

**Conference of Management Authorities (CMA)**  
**Meeting Minutes, May 15-16, 2018**  
**Yellowknife, NWT Nunasi Conference Services, Genesis Room**

Attendees	Organization
Jody Pelissey, Chairperson	Wek'èezhì Renewable Resources Board
Margo Fleming	Acho Dene Koe First Nation
Leslie Wakelyn	Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board
Isabel Duclos	Environment and Climate Change Canada
Fred J. Mandeville	Environment and Natural Resources (day 2 only)
James Hodson	Environment and Natural Resources (guest presenter)
Joanna Wilson	Environment and Natural Resources
Norman Snowshoe	Environment and Natural Resources
Eugene Pascal	Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board
Kaytlin Cooper	Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board
Sam Bullock	Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board
Henry Tambour	Kátł'odeeche First Nation (portion of day 2 only)
Melissa McLellan	North Slave Métis Alliance
Nicole Goodman	North Slave Métis Alliance (day 2 only)
Shin Shiga	North Slave Métis Alliance (day 1 only)
Deb Simmons	Sahtú Renewable Resources Board
Leon Andrew	Sahtú Renewable Resources Board
Jessica Hum	Tł'chǫ Government (day 1 only)
Jolene Husky	Tł'chǫ Government
Sean Richardson	Tł'chǫ Government
Aimee Guile	Wek'èezhì Renewable Resources Board
Laura Meinert	Wek'èezhì Renewable Resources Board
Allison Thompson	Wildlife Management Advisory Council (NWT)
Rob Gau	Wildlife Management Advisory Council (NWT)
Claire Singer	Species at Risk Implementation Supervisor
Michele Grabke	Species at Risk Implementation Specialist

1. Introductions – *led by Jody Pelissey (Chairperson)*  
*Round table introductions.*
2. Agenda – *led by Jody Pelissey (Chairperson)*  
*Review of agenda.*
3. Minutes – *led by Jody Pelissey (Chairperson)*  
*Review and approval of draft minutes from February 20-22, 2018 meeting.*

February 20-22, 2018 meeting minutes approved with edits discussed.

4. Action items since last meeting – *led by Claire Singer (Secretariat)*  
*Review of outstanding action items.*

#A2018022101 (GNWT to circulate summary of existing monitoring work for grizzly bears in the Sahtú region to CMA members) – Bring forward. ENR will circulate this material in June.

5. Decisions made since last meeting – *led by Claire Singer (Secretariat)*  
*Review decisions made by email since last meeting and write them into the minutes.*

**Decision #D2018051501: Decision not to add grizzly bears to the NWT List of Species at Risk.**

**Decision #D2018051502: Consensus agreement respecting implementation of the ISR Polar Bear Joint Management Plan and Framework for Action signed and submitted to the Minister of ENR.**

6. Letters sent and received since last meeting – *led by Claire Singer (Secretariat)*  
*Review of letters sent and received since the last meeting.*

One letter received since last meeting. This letter is addressed in more detail under agenda item #10.

7. Updates – *led by Jody Pelissey (Chairperson)*  
*Updates from Management Authorities and participating organizations.*

Government of Canada

- Boreal caribou – Last month, ECCC released its assessment of critical habitat protection. The assessment determined that all provinces and territories have gaps in their protection. In that context, Canada is developing conservation agreements with provinces/territories that will contain commitments to range planning and protection measures. In the NWT, these discussions are occurring with the GNWT. The next report on critical habitat protection will be published this fall.
- Barren-ground caribou – Community consultations have already been completed in the NWT and Nunavut with respect to the proposed federal listing. The other consultations are scheduled to take place this summer and fall.
  - There was concern expressed that some communities in the NWT and Nunavut (e.g., Kivalliq region), in which ECCC has already presented, may be unsure about the expectations ECCC has of them in terms of submitting comments/feedback on the proposed listing. These communities may want to see additional consultation efforts by ECCC. Follow-up may be required.
- ECCC is working through their processes for a number of proposed species listings.
- The AFSAR (Aboriginal Fund for Species at Risk) application period has closed and ECCC is currently reviewing the applications that were received.

