Canadian Heritage **Patrimoine canadien**

Sport for Social Development in Indigenous Communities Survey

Executive Summary

Prepared for Indigenous Sport Unit Programs Division of Sport Canada, Canadian Heritage

For more information on this report, please contact Canadian Heritage at: address@canada.ca

Ce rapport est aussi disponible en français

Canada

Sport for Social Development in Indigenous Communities Survey
Executive Summary

Prepared for Indigenous Sport Unit Programs Division of Sport Canada, Canadian Heritage by Environics Research

May 2023

Table of Contents

Executive summary

Background and objectives

May 2019 marked the launch of the Sport for Social Development in Indigenous Communities (SSDIC) component of the Sport Support Program (SSP), delivered by Sport Canada. The objective of SSDIC is to close gaps between Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities in terms of social development indicators in the areas of health, education, employability, and the reduction of at-risk behaviours. The program is currently delivered in three funding streams:

- **Stream One**: Available to the 13 Indigenous Provincial/Territorial Aboriginal Sport Bodies (PTASBs) and the Aboriginal Sport Circle (ASC).

- **Stream Two:** Available to Indigenous governments, communities, and organizations as well as other delivery organizations submitting proposals in collaboration with Indigenous communities whose programs serve Indigenous participants.

- **Stream Three:** Available to Indigenous governments, communities, and organizations, as well as other organizations submitting proposals in collaboration with Indigenous groups whose programs serve Indigenous women, girls, and 2SLGBTQQIA+ participants.

Sport Canada wanted to hear directly from diverse Indigenous stakeholders, including Indigenous women, girls, and 2SLGBTQQIA+ representative organizations, on how to improve the design and delivery of the three funding streams, to ensure SSDIC serves their self-identified social development goals. Overall objectives were to:

- Determine levels of awareness of and familiarity with the SSDIC program, along with general views on the SSDIC program;

- Measure levels of satisfaction with the application and reporting processes;

- Gather feedback on current applicant eligibility criteria

- Perceptions of current funding distribution model; and

- Help inform the design and delivery of the newly established *Reconciliation and Strength of Indigenous Women and Girls through Sport for Social Development* (Stream Three) initiative, which aims to ensure that Indigenous women, girls, and 2SLGBTQQIA+ peoples have access to meaningful sports activities that support the Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls (MMIWG) Calls for Justice.

Sport Canada's ultimate objective was to ensure that all voices and diverse perspectives were heard and reflected in the results of the program review, to ensure that all three streams meet the needs and expectations of program recipients.

Methodology

From the outset, as part of their commitment to the principles of Reconciliation and to Indigenizing the design and delivery of the SSDIC program, Sport Canada was committed to hiring an Indigenous research firm to guide the design and implementation of this consultation. Environics Research and Sisco & Associates Consulting

Services (SISCO), an Indigenous consulting firm specializing in research with and for Indigenous organizations and communities, partnered on this research. The research was conducted by both parties in two phases and reporting was done collaboratively to ensure the diversity of Indigenous voices was accurately captured[1].

SISCO routinely uses collaborative, community-based partnership research (CBPR) and participatory approaches together with Indigenous methodologies in our work to foreground the voices of Indigenous partners and participants. Consistent with community-based partnership research (CBPR), the SISCO team, which included two Indigenous researchers, was engaged as full partners throughout the process at critical junctures to ensure input into the project work plan (design), knowledge gathering (data collection and analysis), and knowledge sharing (validation session, reporting, and presentations).

SISCO is committed to employing protocols based on Indigenous data sovereignty, including OCAP® (Ownership, Control, Access, and Possession), USAI (Utility, Self-Voicing, Access, Inter-Relationality), Principles of Ethical Métis Research, Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit (IQ), and First Nation community-level protocols. This project did not engage specific First Nations, Métis, or Inuit communities, and therefore there is not one or several targeted communities to which the data belongs and could be transferred back to in raw form. Rather, Indigenous organizations involving and serving Indigenous communities and peoples, the five Rs of CBPR and the USAI principles would be most appropriate to guide the work. The table below demonstrates how each set of principles were upheld.

