

A FIRST NATIONS LANGUAGES  
FUNDING MODEL:  
POSITION PAPER

## Acronyms

AFN	Assembly of First Nations
ALI	Aboriginal Languages Initiative
CCOL	Chiefs' Committee on Languages
CIRNAC	Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada
DCH	Department of Canadian Heritage
ILC	Indigenous Languages Component
ILCP	Indigenous Languages and Cultures Program
ISC	Indigenous Services Canada
OCIL	Office of the Commissioner of Indigenous Languages
SGA	Self-Governing Agreements
TBS	Treasury Board Submission
TCOL	Technical Committee on Languages
TRC	Truth and Reconciliation Calls to Action
UNDRIPA	United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act

# Table of Contents

- Section I..... 3
  - Preface ..... 3
  - Purpose ..... 4
  - Context..... 7
  - Authorities Sought from the Treasury Board..... 9
- Section II..... 10
  - Funding Streams ..... 10
    - First Nations Control ..... 16
- Section III..... 18
  - Costs..... 18
- Section IV ..... 20
  - Results and Performance Measurement ..... 20
- Section V ..... 23
  - Risks ..... 23
- Section VI ..... 25
  - Implementation of the First Nations Languages Funding Model ..... 25
    - Transition to Ongoing Programmatic Funding and Agreements ..... 26
    - Regional Allocation Formula ..... 27
    - Data Collection ..... 29
    - Whole-of-Government Approach ..... 30
    - ILCP Revisions..... 30

## Section I

### Preface

It is the constitutional and inherent right of each First Nations government to direct, maintain and develop their own language and culture. First Nations languages pre-existed the creation of Canada and can be recognized as an existing Aboriginal right under section 35(1) of the *Constitution Act*. As such, full authority over their languages and language related matters resides with First Nations.

The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act (UNDRIPA) sets out a framework for the implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UN Declaration) at the federal level in Canada. First Nations have the right to self-determination which is rooted in our own languages, lands, laws, governance, and existence as unique peoples. First Nations languages are linked to the land and the land is linked to ceremonies – ceremonies are linked to Treaties and Treaties are ceremonies. The reclamation, revitalization, and maintenance of Indigenous languages globally is important to the survival of Indigenous Peoples globally, including First Nations.

The Government of Canada has commitment to addressing First Nations language revitalization as stipulated in the *Indigenous Languages Act (the Act)*. The purpose of the Act, in part, is to support the reclamation, revitalization, maintenance and strengthening of Indigenous languages in Canada. The First Nations Languages Funding Model further acknowledges that a substantial increase in funding is essential to the success of the Funding Model in fully addressing the needs of First Nations, First Nations languages and implementing the Act.

The annual proposal-based funding approach that the Department of Canadian Heritage (DCH) used for the former Aboriginal Languages Initiative (ALI) and now used for the Indigenous Languages and Culture Program's (ILCP) Indigenous Languages Component (ILC) does not meet First Nations' needs. This document proposes a way forward in better supporting the transmission of First Nations languages by: increasing the availability of adequate, consistent, and long-term funding to First Nations and First Nations organizations and increasing First Nations decision-making with respect to languages funding.

DCH must submit a Treasury Board Submission for a new distinctions-based Indigenous Languages Funding Model in the fall of 2022. Adherence to that timeline is essential to unlock languages funding that Budget 2019 provided for 2023-24 and future years. In the absence of an approved Treasury Board Submission, DCH will not have the authority to spend its ILC funding, which amounts to \$115.7 million annually for all distinctions.

As mandated by Resolution 10/21, *Support for the co-development of a distinctions-based Indigenous Languages Funding Model*, the Assembly of First Nations (AFN), the Technical Committee on Languages (TCOL) and First Nations regions were involved in the development of the proposed First Nations Languages Funding Model (“Funding Model”), with support from the Chiefs Committee on Languages (CCOL). Resolution 10/21 also called on First Nations-in-Assembly to ratify the Funding Model before it is delivered to DCH.

Therefore, the development and approval of the Funding Model is a practical, interim measure to achieve the release of Budget 2019 funding to support language revitalization. It is important to note that the Funding Model does not include languages funding through the education system for Kindergarten to Grade 12 (K-12). A parallel process is being determined to support a separate budget ask for funding through Indigenous Services (ISC) Canada for languages in schools.

## Purpose

First Nations have made it clear that funding for language revitalization must be significantly increased and that new approaches to distribution are required to support First Nations languages. The Funding Model envisions a shift away from proposal-based funding and toward the implementation of ongoing programmatic funding for language revitalization, and the use of long-term agreements under Section 8 and 9<sup>1</sup> of the Act as vehicles for defining needs and transferring funding, along with increased funding to support First Nations languages. Successful language reclamation, revitalization, maintenance, and ultimately, normalization require a commitment to long-term and predictable funding. The Funding Model also proposes substantial increases in funding to better address the needs of First Nations, First Nations languages, and support the full implementation of the Act.

The Funding Model is a means for ensuring adequate, sustainable, and long-term funding for community-based language revitalization initiatives led by First Nations and First Nations organizations. The Funding Model supports the transfer of decision-making to First Nations. The Government of Canada must not proceed with a unilateral decision-making process and must not transfer ILCP funding to other federal departments, provincial and territorial governments, or non-First Nations organizations at its sole discretion. Control over funding decisions regarding languages must be transferred to First Nations to ensure a First Nations-led approach.

First Nations must lead in the implementation of the Funding Model and in language reclamation, revitalization, maintenance, and strengthening more broadly. To ensure holistic support, the provision of funding must account for the multi-faceted and multi-

---

<sup>1</sup> It is acknowledged that, at this time, there is only funding available to support short-term Section 8 and 9 agreements.

generational nature of language reclamation, revitalization, and maintenance efforts. This is essential to ensure the progression towards increased language fluency and the normalization of language usage. Language revitalization requires planning, various funding streams, the appropriate sequencing of activities and consistent monitoring. Funding certainty is essential for all funding streams to ensure the success of language initiatives for all stages of language revitalization and to respond to the unique goals of individual First Nations for their languages. Over time, First Nations languages will be taught and used in multiple domains, including the household, workplaces, the community, and beyond.

First Nations are proposing an interim Funding Model to:

1. Ensure Budget 2019 funding is unlocked for 2023-24 and future years (\$115.7M annually for all distinctions and the Office of the Commissioner of Indigenous Languages) – without approval of the Indigenous Languages Funding Model, no future funding will be available through the Indigenous Languages Component of the Indigenous Languages and Cultures Program;
2. Provide a budget ask for greater funding to support First Nations languages at approximately \$14 billion over 10 years;
3. Shift the transfer of funding from the current proposal-based funding approach toward ongoing programmatic funding that does not have to be applied for, and funding agreements;
4. Conduct an initial 3-year review of the Funding Model, with subsequent reviews as determined by First Nations to make adjustments to the Funding Model as needed; and,
5. Recommend new factors that are supported by First Nations to inform the development of a revised regional allocation formula and to ensure equitability in funding allocations across all regions.