**Environment and Natural Resources**

- The joint federal/territorial NWT Species at Risk booklet was published. ECCC is handling the mail-out.
- Wood bison – The Mackenzie population management plan has been finalized and published. The Slave River Lowlands population management plan is drafted and is moving through internal processes. Consultation and engagement should begin in the near future for that plan. The draft Nahanni population management plan will also soon be ready for consultation and engagement.
- Barren-ground caribou – This is a survey year for a number of the NWT's barren-ground caribou herds.
- Grizzly bears – Regarding DNA work in the Mackenzie Mountains – the genetics information has been received from the genetics lab. Some analysis is still required. ENR has committed to present the results in Tulit'a. No new fieldwork is planned for this coming summer.

**Tł'cho Government**

- Submitted their 'actions to prepare for consensus agreement' for the wood bison recovery strategy. Have been looking forward to consultation/engagement on the recovery strategy this fall.
- Boreal caribou range planning – Preparing to attend one of the webinars on the boreal caribou range planning framework.
- Boreal caribou section 11 agreement – Sent a letter to ECCC and had a follow-up conference call with them in response to ECCC's January letter. Looking forward to reviewing the intentions documents that the GNWT will be releasing and looking forward to participating in the development of their own section 11 agreement.

**Wildlife Management Advisory Council (NWT)**

- Council meeting was in late February. At this meeting, the Council re-affirmed its positions on the potential listing of barren-ground caribou and grizzly bear.
- Members have attended CARMA (CircumArctic Rangifer Monitoring and Assessment Network), PPISC (Pests, Pathogens, and Invasive Species Symposium/Council), IFA (Inuvialuit Final Agreement) 101, and the North American Goose Conference.
- Polar bears – polar bear range state meeting, Polar Bear Technical Committee meeting, Polar Bear Advisory Committee meeting.
- Participated in ACCWM (Advisory Committee for Cooperation on Wildlife Management) action planning process for the Cape Bathurst, Bluenose-West, and Bluenose-East herds and in the communication and education working group.
- Still planning a Dolphin and Union caribou management planning meeting to kick off community-driven implementation actions but will be smaller and later in the year than originally anticipated.
- Next WMAC (NWT) meeting is in June in Tuktoyaktuk.

- Community conservation plans have been released.
- Met with the Tuktoyaktuk, Inuvik, and Aklavik HTCs to start planning for an eventual recovery strategy for the Tuktoyaktuk Peninsula and Cape Bathurst caribou herds and possibly protecting the calving grounds for those herds.

**Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board**

- Two new individuals have been appointed to the board (Charlie Snowshoe, reappointed, and Sam Bullock).
- Attended CARMA meeting, completed a number of reviews for the Wildlife Care Committee, attended the April 2018 SARC meeting, and completed work related to the federal SARA (Harris' sparrow and transverse lady beetle).
- Have been keeping up to date on the boreal caribou section 11 agreement and will be attending a boreal caribou range planning webinar.
- Have assisted in the development of federal management plans for collared pika and Bank swallow.
- Circulating NWT Species at Risk booklets and other resources such as GNWT identification books.
- Will be conducting further bat surveys this summer.
- Received Stewardship Program funding for two projects.
- Renewable Resource Manager is developing a species at risk course for schools (which will include the concept of species at risk, stewardship, a bat focus, and a field trip).
- Wildlife Biologist - Surveys – Dall's sheep (developing a monitoring program with remote cameras), barren-ground caribou, participated in muskoxen collaring in the winter (12 collared, 3 in the Gwich'in Settlement Area), looking into the feasibility of a bird identification workshop focusing on species at risk.
- Fisheries and Forestry Biologist - Has been doing a lot of work on Dolly Varden char, including surveys this summer. Rat River Working Group meeting as per normal schedule in early March; population numbers were close to last year's so kept the harvest allocations identical. Research planned this summer: final-scale exploration of stream temperature regimes, possibly more eDNA sampling (not confirmed yet), char harvest monitoring program and fall seine program (both DFO-led) as per usual. More satellite tags were placed on fish last fall seine and will 'pop off' this summer to give more identification of what habitats Dolly Varden are using when they're out in the Beaufort Sea. Also attended Pest, Pathogen, and Invasive Species Symposium Council.
- Continuing to work on muskrat research and push-up surveys.

**Sahtú Renewable Resources Board**

- Sent Colin MacDonald and George Barnaby to the CMA's February 2018 meeting. Grateful for their help and for transmitting the outcomes of the meeting back to the board. Had further discussions after that meeting regarding grizzly bears. The board submitted a response that supported the consensus and

revised their previous decision. That was an interesting learning process for the board.

