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Report Summary

This study, *Researching Indigenous Partnerships*, aims to answer the question, “What is the current level of corporate-Indigenous engagement and partnership in Canada?” In addressing that question, we have identified where there are gaps, and where there are opportunities to advance both corporate Canada and Indigenous communities. With support from the Government of Canada, and with the services of an independent research firm, R.A. Malatest & Associates Ltd., this study has established a baseline score for Indigenous-corporate engagement—and uncovered how to spur new relationships, and convert existing ones into sustainable partnerships.

Improving the baseline score is a public policy challenge for Canada, as low engagement and partnership inhibits Indigenous employment, business development, and social development, which in turn reinforces the socio-economic challenges Indigenous communities face today. The value of this research is that it provides a means to track progress on this issue, using a new tool (The Partnership Matrix), and provides direction on where and how interventions could be initiated to encourage and stimulate engagement in specific sectoral and regional clusters.

The full report provides an evidence-based narrative for partnership building, including the steps businesses take to progress from disengaged to committed partners, and possible next steps for advancement strategies and future research. This report summary provides an overview of key findings, including how to engage businesses by engagement level and sector, and potential roles for government. The main body of the report provides further detail and context to these findings.

The Benefits of Partnership

Partnerships between corporate Canada and Indigenous communities have the potential to propel growth for both parties. But this will only be achieved if each party can be motivated to engage with one another. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission on Residential Schools (TRC) made a specific call to action for corporate Canada to make opportunities available for Indigenous peoples by addressing the gaps that have disconnected their communities from economic opportunity, build respectful relationships and, ultimately commit to partnerships that will lead to long-term sustainable growth. This study found that corporate Canada is unlikely to act on this call to action on their own and that engagement and partnership gaps will continue to be the norm.

Without partnerships, both Indigenous groups and corporate Canada are missing opportunities for immediate and long-term rewards.

- **For Indigenous communities, businesses, and groups:** partnerships with corporate Canada can help them grow and diversify their capacities, increase wealth and improve social well-being among their members. Partnerships may be used to leverage capital, as well as connections and expertise that lead to future business opportunities. Once established as partners, Indigenous businesses may attain preferred vendor standing. Overall, partnerships are a means for Indigenous communities to achieve their stake in the Canadian economy, fulfilling a nation-to-nation relationship between them and non-Indigenous Canadians.

- **For corporate Canada:** there are both immediate rewards and long-term benefits of partnership. Engaging Indigenous groups and working towards partnership can provide solutions to employment and business needs. They can access Canada’s fastest growing
demographic and labour pool, as well as access new markets. Partnership may be necessary to move projects forward where they require working near or in Indigenous territories.

There are further benefits that come from partnership, such as an improved reputation (which leads to more business) and a more respectful and accommodating workplace culture (which inhibits turnover). For federally regulated employers, partnership makes it easier to meet legislated requirements such as the Employment Equity Act. Overall, partnerships give businesses an edge, ready to respond to shifting economic, demographic, and policy conditions.

To unlock this potential, we need to understand current conditions and what can transform them. Thus, our research is guided by two key aims: 1) to gauge the extent to which corporate Canada is currently engaged with Indigenous groups; and 2) to identify the organizational competencies, structures and supports necessary to spur more engagement, relationships and partnerships. This requires both quantitative and qualitative research to identify the hard facts and stories, respectively, which may be used by businesses, Indigenous groups, and government to act.

The Partnership Matrix

This research is grounded by a new tool for assessing businesses’ commitment to engage: the partnership matrix. In developing the matrix, we reviewed and adapted Indigenous Works’ Seven Stage Partnership Model.¹ The matrix applies the TRC’s focus on employment, business development, and community development, combined with the benchmarks for organizational competencies, strategies, and practices. This matrix tool has since been employed by surveying over 500 medium and large, Canadian businesses,² across sectors and regions, and validating it with guidance from corporate, Indigenous, and government leaders. Using the survey and matrix, we have been able to “score” engagement for each business based on their awareness, readiness, strategies, consultations, and, where they exist, partnerships (see Figure 0-1 below). Survey findings were contextualized by follow-up interviews with businesses, Indigenous groups and other stakeholders (such as industry associations).

¹ More information on the model may be found at Indigenousworks.ca.
² Defined as private enterprises, excluding public employers, such as health and education, and businesses with Indigenous-ownership.
Figure 0-1: How engagement scores are calculated using the partnership matrix

- **Aware**
  - Leadership aware: Indigenous groups where you do business? ASETS? TRC Calls to Action?
  - Do you have Indigenous employees? Ever worked with groups? Invested in communities?
  - Up to 5 points

- **Ready**
  - To what extent does your business have the ability, knowledge, and experience to act?
  - Up to 20 points

- **Strategy**
  - Strategies for Indigenous employment, business development, or community development?
  - If yes, formalized? Do they apply enterprise-wide? Brought in Indigenous perspectives?
  - Up to 25 points

- **Consult**
  - Consults groups when making employment, business, or community development decisions?
  - If yes, practices enterprise-wide or limited to departments? Acknowledge & promote input?
  - Up to 25 points

- **Partner**
  - Any partnerships with Indigenous organizations or communities? Objectives? Long-term?
  - Have you formalized your partnership? If yes, how?
  - Up to 25 points

**Total engagement score (Up to 100 points)**

The full matrix is included in Appendix A, and the associated survey questionnaire in Appendix B.
**Overall Engagement Levels**

On a scale of 0 to 100, corporate Canada averaged a matrix engagement score of 13. Different regions and industries appear to be at different points along the partnership matrix, with unique strengths and opportunities to build upon. Although it is perhaps not surprising to see that the resource sector or Western Canada is particularly engaged, the rest of corporate Canada is not necessarily stuck at the starting line: different industries appear to be at different points along the matrix, with unique strengths and opportunities to build upon. Some overall findings include:

- **Low awareness of opportunities:** Only half of businesses (54%) were aware of local Indigenous groups. Less than half were aware of the demographic potential of Indigenous communities (39%), and fewer still had heard the TRC calls to action for corporate Canada (28%). Only one-third of businesses (35%) were aware of the Aboriginal Skills, Employment, and Training Strategy (ASETS) that can bridge the gap between the Indigenous workforce and corporate Canada.

- **Low priority, limited capacity:** Only half of businesses wanted to do more business with Indigenous groups (49% medium or high priority), and fewer were prioritizing hiring Indigenous peoples (44%). Most at odds with the TRC Calls to Action, only one-in-three businesses (34%) considered investing in Indigenous communities a priority. Even among those that are prioritizing engagement, there are capacity challenges. Medium-sized businesses in particular had difficulty dedicating resources to engagement.

- **Lack of strategy:** One-in-four businesses have a strategy for engaging Indigenous groups. However, these strategies are often informal, limited in scope, and developed internally without Indigenous perspectives. However, we did find that strategy is a necessary foundation for moving forward to consultation and partnership. Employment Equity reporting requirements can provide a solid foundation for strategy development, though it does not push businesses to act further.

- **Consultation is the exception, not the rule:** Businesses are unlikely to consult Indigenous groups when making business decisions. Overall, one-in-four businesses have consulted with Indigenous groups in the past two years. Consultations tend to be sporadic and project-driven. For instance, while we found 15% of businesses consulted Indigenous groups on hiring, only 4% always consulted when hiring.

- **Partnership is rare, but powerful:** Few businesses have partnerships but those that do are reporting significant outcomes. As is, only 13% of businesses had any partnerships, either formal or informal. Most partnerships are geared toward employment objectives, while only half consider community objectives. Indigenous groups we interviewed challenged whether partnerships that are informal or do not consider community development may be considered genuine partnerships. Businesses with full partnerships, geared towards both business and community goals, reported they are hiring more Indigenous people, doing more business in their communities, and seeing their reputations grow.

**Categorizing Corporate Canada**

Overall results paint a pessimistic picture, with significant room for improvement. However, we found businesses with very different levels of engagement, from the least engaged to the most engaged, and many somewhere in the middle. To provide a narrative that charts advancement from awareness to partnership, we divided corporate Canada into four tiers based on their engagement scores (see Figure 0-2 below). The largest group, reflecting the low average score, is the disengaged majority.
With businesses categorized into discrete engagement tiers, we can identify key supporting structures and inhibitors of progress towards partnership. As businesses move from one tier to the next, they achieve breakthroughs in employment, business development, and community development. This drives home the business case for partnership, as we found that efforts to strengthen workplace culture and reputation among Indigenous peoples provide access to new labour and markets.

**The Disengaged Majority**

Unlocking the potential of partnership requires substantive changes to how corporate Canada engages Indigenous communities, groups, and businesses. According to a survey of over 500 medium and large businesses, 85% of corporate Canada may be described as disengaged. This disengaged majority is unaware of local Indigenous communities, or their potential to address labour and business needs. Few businesses consider engagement a priority. Rather they tend to be reactive, with engagement off the radar until they are approached or required to act. As it is a low priority, few businesses have committed resources to manage engagement, which makes it difficult for them to consult or partner with Indigenous groups.

**Table 0-1: What holds back the disengaged majority—and what would help?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why have they not considered engaging Indigenous groups?</th>
<th>What needs to change?</th>
<th>What supports do they need?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>× Few Indigenous people where they do business/unaware of them</td>
<td>➢ Waiting to be approached by Indigenous groups directly</td>
<td>✓ Guidance from Indigenous groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>× Passive engagement (“We don’t discriminate”)</td>
<td>➢ Need to see the employment and business potential</td>
<td>✓ Mentorship from experienced businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>× Limited perceived value</td>
<td>➢ More experience and knowledge</td>
<td>✓ Direction from third-parties and government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>× Lack of knowledge</td>
<td>➢ Economic and policy conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>× Costly/limited capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though there are significant differences by region and sector, the reality is that the majority of businesses in every province and every sector of the economy are disengaged, and unlikely or unable to
advance without external support. The disengaged majority can be motivated to engage if they are approached directly by Indigenous groups, and made aware of the material benefits of partnership, such as access to new labour and new markets (see Table 0-1 above). As the fastest growing demographic in Canada, Indigenous communities are an opportunity hiding in plain sight. When motivated, businesses need supports, specifically guidance from Indigenous groups, assistance from experienced resources, and mentorship from committed partners.

**Why businesses say they have never considered engaging or reaching out to Indigenous communities and organizations:**

“Never thought about it.” “Pas besoin.” “We need people with specific designations, so that is the priority.” “Not applicable to our business.” “No policy.” “Has never been considered.” “People generally come to us, we haven’t needed to reach out.” “Unintentional oversight.” “Let employees come to them.” “Has not been considered.” “No opportunity.” “No long-term HR strategy.” “No incentive to do so.” “No reason.” “Not contractually obligated as is in the past.” “Don’t reach out to any of those special communities.” “Need more information.” “Assumption we were reaching any interested candidates through job postings.” “We don’t reach out to any group in particular.” “We would respond if they reached out to us.” “We don’t ask.” “Hasn’t been a priority for the business.” “Only look at skills.” “Lack of opportunity to engage.” “Il n’y pas d’autochtones dans la communauté.” “Doesn’t fall under business objectives.” “Not on our radar.” “No direction from corporate.” “We do not target specific communities.” “We don’t discriminate.” “Leadership hasn’t made it a priority.” “Never occurred to us.” “Nothing formalized.” “All of the above would apply.”

– Direct quotes from disengaged businesses

**Engagement Novices**

There are businesses in Canada that have engaged Indigenous workers, businesses and communities, and their experiences provide a roadmap for advancing the disengaged majority. There are examples of Canadian businesses that have progress through various levels of engagement; from engagement novices to relationship developers to committed partners. Currently, 9% of businesses are at the novice stage. Motivated by the employment and business potential of Indigenous communities, they have drafted engagement strategies and begun consulting Indigenous groups to address project-specific needs.

Engagement novices adopt the basic policies and practices that are a necessary foundation for advancement towards the intermediate and committed tiers. Nearly all novices had drafted strategies and consulted Indigenous groups, and over half had initiated partnerships. However, these engagements can be shallow. For instance, while nearly all novices had strategies, less than half of novices' strategies were validated by Indigenous peoples, and only one-in-three strategies considered community development. This limited commitment to strategy development impacts consultation and partnership practices. Consultation is generally restricted to specific projects or regions, partnerships are informal, and both consultations and partnerships are primarily focused on employment objectives.
Our survey data and follow-up interview identified three, interrelated gaps that inhibit partnership development behind novice engagement. In turn, we have identified three key competencies that need to be developed to address these gaps:

Table 0-2: What gaps inhibit engagement and prevent partnership—and how are they overcome?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gaps preventing partnership</th>
<th>Competencies to bridge gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Commitment Gap:</strong> Partnership is a serious matter for Indigenous groups; businesses fall short when they treat it as a sales, HR, or worse yet, PR exercise. Businesses often go into partnerships with Indigenous groups simply to ‘check a box,’ or as one EDC put it, “To rent our name.” While Indigenous partners may commit their leadership to directly manage the relationship, engagement novices may delegate responsibility to a relatively low-ranking resource, thus treating their “partner” as just another customer.</td>
<td><strong>Commit resources with top-down support:</strong> Committed partners make a commitment from the top-down, where decision-makers are involved in the Indigenous partnerships from the get-go. One EDC referred to this as “chief-to-chief” meetings that ensure a close relationship over the years. This ensures that the Indigenous partner can present and access opportunities as they arise. In addition to a top-down commitment, dedicate Aboriginal liaisons or departments. These offices act as intermediaries within the business between decision-makers on both sides. They can compile their track record of engagement and investment in communities, which Indigenous groups look for when considering partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity gap:</strong> Businesses overestimate Indigenous capacity (expectations too high), and underestimate the capacity they must dedicate for sustaining a relationship. Indigenous businesses and communities have difficulty finding themselves a place in the supply chain. Indigenous groups tend to be small compared to non-Indigenous enterprises, they are unable to meet all the needs of their would-be partners; businesses need to be flexible. Businesses must be willing to commit significant resources on their side to effectively implement their strategies.</td>
<td><strong>Build capacity of Indigenous partners:</strong> Partners need to provide scale-appropriate opportunities to do business together, and identify new opportunities to develop capacity. Committed partners reexamine their needs and find ways to break apart procurement into smaller contracts that Indigenous bidders can win and succeed. Building Indigenous capacity also demands building community capacity. Authentic partnerships and strategies consider community development. Investment in the development of Canada’s fastest growing demographic, it primes businesses to access labour, markets, and knowledge necessary for sustainable, long-term growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communications gap:</strong> At the outset of relationships, there can significant gaps in expectations and urgency. When these divergent perspectives are not articulated, partners may feel alienated from one another and allow the relationship to lapse. For a relationship to become a partnership, it has to be a start to something with agreed upon goals. For the partnership to last there must be regular, formalized lines of communication that connect decision-makers on both sides.</td>
<td><strong>Communicate regularly and honestly:</strong> Partners need to establish clear and consistent means of communication. This may take the form of joint leadership committees, regular meetings, and routine reporting. This is vital for both when opportunities arise—and when they are sparse. When there are opportunities, liaisons and committees ensure Indigenous peoples know where a business is headed and how they can work with them. When opportunities are sparse, strong communication keeps a partnership from falling apart.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relationship Developers**

The relationship developers (4% of businesses) are those who are at the intermediate level of engagement. They recognize both the business case and social responsibility for Indigenous
partnerships. They are as likely to be motivated by access to labour and markets as by corporate social responsibility and wanting to improve workplace culture.

Businesses at this level are in the difficult process of scaling up their engagement from pursuing narrow business and hiring objectives, which incidentally demand engagement, to seeing engagement as a core competency to remain competitive in corporate Canada. These businesses need to be confident in their potential Indigenous partners. This means Indigenous groups need to ensure they take co-ownership of the partnership, and are able to be accountable and flexible. As such, they are especially attracted to EDCs and ASETS-agreement holders—if they are aware of them. Although relationship developers are more likely to work with EDCs than novices, they were no more likely to have engaged ASETS-agreement holders or to have worked with Indigenous-owned businesses.

Navigating this intermediate stage necessitates recognition that authentic partnership is more than a business contract but a commitment to collaborate and innovate. Relationship developers will find themselves at the novice stage again if they are not committed to what they have begun.

To support their ‘broadening’ or ‘scaling up,’ these relationship developers need a roadmap, including how to validate their practices, implement them enterprise-wide, and take full potential of Indigenous businesses and ASETS agreement holders (see Section 3.5 for the full road map). At this stage, there are roles for businesses, Indigenous groups, and third parties to fulfill and a need to collaborate:

Table 0-3: How can partners and stakeholders develop relationships into committed partnerships?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Indigenous businesses</th>
<th>Indigenous groups</th>
<th>Third parties (Govt., industry association, consultants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Recognize authentic partnerships are more than business contracts</td>
<td>✓ Demonstrate accountability and self-determination</td>
<td>✓ Provide templates for partnership agreements (e.g., MOUs, IBAs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Enterprise-wide approach—not just an HR project or local practice</td>
<td>✓ Demonstrate flexibility (e.g., different metrics for employment, responsiveness to changing business conditions)</td>
<td>✓ Promote ASETS and EDCs to corporate Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Validate efforts to date to avoid falling backwards</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Continue to foster mentorship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Together, businesses and Indigenous groups, supported by third parties:
- ✓ Formalize relationships (e.g., MOUs, cooperation agreements)
- ✓ Strike joint committees to manage and sustain the partnership
- ✓ Build enterprise-wide/organization-wide buy-in for the relationship

Committed Partners

There are few businesses that may be considered ‘committed partners’. Only 2% of businesses have reached this stage or “tier,” where consultation is the norm, partnerships are geared towards long-term sustainability (not short-term gain), and core engagement competencies have been internalized. These competencies include committing to partnership from top-down (not merely engaging as a human resources or public relations exercise), investing in building Indigenous capacity, and maintaining clear and consistent communications. The rewards for businesses are access to new workers and new markets, and integration with the communities where they operate.
Committed partners tend to be larger businesses (1,000+ employees) with the capacity to act, and have comprehensive, validated strategies for engagement. Most committed partners are partnering with Indigenous businesses and EDCs. It is also at this level that we see a breakthrough with other organizations; nearly half of committed partners (47%) worked with ASETS agreement holders, and nearly as many (44%) have worked with national Indigenous associations. At this point, engagement is such an ingrained practice that these businesses find it easier to meet hiring targets and set-asides for Indigenous peoples than other equity groups. They report their workplaces are more accommodating thanks to the fact consultation is the norm.