The Funding Model also allows First Nations and First Nations organizations to pursue their own language revitalization activities as they see fit and acknowledges the importance of data collection to inform language revitalization funding renewal.

Importantly, the Funding Model will not remain fixed or unchangeable. It is subject to periodic reviews by First Nations and will be amended as required to improve it and to better accommodate First Nations' interests in their unique circumstances. The Funding Model will be updated as required to ensure that it remains flexible and responsive to First Nations' evolving needs. The Funding Model calls for an initial review after three years, after which the review schedule will be determined by First Nations.

The Funding Model also recommends, following the initial review, that the regional allocation formula be reviewed periodically to ensure its continued equitability and effectiveness. New factors for inclusion in the allocation formula are set out in this

proposal. In addition, changes to the allocation formula will have to be discussed further with First Nations during the implementation phase. No region is to receive a reduction in its funding through the transition to a revised regional allocation formula.

If the Funding Model requires revisions to the terms and conditions for grants and contributions or to the Program Guidelines under DCH's ILCP, those revisions will also have to be discussed further with First Nations on a co-management basis.

As stated earlier, the Funding Model does not include language funding that is transferred to and is required for K-12<sup>2</sup> in the on-reserve education system, which falls under the mandate of Indigenous Services Canada (ISC). In addition, the purposes for which ILCP funding may be spent do not include purposes that are funded via ISC's K-12 programming.

A whole-of-government approach is required to support First Nations language revitalization and the success of the Funding Model. It is acknowledged that all levels and all branches of government – federal, provincial, territorial, and municipal – need to work together with First Nations toward language revitalization and the full implementation of the Act. Education, health, social, justice and infrastructure are important areas to be included in this whole-of-government approach. The Funding Model acknowledges the need for regions and communities to have the infrastructure to support language revitalization efforts. Support for infrastructure needs is not provided through ILCP funding and the Minister of Canadian Heritage will need to support collaboration with other federal government departments and must be part of the implementation process.

At the request of First Nations, the Minister must engage key federal departments, including ISC (e.g., K-12 language instruction, Post-Secondary Education), Health Canada (e.g., Head Start), Employment and Social Development Canada (e.g., skills development training, accreditation) and Correctional Service Canada, among others, in discussions about those departments using their resources, where possible, to support the revitalization of First Nations languages. Similarly, the Minister must facilitate engagement with provincial and territorial governments in similar discussions where First Nations so choose.

Under the Funding Model, funding will be available to all First Nations, including Self-governing First Nations (SGFN) and First Nations with Modern Treaties. The Funding Model respects and acknowledges SGFNs' existing Treaty and fiscal processes. The

---

<sup>2</sup> A separate funding approach will have to be developed for language revitalization that takes place within K-12 on-reserve education programming. Public schools fall under the provincial/territorial jurisdiction and the provinces and territories must also ensure that public schools receive funding for language revitalization that occurs off-reserve. Section 8 or 9 agreements may support such coordination. However, under the First Nations Languages Funding Model, the Minister of Canadian Heritage will not unilaterally transfer ILCP funding to provinces and territories; the Minister may enter into agreements with the support of First Nations.

Funding Model also recognizes Self-Governing Agreements (SGA) and Financial Transfer Agreements (FTA) as products of the unique Nation-to-Nation relationship which governs Crown-SGFN relations. Pursuing funding under the Funding Model alone would not necessarily satisfy Canada's obligations pursuant to their SGA.

The Government of Canada frequently uses grants to transfer funding to SGFNs. Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada (CIRNAC) administers most of Canada's grant transfers to SFGNs. SGFNs are able to access languages funding under the Funding Model through: (1) ongoing programmatic funding, multi-year or annual proposal-based funding or (2) through Section 8 and 9 agreements. SFGNs may also access languages funding through (3) the fiscal provisions and processes within their SGA and/or Modern Treaties. Whether or not an SGFN decides to access funding under the Funding Model or through a Section 8 or 9 agreement, the underlying Treaty/SGA/FTA obligations would still remain in place.

In this paper, the term "First Nations organization" refers to an organization that is owned and controlled by First Nations persons, including a First Nations-owned corporation or a First Nations controlled non-profit organization, that directly delivers language revitalization services or that otherwise supports the delivery of language revitalization services.

## Context

After years of advocacy by First Nations, the Government of Canada now has a legislated commitment to respecting Indigenous languages with the passing of the *Indigenous Languages Act* (the Act) in 2019. The purpose of the Act is to support the reclamation, revitalization, maintenance and strengthening of Indigenous languages in Canada. One of the key objectives of the Act is to ensure that Indigenous Peoples have adequate, sustainable, and long-term funding and support for Indigenous-led initiatives. The development of the broader Indigenous Languages Funding Model is therefore, in part, a response to the advocacy for and passing of the Act.

Indigenous Peoples have the right to revitalize, use, develop and transmit their languages to future generations, as affirmed by the UN Declaration. Through the Act, the Government of Canada recognizes and reaffirms Indigenous language rights as inherent, Constitutional (Section 35 of the *Constitution Act, 1982*), and international human rights, through the UN Declaration. The UN Declaration contains specific articles on Indigenous languages and articles that relate to Indigenous languages (Articles 1, 5, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 31). The Truth and Reconciliation Commission's (TRC) Calls to Action also include a number of calls (13, 14, and 15) directly related to languages. Consistent with these obligations, the Government of Canada must respect First Nations' autonomy over their languages and provide adequate, sustainable, and long-term funding to reverse the impact of past and current colonial policies and actions



aimed at destroying First Nations and their languages. The Residential School System, Sixties Scoop and Day Schools actively removed First Nations from their languages. The social fabric of First Nations must be restored through the transmission of language and culture.

First Nations have identified serious issues with proposal-based funding, including the excessive administrative burden of proposals and the resulting delays in the transfer of funding. The absence of long-term funding limits the scope of language planning initiatives and the ability to fulfill community goals. It also does not allow for revitalization services to be delivered continuously from one year to the next given that there is no certainty that a subsequent proposal will be funded and no predictability about the level of future funding. Over the years, eligible funding proposals have been rejected due to inadequate funding and proposals have been further limited by caps.

The Funding Model includes a request to DCH, amounting to approximately \$14 billion annually over 10 years, for language revitalization. The First Nations' share of existing funding must be netted out from that total to reveal the required incremental funding. The Funding Model also provides for a shift toward ongoing programmatic funding and long-term funding agreements, so First Nations and First Nations organizations involved in language initiatives will no longer have to submit funding proposals.

First Nations have been advocating for increased funding to support First Nations language revitalization for decades. The AFN's *2017 National Engagement Report* provided input for the development of an *Indigenous Languages Act*. Recommendations within the report inform the First Nations vision for languages funding and the proposed Funding Model.

The development of a Funding Model is further supported by input provided at various engagements, consultations, forums and through resolutions, including Resolution 77/2017, *Support for the continued co-development of the Indigenous Languages Act*, and Resolution 10/2021, *Support for the co-development of a new distinctions-based Indigenous Languages Funding Model*.

