deadline, and for those of us who are sitting here, 25 of us have not been told why this date is firm. I have not heard anything, Chair. Thank you for allowing me to ask.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You want to respond? This will be the last question.

Aisa: *(Translated)*: Aisa Surusilak, Puvirnituk Hunters and Trappers Organization. We talked about caribou on the island. There is a lot of food source there. For example, Pujjunaq had caribou, but we had wet rain and freezing rain. The caribou perished. They starved. This is challenging for caribou when we think about caribou on the islands. The conditions have to be right, so we don't plant caribou that won't survive. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Yes, that's a comment. I don't have any more names. Let's thank Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated.

(Applause)

Aluki, do you have any closing comments?

Aluki: *(Translated)*: Just that we will have a chance at the end to speak. Thank you for this opportunity. We will write written responses to the questions. Thank you to the staff at NTI for being able to answer questions. We miss James Eetoolook. He was our wildlife expert at Nunavut Tunngavik. I have not dealt with wildlife issues, so I am grateful for their support.

Thank you to the community representatives in Nunavut and Nunavik. We are here with different views and opinions. The Commissioners have the hard work of sorting out all of this information after the hearing. Thank you for this.

(Applause)

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Tomorrow we shall proceed again at 9:00. We are adjourned for the day.

DAY 5: November 18, 2022

Chairperson: (*Translated*): Good morning. We may proceed again this morning. Before we start, Sharon has some housekeeping items.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and welcome back to another day at the Iqaluit public hearing. Regular housekeeping: If you have a cellphone, please mute it. We are broadcasting live on Uvagut TV, Facebook, and YouTube, as well as transcribing the meeting, so please when you speak, state your name and your organization, and speak slowly for the interpreters.

We will be taking our normal two 15-minute breaks, and the Chair will advise if we will be having an evening session later today. We had an issue with the coffee this morning, as most of you see. It was full of coffee grounds, so they are bringing the coffee back as soon as there is a new batch. I know there will be a beeline as soon as that comes back.

For the agenda, we will be following Friday's agenda. First up, as you see, is the Government of Canada. Again. As we saw with NTI, there were a lot of question, and we want to ensure that all participants have an opportunity to speak. Please ensure that it is on topic when you are asking your question so that they know. We do appreciate everyone participating and speaking honestly and openly. Just a reminder that the Commission does foster transparency, respect, and working together. All comments from all participants are welcome. So, with that Mr. Chair, I will turn it back over to you. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. As with the other days, set your ringer off on your cellphone. We will have a presentation. State your name, whoever is going to the microphone, and your organization, just as a reminder. We are ready for the federal government. You may proceed.

Presentation by the Government of Canada

Terry Audla, Regional Director General with CIRNAC

Kim Pawley, Manager CIRNAC

Spencer Dewar, Director of Resource Management, CIRNAC

Jeff Hart, Manager of Land Use Planning, CIRNAC

Janice Traynor, Policy Coordinator Sustainable Development, CIRNAC

Michelle-Claire Roy, Environmental Policy Analyst

Nathalie Lowry, Environment and Climate Change Canada

Abby Menendez, Environment and Climate Change Canada

Jaideep Johar, Transport Canada

Anita Gudmundson, Transport Canada

Karen Petkau, Parks Canada

Greg Matthews, Department of National Defence

Neil Modi, Justice Canada

Simon Gruda-Dolbec, Justice Canada

Terry: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. My name is Terry Audla with the federal government. First, I did not have coffee yet, so I might be a little cranky.

(Laughter)

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to the Commission on the federal government's response to the Land Use Plan and concerns related to the first Draft.

(English): I will continue. Before I go into my presentation, there was one fellow that presented yesterday, and I did not recognize him until he said his name. In the late 1980s, I was a summer student for Resources Wildlife and Economic Development of the Government of the Northwest Territories, GNWT, up in Pond Inlet. That person that I was reporting to, back then he had curly black hair and black beard. He was based in Pond Inlet, and that was Mike Ferguson. He was the caribou biologist.

He had a Quonset hut outside of his office, and next to that Quonset hut outside was a large freezer full of diseased animal carcasses: foxes with rabies, caribou with brucellosis, walrus with trichinella, all the diseases you can imagine in that one freezer chest. We didn't realize during that summer that somebody had unplugged it. As a summer student, it was my job to take out all the liquified rotting carcasses wearing a Hazmat suit.

It took me three days, and my job was to take all that rotting diseased carcasses wearing a Hazmat suit on a Honda to the dump with a pail of gasoline and burn them until they burnt to the crisp down to the ashes. I had to stand at that dump for a good three days with all that smoke and all that smell. I was staying at Burt Dean's place, and Burt Dean did not like me coming back smelling like that. Mike, I think you still owe me overtime.

(Laughter)

Anyhow, so that is the morning Friday without coffee introduction. I am the Regional Director General at the Nunavut Regional Office here in Iqaluit for Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. First, I would like to thank the Commission for providing us the opportunity as the Government of Canada to present our views and opinions and suggestions as to the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. I would also like to welcome all the participants here to Iqaluit.

(Translated): Welcome to the participants and those from Nunavut.

(English): I just want to introduce my grandpa, Johnny Kasudluak. He was named after my grandpa in Inukjuak.

(Translated): So, welcome, Nunavik.

(English): Also, I would like to thank the City of Iqaluit for hosting this hearing. With me here today, representing the Government of Canada, we have from Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada to my left is Spencer Dewar, Director of Resource Management; Jeff Hart, Manager of Land Use Planning; and Michelle Claire-Roy, Environment and Policy Analyst.

To my right is Kim Pawley, Manager of Environmental Assessment, Land Use Planning and Conservation, as well as Janice Trainer, Policy Coordinator, Sustainable Development. We have other representatives from the Government of Canada in the audience today. We have from Transport Canada, Anita Gudmunson and Jaideep Johar. From Justice Canada, we have birthday boy, Simon Gruda-Dolbec and Neil Modi. From Environment and Climate Change Canada, we have Nathalie Lowry and Abby Menendez. From Parks Canada, Karen Petkau.

I believe there are other Government of Canada representatives as well sitting on the live stream. When there are questions, if I can't answer them, they will try and provide us the responses online, just so you are aware.

As a way of introduction, developing a first-generation Nunavut Land Use Plan is a difficult, complex task, and the Government of Canada recognizes the efforts and commitment of the Nunavut Planning Commission.

Principles and objectives in Article 11 of the *Nunavut Agreement*, and Part 2 of the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act* require an understanding of how people are supported by the land socially, culturally, and economically, the values and priorities of residents, and particularly the aspirations Inuit have to determine their own path to future wellbeing. The result must be a Plan that meets these aspirations, guides development, and also provides for conservation and other uses of the land.

Since the Plan was released in July 2021, the Government of Canada has been working to provide productive recommendations to the Commission, as well as working with the Government of Nunavut and the Designated Inuit Organizations to discuss issues we have in common. The Government of Canada continues to be committed to this process for the benefit of Nunavummiut and all Canadians.

The mandate of the Government of Canada under the Nunavut Agreement and the Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act is an approving party to land use plans in Nunavut. In addition, it shares a role in ensuring the principles and objectives of the planning process are met.

The mandate as well for the Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada is to continue to renew the nation-to-nation, Inuit-Crown, government-to-government relationship between Canada and First Nations, Inuit, and Metis; modernize Government of Canada structures to enable Indigenous peoples to build capacity and support their vision of self-determination; and lead the Government of Canada's work in the North.

This submission was developed on behalf of the Government of Canada in part, by the Canadian Coast Guard, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada, Department of National Defence, Environmental and Climate Change Canada, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Global Affairs Canada, Justice Canada, Natural Resources Canada, Parks Canada, and Transport Canada.

As mentioned earlier, some representatives from various departments are here with me today, while others are viewing on the live stream. The summary of each department's mandates can be found in the annex at the end of this presentation, which are available at the front in Inuktitut, Inuinnaqtun, English, and French.

The Crown has a duty to consult because of its role in deciding whether to approve the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. The Crown relies on the Commission's process to assist with fulfilling the duty to consult. When drafting and revising the Plan, the Commission considers comments at the hearings and community meetings as well as any written submissions. These could include any concerns brought forward on potential impacts to Section 35 rights.

The Government of Canada encourages Indigenous organizations and governments to identify to the Commission any potential adverse effects or impacts to their rights and how these may be addressed through the Draft Plan. The Government of Canada remains actively engaged throughout the Commission's process, listening to Indigenous concerns, and seeking any information on how they may be resolved.

The purpose of this presentation is to provide a high-level overview of the comments and recommendations submitted to the Commission by the Government of Canada on the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. The written submissions we provided to the Commission are on the public record. They are more comprehensive and contain more detail on the issues than we have time to present today. It is important to note that although we are identifying issues that need resolution, the Government of Canada is confident and committed to a collaborative process that will make progress towards developing a sound, well-supported, and clear first-generation Land Use Plan that can be successfully implemented.

The remainder of our presentation will focus on key outstanding issue and recommendations for how they may be resolved. We will then provide some conclusions and talk about a process for moving forward.

One, in the principles used to review the Draft Plan, the Government of Canada's review is guided by our priority expectations for a first-generation Land Use Plan. These include that the planning and resulting Plan legally comply with *the Nunavut Agreement* and the *Nunavut Planning and*

Project Assessment Act. The Plan must be consistent with federal commitments and policies. The planning process has credibility, so it is clear that the development of the Plan is supported by a meaningful, inclusive, and transparent public and stakeholder consultation process. As well, the Plan must be clear, understandable, and provide certainty for users. The Plan must be practical, implementable, and conformity requirements must be clear. The Plan should contribute to the efficiency of Nunavut's integrated regulatory system.

Our review is also guided by the Commission's *Broad Planning Policies, Objectives, and Goals* that were developed by the Commission with the Government of Canada, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, and the Government of Nunavut. The 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan has addressed many concerns that the Government of Canada brought forward in 2017 and 2018. There have been significant improvements. However, several substantive issues remain, and these important issues should be addressed and resolved prior to the Plan being submitted for approval.

First, clarity and certainty: The Government of Canada has key outstanding issues on clarity and certainty in how the Plan should be read and are critical to successful implementation of the Plan. There have been improvements from previous drafts, but there are still areas that need work. For instance, overlapping land use designations remain. These should be eliminated from the Plan, or clear guidance should be provided on how overlapping land use designations are to be applied to avoid ambiguous interpretation.

Language in the Plan requirements should also be improved to add certainty. The Government of Canada recommends adding guidance on how to interpret the application of Plan requirements, especially where designations overlap, and revising language to be clear and in line with legislation. For example, replacing the term "no person" with "no proponent" would be in line with the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act* definition of proponent.

Mapping: Maps are the basis for being able to understand and apply any land use plan. The accuracy of the maps that show the zoning in the Nunavut Land Use Plan are necessary for the public, project proponents, and regulators, as well as the Commission to make decisions about the requirements that the Plan intends to apply to a project.

Here on the map, we have selected a map of Cambridge Bay, Ikaluktutiak to provide an example of overlapping lands that are legally recognized, in addition to those land use designations found in the Plan. As you can see, the overlap in this case is extensive. The Government of Canada understands there were some challenges experienced by the Commission in accessing certain map data and understands that work is underway to address this issue. Before a final Plan is submitted, the Government of Canada recommends that the Commission revise all maps in the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan to improve their accuracy and use a consistent mapping standard for the Land Use Plan.

Mineral development, existing rights, and conservation: Now we will speak to finding the balance between economic development and conservation, and the treatment of existing rights. The Government of Canada recognizes the efforts the Commission and the challenges it has faced. We want to be clear: the Government of Canada supports protection of caribou. Nunavut includes important habitat for caribou and wildlife, which are critical to the wellbeing of people and the environment. As well, there are existing rights related to mineral tenure and Inuit rights, including those associated with Inuit Owned Lands.

In our view, the Plan cannot and should not be counted on as a solution to protecting all of these values on its own. There are a number of mechanisms available in Nunavut that will help to achieve these purposes. Overlaps between existing mineral tenure and Limited Use zoning in the Draft Plan are creating conflict. These need a closer look by all parties to ensure the benefits and rights guaranteed in the *Nunavut Agreement*, and the rights of tenure holders can still be realized, and caribou and wildlife are still protected.

Caribou population numbers have declined over time, which generates concern amongst all participants here. The Government of Canada's objective is that the Land Use Plan supports healthy populations that can support sustainable harvesting into the future. The Commission has many tools to consider for supporting caribou conservation, from applying Valued Eco-systemic Component designations, to prohibiting land uses through Limited Use zoning.

In a Plan the size of Nunavut, not one size fits all. The Commission's use of these tools should target resolving potential land use conflicts and consider regional diversity. It is important that the Commission ensures that it knows whether the selected approach is working. Ongoing monitoring could help inform the Commission if its measures are effective.

It is important to acknowledge the value the mineral economy brings to Nunavut as a key consideration. A healthy mining sector provides opportunity for Nunavummiut. It provides employment, contracting, training, and vital contributions to government, Inuit organizations, and communities that allow support of local programming.

The challenge for approving parties and the Commission is to determine the best approach to ensuring that caribou and other wildlife habitat is conserved so that caribou and wildlife can thrive and ensure that Nunavummiut have the opportunity to benefit from the economic potential that comes from the mineral sector. Clear zoning without conflicts is important for ensuring conservation, as well as clarifying opportunities for economic investment.

As you can see on the map, mineral tenure covers 2.5 percent of Nunavut. Over one-third of that tenure is overlapped with Limited Use zones that prohibit mineral exploration, development, and related activities. As well, a number of areas with mineral tenure are fully enclosed within Limited Use zones. There are options to create clarity in such areas through place-based analysis. This analysis should result in clarity so that land use is clear, and impact on communities, rights holders, and the environment is considered and understood.

The Government of Canada has heard from and agrees with the Designated Inuit Organizations about the importance of considering Inuit goals and objectives with respect to Inuit Owned Lands and self-determination. From the perspective of a Land Use Plan, this could be achieved in multiple ways. Nunavut has a robust regulatory system. The Land Use Plan can be one tool. Others include collaborative work with wildlife boards and the regulatory process in Nunavut.

It is important to keep in mind that all projects remain subject to Nunavut's regulatory regime. In addition to the Land Use Plan, projects are further regulated with a view to protecting the environment. They all possess Nunavut Impact Review Board project certificates, Nunavut Water Board Type A water licenses, Crown land use permits and leases, and authorizations from the

Regional Inuit Associations. Collectively, these authorizations tailor a robust set of terms and conditions under which the projects must operate.

The Draft Plan applies a Limited Use designation to three of Nunavut's four active mines. The Government of Canada recommends that the Commission rezone areas where existing mineral tenure overlaps with a Limited Use designation to Mixed Use. There should be no overlap of Limited Use zoning with mineral tenure. Information on important caribou habitat should be retained as a Valued Ecosystem Components designation to ensure it is considered by proponents and other parts of the regulatory regime.

The approach in the current Draft Plan to address the issue of overlap between Limited Use zones and existing mineral rights includes a list of projects in Appendix A that would be exceptions to the Limited Use prohibition on future mineral development. Just to provide some context on the scope of this exception, existing mineral tenure makes up about 4 percent of the Limited Use caribou calving areas currently included in the Draft Plan. Should the Commission remain committed to using Appendix A to list properties that are an exception to the zoning, the Government of Canada recommends that the Commission rezone Limited Use Areas where they overlap with Nunavut's operating mines, to Mixed Use Areas with no applicable prohibitions, seasonal restrictions, and setbacks.

As well, information on important caribou habitats not already identified as Valued Ecosystem Components should be retained under the Valued Ecosystem Components designation to ensure that it is considered by proponents and regulators. In addition, all remaining mineral tenure that overlaps with Limited Use designation should be included in Appendix A and clarified that the prohibitions for exploration, development, and ancillary activities, such as roads, lines, airstrips, quarrying, do not apply to new project proposals or significant modifications to current projects.

The Government of Canada recommends that the Commission work with Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada and holders of existing mineral rights and interests to ensure that any existing or future projects arising from existing mineral tenure that would be impacted by proposed Limited Use Areas, are accurately identified under Appendix A of the Plan.

Now we will focus on marine transportation. The Government of Canada understands the importance of the marine environment to Inuit and Inuit culture. Given this, a number of key considerations have guided the Government of Canada's comments about marine transportation, being it is important that navigation is done in a way that reduces its potential environmental impacts. Where there is an exception or exemption that applies to a vessel that would otherwise be restricted, the vessel should follow what the Plan sets out for that area when and where possible.

The Plan could help provide protection to Tallurutiup Imanga National Marine Conservation Area in the period before it is fully established by legislation. Canada has international legal obligations to meet and has to have the ability to ensure proper control of foreign navigation in areas where icebreaking restrictions will be put in place. Plan requirements for the protection of the marine environment such as setbacks around walrus haul-outs, should not prevent the delivery of vital services required to maintain healthy communities or to protect the environment.

The Government of Canada supports the exceptions in the Draft Plan for activities such as community resupply, emergencies, and safe navigation. We have recommended to the Commission

that other activities, such as law enforcement monitoring and the placement and maintenance of navigational aids be added to the list of exceptions in the Plan, and the Plan define certain vital services for clarity.

For example, without definition, the meaning of “safe navigation” could be unclear. Someone could argue they can travel near a walrus haul-out when they think it is safe to do so. However, the Government of Canada’s interpretation of safe navigation is that a vessel can travel near a walrus haul-out only when it is required for the safety of the ship, crew, and passengers.

The Government of Canada is also seeking confirmation that the Commission’s conformity determinations will also include the exemptions granted to the Ministry of National Defence within the *Nunavut Agreement*. This will help ensure the Plan complies with the exemptions in the *Nunavut Agreement* and improve clarity and certainty for users.

The Plan includes seasonal prohibitions on icebreaking. Seasonal prohibitions on icebreaking through any part of the Northwest Passage could be challenging. Possible differences of views with some other countries regarding the status of the water of the Northwest Passage make it important for the Government of Canada to retain the flexibility to allow navigation in order to assert Canada’s sovereignty over its Arctic waters. We must be able to meet all legal obligations, and the proposed restrictions may prevent this.

The Government of Canada has considered how the Plan could provide necessary protection of sea ice during critical seasons, while at the same time providing the flexibility required to meet international legal obligations. We have recommended a collaborative approach to address the need for such protection, which would allow the Government of Canada to retain the capacity to consent to navigation, as well as proposing an exception of individual vessel movements from the requirements of the Plan.

Regarding individual vessel movements, the Government of Canada recommends that Plan requirements which restrict icebreaking include an exception for individual vessel movements where a vessel is transiting through but not stopping in the Nunavut Settlement Area. The Government of Canada’s understanding is that individual vessel movements are not typically considered projects.

We note that these small number of individual vessel movements would still be subject to oversight including being required to follow applicable laws and regulations. As well, whenever the Government of Canada is contacted by vessels prior to their navigation in Canadian Arctic waters, we communicate about environmental considerations, such as ecologically sensitive areas or known mammal migrations, as well as recommended routing. For individual vessel movements, we could also encourage vessel operators to engage with communities as part of the voyage planning. It is our experience that these vessels take this advice into consideration.

The collaborative process the Government of Canada is recommending for caribou crossings would be similar to the collaborative process for on-ice travel routes in the Draft Plan, which is itself similar to the model currently in place in the Kitikmeot region under the Proactive Vessel Management Initiative.

As for on-ice travel routes, project proponents would need to engage with communities and Hunters and Trappers Organizations before a project shipping occurs. Importantly, if a Plan requirement for a collaborative process to protect caribou sea ice crossings is included in the Plan, it would be enforceable under the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act*. I had the acronym, and I was not sure if I said it correctly in the long form.

It should also be noted that the proposed exception would not apply to shipping associated with a broader project, such a mining project. The reason for this is that recurring shipping associated with such a project would not qualify as an individual vessel movement. In addition, the Nunavut Impact Review Board can impose additional terms and conditions that further mitigate the impacts of shipping in respect of such a project.

Now we will focus on National Marine Conservation Areas. The Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan will only apply to Tallurutiup Imanga until the *Canada National Marine Conservation Areas Act* comes into effect. A joint Inuit-Canada co-management board makes consensus decisions that include Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit for managing the marine conservation area. Some of the prohibited activities listed in the Plan requirements may change after legal establishment as the co-management board and planning processes will make decisions on appropriate activities.

Migratory bird setbacks will apply to the key habitat areas located in Tallurutiup Imanga. The Plan requirements currently do not address this. It is recommended that activities that may be changed after establishment be identified as interim prohibitions to avoid confusion with future management direction. It is further recommended that the migratory bird setbacks identified in Table 1 of the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan be included in the Plan requirements for the National Marine Conservation Area. The Government of Canada has provided some suggested wording for Section 3.1.2 to clarify the difference between the National Marine Conservation Area awaiting establishment and future National Marine Conservation Areas.

In regard to disposal at sea, the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act* governs disposal activities in Canadian and international waters near Canada. The act prohibits disposal at sea without a permit. The Government of Canada prefers that the disposal at sea prohibitions be removed from the Draft Plan and suggest that disposal at sea continues to be addressed on a case-by-case basis under the *Canadian Environment Protection Act* using the mandated consultation processes.

As required under the Act, the Disposal at Sea Program will continue to consult on permits in Northern waters to address environmental concerns, including those in Marine Conservation Areas and Limited Use Areas. It should also be noted that vessel discharges are regulated under the *Canada Shipping Act 2001*, the *Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act*, and their regulations.

In regard to operations at Department of National Defence sites, the Government of Canada is reevaluating the prohibitions of all uses in areas zoned as Limited Use for military facilities. There may be an opportunity to allow for some uses that would not conflict with national defence and national security. The planning process would ideally include the Department of National Defence in decision-making and approval processes, which would allow activities not contrary to those of the department to advance.

This may be achieved through a Valued Socioeconomic Component designation for military but would require a clear definition and what planning considerations are afforded as a result. The

Government of Canada is seeking to strike a balance between having to uphold its national defence and national security mandate and remaining a partner in Nunavut.

To summarize, the Government of Canada recognizes the importance of land use planning in Nunavut's regulatory system and will continue its role on a path towards a Plan that can be accepted. We believe the issues presented by the Government of Canada can be resolved through continued collaboration with all involved. The Government of Canada along with Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, the Regional Inuit Associations, and the Government of Nunavut recognize that issues related to Inuit Owned Land, Inuit Impact Benefit Agreements, and consultation as they relate to the Land Use Plan are important issues in this process. The parties have begun discussions on these topics in hopes to advise the Commission on a path forward to resolve these issues.

The Government of Canada supports the Commission working with the Government of Canada, the Government of Nunavut, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, and the Regional Inuit Associations to develop a process to collaboratively address concerns raised in this submission and at the public hearings before revisions to the Plan are completed. We have started this collaboration on issues of common interest and are beginning to make some progress on aligning advice to the Commission in final submissions. The Government of Canada will continue to listen to Indigenous concerns, noting how they may be resolved and will take any further steps necessary to ensure its duty to Indigenous rights holders has been met.

Throughout the public hearings, we have heard communities around the table asking the Commission to extend the January 10, 2023, deadline for final submissions to give them time to provide additional information. In our view, the Commission should give serious consideration to these requests. If there is a possibility for a modest extension, that would also be welcomed.

That is the end of our presentation, but if the Chair permits, with your permission there were some comments and questions that were raised by the communities and HTO representatives around the table over the last few days. We have responses ready on these ones. I could speak to them now if the Chairperson permits. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You may proceed.

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. I believe Jonah from Qikiqtarjuaq raised the issue of their houses being vulnerable to ocean forces because of climate change and if the Government of Canada could provide any support on this problem. Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada has a program called Climate Change Preparedness in the North, which provides funding to do work such as assessing risk from climate change, as well as some for addressing those risks.

We can provide contact information following our presentation, and we would be happy to discuss your situation with you, as well as those people that would provide contact information on, and welcome starting the discussion with the Community of Qikiqtarjuaq.

Secondly, I believe it was Johnny Mike from Pangnirtung on Day 2 of the hearings who talked about his concerns about beluga whales and disturbance of marine mammals and commented about whether Fisheries and Ocean Canada knew about these issues. Fisheries and Oceans Canada and other Government of Canada departments have supported the Nunavut Planning Commission's

development of the Nunavut Land Use Plan, including by providing science reports and studies to the Commission.

That information, together with Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, has informed the Commission's planning decisions. For example, the Draft Plan includes a beluga calving area in Cumberland South, west and north of Pangnirtung, which has Limited Use designations in the Draft Plan that prohibits oil and gas exploration, production, and restricts some vessel travel during Aujaq, during the summer season.

These same restrictions apply to a Limited Use Area to protect beluga calving habitat that is adjacent to Clearwater Fjord. Disturbance of marine mammals, including by tourists on cruise ships is regulated under the Marine Mammal Regulations under the *Federal Fisheries Act*. Those regulations prohibit the disturbance of marine mammals with some exceptions. We can provide you with the contact information when you need to report on occurrence of a disturbance of marine mammals. If need be, I can provide all the contact information and the specific individuals to help.

Prior to the conclusion of this presentation as well, as we did in Rankin Inlet, Mittimatalik, we have a video that we would like to show, if the Chairman is okay with that prior to opening up for questions. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Go ahead.

(Video Presentation)

Voyage of a Vessel: Understanding Canada's Marine Safety & Security System - Arctic
<https://youtu.be/7YOiNPVwdiU>

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. That concludes the Government of Canada's presentation, and we can make ourselves now available for any questions.

(Translated): If I can't answer questions, others around the table will be able to, also like Transport Canada. We just saw their film. Jaideep Johar will be available for any autographs later. Qujannamiik.

(Laughter)

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Before we get into questions, before we get too grumpy, there is coffee. Before it gets too bad, let's take a coffee break for 15 minutes.

Break

Chairperson: *(Translated):* As with other participants, we will open up the floor with staff first. Then we will go to the floor, then Nunavik, registered guests, and the general public. Qujannamiik. We are ready to go once again. Jonathan, go ahead.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. This is Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thanks again to the Government of Canada for their detailed presentation. First question, this is Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission, is in regard to the listing of barren ground caribou as threatened under the *Species at Risk Act*.

We understand that a federal cabinet decision is pending regarding this issue and are wondering if you are able to comment on the potential impacts this decision could have on the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan and the protection of caribou and caribou habitat. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Please proceed.

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. As to the status, the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada assessed barren ground caribou as threatened in 2016. The process is underway for a listing decision under the *Species at Risk Act*. For the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada assessment of barren ground caribou, the Government of Canada is following the due process for the *Species at Risk* listings in Nunavut.

Obviously there will be consultations with the Nunavut Planning Commission, the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board, and all those that will be affected, prior to making a decision on listing for the barren ground caribou. The Nunavut Land Use Planning Commission again will be one of the many tools to manage the decline of the barren ground caribou through mitigating and avoiding impacts to barren ground caribou. As for specifics on dates, I can't provide that at this moment. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. This is Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you, Terry, for that response. I would next like to touch on the issue of the management of Inuit Owned Lands within the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. We have heard a number of different suggestions from Nunavut Tunngavik and the Regional Inuit Associations about the management of these lands in the Draft Plan. We have heard Canada express its support for a distinct approach to Inuit Owned Lands within the Plan.

We are wondering if the Government of Canada has any practical options or suggestions on how to achieve this distinct approach, and in particular, if you have any comments on the Qikiqtani Inuit Association's recommendation that an option be provided for a letter of support being used to authorize prohibited uses within Limited Use Areas in certain cases. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can proceed.

Terry: On principle, Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. The Government of Canada supports that the Plan apply a distinct approach to land use planning on Inuit Owned Lands. The *Nunavut Agreement* is clear that the Nunavut Planning Commission must take into account Inuit goals and objectives for Inuit Owned Lands. I will just read directly from the *Nunavut Agreement*.

Article 17, Purposes of Inuit Owned Lands, 17.1.3: Inuit Owned Lands shall, to the extent possible, provide for a mix of the characteristics outlined above where it lists areas of value principally for renewable resource reasons, including principle or other wildlife harvesting areas; areas of significant biological productivity or value for conservation areas; areas of high potential for propagation, cultivation, or husbandry; areas of current or potential occupation by outpost camps; areas of value for sports camps or other tourist opportunities.

Part B goes into areas of value principally for reasons related to the development of non-renewable resources, including areas of known or potential mineral deposits; areas of values for various operations and facilities associated with the development of non-renewable resources; areas of commercial value; and areas of archeological, historical, or cultural importance.

Then Part 17.1.3 further goes to say that it will provide for a mix of the characteristics I just read out in order to secure balanced economic development. However, it goes on to say the relative weighting of the characteristics with respect to any particular community or region shall turn on the actual and potential economic opportunities at hand and the particular community or regional preferences.

So, this part describes generally what the purposes of Inuit Owned Lands are. As the Government of Canada, we respect that Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated and the Regional Inuit Associations are title holders. Really for them, it is about self-determination. I know there has been a lot of back-and-forth amongst the participants here in the room, but it is also important to know and understand that although Limited Use designations sort of overlap a lot, about 42% of Inuit Owned Lands currently being proposed, it is about who makes that decision as to what happens on those lands.

Yes, Limited Use designations will provide some protection, but at the same time, Inuit Owned Lands can provide for that protection as well. It is a matter of the Regional Inuit Associations and Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated including the HTOs and the communities that they are involved, and they do have mechanisms of their own to make that determination.

So, for us as the Government of Canada, what we can do is to try and provide that collaborative approach between the Nunavut Planning Commission, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, and Regional Inuit Associations and work together as to what would be the best form of designation for the purposes of ensuring that important areas for the Inuit are taken into consideration, specifically in Limited Use Areas that may overlay Inuit Owned Lands. That is the only answer I am going to give on that. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan, proceed.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you, Terry, for that response. I would next like to talk about oil and gas significant discovery licenses. As you are aware, there is currently a moratorium on oil and gas exploration in the Canadian Arctic. We understand that there is a requirement for a review of this moratorium.

In addition, in the moratorium announcement, there is reference to discussions to be held with significant discovery license holders regarding potential impacts on those existing rights. I am

wondering if the Government of Canada can comment on the status and nature of those discussions at this point. Thank you.

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Thank you for the question. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. The Arctic offshore oil and gas moratorium announced in 2016 is indefinite. It is still active. It designates Canadian Arctic waters as off limits to future oil and gas licensing, while also maintaining the current terms of exploration licenses and prevents them from expiring.

This decision is periodically reviewed every five years through a climate and marine science-based lifecycle assessment, which also works towards including Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit in the Government of Canada's consultation with Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, the Inuvialuit Regional Corporation, and Makavik in Nunavik, as well as Nunatsiavut in Northern Labrador.

So, the Government of Canada is currently working with the Northern leaders to review the extension of that five-year moratorium considering in 2016 it was put in place. It has now been five years. That review is pretty much complete. The Government of Canada again, is working with Northern partners to engage on the review's findings through this fall, now winter. We are hoping to have a clear direction sometime in the new year. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan, proceed.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you again, Terry, for that response. We heard you today asking the Commission to consider a modest extension to the January 10th, 2023 timeline. If the Commission were to grant such an extension, what time would be of benefit to the Government of Canada, and in particular, what plans does the Government of Canada have to find a consensus with the other signatories to assist the Commission in finding solutions? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed.

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. Based on some of the community concerns that we have heard, based on our collaborative work to date with Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, the Government of Nunavut, as well as the Regional Inuit Associations, and hearing, for example the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board in the work that they need to do within a very short period of time to meet that January 10th deadline, the extension that we are thinking in the modest sense, we are talking weeks, not months.

It's just to try and make it so that we can do the work that is required just to compile all that information and to make sure that it is all accurate and that it is in a format that is clear and concise and understandable once we provide those submissions to the Nunavut Planning Commission. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do you have more, Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you, again, Terry for your response. In follow up to that, I would like to note, as I am sure you are aware that myself and other NPC staff have had very productive conversations with Government of Canada representatives, as well as discussions separately with the Government of Nunavut, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, and the three Regional Inuit Associations.

We feel those discussions have been very productive and helpful towards finding appropriate solutions to the issues that have been identified in the Draft Plan. I am wondering if it is the Government of Canada's intention to possibly include NPC staff in the ongoing collaborative discussions you are having with other signatory parties in advance of the close of the record. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead with a response.

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq, and thank you for the question. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. Yes.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan? Is that good? From the table here and communities, questions? Proceed.

Jetaloo: (*Translated*): Good morning, Mr. Chairman. Jetaloo Kakee, Iqaluit. Nice chairs you have, the federal government. We are expecting lots. Looking back for me before there was a government, there was no government. There were preachers and police. From that, I have worked for the government myself as a painter. We never had an Inuk boss, and then finally we did. I know it was just a shadow.

There has to be an Inuk, so there was an Inuk at the office, but just in filling that position with no real responsibility in running things. We would in the future have an Inuk Regional Director for the federal government, for Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, Qikiqtani Inuit Association, the Wildlife Management Boards who have to be involved.

You are the people that guide us. You guys are not the bosses. The HTOs should be above you regarding the condition of Inuit country and the animals. For example, if I saw with my own eyes and desired something, then I would expect a response. Then, you'll say no, it is not my responsibility. Do you understand where I am coming from? We can get help. Is it part of your work? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can proceed.

Terry: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq and thank you for the question. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. Thank you. Your question is real, and the role of the federal government, we have to follow the *Land Claims Agreement* and increase Inuit employment within the federal government. It is proceeding.

I am here. When we have an office here in Iqaluit, I am available to you at any time. Our office is very close to this building here. Anytime you want to approach me, we are open. We will listen to your concerns, and we can find a response for you or what routes to get the response to your concerns.

There are many departments and employees within the federal government, so it is complicated. I am trying to find the right response for you and whether funds that you may be requesting for Hunters and Trappers Organizations, the wildlife being the main food source and how we can secure that food source. The federal government is open.

If you come or if you are looking for support for your association, the Inuit Association can also be a route if you need assistance for the communities, the wildlife associations. We hear your concerns around the table, and we are interested in finding solutions. We are hearing all this stuff. You are being recorded. The solution comes when comments are raised. We are open to you. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Jetaloo: *(Translated)*: Jetaloo Kakee, Amaruq Hunters and Trappers Elder. I might have another question yet. Let me ask. As I stated, I was born before we had a government, and that is the way it was. The Canadian government Prime Minister has had an apology to Nunavut and the world. Are you guys easier to get along with now?

You claim your office, I cannot approach it. Your door is locked. We are located in the same community. It happens, but the guy on your right as I said, from what I see, bylaws state a certain way. I thought maybe, let me say how does the government current that I ask to get back to my question. After the apology by the Prime Minister, have you changed? Are we benefitting? Is there more support? Are you guys still as hard as a rock? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed.

Terry: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq, and thank you for the questions. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. The door might be locked. Phone me, and I will have the door open for you: 975-4501.

(Laughter)

If I am not available, we have a receptionist that speaks Inuktitut, and we are open for your phone call if you have concerns. If you want to speak, we are available to you. Our Prime Minister was here, and other federal Ministers were here with the apology. From there, when we talk with the Qikiqtani Inuit Association, they had a commission on the dog slaughter in the Baffin region. The funds we have forward in terms of the suggested improvements from the dog slaughter and relocated Inuit. This is an ongoing process through the Qikiqtani Inuit Association. We are working with them.

Another example with the Qikiqtani Inuit Association, they are working with them on the dog slaughter issue. Arctic Bay and Igloolik the annual Nunavut quest dog race, that too has been supported by the federal government, and other numerous projects that have been financed following the apology. I hope that answers your question. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Another question?

Jetaloo: *(Translated)*: Jetaloo Kakee, Iqaluit Elder. Also, I had some tough questions, but when we were watching the film, I must have swallowed my questions. I want to make sense here. Bears, polar

bears, we have been dealing with this issue. The bears will be affected by climate change. We still don't believe that as Inuit.

When we are talking about caribou, the caribou are over-harvested. I am wondering what protection we are going to give them. Now we are dealing with walrus haul-outs. They are there for a short amount of time. They are eating out there. Hunters with the two animals, it would take over an hour to look for them, and caribou was the third. The bear hunter looking around could take over an hour. The walrus hunter looking could take over an hour. He could be underwater. If he sees one that they won't be eating in that area, he knows they are moving. They are not eating in the location.

Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, we don't think it is ancient. It is current, and it is the way we live. The Inuit will end up in offices, and then we will mix with the Qallunaat. It is hard to explain the situation. In the office, they are the boss. If he has no support, he has no power. When he is back, he will have lots of power. That is the way we understand. We are the regular public.

Services that we require and the Plan that I will expect them that they will happen when I am gone. 1959, 1960, the government started arriving. Now we are in 2022, and I am asking this question, whether we will get movement. I am not expecting any, Mr. Chairman. Current issue for benefit, shouldn't there be something for today and for the future? Then you won't use it, and then I will ask again. I hope you can understand me. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed.

Terry: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq, and thank you for the question. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. I totally understand what you are saying. For you to be aware, we are talking about issues related to the *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement* that there is a section and whole management of wildlife there. The various HTOs, RWOs are dealing with wildlife management and the regulations and such.

We as the federal government, the former Canadian Wildlife Service, we work with organizations in Nunavut. In terms of Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, we encourage areas where we could do more. We have agreements on how we can improve, let's say for caribou, bears, walrus, or whales that are clear, complete, and with suggested improvements in the management.

For the concerns to be dealt with, the organizations do exist. To be aware, we have more of a desire to be involved from the federal government to hear about Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit working with the Hunters and Trappers Organizations. Yesterday, Mike Ferguson spoke about the process under which the hunters and the Hunters and Trappers Organizations see and understand the wildlife and where we could improve for Nunavut Inuit. It is holistic.

The *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement*, this will only proceed and forward. We look at ways to improve, and we encourage the involvement of communities and Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit. We are progressing, and the Planning Commission in doing their work is also spelling out how we will have a roadmap that they are working on. I hope I am understandable to the question. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik.

Jetaloo: *(Translated)*: Jetaloo Kakee, Iqaluit. For the future that we are working on and for us to remember, the people that represent me, I am speaking for them, not just to you, not just to me. Let me say one little thing. For the future, we seem optimistic. We can have a reminder that our ice is disappearing. We are losing ice.

We might to have land trails instead of going on the ice. I can go to Pangnirtung by going on the land without going on the ocean. The ice, we are getting less ice. Our ships, the icebreakers are a life saver that we give permission that an icebreaker is a useful ship. We have seen it here, but the routes are going through the hunting areas where the seals are, where the whales come through. They say it is a better route on the right side. The left side is shallower. The ship route, we have spoken about in Iqaluit.

Looking forward, I think it is quite possible the ship going further down coming into Frobisher Bay, there are numerous channels. Can we adjust the way the ships come in? That is what I am saying. It is not my thoughts but others. We support the icebreaker in Nunavut. The DEW Line fuel delivery has to be shipped in annually if we are going to monitor.

Also, we are hearing Indian country and that they have identified land, but the hunter is an environmentalist. The hunter cannot be placed lower on the list when you are doing the weather, the land, the ice, quotas, dealing with Inuit. I am not the only one to speak, so I am stopping here before I get too bitter. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. That was food for thought. Currently, we have Solomon.

Solomon: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Thank you to the federal government for your presentation at the hearings. My understanding of DEW Line sites, I am Solomon Awa, Iqaluit Mayor. I forgot to mention my name. The former military sites, some are still open like DEW Line sites. Some have been cleaned and restored. Others I believe have to be further remediated in the future.

My question is do you have a list of sites to the Planning Commission on how to clean up the rest of the DEW Line sites in Nunavut, including Iqaluit? Is there a plan for remediation of the sites? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Terry: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Thank you for the question. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. Perhaps in English:

(English): First of all, I forgot to mention in the introduction, we do have one Department of National Defence representative in the audience, Greg Matthews. I apologize to Greg for missing him on the roster. The Government of Canada including the Department of National Defence and Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada are open to direct conversation with the City of Iqaluit to better understand the concerns it has in regard to the environmental legacy sites.

We would like to work together to clearly identify the sites throughout the community that are of a concern and assemble an historic background for each site in their current state. So, based on the representative from the Department of Defence, he is here, and he is listening. We will definitely

reach out to the City of Iqaluit for more working together in collaboration just to identify and work on those areas.

As for the actual inclusion into the Nunavut Land Use Plan, they won't necessarily be included within the Plan itself, but it is something that we want to work together on to see what we can do to clearly identify those areas and see what the next steps may be.

(Translated): If it is okay with you, Mr. Chair, the comments from Jetaloo and the discussions we have around the environment, the federal government representative would like to make comments and reply to the discussion that took place. Transport Canada.

Chairperson: *(Translated):* Qujannamiik. I am reminded that Jetaloo has some comments. As we had discussion this morning, we should have stuck to the topic. Some of his comments were valid questions and should have some answers to his questions.

(English): Jetaloo asked earlier about the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan might not be signed in the near future, but there is some important stuff that needs to be dealt with. Maybe there is some temporary agreement, if there can be a temporary agreement between the Government of Nunavut, the Government of Canada and NPC. That was part of his question. I don't think it was answered, but I will get him to answer first, and I will get back to you guys. Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Jaideep: Good morning, Mr. Chair. Is it my turn to speak? Good morning, Mr. Chair. Jaideep Johar, Transport Canada. Thank you very much for your question regarding the safe travel of the vessel through the Frobisher Bay. Can you hear me now? Thank you very much with regard to the safety of hunters and trappers, and also the location where the marine mammals are in Frobisher Bay when the vessels are transiting.

I believe it is very important to know that Frobisher Bay is challenging navigation, especially in ice conditions. Also, the ships have limited room sometimes because of the ice conditions. There they can safely navigate, so there are safety precautions, which the captain should undertake when navigating in these areas.

I believe it is very important for the communication to take place with the Hunters and Trappers and the ship's captain directly and come to a collaborative approach where a vessel can slow down or take an alternate route, which might be safer, to allow the Hunters and Trappers or to communicate in advance about where the Hunters and Trappers will be doing their marine mammal hunting.

Also, the Government of Canada is working very closely on an initiative called Low-Impact Shipping Corridor where we are in Phase 2 of that process. More consultation is going with everyone, and also with our Indigenous partners to understand where we can locate or where we can track the vessels, or where we can provide enough charting so that the vessels stay in those lanes.

This Low-Impact Shipping Corridor also takes into concern anything related with marine mammals, sensitive areas. So, the corridors are made to ensure that these are taken into consideration and the work is going on, which will surely help to address this issue.

I am also aware that the Iqaluit deep seaport will be running very soon, I believe. That is, again, a very good opportunity to work with the port and inform the ships about the position of hunters and trappers in this area. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do you have additional comments?

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. As for that question on temporary or I guess a short-term type of arrangement when there is no consensus, we are not there yet. We don't think we will get there either. We are hoping that all parties will come to some agreement and consensus, and what we are striving for is the actual final Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan, knowing and understanding that this will be a historical document and the largest land use plan of its kind, covering the whole of Nunavut.

Basically, what we requested was just for an extension, a nominal extension just for the purposes of ensuring that all parties as well as communities through the various Hunters and Trappers Organizations or their Regional Wildlife Boards are able to provide all that information to the Planning Commission. As I suggested it would be just weeks, not months, but I don't think there would be a need for any interim arrangement based on the fact that we are still aiming for the final Draft of the Nunavut Land Use Plan. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Solomon, are you done? Abraham?

Abraham: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Abraham Qammaniq, Sanirajak HTO. The federal government has mentioned that there are some budgets. I brought it up perhaps, the budget that was questioned would be towards this process. I don't see anything that is really happening with Nunavut climate change, and the new housing. Dwellings in Nunavut should really reflect what is coming in the future.

We will build units, and the units are to be used and shipped to Nunavut should reflect the federal government policy regarding safe homes, climate-gearred homes. It is also a problem in Nunavut that the houses, the units are so overcrowded. Because of high heat sometimes and perhaps due to sanitary issues, many of the occupants are getting sick. The health to these overcrowded units is a problem.

I think a lot of budgets geared for Nunavut have been wasted a lot. Perhaps the Nunavut Planning Commission should also be concerned of units coming up north for the betterment of the Nunavut Land Use Plan and its people. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead with an answer.

Terry: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq, and thank you for the question. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. As I answered in a previous question in relation to climate change, the federal government is very concerned. There are some budgets towards this area. We are aware of the problem in Sanirajak, your concerns and the climate change that you are experiencing due to the low shoreline in your community.

The federal and Nunavut Government is also aware of how the problems in your area can be looked at. I would like to give you questions to you and Jonah, how financial assistance can be had towards

the questions and the problems that you have mentioned. We will be answering your questions anytime.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Johnny Mike?

Johnny M: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Johnny Mike, Pangnirtung HTO, Fisheries. I am representing my organization in the community. Thank you for being here, Terry. It has been a while. I did not realize that you are in the government hierarchy now. It's okay. It's fine.

Article 11 in the *Nunavut Agreement* says about the Nunavut Planning Commission. Your answers as you sit there, your questions could have been much sweeter to me and to the table around here. Over the years, in my father's dog slaughter era, people of Nunavut were forced to relocate, and some attended federal school days.

Today, the apologies have been mentioned time and time again, and I don't think this problem from over the years has really come to the past. This includes resolving Inuit in Nunavut. It appears that none of us are making sense when it comes to deciding on what the Nunavut Settlement Area is. When it is discussed, there is in a way, a lot of evasive answers where it should have been a straightforward discussion.

For instance, the shoreline, the 12-kilometer zone where the Canadian seaway is, that is very clear. We also have concerns beyond Nunavut Canadian waters, especially in the fishing industry. All this has to be looked at. In the discussions, nothing has really been concrete. There is a plea from Pangnirtung HTO and other Baffin region communities. There are a lot of resources.

The United Nations has made a special proclamation that relates to Indigenous populations of the world, and we are included. Have you ever noticed their ideas on how Indigenous populations should be looked at? If you were to adhere to that proclamation of the United Nations, your presentations could have been much sweeter.

We are looking for solutions, especially when the United Nations has identified many Indigenous nations and their organization people. The Government of Canada, when will you start taking that step that was taken? When will you start doing things?

Another topic is on beluga whales. Pangnirtung has been mentioned a few times that we have two species in our area. Beluga whale calving areas, with one species we have a quota where we can harvest. The HTO in our community and the membership has been harvesting in that area where quotas are set. I just want to clarify. We do these harvesting at our will. We go where we can as Inuit. This is for your information.

There was also discussion on Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit, and that is supposed to be a policy for whatever it is, wildlife or something else related to this topic. Many would want to follow Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit. We have talked about it but not in depth, our Traditional Knowledge on calving areas of these species, beluga whales. We need to know for sure that our requests, our needs are followed and listened to.

In other areas, in Cumberland Sound just outside, all of the area at one time, the whole area was a calving area from the past. The Nunavut Planning Commission is probably aware of this area. They

say that they are concerned with terrestrial and marine planning. Cumberland Sound is mentioned in the *Nunavut Agreement*. I don't know why the discussions from the original *Agreement* are being discussed differently.

Chair, another topic is the boundaries that you have imposed on this process. What is it going to be? What are you looking at? How are you thinking of land parcels that should be rezoned? The HTO in Pangnirtung is very concerned on marine and terrestrial mammals. We want to do our best to protect these areas. Thank you.

Chairperson: An answer, please.

Terry: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq and your questions. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. You have many concerns, and you made points in some of them of what the solution should be. My opinion on your questions will be answered in English.

(*English*): How will the Government of Canada address its commitments with respect to the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* and the principle of Free Prior and Informed Consent, I will try to respond to that in the context of what Mr. Mike had said about international aspects and what we need to do on the international side of things.

As part of its guiding principles, respecting the Government of Canada's relationship with Indigenous people, the Government of Canada recognizes that meaningful engagement with Indigenous peoples aims to secure their Free Prior and Informed Consent when Canada proposes to take actions, which impact them and their rights, including their lands, territories, and resources.

The concept of Free Prior and Informed Consent means that obtaining consent must be at the center of the Crown's consultation efforts. In the early days, in living memory, decisions were being made from the top down. We are now looking to the communities and having and wanting decisions being made from the communities up.

