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Executive Summary

As a strategy to address the challenges and potential impacts that climate change is having on a number of species that depend on Arctic sea ice, the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) is examining the feasibility of special management to preserve both the natural and cultural values of Arctic ice and associated land areas. Based on the predictions from a number of climate change models, WWF has identified the area between northern Nunavut and northern Greenland as one of the areas where the summer sea ice will persist the longest.

The study area for the project encompasses an area bounded on the northern side by the northeast point of Ellesmere Island, on the eastern side by the international boundary with Greenland, on the south by the community of Clyde River, and on the western side by the shores of Ellesmere Island, Devon Island, Bylot Island and Baffin Island. The communities included in the study area are: i) Grise Fiord; ii) Resolute Bay; iii) Arctic Bay; iv) Pond Inlet; and v) Clyde River.

The key stakeholders identified in relation to the study area were: i) Local communities, ii) the Inuit of Nunavut, iii) Government of Nunavut, and iv) Government of Canada.

The key organizations involved in development and management of the study area include:

i) Nunavut Tunngavik Inc. (NTI) which represents the interests of Inuit of Nunavut at the territorial and national levels;

ii) Qikiqtani Inuit Association, which represents the interests of Inuit at regional level;

iii) Nunavut Wildlife Management Board, whose main mandate is to achieve sustainable and long-term protection of wildlife and wildlife habitat in harmony with traditional and cultural Inuit values;

iv) Nunavut Impact Review Board, whose mandate is to screen major project proposals and determine whether or not they will have any significant impact on the environment;

v) Nunavut Planning Commission, whose mandate is to prepare and implement land use plans that take into consideration the traditional and cultural values of Inuit;

vi) Government of Nunavut, whose main mandate is the betterment of the lives of the residents of Nunavut;

vii) Indian and Northern Affairs – Canada, whose main mandate is to support the economic development of First Nations and Inuit communities through financial support for various economic development initiatives, and

viii) Parks Canada, whose main mandate is to protect and promote Canada’s natural and cultural heritage.

The key documents that influence the development and management of the study area include:

i) Nunavut Land Claims Agreement, which establishes the rights and obligations of Inuit and Government of Canada. The main Articles of the Nunavut Land Claim Agreement related to special management of the LIA are Article 5 (Wildlife), Article 7 (Outpost camps), Article 8
ii) Inuit Impact Benefit Agreements – the IIBA-in-Principle for National Wildlife Areas and Migratory Bird Sanctuaries in the Nunavut Settlement Area, and the Umbrella Inuit Impact and Benefit Agreement for Territorial Parks in the Nunavut Settlement Area. The main Articles of the IIBA-in-Principle for National Wildlife Areas and Migratory Bird Sanctuaries in the Nunavut Settlement Area that relate to special management of the LIA are Article 2 (General Provisions), Article 3 (Co-Management), Article 5 (Inuit rights and use of NWA and MBSs), and Article 13 (Changes to NWA and MBS). The main Articles of the Umbrella Inuit Impact and Benefit Agreement for Territorial Parks in the Nunavut Settlement Area that are related to special management of the LIA are Article 3 (Matters respecting certain Inuit rights and use of Parks), Article 9 (Wildlife Resources), and Article 10 (Mineral Resources);

iii) North Baffin Region Land Use Planning – which states amongst other issues that in relation to the establishment of a conservation area, the Nunavut Planning Commission “shall consider proposals for new conservation areas once it has been demonstrated that the proposal: a) has been initiated by, or is supported by, local community and regional organizations; b) blends traditional and local knowledge of ecosystems with scientific information; c) considers economic and social values; d) considers existing land use planning and wildlife management regimes; and e) provides interim protection, preferably for no more than five years”;

iv) Community Economic Development Plans prepared by the communities encompassed by the study area.

While the majority of the Inuit-owned Lands are in the southern part of Nunavut. There are some Inuit-owned Lands in and around the study area. In relation to the study area, the northeast boundary of Inuit-owned Lands is just south of the settlement of Eureka and the Inuit-owned Lands that are located on the shoreline facing Kane Basin are GF 06, GF13, GF14, GF15, GF17, GF18, and PI 46, and further south there are GF 11, GF12, GF21, and GF49.

The main source of information in relation to the traditional Inuit uses of the study area was the Land Use and Occupancy Project. For the purpose of the Scoping study, the traditional community uses of the area were divided into two main components: i) harvesting (including trapping and hunting), and ii) cultural (archaeology). The areas around all the communities included in the study are extensively used by the residents of those communities for harvesting wildlife (hunting and trapping), as well as for their cultural values. Third parties interests in the area include the mining industry, oil and gas sector, tourisms sector, fisheries, transportation, and military.

While the data collected through the research does not indicate any increase in the areas traditionally used by community members, it is important to note that the level of harvesting has the potential to
increase. The key factors that might cause a potential increase in the harvesting level for one or more species of wildlife include the increase in the number of people living in the communities.

Nunavut has attracted the interest of the mining and the energy sector, as demonstrated by the increased in the number of prospecting permits issued during 2008 (a total of 214 prospecting permits compared to 170 permits issued in 2007).

Some of the potential impacts identified as the result of the implementation of any large scale project in the area include:

i) Potential positive impacts: employment opportunities for community members; revenues for communities; training opportunities; better community infrastructure; and business opportunities for community members, and

ii) Potential negative impacts such as environmental degradation; disruption of habitat for wildlife and as a results changes in the traditional harvesting patterns; disruption of social and cultural patterns – as the Government of Nunavut favours the fly-in fly-out approach instead of the establishment of new communities; and loss of traditional way of living (especially amongst males) employed by the large operations with less time to practice traditional skills.

The key impacts of changing climate conditions on the study area could include the loss of habitat for ice-depanding species; reduction in the number of wildlife species that depend on ice; the change in the climatic conditions triggering changes in the distribution, diversity and habitats used by wildlife, and thus changes to the lifestyle of Inuit whose livelihood depends on harvesting wildlife; the reduction in the number of ice-depended species; declining food security for people and communities that depend on wildlife harvesting for their livelihood; the threat to the Inuit traditional way of living as the number of ice-depended species is being reduced; an increased pressure to explore and extract various minerals and oil and gas which is associated with an increase in the employment opportunities for Nunavut residents, and increased revenues for the communities and the government; and an increase in the intensity of use of water-based transportation, with potential expansion of the travel routes further north.