Resolution 10/2021 sets out a mandate for the CCOL, TCOL and AFN to:

- "...continue collaborating with regions, First Nations, First Nations educators, First Nations language experts, the Government of Canada, other Indigenous organizations, and other organizations as required in developing a new Funding Model, including a framework or regulations for agreements or arrangements under Sections 8 or 9 of the *Indigenous Languages Act* (the Act); and...
- ...ensure that any Funding Model...including any related framework or regulations for agreements and arrangements:
  - a. does not detract or hinder First Nations from advancing their own processes towards language revitalization;

- b. does not define, limit, prejudice, abrogate, or derogate from any of the rights, interests, or jurisdiction of individual First Nations, or from advancing their own processes towards language revitalization;
- c. supports First Nations, regional groups, Treaty groups, or language groups that want to independently engage in processes relating to First Nations languages; and,
- d. includes an agreed upon process to ensure that there is an equitable and sustainable distribution of funds across the regions...”

A significant change introduced by the Act is the possibility of entering into Section 8 and 9 agreements. Sections 8 and 9 of the Act are about government-to-government agreements, and other agreements that concern language revitalization. Funding for Section 8 and 9 agreements is distinct from and in addition to DCH’s ILC.

Consequently, First Nations assert that a separate renewal of funding for Section 8 and 9 agreements will be required for those agreements to continue after Budget 2021 funding ends.

Engagements and consultations in recent years have provided an abundance of evidence that the current funding mechanisms do not meet First Nations interests. Nothing in the Funding Model or this paper limits any First Nation’s choices about the funding mechanisms that work best for them.

## Authorities Sought from the Treasury Board

First Nations must lead the recovery, reclamation, revitalization and maintenance and normalization of First Nations languages. Structures must be designed to support what First Nations need to achieve their vision and goals for their languages.

Authority is sought for DCH to include the Funding Model as part of the distinctions-based Indigenous Languages Funding Model that will be submitted to release frozen funds from Budget 2019, and to access new funding for First Nations languages.

## Section II

### Design and Delivery of the First Nations Languages Funding Model

#### Funding Streams

Under the Funding Model, ongoing funding and funding through Section 8 or 9 agreements represent new funding streams that support the transition away from proposal-based funding. Over time and as proposal-based funding has been largely reduced, First Nations and First Nations organizations will generally receive either ongoing funding or funding under a Section 8 or 9 agreement. Not all First Nations or First Nations organizations will make the transition immediately, and as such, proposal-based funding will remain available for time-limited projects or for new entrants. DCH will continue to notionally allocate regional amounts of ILC funding (e.g., for ongoing programmatic funding and proposal-based funding), by means of a regional allocation formula until sufficient funding is available (see Implementation of the Funding Model).

DCH must not reduce the First Nations share of ILC funding at its sole discretion and receive clear direction from First Nations. The Funding Model acknowledges that the Government of Canada is committed to providing adequate, sustainable and long-term funding for the reclamation, revitalization, maintenance and strengthening of Indigenous languages and further acknowledges that there is a need for the Government of Canada to provide continuing support for First Nations and other entities that have mandates to reclaim, revitalize, maintain and strengthen their languages.

Funding under Section 8 or 9 agreements is complementary to ongoing programmatic funding. First Nations and First Nations organizations will receive either ongoing funding or proposal-based funding under the ILC. Additional funding under a Section 8 or 9 agreement will be provided in addition to either ongoing or proposal-based funding, where warranted. It is expected that ongoing funding and Section 8 and 9 agreement funding will contribute directly to increasing numbers of speakers or to improving speakers' fluency.

Therefore, the principal funding streams proposed by the Funding Model for language revitalization are as follows:

- Ongoing Programmatic Funding
- Section 8 and 9 Agreement Funding
- Proposal-based Funding
  - Annual
  - Multi-Year

## Ongoing Programmatic Funding

The reclamation, revitalization, maintenance and strengthening of First Nations languages are large and complex undertakings that will require sustained effort and investments over decades. Ongoing programmatic (“core-like”) funding is more appropriate for language revitalization than annual or multi-year proposal-based funding because the funding is ongoing, predictable, and does not have to be applied for. Ongoing funding is also flexible in the hands of the recipient for a variety of language revitalization purposes.

Ongoing funding for First Nations and First Nations-led organizations is available under the ILCP’s current Terms and Conditions. However, it has not yet been implemented due to Budget 2019 funding being locked after 2022-23, unless DCH obtains approval for its Treasury Board Submission (TBS) about the Indigenous Languages Funding Model. Further, insufficient funding poses another challenge to the transition to ongoing funding.

The Funding Model must enable First Nations or First Nations-led organizations to access ongoing funding. New funding (see Section III on costs) starting in 2023-24 must be provided to support a broad uptake of ongoing funding by First Nations and First Nations-led organizations.

First Nations and First Nations organizations that receive ongoing funding will have received funding from the ILC funding stream to support language initiatives, have supported their own language revitalization efforts, or are eligible for a 10-year grant under the New Fiscal Relationship. They likely will also be expected to have a long-term language plan or a work plan in place to guide the delivery of revitalization services over the period of their agreement. Many First Nations and First Nations organizations already have experience providing revitalization services and have language plans or work plans. First Nations and First Nations organizations that do not yet have experience or a plan will be able to access proposal-based funding and then transition to ongoing funding.

A portion of the amount required for ongoing programmatic funding could be sourced from existing funding under Budget 2019 and Budget 2021. However, the ILCP is currently only sufficient for reaching a small proportion of First Nations and First Nations language learners. An evaluation of the Aboriginal Peoples’ Program – a forerunner of the ILCP – that DCH recently released indicated that the program “supported an average of 129 projects per year over the 5-year period, reaching an average of 7,428 participants annually.” The 7,428 participants include Inuit and Métis as well as First Nations persons and represent well under 1% of the population. While Budgets 2019 and 2021 provided new funding, the scale of the current ILCP is inappropriately low,

and the current funding is insufficient for the language revitalization challenge that First Nations and First Nations organizations are facing.

The amounts allocated to the ILC for 2023-24 and future years through Budget 2019 are not sufficient for implementing an ongoing programmatic approach. Ongoing programmatic funding will require additional funding and will have to be implemented over several years. In the near term, ongoing funding and proposal-based funding will both be sourced from the ILC funding stream. Initially there will be a trade-off between the amounts that are available for those purposes, i.e., more ongoing funding will mean less proposal-based funding and vice versa.

The Funding Model anticipates that the proportion of ILC funding allocated as ongoing programmatic funding will increase over time and the proportion allocated as proposal-based funding will decrease over time. In 2022-23, DCH is planning to sample the level of interest among First Nations in implementing the ongoing funding approach and in entering into Sections 8 and 9 agreements. The Funding Model does not recommend that any particular percentage of the available ILC funding be committed to ongoing funding, however the preliminary information from the call for interest may provide useful data. Where regions so choose, they will be able to influence or determine the rate at which the transition to ongoing funding is phased in for their region.

