

Background on FN-Municipal Partnerships



Western Social Science

Indigenous Water Governance: Best Practices

- Adequate funding
- Regulations
- Formalized Decision-Making
- Relationality
- Seven Grandfathers/Generations
- Women Leadership

Analysis of Existing Agreements

Agreement Assessment Criteria

A. Financial Capacity

- 1. Does the agreement include bulk water fee structures that better align with Indigenous economies?
- 2. Does the agreement include provisions for the negotiation of any future rate increases?
- 3. Does the agreement include funding provisions for initial capital costs associated with the implementation of the agreement?

4. Does the agreement include other factors which impact the capacity of First Nations to implement the agreement?

B. Cultural Protection

1. Does the agreement include wording which recognizes the spiritual relationship of First Nations to water as something more than a commodity?

C. Sovereignty

1. Does the agreement include provisions which recognize Indigenous nationhood, treaties, rights, and other forms of Indigenous sovereignty?

2. Can the municipality, for any reason outside routine maintenance and repair, unilaterally cut off the supply of water to the First Nation?

3. Does the agreement allow for the free usage of water, for any purpose, by the First Nation?

- 4. Does the agreement include mechanisms of joint governance of the agreement?
- 5. Does the agreement include other factors which impact the sovereignty of the First Nation?

TABLE 2 Agreements by category

Categories	Number of agreements	% of Total agreements
A. Financial Capacity		
1. Bulk Fees	36	90.0%
2. Rate Negotiation	10	25.0%
3. Capital Costs	13	32.5%
B. Cultural Protection		
1. Spiritual Relationship	2	5.0%
C. Sovereignty		
1. Recognize Indigenous Rights	19	47.5%
2. Unilaterally Cut-off Water	19	47.5%
3. Free Usage of Water	28	70.0%
4. Joint Governance	6	15.0%

Western Social Science