We respect as the Government of Canada those that have lived where they have been living throughout history. We want those people to be able to provide us the direction as well as to ensure that they are giving all the information and are given the opportunity to have that Free Prior and Informed Consent.

(*Translated*): Inuktitut: Indigenous people, you have mentioned how they would be benefitted and what the solution would be. We have to work on what we hear from you especially that the *Nunavut Agreement* has made it possible to do our direction, especially Article 11. It is real progress. It is a real process. People are participating. Nunavummiut are participating what their needs are according to the *Land Claims Agreement*, especially the Nunavut planning process.

At this final hearing, the final Draft once it is approved, the federal government will work on this model how things should shape in the Nunavut area. The land use planning process and in this last public hearing on the proposed Draft Land Use Plan, once the signatories have approved, it will have regulated policies followed in the Nunavut area and on Nunavut planning projects. *NuPPAA* has to be adhered to.

NTI, the Government of Nunavut will have to work together to work towards approving the Draft Land Use Plan. Your question: There are concerns about Limited Use zones, especially in Nunavut Inuit Owned Lands, the parcels. I have heard that it was 42% of the land mass. Qikiqtani Inuit Association, NTI briefly spoke on Inuit Owned Lands because as landowners, they have authority of these land parcels. This would be an ideal situation. Does that answer your question?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Johnny?

Johnny M: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Johnny Mike, Pangnirtung HTO, Fisheries. Your response to the Indigenous question and your reply that the Nunavut population will be advising, but we have not heard this. It is unreal to us, especially on situations. The federal government surveillance aircraft, we see it flying but why have we not responses? All it does is to fly over us, and can we receive information from this aircraft?

In the Nunavut planning process, what boundaries are there? You as the federal government, you claim that Inuit selections of the lands are real, and this aircraft for many years, a federal government aircraft perhaps is doing some surveillance. It says that is what their job is. They fly over Inuit Owned Lands while people are harvesting species. There has never been any indication as to what the findings are of these surveillances.

I am not directly criticizing, but I am mentioning that I am never informed. We need to know the wildlife in Nunavut. We have been looking for answers for many years, and there is no response from the Government of Canada, the planning process, especially to Pangnirtung population of the whale population, animal species, terrestrial. Harvesters would know how it is planned. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. The next name I have is Ben.

Ben: *(Translated)*: Maybe I lost my voice. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Thank you to the Commission. Ben Kovic from Amaruq Hunters and Trappers Organization, Iqaluit, Fisheries too. I am looking at the Wildlife Organizations. I felt small when we are here as Hunters and Trappers Organizations, as we see the federal government. There are answers to our question, but we know Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit.

The limited understanding of the planning process, I was envious at the federal government. The Hunters and Trappers that you see here, we get funding from the federal government for our operations. We know the organizations have a lot of knowledge and are unified on any given issue, but I was envious. Those of us in front of the Commission for our purposes, for our hunting grounds near our communities, the ocean, the land, the waters.

I am trying to say that the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board for example, has a biologist researcher. For serving the 12 communities, it is too much work for one person in terms of planning. They did not come around. There are issues, Mr. Chairman. For example, so you understand, we have over 4,000 members in Iqaluit to the Hunters and Trappers Association. At the AGM, our funding is the same as what is divided around the table for the work done on behalf of the associations. We won't get any additional funding. We get the same kind of funding as the smallest Nunavut community.

I don't want to point fingers, but if you look at Sanikiluaq, their annual operations for their members aren't that many. They receive the same kind of funding although we have 4,000 members. That is

a struggle for our organization as the capital and central location for many organizations. We end up dealing with issues here locally.

So, Terry can hear, when we have a lot of non-beneficiaries in town that are granted rights under the *Claim*, the assignment of rights, we are aware that we can assign our rights, but it relates many times to finances. That relates to planning for our annual monies. Our hunters gathered together trying to work on maps.

Yes, we are part of Fisheries as well. We make additional funds at the Annual General Meeting. We use dedicated funds. I am telling you, Terry, the Hunters and Trappers Organizations need adequate funding to hire a technical writer. As I stated, the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board has a technical writer. We envy that. For our little offices, we have an office here.

I can say we can barely put proposals together. In terms of being prepared, I now have more questions, but for the planning process and the presentations we see, we are not at all caught up with many issues. We have been left behind in the work. It is more complicated. We need advisors to help us focus. We have gone through a lot of stuff this week. We could probably sit another five days without the questions that we want to ask.

As Inuit, you are aware that we try not to rock the boat. We question people, chairmen, and we in turn do not focus on our own selves. We have been told by our Chairperson that the questions are not focused to the Plan, so we don't get a lot of responses to questions. We hardly ever meet as a big group like this. I just want to recognize the Chair focusing the discussion. We need help in funding to help the planning process and to hire writers that can write the technical requirements.

When you talk about an overlapping boundary, what parameters do they have that makes them overlap? Some of the areas ourselves we say are overlapping. For the Commission, don't mark too much of the land and base on Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit to be included in the planning process. Also, from our manager or advisor, don't mark too much, because they are going to have to approve it. The federal government might say no if it is too big.

These are the parameters with which we try to operate. We need advice. We can write. The Commission tells us we can write, but don't mark too much. Then the Government of Canada might say no. These are some of the apprehensions we have. I just want to lighten my load. I am not upset. I just feel inadequate as Ben Kovic from Amaruq. I kind of understand what is going on. The workload that I have, I want to lighten it up as well. I don't want to leave comments that I should have said when I go out that I will regret not saying before that January 10th date. We might not be done before that date, Mr. Chairman.

When we first started, we kind of had expectations that during our individual presentations to the planning process that maybe I thought I would see maps related to our community. There were none. I thought Mr. Chairman, we won't see them. As we have been told, we are trying to mark too much land. It is showing now. The maps that we marked in Iqaluit are not showing up. You are marking too much land maybe.

I am trying to talk to Terry that we have inadequate funds. As an association, we receive the same funds for operations from the Canadian government. Through that process, we know we require more funds, but we would like an increase so we can get the support that we need when coming to

meetings. Here is what you need to focus on, the kind of advice that would be appreciated. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. I am rambling a bit. I am trying to lighten my knapsack on my back. There is more in my knapsack. Thank you.

(Applause)

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Before we get to a response and before we go for lunch, I don't want to limit the discussion, but we have to focus our discussions. I keep refocusing the discussion. When this process started, I said the federal government is going to be here, the Government of Nunavut is going to be here, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated is going to be here, the Inuit Associations are going to be here, Kitikmeot, Kivalliq, Qikiqtani Inuit Association organizations.

There are many questions we are aware. I am trying to focus as a Chairman to the work at hand and not go outside. We seem to be ahead of the agenda, and we want to proceed. We are on schedule with the agenda. I don't just want to limit the discussion, but it has to be for the work. I know you have questions for others, but we are here to talk about the Land Use Plan. That is what I keep stating as the Chairman.

I am not trying to limit your discussions with others. They have been available to answer questions. We, too, don't see them all the time, and we need to hear responses to our concerns. I understand the opportunity for responses regarding issues or problems we are dealing with. As a Chairman, I am trying to focus the discussion. I am sorry.

When you claim just to be an Inuk, just an ordinary person, I want to defend you. Under the *Land Claims Agreement* when we are considering the work, the oral presentations that Inuit provide will be part of the consideration. From when this process started, we had from the government and NTI and others from the general public, not just in here, we had people from Northern Quebec here in 2017 marking lands. It is evolving. It is a work in progress as well.

I also want to state the words we hear, sometimes we don't have an immediate response to understand more. We won't get consensus on everything, but we are here to listen to all related to the work set out through the *Claim*. Even before I sat in this chair, this work was underway. The work today that we are doing, the words that we hear will adjust. Not everything will be included. Not all your words will be included.

We hear a lot of similarities. To hear regarding the work that we are doing, it is a living document that we will be able to adjust in the future. If communities have a concern or a desire to change the Land Use Plan, then there will be the opportunity to adjust it. It will take time, and it will be adjustable. It won't be set.

We are trying to include all the comments we hear from the Inuit, from the government, from the Inuit Organizations. That is the purpose of our work that we will have to make decisions on. We will come back after lunch. There was another name, but we will come back after lunch.

Terry: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. For the comments to Ben, Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada.

(English): We see you. We hear your, and I am aware of the historical underfunded HTOs. It has always been like that for the longest time, and I know that you guys play a crucial role when it comes to the wildlife and the environment in Nunavut. You have a large undertaking when it comes to what we want to hear as the Government of Canada, the Nunavut Planning Commission and all the others.

There are always these differing, pulling-at at the HTOs. The HTOs I know are underfunded when it comes to their true mandate as to the wildlife management aspects and the environmental considerations that need to be taken into place. Knowing and understanding the *Nunavut Agreement* and how it is set up, there are opportunities where during the contract renewal of the implementation of the *Nunavut Agreement*, that is something that we can put more emphasis on with respect to the underfunded HTOs and what we can do to try and bring about more funding in that aspect.

We will certainly put that into consideration for the purposes of renewing the implementation contract. Know and understand that we do provide as the Government of Canada a lot of funding for the purposes of ensuring that the community concerns and HTO concerns are being brought forward so that it is included in the land use planning process.

Just very briefly, the funding that has been provided to the Nunavut Planning Commission starting from 2015-16, for that year it was \$7 million. Then for the 2016-17, it was in the area of \$10 million dollars; then 2017-18, just a little over \$5 million dollars; 2018-19, \$5 million; 2019-20, \$6.6 million; 2020-21, \$5.6 plus another \$2.58 million; 2021-2022, \$8.2 million; 2022-2023, just over \$11 million dollars, for a total of about \$46 million dollars.

What we hope through providing those funds to the Nunavut Planning Commission is that they are able to carry out their mandate and include the HTOs and the communities in the whole planning process.

I know and understand where you are coming from, Ben, when it comes to the under-resourced aspects of the HTO, considering that your funding levels have not changed, and it is not necessarily reflective of the actual members within each of the communities that use in your example between Iqaluit and Sanikiluaq, but that is something that we would want to work together on to see what we can do to bring about more adequate resources for the HTOs to provide all of that, because what you guys do is crucial.

It is an amazing tool for everybody that is involved when it comes to planning and the Government of Canada's initiatives. I will use the polar bear as an example. In ensuring when it comes to the endangered species aspects of consideration for the polar bear, we really heavily lean on the HTOs.

Just like someone said from the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board, what you guys provide is based on 365-days-a-year of experience of on-the-land and the environment that you are faced with and the extreme conditions that you are faced with, as well as the crucial role that you have within each of the communities when it comes to food security.

We see it. We hear it. I want to be able to work together to see what we can do to bring about more confidence in the resources that you have and what we can do to address the under-resourced aspects of what it is that you guys would like to do and then go from there. This is guaranteed not

the end of our discussions. For sure, I will be reaching out to yourselves as well as the Regional Wildlife Boards and the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board to ensure that we can work together.

The one thing we don't want to happen is to have one aspect of the Nunavut dynamic excluded based on under-resources. Just keep that in mind, Ben, and Qujannamiik for that. We will certainly keep working together to see what we can do to make improvements. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon has some housekeeping items.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. Just before we go for lunch, there are new people that are here. The Legion, as long as you show if you are a registered participant, they will let you go and eat over there. Today, they have specials. For lunch, it is a prime rib special that they wanted us to announce for \$20 dollars. You are allowed to go there for dinner as well, and tonight is steak night. Anybody that wants to go to the Legion, we don't pay for that. You pay for that, but you are welcome to go eat there.

Just a reminder, please lock your vehicles out front. We are not responsible if you don't lock your vehicle and things are missing. Please pay attention and lock your vehicles. We will see you at 1:15. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik.

Lunch Break

Chairperson: Government of Canada are at the table. We have two names still from the floor, from the communities. Terry wanted to speak first.

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. (*Portions inaudible due to interpreter speaking Inuktitut over the speaker*): Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. Just to clarify a response that I had provided to Mr. Ben Kovic, when I listed out the funding that is provided to the Nunavut Planning Commission, I added the supplementary and the core funding in the figures. On an annual basis, it is about a rate of \$5 million dollars per annum. There is supplementary with respect to what they need to do for hearing purposes and stuff like that.

There aren't necessarily any funds provided with to have intervener-type of funding arrangement where the HTOs could have their own technical team and stuff like that. That is separate than (*inaudible*) identify. I just wanted to clarify that, just so there is no confusion.

(*Audio corrected*): At the same time, the funding that is provided is mostly for the purposes for ensuring that the appropriate people are in the room when the hearings happen. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Paul is next.

Paul Q: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Quassa, City Councillor, City of Iqaluit. Welcome, Terry and your guests. Good day. Good afternoon. I think I have been speaking the same questions for

those that come up to speak to us. First, to say that we have the freedom of speech, and they are here to listen. It is not personal, but we are speaking our minds. That process is proceeding. I wanted to state that first. I will speak English.

(English): We have been talking a lot about Inuit Owned Lands. Certainly, we are Inuit ourselves sitting here sitting at the table, and we are the ones that selected those Inuit Owned Lands across Nunavut, including Iqaluit, Pangnirtung, everywhere, I guess. Just a question on your submission: Is your submission based on Inuit feedback concerning Inuit Owned Lands? If so, could you, I would be interested in seeing a record of community consultations that supports this position concerning Inuit Owned Lands.

I mean that is a question I keep asking to each and every one who sits here and talks about Inuit Owned Lands, because those are very important provisions in our *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement*. They are very dear to our hearts, all the communities. Those were selected for a very important purpose, and that was to protect them, those Inuit Owned Lands.

That is one of the reasons why we ensured that we had national parks. Those parks are also protected. When Inuit were selecting lands, they were identifying those so those could be protected for our future generations. That was the division of the negotiators, the communities. So, just going back to my question, I hope you still have the question. That was the question I want to hear on Inuit Owned Lands. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed.

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq and thank you for the question. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. I said earlier in a response, that is all I will say about that, but because you asked, Paul... First, I want to recognize Paul Quassa. He has been a long-time Nunavut leader as well as one of the early negotiators. First of all, I want to give a round of applause for Paul.

(Applause)

That is not to butter you up or anything, because I am going to give a response. Paul used to be my boss as well back in the Baffin Regional Inuit Association. days. I have been listening to a lot of the discussion surrounding Inuit Owned Lands, Limited Use designations, and sort of the extent of Limited Use designation overlapping Inuit Owned Lands, about 42% or so.

We rely on what is in the *Claim*. You very well know, Paul, that the people that negotiated this document had a lot of forethought and were thinking way beyond the present day into the future and what might happen. There is a lot of beauty in the design of the *Agreement*, and that is part of the reason that we are here today before the Nunavut Planning Commission, an Institution of Public Government where Inuit and Crown are working together to ensure that all the views from the Inuit of the communities are being heard.

This question on the purposes of Inuit Owned Lands, I read out what was in the *Nunavut Agreement*. We as the Government of Canada rely on the duty to consult aspect of what is required in finalizing the Nunavut Land Use Plan. We turn to the Inuit organizations for that purpose, so we work in collaboration with Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, the Regional Inuit Associations who happen to also be the title holders to the Inuit Owned Lands.

So, we rely on them for their feedback as to whether or not these Inuit Owned Lands are being managed in such a way that it is really about their self-determination. This is what we have said in our presentation is that we agree with what Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated is saying, and we agree with the Regional Inuit Associations. We understand that Limited Use designations would protect or further protect the lands that Inuit hold dear in their communities for whatever purpose, the cultural significance, the harvesting significance, wildlife habitat, which is also identified within the purposes of Inuit Owned Lands.

The one point I want to make is that because Inuit had selected these areas specifically for their own ownership and the rest remain either Crown or Commissioner's land that these areas were held in the highest of regard by the Inuit so that they had say as to who steps on those lands and how those lands are used.

We still respect the title holder aspect of it, and we respect that there were many days of negotiations where people were fighting hard to ensure that Inuit retained title to these specific areas. I will emphasize that we rely on the title holders to ensure that they are representing the people that they represent, the Inuit.

I heard a response, I think it was Levi Barnabas, where within their management regime for Inuit Owned Lands, they do include the Community Lands and Resource Committees who are representatives from the HTOs, the hamlets, the Elders, the women, and youth. In that way, they have tried to set up to ensure that there is inclusivity and that no one is being missed within the community.

I know and understand people around this table here from the HTOs and hamlets. They represent very specific individuals as well when it comes to harvesting and the environment and the community in which they live, but we have to keep in mind that there are a lot more people that rely on our decision making as well that we have to keep in mind. So, thank you. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Just a reminder to put your phones on silent mode. I was hearing cellphones. Paul, do you have more questions?

Paul Q: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Quassa, City Councillor, Iqaluit. Thank you for your response, Terry. Also, the Inuit Organizations, I too asked them this question whether they actually consult the communities. If we look at Baker Lake, Whale Cove, Pangnirtung, Qikiqtarjuaq, they are identified, the communities. Are they really consulting communities? Maybe for suggested improvements and questions to come in, this is why I question. As a city Councillor, maybe I don't see issues talking about Inuit Owned Lands.

That is just a comment. In conclusion, military sites, national defence sites were mentioned. Our mayor mentioned this earlier the markings on the map where it is written.

(English): A recommendation, and it is going to be in English: Military sites have been assigned a Valued Socioeconomic Component land use designation. The Government of Canada wishes to clarify its definition and what planning considerations are afforded as a result. I just want to get a bit more clarification, just on that particular statement that you have under 2.7: Operations at Department of National Defence Sites. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. If you don't mind, I would like to have Greg Matthews speak to the issue, Mr. Chairman.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Say your name, your organization, and go ahead.

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. If I could ask the questioner to repeat the question so we are clear on the question if the Chair permits.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: You can proceed, Paul.

Paul Q: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Quassa, City Councillor of Iqaluit. Just on one of your recommendations concerning national defence sites, you state that the Government of Canada wishes to clarify its definition and what planning considerations are afforded as a result. Can you clarify that statement? I just want to get a bit more understanding of what it is trying to say. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Greg: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Greg Matthews, Department of National Defence, Government of Canada. The clarification stems from a conversation we had in the 2016 review in which there were concerns expressed by the Inuk and the communities in which we operated that all activities were prohibited, and that is not the message we were trying to convey at that time. So, we have been having conversations with NTI and those communities to probably making a clearer definition into this release of the Plan. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Johnny wanted to ask a question.

Johnny *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Thank you for the presentation from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans on the depths of the oceans, whales that we see an area that is protected. Perhaps they did not understand. Inuit from what the government sets under the *Claim*, it says that in terms of self-determination to defend our wildlife. I am speaking. I did not get an answer.

We saw a film that shipping is complete. That is not what we are talking about where you stop discussion. For us when we want to comment, we have to better understand that they are free to speak, and then when we ask, they do not allow our question.

If I didn't see the film, I probably wasn't going to speak, but it has to do with the Commission, the transportation through the air, through the water, through the land, through the ice. Mr. Chairman, he would have answered on his presentation how it is going to affect us. This has to improve. We realize that I am speaking as an Inuk. Can the Canadian Government regard the support and management of whales based on Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, not the government? I want that noted.

I am speaking regarding Article 11, special attention to Inuit. Inuit Owned Lands, for me, it is a word. If I am the only one being looked at after reading that, the rest does not matter. That is not the way I see it. For us from the Wildlife Organizations, we did not have much of a presentation. I saw an

airplane. Shipping in Nunavut, I saw. We also want it to be defended. I'll give that to you like that. It affects me. It affects Inuit. It affects hunters. It affects animals.

This I mention because we know the Department of Fisheries and Oceans through the Government of Canada on fisheries management, environment, wildlife management, it is your mandate. What I am trying to say is if that is the way it is going to be, it needs to be like this for this reason. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans only deals with their mandate to the lakes that they have jurisdiction around Pangnirtung on Inuit Owned Lands. So, following the *Claim*, that is how it is.

What makes it a hinderance, I want it noted that we have been monitored. The boundaries and calving grounds of whales as people from Pangnirtung is not controlled by others, because we have our own strength. That is how we manage wildlife. This government will fly around and maybe they are catching too many whales. Maybe they finished their quota. We have seen that. When they give it to you, what are you going to do with it? What are you going to do as the Commission?

If we don't speak, we are trying to change your mind. That is what we want. That was why I wanted to speak. I didn't get an answer. Are you going to be like that on Inuit Owned Lands on the presentation by the government on Inuit Owned Lands for Inuit landowners and waters? We are dealing with a lot of ocean-related issues in Pangnirtung. We have a lot of fish. There is no fisheries officer, but there is a lot of work. There are turbot, whales, char, and others.

That what they planned, it is just going to trample my mind. You have to be concerned about that. This is a quite heavy issue that we are talking about. I am concerned. I want to at least feel better coming out of here and going home. I am hope I am understandable. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Thank you for the clarification. Terry wants to respond.

Terry: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq, and thank you, Johnny. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. Just note, Johnny, our submission to the Commission will be inclusive. Inuit have the opportunity, and they have an avenue to voice their concern based on the *Land Claims Agreement* and who will ultimately do the work and who will manage wildlife for example.

(*English*): Article 5, Part 2, Establishment of Nunavut Wildlife Management Board: Again, it is an Institution of Public Government with Crown and Inuit working together, similar to that as the Nunavut Planning Commission. The video that was presented showed a pilot project that happened in the Kitikmeot. Currently, it is being viewed as to how well that process worked so that Inuit are included in part of the marine management aspects of things as it relates to transportation.

The examples include a dynamic collaborative process with specified critical times based on Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, and they also include communications processes between say, a vessel operator or a proponent and the local Hunters and Trappers Organization. That pilot project in the Kitikmeot, as mentioned before, included protective measures such as reduction of speed, the amount of traffic in the area, and sensitive areas for wildlife.

There was also one thing I wanted to clarify too, with respect to the air surveillance that you have been noticing. We are going to be reaching out to DFO to gather more information and provide that to you, as to the frequency and for what purpose and so on. But the one thing that I want to

emphasize here is that whatever we provide to the Nunavut Planning Commission, we want to make sure that we cross all our T's, dot all our I's, and make sure that what you are saying from Pangnirtung and what others are saying from the communities are included in some form and that they are provided to the Planning Commission.

Nothing is perfect right now, but we are trying to get there. We are always trying to get there. The more we include the communities within the decision-making, the better. Like I said before, Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit is second to none, in my opinion, when it comes to the Nunavut land and marine mammals as well as the harvesting aspects of it. It is an amazing tool that the Government of Canada can utilize and help manage the very important resources, renewable and non-renewable.

So, keep that in mind, and I hear you. I will try and continue forever and a day to work with you and to ensure that all the Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit aspects and (*Inuktitut word not interpreted*) are being included, somehow being listened to. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Is that good? Lazarusie would like to ask a question.

Lazarusie: (*Translated*): Lazarusie Ishulutaq, Hamlet of Pangnirtung. My comment is we were invited here for us to comment and speak our minds. Some of the questions or comments are not included or allowed. I am a hunter, and I know you are all hunters who are here. I want to state as a hunter, we would be interviewed to where are the animals and where is what.

In the questioning, maybe we won't be asked anymore now that the land is marked limiting access. We cannot access those sites anymore, perhaps for bear denning areas that we were questioned about. Maybe we won't be able to go to those sites anymore, bear denning areas. Even I as a hunter cannot go there anymore. That is the way I understood it.

Mr. Chairman, were we invited to see what we are discussing? For us as Elders, we see from our youth, we wanted to see these improvements that we can use. As an Elder, we had a leadership in the community, a wise leader to ensure everyone's wellbeing. If they were hungry, he would send his workers or hunters to go hunting who had parents.

Where many of us today, I am trying to comment that I will return to my community and see a finished project. I have children. I have grandchildren. I will be asked what we were talking about. What meetings were you at and what did they resolve at the meeting? My grandchildren want to know what is going on. I should say that I want to note that I may speak a bit more.

Nunavut Tunngavik were in Pangnirtung on the commercial fisheries and identifying lakes for commercial purposes. Are we going to be like that? Will we not need licenses anymore, as they sought our opinion? Is the Commission going to finalize this work? What Jetaloo mentioned today, if you prepare, there will be some issues we are not happy with that you will hear how we will be spoken to. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq, for this opportunity to meet. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. To restate, the red area is based on Inuit culture, Inuit hunting. Inuit activities will not be affected, as we have been saying. Those red areas are for mineral and oil and gas limitations for those areas, but for Inuit hunting and travelling, you are not affected in any way. That is already spelled out in the *Land Claim*.

We are here to listen, as I have been saying. We are here to have hearings. I have to remind those of us here. Your comments are being heard. They will help guide us in our decisions. We are not here to argue. We are here to listen to you. That is the purpose of this hearing, for all of you to have an opportunity. I wanted to remind that where we hunt in the red areas, your hunting rights won't be affected. I hope that is clear, what Lazarusie mentioned. I have more speakers. Eejetsiak?

Eejetsiak: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Eejetsiak, Hamlet of Kinngait. I want to speak regarding wildlife in the Arctic. Bears especially and other animals are conserved by the government when the bears are a danger to the communities. I am sitting here. I am happy to be involved because I would have been taken by a bear. He was so close to me, running at me. He tried to get me. I couldn't even put a bullet in my gun. It happened so fast. I was helped by some unknown external source that protected me.

I want to say that the bears and the caribou are being listed as threatened. We know that through Traditional Knowledge, our grandfathers would know regarding the wildlife as a food source before there were Qallunaat up here. Now the government needs to be reminded that this is our continued food source in the Arctic. As a food source, we know up here in the North.

For that reason, the government in their efforts to conserve animals in the Arctic, they use Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit that they consult Inuit in the communities, affected communities based on Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, that they seek knowledge of what areas they might want help in. Thank you for the opportunity, Mr. Chairman.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Thank you for your comment. I don't have any more names. Nunavik, any questions to the presenters? Two of them.

Adamie K: *(Translated)*: Adamie Kaitak, Salluit, Chairman of Hunters and Trappers Organization. I want to ask if you are responsible for wildlife management.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: I was speaking. Sorry. Proceed.

Terry: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq, and thank for the question. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. If I understand the question correctly, there are multiple departments that are responsible when it comes to the management of wildlife. That could be Canadian Wildlife Service, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, and other departments as well.

Here in the Nunavut context, we try and do that through what is in the *Nunavut Agreement*. There are some similar initiatives happening as well in Nunavik when it comes to co-management. Here, it is the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board and the Institutions of Public Government, the Hunters and Trappers Organizations, as well as the Government of Nunavut, and again various departments within that. I hope that answers the question. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Proceed.

Adamie K: *(Translated)*: Adamie Kaitak, Salluit, Hunters and Trappers Organization Chairman. I want to say in defense of my Inuit here, the research work that is happening is not accurate in wildlife management. We are the ones that know the animals. The researchers that determine numbers of animals that know properly how to count animals, we have been dealing with wildlife management

saying our animals are disappearing. We see that there are a lot of animals. We need support from the government, from you. You also have monitors that will support Inuit for the departments doing their own work. That is what I wanted to mention, Mr. Chairman.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Behind you as well. State your name.

Adamie A: *(Translated)*: Adamie Angiou, Puvirnituk Vice Chair of the Hunters and Trappers Organization. Between Nunavut and Nunavik, there are different traditions and styles. Nunavut has more flexibility, especially related to whales. When we hunt, we enjoy it. We smile. That is how we are. That is the way we see it. Currently when we hunt and see whales, we are frowning. We are upset because we have hit the law when we go hunting today. That is how it is.

We used to have freedom to hunt the animals that we have. Nunavut and Nunavik should have similar policies related to wildlife management. We have the same rules for Inuit relating to wildlife management. We hit the law many times. We go a long distance. When we are hunting, we would be like that to enjoy it, but we are scared of laws. The supplies and the gas are a very bit concern as well.

It would be good to have similar rules for Inuit of the different regions. It would be better for us. This I have thought about. Let's say whales, we have different rules. We are limited. The season opens in November when the season is over, and the ice is not good for boating. So, they are trying to limit our hunting activities in that way. The desires of Inuit and looking at laws for us, they should be the same in Quebec for hunting as the Inuit are treated in Nunavut. That is my concern. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Johnny? Eli?

Eli Angiou: *(Translated)*: Eli Angiou, Akulivik Hunters and Trappers Chairman. I am also the mayor of the community. I will try and speak English for you.

(English): Concerning the shipping through the waters of Nottingham Island and Salisbury Island, it has not yet been implemented to pass a moratorium for the sea mammals and wildlife that need to be protected from the increasing sound of the ships, pleasure crafts, and whatever have you that pass by. This Planning Commission, I don't know who I will direct this to. Maybe it is the guy with a turban, turban hat. He's the guy under Canada Transport.

You said earlier that you will abide by the Planning Commission implementation, and you are going to stick with it, but here I am concerned with the walrus, concerned with the ships that pass by, which are increasing there in Salisbury Island. We both have jurisdictions 50-50. Under Planning Commission, I want to state that there should be a moratorium for at least 5 to 10 miles from the Basking Island for the walrus. That's that.

Also, we are never going to find the Planning Commission. We will never find the perfect holier-than-thou planning text. We will never find a perfect text. That is nowhere in the world. Nobody gets a perfect plan. So, I suggest you move ahead with what you have. Besides, it is a living program or whatever you call that. You can adjust accordingly whenever there is a problem with it.

(Translated): Let's do the work. We won't get a perfect Plan the first time, so we can improve the Plan. I would suggest that we come up with a Draft Plan that can be discussed to move forward. Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Terry said some others might be able to answer if he can't answer. Terry?

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq, and thank you for the question. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. Thank you for those words. For the areas in question, when it comes to Nottingham Island, those islands within the Area of Equal Use and Occupancy, Adamie Alayco spoke to those as well. I heard the previous issues and concerns that were brought forward from Puvirnituk and Salluit.

Know that the Government of Canada will be working with Nunavummiut and Nunavikmmiut in those areas of co-management and that the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board, the Nunavut Planning Commission, the Nunavut Impact Review Board, and the Nunavut Water Board have provided for joint management. So, we have people from Nunavik sitting on as either Commissioners or part of the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board side of things.

For the questioner, right now when it comes to the in-shore ship traffic, we will take that into consideration as well and work with the Department of Transport. If Jaideep Johar wants to speak or respond to some of that, I will provide that opportunity if you permit, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Do you want to add? If he can comment, he can.

Terry: And Mr. Chair, it is mostly in relation to what methodology would be used for the purposes of identifying areas that may be sensitive to ship traffic.

Chairperson: Okay, proceed. Go ahead.

Jaideep: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair. Jaideep Johar, Transport Canada. In addition to what Terry has mentioned, I think it would be good to know whether those restrictions, the proposed restrictions are already there in the Nunavut Land Use Plan with regard to protecting walrus. If they are there, then we can look at the measures to protect, which we already have. If they are not there, then I can surely look into this concern with regard to protecting marine mammals, similar to what we did for Southampton and Coats Island. So, further information would really be appreciated to look into it and to communicate with vessels. Thank you.

Chairperson: (Translated): Qujannamiik. Are you finished? Terry, do you want to add? We have two more questions. Our staff has a question. He will have to depart, so he has some questions. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. I had first just wanted to clarify the question regarding walrus haul-outs within the Areas of Equal Use and Occupancy and note that there are currently identified walrus haul-outs with Limited Use designations in both the Areas of Equal Use and Occupancy. There are varying setback distances depending on the size of the vessels. So, we have included those designations in the Draft Plan, and of course welcome feedback on the appropriateness of that approach.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to ask another question. I will try and keep this brief, but we had asked some questions of other participants this week about jurisdiction and mandate within the Areas of Equal Use and Occupancy and had made references to sections within both the *Nunavut* and *Nunavik Agreements*.

Perhaps I would just ask if the Government of Canada has any views on the management structure that is currently in place and whether there is any intention to prepare a more permanent structure for these areas, in particular drawing your attention to Section 4.2.3.5 of the *Options and Recommendation Document* that outlines some of these concerns where both the Nunavut Planning Commission and the Nunavik Marine Regional Planning Commission are now mandated to establish land use plans to guide and direct land and resource use in these areas.

I expect that might take a little bit of digging, but I would really appreciate some interpretive guidance in your written submission. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq and thank you for the question. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. We will respond to that in writing based on the fact that there are multi-jurisdictional aspects to it being that there are different levels and different jurisdictions within the Province of Quebec, the Government of Nunavut, and all other sectors. We will provide something to the Planning Commission once we have had the opportunity to ensure that we have a fulsome answer in written form.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan, go ahead.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I would just like to note that I appreciate the opportunity to ask additional questions before I leave. I would very much like to stay for the entirety of the hearing, but I guess you can't always get what you want. Thank you.

(Laughter)

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. I have a questioner. I don't know your name. I'm sorry.

Paulusi: *(Translated)*: Paulusi Tarriasuk, Ivujivik. Thank you, Mr. Chairperson for work and cooperation. When you look at Ivujivik shipping route, we want the ships to go right between the land at the furthest distance from those points of land to July, August 31st that we have to defend our wildlife. The nesting auks on the island, the ships come too close. It is deep water, so they drive close to the islands where there are colonies of birds nesting. Lots of auks will lose their eggs, as they are not in a nest but on a cliff.

One thousand, two hundred sheer cliffs are on the Quebec side. There are high cliffs with eggs. When they are nesting, they should be defended seasonally, as they are being affected in numbers. They should go right between the islands July to the end of August. The shipping corridor for our community of Ivujivik, we have to defend those islands. The ocean is deep. They drive right by the site of the island when they are nesting because it is conveniently deep to go through there.

They are affected, so we have to protect the animals. That is what we have been told to do as our culture. They have given us the strength that we too will pass on to the future generations. Be that I want to work with the industry, transport industry to get support for Ivujivik. We are the Hunters and Trappers Organization, and they live on those islands. I wanted to state that regarding shipping routes to work with the government. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Terry, did you want to comment?

Terry: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq, and thank you for the question. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. I would like to let Jaideep speak to the issue regarding the island. Transport Canada regulates this if you have a concern that relates to Northern Quebec and the routes that should be used. You spoke of bird colonies and that they be more aware. I will answer.

(English): Duly noted. The response from Jaideep from Transport Canada will include that as part of the response. It is always good to hear where there may be sensitive areas for wildlife purposes when it comes to marine vessel corridors and transport. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Another question?

Ali: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Ali Qavavauk, Ivujivik Hunters and Trappers Organization Chairperson. I just want to state between Nunavut and Nunavik, we should get our own independent researcher on wildlife numbers. We have researchers in Nunavut and researchers in Nunavik. We need to share this information. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. There was another arm up over here. You may proceed.

Aisa: *(Translated)*: Aisa Surusilak, Puvirnituk Hunters and Trappers Organization member. I want to state about shipping. The disposal, they should not change ballast waters in the North. When they use ballast water to balance, there are rules that they are not allowed to dump these waters. They could come from Quebec rivers that have pollution from the south into our waters. It gets released into our waters.

I mention this that outside of our community, there was a lot of shrimp that made even the beach smell bad. We assumed the ships might have spilled some that affected the shrimp, and the ship might have spilled some of their water in our areas. The shrimp are the food of the char, and the shrimp died off.

What rules are in place for disposing of ballast water without the required approval? Is that the work of the federal government or will the communities close by get compensated? That was my question. Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do you want to respond, Terry?

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq, and thank you for the question. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. I believe the question was set around ballast water exchange. I will request that Jaideep Johar respond to that if the Chair permits. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Jaideep: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair. Jaideep Johar, Transport Canada. Thank you very much for the question. I will provide you with information of how Transport Canada looks into the ship in managing ballast. As you are all aware, ballast is very important for the stability of a ship. Before any ship enters our Canadian waters, they are required to change their ballast. If they have taken ballast, let's say for example in Europe in Rotterdam or anywhere else in the world, but before they come to our waters, they are required to exchange the ballast.

Exchange of ballast for one means to protect the invasive species to come to our waters. Now with new regulations, we are asking the ships to treat the ballast also. So, any ship which comes to Canadian waters needs to exchange the ballast, report to Transport Canada at least 96 hours in advance. We look at reports from the ship, and if we find any nonconformity, we can direct the ship to leave our waters.

Whenever we get an opportunity, we inspect the vessels in the Arctic. For example, going to Millport going to various other ports, this year we inspected ships in Millport and a lot of cruise vessels. To answer your question with regard to exchange, looking at the science from Department of Fisheries and Oceans, there was a ballast exchange zone in some part of Hudson Bay and also in Lancaster Sound, looking into our pristine waters and looking at DFO recommendations.

We have taken it out from our regulations. The only place if the vessel needs to do some alternate exchange is in Baffin Bay. This is one of the examples of how we are considering the science and input from our Indigenous organizations and applying to our regulations.

You spoke about compensation. We have, the Government of Canada has a very good compensation regime system in place whereby if any community member feels or are impacted by a spill, they can ask for compensation. The Government of Canada works towards providing that compensation. So, there is a regime in place to have compensations as required.

I believe that answers the questions. Also, if there is anything else out of the hearings, please feel free to contact me anytime if I can assist you with anything else. Thank you very much.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Understood. I have no further questions from Nunavik delegates. Go ahead.

Archie: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Archie Angnakak, Amaruq HTO. First of all, I would like to notify delegates from NTI and the federal government. These two organizations appear to be in total authority of mining nonrenewable resources and drilling explorations. I think there is not much information given out in this forum, Mr. Chair.

Inuit Owned Lands, there are about nine, and there are two that have been inspected as in concern, for instance, here in Iqaluit. I don't think I understand, and I do not like both organizations, the federal government and NTI and how else they can answer questions when questions arise when it comes to revenue ventures.

We had this concern for many years, for instances with fisheries. Many southern companies are fishing our waters. There are too many sports fisherman. They cast. They reel it in, show it up, take a picture, and throw it back to the water. These are our food sources. We sell these fish at a certain

amount. We should have good ideas on how we can earn revenue from fisheries and other schemes related to wildlife.

Mike Ferguson gave you good detail how things were in this area yesterday. NTI and federal government have briefly given you descriptions in their presentations and why there are land categories, Limited Use, Mixed Use sort of thing. Non-renewable resources are more important than categories that are drafted in the maps.

These two organizations are more concerned of creating employment for Inuit. They have both stated that Inuit will gain employment and become self-sufficient. After that, the HTO has concern of the Inuit Owned Lands, federal government, parks government. We need a lot more clarification on areas categorized.

I need to hear if Transport Canada and the federal government with especially cargo ships to Nunavut. They have no firm routes that are established yet for transport vessels, for cargo vessels to travel through. There has been mention on different sorts of vessels where they should be travelling in Nunavut. I would like some clarification before I ask more questions.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq and thank you for the question, Archie. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. If I am not mistaken, the question is how marine transportation routes are determined, and I will request, if the Chair permits, Jaideep Johar to respond to that.

Chairperson: I think there needs to be a clarification.

Archie: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Archie Angnakak, Amaruq HTO. Can you clarify exactly what the rules are surrounding registering when they go to travel in Arctic marine? My understanding is very limited. If I am correct, as long as the vessel has 12 or less people in the vessel, they do not have to register that they are going to be travelling in Arctic waters.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed.

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. Again, thanks for the clarification on the question. I will request through the Chair that Jaideep Johar respond.

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Jaideep: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair. Jaideep Johar, Transport Canada. Thank you for the question. There are two parts to the question. One is with regard to the ship's route. That is totally correct. The ships can move anywhere in the Arctic where they feel safe. There are a couple of things that should be realized. One is that Canadian Arctic is chartered to the modern standards up to only 15 persons, and the work is going on. So, it is very imperative and very important for the ships to take a safe route.

Most of the community resupply vessels that come to the Arctic, those companies have been there for ages. They know those waters very, very well. The challenges are for the new operators. That is where the Government of Canada has come up with an initiative, which is called the Low Impact Shipping Corridor Initiative where we are working with stakeholders, Indigenous organizations, and the industry to chart specific routes in the Arctic, which are safe, taking into consideration any issues with sensitive areas or marine mammals.

That is the work that is being undertaken. Also, it should be noted that similar to how we drive cars, for the ships, there are collision regulations to follow, and they are very strict regulations of when they see a vessel close by, what they should be doing, and when they see a fishing vessel what they should be doing. If we find or are made aware that the vessel has not followed that rule and respected the rule, we will take enforcement action.

As you realize, the Arctic is huge. It is challenging for Transport Canada to be everywhere, and that is where we really have worked and would like to work further with our Indigenous organizations to let us know if there is a ship that they think is not following any rules and regulations. We will ensure that proper compliance is taken for those vessels.

With regard to vessel reporting and being monitored, all the large vessels are required to report to MCTS, which is in Iqaluit here. I would really request that given an opportunity that it would be a very good eye-opener to see how the vessels are managed if given an opportunity. I can surely arrange that communities can probably visit MCTS in Iqaluit and to see the work that is being done.

The large vessels are required to report and to report regularly. The challenges are with the small vessels, the small foreign pleasure crafts where there is no reporting requirement. These pleasure crafts inform Transport Canada of their voyage in advance. Sometimes they do, and sometimes we are not aware. When we are made aware, we provide information to the pleasure crafts to follow proper regulations to avoid areas where they should not be going, and most importantly before there I would communicate with the communities they would be heading to.

Again, I realize that there are challenges with monitoring the small foreign pleasure crafts. We are working into looking into making the reporting mandatory for these vessels. I will also draw your attention to the latest OAG report, Auditor's General Report, which came about evidence of Arctic waters where it is recognized that there are challenges in monitoring the small vessels. We are committed to working toward that. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can stay there and stand by.

(Laughter)

Go ahead.

Archie: *(Portion of Archie's statements were not translated. Interpreter acknowledged he was on mute and began mid-sentence):* ...whereabouts they are going.

(English): Confirming my limited knowledge on that, I just wanted to point out, Mr. Chair, the challenges that they have on smaller vessels coming up here, especially with vessels that carry 12

or less. They don't have to register. That goes back to my point on Inuit Owned Lands where it does say archeological, historical, and cultural importance.

Whether it is my ancestors to these sites and whaling sites or old camps, that is what the people, the beneficiaries have highlighted in Inuit Owned Lands, because it is important to them. There is archeological history. There is ancestral history. With this challenge of not being able to monitor or fully find out where they are going, these sites that we are marking are very important, more important than mineral development or gas.

Because they are historical, archeological sites, we can turn that into an economic venture: tourism. This is what is missing from the federal government and NTI, these kinds of statements; stressing the importance; being neutral and pointing out all the key factors, everything, where we can make economic happen. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Terry, do you have a response or comment?

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Thank you for the comment, Archie. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. I will go back to one of the concerns that was brought up on the two items jointly managed, as well as the migratory bird nesting sites when it comes to ship traffic, and also the importance of specific Inuit Owned Lands that may have been selected for the purposes of archeological, historical, or cultural significance.

That is something also that the Government of Canada in respect of how Nunavut Tunngavik or the Qikiqtani Inuit Association or the other Regional Inuit Associations make that determination as to which parcels of Inuit Owned Lands are culturally significant for archeological or historical purposes, that they also be identified either to us, the Government of Canada, Transport Canada, so that we are aware of those sites that are sensitive, so that they can be treated just the same as walrus haul-outs, as an example.

Let me reemphasize that we want to take a balanced approach. We are not pro-development, nor are we suggesting that Inuit Owned Lands are only for the purposes of nonrenewable development. We leave that with Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated and the Regional Inuit Associations. What we are wanting to do is to ensure that there is a balanced approach to it all.

We are not suggesting that culturally significant or archeological or historically significant areas are to be disturbed for the purposes of development. That is not what we are saying. What we are saying is that we leave that with Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated and Regional Inuit Associations to help us in identifying those areas that may be highly sensitive for non-Nunavummiut to be approaching or visiting, either through marine transport or land. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there questions from the registered participants?

Paul C: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Paul Crowley with Friends of Land Use Planning. Hi Terry. I would like to ask some questions with regard to existing rights and the position of the Government of Canada. The position of the Government of Canada is that all existing rights obtained until this Plan is finalized should be allowed to continue and that even further, if those rights are obtained in an area that would be a Limited Use Area, say for the purposes of caribou conservation, that not only would

those rights continue to exist, but also there should be un-prohibited access through linear development to get to it.

Under the Nunavut Mining Regulations, the federal government's Nunavut Mining Regulations, as I speak, someone could be going online and securing rights staking within this region. Let's pick, for instance near Netsilik Lake. Let's say that it is not only on Crown land but also on surface Inuit Owned Land. These areas have been identified clearly as being important culturally and also for wildlife.

Under the federal government's position, those rights now would carry through to any final plan regardless. I ask the federal government how this respects the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People* and the right for Free Prior and Informed Consent. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Terry: Hi, Paul. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq, and thank you for the question, Paul Crowley. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. That is somewhat of a very broad question when it comes to any consideration of say, implementing a moratorium on issuance of new mineral tenure or of those that are existing.

We were approached in late 2015 with a request for a temporary moratorium on issuing claims, licenses, and permits to caribou calving grounds until a land use plan was complete. We engaged with our partners, the Government of Nunavut and Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated and decided that the best way forward was to pursue the completion of the Nunavut Land Use Plan to balance the needs of economic development and wildlife and environmental protection.

In the Government of Canada's view, the simplest path is for the Commission to put forward a Draft Plan, the final Draft that is acceptable to all three signatories. In no way are we opening the floodgates to issuances of new mineral tenure.

At the same time, we rely on the current regulatory system that is in place, where I suggested in our presentation that it is a robust regulatory system that includes Institutions of Public Government, the Nunavut Impact Review Board, the Nunavut Water Board, and in some cases the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board. Within those mechanisms are opportunities for the duty to consult, which includes the Free Prior and Informed Consent of Inuit. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Go ahead if you have another question.

Paul C: Thank you, Terry, for that answer. Paul Crowley, Friends of Land Use Planning. Under this scenario and the Nunavut Mining Regulations, this company has acquired these rights, but not only just acquired them. They are not mere administrative rights. They are required to conduct work under the Nunavut Mining Regulations to keep those rights.

Work is defined in the Nunavut Mining Regulations as being able to include stripping, drilling, trenching, sinking shafts, and driving adits or drift; geological, geochemical, geophysical work, or other exploratory work approved by district geologists; a survey of the claim approved by the Surveyor General; and work done in constructing roads or airstrips to provide access to the claim.

We have been hearing for days here now at this hearing and in previous hearings in Cambridge Bay, Rankin Inlet, Thompson, Pond Inlet what is most important to Inuit: protection of caribou, protection of wildlife, protection of calving grounds. Under the free entry system and online staking, this does not exist. There is no Free Prior and Informed Consent.

As long as those lands are staked, those rights go before anything else, even on Inuit Owned Land, surface lands. If I am the owner of that exploration company, I cannot be refused to go explore. Conditions can be put on how I explore, but I cannot be refused.

I am having a hard time understanding how there is Free Prior and Informed Consent if we have been hearing for months now and years about lands that should be protected. Yet, the system regulated by the federal government under the Nunavut Mining Regulations and the Territory Lands Act undermines it. Can the federal government describe it in a different way that would give us comfort that this is not the case?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq, and thank you, Paul. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. The current system in question is in line with what is provided for under the *Nunavut Agreement*. When it comes to increased activities to maintain that tenure, that claim, there are regulatory requirements, an application process that includes informing whichever title holder, the Crown or Inuit Owned Lands.

In that process, there is inclusion of Inuit with respect to the decision-making and when it goes on further. We have the Nunavut Impact Review Board and the Nunavut Water Board as well, which are considered co-management institutions, Inuit and Crown working together.

I believe you are entitled to your opinion on Free Prior and Informed Consent, but as it stands right now, when we are discussing about 4% of all of Nunavut, in the Government of Canada's case, we are quite comfortable with how things are progressing as well as what is happening through the hearings as well with respect to the Nunavut Planning Commission's public hearing process in identifying Limited Use Areas.

Again, that is not currently a tool that we have. Once the Plan has been finalized and signed off, that will be yet another tool to determine where things will happen based on the Plan considering the screening process of conformity that the Nunavut Planning Commission will have a role in. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Further questions?