What supports the success of their partnerships is their sustainability. In interviews, these businesses described their partnerships as long-term, ongoing relationships that are not limited to short- or medium-term goals. They are not geared around specific projects or opportunities, but around the relationship—and the opportunities that can generate. For this to happen, there needs to be trust and openness from both sides. This means that when times are tough and opportunities to work together are sparse, the partnership remains, the lines of communication open, and economic storms are weathered together.

Committed partners may still do more to advance engagement. They may act as mentors for less engaged businesses in their sector. They can continue to develop their partnership competencies, such as building capacity of Indigenous groups and communities. Together with their Indigenous partners they may identify new opportunities for collaboration, and promote their success as a template for corporate-Indigenous relations.

**Sectoral Clusters**

Engagement varies significantly between different sectors of the Canadian economy. Sectors also have different motivations for engaging that must be considered by Indigenous groups and other stakeholders looking to spur advancement. The table below summarizes our in-depth analysis of the seven sectoral clusters included in Section 5.2 of the full report. Sectors have been ordered by the engagement score for an average business in that sector, from most to least engaged.

**Table 0-4: How do sectors compare?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Most engaged, 1 in 4 has partners. Average engagement score of 23.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Mining, oil &amp; gas at the novice level; agriculture and forestry lagging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Motivated by clear business case (proximity, need to access markets)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Novices in sector want to be mentored by committed partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o 1-in-3 aware of TRC calls to action; awareness campaign warranted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation and Warehousing</th>
<th>Making progress, 1 in 3 is consulting. Average engagement score of 21.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Highest share of federally regulated businesses (Employment Equity)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o EE is motivating strategy development, but not substantive engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Similar motives to resource sector (proximity, market access)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Stalled momentum? Most likely to abandon strategies if not paying off</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o ASETS uptake gap: 46% aware of ASETS, but only 8% engaging them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Roles and Responsibilities for Government

The Government of Canada recognizes the complexity of this relationship, and the need for action. In the 2015 Speech from the Throne, the Government stated, “Because it is both the right thing to do and a certain path to economic growth, the Government will undertake to renew, nation-to-nation, the relationship between Canada and Indigenous peoples, one based on recognition of rights, respect, cooperation and partnership.” Shortly thereafter, the TRC included amongst its 94 calls to action specific commitments for corporate Canada. Specifically, the TRC called upon corporate Canada to provide Aboriginal peoples’ equitable access to jobs, training and education opportunities; to commit to meaningful consultation and building respectful relationships with Indigenous peoples before proceeding with economic development projects; and to ensure that communities gain long-term sustainable benefits from projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Average Engagement Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Construction and Utilities | Making progress, 1 in 3 is consulting. Average engagement score of 18.  
  - Most experience with Indigenous-owned businesses  
  - Lagging behind on community development  
  - Tend to be smaller, less capacity to take on community development  
  - ASETS uptake gap: 60% aware of ASETS, but only 6% engaging them | 18                       |
| Hospitality            | See labour solution but unable to act. Average engagement score of 14.  
  - Greatest interest in tapping the Indigenous labour pool  
  - Temporary Foreign Workers Program created a labour-crunch, especially outside urban centres  
  - Passive approach: see labour solution but unwilling to invest resources  
  - Lacking in strategy and direction (e.g., lowest ASETS awareness)  
  - Interested in guidance from Indigenous groups and third-party consultants | 14                       |
| Professional Services  | Stuck at strategic planning; doubts about Indigenous capacity. Average score: 12.  
  - Skills and specialization requirements inhibiting engagement, employment  
  - Mostly likely to be motivated by ethical arguments, but they don’t think Indigenous workers or businesses can meet their needs  
  - Finance, IT have strategies but no success; lower-skilled service providers (call centres, security) having more luck | 12                       |
  - Little interest in engagement unless compelled  
  - Least likely to say they would engage if approached by Indigenous groups  
  - Most responsive to policy direction from government  
  - EE makes a big difference: provides structure for planning. | 10                       |
| Retail and Wholesale Trade | Reactive: Location is everything. Average engagement score of 8.  
  - Most likely to be motivated by public demand, proximity to Indigenous communities and access to markets  
  - Consider their workplaces accommodating, despite lowest rates of strategy or consultation  
  - Highest interest in staff training and road maps for engagement | 8                        |
Fulfilling the TRC calls to action will improve conditions for both Indigenous communities and corporate Canada. For Indigenous communities, it will advance the social and economic well-being of communities that have too often been cut out from economic progress. For corporate Canada, it promises new opportunities to access previously untapped markets and labour pools. It also will make doing business easier, as they will be less likely to encounter conflict where short-term business goals clash with long-term community development.

The Government of Canada through its departments, agencies and funded partners can address the engagement gap between corporate Canada and Indigenous businesses. There is general agreement among both corporate Canada and Indigenous groups that external actors could work to boost awareness and facilitate networking between Indigenous groups and non-Indigenous businesses. Stakeholders would include not only the public sector but the non-profit and industry groups. While there is no consensus on direct interventions, such as set-asides or new policies, the federal government does have a direction it can take, based on the guidance of TRC. The role for actors is not to intervene directly with new legislation or industry standards. Rather, they should facilitate interaction between both sides of the partnership equation, boost awareness of existing opportunities and services, and invest in existing partnerships to create clusters for economic collaboration.

Specific government actions could include:

- **Promote Indigenous groups ready for partnership:** Raise the profile of existing business and employment solutions offered by Indigenous communities, namely the Economic Development Corporations (EDCs) and Aboriginal Employment, Skills and Training Strategy (ASETS) program. Awareness and engagement with these entities is currently low. EDCs and ASETS-agreement holders have the capacity, accountability, and experience necessary to work with engagement novices and relationship developers who are looking for Indigenous partners but don’t know where to start.

- **Connect federally regulated businesses with Employment Equity solutions:** Federal legislation around employment equity is not driving action with regards to Indigenous partnership. This research found that federal legislation, namely the Employment Equity (EE) Act, motivated businesses to prioritize engagement and develop strategies. The EE reporting structure helps regulated firms focus and develop a viable plan with goals they can work towards. However, they are not necessarily working towards the goals they have set. Regulated businesses are no likelier to have partners, nor did they report to be hiring more Indigenous employees than their unregulated competitors. Moreover, they are missing opportunities. For instance, regulated businesses were no more aware of ASETS than unregulated firms. Rather than add more requirements for businesses, it may be most efficient to help connect regulated businesses with ASETS-agreement holders and other Indigenous groups through networking events or accessible databases.

- **Facilitate business-to-business mentorship to develop sectoral clusters:** Disengaged businesses do not know where to look for Indigenous groups, and are waiting to be approached. Engagement novices and relationship developers are interested in being mentored by committed partners. Committed partners want to be recognized for their achievements and share their expertise. Rather than wait for businesses to engage one another, government can innovate and create programs to bring businesses together. Mentorship and networking programs should take a clustered approach, bringing together businesses by sector.
Supporting Indigenous partnerships is a major public challenge. This report is a foundation for action, with evidence and guidance from over 500 Canadian medium and large businesses, Indigenous EDCs and national associations, and other experienced stakeholders. The recommendations for government draw on that foundation, and would be well received by businesses and Indigenous groups. In tandem with those actions, other research may help strengthen and focus those activities. Future research we would recommend includes sector-specific investigations, evaluations of engagement programs (such as ASETS or EDCs), and conducting a second survey to update the baseline established here.
SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

This study aims to answer the question, “What is the current level of corporate-Indigenous engagement and partnership in Canada?” In addressing that question, we may then identify where there are gaps—and where there are the opportunities—to advance both corporate Canada and Indigenous communities. As this study is unprecedented in Canada, it was necessary to carefully set out key research questions and aims, bring together stakeholders from all sides of the issue, and develop new instruments to collect data and ultimately uncover the “engagement score” for Indigenous-corporate relations.

1.1 Background

As Canada marks its sesquicentennial anniversary, many Canadians are taking stock of their history. Often this includes revisiting the big events and ‘heritage moments,’ but also examining our social fabric (the bonds between peoples) and our social capital (the economic potential of these linkages). How do the diverse groups, communities, and nations that make up Canada engage one another? And perhaps more importantly, how do we move forward together? There has been a great deal of research on the relationships between Indigenous peoples and the state, religious institutions, and other entities, but one gap in the research is on the contemporary relationship between Indigenous peoples and corporate Canada. While it is easy to make assumptions based on one’s news feed, that Indigenous-corporate relations have been challenged, the reality is that some businesses take their relationship with Indigenous communities seriously. Corporate Canada is as varied as any community.

The Government of Canada recognizes the complexity of this relationship, and the need for action. In the 2015 Speech from the Throne, the Government stated, “Because it is both the right thing to do and a certain path to economic growth, the Government will undertake to renew, nation-to-nation, the relationship between Canada and Indigenous peoples, one based on recognition of rights, respect, cooperation and partnership.” Shortly thereafter, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission on Residential Schools (TRC) included amongst its 94 calls to action specific commitments for corporate Canada. Specifically, the TRC called upon corporate Canada to provide Aboriginal peoples equitable access to jobs, training and education opportunities; to commit to meaningful consultation and building respectful relationships with Indigenous peoples before proceeding with economic development projects; and to ensure that communities gain long-term sustainable benefits from projects.¹

Albeit the Government of Canada’s aims are laudable and necessary, they will not be easy to achieve without broad participation from Canadian businesses, communities, and non-government organizations. Certainly, to achieve the desired socio-economic changes, corporate Canada would need to increase its engagement with Indigenous communities and businesses. And even if corporate Canada has the willingness to get more engaged, it may lack the knowledge and capacity to act.


1.2 Methodology

The TRC’s call to action challenges corporate Canada to engage with Indigenous peoples to address employment, business development, and community development objectives. But to what extent are businesses engaging or even ready to engage? To answer that question, we need a baseline measurement to ground and guide expectations. Indigenous Works, along with its research partner, R.A. Malatest & Associates Ltd. (Malatest), developed a multi-step research strategy to track corporate Canada’s engagement.

1.2.1 Establish key research questions and aims

The aims of the study were twofold:

1. To gauge the extent to which medium and large businesses (i.e., those that employ more than 100 employees) are engaged with Indigenous communities and organizations; and
2. To identify the organizational competencies, structures, and supports necessary to spur engagement, relationships, and partnerships between business and Indigenous groups.

This research has the potential to reshape how stakeholders approach Indigenous-corporate relations:

- Businesses will be able to learn where they stand in comparison to their sector and corporate Canada as a whole, and how they can see engagement as a business opportunity;
- Indigenous groups will know the relative positions of different sectors of the economy, and thus will be better able to tailor their approach to businesses; and
- Third-parties such as government agencies can target their efforts with both non-Indigenous businesses and Indigenous groups, by boosting awareness among the disengaged, providing support for novices, and locating potential engagement clusters.

1.2.2 Convene a cross-cutting, national steering committee

A National Advisory Committee was struck for this research project by Indigenous Works to guide the research and provide insights into the key findings. This committee has enhanced the study, as it has directed the research, validated findings, and strategized how to effectively communicate this knowledge to varied audiences, including different sectors of the Canadian economy, Indigenous groups, and different levels of government. The committee included members from:

- Large non-Indigenous businesses, including representatives of the communications, construction, resource, and service sectors;
- Indigenous organizations, including economic development corporations (EDCs); and
- Government agencies, including Indigenous and Northern Affairs; Employment and Skills Development Canada; and Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada.

1.2.3 Review relevant literature and documents

To build from the guidance of the National Advisory Committee, Indigenous Works and Malatest reviewed literature on partnerships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous groups. It was confirmed that this research is effectively brand new as there has been minimal study on contemporary Indigenous-corporate relations, let alone a means of quantifying it. There have been primarily qualitative studies on Indigenous-corporate relations, especially in regards to the duty to consult, but
what is unique about this study is its quantitative focus. Nonetheless some guides for effective partnership were found, albeit for other arrangements (for example, Indigenous groups and government). Additionally, Indigenous Works was able to provide its Seven Stage Partnership Model, and draw upon its own library of research and partnership experience to provide context and direction to this work (for example, reports on EDC roundtables and case studies of non-Indigenous businesses).

1.2.4 Develop a research framework: The partnership matrix and engagement score

A key output of this research was to design a tool for measuring any non-Indigenous business’s engagement with Indigenous groups. In developing the matrix, we reviewed and adapted Indigenous Works’ Seven Stage Partnership Model. The matrix we produced applies the TRC’s focus on employment, business development, and community development, combined with the benchmarks for organizational competencies, strategies, and practices identified in the model. By assessing a business through a battery of metrics, we were able to assign businesses an “engagement score” from 0 to 100. Generally speaking, the matrix assesses four levels of engagement across three dimensions of business activity (see Table 1-1below). The full matrix includes 39 unique indicators and is included as an appendix (see Appendix A). Using the matrix, we may not only assess a business’s relative commitment, but identify their strengths and weaknesses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Business development</th>
<th>Community development</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awareness &amp; Readiness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness &amp; Readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Up to 25 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy in place,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formalized, validated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Indigenous peoples?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Up to 25 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult when hiring?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult on business decisions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult on community impact?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(up to 25 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment goals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships with Indigenous businesses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships with communities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(up to 25 point)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business development score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Engagement Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out of 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The matrix presented here is a simplified form of the full matrix. The full partnership matrix is included as an appendix (Appendix A).

5 More information on the model may be found at Indigenousworks.ca
A questionnaire was designed to assign per-business values to partnership matrix indicators, as well as capture contextual information about business demographics, partnership details, and outcomes. The full questionnaire is included as an appendix (see Appendix B). The figure on the next page (Figure 1-1) illustrates how the survey’s programmed “skip logic” customizes the questions respondents were asked, whether completing it over the phone or online.
Figure 1-1: Skip logic of survey instrument and overview of questions asked

Awareness:
- Demographics / Trends
- Policies (e.g. TRC)
- Opportunities

Readiness:
- Priority?
- Capacity?

Do you ever consider engaging?  
No  Why is it not on the radar?
Yes

Any strategies?  
No  Why no strategy in place? Did you have one before?
Yes

Strategies:
- Formalized?
- Breadth?
- Validated?

Strategies with other equity groups?

Any consultation?  
No
Yes

Consultations:
- With whom?
- Acknowledged?
- Impact on biz?

Why do you not consult or partner? Did you before?

Partnerships:
- Objectives?
- Sustainable?
- Outcomes?

All businesses are asked the following:  
- What would need to change and what would your business need to increase its engagement?
- How do you compare to other businesses in your industry? To where your business was two years ago?
Both the matrix and survey were vetted by the National Advisory Committee. Drawing on their knowledge, they helped us to better understand the narrative behind existing partnerships (e.g., competencies necessary to act, future opportunities for partnership or collaboration), and to ensure our scoring process was fair and accurate.

1.2.5 Survey medium and large businesses

To establish a baseline engagement score, we surveyed 310 medium and 201 large Canadian businesses. The survey was fielded between February and May 2017, and had an MRIA response rate of 21%.

The final data was weighted based on business size to generate a representative sample of corporate Canada. As Table 1-2 below shows, although we interviewed 201 large businesses accounting for 39% of our sample, large businesses account for only 9% of all medium and large businesses in Canada. However, these large businesses employ over 40% of the Canadian workforce, warranting deeper examination of their capacity for engagement and partnership. Therefore, large businesses were oversampled to provide a firm understanding of the different challenges and capacities of both medium and large employers. This oversampling required a weighting strategy to return that oversample to its proper proportion when considering overall results.

### Table 1-2: Total businesses surveyed and weighted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Total Surveyed</th>
<th>% of Sample</th>
<th>Total Weighted</th>
<th>% of Business Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium (100-499 employees)</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (500+ employees)</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.6 Validate findings with Indigenous, business, and other stakeholders

Key informant interviews were conducted with businesses, Indigenous groups, and other stakeholders to validate findings. Business interviewees were identified from the 511 total and chosen to represent a range of regions, sectors, and business sizes. Indigenous and other stakeholders were identified by Indigenous Works. Unique interview guides were used for each audience, including customizations based on business engagement and partnership experiences. An interview guide matrix, that displays all these guides and customizations, is provided in Appendix D.

---

6 Detailed response rates by sector are included in Appendix C calculated using the Marketing Research and Intelligence Association’s standard formula. https://mria-arim.ca/standards/response-rate-calculation-formula.

Table 1-3: Key informant interviews completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder group</th>
<th>Interviews completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Indigenous businesses</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous organizations, including Economic Development Corporations, and regional and national associations.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other stakeholders, including industry and business associations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.7 Limitations

The main limitation of this research is that the partnership matrix is a new research tool. It has not been previously employed, and thus has not been validated in a formal sense. However, it was iteratively modified by the steering committee, key informants, and following an initial field test of the survey. The matrix was also designed to measure a wide range of approaches to engagement, rather than demand businesses meet specific criteria to demonstrate engagement. The matrix considers multiple levels and dimensions of partnership. Thus, it is possible for businesses to demonstrate novice, intermediate, and committed partnership based on their own unique policies and practices.
SECTION 2: THE NATIONAL ENGAGEMENT SCORE: A BASELINE FOR INDIGENOUS CORPORATE RELATIONS

Based on the statistics derived from the survey, the baseline score for medium and large businesses is 13 out of 100. What does this mean? Most businesses are disengaged, but there are individual companies, regions and sectors that are ahead of the pack.

Using these statistics further, Canadian businesses can be classified into four tiers, ranging from the disengaged majority (85% of businesses), to engagement novices (9%), to relationship developers (4%), and finally to the committed partners (2%). Each of these tiers differs in their engagement inhibitors and motivators.

2.1 The baseline score for corporate-Indigenous engagement

Using the partnership matrix and the data reported below, Canadian businesses can be grouped into four tiers (see Figure 2-1 below). Overall, the average score out of 100 is 13, firmly within the disengaged tier.

Figure 2-1: Locating the baseline using the partnership matrix

Though the “average” business is disengaged, there are businesses that have progressed along the partnership matrix (see Figure 2-2 below). There were responding organizations that landed in each of the higher tiers. While most businesses may be categorized among the disengaged majority (85%), the other sixth of businesses can be divided into three progressively engaged tiers: engagement novices (9%); relationship developers (4%); and, committed partners (2%). Each of these four groups differs in their relative achievements and shortcomings (as shall be discussed in Section 3).
2.2 Limited awareness and commitment inhibits readiness to engage

Corporate-Indigenous relations rely on a top-down commitment from business leaders. Feedback from Indigenous economic development corporations (EDCs) and other national groups was unanimous that engagement requires that communities are connected to decision-makers. As such it is vital that leadership is aware of Indigenous issues and policies, and sets them as priorities.