- Participated in the PPISC Symposium in April. Looking forward to participating on the PPISC Council. Will be participating in the Canadian Parks Council's climate change workshop in June. Participated in a data tools workshop – how technologies for monitoring might bridge regional/indigenous initiatives and science/TK.
- Held a 'Living on the Land' forum, which included substantial discussion about boreal caribou. That discussion was very lively and helps prefigure the range planning work that needs to be done.
- The board has been devoting a lot of its time to developing a community conservation plan with 3 communities for mountain caribou (Norman Wells, Tulit'a, and Ross River). To support initiatives like that and their expansion to other communities, thrilled to announce a new Conservation Areas Planner, who will join the SRRB at the end of June (Kirsten Jensen).
- Have not been as involved in the ACCWM as the board would like to be.

**Wek'èezhìi Renewable Resources Board**

- Have been attending conferences – CARMA, PPISC, ACCWM (communication/education work), upcoming boreal caribou range planning framework webinar.
- Preparing for wood bison recovery strategy joint consultations (with the Tłı̨chǫ Government) in the fall.
- At the next board meeting, will be reviewing olive-sided flycatcher and common nighthawk, plus some proposed federal listings.
- Two new board members have been appointed and they are in the process of having a new Chair appointed, as Grant will be leaving in June. Also two new staff – Laura Meinert (Wildlife Management Biologist) and Aimee Guile (Conservation Biologist).
- Will be participating in the June barren-ground caribou photocensus surveys.
- The next board meeting will be June 19-20 in Gamètì.

**North Slave Métis Alliance**

- Applied for federal and territorial species at risk funding. Funding proposal to the Stewardship Program was successful. Still waiting to hear back regarding federal funding proposal. The Stewardship Program funding will be used to offer training on the use of eDNA technology using water samples. The federal funding would go towards testing soil-based eDNA testing.
- Part of the Bank swallow working group.
- Hadn't yet heard about the boreal caribou range planning framework webinar.
  - ENR committed to following-up about this.
- Will participate in June caribou surveys as well.

**Acho Dene Koe First Nation**

- Recently submitted a report to CIMP (Cumulative Impacts Monitoring Program) on boreal caribou work. This included information from TK interviews with ADKFN members as well as a literature review and a geospatial analysis. Although some herds of healthy boreal caribou exist in their territory, the study identified a number of threats as well.
- INAC (Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada) Community-based Indigenous Monitoring funding application submitted. The proposed work focuses on the effects of climate change on salmon in the Liard River basin (water quality monitoring, fish harvesting, and TK interviews).

**Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board**

- Have been trying to get some kind of harvest reporting system in place across the range, among jurisdictions. Have an educational campaign associated with this, including two poster/prose contests that ran in Nunavut in fall 2017, and in Manitoba and Saskatchewan in spring 2018. Received some Stewardship Program funding to offer this contest in the NWT as well, which will occur in fall 2018.
- Board met last week in Saskatchewan. The agenda included presentations from ENR and ECCC regarding barren-ground caribou (recovery and listing, respectively). The members want more community-by-community consultation. They noted that the ECCC presentations to Nunavut's Kivalliq region communities were from people they'd never seen before and that they didn't get suitable answers to their questions. This was seen to be in line with government's reputation (coming, leaving, and then calling that consultation). Regarding the territorial listing of barren-ground caribou, people thought there would be more consultation and some didn't realize that a listing decision had moved ahead. This could have important implications for recovery planning as that moves forward. The federal listing process could also impact the NWT's work on a recovery strategy.
  - It was noted by a meeting participant that it may be advisable for Management Authorities to distance themselves from the federal listing process for the time being to avoid confusion. Federal recovery planning is going to be 5+ years into the future. The CMA needs to focus on territorial processes for recovery and herd-specific management plans.
  - However, it may be harder for community members to separate these two processes and the reality is that ECCC is conducting consultation on the proposed listing this year, therefore raising questions in the communities that are relevant to both territorial and federal processes.
  - The most important question in communities is how the listing/recovery strategy will impact harvesting. A strategic approach to this might therefore need to be considered.
- Participated in the CARMA meeting and a number of environmental assessments.

- Protection of both caribou and habitat in calving grounds is still a really big priority for the board.

8. Stewardship Program – *led by Shin Shiga (Stewardship Sub-committee)*  
*2018-19 selected projects. Discussion of scope and intent of stewardship projects.*

The Stewardship Sub-committee summarized the successful 2018-19 applications. During their evaluation of projects, two questions arose that they wanted feedback from the CMA on.