Paul C: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Paul Crowley, Friends of Land Use Planning. Reliance on the other elements of the regulatory system requires a strong land use plan, as has been stated by the Nunavut Impact Review Board in its presentation to these hearings where they say that deferral of broad land use planning issues to NIRB's project-specific impact assessment process does not provide an effective mechanism for addressing land use planning, priorities, and options.

It is critical then that the Land Use Plan, as Terry has pointed out, is in place. However, existing rights and the position of the Canadian Government on existing rights can undermine much of the input

that Inuit have had when it comes to protecting the most important areas. A specific example is near the community of Taloyoak where they have been trying to protect the Boothia Peninsula, the larger area around the Boothia Peninsula, they say since the 1970s, so for 50 years, to protect it for their caribou calving grounds.

Last year, southeast of the community, new mineral rights were acquired. That company that acquired those rights now by law must conduct work on those or lose them. This is not a theoretical issue. This is a real issue for some communities, and it could continue to be a real issue. Will the federal government reconsider its position with regard to withdrawing lands from possible mining staking until this process is finished and there is a Plan in place? Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Communities Qujannamiik. You can respond.

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq, and thank you for the question, Paul. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. Right now, there is the Tallurutiup Land Use Plan and the Kivalliq Land Use Plan that are currently in existence, but this Nunavut Land Use Plan, once finalized and signed, will be the Nunavut Land Use Plan.

For the questioner to suggest that it is like the wild, wild west when it comes to land use activities without a Plan, is in my opinion based on a shaky premise. Based on the fact that we do have, again, robust regulatory systems, and knowing and understanding that the example he used for people in Taloyoak for the Boothia Peninsula, there are current discussions to look at a conservation area of some type in that area right now.

Again, I will clarify when it comes to the 4% that is in Limited Use proposed areas, 4%. For all of Nunavut, it is 2½ percent. I will use the example based on the recent decision by our Minister, Dan Vandal on the Phase 2 aspects of Baffinland, because the community had concerns. The communities were not comfortable with that advancing. Hearings happened, and the regulatory system was put into place. The Phase 2, as proposed was not approved.

So, that is an example of the robust regulatory system. I don't think the sky is falling. At the same time, we are confident in what we have done to date and will continue at the same time to look forward to when the actual Nunavut Land Use Plan comes into play, because that gives us that added layer of screening. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Paul C: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Paul Crowley, Friends of Land Use Planning. I would like to change directions a little bit. The federal government position is that there should not be in the Plan limitations on ice-breaking in the Northwest Passage. Does this also include the Northwest Passage route that would go from west to east through Fury and Hecla Strait and down through Foxe Basin over into Hudson Strait?

Communities Qujannamiik. Terry?

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq, and thank you, questioner Paul. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. I promise it is not you, Paul, but I have been asking the Chair for a pee break.

(Laughter)

As it stands right now, the Government of Canada continues to support the development of a Plan that balances protection and conservation measures to reduce the impacts of marine shipping with the need to support marine transportation and project development. To support this balance, the Government of Canada, has recommended that where shipping restrictions are included, clear, consistent exceptions should be included in the Plan to reduce impacts to vital services, such as emergency response, community resupply, and law enforcement.

The Government of Canada also recommended that the Plan be clear that the vessels transiting through the Nunavut Settlement Areas, which are not part of a project, are not subject to shipping restrictions. I hope that clarifies for you. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: (Translated): Qujannamiik. We will take a break of 15 minutes. My apologies.

Break

Chairperson: (Translated): Qujannamiik. Before we get back to our agenda, we will be back for an evening session tonight. We will get back to the questions from registered participants, back to Paul Crowley.

Paul C: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Paul Crowley, Friends of Land Use Planning. Terry, I only have one more question for you. It depends on your answer, of course. Earlier in your presentation in response to questions, you indicated the possibility that the federal government would support a position of having restrictions, not only for walrus haul-outs, migratory bird areas where there are restrictions of going close and also setbacks, but that there could also be restrictions for cultural practices, harvesting areas. I am just asking if you can confirm this position.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead with a response.

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq, and for your question, Paul. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. Yes, that's correct, Paul. The Government of Canada has always supported applying restrictions that are not necessarily relating to wildlife as well, but it is something that ourselves, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada as well as Transport Canada, along with Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated and the Regional Inuit Associations can definitely come together and discuss those areas that may be highly sensitive for other purposes outside of wildlife, culturally sensitive, archeological, historical aspects as considerations for restrictions on either marine traffic or land traffic. That is something that we can definitely have more discussions on. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. An additional question? Go ahead.

Paul C: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Paul Crowley, Friends of Land Use Planning. I will cede the floor at this point. I am sure there are others who have questions. Terry looks eager to answer them as well.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead, Mike.

Mike F:

Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Thank you very much. I have for the federal government, one comment, which is general, one request, and one question. It should be pretty simple. My comment is, and I realized this some years ago when I might draw a graph of a population increase. We talked about the caribou increasing, or I may draw a circle on a map and say this is where the caribou are.

Inuit would say to me, "No, those are just lines on maps or lines on paper. They are not real. What are you talking about, Mike?" Jetaloo yesterday to me, told a very moving story about, and I may get some of the facts wrong, but when he grew up in Tuakjuak and was moved to Pangnirtung. He said something along the lines through the interpreter that those places will become unknown. We knew the bears. We knew the caribou. We knew the foxes. We knew the berries. We knew the wolves, and so on. In other words, they know a place.

When Inuit draw circles on map, and I will say that other people, Inuit have spoken from that kind of point of view. When they draw circles on maps, the circles on the map are just circles on paper, but what they are picturing in their minds are real places, real experiences, real wildlife, real living things, not a living document. It is real-life living. That is something that I try and remind myself all the time of. Inuit did not need me to say that, but I am just passing that point of view on to other people.

Now for my request to the federal government: In the submission submitted to QWB in 2018, there are circles on maps. There are statements on paper, but behind that are the real places. Each circle is a place that means something to Inuit. So, what I ask the federal government to do, they have spoken of categories or too many Mixed Use Areas, or this mining here, and so on and so forth.

In order to help the QWB review the 2021 Draft Plan, we need a review of the places, the real places that the federal government may agree with and may disagree with the classification and the restrictions that the QWB and HTOs have requested. So, I request for every area applicable submission to the NPC in 2018, that the federal government for the areas that cover their jurisdiction, marine areas, probably Arctic char, and also migratory birds, that they look at each place and tell us do you agree with this request of a prohibition or condition. Do you agree with that, yes or no, and if it is no, why.

With that, we can discuss those with the HTOs and come up with potentially alternate positions. We cannot address real places in broad categories. That is my request to the federal government.

My question to the federal government is Jonathan has told us that the Planning Commission is allowing overlapped designations. For example, a migratory bird area may also be used in summer by post-calving caribou. They say that they will allow those two types of areas to overlap. The federal government has put a position on the table, as I understand it, that they do not like overlapping areas.

The QWB has already dealt with that. Because Inuit go to places to harvest, they may in the same vicinity go there in the winter and hunt for polar bears. They may go at different times of the year and harvest eggs or birds. They may go there and fish for char. So, what we did is when you put all those areas or types of use into a closed geographic area, we call those Multiple Value Areas.

I think those were largely rejected by the Planning Commission, but I would like to get an opinion from the federal government as to whether or not they believe something, it may be a different

name, but something like a Multiple Value Area could potentially deal with overlapping types of area. One request for a list of what they agree with, and another question about how to deal with overlapping areas. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq, and thank you for the question, Mike. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. With respect to the first question on areas that are significant but are not necessarily depicted in some form on a map, what we can do as the Government of Canada is I would turn to the Nunavut Planning Commission through their mapping exercise as to identifying those areas, but it is also something that we would like to work with Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, the Qikiqtani Inuit Association, and the other two regions of Kivalliq and Kitikmeot, along with the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board in identifying those areas that are of significance to Inuit, and that they are somehow captured within the Land Use Plan.

As to overlap areas, the less the better for certainty and clarity. The suggestion on multiple use areas where there may be some sensitive wildlife habitat, caribou calving or what have you, there are other jurisdictions that use, say for example, high value areas. Those could also be used as an example, but that is something that we would be open to as well to determine that some areas are more sensitive than others, and at the same time would allow for Mixed Use and multiple use, knowing and understanding that there could be sensitive areas as well.

The one thing that we would like to do within providing support and options to the Nunavut Planning Commission is to ensure that at the end of the day that we provide more certainty and clarity for all the stakeholders, be it the rights holders or land users. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Mike F: Mike Ferguson, QWB. It appears that some clarification is required. I am sorry I didn't explain this better. We submitted 43 submissions in 2018, we the QWB. They came from both the QWB and the applicable HTOs for each submission. The submissions are very clear.

On 42, if I recall correctly, 42 of the 43 submissions, either what is now being called the Limited Use Area or multiple limited use areas, are delineated on the map, and the prohibited or restricted land uses that the QWB and the HTOs would like to have applied to those mapped areas are clearly laid out in each submission, each of the 42. So, they are mapped. They are either classified, at that time it was Protected Area, which is now a Limited Use Area, or what was then a Special Management Area and is now called a Conditional Use Area. They are on the map.

So, what we are requesting from the federal government is they go through each of our submissions, which I can supply to them. They were publicly available on the Commission's website for three years. I don't know if they are still publicly available, but I can provide them to the federal government if they wish. We would like each one of those submissions to be gone through.

Just say, we have for example, requested that this area be classified as a Limited Use Area. Do you agree with that or not, or if you don't want to be so clear, you could just say these are our concerns about classifying this as a Conditional Use or a Limited Use Area. Then we can address those specific real-place indications, as opposed to broad categories.

The one other nonspecific area-based submission deals with migratory bird setbacks. This is based on Inuit Knowledge of how far, for example, flightless birds travel on the water and under the water away from their colony areas. The setbacks, according to Inuit for shipping near colonies of various species is far too close. We have asked for much larger setbacks.

We need to know why those setbacks appear not to have been accepted. It is not a huge part of Nunavut, but these birds are very important for harvesting and for eggs. The Inuit do not want them at risk to be ground up in the prop wash of various ships, getting too close in areas where flightless birds cannot escape, among other issues.

So, we would like some real hands-on feedback from the federal government as to whether or not they agree with those setbacks, as well as with the areas in the other 42 submissions. I hope that is clearer. If there are any questions, I can talk to the federal government separately. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq, and Mike. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. The Government of Canada's review is guided by our priority expectations for a first-generation all-of-Nunavut Land Use Plan. These include that the planning and resulting Plan legally comply with the *Nunavut Agreement* and the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act*, and the Plan must be consistent with federal commitments and policies, and the planning process has to have credibility so it is clear, and that the development of the Plan is supported by a meaningful, inclusive transparent public and stakeholder consultation process.

As well, the Plan must be clear, understandable, and provide certainty for users. The Plan must be practical, implementable, and conformity requirements must be clear. The Plan should contribute to the efficiency of Nunavut's integrated regulatory system.

One zone with multiple values is okay. There are different planning rules applied to the same area, but that needs to be clear and concise. There could be high-value areas, as an example. We know that there are sensitive areas, such as the setbacks that you mentioned with respect to migratory birds and sensitive wildlife habitat.

Again, concerns with respect to what the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board provided with respect to the 47 submissions or so, should be raised through this forum, and it isn't necessarily solely the Government of Canada that can respond to those submissions, but use the Nunavut Planning Commission as a vehicle to determine whether or not they will be included within the actual Land Use Plan.

We will provide input. We will provide supporting documents. We will provide feedback as to what we feel about those areas, but I think that is all I can say for now with respect to a response. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. We appear to be out of questioners. We will go back to Johnny a bit.

Johnny K: (*Translated*): Johnny Kasudluak, Inukjuak. As an observer, I heard and want clarity with an answer from Paul Crowley's questions, the appointed communities, and their representatives. For the

purpose of mineral exploration, you said that mineral activities can proceed within the current land regime.

The way I seem to understand it or not understand it is that the work being done in the planning process in the work that we see here and the appointed Commissioners, the work proceeds. We are discussing the work whether the land regime restricts anything to reflect the Land Use Plan. So, which reality is in effect? Is it open to select lands and to do exploration work on lands the Inuit selected, the 4% of the land selected by Inuit?

When you see that is the basis of this discussion, I want to know if it is true. Which regime are we following for land purposes? At what point will these rules apply, whether there is a moratorium that you mentioned while we plan the Land Use Plan before it is implemented. That is my question. I want clarity. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Proceed.

Terry: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq and for the question. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. The planning process, the Land Use Plan will be signed. It will be implemented, but the Commission will review. If anyone wants to use those lands within Nunavut whether they comply with conformity, but 4% and the 2½ percent that I mentioned would proceed.

If you are going to increase the amount, the federal government, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated or the Inuit Organizations, Nunavut Impact Review Board or the Commission has to do their work. What kind of conditions but in the planning process for the Commission for Nunavut, until it is in effect, it is the standard system that they are using, if that is understandable. You can seek clarification if you wish.

(*English*): In English, the aspect is we don't think that a large increase in tenure will occur during the planning process. It hasn't happened, and it is not happening now. Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada sent notices on March 14, 2022 to all holders of tenure to ensure that they are informed of the Plan and understand the ongoing public review process.

In special circumstances, such as the Boothia Peninsula that Mr. Crowley had mentioned, if it continues where it becomes a protected area, then those that have the tenure will actually be informed of such, and there will be arrangements made. I am just right now unsure as to what those arrangements would be based on the fact that we are not there yet. Once we get there, we will cross that bridge when we get to it. I hope that answers your question, Johnny. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon wanted to add.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and Johnny thank you for your question, and Terry for your clarification. Sharon Ehloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. So, just for clarity purposes to Johnny's question, the Commission currently has two existing Plans, one in the North Baffin and one the Keewatin Land Use Plan that guides and directs the terms and conditions on those two areas that have a plan.

In the absence of a Land Use Plan on the question of timeline, it is an obligation of the *Nunavut Agreement* to have a land use plan in place. In the absence of the Plan being in place, the areas that are not included in a land use plan can be staked. So, the importance of getting a Land Use Plan in place and everyone coming to these hearings and stating their positions, or their submissions is very important.

We see that the communities and the Commissioners are listening, but the point of having these hearings is to have community members, participants, government, and others listen to each other's positions and submissions. The mandate of the Commission is clear. It is outlined in the *Nunavut Agreement* and in the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act*. The Commission must give great weight to Inuit, Inuit priorities, Inuit Owned Lands, community, community concerns, and the human component, that being Inuit and people are a priority in the planning.

Some of the conflict that we are seeing is the question on Inuit Owned Lands. The Commission is tasked in Article 11.8.2.: The land use planning process shall apply to Inuit Owned Lands. Land use planning shall take into account Inuit goals and objectives for Inuit Owned Lands. So, listening to all the organizations, government, NTI, listening to all positions and the solutions and the options that everyone is putting forward to the Commission, the Commission must, based on the evidence, make those decisions.

So, when we are talking and there is confusion about the Inuit Owned Lands, this is one of the major pieces that the Commissioners need to hear from community members, from Canada, from NTI, from the Designated Inuit Organizations, from the Government of Nunavut of what their options and solutions are of how they want to see these lands managed.

Johnny, I hope that answers with a little bit of context, but in the absence of a Land Use Plan, staking can occur and has occurred and will continue to occur. We have heard, and Commissioners are listening, with regards to the timeline, this process has been in the works for 20 years, and at some point, it must come to a conclusion. The implementation of a Land Use Plan must happen.

For the record, the Commission has been working very well with all of the parties, working as best as possible with the communities, and supporting to ensure that the information on the process and on the documents are being understood. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are you good, Johnny? Paul wanted to add. Go ahead.

Paul C: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Paul Crowley, Friends of Land Use Planning. We hear a lot about balance: balance economic and protection. The system generally is already unbalanced in favour of mineral development. Anywhere where lands have not yet been withdrawn, either by the creation of a park or eventually by the Land Use Plan putting prohibitions, is open for staking.

If those staking rights are acquired online, those staking rights then take precedent over, in the case of Inuit surface lands, the ability of Inuit to say no, we don't want you there. The genie is out of the bottle as soon as the lands are staked. The Inuit Organization can tell a company you can't do it this way, you can't do it that way, but they cannot say you cannot do it if it is on Inuit surface lands. If it is on Crown land, it is the same.

We hear a lot about a robust regulatory system. Until there is a Land Use Plan in place though, only once that I am aware, has the Nunavut Impact Review Board refused an exploration project. They generally all go through. So, the genie leaves the bottle as soon as those lands are staked. Whether it is on Crown land or Inuit Owned Lands, they are still available for staking. I hope that helps clarify.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Terry?

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. Nunavut is a vast territory, and it is being shown through this exercise of the land use planning hearings where we had visited two time zones away in Cambridge Bay, one time zone away in Rankin Inlet, south of Nunavut border in Thompson, as far south as Thompson is to here, as far north to Pond Inlet with respect to the hearings in that direction.

Considering that we have four existing mines across that vast area, and I referred to 2½ percent of Nunavut, I can't see how it could be construed as unbalanced as pro-development. We have multiple parks, conservation areas, migratory bird sanctuaries larger than the areas of the projects I mentioned earlier.

When a stake is claimed, it is not necessarily having the genie come out of the bottle, as suggested, but there are terms and conditions, regulations, and steps to follow. If it is going to go any further, it triggers the regulatory process with respect to the Impact Review Board, the Planning Commission, the Water Board. If Inuit don't want it to happen, typically it doesn't happen.

So, again, we have to ensure that all views are being heard, and that it is a balance, and that it is clear, and that there is certainty. I will leave it at that. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. I currently don't have any more names. From the general Iqaluit audience to the presentation? Proceed.

Meeka: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq and to the Commission. Thank you, Terry for being here and your staff. I don't know as a CLRC member, I have relatives in Pangnirtung and Iqaluit. Thinking of them, the implementation contract, I want to find out about Chidliak. Does anyone know about Chidliak?

Through my dad's parents who will defend communities in dealing with maps, I am talking about tent sites that have not been marked near the Chidliak site, and Inukshuk that we put up at \ that area to cross from Kinngait to (*inaudible*). I want that protected. I didn't have a pen back then so that they will remember on the land. It might be complete Crown and Inuit Owned Lands. There are five or six locations with the gathered sites and the hunting camps, caribou hunting grounds, and also to note who defended that land. It was Inuit men. Siatut, (*spelled phonetically*) that is what they are called, ancestors caught to my grandfather's father.

The glacier is melting there. It wasn't too busy or that they did go. I didn't catch my grandparents. That's that. They have the same distance. I have tried to find them since 1991. When the snow is melting, I am afraid of the river up there. I would like to understand it more. I have never gone up there in the summer. I want those sites that would be the work of the Inuit Heritage Trust. They are only dealing with old artifacts. Okumiut means the Inuit of this area. That's that.

The Inukshuk that we put up near Chidliak, there is not only one. Some of it goes down to Supanga (*spelled phonetically*). I don't know what year, maybe 1998 or 1999, there was a court that my grandfather Nowdlik family that 1974, 72. I would like those marked as heritage sites. I am not attached to anything. I am not a person of Iqaluit or Pangnirtung. The CLRCs don't seem to be working anymore. They deal with Inuit Owned Lands and also Crown lands. That needs to be reinvigorated. The Pangnirtung trail, it was four men that could lift it up. It is on top of a big rock. It did not seem to be there, because it was covered with snow. That's that.

They are on Crown land. Some of it is on Inuit Owned Land, as we were not part of Canada. My question, the second question is on the implementation contract. It is late. Okumiut wanted it done five years before, and it is now three years late. I was the eldest assistant. I worked for four years and supported them and their priorities, CLRCs and wildlife committees.

The Nunavut Heritage Trust, research trust, has a purpose. I worked four years, and we also dealt with Baffinland. I was paid one year as Inuit rights. What I am speaking about is legitimate. We were dealing with maps. I, too, helped write. Without foundation, we had to seek money all the time. It is on demand with the wildlife organizations and the CLRC. I am not complaining, but it won't come to fruition in a circle.

The writing is not under it. Those that come to work here don't know that they are affecting those. So, for the hearings, I want to go caribou hunting and hang around my grandchildren and take them to our old lands. I have not been able to do that. I don't know your roles or conditions. If someone can make a motion, we have Inuit rights. We have Canadian, we have public rights. It would be nice to be supported, not through a proposal.

What we are saying is real, and then they said it is not related to the agenda, and the support coming from Amaruq. I am using my own phone. That is how it was. I support what has been said that they could be part of the implementation contract. The Planning Commission is planning the Land Use Plan. It relates to the implementation contract to the second one. That is how it was by the Elders. This is it, to hear two items. The first one is two-part, my questions, and the second is the implementation contract. Thank you.

Chairperson: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. For part of the work, again, they're items that are outside of our agenda and discussion points. I realize we are supporting a lot of wildlife agencies and organizations, but that is not the goal of this meeting. Regrets that we have no issue related to the contract or with quotas. I just want to state that. Part of what you said will be part of the consideration. Based on Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, it will be considered. Do you want to add to your question?

Meeka: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul had a lot of questions. I have more rights. I want to ask more questions, but you said it is not attached to the agenda. We are talking about things on the land. They are here. The implementation contract will be the venue, but we are putting up obstacles. We have heard around the table that they are not able to comment. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Understandable. Terry, do you want to comment?

Terry: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq, and for your comments, Meeka. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. The issues you mentioned, we have heard them. We will want to hear more, how we can benefit. For example, the CLRCs, the Community Lands and

Resource Committees are run through the QIA or through the Regional Inuit Associations and that process.

You mentioned Chidliak. You can come by our office to find out more and where they are located and what kind of operation they currently have. You are welcome to come and see us. The archeological sites are run by the Government of Nunavut. It is under federal legislation, but they are responsible, the Government of Nunavut.

The Hunters and Trappers Organizations also would through the implementation contract that I mentioned earlier to Ben, will be another avenue we can explore on working with the wildlife organizations through annual funding. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do you have a question to the presentation?

Meeka: *(Translated)*: Have been heard, a heritage site, but we did not have a marker whose relatives, whose rights, whose Inuit rights they are. Canada has land title. They are marked. I mentioned I could not find them in the snow where Jetaloo was born. When we started moving, there was good will before the *Land Claims*. Where Jetaloo was born, he was born in a beautiful place. They will be able to live there. I don't say it as well as Jetaloo. Beautiful country. Accord but not written on paper. I am trying to make it a heritage so people will know my descendants and who my ancestors are. That is what I wanted to identify. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Other questions from the audience? I'm glad Terry had coffee this morning. We have had a full day. Terry, and those of you at the table, thank you.

(Applause)

Looking at the clock, we will meet tonight at 6:00 to deal with the Government of Nunavut. We will meet back here.

Supper Break

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Before we start with the next presentation, I would like to say thank you for coming back. I would like to thank the Elder at the back, Ian Imakpa. Give him a round of applause.

(Applause)

Also here are elected members in the hall, Minister David Akeeagok, Minister of Environment.

(Applause)

Also, Premier, P.J. Akeeagok.

(Applause)

Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated president, Aluki Kotierk.

(Applause)

Qujannamiik for taking part in these discussions. Anytime you are ready. As before, set off your cellphone ringers. Just a reminder to put it on silence mode. State your name and your organization before you speak. You may proceed.

Presentation by the Government of Nunavut

Henry Coman, Assistant Deputy Minister for the Department of Environment
Daniel Haney, Manager Land Use and Environment for Department of Environment
Dirkus Gissing, Director, Wildlife Management
Diane Lapierre, Manager of Environment Assessment and Regulation
Michele LeBlanc-Havard, Director of Environment
Annie Cyr-Parent, Department of Economic Development and Transportation
John Ringrose, Wildlife Biologist for the Baffin Region, Department of Environment
Eamonn Carroll, Legal Counsel

Henry: Hello. Firstly, I would like to acknowledge, Premier Palulooosie Akeeagok, as well as Minister David Akeeagok who are present in the audience. Thank you.

My name is Henry Coman. I am the Assistant Deputy Minister for the Department of the Environment. Today it is my privilege to speak for the entire Government of Nunavut. Thank you to the Nunavut Planning Commission for the opportunity to present today, as well as the opportunity to listen to the thoughts of Nunavummiut and others regarding the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan.

I would like to start by acknowledging the hard work done by the Commission and their staff for reaching the hearings for the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. We would also like to thank the community delegates, Hunters and Trappers Organizations, and other planning partners for their ongoing participation in the planning process. Lastly, this would not be possible without the support of the interpreters, caterers, and information technology support, and we thank you for your hard work supporting these meetings.

There are many Government of Nunavut experts and support staff from across departments who have contributed to the technical review of the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan, many of whom are here today or are following the proceedings online. This review is the outcome of the collective work of all Government of Nunavut departments. We are going to provide an overview of the Government of Nunavut's technical review regarding the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan.

In the presentation, I will talk about the Government of Nunavut's role in this process, as well as the mandate that guides our participation. Following this, I will present the Government of Nunavut's technical review of the 2021 Plan. Finally, I will conclude the presentation, and we will be happy to answer any questions.

The successful completion of the Nunavut Land Use Plan is an obligation under the *Nunavut Agreement*, Article 11 and the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act*, Section 53 and is a priority for the Government of Nunavut. Once approved, the Nunavut Land Use Plan will guide and direct the territory's long-term vision for development and conservation. This is a monumental task for the Commission, requiring a balanced approach that is reflective of a range of views.

No issue exemplifies the competing values of responsible economic development and environmental protection more than the Draft Plan's proposed designations for caribou habitat. This will, therefore, be a primary focus of the technical review portion of our presentation today.

Katujjiluat is the vision and overarching policy goal that will guide the Government of Nunavut's final review of the 2021 Draft Plan once it is submitted by the Commission. As a territory, the Government of Nunavut wants more communities to benefit from fishing, harvesting, and tourism, as well as increased Inuit employment in mining and mining-related sectors. The Nunavut Land Use Plan should balance responsible economic development as well as ensuring the development of critical infrastructure such as roads.

Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit and its eight principles are integral to the Government of Nunavut, and we believe that Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit is essential to the Commission and the Nunavut Land Use Plan. The Plan and its vision should create the condition for traditional activities that have sustained Inuit for thousands of years but also account for the responsible development of Nunavut's natural resources and diverse economic opportunities through increased employment and other investments.

The Government of Nunavut employs a "whole-of-government" approach in our participation in land use planning. All departments in the Government of Nunavut contribute to the technical review and make recommendations to senior management. The Government of Nunavut's submissions to the Commission represent a unified voice.

This slide brings us to the Government of Nunavut's technical review of the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. This map represents the important issues that drive Nunavut Planning Commission to put zoning in place. It shows where land access restrictions have been proposed by the Commission and why.

This slide shows the main priorities which the Government of Nunavut has identified in relation to the Draft Plan. The Government of Nunavut recommends that there is a balance in the Plan between environmental protection and responsible economic development. This includes both environmental stewardship as well as current and future economic opportunities. This is the first-generation Nunavut Land Use Plan, and it will change in the future.

The Plan must therefore be appropriately scoped and avoid using extensive land use prohibitions. Lastly, municipal views require more explicit inclusion in the implementation of the Plan to ensure that it is compatible with municipal plans.

The Government of Nunavut's main comment is that the Plan does not adequately balance environmental and economic goals. We understand that everyone may have a different understanding of what a balanced Plan is. The Government of Nunavut sees a balanced Plan as one

where there is enough wildlife, such as caribou, to meet the dietary and cultural needs of Inuit regarding food sovereignty, and where there are diverse economic opportunities for Nunavummiut and the development of Nunavut's infrastructure such as roads.

This graph is a summary of land use designations proposed in the 2021 Draft Plan for the Nunavut Settlement Area organized by region. All Limited Use designations prohibit development activities including quarrying, mining, oil and gas exploration. Limited Use Areas are 22% of the Nunavut Settlement Area as proposed in 2021. This is an increase from 16% proposed in the 2016 Draft, broken down as such:

- 22% of the Kivalliq region
- 36% of the Kitikmeot region
- 17% of the Qikiqtani region

Limited Use Areas may affect some communities, such as those with closer proximity to known resource potential or those with greater transportation and infrastructure potential. The 2021 Plan states that an effective Land Use Plan needs to achieve a balance between environmental, social, and economic needs and potential. One of the Government of Nunavut's primary assessment is this balance has not yet been achieved. However, we do think there is a path forward.

To further explain the Government of Nunavut's position, this slide shows the mainland caribou herds and our understanding of their population trends. Caribou are important to Nunavummiut for many reasons. They are culturally significant, provide a good local source of food regarding food sovereignty, and support the economy. Sustainably managing caribou can guarantee that they will be a part of Nunavut into the future. Many herds are in decline, and there is uncertainty of the causes. Communities have expressed their concern that something needs to be done, and the Commission has heard them. In the 2021 Plan, the Commission has designated caribou calving and post-calving grounds, key access corridors, and freshwater crossings as Limited Use Areas. This comes with year-round prohibitions.

In the Government of Nunavut's assessment, an increase in Limited Use supports conservation but does not support economic development adequately. We must consider the socioeconomic implications of those protections. The Government of Nunavut generally supports the protection of critical caribou habitat through land use designations and has faith in the robust regulatory system in Nunavut to help address impacts.

In the Government of Nunavut's assessment, excessive Limited Use designations limit economic opportunity, such as access to resources, infrastructure development, and community development goals and priorities. The Government of Nunavut therefore recommends that Conditional Use zoning with seasonal restrictions can better achieve a balance between these priorities.

This slide shows the ranges of Baffin, Southampton, Mansel, and Coats Island caribou and has been developed by the Department of Environment in collaboration with co-management partners. The Department of Environment works closely with Hunters and Trappers Organizations, communities, and co-management partners to collect scientific data and Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit to monitor the health of caribou herds. Although there is a degree of uncertainty associated with caribou data, the Government of Nunavut is confident that its delineations are accurate and is committed to continuously monitoring the accuracy of these areas.

Lack of long-term telemetry data on Baffin Island caribou has made precise delineation of their calving grounds difficult. Where the Government of Nunavut does not have sufficient scientific data to delineate caribou habitat, we rely on Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit. This slide helps to demonstrate the need for a balance to be struck.

The population of Nunavut is growing. In the next 10 years, 10,000 young Nunavummiut will become adults who will need jobs. These youth will represent one-fifth of all Nunavummiut. This is shown on the graph on the right. Additionally, Nunavut has the...(cutoff mid-sentence)

*The power went off in the building.
Meeting was consequently adjourned to resume the next morning*

DAY 6: November 19, 2022

Chairperson: (Translated): Qujannamiik. I want to recognize this morning, and he has been here at Cambridge Bay, and Rankin Inlet, James Eetoolook is here.

(Applause)

Welcome James. Sharon will go through some housekeeping items.

Sharon: Good morning, everyone and welcome to our final day of our public hearing here in Iqaluit. Whoo-hoo and may the power stay on today. A couple of housekeeping items as normal: First of all, if you have a cellphone, please put it on mute. We are recording the hearing, and we are broadcasting live with Uvagut TV, Facebook, and YouTube.

When you are speaking, please speak through the Chair. State your name, your organization, and your topic. We will be taking two 15-minute breaks, probably three 15-minute breaks, because I'm sure we are going to be having an evening session today. Fire exits: There is one at the front, the side, and the entrance you came in. The washroom is as you came in. Please feel free to help yourself to the coffee, tea, and snacks. We are looking forward to a very productive day. With that, Mr. Chair, I will turn it back to you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Welcome and good morning. We shall proceed where we left off last night before the lights went out. On our way out, the lights came on, but we couldn't proceed again last night. We are ready to go again this morning. You can proceed where you left off. Henry?

Henry: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Henry Coman, Government of Nunavut. For the benefit of the interpreters, it is the top of Slide 14. This slide helps to demonstrate a need for a balance to be struck.

The population of Nunavut is growing. In the next 10 years, 10,000 young Nunavummiut will become adults who will need jobs. These youth will represent one-fifth of all Nunavummiut. This is

shown on the graph on the right. Additionally, Nunavut has the highest unemployment rate in the country. A solution needs to be found to ensure that jobs are available for these young adults.

The mining sector represents the largest private sector opportunity for employment in Nunavut and is a key part of making Nunavummiut self-sufficient. The Government of Nunavut is also promoting other sectors related to fisheries and the traditional economy.

The Government of Nunavut's technical assessment has determined that the 2021 Plan is too restrictive. The current Plan prohibits mineral exploration in approximately 21% of the planning region. This map shows how mineral exploration activities in gray, interact with land use planning designations. Large areas of Nunavut remain un-surveyed. As such, the mineral resource potential is unknown and holds considerable value. The Limited Use designation prohibits exploration work that is needed to properly understand the resource potential to make informed decisions on the acceptability of development.

Few exploration projects develop into a full productive mine. That is about 1 in 1,000 in Nunavut. A plan that unduly limits exploration can therefore reduce the chance that a viable deposit is found. Nunavut is already considered a difficult area to develop. The Government of Nunavut does not want to create additional barriers to potential opportunities. Exploration activity can be low impact and have flexible schedules. The exploration industry also makes significant investment contributions. There is a lack of infrastructure in Nunavut. However, the mining industry is a source of infrastructure development that can benefit the territory. For successful exploration projects, the Government of Nunavut is an active participant in the territory's robust Environmental Assessment process led by the Nunavut Impact Review Board.

As mentioned, Nunavut's unemployment rate is high and employment opportunities may be limited. The economic implications of the current Draft Plan are significant. Opportunities for Nunavut and its residents may be limited by prohibiting exploration and unduly restricting transportation or hydro, such as the Manitoba-Kivalliq connections for both development and communities.

Nunavut is home to an abundance of minerals and metals, including critical minerals for green technologies, as well as potential for significant oil and gas development. Post-devolution, the Government of Nunavut will rely partly on revenue and royalties driven by economic opportunities, such as from resource development to provide services to the territory. A restrictive Plan limits the economic potential available.

More consideration needs to be given to the socioeconomic impacts of prohibitive land use designations. The territory's population and socioeconomic needs are increasing. The Nunavut Land Use Plan should support development in a way to address both conservation and responsible development factors.

The Government of Nunavut's current assessment is that Conditional Use designation with seasonal restrictions for caribou calving and post-calving grounds, key access corridors, and freshwater crossings is appropriate to balance environmental and economic goals. This would create formalized protection during the most sensitive periods of the caribou life cycle while allowing for a flexible case-by-case approach during the Nunavut Impact Review Board assessment. Further, the Government of Nunavut supports seasonal restrictions, up to and including the seasonal phased

shutdowns in these areas, and we have provided the critical timing windows for when caribou are present.

The Government of Nunavut does not consider large Limited Use Areas to be desirable in this first-generation Plan. As a first-generation territory-wide Plan, the Government of Nunavut recommends an incremental approach to land access restrictions. The Government of Nunavut acknowledges that over time, more information and regional decisions may lead to amendments to make some areas more restrictive. The Government of Nunavut recommends a red-flag approach to identify areas of interest, concern, significance, and where competing interests exist and require greater scrutiny. As more information is known, the Plan can be updated through periodic reviews and Plan amendments.

The Government of Nunavut has identified that the Nunavut Land Use Plan is not compatible with community plans. In this slide, we can see examples of how Limited Use Areas overlap with municipal boundaries. As per the *Nunavut Agreement*, the Nunavut Planning Commission must consider municipal views when developing land use plans. In addition to consulting the municipalities directly, their views are also found within community plans. For example, some communities have Limited Use zoning within them that conflicts with community plans, such as the prohibition on quarries in Kugluktuk. Future projects before they reach the Commission may conform to these plans and have community support. To address this, the Government of Nunavut recommends that a mechanism to recognize community views and priorities is included in the Nunavut Land Use Plan.

The Nunavut Land Use Plan needs to account for the community plans within municipal boundaries. Community planning is central to the Commission's goal of building healthy communities and should therefore be reflected in Chapter 4 of the Plan. To address these concerns, the Government of Nunavut recommends that the scope of minor variances be broadened so that projects that conform with community plans may be referred to the Review Board for screening, or a general exemption should be built into the Plan if the project is in conformity with the community plan, or areas within municipal boundaries are zoned as Mixed Use.

Another point to consider is the Grays Bay Port and Road corridor, which is zoned as a Valued Component and overlaps with Limited Use Areas that prohibit linear infrastructure. The Government of Nunavut is a supporter in principle of this project. Since other priority transportation corridors are supported by the Plan, the Government of Nunavut recommends that the Grays Bay Port and Road corridor as a project of interest, should also be supported by the Plan and zoned appropriately.

The Government of Nunavut recommends that all existing rights should be protected and able to reasonably develop without a Plan amendment. Some of Nunavut's existing rights are not protected in the current Draft Plan. Stranded assets are existing rights surrounded by Limited Use Areas needing a Plan amendment to access them. The surrounding Limited Use restrictions in these areas also impact the value of those existing rights. The Government of Nunavut recommends that the issue of stranded assets be addressed in the Plan.

Having access to clean drinking water is important and recognized by the Commission. Recently, several communities have had to draw water from their secondary sources. The Government of Nunavut has identified two secondary water sources outside municipal boundaries and has supplied

them to the Commission. It is important that the identification of secondary drinking water sources does not unduly restrict other municipal goals such as transportation and quarrying for aggregate resources. To balance drinking water with other municipal goals, the Government of Nunavut recommends that secondary drinking water sources beyond municipal boundaries be designated Valued Components.

As part of its dual mandate in the Nunavut Land Use Plan, the Government of Nunavut has been asked by the Nunavut Planning Commission to confer with its co-signatories on certain issues. These meetings between the three signatories, the Government of Nunavut, the Government of Canada, and Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated are ongoing. As well as direct signatory meetings, all three signatories are also part of other ongoing negotiations. As part of devolution, some of what are currently federal lands will become Government of Nunavut lands. Additionally, all three signatories of the Nunavut Land Use Plan are part of the ongoing treaty negotiations related to the Dene overlap area. All this work will continue for the Government of Nunavut throughout this process.

The Government of Nunavut continually works with local hamlets on municipal land management. The Government of Nunavut wildlife officers and biologists work with Hunters and Trappers Organizations to continually incorporate Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit and gather scientific data. The Government of Nunavut also listens to both large project proponents and local entrepreneur on development concerns. This work will all continue throughout the life of this first-generation Nunavut Land Use Plan. In light of community comments and in respect of this ongoing work, the Government of Nunavut is requesting an extension of several weeks from January 10th.

The Government of Nunavut appreciates this opportunity to discuss our technical review and recommendations and provide additional perspective for our fellow planning partners' considerations. Development in the North can be particularly challenging, and we owe it to Nunavummiut to collect all the necessary information and input before making land access decisions. We must emphasize the importance of integrated resource management systems and the work carried out, not just by the Nunavut Planning Commission, but also the Nunavut Impact Review Board, the Nunavut Water Board, and the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board. Together, these institutions safeguard the eco-systemic and socioeconomic integrity of Nunavut and ensures the responsible development of our natural resources.

At this point, the Government of Nunavut would like to emphasize that there have been improvements to the Plan. The Government of Nunavut found that the *Options and Recommendations Document* has been greatly improved and helped facilitate our review of the Plan. The Government of Nunavut would like to see the Commission's rationale expanded so there is better understanding of the tradeoffs that were made in the decision-making process for the different land use designations.

Going forward, the Government of Nunavut is hopeful that a balance can be struck between Conditional Use with seasonal restrictions that supports responsible development, and economic growth. The Government of Nunavut has faith in the Nunavut Planning Commission process and in Nunavummiut. The Government of Nunavut has listened and heard what all participants in the process have brought forward. The views of the communities, Hunters and Trappers Organizations, and other planning partners are important. The Government of Nunavut is looking forward to receiving a revised Draft Plan from the Commission after the record has closed. We will now be happy to answer any questions you might have for the Government of Nunavut. Thank you.

Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. As the process, we will go through our staff first. Go ahead.

Goump: Thank you. Goump D'Jalogue, Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you for your presentation. Our first question is related to Article 11.2.2(b) and 11.4.1(b) of the *Agreement* where it is highlighted that the objectives of the Nunavut Land Use Plan shall be to guide and direct resource use and development in the Nunavut Settlement Area. We have also heard overwhelming support from the communities to exclude nonrenewable industrial development from some specific areas, to preserve sensitive wildlife habitat and cultural values, as well as to support the development of renewable economic projects that the communities might have.

Given those facts, has the Government of Nunavut considered and comment on if for this first-generation Nunavut-wide Land Use Plan one of the avenues might be to guide and direct nonrenewable resource development toward the proposed Mixed Use Areas where there are no essential values identified by the communities, and on the other hand preserve the identified Limited Use Areas for the development of renewable local economic development and food sovereignty for the communities.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can respond.

Henry: Thank you. Henry Coman, Government of Nunavut. Can you rephrase the question, please? Thank you.

Chairperson: Goump, go ahead.

Goump: Yes, thank you. So, this is related to one of the objectives of the *Agreement*, 11.2.2(b) and again in 11.4.1(d) to develop a Land Use Plan that will guide and direct resource use and development in the Nunavut Settlement Area. And also, we have heard from the communities that they would like to exclude nonrenewable industrial development from some specific areas to favour to support the development of some local economy, renewable local economy.

Given that, has the Government of Nunavut considered that it might be a better approach that this first-generation Nunavut-wide Land Use Plan that nonrenewable resource development should be direct and guided toward the Mixed Use Areas in the Plan while keeping aside the Limited Use Areas for the development of local renewable economic opportunities and food sovereignty for the communities.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik, Goump. You can respond.

Henry: Thank you. Henry Coman, Government of Nunavut. If we could just have a moment to talk to each other. Thank you.

(Pause)

Thank you. Henry Coman, Government of Nunavut. We will have to provide a written response for this question before the close of the record.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Goump? Okay, Adrian, go ahead.

Adrian: Adrian Gerhartz, Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you to the representatives of the Government of Nunavut for your presentation. Throughout your presentation, you mentioned several times the need to find appropriate balance between economic and environmental conservation objectives. Just to bring attention to Slide 10, it has the different regional...yeah, that slide. Particularly, with the Qikiqtani regions, 17% of the region is listed as Limited Use, which restricts mineral exploration and production and to provide for the protection of important wildlife habitat as well as community-identified Areas of Interest, such as drinking water supplies.

On the other hand, 83% of the region that is the combination of the Mixed Use and Conditional Use, 83% support nonrenewable economic opportunities, such as mineral exploration and production for the entire Baffin region. In trying to reconcile those two, here we are wondering if the Government of Nunavut can provide guidance to the Commission as to what a balanced approach should look like for the Qikiqtani region. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Can we get a response, please?

Henry: Thank you. Henry Coman, Government of Nunavut. We will have to provide a written response for this question as well. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon wants to ask a question. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. So, in your presentation in all of these public hearings, we have heard clearly from all the communities overwhelmingly how important their water sources are to them. In the Plan, they are noted as Limited Use. In the GN's presentation, you are recommending having that changed to Valued Components and Mixed Use.

We also heard clearly from the City of Iqaluit how important their water sources are and the challenges that they are having with their water sources and the crisis that they have faced over the last number of years. I am wondering if the GN can confirm why they would like those water sources designated as Mixed Use instead of Limited Use, and does the GN support the recommendation that the City of Iqaluit has made for their water sources to remain as Limited Use, and their secondary source? Thank you, Mr. Chair. That is my first question.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can respond.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. I would just like to make a correction. We are not recommending that primary water sources be Mixed Use. We actually have not commented on primary water sources. Our comment is on secondary water sources outside of municipal boundaries. For those two that have been identified in Iqaluit and I believe in Gjoa Haven, we are recommending a Valued Component designation to support community development, such as quarrying and any transportation corridors or infrastructure that may need to be built in those areas. We believe that strikes a balance between preserving a water source and community growth. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. Supplementary question then to the water sources: With regard to the watersheds that are outside of the municipal boundaries, is the Government of Nunavut's position still recommending Mixed Use on the watersheds? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead when you're ready.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. No, we are not recommending Mixed Use on primary water sources. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. I asked for the external watersheds that are outside the municipalities. Can the GN please state what the recommendation of use is for the watersheds outside of the municipalities? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can proceed.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. I don't believe the Government of Nunavut has come to a position on this. We will have to discuss internally and respond in writing. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon, go ahead.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The Government of Nunavut has stated that the Limited Use Areas, including the caribou calving grounds and habitat should be changed from Limited Uses to Mixed Use. Does the Government of Nunavut support exploration and development in the core calving grounds, the post-calving grounds, important habitat areas, and water crossings? Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can proceed with a response.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. That is incorrect. The Government of Nunavut is not recommending Mixed Use in core calving, post-calving, key access corridors, and freshwater crossings. We have recommended Conditional Use in those areas. That is to strike a balance between economic development and environmental protection.

I would also like to note that we are listening to the comments that have been going on in these hearings throughout. Yes, we are listening. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for the correction. I'm not Jon Savoy, so I am asking the questions on his behalf. If you are recommending that use, would the Government of Nunavut support exploration on the core calving grounds and habitat areas? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can proceed with a response.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. We would be supporting in principle exploration in those areas outside of the critical seasons that we have identified. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead, Sharon.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. We have heard overwhelmingly in every single public hearing that communities, the HTOs, do not want exploration and development on important caribou calving ground, habitat areas, water crossings, post-crossings. If the Government of Nunavut is supporting exploration, will they be supporting the development of mines on the core calving grounds and important habitat areas? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can answer.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. There is not guarantee that exploration develops into a productive mine. A productive mine would need to go through the Nunavut Impact Review Board process in which the Government of Nunavut is an active participant. We would comment on those projects on a case-by-case basis and make recommendations to the board in order for activities to be appropriately scoped and impacts be mitigated.

Yep, we would actively participate in those processes, and we are actively listening to the commentaries that communities and HTOs are sharing with us. We will be taking that back to the government after the close of these hearings. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon, go ahead.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. So, if the Government of Nunavut is supporting exploration and development, the Commission is tasked to provide in the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan clear direction and guidance for terms and conditions. Can the Government of Nunavut provide how the Commission would provide solutions, directions, or terms with regard to the recommendations that the Government of Nunavut is doing with the exploration and development on the important caribou habitat areas? Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. Yes, we can certainly collaborate with the Nunavut Planning Commission on strengthening those terms and conditions in Conditional Use Areas. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. I have no more names from our staff. From the floor? Communities? Johnny? Johnny and Jetaloo.

Johnny M: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Thank you for your presentation from the Government. In terms of land use planning, from the questions of the staff, they said they would provide a written response. We hope to see a copy as well. I am Johnny Mike from Pangnirtung, Hunters and Trappers Organization.

It is good to see you, those who are sitting here. My question that I have been mentioning throughout, it is the Plan for Nunavut land use. I want to feel comfortable with it, so we are providing comments, mostly on the *Land Claims Agreement*. That is where we get our strength for Inuit. The Government of Nunavut in terms of Article 11, the insides of the *Agreement*, 11.2.1, the body, it has a liver that tastes good. On (b), it is part of the stomach, so that is how it is. (b) states about the government.

We want to hear about Inuit Owned Lands, signatories to the *Land Claim*. Sometimes we are in front of the government. Sometimes we are in front of the Commission. It states here, 11.2.1(b), the liver, I want to understand better, Mr. Chairman, whether they rely on this Article. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do you have a response?

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney. Yes, we certainly do take Article 11.2.1(b) very seriously, and we respect the rights of Inuit to determine how they want their land to be developed. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik.

Daniel: Also, I just wanted to add that any written responses that we will provide to the Commission we can also provide to communities and HTOs.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there questions? Follow-up? Jetaloo?

Jetaloo: (*Translated*): Good morning, Mr. Chairman, guests, and all from Baffin, and all watching online. I come from Amaruq Hunters and Trappers Organization. I am an Elder on the board. Yesterday, I was talking about the future. First, we have a dock facility built here. They are dealing with depths of the ocean and on the bottom of the ocean, and they dig up the bottom of the ocean for the area near here. I was going to bring this up. If you don't hear it, then you won't know.

