**Single Infrastructure Authority – Cross-Walk of Existing Infrastructure Funding Programs**

**Context:** This document presents information on key features of the five programs that will form part of the Single Infrastructure Authority. It is intended to be an evergreen general resource for the purposes of supporting future analysis and discussion on specific areas that may need to be examined in further depth in order to move towards the implementation of this new authority. Feedback from future internal discussions and external engagement with rights holders will be captured separately (see [GCDocs #109057417](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=109057417)). If you have any comments on this document, have additional information to share, or would like to learn more/become involved in the ongoing work to harmonize policy and process under the single infrastructure authority please contact Xu Qian or Aviva Silburt.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Theme**  | **Capital Facilities and Maintenance Program (CFMP)** | **First Nations Infrastructure Fund (FNIF)** | **Health Facilities Program (HFP)** | **Solid waste management (under environmental protection elements of the Land and Economic Development Services Program [LEDSP])**\*Note: the First Nations Solid Waste Management Initiative (FNSWMI) appears to be the only program leveraging this program for Infrastructure-related costs. | **Community Opportunity Readiness Program (CORP) – economic infrastructure component** |
| **Objective & Scope** | Provides funding for the development and maintenance of capital infrastructure for First Nations communities on reserves. Off-reserve infrastructure projects are funded in cases of shared projects with municipalities or provinces. **Asset Types:** * Water & Wastewater
* Housing
* Schools
* Solid Waste
* Other Community Infrastructure (cultural and recreational facilities, band administrative buildings, fire protection, structural mitigation, connectivity, energy systems, roads and bridges, planning and skills development)

Section 5.1 of the CFMP provides authority to fund community infrastructure, which apply to First Nations, other eligible recipients, and off-reserve in cases of cost-shared projects with municipalities or provinces. For example, off reserve access roads to link a reserve community to a main provincial road, water, sewer or electrical grid services. | Supports the delivery of on-reserve infrastructure that falls under the Other Community Infrastructure sub-program to improve the quality of life and the environment in First Nations communities.**Asset Types:** * FNIF Community infrastructure categories:
* roads and bridges
* fire protection,
* energy systems, including fuel tanks
* structural mitigation[[1]](#footnote-1)
* connectivity
* cultural and recreation facilities
* band administrative buildings
* planning and skills development
* solid waste management

Proposals for off-reserve projects can be considered if the primary beneficiary is a participating First Nation community or communities, and if the off-reserve project will be cost-shared between an on-reserve First Nation and non-First Nations partners.  | Enhances the development and delivery of health programs and services through infrastructure by providing associated funding to eligible recipients for First Nation community-based health infrastructure. **Asset Types:** * Health Facilities:
* Health Facilities with Primary care service delivery including those that have Federally employed nurses (approximately 50 in remote & isolated communities)
* Health professional Accommodations / residences (nurses, allied health, dentists, other)
* Substance use/ addiction treatment Centres
* Aboriginal Head Start on Reserve spaces
* Dental Offices
* Other health infrastructure
* Support Infrastructure (e.g. generator sheds)
* Dental and other health infrastructure
 | Launched in 2016, and renewed through B2017, the FNSWMI supports the development of sustainable waste management systems in First Nation communities through modern infrastructure, training, and partnerships. **Asset Types:** * Solid Waste (can also be funded under the FNIF, CFMP and LEDSP)
 | **Objective and scope** Provides project-based funding for First Nation and eligible Inuit communities for a range of activities to support communities’ pursuit of economic opportunities, one element of which is economic infrastructure. **Asset Types:*** Economic infrastructure[[2]](#footnote-2) (does not fund operation, repair, maintenance of infrastructure or telecommunications).
 |
| **Authorities\***(general description)*The powers conferred to ISC, (e.g.* [*financial management authorities, transfer payments*](https://www.canada.ca/en/treasury-board-secretariat/services/treasury-board-submissions/guidance/commonly-sought-authorities.html)*) or overarching responsibilities (*[*machinery of government*](https://www.canada.ca/en/privy-council/services/orders-in-council/process-guide-governor-council-submissions.html)*).**\*Note: Further details on cross-walk of T&C can be accessed in* [*GCDocs #109128115.*](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=109128115) | **Terms & Conditions** [Transfer Payment Program Terms and Conditions: Contributions to support the construction and maintenance of community infrastructure](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1386694148066/1615723191777)**Funding Authorities/Source of Funds:** * **A-Base:** Over $1B/year
* **B-Base:** Various sources of targeted funds provided through [Budgets 2016-2022](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/Overview/96975069) and onward for First Nations on-reserve.
 | **Terms & Conditions** [Transfer Payment Program Terms and Conditions: Contributions to support the construction and maintenance of community infrastructure](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inacdav/nodes/45972414/_otdirinfo.ini)**Funding Authorities/Source of Funds:** * **B-Base:**  Funding sources include the Federal Gas Tax Fund, Building Canada Fund, Budget 2017 for Other Community Infrastructure, Budget 2016 for Structural Mitigation and Cultural & Recreation Facilities, the Revenue Recycling Carbon Tax and Budget 2019 for Structural Mitigation.
 | **Terms & Conditions** [Health Infrastructure Support Authority](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1525115054098/1615723519912)**Funding Authorities/Source of Funds:** * **A-Base:** $20.9 M/year (mostly used for minor capital projects)
* **B-Base:** $33M for O&M (only started in 2021)
* **Time-limited Funding:** the HFP is responsible for approximately 20 different funding streams that began in 2016 and have varying end points. A large part of this funding has been used for major capital projects.
 | **Terms & Conditions** [Contributions to Support Land Management and Economic Development](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1386549231377/1615723253856) **Funding Authorities/Source of Funds:** * **A-Base:** No A-base funding available
* **B-Base: ~**$81-110M per year until 2027/28

FNSWMI uses funds under the LEDSP for targeted funding for public awareness, operator training, diversion stream pilot projects, waste diversion off-reserve, MTSAs, small equipment, environmental planning activities related to solid waste management on reserve  | **Terms & Conditions** [Contributions to Support Land Management and Economic Development](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1386549231377/1615723253856)**Funding Authorities/Source of Funds:** * **A-Base:** $37.9M per year, of which approximately $11M has historically been provided for economic infrastructure, but varies from year to year based on nature of proposals and selection criteria.
* **B-Base:** $15M for five years, from 2022-23 to 2027-28, of which approximately $3M may be allocated to economic infrastructure

Economic infrastructure has a specific meaning in the CORP program (an investment such as a business park that leads to the creation of two or more businesses). It is not synonymous with economic development or construction of a business. Economic infrastructure one of four eligible types of eligible projects in CORP, and is not a stand-alone envelope with dedicated annual funding. Note that CORP funds only a portion of the project budget, up to 2/3 or $3M, and applicants must demonstrate that they have accessed other sources of funding. The program does not fund O&M, as projects are expected to generate revenues to cover operating costs. |
| What Works Well*From the perspective of headquarters and regional employees, what are the beneficial features of each program (to contextualize information about those features)* | * FNSWMI: Flexibility to use both the CFMP and LEDSP authorities has been extremely beneficial to facilitate a holistic waste management system as opposed to one that is asset-focused.
 | * Addresses gaps under the CFMP.
* Effectively leverages funding from other programs (federal, provincial)
* Flexible T&Cs that allow regions to support communities to deliver various OCI projects
 | * The program has evolved over the past 3 years following concerns from TBS to strengthen pre-capital planning processes associated with major capital projects, including a needs-based methodology, to reduce cost overruns, project delays and a lack of data.
* The program is not application based and is rooted in need. As such, it does not favour high capacity communities who are able to leverage government programs with in-house skilled labour.
* Up front planning, relationship building, contracting and greater Indigenous autonomy are priorities for the Program.
* In BC, all FNIHB programs and services are transferred to the First Nation Health Authority. As such, the HFP does not directly fund FN health infrastructure in BC.
* A major capital project is any proposed capital project that has a total cost estimate of $1,000,000 or more, involves funding over more than one year in duration; or, includes the development of architectural design works. Minor capital projects include repairs, upgrades and renovation to a facility that cannot be addressed through existing operations and maintenance budgets and that do not meet the risk and complexity threshold for being considered a major capital project.
 | * FNSWMI: Flexibility to use both the CFMP and LEDSP authorities has been extremely beneficial to facilitate a holistic waste management system as opposed to one that is asset-focused.
* Certain regions (e.g. ATL) heavily rely on LEDSP instead of CFMP due to larger focus on waste audits, waste diversion, MSTAS, training and awareness
 | * Well-situated to fund economic infrastructure investment opportunities as defined by the program (infrastructure that supports two or more businesses) given its focus on economic development.
 |
| Current Challenges*From the perspective of headquarters and regional employees, what features of each program present challenges or opportunities for improvement*  | * Funding demands are enormous (both scope and scale). Most acute in housing, schools, other community infrastructure.
* Inconsistent funding for O&M.
* Inuit communities not eligible.
* Carve-outs provided to MTSGs on an annual basis through CIRNAC
* FNSWMI: Lack of correspondence between programs and authorities results in lack of use of MOU by some regions.
* FNSWMI: Regions rely heavily on Infrastructure FTEs (CMOs and Engineers) as FNSWMI does not have capacity. No dedicated resources in RO for solid waste, means that solid waste projects are low priority.
* CFMP T&C created a challenge for providing funds for Indian Residential Schools, e.g. could use funds to use a former residential school for another purpose (e.g. cultural centre), could only demolish/remediate.
 | * Program funding is insufficient to address all needs and to partner with OGDs.
* Does not directly fund O&M.
* Solid Waste Management (Typically funded under the CFMP under the FNSWMI see LEDSP column).
* Current OCI policy suite is insufficient to provide the level of guidance Regions and First Nations are seeking
* Carve-outs provided to MTSGs on an annual basis through CIRNAC
 | * A-base funding, which is largely used for minor capital projects and based on demonstrated need (not annually provided to recipients), has remained static since 2003, despite increased construction costs, so the program faces pressure to meet infrastructure needs especially when it comes to major capital projects (e.g. building replacements).
* While communities north of 60, including Inuit are eligible recipients under the Program, due to financial constraints and other available federal funding, health infrastructure is generally funded by federal health transfers to provincial and territorial governments in the north.
* HFP is consistently misunderstood by internal stakeholders and the program is consistently pressured to implement initiatives that may not fit well or lack sufficient time to do the proper policy analysis.
* Challenges with infrastructure projects that started before some of the processes and governance around major capital were in place, including more stringent pre-capital planning requirements remain and are taking time to resolve.
* While there have been varying perspectives on whether the HFP T&C can support health infrastructure projects off-reserve, the T&C themselves are silent on this component. Based on the absence of specific wording and the inclusion of Inuit recipients who are not bound to reserve boundaries, the T&C are interpreted to be inclusive of off-reserve projects. Further, communities are not necessarily limited to specific borders. That said, very few projects off-reserve have been supported due to limited funding that barely supports need on reserve.
* On-reserve projects: Lack of regulatory regime with respect to building and fire codes has resulted in Canada adopting a regulation-by-contract approach.
* On and off reserve service delivery sites
 | * CORP and LEDSP use the same T&C, but the T&Cs do not provide accurate or helpful information based on the current programs available
* FNSWMI is a complementary source of funding for solid waste facilities.
* The program leverages 3 different sets of T&C to provide funds, which is complicated.
* FNSWMI: Limitations in funding authority sign-off has been difficult for several regions (inc. MB & BC)
* Limitations on funding caps has made delivery of funding difficult – delegation would be beneficial
 | * Limited funding, program fully subscribed, and the program can only fund a small proportion of proposals. Demand exceeds the program budget.
* Several programs for lands, environmental and economic development in LED, including CORP, LEDSP, and the Aboriginal Entrepreneurship Program (AEP) use the same T&C. The programs use a single overarching authority that supports lands and economic development and are broad to enable flexibility. Respective Management Control Frameworks provide additional details and specific including further funding caps for specific activities.
* Cap of $3M per economic infrastructure project poses challenges for projects in the context of inflation and increasing construction costs.
* Funding for Inuit communities is targeted to those located in the provinces.
* Communities with capacity challenges face barriers to access due to “risk based” project selection criteria that rates potential projects in terms of anticipated economic impacts. Higher capacity communities can more easily access funding.
 |
| **Accountabilities**(general description)*How the above powers are distributed within ISC, and who is responsible for what. Includes governance structures and reporting mechanisms.* | **Overall Accountability** * SADM-RO accountable for CFMP delivery.