Our survey found that business leaders are mostly unaware (see Figure 2-3 below). A bare majority of businesses said their leaders were aware of specific Indigenous groups where they do business. Less than half, however, said their leadership would know Indigenous peoples are the fastest growing demographic in Canada. Fewer still believed their the leadership was aware of the Aboriginal Skills, Employment and Training Strategy (ASETS) program, which can help them reach that demographic, or that TRC issued specific calls to action for corporate Canada.

Figure 2-3: Awareness of Indigenous issues and potential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous groups near business</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fastest growing demographic in Canada</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASETS Program</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRC Calls to Action for Corporate Canada</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=511 medium and large businesses

Ultimately, engagement is not a high priority for corporate Canada (see Figure 2-4 below). Only half of businesses wanted to do more business with Indigenous groups (49% medium or high priority), and fewer were prioritizing hiring Indigenous peoples (44%). Most at odds with the TRC Calls to Action, only
one-in-three businesses (34%) considered investing in Indigenous communities a priority. That is not to say this is the result of outright prejudice or apathy. The varied inhibitors to engagement are described at the start of the aptly titled Section 3.1: The disengaged majority.

Figure 2-4: Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Business development</th>
<th>Community development</th>
<th>Overall (Any Strategies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doing business with Indigenous groups (n=431)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring Indigenous peoples (n=439)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing in community development (n=407)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note Figure excludes non-responses (Don’t know / Prefer not to answer)

2.3 Lack of strategic direction preventing action

With most businesses considering engagement a low or medium priority, it is not surprising that few have strategies for Indigenous employment, business development, or community development. Overall, one-in-four businesses had strategies for any of these purposes (15% mix of formal and informal, 10% informal only).

Strategy development is a phased process. For the purposes of the survey, we have identified four key phases of strategy development: drafting, formalizing, validation (by Indigenous peoples or groups), and enterprise-wide implementation (as opposed to restricting it to specific projects or regions). Figure 2-5 below shows the progress of businesses through the phases of strategy development, including their relative focus on employment, business development, and community development.

Figure 2-5: Strategy development phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Development Phase</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Business development</th>
<th>Community development</th>
<th>Overall (Any Strategies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy drafted</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalized</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validated by Indigenous peoples</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implemented enterprise-wide</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=511 medium and large businesses

Few businesses have progressed beyond the first phases of strategy development. Our research revealed that among business that have strategies, less than half developed and validated them with
input from Indigenous peoples. These figures improve somewhat for formal strategies, particularly for formal community strategies. Nevertheless, these findings suggest that half of existing strategies are informal and incomplete.

### 2.4 Consultation is the exception, not the rule

Businesses are unlikely to consult Indigenous groups when making business decisions. Overall, one-in-four businesses have consulted with Indigenous groups in the past two years. Businesses with strategies were much more likely to have consulted (69%) when making decisions than those without strategies (9%).

Like strategy development, we have considered the processes of consultation as three steps: consulting on decisions / outreach, acknowledgement, and enterprise-wide application. Figure 2-6 below shows the relative commitment to consultation among corporate Canada. Although almost one-quarter of businesses have consulted, these efforts tended to be restricted in scope.

#### Figure 2-6: Consultation practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation Practice</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Business development</th>
<th>Community development</th>
<th>Overall (Any Consultation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consults on decisions</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise-wide application (Consultation is the norm)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=511 medium and large businesses

Business that consulted generally acknowledged the input of Indigenous groups by sharing their final decisions with them and, if appropriate, promoting their contribution publicly. However, these businesses mostly consulted on a per-project or departmental basis, as opposed to committing to consultation enterprise; in other words, even among those that consulted, it was not the norm for corporate operations. For instance, 15% of businesses consulted on hiring, but only 4% always consulted when hiring.

### 2.5 Few businesses are prepared for partnership

As most businesses have no developed engagement strategies and have no experience with consultation, it should come as no surprise few businesses have partnered with Indigenous groups. Partnerships, where they exist, tend to be informal.

The survey divided partnership into several phases (see Figure 2-7 below), as well as asked follow-up questions about means of formalization (Figure 2-8). While 13% of businesses reported partnering with Indigenous groups, only 10% of businesses had partnerships geared towards long-term sustainability (as opposed to short or medium-term gain), and only 6% formalized these relationships.
Partnerships are formalized using a variety of mechanisms (see Figure 2-8 below). Some of these arrangements are formalized through typical business mechanisms, such as contracts and joint ventures. Other mechanisms of formalization are more unique to Indigenous partnerships, like memorandums of understanding (MOU) and cooperation agreements. Often combinations of mechanisms were employed to formalize a partnership. For instance, a broad opportunity agreement may structure a long-term partnership and individual contracts may manage short-term projects. In other instances, an initial contract or agreement may spur deeper engagements, such as joint ventures. A few businesses had gone so far as to solemnize their partnerships with formal ceremonies but this is rare; only 1% of all businesses participated in a formal ceremony with an Indigenous group.

**Figure 2-8: How partnerships are formalized**

![Figure 2-8: How partnerships are formalized](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>% of Businesses with Formal Partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum of understanding (MOU)</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation agreement</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint venture</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution agreement</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity agreement</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal ceremony</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact and benefits agreement (IBA)</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=31 businesses with formal partnerships; multiple responses permitted.*

**Important to Note: Partnerships perspectives vary**

Per interviews and roundtables with EDCs and other Indigenous groups, there is some contention over what constitutes a partnership. From the Indigenous perspective, partnership is a long-term and holistic commitment that goes beyond specific projects and balance sheets. Partnerships need to be
commitments to work together, share opportunities, and communicate. In practice however, often what corporate Canada calls “partnership” is relatively superficial, such as just doing business on a reserve or awarding a tender to an Indigenous-owned business. Follow-up interviews with some disengaged businesses and engagement novices that claimed to have partnerships confirm this disconnect.

From the results of the survey, about one-quarter (24%) of formal partnerships may fall into this grey area. Some partnerships were formalized only by contracts (16% of partnerships), which EDCs and other Indigenous groups would consider to be business relationships. Some Indigenous groups would also not consider joint ventures to be true partnerships, unless paired with other forms of agreements. A joint venture in one instance may represent the highest form of partnership, with businesses and Indigenous groups working in collaboration. In other instances, though, they may only represent marriages of convenience where the non-Indigenous business agrees to the joint venture to move forward with a project and the Indigenous group is a silent partner.
SECTION 3: ADVANCING FROM DISENGAGED TO COMMITTED

Our survey data, validated by key informant interviews, show significant shifts in attitude as businesses advance from disengaged to committed, including the inhibitors and motivators along the way.

- At the disengaged stage, businesses are not prioritizing engagement but they are not opposed to it; in fact, many are simply waiting to be approached.
- When businesses begin to prioritize as engagement novices, they begin to see the business case for engagement—but are prone to novice missteps, such as under-committing and failing to communicate clearly and consistently. We have incorporated guidance from Indigenous Economic Development Corporations (EDCs) and other national and regional associations to identify these missteps and the competencies that may be needed to mitigate them.
- As companies move into the relationship developer stage, businesses see partnership as a broad arrangement, and consider not only business objectives but community development.
- Committed partners, though relatively rare, demonstrate core competencies that sustain these partnerships and lead to positive outcomes for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous parties.

Note that the four tiers are not homogenous. Significant differences exist between each tier by size, industry, and region. Based on these findings, we can see that certain clusters are far more advanced than others, while others are significantly behind.

3.1 The disengaged majority

Most Canadian businesses may be described as belonging to the disengaged majority (85%). Among these businesses, engagement is a low priority at best. They lack not only the knowledge to engage (e.g., awareness of nearby Indigenous communities), but they lack the capacity to act as well. While a share of this group has begun to prioritize doing more business with Indigenous groups, or increasing employment, they are not ready—and perhaps not willing—to partner.

Why businesses say they have never considered engaging or reaching out to Indigenous communities and organizations:

“Never thought about it.” “Pas besoin.” “We need people with specific designations, so that is the priority.” “Not applicable to our business.” “No policy.” “Has never been considered.” “People generally come to us, we haven’t needed to reach out.” “Unintentional oversight.” “Let employees come to them.” “Has not been considered.” “No opportunity.” “No long-term HR strategy.” “No incentive to do so.” “No reason.” “Not contractually obligated as is in the past.” “Don’t reach out to any of those special communities.” “Need more information.” “Assumption we were reaching any interested candidates through job postings.” “We don’t reach out to any group in particular.” “We would respond if they reached out to us.” “We don’t ask.” “Hasn’t been a priority for the business.” “Only look at skills.” “Lack of opportunity to engage.” “Il n’y pas d’autochtones dans la communauté.” “Doesn’t fall under business objectives.” “Not on our radar.” “No direction from corporate.” “We do not target specific communities.” “We don’t discriminate.” “Leadership hasn’t made it a priority.” “Never occurred to us.” “Nothing formalized.” “All of the above would apply.”

– Direct quotes from disengaged businesses
3.1.1 What inhibits engagement?

The disengaged majority do not see a convincing business case for engaging Indigenous peoples. To understand their inhibitions, we can subdivide the disengaged majority into two groups; those that have never considered engagement whatsoever, and those that have—and may have some limited experience, like doing business with communities—but have not taken formal steps, like drafting a strategy. For the larger, former group inhibitors that prevent consideration relate to responsibility and value; that either there are few Indigenous peoples where they do business or, if there are, there is no business case to actively engage them (i.e., limited perceived value or seen as unimportant). For the latter, inhibitors that prevent action include cost and lack of direction from leadership. Some businesses also rolled Indigenous engagement into a broader equity strategy, but in doing so fail to take specific actions for Indigenous groups (see Table 3-1 below). In fact, some businesses remain committed to these forms of passive engagement.

Table 3-1: Primary and persistent inhibitors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inhibitors</th>
<th>Primary inhibitors (Never considered engaging)</th>
<th>Persistent inhibitors (Considered, but took no action)</th>
<th>Relative difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Few Indigenous people where we do business</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive engagement (“We don’t discriminate”)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited perceived value</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important (“Not our responsibility”)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (Time, resources, complexity)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>+6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of business / Restrictions on hiring</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>+4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of direction from government</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of broader equity strategy</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>+12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No direction from leadership</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>+8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risky / Negative experience</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>+2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Primary inhibitors based on 163 medium and large businesses that have never considered engaging Indigenous groups. Persistent inhibitors based on 115 medium and large businesses with engagement experience but no strategy. Note that columns may not add up to 100% as businesses were asked to identify the one or two main reasons for not engaging.

3.1.2 What needs to change?

Ultimately, the disengaged majority may be described as having a reactive approach to Indigenous engagement (see Figure 3-1 below). A third of the disengaged majority indicated they would take action if they were approached by Indigenous communities or groups. Similarly, one-sixth said that if they found themselves doing more business with Indigenous peoples, if even incidentally, it could spur a change within their organization.
Other businesses are waiting for labour and economic developments. A third of these businesses also noted they would act if there were changes to their workforce (i.e., they needed to hire a lot of new employees), or to the labour force (i.e., a change in the supply of qualified candidates). However, even if companies required workers in some occupations, they may not think to hire from the Indigenous community. In particular, some sectors, such as finance and IT, perceive that there is a lack of Indigenous job candidates with the needed skills. As for economic changes, about one-tenth of businesses said they would engage more if economic conditions were rosier and 7% said they are waiting until their own performance improves. Notably, only one-in-ten said they would be motivated by legal requirements or government policy.

3.1.3 What would help?

Decreasing disengagement in corporate Canada may require that other groups, including Indigenous groups, take the first step to approach them. Further, they are looking for guidance from other groups to guide them.

If motivated, most disengaged businesses (68%) identified at least one specific support, service, or resource they would need to move forward. What stood out were not specific resources but access to knowledge and expertise. For instance, businesses were interested in guidance from Indigenous groups (29%), from other businesses (19%), and consultants (15%). This was echoed in interviews with disengaged businesses who said they need to know to whom they could talk (see the text box below).

Businesses could be helped by having Indigenous groups directly approaching them, or facilitated by networking events. In turn, the businesses we interviewed indicated a willingness to give Indigenous groups a guided tour of their facilities so they may fully understand the work they do and their needs. This would be similar to the same approach they would provide all prospective partners. While welcoming, this does demonstrate a passive approach as the groups would have to come to them.
Businesses also said they needed to build and activate internal capacity. While the disengaged may be willing to talk, they may not be ready to do so meaningfully. For instance, in a manner that demonstrates a genuine commitment to engage and cultural sensitivity. Preparing to engage could take different forms, such as dedicating resources to engagement (22%), engaging Indigenous employees for guidance (16%), or obtaining leadership buy-in (16%). Some businesses expressed interest in specific, third-party services, such as staff training (12%), templates (8%), or systems reviews (5%). This interest was strongest in some of the least engaged sectors, such as hospitality and retail. Few businesses said they would need assistance from government (5%), though there was concentrated interest in government direction among manufacturers. (See Section 5.2 for more on sectors).

Engaging the Disengaged:

“It’s hard to figure out, ‘Where do you start?’ We need advisory and networking services we can go to with our ideas to ensure our approach is respectful and responds to community need. We don’t want to come with our agenda; we want to ask how can we help theirs? And, we want to make sure whatever we do we can sustain.”

–Tech Company, 2000+ employees

“Our staffs wear different hats. It would be good to have one point person for this, but we’re not there yet. It would be best if someone reached out and provided some main contacts to get the ball rolling.”

–Manufacturer, < 250 employees

“We’re not doing as much research on this front as we should. In my head, I’m trying to figure out how to engage using the model we use with schools, building relationships with teachers, participating in co-op programs, and job fairs, etcetera. We’d be really interested to set up that same model with an Indigenous group or community, but we’re struggling to make those connections. Who are the people we can speak to?”

–Hotel & Resort, 500-999 employees

3.2 Engagement novices

Building on the narrative above, engagement novices are those businesses that have been spurred to act, albeit typically by necessity. Their key motivators for engagement are the potential labour pool, access and proximity to Indigenous markets, the need to obtain social license, and—perhaps more positively—a sense of corporate social responsibility.

In some ways, the novices are held back by the same challenges as the disengaged majority. They generally described themselves as being only somewhat capable of increasing engagement. To mitigate this, businesses reached outside their organization for guidance. At the novice stage, virtually all businesses have strategies, and half invited Indigenous groups to validate their plans. Validated strategies tend to be broader, and consider community development, while invalidated plans tend to be all about the bottom line.

3.2.1 What motivates novice engagement?

Novices are most motivated by the business opportunities associated with engagement, rather than by social or ethical considerations. Businesses and their leadership need to see the business case for
engagement before they act, and thus we can expect that factors that would improve their bottom line would take precedence over those that would improve socioeconomic conditions. The figure below shows businesses were more likely to be motivated by opportunities such as the potential labour pool (48%) and access to markets (30%), than corporate social responsibility (34%) and access to knowledge (9%) respectively. The relative importance of these motivators differs significantly between sectors (see Section 5.2).

**Figure 3-2: What factors motivated your business to work with Indigenous groups?**

As disengaged businesses often expect Indigenous groups to approach them, it is necessary for those groups to strategically tailor their business case for partnership. For instance, to leverage community engagement, it may be best to connect with the person responsible for corporate social responsibility. If a business is interested in accessing Indigenous labour, it would be better to go through the person responsible for human resources.

**3.2.2 Willing to engage—but still not ready?**

Engagement novices’ high level of awareness and prioritization make them stand out from the disengaged majority—but they report similar capacity challenges. On one hand:

- Novice leadership was twice as likely as disengaged leadership to know the Indigenous groups where they do business, the demographic potential of the Indigenous labour, and the ASETS program; and,
- Novice businesses were three times as likely to rate engagement as a high or medium priority.

On the other hand, the novices generally described themselves as being only somewhat capable of increasing engagement, on par with the disengaged majority. This may be the result of modesty, that the novices appreciate the complexity of engagement and are underestimating their capacity. However, it may also be that businesses have hit a capacity wall—that they took their first steps (e.g., formulated strategies, initiated consultation) and lack the ability to go further. This creates a policy challenge both internally for businesses and externally for third-parties like Indigenous groups and the federal government; how can their existing capacity be amplified to spur further advancement? Below, we
describe what novices are doing, what missteps they are prone to make, and the supports that could be provided to help them avoid missteps and advance.

### 3.2.3 How is novice engagement demonstrated?

Engagement novices adopt the basic policies and practices that are a necessary foundation for advancement towards the intermediate and committed tiers. Nearly all novices had drafted strategies and consulted Indigenous groups, and over half had initiated partnerships. However, these engagements can be shallow. For instance, while nearly all novices had strategies, less than half of novices’ strategies were validated by Indigenous peoples (44%), and only one-in-three strategies considered community development. This limited commitment to strategy development impacts consultation and partnership practices. Consultation is generally restricted to specific projects or regions, partnerships are informal, and both consultations and partnerships are primarily focused on employment objectives.

Where formal partnerships exist, they were mostly business contracts (50%) or joint ventures (35%). As discussed in Section 2.5, these arrangements may be considered business relationships, not partnerships, by Indigenous groups. Few novice partnerships were formalized with more robust agreements, such as MOUs (7%) or cooperation agreements (5%), which are more generally acceptable as markers of authentic partnerships.

Novices are engaging Indigenous groups on a per-case basis, waiting to be approached by Indigenous groups. Half of novices engaged with individual band associations (50%), and one third with Indigenous-owned businesses (31%). Relatively few have engaged ASETS agreement-holders (15%), EDCs (14%), or other service and community agencies (12%). Considering novices are focused on employment objectives, their disengagement from ASETS and EDCs represents a missed opportunity.

Additionally, novices were no more likely than disengaged businesses to consider their workplace a good cultural fit for Indigenous employees. Only two-thirds of the disengaged (63%) and novices (62%) considered their businesses’ values, outlook and practices accommodating, compared to nearly all relationship developers (85%) and committed partners (91%).

### 3.2.4 What missteps do novices make?

There are three common missteps that engagement novices make, according to our interviews with EDCs and other Indigenous groups. These missteps relate to three, interrelated gaps that inhibit partnership: the commitment gap, the capacity gap, and the communications gap. In Section 3.4, we detail the competencies that committed partners demonstrate that respond directly to these gaps.

#### The Commitment Gap

Businesses often go into partnerships with Indigenous groups simply to ‘check a box,’ or as one EDC put it, “To rent our name.” This is a particular issue for businesses that are acting out of necessity, such as those trying to meet employment equity targets or to win a tender that demands set-asides for Aboriginal involvement. As noted above, partnerships at the novice stage tend to be contracts or joint ventures that do not demonstrate a commitment beyond the project at hand. CEOs of Indigenous EDCs told us they have to be careful to ferret out motives of businesses that approach them.
One EDC went so far as to describe these uncommitted partnerships as a "master-slave" relationship. In these situations, the EDC or Indigenous partner has committed resources from their leadership to implement the partnership, but the Indigenous business has delegated their responsibility to a relatively low-ranking resource, such as a sales manager. To the non-Indigenous partner, the Indigenous group may be treated as just another customer.

