20th July 2011

Mr David Richmond
HSS Review
hss.performance.review@immi.gov.au

SCOA Submission to the HSS Review

Dear Mr Richmond,

The Settlement Council of Australia (SCOA) is pleased to have the opportunity to respond to the Terms of Reference and the associated Themes and Key Issues document in relation to the 'External Review of Humanitarian Settlement Services (HSS) Performance Measures and Contract Management'.

The Settlement Council of Australia (SCOA) represents the broad network of migrant resource centres (MRC) and settlement agencies around Australia. In preparing for this submission SCOA has been informed by consultations with members on HSS and our knowledge of HSS issues within the sector, as informed by ongoing communication with our members. We note that the HSS is very new, having rolled out nationally in April this year, with a combination of existing IHSS providers and new providers securing HSS contracts. As such comments may also relate partially to historical issues and perspectives in relation to the IHSS. SCOA's consultation agenda was designed with this in mind, soliciting feedback from members on historical and current perspectives in relation to the IHSS and the shifts in service delivery and contract management present in the HSS. SCOA feels that member's historical knowledge and expertise in relation to IHSS is valuable and also relevant to this review.

As mentioned at our meeting in person on the 5th July, one of the findings of our consultations has been that feedback on the contract management of HSS is not consistent across the country. There are regional variations in the perspectives of SCOA members in relation to HSS. This submission will comment on universal findings as far as possible, noting where variations exist without identifying specific locations.

The review comes at a difficult time for the sector. Many agencies had very short lead times between contract signing and service delivery, which put considerable pressure on agencies. This pressure was amplified by very high numbers of referrals in the initial weeks of service delivery. In addition, transition issues were experienced by agencies gearing up for service delivery or winding down service provision (depending on whether they were successful or not), or transitioning an existing service to the new model of service delivery.

SCOA also included in our consultation feedback from members on how HSS relates to the broader settlement sector, as the links between HSS, SGP, AMEP and now AUSCO (cultural orientation) are also important. The settlement pathways refugees and

humanitarian entrants follow are not necessary linear, and also do not necessarily fit into the timeframes associated with funded settlement services. The HSS is designed as a holistic service, however it naturally connects to a wide range of mainstream and associated settlement services.

Here follows SCOA's response to the specific terms of reference:

Address and respond to key performance indicators to effectively monitor performance of service providers in delivering the services specified in their contracts

The HSS contract is more flexible than the previous contracts under the IHSS framework, with significant positive improvements in scope, and the focus on youth. The Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) in the new contract are very detailed. Health issues are addressed more effectively in the new contract, however the service delivery model still places a great deal of expectation on the Case Manager. The Case Manager is responsible for managing the settlement process of refugees and humanitarian entrants, a role which includes tasks such as initial health assessments and more general settlement orientation.

Members commented on the need for flexibility within the contract to address any future changes in settlement demographics, which may have particularly crucial impacts on areas such as housing. During the period of the IHSS service providers found that the demographics in arrival and refugee settlement trends shifted considerably from large families to single men, notwithstanding additional changes in countries of origin. Providers are well aware that such changes are part of the broader refugee and humanitarian program and its inherent necessary responsiveness to changing situations internationally. It is important that contract management provisions reflect this responsiveness also.

Accommodation was raised as a specific concern, with clarification sought on accommodation standards. The accommodation model put forward in the HSS contracts needs to be appropriate to local situations, which vary significantly. Housing affordability is a challenge across the country, with different pressures and issues in metropolitan and regional areas experienced. This issue is particularly acute for single people who want to live alone, as affordable housing for singles on a Centrelink benefit is not available (anywhere).

Provide quality assurance processes that allow the Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIAC) to have confidence in the delivery of services

Members commented that at this point in time they were unclear about what quality assurance processes were part of the HSS contract. In the IHSS contract an audit approach to quality assurance had been undertaken.

Concern was raised about retrospective implementation of quality assurance within contracts.