[**Funding**](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=108166457)* A-base funding:
	+ Formula-based funding to support additional eligible infrastructure projects and activities
	+ O&M also provided through asset-based formula
	+ SADM-RO approves funding allocation
	+ RIDB Finance allocates approved funding to regions
* B-base funding:
	+ Regional offices select potential community infrastructure projects for funding (FNIIPs, other proposals)
	+ Senior mgmt. committees review and endorse/recommend allocations to the SADM-RO for approval[[3]](#footnote-3)
	+ RIDB Finance allocates approved funding to regions

[**Project Endorsement/Funding Approval**](https://intranet-sac-isc/eng/1547222674994/1547222889897)* SADM-RO: Tier 1 projects (TEC over $15M or high-risk projects over $5M) following review and advice of NIDC and RO-SMC
* RDGs: Tier 2 projects (TEC under $15M, i.e. $10-15M and assessed as low to medium risk)
* Smaller projects delegated:
* $5-10M: directors
* <$5M: managers
* FNSWMI: RDGs: Funding >$1.5 M (may be delegated to director)

**Results*** [**Departmental Results Framework**](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1642624377692/1642624401397)
* Under Core Responsibility for Governance & Community
* Under Departmental Result 7: Indigenous peoples have reliable and sustainable infrastructure
* Program Responsibilities distributed across 4 programs in the program inventory\*:
* [Housing](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/Overview/48054173) – DG RO-CIB
* [Education Facilities](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/Overview/46445364) – DG RO-RIDB
* [Water & Wastewater](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/Overview/46445228) – DG RO-CIB
* [Other Community Infrastructure and Activities](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/Overview/46445381) – DG RO-RIDB
* Land, Natural Resources and Environmental Management – DG LED

\*Note, these programs will become sub-programs within a single Community Infrastructure program (that also includes health facilities) in the DRF by April 1, 2023.**Governance** DG-level Policy committee on infrastructure with AFN representation, chaired by DG of CIBNational Technical Review Committee (NTRC) * Reviews Tier 1 projects to ensure consistent application of technical principles for all projects
* Makes recommendations on project to region to be addressed and brought to NIDC as part of Tier 1 review process

[National Infrastructure Directors Committee (NIDC)](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/open/89630720)* Provides forum for discussions and updates on infrastructure policy and programming, including the CFMP, and infrastructure policy harmonization
* Advisory role to ROSMC and IPC

[Infrastructure Investment Advisory Working Group](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/Overview/46457583) * Sub-committee to ROSMC
* In-year review of investment plan and status of projects, and makes recommendations to ROSMC-Infra re: in-year re-allocation of funds on Vote 10 for CFMP

[Regional Operations Senior Management Committee](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/Overview/49726778) * Provides advice on subjects requiring a collective, RO-wide approach, but does not replace accountabilities of RO senior execs
 | **Overall Accountability** * Same as CFMP.

**Funding*** Same as CFMP.

[**Project Endorsement/Funding Approval**](https://intranet-sac-isc/eng/1547222674994/1547222889897)Same as CFMP.**Results*** [**Departmental Results Framework**](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1642624377692/1642624401397)
	+ Under Core Responsibility for Governance & Community
	+ Under Departmental Result 7: Indigenous peoples have reliable and sustainable infrastructure
* Program Responsibilities in 1 program in the program inventory\*:
* [Other Community Infrastructure](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/Overview/46445381) – DG RO-RIDB

\*Note, these programs will become sub-programs within a single Community Infrastructure program on April 1, 2023.**Governance**Same as CFMP. | **Overall Accountability** FNIHB SADM is accountable for all programs and services delivered and funded through FNIHB, including HFP. FNIHB ADM of Regional Operations accountable for delivery of FNIHB programs and services in regions and for CIAD. Regional Executives are accountable to FNIHB ADM-RO and SADM for implementation in their region. Director of CIAD is accountable to the FNIHB ADM of Regional Operations and functionally to the FNIHB SADM for overall management of HFP. **Project/Funding Approval*** FNIHB SADM, FNIHB ADM-Regional Operations
* REs signing authority for funding arrangements.
* The FNIHB Senior Management Committee also plays a role in the review and approval of capital project funding

[**Project Endorsement/Funding Approval**](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=96853499) **– Capital Investments:** * FNIHB SADM, FNIHB ADM-RO: major capital[[4]](#footnote-4) (projects over $1M, multi-year funding, or includes architectural design works).
* Regional capital teams: Minor capital[[5]](#footnote-5) (does not meet the definition of major capital, includes repairs, upgrades, minor renos that cannot be addressed through existing O&M)
* Regional capital teams: O&M (rent, utilities, cleaning, routine maintenance)

**Funding Approval – Facility O&M Contributions*** FNIHB Management Operational Planning (MOP) process

**Results*** [**Departmental Results Framework**](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1642624377692/1642624401397) **(2022-23)**
* Under Core Responsibility for Governance & Community Development Services
* Under Departmental Result 7: Indigenous peoples have reliable and sustainable infrastructure Program Responsibilities in 2 programs in the program inventory\*:
* [Health Facilities](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/Overview/46682354) – ED FNIHB-CIAD
* [E-Health Infrastructure](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=61871217)– ED FNIHB-CIAD

\*Notes: The DRF is changing significantly in 2023-24, and FNIHB and RO are also working to align infrastructure funding in HFP and CMFP by April 1, 2023. **Governance** FNIHB Senior Management Committee (SMC)* Comprised of ADMs, DGs, REs, AFN, ITK
* Supports SADM and ADM RO in branch management.
* Provides a forum for discussion and decision-making on FNIHB activities and policies
* Reviews/approves national health program/service policies.

FNIHB National Capital Program Review Committee (CPRC) * Reviews health infrastructure projects and priorities, provides advice and recommendations to FNIHB-SMC.

Regional Capital Allocation Review Committees (CARC) * Regional committees that advise REs and oversee prioritization, allocation and monitoring.

Senior Management Committee on Policy and Planning * Develops and monitors Branch Strategic Plan and demonstrates linkages
* Identifies and monitors collaboration and partnerships
* Discusses proposals for new/significant changes to policies and programs

Senior Management Committee on Operations* Forum for discussion for operational planning and performance measurement
 | **Overall Accountability** * ADM LED accountable for the LEDSP

**Funding** * Environment Director – reviews/endorses planned investments, informs RDGs of annual allocation.

[**Project Endorsement/Funding Approval**](https://intranet-sac-isc/eng/1547222674994/1547222889897)FNSWMI:* LED DG: final approval on all projects
* RDGs: Funding >$250K under LEDSP
* RDGs: Funding >$1.5M under CFMP (may be delegated to director)\*

Note: Regions have been asking for greater flexibility and an MOU for CFMP is being used to provide greater flexibility. **Results*** [**Departmental Results Framework**](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1642624377692/1642624401397)
* Under Core Responsibility for Governance & Community
* Under Departmental Result 7: Indigenous peoples have reliable and sustainable infrastructure
* Under Departmental Result 8: Lands and resources in Indigenous communities are sustainably managed.
* Program Responsibilities within 1 program in the program inventory:
* [Land, Natural Resources and Environmental Management](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=61859846) **–** DG, LED-LEMB

**Governance**Environmental Steering Committee* Regional Directors within LED
* Responsible for strategic oversight & direction.
 | **Overall Accountability** * ADM LED accountable for the LEDSP
* The Director General, EBOB, has the authority to issue and amend Program Guidelines for CORP

**Funding** * CORP budget has two components: CORP Regional allocations and CORP Prioritization Framework(PF)
* CORP Regional (projects below $250K) formula driven allocation for regions – Direct EPMD informs regions of annual allocations
* CORP PF (projects above $250K) – Director EPMD is the lead

**Project Endorsement/Funding Approval**Under the current Management Control Framework (MCF) (which will be revised for the 2023-24 fiscal year):* CORP Regional (projects below $250K) – RDG
* CORP PF (projects above $250K):
	+ Up to $500K – DG EBOB
	+ $500K to $1M – ADM LED
	+ $1M up to $3M – DM
	+ $3M+ - Indigenous Services Minister