Even when you talk about cod, it is a benefit. The noise for the harp seals, for whales, that affected the marine mammals here in Frobisher Bay. We have a lot of harp seals. The harp seals were further down the bay. Currently this past summer, the harp seals were once again close to the community.

If work is going to happen, my question is when we are dealing with caribou, you are using letters from 19-something, and the caribou that were born and seen at that time. I want to understand. In 1930 or after, my question is our weather and wind is changing. Our wind directions have changed. I wonder about caribou, not only from you. I will ask after this.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do we have a response?

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. I just wanted to clarify that you are asking about how climate change has affected caribou since the 1930s. Is that correct?

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Jetaloo: *(Translated):* Where do caribou calve? How do I convince you where they calve? That was my question. I am asking about the calving grounds. Henry Coman said and that is my question. I will ask again. *(Translator indicated he was uncertain of the question asked)*

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sorry. We are having difficulty with the question. Can you please state your question again? It is confusing to translate. Thank you.

Jetaloo: *(Translated):* Jetallo Kakee, Hunters and Trappers Organization. My question is we heard about caribou. Where do they calve? Where do they calve, the caribou? I am asking. What do you want to hear? On what year do you want to hear where they calved, or do you want to hear where they calve this year? What do you want to hear about where they calve? That is my question. Was it confusing, Mr. Chairman?

Chairperson: it is clear. Proceed.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. Thank you for the clarification. I believe you are asking about where calving grounds are located on Baffin Island. The Government of Nunavut does not have enough telemetry, radio telemetry data to delineate calving grounds precisely. So, we rely on Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit to tell us where those calving grounds are.

As you know, as you are probably aware, caribou on Baffin Island are different from those on the mainland. They don't migrate as much, so the delineation of those calving grounds is difficult using scientific data. If I could perhaps ask our Wildlife Division to comment on that more, Mr. Chair?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. We will get a response. Go ahead.

Dirkus: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I am the Director for Wildlife Management with the Department of Environment, Government of Nunavut. The calving grounds on the mainland have been clearly delineated through telemetry work that has been done for many, many years in consultation and working with the communities on the mainland. Baffin Island is a bit more challenging.

Chairperson: Can you slow down, please?

Dirkus: Delineating calving grounds on Baffin Island is a little bit more challenging for various reasons. The population has significantly declined over the last 20 years resulting in less migration from areas, so you get much smaller groupings on the islands that are more stagnant and not big migration taking place.

However, we are aware of calving grounds based on Traditional Knowledge and historic information collected through telemetry work, although very limited at the time. We can identify calving grounds when populations are at high, but at the moment, they still are at very low levels. However, our biologists on Baffin Island continuously work with the communities and continually visit the communities to work with the communities to identify research projects that could answer a lot of these questions.

One of the proposals, currently we consulted on with the communities last week. Over the last two weeks, we have been out to put out collars on Baffin Island to try and delineate some of these calving grounds, especially with the populations starting to increase.

There is a lot of evidence that Baffin Island caribou are recovering. We expect that when they have recovered to historical levels where you start seeing migration again, they will go back to, hopefully, those historic calving grounds that have been identified through mostly Traditional Knowledge. I am hoping that answers the question.

So, we are working with our communities to answer these questions. Also, information that has been collected historically and over the last 20 years, intensive research over the last 20 years has been used to inform the proposal to this meeting. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead. Jetaloo?

Jetaloo: (*Translated*): In the days of the NWT and Yellowknife, are you talking of that time? I will be listening. When is the information from?

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. I would ask Dirkus Gissing to respond to that again, please. Thank you.

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Dirkus: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am not sure I get the last question. It seems like the question is about the information we are currently using to manage Baffin Island caribou if that is historical information or current information. It is both. Our biologists do look back at historical information as well as historic Traditional Knowledge information and historic collar information.

But, over the last 20 years, we have continued with a very active research program on Baffin Island. We had some very experienced and talented biologists that have been collecting this information in collaboration with our communities. This information has been regularly analyzed, put into the posts that have been publicly made available. All those reports are publicly available to you and to our co-management partners. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Can you please state your name for the record? Thank you.

Dirkus: Dirkus Gissing. I am the Director for Wildlife Management, Government of Nunavut, Department of Environment.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik.

Jetaloo: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. Jetaloo Kakee, Iqaluit. You are talking about recent times. From time immemorial, as the time you came up, you had a uniform and a gun that you were working. Inuit country, you don't believe the history. My question is where does this start from? I am trying to ask. We marked maps. We marked a lot of area. The government is going to think it is too big. Stay small parcels for you to select small parcels of land.

So, my question is following Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, are you limiting that by limiting the selection when the government deals with maps and then they look at the exploration companies, and they

mark the maps with resources. They have access to all the resources. In 2021, 2022, the work is happening, 20 years. The government marked the land and looked at the wildlife and felt we marked too much land.

My question is you minimize our selection. You thought it was too broad. When we look at the future, we will implement by the Commission that there will be a part we don't believe in because we didn't get enough. Caribou movement, we know it, us descendants and those descendants. The workforce has worked in this area. Inuit dog teams, they go to wherever they may roam as Inuit. You aren't like that. So, Mr. Chairman, I hope I am understandable. I will ask again. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. It is understandable. I didn't really hear a question there. Jetaloo, we are here to ask questions of the presentation.

Jetaloo: *(Translated)*: Jetaloo Kakee, Iqaluit. I'm trying to feed your brain so that your left arm and your right arm are trying to reach your head. Let me say otherwise. Maybe I am confusing you. I want to ask who do you believe, Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit or the mineral Qaujimajatuqangit? Which one do you believe? That is my question. Maybe it might not be understandable. Is it Inuit Knowledge or the rocks speaking to you?

The geologists want that rock, to look for that rock and to find the veins in the rock. He is trying to find the heart of the rock. Can you explain that based on Traditional Knowledge how you balance? Which one do you believe in?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Understandable. Do you want to respond?

Henry: Thank you. Henry Coman, Government of Nunavut. Thank you for the question. The Department of Environment works closely with the Hunters and Trappers Organizations when research is being conducted. The researchers work with the Hunters and Trappers staff as well as volunteers to try and get the best idea of the areas for the caribou calving grounds.

I am not too sure what the mineral exploration part is regarding the research into caribou calving grounds. The Department of Environment does work with the hunters and trappers to try to get that information as best as we can. That does incorporate Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit as well, so we rely on hunters and trappers to get that information. If there are any problems with Hunters and Trappers with our researchers, I would like to know that so we can correct that.

But for the Department of Environment, we don't really look at the mineral exploration part of it. That is a different department. Although I work for the Government of Nunavut and we are speaking as one voice, we do try and make the best efforts we can when wildlife research is being conducted. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do you have another question?

Jetaloo: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jetaloo Kakee, HTO, Elder of the organization. I understand that you are here to make a presentation. Although I have asked questions, it appears that I have misunderstood some of the presentation. So, I apologize. Some of my comments were offline. Right now, I just want to generally say the mining companies are travelling through aircraft helicopters with local guides coming into the communities and to Nunavut. There were some samplings made,

but there were too many times that the local people were perhaps taken advantage of to get licenses and other requirements to operate in Nunavut.

There are some traditional lands that we are concerned about. Many people have harvested soapstone in order to sell to local coops and markets overseas. You said a lot of land was claimed. I realize I know my questions and my comments do not appear to make sense. Perhaps it is being evasively answered. If I cannot get straight answers, just as my questions are not understood, this is why I am making general comments and questions. So, it is a short day. I will stop here.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Your names are in order, and you will be given a mic to ask your questions. Go ahead please.

Jopie: *(Translated)*: Jopie Kaernerik, Hamlet of Sanarijak. Thank you, Nunavut Planning Commission for interchanges with the panels. Around our area over the past, our community and environment was completely open for any sort of exploration and projects. We appear to have no choice. People, proponents were coming in to do what they want. I appreciate the Nunavut Planning Commission sitting here to determine what is really going on.

I have a question regarding municipal lands. Our community, we are very flat. There are no hills in sight anywhere. It is a flat land for many miles surrounding us, the hamlet municipal lands how it was structured and how the perimeter was determined. The hamlet outside the municipal boundaries, suppose our reservoirs and the watershed was outside the municipality land? We have a concern with that and how this would be solved if the water shortages were ever to occur.

You also mentioned that you approve exploration, developments. In our community, the Hunters and Trappers Organization and Hamlet Council, for those of us who are perhaps illiterate at times with written documents, I don't really have information sometimes. When the information does come, it is in limited sources like pamphlets and those sorts of things.

When exploration is taking place so close to the community and from the past when the mining companies want to work on the land that they have selected, they usually come in through the Council or the work area where they want to work. They explain to us after the fact to inform us that their project has been approved elsewhere. This is not a good situation.

So, in the land use planning process, the communities in Nunavut should be the first to be informed, to ask if projects will be approved and if they are good for the area.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do you want to respond?

Henry: Thank you. Henry Coman, Government of Nunavut. Could we just have a moment, please?

(Pause)

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. The Government of Nunavut is an active participant in the regulatory system, and we take community input very seriously. In order to provide a more fulsome response, I would like to confer with my colleagues, and we will provide a more fulsome response in writing. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You will be given an answer in written response. Do you have additional questions? Solomon?

Solomon: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Thank you, Government of Nunavut panel for your presentation to the Nunavut Planning Commission process. Solomon Awa, Mayor of Iqaluit. There were questions from the Nunavut Planning Commission. I don't know if it was properly answered.

The first item, in our *Land Agreement*, 11.1.1(i), it has been mentioned and asked how it differs when it comes to different projects. To the topic that was discussed, land designations, say for instance municipalities have boundaries. For example, the City of Iqaluit, our water source is drying up, and we have to look elsewhere outside the municipal boundary. A short question: So how will it be structured in your planning process so this problem can be solved easily in the future, perhaps in English.

There is too much restricted areas on other projects, say exploration, drilling and other proponents coming up to work on projects that have been put on a moratorium in the past in certain parts of the territory, areas close to the community boundaries. It is not just a problem that we are facing in the City of Iqaluit but numerous communities on Baffin Island are facing this shortage.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Your response, please.

Michele: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Michele Havard, Department of Environment. Solomon, I am wondering if you could just clarify that. I think what you are asking is how is the planning process going to protect water sources outside municipal boundaries. Is that correct?

Okay. The importance of selecting a zone of protection around a drinking water source or secondary source is really important. This process is very important. What it will do is tell the municipality how they can develop around that area. So, certain activities would be allowed, and other activities that could be potentially harmful to the water source watershed would be not allowed. That is why it is important to designate those areas and scope them appropriately.

We all recognize that to get to a water source, you need to have vehicles that would go there. So, there would probably need to be a road. There probably needs to be some type of structure, infrastructure around that water source so that people can work, but they have to do it in a specific way that prevents things, contaminants from getting into the water.

Those zones of protection are really important, and different signatories and participants in this process have ideas on how best to do that, along with the Planning Commission. So, we are all coming to a meeting of the minds to determine the best way to protect those sources. I don't think anybody is in dispute that those sources need to be protected. I hope this answers your question. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You have a question?

Solomon: (*Audio cut off for a few seconds*) ...marking a red zone area, if it is in our drinking water source. Some of these drinking water sources coming through the river outside the city boundaries for here, the municipal boundary. Would there be a plan to make a restriction zone to those rivers coming into our water source? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon would like to say something.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. Thank you, Solomon for your comments, and Michele for the clarity. The Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan currently proposes Limited Use. That means full protection for your watersheds and your water sources. The Government of Nunavut has stated Conditional Use. That Conditional Use...is it not Conditional Use? I believe it is Conditional Use you said, for the water sources allowing other activities to take place around it.

So, for clarity, the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan is proposing Limited Use. As Michele said, there are varying opinions of how this should be managed, and that is the point of why we are having these discussions, to get everyone's perspective of what is the best solution. What do communities want, and how do government and others see that the Commission gets solution to manage these areas? Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. As I said in a previous response, the Government of Nunavut currently does not have a position on primary water sources, so we are not recommending Conditional Use. Michele will add something to this.

Michele: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Michele Havard, Department of Environment. The Government of Nunavut has many people that sit, or many departments that sit on the Land Use Planning Committee, and they all bring their knowledge and opinions about the land use planning process.

Specific to drinking water, the Department of Health and Community and Government Services sits on that committee as well. The Department of Health, for instance, has developed a new public health act and drinking regulations that have additional protections put in them to protect the drinking water sources. There are a number of tools in those regulations that will protect the water sources. We also recognize, as I said before, that a water source has activities that need to occur in order to get the water to the people. Some of that has to be infrastructure, roads, trucks, things of that nature.

So, to the opinion of the Land Use Planning Committee at the Government of Nunavut is that some activity will have to occur around those water sources. That should be controlled through different regulations like the Nunavut Impact Review Board, like the Department of Health. I hope that answers some of your question. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Solomon, does that answer your question? Sharon, do you have an additional comment?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. For clarity for the record, can the Government of Nunavut please state what their position is on the protection or the use or the zoning for watersheds outside of the municipal boundary? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Michele: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Michele Havard, Department of Environment. We have stated previously that at this time, we do not have a government position as you request. This is because, as I have mentioned, we have confidence in the other regulatory processes that control and regulate drinking water sources, but we are happy to provide a written response to your question as well. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. I have some people on the list, but in the meantime, I think we need to take a coffee break. The MP is in the audience.

(Applause)

Break

George: *(Translated)*: Good morning. George Auksaq, Hamlet of Igloolik. I am a hamlet Councillor. I will try and be brief. Igloolik is an island. Its municipal lands cannot go beyond the island. My question is our runway. We need a proper water source. Every year annually, we hit a boil-water order to September or October. Annually, our water has become too small. In June, we basically ran out of water in the reservoir.

We would be able to fill before the freeze-up, refill the reservoir, but our runway is becoming too small for the size of our community. The water becomes very unclear, and we have to boil water. Are we going to always do this? It shouldn't be this way. We are concerned about our water source. Perhaps the water reservoir can be enlarged. The pump house, there is not enough land in that area. We expect that we will be getting another or better one, a larger water source, but it has not happened.

Through our *Land Claims Agreement*, there are no Inuit Owned Lands in Igloolik. They are all government lands. We need a proper water source for our community from the government. Also, there is hazardous waste products at the local landfill. We need to deal with these contaminated fluids. This spring, children were busy going through the hazardous materials at the landfill. They need to be properly contained and disposed.

We have limited land in our community the past three years. This fall, they left by the ship. It would be good to do that again, perhaps the extension of our runway. It would reduce the cost of living. I hope I am following the agenda. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do we have a response?

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. Thank you, George, for your comments and questions. Any changes to the municipal bounds can be carried out under the *Hamlets Act* in collaboration with the Government of Nunavut's Community and Government Services Department. If the Community of Igloolik, and as well Sanirajak, we misunderstood your question earlier, sir. If any changes need to be made to municipal bounds, it is not through the land use planning process. It would be under the *Hamlets Act*. In terms of the water source, I will pass it to Michele to respond.

Michele: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Michele Havard, Department of Environment. I mentioned earlier there are two other departments that are responsible for drinking water: Community and Government Services, and the Department of Health. I had the privilege of working for many years with the Department of Health on drinking water. I have been to Igloolik many times about the drinking water situation. I know that they have made significant efforts to try to expand the reservoir, but you are correct. There is work that needs to be done to the reservoir, and we are happy to bring those messages back to the responsible departments, so they hear your concerns as well.

If I could also speak to the contaminated materials that you are talking about, it is great to hear that the community has done some work to remove the contaminants, and the Department of Environment has been working hard to develop a program to support communities in getting those materials out of their landfills. We worked with three communities this year and had a very successful program. We are encouraged by that, and we will be doing more work for other communities. We will definitely take those messages back and take that into consideration as well. I believe also that someone else wanted to mention something. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Diane: Diane Lapierre, Government of Nunavut. We had an opportunity to better understand questions that came from Sanirajak. With respect to your concern about consultation and exploration companies coming and talking with communities, the Government of Nunavut recommends early community engagement.

We have a Community Engagement Support Program to help support that. It is being (*word inaudible*) financial assistance to mineral exploration and junior mining companies in an effort to support their coming and speaking with communities early and build up that relationship and that engagement. This program is for development that occurs prior to the formal regulatory process. So, it is in an effort to address some of those early activities that take place and ensure that early communication is taking place. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Ejetsiak?

Ejetsiak: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Ejetsiak, Kinngait Hamlet. I want to inquire to the Government of Nunavut. I have heard mineral exploration is permitted in Nunavut, but I would like to understand. In 1930 or 1940, my grandfather with my cousin when we were growing up in Iqaluit, he walked us up the land for a month in August. He wanted us to know back in 1930, 1940, he wanted to teach us where a valuable rock was. He took us up and walked up as there was no transportation. We used to walk great distances as a teenager. I am 79 years old now. That was a long, long time ago.

My grandfather said you will know this rock, and minerals in the North are going to open up. Sure enough, it has happened. I mention this. I would like to find out where, whether in the government resources, I know where that rock is that my grandfather had identified. It looks quite valuable. I know where it is. My head has a brain, so it is in my brain. I want to inform and pass on this knowledge of that rock that my grandfather taught me. I have not heard of anyone else finding it. So, I want to inform you and your employees where the stone is. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Perhaps a response? Go ahead.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. Thank you for your commentary. If you would like to communicate that, or we could communicate that to the Department of Economic Development and Transportation, we would appreciate that. Thank you.

Chairperson: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. If I understand your question, were you asking when you spoke whether an Inuk can be a geologist? Is that what you were asking, or did I misunderstand your question? I thought that is what you were asking. Did you get a response?

Ejetsiak: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Ejetsiak, Hamlet of Kinngait. Yes, that was my question. To which person I could proceed to, so I got a response. Thank you.

Chairperson: He is asking as Inuk if he were to do exploration himself as Inuk, would he be able to. I believe that was part of question. Go ahead.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. Annie Cyr-Parent from the Department of Economic Development and Transportation will respond to that.

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Annie: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Annie Cyr-Parent, Government of Nunavut. Thank you for your question. The Government of Nunavut offers this introduction to prospecting course in all of the Nunavut communities. As soon as you have this course, you can apply for a prospector's license with CIRNAC here at the Mining Recorder's Office in town.

The EDNT, Economic Development and Transportation Office has geologists, and so do two of our regional offices. They are always more than happy to help identify rocks or support community members that wish to go out and learn more about the mineral potential. I hope this answers your question.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. He said yes. Johnny Mike?

Johnny M: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Johnny Mike, Pangnirtung Hunters and Trappers Organization. Regarding the Nunavut Land Use Plan, on page 35, it is talking about geographic distribution of caribou and reindeer population. It is including the GN Caribou Strategy.

(*Portion not translated*). Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. I am trying to remember this when I talk about the map and the boundaries within Nunavut for caribou. I think I was the Minister when we approved this as the Minister of Environment in 2014. My question is the Hunters and Trappers Organization in Pangnirtung from the board, Baffin Island caribou should be delineated with North Baffin and South Baffin.

As the Government of Nunavut identified Baffin Island with three distinct herds, we feel coming from the Inuit that you claim to support, to follow the *Agreement*. I just wanted to mention as hunters, I feel I am a hunter too. My dad helped me catch my first caribou by dog team. The Minister of Environment, as a hunter of caribou, the other part of my life has moved on, but currently, I am a hunter. From when I was a child, it continues.

Today, which way are you thinking about the caribou herds? Are there three distinct herds? Are there two distinct herds? What is your feeling on that about caribou? Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can respond, please.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. I will have Drikus Gissing to please respond to this question. Thank you.

Chairperson: State your name and your organization. Qujannamiik.

Drikus: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Drikus Gissing, Department of Environment, Government of Nunavut. Thank you, Mr. Mike for that question. It is a very good question actually, because there is a lot of debate around that.

We at the moment, currently, we are managing Baffin as one caribou herd. That is based on genetic information that we have collected over the years and analyzed for caribou from South Baffin, North Baffin, and Central Baffin. Genetically, there is no difference between the caribou, so we are managing it as one herd.

However, there is Traditional Knowledge information and information collected by Mr. Ferguson I believe, in the 1990s that does identify groupings, North Baffin, Central Baffin, South Baffin, and I believe East Baffin. In our recommendations on harvesting, we did identify to the Regional Wildlife Organization to allocate harvest based on North Baffin, South Baffin, Central Baffin, and East Baffin. The Regional Inuit Association, however, did not allocate based on those.

So, from a Government of Nunavut perspective, we feel that the Regional Inuit Association has the right to manage it according to those designations, but purely based on genetics, it is one herd. We are managing it as one herd. The Nunavut Wildlife Management Board makes decisions on management as one herd, but nothing prevents the Regional Inuit Organization for allocating harvest based on Traditional Knowledge information and historic information on Baffin Island caribou when there were large numbers that separate out.

At the moment, we don't see that separation of North, South, and Central, but a lot more research needs to be conducted now while the numbers are low. As I mentioned earlier, too, we believe that once the caribou herds in Nunavut start recovering and you start getting larger numbers, they will likely go back to those historical delineations of North, Central, and South Baffin. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Johnny?

Johnny M: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Johnny Mike, Pangnirtung Hunters and Trappers Organization. We need more work in this area. I believe too that it is not a single herd. As I stated, when I got my first caribou, it was different. I have lived here in Iqaluit. The caribou have shorter hair, browner fur, and the white part on their belly is different. It is browner. Some are totally brown and shorter legs.

We have noticed that the caribou seem bigger, larger animals with matted fur, and the white part on their belly is whiter. From what I have seen, when there was a lot of caribou in the summer, the bull would have less fat than the other ones. We know various caribou caught in different regions

from the north, from the south. Regarding caribou, we do, and even to Iqaluit trying to go hunting, the caribou are not one herd.

We cannot tell just by eating, but we find the smaller ones, the one I caught near here tasted like a rabbit. Up near Pangnirtung, the caribou aren't like that. They don't taste like rabbit. You can't really tell that they smell like a rabbit when you eat them, but the blood we feel but the caribou if I am here from the meat, the taste is different here in Iqaluit. That is how it is. That is why I think it is not one herd. The HTO feels the same. They have wanted the delineation or even three separate herds would be okay with us. I wanted to identify that. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Paul?

Paul Q: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Quassa, City of Iqaluit Councillor. My question is first to the Government of Nunavut regarding water outside of municipal boundaries. As we know, the Mixed Use as I understand, if we need to secure our water or quarries, sand, gravel, if it is in Mixed Use, it is easier. That's the way I understood that. It will be easier for communities regarding water if the category outside of the municipal boundary is Mixed Use. Can I get clarification? Does that make it easier for communities to access in the future water or quarry sites? That is my first question. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do you have a response?

Michele: Thank you for the question. Michele Havard, Department of Environment. If I understand correctly, you are asking whether Mixed Use is more beneficial to having a secondary water source. Okay, yes. The Government of Nunavut is recommending that secondary water sources be viewed as a Valued Component outside of municipal boundaries. Again, this is a discussion and a position that we have taken based on the fact that there are other regulatory supports for water sources in the territory. I hope that helps. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead, Paul.

Paul: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Quassa, City of Iqaluit Councillor. I have a question to the Nunavut Planning Commission who are here conducting and supporting many of the municipalities in Nunavut. Would we have a problem if the situation arises in water troubles and many of the communities will be having water shortages and problems, while you have Limited Use? How restrictive would that be for future problems that might arise with water reservoirs and watersheds in Nunavut? The Limited Use, will it be restrictive to the communities and to the city? This is for the Nunavut Planning Commission.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Brian, can you answer the question?

Brian: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Brian Aglukark, Nunavut Planning Commission. That is a very good question, Paul. Thank you for asking. Since we started the public hearings coming in from Cambridge Bay to Rankin Inlet and to Thompson, Manitoba on to Pond Inlet, this is a major concern. Different RIOs have expressed this.

The federal government and the Government of Nunavut says that all projects will be restricted in this area. KIA in the Kivalliq, the president of QIA during their annual meeting in Arviat was pointing

at the map. He was pointing saying everything will stop, anything in the red zone. This was quite false. It is not there written in stone.

For anyone who is affected by the planning process and anyone who has concerns, the Nunavut Land Use Plan is open for amendments. We call that an amendment process. This would be ongoing every so often, for your information. Chair, thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Paul, do you have a follow-up?

Paul Q: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Quassa, City of Iqaluit. Thank you, Brian, for your answer. It is clear. I have an additional question to the Nunavut Planning Commission here in English.

(*English*): If a community needed to expand its boundaries, would it require an application to the Nunavut Planning Commission to verify conformity? Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Goump? Goump will answer that question. Go ahead.

Goump: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. Goump Djalouge, Nunavut Planning Commission. We have never faced that, and there is no clear indication in the *Agreement* there has to be. I think Daniel answered that. The process is normally to the municipal council and then to the Minister of CGS, the application to the Minister of CGS.

So, the municipal council has to first pass a motion and probably work with the CGS staff to determine the expansion that they want. Then it has to be submitted to the Minister of Community and Government Services who would be the ultimate approval person for the extension. So, it does not come through the Nunavut Planning Commission.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Brian, go ahead.

Brian: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Brian Aglukark, Nunavut Planning Commission. The question that Goump has answered is a fact. It will go through a conformity process. Anything new in parks in progress would go through NPC. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Paul, go ahead.

Paul Q: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Quassa, City of Iqaluit Councillor. Okay, I understand. The land when you want to change its designation, I don't know how to say this in Inuktitut. I don't know what it means in Inuktitut, the conformity determination. Now I understand. Now perhaps clarify to the people sitting here who might hear this term, especially with water sources, watersheds. This conformity determination, would it apply to water problems? Could someone explain conformity determination?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Brian?

Brian: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Brian Aglukark, Nunavut Planning Commission. Yes. Sharon?

Chairperson: Sharon will answer. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. If I understand the question correctly, it is the conformity determination process. The conformity determination process is done against the approved Land Use Plan. Currently, there are two approved plans. It is measured against the terms and conditions that are stated in the land use plans.

When the Nunavut-wide Land Use Plan is in effect, it will replace the two regional plans, and the conformity determination process will apply to the whole of the Nunavut Settlement Area. I hope that answers the question about the conformity determinations. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Did that answer your question? Jonah?

Jonah: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jonah Keyootak, Qikiqtarjuaq Hamlet. I have a question. I have only heard about this problem of climate change. Our community is on an island, and the water reservoir, water source is always a problem. With climate change getting warmer in the past few years, our reservoir will be facing problems.

Now my question is, if this continues, we will have no water reservoir. We will have no water source. To replenish the reservoir, we have to go outside of the municipal boundaries. How will we proceed with this water source coming in from outside? Not only that, but it will have to come in through pipelines, through a small water channel. We need to see what the planning should be.

Our water delivery system is by trucks. Because we are on an island, the potential water source is on the mainland, Baffin Island. We are facing a potential water reservoir dry-up. My concern, where should I direct it to? Nunavut Planning Commission, maybe you can answer this, and perhaps NTI as well. Are we going to run out of water before any organization is able to solve it?

Chairperson: Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. Thank you for the question. With regard to the municipalities, and I am not going to speak for the GN, but the responsibilities of working with the communities, I believe falls under Community Government and Services. To work to identify the water sources I think within the municipalities and the watersheds, that falls within the GN. So, I would ask Mr. Chair, if the GN wants to comment on the identification of alternate water sources. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can go ahead when you are ready.

Michele: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you for the question, Jonah. My name is Michele Havard, Department of Environment. I believe yes, Sharon, you are absolutely right. Community and Government Services have identified secondary drinking water sources for almost all of the communities, but Jonah you are right. There are always obstacles to some of these sources and accessing them.

We are happy to take your comments back and share them with Community and Government Services and those responsible. I don't have an answer for you right now in terms of if and when the community would run out of water. I know that Community and Government Services and Department of Health are working very closely on a lot of those issues. I hope that helps. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Maliktoo?

Maliktoo: (*Translated*): Maliktoo Lyta, Hamlet of Kimmirut. I have a question to the panel. We need to be informed if any exploration is going on in our vicinity. We need to be informed. This has not been the case. The past summer, an exploration company just approached and started doing their work. The approval for this proponent appeared to have come in from somewhere else. We had no idea who approved it.

We need to have your departments, Government of Nunavut to know who is approving the proponents coming in to do exploration. We need clarification. HTOs have to always be kept informed. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. The Government of Nunavut does not approve exploration projects. That lies with the Government of Canada, the Mining Recorder's Office. I would like Diane to add more about the Community Engagement piece. Thank you.

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Diane: Diane Lapierre, Government of Nunavut. Yeah, just to add what I said earlier about the Government of Nunavut's Community Engagement Support Program, when project development, if project development proceeds to more advanced exploration and through the Nunavut Impact Review Board process, they need to show that they provide meaningful engagement. With the Government of Nunavut Support Program that helps small exploration companies to engage with communities, the ideal candidate is those who provide meaningful engagement.

So, we continually support early engagement, and the Community Engagement Support Program is meant to facilitate that in an effort to keep those communications open and meaningful and to ensure that the community is feeling those meaningful engagements. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Paul, go ahead.

Paul Q: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Quassa, City of Iqaluit Councillor. The questions I will ask in English.

(*English*): Concerning existing rights, I do remember talking about those when we were negotiating the *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement*, the fact that we had to respect existing rights. I guess my first question would be, I know that the GN has explicitly said that they want to see existing rights protected. Does the Government of Nunavut know how many existing rights there are in Nunavut that are not? Just a simple question, do you know how many existing rights there are in Nunavut as we speak? Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can respond.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. At this time, no, we don't have an exact number, but we can look into that and respond in writing. Thank you.

Chairperson: Go ahead. More questions, Paul?

Paul Q: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Quassa, City of Iqaluit Councillor. I think I will be saying this every day, every time I walk out of here. I'll ask the question in English.

(*English*): I'm sure the Government of Nunavut does have that information if they are really concerned about that, existing rights to be protected. I'm sure you guys have a number or have an idea. If you didn't, then how can you say that existing rights should be protected when you don't have that number? But, on the other hand, I do recall that we have to respect existing rights in Nunavut. Can you elaborate a bit more of what your concerns are? Is it because the present Draft Land Use Plan does not identify those existing rights? Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can respond.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. As we stated before, the Government of Nunavut does not manage existing rights or mineral tenure. That lies with the Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada, the Mining Recorder's Office. So, no, we do not have an exact number for the amount of existing rights. You might want to pose that question to CIRNAC.

In terms of our position on existing rights, that is in order. Because these rights were legally obtained, we cannot extinguish those rights without compensation. Our position currently is that they should be allowed to reasonably develop through the regulatory system. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Another question?

Paul Q: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Quassa. Clear answers. These existing rights were there before the *Nunavut Agreement*. Turning on to the Nunavut Planning Commission, the existing rights in the Nunavut area, you will be approving these companies under existing rights?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Paul, for your question. What I can speak to is what the Plan currently proposes. So, when the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan, the 2021 Draft was released, there are a number, based on the data that was given to the Commission, I don't have the number offhand. There was a slide in our presentation that stated the number of existing rights.

The Commission recognizes that those existing rights need to be acknowledged, and they are proposing in the Plan that those existing rights be protected. There is an acknowledgement in the Plan that as it goes forward, those existing rights are honoured to protect certainty for those that have invested in the exploration and mining sector within the territory. I hope that answers your question. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Paul?

Paul Q: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Quassa, City of Iqaluit Councillor. I am starting to get confused. At first, the Government of Nunavut made a discussion on this topic that it goes to the federal government, now the Nunavut Planning Commission. Protection, they need to be protected and honoured as under existing rights, and both levels of government are saying that they will be protected.

I fail to understand why there are differences in both levels of government. One of you will have to clarify for me to understand. It appears that these proponents are protected under existing rights, so I don't know which government to direct this to. There is no intent of malicious questions, but just to clarify what the situation is under existing rights. Who really is responsible for this, Chair?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can answer? Go ahead.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. Our comment is Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada pointed out that the number of existing rights that exist in Nunavut does not match the number that the Nunavut Planning Commission has. So, their comment is that those should also be respected. The Government of Nunavut generally supports that position as well. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for the question, and Daniel the clarification. The Commission received the information on mineral rights from the Government of Canada and Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. The criteria were selected for the active projects and the rights that overlap within the Land Use Plan. Currently, I do have the number now. It is 52.

In saying that, there is a discussion, and that is why we are here today to see what the perspectives are on existing rights going forward. That number probably may or may not change depending on the submissions that are given to the Commission with regard to existing rights from communities and the parties.

The recommendation in the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan is not final. It is what we are here to talk about to see what it should look like and solutions going forward. I hope that answers your question. Thank you.

Chairperson: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. I have no more names from the floor. Nunavik, questions to the presentation? There is one. Get a microphone to him, please.

Adamie Kaitak: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Adamie Kaitak, Chairperson Salluit. For the Government of Nunavut, as we have been hearing all the presentations, they seem to be pushing mineral rights and not the desires of Inuit. For example, there is a quota in Nunavut for bears. I am defending the Nunavut Inuit where maybe at some point we won't be able to eat polar bear meat.

Now we are trying to open up the land for mineral exploration and activity and not the desires of the Inuit that want to see protection. So, when I hear that, I want to defend my fellow Inuit when there are so many bears, and we are restricting with quotas in Nunavut. There are too many. They are a hinderance now, the bears. They are eating islands of duck eggs. They are clearing all the eggs of the islands, and now you also want to open mineral activity. I want to ask, is that your position? Thank you.

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. Our position generally is that a balance needs to be struck between wildlife conservation and mineral development. In terms of the polar bear specifics, I would like to ask Drikus Gissing to expand on that, please. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Please state your name.

Adamie Kaitak? (*Translated*): I just want that you put the Inuit first. When we talk about bears, there are lots and lots of bears. Here Nunavut has quotas on bears. There are too many bears. You should believe the Inuit. You are looking at the islands that we could possibly on some of the islands run out of water. We need to be looked after properly. Mines should not be the leading point of discussion. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Johnny is next.

Johnny K: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. Johnny Kasudluak, Inukjuak. I have been hearing every so often. I wanted to mention three points. It is not a real question. For example, in our community, we are tied with the province of Quebec through agreements with the communities. We have various lands, Category 1, and community municipal corporations own land. With our government and looking at the economic growth with roads, power lines, and other municipal infrastructure, the land that is selected is not returned right away. You mentioned the *Hamlet Act* here.

When you mentioned the municipal boundaries need adjusting, there was some discussion. The identification of Limited Use whether the municipal lands or other activity on those lands, if the community has selected, do you trade lands? Do you use this process to trade lands?

Also, I hear the names that if we get a response from an expert. That is what I wanted to share. The discussion on Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, it has to be further defined and explored in the context of self-government. It is a Qallunaat system. Inuit have their own. If we were not here the discussion would not happen.

I want to say that Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit is not just a phrase. Inuit have desires and wishes, and Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit has to be legitimate. What we are hearing from the communities has to be the base. For example, about caribou, where do they calve? They don't have the research, but they claim they rely on Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit when there is a Mixed Use category. That is based on Inuit Knowledge, and they don't seem to have a proper response. It needs to be better clarified, the knowledge base that you claim to support, that you balance Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit. I saw this. I just wanted to note that. That is it. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. If you want to respond, he did have a question. Proceed.

Henry: Henry Coman, Government of Nunavut. Thank you for the comments. We heard you, and we will take that back to the Government of Nunavut. Thank you.

Chairperson: Okay, Qujannamiik. Eli?

Eli: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. Eli Aullaluk, Akulivik Wildlife Association Chairman. The Nunavut Tunngavik said the red markings, there are too many, too big. Now the Government of Nunavut said

the red ones are too big. There is too much Limited Use. The category of Limited Use could mean that you can proceed once it is cleared or granted permission.

The red markings on the map, those are Inuit hunting grounds and waters that they identified. They value those locations. That is the food source. We rely on country food, and this is the number one base of who we are, having proper clean waters. It will only get more valuable. We have to protect for the purpose of the world. We are running out of water as the world heats up.

We have to defend and protect our lands, the waters. We have to protect the waters, the glaciers, and the ice. We have to fuel for that, and please will the Government of Nunavut put Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit first? Can they protect land base and not minimize those selections? The Nunavut Planning Commission will have to determine as we look from the outside and the future that water will become more of a valuable commodity. We have a lot of lakes.

We have never had a shortage of water. We even now understand water issues will face us in the future. We have to consider as hunters. We see clean, pristine land, the home of the wildlife. That is the desires of the hunters, and it is important. That is why I speak based on Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit that we have.

They said there would be lots of Qallunaat coming to Inuit country. We didn't know why, but the water around the world is drying. Perhaps we might see more people coming. We have to plan our lands, the valuable waters and lands. Mining companies will only work for a short time, and then they will be gone. They will come and go, but they shouldn't be the priority for the people of Nunavut. Wildlife should be the priority. That is what I wanted to say as we try and guide this. It is not a question. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: That is not a question. Simiunie?

Simiunie: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. I will try and be fast. We are running out of time. Simiunie Ohaituk. We have been hearing and discussing. Inuit say one thing, and the knowledgeable base once they start, they confuse the issue to all the members. One person's comments speaking is understandable. Then when we go into questions, and we all speak with one voice. We seem to hit another obstacle.

For example, when we started dealing with the governments as an association, before Makavik was created, we as Inuit spoke with one voice. We are basing things on Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit. We talk about Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit. We don't use it. A response comes from the government. Our words, Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit is now visible to governments, and they feel inclusion, but they don't really include it.

So, we speak with one voice here, but I understand different from what I hear. Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit is legitimate. Maybe you don't understand it properly in the government. We have one united voice, but the questions maybe are not understood when we speak. We have reached this point as the united voice of Inuit. We might have a better agreement with each other.

Maybe you don't understand what we are saying anymore and what we want to see. I'm sure some of it you understand. Looking at our ancestors, we need to be informed about Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. I don't have your name, sorry. There is another hand up over here.

Adamie Kaituk: *(Translated)*: Adamie Kaituk, Salluit Hunters and Trappers Organization Chairperson. I am trying to ask the Government of Nunavut what advantage, benefits do you have for Inuit? Are you only catering to the mining companies? That is my question. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Proceed if you have a response.

Diane: Diane Lapierre, Government of Nunavut. If I understand correctly, benefits to Inuit specific to economic benefits, the Government of Nunavut has put forward a position that helps to accommodate various economic opportunities. Yes, resource development offers opportunities for employment and training specific to mining, as well as revenue to the government and other organizations.

When trying to strike that balance in the Land Use Plan, other economic opportunities include community development and access to some of the things we have been talking about today, such as aggregate resources, as well as opportunities of transportation and associated infrastructure, linear infrastructure that can help moving goods and services across the territory, and the ability for future goals and priorities that will continue to benefit Inuit. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. More questions? Go ahead.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. In addition to mining, we also are encouraging a diversified economy. The Department of Environment specifically, we are heavily invested in supporting our wildlife populations so that Inuit can harvest them into the future. We take that very seriously, and we consider that traditional economy to be incredibly important. There is upwards of a million dollars that goes directly to Inuit in selling wildlife harvests. We recognize that and believe it is incredibly important. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Adamie, do you have another question?

Adamie K: *(Translated)*: Adamie Kaituk, Salluit Chairperson. The Government of Nunavut should inform Inuit the advantage of economic potential and for the betterment of Inuit. Mining related issues should not be the priority. When we talk about bears, Nunavut Inuit have concerns on bears. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Perhaps a response? Go ahead.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. Perhaps Drikus Gissing can add something in the context of polar bears. Thank you.

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Drikus: Drikus Gissing, Department of Environment, Government of Nunavut. If I understand the question correctly, it was related to polar bear management and what we are doing related to polar bears. We have a very active polar bear research program going on across Nunavut. We spend annually about \$1.5 million dollars on managing our polar bears. We work very closely with the communities on polar bear research to identify appropriate research and management actions.

For the South Baffin specifically, we just completed a Davis Strait Project that we are planning to consult with all the communities on in South Baffin very shortly within the next few months on the results of the studies and appropriate management actions.

The research that we are doing also helps to inform and to identify critical habitat for polar bears or areas that are important for polar bears that will also help to inform decision making as it relates to development, shipping, and those types of things. I hope that I answered the question correctly. If there is any follow-up question on that or correct me if I misunderstood the question. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Adamie, go ahead.

Adamie K: *(Translated)*: Adamie Kaituk, Chairperson of Salluit Hunters and Trappers. There are funds for polar bear management. When there are lots and lots of bears, it is just a waste of money. There are lots and lots of bears. You cannot say the bears are disappearing. That is not the case. Our descendants have to be able to eat bears. We are treated like this as Inuit. Not just bears, but all animals.

For what reason are we doing this when there are lots and lots of bears. They are even scary now, but now you can't catch bears. It shouldn't be the case. They are spending over \$1 million dollars on bear management. They are not using Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit. Inuit customs are not being used. We are trying to destroy all the wildlife. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. That was just a comment. Go ahead.

Ali: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Ali Qavavauk, Ivujivik, Chairperson. The bear research, Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, Inuit know about bears. White men have been studying bears forever. The bears that are put to sleep, when you put a tranquilizer in them, it affects the taste of the bear. We know as Inuit. There is research going on with bears, but they have not found what they are looking for. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there comments to the report, please?

Paulusi: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paulusi Tarriasuk, Ivujivik Hunters and Trappers Organization member. Mineral companies are free to do whatever they want. When we speak about the ocean, the animals are being ruined, for example, scallops, mussels, clams, furs, different creatures on the bottom of the ocean. The contaminants travel far from the mining companies due to currents and conditions. The wildlife will be affected.

That is why we are being made to be quiet while they ruin our land and our animals. They are going to be ruined. I am apprehensive with all the travelling that we do the contaminants from mining. I am defending the animals. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. There was no question there either, just a comment. I have no more names from Nunavik. Do we have any questions from the registered participants? We have a hand up. Archie. I know that we are hitting lunchtime. We are just going to finish the program here until we are done before lunch. Go ahead.

Archie: (Translated): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Archie Angnakak, Amaruq Hunters and Trappers member. I will speak Chinese.

(English): I know GN did a harvest study on caribou in the '90s. I know that it stems from the *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement* as required. I would ask you to submit that to the Nunavut Planning Commission as a fact. That would also include the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board to give that study to them as well, as it is based on the *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement*. That is one thing.

I would also, Mr. Chairman, like to give GN one example of Inuit rights that Amaruq Hunters and Trappers is asserting and is going to be asserting in our submission to you. That is in terms of Article 7, from the date of ratification, that is 7.2.2. It is very clear that subject to approval from Hunters and Trappers Organizations and exercising Inuit rights under Article 5.7.16, which refers to the Inuit have unrestricted free access for the purpose of harvesting to all lands, water, marine areas within the Nunavut Settlement Areas, except lands described in 5.7.16, and that refers to national security issues.

Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the right of access shall extend to all Crown land including for great and certainty parks and conservation areas, and to municipal corporations. In our submission, we are going to be pointing that out to the Nunavut Planning Commission.

We are going to be exercising that right, and in doing so, we have already asked all members to identify lands that that they feel should be highlighted in red, which is Limited or yellow, which is Conditional. That is our right, and we are going to be asserting that.

(Translated): Also, Mr. Chairperson, it was asked what rights we have, and they could not answer. For your knowledge, we have rights to the Planning Commission, to identify as Amaruq Hunters and Trappers and how it should be red or yellow. Based on our rights, identity within our areas, and if it is related to hunting, the federal government lands, waters, and the sea, the land fast ice with the Land Claim land. Border shall be inside the Nunavut Settlement Area, including military sites. It states that hunting activity and Inuk can have access free on Crown lands, so it is more understandable, or the government lands. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead, Mike.

Mike F: (Translated): I have one comment and two questions. The questions, depending on the responses, may have follow-up. The first comment is to clarify some information regarding how QWB allocates caribou quotas. I know it is off topic, but I think I should clarify things. The QWB takes into factors from IQ very much, along the lines of what Johnny Mike described.

The allocation is done for 10 different communities all with different situations. A maximum number is imposed upon the QWB by the Government of Nunavut by the Minister. However, QWB manages the allocation by community, 10 separate communities. I just want to make sure that is clear to everybody.

Now to my questions: The Nunavut wildlife regulations under the *Nunavut Wildlife Act* legally recognizes and delineates 8 caribou calving areas already. Three of those calving areas are on Baffin Island. They are named the Dewar calving area, the Longstaff calving area, and the Baird calving area.

I have looked for regulations in the GN's legislation, but I have not found for the calving areas that the GN already legally recognizes, I have not found regulations that protect cows and their calves. Will the GN provide us with information? Since they support Conditional Land Use regulations, can they describe to us the regulations in the legally recognized calving areas by the Government of Nunavut? What are the regulations that protect caribou calves and their females within the 8 areas that the government already recognizes? That is my question.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. I would ask Drikus Gissing to please respond. Thank you.

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Drikus: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Drikus Gissing, Department of Environment, Government of Nunavut. We will have to look it up. I am not aware of any regulations relating to the protection of cows and calves at this stage, but we will have to look it up. We can provide a response back to the QWB. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do you have another question?

Mike F: Thank you. That corresponds with the fact that I could not find any regulations, but maybe there are some, and that would be very informative. Thank you, Drikus.

My other question is, the GN has described its lack of support for Limited Use designations. My question is this: There are 14 organizations under the *Land Claim*. The QWB is rarely mentioned by the GN, but the 13 HTOs and the QWB have specific mandates that are very similar in terms of wildlife under the *Nunavut Agreement*, Section 5.7.

So, my question is this: How many HTOs and the QWB, of those 14 organizations, how many of them have provided support of the Government of Nunavut for the government's current position regarding Limited Use designations?

Chairperson: You can proceed with a response.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. Informing the Government of Nunavut's positions, we take a whole-of-government approach, so that incorporates all of our various departments. We also rely on feedback from our wildlife biologists who are in communication with Hunters and Trappers Organizations and communities.

Also additionally, we are here at these hearings to hear what those communities and Hunters and Trappers Organizations have to say themselves. We take that information and incorporate it into our positions. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Mike F: My response to that answer comes from Article 19 of the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People*: States shall consult and cooperate in good faith with Indigenous peoples through their own representatives institutions, which in this case are HTOs and RWOs, in order to obtain their Free Prior and Informed Consent before adopting legislative measures that may affect them.

I would like to know in line with the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People*, clear expressions by the HTOs and the QWB of support, for the Government of Nunavut to adopt the measures that they are describing here, which will affect harvesting by Inuit. That is a request. You can provide the documentation at a later time.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. That consultation is taking place right now. That is what these hearings are, and we are listening and taking that information back, and it feeds into our position. Thank you.

Chairperson: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. We are hitting lunch. Some are leaving. Johnny Mike has to depart this afternoon. After that, we will break for lunch. Proceed, Johnny.

Johnny M: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Johnny Mike, Pangnirtung Hunters and Trappers Organization. I am following the process, but I have to catch a flight. I have to depart. I am glad we have the opportunity. From what I have to say in terms of looking at the *Land Claims Agreement*, it is the base on wildlife management, fisheries.

In Pangnirtung, Chairman, items that are introduced from various organizations and positions, issues related to the bottom of the ocean near Pangnirtung like turbot and shrimp, we want to be involved, and also through Department of Fisheries and Oceans. We have some hunting grounds that are adjacent to our communities. I say that. No one mentioned the Nunavut Settlement Area inside. We have claimed Nunavut. We are speaking of only certain parts.

What I am mentioning is a priority. The land has come up in terms of fishing commercially. I am worried about that. Currently in the planning process, I am concerned of Inuit rights, Inuit lands. I might be the only one speaking under Article 11 on how the work needs to be done in the planning process and how inclusive the communities are.

The Claim, 11.2.1(b) whether you support that Article in the planning process, but to identify, there is none. I am worried that NTI, Canada, QIA, and others have not clarified in the Claim what I am talking about. You won't hear from me again. I have a 1:00 flight, and that is the only reason. I wanted to spell this out. Don't forget 11.2.1(b). It says special attention. Let's defend that and raise it, raise it higher with Inuit culture, Inuit lands. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

(*Applause*)

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. We will take a lunch break. We will be back with them after lunch with more questions. Be back at 1:15.

