

## **Beyond the bad news of Indigenous water: Indigenous water capacity initiatives**

### ***1. Introduction***

Much has been written in the media, and by academics, of the ongoing problems of Indigenous water access in Canada. Rather than repeat these negative stories of ongoing boil water advisories, my issue paper will present recent good news examples around Indigenous water capacity building techniques and examples of recent funding initiatives. It is hoped these capacity project and programs will go a long way to improve the water management of Indigenous water systems.

Recent media reports and government actions have suggested to me, that there may be a possible shift occurring within the new federal Liberal government regarding Indigenous water issues. A public announcement happened a few weeks ago in remote Dryden, ON., regarding Indigenous water issues. Unfortunately, it received little public attention. The Minister of Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) was there and gave \$4 million in-person, to a experimental Indigenous training program, called the Safe Water Project (SWP), in Dryden, ON. The new funding was to recognize their important work of the collaborative SWP. In just one year, the Indigenous center was successful in lifting three of the five local community boil water advisories (BWA). This success of this initiative got the ear of Ottawa and the Minister of INAC and government wanted to showcase this support and now expand this model and services to others. So far, 19 other FN's are interested in this new approach to capacity building opportunity (CBC(a), 2016). This is fantastic news and its stories like these that make me believe some progress can be made. Other encouraging signs is from the rhetoric coming from the Minister of INAC. In all my years of government, I have not heard a Minister publicly make comments such as: 'Money alone won't fix the problem'; 'Admit the issue of aboriginal water has been under funded for many years'; 'We need to close the gap in First Nations health'; 'We need to build human capacity and institutions, not programs'; 'We need to empower First Nations to be self-sufficient in these issues'; 'We'll get there, in fixing this first nations water problem' (INAC1, 2016): (INAC2, 2016): (INAC3, 2016). If there is new interest building capacity for individuals and institutions, then, any such initiatives need to have good base line information on capacity, from which to measure any progress and to give a starting point.

Intuitively, broad-based capacity development initiatives can only be a good initiative to help improve water governance. However, in developing training programs, there has been little attention paid to what is exactly the capacity gap? how was it determined? what exactly needs to be improved or strengthened? Is the capacity development initiative even relevant? Defining broad-based capacity strengths and weaknesses of a water system is important as it provides a starting point to improve (Graham, 2006). This water issues paper asserts that before aboriginal capacity development can begin; a baseline assessment is required to guide the capacity building programing. From the literature, an aboriginal capacity determination tool was found. This paper evaluates these recent tools in determining capacity baseline from 2 case studies. A simple model for closing the known capacity gap is also presented. A discussion of the funding and the

case for capacity is also made. Recommendations to government for suggested improvement in First Nation water management are finally offered.

## ***2. Capacity Development Initiative***

### **2A. Safe Water Project, Dryden, ON**

The backstory of the good news announcement that came from Dryden, Ontario, where about an experimental Indigenous training project, created in early 2015, by the Chiefs of five local First Nations, lead by the Keewaytinook Okimakanak Nation. The pilot project was aimed around management of drinking water and wastewater treatment systems was called the Safe Water Project. The project was started because all five communities had Boil Water Advisories imposed on them. The Chiefs took it upon themselves and eventually pressured the government to give them a chance in resolving the problem. The “Centre of Excellence” and Safe Water Project wer develop using an Indigenous approaches to training and mentoring, aimed at local students and the public (Marchand, 2016). Because the center was Indigenous lead, local people were more interested in being engaged and with that came more responsibility (Rodriguese, 2016). The training program also prepares operators for writing the certification exam and the use in remote monitoring. Previously, there was never any First Nation empowerment with regards to their own water and waste water systems. Too often, the federal government hires a far removed engineering consultant to design and build over-engineered infrastructure and then do not empower the personnel to undertake maintenance, thus no motivation to be engaged or a sense of ownership. The Centre of Excellence also helps students their grade 12 GED, which is the minimum education needed to be an water operator. By having First Nation people earning a skill and increasing their self confidence, in addition to a strong sense of belonging is a benchmark of success. Quentin Rae, a 19-year-old, from North Spirit Lake First Nation exemplified the unique goals and objective of this training center. He is one of the important front line personnel needed to solve their long standing BWA. With support the Safe Water Project he was able to graduate from high school with his GED. The SWP further supported him to become a certified water operator. He is now operating the water treatment plant, with a remote alarm back up (CBC (2), 2016).