The main advantages and disadvantages of special management may be summarized as follows:

i) Advantages – the maintenance of the Inuit traditional way of living and culture; increased opportunities for tourism-related opportunities (wildlife viewing); the preservation of ice-dependent species; the protection of the ice-cover from development; an increased certainty of protecting the habitat for ice-depanding species; ensuring a place where to harvest wildlife; promotion of some of the goals of NLCA (protection of traditional way of living and environmental sustainability); ensuring the implementation of NLCA, and being associated with a high-profile issue (climate change) and case (protection of polar bears);
ii) Disadvantages – the loss of potential economic opportunities; the loss of potential revenues, the loss of control over the use of Inuit-owned Lands and other areas; and the loss of potential employment opportunities.

This report concludes by noting that the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement, and the organizations and instruments it creates, provide a clear legal foundation and process for land use. Any initiative for special management in the LIA must, in order to win Inuit, territorial and federal support, be an initiative of Inuit in the communities and Inuit regional organizations, and follow the established channels set up under the Agreements.
Background

Proponent and the objectives of the assignment

As a strategy to address the challenges and potential impacts that the climate change is having on a number of species that depend Arctic sea ice, the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) is examining the feasibility of the establishment of special management to preserve both the natural and cultural values of Arctic ice and associated land areas.

Based on the predictions from a number of climate change models, WWF has identified the area between northern Nunavut and northern Greenland as one of the areas where the summer sea ice will persist the longest.

As part of their feasibility analysis, WWF initiated a scoping study of the socio-economic and socio-political implications for Nunavut and Canada.

Key research questions

The key research questions\(^1\) for this assignment included the following:

i) Who are the key stakeholders for the identified area?

ii) What are the traditional, current and potential future uses of the identified area?

iii) What are the currently known resources in the area, and what is their current and projected economic value?

iv) What are the community, regional, territorial, and national plans for the identified area?

v) What might be the socio-economic advantages / disadvantages of the proposal to local communities and regional governments?

vi) What might be the cultural advantages / disadvantages of the proposal to local communities and regional governments?, and

vii) What might be political and economic advantages / disadvantages of the proposal to local communities and regional governments?

Methodology

To address these research questions, the following methodology was used.

Study area

As the future areas covered by ice (between Nunavut and Greenland) could not be predicted accurately by any of the existing climate models, the study area for the Scoping project was based on the documentation provided by WWF and discussions with WWF representatives. The study area for the project was defined as follows: the northern boundary was set at the northern point of Ellesmere Island (approximately 82\(^0\) 13’ N and 60\(^0\) 07’ W); the eastern boundary is the international boundary with

---

\(^1\) Source – Scoping study ToR

\(^2\) Source – Google Earth
Greenland, the southern point is the community of Clyde River (approximately 70° 26’ N and 68° 59’ W), and the western boundary is the shore of Ellesmere Island, Devon Island, Bylot Island and Baffin Island. Map 1 shows the location and the extent of the study area.

**Map 1 – Study area for the Scoping study**

Communities included
The communities included in the study area include: i) Grise Fiord (approximately 76° 34’ N, 82° 52’ W); ii) Resolute (approximately 74° 41’ N, 94° 56’W): iii) Arctic Bay (approximately 73° 01’ N, 85° 14’ W); iv) Pond Inlet (approximately 72° 41’ N, 78° 03’ W): and v) Clyde River (approximately 70° 26’ N and 68° 59’ W).

Key assumptions for Ice Coverage
As none of the present climate change models can predict with accuracy the extent of the area where the summer sea ice is going to persist the longest, the projected area for continued ice covered was identified as the Kane Basin, with the following boundaries: the northern boundary - approximately 80° 12’ N and 680 27’ W, western boundary - Ellesmere Island, eastern boundary - Greenland (Denmark), and the southern boundary - approximately 78° 28’ N and 730 52’ W (in between Alexandra Fiord – Nunavut and Etah – Greenland). Map 2 provides details of the primary study area\(^3\).

---

\(^3\) Source – Land Use and Occupancy Project – Volume 1
Research methodology
The key steps involved in conducting the research and analysis included:

Identification of key sources of information
To complete the research and address all the research questions, a number of documents (on-line and print version) were identified. These documents were identified based on in-house expertise and knowledge in relation to Nunavut and Inuit, in consultation with WWF.

Key documents consulted
The key documents consulted and reviewed included:
   i) Inuit Land Use and Occupancy Project (1976),
iv) Umbrella Inuit Impact and Benefit Agreement for Territorial Parks in the Nunavut Settlement Area (2002),
v) Key marine habitat sites for migratory birds in Nunavut and the Northwest Territories (2004),
vi) The Nunavut Wildlife Harvest Study (2004),
vii) Nunavut Fisheries Strategy (2005),
viii) North Baffin Regional Land Use Plan (2000),
ix) Community Development Plan – Arctic Bay (2000), Community Development Plan Resolute Bay (2008),
x) Community Development Plan – Pond Inlet (2005),
xi) Community Development Plan - Clyde River (2007),
xii) Nunavut – Overview 2008 – Mineral exploration, Mining and Geo-science,
xiii) Fraser Institute Annual Survey of Mining companies 2006 / 2007,
xiv) Government of Nunavut Business Plan 2009 – 2010,
xv) Parnautit – A Foundation for the Future – Mineral exploration and Mining Strategy,
xvi) Nunavut Planning Commission - Socio-demographic and economic sector analysis (2008),
xviii) NTI web-site (http://www.ntilands.com/inuitownedlands/),
xix) Government of Nunavut web-site (http://www.gov.nu.ca), and

Limitations
There were two factors that affected the research. Those were:

i) Limited time – the research team had only three weeks to review all the identified documentation and complete the analysis. Given the complexity of the research topic, a longer period of time should have been assigned for the project;

ii) Research was conducted based only on secondary data. Due to limited resources (time and financial), and the need to avoid raising community, regional or territorial expectations and concerns, the research was solely based on secondary data. Thus the identified potential impacts on the local communities and regional governments could not be validated with the key stakeholders.