Lunch Break

Paul C: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Paul Crowley, Friends of Land Use Planning. There is another document that the Government of Nunavut has created based on research on the influence of roads on caribou. It is entitled, "*Analysis of Caribou Movements Relative to the Meadowbank Mine and Roads During Spring Migration.*" I would like to know if the Government of Nunavut could also put this document on the public record. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. I believe that report is already publicly available, but yes, we can put it on the record.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Paul C: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Paul Crowley, Friends of Land Use Planning. I would like to explore and ask questions with regard to balance that the Government of Nunavut has talked about in terms of protection versus economic development.

In its presentation, the Government of Nunavut has put forward that the areas where mineral potential is unknown, including those areas that are currently identified as Limited Use, have considerable value because they are unknown. The mineral values are unknown. Can I just have the Government of Nunavut please confirm that position?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead when you are ready.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. I don't believe we have ever qualified those areas as having considerable value. We just emphasized that they are unexplored, and therefore, we would like them to be explored before they are closed off for development. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Another question?

Paul C: My notes, which I tried to take verbatim from your presentation earlier holds that mineral potential is unknown and holds considerable value. Regardless, when it comes to the balance, we have roughly 80% of the land, which is open for exploration. So, anyone with a prospector's license can go online, secure rights, and then have a duty, responsibility, requirement to work to keep those rights, and they can do so without consulting with communities first. That is in Mixed Use Areas.

So, there is a heavy weighting, basically the size of Spain, France, and Germany, that is fully open to mineral exploration even without the requirement for consulting communities before. Then we have the remaining 20% currently in this Draft as Limited Uses Areas. The Government of Nunavut is saying that these areas because they are unexplored potentially, have great value and should remain open to mining.

I am failing to see a balance. I see 80% of the lands fully open, and then the Government of Nunavut asking for the remaining 20% to be also open so that exploration and prospecting can occur without prior community consultation or any prohibitions. Is this correct?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Response, please.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. It is not entirely correct. We are advocating for Conditional Use where there will be seasonal restrictions and phased shutdowns. Additionally, if a project were to develop past an exploration phase, it would go through the Nunavut Impact Review Board, and their project-specific terms and conditions would be applied. I would ask Annie Cyr-Parent to add on to the mineral part. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Annie: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Annie Cyr-Parent, Government of Nunavut. We do say the fact that we don't know the mineral potential has value in the sense that it is important to consider that aspect. We don't know, so there could be significant values in regions or areas that are unknown for their mineral potential, so our position is not that we want the land to be fully open at all. It is that we want Conditional Use for caribou protection to allow for a case-by-case analysis.

We also believe that the Nunavut Impact Review Board plays an important role in consulting with all the parties. We have a strong regulatory regime, as we just noticed with Baffinland. So, the Government of Nunavut does not believe that everything should be open for exploration. In fact, it is not, even in Mixed Use Areas. Companies have to go through the process.

It is not because you claim mineral rights that you can do any activity, even drilling or picking up rocks or anything. You cannot just go ahead and do that as soon as you have a prospector's license or mineral rights. First, you have to go through the Nunavut regulatory process, including the Nunavut Planning Commission and the Nunavut Impact Review Board.

As always, the Government of Nunavut always recommends to all parties to engage as early as possible with communities. That is something that we strongly believe in along with our regulatory regime. I hope that answers your question. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do you have another question?

Paul C: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Paul Crowley, Friends of Land Use Planning. There is so much to unpack with that answer. Under Conditional Use with seasonal restrictions, would those lands have prohibition on exploration, or could they still be staked?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. Yes, exploration would be permitted in those areas.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do you have another question?

Paul C: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for that answer. Thank you, Mr. Chair, Paul Crowley, Friends of Land Use Planning. So, these lands would be open for exploration as well without prohibition except for potential seasonal ones. But I, if I have, or a company could go online tonight and secure

rights in an area that has a seasonal restriction through Conditional Use and still be then to maintain my rights, required by law to work them.

I would be able to do so without the community being able to stop me. That includes on Inuit owned surface lands. The right to exploration is the most important right under the free entry system. I can be told how I can explore, the limits of what I can do to explore, but I cannot be told I cannot explore. That is even on Inuit surface rights land.

So, again, we have been hearing in Cambridge Bay, Rankin Inlet, Thompson, Pond Inlet, and here that there are lands that Inuit want protected, fully protected. Under the Conditional Use approach of the Government of Nunavut, it would allow them to be open for exploration without the community having an ability at the exploration stage to say no.

I would like to ask a question related to this. When the Government of Nunavut took the position that these Limited Use Areas should have seasonal restrictions and be Conditional Use, taking into account that they are hoping this will encourage economic development, did the Government of Nunavut consider that by moving from Limited Use to Conditional Use, this will take away the possibility for Inuit to negotiate an Impact Benefit Agreement, that based on past experience could be bringing in hundreds of millions of dollars into the territory that otherwise would not come. Was this taken into consideration when the Government of Nunavut puts forward the position that Conditional Use should replace Limited Use? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Would you like to respond?

Henry: Henry Coman, Government of Nunavut. If we could have a moment to confer with each other. Thank you.

(Pause)

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. Yes, that was considered. I just wanted to also correct that the Regional Inuit Association has the right to refuse mineral tenure on Inuit Owned Land. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Paul: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Mr. Chair, Paul Crowley, Friends of Land Use Planning. When it comes to Inuit owned surface lands, there is no right of refusal. A company needs to negotiate access. That access cannot be unreasonably restricted. If they cannot come to agreement, then the company can go to the Surface Rights Tribunal, and the Surface Rights Tribunal must award access but can impose conditions. If the Government of Nunavut sees this differently, I would be pleased to hear their opinion.

Chairperson: You can respond.

Henry: Thank you. Henry Coman, Government of Nunavut. We just need a moment to confer once again.

(Pause)

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. Our position on Inuit Owned Lands is that the Regional Inuit Associations have the right to decide how to manage those lands, and in doing so, they may propose any land use designations that they see fit. The Government of Nunavut would support that. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Paul C: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Paul Crowley, Friends of Land Use Planning. Thank you for that clarification. So, unless those lands, Inuit owned surface lands are protected through Limited Use, even if they are Conditional Use, Inuit Owned Lands, surface lands, are available for staking and exploration.

I would like to ask some questions with regard to the seasonal restrictions versus full-year restrictions as well. We have heard evidence from the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board, from this table, these tables frequently, and previous hearings that full-year protection is what Inuit Knowledge holders are asking for.

Is the Government of Nunavut also aware that the Nunavut Association of Municipalities recently passed a resolution asking for full-year protection of important caribou areas, and also asking that icebreaking on caribou crossings be limited?

Chairperson: Go ahead with your response, please.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. Paul, could you please repeat the first part of your question? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Paul C: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Mr. Chair, Paul Crowley, Friends of Land Use Planning. I will try to remember what the first part is. With regard to having seasonal protections versus full year, there has been evidence presented to the Commission through interventions from participants, community delegates, as well as the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board that Inuit Knowledge confirms that full-year protection is what is best for protecting caribou herds in terms of protecting calving grounds, post-calving grounds, freshwater crossings, and migratory corridors.

In taking its position that these full-season, full-year protection should not occur but rather should be conditional and seasonal, did the Government of Nunavut consider the recent resolution passed by the Nunavut Association of Municipalities that resolved that they supported year-round protection of important caribou habitat such as caribou calving grounds, post-calving grounds, migratory corridors, and freshwater crossings in the Nunavut Land Use Plan?

They further resolved that the Nunavut Association of Municipalities supports seasonal restrictions on icebreaking in areas where caribou cross sea ice in the Nunavut Land Use Plan.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can respond.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. Thank you, Paul. Our position was arrived at prior to this resolution. As we have said before, we are here at these hearings to hear

from Inuit, from our planning partners. We will take all of this information back to our government for consideration. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do you have another question? Go ahead.

Paul C: Thank you. Paul Crowley, Friends of Land Use Planning. Again, going to this issue of balance, I would like to ask some questions with regard to the economic development side. The Government of Nunavut is suggesting that ensuring the 20% of lands that are currently identified as Limited Use, opening them up for exploration will ensure economic growth and will help fill the need of 10,000 jobs that are going to be coming on over the next 10 years in the population.

On what projections in terms of mine development, mineral exploration activity, and related activities does the Government of Nunavut base this approach on?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can respond.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. I just want to clarify that we are not proposing that the entire 21% of Limited Use be converted to Conditional Use. For the mineral part, I will pass it to Diane.

Chairperson: Go ahead when you are ready.

Diane: Diane Lapierre, Government of Nunavut. The Government of Nunavut collects information internally and consolidates information from Statistics Canada and the Nunavut Bureau of Statistics. We use that information to prepare an Annual Nunavut Socioeconomic Monitoring Report. This report presents social and economic information about Nunavut, including at regional levels. It provides employment, revenue, labour market participation rates, education, and health indicators, and other social economic indicators. As mentioned, it comes from the Bureau of Statistics and Stats Canada and internal government departments directly.

In addition, as part of project certificate obligations, proponents must monitor project-specific socioeconomic effects. These effects include direct effects of the mining project, such as project employment, business contracts, training, and these are presented their project-specific monitoring reports and through the Regional Socioeconomic Monitoring Committee meetings.

Labour market analyses are performed by proponents, and the Government of Nunavut has used these analyses to ensure that the government and proponent share a similar understanding of project labour demand and territorial supply. That helps to inform training programs and other initiatives. Specifically, with some of the data that we have provided, again we have sourced Statistics Canada and Nunavut demographic statistics. Current employment with projects come from the industry statistics.

More broadly, as we have mentioned, the government position has highlighted that there is economic potential that is unknown and that appropriate and responsible accessed opportunities and the ability to make future decisions on future goals and priorities for things like economic development, such as tourism opportunities, commercial fisheries opportunities, as well as resource development opportunities, priorities for community development, and government support for community development, such as the aggregate sources, water sources, or other

community priorities, priorities for infrastructure to support these priorities, as well as to address the broad infrastructure needs for the territory, which include transportation links, information, and energy links. I hope that covers most of your question. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Question?

Paul C: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Paul Crowley, Friends of Land Use Planning. What I am really trying to understand is that the Government of Nunavut is going against Inuit Knowledge holders in terms of what they want for protection. They are doing so because they believe economic development will be spurred by opening up or ensuring these areas are open.

I understand that the government has access to a lot of data. What we haven't seen, and perhaps I have missed it, is a specific analysis that says we think by opening up these areas for exploration, we expect to have so many more jobs and that those jobs will be matched with the labour force and enable Inuit to participate in them. Has such an analysis been done, and if so and it is not already on the record, could the Government of Nunavut submit it to the public record for all of us to be able to see?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead with the response.

Diane: Diane Lapierre, Government of Nunavut. The position that the Government of Nunavut has taken has tried to accommodate the need for the potential growth and ability to make decisions when and where appropriate, future decision-making and future priorities in an effort to also balance the need and obligation of wildlife management.

The Government considers access to economic opportunities and wildlife management as economically valuable. The Government of Nunavut is obligated to accommodate both, not one over the other, and our current Government position reflects that balance.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead with your question.

Paul C: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Paul Crowley, Friends of Land Use Planning. I am going to paraphrase or try and repeat so that I make sure that I understand. 80% of the territory under this Draft is already open for mineral exploration. The Government of Nunavut does not want to see full-year protections on Limited Use Areas but would rather see Conditional Use, which would then open up those lands for exploration as well.

So pretty well, the majority of lands are open for exploration. I guess balance is in the eye of the beholder, but for me, the balance is very much in one direction. Through this, communities will not have a say on whether exploration can happen or not around them.

Once again, under the online system of free entry, if you do secure rights by staking, you are required by law to work those rights. You can do so without asking a community first. If you go beyond a threshold, yes, the rest of the regulatory process will kick in, but the genie is already out of the bottle. You cannot put it back in. You cannot say no, you cannot come here. You cannot explore.

Companies have this right. It is a right that dates back to the free entry system, which is a colonial system that was created over 100 years ago and remains. I do not see the balance. Is there a balance that myself or others in the room are missing that the Government of Nunavut could explain?

How are almost all of the lands being opened for exploration a balance, when on the other side you have only a small percentage of these lands, 20%, where communities, Knowledge holders are saying they need protection for what is most important?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Response please.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. Again, we are not proposing that 20% be converted to Conditional Use. The mineral potential in Nunavut is unknown, and it is widespread. Achieving that balance is about allowing that exploration to take place and those deposits to be identified so that decisions can be made for future generations. Thank you.

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Paul C: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Paul Crowley, Friends of Land Use Planning. Correct. The Government of Nunavut, if I understand, is not suggesting Mixed Use. It is suggesting Conditional Use, which earlier the Government of Nunavut agreed also opens up those lands to exploration. So, while the semantics may be different, the point is still the same.

Almost all the lands in Nunavut under the Government of Nunavut's proposal will be open to exploration, and communities will not be able to say no to that exploration. They will only be able to contribute to a regulatory system that says how that exploration will happen. Is this correct?

Chairperson: You can proceed with an answer.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. Communities and Hunters and Trappers Organizations have the opportunity to voice their concerns in these hearings. The Government of Nunavut is listening. Our positions are not set in stone. They may change in the future. This is a consultation process. This is a Draft Plan.

The Nunavut Planning Commission will then submit a recommended Plan to the signatories. We will review it, and we will decide whether we can accept that Plan. This process is not over. There is still consultation taking place in this room right now, and we are listening. We take this very seriously. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead with your question.

Paul C: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Paul Crowley, Friends of Land Use Planning. I am heartened to hear that the Government of Nunavut is seriously considering changing its position. After hearing the same presentation five times, I was beginning to doubt. So, I welcome the reconsideration.

I would like to speak to the issue and ask questions to the issue of existing rights. The Government of Nunavut is taking position that all existing rights should continue through no matter where they are. Rights that exist as of today or that exist in the months to come before this Plan is finalized, whether they are in caribou calving grounds, post-calving grounds, migratory corridors, or close to

freshwater crossings, from the Government of Nunavut position these mineral rights should take precedence over what communities have clearly expressed here in terms for a desire for protection. Is this the position of the Government of Nunavut with regard to existing rights?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Response please.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. As I mentioned, that is our current position. We are listening to the feedback that is happening in this room, and we will take that back for consideration.

I would also like to state that simply the fact that existing rights is there does not guarantee that can be developed. The rights holder still has to go through the regulatory system if they were to develop from an exploration project into a more advanced exploration, bulk sampling, mine development. That would need to go through the full regulatory system.

There will be plenty of time for input from communities, from government interveners, etcetera, and project specific terms and conditions can be placed. Simply the fact of an existing rights does not permit the owner to develop as they choose. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Another question?

Paul C: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Paul Crowley, Friends of Land Use Planning. The regulatory system that kicks in after the genie has left the bottle, we all agree that it is there. We have also seen the high cost of that on communities. Where there are areas where they may not want to have mineral activity, they now have to through the HTOs and hamlet, go through impact statements, secure positions, get technical advice.

We have seen the heavy price of that. I have heard a few times now what a good regulatory system we have. Look at what happened recently with Baffinland, but I also look at the cost of what happened: the uncertainty for the company and the high cost for the community to participate; the high cost to the community to be heard, which in the case of Baffinland included hunters going to the mine site and standing on the runway.

To ensure that there is less strife, why would the Government of Nunavut propose that existing rights in known areas that communities want protected go forth through that same regulatory system?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Response, please.

Henry: Henry Coman, Government of Nunavut. If we could just have a moment, please.

(Pause)

Eamonn: Eamonn Carroll, Department of Justice. We are fully willing to speak with Friends of Land Use Planning's legal counsel, Mr. Crowley at length, if he wishes, about the issues of existing rights and the nature of rights, or we are fully willing to follow-up in writing to Mr. Crowley, legal counsel for Friends of Land Use Planning if there is some kind of confusion about how existing rights function

or the nature of existing rights and the nature of rights themselves. I am happy to meet with him on the side or follow-up in writing. I believe Daniel Haney will expand on this.

Daniel: Thank you. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. Yes, Paul, we are aware that there are gaps in the regulatory system. We are aware that there are issues, and we are working hard with our fellow governments, the Government of Canada, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, the Regional Inuit Associations, to come to solutions.

We believe that the regulatory system when it functions, it functions well. That emphasizes the importance of this Land Use Plan as well. The Land Use Plan serves as the entry point to the regulatory system. As I stated before, the Government of Nunavut is listening to the feedback from communities, Hunters and Trappers, and other planning partners, and we will take this all into consideration when we review the final recommended Draft Plan. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Another question?

Paul C: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Paul Crowley, Friends of Land Use Planning. Just one last direction I would like to go in, and that goes as well to existing rights and the Government of Nunavut's position that those rights should also come with the ability of proponents to put in roads, linear infrastructure to access those areas.

In coming to this position, what Inuit Knowledge, Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit did the Government of Nunavut integrate into deciding that not only that existing rights should be allowed to go forward in potentially Limited Use Areas and then those areas would be changed to Mixed Use, but also that roads would go forward and go through a regulatory process? Linear infrastructure has a broad impact, much wider than a narrow road.

The Government of Nunavut's own research as I understand it demonstrates that for the Meadowbank and Whale Tail Roads, caribou as far out as 17 kilometres are impacted by the roads. So, a 100-kilometer road is not just a narrow band. It has a broad area of influence. If every existing right is meant to also have an ability to access it through the Land Use Plan, I would like to know how the Government of Nunavut integrated Inuit Knowledge to come to this position.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can respond.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. The Government of Nunavut has consulted the Nunavut Planning Commission's *Options and Recommendations Document*, and the extensive consultation record that the Commission has amassed in its 15 to 20 years of this process. We also rely on feedback from Hunters and Trappers Organizations and communities throughout wildlife biologists. We listen at hearings through the Nunavut Impact Review Board, and yes, we realize that roads have an impact.

Those effects can be mitigated if proper mitigations are put in place and enforced. Additionally, again, not every existing right is going to develop into a mine. Not every existing right will require a road. Some of them will use a winter road, which has significant less impact than a permanent road. Again, not every is going to develop. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Paul C: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Paul Crowley, Friends of Land Use Planning. What is the Government of Nunavut's experience to date with conditions put on by a project certificate to ensure that roads minimize impact on caribou? What is the Government of Nunavut's experience with those conditions and project certificates being implemented? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. The Government of Nunavut, and in particular the Department of Environment is heavily involved in monitoring the terms and conditions of active projects. We are involved in the Terrestrial Advisory Groups and Terrestrial Environment Working Groups that these active mines have in place. The Regional Inuit Associations and Hunters and Trappers Organizations are also involved in those groups.

Yes, Paul, we acknowledge that there are gaps and there are issues. We are working with the mines and with the Government of Nunavut and the Nunavut Impact Review Board to resolve those issues. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Paul C: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Paul Crowley, Friends of Land Use Planning, and I will cede the floor after this. My understanding based on documents on the public record in front of the and recently in the media is the one example where there is a haul road at Meadowbank, now Whale Tail in the Kivalliq, conditions that were negotiated and then brought about through project certificate four years ago. The Government of Nunavut has found that the company has not yet implemented them four years later.

Understanding that the Government of Nunavut has to work with proponents and make sure that conditions are met, I just find it very difficult that a position that allows without intervention of the Land Use Plan for linear infrastructure to be associated with rights, existing rights that will go through if the Government of Nunavut has its way into the final Plan, that the Government of Nunavut is not more concerned that allowing these roads will undermine the very exercise of trying to protect the caribou herds that communities and other interveners have been asking for.

How does the Government of Nunavut expect before the close of the record to be able to inform the Commission and participants on how it has confidence, based on the experience to date, that their position will not undermine the protection of critical caribou habitat? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. A response, please?

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. In all regulatory systems, there is collaboration between parties. The Government of Nunavut has a role to play in this regulatory system, and we function as a monitoring body essentially. We do not enforce the terms and conditions. We notify the Nunavut Impact Review Board when we notice that there are gaps, and then we work with the enforcing body, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada and the proponent to try and address those gaps.

Again, as I have stated several times, we are here to listen, and we will take all of this information back and consider it in our final review of the Plan. Thank you.

Chairperson: Thank you. You can proceed.

Paul C: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Paul Crowley, Friends of Land Use Planning. I do not have any other questions for now. I thank you all for your patience. I thank the Government of Nunavut for its answers.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik to you too. Solomon?

Solomon: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Thank you to the government for your presentation this morning. Solomon Awa. I am changing hats to QIA. I was at the Pond Inlet hearings, and I spoke there with the work from QIA. The caribou crossing sites on Melville Peninsula, this stretch of mainland, Igloodik and Sanirajak to Naujaat. In documents, the caribou cross in that direction. The government or the Commission can identify on the map to remind me. Do Baffin Island caribou go to Naujaat? That is my question. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do we have a response?

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. I would like Drikus Gissing, Director of Wildlife Research to respond. Thank you.

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Drikus: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Drikus Gissing, Director of Wildlife Management, Government of Nunavut. We have no evidence that caribou from Baffin Island migrate to Naujaat. Thank you.

Chairperson: Go ahead, Solomon.

Solomon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, wildlife person. I did not catch your first name. In the Nunavut Government saying that they want to include the Traditional Knowledge holders, and also, I hear from the Nunavut Planning Commission that they should include the Traditional Knowledge holders. When I am looking at this map, it does not include Traditional Knowledge holders.

Traditional Knowledge holders saying that the caribou migrate all the way down to Naujaat from Baffin Island, crossing the sea ice. There is also Igloodik reporting now that they are crossing back to Baffin Island through the sea ice. My request to the Government, perhaps to the Nunavut Planning Commission is to include the Baffin Island caribou to be included in the Melville Peninsula area. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. A response, please?

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. Thank you for that information. We will bring it back to the Wildlife Research section.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Archie?

Archie: (Translated): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Archie Angnakak, Amaruq Hunters and Trappers Organization. Thank you, Paul, for your line of questioning. You claim 80%. Percentage is hard to figure out in Inuktitut. I want to say North lands, Commissioner lands, I want to tell you from the Hunters and Trappers Organization and members, the red and yellow areas, we know the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board said the traditional economy country food is \$60 million dollars a year annually.

Also, it is good for trading, buying and selling, buying muktuk, buying fish, buying turbot, buying caribou meat. It is \$60 million. You mentioned that by the presentation. Also, Mr. Chairman, they marked sites they wanted protected. We caught a bit of the seal, fur trade, and the fox skins were valuable. That was a large part of our economy: harp seals, ring seals, and fox. Those three, we would make \$15,000.00 to \$16,000.00 in the '60s and '70s. In today's money, that is \$25,000.00 or \$30,000.00 in those that can hunt, 16 and over.

7,800 is just an example. If all 7,000 on Baffin Island in the 1960s and 1970s money traditional rate, 7,800 it would be \$700 million dollars that we are talking about just for Baffin Island. We know 80%, we already know. Seals, furs, and fox. There are wolves, rabbits, and other animals. Fish were not included in the \$700 million. This is what we know, 80% that you can benefit from, \$700 million dollars. I want to say the Hudson Bay Company were the buyers. If we were the company, over \$700 million.

I want to tell you, Amaruq Hunters and Trappers Organization Board that the red areas and yellow areas, there is economic opportunity. We never spoke about those, not even by the Government of Nunavut or the federal government with money. They have never said a word. They support mining. They are trying to defend mining. There are opportunities available that we have not done, but we know what we are saying.

Our rights, we are going to exercise our rights. I'm telling you, Amaruq Association we are going to push those rights. The responses to Paul Crowley's questions related to justice, they're listening. They are listening. I want to tell you what it says in our *Land Claim*. I will read it to you. 2.12.2: Where there is inconsistency or conflict between any federal, territorial, or local government, the *Agreement* shall prevail to the extent of inconsistency and conflict, and Mr. Crowley pointed out very possible conflicts or inconsistencies in the *Land Claims Agreement*.

Chairman, in conclusion the *Land Claims Agreement*, speak about this, about the *Agreement*. Thank you for the opportunity. Under 37, maybe you can send a bill to the Nunavut and federal governments that you are teaching us. In 37, it states that the work, you can send them a bill. That's it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. I did not hear a question. I have no more names. Mike? You can proceed.

Mike F: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq, and thank you to the Government of Nunavut for being present to answer questions. My questions sort of continue on from things that coincidentally Paul was asking about and things that Archie just mentioned. I have questions. I will try to word most of my comments as questions, although it may be difficult.

The Government of Nunavut mentioned about the growth in the Inuit youth and the employment needs that will come up as they project in the next 10 years or so. That is a very valid concern.

Chairperson: Can you put the mic closer? Go ahead.

Mike F: The Government of Nunavut spoke to the issue of future Inuit and the growth in that, and that certainly is a concern for everyone in the room here and all across the region. However, I did not hear a clear statement about how many jobs are foreseeable that the mining industry is likely to fill for Inuit youth in the future. I have not heard a clear prediction.

So, my question to the Government, or one of my questions is, what has been the net annual growth in jobs in terms of person years for Inuit youth in the Qikiqtaaluk region over the past 40 years? In that time, one mine has started. Two mines have closed. How many jobs per year net over those 40 years annualized has the mining industry provided to Inuit youth?

Another question is related to that if you predict overusing the current percentage of Limited Use. If you accept that is going to happen, mining industry has access to 80% of the land mass for exploration and mine development. What do you predict will be the number of jobs in the next 10 years to Inuit youth in this region? What do your models predict? Those should just be simple numbers if you have done the work.

Then look at the downside of changing Limited Use to Conditional Use. In the Harvest Study in the early '80s, 20% of Inuit in the region were at some level active in wildlife harvesting. In the last three years of the NWMB Harvest Study from 1998 to 2001, 24% of Inuit, the population had increased, but even a higher proportion of Inuit were active in wildlife harvesting.

If it is today still around 24% or 25%, one in four Inuit are active in harvesting. That is a lot of people getting food and self-employment through harvesting. If the HTOs are correct that if you do not protect areas that are crucial to Inuit harvesting, what do you risk losing? I would say over the top, you could risk a large proportion of the 24% that may be already employed in Inuit harvesting if that is opened up to exploration and mining, development, roads, transmission lines, hydro dams, anything you can imagine could happen.

So, what is the downside to Inuit harvesting from all that potential development on an additional development 20% of the land, and that 20% is the critical land that harvesters want protected? They are not just pieces of land. They are real places that Inuit know and depend upon for harvesting or the wildlife depends upon them. I can't imagine that it is going to be a minor impact.

So, you open it up for all sorts of development and everything, what are you going to lose? I would like to know from the Government of Nunavut if they have come up with a policy of employment of youth through mining, for example, among other things. Have you predicted exactly how many jobs Inuit youth will get in the next 10 years?

Have you looked at the downside, and how much nutrition have you lost? How much activity? How much wildlife populations recover? Will they continue? Will they be lost? If that happens, if you do not follow the advice of Inuit who know the land, what is going to be the impact on the economy and the culture of the people?

That brings me back to many years ago, I was learning from a person who I trusted very well, Paulusi Qilbako (*spelled phonetically*), Iqaluit. I used to talk about the economic value of Inuit harvesting,

and he would get so angry with me. He would say, “Mike, you don’t understand what wildlife and wildlife harvesting is to Inuit.” Inuit don’t get into long explanations. He summed it up. I don’t know if it will mean anything to people here, but he said how can you have a community feast with all your family and all your friends without caribou? That is how he explained the value of the culture to me, and I understood when he said that. You are not talking about money. You are talking about people’s lives. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. A response, please?

Diane: Diane Lapierre, Government of Nunavut. The Government of Nunavut has looked at information. The percentage of annual employment for mining, quarrying, oil and gas in Nunavut in 2020 was 12.2% of total employment. This is coming from Statistics Canada. Looking at figures going back to 2006, this percentage has increased from 2.1% in 2006 through to 12.2%, increasing employment year over year.

Currently, as we have also mentioned in our presentation, three mines across Nunavut employ 1,000 Inuit, which comes from a snapshot of industry employment figures. Also, as we have mentioned, there is unknown potential, unknown information, and the potential employment or other economic benefits are therefore unknown under a restriction or prohibitions in these Limited Use Areas. Thank you.

Chairperson: Go ahead if you want to add.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. I just wanted to add onto that. The Government of Nunavut absolutely recognizes the incredible importance of wildlife harvesting for Inuit culture. The Department of Environment’s mandate is to conserve wildlife for harvesting, not simply for the sake of conservation. We absolutely recognize that people’s lives are at stake and culture is at stake. That is why we take wildlife conservation very seriously. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any questions from the registered participants? *(Pause)*

I have no more names. Any from the general public? Lori Idlout, welcome.

Lori: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. First of all, I would like to say thank you. It is nice to see people, my fellow Inuit. Glad to see you and the communities that are here. Welcome from Nunavik. We are glad that you support each other’s rights and talk about Inuit Knowledge. That is very important, the work we are doing as Inuit and to work together in cooperation. I was grateful to see that.

I also want to say that I want to honour you that you are being heard. The Commission has been listening. When you see Baffinland and the process of saying no, there were a lot of unknowns whether Inuit were going to be heard. Also, to push the federal government and the Minister that you showed the support for Nunavut Impact Review Board’s decision. That revealed the power of the Inuit when we work together, that we are listened to.

I want to raise you and put you up, to encourage you to keep going. We have to fight. We are not just talking about the land. We are not just talking about planning. We are talking about the fellow

Inuit we have in the communities, families. We are looking to the future. I can feel the work that you are doing, and it is a base. I honour everyone here.

(English): I would like to ask the question on existing rights. I wonder if the technicians can move the Power Point to the slide that was on existing rights as presented by the Government of Nunavut.

It is frustrating for me to have arrived today to hear my fellow Inuit begging to be heard by the Government of Nunavut with the Government of Nunavut employees all being non-Inuit, with one person who seems to be an exception. I think that is why many of you at the table are demanding to be heard.

When I heard Jetaloo speaking and asking a question about Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, it really is hard to see the people, the Government of Nunavut employees how much they have learned in their short time that they have been in Nunavut about Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit compared to all the other Inuit, the Hunters and Trappers Organizations, and the hamlets who have received generations of Knowledge about the lands, about the wildlife, about the marine environment. For the Government of Nunavut to say that they will consider these things is very frustrating.

It has been 23 years since the creation of the Government of Nunavut. It was created because Inuit wanted control and management and decision-making on what will happen on our lands that we have lived on since time immemorial. I really want to remind the Government of Nunavut employees that your time here is short.

I need to ask some questions, because the recommendations that you are going to make to the Nunavut Planning Commission, you have to make sure that you are very meaningful in your recommendations. My first question to you is in what ways have the Government of Nunavut employees used Inuit laws in developing or establishing its positions in this file? That is my first question.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Please proceed with a response.

Henry: Thank you. Henry Coman, Government of Nunavut. So, the two ways in which Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit has been incorporated into the recommendations that the Government of Nunavut has put forward to the Nunavut Planning Commission is through the incorporation of the different articles of the *Nunavut Agreement* as well as through consultations with our newly elected leaders through the cabinet. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed.

Lori: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Lori Idlout, Member of Parliament for Nunavut. I was not asking about Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit. I was asking about Inuit laws. The concern I hear from so many Nunavummiut is that lip service is paid to Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit by the Government of Nunavut employees. I would like to ask again what Inuit laws were used in developing your positions in this file. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Can we get a response please?

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Could we just have a moment please? Thank you.

(Pause)

Eamonn: Eamonn Carroll, Legal Counsel, Government of Nunavut. Thank you, Mr. Chair. In response to the Member of Parliament's question, we would like some more clarity. Perhaps she might like to give that in writing, but besides that, in terms of how Inuit laws are incorporated into the Government, the Government is formed under the Section 35 treaty of the *Nunavut Agreement*. This also informs our cabinet consensus decision making.

The cabinet consensus brings about a cabinet mandate, and that informs. That source of law is what informs all aspects of the Government of Nunavut's structure and policy. So, we would need a little bit more detail rather than just broadly what Inuit laws from the Member of Parliament. The policy comes from the cabinet consensus. David can certainly, and I have been asked to pass this to David Akeegok [sic], Minister of the Environment.

Chairperson: Go ahead when you are ready.

David A: David Kunuk, Deputy Minister of Economic Development and Transportation with the Government of Nunavut. Qujannamiik. Lori.

(Translated): Thank you for the question, Lori. I go hunting. I work from the Government of Nunavut. We have Inuit employees on how Inuit issues relate to the environment. We work within the system on promoting and teaching Inuit values, conservation, preservation of the environment that we feel for the animals and the land. I am just trying to be brief here. We are Inuit. At my workplace, there are a lot of Inuit. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can proceed to ask more questions.

Lori Idlout: (Translated): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Lori Idlout, MP for Nunavut. I understand that I did not get a complete response, but I just want to note that Inuit laws are not being used in the Nunavut process in decisions related to the land and animals.

Sitting here, I would like to encourage them to be concerned and the fact that you need to be heard. Don't stop wanting to be heard. I want to thank David Kunuk for his response as an Inuit working within the Government. I too, worked for the Government of Nunavut, but the issue of consultation and maybe I will proceed to a different area.

(English): I will switch to English. Just a very quick question in line with some questions that another intervener asked, Paul Crowley about the open entry system. Is the GN responsible for the open entry system with online staking that allows mining exploration?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. Thank you, Lori, for that question. No, the Government of Nunavut is not responsible for that system. That is administered by Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Question?

Lori: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Lori Idlout, Member of Parliament, Nunavut. I have taken note that six years ago in 2016 when the Government of Canada removed its objections to the *United Nations and Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, the Premier back then was very excited that Canada decided to accept *UNDRIP*. At that time, it was Premier Taptuna. Has the Government of Nunavut created a position regarding *UNDRIP* and how it plans to implement this important piece of international legislation?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can respond, please.

Eamonn: Eamonn Carroll, Legal Counsel, Government of Nunavut. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Member of Parliament for the question. There are legislative initiatives across the country in various other jurisdictions that we are exploring and keeping monitor of as we develop our own legislation. This is very much separate from the land use planning process, but the work continues in terms of exploring the necessary legislation to bring it into force in this jurisdiction. It is international and incorporating legislation will be necessary in Nunavut. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do you have a question?

Lori: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Lori Idlout, Member of Parliament, Nunavut. Regarding the foundations of *UNDRIP*, I understand what you were saying, though there is to be Free Prior and Informed Consent. Given that existing rights go back a number of years, can the Government clarify its position on the existing rights that have been allowed to be established when there may not have been actual adequate information provided to Inuit, specifically in those areas related to mining?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead with a response, please.

Eamonn: Eamonn Carroll, Legal Counsel, Government of Nunavut. That question might be better directed towards the Canada delegation. Our position around existing rights reflects a variety of factors and is really expressing support for the Government of Canada position. Thank you to the Member of Parliament for the question, and we are happy to follow-up in writing if the Member of Parliament requires any further follow-up in terms of our position around existing rights.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. The question will be answered in a written submission.

Lori: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Lori Idlout, Member of Parliament for Nunavut. The reason I asked for the Power Point slide to be appearing during my questioning is it appears that you are making a recommendation that the value of existing rights should be protected. Does that mean that you favour the existing rights of mining rights over the existing rights of hunters and trappers right to harvest and be sustained by the environment?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Response, please.

Eamonn: Eamonn Carroll, Legal Counsel. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Parliament for the question. That is not the case. What it is simply recognizing is that with this being an open question for devolution, there is not a position that the Government can take which extinguishes existing rights at this time. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Lori: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. This is the last question. Lori Idlout, Member of Parliament for Nunavut. Can you just explain on that Power Point what you mean by the recommendation on the value of existing rights should be protected. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Response, please.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. In order for those rights to be extinguished, compensation would be required. At this time, the Government of Nunavut does not have the funds to provide compensation to all existing rights. Thank you.

Chairperson: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. We are going to take a 15-minute break. I have five or six names.

Break

Chairperson: (*Translated*): Before we get back to the agenda, there are still presenters to present. Tonight, some of this stuff has to be returned. They need the hearing devices back tonight, but we will proceed. I have names. Archie? Go ahead. Olayuk.

Olayuk: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Page 7 2980 (?) My question as Inuit...

(*English*): Just a quick question to the panelists from the Government of Nunavut: We know that the government uses a lot of the legislations that are under the Government of Nunavut along with the Government of Canada's legislations. I just want to ask if the Government of Nunavut did research before they sat over here, and which of the legislations that are affected to the NPC consultation in South Baffin or the whole territory is affecting their legislation on some questions that they are not answering from the organizations, or just us that are sitting here monitoring and observing the meeting.

Which of the legislations in the Government are affected with this consultation from NPC and is there a way of amending or learn what the questions are and amend the legislations later to reflect both the *Nunavut Agreement* and/or the concerns from the communities. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do we have a response?

Henry: Thank you, Henry Coman, Government of Nunavut. I am going to defer this question to Eamonn Carroll, Legal Counsel.

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Eamonn: Thank you, Chair. Thank you, Henry. Eamonn Carroll, Legal Counsel, Government of Nunavut. We are a little bit unsure as to your question. So, under the Canadian constitution, Section 35, the *Nunavut Agreement* becomes part of the constitution, so legislation must comply with the *Nunavut Agreement* and must be in line with the constitution.

It is not necessarily the case that it is the other way around. We are open to working with any parties that might raise some constitutional questions around this, and we at the Department of Justice always seek to hear any sorts of issues that might be challenged in our legislation on this matter. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do you want to ask again?

Olayuk: Just to clarify a little more, I think my question is, is any of the legislation under the Nunavut Government related to this consultation? If so, is there any possibility of making any amendments to your legislation that will reflect this consultation on the Nunavut Planning Commission. A lot of the issues that we are talking about is what we want to see in our territory, what we want to hear, what we want to make changes to reflect our *Nunavut Agreement* along with your legislation.

We know that in 1999 when we became a territory, we grandfathered or adopted all those legislations from the NWT Government. I am asking if there will be any changes that will reflect what we want to see in our territory to ensure that we respect the rights of Inuit in your legislation. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can proceed.

Eamonn: Thank you, Chair. Thank you, sir, for the qualification and clarification. The legislation...Sorry, Eamonn Carroll, Legal Counsel, Department of Justice. I apologize, Chair. The legislation governing the matter here before us today is the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act*. This is federal legislation, and it was brought in as part of the implication of the *Nunavut Agreement*.

So, the Nunavut legislation that we are discussing here today would be secondary to this matter. However, it is always the case that it is able to be amended by a simple act of the legislature. While much of the legislation was inherited from the Northwest Territories, it has continuously been amended over the course of Nunavut's existence. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Paul Idlout?

Paul I: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. Paul Idlout, resident of Iqaluit. I think their seats are getting rather warm. I heard when Solomon asked about caribou crossings, I heard the Government has not on Baffin Island, but in working with the Hunters and Trappers, caribou cross here when it ices. This is legitimate where they cross, north of Igloodik, Akanajuak and Okunajuk (*both spelled phonetically*). It is a short distance.

If we saw from here to the other side, it is about that far, about that distance. It is close. When there is ice, the caribou cross. The crossings, we hear about that under plan, you have to be in that area. It will be real in the future. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed. Sharon is saying that the translation was missing or losing connection. Please proceed to ask again. The translation was not coming through, so please ask again.

Paul I: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. Are we good? Are we okay? I am asking, I heard that they don't know where the caribou crossings are on Baffin Island or the caribou crossing from Baffin Island to the mainland. That is a caribou crossing area in the wintertime from Baffin Island to the mainland, and

Inuit have said that. Why hasn't the Government recognized that caribou migrate from the mainland to Baffin Island and back?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do we have a response?

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. Drikus Gissing, could you please answer this?

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Drikus: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Drikus Gissing, Government of Nunavut, Department of Environment. As I mentioned earlier, we have no scientific evidence that there is migration from the mainland to Baffin or from Baffin back to the mainland. In 2014, we did a Baffin Island-wide survey. During that time, as part of the development of that survey, there were a lot of consultations that took place with the communities.

What we heard at the time was similar to what Paul just said that caribou migrate from the mainland to Baffin and vice versa. A decline at the time may have been due to caribou leaving the island, Melville Peninsula, onto the mainland. What the Government of Nunavut did at that time, of course we did not have telemetry or collars on caribou to look at those movements. We did have one project in North Baffin, but those caribou just stayed in one area. They did not move on or off the island.

We did an extensive genetics study on caribou, on the mainland as well as on Baffin Island. We took samples from all across Baffin Island, as well as Melville, as well as the mainland. Those study results are available, and I could share it with anybody that wants to look at the genetic results from that study.

The study found that there has not been interaction between Baffin Island and the mainland for a number of generations. What this study found is not that it is impossible for caribou to move on and off the island. It likely happened. I suppose that is how caribou got onto Baffin Island. They came from the mainland. So, it is not impossible.

We are not disputing what we are hearing from communities, especially in Igloolik and in those areas, people that hunt in Melville Peninsula or on the North Baffin that caribou are moving in that specific water crossing. From a purely wildlife management perspective, we would have no objection to NPC identifying that as a water crossing and protecting it as a water crossing, because the Traditional Knowledge is saying that is where the caribou are crossing.

We, from a wildlife management perspective, we are not disputing it. We are supporting Traditional Knowledge, and we use Traditional Knowledge with scientific evidence. So, I am not disputing what Paul is saying, and we are in support of protecting that water crossing. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Archie?

Archie: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Archie Angnakak, Amaruq Hunters and Trappers Organization, Councillor. Just a reminder that under our rights, the underlined *Claims Agreement*

has been approved. They are the law of where we are today in this proceeding. Protecting the rights, they are entrenched in the *Land Claims Agreement*. They are not for us to amend, delete, or add to.

Iqaluit City Council, QIA, RIOs are not there to interpret and make use in a different way. It is there. I just wanted to remind you, Chair, and the proceedings here.

Chairperson: Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. Final question from the Commission just for clarity of the record please: The City of Iqaluit has clearly stated recommending a Limited Use designation for their secondary water supply. Can the Government of Nunavut identify if it supports Iqaluit's recommendation for the watershed to be designated as Limited Use? Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. We would need to consult with the Community and Government Services and the Department of Health in order to come to a position on that. Thank you. And we will do so. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. I have a person that wishes to ask that I did not see.

Brandon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Brandon Laforest, World Wildlife Fund Canada. Two quick questions: Can the Government of Nunavut explain what a red flag approach to land use planning is, as referenced on your slide, and provide an example of how a red flag approach would work?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. Thank you for the question. Essentially, the red flag approach is identifying areas that are of significance and concern and putting them forth to the Commission. It is essentially similar to the Valued Component designation. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Brandon: Brandon Laforest, World Wildlife Fund Canada. My last question summarizes a lot today, I think. Can the GN commit to distributing their multiple deferred written responses before the close of the record so community reps and other participants can consider their responses when drafting their final comments? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Response, please.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. It is for these reasons that we are requesting an extension to the deadline, because there is a very short period of time between now and then, and there is a lot of work for the Government of Nunavut to do in compiling all of the information that we have gathered, consulting with other departments, and generating those responses.

So, yes, it is absolutely our intention to put those responses onto the record, and it is our intention to do that before the close of record. We will make every effort to do so. Thank you.

Chairperson: (Translated): Qujannamiik. And going back to the table, Lloyd?

Lloyd: (Translated): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Lloyd Idlout, Igloolik HTO. In the beginning of the proceeding this morning to mineral exploration, my question is, the prospectors on the final fines of what they are looking for, when they are ready to explore fully, what I really know is what your procedures are to approve these explorations before they go into production.

So, I ask you what kind of inspectors you do have as they progress to become producing, for instance, oil spills on the side. If the spill is too huge, something dangerous to the environment, do you have inspectors at hand? Do they travel and where? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead with a response.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. Thank you for that question. It is a good question. As an exploration project further develops, it goes into the regulatory system, so it would go through a Nunavut Impact Review Board screening and assessment. The Government of Nunavut is an active participant in that.

We analyze all of the project documents, all of the management plans. Companies typically submit a wildlife management plan, a waste management plan, a spill management plan, among others. I am forgetting some at the moment, but we review all of those for completeness and to ensure any impacts would be effectively mitigated.

Yes, we do have environment protection officers who do respond to spills. In the case of a major spill, the company itself would be responsible for the cleanup, and that would be supported by both the Government of Canada and the Government of Nunavut depending on where the spill takes place. In the marine environment, it would be entirely the Government of Canada. In the terrestrial environment, the Government of Nunavut would play a role in that as well. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Lloyd: (Translated): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Lloyd Idlout, Igloolik HTO. I don't think you answered all my questions. I was asking if there are inspectors. Do they actually go to proponents who are working on their proposed projects? Are they inspected? Is it annual? How often do the inspectors travel? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. I apologize for missing that part of the question. I just want to clarify that at the Government of Nunavut, Environmental Protection Officers do not go in and inspect. The inspection is done, is taken care of by the federal government. They have inspectors that enforce project certificate terms and conditions.

On top of that, the Nunavut Impact Review Board also has project monitors that go to the project site every year, on a yearly basis, and perform inspections to ensure that the project certificate term and conditions are being respected. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Loasie: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Loasie Alikatuktuk, HTO. I had two topics that I have forgotten so I will mention these for now. There are two separate questions. Last year we had an environment cleanup south of the community. We have yet to do the north side, especially the fishing areas. The cleaning has taken place. We will need to send a bill somewhere. The lakes have yet to be clean. The areas north of it will need to be cleaned. We have cleaned the shoreline and camping areas, camping grounds.

We started last summer, and we started the summer cleanup all along our shores, the coast. Not only that will be worked on, but we have six people with boats doing the cleanup on the shorelines. There is a lot of clean-up of scrap metal or wood. The animal parts, the bones, we don't touch them. We let them decompose where they are.

We are not done yet. We have a lot of areas to clean up. We will need to look elsewhere for funding sources because it is the environment, and we will not start this project again until the next summer. We need to clean up our area. Is it clear?

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Yes, we understand that, but your question is not related to land use planning.

Loasie: *(Translated)*: We would like to work on this next summer. I want to be understood.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Yes, you are clear. We hear you. I am sure departments that can assist you are here listening to you. Thank you. I hear you.

Loasie: *(Said something that was not translated followed by laughter)*

(Translated): Broughton Island where I have a camp, there are a lot of polar bears in that area, a lot of them. The polar bears are now encroaching northward, and there are many now in Broughton Island. I think our past summer was the worst for polar bear populations. They are now right into the community, and people at night are just barging into the communities taking shelter.

There are too many now. So far, everyone is safe. They are just very dangerous. Then again, there is no funding for this. We did not have a conservation officer this summer. We have one now, and by law in the community has been doing a lot of work, especially in the past three months. When the fall comes and the ice starts forming, this is when they are numerous.

Although we have funding for HTO operations, they are not intended for this purpose. We have approached the hamlet office to participate in this cost saving so we can have monitors. We need assistance, and it is not forthcoming. We just don't want to sit by idly and watch this problem grow. It is still a problem. My comment from my community is to see what assistance can be had from any department.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: I am sure people here would be able to assist you. This will be a last question. Paul?

Paul Q: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Quassa, Iqaluit City Councillor. This is just a general comment, but first, I was born and raised in Igloolik. The TV company up north is doing this production, the proceedings here. They have been there for a long time. Initially, the community did not want television in our community. Despite that, now we are being produced by this company in Igloolik.

I want to say as I hear the discussions of proponents, mining exploration, from my understanding many of you are all opposed to this production of mineral exploration. It is not true. There are some Inuit who support this sort of venture. It was made clear when we had a referendum on what and how Nunavut should be. It has been solved way back. The whole of Nunavut are against mining exploration. That is for your information.

Just listening to Inuit Owned Lands, it is very touching especially now for those who are making decisions who did not participate in the land selection. Now are we taking directions of how these Inuit Owned Lands should be operated? I do not feel it is right. People selected these land parcels, Inuit Owned Lands. They participated. Now we have organizations, levels of government saying this is how we want your Inuit Owned Lands parcels to be handled.