### **2B. H2O CREATE, Winnipeg, MB**

Another interesting development was the partnership initiative coming from the University of Manitoba, called H2O CREATE. It was stated in 2013 and was the first academic program focused entirely in First Nations water and sanitation security, combining culture, science and engineering research training. The program was also developed to address the longstanding lack of accessible to safe drinking water within First Nations communities. The \$ 3 million partnership was between the U of Manitoba, Trent University and Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) over 6 years (Rodriguese, 2016).

## 2C. Technical Services Advisory Group, Edmonton, AB

Another successful capacity building initiative is from Alberta, with a group called Technical Services Advisory Group (TSAG). It is a not-for-profit Indigenous training and mentoring organization created by the Chiefs of Alberta. They provide technical support and capacity building to Alberta First Nations. TSAG's goals are to empower community and administrations to gain the confidence and assist First Nations gain appropriate tools and knowledge to help communities improve management around water safety, wastewater treatment and environmental management. TSAG offers numerous services in: water infrastructure asset management and inspections, they also provide training and support to drinking water and wastewater system operators via the Circuit Rider Training Program (TSAG, 2016).

## 2D. INAC Supported Nation Circuit Riders Training Program, Ottawa, ON

Trained and certified operators are extremely important in reducing overall risk and helping to ensure safe drinking water in First Nation communities. Operators are required to be certified through most Provincial regulations. The federal government spends over \$10 million per year into a unique national training program (Mitchell, 2012). To help mentor First Nation' directly, INAC established the *Circuit Riders Training Program* (CRTP) which is a capacity building initiative that provides training and mentoring services to aboriginal water operators of drinking water and wastewater systems (INAC, 2016). The CRTP supports First Nations in developing and retaining the capacity to operate and maintain water and wastewater systems. Qualified water utility professionals, usually non-aboriginal, are retained across Canada, and rotate through a regular circuit of First Nation communities, training the operators in the many technical and reporting requirements (Mitchell, 2012). These water experts are called 'Circuit Rider Trainers' whose roles are to mentor First Nation operators and provide general technical support to perform various functions such as obtaining and maintaining their required certification, increasing the reliability of their systems, ensuring efficient operations and maintenance, confirming standards for health and safety are met, and reducing the number of boil water advisories (CRTPA, 2016). The CRTP offers 24-hour access in case of emergencies. The CRTP is available for every First Nation community with a drinking water system or wastewater system at no expense. The benefits of the CRTP are numerous; for the federal government, the CRTP helps maintain the assets of which the government has invested billions. In addition, the program reduces maintenance costs, ensures minimal interruption of services, helps to retain operators thus reducing turnover, and promotes higher operator self-confidence, self-esteem and leadership skills (INAC 7, 2011). Every Province and Territory has their own regional version of a Circuit Rider Training program with all funding coming the federal government. No data could be found to indicate if this training program is quantifiably improving the capacity of water operators

### 3. *Funding Resources*

#### 3A. First Nations Water and Wastewater Action Plan

The federal government is investing significant money on this issue. Already budgeted is \$2.3 billion for this fiscal year (Table 1) and for the next 2 years. Also, 22 new positions and another 44 over the next 2 years. All in the hopes of having 54 % of the water systems ranked

low risk. And 65% for wastewater (INAC5, 2016). Of the 720 or so water systems, this is a shocking percentage indicator for achievement.