Five Rs of CBPR	USAI Principles
1. Respect for Indigenous knowledges, ways of knowing and doing (including in research and engagement), and multiple perspectives. 2. Relevance of research to the cultures and communities engaged, including Indigenous organizations and the communities they serve. 3. Reciprocity in knowledge exchange through the sharing back of information gathered from Indigenous partners in accessible ways (member checking of interview notes and validation session), and of benefits like the programming changes. 4. Responsibility of researchers to empower community research partners (in this case Indigenous organizations and the SISCO	• Utility, like relevance, reflects a need for relevant vision and reflection on useful action. This project is applied and action oriented, impacted the SSDIC programming that is relevant to Indigenous organizations and the communities they serve. • Self-voicing is demonstrated through the foregrounding of Indigenous organization participant voices throughout the report, based on both research conversations and survey data, that was validated through member checking and a validation session with participants. • Access acknowledges that all life manifestations (all of creation) is relevant in research and ensures that findings can be understood all. This is the purpose of the validation session.

---

[1] In early discussions, Environics Research provided research published by the Canadian Council for Aboriginal Businesses (CCAB), funded by the Government of Canada, that highlights the challenges Indigenous businesses face in the Federal procurement process. Sport Canada is committed to working with contracting and procurement services to address these challenges for future research needs.

research team) through engaging them throughout the process, and disseminating research outcomes that are accessible and respectful for audiences. 5. R**elationships as the foundation** to the work, as demonstrated through the approach **(Kirkness & Barnhardt, 1999).**	• Inter-Relationality is demonstrated through the foregrounding of relations as context to all findings and the overarching approach (OFIFC, 2016).

Qualitative: Qualitative in-depth interviews (IDIs) were led by SISCO. The research team reached out to 39 Indigenous organizations for interviews, including to an initial list provided by Sport Canada of 28 organizations previously involved in SSDIC in some capacity, plus an additional 11 organizations referred by interview participants.

Between December 2022 and March 2023, a total of 22 individual interviews were conducted as follows:

- 12 interviews with PTASBs and the ASC that are eligible for funding through Stream One.

- 10 interviews with National Indigenous Organizations, National Indigenous Women's Organizations, and 2SLGBTQQIA+ organizations, to help inform the design and delivery of Stream Three.

Interviews were conducted as participant-led research conversations with Indigenous partners drawing on the principles of sharing circles and a focus on honouring participants' stories of lived experiences. Sharing circles are comparable to focus groups in that they involve group discussion, but distinct in that they are a healing method in which all participants (including the facilitator) are equals engaged in sharing and learning together in a wholistic way that involves the heart (emotional), mind (intellectual), body (physical), and spirit (spirit of everyone present, their ancestors and the Creator) (Lavallee, 2009). Circles create non-judgmental, safe spaces for important conversations (Lavallee, 2009).

Consistent with community-based partnerships research (CBPR), which is the gold standard of working with and for Indigenous communities, organizations, and people, the qualitative phase included several components meant to include participants as partners in the research process and share information back to demonstrate respect, ensure relevance, in the spirit of reciprocity, and as a part of the team's responsibility as researchers to taking a relationships-based approach. These components included: member checking interview notes, and engaging participants in a validation session for input into and reaction to the preliminary findings and recommendations.

Quantitative: An online survey was conducted with Indigenous and non-Indigenous organizations potentially eligible for funding through Streams Two and Three. A survey methodology was selected to collect feedback from a broader group of organizations than the IDIs, ensuring that those who wished to provide input had the opportunity.

Sport Canada initially provided Environics/Sisco with a list including email addresses and/or phone numbers of 336 organizations who were previous applicants and/or recipients of SSDIC funding. Environics emailed invitations to potential research participants and followed up numerous times, including phoning non-respondents. To increase accessibility, alternative methods of survey completion were offered. Due to an initial low survey response rate, it was agreed to have Sport Canada subsequently share by email an open survey link

with a broader audience of 2,147 organizations, including those that had applied to the most recent 2023-2024 program intake and those identified as potential future applicants. A total of 121 organizations completed the survey between January 3 and March 10, 2023.