Despite this, when we selected Inuit Owned Lands, it was for our use. It was not selected for its productivity. Whatever it may be, Inuit Owned Lands were selected so it could be kept pristine, so it can be used for Inuit uses. Someone mentioned 80%. This land, 80%, many can use it, whatever they want to use it for. It is there, 80% open. Inuit Owned Lands, I'm hearing 20%, perhaps 18% at the least.

So, with these numbers, selection, people are speaking for its protections. Looking at Nunavik, they have what they call Category 1 in proposed works in your area. I just want to emphasize that these Inuit Owned Lands were selected. They did not select them for any other use. They wanted to use it for their own use. I think you can understand me there. We did not select again, for no other use. People voted so they can be protected. They selected these land parcels.

I am just repeating myself now. There are now lands used for economic revenue, for instance Mary River. It is not the only company that would be giving benefits to the economy. Just as a reminder, land was selected for their use. Having said that, there is a large area, a large tract of land for those who did not participate in the land selections. Everybody now wants to have their say, perhaps without understanding why these lands were selected for Inuit use.

I just wanted to remind you why these lands were selected. The landowners, RIOs should know very well why the Inuit selected these lands for their own land. I just wanted to clarify this. Thank you, Chair.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: I don't have any more on the list, so the panel, you did a very good job. Thank you for your participation. Give them a hand, please.

(Applause)

We now have Baffinland. There are others on the agenda, and some of them have not shown up. We have Baffinland next on the agenda. Please proceed whenever you are ready, please.

Presentation by Baffinland

Megan Lord-Hoyle, Vice President of Sustainable Development
Lou Kamermans, Senior Director of Sustainable Development
Mike Settingington, Wildlife Biologist with Environmental Dynamics Inc.

Lou: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you for having us here today. My name is Lou Kamermans, Senior Director of Sustainable Development with Baffinland Iron Mines. With me is Mike Settingington, our registered professional Wildlife Biologist from Environment Dynamics, Incorporated.

Baffinland has previously filed written submissions in this process, and we thank the Planning Commission for considering them. We do plan to file follow-up prior to the end of the record. Instead of repeating that submission we have made to date, we are focusing this presentation to provide the Commissioners and participants with information on protection measures that we have developed with community members, the Qikiqtani Inuit Association, and territorial regulators through the Nunavut Impact Review Board process.

Baffinland is focused on our project in the North Baffin region. We have no other projects outside of the North Baffin. We are committed to developing the Mary River Project in a way that demonstrates environmental stewardship and respect for all. We are incredibly thankful to all of the North Baffin communities, and especially the Mary River Project Inuit employees for all of the knowledge they have shared with us to help develop and improve our project since operations began in 2015.

As the Commission has heard from many participants in this process, we agree that the topic of existing rights should be revisited in the final version of the Plan. We are asking the Commissioners to recognize the significant investment in Nunavut that Baffinland has made to date, which includes over \$3 billion dollars expenditures and over \$100 million dollars in wages to Inuit alone. The intent is to implement the systems needed and the Plan to realize the full potential of the Mary River group of deposits.

For mining and exploration projects, we are asking the Commission to take the Option 4 approach that was developed by your staff in the *Options and Recommendations Report*. Under Option 4, if we make any applications for new or modified activities, we would be required to address those topics as identified in the Land Use Plan. This Option 4 land use planning requirement would help ensure that our applications are complete and address the issues that Inuit have identified to the Commission.

We have asked that the Commissioners define the Mary River Milne Inlet infrastructure corridor approximately and that minor adjustments to infrastructure alignments not require future Land Use Plan amendments. We have also suggested a Valued Socioeconomic Component designation rather than a Limited Use designation for the corridor, which would otherwise limit necessarily incidental or compatible future uses.

Baffinland also identified that ice bridging requirements over on-ice travel routes may not be feasible in a number of cases, and that a more site-specific approach is needed. Baffinland has provided that in instances where shipping through ice overlaps known on-ice travel routes, the proponent be required to work with local communities to develop a safe travel policy. This policy can take unique features of the proposed activities, local and seasonal ice conditions, as well as the local community priorities into consideration to develop solutions that are safe, effective, and achievable.

The remainder of this presentation will focus on caribou protection at Mary River as an example of the types of mitigations that can be achieved through the processes administered after a project meets conformity with a Land Use Plan. This is the same system that Baffinland recommends continue under the first-generation of the Land Use Plan where sensitive caribou areas are identified for additional scrutiny in the Impact Assessment Phase, that the areas are refined with additional studies by both traditional and scientific means, and that the effectiveness of mobile or site-specific protection measures be given due consideration.

The measures that we have in place are based on Traditional Knowledge and the best available western science and were developed in collaboration with Inuit and our Terrestrial Environment Working Group. Mike Settingington will now speak more about our understanding of North Baffin caribou and our approach to caribou protection.

Mike:

Mr. Chair, I am Mike Settingington with Environmental Dynamics, a wildlife biologist for the Baffinland Project. Slide 9, the next slide, summarizes some of the opportunities we have had to work directly with Traditional Knowledge holders, to learn about areas important to caribou, and the relevance of those areas to the mine site activities and broader areas that may be affected by the Mary River Project.

The work included a number of workshops over the years, as illustrated on the slide. Also, as part of the recent Nunavut Impact Review Board Assessment, and regardless of the rejection of the Phase 2 proposal, Baffinland remains committed to partially fund the Qikiqtani Inuit Association's Baffin Island-wide Caribou Traditional Knowledge Survey. That additional Traditional Knowledge information can provide a broader perspective of how abundance and habitat use will change as caribou return in large numbers as part of their natural population cycle.

Baffinland also supports the Government of Nunavut in its studies of caribou abundance. Baffinland is also committed to Inuit-led project effects monitoring. A mix of Traditional Knowledge, scientific study, Inuit involvement, and experience from other Nunavut projects is essential to the development of caribou protection measures at the Mary River Project.

I will now speak briefly on the Traditional Knowledge baseline information that was shared with us. Starting in 2006 during the early years of this project, we recognized that we were working in an area deficient in scientific understanding but rich in Traditional Knowledge of caribou behaviour and distribution. We knew we had to go to local Elders and Knowledge Holders, who are the caribou experts, to help us understand the caribou.

Baffinland recognized the important need and large responsibility to work with Knowledge Holders to document Traditional Knowledge relevant to the project area to ensure that they were informed and could manage risk effectively and operate a mine. Inuit generously shared knowledge on where

caribou have been known to calve, their seasonal movements, their 70-year population cycle, and signs of when the caribou would return in large numbers.

Slide 10 on the screen illustrates some of the caribou information that was shared and used in the impact assessment and mitigation plans. Slide 11 shows information about caribou calving near the Mary River site. The community members who had experienced the last high in caribou abundance and used this land area, helped Baffinland understand the importance and behaviour of North Baffin Island calving caribou.

We learned that the calving behaviour of Baffin Island caribou is very different from the behaviour of herds on mainland Nunavut. While caribou have been known to calve in areas identified by some participants in the red outlined areas seen on this slide, they don't necessarily group together when calving. They tend to be distributed individually in often barren, high elevation areas. Knowledge Holders have shared with us that it is likely that Baffin caribou will go hide to avoid predation by wolves.

Understanding caribou calving ecology in North Baffin Island is much richer than simply identifying areas on maps. While caribou can be found in many areas, it is important to understand that when calving, they are up high, sparsely distributed, and not always in the same area for years on end. In recognition of this distinction from calving behaviour on the mainland, if calving areas are designated in the final Land Use Plan, the Baffin areas where caribou have been known to calve should be clearly distinguished and treated differently from the calving grounds identified on mainland Nunavut.

Slide 12 illustrates some of the information of how caribou movement as shared by Knowledge Holders is integrated in project design and mitigation. Again, the information comes to us from the local land users and harvesters through interviews, mapping, and discussions. Our work with the local Knowledge Holders also included discussions about risk and consequence so that Baffinland could focus mitigation efforts appropriately.

Prohibitions and exclusions are not always the correct answer. Every project proponent needs to understand the area they are working in and develop mitigations that respond to the unique features of each project area and each landscape. This understanding requires careful planning and collaboration, evaluation of risk, and development of mitigations to reduce potential adverse effects. With a commitment by involved stakeholders, the result can be a project that coexists with caribou. At that same time, Inuit can still have opportunities for a consistent sustainable harvest.

Slide 13 and 14 in Inuktitut illustrates an example from one of Baffinland's Environmental Management Plans. The project certificate requires that the plan include measures to protect caribou and be revisited regularly so that the most up-to-date information, including Inuit feedback, is addressed. This example illustrates how Baffinland protects caribou along the Tote Road. When caribou are near the Tote Road, trucks stop to ensure that caribou can move freely. Caribou have the right-of-way.

These measures are a part of the approved project. They have been in place for many years and will continue to be used on the project and improved as necessary. So, Mr. Chair, the environmental protection measures implemented at the Mary River Project exceed the standards in any other Canadian jurisdiction where I have worked, particularly for the protection of the land and caribou,

the plans for future research and monitoring when the caribou return, and the constant vigilance and engagement of the authorities and Inuit in follow-up monitoring.

In my experience, the protection measures implemented at this and other Nunavut mining projects show Nunavut's leadership in environmental protection and resource development. The Nunavut Planning Commission should acknowledge these existing approaches within the context of the Nunavut Land Use Plan. Lou Kamermans will complete the presentation.

Lou:

Thank you, Mike. In 2014, Baffinland and the Qikiqtani Inuit Association developed and submitted the Mary River Caribou Protection Measures to the Nunavut Planning Commission. The protection measures draw from the North Baffin Regional Land Use Plan and incorporate refinements to address project-specific application. The protection measures are detailed but also provide flexibility for parties to modify our approach over time, as the situation has demonstrated to warrant it through project monitoring.

In 2022, Baffinland and the Qikiqtani Inuit Association agreed to advance key sections of the Caribou Protection Measures. In 2022, and consistent in 2014, the protection measures continue to respect the principle that mitigations should take the presence of caribou into consideration before they are implemented, consistent with the approach outlined in the North Baffin Regional Land Use Plan.

Through the protection measures, it is possible for parties to gain a greater understanding of North Baffin caribou and enhance their protection over time, aided by the ongoing inputs provided by project monitoring and local Inuit experience. I just want to discuss monitoring at the project at the moment in these final slides.

We conduct a variety of monitoring programs every year, and each year, Baffinland submits its reports to the Nunavut Impact Review Board, which are then circulated to all parties on the public distribution list. The board then administers an open and transparent review process, which concludes with the issuance of any recommendations the board feel is necessary.

To maximize community participation and awareness, Baffinland translates a summary of the annual report and provides printed copies of the full report to all five North Baffin hamlets and Hunters and Trappers Organizations. On the screen here, you can see examples of some of the past terrestrial monitoring reports with highlights of some of the focus areas of each of the annual reports, and changes that we have made to reflect feedback from the reviewers.

Inuit involvement is integral to the success and longevity of Baffinland-led monitoring programs. Over time, we have seen the composition of our monitoring programs evolve with some reporting over 50% local Inuit participation. We have also seen the same people return year over year and more often take on leadership roles.

Through the long life of this project, Baffinland expects that Inuit will lead both the monitoring and operation of the project. This vision fits within the broad goals of the Nunavut Land Use Plan. We believe that mining and caribou can coexist.

In closing, we respect the Commission's advice that the focus of the discussion be on land use planning and not specific to the Mary River Project. However, if anyone here has specific questions

about the project, I am happy to speak at break or at any time I am in your communities. Thank you, Mr. Chair. This completes the presentation and we are ready for the land use planning questions.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Thank you for your presentation. Currently, there are no staff questions to the presentation.

? (*Name not stated. Translated*): Thank you for your report. I want to ask when they go near the mine site, the snow looks reddish. Does their fur get affected by the dust near the mine? That is my question. Thank you.

Chairperson: Proceed.

Mike: Mr. Chair, I am Mike Settrington, wildlife biologist for Baffinland. Thank you for the question. As I understand it, you noted in pictures that the snow is reddish near the mine site, and you are wondering about caribou and if they are affected by that when they are near the mine site. The monitoring that we do at the mine site includes everything starting with dust fall monitoring to determine what is in that dust.

Every month, we analyze the metals in the dust, and we do remote sensing of dust fall as well. Then during the growing season, we look at the plants themselves that the caribou and other wildlife would eat. We monitor the growth of the vegetation. We look at the metals in the lichen in particular and assess the risk profile to determine if the vegetation that the animals would eat would pose any risk to them. To date, we have not seen any levels of metals that would pose any risk to wildlife eating it. I hope that answers your question, as I understand it. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jaco?

Jaco: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. The hunters monitor, the real hunters. The fish, what sort of research? It seems there is a river, and they could travel along stream upriver and contaminations can flow down river. That might be affected. Is there monitoring of fish? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead when you are ready.

Lou: Thank you, Mr. Chair and thank you for the question. I can quickly confirm that we do monitor fish, and we also monitor water quality. We do this through a number of programs and at a number of locations across the project. Fish are monitored in the marine area and have tissue samples taken to determine if there is any toxicity at Milne Port, and similar monitoring is carried out at the mine site. That is under the Aquatic Effects Monitoring Program.

The intent of that program is that it looks at the part of the project that could be most impacted by dust and by looking at the most impacted area and ensuring that levels are underneath predictions and underneath guidelines associated with health or lethality to wildlife that we can say that we are not having a significant effect or affecting the health of fish across the project.

So, that is part of our annual monitoring programs. It is reported annually. Those reports are made available in the five communities each year. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jetaloo?

Jetaloo: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. We are going on long fishing tonight. I have a question. The mine, what kind of operation do you have? What kind of mining operation?

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: The presentation is for our consideration with their monitoring program. We saw your presentation. They also presented their own presentation for consideration. We are not dealing with the specific operation but the land planning process through their monitoring program, not related to mine activity. It is more on the regulation side.

Jetaloo: *(Translated)*: Chair, yes, I want to understand. Iqaluit Amaruq HTO as the Elder, I am asking the area that you are talking about, this is the operation near Pond Inlet that we are talking about. That is my question. Is that the project we are dealing with, or are we dealing with another project? Are you doing another project somewhere? I am trying to find out which location we are talking about. I want to hear first.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. He would like a response. Proceed.

Lou: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Jetaloo, for the question. For land use planning processes, we are talking about more than just the Mary River Mine, as most people around this table know. We have many exploration properties around the North Baffin. When we talk about the Mary River Mine being multigenerational and operating for 100 years, the deposit we are in right now does not give us that. We need to continue to develop new deposits that we know are in the area for that to be a reality.

So, what we are bringing to today's presentation and in our submissions, is not just about the Mary River Project as people know it. It is all the future areas that would need to be accessed to keep the mine operating to keep delivering the benefits in the North Baffin and to live up to what we have promised to deliver. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jetaloo?

Jetaloo: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jetaloo Kakee, Iqaluit Amaruq Hunters and Trappers Organization. First question is about the Inuit that are employed. They are making \$100 million dollars. Because they are Inuit Owned Lands, Inuit have to benefit. That is the way it should be. If there are not going to be Inuit and we won't agree to that in Inuit country if an operation like that is going to happen.

For the life of the mine, Inuit will be a part of it. I want to say, I will get to a question yet, okay? We are in 2001, maybe afterwards, Pond Inlet was concerned about fishing sites, and we are also aware the hamlet in Pangnirtung used the dust control system from the white man. It wasn't good for the sea. That is what we understand.

I understand that we have a presentation, but we are trying to understand, so we are asking questions. That is the extent. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. We are good? I did not hear a question. It seems like you just made comments about fish and what you found. If you have a question to the presentation, please proceed.

Jetaloo: *(Translated)*: Okay, my question was useless. How about we are trying to defend animals. You want to operate for 100 years. We are concerned about the wildlife because we are going to have to eat the food. You cannot accept the animals from the project. Are you going to compensate us for loss of food?

That is my question, and also, from the rock you extract, you take it away. Somewhere to its destination, you offload it. We have never heard. That is my question from Nunavut. Maybe you are trying not to share information. Before you were working, did not understand. That made it difficult for the project. I am going to ask some more. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Those questions you have are not targeting the work we are doing as he said in the presentation. Outside or during a break, you can talk about what you want to hear. You ask questions that are operational, not related to the Land Use Plan and not the work that we are doing. I want to be clear as well to you, but it has to focus on the work at hand, not general questions.

Jetaloo: *(Translated)*: I am done. Thank you. It is better if we don't ask because we won't get the answers we want. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. I have no more names.

Abraham Q: *(Translated)*: Abraham Qammaniq, Sanirajak Hunters and Trappers Organization. It looks like a pretty good monitoring program. It might be better, but I would also work when Inuit start complaining that they are hurt. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Natalino, to the report?

Natalino: *(Translated)*: Natalino Piugattuk, Igloolik Hunters and Trappers Organization. I have lived in that area. I will try and explain from the site, the mine sites down the Tote Road. The road and the dust that come from that road is 2 miles on either side of the road. There is no vegetation growing in the summer. There used to be geese. When they should be nesting, they are no longer around. They have gone to a different location due to the disturbance.

The ocean to Pond Inlet, we used to have a fishing location there. They would charter a plane into there, and it is not operating now as there are no more fish. These are real environmental issues that I want to bring up to the people at the meeting. Thank you. I have seen it.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Maliktoo?

Maliktoo: *(Translated)*: Maliktoo Lyta, Kimmirut. My question to the presentation is it looks good. You said you monitor animals annually. What is happening to the creatures, the animals? What are you learning? Are they affected? Is it worse or better conditions for them? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can proceed with the answer.

Mike: Mr. Chair, Mike Settrington, wildlife biologist for Baffinland. Thank you for the question. That is a very straightforward question. Your question was you are monitoring the animals annually and are they doing any better or are they affected. What are you seeing? That is your question.

I guess starting off with a key species that we are looking at, caribou is our largest challenge for monitoring. Community members and hunters are telling us that the caribou are avoiding the mine site. We have a problem confirming that on the science side because of the density. The numbers of caribou are so low, so it is difficult for us to measure that.

We do have a research plan in place into the future as the caribou increase across the island, to monitor that. So, we will be able to say more about caribou directly sometime in the next decade. In the absence of caribou, we monitor what they eat to ensure that the food they will eat remains safe to eat.

We also monitor things like songbirds, the birds that nest on the cliffs, the raptors, the Peregrine falcons, the Gyrfalcons, the rough-legged hawks, to see if they are disturbed by the mining activity, and they have not been. They nest just as successfully near the mine site as they do far away from the mine site when they are there to nest.

The songbirds, it is the same issue as caribou. There are very low densities. We work with Environment Canada on monitoring songbirds, and Environment Canada with support from Baffinland study the seabird colonies along the northern shipping route. As well as in the future, they are studying seabirds along the southern shipping route as well to collect years and years of monitoring data.

So, to get at the big answer, are the animals better off or how have then been affected, that is what our entire effects assessment was about, to try and predict where the effect would be to animals. It is a footprint on the land, so wildlife will behave different around it. It takes us quite a while to figure out what the actual response is, but we respond to immediate wildlife, like crossing the road. We stop and let caribou cross the road. We don't see that very often because there are not very many caribou in the area.

Foxes are another thing. We have the odd collision with foxes on the road. We watch. We have foxes coming in abundance toward the mine site, so there is a number of wildlife monitoring we do. From our monitoring perspective, and we understand that there are some differences of opinion with the community members, we are not seeing significant effects yet. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. I think that answers the question. I don't have any more names from the table. Nunavik, do you have questions to the presentation, please?

Johnny K: *(Translated)*: Johnny Kasudluak, Inukjuaq. The monitoring program you have in place, has it been confirmed as a viable venture? Is there some company that would be able to confirm that your monitoring system is in place? I also question how relevant the presentation is to the proceedings, relevant to the Nunavut Land Use Plan and how this project would proceed.

You are telling us of what your projects are like. You mentioned that caribou and other mammals are being monitored. We are not into shore mammals, but perhaps some mammals do come ashore. I wonder how the shore mammals are being affected by the traffic going through that area. The traffic is from taking loads for shipment. As the ships are coming into the harbour are registered carriers, they should adhere to ship ballast when it is released and where. Where they are drained,

what contaminants are part of the ballast water? I would be interested in hearing how you handle incoming. I will say this in English briefly.

(English): The research that you do, ballast, I did not see anything about marine life, especially with the ship, the vessel that picks up all the ore. Is it possible to have information on any research done on the way or from the port where you pick up the ore, and along the route around Nunavut and monitoring data? The research that you do, is it possible that there could be a third-party verification or validation? I think that is basically it. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead with a response.

Lou: Thank you, Mr. Chair and thank you, Johnny. That was a great set of questions. If I miss any, please let me know. To start, I think the core question is how our presentation is related to the Land Use Plan. What we are trying to, particularly where we focused on caribou and our caribou protections, demonstrate how a project that is given the opportunity to proceed past the land use planning process stage can be managed and how it can be managed effectively and collaboratively with regulators, with Inuit, with the Designated Inuit Organizations. That is what we tried to do when we talked about the project-specific mitigation plans and monitoring programs.

I did not focus on our marine programs, because that is not an area of the current Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan where we have provided comments on. We may provide comments, further comments concerning the marine area before January, but at this time, we have not made any. That is why it was not included in the presentation.

That does not mean we don't have extensive marine monitoring programs in place, and they are subject to the same reporting process I described. You can find all of our annual monitoring reports, as well as our wildlife specific monitoring reports for the terrestrial environment and for the marine environment on our document portal.

If you just type in Baffinland to Google, go to our webpage. There is a media tab, and you will find our document portal. It should be up to date with everything up to 2021. We will be submitting our 2022 reports in March coming up.

Johnny K: Also, the question of being validated by a third party?

Lou: So, how it is verified is we submit a large annual report to the Nunavut Impact Review Board. It reports on our compliance against all of what is called our project certificate, all of the terms and conditions.

Then that is issued for public review and all the interested regulators, Designated Inuit Organizations like the Qikiqtani Inuit Association, the Government of Nunavut, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Environment Canada, and environmental non-government organizations like World Wildlife Fund, Oceans North, all have an opportunity to review our reports and provide comments.

The Nunavut Impact Review Board will provide direction if any amendments or changes are needed to our programs. We take it a step further with the marine and terrestrial areas. We have working groups. We issue all of our reports in draft to them, and they contain those groups that I talked

about. We don't issue our final reports until we have received all of the comments on them from that group and modified our report based on those comments.

That is our approach towards verification. I hope that answers the question. Related to land use planning, I am just trying to show the processes that are available once you get past the land use planning stage and the level of oversight that is expected and implemented. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Some of your answers are outside of what we are doing but are still answers. Eli, please have questions related to the Land Use Plan.

Eli: *(Translated)*: Thank you. In the presentation, you mentioned caribou and cargo routes coming in so close to Nottingham Island. This is their main route. It is so close to these islands on Hudson Strait.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: The question to the presentation, please.

Eli: *(Translated)*: I am just trying to add to Johnny's question. Thank you for your correction.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. They do not travel through Hudson Strait. They are bound cargo. Nunavik? *(Pause)*

Are there questions from the registered participants? Go ahead.

Mike F: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Mike Ferguson, QWB. I missed...Part of my question might have come up already, but I missed it. I'm sorry. I do want to bring the focus to land use planning or marine planning. Also, I want to make it relevant to all of the communities that are represented here: Igloolik, Sanirajak, Iqaluit, Kimmirut, Kinngait, Northern Quebec communities, and to some extent Pangnirtung.

Baffinland has approval already to ship 18 million tonnes of ore out of Steensby Inlet in northern Foxe Basin. That would be three times as much as I think you have approval for out of Milne Inlet. Also, the approval I believe, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, is for year-round shipping through Foxe Basin and Hudson Strait. That has potential to impact the harvesting resources of all of the communities that I just mentioned, plus also Nauyasat, Coral Harbour, and all of the Kivalliq communities.

Hudson Strait is an area with the opening ends of it reportedly wintering areas for Hudson Bay narwhal and Hudson Bay beluga. Those resources, if there is year-round shipping, it could impact all of those communities. Kinngait and Kimmirut have in our submissions in the QWB and those HTOs requested no shipping and no traffic along the coast of Foxe Basin and southern Foxe Basin, Foxe Channel, and northern Hudson Strait.

In looking at the 2021 Draft, those areas of Limited Use were not included in the Plan, but I have not completed the analysis yet. So, there are definite community concerns about the Steensby Port development if it goes ahead. I have a few questions. One is does Baffinland know yet when they may develop Steensby Inlet and start shipping ore through Foxe Basin, Foxe Channel, Hudson Strait? Will they engage in further community consultation?

All the communities that could be impacted, I don't think they were consulted in the original application, but I don't know for sure. I wasn't around then. Maybe the Nunavut Planning

Commission can comment as to why some of the marine areas that the QWB and the HTOs requested to be included, why they were excluded from the 2021 Draft Plan. I think those are my questions. They are mostly to Baffinland, but also to the Planning Commission. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. Mike, thank you for your comment and your question, but we are not here to discuss Baffinland's project proposals or their intent of their future operations. We are here to speak to the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan and the *Options and Recommendations*. If you have a question that is focused specific to that, we would be pleased to answer that question. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Mike F: Thank you. I will, therefore, drop my questions to Baffinland. There remains one last question. Why was the area in Foxe Channel with Limited Use requested by Kimmirut and Kinngait not included in the 2021 Draft Land Use Plan. I believe that is a question about the subject area you said we could ask questions on. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think staff are just checking on the Limited Use. I believe in the *Options and Recommendation Document* the submissions were submitted. The designations options are outlined there. I will just ask Brian or Solomon if they have anything further to add on the designation. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Brian?

Brian: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Brian Aglukark, Nunavut Planning Commission. They are consulting, and an answer will be forthcoming.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Solomon?

Solomon: Solomon Amuno, Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you very much for that comment. We will have to take a deeper look at that and get back to you on that question. Thank you.

Chairman: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Brian: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Brian Aglukark, Nunavut Planning Commission. The Draft Plan was amended in 2021. I think the Commission did a lot of work to see what should be included in the Draft Plan and what should not be included and how it was looked at by the public. We will review and answer your concern. Solomon will, I think, be able to give you a clear answer now.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Solomon?

Solomon: Solomon Amuno, Nunavut Planning Commission. First, I want to say thank you to Lou and Mike for that presentation. I just have a quick clarification question on Slide 3 of your presentation. I am

asking, not this page, the one regarding the recommendation for icebreaking. Yes, thank you. That is Slide 6. Sorry about that.

My question here is can Baffinland provide its rationale for recommending that the Commission remove reference to ice bridging and also reconsider seasonal references? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Lou: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Solomon, for the question. It is outlined in our written submission, but to sum it up, there were two areas of concern. The one is the seasons it was potentially required in. In the North Baffin, the second season extends into July, and that is a period when you can have mobile ice. The land fast has started to break up. You need fixed ice to deploy bridges. You need two fixed points for them to attach to. So, once the ice starts to break up, it is unsafe to implement.

Beyond that, when the ice is frozen, there are a lot of logistical considerations that go into a program like this. Where I think it is most widely known for being used is at Voisey's Bay. That is a much different operation than what ours would look like in Steensby. There are very few vessels that go through in the winter season, the MV Arctic. It is a much smaller vessel than what we would be using at Steensby.

Because there are so much fewer and because the draft is so much smaller, it can take the same path over and over so you have consistency with where you are deploying the bridge. It is a much shorter bridge. It is actually very close to main, so it has a logistical center to deploy from. In our situation where one of the on-ice travel routes overlaps our shipping route, it is quite far from any infrastructure, community, or Steensby Port.

So, for us to implement a bridging program would mean maintaining a dedicated camp that is remote, possibly off an island in Foxe Basin. That presents challenges, just practical, but also in safety, having to maintain a remote camp like that through the winter. I can't recall if there were any other points, but like I said, they are in our written submission.

Our solution is, we want to recognize that we do want to maintain travel. We would have to maintain travel, and that would likely be part of, well, it was part of discussions related to the EA and any future proposals that affect other on-ice travel routes, whether it is related to our project or other projects.

It makes more sense to take a more flexible approach and just require proponents to work with communities to develop something that is a best fit for that area, because it is not always going to be the same solution everywhere. That was our thinking, and those were the details that I could recall. Thanks.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon, go ahead.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for the answer. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. Mike, just a final comment. The Draft Plan is built on the recommendations outlined in the *O&R Document*, and the Commission would welcome if QWB has any further suggestions or submissions that they would like to put forward in this area to the Commission. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. We have no further names from registered participants. Go ahead.

Meeka: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Commissioners. We have been in the planning process with the Wildlife Board for 9 years representing Nunavut cargo routes. It has been an ongoing discussion and concern for many years. You are doing land use process with Inuit in mind. My question is, people before us were concerned at that time, and it has been a problem for some time how much disturbance it would be if something was drastically happening, for instance, icebreaking cargo routes. I think it is existing rights under *(inaudible)*.

(English): *(Inaudible)*... not just on the Deposit 1, but what are the fiscal benefits?

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: I think your question is more relevant to Baffinland, not to the Nunavut Planning Commission. We hear that there are many concerns aside from what our purpose is for this process. We are here to listen to land use planning that would give us an idea how to refine the Draft Plan. At times, it appears we do not care, and we ask people sometimes when it is not relevant, but we want the Commissioners to hear on problems related to land use planning if you have a question on that topic.

Meeka: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. On Slide 3, we will be going home after this process. What are we going to say to our children, to our future children? I am particularly concerned about Deposit 1 and the fiscal perhaps rewards. It is related to existing rights. My comment is related to existing rights, and it appears to be on the position of existing rights and the planning process that you are undertaking.

We are speaking about existing rights and Deposit 1 is part of that existing rights. They are related to the planning process that you are holding. It will affect us directly, and you should be aware of this. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. Thank you, Meeka, for your comment. I believe the context of the existing rights that are pertaining to industry are different from the existing rights, which are also relevant to Inuit. When we are talking about existing rights specific to exploration and staking that is already in place or mines that already in place, that is the context that we are speaking of existing rights to the presentation and to stakeholders that already have invested in the territory, for that clarification. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Meeka, go ahead.

Meeka: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. I am trying to get a question answered from the panel on Deposit 1. Can you further elaborate on Deposit 1, please?

Chairperson: You can respond.

Lou: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Meeka. I hope I answer your question. I think you want me to confirm that Deposit 1 would be included in what we are proposing for the protection of existing rights, and it would be. That is what we are seeking.

You also asked about the fiscal benefit. Again, I am answering this just to give a practical example of the value of projects that make it past the land use planning phase. Deposit 1, at its current estimate in ore size, the economic benefit is tremendous. Payments to Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated in terms of royalties are anticipated at close to \$1.6 billion dollars.

There are additional revenues that would go direct to the Qikiqtani Inuit Association that would accrue through the life of mining Deposit 1. As the Inuit Impact and Benefits Agreements is currently written, it is over \$500 to \$600 million dollars direct to your region. Then there are significant fiscal benefits, over \$2 billion dollars in territorial and federal taxes.

That does not mention, and we can't even begin to quantify in terms of the benefits to the North Baffin to people that can find jobs and live in their communities, to people that can gain new skills that are transferrable, to the businesses they can develop over time. We have awarded significant value of contracts, again, \$3 billion dollars in contracts, many of which have gone through Inuit owned firms.

So, there is a tremendous amount of value in Deposit 1, and that is just one of our potential deposits that could be developed through the project. This is one project that is similar to another that just has not been found yet or is just beginning to be explored. That is what people are trying to protect through existing rights is the ability to define that opportunity, propose that opportunity, and see if it could be worked out and carried forward. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Is that good, Meeka?

Meeka: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. When Elders are not allowed to speak freely, questions are not related so it seems to planning, but our forefathers have been planning this whole process for a long time, way to Labrador. So, these comments when they say it is not related to the Plan, they could really feel that.

The small bylaws without consulting the committee, the CLRCs are not running properly. We are left out of the loop. They have to monitor. We have no strength, and we don't have an organization. Somehow, it needs to be fixed and those that have existing rights. We haven't been told if we haven't been described what the land looks like.

My fellow Inuit, I love you for getting your voices close. I have not been with the NWMB for a long time, but the shipping routes need to be defined. Who is representing? I would like the Nunavik without, so as we stopped by our chairman when we want to comment. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. *(Chairperson's statements were not translated initially)* ...so as a Chairman we have to make decisions about the process of the meeting.

Meeka: *(Translated)*: We just would like an avenue where we could speak. We are not trying to upset people. Thank you.

Chairperson: Lori, proceed.

Lori: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Lori Idlout, MP for Nunavut. I have questions related to existing rights. Thank you for your presentation. When I say on Power Point Slides number 3 and 4, you appear to be making some recommendations based on your current experience with the project and your projections with what the deposits have. So, my first question to you is based on your projections, why would it be necessary to have your existing rights to include mineral tenure?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Lou: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Lori, for the question. What we have proposed in our written submission, we actually have a figure. It shows all of our various mineral tenures in the North Baffin area. We would expect all of those to be recognized under the existing rights provisions of the Land Use Plan. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed.

Lori: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. If you could explain.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: If you could translate that.

Lori: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. It would be very useful if you could at least elaborate on some of what you just mentioned about the submission. Can you please share with this group what the submissions are. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed. Maybe they did not understand your question.

Lori: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Lori Idlout, MP for Nunavut. I don't think that everyone in this room has read all of what you have submitted to the Nunavut Planning Commission. So, you've mentioned in your testimony that you are projecting many royalties going to NTI, QIA, and the tax system. How is it if you are projecting all these great amounts of money that we will all benefit from? Why is it necessary to recommend that you need to include mineral tenure as part of your existing rights?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon wants to speak. Proceed.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. Thank you, Lori, for your question. With regard to existing rights, when a proponent has staked and has exploration, and has an active mine, they already through the various legislations and acts have existing rights. Those are the existing rights that we are looking at and looking for recommendations to the Commission on how existing rights going forward should be managed.

Recognizing that we appreciate that Baffinland is here giving the recommendations on how they see existing rights and other options in the *Options and Recommendation Document*, and other related industry recommendations that are required in the Land Use Plan should be managed. That is the focus. Their existing rights already exist through the legislation and through the development of the mine and the development that is already existing. I hope that provides context for the existing rights. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Lori, go ahead.

Lori: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Lori Idlout, MP for Nunavut. Baffinland is recommending to the Nunavut Planning Commission that existing rights must be included for the future Nunavut Land Use Plan, including mineral tenure. Can you elaborate on why you have made this recommendation?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead if you have a response.

Lou: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Lori. Again, I will try to explain it to the best of my ability. I can only provide our perspective as one industry proponent. The Chamber is likely going to discuss this more at an industry level, and then the Nunavut Planning Commission has their own approach towards this as well.

Our interest is in the fact that we have made claims to areas under the Mineral Tenure System, whether it is federal or the one administered by Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated for subsurface mineral rights. That is distinct. That process is separate. Having the rights is one thing, but then bringing the project through the exploration phase and possibly into a mine, that has to be supported by the Institutions of Public Governments in Nunavut. We have to go through the Nunavut Impact Review Board, through the Nunavut Water Board.

We have only done that for Deposit 1, but there are other deposits; 2 and 3 are close to Deposit 1. Deposit 4 and 5 are midway between the mine site and Milne Port. Those are projects we have actively explored, we have invested in. We have defined their potential, but we have not gone through the regulatory process to permit them as mines.

So, what we are asking for is that we have the tenure. We have the intent to develop those deposits in the future. If Limited Use Areas are designated over top of those leases, we want the ability to still propose a development there and not to be limited at the land use planning stage. So, we would be able to go to the Nunavut Impact Review Board with an Impact Statement to study the area, to work with Inuit, to build the Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit understanding of the area, and the potential interactions of the project, and to put it in front of the Board.

So, that is what we are looking for with existing rights. It starts, you have to have tenure to be able to explore an area, but you also have to go through the rest of the process to approve the activities needed to explore. We are just asking for the ability to go into that stage. It does not guarantee us an approval, but it lets us try. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do you have another question?

Lori: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Lori Idlout, Member of Parliament. Thank you for that explanation. It does clarify why you have made that recommendation. I understand that the cost of doing business in Nunavut is high. The cost of for Inuit for having lived in our lands since time immemorial is higher. We have already been forced to extinguish our rights through the *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement*, and that is why you are getting the questions you get.

That is why the Government of Nunavut, the Government of Canada get the questions that they get, because all too often when it comes to recognizing the cost to Inuit, never mind the cost of doing business, we are the ones who are losing the most. That is why questions from people in this room, including Meeka before me, are so important. We are not just asking within this process,

within this Nunavut planning process, what this means specifically to Baffinland, but the whole process in and of itself.

Having said that, I do have another question on Slide 4 regarding your other recommendation of asking for allowances to these examples, such as transportation infrastructure within Limited Use Areas and surrounding projects where there are limitations. I wonder if you could elaborate on that as well, because it was not clear in your presentation what exactly what you are recommending. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed.

Lou: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yeah, my apologies. I should have made that slide more plain language. What it is really saying is if any of our existing rights, say the outline of a current mining lease, are entirely inside of a Limited Use Area and there is no connection to an area outside of it that is Mixed Use or Conditional Use, that is what you would call a stranded resource. It is basically an island.

If you are operating a mine, you need some form of access, typically by road or rail, that would allow you to take or deliver freight and fuel to that site and then to also transport your mine product out of that area. So, what we are asking for is connecting your existing rights to a Mixed Use or to a Conditional Use Area is essential to really affording you what the intent of existing rights is, which is to possibly develop that resource.

What we are saying is, if there is a parcel that is entirely inside a Limited Use Area, we should be able to connect to it and put that forward to the Impact Review Board and not have it blocked at the Land Use Plan stage. I hope that makes sense. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Another question?

Lori: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Lori Idlout, MP for Nunavut. On the *Leading the Way Through Land Use Planning* document that is provided to us, on page 44, it talks about prohibitions that would be for the Mary River Milne Inlet including all-weather and seasonal roads, railways, seasonal airstrips, or ice strips, quarries, and the construction of infrastructure support facilities, and any other related systems associated with the use of the corridor. Do the items on Slide 4 in your presentation relate to any of these items that is on page 41? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Lou: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thanks again, Lori. We actually have a submission on this corridor specifically. Just to sum it up, I believe in the Land Use Plan, that corridor is given a Limited Use designation. It allows for all of the uses you just listed. What we have asked is that that corridor just be designated or identified for its transportation potential.

All we need is to ensure that the transportation is allowable in that area. We don't really need to restrict other uses. There are possible other uses that may be compatible with that area. That is the sum of our submission on the corridor. Thank you.

Chairperson: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. There appears to be no more questions from the public. Thank you for the presentation.

(Applause)

We have a lot of work to do yet, so we will take a 15-minute break.

Break

Presentation by World Wildlife Fund Canada

Erin Keenan, Manager Arctic Marine Conservation
Brandon Laforest, Senior Specialist, Arctic Species and Ecosystems
Jason Harisimo, Specialist Arctic Species and Ecosystems

Chairperson: Are we ready? Qujannamiik. If you are ready for your presentation, state your name and organization. You can start.

Erin: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Erin Keenan, World Wildlife Fund Canada. I will just start maybe by introducing the team that I have here. To my left is Brandon Laforest, and to my right I have Jason Harisimo, who both work on Arctic species for WWF Canada. I focus on marine conservation, and we also have Paul Okalik, who is not here tonight but has been a key part of the team working on this file for World Wildlife Fund. He has been present at some of the previous hearings.

Despite that fact that “World” is in the name of our organization, I also want to emphasize that our team is all individuals who work almost exclusively on projects related to Nunavut, and we are very invested in connecting with others in this field in Nunavut as well.

Thank you to the NPC for the opportunity to address the hearing. We do not take for granted that we are given the time and space to speak in a group full of Inuit leaders such as this, so we are very grateful for the opportunity. We will keep our presentation brief.

World Wildlife Fund Canada is a not-for-profit organization with a focus on conservation. We have a permanent office here in Iqaluit, and we work on a variety of environmental issues in partnership with local, territorial, and federal organizations across the North. Our work includes supporting the development of local inshore fisheries, advocating for cleaner fuel and practices in the Arctic shipping industry, intervening where appropriate in regulatory processes such as this one, and supporting Inuit-led protected and conserved areas and initiatives.

A few examples of work that we have been involved with recently in the Qikiqtani region include supporting inshore fisheries development in Kinngait, as well as sponsoring community cleanups through the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board and with Amaruq HTO this past summer.

As an organization, we have been actively engaged in the development of the Nunavut Land Use Plan for many years providing expert reports, datasets, geographic information layers, specific recommendations and comments, and attending numerous technical and procedural meetings.

Something that we are particularly proud of is also supporting the participation of other groups at their request.

We work directly with local communities and are always open to receiving requests from community groups and Hunters and Trappers Associations to support their participation in this or any environmental process in Nunavut. So, I am going to get into more of the technical content of this presentation. I just want to provide some context that as a team from World Wildlife Fund Canada, we have spent years at this point, meeting with HTOs all across Nunavut and all three regions of Nunavut to discuss the 2021 Draft Plan and previous drafts of the Plan.

Those meetings and that engagement with local organizations and local leaders is what has informed our positions on the 2021 and the content that we are going to be discussing now is all informed by those conversations and reflects what we have heard from communities to guide our input into this process.

An immense amount of work by all parties has been put in to get this Land Use Plan to this stage, as everyone is aware, and we would like to applaud the Nunavut Planning Commission on the release of this Draft and all of the work that has gone into the public hearings up until this point at the 11th hour.

However, the Plan is, of course still in draft form, and as has been discussed throughout the day and throughout this week, that means it is possible for mineral claims to be issued in areas that have clearly been identified for years through the planning process as areas that should be eventually designated as Limited Use.

There are plenty of areas where communities have expressed that they are not interested in seeing industrial development take place, but because we don't have a Plan in place at the moment, there can be claims that can be issued in those areas. The takeaway from that is that there is really an urgent need to implement a Land Use Plan to guide those decisions.

Issuing those claims threatens the integrity of biological and cultural features that the Plan is designed to conserve, and also creates lengthy environmental impact assessment processes with the result that areas important to communities are being claimed by interests that they do not agree with and without their input.

The Land Use Plan is a living document that will be frequently updated through regular reviews and can also be modified through the amendment process and through ministerial exemptions. I will hand it over to Brandon.

Brandon: Brandon Laforest, World Wildlife Fund Canada. I'll just continue with some of our more technical elements. I won't read out the page references, but they are on the screen for reference to the actual Land Use Plan.

When it comes to caribou habitat, although some refinement through intervener submissions and input received during the hearing process will be necessary, we recommend maintaining the Limited Use designation and associated year-round prohibitions on incompatible uses for caribou calving areas, post-calving areas, and freshwater crossings, with note of key access corridors being more relevant to the other two regions. We note that work of the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board and all of

the Qikiqtaaluk HTOs to designate the caribou habitat that is in the 2021 Draft on Baffin and support the classifications that have been put forward as Limited Use.

As we noted here with the refinement in intervener submissions, we heard this week Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board and Qikiqtani Inuit Association are working on a new joint submission. That is the exact kind of thing we support in terms of wanting to see those Limited Use, or whatever they may be at the end of the day, recommendations submitted for the final Draft of the Plan.

At the time of the release of the 2016 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan, most herds of caribou across Nunavut were in decline. Today, many herds are still declining or declining slower, or hitting bottom plateaus of their population, though we note the encouraging signs of recovery of the herd here on Baffin Island.

Total allowable harvests are in place for many herds, including most notably here. Yet there is still no Land Use Plan. Communities continue to shoulder the burden of management restrictions, while mineral exploration is free to continue in the South Baffin region even in key caribou habitats for the herds down here and across the territory on core calving areas for herds that are still in decline.

The decisions made on caribou land use will have longstanding impacts on the recovery and sustainability of caribou herds in Nunavut. We heard from the Qikiqtani Inuit Association presentation the need to have these areas Limited Use designations, so caribou have the habitat to grow into. We recognize through Inuit Knowledge that the caribou will come back, but as we have heard throughout this week, one clear way to foster that recovery is to ensure that the proper areas are protected to allow them the space to come back.

The *Options and Recommendations Document* makes it clear that there is widespread evidence and community support across the territory that calving areas, post-calving areas, key access corridors on the mainland, and freshwater crossings should be designated as Limited Use Areas with year-round prohibitions for those incompatible uses.

This next slide come up more on the mainland, but it has been mentioned a bit in this hearing to do with mobile protections. We put forward that mobile measures are not an appropriate land use mechanism for caribou in critical habitat, simply because they do not protect the actual habitat. We recognize the use of mobile measures outside of caribou calving areas or post-calving areas and all the great work that has gone into operating mine sites and exploration sites outside of these critical areas, but from a land use planning perspective, we don't see them as the appropriate mechanism for the specific areas we have mentioned.

Land use designations and the associated assessment of projects by the Nunavut Planning Commission are the only mechanism by which to properly assess and prevent the negative aspects of cumulative impacts of multiple sources of disturbance across caribou habitat, so it is really important to take a larger scale look at caribou herds through a Land Use Plan to avoid those cumulative impacts from multiple disturbances across a range. That is something we have heard from the Nunavut Impact Review Board over time as well.

Moving on to caribou sea ice crossings, we are supportive of the Conditional Use designation here and the seasonal restrictions in the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan for caribou sea ice crossings. It varies regionally in terms of the specific caribou, but there is widespread community support to

seasonally prevent icebreaking during critical times for Dolphin and Union out in the Kitikmeot region, Peary caribou in the high Arctic, and we heard today from Paul Irngaut and others, Baffin caribou migration across sea ice in specific locations that I believe have largely been mapped by the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board.

We recognize the complex jurisdictional nature of these areas, and we really appreciate conservations with Transport Canada, in particular on how to advance appropriate measures on sea ice crossings, but we continue to advocate for these designations as Conditional Use as is currently in the 2021 Draft Plan.

We heard a lot this week about the need to potentially exclude single transits of international ships, and we can understand that, but at a minimum, there must be clearly stated restrictions on domestic projects operating within Canada to not include any sort of icebreaking activities in these areas in the seasonal timelines.

We note the great work in the Kitikmeot region led by the Cambridge Bay Hunters and Trappers Organization but note that those are still voluntary mechanisms. The Land Use Plan is a great avenue to put forward regulatory mechanisms to prevent icebreaking on caribou sea ice crossings.

Lastly from a recommendation perspective, are walrus haul-outs. In all hearings, we have heard support for this from I think everyone, but we are supportive as well of the designation of the walrus haul-outs in the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan as Limited Use designations with appropriate setbacks.

We do recommend that abandoned haul-outs be listed as Valued Ecosystem Components with notice to proponents to voluntarily avoid these areas. These recommendations come from the fact that walrus are highly sensitive at their haul-outs, their high cultural importance to Nunavummiut, the small geographic coverage of the areas, and the limited existing regulatory protections for walrus and their haul-out habitat.

We note that research and IQ suggests that walrus may return to abandoned haul-outs sites in the future. Given the relative feasibility of shipping proponents to avoid these geographically small areas, we recommend that at least voluntary measures be in place around the abandoned haul-outs just to create a precedent of ship planning that does not interfere with an area that walrus are known to and may return to in the future. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I will turn it back to my colleague.

Erin:

Erin Keenan, World Wildlife Fund Canada. Our last point relates to important watersheds and fishing areas. This is, again, something that came up frequently in our conservations with Hunters and Trappers Organizations about the Nunavut Land Use Plan. In those consultations, we noted many concerns around the protection of important watersheds and fishing areas to ensure clean drinking water and healthy fish.

We have heard directly of the importance of ensuring no disturbance or discharge is allowed upstream of these areas to ensure the pristine nature. We have heard more discussion about that this week as well. In either this or future iterations of the Plan, we recommend the consideration of these watershed areas as identified by communities as off limits to exploration and mining development to ensure the health of lakes, rivers, and fish important to each community.

This will allow for the exploration of local fisheries as alternative economic development opportunities, as well as continued exercising of the constitutionally protected right of Inuit to fish for their food.