Contain reporting processes appropriate to collect sufficient information throughout the life of the contract to assess and validate the achievement of outcomes defined by the performance indicators

The reporting frameworks within the HSS contracts are very detailed, and operate oriented towards DIAC systems, not those of service providers. As a result it is not always easy for

service providers to integrate their contract management reporting within internal reporting structures. This can create duplication of systems and add to cost and inefficiencies for service providers. There are also significant differences within the reporting frameworks for different DIAC funded programs, for example OSCAR reporting under the SGP is quite different to the HEMS reporting under the HSS. Agencies are often providing services under both programs so have to implement different internal management systems to comply with the related grant and contract reporting requirements. Agencies need to track invoicing milestones within HEMS and their own systems to ensure that they are charging correctly for services delivered. Cross-checking data between systems can be time consuming.

Members also expressed concern that reporting formats and templates were not available till after the contracts were signed, resulting in agencies being unclear as to what they were agreeing to, which also impacted planning (and has associated cost implications).

The Case Management Plan templates in the contract are quite prescriptive, and do not acknowledge agency expertise in case management (a key requirement of the contract). A national case management model overrides region specific knowledge and agency expertise and processes. It also orients service provision towards a form oriented tick box approach to settlement, which is not ideal.

Some members commented on the contract management approach by DIAC staff. This was not a universal comment. It was felt that in some areas DIAC have greater resources invested in contract management, and that consequently contract management staff spend time requesting clarification on details in reports, with minor queries taking significant time for contractors to address, time which could be better spent on service delivery (particularly given the challenges of high referral numbers and service transition).

Provide early alert to emerging issues and risks

Members felt that the existing frameworks within the contract provided early alert to emerging issues. In general the contract management in HSS is quite close, so early alert to issues are addressed within the flow of routine contract management. In addition there are structures in place which can provide important mechanisms to track emerging issues, in particular the Local Area Coordination (LAC) meetings. LAC is also important as it limits the silo affect that can occur within the HSS, as it provides a structural link to services and community members outside the direct HSS service. The LAC structure is also responsive to regional variations, and needs to retain this flexibility to remain relevant to each region.

In some regions there is a lack of clarity around membership and ownership of Local Area Coordination meetings. Some members expressed concern that it is not up to DIAC to approve or reject membership in the LAC or LAC meeting agendas, given that LAC meetings relate to issues relating to HSS and beyond. There is also a shift being experienced in some regions where contractors are now responsible for sharing information on broad settlement trends to the sector, it was felt that this responsibility should remain with DIAC, as services are responding to referrals from DIAC, and DIAC has access to primary information on referral trends and numbers.

Ensure that DIAC's contract management framework enables issues to be addressed in a timely manner or, where appropriate, escalated.

Contract management approaches differ across the country. Members commented on the tension in contract management between Central Office and the various State and Territory Offices. As mentioned above, in some areas the DIAC HSS Contract Management Teams are intensively staffed, resulting in contractors needing to also intensively contract manage to respond to the range of inquiries (effectively servicing the DIAC contract managers).

A broader concern in relation to contract management expressed by members was that the contract management approach is driven by fear, tending towards micro-management as a result. Micro-management of the HSS contracts is not informed by understanding of 'settlement' as process, but rather a narrow reading of the letter of the contract. Current contract management relationships between DIAC and contractors are held together by relationships established in past, but this is not sustainable.

Members commented that on occasion referrals necessitated dealing with up to six different DIAC officials and teams in some cases, with each having different approaches to contract management. This displays a lack of coordination from DIAC which agencies need to factor into their management of referrals.

Specific comments were received in relation to Client Case Visits in some locations, where houses had been visited twice, adding to the time required to arrange visits for providers. Providers would also like to receive feedback on the outcome of Client Case Visits.

General challenges impacting service provision

Members commented on general issues in relation to HSS which impacted on service provision, planning and contract management. Some comments were covered in the introduction but are summarised under broad headings here in the interests of clarity:

Planning, numbers and notice:

The large and fluctuating numbers of arrivals (in some cases 1000% increase during transition period) had significant impact on agencies. That service delivery continued to be provided to a high standard during the transition period is a testament to the dedication of the providers and their staff, not to the structural supports provided by the contractual framework. Providers are also often having to provide services at very short notice, which has direct implications for agencies in terms staffing, and also significant impacts on flow on related services such as accommodation.