Further discussion of methodology can be found in Appendix B.

The discussion guide and questionnaire can be found in Appendices C and D.

Statement of limitations. Qualitative research provides insight into the range of opinions held within a population, rather than the weights of the opinions held, as would be measured in a quantitative study. The results of this type of research should be viewed as indicative rather than projectable to the population.

The online survey was an attempted census of Indigenous organizations engaged to some extent with the Indigenous Sport Unit of Sport Canada. There is no margin of sampling error since no sample was drawn. However, due to the potential for non-response bias (i.e., a potential difference in views between organizations that responded to the survey and those that did not), the results should be interpreted with caution.

Key Findings & Recommendations

This section of the executive summary is subdivided into three parts: the context in which the study recommendations are ultimately situated, and the study limitations, for readers to be aware of; research findings organized by the key questions and research intentions originally provided by the SSDIC program; and, the recommendations stemming from the research findings, organized into short-term, medium-term, and long-term implementation, which captures participant input as well as practical considerations for government implementation.

Study Context and Limitations

Like many federal government programs, SSDIC funding flows from the federal government to organizations that in turn provide services to Indigenous Communities. While it is and has been the practice of the SSDIC program to fund Indigenous communities directly or ensure they are supportive of the programming to be delivered in their community, strictly speaking the latter approach can undermine Indigenous sovereignty by conflating Indigenous organizations (typically those that are Indigenous-owned or -operated) with Indigenous Nations and Communities, who should have a right to jurisdiction over programs affecting them. This happens because Indigenous Communities are often mistakenly regarded as subsidiary groups within Canada, which erases their Nationhood and self-determination.

The Indigenous Communities in greatest need of SSDIC funding are not necessarily the ones with Indigenous service providers in proximity or, put another way, access to organizations that can provide appropriate services can be limited. This is especially true for rural and remote Communities. It must also be acknowledged that external organizations are often not as adept at providing for the unique needs of each individual community, considering the incredible diversity of Indigenous Nations and Communities. As such, it is key for government funding programs to consider prioritizing Indigenous communities themselves. This approach will respect Indigenous sovereignty by investing dollars into the hands of Communities themselves who are then empowered to make their own decisions for how services will be developed. Doing so will also support grass-roots capacity and allow communities to delegate funds to outside organizations should they choose to do so.

Honouring Indigenous sovereignty over sports programs would involve transferring funding directly to Indigenous Nations or Communities and supporting their jurisdiction to allocate funding. Indeed, as a consulting firm that has extensive experience and expertise in engaging Indigenous Communities, SISCO has found that Indigenous Communities are increasingly advocating for control over programs designed to serve them. Indigenous Nations and Communities are best positioned to understand their needs, not service providers nor the federal government. Critically, it is incumbent upon governments to recognize and support Indigenous sovereignty, including the right to "maintain, control, protect and develop…sports and traditional games" as stated in Article 31 (1) of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous peoples (UNDRIP, 2007, p. 22).

If the federal government is committed to implementing UNDRIP and therefore contributing to current reconciliation and decolonization efforts, then a more thorough consideration of how to support Indigenous sovereignty must be at the heart of the design and delivery of all its funding programs. This study was initiated partly in response to requests from ongoing recipients of SSDIC funding (the ASC and PTASBs) to more fully integrate their diverse perspectives into the design and delivery of the SSDIC program. At the same time, the intention of this research has been to hear from as many other diverse Indigenous voices and potential program stakeholders as possible, specifically all NIOs, NIWOs and 2SLGBTQI+ organizations as well as hundreds of Indigenous communities across all jurisdictions. While this broad reach is commendable and has been partially achieved, there remain limitations to research projects that arise out of western or non-Indigenous methodologies.

Recommendations set forth below will evolve the SSDIC program to be even more aligned with the diverse perspectives of the Indigenous communities it seeks to serve, and yet, there is still a long way to go to decolonize the way these types of funding programs are conceived of and delivered.