#### [Section 8 and 9 Agreements](#)

Section 8 and 9 agreements were introduced through the Act. First Nations can enter into an agreement with DCH, along with other federal departments, and with provinces or territories if First Nations so choose. For example, First Nations or First Nations organizations can enter into an agreement with both levels of government in certain circumstances regarding their funding, service provision, innovations, capacity building, among others.<sup>3</sup>

Section 8 or 9 agreements are a means by which First Nations may negotiate revitalization programming and funding with other governments. They offer maximum flexibility for developing and implementing revitalization initiatives that are suited to First Nation's specific needs and are funded appropriately and continuously during the period of the agreement.

---

<sup>3</sup> Section 8 of the ILA provides that the Minister of Canadian Heritage may cooperate with other governments, including First Nations governments — including by entering into agreements or arrangements with them for purposes such as providing Indigenous language programs and services in relation to education, health and the administration of justice — to coordinate efforts to efficiently and effectively support Indigenous languages in Canada. Section 9 of the ILA provides that the Minister of Canadian Heritage, and an “appropriate” Minister, may enter into an agreement to further the purposes of the ILA with a provincial or territorial government, an Indigenous government or other Indigenous governing body or an Indigenous organization.

Entering into an agreement under Section 8 or 9 of the Act will not prevent a First Nation from entering a Treaty, including a land claims agreement, or a self-government agreement that provides for the reclamation, revitalization, maintenance or strengthening of a First Nations language. (See Section 10 of the Act<sup>4</sup>.)

In recognition of First Nations jurisdiction over their languages, the Funding Model provides that federal Ministers will enter into a Section 8 or 9 agreement with First Nations governments or organizations, solely at the request of those First Nations governments or organizations and will not enter into Section 8 or 9 agreements other than on request from a First Nations government nor organization. Provincial and territorial governments, and other federal departments will provide evidence that First Nations directly support any request that they put forward to DCH for language revitalization funding. Under the Funding Model, the Minister of Canadian Heritage will not allow transfers of ILC funding to other federal departments or to other governments without there being clear evidence of First Nations support for that initiative and the associated funding requirement.

Having an Indigenous partner is not a sufficient condition for Section 8 and 9 agreements. Language revitalization initiatives must contribute effectively to revitalization and agreements must be led by First Nations and First Nations organizations.

Unlike ILC funding, the funding for Section 8 and 9 agreements will not be allocated by a formula. If funding for Section 8 and 9 agreements is not renewed, DCH will not fund existing<sup>5</sup> or future agreements from ILC funding. If funding for Section 8 and 9 agreements are renewed on an ongoing basis, the Funding Model will reconsider whether DCH should employ a formula, or some other means, for notionally allocating Section 8 and 9 funding to regions.

---

<sup>4</sup> 10 For greater certainty, sections 8 and 9, and any agreement referred to in those sections, are not to be construed as preventing

(a) any person or entity from relying on a provision relating to the reclamation, revitalization, maintenance or strengthening of an Indigenous language that is contained in a treaty — including a land claims agreement — or a self-government agreement; or

(b) an Indigenous government or other Indigenous governing body from entering into, with the Government of Canada or the government of a province or territory, a treaty — including a land claims agreement — or a self-government agreement that provides, among other things, for the reclamation, revitalization, maintenance or strengthening of an Indigenous language.

<sup>5</sup> Two “pathfinder” agreements, which are precursors to Section 8 and 9 agreements and are currently funded from ILC funding, will not be funded with ILC funding after the current agreements expire in the next few years.

In addition, the Funding Model provides that any Section 8 or 9 agreement that the Minister and an “appropriate Minister” enters must be for purposes that directly support the efforts of First Nations to reclaim, revitalize, maintain and strengthen their languages. First Nations have asserted that equitability must be ensured in the entering into such agreements. The Funding Model includes the objective that there will be an equitable allocation of Section 8 and 9 agreement funding for First Nations, and across regions. Funding for agreements must meet demand and allocations must be equitable among distinctions if this is not provided. Equitable funding must be provided across the regions at maturity or until all agreements are funded fully as negotiated with First Nations.

Section 8 and 9 agreements emphasize collaborative work among parties. Individual First Nations, groups of First Nations, and First Nations organizations are able to work together on initiatives. Agreements could support collaborations between First Nations or within a language family, cross-regional initiatives, the development of new technologies, readiness and capacity development, network establishment and resource sharing, and partnerships with different levels of government as noted above.

Canada must be transparent about the purposes, costs, and duration of Section 8 and 9 agreements. That type of transparency is necessary for third-party organizations and the First Nations Review Committee to make informed decisions when recommending project funding for applicants who have also negotiated Section 8 or 9 agreements with Canada or trilaterally with Canada and a provincial or territorial government.

Subject to additional funding, agreements must span a minimum of at least five to ten years. Funding for Section 8 and 9 agreements will be managed by DCH. At this time, funding targets for agreements will not be allocated to regions in the manner that ILC funding targets are. DCH must also provide First Nations with information about how to enter into negotiations for a Section 8 or 9 agreement.

#### [Proposal-based Funding](#)

Some proposal-based funding will continue to be available to facilitate new applicants becoming involved with language initiatives and the ILCP. Proposal-based funding will also be available for time-limited projects by proponents that are currently receiving ongoing funding or Section 8 or 9 agreement funding. However, over time, ongoing programmatic funding, and funding through Sections 8 and 9 agreements, will become norms for First Nations governments and organizations.

Proposal-based project funding is generally unsuitable for ongoing language revitalization work that needs to be done over an extended period of time. Proposal-based funding is broadly inefficient as a sustained means for funding because it imposes an enormous and unnecessary administrative burden on First Nations and

Canada. It causes lengthy delays in the timing of funding transfers. Funding is usually not received until the middle of the second quarter of the fiscal year. The burdensome application process, delayed transfers and resulting interruptions of revitalization programming from one year to the next are longstanding issues that have been drawn to DCH's and the Auditor General's attention several times. Proposal-based funding means there is no certainty and effectively suppresses the planning and implementation of the long-term programming that is required for language reclamation, revitalization, maintenance, and strengthening. Supporting the restoration of First Nations languages requires a long-term perspective, long-term planning, and long-term programming.

During the transition period when proposal-based funding is being largely, but not entirely, phased out, the Government of Canada's role in evaluating proposals and allocating funding can be significantly reduced under the Funding Model. Where First Nations and regions so choose, First Nations-led organizations could provide support and services to First Nations in the evaluation of proposal and ongoing funding applications and funding allocation decisions, similar to the way in which the First Nations Review Committee reviews proposals for regions where no third-party organization exists (see First Nations Control below).

#### MULTI-YEAR PROPOSAL-BASED FUNDING

Multi-year proposal-based funding is available now under the ILCP, but will be largely phased out over time. However, multi-year proposal-based funding will continue to be available under the Funding Model until First Nations choose to fully transition to ongoing funding and agreements. The term for multi-year funding agreements is currently limited to less than two years because Budget 2019 funding for 2023-24 and future years is currently locked and not available for expenditure. Typically, multi-year funding will be available for up to three years. Multi-year funding can support short-term initiatives to support language revitalization or to support new applicants in testing initiatives.