Research results

Key stakeholders
The key stakeholders identified for the study area include the following (not in order of importance):

i) Communities - The ToR for the project identified only two communities (Grise Fiord and Resolute Bay) as communities that might be potentially affected by special management of the LIA. Through the research conducted we identified five communities that might be potentially
affected by special management of the LIA. These communities are: i) Grise Fiord, ii) Resolute Bay, iii) Arctic Bay, iv) Pond Inlet, and v) Clyde River,

ii) Inuit of Nunavut,

iii) Government of Nunavut (GN), and

iv) Government of Canada (GoC)

v) Industry (including tourism and resource extraction).

**Key organizations involved in the development and management of the study area**

The key organizations involved in development and management of the study area include:

i) Nunavut Tunngavik Inc (NTI) – The main mandate of NTI is to make sure that the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement is implemented in its entirety as envisioned and understood by all parties. NTI represents the interest of Inuit of Nunavut at the territorial and national levels. NTI also holds the rights to Inuit-owned subsurface lands in Nunavut, and has the authority to provide input on any legislative measure that might affect the social, economic or cultural well-being of Inuit.

ii) Qikiqtani Inuit Association (QIA) – The main mandate of QIA is to promote and protect Inuit culture, values and social rights, as well as to raise awareness about Inuit culture and to promote it. QIA represents the interest of Inuit at regional level. QIA also hold the rights to Inuit-owned surface lands in Nunavut.

iii) Nunavut Wildlife Management Board (NWMB) – The main mandate of NWMB is to achieve a sustainable and long-term protection of wildlife and wildlife habitat in harmony with traditional and cultural Inuit values

iv) Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) – The main mandate of NIRB is to screen major project proposals (to be implemented in Nunavut) and determine whether or not they will have any significant impact on the environment

v) Nunavut Planning Commission (NPC) – The main mandate of NPC is to prepare and implement land use plans that take into consideration the traditional and cultural values of Inuit

vi) Government of Nunavut, Department of Economic Development & Transportation (ED&T) – The main mandate of ED&T is to identify the necessary conditions for the economic development of Nunavut. One of the priority sectors prioritized by ED & T within the Nunavut economy is sustainable mining and oil and gas industries in Nunavut

vii) Government of Nunavut, Department of Environment – The main mandate of the Department of Environment is to ensure “protection, promotion and sustainable use of natural resources in Nunavut by supporting the management of the environment, wildlife and parks”

viii) Indian and Northern Affairs – Canada (INAC) – The main mandate of INAC is to support the economic development of First Nations and Inuit communities through financial support for various economic development initiatives

---

4 More information on the mandate and activities of these organizations can be found on the Appendices of this report

ix) Parks Canada (PC) – The main mandate of PC is to “protect and present nationally significant examples of Canada's natural and cultural heritage, and foster public understanding, appreciation and enjoyment in ways that ensure the ecological and commemorative integrity of these places for present and future generations”.

**Key documents that influence the development / management of the study area**

The key documents that influence the development and management of the study area include:

i) **Nunavut Land Claims Agreement (NLCA)** – NLCA was signed in 1993 and establishes the rights and obligations of Inuit and Government of Canada. NLCA has a total of 42 Articles. Those related to special management of the LIA are:

- Article 5 (Wildlife), which states that Inuit “must always take part in decisions on wildlife” and calls for the establishment of the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board;

- Article 7 (Outpost camps), which states that Inuit can set up new outpost camps on Crown land, and that the approval for the new outpost camps can be done by the local Hunter and Trappers Organizations (HTOs);

- Article 8 (Parks) which outlines the role that Inuit have in creating and running parks, and at the same time it protects the right that Inuit have to hunt, fish and collect plants in the park areas;

- Article 9 (Conservation Areas), which states that Inuit “will help to create and run conservation areas” and at the same time protects the Inuit right to hunt, fish and collect plants in the conservation areas;

- Article 11 (Land Use Planning), which outlines the process to ensure utilization of land, water and other natural resources in a sustainable way and in accordance with Inuit values;

- Article 15 (Marine Areas) which states that “Inuit should continue to use and benefit from the ocean around Nunavut Settlement Area”, and that Inuit will have a say on what happens in these waters;

- Article 16 (Outer land fast ice-zone – East Baffin Coast) which states that the Inuit harvesting rights extend beyond Canada’s marine management jurisdiction, and that Inuit can “still harvest for personal use any animal other than marine mammals” in this area;

---

7 More information on these key documents is provided in the appropriate Appendix
8 Source – A Plain Language Guide to The Nunavut Land Claims Agreement
Article 21 (Entry and Access) which establishes the rules on how non-Inuit can go onto Inuit lands;

Article 32 (Nunavut Social Development Council), which states that Inuit have the right to be consulted and participate in decision making on matters that affect the social, economic and cultural well being of Inuit in Nunavut; and

Article 33 (Archaeology) which states that the archaeological area in Nunavut extends to the marine areas in the Nunavut Settlement Area.

ii) **Inuit Impact Benefit Agreements (IIBAs)** – The IIBA-in-Principle for National Wildlife Areas and Migratory Bird Sanctuaries in the Nunavut Settlement Area has a total of 16 Articles. Those related to special management of the LIA are:

Article 2 (General Provisions), which states that the establishment and the management of National Wildlife Areas (NWAs) and Migratory Bird Sanctuaries (MBS) should be consistent with Inuit harvesting rights as specific under the NLCA;

Article 3 (Co-Management), which states that for each NWA and MBS an Area Co-management Committee shall be established and that Inuit will be represented in the Co-management committee;

Article 5 (Inuit rights and use of NWA and MBSs), which “acknowledges Inuit rights to harvest wildlife in NWAs and MBSs as set forth in the NLCA”; and

Article 13 (Changes to NWA and MBS), which states that if an access corridor across an NWA or MBS is required, NTI, the appropriate Regional Inuit Association (RIA), and Canadian Wildlife Services (CWS) will have to consider the request.