Just to conclude, the Nunavut Land Use Plan is an incredible tool that will facilitate the territory-wide conservation of environmental features of importance to Nunavummiut, while also providing greater certainty for industrial development to proponents on areas that are open for development. We would like to thank the communities for their openness and willingness to share their areas of importance in this process. We also appreciate the opportunity to be interveners in this process, and we wish everyone success as we wrap up this hearing process and move forward with written submissions. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. We will proceed as we have done all along with questions from the staff followed by the table.

Maliktoo: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Maliktoo Lyta, Kimmirut Hamlet. I have a question to World Wildlife Fund. Our food source is the caribou, and the abundance of wolves has caused a downfall in the caribou herd. They kill a caribou, take a bite, and leave it. Inuit are not like that. The problem appears to be that when it comes to caribou problems, no one ever blames or talks about wolves killing caribou. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead. Did you get the question?

Brandon: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for the question. Apologies for the delay. I was not sure if it was a comment. Brandon Laforest, World Wildlife Fund Canada. I believe the question was what more can be done on predator control.

Chairperson: *(Inaudible but appeared to be discussing the nature of the question posed)*

Brandon: Brandon Laforest, World Wildlife Fund Canada. We have heard that in all regions everywhere. I think it is a problem or community concern. In this forum, I don't think anything can be done from a land use planning perspective, but we note that the Nunavut Impact Review Board is maybe a more appropriate place to discuss that.

As an organization, we are not anti-harvest. We are not anti-management when it comes to wildlife. We do recognize that there are many factors that contribute to successful caribou management, and predator control could be one. You just didn't see anything about that in our slides because we were focused on the Land Use Plan. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Paul?

Paul Q: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Quassa, City Councillor. I have just a comment on what I have heard from the communities and the knowledge we receive from our Elders. The calving grounds, sometimes they are not all that stationary. They don't traditionally come back each year. Once in a while they move their calving grounds. It is just a thought. It could be true that their calving grounds at times are moved elsewhere, and the herd moves elsewhere.

The thing we called Limited Use on calving grounds, it says to be closed year-round. Suppose the traditional calving grounds have moved. Once the land is designated as Limited Use, what do we do and what would happen with this Limited Use designation when it is in fact, now empty if the herds have moved elsewhere to do calving? They roam widely and have different locations for calving.

I just wanted to say, Mr. Chairman, that the calving grounds for the caribou, it is Traditional Knowledge that they do move around. In fact, I don't know if it is true, but just keep it in mind. Once you designate this land with Limited Use, it is on and on and on. What do we do with the land that is given a designation of Limited Use? We have heard this over the time to the communities that you have visited to do your public hearings. For myself, I don't know exactly about it, but I have just heard about it. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead, Jaco.

Jaco: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. Jaco Ittukaliak, Pangnirtung Hamlet Councillor. I have three questions or comments in relation to the caribou that has been discussed widely and the caribou herd that we have heard. The caribou ice crossings have been mentioned as an important route for their travels to their habitat, winter or summer habitation.

The summer migration, in early and late summer, they migrate widely, and they do cross over certain areas. Sometimes they deplete their feeding grounds, and they have to move on elsewhere. Just for your information and for the future information and of our children, when you do your land selection process, keep this in mind, mobility.

Chairperson: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. It is advice to the planning process. Are there any more questions to the panel?

Jaco: (*Translated*): And the calves, the movement of calves, post-calving grounds, people have Traditional Knowledge that they come in traditionally to one area all the time. The calving caribou gave birth to calves anywhere as they migrate to their calving grounds. Some are born in many parts to that area or near its vicinity. So, this is for the Traditional Knowledge of our future.

Chairperson: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. That is a good idea. We will keep that in mind.

Jaco: (*Translated*): The other topic we have discussed considerably is walrus haul-outs. This is also for our future. Walrus haul-outs, sometimes when a mess in these areas is left behind, anything of contamination, human use, the walrus will usually abandon that site. They are not only good food, but they are good (*inaudible*), and would like to have the habitat in clean areas.

Suppose there were oil spills near a walrus haul-out. That would be a problem. The walrus will never come to this area again once their habitat is contaminated. This is the same with waterfowl, lesser geese, where they traditionally go to areas where they lay their eggs. It has been known that when they are disturbed by polar bears, they tend to go elsewhere. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Jetaloo: (Translated): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Amaruq Hunters and Trappers Organization, Elder in the making. I want to ask. We have taken quite a bit of information and have worked with you more than once. In looking at the future, are you going to do more work with us, first of all?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed.

Erin: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Erin Keenan, World Wildlife Fund Canada. In a word, yes. I think we mentioned in our presentation that our way of working in Nunavut is we love being asked to provide support to Hunters and Trappers Organizations, and that is what really guides all of our projects. We are open and eager to work more with the Amaruq HTO or any other HTOs that share priorities that are relevant to our work. Thanks.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Question?

Jetaloo: (Translated): Qujannamiik. I actually had a question answered. As a wildlife organization, the conservation, they put Band-Aids on animals. Currently in August when our caribou tags were gone, there were caribou just past Apex, a large size herd. In terms of conservation when they are close to the communities, there might be poaching. Do you guys look at this area, Mr. Chairman?

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Erin: Erin Keenan, World Wildlife Fund. This may not be as satisfactory of an answer, unfortunately. Generally, our focus is on habitat conservation. Nunavut has a very robust wildlife management system. We have talked about that this week. It is all laid out in the *Nunavut Agreement*. As far as World Wildlife Fund is concerned, we typically leave harvest management and enforcement of harvest regulations up to the Government of Nunavut and the other wildlife management authorities, so it is a little bit outside of what we would typically work on.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead, Jetaloo.

Jetaloo: (Translated): Now I got a second question answered. I am losing my mind. I don't have too many more questions, though. I get scared easily. I am trying to comment but not get cut off. When you do your work, how many Inuit do you employ or work with? Thank you. Last question, Mr. Chairman.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed.

Erin: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Erin Keenan, World Wildlife Fund Canada. Our one model that we have been embodying more and more in Nunavut is to support Hunters and Trappers Organizations and other community organizations to apply for funding programs that allow for the creation of jobs in Nunavut communities. There are some examples of that in our work with Taloyoak in the Kitikmeot region as well as Chesterfield Inlet in the Kivalliq region.

So, this may not be a direct answer to your question, but one of our priorities in our work in Nunavut is to create jobs in conservation for Inuit and find ways to provide more funding to Hunters and Trappers Organizations to employ more Inuit in their work relating to wildlife and conservation.

I know it has been mentioned, I think by several HTO representatives that funding is an issue and capacity is an issue. That limits a lot of the amazing work that Hunters and Trappers Organizations

are trying to do. We are very aware of that. In other words, in our organization name in English anyway is “fund,” so we are always trying to find ways to flow money to create employment and job opportunities for Inuit within the field of conservation.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. I have no more names. Solomon?

Solomon: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Solomon Awa, Mayor, City of Iqaluit. It has been mentioned about mobile protection measures. If I understand it, it will be here, and another time it will be at another location. Is that the way I understand it? Perhaps that World Wildlife Fund is World Wrestling Federation. Jetaloo likes wrestling.

(*English*): Maybe I should proceed in English. I heard that there was mobile protection. I heard the different location of the caribou calving grounds from the Traditional Knowledge. I also heard about the walrus haul-outs that they may be moving here and there, one year here and the next year there, and so on and so forth.

My question to the Planning Commission and also your organization, would there be a recommendation even after the Plan has been approved that would like to recommend this location for the walrus haul-out before...I mean, I heard that you may change small bits and pieces during the life of the Plan. Qujannamiik. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. Solomon, thank you for your question. Yes, in the interim of the complete Plan review and whether it is the 7 to 10 years, whatever is determined in the final Plan, there is an allowance in the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act* that amendments can be proposed to the approved Land Use Plan, and it can be done at any time.

So, as new datasets become available, whether it be on climate change, on migratory paths, on mineral exploration, or pertaining to waters, any areas can be proposed for amendments at any time. That can be put in front of the Commission for consideration. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have no more names. Nunavik? Johnny?

Johnny K: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. Johnny Kasudluak. It is not a real question. The wildlife moves, migrates, as Paul Quassa mentioned. They don't say in one location. The first or second day, I spoke to this issue, moving from location to different locations. The land is changing. I thought that climate change, *Options and Recommendations Document*, there is not enough written about migrating and/or changing sites, going on to new sites.

It should be clearer for subsurface, but part of the planning, the ice might be thought of and not believed that we need more definition. That's it for now. That's it. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. It sounded just like a comment. Any questions from Nunavik? (*Pause*)

Are there any questions from the registered participants? Go ahead.

Lori: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. MP Lori Idlout. First, thank you for your wonderful presentation. I want to ask on the *Options and Recommendations Document* about commercial fisheries, whether you have thought or read options regarding commercial fisheries. Can you speak to that?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can respond.

Erin: Erin Keenan, World Wildlife Fund. Thank you for the question. Our focus for our submission on the Draft Plan is focused less on the large-scale commercial fisheries and more on local fisheries development. I don't know if I can answer your question fully, but we can also follow-up after the fact. We do have staff that work a little bit more on commercial fisheries in the North, so I would be happy to follow-up if that would be helpful.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Are there any other questions from the registered participants? *(Pause)*

Any from the general audience to the presentation? *(Pause)*

Hearing none, thank you for your presentation.

(Applause)

If De Beers can come up for their presentation. After that is the Canadian Association of NWT and Nunavut Chambers of Mines will present. De Beers?

Presentation by De Beers

Sarah McLean, Environment and Permitting Manager

Mark Lincoln, Project manager for Chidliak Project & Diamond FutureSmart Initiative

Sarah: Good afternoon. It is not quite time for the beers yet, unfortunately, but it is time for De Beers, our company, a little less exciting. Good evening, Nunavut Planning Commissioners, NPC staff, community representatives, fellow presenters, and attendees. My name is Sarah McLean, and I am the Environment and Permitting Manager for DeBeers.

I am here with my colleague Mark Lincoln. Mark is the Project Manager for the Chidliak Project and also for the Diamond FutureSmart Initiative. We would like to thank the NPC and the Community of Iqaluit for hosting this important event and welcoming us to present.

The Nunavut Planning Commission is an ambitious endeavour. We would like to acknowledge the enormous amount of work that has gone into its preparation. We would also like to thank the NPC staff and Commissioners for providing additional opportunity over the past year for feedback from affected organizations such as ourselves.

We have come here today to introduce you to the opportunity of the Chidliak Project. We think it presents a great opportunity, not only in terms of employment and financial benefit, but perhaps

more importantly as an opportunity to accelerate the development of a green economy on South Baffin Island. We believe that our project could act as a catalyst to transform the economy to an environmentally friendly, sustainable, and future-fit one.

We plan to achieve that vision, not alone, but through collaborations with governments, Inuit and non-Inuit organizations, businesses, and community members. These collaborations should be focused on addressing common challenges such as water security, obtaining affordable energy sources, providing employment opportunities that actually foster healthy communities, addressing waste management in a way that reduces the reliance on landfills, and promotes a circular economy.

We feel that the Chidliak Project has the potential to be overwhelmingly positive for the region if allowed to proceed. We are concerned, however, that the Nunavut Land Use Plan as currently written, puts the viability of the project at risk. Although we feel we can design this mine in a way to coexist with wildlife, we are concerned that the designation of a Limited Use zone over much of the project area would prevent us from successfully advancing the project through assessment and permitting.

To enable projects like ours to be given a fair shake and a full opportunity through the established Nunavut Impact Review Board process, we would like to respectfully recommend that the NPC take a more flexible approach, an approach that preserves the ability to evaluate both existing projects and new opportunities on their own merits, and in light of recognized ecological and cultural values.

I would like to take a step back in time. These figures on the slide illustrate the changes to the Nunavut Land Use Plan on the Central Hall Peninsula over time. Peregrine Diamonds began exploring this area in 2007. The first kimberlites were discovered in 2008. Kimberlite is the type of rock that contains diamonds. A small exploration camp was established at the site in 2008.

The blue squares on this figure represent the current Chidliak mineral leases. These mineral leases are areas where De Beers has the right to explore for and potentially extract minerals, only after any proposed development project is reviewed through the Nunavut Impact Review Board and approved by multiple agencies. Any potential mine would only occupy a fraction of this area. It would be a dot within one of those blue squares, or a few of those blue squares at this scale.

The coloured areas represent the designations under the various iterations of the Land Use Plan. On the left is the Draft Plan in 2014. That iteration of the Plan identified the Chidliak area as high mineral potential. In the 2016 version of the Plan, this high mineral potential area was expanded and still covered the entire Chidliak Project.

Two years later in 2018, De Beers purchased the Chidliak Project for the sole purpose of potentially developing a FutureSmart diamond mine. You can imagine that it came as quite a surprise to us when the 2021 version of the Land Use Plan was released, and the designation of high mineral potential was entirely gone and replaced instead with a new Limited Use zone. We were not engaged at all on the development of the 2021 Draft Land Use Plan or the boundaries of the new proposed Limited Use zone.

To be clear, we are not at all opposed to caribou protection. We plan to design our mine right from the beginning with caribou protection measures embedded. We strongly believe that we can construct and operate a mine to coexist with caribou.

The Limited Use zone explicitly prohibits mineral exploration and production, hydroelectrical, wind turbines over 15 meters, and linear infrastructure. These are all components that De Beers is considering but has not yet selected for inclusion in a future mine. If such associated infrastructure is required, it may need to be sited outside of the existing leased boundaries.

We acknowledge that the NPC included an exception against these conditions for existing rights holders. However, we are concerned that that exception is limited to only within the leased boundaries, and also that other regulatory agencies may take a more conservative approach when they have to set terms and conditions within their permits and approvals to align with the Land Use Plan.

Permitting a mine in Nunavut requires substantial investment. This process, it typically takes between 10 and 20 years from discovery of the first ore to complete approval. We believe we still have between 3 and 5 years of work ahead of us to potentially permit a mine at this site. This will require significant additional investment. The establishment of a Limited Use zone dramatically decreases investor confidence in the eventual outcome of this process.

De Beers believes that although the goals of the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan are very good, and in fact very well aligned with our own goals for sustainable development, the methods by which it is achieved are overly prescriptive and likely to result in reduced economic growth potential, including potentially losing the opportunity of the Chidliak Project. I would now like to pass the microphone to my colleague, Mark Lincoln, to describe that opportunity of the Chidliak Project.

Mark: Thank you, Chair and Sarah. Good evening, Mr. Chair, the Commissioners, and fellow attendees. Mark Lincoln, De Beers. The Chidliak Project is for sure going to be different, and I hope to give you that context during the course of this presentation. First, I would like to step back to just give you a context of De Beers, the holding company of Chidliak.

First of all, De Beers is a longstanding company formed in 1888, a big leading diamond company. It extends throughout the supply chain from exploration, mining, to midstream, to polishing, to eventually retail. So, it fully, fully embeds the whole structure of the supply chain. It employs about 20,000 people, and it is very, very diverse geographically in many countries and operations.

If I take a snapshot a little bit closer to home in De Beers Canada, De Beers Canada has been around since 1960, also very long. We have one active mine in the Northwest Territories, Gahcho Kué, fully operational. We are in the midst of closing two operations, one Victor and one Snap Lake. We continue to explore in the rest of Canada for diamonds.

Then we have the Chidliak Project here in Nunavut, and I will talk a little bit more about that in the next bit. This just gives you a context of where everything is. We are quite dispersed, but you can see Chidliak relative to Iqaluit.

One of our key themes at the heart of De Beers is a theme called "Building Forever." It is the powerhouse in terms of setting our strategy. It allows us to operate our mines effectively, to build

and then close. It is extensively supported by pillars. You can see the pillars, and you can see the pillar of Protecting the Natural World. It is very important that is at the heart of what we do and what we are going to transform.

Just to show relative to our host communities, you can see Pang and Iqaluit and where we are. As Sarah mentioned, we are only going to be a dot in that cluster of activity. It is a very small operation in comparison to typical metal mines or base metals. I mentioned Building Forever, and under Building Forever is a concept called Diamond FutureSmart. FutureSmart is a term in a holding company. It has been around for a long time, 2013. We have tried to change the paradigm, change the way we operate, change the way we are going to mine.

It is such a fundamental theme. I will give you one example of what we have changed. Recently, we have just developed the hydrogen truck, which is now deployed in one of the mines in South Africa, now tested and being rolled out. I mean, it is real innovation. So, Building Forever is that same vehicle that we want to apply to Chidliak or are applying to Chidliak.

It has four lenses. When you take the operation, you start with the operation, and what is that? That is less waste, less water, more modular, less energy, and very precision mining. It also entails hopefully going underground more and leaving the environment intact on surface. So, it is a very, very key driver.

The next sort of finger or lens that you have is the connectivity to sustainable environment. That is very, very key, so that is a lot of technologies and associations with less water. It's less connectivity in terms of fossil fuels, reliance on fossil fuels and to become 100% renewable. So, that is the second part of the connectivity with the environment.

The third part, which is very key, is changing the operating model. The operating model is leaving execution at site and moving operation out of the site into host communities. That is a huge dimensional shift. It allows for a better work-life balance in the communities. It allows for a more gender diverse workforce, and a much more normal way of life, and a much better way to control the mine in that we don't have to fly everybody to the mine. So, it is very big shift, and we really got that working in Chile as an example.

Then, the last lens is the connectivity component. The connectivity component is leveraging technology and then creating a data-driven organization. We all have apps. It is to utilize that component to control things. We are developing a product called Voxel, which is an endemic platform to allow us to control these mines better.

So, those are the four lenses that underpin what we have been doing at Chidliak. I will just step through, well before I step through, the guiding principles. How do we use that Building Forever, and how do we drive that? Typically, in any big project, it would be MPV, but now, that is almost a sub-criterion. We've got to drive these criteria further. That is what is allowing us to change things. So, a smaller footprint: everybody will relate to that, a smaller footprint, less legacy. A smaller footprint, less damage. So, it's very, very important.

Modular means that we can take things and put them down and remove them and keep them small. We have been guided by all these principles, and we report against them, and that is what the metric is of success.

Just stepping through what it would actually look like at Chidliak, we are in a concept of study of Chidliak moving into the pre-feasibility study. So, is still a lot of work to do to change this paradigm. As you can see, it almost looks like it is at Mars. You can put it down, and you can remove it. We don't want fixed foundation... *(Audio cut off)*

(Audio resumed mid-sentence) ...and to reduce the waste everywhere. The processing plant that you see there is quite unique. First of all, as you can see, we can fly that in, in sections and put it down. We can just as easily take it out. Very neat. It also does not have a lot of conveyors internally, which means that it is very energy compliant.

We have actually done all the engineering around that, and we are in the process of actually testing that out. That will be 100% remote control. So, again, talking about the communities, we would actually run this mine externally from our communities and not on the mine side. Energy and logistics are key. Our concept will be to reduce roads and to fly things in. We also want to be 100% renewable, and we are striving towards that. These are difficult concepts, but we feel we have got a solution to get there.

Lastly, in terms of the concepts, again going back to that employment model or the operating model is the remote centers where we connect with our mine, and we operate in that environment. I think this gives you a context of what change we are trying to do, and that change will have a positive legacy. I am now going to hand it back to Sarah to conclude the presentation. Thank you.

Sarah: Thank you, Mark. We know that this mine must be compatible with Inuit values, including respecting and care for the land, animals, and environment. One of the ways we are trying to demonstrate that we can build this site in a low-impact way is to start with the way that we conduct monitoring.

Supported by Iqaluit-based contractors, we have established a network of remote cameras around the site. We have observed something that I suspect Inuit have always known, and that is that caribou are curious creatures. They approach the cameras to investigate them, and then they move on. This is a good way of documenting habitat use by animals.

Although it has its limitations, it is a very low-impact form of monitoring. It does not require people to be present. It does not require regular use of helicopters. The cameras are entirely silent. Not only do they detect the presence of animals, but they also monitor temperature, cloud coverage, snow melt, snow accumulation, and emergence of vegetation in spring. This is the type of monitoring that we will continue to implement. It is effective, low-impact, and produces scientifically valuable data.

We are currently working on a method to pair this with interpretation of satellite imagery. So, if a caribou is seen on a remote camera, we can capture a series of satellite images taken around that time and understand if there were more caribou in the area around that time. It is a difficult method, but we are working on trying to advance that method to even reduce the impact of our future monitoring from remote cameras on the ground to satellite monitoring.

We know taking pictures of animals on the landscape is not enough. It provides a snapshot in time, but it does not fully describe how caribou use the landscape. There is much that remains unknown, or at least undocumented. For example, it is not clear if caribou have distinct calving and post-

calving grounds areas in the region around Chidliak, or if they return to different areas year after year. To address that question and other questions concerning wildlife and the Inuit use of landscape, De Beers has initiated an IQ study in Pangnirtung.

This IQ study is directed by the Pangnirtung Working Group to document Inuit Knowledge in the Project area. The study will take some time to complete, but we are hopeful that it will provide additional insight into caribou use of the area, as well as other key questions. We plan to launch a similar study in Iqaluit next year.

Understanding more about caribou movements and habitat use will help to support the establishment of effective caribou protection measures. De Beers is willing to support continuing monitoring and research, including IQ, and we will work with other Inuit organizations and the GN to gather both Inuit and scientific knowledge.

To facilitate caribou protection while still enabling opportunities, such as the Chidliak Project, we recommend to the NPC that they provide clear guidance but not hard restrictions to protect caribou in the region. The Land Use Plan has already developed a mechanism that we have heard much about, called Option 4, or Identification of Valued Ecosystem Components. This mechanism will enable proponents, communities, and regulators to find the right balance of development and conservation. We feel that this approach would have the following advantages:

- It would prioritize caribou calving and post-calving protection
- It would enable project-specific considerations by Inuit and other organizations
- It would encourage adaptive management
- It would require temporal and/or spatial protection measures

De Beers is committed to caribou conservation, and we understand the need to put measures in place to protect caribou, particularly at sensitive times of the year. We believe that we can build the mine in such a way as to remain compatible with caribou protection and conservation if given the chance.

We respectfully put forward a set of recommendations. This is a summary of our written submission to the NPC. The first is to reclassify the Central Hall Peninsula as an Option 4 Valued Ecosystem Component. The second is to address the data gaps regarding caribou use of the area. We are willing to work with all parties to address those gaps.

Third, is to apply an adaptive management framework to decision making. All of us need the flexibility to improve over time, to adjust practices, and respond to new information. I heard it suggested earlier that caribou move. They move around the landscape, and perhaps their calving areas also change from year to year. So, a static protection zone may not be sufficient to protect the value of caribou calving and post-calving grounds.

We would like to see very low-impact activities allowed to proceed within Limited Use zones, and we would allow regulators some leeway to regulate those activities. We would also like flexibility for existing projects to change their footprints, even if it means going beyond the boundaries set in 2021. My supervisor, who some of you may know, Eric Madsen, always tells me that the only thing constant in this world is change. Mines also need the flexibility to change, and we would like to see that incorporated in the next iteration of the Land Use Plan.

De Beers purchased Peregrine Diamonds for the sole purpose of developing the Chidliak Project, and at this point we feel that the designation of a Limited Use zone in our area puts the entire project at risk. We would like to see a more agile, flexible approach that enables the robust regulatory system that is already in place, to do its work.

De Beers is committed to partnering with other Knowledge Holders to address the information gaps and contribute to caribou conservation if allowed the opportunity. We believe Chidliak will be designed, constructed, and operated as a FutureSmart diamond mine, incorporating Inuit values at all stages. Thank you. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any questions from the staff? We will do the same process. *(Pause)*.

There are no hands. Nunavut and Nunavik? *(Pause)*

Are there any questions from the registered participants? Go ahead.

Daniel: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Daniel Haney, Government of Nunavut. I am curious as to why De Beers is going for a Valued Ecosystemic Component rather than Conditional Use, which would support the development of your Project. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead with a response.

Sarah: Thank you very much for the question. Conditional Use as I understand it would require potentially seasonal shutdowns of a mine that would be located within a Conditional Use Area. Those shutdowns can be very problematic for an operating mine, and potentially, depending on what exactly is required, they could be prohibitive for implementing a full mine and operating a mine. So, we would have concern about the categorization of the area as Conditional Use.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Any other questions from the registered participants? Go ahead, Mike.

Mike F: Qujannamiik. Mike Ferguson. I have a somewhat similar question to the last one. If I understand what you are requesting is for the entire calving area to be reclassified, as opposed to just reclassifying the area, the intended footprint of the development. It is only touching, according to the map, a margin of the calving area.

So, what are the long-term intentions of De Beers in terms of that area? Is there potential that they may look to develop diamond mines in the entire, or a very large part of the current calving area? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead with a response.

Sarah: May I go ahead, Mr. Chair? Okay, thank you.

Chairperson: Thank you.

Sarah: Thank you for the question, Mike. I think there are options that remain available for adjustments to the zone beyond just the one that we recommended in our submission. There are probably other options that also exist that we could be compatible with.

De Beers does not have intentions throughout that entire zone that was identified as Limited Use in the 2021 submission. However, we have not yet identified a potential overland travel corridor to our Project area. So, we need to ensure that potentially we could have an overland travel corridor into our site.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are you good, Mike? Okay, thank you. Are there other questions from the registered participants? *(Pause)*

From the general audience of Iqaluit? *(Pause)*

Thank you. Give them a round of applause.

(Applause)

Nunavut and NWT Chamber of Mines, you can come on up.

Presentation by the NWT and Nunavut Chamber of Mines Priya Sharma, General Manager, NWT and Nunavut Chamber of Mines

Priya: May I start, Mr. Chair?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Yes, as always, state your name and your organization before you proceed. You can start.

Priya: Priya Sharma, General Manager of the NWT and Nunavut Chamber of Mines. Good evening, everyone, and thank you, Nunavut Planning Commission Chair and members, as well as the various organizations, signatories, and the public for being present for the Chamber's presentation that accompanies our written submission and that is available both in English and Inuktitut.

My name is Priya Sharma. I am the General Manager of the NWT and Nunavut Chamber of Mines, office here in Iqaluit, Nunavut. I am a resident of Iqaluit as well as former educator in both the Kivalliq and Qikiqtaaluk regions of Nunavut. I feel incredibly honoured to represent the Chamber to contribute to the finalizing of a document that has required rigorous planning and input from many different perspectives.

I would like to begin by sharing that we are all here for the same purpose, and that is to support Nunavummiut, not just today but for the coming generations. The Chamber has had over 50 years of presence in the North and has been involved and committed to the land use planning process since the inception of the Keewatin Land Use Plan in the late 1990s.

We advocate and continue to advocate for responsible, sustainable mineral exploration and development in the territory. We represent over 200 member organizations, which all play a hand in supporting a strong resource sector in both territories. The Chamber has two offices, one in Yellowknife and one here in Iqaluit at the Astro Hill Complex inside the Frobisher Inn. My door is always open to discuss any industry-related issues and concerns. I will provide my contact information and details at the end of our presentation.

The Chamber and Inuit have been working together to develop a sustainable mineral industry in Nunavut for decades. An early but important example occurred while the *Land Claims Agreement* was being negotiated in the early '90s. The Chamber provided support at the request of Tunngavik Federation of Nunavut in selecting high mineral potential lands with the intent to potentially develop those lands for the benefit of Nunavummiut and their future.

Our Chamber, along with the two national associations, Prospectors and Developers Association of Canada, PDAC, and the Mining Association of Canada, fully supported the negotiations with Ottawa. The Chamber shares the concerns raised by NTI that the current Plan as it stands, does not recognize the unique role of Inuit Owned Lands and the process that allows NTI and Regional Inuit Associations to make decisions on protection measures for land values that reflect Inuit priorities and knowledge necessary for Inuit self-determination.

Robert McPherson, an experienced geologist hired by NTI to select high parcel land, highlights this incredible story in his book, *New Owners in Their Own Land*, where Inuit were major proponents of development and benefitted immensely from such benefits before the signing of the *Nunavut Agreement*.

Today, Nunavut has four operating mines and several developing projects. From 2009 to 2021, mining contributed over \$10 billion dollars towards Nunavut's economy with millions contributed towards wages to many Inuit and billions towards contracting of Nunavut-owned businesses annually.

However, this does not happen easily. Not only is Nunavut's environment complex with limited infrastructure and a difficult climate to explore and operate, but there is also a rigorous approval process that takes time. It takes years of permitting, millions of dollars for licensing, hundreds of community consultations and meetings, tens and thousands of in-person hours, major Environmental Assessments, and sometimes that is not enough.

Nonetheless, each company aims to ensure that all signatories, especially Nunavummiut, are satisfied with the project. We have heard this throughout many of the previous presentations, but Nunavut currently has a robust regulatory system that ensures Inuit to have a voice in project review and approval. As part of this process, companies are required to include Inuit in their development plans through the negotiation of Inuit Impact and Benefits Agreements.

I would like to use Sabina Gold and Silver Back River Project as an example. Sabina's properties exist in the Kitikmeot region of Nunavut. They have included Inuit in their process and within their development plans. They had to undergo a strict permitting process that lasted five to six years and cost over \$35 million dollars to approve, with an Environmental Assessment that was approximately 15,000 pages long.

They took the time to meet with the community and proponents and received thousands of technical comments and information requests from reviewers, especially following Nunavut Impact Review Board's initial rejection of their project. Following this, Sabina further engaged with the communities to mitigate and address the concerns of stakeholders and NIRB, which resulted in NIRB making a recommendation to the federal Minister.

This demonstrates the strength of the current system, and it is important that the current Land Use Plan does not undermine it. Sabina has been admired for its implementation of IQ and their efforts to consult the community, and their partnership with the KitIA and local HTOs for their caribou monitoring and mitigation programs, which have also led them to win and receive a sustainability award recognized by a reputable mining association of Canada.

This system created the opportunity to have constructive deliberation to find a middle ground of the proponent, stakeholders, and rights holders to ensure the socioeconomic benefit of Inuit were visible in the region. Industry uses IQ, science, and engineering to ensure it protects the environment. They take important measures to implement sustainable technology and tools to ensure that the environment is not impacted or disturbed.

IQ is at the forefront of these mitigation efforts. This information is all available within each company's Socioeconomic Monitoring Reports that must be submitted to NIRB and made public every year. Companies do not want to see caribou or wildlife and marine mammal populations decline, nor do they want to impact them.

While some presentations and submissions you have heard to date have argued that the decline or risk to recovery of caribou populations is related to development, this is opinion and not based on science. Research needs to be conducted to rule-out climate change and other factors, such as migratory patterns.

The mining industry's rigorous environmental monitoring is science-based in conjunction with IQ to proactively mitigate impacts. The environment and wildlife are not stagnant. They are everchanging and adapting to non-developmental triggered realities, such as climate change. By attempting to regulate wildlife issues via a Land Use Plan further limits the future ability of the regulatory regime that is already in place to assess and consider non-development related changes and factors.

Land use and caribou can readily coexist. The Draft Land Use Plan cannot be misused as a caribou protection plan. Companies implement important environment and mitigation strategies and programs that are based on science and are proven to work. Caribou, marine mammals, and wildlife are monitored using various surveying tools and monitoring technologies to ensure that they are not disturbed and can move freely.

I am going to give a few examples. In 2021, Agnico Eagle's Meliadine Mine used its Terrestrial Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring Program, TEMMP system, to detect more than 50 caribou present within 5 kilometers of their mine site. As a result of that, Agnico shut the mine down for 10 days. This included any drilling, blasting, road closure, and flying of helicopters.

Agnico Eagle's Terrestrial Advisory Group, TAG, consists of the KIA, local HTOs, government, biologist, and Elders who support in providing advice and ground-based monitoring, behaviour

monitoring, tracking movement using GN and GNW satellite collars, and as well, camera monitoring. These systems have been tested and validated by human observers.

As stated earlier in Baffinland's presentation, Baffinland has several monitoring programs and tools to support the environment, such as aerial and tagging surveys, underwater noise recorders, and as well, passive dust collectors to mitigate and monitor the dust at Baffinland's Mary River operations. Baffinland's Bruce Head Shore-Based Monitoring Program helps to evaluate potential effects to marine mammals, including narwhal of the Milne Inlet from shipping activities that may lead to changes in animal behaviour, relative abundance, distribution, and migratory movements within the project's local and regional study areas.

Another example comes from Sabina Gold and Silver and the Bernard Harbour Restoration Program. In 2014, Sabina worked with residents of Kugluktuk, local HTOs, Environment Canada, and the Government of Nunavut to use Traditional Knowledge to help restore an important harbour that originally experienced declines of char due to low water and blockages in the creek. The char is now able to move freely, and the community continues to monitor the creek and be sole owners of the initiative and program. This is an example of a win-win for the environment and the residents of Kugluktuk.

In regard to climate change, industry is taking important measures to implement sustainable technologies for greener mine sites and meet important climate change goals and standards. These Towards Sustainable Mining, TSM standards, are standards developed under the Mining Association of Canada and is a globally recognized sustainability program that supports mining companies in managing key environmental and social risks at their sites and within their operations.

Nunavut companies are incorporating these TSM standards to lower their greenhouse gas emissions and their dependence on diesel, as well adopting alternative energy sources, such as wind and solar within their operations. A prime example of a company implementing this standard is De Beers, whom you heard from just before myself and their Chidliak Diamond Project located 120 kilometers northeast of Baffin Island.

De Beers has been working towards creating a mine of the future that is small, moveable, and powered by clean energy. This is a testament that mining of today is not what it used to be. Industry is using clean technologies and taking important measures to support sustainable methods and standards of best practice within their projects and operations.

When considering the direct and indirect benefits that the industry provides in Nunavut, the industry supports and continues to support almost half of Nunavut's economy. However, these economic benefits are not sufficient enough to sustain and support the current socioeconomic environment and future of Nunavut, and to quote Terry Audla from the Government of Nunavut [sic] and their presentation at the hearings yesterday, "to support Nunavut's path towards self-sufficiency."

Mining production is important to government who invite Industry to come to Nunavut to explore and hopefully find mines in order to create benefits for Nunavummiut. Industry provides immense benefits and takes important measures to ensure that Inuit are employed and continue to be employed within their projects and operations. Industry provides hundreds to thousands of jobs to Inuit. Many Inuit have reaped benefits from these jobs, and I can affirm these benefits are evident

and seen by families and their children that I used to teach, both here in the Qikiqtani, as well as in the Kivalliq regions of Nunavut for almost five years.

These benefits can continue being seen if the Limited Uses designations of the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan are reduced. Nunavut has another opportunity. Not only can Industry continue to support Inuit employment numbers, but Nunavut can also help Canada and other countries, specifically our allies, to supply energy and transition to a greener economy.

There is significant potential here for Nunavut to support Canada and the international world to meet the United Nations sustainable development goals and *Paris Accord Agreements*, ESG targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and fight climate change, while also providing tremendous opportunity for our youth to live in a world that is equitable and sustainable.

Nunavut is under-mapped and under-explored. There are still many discoveries to be made. Canada is taking significant measures to support the exploration and extraction of critical minerals to support the transition to clean energy. Nunavut is home to at least 22 critical minerals on Canada's list and could be a leader in supplying these much-needed minerals that are necessary to transition to that green economy.

This Draft Land Use Plan will negatively affect new mining of this kind and will not support Canada's effort to address climate change if critical minerals are not available or considered. Nunavut will need to harness this resource potential. The territory is in a period of significant population growth. It is also underserved with healthcare, housing, jobs, and important infrastructure necessary to support its growing population. Nunavut will need to harness further mineral potential to assist Nunavut to become self-reliant and provide resources to help government support strong and healthy communities.

Devolution requires the GN to move to a position of economic strength, and the current Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan will not support those efforts. As a former teacher, I witnessed the effects of the lack of opportunity and the impact it had on our youth, Nunavut's future. They need to be able to see the opportunities that are available in a thriving and sustainable economic environment. With 10,000 youth coming of age in the next decade, unquote, that is Jimi Onalik's words, the Land Use Plan needs to consider a Plan sustainable for future generations.

Companies are doing their part to help with increasing graduation rates and providing the support for individuals and the future to pursue industry-related education and jobs. I am going to provide a few examples. From 2014 to 2021, Agnico Eagle contributed a total of \$10 million dollars towards education and training initiative, and towards building a mine training center and constructing a trade university.

Baffinland's Qikiqtani Skills and Training, Q-STEP Program partner-shipped with the QIA, Government of Nunavut, and Kakivak and contributed \$19 million dollars to support education and training programs. Baffinland also provided a laptop to every single high school graduate in the Baffin region. As a teacher, that is a commendable thing.

Sabina Gold and Silver created a Regional Wealth Creation Fund, contributing \$4 million dollars towards education and training. De Beers' group partnered with the United Nations Sustainable Goals for Women to provide \$3 million dollars towards programs to support women and young girls

to pursue science, technology, engineering, and math STEM-related education careers and programs. North Arrow Minerals' Naujaat Diamond Project pictured in this slide, 2017 to 2021 Sampling and Drilling Program, provided onsite training and jobs to several Inuit living in Naujaat.

With the current Land Use Plan as it stands, mineral potential, which we see as Nunavut's potential and basis of Nunavut's economy and Nunavummiut, success is at risk. The map on the left is a mineral potential map that is a Draft Nunavut Land Use map. The map on the right shows proposed Limited and Conditional Uses, both of which would prevent or significantly affect mineral development. This is of great concern.

When looking at the Limited and Conditional Uses, there are huge Limited Use designations, which will prohibit new exploration and mining. To be specific, 36% of this land overlaps with Limited Use. I got these numbers from the Mining Recorder's Office, a CIRNAC individual here in Iqaluit, and to name is Matthew Senkow, geologist of CIRNAC. Limited Use also constrains existing rights of which there are many in these areas.

There a total of 1,051 mineral claims, three prospecting permits, and 231 mineral leases included in Appendix A of the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. 101 mineral claims, 33 prospecting permits, and 12 mineral leases not included but overlap with Limited Use. Though the Chamber does not have details of overlaps with Conditional Use, these restrictions will negatively affect future opportunities from both Crown and Inuit Owned Lands.

Already, just by drafting this proposed map, it is affecting investment. There are 44 claim owners, 8 prospecting permits, and 18 mining lease owners. However, most of these are junior projects and small claim owners. Companies can go anywhere in the world with a much simpler Land Use Plan. There are major investments required to build and operate a good project, so there needs to be investor certainty and confidence, and this Plan does not provide that.

Grandfathering is offered, but it still does not provide enough flexibility. The Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan suggests that those projects captured by certain boundaries will be grandfathered, but it does not consider the possibilities to supply infrastructure and project development and growth should geology and markets make that possible.

We believe this is also unnecessary as it is farfetched. It is not needed in the grander scheme of protection and management that the *Nunavut Land Claim* and that the legislation provides. It does not allow Nunavut's co-management regulatory system to work as intended with its embedded social, environmental, and economic reviews to provide a balanced approach to land use in the territory.

Taking away power and responsibilities of NIRB and the process, for example by drawing huge, protected areas, is not Canada's expectation of a first-generation Land Use Plan. The Chamber has some recommendations. Make this first Nunavut-wide Land Use Plan simple and beneficial with a better balance between land development and land protection.

Future iterations can be refined based on what has been learned. For instance, we will know more about the direction of critical minerals in the next years and be in a place to make informed decisions. The Limited and Conditional Use designations need to significantly be reduced to give companies the confidence and Nunavut the promise to be self-sufficient and to build strong and

healthy communities. Use Limited Use designations only where absolutely necessary and no other option would produce the desired outcome. Preferred use of land use policy, Option 4 outlined in the 2021 *Options and Recommendations*, provides clear guidance to Inuit landowners and Institutions of Public Governance, IPGs, and the Valued Components associated with the land use in specific areas.

Leave the conditions of usage on the remaining lands to Inuit organizations. The Nunavut Impact Review Board, the Nunavut Water Board, and the Nunavut Water Board publish all environmental values gathered to date in a guide to land users and managers. This will help inform IPGs, land managers, and resource developers what is important, and the actions required by all to protect Valued Ecosystem Components.

Let me conclude now by saying Nunavut is fortunate to have tremendous mineral wealth where Inuit are the owners and also regulators through the existing regulatory system that is in place and works very well through the wisdoms of the Inuit negotiators under the *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement*. Nunavut is a leader in sustainable resource development, which is predominately in the mineral sector.

Mining today is not what it used to be. Careful consideration of environmental, social, and cultural values, including IQ are mandatory. Inuit communities have been clear in communicating that the lands and waters are valuable and sensitive, and the current Nunavut regulatory system provides a strong framework to ensure these issues are addressed before projects can be developed.

Ideally, this Land Use Plan will make Nunavut a place that will be successful in attracting companies to build and operate mining projects that generate social and economic benefits for many generations of Inuit. In order to achieve this, a more flexible and balanced Plan is needed that considers the current regulatory system and that can adapt to change. It also needs to consider critical minerals and the future of the 10,000 Inuit youth who will come to age in the next decade.

The Chamber will continue to work with Nunavummiut and our member companies to promote a sustainable minerals industry fit for Nunavut today and for our future generations. I would like to say thank you, NPC, for organizing these hearings, and for everyone in this room for taking the time to listen to the Chamber's presentation. I am happy to answer any questions related to our presentation and the Land Use Plan, and I am always here to meet with anyone who would like to talk about the mineral sector in Nunavut. My contact information is here on this final slide:

Please jot down my email and my number, and my door is always open inside of the Frob Astral Hill Complex, Room 116. Thank you very much. Quana, Matna, and Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. As we do, the first questions will come from NPC staff. How about community members?

Paul Q: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. Paul Quassa, City of Iqaluit. You are doing exploration now where I live. I have not been to your site yet. It is not a question but just a general comment. Robert McPherson spoke, and I know him quite well. He used to work for NTI, Tunngavik Federation of Nunavut, the old brand not NTI, just to make that differentiation.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. That was a comment. Are there any questions? Nothing here? Solomon?

Solomon: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Solomon Awa, City of Iqaluit Mayor. Perhaps what was stated and perhaps directed to the Commissioners of the Nunavut Planning Commission, this would be giving you an idea. It says 36% are being supported for these ventures in Nunavut. It talks of restricted zoning. It says if the 36% of restricted Limited Use were reduced then the mining exploration would perhaps advance considerably.

Stating that, I would suggest to the Nunavut Planning Commission Commissioners that you keep this number in mind. It would be good for all of us to look at the 80-20 number that was mentioned on Nunavut surface landmass. The presenter also said that she urges that people of Nunavut should understand what this organization is trying to work on. So, Commissioners, keep in mind what was presented to you. I am just saying a general comment so you can keep this presentation in mind.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. It is a general comment. Thank you. I have no one around the table. Nunavik? Johnny?

Johnny K: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Johnny Kasudluak, Inukjuak. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak. It is not really a question either. When you hear in her presentation that there are a lot of unknowns, terra incognita, it is not that way for Inuit. We appoint members. The existing tenure that is known where the potential is located, the mine they want to develop a mine that know what that. That is my first comment.

They want to explore because they don't know what is in the ground. She is an educator, she mentioned. To stage mineral activity, you are representative of the mining industry. Talking about children but you mentioned that, so I raise this. The children that will be taught on how they should be and what they will become, as we do not know. They will figure out what they want to do later on in life. They too, will need jobs as you mentioned.

From what I understand, that is not the case. Children are born that are going to work in the tourism industry. They are not all going to be like that. Not all of them are like that. Our communities, my community, that is how it is. We have a mine. Not all Inuit in Nunavik work at the mine. Our communities will still have to run. There will be existing rights on the land doing different things, and mining was something that everything seems to be related to. That is what I wanted to say.

With the mining industry and to the government, the Environment Assessment for mines seem to feel through the Agreements that they have to understand what they are affecting. The review done by, there is no sense or feel for the Environmental Assessment. Self-assessment through a satellite seems like it could be possible now. You would say passive. Don't scare them. There is research that is done, but... *(Translator stated he did not understand the speaker)*.

In terms of research for Inuit-run affairs, breathing air for example, the Government of Nunavut by itself has to assess a fragmented sector. The ones that want progress are given a mandate to feel. That is what I wanted to say.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Any questions from Nunavik to the report? *(Pause)*

Hearing none, are there any questions from the registered participants? The general public? Proceed.

Lori: (Translated): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. If I don't get an answer, I just want to state and to explain the need for Inuit to be consulted. The defense of wildlife and the environment should be a higher priority. The world has rules, some kind of rules, not to be worried about it. Canada, other countries, Canada does not follow international obligations anyway for First Nations. Support of Indigenous rights are trampled.

For example, they are posing their positions that they want the conditions changed or terms, the conditions are not placed, not to be concerned. For example, in English, Canada is not meeting its obligations under the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* and *Conventions on the Rights of the Child*. Those two we know from our communities.

If there was lots of money made in mining, why are our kids still struggling? Why are we short of housing? Why do we have water problems and many issues? With a lot of money that is a happening, it is a concern. When we have a period of speech, we have to defend. I want to see benefits coming into communities from mining. If it is going to be approved, the benefits to the communities should materialize, more benefits to the communities that are affected, and the land being ruined. I am trying to be brief. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. That was a comment. Thank you. Are there any other questions from the public? (Pause)

Seeing none, thank you for your presentation.

(Applause)

Last presentation, you can come on up. We will take a brief break when he is done. As with all presenters, state your name, your organization, and you may start your presentation.

Presentation by the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers Paul Barnes, Director, Atlantic Canada and Arctic

Paul B: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. My name is Paul Barnes, and I am the Director of Atlantic Canada and the Arctic for the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers. I would like to thank you for the opportunity to appear at today's public hearing on Nunavut's Draft 2021 Land Use Plan. It is great to be back in Iqaluit. I have been here a number of times over the years presenting at various forums at the Nunavut Impact Review Board, the review of the Strategic Environmental Assessment of Baffin Bay, Davis Strait. I presented to them, and I have been involved in a number of oil and gas related forums that the Nunavut Government have conducted over the years.

A copy of my speaking notes and our written submission that was previously provided in October of 2021 can be located in the public registry, but it is also available at the back entrance of the room here if anyone is interested in picking up a copy.

The Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, or CAPP, represents companies large and small that explore, develop, and produce natural gas and oil throughout Canada. CAPP member companies produce about 80% of Canada's natural gas and oil. Our head office is located in Calgary, Alberta, but we have regional offices in British Columbia, Ontario, Newfoundland, and Labrador. As I mentioned, I am the Director of Atlantic Canada and the Arctic, and I am actually based in St. John's, Newfoundland.

My association's interest in the Draft Land Use Plan and process stems from the amount of new lands that are being proposed that may be off limits to not only future oil and natural gas exploration, but also in areas where there have been already significant oil and gas discoveries and corresponding licenses issued, which is in the high Arctic area of Nunavut, mostly in the Sverdrup Basin.

The proposed lands that would be off limits would cover approximately 26% of the Nunavut Settlement Area at an increase of 11% from the last Draft. This is of concern to our association and our members and will impact any future investment, development, and corresponding economic and social economic benefits from our industry in Nunavut.

While Nunavut's exact oil and gas reserves are still unknown, our industry believes there is much potential in certain areas of the territory for new and significant oil and natural gas discoveries. The Geological Survey of Canada produced a document earlier this year, which is posted to the public registry, called *Hydrocarbon Potential Map of the Canadian Arctic Archipelago*, which highlights the oil and gas potential areas in the territory. It is also located, I noticed, in the few copies in the back of the room as well.

In addition, several significant oil and gas discoveries were made in the high Arctic region of Nunavut in the 1970s and 1980s and remain of considerable interest to our industry. These significant discoveries are still held under licenses by oil and gas companies today who collectively have spent billions of dollars in exploring and investing to obtain those licenses. These license holders who are primarily Suncor and BP or British Petroleum, would need access to those lands in those areas in order to exercise their rights in conducting further exploration and assessing future development and investment.

The proposed prohibitions and restrictions in the Draft Land Use Plan would nullify the collective and individual license holder rights that they have expended considerable financial resources to obtain and would be considered an expropriation of licenses with no real compensation and with some possible legal implications.

