



Canadian
Chamber of
Commerce
Chambre de
Commerce
du Canada

The Future of Business Success
L'avenir de la réussite en affaires

Canadian Chamber of Commerce National Policy Resolution Process

Submission Guidelines

APRIL 2026

Table of Contents

Welcome!.....	3
A. What is a Policy Resolution?	4
Why This Matters for Your Chamber	4
The Resolution Process: A Reimagined Approach	4
B. Before You Begin & How to Start.....	5
Community Consultation	5
Federal Jurisdiction & National Interest	5
Quality of Evidence.....	5
Alignment with the Canadian Chamber’s Policies	6
C. The Revised Screening Criteria.....	7
Please be Advised.....	7
1. Within Federal Jurisdiction.....	8
2. In the National Interest.....	9
3. Timely and Actionable	10
4. Fundable	11
5. Credible.....	12
Printout: The Five Screening Criteria	15

Welcome!

Thank you for your commitment to shaping federal policy that strengthens Canadian business!

Your chamber has important insights about the challenges facing businesses in your community and those insights deserve to reach federal decision-makers.

The 2026 Submission Guidelines are designed to help you transform your local business knowledge into a powerful national policy resolution that will advance through the review process and influence government action.

The five screening criteria, detailed in section C, are here to help you succeed. Use them to strengthen your resolution before you submit by providing a framework to identify what's working well and to spot opportunities to make your case even stronger.

The following five criteria are meant to ensure that every resolution is:

- **Within federal jurisdiction**, meaning the federal government has clear authority to act on the issue.
- **In the national interest**, meaning the recommendations benefit Canadian business broadly or benefits a national business segment.
- **Timely and actionable**, meaning the resolution addresses a current Canadian public policy issue and advances clear, material recommendations.
- **Fundable**, meaning that any funding requirement has been clearly identified and is realistic, considering the macro-Canadian economic climate and the federal public sector's fiscal position.
- **Credible**, meaning the information underpinning the resolution is verified, trustworthy, and persuasive.

Here's what you'll find for each of the five criteria:

- **A clear description** of what the standard means and why it matters.
- **A practical checklist** of questions to ask yourself while drafting your resolution.

A. What is a Policy Resolution?

A policy resolution is your chamber's formal recommendation to the federal government, developed by chambers and delivered through the Canadian Chamber of Commerce (CCC). When adopted, it becomes part of the Canadian Chamber's national policy agenda, and it is used to advocate directly with ministers, senior officials, and Members of Parliament.

Why This Matters for Your Chamber

Your members' issues resonate beyond their local communities: For your members, membership at your chamber means more than a local network, it means their chamber is plugged into a country-wide effort to influence national priorities. Their concerns are carried forward through a trusted national resolution process that is discussed and voted on by a national business network.

Champion federal issues locally with confidence and authority: The policy resolution process strengthens your chamber's credibility to engage on federal priorities in your community and with local representatives, backed by resolutions debated and approved across a national chamber network.

The Resolution Process: A Reimagined Approach

The reimagined, iterative process introduces earlier engagement and multiple feedback points to ensure an aligned and well-rounded policy process.

1. **Expression of Interest:** Chambers submit a brief outline of your ideas. The CCC Policy Team provides early guidance on federal jurisdiction, national scope, and whether similar resolutions exist before you invest time in a full draft.
2. **Drafting & Feedback:** As you draft your full resolution, you can reach out to contacts at the CCC to receive specific suggestions to strengthen your submission.
3. **Final Submission:** Submit your complete resolution, which should incorporate the five screening criteria, meaning clear federal authority, credible evidence, and concrete recommendations.
4. **Chamber Network Review:** Experienced chamber professionals from across Canada will evaluate your resolution against the five screening criteria described in this document. Successful resolutions will appear in the Draft National Policy Book to be voted on at the 2026 Annual General Meeting (AGM).
5. **Policy Committee Alignment:** The CCC's Policy Committees will review the resolutions and attach the CCC's endorsement to resolutions that align with policy advocacy priorities.
6. **Adoption & National Advocacy:** Resolutions adopted at the AGM become official CCC policy for three years and are used to brief federal ministers and senior officials; inform federal budget submissions and consultations; and guide advocacy meetings with Members of Parliament and other government decision-makers.