**The Capacity Gap**

Businesses—particularly larger ones—often fail to recognize the capacity issues Indigenous businesses and communities face. Because Indigenous groups tend to be small compared to non-Indigenous enterprises, they are unable to meet the needs of their would-be partners. For instance, a business may start consulting an Indigenous group with employment and business opportunities, and then put out a tender that demands a 200-page proposal for tens of millions of dollars in work. Ultimately Indigenous businesses and communities can play a role in the supply chain, but the role is often modest.

The capacity gap can also manifest itself within non-Indigenous businesses. Particularly among smaller businesses, there are insufficient resources dedicated to engagement and partnership. This results in strategic plans that are not acted upon, or partnerships that are allowed to lapse. This aspect of the capacity gap is an extension of the commitment gap, and precludes addressing the Indigenous-side of the capacity gap.

**The Communications Gap**

Communications between corporate Canada and Indigenous groups can be difficult. This can include misunderstandings at initial stages that derail projects, and a lack of communication over time. At the outset of relationships, there can be significant gaps in expectations and urgency. Businesses often tend to be anxious for short-term profits, while Indigenous communities are looking for long-term commitments that will be both profitable and sustainable. When these divergent perspectives are not articulated, partners may feel alienated from one another and allow the relationship to lapse.

For a relationship to become a partnership, it has to be a start to something with agreed upon goals. Then, even if the corporate and Indigenous partners can get past the “honeymoon period,” said one EDC, it is necessary to communicate and benchmark progress regularly to ensure both sides are “pulling the rope in the same direction.”

### 3.2.5 What supports do novices need?

Novices need resources with engagement experience and consulting services to validate and build upon the foundations they’ve laid. For one, they need to address internal capacity issues. They need to get past the internal “capacity wall” that tempers their commitment to engagement. That may be addressed externally by third-parties who can act as advisors to guide them through new experiences and challenges. This role could be filled by subject matter experts from Indigenous organizations and sector specialists that can draw on their own successes – and failures.

Novices also need Indigenous groups to recognize their expectations and needs. While businesses need to temper their urgency and expectations, Indigenous groups need to present themselves as capable and responsive partners. EDCs attributed their success in winning contracts and forging partnerships to
their professionalism, their track record, and their transparency. These are qualities non-Indigenous businesses would expect from other businesses. As one EDC described it, Indigenous communities and businesses need to approach corporate Canada from a business perspective. It is only after a non-Indigenous company sees the business case for partnership that the relationship develops and so does the business.

### 3.3 Relationship developers

The relationship developers are those businesses who are at the intermediate level of engagement. They recognize both the business case and social responsibility for Indigenous partnerships. They are as likely to be motivated by access to labour and markets as by corporate social responsibility and wanting to improve workplace culture.

Businesses at this level are in the difficult process of scaling up their engagement from pursuing narrow business and hiring objectives, which incidentally demand engagement, to seeing engagement as a core competency to remain competitive in corporate Canada. For example, these businesses report that the amount of work they do in Indigenous communities is increasing, and in turn report their reputation among Indigenous communities is strengthening; a sign of their more holistic approach to engagement. Paradoxically however, relationship developers indicated that hiring more Indigenous peoples was a high priority while conceding that their Indigenous staff levels remain on par with engagement novices.

#### 3.3.1 Strength in capacity and commitment

In some ways, novices and relationship developers were similar. They both had similarly high awareness of Indigenous groups and trends. Additionally, by the novice stage business had strategies and had initiated consultation. What separated the relationship developers were their capacity to act and their commitment to community development.

Relationship developers are capable of engaging on a range of fronts (see Table 3-2 below). At this intermediate stage, businesses report they are very capable of “walking the talk.” While their human resource capacity is only somewhat greater than novices, it is their commitment to corporate social responsibility that demonstrates their advancement and readiness to partner.

**Table 3-2: Capacity to act on engagement initiatives, comparing novice and intermediate businesses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement initiative</th>
<th>Engagement Novices</th>
<th>Relationship Developers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employing more Indigenous peoples</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>65% (+14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing more business with Indigenous groups</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>77% (+27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing in Indigenous community development</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>77% (+63%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages indicate those businesses that describe themselves as “very capable” of acting, and excludes those who rated the initiative as a low priority. Counts differ per cell, but range from 19 to 27 for novices and from 12 to 15 for relationship developers.

This high capacity is structured by well-rounded strategies (see Table 3-3 below). While novice strategies tended to leave out community development, most relationship developers included community development. Moreover, nearly all intermediate strategies included Indigenous groups as part of their business development; the relationship developers we interviewed recognize their success and the success of Indigenous peoples go hand-in-hand.
Table 3-3: Strategic focus of engagement initiatives, comparing novice and intermediate businesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic areas</th>
<th>Engagement Novices</th>
<th>Relationship Developers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous employment</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>77% (+4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business development that considers Indigenous groups</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>95% (+26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous community development</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>67% (+32%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=31 engagement novices and 17 relationship developers that have strategies.

3.3.2 Meaningful consultation with room to grow

Relationship developers consult on a broader range of decisions than novices, but consultation remains limited to specific projects or regions rather than enterprise-wide application. Most relationship developers consulted on employment (81%), business decisions (78%), and community development (75%). However only one-quarter of developers (25%) had enterprise-wide consultation practices (e.g., all hiring initiatives include consultation, versus only select hiring drives). While that was twice the rate for novices (13%), it was a fraction of the rate among committed partners (82%). Tellingly, relationship developers were no likelier than novices to say their consultations had a very significant impact on their business. This finding demonstrates that developers still have room to grow. They are laying the foundation for this growth by formalizing broad, sustainable relationships that will have the transformative, enterprise-wide effect that comes with Indigenous partnerships.

3.3.3 Formalizing broad, sustainable partnerships

Despite gaps in consultation, relationship developers are in fact moving forward with sustainable, formalized partnerships. At this intermediate stage, virtually all businesses have partners, and nearly all partnerships have been formalized. Formalization was implemented using more sophisticated mechanisms than contracts, such as cooperation agreements (43%), MOUs (34%), and contribution agreements (32%). Moreover, these partnerships had broad scopes, reflecting the capacity and strategic strengths described above (see Table 3-4 below). If we were to compare novices and relationship developers solely in terms of employment, the two tiers would be indistinguishable. However, when this lens is broadened to consider business and community development, we see clear differences between novices and intermediate businesses.

Table 3-4: Partnership objectives, comparing novice and intermediate businesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership objectives</th>
<th>Engagement Novices</th>
<th>Relationship Developers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous employment</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>87% (+3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business development that considers Indigenous groups</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>99% (+56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous community development</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>89% (+63%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=24 engagement novices and 16 relationship developers that have partners.

At the intermediate stage, businesses begin branching out beyond individual band associations to other Indigenous groups. Relationship developers were twice more likely than novices to be working with EDCs (27%) and other service and community agencies (37%). However, they were no more likely to be

---

8 5% of relationship developers do not have partnerships but have extensive consultation practices that merit their membership in this engagement tier.
working with Indigenous-owned businesses or ASETS agreement-holders. It is only among the committed partners where we observed regular engagement with those groups, as well as engagement with national associations.

3.3.4 Navigating intermediate challenges and benchmarking progress towards commitment

It is vital to remember the partnership matrix is not a one-way street. Relationship developers are at a critical stage where they have entered into formal partnerships but may have exceeded their capacity or foundation. As the tables above show, nearly all businesses are partnering towards employment and community objectives but many do not have specific strategies for those areas. In a way, relationship developers may suffer from their own success, and get ahead of themselves. They are still vulnerable to the same missteps novices make, and could reverse their progress towards partnership.

To support their ‘broadening’ or ‘scaling up,’ these relationship developers need a roadmap, including how to benchmark and validate their practices, implement them enterprise-wide, and take full potential of Indigenous businesses and ASETS agreement holders. Due to the small size of this group (4% of businesses), and its transitory status between novices and committed, it can be difficult to identify specific needs. Some businesses may be at this stage because they have developed strength in one area (e.g., formalized and sustainable employment partnerships) while neglecting others (e.g., only limited commitment to community development). Others are at this stage because they have made commitments equally to employment, business development, and community development, but these commitments are limited in application.

Any good roadmap includes mile markers that benchmark progress towards a goal, and a partnership roadmap is no exception. As relationship developers may have different strengths and take different routes, they could use quantifiable but flexible metrics for benchmarking. The partnership matrix is such a tool. We have developed a roadmap that illustrates the journey businesses may take to develop relationships and partnerships, using key benchmarks established by the matrix and qualitative feedback from business and EDC interviews (see subsection 3.5 at the end of this Section).

Businesses at this point expressed that they need to be confident in their potential Indigenous partners. One business we interviewed stated that from a company perspective, it is vital that their Indigenous partners accept responsibility in the relationship. For instance, if the business has promised to hire a certain number of high school graduates from a community, then the community has to take ownership that they will sufficiently educate their youth. As another example, if the non-Indigenous business has agreed to procure from Indigenous-owned businesses, the Indigenous businesses have to ensure they are delivering satisfactory products. However, non-Indigenous businesses need to recognize their Indigenous business partners may have limited capacity and experience relative to their non-Indigenous competitors, which warrants flexibility. One business we interviewed did concede, “We need to challenge ourselves, and ask ourselves if we are being fair. Are we placing unnecessary hurdles in front of Indigenous groups?”

Navigating this intermediate stage necessitates recognition that authentic partnership is more than a business contract but a commitment to collaborate and innovate. Relationship developers will find themselves at the novice stage again if they are not committed to what they have begun.
3.4 Committed partners

At the top of our partnership matrix are the committed partners, who have much to teach disengaged, novice, and developing businesses looking to increase their engagement. These tend to be larger businesses (1,000+ employees) with the capacity to act, and have comprehensive, validated strategies for engagement. Most committed partners are partnering with Indigenous businesses and EDCs. It is also at this level that we see a breakthrough with other organizations; nearly half of committed partners (47%) worked with ASETS agreement holders, and nearly as many (44%) have worked with national associations. At this point, engagement is such an ingrained practice that these businesses find it easier to meet hiring targets and set-asides for Indigenous peoples than other equity groups.

What supports the success of their partnerships is their sustainability. In interviews, these businesses described their partnerships as long-term, ongoing relationships that are not limited to short- or medium-term goals. They are not geared around specific projects or opportunities, but around the relationship—and the opportunities that can generate. For this to happen, there needs to be trust and openness from both sides. This means that when times are tough and opportunities to work together are sparse, the partnership remains, the lines of communication open, and economic storms are weathered together.

A committed partner that was interviewed described mutual accountability and transparency as the essential elements of authentic partnerships: “The communities and Indigenous businesses we are most successful with are the ones that know where we are going, and see our company as part of that.” In order to formalize that commitment, nearly all businesses at this level have signed MOUs and other agreements.

Committed partners demonstrate key competencies that sustain their partnerships. These findings are based on feedback both from non-Indigenous businesses and Indigenous EDCs and other groups. And they respond directly to the missteps novices make.

**EDCs on commitment and capacity building:**

“Everyone talks about strategic planning. I tend to talk about strategic people. You can plan all you want but if you don’t have the people to execute the plan, it doesn’t get traction.

“**Our partner gave us opportunities.** From initial contracts, we moved from the mailroom, to warehousing, and eventually freight delivery. That was the result of a close relationship over the years, sustained by chief-to-chief meetings and a structured framework.

Committed partners make a commitment from the top-down, where decision-makers are involved in the Indigenous partnerships from the get-go. Often Indigenous groups are approached by sales level staffs, but what they expect—if they are going to become partners—is that they are met by senior executives who will see the partnership through. One EDC referred to this as “chief-to-chief” meetings that ensure a close relationship over the years. This ensures that the Indigenous partner can present and access opportunities as they arise.

In addition to a top-down commitment, committed partners need dedicated Aboriginal liaisons or departments. These offices act as intermediaries within the business between decision-makers on both sides. This capacity can be vital in
maintaining the next competency, communication. They can also be useful in compiling their track record of engagement and investment in communities, something that Indigenous groups say they look for when considering partners. However, this can present something of a paradox as well. It is often only larger and more experienced businesses that have the capacity to create these offices. For the smaller or less experienced firms, they need to be secure in their business case to take this risk and commit the necessary resources.

3.4.2 Competency #2: Communicate clearly and consistently

To support their commitment, partners need to establish clear and consistent means of communication. For instance, corporate and Indigenous partners described the benefit of having leadership committees that bring together both sides, meet and report regularly, and connect on an ongoing basis via liaisons. This channel of communication is vital for both when opportunities arise—and when they are sparse.

When there are opportunities, liaisons and committees ensure Indigenous peoples know where a business is headed and how they can work with them. This can connect with the next competency, building Indigenous capacity; a partnership may start working in one area, then through open channels, lead to new opportunities for the Indigenous partner. This can also ensure that businesses don’t exceed Indigenous capacity (see below).

When opportunities are sparse, strong communication keeps a partnership from falling apart. Economic conditions, such as recessions, may limit opportunities for partnership activity for several years. Partners and EDCs described these as times to keep communications going in order to be ready to move when previous work can resume, and identify alternative ways to satisfy agreements. For instance, if a partnership originally promised to hire 50 members from a First Nation, but staffing needs change and only 25 hires are needed, the partners may adjust the agreement to focus on retaining and advancing those 25.

3.4.3 Competency #3: Build Indigenous capacity

As the fastest growing demographic in Canada, Indigenous businesses and communities have capacity to grow—but they are also limited in their capacity due to historical and socioeconomic factors that persist today. Capacity is broadly defined as the resources, both human and material, that a group can bring to a partnership. Human resources may include the supply of labour, and specifically skilled labourers, while material resources may include equipment, facilities, and capital. As such, it is contingent on committed partners to help build the capacity of Indigenous partners. To do this, partners need to provide scale-appropriate opportunities to do business together, and identify new opportunities to develop capacity.

Indigenous businesses and communities have difficulty finding themselves a place in the supply chain. Corporate Canada is often looking for large suppliers to satisfy large tenders, which excludes Indigenous participation due to their limited capacity or experience. Committed partners reexamine their needs and find ways to break apart procurement into smaller contracts that Indigenous bidders can win and achieve success. While this can make a project more complicated, it can make the next project less so once their Indigenous partners have grown their capacity.
Building capacity though is about more than working with Indigenous businesses; it is also about building community capacity. Authentic partnerships and strategies consider community development. A medium-mining company put this eloquently: “The best companies in Canada return as much as possible back in the communities they operate.” This is not only a social good, but it’s good for business. Through investment in the development of Canada’s fastest growing demographic, it primes businesses to access labour, markets, and knowledge necessary for sustainable, long-term growth.

3.5 How can corporate Canada, Indigenous groups, and other stakeholders advance together?

With Canadian medium and large businesses tiered into engagement levels, it is possible to map a path for those companies looking to advance from disengagement all the way to commitment (see Figure 3-3 below). The path taken by businesses will differ based on their circumstances and priorities, but we can identify key markers, such as policies or practices that help us assess their position between disengagement and commitment.

It is important to consider that this path is difficult to complete by businesses alone. Thus, there are roles for Indigenous groups themselves, as well as for other stakeholders such as government agencies and Indigenous Works. Indigenous groups can be proactive and strategic in how they approach businesses at different levels of engagement. Other stakeholders such as EDCs, industry associations and government can provide the supporting structures and training the competencies necessary for involvement, tailored to different tiers. Moreover, advancing along the roadmap demands a collaborative approach. While first steps may be taken in isolation, genuine progress towards committed partnership necessitates collaborative action. Thus, the roadmap below includes both actions that groups would take alone, and those that they would take together.
Figure 3-3: How corporate Canada, Indigenous groups, and other stakeholders can advance together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disengaged majority</th>
<th>Businesses need to...</th>
<th>Indigenous groups should...</th>
<th>Third parties may...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Shift from a reactive to active approach to inclusion</td>
<td>✓ Approach businesses and industry associations and identify themselves</td>
<td>✓ Boost services (e.g., ASETS) and opportunities (e.g., labour potential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Research Indigenous groups and their issues</td>
<td>✓ Make the case for working together</td>
<td>✓ Connect disengaged businesses with engaged businesses and Indigenous groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Draft strategies</td>
<td>✓ Be prepared to deal with inertia and inexperience among businesses</td>
<td>✓ Facilitate networking opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Be willing to meet and host visits by Indigenous groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Provide training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Together, businesses and Indigenous groups may:
- Identify their complementary capacities and needs
- Teach one another about their culture and values
- Collaborate with third-parties to support their nascent relationship

Engagement novices

| ✓ Recognize corporate social responsibility and business case for engagement | ✓ Present themselves as capable sources for procurement and labour | ✓ Assist strategy development and formalization |
| ✓ Build internal capacity / dedicate resources | ✓ Recognize expectations | ✓ Boost awareness of social responsibility (e.g., TRC) |
| ✓ Formalize and validate strategies | ✓ Connect with decision-makers within businesses (get past the sales and HR managers) | ✓ Crystallize their personal business case for inclusion |
| ✓ Broaden scope of relationships (e.g., community development) | ✓ Negotiate social license | ✓ Foster mentorship between committed partners and novices |

Together, businesses and Indigenous groups may:
- Assign designated liaisons who represent decision-makers/leadership
- Validate approaches (e.g., strategies, business plans)
- Shift from opportunity/convenience model to long-term lens
### Businesses need to...

- Recognize authentic partnerships are more than business contracts
- Enterprise-wide approach—not just an HR project or local practice
- Validate efforts to date to avoid falling backwards

### Indigenous groups should...

- Demonstrate accountability and self-determination
- Demonstrate flexibility (e.g., different metrics for employment, responsiveness to changing business conditions)

### Third parties may...

- Provide templates for partnership agreements (e.g., MOUs, IBAs)
- Sell EDCs to corporate Canada
- Continue to foster mentorship
- Benchmark progress

### Relationship developers

- **Together, businesses and Indigenous groups may:**
  - Formalize relationships (e.g., MOUs, cooperation agreements)
  - Strike joint committees to manage and sustain the partnership
  - Build enterprise-wide/organization-wide buy-in for the relationship

- **Committed partners**

- **Together, businesses and Indigenous groups may:**
  - Identify future opportunities for collaboration
  - Built capacity on both sides
  - Promote their success as a template for their sector

- **Committed partners**

- **Together, businesses and Indigenous groups may:**
  - Come together and collaborate with other Indigenous groups
  - Demonstrate collective power of Indigenous clusters

- **Committed partners**

- **Together, businesses and Indigenous groups may:**
  - Support cluster development
  - Tangibly recognize economic and social impact of partnerships (e.g., validate and promote their achievements; uphold them as industry leaders)
SECTION 4: ENGAGEMENT AND PARTNERSHIP OUTCOMES

As businesses move up the partnership matrix, they report increasing progress towards Indigenous inclusion and engagement. These survey findings validate the partnership matrix with evidence that a full commitment to partnership leads to breakthroughs in Indigenous employment, business development, and community development. Drawing on Indigenous and industry perspectives, we are able to identify the key benefits partnerships can offer to Indigenous communities and Canadian businesses.