Findings by Project Aspect:

Project Aspect & Question	Corresponding Findings
1. Review the Stream One 'regional distribution' formula: How should this funding formula for the PTASBs be calculated?	
• For example, how should the formula account for remoteness of Indigenous populations (vs. rural and urban)?	• Participants identified community needs, remoteness, population, and data accuracy as the most important eligibility criteria for consideration. Participants shared that eligibility should: o Be based on outcomes and community impact (e.g., overall satisfaction with program, improved participant wellness, sense of hope and belonging, etc.,), as opposed to reach; o Consider individual community context, needs, and capacity (e.g., remoteness of location and associated costs and logistical challenges, available resources, accessibility barriers, etc.,); and o Take a distinctions-based approach, which should have P/TASBs encouraged to demonstrate equitable funding distribution among First Nations, Métis, and Inuit through developing separate funding pots and considering data on needs. • Interview participants said that funding distribution should consider population, geography, and community needs together as the most

	important factors to reflect the specific needs and costs of communities in rural and urban settings.
	o Factors that may reflect community need include existing access (or lack thereof) to sport programs and other related resources (e.g., other health or mental health programs), as well as remoteness of location as well as associated costs and logistical challenges (e.g., fly-in communities).

• Should the calculation be based on relative population sizes or are there other needs-based formulas that are potentially more appropriate?	• Both survey and interview findings suggest that Indigenous organizations believe a funding formula based on per capita alone is inadequate. Other important considerations are:
	
	     o the higher costs of programming for smaller and under resourced regions, especially those with many fly-in communities (which is included in the current funding formula); and
	
	     o the significant impacts smaller regions have on those they service, who tend to be in greater need of programming.

• What are the different viewpoints of our stakeholders and how can we reach a sustainable solution?	• Participants generally agreed that the formula should not be strictly based on per capita but should be both needs- and distinctions-based. • There was no consensus among participants in terms of how the SSDIC program could be structured to meet the needs of each Indigenous distinctions-based group (First Nation, Métis, and Inuit), as this might require technical expertise in formula funding modelling. • However, participants suggested considering new distinct funding pots within Stream One for each group (i.e., for First Nation, Métis, and Inuit) (which, we note, is consistent with views about how Streams Two and Three should be structured).
• How are complex issues to do with distinctions-based identity groups and/or regional considerations taken into consideration?	• Interview participants were clear in wanting funding decisions to take a distinctions-based approach and consider community needs, so that First Nation, Métis, and Inuit groups as well as specific communities' individual expenses and access to resources are taken into consideration. • They did not feel the current process is distinctions- or needs-based.
• What data-sets should be considered in calculating the formula?	• The current data on Indigenous Community needs is unreliable and there are widespread gaps. o This is because of incompletely enumerated Indigenous communities, low participation (due to a trust deficit because of a long history of research practices that have harmed Indigenous communities), and cultural differences in how research is conducted (including the way in which questions are framed, indicators that reflect community needs and interests, data collection methods, reporting, etc.). • For these reasons, participants would prefer data to be Indigenous-sourced. However, a comprehensive Indigenous-sourced data set does not currently exist. Investment in developing primary data is needed. • The gold standard for Indigenous data collection is to conduct research in partnership with the Indigenous Communities who have an interest (in this case, who have a need or stated interest in enhancing sports

	programming). Conducting research through the government or other external organizations is generally ineffective.
	• The specific data-sets of interest should be determined by the Indigenous Communities who opt to participate because of a need or interest in sports programming. However, based on the findings of this project, we expect that indicators would relate with a combination of population, geography, and community needs.

2. Review eligibility for Stream Two and Three: What is the best approach for determining the distribution of these funds?