**Results*** [**Departmental Results Framework**](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1642624377692/1642624401397)
* Under Core Responsibility for Governance & Community
* Under Departmental Result 7: Indigenous peoples have reliable and sustainable infrastructure
* Program Responsibilities within 1 program in the program inventory:
* [**Economic Development Capacity & Readiness**](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=61870286) **–** DG, LED-EBOB

**Governance*** Regional economic development directors committee (chaired by HQ, includes Directors of Land and Economic Development within RO Regional Offices, with environmental and lands representation on occasion)
* Regional economic development managers committee, includes managers of economic development within RO Regional Offices.
 |
| What Works Well*From the perspective of headquarters and regional employees, what are the beneficial features of each program (to contextualize information about those features)* | FNSWMI: The MOU outlining the delegation of signing authority within CFMP has been extremely beneficial and utilized to its fullest capacity in some regions including SK. | * Some Regions have anticipated certain FNIF projects will exceed $15M and have requested HQ pre-review prior to PAR and/or Change Request submissions to NIDC.
 | * AFN and ITK participate in FNIHB SMC, allowing FN participation in HFP governance.
 | * FNSWMI: No required crossover between LED-LEMB and another branch sometimes results in smoother transition of funding
* Communication between HQ and Regions
* Support from HQ for solid waste when requested by regions
* HQ can use data already available from the Regions to respond to requests related to indicators and results
 | * Rigorous proposal review process by Regions and HQ results in projects highly likely to generate significant economic growth in participating communities.
* Economic infrastructure is the most complex type of project funded under CORP and accelerates economic development in communities.
* Strong Communication between HQ and Regions
* Clear separation of roles between Regions and HQ (CORP Regional components and CORP PF)
* Allows different perspectives (regional and HQ) to inform decision making/project selection
* CORP funds both capacity development/preparation and the construction phase. Program funding is not dedicated to specific streams of eligible projects and are selected based on criteria: regional criteria (CORP Regional component) and the Prioritization Framework and national review process set-out in the MCF for projects over $250K, following bi-annual callouts
 |
| Current Challenges*From the perspective of headquarters and regional employees, what features of each program present challenges or opportunities for improvement (to contextualize information about those features)* | * Some regions still view waste management infrastructure projects as “LED projects” that they help advance, rather than CFMP projects.
* AFN flagged concerns with the current delegation of project funding approval in its [final report on the Tendering Policy](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=105720574), and is interested in adjusting this.
 | * Some of the assets and activities, such as asset management planning and fire protection fall under the responsibility of CIB
* Must also report to Infrastructure Canada under IICP and other OGDs, ISED for connectivity, NRCan for energy, and structural mitigation is part of emergency management tiers.
 |  | * FNSWMI: Lack of FTEs to support program administration – additional PM or Envtl Officers would increase efficiency & effectiveness
 | * Data sharing and collection issues between HQ and Regions (work underway to improve)
 |
| **Roles & Responsibilities**(general description)*Flowing from accountabilities, how work and roles and responsibilities are distributed and organized within the relevant organizations*  | **Investment Planning:*** RIDB, Strategic Portfolio Management & Reporting (Investment Planning and Project Governance)
* Regional offices

**Policy/Standards:** * CIB – IPMCMD (Infrastructure Policy Interpretation and Compliance) & RIDB

**Project Approvals:** * RIDB & CIB-IPMCMD
* Regional Offices
* See accountabilities (above).

**Funding Administration:** * CFRDO, RIDB, & Regional Offices

**Project Management:** * Regional Offices

**O&M/Asset Condition Reporting:** * RegionalOfficesresponsibleforinputtinginformation into ICMS/ACRS

**Reporting:*** RIDB- SPMR (Reporting Services)
* [ISC Targeted Infrastructure Investment Quarterly Report](https://www.gcpedia.gc.ca/wiki/ISC-QuarterlyReport) & [OCI Report](https://www.gcpedia.gc.ca/wiki/ISC-OtherCommunityInfrastructure)

**Results:** * RIDB and CIB

Each program is responsible for results under the DRF:Water – CIBHousing – CIBEducation Facilities – RIDBOCI and Activities – RIDB and CIB**Evaluations:** * SPPD – Evaluation.
* Undertaken in accordance with 5-year evaluation plan:
* 2021-22 Education facilities
* 2021-22 OCI and Activities
* 2022-23 Housing

**Note:** FN responsible for:* Developing/updating the community-level FNIIP;
* Managing infrastructure activities, including the technical and financial planning, complying with the PIFI, FA, other ISC funding obligations;
* Reporting requirements as set out in the FA & Reporting Guide, submitting validated data to ISC within prescribed timelines.
 | **Program Management:** * RIDB’s Sustainable Operations Directorate

**Investment Planning:*** Same as CFMP and RIDB’s Sustainable Operations Directorate for OCI sub-assets

**Policy/Standards:** * Same as CFMP and RIDB’s Sustainable Operations Directorate (SOD) for OCI sb-assets, and climate adaptation and mitigation for community infrastructure
* **Project Approvals:** Same as CFMP

**Funding Administration:** * CFRDO, RIDB & Regional Offices

**Project Management:** * Regional Offices

**O&M/Asset Condition Reporting:*** Regional Offices responsible for inputting information into ICMS/ACRS

**Reporting*** RIDB, SPMR (Reporting Services)
* Quarterly First Nations Targeted Infrastructure Investment Report

ResultsEach program is responsible for results under the DRF:Water – CIBHousing – CIBEducation Facilities – RIDB* OCI and Activities – RIDB and CIB

**Evaluation:** * Evaluation
* Undertaken in accordance with [5-year evaluation plan:](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1601896999938/1601897029080)
* 2021-22 OCI and Activities

**Note:** FN have same responsibilities as CFMP.  | **Investment Planning:*** Communities, FNIHB-CIAD & Regional Offices
* Communities determine capital infrastructure priorities with assistance from regions
* HQ (FNIHB-CIAD) identifies major capital infrastructure priorities using the needs –based methodology and prioritization framework.

**Policy/Standards:** * FNIHB-CIAD
* FNIHB-PHCPH

**Project Approvals:** * FNIHB-CIAD
* Regional Offices
* SMC, FNIHB ADMs

**Funding Administration:** * CIAD
* Regional staff
* FNIHB (MOP)

**Project Management:** * Regional Offices
* Communities

**O&M/Asset Condition Reporting:*** Regional Offices

**Reporting & Results*** FNIHB-SPPI (Michael Savage)
* CIAD, HFP

**Evaluations*** SPPD-Evaluation
* Undertaken in accordance with [5-year evaluation plan:](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1601896999938/1601897029080)
* 2021-22 Health Facilities Cluster Evaluation (currently underway)

**Note:** FN are responsible for delivering capital projects that receive funding, while FNIHB provides subject matter expertise in capital project delivery, and in administering the funding arrangement on behalf of ISC. | **Investment Planning:*** Regions outline which community projects will be funded through the investment planning process and what has been approved by their RDG and submit that information to HQ
* RDGS review and approve regional investment plans
* HQ reviews proposed projects for program eligibility and funding amounts before approving at DG level

**Program Admin, Policy/Standards:** * LED-LEMB (HQ Environment) – overall planning, tracking, monitoring, risk management, evaluation, development of policies, procedures, technical guidance.
* HQ Senior Manager leads/oversees.

**Project Approvals:** * LED-LEMB - HQ reviews proposed projects for program eligibility and funding amounts before approving at DG level
* Regional Environmental Management Specialists/Officers support FN to identify, develop, implement waste management solutions.

**Funding Administration:** * Funding does not need to be transferred between branches and the director has the authority to use the CFMP and LEDSP authorities; however, funding can be transferred between branches to facilitate solid waste projects.

**Project Management:** * Regional Offices – Regional Capital Management Officers and Regional Environmental Officers except in AB region (i.e. just Environmental Officers); Regional Engineers through the Community Infrastructure Branch facilitate waste infrastructure projects (FNSWMI)
* QC region is the only region where the Environment team is part of the overall Infrastructure team.

**O&M/Asset Condition Reporting:*** There is no O&M facilitated through this authority
* There are no assets facilitated through this authority

**Reporting** * LED-LEMB participates in the Infrastructure Quarterly Reporting Process led by the BIRT team
* Quarterly First Nations Targeted Infrastructure Investment Report (excluding O&M and A-base funded projects)
* LED follows up with indicator results and reporting requirements for funding for FNSWMI, regardless of funding transfers
* 472939 Lands and Economic Development Programs Project Status Report

**Evaluations:** * SPPD – Evaluation
* Undertaken in accordance with 5-year evaluation plan:
* 2021-22 Solid Waste Management
 | **Investment Planning:*** There is not a process comparable to the RO community planning. Project identification is generally done through the bi-annual intake process. Projects funding is limited to one or two years
* Regions identify potential upcoming projects based on internal processes
* CORP PF projects not selected in a given year can be retained for future year funding consideration

**Policy/Standards:** * LED-EBOB-EPMD - overall planning, tracking, monitoring, risk management, evaluation, development of policies, procedures, technical guidance.
* HQ Operations team

**Project Approvals:** * CORP Regions – Regional processes
* CORP PF – Regional and HQ economic development manager committee – reviews proposed projects for program eligibility, funding amount, and project selection for final approval based on MCF process (under review)
* See “Accountabilities Section**:** Project Endorsement/Funding Approval” for final project approvals

**Funding Administration:** * CORP Regional – Regional Offices and AFIs
* CORP PF – HQ flows funding to Regional Office and Regional Office manages contribution agreements with recipients

**Project Management:** * Recipient manages project and provides reports to Regional Offices.

**O&M/Asset Condition Reporting:** * N/A – CORP does not provide funding for O&M or asset renewal. Approved projects are expected to generate revenues to cover O&M and asset renewal.

**Reporting** * Annual contribution agreement reporting
* Assess Progress of the project;
* Conduct post-completion monitoring as per funding arrangement conditions, or per the program’s performance measurement strategy;
* Evaluate effectiveness of the contributions; and
* Assess long term viability of a business opportunity.