B. Before You Begin & How to Start

Use this section to ensure your resolution is ready for submission. These questions help you self-assess whether your idea is a good fit for the national policy process and guide you through the preparation steps.

Answer these questions honestly before submitting. If you answer “no” to questions 1–10, your resolution may need strengthening. That’s okay! As you begin drafting your resolution, use the screening checklists for each of the five criteria in section D to increase the chances of your resolution passing the Chamber Network Review stage and being endorsed the Policy Committee Alignment stage.

Community Consultation

- 1. **Have you consulted with your members and board?** Does your membership support this? Have you gathered input from affected businesses in your community?

Federal Jurisdiction & National Interest

- 2. **Is this truly a federal issue?** Can Parliament or a federal department act on this issue? Or does it require provincial/territorial or municipal action?
- 4. **Can you name a specific federal department that would be in charge of implementing the solution?** (Examples include Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada; Transport Canada; Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada; etc.)
- 5. **Has the Government of Canada signaled an interest in acting on the issue you’re presenting?** Look for alignment in ministerial mandate letters, budgets, throne speeches, departmental plans, consultations, and press releases. If no government signal exists, have you provided a clear rationale for why the government should prioritize this issue, drawing from academic research, industry reports, think tanks, or other credible sources?

Quality of Evidence

- 6. **Do you have credible evidence?** The government requires citations for the underlying facts that support your resolution. Citations shouldn’t be older than 3 years (if avoidable).
- 7. **In case of AI usage, have your sources been verified by a human?** Resolutions that are developed using AI where the citations or underpinning facts are inaccurate or “AI hallucinations” will be deemed to contravene Criteria 5 (Credible) and will be rejected at the Chamber Network Committee Review stage.

Alignment with the Canadian Chamber's Policies

- 8. **Have you searched for the issue in existing CCC policy resolutions?** Visit the [2025, 2024, and 2023 National Policy Books](#) to see if a similar resolution already exists.
- 9. **Does your resolution align with the CCC's advocacy priorities?** Review current CCC advocacy positions at <https://chamber.ca/advocacy/> to see if this resolution complements existing advocacy efforts.
- 10. **Is this a sunseting resolution**, meaning it was a [policy passed in 2022](#) and now needs renewal?

Note on Sunseting Resolutions: Even if a resolution was previously adopted, it must be re-evaluated against current criteria when returning to the floor. You must provide *new* data or references that contextualize the issue in 2026, and/or provide *new* evidence of urgency that justifies the resolution's renewal. Do not simply resubmit the original text, it will automatically be rejected by the Chamber Network Review Committee.

C. The Revised Screening Criteria

All resolutions will be evaluated against five screening criteria at the Chamber Network Review stage. Understanding these criteria from the start will help you craft a resolution that meets expectations and advances to the Draft National Policy Book.

Each of the five screening criteria includes:

1. **A clear definition** of what the standard means.
2. **An explanation** of why the criteria matters.
3. **Operational tests**, in the form of a checklist, that reviewers will apply.
4. **Examples or indicators** of what satisfies the requirement (where possible).

The frameworks provided in the following sections will allow you to self-assess the strength of your resolution before the submission deadline and ensure reviewers have shared reference points for consistent evaluation across all resolutions.

Please be Advised

Please ensure that you review all the criteria carefully and can confidently answer each of the following questions in the positive. During the drafting process, if you have any questions or are unsure about whether you're heading in the right direction, do not hesitate to reach out to policyresolution@chamber.ca.

No one checklist item will be determinative in the assessment of whether your resolution passes or fails any criterion. However, the more items you check off, the more likely it is that the Chamber Network Review Committee will give a passing score on your resolution.

See the **2026 Submission Template Guide** for a comprehensive overview of where in your submission each of the checklist items should appear. A printable list of all checklist items also appears at the end of this document.

If you are unclear about how to approach each criterion, refer to the **2026 Drafting Toolkit** for guidance and practical tips.