First, the Sub-committee observed that there is no current mechanism for them to weight applications according to how well they meet the program objectives. The Sub-committee feels that a project meeting all four objectives should get a higher score than a project that meets just one objective. The CMA was supportive of this recommendation. The Sub-committee will make the necessary changes to the application form. It is not necessary to return to the CMA to further approve the wording.

**Decision #D2018051503: Consensus to support the Stewardship Sub-committee's recommendation to weight applications based on how well they meet the Stewardship Program's objectives.**

Action #A2018051501: Stewardship Sub-committee to amend application package to include weighting for how well an application meets the program objectives.

Second, one application, which was not approved for funding, included proposed activities that appeared to be within the scope of 'normal' implementation work under the *Species at Risk (NWT) Act*. Although the Sub-committee felt that the proposed work was important, they were concerned about setting precedent and the Stewardship Program becoming used largely for the implementation activities of Management Authorities. This decision has already been made, but the Sub-committee wanted to bring it to the CMA for discussion.

Through discussion, this appears to be a larger issue as many Management Authorities don't have core funding to cover their business under the *Species at Risk (NWT) Act*. Originally, when the Act was drafted, the intention was to be able to access additional funding through GNWT supplementary funding requests. However, this mechanism for accessing funding no longer exists. This a clear gap in the implementation of species at risk activities in the NWT.

In this context, how to resource implementation activities is an important conversation to have. What could a new funding formula look like? Should funding be solicited from the Government of Canada? Can partnerships be developed? How can implementation be strategized to match the available resources? Should all Management Authorities

contribute money to an 'implementation fund' that can be accessed for implementation activities?

For the larger strategic discussion, agreement to add this to the February 2019 meeting agenda. Regarding the Sub-committee's question, the Management Authorities will consider the issue with their boards and re-convene to discuss this via teleconference in the fall.

Action #A2018051502: Management Authorities to consider whether the scope of the Stewardship Program should include Management Authorities' species at risk implementation activities and come prepared to present their positions at a fall 2018 conference call.

9. Annual reports – *led by Jody Pellissey (Chairperson)*

*Review and approval of draft text for 2017-18 CMA annual report. 2017-18 Species at Risk (NWT) Act annual report from ENR.*

**Decision #D2018051504: Consensus to approve the CMA's 2017-18 annual report with edits discussed.**

ENR's 2017-18 Species at Risk (NWT) Act Annual Report was reviewed and accepted.

10. Submissions from SARC – *led by Jody Pellissey (Chairperson)*

*Proposed 2019-2023 assessment schedule.*

Discussed SARC's submitted 2019-2023 Species Assessment Schedule. SARC did not add any new species to the assessment schedule. However, through prioritization, SARC determined that a number of species had sufficiently high scores to be considered for inclusion on the assessment schedule. Rusty blackbird in particular was of concern because of negative trends and threats. In lieu of including them on the assessment schedule, SARC submitted a number of management recommendations, which, if undertaken, they feel could prevent those species from becoming at risk.

**Decision #D2018051505: Consensus to approve SARC's proposed 2019-2023 Species Assessment Schedule with no changes.**

Action #A2018051503: Secretariat to draft letter back to SARC approving the 2019-2023 Species Assessment Schedule and noting that Management Authorities will consider the recommended management actions.

The Secretariat requested clarification from the CMA regarding the addition of prioritized species to the assessment schedule in the future, given that a number of species were removed from the assessment schedule by the CMA last year, citing capacity concerns. The decision to remove species from the assessment schedule perhaps resulted in

some confusion or frustration from SARC. Clear direction back to SARC regarding expectations would therefore be helpful.

The CMA noted that they would like SARC to continue submitting proposed assessment schedules that include the species they feel should be assessed. The CMA may still need to make some decisions based on capacity considerations, but this shouldn't preclude SARC from recommending species for assessment. Regardless of capacity concerns, getting this advice is important. It would also be helpful for SARC to explain why they feel a species should be assessed when submitting a proposed assessment schedule.

11. SmartProsperity Institute report on species at risk – *led by Jody Pélissey (Chairperson)*  
*Discussion of recommendations for policy reform regarding species at risk.*

Review and discussion of SmartProsperity Institute's paper on the effectiveness of the federal *Species at Risk Act* (SARA) implementation. Despite the focus on SARA, many of the recommendations are relevant to provinces and territories as well, both in the implementation of their own species at risk legislation and in their responsibility to provide effective protection to federally-listed species. The paper, along with a summary completed by the Secretariat, was circulated to the CMA earlier this year.