**Table 1. INAC resources commitments for First Nation's water and wastewater systems between 2016 to 2019, to achieve given objectives.**

	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
<b>Budget (\$ Billion)</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>2.3</b>
<b>Human Resources</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Results</b>			<b>54%</b> of all water systems to be <b>low risk</b>
			<b>65%</b> of all wastewater also low

The funding comes from the First Nations Water and Wastewater Action Plan, which is the national program that provides most of the funding required for the plan, design, construct, operate and maintain water and wastewater systems. It also provides funding to: coordinate training and capacity building for activities related to the operation and maintenance of these systems (INAC 8, 2011). The goal is to support First Nations in meeting health and safety standards and provide on-reserve residents with service levels comparable to those off reserve. The First Nation administrations must identify priorities and needs and then present proposals to INAC seeking funding support. However, government funding is often only provided for projects based on a priority assessment (INAC 8, 2011).

### 3B. Risk Ranking Criteria

The low to high risk ranking determinations for the First Nation water and wastewater systems on most reserves across Canada are determined annually. These annual inspections produce a risk rating between 1 and 10, describing the likelihood that the system may produce unsafe water under adverse conditions. Ratings are based on five weighted criteria components. Any system scoring higher than 7 is deemed high risk. The criteria are: quality and quantity of source water (10 %); system design (30 %); operation and maintenance (30 %); record keeping and reporting (10 %); operators' training and certification (20%) (INAC 7, 2011).

## 4. Capacity Assessment

### 4A. Defining Capacity

Switching gear from the examples of the above good news, the issue of defining capacity for baseline info needs to be established. Defining the strengths and weaknesses of a water management system is very important, it provides a starting point to improve and plan. But, what does that look like? How is it determined? What areas need to be strengthened? Is the training program chosen even relevant? This paper asserts that before aboriginal capacity development can begin, a proper baseline capacity assessment is required, to guide the intended capacity

building programming. The literature reveals two analytical frameworks around the dimensions of capacity capability and were used in determining capacity baselines.

#### 4B. Definition

The commonly accepted UNDP definition of capacity building is used: “*Capacity is the ability of an individual, organization and society to perform functions, solve problems, set and achieve goals. It entails the sustainable creation, utilization and retention of that capacity in order to reduce poverty, enhance self-reliance and improve people’s lives.*” Note: capacity building also means different things to different people in a different context. Not all approaches are applicable, pre-conditions are required and there are always constraints (UNDP, 2016).

### 5.0 Analytical Framework

From the literature two case studies in aboriginal capacity analytical frameworks were found and expanded upon here within.

#### 5.1. Case Study 1, Montreal Lake First Nation, Saskatchewan

Lebel and Reed (2010), established the first analytical framework for assessing the capacity of an aboriginal community and their ability to provide potable water to its customers. The case study was completed in the relatively remote aboriginal reserve of Montreal Lake, Saskatchewan. The reserve population was 1,877 members with a large percentage of youth. The community was of low economic income resulting from the decline of forestry and fishing activity. There were two small drinking water systems using the surface water of Montreal lake. A majority of the community was connected to a piped water system within the community, while the remaining customers outside the community were on trucked water service.

The Lebel framework investigated five primary dimensions of capacity building (Financial, Human Resources, Institutional, Socio-politico and Technical) and used 38 indicators to assess the variation of capacity associated with management of the water systems. Qualitative data was obtained through standardized question interviews and workshops in the community and document analysis, over one year. A rating table (Fig 1.) was created listing the indicators and then rated the capacity ‘ability’ and ‘presence’ as either positive or negative or partially. The authors gave a caveat that the scope of the study had been narrowed, by leaving out aboriginal traditional belief systems, attitudes, knowledge and issues of aboriginal rights and title