1. Within Federal Jurisdiction

What this means: Your resolution must **(A)** address an issue that the federal government has authority to act on and **(B)** identify a specific government entity (or, if applicable, multiple entities) that would implement your recommendation(s).

Why it matters: The Government of Canada (GoC) is limited by both constitutional authority and administrative expertise in implementing policies or programs. If a proposal is not clearly within federal authority, the GoC risks facing a drawn-out legal procedure to justify an unconstitutional policy or action. If there is no existing department that has the expertise and/or mandate to implement a proposal, the GoC must devote additional resources to building such capacity. By identifying a clear source of authority to act and a competent actor, your resolution mitigates the risk of a proposal being struck down and is thus more readily supportable.

Screening Checklist

- (1.A) The recommendation(s) I'm suggesting can only be achieved by an act of Parliament or a federal department, independent of the provinces/territories and municipalities.
- (1.B) I have named a specific federal agency or institution that has the authority to act on my recommendations.

EXAMPLE

✗ NOT FEDERAL: "That the Government of Canada require all provinces to adopt the same business licensing process." (*The provinces/territories control licensing.*)

✓ FEDERAL: "That the Government of Canada [amend/establish/modify] [specific federal act/program/regulation] to [concrete change]."

If your issue requires coordinated effort between the GoC and other levels of government (or other entities in general), your recommendations should be limited to actions that are **within the exclusive control** of the GoC.

2. In the National Interest

What this means: Your resolution **(A)** focuses on an issue that affects businesses nationwide (or affects a nationally connected sector like agriculture or transportation) and your recommendations, if implemented, would improve competitiveness, facilitate trade, or improve operations for businesses across Canada (or all businesses in your sector). Implementing your recommendations **(B)** would not require taking away opportunities from businesses in other locations or sectors.

Why it matters: Policy proposals that clearly favour one region of Canada, or one particular business sector, to the detriment of others are not popular on the floor of the House of Commons. Even in a majority government, Members of Parliament hail from many different regions of Canada. Policies reflecting clear favouritism, or “creating winners and losers,” are divisive and difficult to defend politically. By identifying an issue and recommendation(s) in the national interest, you increase the chance of your resolution receiving broad support.

Screening Checklist

- (2.A) I have provided evidence of how the issue affects businesses nationally and my recommendations, if implemented, would increase competitiveness, facilitate trade, or improve operations for businesses across Canada.

EXAMPLE

✗ ONLY LOCAL: “That the Government of Canada create an economic development fund for [my broad business region].” (*The economic impact of this is limited.*)

✓ NATIONAL IMPACT: “That the Government of Canada, through [existing federal program/authority], [does a concrete action], to improve [national competitiveness aspect] for [broad category of businesses] across Canada.”

If your issue primarily affects your region, you should aim to nationalize it by providing evidence of how the issue affects businesses across Canada.

- (2.B) I am not asking the government to redirect resources from one group (e.g., business sector or region) to another to fund my recommendations.

EXAMPLE

✗ PITS GROUPS AGAINST EACH OTHER: “That the Government of Canada redirect funding from [Sector A] to [Sector B].”

✓ BALANCED: “That the Government of Canada establish [a program] available to [all affected sectors/regions] that [meet objective criteria].”

If implementing your recommendations could adversely impact some businesses or leave out certain regions, explain why the broader national benefit would justify the approach.

3. Timely and Actionable

What this means: Your resolution must identify an issue that **(A)** is currently adversely affecting businesses, or one has the imminent potential of doing so. Your recommendations **(B)** are specific, concrete, and directly address the issue as defined; and **(C)** can be acted upon in the near-term (i.e., one parliamentary cycle).

Why it matters: With all the time in the world, the GoC might be able to solve every problem in Canada. However, every government operates under the mentality that they will only be around for 4 years. In a majority government, things might get done quicker. In a minority government, a seemingly brilliant proposal could take years to get off the ground. By recognizing that big changes take time and are achieved incrementally, you make your recommendation(s) more appealing and increase the likelihood of implementation.