4.1 Exceeding the bare minimum

Some businesses may presume themselves to be sufficiently engaged based on a few minimum requirements. As the figure below shows, most businesses had Indigenous employees, including a majority of disengaged companies. Moreover, most businesses outside the disengaged majority reported having worked with Indigenous groups and contributed to community development. While the charts below illustrate a staircase pattern, they tend to suggest the first step (from disengaged to novice) is the steepest. In reality though, there are major steps to be taken as well between novice, intermediate, and full commitment, as will be shown in the subsections and figures that follow.

Figure 4-1: Overview of engagement (self-reported), by engagement tier

![Bar Chart]

Note that this section presents data based on outcomes questions, which are distinct from the indicator policy and practice questions which were inputted into the partnership matrix. This allows us to objectively compare outcomes across the four engagement tiers. Also note that total counts per tier are at times restricted by tier. All businesses were provided feedback on employment, business, and community outcomes, but only those that consulted or partnered were asked direct follow-up questions on those engagements. For example, we may only comment on partnership progress among some novices as many novices have yet to partner. Most analysis has sufficient sample to make reasonable conclusions, but some relies on small sample sizes and should be interpreted with some caution.
4.2 Integrating the impact of consultation requires commitment

Businesses committed to consultation reported that outreach has had a very significant impact on their business. Our survey data found that when businesses begin to consult, they see a modest impact on their organization (see Figure 4-2 below). Where consultation was the norm (practiced enterprise-wide), most businesses reported major impacts on their organization.

Figure 4-2: Impact of consultation businesses, by engagement tier

Note: Totals per tier are restricted to those that consult, excluding most disengaged businesses, and some novices.

4.3 Making progress takes a comprehensive approach to partnership

Businesses committed to comprehensive, formal partnerships made more progress towards their objectives than those who partnered informally and in limited areas. The figure below shows the clear relationship between partnership practices and outcomes. For instance, the novices had few formal partnerships. The relationship developers broadened the scope of their partnerships, but did not support that with an enterprise-wide approach to consultation, which committed partners did.

Figure 4-3: Progress towards partnership objectives, by engagement tier

Note: Totals per tier are restricted to those that partner, excluding most disengaged businesses, nearly half of novices and some developers.

4.4 Partnership improves workplace culture

Developing relationships and committing to partnerships makes workplaces a better ‘cultural fit’ for Indigenous employees. Cultural fit is a human resources concept that describes the extent to which business values, outlook and practices accommodate different groups. For Indigenous peoples, this may include respect of their traditions, acknowledgment of their history, and a discrimination-free environment. Our data found cultural fit begins to improve significantly once a business begins developing relationships and partnerships (see Figure 4-4 below). Novices, who tend to have only designed strategies and consulted sporadically, were no likelier than the disengaged to have improved
their workplace culture. This finding comes as no surprise. Novices have only laid the foundation for engagement and partnership; they have yet to consult and validate their efforts with Indigenous groups.

**Figure 4-4: Cultural fit of workplaces, by engagement tier**

![Bar chart showing cultural fit of workplaces](chart1)

**4.5 Engaged businesses report gains in hiring, business, and community development**

Businesses see gains across employment, business, and community development fronts as they move along the partnership matrix. Novices, who have drafted strategies and prioritized engagement, reported a major increase in the amount of business they do with Indigenous groups (see Figure 4-5 below, left chart). As they develop, businesses then see their efforts reflected in communities where they operate. Businesses at the intermediate stage reported a significant improvement in their reputation among Indigenous communities (centre chart). Finally, businesses that are fully committed to partnership were able to bring more Indigenous people into their organizations (right chart).

**Figure 4-5: Engagement outcomes (Past two years), by engagement tier**

![Bar chart showing engagement outcomes](chart2)

**4.6 Partnership benefits for Indigenous communities and corporate Canada**

Based on a survey of over 500 medium and large businesses, and 20 in-depth interviews with industry, Indigenous EDCs and national groups, and other partnership stakeholders, this study has validated the
value of partnership with quantitative and qualitative data, identifying benefits for both sides of Indigenous-corporate relations. The findings suggest that without partnerships, both Indigenous groups and corporate Canada are missing opportunities for immediate and long-term rewards.

- **For Indigenous communities, businesses, and groups:** partnerships with corporate Canada have helped them grow and diversify their capacities, increase wealth and improve social well-being among their members. Partnerships have also been leveraged to access capital, connections and expertise that lead to future business opportunities. Once established as partners, Indigenous businesses have attained preferred vendor standing with corporate Canada. Overall, partnerships respect Indigenous communities’ rights and stake in the Canadian economy, fulfilling a nation-to-nation relationship between them and non-Indigenous Canadians.

- **For corporate Canada:** there are both immediate rewards and long-term benefits of partnership. Engaging Indigenous groups and then working towards partnership has provided solutions to employment and business needs. They can now access Canada’s fastest growing demographic and labour pool, as well as access new markets. Partnership has been necessary to move projects forward where they require working near or in Indigenous territories. There are further benefits that came from partnership, such as an improved reputation (which leads to more business) and a more respectful and accommodating workplace culture (which inhibits turnover). For federally regulated employers, partnerships have made it easier to meet legislated requirements such as the Employment Equity Act. Overall, partnerships give businesses an edge, helping prepare them to respond to shifting economic, demographic and policy conditions.
SECTION 5: LOCATING THE ENGAGEMENT CLUSTERS

In reviewing the survey data, we identified the strengths and weaknesses among major sectors and regions. Clusters of innovative partnerships are struck along lines such as business size, sector, and region. Clusters offer the possibility of matching like-minded businesses thereby achieving greater opportunities to scale development. If better understood, these cluster formations could be leveraged to accelerate economic growth for both corporate Canada and Indigenous communities alike. Looking at the potential of sectoral or regional clusters may show opportunities to move the needle on engagement. With further research, we may be able to identify potential superclusters where these sectoral and regional clusters intersect with one another, especially noting where they overlap with Indigenous communities that are ready to partner.

5.1 Larger businesses have the capacity to engage

As described above, we have found a strong correlation between business size and engagement. Large businesses are far more likely to be engaged with Indigenous business and communities. The figure below illustrates this dynamic. Medium-sized businesses we interviewed told us that a key inhibitor to engagement is their limited capacity; they simply do not have the resources to dedicate. When considering how to boost engagement among corporate Canada, it is necessary to keep this dynamic in mind (illustrated by Figure 5-1 below).

Figure 5-1: Relative engagement by business size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
<th>Average engagement score (Out of 100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000 or more</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 to 1999</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 999</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 to 499</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 to 249</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=511 medium and large businesses.
The Capacity Gap:

“Ultimately large companies have capacity, dedicated staff, and chances to learn from success and failures. Smaller companies don’t.”

– National Indigenous organization

Community development represents the widest capacity gap between medium and large businesses. Medium and large businesses expressed similar levels of confidence in their ability to act on employment and business development initiatives. Where they differed was community development. Large businesses were much likelier to report having capacity to invest in community development. Moreover, they were much likelier to be aware of the TRC Calls to Action and to be motivated by corporate social responsibility. With this in mind, it may be fair to conclude that larger firms can afford to take a broader approach to engagement while relatively smaller firms need to focus on areas, like employment and business development, which have a direct impact on their bottom line.

Indigenous groups are aware of this capacity gap, and are have responded strategically EDCs said they are predisposed to working with large businesses (500+ employees) because they will have the capacity and resources necessary to engage with the Indigenous community. This can compound the challenge for medium businesses (100-499 employees), that lack capacity and tend to be reactive. This presents a paradoxical challenge, as smaller businesses are waiting to be approached but Indigenous groups are less likely to approach them. This challenge offers an opportunity for third-parties to fill this capacity gap among medium businesses by acting as dedicated resources to facilitate or assist engagement.

5.2 Seven sectoral clusters

Engagement varies significantly between different sectors of the Canadian economy. Our analysis of individual sectors and the engagement performance within each provides some indication of where some future engagement facilitation could be encouraged. Table 5-1 below summarizes engagement by sector, including the frequency of businesses that have strategies, consult, and partner, as well as their average sector. There are some significant variations within sectors that have been included below, such as between oil & gas and agriculture & forestry within the resource sector, and between modest- and high-skilled settings in the service sector. For instance, within the resource sector; quarrying, mining, oil & gas appears to be more engaged than agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting (average scores of 28 and 18 respectively). However due to modest sample sizes within sector levels, some caution in interpreting results is required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector and Selected Subsectors</th>
<th>Strategies?</th>
<th>Consults?</th>
<th>Partners?</th>
<th>Average Engagement Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource (n=48)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarrying, Mining, Oil &amp; Gas (n=26)</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing &amp; Hunting (n=22)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing (n=48)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Utilities (n=47)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality (n=60)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation (n=9)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services (n=51)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services (n=70)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and Support Services (n=19)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology (n=10)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance (n=7)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing (n=166)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail and Wholesale Trade (n=73)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade (n=43)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade (n=30)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (n=511)</strong></td>
<td><strong>24%</strong></td>
<td><strong>23%</strong></td>
<td><strong>13%</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Subsector results should be interpreted with caution due to small counts.

Not only are some sectors more engaged than others, but the nature of that engagement differs significantly. Some sectors that are close in score may have different motivators. Additionally, awareness of the opportunities for businesses differ between sectors and these differences might mean that approaches to increase engagement may need to be segmented by sector (see Table 5-2 below). For instance, although most hospitality businesses were aware of Indigenous groups in their area (second only to resource companies), they reported the lowest level of awareness of the ASETS program, a key linkage to those very groups. In the subsections that follow, we focus on the seven main sectoral clusters and identify how they are unique.
### Table 5-2: Relative awareness of Indigenous issues and potential, by sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector (Ordered by average engagement score)</th>
<th>Indigenous groups near business</th>
<th>Fastest growing demographic in Canada</th>
<th>ASETS Program</th>
<th>TRC Calls to Action for corporate Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource (n=48)</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing (n=48)</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Utilities (n=47)</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality (n=60)</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services (n=70)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing (n=166)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail and Wholesale Trade (n=73)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Above-average awareness levels appear in green; below average levels in red.

#### 5.2.1 Resources

The resource sector, primarily due to necessity, is the most engaged sector of the Canadian economy. These businesses are motivated by proximity to Indigenous groups, the need to access markets, and a clear business case to drive engagement. There is a major opportunity for business-to-business mentorship in the resource sector. Among businesses without partners (disengaged and novices), resource firms were the most likely to express interest in mentorship. Fortunately for them, half of the committed partners we surveyed are in their sector.

That said there are gaps in this sector and opportunities for improvement. While leaders in this industry are the most likely to know the Indigenous groups where they operate and their demographic potential, they demonstrated only somewhat above-average awareness of ASETS or the TRC Calls to Action. That suggests that directing awareness efforts the resource sector may still be warranted. Additionally, resource companies were less likely than most other sectors to say their business’ values, outlook and practices provide a good cultural fit for Indigenous employees.

#### 5.2.2 Transportation & warehousing

Like the resource sector, transporters and warehouses are most motivated by proximity to Indigenous communities and access to markets. Businesses in this sector are the most likely to be federally regulated, with two-thirds of businesses subject to the Employment Equity Act. Unlike most EE businesses, transporters and warehouses reported relatively high awareness of ASETS, and the highest relative awareness of the TRC Calls to Action. This is turning to action, as they are the most likely to be working with ASETS agreement holders, and are more likely to have capacity and strategies dedicated to community development.

Keeping engaged is a challenge for this sector. Transporters and warehouses were the most likely to have discontinued their strategies when they found they were not netting returns. Additionally, while ASETS-engagement was highest for this sector, still fewer than 10% of these businesses have consulted or partnered with an ASETS-agreement holder (see Figure 5-2 below; a similar trend was also found for
the construction and utilities sector). Despite being federally regulated, businesses in this sector are not seeing stronger outcomes, such as hiring increases, compared to other more engaged sectors. As was discussed above, EE is a good motivator for developing strategies, but it is does not necessarily lead to substantive engagement.

**Figure 5-2: Relative awareness and engagement with ASETS agreement-holders for selected sectors**

![Graph showing relative awareness and engagement with ASETS agreement-holders for selected sectors]

**5.2.3 Construction & utilities**

Construction firms and utilities demonstrate significant strengths but also significant needs. On one hand, businesses in this sector\(^\text{10}\) were the most likely to be aware of ASETS, to have employment strategies, and to report increased Aboriginal hiring. This sector also reported the most engagement with Indigenous-owned businesses. Despite these strengths, their engagement with ASETS agreement-holders lagged behind other sectors, they reported capacity challenges, particularly in regards to community development. Per surveys and interviews, construction firms tend to be smaller and thus less able to take on community development initiatives. Businesses in this sector were also the most likely to say they need assistance from government in order to increase engagement (18%) compared to corporate Canada overall (5%).

It should be noted that in 2016 Indigenous Works developed an engagement guide for the construction sector with the Canadian Construction Association (The *CCA Indigenous Engagement Guide*). Though it may be too soon to attribute sectoral outcomes (such as partnership with Indigenous businesses) to the guide, it may be wise to track uptake of that product, which may provide a template for other sectors.

**5.2.4 Hospitality**

There is significant partnership potential in the hospitality sector. Businesses like hotels and restaurant chains reported high interest in tapping the Indigenous labour pool, but they are lacking in strategy and direction. For instance, despite recognizing the demographic potential, businesses in this sector were the least likely to be aware of ASETS. There is a significant opportunity to build awareness of that program, among other available supports.

\(^{10}\) Most businesses surveyed in this sector are construction firms (87%) rather than utilities (13%).
Based on interviews, recent limitations on the Temporary Foreign Worker Program have produced a labour-crunch for the sector, particularly outside of urban centres. One rural resort we interviewed was interested in addressing this gap with Indigenous labour, but did not know where to start. They had attempted to work with one local agency but failed to sustain communication, and have not prioritized finding other groups.

Hospitality businesses tend to take a passive approach to engagement, seeing Indigenous peoples as a business solution but unwilling to invest the internal capacity necessary to engage. However, the data suggests they may be reactive as well, and would benefit from outreach and direction. Hospitality businesses were interested in receiving guidance from Indigenous groups and consulting services. As such there is a significant opportunity for Indigenous groups and third-parties to bridge the gap between this labour-starved sector and the Aboriginal workforce.

5.2.5 Professional services

The professional services sector has a diverse workforce, including high-skilled, white collar workers such as in finance and information technology (IT), but also more modestly-skilled workers such as in administrative and support services, such as call centres and security providers. Generally, firms with higher skilled workforces are having more difficulty than the those with less skilled, though businesses in this sector often tend to have difficulty moving beyond strategy and consultation to partnership.

The service sector is unique in that it was the only sector where businesses say that the nature of their work is a primary inhibitor to engagement. Surveyed and interviewed businesses reported difficulty hiring qualified candidates due to education and skills requirements. Accordingly, there is limited interest in the Indigenous labour pool within this sector due to the perception that Indigenous workers lack these requirements. Most notably, nearly half (44%) of federally regulated firms in this sector said meeting Aboriginal equity targets was more challenging than meeting the targets for other equity groups (18%).

Businesses in this sector may be more persuadable with ethical arguments than other sectors. This sector reported above-average awareness of the TRC Calls to Action. Service sector businesses that were engaged were more likely to cite corporate social responsibility as a motivator than other factors. With above-average rates of strategy development, these businesses may be interested in moving beyond policy to practice.

5.2.6 Manufacturing

Our survey found manufacturers tend to have little interest in engagement unless compelled. Due to the large size of the manufacturing sector (about one-third of our total sample), few manufacturing trends stood out from the overall picture. That may pose a challenge itself; there is no specific motivator that can be used to engage these businesses.

A lack of awareness and a lack of corporate memory are major impediments for engagement among manufacturers. One trend we did find was that not only are manufacturers generally unaware of Indigenous issues and potential, the respondents we spoke with (generally HR directors or information managers) were often unaware of their engagement history. Manufacturers were the least likely to
know whether they had Indigenous employees, how much business they do with Indigenous groups, or their reputation among Aboriginals.

Discouragingly, manufacturers were the least likely to say they would engage if approached by Indigenous groups. This was echoed by follow-up interviews with two disengaged manufacturers who said hiring and community decisions are shaped by internal dynamics (e.g., hiring based on internal referrals, directing philanthropy based on employee suggestions). We spoke to one HR manager who was particularly blunt with the problem with her employer’s approach:

“There is not a lot of diversity in this building although the area we cover is quite diverse. We rely on internal referrals where so-and-so hires so-and-so’s friends, who hire their friends, and so on—so, you wind up with a building full of white men. I don’t think it’s a matter of discrimination as lack of exposure. I think we just need someone to point us in the right direction.”

– Medium manufacturer, Ontario.

Moving the manufacturing sector along the partnership matrix may be more a matter of stick than carrot. Manufacturers were the most likely to say they have engaged—or would—if required to by government. A third manufacturer we interviewed said that EE reporting requirements have helped them develop a viable plan with goals they can work towards, and moved them from disengaged to novice engagement. The challenge for government would be to build upon existing requirements without making the process too onerous for a sector generally disengaged and disinterested.

5.2.7 Retail & wholesale

The retail and wholesale sector (herein retailers) is the least engaged with Indigenous peoples. However, it is appropriate to describe the sector as reactive. For retailers, location is everything; they are the most likely to attribute their decision to engage (or more commonly not) to proximity to Indigenous communities and access to markets.

Retailers may be motivated if approached by Indigenous groups and, more so than other sectors, by public demand. Perhaps paradoxically, most retailers surveyed said their business is a good fit for Indigenous peoples—despite being disengaged, and the most likely to say Aboriginal recruitment and business has been stagnant. Promisingly though, retailers are interested in third-party supports; they were the most interested in staff training and road maps for engagement, as well as receptive to consulting services and systems reviews. They are waiting to be approached.