Indicator	Rating			
	Capacity Absent		Capacity Present	
<b>Legend</b>				
(-) indicator does not meet standard	-	+/-	+	->*
(+/-) indicator partially meets standard				
(+) indicator meets standard				
(->) indicator meets standard and is expected to in the future				
<b>Financial Capacity</b>				
Funding is available for operation and maintenance				*
Funding is sufficient for operation and maintenance				*
Funding is available for infrastructure and water system projects				*
Funding for water system is stable				*
Funds are generated within the community	*			
Funds are generated outside the community				*
Water rates for customers reflect the cost of providing drinking water (treatment, distribution, maintenance)	*			
Funding surpluses are saved for future water system requirements		*		

Fig 1. Example of rating tables, Montreal Lake First Nation, Saskatchewan

The results of framework analysis (Fig 2) indicated that the trucked water distribution system was the highest risk (weakest link) in the entire system. The water was at risk of contamination from improper handling procedures and poor communication between internal departments. In addition, the storage tanks in private residences were not being routine cleaned or sampled for water quality analysis.

Dimension	Total Indicators	Capacity		Ratio of Capacity Present to Total Indicators
		Present	Absent	
Financial Capacity	8	5	3	5/8
Human Resources Capacity	7	6	1	6/7
Institutional Capacity	7	4	3	4/7
Social/Political Capacity	7	3	4	3/7
Technical Capacity (Piped Distribution System)	9	7	2	7/9
Technical Capacity (Truck Haul System)	9	4	5	4/9
Total (Piped Distribution System)	38	25	13	25/38
Total (Truck Haul System)	38	22	15	22/38

Fig. 2. Summary of Results, Analytical Framework for Capacity-building. Montreal Lake First Nation, Sk. (Lebel and Reed, 2010).

## 5B. Case Study #2, Two First Nations in Quebec

Rizvi & Adamowski (2013) also developed and carried out a similar case study using an analytical framework to assess the capacity of 2 First Nations in Quebec, to implement IWRM. The First Nation communities were, Kitigan Zibi, 130 km of North of Gatineau, and Kahnawa:ke, 10 km south of Montreal. The framework assessed similar key dimensions of capacity building, found in the 2010 Label and Reed study, but added two indicators, “Actor Network” and “Information Management”. Their assessment used 79 indicators around the six dimension, that were taken from literature associated with accepted norms for drinking water management. The methods of qualitative data collection were through structured interviews and workshops from the selected stakeholders, who’s responses were recorded as either ‘yes’ or ‘no’, as shown in Figure 3. Each of the six dimensions of capacity had an individual table completed as in the example.

<i>Elements of capacity</i>	<i>Capacity met</i>							
	<i>Kitigan Zibi</i>				<i>Kahnawà:ke</i>			
	<i>No</i>	<i>In part</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes+future</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>In part</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes+future</i>
<i>Cross-Sectoral Cooperation</i>								
• Partnerships with different communities & stakeholders	•						•	
• Conflicts with other parties (communities, stakeholders) dealt with constructively, resulting in inclusive agreements to which the parties are committed	•					•		
• Use of cross-sectoral analysis to identify emergent problems and for policy implementation	•					•		

Fig. 3. Example of analytical framework rating tables, First Nations of Kitigan Zibi and Kahnawa:ke, Quebec (Rizvi & Adamowski (2013).

The results of this framework assessment (Fig. 4) revealed that overall, both aboriginal communities had only ‘moderate’ capacity to deliver potable water, with Kahnawa:ke – 48% and Kitigan Zibi – 43% capacity respectively. The research pointed to a lack of financial funding, both in terms of receiving from the federal government and in the ability to generate income. The lack of finances negatively impacted on the other dimensions of capacity. In this study, the dimension of ‘actor network’ scored very low, indicating a lack of social linkages with community, institutions and partnerships. Once the capacity weakness has been identified using this analytical framework method, it is possible to begin a strategy for resolving the capacity problem.