• How will 'Indigenous organizations' be defined in the context of SSDIC eligibility (e.g., Friendship Centers or other organizations in urban settings)?	• Survey participants widely agreed that Indigenous organizations are majority Indigenous-owned/operated (86%) or operate Indigenous programs (programs serving Indigenous people) (82%). Participants were less likely to define an Indigenous organization as one founded by an Indigenous person (or people) (72%) or controlled by a majority Indigenous Board of Directors (69%). This indicates the latter two criteria are not considered sufficient on their own without *also* being Indigenous-owned or -operated or serving Indigenous populations.
	• The qualitative data further shows that interview participants think Indigenous organizations should be defined as Indigenous-owned or -operated **and** primarily serving Indigenous populations specifically. They noted that organizations that are not Indigenous-owned or -operated should **not** be considered Indigenous organizations (even if they primarily serve Indigenous populations specifically). (Please see section 3 below for additional discussion of Stream Three eligibility specifics).
	• This differs from definitions widely used by the Government of Canada (including the Procurement Strategy for Indigenous Business (PSIB)) and Indigenous Organization's like the Canadian Council on Aboriginal Businesses (CCAB) who require majority (51%+) Indigenous ownership (shareholders) and control (Board membership) as well as significant (33%) Indigenous operation. These definitions generally do not include criteria for serving Indigenous people.
• What is the recommended percentage (if any) of non-Indigenous delivery organizations that should be eligible for Streams Two and Three?	• While participants did not provide percentages, responses were mixed in terms of support for funding non-Indigenous organizations (who do not meet the above definition of an Indigenous organization).
	○ Most survey participants opposed funding non-Indigenous service providers for Stream Two (64%) and Three (60%) **on their own** (outside of partnerships with Indigenous organizations). This is consistent with SSDIC current eligibility criteria which does not fund non-Indigenous organizations on their own.
• Is it only Indigenous organizations who can apply (as opposed to some non-Indigenous orgs who serve Indigenous populations)?	▪ Interview participants indicated that non-Indigenous organizations **could** be eligible for Stream Two and Three funding if they primarily serve Indigenous populations specifically. However, Indigenous organizations should be prioritized, meaning they should be funded first, with non-Indigenous organizations funded only if there is a remaining surplus of funds. In practice, the over-subscription to SSDIC means non-Indigenous organizations are unlikely to receive funding.
	○ There was no consensus on funding non-Indigenous organizations that are **partnered** with Indigenous organizations but fewer than

	half of survey respondents were in favour (43% for Stream Two and 48% for Stream Three). It is possible that a greater percentage of respondents support these partnerships for Stream Three because of a recognized shortage of Indigenous 2SLGBTQQIA+ organizations. There was also no consensus on whether the current funding reserved for partnerships should remain capped at 25 percent (32%), lowered (20%) or eliminated (17%), or increased (21%).
	▪ In the interviews and the open-ended survey comments, there is recognition of the capacity benefits of partnership but also concerns about how to determine if these partnerships are authentic and truly benefit Indigenous communities and organizations especially in the longer-term (by allowing them to develop their own capacity). To ensure that is the case, interview participants want the Indigenous organization to be the primary applicant and to receive the funds.
3. Consult with Indigenous Women, Girls, and 2SLGBTQQIA+ organizations on the design and delivery of the Stream Three component: What is the recommended design and delivery for the new Stream Three funding?	
• Determine formula(s), eligibility, other considerations (e.g., review committee processes) of the Stream Three component as this has not yet been done.	• Survey respondents favour making Stream Three funding available to any Indigenous organization **serving** women, girls, and 2SLGBTQQIA+ communities (70%), and not only to organizations **led** by individuals from these communities (23%). That is, Stream Three applicants do not necessarily need to be owned or operated by Indigenous women or 2SLGBTQQIA+ people, but need to serve these populations (whereas Stream Two needs to be both owned/operated by and serve Indigenous populations). This may reflect awareness of: ○ a shortage of organizations led by Indigenous women, girls, and members of the 2SLGBTQQIA+ community; and / or ○ capacity shortages among the few existing organizations that are led by Indigenous women, girls, and members of the 2SLGBTQQIA+ community. • Interview participants recommended that service provider organizations be required to provide evidence of their focus and impact on these populations (e.g., mission or mandate, strategic plan, testimonials). • To ensure equity in serving both groups, interview participants suggested allocating separate funding pots within Stream Three for projects for women and girls and for 2SLGBTQIA+. This is best accomplished as an additional consideration within the Stream (like geography or distinction) since the priority should be impact.
4. Additional Considerations (not posed in the statement of work)	
• The need for Multi-Year funding.	• Participants raised a number of challenges with the current approach requiring annual funding applications, including an administrative burden that falls on already underfunded and understaffed organizations and communities, and the associated costs. ○ Multi-year funding has a number of benefits that collectively support program sustainability, including: ▪ reduced administrative burden and associated costs;