#### ANNUAL PROPOSAL-BASED FUNDING

Under the Funding Model, annual proposal-based funding will be largely phased out and ongoing funding and agreements will be phased in. The continued availability of some annual proposal-based funding will allow new entrants to become involved with language revitalization, including the development of language plans and conducting language assessments. Annual proposal-based funding will continue to be an option under the Funding Model but would not be one of the principal means by which funds are transferred.



## First Nations Control

First Nations must have control over decisions about allocations of language funding. With the transition away from proposal-based funding, the Government of Canada will increasingly be removed from funding allocation decisions. The Government of Canada will become less operational and more administrative and more confined to transferring funding to the First Nations and First Nations organizations that are revitalizing languages. The Government of Canada's discretionary allocations of revitalization funding for purposes that do not result in new or fluent speakers are particularly problematic in an environment where existing funding is not sufficient to meet the demands of First Nations that wish to provide direct revitalization services.

Currently, a First Nations Review Committee reviews proposal-based funding applications for regions that do not have a First Nations-led regional organization in place. Where regions do not have a representative organization, a functionally specific First Nations organization, such as the First Nations Review Committee or a regional organization (third-party organization) could provide support regarding funding decisions and largely remove DCH from the decision-making process.

First Nations must participate in all decisions about the allocation of funding for revitalization. One of the objectives of the Funding Model is to secure a process to ensure the involvement of First Nations in all aspects of deciding on uses of the funding for revitalizing First Nations languages.

Where regions so choose, First Nations organizations could play a role in high-level assignments of funding to ongoing programmatic funding, and proposal-based funding within the ILC. Several First Nations-led regional organizations have played the role of both third-party organization and funding delivery agent in certain provinces. These organizations have reviewed proposal-based applications through the ILC. Where First Nations so choose, new regional organizations could be established to distribute funding similarly to the role that third parties currently play in various regions (British Columbia, Ontario, Nova Scotia) or they could continue to receive funding through the First Nations Review Committee or through a similar process.

Given that a number of First Nations are interested in working with third parties, the Government of Canada must respect regional processes – organizations must be set up only where mandated by First Nations. DCH must be transparent about the process for becoming a third party to enable First Nations organizations, supported by First Nations within the region, to take control in coordinating the review of proposals, where proposal-based process is used. A formal and transparent process for the review of proposals and future ongoing funding applications is required and must be communicated clearly moving forward.

Similarly, First Nations may choose to establish and support organization that deliver language revitalization services and programs on behalf of the participating First Nations to pool resources or organize collective initiatives.

To further support flexibility and First Nations control on the use of funding for proposal-based time limited or ongoing initiatives, the Funding Model provides that First Nations should be able to transfer their funding from one eligible activity to another eligible activity without the need for any explicit pre-approval from DCH.

For recipients, First Nations and First Nations organizations that receive ILCP funding must be able to transfer the funding to their agents for delivering language services on their behalf.

#### Urban and off-reserve First Nations

Many First Nations governments want and intend to provide programs and services for all citizens, regardless of their residency on or off reserve. However, the persistent lack of sufficient funding serves as a substantial barrier to providing these language programs or services. Currently, most of the language revitalization programming that First Nations governments and First Nations organizations provide is focused on populations that reside on reserves or Settlement Lands.

The Funding Model acknowledges the importance of funding language revitalization through First Nations organizations. Where language revitalization services are available for First Nations persons in urban areas, those services are generally being provided by other service delivery agencies, rather than by First Nations governments.

The Funding Model acknowledges that, until First Nations deliver a broad range of services to their citizens who reside off-reserve or off Settlement Lands, external agencies, including Friendship Centres, Cultural Centres, and other First Nations not-for-profit organizations, will likely continue providing language revitalization programs and services for persons residing in urban areas. For the present, the Funding Model will focus on identifying and including the costs of existing and required service agencies in urban areas. The Funding Model supports the longer-term goal that First Nations governments have capacity to deliver services to off-reserve citizens. First Nations persons must also be able to access language regardless of their place of residence, both on- and off-reserve.

## Section III

### Costs

A substantial increase in funding to support First Nations-led language initiatives is required to ensure the success of the Funding Model and the full implementation of the Act. The table below shows existing funding from Budgets 2019 and 2021 to various ILCP purposes. The table shows the funding that is available for First Nations, Inuit, and Métis language initiatives.

<b>Total DCH Funding for Language Revitalization (all distinctions)</b>						
<b>Budget 2019 (in black)</b> <b>Budget 2021 (in red)</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	<b>2023-24</b>	<b>2024-25</b>
Co-development / <b>engagement</b>	\$2.0	\$2.0	\$2.0	\$2.0	<b>2.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>
Indigenous Languages Component (ILC)	\$10.6	\$35.0	\$45.0	\$50.0	\$75.0	\$75.0
<b>Indigenous Languages Component (ILC)</b>			<b>\$28.8</b>	<b>\$58.8</b>	<b>\$88.8</b>	
Funding for OCIL operations	\$2.0	\$3.0	\$5.5	\$6.1	\$6.6	\$6.6
Funding for OCIL's research and innovation projects			\$15.0	\$25.0	\$30.0	\$30.0
DCH Administration (Vote 1)	\$1	\$4.1	\$4.1	\$4.1	\$4.1	\$4.1
<b>Section 8 and 9 Agreements</b>			<b>\$4.0</b>	<b>\$15.9</b>	<b>\$35.4</b>	<b>\$31.5</b>
<b>DCH Administration (Vote 1)</b>			<b>\$1.9</b>	<b>\$1.9</b>	<b>\$2.0</b>	

Additional funding must be secured for both the ILC and for Section 8 and 9 agreements. Currently, the funding required for Section 8 and 9 agreements is time limited. Funding required for future years of a Section 8 or 9 agreement (beyond the period when Budget 2021 funding for Section 8 or 9 agreements is available) will not reduce the amount of ILCP funding remaining for the ILC component. DCH must secure new funding for any Section 8 or 9 agreement that continues after, or that is signed after, funding from Budget 2021 ends to ensure First Nations can benefit from agreements on an ongoing basis.

The ILC funding under Budget 2019 reflects available language revitalization funding for all distinctions that must be unlocked for 2023-24 and future years. Approximately 75% of the funding available for all distinctions has traditionally been available for First Nations and First Nations organizations to tackle and address the urgent issue of language revitalization – this is the minimum required until funding is provided based on the costing set out below and as negotiated directly with First Nations and First Nations organizations.

The AFN retained Daniel J. Brant & Associates in 2021-2022 to identify the costs of language revitalization outside of schools. The report reflects a set of reclamation, revitalization, and maintenance initiatives being implemented by all First Nations and another set of initiatives being implemented by “hub” organizations in each region. The cost estimate in the research report is \$2.04 billion per year. This report demonstrates the desperate need for a substantial increase in funding to support language reclamation, revitalization, and maintenance.

Currently, less than 20% of First Nations are participating in DCH’s ILCP. The annual costs are seen as increasing toward the full \$2.04 billion over 10 years, by which time the Funding Model assumes that all First Nations will be receiving funding.