Overall, the report authors raised a number of concerns with the effectiveness of SARA implementation and provided a number of recommendations for improvements. Highlights/recommendations of potential interest to the NWT included:

- Prioritize tools like section 11 agreements to facilitate cooperation and stewardship, followed by backstop protection measures like safety net orders and emergency protection orders in the case of provincial/territorial non-compliance.
- Recovery actions generally designed to mitigate indirect or direct sources of mortality (e.g., harvest, invasive species, pollution) are most likely to have detectable positive impacts on recovery. The effects of habitat-focused measures are currently difficult to detect; objectively evaluating their effectiveness will require substantially improved data collection.
- Protected areas are one of the main tools for protection of species at risk. Evidence suggests that protected areas have a limited role in species at risk recovery and that expansion won't be enough for recovery. Some weaknesses of this tool include: most protected areas are not primarily established for species at risk conservation purposes, habitat suitability in protected areas for species at risk is expected to decline over time, and most protected areas are too small for species at risk recovery.
- Look for opportunities to enhance the implementation of stewardship programs, including targeting funds towards higher priority species at risk, threats, or landscapes. This could include extending the length of grants to five years or longer, sharing data from recovery actions implemented through stewardship

programs, and prioritizing interventions that take an experimental or quasi-experimental approach.

- Data is crucial for informing management and recovery actions and evaluating their success. It's important to avoid spending time collecting data that's not ultimately useful and avoiding duplication.
  - Ensure that all of the key species at risk recovery players are measuring and gathering data in a consistent fashion.
  - Governments should ensure that partner organizations understand which kinds of data (and which means of collecting and encoding it) are most useful for policymakers.
  - All partners should consider adopting a comprehensive 'negative list'<sup>1</sup> approach for sharing species at risk data.
  - Make data available and accessible to the public (where appropriate).
- Complement project-scale impact assessments with regional impact assessments to pull in a more appropriate spatial and temporal scale for cumulative effects. These should be timely and efficient and not get bogged down in process.
- Regarding resourcing, part of the problem is the high share of resources devoted to 'front end' processes (listing and recovery strategies) compared to action planning and implementation (and evaluating their effectiveness).
  - Allocate the majority of additional revenues towards action plans and stewardship.
  - Work on developing reliable estimates of the costs of species at risk implementation in order to estimate the efficacy of spending.
  - Evaluate the effects of species-specific expenditures on species at risk recovery.
  - Consider new funding instruments (pay for success, tax increases, development cost charges, carbon pricing revenues, portion of resource royalties, deposit return schemes, hunting licenses, taxes on industrial inputs, etc.).
- Consider multi-species or ecosystem approaches to recovery where species share threats, share recommended recovery actions, and/or share habitat associations. Bundling assessments in the same manner would help facilitate this.

From this report, there are some questions that may be worth considering at the CMA table:

- Does the information and conclusions/recommendations in the report lead you to feel that changes in our approach to recovery strategies/management plans are required?

---

<sup>1</sup> negative list approach = making unencumbered data sharing the default, although parties would be free to identify specific types of data that they do not wish to share for confidentiality reasons, existing non-disclosure agreements, etc.

- Should the scope of the CMA's Stewardship Program be changed to address the stewardship-related recommendations noted in the report?
- As we look towards beginning the 5-year reviews of recovery strategies/management plans, how do we anticipate measuring or assessing their effectiveness?
- Are we devoting too much time/too many resources to front-end processes (assessment, listing, development of strategies/plans)? If so, how can we shift the emphasis of the NWT species at risk program to implementation and evaluation?

There was strong interest from participants in having a broader conversation about effective implementation in the NWT at next February's face-to-face meeting. If possible, this will be a facilitated discussion. Also, because the report is focused on the effective implementation of SARA, federal staff should be encouraged to attend and participate.

Action #A2018051504: All CMA members to review the SmartProsperity report, along with the questions noted in these minutes (above), with their boards/councils/leadership and come prepared to participate in a facilitated discussion on this topic at the February 2019 meeting.

The possibility of ecosystem-based approaches to recovery was also of particular interest, as was the importance of adequate resourcing for implementation. Realistically, the Secretariat has 1.8 staff, and ENR has one full-time species at risk biologist. The boards are also already at capacity. Brainstorming a path forward with this situation in mind would be beneficial.