	- enhanced staff retention; - more reliable program data as an evidence base to inform program planning; and - longer-term program outcomes. - Stable funding for federal government Indigenous sports programs is among the TRC's Calls to Action Report (90(i)) (TRC, 2015)
• Provide greater flexibility to organizations in how they define and measure success (impact).	• Interview participants want greater flexibility to define their own goals and measures of success to be more reflective of Indigenous values and ways of knowing and being. For example, organizations may find it more relevant to share success stories in audio-visual format rather than demographic or other statistical information.

Recommendations:

The following recommendations are framed within a staged approach for implementation in the short-, medium-, and long-term. Short-term recommendations provide small changes that can be made within the current SSDIC system, without substantive modifications; medium-term recommendations promote a more rigorous process of redeveloping the funding formulas for these Streams in the interim; and long-term recommendations relate to a substantive program transformation to a community-driven, needs-based approach grounded-in Indigenous sovereignty that honours UNDRIP and the TRC Calls to Action. Collectively, they provide a roadmap for the transition to occur through the implementation of a series of steps over time.

Short-Term (1 year)	Medium-Term (2-3 years)	Long-Term (4-5 years)

1. Provide multi-year funding
 	
• Provide opportunities for multi-year funding across all Streams to promote program stability consistent with the TRC's Call to Action 90(i) (TRC, 2015, p. 10).
 	
2. Update and clarify Indigenous Organization definitions and eligibility criteria
 	
• Update the definition of Indigenous organizations for all Streams as those that are:
 	
   o Indigenous-owned (51% + Indigenous shareholders) or Indigenous-operated (51% + Indigenous staff)[2];
 	
   o and primarily serve Indigenous populations through their programs
	5. Develop funding formula for Stream One, and consider implications for Stream Two/Three consideration matrices
	
	• Develop Indigenous Community data framework for needs and other factors with Indigenous communities based on a process of engagements and community-based partnership research.
	
	• Collect data on community needs and other factors to inform funding formula development.
	
	• Collect data on how to define an Indigenous Community and other factors (such as how to ensure funding Indigenous people in urban settings) that
		7. Pilot community- and needs-based formula funding
		
		• Apply Community formulas to funding allocation by Stream.
		
		• Develop and implement a communications plan and materials to ensure Indigenous Communities (and service providers) understand the new formula and have equitable access to funding, based on eligibility.
		
		8. Evaluate community- and needs-based formula funding
		
		• Conduct an Indigenous community-based program evaluation of the pilot.
		
		• Share back the results of the evaluation and recommended

---

[2] The research did not delve into which employee types (full-time, part-time, seasonal) should be considered for a calculation of 51%+ Indigenous staff. However, with the goal of being as inclusive as possible and recognizing the structural inequities which may lead Indigenous people towards part-time or seasonal work (e.g., lack of child care, lack of education), we recommend that all employees be counted towards this 51%+ target.

(51% + clients are Indigenous);

- o and emphasize the inclusion of Métis organizations and Communities as eligible funding recipients more explicitly.

   - ▪ Develop a program communications plan for all Streams, with specific materials and actions to promote this information to Métis organizations and Communities.

- For Stream Three, eligible organizations (that are not Indigenous Communities/Nations) should be required to have a mandate to serve Indigenous women / girls / 2SLGBTQQIA+ primarily or exclusively.

3. **Allocate funding to both Indigenous and Non-Indigenous organizations**

- For Stream Two, continue to allocate at least 75% of the funding to organizations that are majority Indigenous-operated (and / or Indigenous-owned), and up to 25% to non-Indigenous organizations that primarily serve Indigenous populations specifically and are partnering with Indigenous organizations.
   - o As noted in the context section, while organizations favoured an approach that prioritizes Indigenous organizations, this could lead to widespread funding gaps for Indigenous communities that are not in close proximity to an Indigenous service provider and because Indigenous organizations

will inform the transition of the funding flow from government to Indigenous Communities directly (as opposed to the funding flowing to organizations serving Communities).