5.3 Employment Equity and federal legislation provide a foundation, but does not facilitate partnership

This research found that federal legislation, like the Employment Equity Act, motivates businesses to prioritize engagement and develop strategies, but that is not producing significant outcomes with respect to partnership. As part of our survey, we asked businesses whether they were subject to the Employment Equity (EE) Act to determine the impact federal legislation has had on corporate-
Indigenous relations. The Act applies to businesses in regulated sectors, and those with significant contracts with the federal government. It requires them to remove barriers to employment that disadvantage four designed equity groups: women, people with disabilities, visible minorities, and Indigenous peoples.

Our surveys and interviews found that the EE reporting structure, to paraphrase one business, helped regulated firms focus and develop a viable plan with goals they can work towards. However, as the table below shows, the differences are relatively minor, and EE businesses are not statistically likelier to be partnering.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement indicator</th>
<th>Subject to Employment Equity Act</th>
<th>Not Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any strategies?</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any consultation?</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any partnerships?</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(n=414\) medium and large businesses. Note that approximately one-fifth (19%) of businesses were unsure whether they were subject to Employment Equity; those businesses were excluded from this analysis.

Regulated businesses were more likely to have formal employment strategies than unregulated businesses, but not likely to have considered business or community development. Moreover, despite having employment strategies, EE businesses were no more likely to report increases in Aboriginal hiring over the past two years or describe their workplace as a good, cultural fit for Indigenous peoples. This may be attributed to a disconnect between federal legislation and awareness. Despite being more likely to have strategies and, to a lesser extent, consult, regulated businesses were not particularly aware of Indigenous groups where they do business, the demographic potential they present, or programs to connect with them (i.e., ASETS).

Ultimately the survey found that while businesses subject to EE were more likely to consider engagement and describe it as a priority, there are no connections between legislation and awareness or legislation and capacity. Interestingly, EE businesses were much likelier to cite a lack of Indigenous peoples where they do business as primary inhibitor to engagement than unregulated businesses.

5.4 Regional clusters

It comes as no surprise that Western Canada is well ahead of the rest of Canada when it comes to Indigenous engagement and partnerships, due to a concentration of Indigenous population (see Figure 5-3 below). In fact, all committed partners identified by this study are located in the four Western provinces. Comparing regions broadly, the western provinces and territories have an average score of 19/100, while Eastern Canada (Ontario eastward) averages 8/100. Within the regions, there is variation. In the East, nearly all business in Ontario (94%) and Québec (97%) were disengaged, while the situation was closer to the national average in Atlantic Canada (86% disengaged). In the West, there is a significant range. Only half of business in Saskatchewan were disengaged (57%) versus ‘Ontario-levels’ of

The limitation to this approach is that survey respondents may have over-reported the reach of federal regulation, potentially confusing federal and provincial legislation. Some businesses that reported being subject to EE may have misreported, potentially diluting the observed impact of the legislation. However, the differences observed in strategy development and focus on employment suggests the metric is generally accurate.
disengagement in Manitoba (93%). In between were Alberta (70% disengaged) and British Columbia (80%).

Figure 5-3: Average engagement scores per province or region

Among provinces and regions there are significant variations in awareness (see Table 5-4 below). The table below may serve as a strategic map for planning outreach activities and working to persuade businesses to engage. For instance, while the demographic potential of Indigenous peoples is known to most businesses in the Prairies, it could be news in Ontario or Québec.
Table 5-4: Relative awareness of Indigenous issues and potential, by province/region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province / Region (West to East)</th>
<th>Indigenous groups near business</th>
<th>Fastest growing demographic in Canada</th>
<th>ASETS Program</th>
<th>TRC Calls to Action for corporate Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia (n=83)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta (n=97)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan (n=23)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba (n=29)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario (n=180)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Québec (n=63)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic Canada (n=35)</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Above-average awareness levels appear in green; below average levels in red.

If government or other third-parties are looking to model templates for corporate-Indigenous relations, they should likely consider Saskatchewan first. One-third (35%) of businesses there have worked with Indigenous-owned firms, and nearly as many (30%) have worked with EDCs.

Diagnosing the disengagement in Eastern Canada reveals different inhibitors. Québec businesses were most likely to cite a lack of Indigenous peoples nearby. Awareness figures for the province suggest this may be more a matter of absence of awareness than an absence of Indigenous. In Ontario, by comparison, the disengaged were most likely to cite a lack of knowledge and concede a passive approach to engagement. In turn, federally regulated businesses in Ontario reported the highest relative difficulty meeting equity targets for Indigenous employment.

Like Ontario, Atlantic Canada also tended to cite a passive approach to engagement. However, Atlantic businesses may be motivated if approached. Businesses there were more likely than those in Québec or Ontario to increase engagement as they have more experience with Indigenous peoples and businesses, or will do so if they are simply approached.

While Western Canada is ahead today, there is some evidence that the West may be regressing somewhat. For instance, despite the second highest engagement score, one-in-ten Alberta businesses have seen Aboriginal hiring decrease over the past two years—a rate double the national average. Input from businesses on the Steering Committee (echoed by interviews with businesses and EDCs) suggest the recent economic downturn in the resource sector has constrained businesses’ commitment to engagement. With margins tightening, it has been reported that businesses are cutting Aboriginal set-asides from their tenders.
SECTION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The reality for corporate-Indigenous relations may be described as gaps and opportunities. In terms of gaps, corporate Canada is largely disengaged from Indigenous communities and organizations, and without action by Indigenous groups, government, and third-parties, substantive change is unlikely. Partnership is not on their radar.

Although this reality is disheartening, opportunities exist for Indigenous groups, government, and other stakeholders to put this on the corporate radar. Disengaged businesses are open to dialogue if approached by Indigenous groups. Other businesses have considered engaging but have not acted simply due to not having the required resources. Most businesses lack the internal capacity, experience, and connections necessary to know where to start.

These businesses could be engaged if provided support in overcoming these barriers. Thus, spurring relationship development and commitment to partnership among the disengaged requires engaging and educating businesses. Indigenous groups expect businesses to help them build capacity, commit from the top-down, and communicate clearly and consistently. Developing these competencies will advance businesses along the partnership matrix.

Needed supports include guidance from Indigenous groups, dedicated and experienced resources, and mentorship from engagement veterans (i.e., committed partners). Disengaged businesses are interested in receiving guidance from Indigenous groups and mentorship from experienced businesses. Engagement novices need resources with engagement experience and consulting services to validate and build upon the foundations they've laid. Relationship developers are interested in means for benchmarking and validating their efforts to guide them towards sustainable partnerships. The role for government and other stakeholders, such as industry associations and third-party consultants, may be to link businesses with these supports.

There are also corporate champions that can act as examples. A small proportion of businesses are already committed to partnerships with Indigenous groups, working towards employment, business development, and community development objectives. These businesses, situated particularly in the resource sector and among Canada’s largest employers, have the experience and connections to serve as mentors for others and facilitators of engagement clusters.

6.1 Advancing strategies that respond to gaps and opportunities

These findings provide a solid foundation for both further research and strategic action. We have been able to categorize corporate Canada into four distinct engagement tiers, and identify trends by size, sector and region. By analyzing businesses policies and practices, as well as probing their strengths and needs, we have begun to map different strategies tailored to business characteristics, which could be used to help companies become more engaged. While further research will help us refine these strategies (see Subsection 6.3 below), we can suggest four innovative pilot projects, each targeting businesses at different engagement tiers. At this time, we can provide the following directions:
### Table 6-1: Advancement strategies per engagement tier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement tier (% of businesses)</th>
<th>Strategic approach</th>
<th>Key audience(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disengaged majority (85%)</td>
<td><strong>The disengaged majority require a proactive effort by Indigenous groups, and significant awareness and guidance provision by third parties such as industry associations, business mentors, and government.</strong> Although there is some indifference towards inclusion and engagement here, there are many businesses that simply lack the capacity and knowledge to act. They are waiting to be approached with offers and information. Efforts should be focused on boosting awareness of services and opportunities, and facilitating networking and connections. Disengaged businesses are interested in guidance from Indigenous groups, mentorship from experienced businesses, and some direction for government. When approaching disengaged businesses, it may be prudent to carefully consider the point-of-entry when making the case for engagement (e.g., sell the labour potential to HR directors, but reputational benefits to marketing managers).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement novices (9%)</td>
<td><strong>Engagement novices need to be coached as they develop their strategies and first attempt consultation and partnership.</strong> These businesses recognize engagement will help them grow their business, but they don’t have the required competencies or experience. Third-parties like industry associations and consultants could be of great service to the novices in particular to help them crystallize their business case for inclusion, formalize strategies, and develop internal capacity. Indigenous groups are likelier to get more traction when approaching these businesses compared to the disengaged majority, but need to be cognizant of the novices’ gaps in awareness and the fact novices are often acting out of necessity, rather than corporate social responsibility. Thus, it is also necessary to make novices aware of the social case for partnership (e.g., the TRC’s Calls to Action).</td>
<td>Businesses in federally regulated sectors that have taken first steps due to Employment Equity requirements. Some sectors are leaning towards novice engagement, with high levels of readiness that may be seized upon: namely, construction, transportation, utilities, and warehousing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement tier (% of businesses)</td>
<td>Strategic approach</td>
<td>Key audience(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship developers (4%)</td>
<td>The relationship developers are at a critical juncture between novice engagement and full commitment, and need guidance to benchmark their progress through this stage. These businesses have expanded the scope of their engagement efforts to consider community development, and may be ready to scale up the reach of their activities (i.e., move from project-specific to enterprise-wide engagement). To get there however, they need to benchmark and validate their efforts. Benchmarking will help them to connect their investments to positive outcomes, to sustain their commitment to date (to avoid falling backwards), and to develop the core competencies of a committed partner. These businesses would be receptive to consulting services that can provide these services using a tool akin to the partnership matrix.</td>
<td>Businesses in the resource and federally regulated sectors are moving through this intermediate stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed partners (2%)</td>
<td>The committed partners do not need assistance—they need to be recognized as industry leaders and mentors. These businesses have made authentic commitments to Indigenous communities. They may be recognized in different ways, including public recognition or formal designations, being asked to guide novices and relationship developers, or, where possible, being tangibly supported by government for their contribution to economic and social development of Indigenous communities. Beyond financial incentives such as tax breaks, government could work with these businesses to strike communities of practice for Indigenous-corporate partnerships. Acting as mentors within their sector, they have the capacities and experiences to accelerate the formation of innovative clusters and foster sustainable economic growth for both corporate Canada and Indigenous communities.</td>
<td>Located exclusively within Western Canada, there are outstanding examples from different industries but the trends so far point to resource businesses in the resource sector, and among larger businesses (1000+ employees).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.2 Catalyzing change

All participating businesses will be provided a summary report that includes their engagement score relative to their sector, and corporate Canada overall. For some businesses, this will affirm their efforts. For others, this may be a wake-up call and spur them to recognize that thriving in a competitive economy may include Indigenous partnership. As such, this research in itself may play a role in catalyzing change among the disengaged and engagement novices, and provide a foundation for strategic action among corporate Canada. But even among those that come to these realizations, it must be made clear, that they will need more support in transforming this awareness into meaningful action.
6.3 Investigating and benchmarking further advancement

Beyond this study, researchers could continue studying businesses to enhance their capacity to target clusters, tailor programming to business needs, and benchmark progress in corporate-Indigenous relations. This study has provided Indigenous Works with the following tools for future work:

- A validated research framework, the partnership matrix and survey instrument; and,
- Representative, baseline data, based a survey of over 500 businesses.

With these tools and our findings, we would make the following recommendations for future research:

- **Sector-specific investigations and context reports:** Building on the findings of this survey, identify how best to motivate engagement, align strategies, and develop clusters for consultation and partnership. Key informant interviews could be conducted with business leaders, and additional businesses would be surveyed and assessed using the partnership matrix to produce a more comprehensive understanding of each sector's roadmap to partnership. Potential Indigenous connections for each sector would also be investigated, leading to the possibility of corporate-Indigenous focus groups to identify common ground and potentially match-make future partners.

- **Engagement program evaluation:** Programs such as ASETS (established by Employment and Skills Development Canada) and groups like EDCs (established by Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada) suffer from limited awareness and uptake. For example, awareness of ASETS is high in the construction and transportation sectors, but still very few of those businesses engage agreement-holders. Moreover, many businesses expressed concern that Indigenous groups may be unable to meet their needs, but very few have considered engaging with EDCs, large, professional organizations with multiple business lines. It may be prudent to evaluate these programs in order to identify ways to amplify their reach and effectiveness. This could have a particular impact on federally regulated businesses looking for Employment Equity solutions, and novice businesses looking for reliable, first partners.

- **Best practices for engaging the disengaged:** A plurality of disengaged businesses are waiting to be approached by Indigenous groups. Indigenous groups need to know how to navigate this passivity and connect key decision-makers with relevant businesses cases for partnership. Best practices for engagement may be learned from businesses and Indigenous groups that have made these breakthroughs together. Data collection could include a combination of group interviews and focus groups, leading to case studies and a synthesis report on best practices.

- **Measuring progress among corporate Canada by updating the baseline measure with a second 500-business survey:** A second iteration of this survey could be conducted in the next few years. This update study would include a balance of previously surveyed businesses and new respondents. The partnership matrix would be updated with benchmark indicators to, one, test the benchmarking program, and two, to assess change since the baseline was taken. This would lead to a more effective, fine-tuned matrix that mitigates its limitations.
Appendix A: Full Partnership Matrix
## Full partnership matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>BUSINESS</th>
<th>COMMUNITY</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>READINESS</strong></td>
<td>5 POINTS</td>
<td>5 POINTS</td>
<td>5 POINTS</td>
<td>Up to 15 points for Readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Awareness (up to 1 point)</td>
<td>• Awareness (up to 1 point)</td>
<td>• Awareness (up to 1 point)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Priority (up to 2 points)</td>
<td>• Priority (up to 2 points)</td>
<td>• Priority (up to 2 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Capacity (up to 2 points)</td>
<td>• Capacity (up to 2 points)</td>
<td>• Capacity (up to 2 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRATEGY</strong></td>
<td>5 POINTS</td>
<td>5 POINTS</td>
<td>5 POINTS</td>
<td>Up to 15 points for Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Formalization (up to 2 points)</td>
<td>• Formalization (up to 2 points)</td>
<td>• Formalization (up to 2 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Breadth (up to 2 points)</td>
<td>• Breadth (up to 2 points)</td>
<td>• Breadth (up to 2 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Validation (up to 1 point)</td>
<td>• Validation (up to 1 point)</td>
<td>• Validation (up to 1 point)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSULTATION</strong></td>
<td>5 POINTS</td>
<td>5 POINTS</td>
<td>5 POINTS</td>
<td>Up to 15 points for Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Has consulted (up to 1 point)</td>
<td>• Has consulted (up to 1 point)</td>
<td>• Has consulted (up to 1 point)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Breadth (up to 2 points)</td>
<td>• Breadth (up to 2 points)</td>
<td>• Breadth (up to 2 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Acknowledgement (up to 2 point)</td>
<td>• Acknowledgement (up to 2 point)</td>
<td>• Acknowledgement (up to 2 point)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARTNERSHIP</strong></td>
<td>5 POINTS</td>
<td>5 POINTS</td>
<td>5 POINTS</td>
<td>Up to 15 points for Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Have partners (up to 1 point)</td>
<td>• Have partners (up to 1 point)</td>
<td>• Have partners (up to 1 point)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Formalization (up to 2 points)</td>
<td>• Formalization (up to 2 points)</td>
<td>• Formalization (up to 2 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sustainability (up to 2 points)</td>
<td>• Sustainability (up to 2 points)</td>
<td>• Sustainability (up to 2 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Up to 20 points for What do businesses do to facilitate Indigenous Employment?</td>
<td>Up to 20 points for What do businesses do to involve Indigenous groups in their business development?</td>
<td>Up to 20 points for What do businesses do to support Indigenous community development?</td>
<td>Total score out of 60 points*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Divide total score by 60 to obtain percentage, i.e., “engagement score” out of 100.
Appendix B: Questionnaire
Researching Indigenous Partnerships – Survey of Medium & Large Businesses

Native Works

INTRODUCTION – Page one

Hi there, this is _________ calling on behalf of Indigenous Works from R.A. Malatest & Associates Ltd.

S1. Could I please speak with a) _________ (Respondent’s Name) or b) your HR department?

o [Respondent identified; proceed with survey]

INTRODUCTION – Page two

We are currently conducting a study with Indigenous Works to analyze how medium and large businesses in Canada engage, consult, and partner with third parties. Indigenous Works is a non-profit national organization that builds partnerships between corporations and Indigenous communities, and they've hired our research firm to reach out to companies and collect this data. All participating companies will also receive a detailed report of the results in summer 2017, as a token of our appreciation. I was wondering if you might have 5 or 10 minutes to go over a few questions with me now on the subject, and how your company works with Indigenous organizations and communities.

Please note that this information will be used by Indigenous Works and various government agencies to implement policies that will make it simpler for businesses and Indigenous peoples to work together, and that all the responses collected will be treated in the strictest confidence. In accordance with the provisions of the Privacy Act, the study will not identify respondents and all reports will be based on aggregates and averages. If there is any question you feel unable to answer, you may reply "Don't know" and we will move onto the next question. This call may also be recorded for quality control purposes.

S2. Would you like to complete the survey online or over the phone?

o Online – Send email using CallWeb’s ZMail function

o Phone – Read: “Thank you for agreeing to participate. Please note this call may be monitored for quality control purposes.”

o No thank you [Exist the case and code as a refusal]

(If respondent is not interested and won’t schedule a CB) Would it be possible for us to email you some more information on this study? Rather than completing it over the phone, you can read up a bit more on the project and complete everything online at your own pace.
ONLINE INTRO

We are conducting a study on behalf of Indigenous Works, a non-profit national organization that builds partnerships between corporations and Indigenous communities. They have contracted our firm, R.A. Malatest & Associates Ltd., to study how medium and large businesses engage, consult and partner with third parties. We would like you to complete a survey about working with Indigenous organizations and communities. This information will be used by Indigenous Works and government agencies to implement policies that will make it simpler for businesses and Indigenous peoples to work together. All participants will receive a copy of the results in summer 2017.

Please be assured that all the responses collected will be treated in the strictest confidence. In accordance with the provisions of the Privacy Act, the study will not identify respondents and all reports will be based on aggregates and averages. If there is any question you feel unable to answer, you may reply “Don’t know” and we will move onto the next question.

If you have any questions about this survey please feel free to call 1-877-688-5051.

Please click below for a list of frequently asked questions
[Frequently asked questions]

Please click on ‘Continue’ to start your survey.