Providers receive very little information on arrivals, which is particularly concerning in relation to health issues, but also has impacts on case management planning. Service provision would be improved if providers had clear information on any pre-existing health conditions, levels of English and education attainment levels of arrivals.

Regional settlement is difficult in some cases as arrivals have connections to friends and family in metropolitan areas and do not stay long in the primary settlement region. While freedom of movement and location is clearly an important human right which providers support, new arrivals moving rapidly has significant implications for service provision, service duplication and supporting overall settlement support for refugees and humanitarian entrants. (See also the report on Settlement Mobility attached to this submission for a more detailed examination of this issue).

Settlement Planning Committees are closed to provider representatives in some regions. This limits the capacity of HSS Providers to provide meaningful input into settlement planning, an area that they feel they can contribute positively to.

Transition process

As mentioned above, the transition timeframe was very short, and characterised by high referral numbers. This was complicated by difficulties with staffing in some areas, as staff moved from old to new providers. Competition has an impact on relationships in sector, which need to be re-built after providers become established in the new contracts. Links to other services are also impacted by contract transitions and the related level of change experienced in the sector.

HSS/IHSS

Within the consultation members commented on the improvements in the HSS from the IHSS, namely:

- o Smaller, more logical regions
- o Enhanced case management
- o Greater focus on orientation program, and acknowledgement that material covered in the orientation program needs to be repeated over a period of time
- o Youth needs specifically addressed

Conclusion:

Providers are working hard, under difficult conditions, to continue to provide excellent settlement services under the HSS. To help providers in their work it would be ideal if providers could be given earlier and more detailed information on arrivals. A contract management approach which focuses on the overarching outcome of settlement, rather than the detail focus on specific KPIs would assist providers in working with DIAC to achieve positive settlement outcomes.

If you would like any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Sky de Jersey
EO

Attachments: Agenda SCOA HSS Review Consultations
              Settlement Policy Network – Settlement and Mobility Report, June 1, 2011

Settlement Council of Australia

Suite 333
410 Elizabeth Street
Surry Hills NSW 2010

p: 02 8065 5225
f: 02 9281 7741
e: info@scoa.org.au
w: www.scoa.org.au

SCOA HSS Review Consultations

Thursday 30ᵗʰ June, 2-3.30pm

Agenda:

1. Welcome and introductions (5 mins)
2. Discussion on best/worst elements of IHSS historically (10 mins)
3. Discussion on best/worst elements of HSS (10 mins)
4. Experiences and discussion regarding DIAC contract management of HSS (15 mins)
5. Discussion on reporting frameworks within HSS (15 mins)
6. Discussion on emerging issues within HSS (10 mins)
7. Discussion on links between HSS, SGP and other services (10 mins)
8. Next steps (5 mins)

NATIONAL SETTLEMENT POLICY NETWORK

Settlement and mobility:

Exploring models of support and challenges faced by recently arrived refugees who move to secondary settlement locations

---

REPORT

BACKGROUND

The movement of refugee and humanitarian entrants from one location to another in their early stages of settlement presents a series of challenges for individuals, communities and service providers. This teleconference explored the implications of inter- or intra-state mobility and refugee settlement, with presentations and discussion focussing on the following questions:

1. After settling in Australia, where are newly arrived refugee communities moving to and from (current trends)?
2. Why do people move to secondary settlement locations (push/pull factors)?
3. What are the challenges for refugee individuals and communities who move inter- or intra-state?
4. What are the challenges for service providers in meeting the needs of refugee individuals and communities who have moved from another region or state in their first five years of settlement?
5. What are examples of support that have worked well in secondary settlement locations?
6. What needs to happen to better support the settlement needs of recently arrived refugee and humanitarian entrants who move inter- and intra-state?

SETTLEMENT POLICY NETWORK TELECONFERENCE

The National Settlement Policy Network teleconference was held on Wednesday 1st June 2011 and involved participants dialling in from hubs in ACT, New South Wales, Northern Territory, Queensland, South Australia, Victoria and Western Australia. Presenters included:

- Vincent Giuca, Refugee Support Branch, Department of Immigration and Citizenship
- Michael Krafft and Tejal Thanki, ACCES Services (QLD);
- Paul Kyaw, Multicultural Services Centre of Western Australia (WA)
- Anni Gallagher, Orange City Council (NSW)

OBSERVATIONS AND ISSUES RAISED

The following observations and issues were raised by presenters and discussion participants, and from feedback provided by participants after the teleconference. Issues have been grouped by theme.