The Umbrella Inuit Impact and Benefit Agreement for Territorial Parks in the Nunavut Settlement Area has a total of 16 Articles. The Articles related to special management of the LIA are:

Article 3 (Matters respecting certain Inuit rights and use of Parks) states that the establishment of any Territorial Parks must avoid limitations and restrictions on Inuit rights, including harvesting rights;

Article 9 (Wildlife Resources), which states that establishment of a Territorial Park should have no net impact on community harvesting quotas; and
Article 10 (Mineral Resources) which states that the boundaries of a Territorial Park “should be based in part on Mineral resource potential”.

iii) **North Baffin Region Land Use Planning** – The North Baffin Region encompasses an area that stretches to the west from the eastern limit of the Inuvialuit Settlement Region, to the east up to the eastern limit of the Outer Land Fast Ice Zone, to the north up to the limit of Canada’s fishing zone, and to the south, up to the southernmost extent of present land use by the communities within the region. The Land Use Plan (LUP) states that “in the marine area and the Outer Land Fast Ice Zone of the planning region, the plan shall be interpreted and applied in a manner consistent with Canada’s international obligations”. The LUP recognizes the importance of renewable and non-renewable resources that are part of the area. In relation to oil and gas, LUP recognizes the fact that “The Sverdrup Basin and the eastern end of Lancaster Sound have the highest known oil and gas potential of the sedimentary basins of the Arctic islands”, while much of the area remains unexplored for mineral deposits.

In relation to the use of renewable resources, the LUP acknowledges that “communities are particularly concerned that no land use activity disturb or deplete habitat or wildlife to such an extent that populations could not fulfill continuing harvest needs”. The LUP states that the protection of renewable resources could be accomplished through three different mechanisms: a) as part of the regional land use plan, b) through the wildlife regulation established by NWMB, and c) through the terms and conditions set to land use authorizations.

In relation to the establishment of a conservation area, the LUP states that the NPC “shall consider proposals for new conservation areas once it has been demonstrated that the proposal: a) has been initiated by, or is supported by, local community and regional organizations; b) blends traditional and local knowledge of ecosystems with scientific information; c) considers economic and social values; d) considers existing land use planning and wildlife management regimes; and e) provides interim protection, preferably for no more than five years”.

iv) **Community Economic Development Plans**\(^9\) – At the time this report was prepared, four of the five communities within the study area had developed community economic development (CED) plans. These communities were Arctic Bay, Pond Inlet, Resolute Bay, and Clyde River.

The CED plan for Arctic Bay states that the economy of Arctic Bay can be characterized as “mixed”, where traditional subsistence activities, including hunting, fishing, trapping and gathering, are combined with a wage labour and business activity. In terms of natural resources, the CED plan identifies the fact that the region is rich in non-renewable resources but that much

\(^9\) Details about the CEDs for each of these communities are provided in the appropriate Appendix
of the area remains unexplored for mineral deposits. The key long-term economic strategic directions for the community include tourism and mining.

The CED plan for Resolute Bay states that some of the key long-term economic development directions include tourism, traditional land-based economy, and mineral research and exploration.

The vision for the community of Pond Inlet states that “...Mittimatalik will be a hub for the northern Qikiqtani region, both in terms of economic activity and relations with other communities in terms of tourism and other development, and as a transportation hub that may potentially have a jet airstrip, an active shipping schedule, and a breakwater and deepwater wharf.” In terms of non-renewable resources, the known resources include oil and gas in Lancaster Sound area and iron ore at Mary River, but as in the case of other communities, much of the area remains unexplored for mineral deposits. Some of the key long-term economic development directions include tourism and mining.

The community of Clyde River envisions its future being based, among other economic development areas, on tourism and mining. The tourism sector is closely linked with the potential establishment of a territorial park (the boundaries of the territorial park are provided in Map 3). It is worth mentioning that the community decided to pursue a territorial rather than a national park nearby because there are fewer land use restrictions within a territorial park.

**Map 3 – Proposed Territorial Park in vicinity to Clyde River**
Inuit-owned Lands

The location of some of the Inuit-owned Lands (IOL) in the vicinity of the study area is shown in the following maps\(^\text{10}\). While the majority of the IOL are on the southern part of Nunavut, there are some IOL in and around the study area. In relation to the study area, the northeast boundary of IOL is just south of the settlement of Eureka. The IOL that are located on the shoreline facing Kane Basin are GF 06, GF13, GF14, GF15, GF17, GF18, and PI 46, and further south there are GF 11, GF12, GF21, and GF49.

Map 4 – Part of IOL around Kane Basin

\(^{10}\) Source - [http://www.ntilands.com/inuitownedlands/](http://www.ntilands.com/inuitownedlands/)
Map 5 – Part of IOL in Ellesmere Island

Map 6 – IOL in Devon Island
Map 7 – Part of IOL in Bylot and Baffin Island

Map 8 – Part of IOL around Clyde River
Present uses of the study area

The following section describes the present uses of the study area, which include the traditional use of land (hunting and trapping), exploration and use of non-renewable resources, fisheries, tourism, and by the military.

Traditional community uses of the study area

The main source of information in relation to the traditional Inuit uses of the study area is the Land Use and Occupancy Project completed in 1976. For the purpose of the Scoping study, the traditional community uses of the area was divided into two main components: i) harvesting (including trapping and hunting), and ii) cultural (archaeology).

Overall traditional use of the study area

Map 9 shows the extent of the Inuit land use in living memory. The map shows that the extent of land use – in relation to the study area – on the northern part stretches up to the southern edge of Kane Basin.

Map 9 – Partial outer extent of Inuit land use in living memory

Some of the travel routes used by Inuit are shown in Map 10
Communities of Arctic Bay and Pond Inlet

The residents of the communities of Arctic Bay and Pond Inlet conducted their trapping for the most part alongside the southern part of Devon Island, around Bylot Island, as well in the ice on the eastern part of Bylot Island, and along the northern part of Baffin Island. Map 11 shows the extent of the area used for trapping\(^\text{11}\).