**Table 1** Summary of capacity results for Kitigan Zibi and Kahnawà:ke First Nations

<i>Capacity type</i>	<i>Total indices</i>	<i>Capacity indicators (Present:total)</i>	
		<i>Kitigan Zibi</i>	<i>Kahnawà:ke</i>
Actor network	18	2:18	6:18
Information management	10	4:6	4:6
Human resources	4	2:4	3:4
Technical	26	14:26	12:26
Financial	12	4:12	3:12
Institutional	9	6:9	8:9

**Fig. 4.** Summary of analytical framework results, First Nations of Kitigan Zibi and Kahnawà:ke, Quebec (Rizvi & Adamowski (2013)).

## 6.0 *Closing the capacity gap: Institute of Governance*

### 6.1 Questioning Model

The Institute on Governance, a Canadian non-profit think tank, developed a simple and broad-based model that fits well for this paper, as it is a method that can be used to close to identified gap(s). The model recognized that capacity building needs be expanded wide within a targeted system. The capacity development model is aimed at individuals, organizations and societal systems, as all three of these targets need to be supported in capacity building initiatives. The simple model presents: Where do we want to be?, for capacity capability? Where are we now? From those responses, it's possible to then Identity the Gap, in capacity. Then the next question is How do we get there? (what are the strategies, priorities and techniques?) and finally, How to stay there? (achieving sustainability) (Graham, 2006). Once capacity is defined, the implementation and monitoring of the plan can begin. By targeting the three levels for building capacity; individuals, organizations and societal systems, the process becomes robust, integrated and there is likely a more improved process.

## 7.0 *Discussion:*

From the literature and the evaluation of the case studies, points of discussion are presented. As the Federal government has a fiduciary responsibility to First Nations, while at the same time First Nation governments own and operate their own community drinking water systems, there can be misunderstandings over the roles and responsibilities. The government exerts significant influence over the First Nation administrations, especially over funding allowance, approvals, and engineering oversight for infrastructure designs. This overlap may be contributing to additional problems because too much government meddling into a communities'

water management can backfire when trying to build capacity because there is no incentive by the community to take on the required responsibilities, nor to build leadership within.

An example of the need for leadership for capacity development was highlighted from Biswas (1996), who argued that too much finger pointing of blame went to institutions for not developing capacity building opportunities for improved water management. Instead of blaming institutions for performing badly for not building capacity in water management, Biswas stated, that it was more likely to be because the wrong people were positions of leadership and influence. He suggested, that even the best policies and available funding can be managed badly by the wrong people. However, by having the right people with the right qualities in decision-making positions, those with leadership skills, motivation, vision, strategic thinkers and risk takers, almost any initiative can be implemented. In addition, Biswas asserted that many capacity building initiatives in water fail to establish a good baseline understanding of the client's level of knowledge and skills, which then runs the risk of developing programing that is not relevant to the audience (Biswas, 1996).

The two analytical framework presented here were compared and several differences noted. The 2010 Lebel framework focused on only one remote aboriginal community that had two water systems. The intent of the study was to assess the availability of capacity in the First Nation, to deliver potable water to the community. The framework used five dimensions of capacity to assess 38 narrow indicators, without any aboriginal context. So already, there was a weakness in the method, but nonetheless it remains a good framework for revealing weakness in the systems and ideal for a baseline method for future studies. The Lebel approach also effectively highlighted how multidimensional capacity development can be.

The other framework by Rizvi & Adamowski 2013, was applied three years later on two very different aboriginal communities. The Rizvi framework was developed and applied to assess capacity on the ability to implement integrated water resource management, thus making this framework evaluation significantly more robust. The framework used 6 dimensions of capacity, with 79 indicators (twice as many as Lebel). The indicators included an aboriginal context within the questions. Of the 6 dimensions used there were two new categories, namely the dimensions of "Actor Linkage" and "Information Management". Actor networks are valuable agencies for the First Nation community and their participation needs to be encouraged. Such networks are important venues for collaboration, leadership, communication, cooperation, relationship building among other like-minded people.