Background and definitions

- Secondary settlement refers to people relocating from their original on-arrival settlement location to another place within their first five years after arriving in Australia.
- Feedback received by RCOA after the teleconference raised concerns about the label "secondary settlement", as often people can and do move multiple times and settlement is a dynamic process. It was suggested that "relocation" is a better term.
- Humanitarian entrants on permanent visas are like any permanent resident; they are free to move. Clients who exit Humanitarian Settlement Services (HSS) are like any other Australian; they can and do relocate.
- One participant raised the question of why we needed data on the mobility of humanitarian entrants as we don't track any other permanent residents i.e. why is this an issue? Discussion followed about the need to understand settlement and mobility trends better to enable better planning of services. For example, services had difficulty responding to community needs in the case of the spontaneous relocation of ~500 Sudanese community members from the City of Greater Dandenong to Latrobe Valley in Victoria. Another example cited was the spontaneous relocation of mainly Afghan and Tamil single men from Brisbane to Rockhampton in Queensland. Local services struggled to get a handle on how to respond and there were no IHSS or SGP providers in Rockhampton at the time.
- Feedback from the teleconference also highlighted concerns about how people are defined and labelled. Examples given included using the terms "IMAs" (Irregular Maritime Arrivals), "migrants" and "refugees" interchangeably, as well as using terms such as "ex-detainees" and "multicultural people". There is a need for consideration of how service providers and advocates label people and the potential impact of our language.

Data

- It is hard to find accurate statistics on the mobility trends of recently arrived humanitarian entrants as existing data sources all have limitations.
- The 2011 Census could provide the most up-to-date and accurate data when released.
- The Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIAC) uses the Humanitarian Entrants Management System (HEMS) database for HSS providers to track clients, but this is not set up as a tool for analysing mobility trends and tracks only HSS clients. Clients are not required to provide updated contact details to DIAC post-HSS.
- The online DIAC Settlement Reporting database (http://www.immi.gov.au/settlement/) provides longer-term data on refugee entrants, but has limitations as it is only up-to-date if people update their address with Medicare.
- Settlement Grants Program (SGP) providers do not track individual clients.
- Centrelink data is available on request and can be a good source of data, but will not capture all humanitarian entrants as they need to be getting income support to be included in the Centrelink database.

Current trends

- DIAC tries to place people where they have links, and if they do not have links, where they can be 'at home'. However, people still move to be closer to friends/family/community or for employment, housing or lifestyle reasons.
- It is estimated that humanitarian entrants settling through the offshore program do not move that much in the first five years (5%?), however there is much higher mobility among

humanitarian entrants who are granted permanent protection onshore (particularly Afghan and Tamil community).

- Some recently arrived humanitarian entrants relocate multiple times.
- In areas of spontaneous settlement, the community can be quite fluid. In Orange, for example, there has been an ebb and flow in the size of the Sudanese community. People sometimes stay for only a short time and then disappear.

Push/pull factors

- Pull: In Queensland, service providers found there was lots of interest from HSS clients to relocate to regional areas, particularly those who come from rural backgrounds (e.g. Burmese), because of the lifestyle and familiarity with agricultural labour market.
- Pull: The economic boom in Queensland and demand for labour in regional areas as drawn people to regional areas for work.
- Pull: In the case of former detainees, finding employment is a priority and they will relocate to where jobs are.
- Push/Pull: One community member highlighted that we are social animals, and that people want to live near their friends and family. Even if there are great employment opportunities and housing in a settlement location, people will be drawn and relocate to where they find their community.
- Push/Pull: The availability of affordable housing can be a key reason behind relocation.
- Push: Some humanitarian entrants find there is a lack of opportunities in urban areas.
- Push: In larger cities, some new arrivals find it harder to integrate. People from rural backgrounds feel like 'uninvited guests' in big cities.