Screening Checklist

- (3.A) I have provided evidence that the issue is adversely affecting Canadian businesses at this moment, or that it has the potential to imminently develop adverse effects if left unaddressed.

If this is a **sunsetting resolution**, you should provide evidence of *what has changed* since it was originally passed, providing up-to-date data and context for why the issue continues to persist.

- (3.B) My recommendations are specific and concrete, suggesting an action with a measurable outcome, and would directly address the issue as I've defined it.

If applicable, you should explain why existing federal programs or initiatives aren't solving this problem, or why previous attempts to resolve this issue have failed and how the government could approach the issue differently.

- (3.C) My recommendations can begin or be completed within one parliamentary cycle (approximately 4 years).

EXAMPLE

✗ NOT ACTIONABLE: "That the Government of Canada address the skills gap." (*What are the conditions of the program? What can the current government do? No concrete action is proposed.*)

✓ SPECIFIC & CONCRETE: "That the Government of Canada [launch a 3-year pilot program] and [establish baseline metrics]."

If this resolution addresses a long-term challenge, your recommendations should be centered around concrete *first steps* that can start immediately (e.g., pilot programs, strategy development, regulatory changes, etc.).

4. Fundable

What this means: Your resolution must **(A)** identify a realistic funding mechanism that demonstrates alignment with an existing government funding stream or priority; or in the absence of alignment, **(B)** provide a rationale for why the government should allocate funds to address the issue (drawing from academic research, industry reports, think tanks, or other credible sources).

Why it matters: The GoC does not have unlimited resources. Every penny spent is placed under scrutiny by the rest of Parliament and the Canadian public. Spending decisions must be pragmatic and prioritize a mix of items that will generate near-term, medium-term, and long-term gains. By pointing to an existing funding source or suggesting actions that are low-cost but high impact, you greatly increase the chance that your recommendation(s) can be adopted.

Screening Checklist

- (4.A) I have identified whether my recommendation(s) requires new funding, uses existing funding, does not require funding (in the case of amending Acts), or is cost neutral (e.g., in the case where taxes generated from increased business activity would offset the costs of the program).

If new funding is required, you should (1) indicate the general scale or range of the funding (e.g., "tens of millions" or "comparable to Program X"), and (2) identify a realistic funding mechanism, such as an existing federal program, fund, or budget line.

- (4.B) I have identified how the Government of Canada has signaled interest in funding my resolution (e.g., through a mandate letter, throne speech, or federal budget). Where no government signal exists, I have provided a rationale for why the government should allocate funds to address the issue (consider academic research, industry reports, think tanks, or other credible sources).

EXAMPLE

✗ NO FUNDING DETAIL: "That the Government of Canada invest in [policy area]." (*How much? From where? This suggests no fiscal details.*)

✓ SHOWS FUNDABILITY & INTEREST: "That the Government of Canada, act on [Minister/Department]'s [year] mandate letter commitment to "[relevant priority]" and the ongoing investments through [proposed/existing program]." (*An existing program demonstrates the funding mechanism, a mandate letter is a clear government signal, and "comparable to current levels" suggests scale.*)

5. Credible

What this means: Your resolution (**A**) relies on timely data from credible sources to make sound arguments, and sources are properly cited in the footnotes. Your resolution (**B**) does not contain AI hallucinations, and any that do will be rejected.

Why it matters: Public policy decisions need to be grounded in compelling evidence and in consideration of the bigger picture. It's true that persuasive writing necessitates a degree of bias, and you won't be able to cover every perspective on an issue. Still, doing your due diligence prevents delays in considering your resolution as the receivers of your message won't have to question every statement. By relying on as much data (quantitative **and** qualitative) as possible from reputable sources and drawing cogent conclusions from said data, you greatly enhance the credibility of your resolution and make it easier for the GoC to support your recommendations.

Screening Checklist

- (5.A) I provide evidence from a minimum of one reference, published or obtained within the last 3 years, which is from a credible source (e.g., member surveys or consultations, government statistics, industry reports, peer-reviewed research, etc.).
- (5.B) I have verified that all cited facts and sources *exist*—especially if AI tools were used in drafting or research—and are appropriately cited, and I understand that failure to do so will result in my resolution being rejected by the Chamber Network Review Committee.