Sharing the data and project reports produced through the Stewardship Program was also noted, although the Secretariat had some concerns with creating extra paperwork for what are typically very small projects. There was consensus to leave the publication of project reports to the discretion of the Sub-committee. This requirement could be targeted towards larger projects or projects that produce data about species at risk.

Action #A2018051505: Stewardship Sub-committee to consider the idea of making project reports/data publically available and present their decision to the CMA at the February 2019 meeting.

12. Guidelines and template for management plans and recovery strategies – *led by Joanna Wilson (ENR)*  
*Review and approval of revisions to guidelines and template.*

This is a bring forward item from an earlier CMA meeting. To increase flexibility in the development of recovery strategies and management plans, a number of changes needed to be made to the CMA guidelines and template for strategies/plans. At a high level, most of the revisions are to reflect what the CMA ended up doing in practice

(single species plans, multi-species plans, and inter-jurisdictional plans). It was important to make the template work on a case-by-case basis but still ensure that the required elements are included. The revised template allows for different options depending on the partners involved and the species in question. Quite a bit of information has been moved into the appendices, including processes and partners because people were finding that there was too much process-heavy text up front. Generally, there's some simplification to make things more concise and shorter. The threats calculator is now no longer the default, but can still be included. Some formatting changes include tabulated performance measures and a bulleted/tabulated framework for an easy-to-reference list. Identification of who's the lead is no longer part of the template since this has typically been dealt with during implementation. Some revisions have also been made to reduce repetition between sections. Ultimately, the aim was to make the guidelines and template shorter, simpler, and more flexible.

Action #A2018051506: CMA to review the draft revised guidelines/template for recovery strategies/management plans and return comments to Joanna Wilson by no later than May 31, 2018.

**Decision #D2018051506: Decision to approve, in principle, the revised recovery strategy/management plan guidelines and template.**

13. Wood bison recovery strategy – *led by Michele Grabke (Secretariat)*  
*Discussion of draft 2 of recovery strategy. Workplan review and confirmation.*

Secretariat walked the CMA through draft 2 of the wood bison recovery strategy. This included an overview of changes made since draft 1, and the opportunity to get some direction on outstanding questions and comments.

- The draft uses the terminology 'Aboriginal governments'. With that terminology shifting, suggestion to update this. Options include 'Indigenous governments' or 'Indigenous governments and organizations'.
  - Consensus to use 'Indigenous governments and organizations'.
- Should the term 'NWT residents' be changed to 'people in the NWT'?
  - 'NWT resident' was felt to be too strongly associated with 'resident hunter'. Where the text is meant to refer to everyone in the NWT (not just resident hunters), 'people in the NWT' should be used.
- There was a suggestion to change the photo on the cover page to one that includes a calf. Does anyone have preference?
  - No preference stated (photo can be changed).
- There was a suggestion include a summary of the approaches in the Executive Summary. The template indicates this is optional.
  - Consensus to include them and if this makes the Executive Summary too long, they can be removed later.
- The term 'community knowledge' is used. The other option is 'local knowledge'.

- Consensus to use the same terminology as used by SARC; that is, 'traditional and community knowledge'.
- Section 5 includes headings for bison/human conflicts and bison/vehicle conflicts. Suggestion to move to one heading (bison/human conflicts) with two subsections and one challenge statement.
  - Consensus to approve this proposed approach.
- Table 2 included approaches to conservation and recovery. There was a suggestion to remove the detailed actions column. The detailed actions appear in the herd-specific management plans, so this would reduce duplication.
  - Approval to remove the detailed actions column, but desire to indicate where those detailed actions can be found (cross-reference with herd-specific management plans).
- Earlier concerns were noted about the use of the term 'historic range' (with historic range defined as the last 5,000 years). 'Throughout their historic range' therefore replaced with 'throughout Canada'.
  - Suggestion to change 'throughout' to 'within' since it's unlikely that people want bison throughout Canada. However, this goal may be tied to the federal recovery strategy to mirror/match the wording there. The report preparer should therefore consider whether this wording should be retained.
- Concern that the new term 'broadly distributed' might not be sufficiently definable and may also not guard against population extirpation.
  - Suggestion to consider current distribution as a minimum to protect the populations, although wording would need to be carefully chosen in case there was a large population-level event outside of Management Authorities' control (e.g., anthrax).
- Objective 1 re: relationship between the Slave River Lowlands herds and Wood Buffalo National Park) – Rather than adding the explanatory terminology in the objective statement, suggestion to explain this close by. The relationship is important to explain, but perhaps not in the objective.
- Objective 2 re: socio-cultural acceptance and economic benefits – Suggestion to incorporate the idea of cultural benefits here too. Report preparer will work on the development of suitable replacement wording.
- Objective 3 re: removal of term 'genetically diverse' – For wood bison, genetic diversity is seen to be an important issue, over and above the diversity that may normally be associated with a healthy population. Further, it was noted that a productive population is not necessarily also genetically diverse. Consensus to retain 'genetically diverse' wording.
- Approach 3.1 was changed from 'Monitor disease levels in all populations' to 'Continue to manage the risk of disease transmission'. Another alternative is 'Monitor health in all populations'.
  - Consensus to combine the two approaches (disease transmission and monitoring health) so that nothing is lost.