Map 11 – Partial extent of trapping areas – Pond Inlet and Arctic Bay

\[^{11}\text{The legend for all the maps is provided in the appropriate Appendix}\]
The hunting areas for the communities of Pond Inlet and Arctic Bay are shown in Map 12.

**Map 12 – Partial extent of hunting areas – Pond Inlet and Arctic Bay**

The main species harvested by the residents of Arctic Bay and Pond Inlet are provided in Table 1 and Table 2.

It is important to note that: i) amongst the species harvested there are some that are ice-dependent such as polar bears, seals (ringed, bearded, and harp), and walrus; ii) seals (especially ringed seals) are very important for the residents of both communities; and iii) the number of harvested species has gone up (due to the increase in population).
## Table 1 - Species harvested - Arctic Bay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Total harvested a, c</th>
<th>Per resident</th>
<th>Total harvested b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>1.2062</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Musk-ox</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Polar bear</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0171</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0202</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Arctic fox</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0.1767</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Arctic hare</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.2109</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ringed seal</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>2.2481</td>
<td>1551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bearded seal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.0217</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Harp seal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0155</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Walrus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0047</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Beluga</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.0217</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ptarmigan</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>0.8853</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Arctic char</td>
<td>10237</td>
<td>15.8713</td>
<td>10951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cod</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>0.2357</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* - Based on data from Harvest Study  
*b* - Based on estimated population  
*c* – Average harvest level for each species for the period 1999 - 2001
Table 2 - Species harvested - Pond Inlet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>2001 Total harvested</th>
<th>2001 Per resident</th>
<th>2006 Total harvested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>1.4984</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Musk-ox</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.1017</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Polar bear</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.0118</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0107</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Arctic fox</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.0318</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Arctic hare</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0.0861</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ringed seal</td>
<td>2113</td>
<td>1.7320</td>
<td>2278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bearded seal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.0230</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Harp seal</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.0238</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Walrus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0041</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Beluga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ptarmigan</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>0.7590</td>
<td>998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Arctic char</td>
<td>12114</td>
<td>9.9295</td>
<td>13057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community of Resolute Bay

The residents of Resolute Bay used as a trapping area the coastal areas of Somerset Island, the southern part of Cornwallis Island, and the southern part of Griffith Island. Map 13 shows the extent of the trapping area.

Map 13 - Partial extent of the trapping area - Resolute Bay
Map 14 shows the extent of the hunting area used by the residents of Resolute Bay.

Map 14 - Partial extent of the hunting area - Resolute Bay

Table 3 shows the harvest data for the community of Resolute Bay.

Table 3 - Species harvested - Resolute Bay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Total harvested a, c</th>
<th>Per resident</th>
<th>Total harvested b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.0791</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Musk-ox</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0326</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Polar bear</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.0837</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Arctic fox</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.1442</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Arctic hare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ringed seal</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>2.6140</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bearded seal</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.0930</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Harp seal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0326</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Walrus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0233</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Beluga</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.0977</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ptarmigan</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>1.7581</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Arctic char</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>3.4465</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community of Grise Fiord

Map 15 shows that travel routes used by Inuit during various periods of time; one of the areas used for travel is Kane Basin.

Map 15 – Travel routes from Grise Fiord

The partial extent of the areas where the residents of Grise Fiord trapped and hunted are presented in the three following maps (Map 16, Map 17, and Map 18).

Map 16 - Partial extent of the trapping area - Grise Fiord
Table 4 shows the species harvested by the communities of Grise Fiord.
Table 4 - Species harvested - Grise Fiord

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Total harvested</th>
<th>Per resident</th>
<th>Total harvested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.2485</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Musk-ox</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0424</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Polar bear</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.1152</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Arctic fox</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.1212</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Arctic hare</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.1697</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ringed seal</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>3.9576</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bearded seal</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.1212</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Harp seal</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.2788</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Walrus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0424</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Beluga</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0424</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ptarmigan</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>1.6788</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Arctic char</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>2.9576</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cod</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0.6545</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community of Clyde River

The areas used by the residents of Clyde River for trapping and hunting are shown in Map 19 and Map 20. Table 5 shows the data related to species harvested by the community members.

Map 19 - The partial extent of the trapping area - Clyde River
Map 20 - Partial extent of the hunting area - Clyde River

Table 5 - Species harvested - Clyde River

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>Per resident</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>0.4446</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Musk-ox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Polar bear</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0115</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0038</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Arctic fox</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.0459</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Arctic hare</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.0701</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ringed seal</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2.5529</td>
<td>2093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bearded seal</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.0242</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Harp seal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0166</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Walrus</td>
<td>8463</td>
<td>10.7809</td>
<td>8840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Beluga</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>1.5465</td>
<td>1268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ptarmigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Arctic char</td>
<td>8463</td>
<td>10.7809</td>
<td>8840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cultural traditional use

The known locations of archaeological sites in and around the study area are presented in Map 21

Map 21 – Archaeological sites

Current resources and third party use

As stated in the ToR, for the purpose of the Scoping study, the current resource use by third parties considered the following: i) Minerals, ii) Oil and gas, iii) Tourism, iv) Fisheries, v) Transportation, and vi) Military.

Minerals

The main minerals extracted or explored in and around the study area include uranium, gold, iron ore and base metals. The majority of exploration in the last five years has been related to kimberlite. The locations of the existing operational mines and exploration sites are as follows:

Base metals – An exploration site is located 150 km south of Resolute Bay - In 2008, three prospecting permits with a validity of five years were acquired.

Diamonds – i) Exploration site located - 160 km southwest of Arctic Bay; ii) Exploration site located 110 km southeast of Arctic Bay – In early 2008 field season, more than 23,470 ha of contiguous mineral claims were identified; iii) Exploration site located 100 km northwest of Arctic Bay.

It is worth noting that there are other explorations sites in Nunavut
Uranium – Exploration site located 50 km south of Arctic Bay - Initial exploration work was conducted by the partners in 2007.