The simple model offered by the Institute of Governance can then be applied as a guiding method to strategically identify the capacity gap and begin work to resolve it. The use of the broad-based tripartite approach for individuals, organizations and societal systems is key to prevent capacity development occurring in a vacuum. Further, targeting individuals for capacity building is certainly critical to enhance their skills, knowledge and values related to water management. At this level, there are opportunities to ensure that training is relevant and appropriate, meaning, there should recognition that aboriginal people learn differently and holistically, using the heart, spirit, body and the mind, thus all efforts to accommodate this fact should be made to improve comprehension and retention of the training messages and processes. Examples include: Experiential learning techniques focusing on hands-on experimentation, collaboration opportunities and encouraging leadership skills. Training individuals is relevantly inexpensive, measurable and short. However, capacity development cannot be limited to just the individual. The organization also needs attention to help establish institutional strength for its

visions, goals, policy, roles and responsibilities. Examples include support for certification bodies, associations, conferences and workshops. Targeting at this level is more expensive and more of a risk. Not everyone may buy into the plan for improvement. Beyond the organization, civil society and governments also need support, yet more challenging to achieve and may well represent the weak link of the tripartite approach. At this higher level, it is key to have skilled people and leaders. Examples of capacity development can include partnerships, treaties, conventions and regulations. Such initiatives are expensive, high risk and heavily influenced by political decisions.

## 8.0 *Recommendations for Federal Government*

Based on the findings of this paper, it's clear to the author, that the federal government needs to dramatically improve its efforts in building stronger relationships with First Nations across Canada. This includes creating spaces for dialogue, collaboration and understanding as this would go a long way. There is a strong need for long term funding formulas so that First Nations can be engaged in longer term strategic planning. This funding should not be dedicated just for large and often over-engineered water infrastructure project, but into soft path programs that funds the development of improving the skills, knowledge and values of frontline water operators, managers and the institutions that support them. However, before this training begins, an initial capacity assessment for First Nation administrations is required to structure the approach of the training program. Additionally, the government needs to encourage individuals to participate in professional associations, and net-working opportunities, partnerships, team building, rewards and recognition initiatives and seek out culturally appropriate tools for learning, with examples being, experiential education approaches, collaboration and mentoring. Another recommendation would be to support the establishment of aboriginal watershed councils.

Another recommendation to government is the need to establish a single federal department that deals with all the important issues around water and First Nations communities. This consolidation approach may help to avoid confusions, better streamline operations, improve communications and have less bureaucratic burden on First Nations. A one stop window approach could greatly streamline operations and relations and perhaps even improve the effectiveness of government and First Nation administrations.

## 9.0 *Conclusion*

Beyond the bad news around Indigenous water access issues, this paper highlighted a sampling of good news initiatives and asserted that to help solve Indigenous water crisis the government needs to invest in appropriate human and institution capacity, and not just building infrastructure. As this paper revealed, going forward, capacity building programs cannot occur in isolation, both individuals and institutions need support that is based on the results of crucial initial baseline assessments, of which two models were presented. Without improved capacity building of aboriginal operators, administrations and institutions, water systems can become higher risk of problems. There is clearly still a long way to go to improve access to safe water for First Nations. The tools, methods and technology to get there all exist, there now needs to be

leadership, vision and political will from the federal government...and maybe this is starting to unfold?