Challenges for individuals/communities

- One community member suggested that if the local community is welcoming, new settlers will be happy and are more likely to stay.
- The bigger the family, the harder it is to relocate. One participant felt that people considering relocation should be encouraged to first visit an area before deciding to move.
- People think the grass is greener, but sometimes don't realise the implications of relocation. For example, if they move they cannot get another allocation of household goods.
- Sometimes people expect the same services to be available when they relocate when in reality there are not (e.g. there are Dinka language aides in some Sydney schools, but not in Orange).
- New arrivals moving to remote areas with limited English can make them vulnerable. There needs to be appropriate opportunities for people to learn English – particularly workplace-specific English for mature age people with limited education. For example, if someone is a carpenter, they can find it difficult to work even though the tools are the same. If there is opportunity for them to learn on-the-job English relevant to their industry, they can be productive members of the community.
- Transport is an issue, particularly in regional and rural locations where some secondary settlement is happening. New arrivals need help to get a driver's licence in these areas.
- Not all regional areas provide employment opportunities and there needs to be targeted assistance for people to find work. For example, in Orange, some of the community that relocated from Sydney have not been successful in finding employment after a number of years, even though they have participated in lots of training.
- Where people relocate and do not find appropriate support, there is the potential of exploitation by unscrupulous employers.

Challenges for service providers

- There is no funding within Job Services Australia to support the relocation of people – in this case, humanitarian entrants – to areas with labour shortages.

- In the case of spontaneous settlement in Rockhampton, the local council and services felt unprepared and had little experience working with and welcoming people from diverse cultural backgrounds. The new settlers in the area were 'highly visible' and the (negative) behaviour of some individuals was generalised to the whole community (e.g. Afghan Muslims).
- Local councils want to be involved, but often don't know how to get involved.
- In the case of planned secondary settlement, there needs to be recognition and awareness of the history of local settlement. The reaction of local communities can be negative if they associate new arrivals with previous negative experiences. It is important to get local community and leaders involved and on board (e.g. Tamworth settlement experience divided the community).

What works well

- Pre-movement investment in raising awareness within local communities where relocation of humanitarian entrants is planned.
- Ensuring there are established links to schools, housing and employment before planned relocation.
- Equipping new arrivals with information and confidence to be able to make informed decisions about relocation (i.e. the grass is not always greener).
- Direct regional settlement can work well for some families that come from rural backgrounds (i.e. so they are not relocating after arriving).
- Coordination of services – in the case of Orange in NSW, housing, education, council and other services came together to form the Orange Multicultural Network to plan services and response to the spontaneous settlement of Sudanese community members which started around December 2005.
- Capacity building – providing education/training to services and the local community in the context of new people relocating to an area. For example, encouraging services to use interpreters and take on cultural competency training.
- Partnership is key in regional areas.
- Community development approach – bringing new settlers together with others in the local community (e.g. drumming and singing has brought people together in Orange and can be a non-threatening way of educating the local community); providing opportunities for new settlers to come together and support each other (e.g. sport and recreation programs for young people, mother's groups, mentoring).
- Flexible funding to respond to mobile populations with settlement needs.
- Families moving together or being able to reunite is more likely to lead to sustainable settlement in regional areas.
- Importance of buy-in from local community, leaders, employers and other stakeholders.

Program responses

- Some changes from IHSS to HSS mean there is more flexibility for services to respond to clients who relocate. Case management plans through HEMS can be shared between service providers in cases where clients move. Although HSS services cannot be duplicated, clients can access entitlements they have not already accessed from different providers in the case of relocation.
- ACCES Services' Rural Employment Assistance Program (REAP) – funded through the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) and aimed at supporting the planned relocation of humanitarian entrants from Brisbane to Biloela, and to respond to the spontaneous settlement of humanitarian entrants in Rockhampton. The project has just been evaluated and could be a model for replication in other areas.
- In Orange, services have developed a pilot Certificate II 'Life in Australia' which is a pathway to employment. The pilot is an 18 week course and a recognised activity for JobStart.