The cost of \$2.04 billion in 2022 dollars, was escalated for inflation (at 2.8% for year 1 and 2.0% thereafter) and for population growth (at 3.0% per year). The combined effects of the two indicators resulted in an increase of 5.88% in year 1, followed by annual increases of 5.06% thereafter. This results in an adjusted cost of **\$3.4 billion in year 10**. The annual costs over the coming ten years were calculated as shown in the table below.

DCH – ILCP (\$ millions)	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	2031-32	2032-33
Required	\$318	\$413.3	\$537.2	\$698.3	\$907.6	\$1,179.6	\$1,533.2	\$1,992.9	\$2,590.2	\$3,366.7

The funding required to revitalize First Nations languages outside the schools extends well beyond the sum of the First Nations’ shares of the Budget 2019 and Budget 2021 funding increments for the coming five years. The table above demonstrates that First Nations will require **\$13.5 billion over 10 years** and, at maturity in 2032, **\$3.4 billion for that year**, which will be escalated annually going forward. It is expected that the required funding will begin to level off after year 10.

A portion of the required funding can be sourced from the ILC funding and the Section 8 and 9 agreement funding. However, ILC and Section 8 and 9 agreement funding streams are only known for a few years and thus the offsets cannot be determined for the full 10 years.

The Funding Model interprets sufficiency of funding as meaning that funding escalators will have to be included appropriately in multi-year transfers, whether by means of grant or contribution agreements, to ensure that the purchasing power of the funding is not diminished over time. Subject to reviews of the Funding Model and as new data become available, if new funding is required, the Government of Canada must work with First Nations to ensure adequate, consistent, sustainable, and long-term funding is made available to support the implementation of the Funding Model.

The funding that is currently available for revitalizing First Nations languages is insufficient and expenditures of ILCP funding must support language reclamation, revitalization, maintenance, strengthening, and ultimately the production of new and more fluent speakers. The Funding Model calls on DCH to immediately stop transferring ILCP funding to Indspire for scholarships and awards shows and to immediately stop allocating ILCP funding to National Aboriginal Day celebrations. ILC funding must not be transferred to other departments for other programs and projects, other than at the request of First Nations. DCH must not conduct any unilateral transfers to other federal departments, or to provincial, territorial, or municipal governments.

## Section IV

### Results and Performance Measurement

For an individual First Nation or First Nation language, there might be an expectation that inputs and processes will emerge first, and that broader objectives will manifest over time. However, when aggregating across 634 First Nations and roughly 70 languages, sharp time delineations (e.g., short term, medium term, long term, immediate outcome, intermediate outcome, ultimate outcome) become more difficult to conceptualize.

First Nations broadly share the desired outcome of revitalized and normalized languages. However, for First Nations and languages within First Nations, the process of revitalization will begin from different starting points and may also have different specific objectives. Plans, and program development and implementation, are expected to unfold on different time schedules across various combinations of language circumstances, First Nation circumstances and specific revitalization objectives.

Accordingly, the results framework must differentiate program level indicators from regional or community level indicators. It is expected that data sources will improve over time and First Nations must be involved in revising the results framework as required and as new local, regional or national data becomes available.

Tracking success supports the building of wise practices and can spread collaborative learning and improve the efficacy of initiatives. The Funding Model acknowledges the importance of data collection, and that reporting on progress will be necessary to track progress of language revitalization. Reporting requirements will vary based on the funding stream but will be greatly reduced compared to the current reporting burden, particularly for ongoing programmatic funding and Section 8 and 9 agreements.

Ultimately, building fluency in First Nations languages and restoring the natural intergenerational transmission of languages are the underlying vision to the Funding Model. The following list of indicators will demonstrate progress towards the ultimate outcomes, as defined, where they represent First Nations goals for their respective languages.

### **Long-term Outcomes**

Over the long term, the aim of the Funding Model is to support First Nations language revitalization and normalization, including:

- Increased natural, multigenerational transmission of language knowledge.
- First Nations are speaking First Nations languages across all domains regularly and frequently, regardless of location.
- First Nations languages are used in radio station broadcasting, television, print media, books, social media, arts, and orally.
- Endangered languages reach stabilization and sleeping languages are revived
- Increased number of services to First Nations people being delivered in a First Nations language.
- First Nations languages are visible in public spaces.

### **Indicators:**

- Significantly increased number of fluent speakers (mother tongue and/or second language fluent speakers).
- Significantly increased language use in the home (self-reported).
- All First Nations actively use First Nations languages in everyday activities (e.g. via language policy).
- All First Nations languages are archived and documented over time (including through the recording of fluent speakers, or the preparation of word lists and lexicons, grammars, dictionaries, orthographies, among others).

## **Intermediate**

The Funding Model provides that in the intermediate term, the following indicators could be gathered to demonstrate continued progress towards language revitalization efforts by First Nations and First Nations organizations.

### Indicators:

- Proportion of First Nations and First Nations organizations that have developed an assessment of their language status in the past 5 years has increased.
- Proportion of First Nations and First Nations organizations that are funded to fully implement their language plans or workplans has increased.
- Increased individual language proficiency (self-reported on interim basis or based on proficiency assessments designated as relevant and appropriate by First Nations languages programs).

## **Immediate**

At the outset, a few indicators or performance measures that will support the achievement of language revitalization could include the following while recognizing that each First Nations community and individual is starting their language revitalization journey at different stages.

### Indicators:

- Increased numbers of First Nations and First Nations organizations develop language plans or workplans.
- Increased numbers of persons participate in language revitalization programs (including revitalization activities and services) each year.
- Increased numbers of language assessments by First Nations.
- Increased numbers of persons participate in language immersion programs (outside K-12), for example, language nests, Mentor-Apprentice pairings, land-based immersion, etc.) by language.
- Increased numbers of instruction hours per person per year (outside K-12) e.g., adult language instruction, etc.).
- Increased numbers of First Nations and First Nations organizations are funded for language revitalization.
- Funding is increasingly shifted to ongoing funding from proposal-based.

## Section V

First Nations languages are at risk and in need of immediate and urgent support and action. While government funding for language revitalization in Canada has increased recently, it is woefully insufficient at this stage to tackle the need and existing demand.

The Government of Canada actively suppressed First Nations languages and cultures and is obligated to fund the restoration of those languages. The Funding Model seeks additional funding to support language revitalization outside schools. A related but separate funding approach will seek additional funding from ISC to support language revitalization in the education system.

When sufficient, consistent, long-term funding is provided for First Nations languages:

- First Nations' demand for revitalization funding would be better met;
- ongoing funding could be implemented or expanded;
- the shift toward language extinction could be averted;
- Canada would be better placed to meet its UNDRIP obligations; and
- Canada would be better placed to meet its reconciliation objectives.

### Risks

The Funding Model must be included as the only First Nations supported approach to unlocking Budget 2019 funding and to support an ask for additional funding to support First Nations languages in Canada. To move forward with the Treasury Board Submission without the First Nations approach would effectively undo the progress achieved through the co-development of the *Indigenous Languages Act*. Further, it would ignore the impacts of colonialism endured by First Nations in Canada's Residential School System and its ongoing impacts. The Funding Model must inform the Treasury Board Submission to facilitate access to First Nations language resources and funding and pave the way for continued improvements in language revitalization and for the full implementation of the Act. The Government of Canada will face scrutiny if the Funding Model, as co-developed with First Nations, is not reflected as a preferred approach within the new Indigenous Languages Funding Model. The failure to move forward with a TBS with First Nations support may be particularly noted during the United Nations International Decade of Indigenous Languages.