**Evaluations*** SPPD-Evaluation
* Undertaken in accordance with [5-year evaluation plan:](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1601896999938/1601897029080)
* 2022-23 Ec Dev Capacity & Readiness (delayed into 2023-24 by SPPD)
 |
| What Works Well*From the perspective of headquarters and regional employees, what are the beneficial features of each program (to contextualize information about those features)* | * FNSWMI: Certain regions (e.g. SK, BC, and ON) have very functional relationships with their regional CIBs
* CMO and Regional Engineer crossovers work well
* Support from HQ for solid waste when requested by regions
 |  |  | FNSWMI: * Organizational structure works well as it is
* Communication between HQ and Regions works well
 | * Regional autonomy provides efficiency for the program
* Strong communication between HQ and regions
* Division of roles between Regions and HQ for managing the two components of funding (CORP Regions and CORP PF)
* Allows different perspectives (regional and HQ) to inform decision making/project selection
 |
| Current Challenges*From the perspective of headquarters and regional employees, what features of each program present challenges or opportunities for improvement (to contextualize information about those features)* | * Once on-reserve capital projects are completed, First Nations own their on-reserve assets and are responsible for O&M.
* FNSWMI: Limited FTEs available in both regions & HQ for solid waste creates difficulty facilitating waste infra projects.
* FNSWMI: Not all regions have good relationships between LED and CIB
* FNSWMI: Lack of dedicated staff within CIB for waste-related infra projects
* FNSWMI: CFMP processes/timeline structure can result in project delays
* FNSWMI: Receiving reporting from communities
* Reporting inconsistencies between what HQ reports for O&M for solid waste and what regions report
* ICMS data integrity
 | * FNIF projects are most often <$15M and approved by RDG, and managed within Regions, making it difficult for HQ to have good visibility on projects and the overall program.
* There have been some challenges delivering environmental review requirements for infrastructure in regions. regional workshops, with the goal of improving environmental review of infrastructure projects, in ATL and MB have resulted in progress.
 | * For the Aboriginal Head Start on Reserve (AHSOR) component of Indigenous Early Learning Childhood Care (IELCC) facilities, regional tables make programmatic decisions, but these are currently separate from the supporting infrastructure, which is problematic. It means that program expansion could be approved/funded without the corresponding infrastructure to accommodate the additional space needs for the programmatic requirements. The is reason behind the 2021 CHRT 41 decision on major capital. The gap in services was being covered by Jordan’s Principle but without the space to deliver the service itself, presenting an impediment to getting service.
 | * There is no A-base funding available for LEDSP specific projects and this will sunset in 2027-28
* Additional FTEs would be beneficial to expedite LEDSP projects in various regions (i.e. ATL, AB, BC, SK, ON)
* Transferring funds to CFMP is difficult due to lack of solid waste infrastructure prioritization. Additional FTE capacity within the CIB dedicated to solid waste infrastructure at the regional level would be beneficial for every single region.
 | * Currently no FTEs assigned to the CORP
* Current need greatly outstrips existing budgets
* CORP’s program design is not based on a forward looking projection/investment planning approach for all First Nations and Inuit communities. The budget for the program provides a portion of the project budget, not the entire cost of the project necessitating transparent project prioritization and selection criteria. Any program/policy seeking to provide adequate funding for economic development or economic infrastructure on an ongoing basis for specific First Nations and Inuit communities would require a new needs based method for establishing a source of funds.
 |
| **Policies**(general)*Flowing from authorities and accountabilities, the internal and external rules, standards, procedures, and/or measures that are put in place to achieve expected results.*  | **Program Management:** * [CFMP Program Manual](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/Overview/46345243) (2016)\*Note: out of date, needs to be updated.
* [Program Control Framework (PCF) (2022)](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=100307299)

**Investment Planning:** * [2022-23 FNIIP (Targeted)](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=102931299)
* DCI 460674 First Nations Infrastructure Investment Plan – Annual Report ([Form](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/ForcePDFDownload?url=https%3a%2f%2fwww.sac-isc.gc.ca%2fDAM%2fDAM-ISC-SAC%2fDAM-TRNSPRCY%2fSTAGING%2ftexte-text%2fdci_2022_2023_460674pri_1639426995450_eng.pdf) & [Instructions](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/ForcePDFDownload?url=https%3a%2f%2fwww.sac-isc.gc.ca%2fDAM%2fDAM-ISC-SAC%2fDAM-TRNSPRCY%2fSTAGING%2ftexte-text%2fdci_2022_2023_460674pri_1639426995450_eng.pdf))

**Prioritization/Project Endorsement:*** [Evaluation of Capital Projects under Contribution Agreements](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1100100010652/1533652180430)
* [Operational Parameters for the Review and Evaluation of Construction Management Projects](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1100100010616/1533650954222)
* [National Prioritization Ranking Framework (NPRF)](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/Overview/50892434)
* [School Priority Ranking Framework (SPRF)](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/Overview/46399076)
* [Water/Wastewater Priority Ranking Frameworks](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/Overview/46399100)
* [General Assessment Directive (2011)](https://intranet-rcaanc-cirnac/prev-prev/eng/1404325934896/1404483971134)
* [Project Risk Assessment Tool (PRAT)](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/Overview/46192616)\*\*Note: Currently being updated.
* [Standard Cost Thresholds for Schools and Water/Wastewater (2020)](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/link/61944280)

**Project Design/Delivery:****All:*** [Tendering Policy on Federally Funded Capital Assets](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1100100010608/1533651727486)
* [Framework to Guide the Development of a First Nations Tendering Policy](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1100100010612/1533651230183)
* [Operational Parameters for the Review and Evaluation of Construction Management Projects (OPRECMP)](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1100100010616/1533650954222)
* [Protocol for ISC Funded Infrastructure (PIFI)](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/Overview/95357782)
* [Guide to the Environmental Assessment/Site Assessment Process](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1403215245662/1613076676889)/Project Description Form\*

\*Note: out of date. * Lifecycle Costing Policy & Guidance
* Land Surveys
* [“Other” Funding Agreement Model Template](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1638990955980/1638990986628)
* [Tolerance Policy](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=100307299) (see PCF pg. 26)

**Education:*** [School Space Accommodation Standards (SSAS)](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/prev-prev/eng/1326828445933) (2021)\*\*Currently being updated.
* [School Site Development Policy](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1100100010640/1533650627200) (1998)
* [Level of Service Standards and Management of Teacherages on Reserve (Teacherages Policy)](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1100100010644/1533651868855)
* [Rental of Facilities for Federal and Band Operated Schools](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1100100010648/1533651455504)

**Water:** * [Water and Wastewater Level of Service Standards](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1312228309105/1533729544122)
* [Design Guidelines for First Nations Water Works](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1100100034922/1533666798632)
* Others (see PIFI)

**Reporting*** Data Collection Instrument (DCI) 4548549 Activities & Expenditures Report ([Form](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/ForcePDFDownload?url=https%3a%2f%2fwww.sac-isc.gc.ca%2fDAM%2fDAM-ISC-SAC%2fDAM-TRNSPRCY%2fSTAGING%2ftexte-text%2fdci_2022_2023_4548549fil_1639493196216_eng.pdf) & [Instructions](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/ForcePDFDownload?url=https%3a%2f%2fwww.sac-isc.gc.ca%2fDAM%2fDAM-ISC-SAC%2fDAM-TRNSPRCY%2fSTAGING%2ftexte-text%2fdci_2022_2023_4548549ins_1639493244009_eng.pdf))
* DCI 41701 Community Infrastructure and Housing Annual Report ([Form](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/ForcePDFDownload?url=https%3a%2f%2fwww.sac-isc.gc.ca%2fDAM%2fDAM-ISC-SAC%2fDAM-TRNSPRCY%2fSTAGING%2ftexte-text%2fdci_2022_2023_41701fil_1639423699084_eng.pdf) & [Instructions](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/ForcePDFDownload?url=https%3a%2f%2fwww.sac-isc.gc.ca%2fDAM%2fDAM-ISC-SAC%2fDAM-TRNSPRCY%2fSTAGING%2ftexte-text%2fdci_2022_2023_41701ins_1639423728212_eng.pdf))
* DCI 460671 Capital Projects Report ([Form](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/ForcePDFDownload?url=https%3a%2f%2fwww.sac-isc.gc.ca%2fDAM%2fDAM-ISC-SAC%2fDAM-TRNSPRCY%2fSTAGING%2ftexte-text%2fdci_2022_2023_460671fil_1639425544483_eng.pdf) & [Instructions](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/ForcePDFDownload?url=https%3a%2f%2fwww.sac-isc.gc.ca%2fDAM%2fDAM-ISC-SAC%2fDAM-TRNSPRCY%2fSTAGING%2ftexte-text%2fdci_2022_2023_460671ins_1639425629191_eng.pdf))

**Results*** Policy on Results
* Policy on Gender-Based Analysis Plus
* 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development
* Report on Progress on Federal Sustainable Development Strategy
* Report on Horizontal Initiatives

**O&M:** * [O&M Policy (2022)](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=108165554) & [Cost Reference Manual (2005)](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=108164216)
* [Maintenance Management Plan (MMP)](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/Overview/63663383)
* [Evaluation of Capital Projects under Contribution Arrangements](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1100100010652/1533652180430)
* Asset Condition Reporting [Form](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/ForcePDFDownload?url=https%3a%2f%2fwww.sac-isc.gc.ca%2fDAM%2fDAM-ISC-SAC%2fDAM-TRNSPRCY%2fSTAGING%2ftexte-text%2fdci_2022_2023_460649pri_1639424840033_eng.pdf), [Instructions](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/ForcePDFDownload?url=https%3a%2f%2fwww.sac-isc.gc.ca%2fDAM%2fDAM-ISC-SAC%2fDAM-TRNSPRCY%2fSTAGING%2ftexte-text%2fdci_2022_2023_460649ins_1639424868943_eng.pdf), [Manual (2004)](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/Overview/15650306), Terms of Reference, Operational Instructions
* [Maintenance Management Plan for Drinking Water & Wastewater Systems in First Nation Communities](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1398350727577/1533667365874)
 | The FNIF uses the same program control framework, performance management strategy as the CFMP. However, the FNIF has different program criteria from the CFMP.**Program Management:*** [FNIF Program Guide](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1497275878022/1533645265362) (2022)
* [CFMP](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=100307299) PCF