- Develop funding formula for allocation of Stream One (and for possible consideration for Streams Two and Three) to organizations, based on the data collected from this process using this framework, with funding formula expert modelling formulas based on needs and distinctions-based funding formula model that consider community barriers, access to resources, and transportation costs in each region, in combination with population and geography.

- Develop preliminary funding formula for allocation of all Streams to Indigenous Communities, based on the data collected from this process using this framework, with funding formula expert modelling formulas based on needs and distinctions-based funding formula model that consider community barriers, access to resources, and transportation costs in each region, in combination with population and geography.

- Share back the funding formula model options (suggest 3 to 5) with organizational and Community stakeholders, modelling specific scenarios and outcomes, and engage them in an options analysis to develop a consensus on the most suitable model.

6. **Implement organization formula funding in the interim**

program changes with Communities for validation.

- Adjust the community- and needs-based approach, including the formulas as needed based on the evaluation and Community validation results.

9. **Implement the adjusted community- and needs-based formula**

- Implement the new community- and needs-based approach, including the formulas as needed based on the evaluation and Community validation results.

- Develop and implement a communications plan and materials to ensure Indigenous Communities (and service providers) understand the new formula and have equitable access to funding, based on eligibility.

10. **Support longitudinal Community data collection**

- Embed an ongoing community evaluation process that collects long-term data aligned with the data framework developed to provide outcomes across all indicators in the long-term.

are not necessarily representatives for the Communities they serve.
 	
   o Set and communicate a timeline for eliminating the 25% allocation to non-Indigenous organizations so that Indigenous Communities/Nations can prepare accordingly.
 	
• For Stream Three, allocate funding by priority group as follows, until funding is expended:
 	
   o First to organizations owned (51% + shareholders) or operated (51% + staff) by Indigenous women / girls / or members of the 2SLGBTQQIA+ community and primarily serve Indigenous women / girls / or members of the 2SLGBTQQIA+ community through their programs (51% + clients); and
 	
   o Then to organizations Indigenous-owned (51% + Indigenous shareholders) or Indigenous-operated (51% + Indigenous staff) and primarily serve Indigenous women / girls / or members of the 2SLGBTQQIA+ community through their programs (51% + clients); and
 	
   o Finally to organizations that do not meet the above criteria but primarily serve Indigenous women / girls / or members of the 2SLGBTQQIA+ community through their programs (51% + clients).
 	
4. Gain Community input on needs to inform Stream One funding formula
	• Apply formulas to funding allocation by Stream.
	
	• Develop and implement a communications plan and materials to ensure all stakeholders understand the new formula and have equitable access to funding, based on eligibility.	

• Explore how to develop a data framework to collect data on community needs and other factors that will inform the development of the funding formula. While this process must engage Indigenous communities, it could include collaborations with other Government programs or identifying existing sources of this information, in the interest of reserving as much program funding as possible for communities. • Retain an expert on funding formulas to ensure process supports collection of data that can inform funding formula options to present to stakeholders for all streams. • Maintain the current Stream One formula while this work is underway.		

Contract value

The contract value was $100,941.77 (HST included)

Political neutrality statement and contact information

I hereby certify as senior officer of Environics that the deliverables fully comply with the Government of Canada political neutrality requirements outlined in the Communications Policy of the Government of Canada, and Procedures for Planning and Contracting Public Opinion Research. Specifically, the deliverables do not include information on electoral voting intentions, political party preferences, standings with the electorate, or ratings of the performance of a political party or its leaders.

Sarah Roberton
Vice President, Public Affairs
Environics Research Group
sarah.roberton@environics.ca
613-793-2229

Supplier name: Environics Research Group
PWGSC contract number: C1111-22-0166
Original contract date: 2022-09-20

For more information on this report, please contact the Department of Canadian Heritage at: PCH.info-info.PCH@canada.ca.