Guide to Footnotes

To add a footnote, go to the References tab in Word's ribbon and click the icon that says Insert Footnote.

The final National Policy Book uses a modified version of the Chicago footnote style. In general, there are two types of footnotes: full notes and short notes. The first time a source is referenced, you should always cite it using a full note. In subsequent references, you can use short notes.

EXAMPLE: FULL NOTE FOR A WHITE PAPER

Author Full Name(s), "Article Title," *Publisher*, publication/access/last modified date, URL, [page number(s)].

EXAMPLE: SHORT NOTE FOR A WHITE PAPER

Author Last Name(s), "Short Title," [page number(s)].

FORMATTING NOTES:

- Always provide either the date the source was published or last updated/modified, or, if this information's not available, the date you accessed the source.
- Always provide the specific page(s) you pulled a piece of information from, if the source has page numbers.
- Footnotes always appear outside of punctuation, after a comma, period, quotation mark, semi-colon, etc.

Below is an example of how a passage should be cited:

Immigrants are an important part of the Canadian economy. In 2020, there were approximately 474,000 immigrant-owned incorporated businesses across the country, and 342,000 unincorporated immigrant-owned businesses.¹ The total revenue of these businesses was approximately \$186 billion, adjusted for inflation in 2025.²

—

¹ Marwa Abdou and Dr. Sui Sui, "From Roots to Routes: Immigrant Entrepreneurs and How They Are Shaping Canada's Trade Future," *Business Data Lab*, published October 2025, https://businessdatalab.ca/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/BDL_Immigrant_Entrepreneurs_Report2025_EN_Final.pdf, 14.

² Abdou and Sui, "From Roots to Routes," 16.

For more information on the Chicago footnote style and how to cite other types of resources, visit: https://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools_citationguide/citation-guide-1.html.

You are **not** required to provide a bibliography with your resolution, as all your references will be captured in footnotes.

Good luck with your submission!

If you have any questions, please reach out to policyresolution@chamber.ca.

Printout: The Five Screening Criteria

1. Within Federal Jurisdiction

- (1.A) The recommendation(s) I'm suggesting can only be achieved by an act of Parliament or a federal department, independent of the provinces/territories and municipalities.
- (1.B) I have named a specific federal agency or institution that has the authority to act on my recommendations.

2. In the National Interest

- (2.A) I have provided evidence of how the issue affects businesses nationally and my recommendations, if implemented, would increase competitiveness, facilitate trade, or improve operations for businesses across Canada.
- (2.B) I am not asking the GoC to redirect resources from one group (e.g., business sector or region) to another to fund my recommendations without significant justification.

3. Timely and Actionable

- (3.A) I have provided evidence that the issue is adversely affecting Canadian businesses at this moment, or that it has the potential to imminently develop adverse effects if left unaddressed.
- (3.B) My recommendations are specific and concrete, suggesting an action with a measurable outcome, and would directly address the issue as I've defined it.
- (3.C) My recommendation(s) can begin or be completed within one parliamentary cycle (approximately 4 years).

4. Fundable

- (4.A) I have identified whether my recommendation(s) requires new funding, uses existing funding, does not require funding (in the case of amending laws), or is cost neutral (e.g., in the case where taxes generated from increased business activity would offset the costs of the program).
- (4.B) I have identified how the Government of Canada has signaled interest in funding my resolution (e.g., through a mandate letter, throne speech, or federal budget). Where no government signal exists, I have provided a rationale for why the government should allocate funds to address the issue (academic research, industry reports, think tanks, or other credible sources).

5. Credible

- (5.A) I provide evidence from a minimum of one reference, which was published or obtained within the last 3 years, from a credible source (e.g., member surveys or consultations, government statistics, industry reports, peer-reviewed research, etc.).
- (5.B) I have verified that all cited facts and sources *exist*—especially if AI tools were used in drafting or research—and are appropriately cited, and I understand that failure to do so will result in my resolution being rejected by the Chamber Network Review Committee.