**Investment Planning:*** Same as CFMP

**Project Prioritization/Endorsement:*** [OCI Sub-Asset Priority Ranking Frameworks](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/Overview/106154143)
* Other policies/tools same as CFMP

**Project Design/Delivery:** * [Level of Service Standards – Fire Protection Services](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1100100010632/1534353148780) (2016)
* [Electric Power Supply & Distribution Systems (1998)](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1100100010636/1533651567408)
* [Roads and Bridges Level of Service Standards](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1100100010628/1533652010591)
* Other policies/tools same as CFMP

**Reporting:*** Same as CFMP

**Results:** * Same as CFMP

**O&M:** * Same as CFMP
 | **Program Management:*** [FNIHB Framework for Planning and Managing Capital Contributions](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=105645913)(2021)
* FNIHB HFP Guidance Manual, which includes:
* Overview of Major Capital Project Phases (2022)
* HFP Capital Project Checklist (2022)
* HFP Templates
	+ Business Case Template (2019)
	+ Project Brief Template (2018)
	+ Health Services Space Allocations Template (~2020)
* O&M Guide (2011)
* Environmental Review Process (2021)HFP Financial coding info)Health Infrastructure Support Authority (2022)

**Investment Planning** * Health Facilities Capital Investment Plan
* Branch Management Operational Plans are the basis for additional minor project and O&M resource allocation
* Communities develop Physical Development Plans, Master Servicing Plans, Comprehensive Community Plans

[**Project Prioritization**](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/link/105648100)* Needs-Based Assessment Model
* [HFP Prioritization Scorecard](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=105402569)
* [HFP Priority Matrix 2022-23](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/link/104365530)

**Project Prioritization/Endorsement:*** Needs-Based Assessment Model
* HFP Prioritization Scorecard
* HFP Priority Matrix 2022-23
* [HFP Capital Project Checklist](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=105649701) (2022)
* Capital Program Modernization Framework
* [Project Brief](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=105402560)
* [HFP Templates: Business Case](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=105396342), [Project Brief](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=105402560), Health Services Space Allocations

**Project Delivery:*** [Health Infrastructure and Capital Protocol](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=105649700) (Tendering Policy)
* [HFP Health Services Space Allocations](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=105396064)
* [HFP Guidance Environmental Review Process](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=105400157)
* Either: [Consolidated Contribution Agreement](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1583777733733/1583777749692) or [Canada Common Funding Agreement](https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1479908932834/1620854262895) (TBC by FNIHB)

**Reporting\**** Data Collection Instruments (DCIs) associated with HFP include:
* DCI HC-P018 Capital Facilities Operation and Maintenance (CF-O&M) Annual Report ([Form & Instructions](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/ForcePDFDownload?url=https%3a%2f%2fwww.sac-isc.gc.ca%2fDAM%2fDAM-ISC-SAC%2fDAM-TRNSPRCY%2fSTAGING%2ftexte-text%2fdci_2022_2023_HC-P018_prt_1638996328394_eng.pdf))
* HC-p019 Security Services Annual Report
* DCI HC-P021 Capital Design and/or Construction Progress Report for Flexible ([Form & Instructions](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/ForcePDFDownload?url=https%3a%2f%2fwww.sac-isc.gc.ca%2fDAM%2fDAM-ISC-SAC%2fDAM-TRNSPRCY%2fSTAGING%2ftexte-text%2fdci_2022_2023_HC-P021_prt_1638998965461_eng.pdf))
* DCI HC-P138 Capital Design, Construction or Specialty Project Quarterly Expenditure Report ([Form & Instructions](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/ForcePDFDownload?url=https%3a%2f%2fwww.sac-isc.gc.ca%2fDAM%2fDAM-ISC-SAC%2fDAM-TRNSPRCY%2fSTAGING%2ftexte-text%2fdci_2022_2023_HC-P137_prt_1639160815646_eng.pdf))
* Other performance indicators and reporting requirements associated with dedicated funding.

\*Note: All DCIs to be revised into performance indicators (rather than accountability measures), with work to begin in 2023.**O&M:*** FNIHB [O&M Guide](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=105401665) within the HFP Guidance Manual
* Regional Building Condition Inspection Manual and Template.
 | **Program Management:*** [LEDSP Program Guidelines (2014)](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1100100033426/1611275404022)\*Note: Currently being updated.
* LEDSP Management Control Framework
* FNSWMI: [First Nations Solid Waste Management Initiative (FNSWMI) Program Control Framework](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/Overview/99726458)\*
* FNSWMI Program Manual\*

\*Note: Draft document, still under development. **Investment Planning:*** Investment Plan

**Project Prioritization/Endorsement*** [Criteria in the Program Guidelines](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1100100033426/1611275404022)
* General Assessments
* Each region prioritizes projects based on their region’s needs. There is no national prioritization list.

**Project Design/Delivery:** * PIFI
* Tendering Policy
* ISC Funding Agreement Model Template
* Municipal Type Service Agreements,
* FNSWMI Program Manual\* \*Note: draft document, still under development

**Reporting** * DCI 4548549 CFMP Activities & Expenditures Report
* DCI 472939 Lands and Economic Development Programs – Project Status Report ([Form](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/ForcePDFDownload?url=https%3a%2f%2fwww.sac-isc.gc.ca%2fDAM%2fDAM-ISC-SAC%2fDAM-TRNSPRCY%2fSTAGING%2ftexte-text%2fdci_2022_2023_472939fil_1639414863024_eng.pdf) & [Instructions](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/ForcePDFDownload?url=https%3a%2f%2fwww.sac-isc.gc.ca%2fDAM%2fDAM-ISC-SAC%2fDAM-TRNSPRCY%2fSTAGING%2ftexte-text%2fdci_2022_2023_472939ins_1639414890951_eng.pdf))
* [FNSWMI Financial Coding Authority Requirements](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/Overview/97928161) (for ICMS & GCICMS).
* Program Activity Summary Report [(GCpedia)](https://www.gcpedia.gc.ca/wiki/AANDC/Lands_and_Economic_Development_Sector/Economic_Opportunities/LEDSP)

**O&M:** * Note: FNSWMI does not use LEDSP for O&M; and FNSWMI O&M is different than CFMP asset/formula.
* FNSWMI O&M Control Management Framework
* FNSWMI O&M Manual
 | **Program Management**:* [CORP Program Guidelines](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1100100033417/1613659339457)

[CORP Management Control Framework](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/link/58456211) \*Note: Currently being updated. **Project Prioritization/Endorsement*** Projects Prioritized according to [Ranking Criteria](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/link/95734240) included in the MCF (linked above)
* Projects must be “shovel-ready” & have secured land tenure, completed any environmental assessments, secured funding commitments from other sources, or negotiated any partnership agreements.
* [CORP-PF Scoresheet Template](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/overview/89289865?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=89289865)
* [CORP-PF Intake Proposals Checklist](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=106059514)
* [CORP PASR Template](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=107512681)
* [Program Guidelines](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1100100033417/1613659339457)

**Project Design/Delivery*** ISC Funding Agreement Model Template
* Program Guidelines – Annex A of Management Control Framework

**Reporting*** DCI 472939 Lands and Economic Development Programs – Project Status Report ([Form](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/ForcePDFDownload?url=https%3a%2f%2fwww.sac-isc.gc.ca%2fDAM%2fDAM-ISC-SAC%2fDAM-TRNSPRCY%2fSTAGING%2ftexte-text%2fdci_2022_2023_472939fil_1639414863024_eng.pdf) & [Instructions](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/ForcePDFDownload?url=https%3a%2f%2fwww.sac-isc.gc.ca%2fDAM%2fDAM-ISC-SAC%2fDAM-TRNSPRCY%2fSTAGING%2ftexte-text%2fdci_2022_2023_472939ins_1639414890951_eng.pdf))
* DCI 4548549 Activities & Expenditures Report

 **O&M:** * N/A Ongoing cost of economic infrastructure is intended to be self-sustaining through revenue generation
 |
| What Works Well*From the perspective of headquarters and regional employees, what are the beneficial features of each program (to contextualize information about those features)* |  | * Uses all of the CFMP policies.
 |  | * FNSWMI/LEDSP projects use ISC tendering policies.
* Current DCI requirements are helpful within regions. Often LEDSP DCI requirements replace CFMP DCI requirements to provide more information to Regions.
 |  |
| Current Challenges*From the perspective of headquarters and regional employees, what features of each program present challenges or opportunities for improvement (to contextualize information about those features)* | * AFN flagged several concerns with ISC’s Tendering Policy in its [final report](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=105720574): thresholds, timelines, regional flexibility, economic opportunities, etc.
* Cost overruns are an ongoing issue, PRAT and other tools currently being updated to better support risk assessment and management to avoid this issue.
* FNSWMI: Solid waste initiatives often put as lowest priority under prioritization frameworks.
* FNSWMI: Currently no policies on national waste standards, but under development.
* FNSWMI: Often LEDSP DCI requirements replace CFMP DCI requirements to provide more information to Regions.
* Current DCI requirements lack information that regions find useful.
 | * While Prioritization Frameworks for OCI sub-assets exist, project prioritization is not consistent across Regions, primarily due to limited funding availability
* Existing policies are outdated and don’t reflect the current reality of the OCI and Activities Program
* Policy gaps exist ; Lack of Level of Service Level Standards and guidance for specific FNIF sub-assets – these are under development
* The development of FNIF asset-specific policies have been a challenge given lack of standards for sub-assets to draw from in provinces or OGDs, and that unlike other CFMP asset categories, SOD does not have multiple FTEs per asset category to dedicate to the development of policies and guidance documents. The only OCI asset category that benefits from a team of people coordinating policy is Fire Protection which resides in CIB not RIDB. In SOD,  each OCI asset category has a single point person who may lead for one or more OCI asset categories.
 | * Multijurisdictional programming policy space involving federally funded community-based health programming, provincially funded programs and services/service providers, and programs and services provided through the federal Non-insured Health Benefits Program is challenging to navigate (?)
 | * FNSWMI: Currently no policies on national waste standards, but under development.
 | * MCF is under review, and a revised MCF is anticipated by end of this fiscal year
 |
| **Processes**(general)*Flowing from people & org structure and policies, what are the main stages or broad sequences of steps involved in providing infrastructure funding and services to First Nations under each program.**(To determine if further discussion on how to harmonize the sequencing of activities may be needed)* | [**Planning Stage**](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=100307299)* [Investment Planning Process](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=108166457) (First Nations Infrastructure Investment Plan [FNIIP])[[6]](#footnote-6)
* Prioritization/Ranking Process
* Funding Allocations to Regions