## References

- Biswas, A. (1996). Capacity Building for Water Management: Some Personal Thoughts. *International Journal of Water Resources Development*, 12(4), 399-405. Retrieved 09 30, 2016
- CBC (2). (2016, 05 16). *First Nations teen solves remote community's drinking water problems*. . Retrieved from CBC Online News: <http://cbc.ca/beta/news/canada/thunder-bay/teen-first-nation-drinking-water-1.3563110>
- CBC(a). (2016, 10 13). *Safe drinking water on First Nations gets \$4M boost from federal government*. Retrieved from CBC Online News: <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/thunder-bay/safe-water-project-1.3803856>
- CRTPA. (2016, 09 12). *Who we are*. Retrieved from Circuit Rider Training Program Association : <http://www.crtpa.com/information.html>
- Graham, J. (2006). Building Governane Capacity: The Case of Potable Water in First Nations Communities. *Aboriginal Policy Research Conference* (p. 14). Ottawa: Institute on Governance .
- INAC 6. (2015, 11 30). *Details of Circuit Rider Training Program* . Retrieved from Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada's: <http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1313424571273/1313424692733>
- INAC 7. (2011, 05 11). *Fact Sheet - Risk Assessment of Water and Wastewater Systems in First Nations Communities*. Retrieved from Indigenous Affairs and Northern Development Canada: <http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1313687144247/1313687434335>
- INAC 8. (2011, 12 19). *First Nations Water and Wastewater Action Plan*. Retrieved from Overview of Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada: <https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1313426171775/1313426357946>
- INAC1. (2016, 09 23). *Government of Canada Invests in a Drinking Water Project at Kitigan Zibi and Works with the Community to Expand the Reserve*. Retrieved from News Release - Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada : <http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?nid=1129219&tp=1>
- INAC2. (2016, 10 13). *Canada Invests \$4 million to expand the Safe Water Project in Northwestern Ontario First Nation Communities*. Retrieved from News Release: Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada: <http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?nid=1137249&tp=1>
- INAC3. (2016, 09 16). *Statement by Minister Carolyn Bennett - Government of Canada Steadfast in Commitment to End Long-Term Drinking Water Advisories On Reserve*. Retrieved from News Release: Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada: <http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?nid=1124109&tp=980>

- INAC5. (2016, 05 16). *2016–17 Report on Plans and Priorities*. Retrieved from Strategic Funding: Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada: <http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1453826795178/1453826845637>
- Marchand, C. (2016, 10 19). *KO's Safe Water Project praised as bottom-up solution*. Retrieved from Keewaytinook Okimakanak First Nations: <http://safe-water-project.ca/>
- Mitchell. (2012, 05 06). *Conference Presentation: First Nation water and wastewater infrastructure, Ottawa, 2012*. Retrieved from Indian and Northern Affairs Canada: [http://www.afn.ca/uploads/files/water\\_conference/gailmitchell.pdf](http://www.afn.ca/uploads/files/water_conference/gailmitchell.pdf)
- Reed, P. L. (2010). The Capacity of Montreal Lake, Saskatchewan to Provide Safe Drinking Water. *Canadian Water Resources Journal*, 35(3), 317-338.
- Rizvi, J. A. (2013, January). First Nation Capacity in Quebec to practice integrated water resource management. *International Journal of Water*, 7(3), 162-190. Retrieved January 28, 2016
- Rodriguese, A. (2016, 11 02). *CREATE H2O, First Nations solutions to First Nations issues*. Retrieved from The Manitoban November 2, 2016.: <http://www.themanitoban.com/2013/09/create-h2o/16071/>
- TSAG. (2016, 09 13). *Who we are*. Retrieved from Technical Services Advisory Group: <http://www.tsag.net/>
- UNDP. (2016, 10 06). *Capacity Development Practice Note*. Retrieved from United Nations Development Program: [http://unpcdc.org/media/8651/pn\\_capacity\\_development.pdf](http://unpcdc.org/media/8651/pn_capacity_development.pdf)
- United Nations Development Program. (2008, October 28). *Capacity Development Practice Note*. Retrieved October 6, 2016, from [http://unpcdc.org/media/8651/pn\\_capacity\\_development.pdf](http://unpcdc.org/media/8651/pn_capacity_development.pdf)