## **Risk 1: Language loss**

First Nations have been calling on the Government of Canada for decades to provide concrete actions to fund and support First Nations languages. If funding for language reclamation, revitalization, maintenance, and strengthening continues to be insufficient and is not transferred efficiently to First Nations and First Nations organizations through ongoing funding and agreements, First Nations languages will continue to be lost. The urgency to make strides through concerted efforts towards the reversal of language loss cannot be overstated.

If First Nations languages (and cultural identities) are lost, many of them will be lost to the world, not just lost in Canada. First Nations people will be denied an inherent right, and a section 35 right in Canada, to use their languages and practice their cultures.

Canada will not be able to honour its commitment to UNDRIP, TRC Calls to Action, and reconciliation goals, nor will it be able to fully implement the Act. Without improved transfers and increases in funding to First Nations and First Nations organizations, the ILCP will not be equipped to support the diversity of First Nations languages across the country. Further, the transition to increasing First Nations decision making with respect to languages is essential in recognition of the fact that First Nations are best placed to manage language initiatives. The Government of Canada must act swiftly to honour its commitment to First Nations.

## **Risk 2: First Nations will not accept the status quo**

Canada will also face public criticism from First Nations if DCH's submission contains content that First Nations do not support and that does not move away from the proposal-based approach. The AFN, and First Nations generally, participated in the co-development of the Act. The AFN is also a member of the Joint Implementation Steering Committee that oversees the implementation of the Act. First Nations are concerned because they have played virtually no role in:

- DCH's 2019 and 2020 revisions to the terms and conditions for grants and contributions under DCH's ILCP;
- Canada's decision to create and provide separate funding for Sections 8 and 9 agreements from the Budget 2021 incremental funding for reclamation, revitalization, and strengthening of Indigenous languages;
- Canada's decision to allocate five years' worth of Budget 2021 incremental funding to three of the five years for which the funding was provided; or
- DCH's amendments to the *Broadcasting Act*, which will also impact and affect First Nations languages.

First Nations expect opportunities for meaningful engagement and consultations about the implementation of the *Act* and will not accept unilateral decision-making with respect to languages.

### **Risk 3: Demand will not be met and the ILCP will continue to fail First Nations**

If funding remains at the status quo First Nations' demand, as revealed through proposals, will continue to exceed the available funding and eligible projects will continue to go unfunded. Further, a majority of First Nations will not benefit from ILCP funding at the current funding levels and ongoing funding will not be fully implementable. The current funding model does not meet the needs of First Nations and the reporting and application burden for proposals leaves many First Nations and First Nations organizations out when it comes to participating in language reclamation, revitalization, maintenance, and strengthening initiatives. The ILCP will not meet its objectives to create fluent speakers and will continue to be unable to meet demand if it continues with a proposal-based model or if funding does not increase.

## Section VI

### Implementation of the First Nations Languages Funding Model

First Nations are best placed to lead language reclamation, revitalization, maintenance, strengthening, and ultimately normalization. As stipulated earlier, more work is required to review the Funding Model as the transition away from proposal-based funding progresses. The Funding Model calls for a review after three years of its implementation to ensure First Nations can make adjustments as the transition to ongoing funding and agreements progresses.

A review of the Regional Allocation Formula is also required to ensure the ongoing success of First Nations language initiatives and of the Model itself. Similarly, improved data collection is essential to supporting the success and monitoring of language initiatives. First Nations must be included in the implementation of the Funding Model and the CCOL, TCOL, and AFN will oversee these ongoing activities.

The Funding Model also acknowledges the needs of language learners in urban areas. It encourages Canada to adopt a whole-of-government (federal) approach and to include other federal departments in the revitalization of First Nations languages. It also encourages Canada to adopt an intergovernmental approach to encourage the provinces and territories to support language revitalization with their own resources. Further discussions with First Nations are required with respect to implementing a whole-of-government approach to supporting First Nations language revitalization.

Following the Treasury Board Submission, the Government of Canada must commit to ongoing co-development and co-management of the Funding Model with First Nations to ensure the full implementation of the Act. Further work on revisions to Terms and Conditions, data collection or the regional funding formula, or support for a whole-of-government approach must all meaningfully involve First Nations.

## Transition to Ongoing Programmatic Funding and Agreements

In 2022-23, DCH intends to launch a call for interest for ongoing funding to gather information on the pace of the transition from proposal-based funding. The transition to ongoing funding must be supported by a pre-budget submission based on the costs identified in this proposal. The transition to ongoing programmatic funding will be phased in over a period of several years. The length of the phase-in should be determined regionally by First Nations and First Nations organizations where processes are in place, or the development of these processes should be made available where First Nations desire. Based on what was heard during the AFN engagements on the Funding Model in January-February 2022, it is expected that not all First Nations or First Nations organizations will immediately want to adopt the ongoing programmatic funding option.

The proportion of recipients that receive ongoing funding is expected to increase over time and the proportion of ILC funding that is transferred by proposal-based funding is expected to decrease over time. There must be funding available for all First Nations that would like to be involved or to engage in language revitalization upon the implementation of the Funding Model. The Funding Model provides that, ultimately, it is up to the First Nations to decide how much proposal-based funding is retained.

Applicants for ongoing funding will be required to demonstrate that they have a language plan or a work plan in place and that they either have previously received ILC funding or ALI funding or have two or more years of experience in delivering effective language revitalization services or programs using funding from other sources. The Funding Model anticipates that DCH's proposal call for the 2023-24 fiscal year will be similar to proposal calls in previous years but will allow for interested First Nations and First Nations organizations to indicate whether they wish to receive ongoing programmatic funding, rather than proposal-based funding.

Groups whose applications for proposal-based funding are approved and who identified that they wish to receive ongoing programmatic funding will be free to use their ILC funding for any of the eligible activities that are set out in the terms and conditions for contributions under the ILCP (or in the terms and conditions for grants under the ILCP, as the case requires). Recipients of ongoing programmatic funding will not have to reapply routinely for renewed funding until circumstances require reapplication (such as not meeting outcomes set in the language plans). Language plans would be reviewed every five years.

Under the Funding Model, recipients of ongoing funding will also continue to be eligible to receive proposal-based funding or Section 8 or 9 agreement funding – for purposes that are different from the purposes supported by their ongoing programmatic funding.

That requirement, in turn, will call for First Nations and First Nations organizations that receive ongoing funding to report on a small set of agreed indicators annually about the language revitalization services or programming being provided via their ongoing funding.