Gold – Exploration site located 160 km southwest of Clyde River - A new gold discovery in 2007 brought the total known gold prospects on the property to 17.

Iron – Mary River located 160 km south of Pond Inlet - Four iron ore deposits are known in the Mary River area. A Definitive Feasibility Study was released in February 2008. The commercial operation is expected to start in 2014.

Map 22 shows the location of various exploration sites.

Map 22 - Mineral exploration

Oil & Gas

Map 23 shows the location of oil and gas wells in the vicinity of the study area.
The main source of tourism in the area is related to cruises. The main cruise routes are shown in Map 24, and Map 25 shows the main tourism related sites.

Map 24 - Cruise routes
Fisheries
While the fisheries contribute between $12 and $14 million per year to the Nunavut economy\(^{13}\), and create more than 300 part-time jobs, the sector lacks adequate infrastructure and funds. As such, currently commercial fishery is not significantly extended to the study area.

Transportation
Map 26 shows the current major transportation routes in the vicinity of the study area.

Military use
The only military installation presently in the vicinity of the study area is located in Alert.

\(^{13}\) Source – Nunavut Fisheries Strategy - 2005
Potential use of the study area

Potential use by the communities

The potential use of the study area or its surroundings by communities is reviewed under three main headings: i) harvesting, ii) economic development, and iii) cultural.

Harvesting

While the data collected through the research does not indicate any increase in the areas traditionally used by community members, it is important to note that the level of harvesting has the potential to increase. The key factors that might cause an increase in the harvesting level for one or more species of wildlife include:

i) Increase in the number of people living in the communities - As harvesting wildlife is one of the key characteristics of Inuit traditional way of life, and also an important cultural aspect of their livelihood, an increase in the number of people living in those communities will mean that the need for harvesting more wildlife would be greater.

ii) Increased level of consumption – One of the key factors that might influence in an increase on the levels of consumption for wildlife is the reduction of employment and economic

---

14 The potential increase is based only taking into account the increase in population. If there will be an increase in the level of consumption, then the level of increase might be higher.
opportunities in the area. With the increased levels of unemployment (for example as the result of boom-and-bust cycles of the mining and energy sector developments), residents of the Nunavut communities will likely depend more on the traditional way of living – which includes supplementing purchased southern food with land food.

Table 6 shows the potential level of harvesting\(^{15}\) for each of the species used by the community members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Arctic Bay</th>
<th>Pond Inlet</th>
<th>Resolute Bay</th>
<th>Grise Fiord</th>
<th>Clyde River</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>+/ -16</td>
<td>+/ -</td>
<td>+/ -</td>
<td>+/ -</td>
<td>+/ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Musk-ox</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Polar bear</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Arctic fox</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Arctic hare</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ringed seal</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2455</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bearded seal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Harp seal</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Walrus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Beluga</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ptarmigan</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1076</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Arctic char</td>
<td>11696</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>14076</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cod</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Table 6, the only community where the level of harvest has a potential to decrease is Grise Fiord, and this is related to the estimated decrease in the number of people living in this community.

**Economic development**

**Arctic Bay** – Strategic directions identified by the community include tourism and mining. Under tourism two specific activities were identified: i) polar bear hunt, and ii) narwhal sport hunt. The mining sector

\(^{15}\) The potential level of harvesting was estimated using the projected number of people living in each of the communities and the average harvesting levels for each species for the period 1999 - 2001

\(^{16}\) Represents the increase or decrease of the level of harvest for each species using as a baseline the year 2006 (in units)
has been identified as a potential sector for providing benefits in relation to employment, training, and business opportunities for local businesses during the exploration, production and post-production (closure and reclamation).

**Pond Inlet** – Amongst other areas of potential development, tourism and mining have been identified by the community members as two important sectors. Under tourism, sports hunting and fishing were identified as services that the community will have to research and invest in order to provide employment and income for the community. The mining sector is considered as an important sector that could provide a number of benefits to the community (under the obligations of the NLCA and IIBAs).

**Resolute Bay** – The community of Resolute Bay has identified the tourism sector as a sector where “...significant opportunities exist for further development of tourism operations and employment in sport hunting and cruise ship landings, as well as new initiatives in adventure and eco-tourism, including wildlife-viewing, cultural and historical tourism...”. Under the tourism sector, polar bear hunt\(^\text{17}\) has an important role and will continue to be developed.

The exploration and mining sector are also identified as important long-term strategic directions for employment, training, and revenues for the community.

**Clyde River** – As in the case of the other communities, potential strategic direction for the community include tourism and mining. One of the aspects of the tourism sector that has been identified as receiving continuous support is polar bear hunting. The mining sector has been identified as a potential sector that can provide a number of benefits to the community (employment, revenues, training).

In general, all the communities within the study area have identified tourism and mining as two of the main strategic directions that they will have to pursue as part of their economic development. It is important to note that communities recognize the importance of the balancing act between protecting and sustaining the natural environment (so they could promote, increase and sustain the tourism activities in their communities), with the need for economic development (energy, mining and other infrastructure related projects).

In relation to sports hunting, it has to be taken into consideration the fact that the NLCA/NWMB system for wildlife management recognizes Inuit use as comprising both subsistence use and commercial use, with no distinction between them. As an available animal stock declines, the NWMB can reduce harvesting levels, but it is difficult to reduce it below the Basic Needs Level or Adjusted Basic Needs Level already identified. Also, Inuit harvesting still includes commercial (guiding, sports hunts) use along with subsistence. So in terms of potential use, Inuit use for both these purposes will continue, managed by the NWMB and other wildlife organizations.

\(^{17}\) In 2008 the polar bear hunt produced more than $300,000 in revenues for the community
**Cultural**

As can be seen from Map 27, there are a number of early settlements identified on the eastern side of Ellesmere Island, with more than ten of those along the west shores of Kane Basin. These early settlement areas could become part of the network of Nunavut Heritage sector, and be included in the cultural and historical tourism that most of the communities have identified as a potential development.