○ Continue >>>
Frequently Asked Questions [Available via pop up in corner of screen]

What is the purpose of the survey?
The purpose of the survey is to gauge the extent to which medium and large businesses are engaged with Indigenous communities and groups in Canada. Indigenous Works wants to know what strategies, consultations, and partnerships exist, and what needs to happen to promote greater engagement.

What does “Indigenous” mean?
Indigenous peoples refer to first or native peoples of a place. The Indigenous peoples in Canada are also referred to as Aboriginal peoples. They include three defined groups: First Nations, Inuit, and Métis.

What is Indigenous Works?
Indigenous Works, a non-profit national organization that builds partnerships between corporations and Indigenous communities. They have been in operation since 1998, and worked with many of Canada’s largest employers. They were formerly known as the Aboriginal Human Resource Council.

How long does this take?
The survey length depends on your answers, but should take no longer than 20 minutes. Most businesses should be able to finish the survey in less than ten minutes.

Who is eligible for this survey?
The only requirements for this survey is that your business be privately-owned and have at least 100 full-time employees or equivalents.

Why do you need to speak to someone in a managerial role?
We would like to speak to someone who is familiar with your business’s approach to working with third parties and communities, and whether your approach is structured by formal policies and strategies. With that in mind, it would likely be someone with your organization in a senior role who understands how your company responds to employment, business development, and community issues.

Will you ask for sensitive business information, like our revenues or proprietary information?
We are interested only in your work with Indigenous organizations and communities. We will not ask any questions about the performance of your business, or any “trade secrets.”

Who is funding this research?
This research is being funded by Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada, and directed by Indigenous Works.

I have completed the electronic survey and I need to contact the company doing the survey to clarify an answer/give more information. Is there a way to contact them?
Yes. Malatest has a toll free number for inquiries at 1-877-688-5051. You may also contact the lead researcher for this project, Jeff Blackman at 613-688-1847, ext. 123, or at j.blackman@malatest.com

I have some questions about the study and would like to speak to someone at Indigenous Works.
If you have questions about the study please contact Harmony Redsky, Director of Marketing & Communications for Indigenous Works at 807-464-2929, or harmonyr@indigenousworks.ca
BUSINESS INFORMATION

1. According to our records, your business is in the [NAICS_CODE] sector; is that correct?
   o Yes
   o No
   o Don’t know
   o Prefer not to answer

If Q1=No or Don’t Know, ask Q2

2. What sector is your business in? [Only read list if respondent is unsure] [Programming: exclude sector from Q1]
   CONTEXT QUESTION
   o Accommodation & Food Services
   o Administrative & Support & Waste Management & Remediation Services
   o Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing & Hunting
   o Arts, Entertainment, Recreation
   o Construction
   o Educational Services
   o Finance & Insurance
   o Health Care & Social Assistance
   o Information
   o Management of Companies & Enterprises
   o Manufacturing
   o Mining, Quarrying, Oil & Gas Extraction
   o Other Services (Except Public Administration)
   o Professional, Scientific, Technical Services
   o Public Administration [NON-QUALIFIER – TERMINATES]
   o Real Estate & Rental & Leasing
   o Retail Trade
   o Transportation & Warehousing
   o Utilities
   o Wholesale Trade
   o Other, please specify: [Up to 100 characters]
   o Don’t know [DO NOT READ]
   o Prefer not to answer [DO NOT READ]

3. Question eliminated or replaced.

4. Approximately how many people does your business employ? [Read list; if they provide number simply fill in the level]
   CONTEXT QUESTION
   o Less than 100 [NON-QUALIFIER – TERMINATE]
- 100 to 249
- 250 to 499
- 500 to 999
- 1000 to 1999
- 2000 or more
- Don’t know [DO NOT READ] [NON-QUALIFER – TERMINATE]
- Prefer not to answer [DO NOT READ] [NON-QUALIFER – TERMINATE]
INTRODUCTION TO SURVEY CONCEPTS [TELEPHONE SURVEY]

In this survey, we are going to talk about how your business may engage with Indigenous organizations and communities.

First, we are going to ask about your awareness of issues related to Indigenous peoples and your organization’s readiness to engage with them. Second, we are interested in what strategies or policies you may have to facilitate Indigenous engagement. Third, we are interested in whether your business consults or partners with Indigenous organizations and communities.

Throughout these sections, we will return to three key themes: employment, business development, and community development.

At the end of the survey, depending on your answers, we will ask a few broader questions about why your business has taken the actions it has, and what sort of outcomes you may have achieved.

Do you have any questions before we begin?
  ○ [Proceed]

INTRODUCTION TO SURVEY CONCEPTS [ONLINE SURVEY]

In this survey, we are going to talk about how your business may engage with Indigenous organizations and communities.

First, we are going to ask about your awareness of issues related to Indigenous peoples and your organization’s readiness to engage with them. Second, we are interested in what strategies or policies you may have to facilitate Indigenous engagement. Third, we are interested in whether your business consults or partners with Indigenous organizations and communities.

Throughout these sections, we will return to three key themes: employment, business development, and community development.

At the end of the survey, depending on your answers, we will ask a few broader questions about why your business has taken the actions it has, and what sort of outcomes you may have achieved.

  ○ Proceed with survey
5. To start, to the best of your knowledge are the following statements true about your business? [READ LIST; select all that apply. If respondent says Yes for some but Don’t know for others, select Yes where applicable and ignore Don’t know] **CONTEXT QUESTION**
   - We have Indigenous employees (i.e., those who identify as First Nations, Inuit, or Métis)
   - We have worked with Indigenous groups for business purposes.
   - We have contributed to Indigenous community development.
   - None of the above [DO NOT READ]
   - Don’t know [DO NOT READ]
   - Prefer not to answer [DO NOT READ]

If “We have worked…” or “We have contributed…” was selected at Q5, skip to Q8

6. Has your business ever considered actively engaging or reaching out to Indigenous communities and organizations? **SCREENER QUESTION**
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don’t know [DO NOT READ]
   - Prefer not to answer [DO NOT READ]

If Q6=No, ask Q7:

7. What are the **one or two main reasons** why your business has never considered engaging Indigenous communities and organizations? [Probe for answer but DO NOT READ LIST, select all that apply, and confirm selections with respondents; avoid using other if possible] **CONTEXT QUESTION**
   - Complicated / Confusing
   - Costly
   - Few Indigenous people where we do business
   - Focus on other equity groups
   - Lack of knowledge
   - Lack of resources
   - Limited perceived value
   - Negative experience
   - No direction / support from government
   - Not important / Not our responsibility
   - Risky
   - Time-consuming
   - Other, please specify [Open-ended reply; up to 500 characters]
   - Don’t know [DO NOT READ]
8. To the best of your knowledge, would the leadership of your business be aware of the following? [Read list; select all that apply. If respondent says Yes for some but Don’t know for others, select Yes where applicable and ignore Don’t know] [Online add text: “Please select all that apply.”] CONTEXT QUESTION

- The specific Indigenous groups in the areas where you do business. [BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT INDEX]
- As the fastest growing demographic in Canada, Indigenous people will represent a larger share of the Canadian workforce in future.
- The Government of Canada has established the Aboriginal Skills, Employment and Training Strategy (ASETS), which provides funding to third-parties to increase Indigenous peoples’ participation in the workforce. [EMPLOYMENT INDEX]
- The Truth and Reconciliation Commission on Residential Schools included specific calls to action for corporate Canada. [COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT INDEX]
  - None of the above [DO NOT READ]
  - Don’t know [DO NOT READ]
  - Prefer not to answer [DO NOT READ]

9. Question eliminated or replaced.

10. To what extent are the following actions a priority for your business? For each action, please respond whether it is a high priority, a medium priority, a low priority, or not a priority at all. [READ LIST] INDEX QUESTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>High priority</th>
<th>Medium priority</th>
<th>Low priority</th>
<th>Not a priority</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q10a. Employing more Indigenous peoples</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10b. Working more with Indigenous businesses and groups</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10c. Investing in Indigenous community development</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If “High priority” or “Low priority” was selected for any of Q10a, b, or c, ask Q11.

11. To what extent does your business have the ability, knowledge, and experience to take the following actions? For each action, please respond whether your business is very capable, somewhat capable, not very capable, or not at all capable. INDEX QUESTION
STRATEGIES

12. Question eliminated or replaced.

12_NEW. Does your business have strategies for any of the following areas? [READ LIST]
- Indigenous employment
- Business development that considers Indigenous peoples and organizations
- Indigenous community development
  - None of the above
  - Don’t know [DO NOT READ]
  - Prefer not to answer [DO NOT READ]

If Q12_NEW=”None of the above”, ask Q13:

13. Previously, has your business had any such strategies? CONTEXT QUESTION
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know [DO NOT READ]
- Prefer not to answer [DO NOT READ]

If (“We have worked...” or “We have contributed...” was selected at Q5) or Q6=Yes (Have considered), but Q12_NEW=”None of the above”, ask Q14

14. Why does your business [If Q13=Yes, “no longer”; If Q13=No or DK or Prefer not to answer, “not”] have strategies for working with Indigenous groups? [Probe for answer but do not read]
list, select all that apply, and confirm selections with respondents; avoid using other if possible]

**CONTEXT QUESTION**
- □ Complicated / Confusing
- □ Costly
- □ Few Indigenous people where we do business
- □ Focus on other equity groups
- □ Lack of knowledge
- □ Lack of resources
- □ Limited value / Perceived low value
- □ Negative experience
- □ No direction / support from government
- □ Not important / Not our responsibility
- □ Part of a broader equity strategy
- □ Risky
- □ Time-consuming
- □ Other, please specify [Open-ended reply; up to 500 characters] [DO NOT READ]
- □ Don’t know [DO NOT READ]
- □ Prefer not to answer [DO NOT READ]

15. Question eliminated or replaced.

If at least one of the three listed choices for Q12_NEW was selected, ask Q16_NEW, Q17 and Q18_NEW:

16. Question eliminated or replaced.

16_NEW. Have you formalized your...? [READ LIST] [INDEX QUESTION]
- □ Employment strategy [If selected at Q12_NEW]
- □ Business development strategy [If selected at Q12_NEW]
- □ Community development strategy [If selected at Q12_NEW]
  - o No formal strategies [DO NOT READ]
  - o Don’t know [DO NOT READ]
  - o Prefer not to answer [DO NOT READ]

17. Strategies may be implemented enterprise-wide, only for specific regions or departments, or only for specific projects or locations. To what extent have you implemented your...? [READ LIST]

**INDEX QUESTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q17a. Employment strategy</th>
<th>Enterprise-wide</th>
<th>Regions / Departments</th>
<th>Locations / Projects</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Question eliminated or replaced.

18_NEW. Were Indigenous peoples involved in the development of your...? [Read list. If respondent does not understand question, ask: "When you developed these strategies, did you involve Indigenous peoples in the process?"] [Online add text: “For example, were they involved in strategy development or validation?”]

☐ Employment strategy [If selected at Q12_NEW]
☐ Business development strategy [If selected at Q12_NEW]
☐ Community development strategy [If selected at Q12_NEW]
  ○ No review by Indigenous peoples [DO NOT READ]
  ○ Don’t know [DO NOT READ]
  ○ Prefer not to answer [DO NOT READ]

19. Question eliminated or replaced.

If “Part of broader equity strategy” was selected at Q14 (value=11), skip Q20.

20. [If Q6=“No” or “Don’t know” or “Prefer not to answer” (No engagement), question should read:] Does your business have any strategies, formal or informal, for working and doing business with other equity groups such as visible minorities or people with disabilities?; otherwise, it should read “Does your business target any other -equity groups such as visible minorities or people with disabilities?”] CONTEXT QUESTION

☐ Yes
☐ No
  ○ Don’t know [DO NOT READ]
  ○ Prefer not to answer [DO NOT READ]

If Q6=“No” or “Don’t know” or “Prefer not to answer” (No engagement) skip to Q38.
CONSULTATION

21. Question eliminated or replaced.
22. Question eliminated or replaced.

23. Does your business consult Indigenous organizations or communities when making the following types of decisions? [READ LIST] SCREENER QUESTION

- Employment decisions, such as where to find new talent, or how to design training.
- Business development decisions, such as where to open new locations, how to market your business, and procurement choices.
- Community development decisions, such as what groups or events to sponsor, or how to minimize your impact on the environment.
  - None of the above [DO NOT READ] [SKIP TO Q27]
  - Don’t know [DO NOT READ] [SKIP TO Q27]
  - Prefer not to answer [DO NOT READ] [SKIP TO Q27]

If at least one of the three listed choices for Q23 was selected, ask Q24 and Q26_NEW:

24. Consultation may be conducted enterprise-wide, only by specific regions or departments, or only by specific projects or locations. To what extent does your business consult with Indigenous organizations and communities about…? [READ LIST] INDEX QUESTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Enterprise-wide</th>
<th>Regions / Departments</th>
<th>Locations / Projects</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q24a. Employment [If selected at Q23]</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24b. Business development [If selected at Q23]</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24c. Community development [If selected at Q23]</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. Question eliminated or replaced.
26. Question eliminated or replaced.

26_NEW. Do you acknowledge the input of Indigenous groups by sharing your final decisions with them and, if appropriate, promoting their contribution, after you have consulted on…? [READ LIST] INDEX QUESTION

- Employment [If selected at Q23]
- Business development [If selected at Q23]
- Community development [If selected at Q23]
  - No acknowledgment [DO NOT READ]
  - Don’t know [DO NOT READ]
  - Prefer not to answer [DO NOT READ]
PARTNERSHIPS

If Q23=“None of the above,” “Don’t know” or “Prefer not to answer,” skip Partnerships Section and proceed to Q35 (Context section). Otherwise, proceed with Partnerships Section.

27. Does your organization currently have partnerships, either formal or informal with Indigenous organizations or communities? **SCREENER QUESTION**
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don’t know [DO NOT READ]
   - Prefer not to answer [DO NOT READ]

28. Question eliminated or replaced.

If Q27=yes, ask Q29; otherwise to Q35:

29. Do any of your partnerships have the following types of objectives? **SCREENER QUESTION**
   - Employment objectives (For example, partnering to support employment of Indigenous peoples with aims such as source talent, ensure cultural sensitivity in the workplace, and maintain an adaptive and innovative workforce.)
   - Business development objectives (For example, partnering to support the mutual development of both your business and Indigenous businesses and organizations, with shared aims such as grow market share, diversify product or service offer, and strengthen reputations.)
   - Community development objectives (For example, partnering to support Indigenous communities, with aims such as strengthen communities where you operate, invest in education, combine intelligence and information, and identify opportunities as they emerge.)
   - None of the above, but other unique objectives
   - Don’t know [DO NOT READ]
   - Prefer not to answer [DO NOT READ]

If Q29=“None of the above, but other unique objectives,” ask Q30:

30. What is the purpose of your Indigenous partnerships? **CONTEXT QUESTION**
   - [Open-ended reply; up to 500 characters]
   - Don’t know [DO NOT READ]
   - Prefer not to answer [DO NOT READ]

31. Question eliminated or replaced.
If at least one of the three listed objectives selected at Q29, ask Q31_NEW:

31_NEW. Have you formalized your...? [READ LIST] INDEX QUESTION

- Employment partnerships [If selected at Q29]
- Business development partnerships [If selected at Q29]
- Community Development partnerships [If selected at Q29]
- No formal partnerships [DO NOT READ]
- Don’t know [DO NOT READ]
- Prefer not to answer [DO NOT READ]

If at least one formal partnership selected at Q31_NEW, ask Q32:

32. How did your business formalize its partnerships with Indigenous organizations? Probe for answer but DO NOT READ LIST, select all that apply, and confirm selections with respondents; avoid using other if possible [Online text: Please select all that apply] CONTEXT QUESTION

- Formal ceremony
- Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
- Cooperation agreement
- Contract
- Contribution agreement
- Opportunity agreement
- Joint venture
- Impact and benefits agreement (IBA)
- Other, please specify: [Up to 500 characters]
- Don’t know [DO NOT READ]
- Prefer not to answer [DO NOT READ]

If at least one of the three listed objectives selected at Q29, ask Q34:

33. Question eliminated or replaced.

34. Partnerships may be designed to achieve specific, short or medium-term goals, or they may designed to be ongoing commitments to work together, even after your original goals are met? Generally speaking, how have you designed your...?[Read list; select all that apply] INDEX QUESTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment partnerships [If selected at Q29]</th>
<th>Ongoing / Long-term impact</th>
<th>Short or Medium-Term Goals</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q34a. Employment partnerships [If selected at Q29]</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business development partnerships [If selected at Q29]</th>
<th>Ongoing / Long-term impact</th>
<th>Short or Medium-Term Goals</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q34b. Business development partnerships [If selected at Q29]</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q34c. Community development partnerships [If selected at Q29]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ongoing / Long-term impact</th>
<th>Short or Medium-Term Goals</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FURTHER CONTEXT**

If (Q12_NEW=1, 2, and/or 3 {Strategies}) or (Q23=1, 2, and/or 3 {Consults}) or (Q27=Yes {Partners}), ask Q35.

35. What factors motivated your business to think about and work with Indigenous organizations and communities? [Do not read list, but probe for answer, select all that apply, and confirm selections with respondents; avoid using other if possible] [Online text: Please select all that apply]

- Proximity to business location (e.g., northern businesses)
- Potential labour pool
- Improve workplace culture
- Access to knowledge (e.g., traditional knowledge)
- Access to markets
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission's calls to action for Corporate Canada
- Corporate social responsibility
- Social license (i.e., acceptance from communities affected by your work)
- Required by government
- Ability to lever government funding programs and tax advantages
- Other, please specify: [Up to 500 characters]
- Don’t know [DO NOT READ]
- Prefer not to answer [DO NOT READ]

If (Q23=1, 2, and/or 3 {Consults}) or (Q27=Yes {Partners}), ask Q36.

36. What kinds of Indigenous organizations has your business consulted or partnered with? [Do not read list, but probe for answer, select all that apply, and confirm selections with respondents; avoid using other if possible] [Online text: Please select all that apply]

- Individual Indigenous-owned businesses
- Indigenous economic development corporations
- Individual band associations
- National associations (e.g., Assembly of First Nations, Canadian Council for Aboriginal Business)
- Aboriginal Skills, Employment and Training (ASET) agreement holders
- Other service and community agencies (e.g., friendship centres)
- Other, please specify: [Up to 500 characters]
If Q6=Yes (Have considered) and (Q12_NEW=1, 2, and/or 3 {Strategies}), but either (Q23="None of the above,” “Don’t know” or “Prefer not to answer” {does not consult}) or Q27=Yes (no partners), ask Q37

37. Why does your business not currently [If both consult =no, “consult”; If consult=yes, partner=no, “partner”] with Indigenous communities or organizations? [Do not read list but probe for answer, select all that apply, and confirm selections with respondents; avoid using other if possible] CONTEXT QUESTION

- Complicated / Confusing
- Costly
- Few Indigenous people where we do business
- Focus on other equity groups
- Lack of knowledge
- Lack of resources
- Limited value / Perceived low value
- Negative experience
- No direction / support from government
- Not important / Not our responsibility
- Risky
- Time-consuming
- Other, please specify [Open-ended reply; up to 500 characters]

If Q27=Yes (Partnerships in place), skip to 39_EE.