Finally, the Funding Model provides that, during the period of its transfer agreement, a recipient of proposal-based funding or ongoing funding may change the use or application of the funding it receives at its discretion to another approved eligible expenditure under the ILCP to meet their needs and ensure flexibility (e.g., language nests, adult instruction, Master-Apprentice pairings, language camps, language planning, language assessments, among others.). That means that if a recipient is funded for a particular (or several) approved expenditure or activity and, during the period of the transfer agreement, wishes to spend the funding for a different kind of approved expenditure or activity, it may do so at its discretion without pre-approval.

### Regional Allocation Formula

Resolution 10/2021 sets out a mandate to ensure that any Funding Model includes an agreed upon process to ensure that there is an equitable and sustainable distribution of funds across the regions.

Funding must be fairly distributed. DCH's notional regional funding targets should be determined in an impartial and equitable way using a formula that considers more than just a base amount and language occurrences. Based on AFN engagements with First Nations in January-February 2022, discussions with the TCOL, a list of factors for inclusion in the regional allocation formula have been identified.

Currently, when DCH calculates funding targets for regions, it applies a formula that DCH developed without direct input from First Nations. As a matter of principle, it is important that DCH allocate existing ILC funding among regions in a manner that First Nations consider to be fair. The existing regional allocation formula, and a revised formula, will not affect a region's range of choices for allocating its ILC funding within the region or limit a First Nation's choices concerning the use of the funding.

The adoption of a new regional funding allocation formula could change the proportion of the total available amount that is allocated to each region. Under the Funding Model, however, no region will receive less funding than it receives under the current formula. New funding must be sought to support its implementation and ensure funding meets the needs of First Nations across the country. The revised formula, in combination with an increased funding level for the ILC, will result in amounts that are equal to or greater than the amount that regions receive under the current formula.

The revised regional allocation formula will apply to all ILC funding (ongoing and proposal-based), but not to funding for Section 8 and 9 agreements.

Under the Funding Model, regions that so choose would be free to set the proportions of their allocations that will be used within their region for ongoing funding, proposal-based funding, but not funding for Section 8 and 9 agreements.

The potential factors for the revised regional allocation formula are set out below. Each factor will need to be weighted appropriately to ensure equity across languages and regions.

Potential Factor	Potential Impact on Revitalization Costs		
	High Impact	Medium to High	Medium Impact
Number of Languages, Dialects	X		
Population, Demographics	X		
Number of First Nations		X	
Remoteness		X	
Learner Dispersion			X
Language Vitality	X		
Capacity/Readiness			X
Disability/Special Instruction Needs			X

Rationales for the potential factors are set out below:

- Number of Languages: a region with more languages faces a larger challenge and must revitalize more languages than a similar region with fewer languages.
- Population: a region with a larger population must teach and improve the fluency of more people than a similar region with a smaller population.
- Number of First Nations: a region with more First Nations must revitalize languages in more places than a similar region with fewer First Nations.
- Remoteness: revitalizing languages in remote locations costs more and a region whose populations are more remote faces higher costs than a similar region whose populations are less remote.
- Learner Dispersion: easy access to speakers increases the efficiency of learning and shortens the time required for fluency. Fluency takes longer if learners are more widely separated – therefore, revitalization takes longer and may cost more where learners are more separated.
- Language Vitality: greater effort is required over a longer period for revitalizing dormant languages than for increasing the vibrancy and range of uses for a living and written language.
- Capacity/Readiness: lower capacity could reduce the efficiency of language learning and could require additional start-up costs.
- Disabilities and Instruction Needs: additional learning accommodations may be required to support persons with disabilities.

At this time, no sources of data across all regions have been identified for the proposed factors that concern language vitality, capacity/readiness and disability/inclusive learning needs. Importantly, factors like the ones listed above could be applied to individual First Nations, rather than regions, to support ongoing funding amounts for First Nations (see also the Ongoing Programmatic Funding section).

Additional work in the implementation phase will be required to ensure the regional allocation formula is revised with the suggested factors in mind.

The Funding Model recommends that the regional allocation formula be reviewed periodically to ensure its continued equitability and effectiveness. Any changes to the allocation formula will have to be co-developed with First Nations during the implementation phase.

### Data Collection

Data collection must be improved to support the monitoring of success of language initiatives and of the implementation of the Funding Model more broadly. Similarly, improved data collection will be required to support the use of some of the proposed factors in the future.

First Nations understand what they need to support language reclamation, revitalization, maintenance and strengthening. Data collection must respect individual First Nation and regional data interests keeping in mind the need for a small set of agreed data that is reported consistently by First Nations in all regions. First Nations-led data must be supported through the implementation of the Funding Model recognizing First Nations ownership over their own information, including ownership, control, access, and possession (OCAP®).

The Funding Model acknowledges the need for a better approach to data collection to support the renewal of funding, including support for First Nations to have the ability to gather, analyze and manage data as part of the eligible community-based activities for funding from the ILC. First Nations will have to gather, analyze, and manage data in order to report on service delivery and for tracking progress toward language reclamation, revitalization, and maintenance.

The Funding Model acknowledges the need for regions and the Office of the Commissioner of Indigenous Languages (OCIL) to receive aggregated versions of language data (that do not specifically identify individual First Nations or the funding they receive) so First Nations, regions, and OCIL may better understand the status and progress of revitalization efforts. This data can be used for planning and cooperation in language revitalization efforts and will advance the goal of transparency for all parties.

The Funding Model provides that data on indicators outlined in this Funding Model continue to be provided to measure progress over time in revitalizing First Nations languages. Data collection is essential to support the renewal of languages funding and demonstrate the progress on language reclamation, revitalization and maintenance initiatives.

### Whole-of-Government Approach

The existing funding available for language revitalization is insufficient. Under the Funding Model, DCH's role must be shifted more toward seeking funding to support revitalization and toward coordinating a whole-of-government response for language revitalization. For example, DCH (or another federal department) must move discussions forward with key federal departments and agencies about a whole-of-government approach under which those federal departments and agencies would contribute their own funding toward First Nations language revitalization.

DCH or another federal department should also encourage provincial and territorial governments to contribute their own funding toward the reclamation, revitalization and maintenance of First Nations languages within their jurisdictions and about coordinating federal, provincial and territorial expenditures to increase the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the language-related services that are being funded by all governments.

In 2018, the Province of British Columbia, for example, provided ongoing funding to support First Nations language revitalization. The Funding Model encourages other provincial and territorial governments to implement similar types of support for revitalization efforts that are led by First Nations.

### ILCP Revisions

First Nations must be involved in the implementation of the Funding Model. The implementation of the First Nations Languages Funding Model will likely require amendments both to the ILCP Program Guidelines and to the Terms and Conditions for Grants and Contributions Under the ILCP. The Government of Canada DCH must appropriately involve First Nations on a co-development and co-management basis to address those amendments.

Further, funding under the ILCP must be exclusively for Indigenous language reclamation, revitalization, maintenance, and strengthening. The need for the reclamation, revitalization, maintenance, and strengthening of Indigenous languages is urgent and well understood. Budget 2019 provided funding for preserving, promoting and revitalizing Indigenous languages. Budget 2021 provided additional funding to support the efforts of Indigenous Peoples in the reclamation, revitalization, and strengthening of their languages. All funding provided to DCH for Indigenous languages must be solely expended to support language initiatives.