The traditional Inuit way of life is based in part on ice-based harvesting, travelling and survival skills. As such, the long-term preservation of these aspects and values of the Inuit tradition and culture will play an important role in the long-term management and sustainability of the environment.

**Map 27- Location of Inuit settlements**

---

**Potential third parties interests**

**Minerals**

The goal of Nunavut Parnaulit – the Nunavut mining strategy – is “to create the conditions for a strong and sustainable minerals industry that contributes to a high and sustainable quality of life for all Nunavummiut”. The foundations of the strategy include: i) Jurisdictional framework, ii) Community benefits, iii) Infrastructure development, and iv) Environmental stewardship.

During the recent years, the mining sector has shown an ever-increasing interest for exploration and extraction in Nunavut. The survey completed by the Fraser Institute (for the period 2006 / 2007) shows that Nunavut has been seen as more attractive to the mining industry. Table 7 provides a summary of the opinions of the mining industry in relation to Nunavut. As can be seen from the table, the aspects where Nunavut has been less attractive (in 06/07 compared to 05/06) are in relation to: i) the
Policy/Mineral Potential Assuming No Land Use Restrictions in Place and Assuming Industry “Best Practices” (from 100% of the respondents stating that in 05/06 the situation either encouraged the investments or did not deter mining related investments to 96% in 06/07), ii) the Uncertainty Concerning Native Land Claims (from 41% in 05/06 to 38% in 06/07), and iii) the Uncertainty over which Areas will be Protected as Wilderness or Parks (from 36% in 05/06 to 27% in 06/07). For other aspects, Nunavut was considered more attractive to the mining industry in 06/07 compared to 05/06.

The growing interest of the mining sector on Nunavut\textsuperscript{18} can be seen by the fact that in 2008 INAC’s Nunavut Region Mining Recorder’s Office issues 214 prospecting permits compared to 170 permits issued in 2007.

\textit{Oil & Gas}

As the Arctic has been estimated to have some 25% of the world’s undiscovered resources of oil and gas, there is great pressure to expand drilling into new areas. Map 28 shows proposed and completed mega-projects related to the energy sector\textsuperscript{19}.

In recognizing the importance that the North could play in energy security, and the economic potential that the energy sector could provide for Nunavut, the Department of Economic Development and Transportation has identified as one of the priorities for the period 2009 – 2010, the development of a “Nunavut Petroleum Exploration and Discovery Overview Report”.

\textit{Fisheries}

The Nunavut Fishery Strategy has identified some of the strategic areas where the Government of Nunavut and NTI will have to focus their attention in order to improve the situation related to this sector. Some of these directions include: i) Improve the fisheries infrastructure (including fleet and harbours); ii) Develop community-based in-shore capabilities, and iii) Achieve greater balance between in-shore and off-shore based activities. While no geographic areas have been identified as important for the development of the fishery sector, the improvements in harbours, ports, marine service centres, the fleet, processing and storage capacity could potentially expand further the present catchment area.

\textit{Transportation}

At the time when this report was prepared, there were no know plans in relation to the expansion of the present transportation routes.

\textit{Military use}

Canada has announced its plans to build two key military bases in the North. One is a deep-water port in Arctic Bay, and the other one is training centre in Nanisivik.

\textsuperscript{18} Source – Nunavut – Overview 2008 Mineral Exploration, Mining and Geoscience – INAC 2008

\textsuperscript{19} Source – The Canadian North – issues and challenges – Robert M. Bone (Oxford University Press 2008)
### Table 7 - Mining industry survey-results for Nunavut

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Scale[^10]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mineral Potential Assuming Current Regulations and Land Use Restrictions</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Policy/Mineral Potential Assuming No Land Use Restrictions in Place and Assuming Industry “Best Practices”</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Uncertainty Concerning the Administration, Interpretation, and Enforcement of Existing Regulations</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Environmental Regulations</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Regulatory Duplication and Inconsistency</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Taxation Regime</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Uncertainty Concerning Native Land Claims</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Uncertainty over which Areas will be Protected as Wilderness or Parks</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Quality of Infrastructure</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Socioeconomic Agreements</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Political Stability</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Labour Regulations/Employment Agreements</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Quality of Geological Database</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Security Situation</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^10]: 1 = Encourages investments; 2 = Not a deterrent to investments; 3 = Mild deterrent; 4 = Strong deterrent; 5 = Would not pursue investment due to this factor
Impact of larger scale development on community use

One key characteristic of large-scale non-renewable resource developments is that they operate in a boom and bust cycle. The impact of this has been seen in Alaska vis a vis oil and gas development, in the Beaufort for the Inuvialuit oil and gas development, on First Nation reserves across Canada, and most recently in Nunavut with the boom and then downturn in mining development. The IIBA process is an attempt to provide Inuit in Nunavut with instruments that control the rate and nature of development, maximize the economic and social benefits to Inuit, mitigate the inevitable negative consequences, and ensure compensation and remediating commensurate with impacts.

Depending on the location of any large scale project in relation to the communities included in this analysis, the potential impacts could be identified as follows:

- Potential positive impacts: i) Employment opportunities for community members, ii) Revenues for communities; iii) Training opportunities; iv) Better community infrastructure, v) Business opportunities for community members
- Potential negative impacts: i) Environmental degradation, ii) Disruption of habitat for wildlife and as a results changes in the traditional harvesting patterns; iii) Disruption of social and cultural patterns – as the Government of Nunavut favours the fly-in fly-out approach instead of the establishment of new communities; iv) Loss of traditional way of living (especially amongst males) as they will be employed by the large operations and thus have less time to practice their traditional skills.

This last point is particularly significant. Land-based (i.e. land and ice-based) harvesting skills are transferred through ongoing training of younger harvesters by elders out on the land and ice; a period when a younger harvester is not out on the land, working in industrial resource development, means that this specific opportunity to learn the required skills is lost forever, and cannot be regained. Therefore, the impact of larger scale development can be to reduce very significantly the level of
land/ice-based survival and harvesting skills among the Inuit population generally; this can jeopardize the long-term viability of the communities during downturns (collapse) of the non-renewable resource development activities.