The work plan has been shifted to accommodate an August-November 2018 consultation period on the proposed recovery strategy. Management Authorities should review the work plan to ensure that it suitably accommodates required board reviews.

**14. Boreal caribou update – *led by Joanna Wilson and James Hodson (ENR)***

*Update from ENR on recent activities respecting boreal caribou.*

ENR provided an update on work towards a section 11 SARA agreement for the protection of boreal caribou critical habitat in the NWT. Under SARA, the NWT is required to protect boreal caribou critical habitat, which is defined as at least 65% undisturbed habitat within their range. On April 30, 2018, the Government of Canada published their assessment for each jurisdiction of whether critical habitat is protected and where there are gaps. There are gaps identified in the NWT for critical habitat protection. The GNWT has raised some concerns with Canada about the things they feel were missing from the assessment. They are currently preparing a letter to this effect that will be shared with co-management partners.

Canada's critical habitat assessment report has to be redone every 180 days.

In terms of the negotiation of a section 11 agreement, the situation is the same as was described in a letter from the Minister of ENR to the renewable resource boards (RRBs) and Indigenous governments and organizations. The GNWT and Canada are working towards a draft intentions document that would address what could be included in a section 11 agreement. They will be sharing that intentions document with RRBs and Indigenous governments and organizations for input before anything is finalized. The GNWT's position remains the same; the agreement needs to reflect the work that we're all doing collaboratively.

Regarding the development of a boreal caribou range planning framework, letters from the Minister were circulated last week to initiate engagement. Moving forwards, two temporary working groups will be established to get input on the framework over the next 6 months or so. This would include 3 face-to-face meetings to review the document. One working group will be focused on the Dehcho/South Slave. The other working group will cover the settled claim areas, all the major land management organizations, non-claimant Indigenous governments and organizations, regulatory boards, and land use planning boards from those regions.

ENR is also planning 3 webinars to introduce the planned engagement process and get feedback. Each of the webinars is the same, they just represent multiple opportunities to participate, depending upon your schedule. These webinars are for the settled claim areas working group, and then ENR will follow-up with the Dehcho/South Slave working group to determine how to proceed. If you haven't received the webinar invitation, please let James Hodson know ([james.hodson@gov.nt.ca](mailto:james.hodson@gov.nt.ca)). There have been changes to the working group representatives, which means you may not have received the invitation.

ENR is also considering inviting some industry/non-governmental organization representatives (Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, NWT/NU Chamber of Mines, Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society), but that invitation will be pending the webinars in order to gauge people's support for having them there.

**15. Barren-ground caribou recovery strategy – *led by Michele Grabke (Secretariat)***  
*Discussion and direction regarding path forward for the development of a recovery strategy.*

Earlier in 2018, the GNWT's draft *Barren-ground Caribou Management Strategy* (CMS) was provided to the CMA for consideration as the potential basis for a recovery document/package for barren-ground caribou. The CMS could serve as an umbrella document, with herd-specific management plans underneath it. Herd-specific management plans could include the Bathurst herd management plan (draft), the Bathurst range plan (draft), the ACCWM's plan for the Cape Bathurst, Bluenose-West and Bluenose-East herds, and the BQCMB's plan for the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq herds.

The CMA was tasked with reviewing the draft CMS and coming prepared to discuss whether this could be adopted as part of a recovery strategy package for barren-ground caribou. Do you think this document can be re-purposed to be the basis of a recovery strategy? If so, what changes do you think are necessary to make this document work for the CMA?