[**Feasibility Stage**](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=100307299)* Feasibility studies
* [Environmental review Process](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inacdav/nodes/45972414/1612816537881_________________)
* Process for developing & endorsing Project Acceptance Requests and related inputs
* Process for establishing Funding Agreements

[**Design Stage**](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=100307299)* [Tendering Process](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1100100010608/1533651727486)
* Contracting/Procurement
* Project Change Requests

[**Construction Phase**](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=100307299)* Process for approving/issuing payments
* Process for progress reporting
* Project Change Requests

[**Close Out/O&M**](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=100307299)* Project close-out process
* Process for transitioning to O&M
* Annual Asset Condition Reporting Inspections

**Annual Budget Process** | * Same as the CFMP.
 | **Investment Planning Process*** Processfor developing the Health Facilities Capital Investment Plan

[**Project Determination Phase**](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=105648100)* Pre-capital planning – internal
	+ Needs profile
	+ Prioritization ranking for pre-capital investment
* [Pre-capital planning – external](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=105400157)
	+ Correspondence with FN
	+ Project Charter
	+ Funding Agreement
	+ Pre-capital planning documents, i.e. health needs assessment, functional program, functional plan, business case, technical feasibility study, geotechnical investigation, site survey
	+ [Environmental Review Process](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=105400157)
	+ Band Council resolution
	+ Prioritization ranking for design phase investment

**Design Phase** * Process for approving/issuing payments
* Delivery requirements
* Updated Project Brief
* Design & Tender documents
* Project Management Team

**Construction Phase*** Construction contracts
* ongoing monitoring & communication on construction progress
* Bi-annual financial updates
* Certificate of substantial completion
* Plan for outstanding deficiencies
* Final payment

**Post-Investment Evaluation Phase*** Initiation process
* Quality of impact evaluation report process
* E-ACRS and ACRS also occur at FNIHB-funded infrastructure and follow the RO process/policy.

**Annual Budget Process** | **Investment Planning Process*** Waste Management projects funded through the CFMP or LEDSP projects undergo the same Investment Planning process
* First Nations identify their waste infrastructure and program priorities with regional offices through specific project proposals, regional engagement or the First Nations Infrastructure Investment Plan (FNIIP)
* Each region develops an Investment Plan based on First Nation requests and the need for nation-wide projects based on the notional allocation
* All projects are reviewed by HQ to ensure high risk projects are prioritized and align with project categories (i.e. capacity building, waste diversion, construction and upgrade of assets, etc.)
* Regional Investment Plans are approved by the RDG
* All projects are reviewed by the DG

**Project Identification/Approval*** FNSWMI: Some regions have a call-out period and accept formal proposals based on regional templates, while others accept emails with attached consultant reports to facilitate projects
* Approved project proposals are added to annual investment plan (January) and receive final approval by HQ DG

**Project Implementation*** Once projects receive sr mgmt. approval, project status report (PSAR) forms are filled out by region and recommended to the Regional Envtl Director for signature
* Regional offices put funding agreements in place, entered into GCIMS/SAP, and funding flowed to FN.
* Once projects completed, financial reporting received based on DCI.

**Permitting process:** * Only one region (SK) is currently facilitating permitting. Solid waste facilities go through a permitting process, managed by the region one year after construction.
* The region completes annual inspections of facilities to keep permits up to date.

**Annual Budget Process*** This is a B-based program and receives a set amount every year (i.e. $15M) until it sunsets in 2027-28
* Regional notational allocations are based on First Nations populations
* Regions are responsible for delivering LEDSP targeted projects
 | **Pre-Development Phase*** CORP Regional component funds pre-development costs.
* This includes: Feasibility studies, business advisory services, Legal and accounting, Licenses, permits, regulations and registrations approvals, Environmental surveys, Engineering/Architectural designs, Project costs estimates, Land tenure.

**Prioritization/**[**Approval Process**](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=95734240)**:*** 2 calls for proposals annually.
* Regions review proposals to determine eligibility for funding
* National ranking & recommendation process

**Project Implementation*** Once projects receive senior management approval, project status report (PSAR) forms are filled out by Regions and recommended to the Regional Environmental Director for signature
* Regional offices put funding agreements in place, enter these into GCIMS/SAP, and funding flows to FN.
* Once projects are completed, financial reporting is received based on DCI

**Close-Out/O&M*** N/A

**Annual Budget Process** |
| What Works Well*From the perspective of headquarters and regional employees, what features of each program present challenges or opportunities for improvement (to contextualize information about those features)* | * FNSWMI: Ongoing communication between Environment and Infrastructure teams enables timely and favourable results
* AFN flagged several concerns with the tendering process (timelines, need for flexibility) in its [Final Report](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=105720574) to be addressed in the ongoing tendering policy update.
 | * Ongoing communication between Environment and Infrastructure teams in HQ and regions enables timely and favourable results to project delivery
 |  | * FNSWMI : Current processes work well, e.g. the allocation and investment planning process between HQ and the Regions
 | * Current process working well between Regions and HQ, Updates to the MCF intended to speed up project approvals
 |
| Current Challenges*From the perspective of headquarters and regional employees, what features of each program present challenges or opportunities for improvement (to contextualize information about those features)* | * FNSWMI: Communication issues within region between Environment and Infrastructure teams
* FNSWMI: Project approvals take longer if waste projects not prioritized within CIB, which impacts all minor and major capital projects
 | * While currently being worked on, there are currently no feasibility guidance documents available for OCI sub-assets.
 | * Large cost-share projects with provincial health departments
 | * No challenges determined.
 | * No challenges determined
 |
| **IM/IT Systems***What are the main IM/IT systems that house data and information used to administer each program and support program accountability.* | * GCDocs – General Repository
* Integrated Capital Management System (ICMS) – also used by FNSWMI
* Enhanced Asset Condition Reporting System (E-ACRS) – ICMS module
* Capital Asset Inventory System (CAIS)
* Grants and Contributions Information Management System (GCIMS) – ICMS module
* System Applications and Products (SAP) – used by regions to commit funding but also by HQ to check Freebalance
* Waste assets – ICMS team currently working with Solid Waste teams to add all solid waste assets into ICMS (for March/April 2023) and they are working with CIB to add asset components in the E-ACRS form (for April 2023)
* Enterprise Data and Analytics Service (EDAS)
 | * Same as CFMP.
 | * ISC Synergy in Action application (SIA) (2018) – To replace RPIMS to support regional capital allocation methodology, capital planning, budgeting workflows, expected to be repository for HFP data moving forward
* GCIMS - Transfer payment system to record, track, manage service transfer payment funding arrangements
* SAP - Tracks departmental expenditures
* FNIHB is currently working on a data collaboration project to integrate available health program and service data with health infrastructure data. The work is intended to augment already available data solutions and datasets housed in internal systems instead of incorporating or developing another separate IT database approach that would not permit the same level of interoperability and relationship-based data compilation.
 | Same as CFMP.  | The CORP uses the following systems:* GCDocs
* GCIMS
* SAP
* BDS
 |
| What Works Well*From the perspective of headquarters and regional employees, what are the beneficial features of each program (to contextualize information about those features)* | * FNSWMI has adopted/integrated into the CFMP systems, which improves consistency and reduces time/effort in reporting.
* FNSWMI: Internal tracking at regional level works well with proper due diligence
 |  | * The work towards greater Indigenous self-determination, transfer and devolution of services at ISC will inevitably require common data collaboration efforts, such as FNIHB’s project, to easily link and maintain relationship-based data for all users, whether internal or external.
 | * FNSWMI: Internal tracking at regional level works well with proper due diligence
* HQ can use data already available from the Regions to respond to requests related to indicators and results.
 |  |
| Current Challenges*From the perspective of headquarters and regional employees, what features of each program present challenges or opportunities for improvement (to contextualize information about those features)* | * Communication/Links between systems:

No communication between GCIMS and ICMS for financial data (in particular actual expenditures).Information must be manually cross-referenced – Project Tracking module of ICMS does not communicate with GCIMS* Access to Systems: Some regions only have access to SAP and not GCIMS (FNSWMI)
* Overlap between SAP and GCIMS with information
* ICMS is not user-friendly, does not allow for integration between programs (i.e. differences among programs have to be manually entered – e.g. not all waste assets are included in Assets module so they are not accounted for within O&M module; waste assets, services and operators funded at 100% within the initiative and do not follow current regional operations’ formulas)
* ICMS is the official repository, but use as the only IM system is not enforced by RO to Regions. Too many black books and side spreadsheets used across RO creating IM/reporting challenges.
* These are all internal ISC systems, for First Nations do not have access.
 | * ICMS data of OCI projects not consistently entered, or used for the same purposes across Regions
* Same issues as other programs with ICMS and GCIMS
 | * Challenging to find/access key documents.
* FNIHB doesn’t use ICMS, which creates challenges for RO for consolidated reporting.
* Data is in many forms across FNIHB.
* Legacy INAC systems do not readily allow for the compilation of health program data with the infrastructure data.
* The BC Tripartite transfer to the BC First Nations Health Authority in 2013 illustrated the unsustainability of stand-alone, legacy IT databases and software developed only for a single program. The way forward must involve industry-standard open data solutions that can be easily transferred to Indigenous communities and organizations as appropriate. Currently, this includes primarily Microsoft-enabled data solutions and formats, which form the basis of most business operations in all industries.
 | * FNSWMI: Project Tracking module within ICMS does not communicate with GCIMs at all; this step must be completed manually by officers within the program
* FNSWMI: Regional officers submit project information into ICMS, which are then utilized for Quarterly reporting purposes, but the financial information within this module is generally forecasted and/or estimated. Headquarters needs to cross reference the actual financials submitted into GCIMs for funding agreements and match them up with the corresponding project in the Project Tracking module in ICMS.
 | * Shared responsibilities between Regions and HQ on the application and selection process results in different types of administrative data being split between Regions and HQ. Work is ongoing to develop best practices for regions and HQ to improve capacity to conduct quantitative analysis without creating undue administrative burden for regions for data collection, cleaning, and transmission
 |
| **First Nations Experience\****What feedback have programs received from First Nations on how the programs work for them, including how these programs enable them to address their infrastructure needs*\*Note: this section will be updated following engagement with First Nations to attribute direct feedback received from First Nations  | * FN communities own the infrastructure once it is constructed.
 | * Same as CFMP.
 | * FN communities own the infrastructure once they construct and maintain it.
* Health infrastructure supports the delivery of health programs and services for First Nation communities.
 | * FN communities own the infrastructure and/or asset once it is constructed.
 | * FN communities own the infrastructure once it is constructed.
* Infrastructure projects are typically proposed by highest capacity communities; small and remote communities face greater challenges with developing infrastructure projects
 |
| What Works Well*From the perspective of headquarters and regional employees, what are the beneficial features of each program (to contextualize information about those features)* |  |  |  | * [Challenges with O&M inefficiency addressed through funding for education and training for communities.](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=107847046)
 | * Return on investment is 3:1 for each CORP-PF project
 |
| Current Challenges *From the perspective of headquarters and regional employees, what features of each program present challenges or opportunities for improvement (to contextualize information about those features)* | * Inconsistent funding for operations and maintenance leads to early infrastructure erosion and loss of investments.
* Despite progress towards lifting long-term drinking water advisories, continued investment needed to achieve that goal. [(2021 Evaluation)](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1626263417608/1626263462807)
* AFN’s [final report on the Tendering Policy](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=105720574) flagged a need to support First Nations capacity in both tendering and in infrastructure more generally.
* **UPIP**: Within the scope of the IRS TB submission, TBS indicated that UPIP should not be used for capital off-reserve, and that ISC should contemplate amendments to CFMP. In accordance with TBS’s comments, the CFMP authorities have been amended within the context of IRS sites only.
 | * Opportunities to integrate energy efficiency measures into new builds/ retrofits to offset costs, increase energy security.
* Challenge to create climate-resilient infrastructure, including wildfire, flood, extreme weather conditions.
* UPIP amendment to include housing – not yet approved.
* Coordination with OGDs: in many cases, other government departments (e.g. Infrastructure Canada, ISED, CIRNAC) also provide funding for the same asset categories and may have funds dedicated to Indigenous project applicants. This requires coordination of information between ISC HQ/regional offices and OGDs. It also increases the burden on ISC O&M funding when OGD fund capital costs, but not O&M support. This is challenging for First Nations communities to navigate.
 | * Building owner vs. occupier/operator dynamics (e.g. addictions treatment centres operate as not-for-profit entities)
* Building owner vs.project administrator dynamics
 | * Funding will not be available through this authority to First Nations once the program sunsets in 2027-28
* Continued investment is required to ensure all First Nations have adequate solid waste management.
 | * Lack of success stories from communities for CORP funded projects.
* CORP continues to be highly accessed across all regions and current need greatly outstrips existing budgets
* More can be done to provide capacity development supports to increase the likelihood of First Nations and Inuit communities successfully navigating the risk-based selection process for project funding
* CORP currently does not fund connectivity projects
 |
| **Program Interactions***How does the program overlap with other programs or initiatives underway/how do infrastructure aspects relate to other services and programs that are delivered*  | RO collaborated with FNIHB on the Infrastructure Harmonization Initiative (IHI). During that project we conducted a lot of research and analysis of the policies and guidance. The outcomes of the IHI will inform the infrastructure work.**Service Transfer Arrangements** work ongoing to transfer service delivery to First Nations, e.g. Atlantic First Nations Water Authority. Potentially impacted by the creation of the single authority and/or this work should be oriented to support eventual service transfer. **Land use planning & capital planning studies -** Strong link between land use and infrastructure, if this is not managed as part of infrastructure, might face challenges down the road. **Environmental Public Health Division (EPHD)** undertakes inspections of CFMP-funded assets, Public Health engineering reviews. Coordination needed to adjust/update policies and processes for this. **Climate Change/Resilient Infrastructure****Indian Residential Schools (IRS)** hasusedtheCFMP’sT&Crelated to schools. Coordination needed as part of the creation of the single authority. **Urban Programming for Indigenous Peoples (UPIP)** alsosupports infrastructure for urban Indigenous communities off-reserve that increase the physical capacity and improve the safety, security, and accessibility of urban and rural Indigenous service delivery organization's facilities to deliver new programming or to respond to increased demand for existing programs (e.g., addictions, disabilities, seniors services, navigator services, training, youth mentoring.) **Primary Health Care Authority (PHC)** The program also provides funding for infrastructure for healthy child development, daycare/early childhood learning, social services, maternal services, cost-shared under the CFMP & HFP. Funding for this may need to be examined as part of the creation of the single authority, and policy and process may need to be adjusted. Jordan’s Principle leverages this program’s T&C also. [**Emergency Management Assistance Program (EMAP)**](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1386012167936/1615723040222) also provides funding for infrastructure in emergency situations. **CHRT Obligations:** [**Jordan’s Principle**](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=107876188)Despite having its own source of funds, it leverages the CFMP’s T&C for infrastructure requests. Coordination needed as part of the creation of the single authority to avoid adverse impacts on Jordan’s Principle but also avoid duplicate funding, demonstrate compliance with CHRT orders. [**First Nations Child and Family Services (FNCFS)**](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1654889232581/1654889302519)also provides funding for infrastructure that supports the delivery of prevention and protection services for children and families. [**Community Well-Being and Jurisdiction Initiatives Program (CWJI)**](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1635435393871/1635435617423) also provides funding for infrastructure to support the delivery of child and family services. [**New Fiscal Relationship (NFR) Grant**](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/Overview/46205087)Sourced from existing reference levels, and administration of funds may need to be adjusted with the creation of the single authority.[**Regional Education Agreements (REAs)**](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1654194365701/1654194420760)on the design and delivery of education services. Coordination needed to ensure education infrastructure supports these arrangements.[**Indigenous Early Learning Childhood Care (IELCC)**](https://www.canada.ca/en/employment-social-development/programs/indigenous-early-learning/2018-framework.html)**Procurement Strategy for Indigenous Business (PSIB)****OGD Infrastructure Programs**CMHC Programs: on/off-reserve renovation funding, Family Violence Prevention Program, Shelter Enhancement Program.CIRNAC: Housing for Inuit, funding for cultural space.  | Same as CFMP, with additional interactions on: **Land use planning & capital planning studies -** Strong link between land use and infrastructure, if this is not managed as part of infrastructure, might face challenges down the road. **Climate Change: Resilient Infrastructure (adaptation) and green buildings/ GHG reductions (mitigation)****Urban Programming for Indigenous Peoples (UPIP)** funds safe, accessible spaces to deliver culturally-relevant services to urban Indigenous peoples, similar to OCI sub-asset of culture and rec facilities. [**New Fiscal Relationship (NFR) Grant**](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/Overview/46205087)Sourced from existing reference levels, and administration of funds may need to be adjusted with the creation of the single authority.**Procurement Strategy for Indigenous Business (PSIB)****Emergency Management –** mitigation is one of the four pillars, which includes structural mitigation**OGD Infrastructure Funding Programs:[[7]](#footnote-7)** NRCan and CIRNAC program (clean energy Hub) to transition Indigenous communities off-diesel by 2030. ISED UBF program for connectivityCRTC program for connectivityINFC program for rural and remote communities (connectivity, roads, community buildings)ECCC on Low Carbon Economy Fund INFC on the Canada Community Buildings Fund (Formerly GTF) INFC on the delivery of the IICP (through bilateral agreements with provinces)CIRNAC FN AdaptNRCan’s Energy Efficiency Programs NRCan’s Green Buildings Strategy ECCC’s National Adaptation Strategy (and implementation under INFC as lead for resilient infrastructure approach). INFC’s DMAF program for climate resilience and adaptationINFC’s Green and Inclusive Communities Building Program for community infrastructure, like arenas, cultural and recreation centres **Provincial programs /mandates:**Electrification / energyRoads and bridges off reservesClimate adaptation (dams and dykes off reserve)Delivery of ICIP through INFC’s bilateral agreements and ISC cost sharing for FN recipients.  | RO collaborated with FNIHB on the Infrastructure Harmonization Initiative (IHI). During that project we conducted a lot of research and analysis of the policies and guidance. The outcomes of the IHI will inform the infrastructure work. **Service Transfer Arrangements** work ongoing to transfer health service delivery to First Nations, e.g. BC First Nations Health Authority. Potentially impacted by the creation of the single authority and/or this work should be oriented to support eventual service transfer.**Land use planning & capital planning studies**Strong link between land use and infrastructure, if this is not managed as part of infrastructure, might face challenges down the road.**Health Services**Health infrastructure supports health service delivery. Currently infrastructure based on current health service delivery of FNIHB programs that require infrastructure space. Coordination needed to ensure that infrastructure continues to meet service needs. (e.g. Primary Care).Provincial support for health service delivery (e.g. Physicians)**Climate Change/Resilient Infrastructure****CHRT Obligations:** [**Jordan’s Principle**](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=107876188)Despite having its own source of funds, it leverages the HFP T&C for infrastructure requests. Coordination needed as part of the creation of the single authority to avoid adverse impacts on Jordan’s Principle but also avoid duplicate funding, demonstrate compliance with CHRT orders.[**First Nations Child and Family Services (FNCFS)**](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1654889232581/1654889302519)also provides funding for infrastructure that supports the delivery of prevention and protection services for children and families. [**Community Well-Being and Jurisdiction Initiatives Program (CWJI)**](https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1635435393871/1635435617423)also provides funding for infrastructure to support the delivery of child and family services.[**New Fiscal Relationship (NFR) Grant**](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/Overview/46205087)Sourced from existing reference levels, and administration of funds may need to be adjusted with the creation of the single authority.**Regional Health Committees**On health facilities/service delivery. Coordination needed to ensure health infrastructure supports these arrangements (e.g. Health Co-management Board) in Alberta).**Procurement Strategy for Indigenous Business (PSIB)****Water/Wastewater****eHealth, broadband, technology** | **Legal and Regulatory Requirements**The *Indian Reserve Waste Disposal Regulations* and *Impact Assessment Act* also need to be followed when undertaking infrastructure projects. **Contaminated Sites On Reserve (CSOR)** First Nations Solid Waste Management Initiative (FNSWMI) leverages the [CSOR T&C for funds for Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs)](https://www.sac.gc.ca/eng/1386010106915/1615723093657), which is not in the scope of the single authority. Coordination/ adjustments needed to avoid issues/duplication. **Land use planning & capital planning studies**Strong link between land use and infrastructure, if this is not managed as part of infrastructure, might face challenges down the road. **Climate Change/Resilient Infrastructure****Indian Residential Schools (IRS)****[New Fiscal Relationship (NFR) Grant](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/Overview/46205087)** Sourced from existing reference levels, and administration of funds may need to be adjusted with the creation of the single authority.**Procurement Strategy for Indigenous Business (PSIB)** | **Land use planning & capital planning study**Strong link between land use and infrastructure, if this is not managed as part of infrastructure, might face challenges down the road. **Climate Change/Resilient Infrastructure****Procurement/Tendering:** LED is piloting an online “Indigenous Business Infrastructure Hub” for FN Housing which could support Indigenous entrepreneurs to take advantage of procurement opportunities in infrastructure investments.[**New Fiscal Relationship (NFR) Grant**](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/Overview/46205087)Sourced from existing reference levels, and administration of funds may need to be adjusted with the creation of the single authority.**Procurement Strategy for Indigenous Business (PSIB)**  |
| What Works Well*From the perspective of headquarters and regional employees, what are the beneficial features of each program (to contextualize information about those features)* |  | * Strong relations built with key partners in OGDs on OCI sub-assets
* Strong relations built with key partners in OGDs on infrastructure adaptation (resilience) and infrastructure mitigation (greening/GHG reductions)
 |  |  |  |
| Current Challenges*From the perspective of headquarters and regional employees, what features of each program present challenges or opportunities for improvement (to contextualize information about those features)* |  | * Significant challenges in ensuring OGD programs do not counteract infrastructure investments by ISC;
* No O&M resources provided by OGD programs
* Projects implemented by OGDs limits available O&M funds available for more assets in a community;
* Given considerable effort required, coordinating funding agreements’ T&C and delivering on different reporting requirements of OGD programs negatively impacts many FN communities’ abilities to access funding and deliver projects
 |  |  |  |
| **Program Information Contact\****Who to contact to get additional about the program.* *\*If you are interested in being engaged in specific discussions, please include your information in the Contact List in* [*GCDocs*#*108205782*](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=overview&objid=108205782) | **Sean Somers, Clava Abou-Takka, Guillaume Danis+ RO Regional Offices** | **Robert Bellizzi, Julie Paquette, Christine Twerdoclib + RO Regional Offices** | **Stephane Romain, Paul Leonard+ FNIHB Regional Offices** | **Andrea McDonald (Acting), Patrick Haggerty, Kaitlin Heron+ RO Regional Offices** | **Lyndon Simmons, Dustin Remillard, Cheryl Sutherland+ RO Regional Offices** |