I wanted to keep my remarks brief, especially considering how late we have run today. So, to conclude, it is our association's recommendations that the Draft Land Use Plan be revised to avoid areas of high oil and gas potential and areas on or close to where significant oil and gas discoveries have already been made to allow for future investment and responsible development of Nunavut's natural resources, in particular, oil and natural gas.

The Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers looks forward to continued dialogue with the Commission and with other interested parties on development and implementation of the Draft Land Use Plan. That concludes my remarks, Mr. Chairperson. I will be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. We don't appear to have any questions from NPC. Solomon?

Solomon: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. I will speak in English.

(English): You mentioned with oil and gas, can you explain on the geographical map which area you are speaking of? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead with a response.

Paul B: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Thank you for the question. I think the question was can you explain the area of high interest to us from an oil and gas industry. The most interested area that our industry has in the territory of Nunavut is largely the high Arctic islands areas, the Sverdrup Basin, and in the far western part of the high Arctic area of Nunavut. In particular, to be a bit more specific, there are 20 significant discovery licenses in that particular area. It is kind of north of Melville Island and north of the Bathurst Island area to be specific.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jetaloo?

Jetaloo: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jetaloo Kakee, Iqaluit Elder. I have two questions. Today's concern is the oil drilling industry. I think your old drill sites are antiquated. This would be at the Panarctic area. Do you know if these leases are still held by the company?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Paul B: Thank you for the question. I don't know if they are specifically held by the companies that drilled on those drill sites, but if a company was awarded a significant discovery license based on a discovery in that area, then they would still have rights there. It may be a different company that explored and found the hydrocarbon, but it would still be held by an oil company. They would over time, continue to do monitoring of those sites to ensure that there is no leakage from them to the surface.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You are finished? Nunavik, are there questions to the presenter? *(Pause)*

There appears none. Registered participants? Go ahead.

Paul C: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Paul Crowley, Friends of Land Use Planning. The significant discovery licenses, many of which were obtained in the 1970s and 1980s, much has happened since then. These significant discovery licenses, as my understanding, have no expiration date. They continue and continue. There is no end to them.

How does that now work with Canada accepting the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People* and the requirement for Free Prior and Informed Consent?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead with a response.

Paul B: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Paul is right. The significant discovery licenses have no expiry date, but if any of the license holders wishes to do any development of those, there is obviously an extensive

regulatory process that they would have to go through with the Government of Canada, and of course the Nunavut Impact Resource Board [sic] and the Nunavut Government, but all that process would involve engagement with Inuit and communities near those licenses. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do you have another question?

Paul C: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Paul Crowley, Friends of Land Use Planning. Understanding that if any of these licenses were to be acted on, they would have to go through the regulatory process, just their near continued existence forever is already impacting on the regulatory system. The recommendation from the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers is to not have Limited Use Areas in the region.

So, these rights acquired in the 1970s and 1980s, once again, trump, take over, take precedence from rights that have been obtained by Inuit or are to be exercised by Inuit. I would also ask one other question. As we were meeting here this week, there were also meetings in Egypt, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

It is clear from reports of the International Energy Agency and others that to meet our targets as a planet, to not go beyond 1.5 or 2 degrees of warming, oil and gas has to stay in the ground, understanding that we as a country already have many resources where there has been much capital already invested and that oil and gas has demand.

What is the likelihood of members conducting extensive additional research in the Canadian Arctic and being able to develop that research into actual production when we have seen both in the Beaufort in the west and Greenland to the east that the promised oil and gas boom never occurred? So, asking to immunize this Plan against Limited Use seems a very risky endeavour for the benefits that may or not accrue. Any comment or response would be welcome.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You can proceed with a response.

Paul B: I think the only comment I would make is our industry certainly has an interest in the Nunavut territory that has the high hydrocarbon potential. While we might not have any immediate plans to do any exploration or development on those licenses in the near term, it is our preference to see that there are no restrictions placed on them for future activity.

The world is constantly changing when it comes to the use of hydrocarbons, and Canada is a very responsible development country when it comes to oil and gas versus many other countries around the world where they are less responsible. So, I would believe that Canada would be a preferred supplier of oil and gas well into the future versus some other areas of the world. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Another question, Paul?

Paul C: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have no more questions. I thank Mr. Barnes for his answers.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any other questions from the registered participants? Go ahead.

Solomon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to rephrase what our Elder was asking about. I think there was no answer on that. Is there a plan to create a biogas? I think I used the right word, biogas, rather than gasoline. I think that was his question.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Paul B: I'm sorry. I did not understand or hear the question. Can you repeat?

Chairperson: Please ask the question again.

Solomon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Is there a plan to create a biogas other than gasoline or diesel? Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Paul B: Thank you. There is no immediate plan to do any exploration or development on any of the current licenses held by any of the companies in the Nunavut territory. The sought-after hydrocarbon for us would be natural gas versus oil because we believe that the territory has high natural gas potential. If our industry was interested in developing in the high Arctic area of Nunavut, it would be for natural gas. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any other questions from the registered participants? *(Pause)*

Hearing none, any questions from the general audience in Iqaluit? Proceed.

Lori: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. MP Lori Idlout. I don't know that I will have another opportunity to speak again, so I just wanted to share some concluding remarks. When I am at the House of Commons in Ottawa, I am reminded every day how big my writing is. A lot of times there is jealousy with how big my writing is. That creates a huge burden on my role.

So, when I think about the work that the Nunavut Planning Commission is doing and who is invited to be speakers and witnesses, I do notice based on my conversation as well with some people back here, that what we are considering economic development in terms of Nunavut land use planning, there seems to be gaps in people who could have maybe shared their evidence as well as to what they see as being useful to be included in the Nunavut Land Use Plan, for example Pangnirtung Fisheries, the fisheries industry, Inuit in the communities.

I know that we have Hunters and Trappers Organizations here, but when we think about Hunters and Trappers Organizations, we see them as doing a great job of protecting our rights to harvest, protecting the environment so that wildlife can keep coming back. I appreciate them. They are by guidepost. I think they are my role models, all the HTOs. I have visited many of them in Nunavut, and they always have great feedback, questions, guidance for me.

I think that and I hope that when we are talking about land use planning that in addition to protecting that environment that we are also seriously looking at how Inuit can rely on their own resources like seals, like whales, and fish. We have such great resources in our environment that it is a shame that we have only seen witnesses from the mining sector, from industry.

I hope that in your reports that you also emphasize the need to maybe at least given this late stage, that you also seek written submissions from Inuit to see what resource opportunities they would like to see, maybe from women who deal with seal skins, from the very many amazing Inuit that I always talk about at the House of Commons who I consider to be the resources that we need to focus on, not only the mining sector of the extractor sector, but really focusing on getting resources so that Inuit can rely and be sustained by the environment like we have for thousands of years.

Maybe instead of giving tenure for mineral rights to mining industry, maybe it is the Hunters and Trappers Organizations that should get tenure. I think we need to start asking those kinds of questions if we are going to have a Nunavut Land Use Plan that actually works for Inuit and for Nunavummiut in the Nunavut Settlement Area. Qujannamiik.

(Applause)

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Thank you for your comments. I don't think we have any more questions. Thank you for your presentation.

(Applause)

Qujannamiik. We are a little bit fewer in here now, but we are almost done. We will take a 15-minute break, and then we will start closing remarks.

Break

Closing Remarks

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon has a bit of process-related issues. Sharon, go ahead.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We are now moving into our closing remarks. Whoo-hoo!

(Applause)

David is finally smiling. Yeah, wow! So, we are actually going to follow our timelines for our closing remarks, and we are going to be starting in the order of the agenda, so with the communities as they are on the agenda. I just want to highlight that for each community, not each person, each community you have three minutes for your closing remarks, and we will be timing them. We will be using these when you are down to one minute.

For the signatory parties, you have 15 minutes, and I know that all the signatory parties are within their timeframes, so I won't be using these, because we have already talked to them. We are going to be timing every presentation to ensure that everything is fair.

Then after we get through the agenda, and some people have left. They have told us they will not be doing their closing remarks. Also, we have offered if they wanted to submit their closing remarks in writing, they are welcome to do that, and we would put that on the file. The Commission will do

the final closing remarks, and then a closing prayer. With that, Mr. Chair, the City of Iqaluit is the first with the closing remarks.

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Solomon: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. I am glad for all the organizations that are here. We have come here. It was good to see the Inuit from Nunavik here as well. The Planning Commission now has its work cut out. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Amaruq?

Paul Q: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Quassa, City of Iqaluit Councillor. Thank you, too, for coming to South Baffin, and being able to come here as the Commission and that we have a voice and to remind everyone that we are from Nunavut. The *Claim* that we negotiated was done to work towards self-sufficiency, self-determination. That is the goal of the *Land Claims Agreement*. The progress and development that happens to the land and the animals will be guided, working together with cooperation.

When we look at development and the animals, the land has to be looked after. We are agreeable that the organizations, different Institutions of Public Governments are responsible in guiding Nunavut. That was the creation of these organizations.

Just in closing, the Inuit in the communities don't opposing mining or the mining companies. We know the benefits they provide like employment. The struggles we face today will help when we have a strong workforce and people are employed. There is a lack of jobs out there that we went about trying to get the things that we want to see. The organizations must also follow their mandates.

We have to remember who we represent, as it is Inuit culture. Many are not hunting. Young people donate country food compared to us. That is reality. I just want to state that we are guided, and we can strike a balance. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Kimmirut? Anybody can speak.

Mikidjuk: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Mikidjuk Kolola, Kimmirut Hunters and Trappers Organization Chairperson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You had a tough role this week in trying to guide our discussion. Your staff, thank you, and thank you to the Commissioners. Here in the deliberations, I have learned a lot. I understand regarding caribou, walrus, and all animals in general. I would like to thank everybody here for welcoming me. Thank you to each of you.

When I was younger, I came here. I am going to go home an old man tomorrow. I had a birthday today.

(*Applause*)

Representing our community, I thank them for being here. We learned a lot. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik.

Jawlie: (Translated): I can probably start, yes?

Chairperson: Sorry. I forgot Amaruq members. Jetaloo? You have only 3 minutes...three.

(Laughter)

Jetaloo: (Translated): Thank you to all of you from outside of Iqaluit. We love visitors in Iqaluit. You are always welcome here. Even we have moved here to Iqaluit. A lot of people come through town. It is a real central location. It is a real transportation hub. We see things here we would not see in our small communities.

Our community, if you don't speak, you don't know. We have some residents that sleep outside. They collect cans and try to make some money, carrying bags of empty beer cans around. They are not hunting. We are hunters, and you are hunters. Are you working harder than that person who is struggling? The people we represent are very welcoming. Part of that is the foods that we share with each other from Inuk to Inuk.

Once we had the creation of Nunavut that we are going to use, maybe I am out of time. We have been sitting a lot. We are all sleepy. That sacrifice we made is the price we have to pay for the work that needs to be done. We will wait to hear what the Commissioners are going to come up with. That is how we are.

Those of you, and those of you watching online, we are thinking of you and the people at our homes and our communities, and those that will depart. When you depart, hopefully you have a good safe trip home. Those of us from Iqaluit, we will still keep going. Each day is different. There will be nice days and bad days ahead. That is how we are. Thank you for coming here and having a meeting here. Thanks to the translators.

(Applause)

Chairperson: Jawlie? You can go.

Jawlie: (Translated): I am happy. Thank you. Jawlie Akavak, Kimmirut Hunters and Trappers Organization. When we were starting, I stated January 10th, 2023 and I stated it is too close. I stated that a month or two, it could easily be two months of an extension, but perhaps even a two-week delay would help, a six week extension to extend the deadline, the closing deadline for written submissions.

Thank you for all those that were here. It was good. Sometimes, we got sleepy, but we made it through. Thank you to all the staff and have a good trip home. Thank you.

(Applause)

Chairperson: Thank you too. Kinngait?

? (Translated): Qujannamiik. I cry at thank you. (Stated something that was not translated followed by laughter from community representatives). When we first started, I was regretting. I was apprehensive but today, I want to honour. I have a great-granddaughter, and I am more optimistic

about their future that you have sought our opinion. This is highly valuable. My father's dogs were slaughtered. When I was five, he would take me to school. I am glad that we are here, and I stayed when my parents around when the governments started arriving.

I am so honoured to be an Inuk. I was born on the land, but I grew up in the community when they left the traditional camp. *(English)*: I did not have much self-confidence as I do now. Yeah.

(Translated): Recycle. Thank you.

(Applause)

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed.

Adamie N: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Adamie Numa, Hunters and Trappers Organization Chairperson Kinngait. I have blue blood. Thank you. I have learned a lot this week and who and what and how to say it. Thank you, all, for being so welcoming. All my cousins from Northern Quebec, good to see you. Thank you. Thanks to all the translators and administrative and support staff, and the staff catering to us at the door. All of you, no one is excluded. Also, the vacated chairs too for the people who were here, thank you all. I have learned a lot this week, and I can talk to my committee. Thank you, all of you.

(Applause)

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Igloolik? Hamlet of Igloolik?

George: *(Translated)*: Good evening. George Auksaq, Hamlet of Igloolik. When I was a youngster, I heard of this Nunavut negotiations for the *Nunavut Agreement*, a lot of meetings. I wondered what they were doing. Are they actually going to claim a land? It appears that they were senseless and hard to understand. Then I realized it was for the benefit of Nunavummiut and that jobs will be created and potential on everything was in evidence.

I thought my representatives in any form of legislator would just install theirs. They were elected. I found out later on, the hard work they had done in the past. We as Inuit, we should be respectful and look after the land respectfully for our future generations. People who I thought were working so hard going to meetings, I thought they were senseless, but it turned out everything they did would be where we are today for those who negotiated Nunavut.

The parcels of land, people are complaining. You have over put in limitations, but it is okay. We will solve it. Thank you.

(Applause)

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Igloolik HTO?

Lloyd: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Lloyd Idlout, Igloolik HTO. I thank you all. I appreciate your appreciations of this proceeding. Chair, if I were a big boss, I would have approved already what we have done here in the past few days, but there is always a but. It won't be a reality. I can't do it, but I appreciate

the proceedings. That gives us an idea of the abilities that we have, decisions that we can make. I thank you again.

(Applause)

I don't want to be a boss, so disregard my wish.

(Laughter)

Natalino: *(Translated)*: Natalino Piugattuk, Igloolik HTO. I would like to say thank you. I am not the brightest man, but I make contributions any way I can through meetings, and it has taught me a great deal to what is going on. I appreciate the people at the table who gave a presentation. They speak English, but still I was able to understand through an earpiece. Thank you.

(Applause)

Jacobie: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Jacobie Malliki, HTO Secretary. I would like to thank you. I thought this meeting would be sort of stiff, boring, legal stuff and things like that. It appears it is not. I understand now what this process is all about. It is not only your aspiration, but also ours. My thoughts are gone. Thank you.

(Applause)

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Hamlet of Sanirajak?

? *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik from the Hamlet. When I was a youngster, it was a time when the *Nunavut Agreement* was signed. I had a lot of expectations, and I looked and waited. There was none until I got here. This work is very important. Iqaluit, you have been a good host. NITI people, thank you. I was waiting for something to happen, and I participated here. Thank you.

(Applause)

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Abraham: *(Translated)*: Abraham Qammaniq, HTO Sanirajak. I am also very grateful for the past few days. I want to emphasize Sanirajak, our land is so close to the Kivalliq border. We need special attention. When they do work in the Kivalliq region, when something is happening down there, they come up sometimes and infringe on our community. It is the same thing with parts of Baffin Island communities.

I also mentioned our territory is cold. The climate is cold, but still, we are so crowded and lacking houses. This should be the priority of today, more houses for Nunavut built for the climate. What we have, there are a lot of repairs needed. What we have today appears to be a Band-Aid solution. So, we need to work as Nunavummiut. They say it is on the drawing boards for better housing, more houses. We complain, we talk, and nothing ever really happens, so we need to see something.

For the person who requested January 10th extension, we are now just going into our offices. Time is constrained. Six more weeks would be of great help so we can do what we want to do in our boardrooms. I support him. Thank you. I don't have any more to say.

(Applause)

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qikiqtarjuaq Hamlet? You will have your turn.

Julie? *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Thank you for conducting this session, Commissioners and your staff. The Elders in this building, your knowledge is very precious. You know the land. You know the animals, so keep advising and participating in all proceedings so our future can benefit. They will remember what you have done today. Many of the proceedings are very worthwhile. You are good teachers as Elders. Thank you.

Jonah: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jonah Keyootak. I have never voted in a long time, but I am here. I appreciate the Commissioners, both levels of government, your staff. I was apprehensive coming here not knowing what to expect. I will bring what I have heard back to my community. I will do my best to inform the community what the process is about, why you have sent for me. Even when I am no longer a Councillor, I will continue and talk to them of what this project is all about. I know you Elders are tired. You have a lot of courage for participating. May God be with you.

(Applause)

Chairperson: Qikiqtarjuaq HTO?

Loasie: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Loasie Alikatuktuk, Nattivak Hunters and Trappers Organization. I am happy to participate. I probably won't express what I want to say, but some of it I will try. This has been very informative. This trip was worthwhile. Thank you, especially Nunavut Planning Commission. Your program appears to be on track, and you have done a great deal of work. The interpreters, thank you for assisting us in understanding what was going on.

Thank you, all. You have a good trip home. Most of us are scheduled to travel tomorrow. We will be going home with a good heart on this workshop, the memories and what I have heard. Qujannamiik.

(Applause)

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Ahmie? *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. This is our team, HTO. What we have heard will not go void. We have learned, and we have something to pursue. What we have heard from different groups, we will bring to our community. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Pangnirtung?

Jaco: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Jaco Ishulautak, Pangnirtung HTO. Thank you for bringing this group together to discuss many things. It was very informative, and I appreciate that and the Commissioners and the community delegations. I will just briefly mention our interpreters again.

They have kept meetings, the proceedings pretty much in line and information flowing. Also, to our MP, federal MP, thank you for your presence.

Land cannot be managed by one person or one group. So, I appreciate the process we are understanding and the staff, and coffee people who worked hard to give us refreshments. Thank you. Johnny Mike, Lazarusie Ishulutaq, they had to leave, so I am speaking on their behalf now. I appreciate and am thankful that they were able to join me in these discussions. Keep in mind what we went through. It was peaceful and informative.

This year I think we will have good ice. We are pretty much happy about that. Sometimes our community does not have any snow, and we are looking forward to full snow. These are my wishes for my community. Thank you all.

(Applause)

Chairperson: Qujannamiik.

Jaco: *(Translated)*: I forgot this young man here. He is our SAO. I forgot to thank him.

Jamie: *(Translated)*: I don't like it too much when I am called a young man. I like to be looked at as a mature person, but I should be talking and thinking like Jetaloo. I am gaining a lot of wisdom. He advised us that we should all be looking for wisdom and have his knowledge, but the important thing is to work together. That is our aspiration, especially here.

I would like to thank you, Commissioners. You have travelled a great deal to seek the public's advice and direction that they have given you, such as this group. This will work. There is no full agreement anywhere. There is always improvement and an agreement inside. Thank you. I have seen my relatives here. Thank you very much. I have been away from home for two weeks now, and I have been here for quite a bit when SAO and mayors had a conference.

Thank you, Nunavik for coming in here. You are good people. Both levels of government and NTI, you have done great work. We know as Inuk Inuit that we can accomplish great deals. There is no sense giving up on the things that we want to pursue. Especially the people at the coffee bar, you have been a great help to all of us. Without you, we would be pretty thirsty. And to the interpreters sitting like stone over there, they must be tired. Thank you. Thank you. I had a great time, so I just want to appreciate and thank you all.

(Applause)

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Next is Inukjuak.

Johnny K: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. I too, feel like a cousin with relatives here around the room. We are grateful for the people of Inukjuak to be part of this. I was given ample opportunity to speak and to be heard. Thank you to the Commission, to the Commissioners, and to the staff, and all the presenters, the coffee providers, the translators. Maybe they made sense when I wasn't making any sense. Also, the organizations that you represent,

I think this is the first time in Iqaluit. It is the first time to see you. There are a lot of new faces. I seem to have gotten wiser this week, learning a lot from you. Yesterday, too, I had a birthday, so I am going to be leaving an older man as well. I am honoured for all the representatives, and the representative from Ottawa, thank you. Let's work together. I am also running out of words too. Thank you very much. We are relatives.

(Applause)

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead. Yes, you may proceed.

Adamie M: *(Translated)*: Adamie Mangluk, Ivujivik. Ali Qavavauk and Paulusi Tarriasuk said they were both very thankful. From Nunavik, I have been to many different meetings in Nunavik, but this is my very first time in Iqaluit. I did not expect such an enormous stage and a lot of Inuit or to see relatives. The Elders are not that many anymore. So, I have seen relatives this week. It is good. I am happy.

Ali and Paulusi, I will thank you on their behalf. In conclusion, this is the first time on one of these stages. I am really happy. I would always say to myself if I see Iqaluit. Now, I bought a rifle here. Thank you. I'm leaving even more happy. Thank you, all.

(Applause)

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed.

Aisa: *(Translated)*: Aisa Surusilak, Puvirnituk Hunters and Trappers Organization. Thank you for the opportunity. My Elders had to leave, and I thank you on their behalf, Adamie Angiyau and Simon Irumia. Let's keep going. Let's keep our culture. I have dogs. I run a dog team, and I like to go boating. Our language, we have to preserve it. Those of us that are younger have to become members, and I would be pushed to become a rights presenter, so I am grateful. Thank you.

(Applause)

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Proceed.

Jusi: *(Translated)*: Jusu Aliqu, Akulivik from the Hunters and Trappers Organization. Thank you, all of you individually, and also Iqalummiut. You are very welcoming here. Thank you to Adamie and Eli. They must have been tired too. They left. They are Elders. Thank you, all of you. You are very welcoming. Let's live. Thank you.

(Applause)

Adamie Kaitak: *(Translated)*: Adamie Kaitak, Salluit Hunters and Trappers Organization. I thank all of you. I also thank on behalf of our Elders that were here, Adamie Saviadjuk. We have been well looked after. We had a great place to stay. We did not go hungry. Thank you, all of you. It is very welcoming here. I really enjoyed being here. Thank you for inviting us here from Nunavik to Nunavut. Thank you.

(Applause)

Chairperson: Qujannamiik.

Adamie Q: *(Translated)*: Adamie Qinuajuaq from Salluit, also manager of Hunters and Trappers Organization. I, too, am thankful for all the communities that are here.

(English): The Deputy National Defence, Deputy Minister, Member of Parliament, we don't speak with them in Quebec, so, I am happy to be with a Member of Parliament, the Deputy Minister, all of those hierarchy positions. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Makavik and Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated are next. James Eetoolook, we would like to recognize him. He has been at other hearings in his final role as Vice President.

(Applause)

Go ahead. You have 15 minutes.

James: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik from NTI to the Commission for the hearings to garner our thoughts on different issues in the hearings with the 2021 Draft Land Use Plan, the land use planning process. Thank you all of you that took part. Hearings are very major in Nunavut. It is a large territory, but we are many users. We had hearings in Cambridge Bay, Rankin Inlet, and Manitoba for Saskatchewan and the Yukon. We share the land, so we have to include and explain to them how the Plan will be.

NTI has been hearing your participation and your thoughts from the communities in the hearings. I mentioned the communities. We have hearings across the territory as spelled out in the *Land Claims Agreement*. We have heard many, many comments that we have to defend the wildlife. The *Claim* was stated for the land and the resources and animals. It plays a part in the work of Inuit.

What we call Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit is legitimate, and the government and organizations do not consider it legitimate, but we have been using our culture for a long time, Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit. We would not have an *Agreement*. Be that as it may, there are many issues on Inuit lands when we had hearings.

NTI wants to say that Inuit rights to self-determination and to determine their own lands for themselves, the resources, the protection of animals, and the land is why we state the land and that we have selected parcels of Inuit Owned Lands for self-determination by Inuit. We own that land. As Inuit, we are the largest landowners in the world.

Also, I have been part of the negotiations. When Paul Quassa spoke, he was true. The lands that have been identified that we started with, some days we would meet for two whole days without sleeping on land selection and land issues for Inuit, and how we would be able to use those lands for our benefits.

Surface rights that we will own, the surface rights were selected for the protection of animals, and Inuit share sites, caribou crossings, caribou calving grounds, and post-calving grounds where they are feeding their young calves. So, we want those lands protected. Also, we have worked hard with

economic development that we will benefit. We know that we need money in order to do the things we want to do so we can use these lands for our benefit in a controlled manner and planned properly.

NTI works with the three Regional Inuit Associations, Kivalliq, Qikiqtaaluk, and Kitikmeot. The work that we do is based on how we will deal with Inuit Owned Lands and to push the issue of rights garnered under the *Agreement*. We have to keep working hard for our land.

Nunavut Tunngavik, the Land Use Plan must protect us in that we be concerned about health and safety of our animals and that we have to identify the economic opportunities. The Inuit rights to hunt must be seen on Inuit Owned Lands and other parts of the Land Use Plan. Through the negotiation process, these rights and the defending of rights is also crucial in that the Land Use Plan does not diminish Inuit benefits and that the Land Use Plan does not squash any Inuit rights. That is something that we will focus on for NTI.

Also in the planning process, the Inuit Organizations, the government are involved in moving forward so this first Draft becomes finalized by the Commission. Nunavut Tunngavik is working hard in the work that still needs to be done. I recognize that this process has taken a long time, but it has to be concluded.

I think we have reached mostly a consensus on the Land Use Plan to extend the deadline of January 10th. It can be extended by a couple of weeks due to the workload of the Wildlife Organizations and the Inuit Associations and the government to come up with a better product. We have no problem with delaying the deadline. Perhaps six weeks would be adequate, as we have to see the best Plan that we can come up with that will affect us and others.

So, we support the extension of the closing date. Somebody mentioned around here now that they have the Christmas holiday, which the holiday makes for a lot of things not to happen. If we could extend the deadline, it would help. We know that you heard a lot this week and that you have some options. You have heard, too, the request for the extension of the deadline for the Land Use Plan.

The communities are here to give the Commission comments before the closing date, to guide the land use planning. Nunavut Tunngavik has been listening to this week to all your comments during the hearings. We actively seek solutions, so we are happy to be here.

As you had the hearings, I was late, but when we went to the hearings in Rankin, Cambridge and Thompson, we are working. We share resources. We share caribou. We share with the First Nations the herds that cross into other jurisdictions including Manitoba, NWT, and Saskatchewan. We have Agreements on the islands with Nunavik. I am glad to see them here. They, too, can speak for their own land use plan, and they have their own lands. We have to strike a fair balance.

The Commission is good the way it is set up. Working towards the Land Use Plan, they will set a Plan, but the Plan will be adjustable. The world keeps changing. We keep changing, renewal. The Elders are going, but we are gaining the youth as we change and evolve. So, we know that our resources, our animals will be important.

I think in Nunavut and Northern Quebec, this is the last frontier. Our animals, resources, we will have to struggle with the difficult world that we have. The populations are growing. There are things

that will come up that will affect our animals. If it is not tomorrow, if it is not next year, then it is further down in the future. So, a Plan needs to materialize so Nunavut can proceed forward. There are those that want to use the land. There is oil and gas. There are mineral companies, and there are those of us that live off the land.

For example, 20 years we were not as many. We had about 400 and now it's 20. We are becoming "manyer." The requirements of the land for all the population, we have to plan. Our forefathers brought us here and looked after the wildlife for us. We have an oral tradition. It is an important culture. Perhaps I could be wrong, but I feel that through Inuit culture, we come from an oral tradition. That is the way Inuit are.

I am grateful. On behalf of our president, Aluki Kotierk, she too feels for this work. She is our leader. Outside of our territory, she represents us. Also, the guests that have come to speak from Nunavik, you guys are not strangers. My grandfather came from Quebec on Inuit umiak. He crossed over to Baffin Island from Northern Quebec. Now we meet to talk about the Land Use Plan that we all want to see improvements.

Thank you. This is the last of the hearings. I am going to retire. I have two more meetings to go to, and then I am done and retiring. We have a lot of support that makes us stronger. When we start fighting, we get divided. That will keep happening. We need to resolve issues and come together and try and work through problems. Even if you don't agree, work constructively. Paul kept speaking. As a whole, we don't think as a whole. We all think different.

At the end of the day, we will all agree on one Plan, and that it is the way. We learn. Makavik had the first *Land Claims Agreement*. We learned from them. We learned from the Inuvialuit with their claim. We cooperate with our fellow Inuit Organizations on our lands. Working cooperatively together is the best approach. Even if we have different and opposing views, we rely on cooperation.

I am grateful. I hope you have a great flight home. I have you good family time at Christmas and that your relatives are the base of who you are. I hope you are okay over the holidays and into the New Year. We have gone through hard times in the past recently, so the COVID is almost behind us. We will see each other more. We were in a closed world for a while. Qujannamiik. I know there is work to be done to have a Land Use Plan that we can use. We are grateful that you listened to us this week. We hope that we have passed some of our opinions to you guys as well.

(Standing Ovation)

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. We have Qikiqtani Inuit Association.

Levi: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. We honour James Eetoolook very much. He is a great role model. Qikiqtani Inuit Association, we are grateful to the Nunavut Planning Commission and all the delegates that came from around Nunavut. The deliberations this week have been good to hear and be a part of us as we discussed this week.

Also, we feel that we have gained a lot this week. The hearings we had in Pond Inlet, and this will guide the final Land Use Plan for the future of Nunavut. We have heard this week that we have to defend the land, the waters, and the resources, and the concerns of the communities when they

are affected by mineral exploration through the air, from the ships, and various things that happen, contaminates as well. They need to be pristine and clean and to include the issues of global warming or climate change.

We heard the communities say that the animals are the main priority: caribou, walrus, sea mammals, seals, birds, bears. Inuit culture has to have a base. We also feel that we need to support and defend the animals and the Inuit so that they don't go into peril. QIA has a role working with the communities. It is ongoing work.

The concerns that we heard for the Land Use Plan is that you have to use Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit. All the communities identified on the different creatures. Let's keep speaking. Let's speak to the wildlife boards, to their chairperson. The meetings have been proceeding and we have been reviewing maps and identifying Community Areas of Interest, not just the caribou.

We will keep meeting with the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board and work with Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated and the Government of Nunavut and the federal government on improving the concerns that are brought forward by Inuit and to look at possible benefits with shipping and other related issues.

Also, the implementation will be important when we set the Plan. It is a guide for the future. Inuit rights have to be enforced that you do not bypass the Inuit. Those are the rights that we have to protect and to push in supporting the benefit of Inuit. We feel the work. We have been at it for a long time, but we want to set up a proper Plan.

Also, we heard, and we support that we could have a six-week extension of the deadline. We also feel that this would help issues related to land use planning and have a better product in Qikiqtaaluk and Nunavut. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(Applause)

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board? Go ahead.

Mike F: Thank you. I am here on behalf of our Chair, James Qillaq and our Executive Director, Kolola Pitsiulak. I first want to thank the HTOs. As Lori mentioned, for the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board, the HTOs are our directors and our guide all year round. They keep us tied to the reality of Inuit in the communities.

I thank the government. I especially thank NTI and James, and all their staff; the government agencies; the other non-government agencies. I want to say something especially from my heart to the Planning Commission.

I have learned a lot of things from many Inuit, but one of my teachers in Mittimatalik was Nutarak. I spent a few hours, quite a few hours learning from him. He taught me something. He was a true historian. He had a long scroll with two centuries of Inuit events laid out on it. He told me, "Mike, pay attention when you look, as things happen in the future, because every 20 years, a certain number of things will happen, and they will be very important for Nunavut."

So, you are right on schedule. Twenty years, next year, the Plan, the first version of the Plan will be done, and it will be, and I think Nutarak would agree, the timing is right. So, have faith. You have done a really hard job, and it is going to go well. So, give us six weeks, and we will be right there with you.

(Laughter)

Qujannamiik.

(Applause)

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Government of Canada.

Jeff: Matna, Itsivautaq. Jeff Hart, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. We know it is late, so in consideration of time, we would like to express a blanket thank you to everyone involved in this hearing.

The Government of Canada would like to recognize the many years of service of James Eetoolook. He has made a positive impact on Inuit in Nunavut and has helped reshape Canada for the better.

This week, we have heard from Nunavut and Nunavik communities and Hunters and Trappers Organizations that the protection of wildlife is a top priority for many participants. The Government of Canada also places significant importance on the protection of wildlife and supports a variety of tools for wildlife conservation, including Limited Use designations for the protection of caribou habitat in the Land Use Plan.

Two exceptions are first, Inuit Owned Lands: The Designated Inuit Organizations should have a say on how Inuit Owned Lands are managed. We view this as an important element of self-determination. Second is existing mineral tenure that has been lawfully acquired under the Nunavut Mining Regulations, and as mentioned represents approximately 4% of Limited Use Areas in the Draft Plan.

The Government of Canada believes the protection of wildlife is reinforced by other elements of Nunavut's integrated regulatory system, such as the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board, the Nunavut Impact Review Board, and the Nunavut Water Board, as well as federal land use permits and Regional Inuit Association authorizations, all of which can impose binding terms and conditions.

Throughout the public hearings, we have heard community representatives, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, Qikiqtani Inuit Association, and the Qikiqtaaluk Regional Wildlife Board ask the Commission to extend the January 10, 2023 deadline for final submissions to give more time to provide additional information. In our view, the Commission should give serious consideration to these requests.

We want to ensure the Commission that the parties to the *Nunavut Agreement* are actively collaborating on issues of common interest and have a series of working sessions set out over the coming months. Parties are making progress on aligning advice to the Commission in final submissions. As we have mentioned in the hearings, we welcome the involvement of the Commission in this work.

As we close the fifth and final public hearing, we recognize that it is the Commission's tremendous effort and the difficult task of developing a first-generation Land Use Plan, one that can be jointly accepted by the Government of Canada, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, and the Government of Nunavut. Matna.

(Applause)

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Government of Nunavut. You have 15 minutes when you are ready to proceed.

David K: *(Translated)*: I am David Kunuk, Deputy Minister, Economic Development, Government of Nunavut. First of all, from the Government of Nunavut, I appreciate the work that you have done. It is a huge task with heavy work. Although the proceedings we never see eye-to-eye or agree, it is still very worthwhile. It went pretty well.

As before me, we would like to see six weeks of extension to the deadline. The Government of Nunavut would like to see this, and they would like to participate in this process that you have undertaken. It is a hard task and will be worthwhile to the whole territory. Your work is well intended. We respect you. Due to the sheer magnitude of this project, it is very worthwhile to do it well. You will have to decide and pursue that it be finalized and be accepted.

I really appreciate the Commissioners on the first-generation Draft Land Use Plan that you have worked on. We have seen it. We have heard representative deliberations, many opinions in safeguarding the lands. It is all worthwhile. It is worth pursuing. Presenters have varied opinions on the Draft Land Use Plan, but their opinions count. They will be part of this process put together as one Plan.

It will impact many parts of Nunavut. Climate change is also a huge problem, and it has been discussed here. It has posed problems. It was discussed today, and solutions were thought to see how to best tackle this problem. The Government of Nunavut is open. Not everything you are doing is acceptable, but we know it will be resolved. We should keep in mind the communities that are most impacted by the mines and hear what they are concerned with.

We have concerns that if we do not complete this properly, it might hinder the finished stage, so we are looking forward to it. From different communities, Qikiqtarjuaq, Igloolik, these two communities are especially hard with a potential shortage of water in their communities. It is going to be hard work to accomplish to resolve this. The health center is total responsible for these concerns. We will talk to them of these two concerns.

You have mentioned walrus haul-outs. We hear, and the caribou, especially Baffin caribou that are migrating possibly to Naujaat. We hear you on that. We respect Inuit culture, Inuit Knowledge. Although we never totally agree on everything, your strength and your perseverance in this task is important. You, the Nunavut Planning Commission, will come to a solution to put a product together.

Lastly, Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, their culture and way of life, we keep in mind that we will support in that area as well. We will base our many decisions on that. Communities from different parts of

South Baffin, thank you for your participation. Your thoughts were very helpful and will be part of the Plan regardless of how varied they are.

The Nunavut planning process is hard work. It requires a lot of time. It has lofty aspirations to be a good product. You are doing well. You have looked at different aspects of everybody. Under the *Agreement*, it is your responsibility how it will look and what the community thoughts are, including wildlife. Regardless of how you will produce it, it will affect many: hydro dams, mining, cargo, routes. They are all affected.

The planning process is one of the biggest things that we have to tackle, all Nunavut-wide. We can work together to look at what the problems are with this project and come to a conclusion together, not only from the Government of Nunavut. There are other concerns, revenue sources such as fishing. Mining is not the total economy of Nunavut. There are many ways to find an economy, revenue that can put people to work.

You are the door to all the proponents coming in, environment, water, surface rights. They really have to decide on many things. The Surface Rights Tribunal, probably soon they will have to decide on something and make a right decision. Other organizations, other boards who are doing work for the future generation, the Government of Nunavut hears you.

We understand that your work is important. We agree there. When you have to deal with us, we are there. We will listen. We want to listen, and we want to hear and participate on the planning process for the future. Here, I would like to say thank you. Our staff has done their best to answer questions, so I appreciate that. As an Inuk from the Government of Nunavut, James, you are in our hearts. Thank you very much. You have done so well for the population of Nunavut from NTI to here.

(Applause)

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Baffinland is no longer here, so we will skip them. Nunavut Water Board will have their say. They were skipped today. We appreciate that, but we will give them an allotted time as we conclude the process. You may proceed.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just before they provide their three-minute closing remark, I want to make sure it is on the record that the Water Board was here for their presentation, but because of the time constraints, the Water Board did give up their time. They did present at the other four hearings, but they did come here to present. The Commission recognizes and thanks them. I just want to acknowledge that they did provide written submissions and have attended all the hearings. With that, Mr. Chair, thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Sergey: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Sharon. Sergey Kuflevskiy, Technical Services with the Water Board and also Assol Kubeisinova is with me. Actually, I wanted to start with assuring the Nunavut Planning Commission that we appreciate the invitation, and we were here from the first day until today. Yes, we were planning to make a presentation.

One of the focuses of our presentation was to inform the community members about one parallel initiative that the Water Board started or initiated a few years ago, and it plays a key role there or leading role there. This is the development of the Nunavut Water Management Strategy. This is multi-agency work: all water-related agencies, territorial and federal government, and territorial organizations, are involved within this initiative. Also, during the break times, we were kind of engaging with community members and informing them about future engagement we will have with communities.

This is to say that community members will hear from the Water Board in the near future about this Strategy, which is to define goals and provide direction with respect to water priorities generally in the territory, long-term direction regarding water priorities in the territories.

One aspect regarding this hearing is we have heard many, many question, many interesting questions, many concerns, including some questions from Government of Nunavut regarding community water sources or zoning of community water sources and watersheds. We should recognize and acknowledge that the Government of Nunavut plays a key role in developing and planning infrastructure within communities.

So, we have heard that there will be future discussion between signatures and the Nunavut Planning Commission. Specifically, we hope that these discussions with the Government of Nunavut and Nunavut Planning Commission will be kind of provide a mechanism or approach that will be protective for water sources and watersheds, and at the same time be supportive of future development in communities.

Once again, thank you very much, Nunavut Planning Commission. Thanks to your staff. Thanks a lot, to all participants, any specific agency or participants. Special thanks to the interpreters for their very stressful and hard work. Thank you again.

(Applause)

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. World Wildlife Fund.

Erin: Erin Keenan, World Wildlife Fund. I know we all really want to get home. I first will say in as few words as possible, thank you to everyone involved in organizing this undertaking. I think the one thing we have heard a lot today and throughout this week is that Nunavut has a really robust impact management system in place, and that means that the Land Use Plan needs a lot of changes, but I would say that it is not a robust system unless there is a Land Use Plan in place, because that is one of the key pieces of how we manage impacts in Nunavut.

So, with that thought in mind, I would wish the Planning Commission success as we move through the rest of this wrap-up, this hearing process, and complete written submissions. I know you have a lot of work ahead of you, so yeah, I just want to wish you luck with that. Thank you, again for giving us the space to participate in this process. We learn a lot from participating, so thank you as well to everyone for sharing all of your perspectives and knowledge throughout this process. Thank you.

(Applause)

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Nunavut Marine Council were going to be part of the presentations, but they gave up their spot and did not do a presentation. They can do closing comments. They have been here all week, and we want to recognize her for being here. You can proceed.

Colleen: I haven't used the mic yet this week. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just started a timer as well so I can try to fit as much as into three minutes as possible. I'm Colleen Parker with the Nunavut Marine Council. The Nunavut Marine Council is defined in the *Nunavut Agreement* under Article 15 and then further defined in the *Nunavut Waters and Nunavut Surface Rights Tribunal Act* and the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act*.

Section 15.4.1 reads that the Nunavut Impact Review Board, the Nunavut Water Board, the Nunavut Planning Commission, and the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board may jointly, together as a Nunavut Marine Council, or individually advise and make recommendations to government agencies regarding the marine areas in the Nunavut Settlement Areas. Governments must consider such advice and recommendations in making decisions, which affect these marine areas.

Under the Nunavut Marine Council's strategic plan, there are two main goals. The first is to establish the Marine Council as a key voice on marine shipping, and the second is to establish the Marine Council as a key voice on marine conservation. Under these two main goal areas, the Marine Council will achieve its vision by performing three key functions related to awareness, advice, and advocacy.

The Marine Council is acting as an observer in the Nunavut Land Use Planning process in order to inform recommendations and advice to government agencies about non-project shipping, which is outside the scope of the Plan, as well as project shipping in shared regulatory jurisdictions. The Marine Council's potential recommendations and advice are very broad, relating to the marine environment in Nunavut and are informed by the information shared in the individual Institutions of Public Government's processes, including these hearings as well as others.

Potential recommendations for shipping regulation outside this process and through the Canadian domestic regime include recommendations to the Low-Impact Shipping Corridors Framework, for example. We have also heard specific recommendations or sorry, concerns related to vessels carrying less than 12 passengers, for example both this week and in the hearings in Pond Inlet, which will be brought to the Council for consideration for specific recommendations.

In conclusion, the Marine Council's role in this process is to listen to the information, concerns, and knowledge shared this week and through the other hearings, and to inform recommendations to government agencies regarding marine areas. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

(Applause)

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. NWT and Nunavut Chamber of Mines? De Beers? The Canadian Association of Petroleum? Okay, thank you. That is it for the members and the delegates to this week's hearings.

(Applause)

Thank you. Sharon will provide her closing comments. I first want to say as a Commissioner, we have been busy this week. We have met many times. We agree that the hearings especially this

week, we have heard a request for an extension of the deadline. We met today. We have extended the deadline almost a month. February 10th is now the extended deadline for submissions. Written submissions will also have to be responded to in that two-week time period. There will be a chance to comment, February 24th. For those that have requested a deadline extension, we have extended it for submissions to February 10th for your information. I wanted to mention that. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Whew! We are near the end. At the first hearing, we did hear our Chair say, "You can't always get what you want." To the participants and everyone, the extension I think, is welcome news. I have some of our closing comments.

First of all, I would like to thank every registered participant, the community reps, the public, everyone who shared their knowledge, and provided submissions orally and in written form to the Commission. My voice is going, so apologies for that. I would like to give special thanks to our Commission staff who are never ever tired, but I think they are tonight, to our legal counsel, our external consultants, to Willi who is sleeping over there...

(Laughter and Applause)

To Chris and Beth, and a special thanks and a big applause for our translators. They have just been amazing.

(Applause)

I want to give a special recognition as well to Uvagut TV and Isuma. Without them, we would not be doing any of the live streaming. They have worked with us to make sure for all five hearings that we are being televised. I want to say thanks to Leena and her team. They are not all here, but if you could stand up, you have been amazing for the week.

(Applause)

The Aqasarniit Hotel did the catering, and to the Legion for letting us go next door for the meals and letting us use the hall. It is always appreciated.

This fifth public hearing is soon coming to a conclusion. I would like to read into the record. The Commission has been asked whether it would consider an extension of the deadline for final written submissions from January 10th, 2023 to a later date. As everyone who has been actively participating in the Nunavut Planning Commission process knows, we have been on a journey for a great number of years.

The Commission highly values the comments we have received in both oral and written form from the communities, the registered participants, and the public. This has been a long public hearing process with the five public hearings, and we are grateful that everyone came with an honest, true voice to give the Commissioners the guidance and direction and solutions that they need to consider for this final Draft.

The Commission acknowledges the request from the communities, the parties, and participants for the written comments timeline to be extended. We recognize the importance of the issues, knowing that many of you wish to provide additional information to the Commission. As Chairperson

Nakashuk noted in his comments, the Commission has agreed that an extension is beneficial to everyone and to the overall process.

As a result, the Commission has determined that the new date for the final written comments will be extended one month. That would be to February 10, 2023. This date will not be extended further, and any submissions that are received after that date may not be incorporated into the deliberations by the Commission in considering the new 2023 Draft Plan.

Further, the Commissioners have agreed that all participants should have an additional two-week period following the February 10th date for the sole purpose of providing comments on any written submissions received by February 10th. The deadline for these comments is February 24th, 2023. This is not an extension period for written submissions. It is only a period to comment on submissions received by February 10th.

The Commission is committed to producing a new 2023 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan as soon as possible after these dates. This important milestone will be the result of deliberations and considerations of all the evidence the Commission has received in the process on the 2021 Draft and also building on all the previous submissions that have been instrumental in moving the process into our current state.

It is the intention of the Commission to still provide the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan to the signatory parties for their review and comment. The process of the last several months moves us all and moves all of Nunavut a few steps closer to a made-in-Nunavut Land Use Plan. The Commission could not have completed its work without the tremendous contributions that have been made by everyone to advance the goals.

The next steps: The Commission staff, consultants will compile all the evidence and all the submissions of the Commissioners to review. As I said, we remain committed. It will now be late spring that the Commission will put forward the document for the signatories' review. For all the community delegates and registered participants that are travelling home, please travel safe back to your families. We wish you all the best at home. Thank you on behalf of the Commission. I will turn it back over to Andrew. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. I would like to thank my fellow Commissioners. They have been at this work and the work of holding hearings. Thank you. We have more work ahead of us to do. The hearings are concluding, but we have our work cut out for us. We are reminded that the *Agreement* dictates the rules, and it spells out the process during the hearings.

Thank you to the members from the communities and the registered participants. Thank you, those that came to speak and the general public that was here and spoke. Thank you.

As the Commission, we will work on a Plan that will try to cover all aspects of what you have discussed and try to get the best Plan we can come up with based on what we have heard. We have heard many things.

I also want to thank the translators, especially today from this morning. They have been here, just like you have been here all day for 14 hours now. Thank you to Leena's crew in looking out for us this week. Thank you, Aqsarniit Hotel for catering snacks and coffee this week, and the Legion. They

provided a lunch and supper venue, and they were free to go in. The Cadet Hall was in part through them.

(English): In conclusion, this is the conclusion of the fifth and final public hearing. Participant submissions must be received by February 10th now in 2023. There will be 20 days of a comment period on the submissions before February 24th.

The next steps of the Commission will be staff and the consultants will compile all the submissions for the Commissioners to review and determine the content of the final Draft. The Commission will be submitting the final Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan for approval in the spring of 2023.

(Translated): We will start to head home. I hope you have safe travels and routing. Thank you to our translators. They have worked hard. Sometimes it is difficult with the different dialects that we are speaking around the table. We understand through the translators. Thank you.

Thank you to our Executive Director, Sharon. She has been busy. I thank her and our staff, the Planning Commission. They work a lot for our organization where we don't see a lot of the work. Thank you to all of them. To those watching on Uvagut TV, thank you. The audience members, thank you and through the internet, thank you as well.

Be aware, this process is not over. We still have a lot of work to do in coming up with a Plan. Qujannamiik. In closing, we will have a closing prayer. Jaco Ishulautak will lead us in the closing prayer. Thank you, everybody. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

Jaco: *(Provided a Closing Prayer)*

(Applause)

End of South Baffin Public Hearing