Overall, members expressed concerns with the CMA using this document as part of a recovery strategy package. It was felt to be very government-centric with a strong science tone to it, which doesn't adequately balance science and traditional knowledge. The actions proposed in the draft CMS don't currently reflect traditional knowledge and experience. In this context, there was some preference to use only the herd-specific management plans. This would save time and would allow Management Authorities to focus their resources at a herd-relevant level. Participants felt fairly comfortable that a plan for the Tuktoyaktuk Peninsula herd could be finalized prior to the CMA's deadline. Likewise, the timeline on the Bathurst herd's management and range plans could be pushed forward. However, the Ahiak herd is still lacking a plan and there's no clear path forward for the development of one at this time, as the Ahiak herd is considered primarily a Nunavut herd and a plan likely couldn't be developed without involvement of Nunavut communities and organizations (including the Government of Nunavut, Nunavut Tunngavik Inc., the regional Inuit association and wildlife board, and relevant HTOs). An umbrella document could provide Ahiak-specific management actions for the NWT in the absence of a herd-specific plan, and could speak to the Tuktoyaktuk Peninsula and Bathurst herds while their plans are being developed.

Decision to support re-purposing of the CMS as part of a recovery strategy package. The report preparer will develop a work plan and start making the necessary revisions to the document. The emphasis should be on making it short, simple, to-the-point, and focused on herd-specific management, plus actions for the Ahiak herd (in lieu of a specific management plan for that herd).

Regarding the level of community engagement, this is meant to just pull together the various elements of barren-ground caribou management in the NWT, which have already been subject to a lot of community engagement. Therefore, the document should primarily be developed at the CMA table with consultation/engagement focused on this as a simple document that will be used to knit everything together.

Action #A2018051601: Secretariat to revise draft CMS for review by the CMA at their February 2019 meeting. The Secretariat will aim to circulate the revised draft in early January to provide sufficient time for review.

Action #A2018051602: Secretariat to develop work plan for development of a barren-ground caribou recovery strategy package and circulate to the CMA via email.

16. Bat management plan – *led by Michele Grabke (Secretariat)*

*Review draft workplan for development of a multi-species management plan for bats in the NWT.*

Discussion regarding the development of a multi-species bat management plan (for all 8 bat species in the NWT), identification of working group members, and review of work plan. This multi-species, working group-style approach is consistent with the approach used to develop the *Management Plan for Amphibians in the NWT*.

Consensus approval for this approach to the development of the management plan. The working group will be composed of: GNWT, Tłı̨chǫ Government, and WRRB. The SRRB, NSMA, and ADKFN have opted to review documents during formal review times but will not participate actively in their development. Given that bats have been reported but not yet confirmed in the Gwich'in Settlement Area, the GRRB will participate in the working group time permitting. Outside of the working group, opportunities for review will be provided to all CMA members and participants.

17. Dolphin and Union caribou – *led by Jody Pellissey (Chairperson)*

*Discussion regarding development of a consensus agreement respecting implementation of the management plan.*

Discussion about the development of a consensus agreement respecting implementation, which is due December 29, 2018. Funding wasn't approved for the original planned multi-party meeting, so this was a logistical discussion.

WMAC (NWT) will discuss this at their June Council meeting and return to the CMA with a recommend path forward. They have another Council meeting scheduled in September, so ideally they would have something ready to review at that time.

**18. Peary caribou – *led by Isabel Duclos (ECCC)***

*Update on progress towards a federal recovery strategy.*

The second jurisdictional review of the draft Peary caribou recovery strategy was completed last summer. At that time, ECCC also sent a copy of the draft to some rights-holding organizations (Inuvialuit Regional Corporation and Nunavut Tunngavik Inc.). ECCC is currently going through the comments and proceeding with their incorporation into a revised recovery strategy. They are also considering the implications of protecting critical habitat. Further engagement might be required depending upon those results, but it's unclear whether this piece will affect the overall timelines. Certainly though, the recovery strategy will not be going to the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board this June, as originally scheduled.

**19. Next meetings – *led by Jody Pellerin (Chairperson)***

*Confirmation of upcoming meeting dates.*

September 12, 2018 at 9am (conference call) – For discussion of the Stewardship Program (discussion points noted earlier in these minutes). Also an opportunity to provide updates on wood bison recovery strategy consultation and engagement.

February 19-21, 2019 (Inuvik face-to-face meeting) – 3 days to accommodate facilitated session. Secretariat will circulate schedulers.