**Impact of changing climate conditions**

The key impacts of the changing climate conditions on the study area could be as follows:

i) Loss of habitat for ice-dependent species;

ii) Reduction in the number of wildlife species that depend on ice;

iii) The change in the climatic conditions will trigger changes in the distribution, diversity and habitats used by wildlife, and as a result the way of living of Inuit whose livelihood depends on harvesting wildlife would change;

iv) The reduction in the number of ice-dependent species will result in declining food security for people and communities that depend on wildlife harvesting for their livelihood;

v) Threat to the Inuit traditional way of living as the number of ice-dependent species is being reduced;

vi) As the ice-free area increases, so increases the opportunity for mineral and oil and gas exploration and extraction and thus increasing the pressure to explore and extract various minerals and oil and gas;

vii) With an increase in the potential for energy and mining projects increases the opportunities for employment for Nunavut residents;

viii) The increase in the number of energy and mining project increases the potential revenues for all levels of government;

ix) The expanded season of the ice-free waters will increase the intensity of use of water-based transportation and at the same time might expand the travel routes to go further north.

**Advantages / disadvantages of special management of the LIA**

Some of the potential advantages and disadvantages that might result from special management of the LIA can be grouped as follows:

**Socio-cultural**

Communities

Advantages:

i) Maintain the traditional way of living and culture- Harvesting is a key underpinning of values and culture in Inuit communities. As such it is important to ensure that ice-dependent harvesting practices continue, through access of Inuit to land-fast ice areas and to opportunities for harvesting of ice-dependent species and training of young Inuit in the required skills;

ii) Ensuring a place to harvest wildlife - Inuit have always maintained that land/ice-based harvesting activities are when Inuit values (of sharing, reciprocity, etc.) are transferred
through training to the young; protection of areas for continued harvesting contribute to the maintenance of fundamental Inuit socio-cultural values;

iii) Preservation of ice-dependent species through the protection of habitat of polar bear and other ice-dependent species, given scenario for global warming, is critical;

iv) Increased certainty of protecting the habitat for ice-dependent species

Disadvantages:

i) Loss of control over the use of IOL and other areas

Regional government\textsuperscript{21}

Advantages:

i) Support and ensure the implementation of some of the objectives of the NLCA (protection of traditional way of living and environmental sustainability)

Disadvantages:

i) Loss of control over the use of IOL and other areas

Political Communities

Advantages:

i) Follow up with some of the goals of NLCA (protection of traditional way of living and environmental sustainability),

ii) Association with a high-profile issue (climate change) and case (protection of polar bears),

iii) Increased level of certainty - Under current system, recommendations of NPC on land-use planning and of NIRB on screening of major projects can be over-ridden by Minister of Government of Canada in certain circumstances; presumably a protected area would reduce opportunity for government to impose development over wishes of Inuit or decisions of Institutions of Public Government (NPC/NIRB),

iv) Provides high profile support to Canadian sovereignty and to declaration of Inuit sovereignty,

v) Maintenance of the option of pursuing harvesting is critical, and is a key objective of the wildlife provisions of the NLCA

\textsuperscript{21} For the purpose of this report, regional government includes the Government of Nunavut, NTI and QIA
Disadvantages:

i) Loss / reduction of Inuit opportunities to guide management of the area – Presently the institutions established under the NLCA provide mechanisms for Inuit to participate in determining, on an ongoing basis and on a case-by-case basis, whether development of a particular area should proceed or not. Inuit have generally maintained that they wish to pursue a balanced approach between protection of habitat and wildlife and development, and the establishment of a protected area would reduce the ability of Inuit to work with this balance on an ongoing basis through the institutions they established under their land claim agreement,

ii) Absence of viable alternatives for employment, training, etc.

Regional government

Advantages:

i) Follow up with some of the goals of NLCA (protection of traditional way of living and environmental sustainability),

ii) Association with a high-profile issue (climate change) and case (protection of polar bears)

Disadvantages:

i) Unless initiated and led by the communities, NTI and the Regional Association, may be perceived as a breach of the intent of the NLCA.

Economic Communities

Advantages:

i) Ensuring continuation of the economic benefits from harvesting - Harvesting is not only a key underpinning of Inuit values and culture, it is also a key element of long-term economic viability of communities - harvesting provides economic benefits in kind (consumption of harvested foods). With boom-and-bust potential of non-renewable resource development, harvesting may decrease and then increase in importance over time. Harvesting can act as a kind of sponge, releasing people in time where other development is strong, and absorbing people in times when other development declines

ii) Tourism opportunities and revenues

iii) Business opportunities

Disadvantages:

i) Loss of potential employment,
ii) Loss of control over the use of renewable resources,

iii) Loss of potential training opportunities

**Regional government**

**Advantages:**
- i) Tourism opportunities;
- ii) Business opportunities

**Disadvantages:**
- i) Loss of potential economic opportunities;
- ii) Loss of potential revenues from energy and mining developments
- iii) Loss of other benefits associated with development IIBAs (scholarship funds, community facilities, etc.)

**Other considerations**

**Consultation with Inuit**

The earlier discussion of organizations and key documents related to management of the study area illustrate the most important single point for consideration: Inuit must be involved in and support any initiative to create a protected area (as per Articles 8, 9, 15, 16, 32, and others sections of the NLCA and other key agreements). These policy documents and organizations provide a clear legal foundation and process for land use. Any initiative for special management of the LIA must, in order to win Inuit, territorial and federal support, be an initiative of Inuit in the communities and Inuit regional organizations, and follow the established channels set up under the Agreement, particularly those relating to land-use planning.

**Options for special management of the LIA**

The establishment of a protected area would not necessarily provide absolute protection. For example, if such an area is established through LUP process, a new conservation area is to provide "interim protection", and under the Conservation Areas IIBA, any requests for access across a wildlife area must be considered.

The establishment of special management through international cooperation between Canada and Greenland/Denmark might provide a higher profile and possibly increased certainty of protection.

We must emphasize, however, that whether done only for Canada, or through international cooperation, any such initiative must obtain the support of affected Inuit communities and organizations to proceed, and must work through the channels established under the NLCA.