**Initial Observations for Discussion**

* **Key Similarities**
	+ CFMP, FNIF, HFP, LEDSP all appear to have the same general process steps for delivering targeted infrastructure funds, e.g. investment planning, project approval.
	+ FNIF, LEDSP already using a lot of the existing policies and tools used under the CFMP, e.g. policies (tendering policy), O&M guidance, systems.
* **Key Differences**
	+ Program accountabilities e.g. project/funding approval is delegated to a different level, with higher delegation of authority under the CFMP compared to others (Directors/Mangers can approve projects under $10M, whereas HFP requires SADM approval, FNSWMI requires DG & RDG approval, CORP requires DG HQ approval for projects over $250k, and LED ADM approval for projects over $1M).
	+ CFMP policies, processes, and supporting tools are significantly more developed than those for other programs, but also more prescriptive allowing less flexibility/discretion.
	+ Whereas CFMP & HFP support pre-capital planning, project scoping, feasibility studies (TBD whether also LEDSP).
	+ HFP uses a needs-based prioritization framework to determine where investments may be made whereas the CFMP conducts a yearly call-out and an application based process for many of the programs. FNIHB’s planning processes start earlier in that they need to determine the service delivery model (i.e. what programs/quantity/program budget/need that translates into space requirements) first before a normative industry standard capital process is implemented.
	+ HFP and CORP do not use the same information systems as CFMP, FNIF, LEDSP.
	+ HFP governance and processes appear involve greater First Nations participation than the other programs.
	+ Whereas the CFMP, FNIF, and HFP’s program objectives are primarily about supporting infrastructure, the objectives of the LEDSP/CORP are primarily about developing land and economic capacity in FN communities (i.e. those programs are not primarily about infrastructure).
	+ HFP contracting/tendering process and requirements are different than the other programs.
	+ Programs have different definitions for common terms, e.g. of O&M, minor/major capital.
* **Key Considerations/Opportunities**
	+ Have all of the relevant features of the five programs been identified?
	+ A decision will be needed on how accountability for the single authority will be distributed before work in other areas can proceed.
	+ A decision will be needed on how funding will be distributed fairly and equitably across asset-types under the single authority as well as across regional offices will also be important. This which funds from the LEDSP and CORP will go over to the single authority, how funds will be distributed between project-based and investment-based approaches, as well as how any new funds sought to support the reforms will be distributed.
	+ This may require updates to supporting policies and processes, e.g. priority ranking frameworks.
	+ Important foundational work for policy & process harmonization in support of the single authority also includes:
		- Establishing common definitions for key terms, such as project, O&M, minor/major capital
		- Ensuring that all programs are using the same IT systems and/or that key systems are linked and/or speak to each other, as this supports other roles and responsibilities. If ISC establishes a Single Infrastructure Authority, there will need to be a single repository to support consistent program administration, reporting, and other accountabilities. Start with expenditures and build from there. This is a IMO this policy/process/roles & responsibilities issue. Clear directions needed from senior management, which would involve major investments in IT reporting solutions. Reporting work done from the old SIA team could be leveraged for this.
	+ Areas that could be achieved more easily include:
		- Investment Planning process, Calls for Proposals, and application processes, and/or other methods for identifying and prioritizing which projects will be funded and when. This includes what information is required from FN and how FN participate in those processes.
		- Reporting requirements, including what information is requested, and how and when it is reported.
	+ LEDSP and CORP don’t have significant FTE support, and HFP is significantly short-staffed. This should be addressed moving forward.
	+ Each of the programs have their strengths and weaknesses, which provides an opportunity to leverage the strengths of all of them. Further discussion should focus on identifying these strengths and weaknesses, and the experiences of First Nations, Inuit, Metis, landless bands and/or other eligible recipients with each of the programs.
	+ Many of the programs work differently in practice than the way they are described in policy/process documents. This will be challenging for learning about how the programs currently operate.
	+ Given that only part of the programmatic areas from the CORP & LEDSP would form part of the Single Authority, consideration will also be needed to ensure that those programs continue to operate well.
	+ A number of other programs and initiatives intersect with the five infrastructure programs listed, which needs to be take into consideration in this work.
	+ As the work to implement the single authority proceeds, it will be important to ensure that the new/adjusted policies and processes facilitate the infrastructure process for First Nations (rather than imposing burdens) and help build their capacity to take on the administration of infrastructure funding themselves.
	+ Former Program Evaluations should be used to gather additional internal and First Nations perspectives on what works well and what doesn’t with the current programs to inform discussions on how to consolidate them into a single authority:
		- Evaluation of the First Nations Solid Waste Management Initiative (sac-isc.gc.ca)
		- Evaluation of the Water and Wastewater On-Reserve Program (sac-isc.gc.ca)
		- Audit of On-Reserve Housing (rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca)
		- Audit of On-Reserve Infrastructure (Excluding Water and Wastewater) (rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca)
		- Preliminary findings from the Housing, Education Facilities and OCI and Activities program evaluations are now available and the report should be available soon, which include interesting info from FNs.
	+ It will be important to outline overlaps and gaps in programming across the Government of Canada (beyond just ISC). This could include the identification of other federal government departments that provide funding or infrastructure for which Indigenous Peoples are eligible. Key considerations in this area could include determining whether funding is available on/off reserve, whether it's accessible to all Indigenous distinction groups and whether the source of funds is proposal/application based or if there are dedicated streams of funding for each Indigenous distinction (this helps determine a baseline of funding by asset type and assess whether addressing gaps and ensuring equity are possible). Examples include programming from ISED, CMHC, CIRNAC.
1. Structural mitigation projects are those that will reduce the impacts of natural disasters and climate-related extreme weather (i.e. the construction of dykes, dams, culverts, berms, fire walls, etc.). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Economic infrastructure is explained in the [Management Control Framework](https://gcdocs.intra.pri/aanc-inac/llisapi.dll/link/58456211) as being that which supports First Nation and Inuit communities in their pursuit of, and participation in, economic activities. Economic benefits can be quantitative or qualitative in nature. All CORP applications must be assessed to ensure that funding will contribute to economic development in First Nation or Inuit communities. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Senior mgmt. committees review funding methodology options (NIDC), make recommendations on funding reallocations (IIAWG), and endorse and recommend funding allocations (RO-SMC) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Major capital is any proposed capital project that has a total cost estimate of $1,000,000 or more, involves funding over more than one year in duration; or, includes the development of architectural design works. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Minor capital projects include repairs, upgrades and renovation to a facility that cannot be addressed through existing operations and maintenance budgets and that do not meet the risk and complexity threshold for being considered a major capital project. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. First Nations can also submit an application for infrastructure projects at any time but it’s always integrated in the annual investment planning process anyway. To get funding, a project should be part of the FNIIP. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. RIDB-SPMR is working to identify all federal programs supporting infrastructure to First Nations: the federal Indigenous Infrastructure Funding Placemat. It itemizes all federal programs aligned to CFMP, FNIF, HFP, LEDSP, and CORP. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)