38. What would motivate your company to engage more with Indigenous communities and organizations? [Do not read list, but probe for answer, select all that apply, and confirm selections with respondents; avoid using other if possible] CONTEXT QUESTION

- Approached by Indigenous communities, groups or individuals
- Business performance – improved
- Business performance – worsened
- Demand from community / public
- Economic conditions
- Increased business / informal experience with Indigenous peoples
- Labour market / Workforce
- Legal requirements / Government policy
- Organizational structure and policies
If Q38 does not equal “Would never consider” or “Don’t know” or “Prefer not to answer”, ask Q39:

39. If you were motivated, what supports, services, or resources would you then need to move forward? [Do not read list but probe for answer, select all that apply, and confirm selections with respondents; avoid using other if possible] **CONTEXT QUESTION**
   - Employees with engagement experience
   - Employees who identify as Indigenous
   - Knowledge / guidance – from other businesses
   - Knowledge / guidance – from Indigenous groups
   - Leadership buy-in
   - Road map / templates
   - Systems review
   - Consulting services
   - Staff training
   - Other [Open-ended reply; up to 500 characters] [DO NOT READ]
   - Nothing we need [DO NOT READ]
   - Don’t know [DO NOT READ]
   - Prefer not to answer [DO NOT READ]

39_EE. Based on your sector or the work your business does, your business may be subject to the federal Employment Equity Act. Would that apply to your situation?

[Prompt: “The Employment Equity Act is federal legislation and applies to federally regulated businesses including banks, broadcasters, telecommunication companies, railroads, airlines, some transportation and mining companies, and private businesses necessary to the operation of a federal act.”]

[Online display this text in italics: “The Employment Equity Act is federal legislation and applies to federally regulated businesses including banks, broadcasters, telecommunication companies, railroads, airlines, some transportation and mining companies, and private businesses necessary to the operation of a federal act.”]

**CONTEXT QUESTION**
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don’t know [DO NOT READ]
   - Prefer not to answer [DO NOT READ]

If Q39_EE=Yes designate as “EE BUSINESS” and ask Q40:
40. Compared to other equity groups, do you find it more challenging, as challenging, or less challenging to meet employment equity requirements for Indigenous peoples? **CONTEXT**

**QUESTION**
- More challenging
- As challenging
- Less challenging
- Don’t know [DO NOT READ]
- Prefer not to answer [DO NOT READ]

**OUTCOMES**

If Q23=1, 2, and/or 3, ask Q41:

41. You indicated earlier that your business consulted Indigenous organizations and communities when making important decisions. Would you rate the impact those consultations had on your business as very significant, somewhat significant, not very significant, or not at all significant? **OUTCOMES QUESTION**

- Very significant
- Somewhat significant
- Not very significant
- Not at all significant
- Don’t know [DO NOT READ]
- Prefer not to answer [DO NOT READ]

If Q29=1, 2 and/or 3, ask Q42:

42. Would you say the progress you have made on your partnership objectives has been very significant, somewhat significant, not very significant, or not at all significant? **OUTCOMES QUESTION**

- Very significant
- Somewhat significant
- Not very significant
- Not at all significant
- Don’t know [DO NOT READ]
- Prefer not to answer [DO NOT READ]

43. Over the past two years, would you say the following things have increased, stayed the same, or decreased? **OUTCOMES QUESTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increased</th>
<th>Stayed the same</th>
<th>Decreased</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q43a. Number of Indigenous employees</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q43b. The amount of business you do with Indigenous organizations and communities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q43c. Your reputation among Indigenous peoples and communities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. It can be a challenge for many businesses to ensure their workplace culture is accommodating to Indigenous peoples. To what extent do your business’ values, outlook, and practices provide a good cultural fit for Indigenous employees? Would you say... [READ LIST] OUTCOMES QUESTION

- To a great extent
- To some extent
- To a limited extent
- To no extent.
- Don’t know [DO NOT READ]
- Prefer not to answer [DO NOT READ]

45. Question eliminated or replaced.

46. Question eliminated or replaced.

**CONCLUSION / KII RECRUITMENT**

47. Would you be interested in taking part in a longer interview about your business’s potential for Indigenous engagement? The interview would take 30-45 minutes, and allow for a more in-depth discussion of how your business could engage and build partnerships with Indigenous organizations and communities. SCREENER QUESTION

- Yes
- Decline

If Q47=Yes, ask Q47_Contact:

Q47_Contact: Please enter your contact details below.
- First name: [Open-field up to 50 characters]
- Last name: [Open-field up to 50 characters]
- Email address: [Open-field up to 100 characters]

48. Thank you for your time. Before we conclude, we would like to invite you to learn more about our study. Would you like a one-page report on how your answers compare to national average? We will be producing these custom and confidential reports later this year for all interested businesses. If so, we will need your name and email address. SCREENER QUESTION
If Q48=Yes, ask Q48_Contact:

Q48_Contact: Please enter your contact details below.
- First name: [Open-field up to 50 characters]
- Last name: [Open-field up to 50 characters]
- Email address: [Open-field up to 100 characters]

Concluding Page [Survey complete]

S3. Thank you for participating in this study. If you have any questions, feel free to contact us at [UNIQUE TOLL FREE NUMBER]. Survey results will be available in the summer.
- Submit survey

Concluding Page [Non-qualifier]

S4. We are only speaking with businesses that qualify as medium-sized (100 to 499 employees), or large (500 employees or more). Thank you for your interest in this study.
- Exit survey
Appendix C: Response Rates
## MRIA Response Rates per Sector and Subsector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector / Subsector</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>MRIA Response Rate</th>
<th>Raw Total</th>
<th>Weighted Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hospitality</strong></td>
<td>540</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation &amp; Food Services</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, Recreation</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manufacturing</strong></td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and Support Services</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Insurance</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, Technical Services</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate, Rental, and Leasing</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing &amp; Hunting</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, Quarrying, Oil &amp; Gas Extraction</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retail &amp; Wholesale Trade</strong></td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation &amp; Warehousing</strong></td>
<td>361</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5140</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: KII Matrix
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Issues (From Research Framework)</th>
<th>Non-Indigenous Business</th>
<th>Indigenous Organization</th>
<th>Other (Government)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Description of organization</td>
<td>• Please briefly describe your organization. (Probe: Where they do business; for how long; corporate identity/culture).</td>
<td>• Please briefly describe your organization. (Probe: Where do they operate; purpose of organization [business, development, government, other]).</td>
<td>• Please briefly describe your organization (Probe: Where do they operate; purpose of organization [government/level, NGO, other]; for how long)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Role &amp; responsibilities of respondent</td>
<td>• Please describe your role &amp; responsibilities within your organization.</td>
<td>• Please describe your role &amp; responsibilities within your organization.</td>
<td>• Please describe your role &amp; responsibilities within your organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If applicable; respondent’s personal experience with Indigenous engagement</td>
<td>• What experience have you had with Indigenous engagement (at your current organization)? (BRIEF OVERVIEW if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Profile of Engagement, Relationships, and Partnerships</strong></td>
<td>Most of this information will be captured by the survey, including:</td>
<td>What engagements, relationships or partnerships (E/R/Ps) does your organization have with non-Indigenous businesses? (Probe: were they formalized, and if so, how? How long have they been in place? Are they geared to specific projects/timelines or sustainable/ongoing?)</td>
<td>If they are the kind of organization that may partner with Indigenous organizations (e.g., service agencies, NGOs):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Characteristics and profile of existing engagements, relationships, and partnerships;</td>
<td>• Existing engagements, etc.</td>
<td>• What are the objectives and purposes of those E/R/Ps? (Probe: Why did you choose these particular partners? What were their motivations?)</td>
<td>• What engagements, relationships or partnerships (E/R/Ps) does your organization have with Indigenous organizations? (Probe: were they formalized, and if so, how? How long have they been in place? Are they geared to specific projects/timelines or sustainable/ongoing?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Objectives and purposes of these engagements, relationships, or partnerships;</td>
<td>• If applicable, objectives of relationships/partnerships</td>
<td>• [Proceed with the rest of the questions we ask of Indigenous organizations]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establishing a baseline for future reporting on the progression of engagements, relationships, and partnerships;</td>
<td>• Baseline data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Why do different groups choose to engage or build relationships or partnerships together? What is the perceived value? After living it for a</td>
<td>• Perceived value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Basis for engagements, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Prepare brief profile based on survey results using partnership matrix; share results and discuss whether it seems accurate; are there gaps?]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Not covered by survey:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What obstacles did you encounter in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not covered by survey:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Issues (From Research Framework)</th>
<th>Non-Indigenous Business</th>
<th>Indigenous Organization</th>
<th>Other (Government)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>while, have those expectations been met?</td>
<td>establishing and developing your E/R/Ps? (Probe: initial versus intermediate obstacles; general versus project/partner-specific).</td>
<td>encounter in establishing and developing your E/R/Ps? (Probe: initial versus intermediate obstacles; general versus project/partner-specific).</td>
<td>If they are a government agency, such as INAC or ESDC, that serves a regulatory or facilitator role:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Obstacles as seen from different perspectives;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• How does your organization facilitate engagements, relationships or partnerships (E/R/Ps) between Indigenous and non-Indigenous organizations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• On what basis are engagements, relationships or partnerships developed between Indigenous and non-Indigenous parties (social license, philanthropic motive)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What do you find motivates Indigenous and non-Indigenous organizations to partner? (Probe: motives; perceived value; differences and similarities).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What obstacles challenge facilitation? (Probe: perceptions; values; knowledge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If they are the kind of organization that may partner with Indigenous organizations (e.g., service agencies, NGOs):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• When looking for partners, what are some of the key features you consider? (Probe: Past performance; similar values/experiences; sector; geography).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Are any of your business E/R/Ps collaborations with third parties, such as other organizations or agencies? (Probe: other organizations such as education, labour, philanthropic, government, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If they collaborate with other Indigenous organizations / work in clusters:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If they are a government agency, such as INAC or ESDC, that serves a regulatory or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters</td>
<td>• When looking for partners, what are some of the key features you consider? (Probe: Past performance; similar values/experiences; sector; geography).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunities for striking Indigenous clusters (by sector or by investment type etc.);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Resistance from parties to working in a cluster model?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What are the conditions needed to develop clusters with different groups (businesses, organizations, education, labour, philanthropic)?; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Perspectives about what makes a good cluster (features, (Indigenous) characteristics, systems, practices, conventions adopted)?; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Examples of clusters with Indigenous participation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If they have any partnerships:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Are any of your Indigenous E/R/Ps collaborations with third parties, such as other businesses or organizations? (Probe: other businesses by sectors, or other organizations such as education, labour, philanthropic, government, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If they collaborate with other business /</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If they are a government agency, such as INAC or ESDC, that serves a regulatory or facilitator role:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Issues (From Research Framework)</td>
<td>Non-Indigenous Business</td>
<td>Indigenous Organization</td>
<td>Other (Government)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in clusters:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What conditions were necessary to strike these collaborations? What obstacles/resistance did you encounter?</td>
<td></td>
<td>What conditions were necessary to strike these collaborations? What obstacles/resistance did you encounter?</td>
<td>Have you had any experience/success fostering collaboration between multiple businesses in order to work with Indigenous groups and communities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator role:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Have you had any experience/success fostering collaboration between multiple businesses in order to work with Indigenous groups and communities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If they have experience with clusters between businesses: What conditions were necessary to strike these clusters? What obstacles/resistance did you encounter?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Partnerships & Competencies

- What are the competencies that people say they need in order to build better Indigenous/non-Indigenous engagements, relationships and partnerships?
  - Leadership competencies
  - Organizational competencies

- Perceptions about how various group view others' abilities to develop engagements, relationships and partnerships. What could they do better?

**If respondents stumble over the word 'competencies'**
- Think about competencies in terms of a blend of knowledge

**If they have any partnerships:**
- What competencies enable your leadership to build partnerships with Indigenous groups and communities? (Probe: training; knowledge; acculturation; experience).
- What competencies does your organization/staff have in order to carry out partnerships? Are these things you look for when hiring, or do you train? (Probe: skills; knowledge; acculturation; experience).
- What particular competencies do you value in your Indigenous partners? How could they do better? (e.g., project/business background; organizational features)

**If they do not have partnerships:**
- What competencies does your organization possess that enable it to successfully partner with businesses? (Probe: leadership versus staff in general).

- What competencies do non-Indigenous businesses need to in order to successfully partner with organizations such as your own? (Probe: training; knowledge; acculturation; experience; leadership versus staff in general).
- What particular competencies do you value in your business partners? What could they do better? (Probe: orientation; cultural knowledge; human resource/leadership features).
- What competencies or capacities does your organization possess that enable it to successfully partner with businesses? (Probe:)

**If they are the kind of organization that may partner with Indigenous organizations (e.g., service agencies, NGOs):**
- [Proceed with the rest the questions we ask of non-Indigenous business]

**If they are a government agency, such as INAC or ESDC, that serves a regulatory or facilitator role:**
- From your experience/standpoint, what competencies do non-Indigenous businesses and Indigenous organizations need in order to successfully partner with one another? (Probe: training; knowledge; acculturation; experience).
- What role can your organization serve in developing these
### Research Issues (From Research Framework)

- and how that helps people nuance their strategies & practices.
  - For non-Indigenous: understanding of Aboriginal people, history, and contemporary culture.
  - For Indigenous: understanding of corporate culture (e.g., deadline and results-driven).

### Non-Indigenous Business

- Leadership have or need to develop in order to establish Indigenous partnerships? What do you need to develop? (Probe: training; knowledge; acculturation; experience).
- What competencies does your organization/staff possess that would enable them to carry out partnerships with Indigenous organizations? Where do they need to improve or learn? (Probe: skills; knowledge; acculturation; experience; corporate culture).
- What competencies would Indigenous organizations need to have order to successfully partner with your business? (Probe: orientation; project/business background; organizational features).

### Indigenous Organization

- Project/business background; organizational features; leadership; resources.

### Other (Government)

- Competencies?
  - What competencies does your organization need in order to successfully play a facilitator role? (Probe: business and cultural knowledge; leadership/organizational features)

### Outcomes & Expectations

- Opportunities for future engagements, relationships and partnerships; and
- Current versus future areas for investment (ability to match or align investment areas in common between Indigenous/non-Indigenous.

**Potential areas for future collaboration:**

- If they have partnerships:
  - How have your partnerships met expectations? (Probe: Intended objectives and goals compared to actual outcomes; unintended consequences)
  - How have partnerships impacted your organization? Your partners? (Probe: Business performance; reputation; inclusivity) (Draw on business profile from survey)

- If they have partnerships:
  - How have your partnerships met expectations? (Probe: Intended objectives and goals compared to actual outcomes; unintended consequences)
  - How have partnerships impacted your organization? Your partners? (Probe: organizational performance; reputation; community)

- Where do you see opportunities for future E/R/Ps? (e.g., investment areas; innovation; alignment of goals/needs).
### Research Issues (From Research Framework)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Indigenous Business</th>
<th>Indigenous Organization</th>
<th>Other (Government)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grow market share;</strong></td>
<td><strong>What future opportunities do you see for E/R/Ps? Are there future areas of investment and collaboration?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What future opportunities do you see for E/R/Ps? Are there future areas of investment and collaboration?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase capacity;</strong></td>
<td><strong>What future opportunities do you see for E/R/Ps? Are there future areas of investment and collaboration?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What future opportunities do you see for E/R/Ps? Are there future areas of investment and collaboration?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity product or market share;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source talent;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combine intelligence and information;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research and development; and</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to capital / other forms of leverage.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Indigenous Works' Roles

- **What role could Indigenous Works play to assist and encourage increased quality engagements, relationships and partnerships?**
  - Kinds of programming
  - Types of tools and knowledge to be developed
  - Different roles for different groups? (Mainstream vs. Indigenous businesses, or foundations, etc.)
  - How do we encourage innovation?

### Potential roles of Indigenous Works:

- **Convenor (e.g., bring parties together to dialogue and facilitate relationships);**
- **Strategy formulation (e.g., helping group of partners coalesce around a strategy);**
- **Research and development;**
- **Determine familiarity with IW; if none/limited, briefly describe IW and their suite of services**
- **What role could Indigenous Works play to assist you in developing and sustaining quality E/R/Ps? (Probe: advisory role vs. specific services; navigating obstacles; strengthening competencies; systems review; staff training; roadmap/templates; networking and connections)**
- **If sufficiently familiar, ask: What types of tools or resources could IW develop in order to assist you?**
- **What role could Indigenous Works play in fostering partnerships between non-Indigenous businesses and Indigenous and non-Indigenous organizations? (Probe: advisory role vs. specific services; navigating obstacles; strengthening competencies)**
- **If sufficiently familiar, ask: What new tools or services could IW develop to support this?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Issues (From Research Framework)</th>
<th>Non-Indigenous Business</th>
<th>Indigenous Organization</th>
<th>Other (Government)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Provision of common service to group of partners (e.g., training, benchmarking); Navigation (e.g., government programs; regulatory hurdles); and Policy advocacy (e.g., assist partners in crystallizing a shared policy position).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government’s role</td>
<td>• What role does government currently play in facilitating partnerships between businesses like yours and Indigenous groups and communities? (Probe: strengths and gaps; policy vs. leadership roles; impact) • What else role can government do to facilitate partnerships? (Probe: Policy changes; supports and resources; leadership)</td>
<td>• What role does government currently play in facilitating partnerships between organizations like yours and non-Indigenous businesses? (Probe: strengths and gaps; policy vs. leadership roles; impact) • What else role can government do to facilitate partnerships? (Probe: Policy changes; supports and resources; leadership)</td>
<td>• What role does government currently play in facilitating partnerships between organizations like yours and Indigenous groups and communities? (Probe: strengths and gaps; policy vs. leadership roles; impact) • What else role can government do to facilitate partnerships? (Probe: Policy changes; supports and resources; leadership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>• Are there any other comments or experiences you’d like to add about E/R/Ps between non-Indigenous business and Indigenous organizations?</td>
<td>• Are there any other comments or experiences you’d like to add about E/R/Ps between non-Indigenous business and Indigenous organizations?</td>
<td>• Are there any other comments or experiences you’d like to add about E/R/Ps between non-Indigenous business and Indigenous organizations?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>