Recommendations

- Need for leadership from Federal Government on how to embed local government in settlement services (see Municipal Association of Victoria (MAV) submission in references below).
- In cases of planned secondary settlement, services need to ensure there are clear pathways into employment and stable housing.
- Need to ensure HSS and SGP funding is flexible and can respond to spontaneous settlement patterns.
- Need to ensure young people moving for employment reasons soon after arrival are able to access appropriate education and English opportunities. In particular, Afghan and Tamil young men who are working six days a week are not accessing English classes; Need to make sure there is flexible delivery of Adult Migrant English Program (AMEP) in these areas.

NEXT STEPS

- Follow-up suggestions and comments from this teleconference should be forwarded to Louise Olliff in RCOA's Melbourne office, settlement@refugeecouncil.org.au
- We welcome comments and suggestions for topics for future Settlement Policy Network teleconferences, which RCOA/SCOA will be holding quarterly.

SCOA AND RCOA UPDATE

- RCOA member bulletin has just been released. More information about what RCOA has been up to and can be viewed at: www.refugeecouncil.org.au/news/bulletins.php
- *2011 Refugee Conference: Looking to the Future, Learning from the Past*, to be held 14-17 June in Sydney, and marks the 60th anniversary of the Refugee Convention. More information ca be found: http://refugeeconf2011.arts.unsw.edu.au/
- Refugee Week is 19-25 June – the theme is 'Freedom from Fear'. Posters designed by Shaun Tan are available for pick-up (see www.refugeeweek.org.au/resources/poster.php). For more information and to register your Refugee Week event, go to: www.refugeeweek.org.au.
- SCOA's draft strategic plan has been the subject of recent consultations, the final Strategic Plan will be ready shortly and will be circulated.
- SCOA would like to introduce their new Membership Services Officer, Laura Anderson.

FURTHER READING AND RESOURCES

Casey, S. (2011). *Reaping the Benefits of Migrant Settlement Planning and Co-ordination: An evaluation of the Rural Employment Assistance Program,* **ACCES Services, Queensland**
An evaluation of the REAP Program will be available on the ACCES Services website shortly (go to www.asi.org.au) or email annieh@asi.org.au to request a copy.

IBIS – Integration: Building Inclusive Societies
This "on-line community" is a relatively new resource showcasing international good practice around local migrant and refugee settlement and social inclusion projects. IBIS is a joint project of the United Nations Alliance of Civilizations (UNAOC) in partnership with the International Organization for Migration (IOM). UNAOC are currently in discussions with a range of organisations (including DIAC, SCoA, RCOA & MAV) to plan an IBIS regional launch and a one day forum in Melbourne on 7 October 2011.
www.unaoc.org/communities/migrationintegration/

LEAD – Locally Embracing & Accepting Diversity
Currently, there are two demonstration pilots in the City of Whittlesea and the Greater City of Shepparton. These involve the development of locally-based responses, all aimed at increasing acceptance of diversity and reducing discrimination. These responses will include a range of different approaches such as community awareness, community development, and supporting organisations with training and other resources.
www.vichealth.vic.gov.au/Programs-and-Projects/Freedom-from-discrimination/Localities-Embracing-and-Accepting-Diversity.aspx.
http://www.unaoc.org/ibis/2011/05/27/localities-embracing-and-accepting-diversity-lead-program/

Melbourne University ARC Linkage Project – Visible Migrants and Refugees in Rural and Regional Australia
Three-year project aims to examine the interrelated social, economic and political factors that shape the resettlement experiences of recent visible migrants and refugees who live primarily in rural and regional Victoria.
www.ssps.unimelb.edu.au/research/projects/vmr

Municipal Association of Victoria (2011). *Submission to the Federal Parliamentary Inquiry into Multiculturalism.*
The MAV has lodged a submission to the *Inquiry into Multiculturalism in Australia* and includes recommendations on involving local councils in settlement.
www.mav.asn.au/CA256C320013CB4B/All/934835C60BCC8E1ACA2578A00019CFF5/$file/Multiculturalism%20Inquiry%20Submission%203.pdf

National Working Group on Small Centre Strategies (2007). *Attracting and Retaining Immigrants: A toolbox of ideas for small centres***, Inter-Cultural Association of Greater Victoria, Canada.**
http://integration-net.ca/english/ini/wci-idca/tbo/EN_Toolbox.pdf

Refugee and Immigration Legal Service (2011). *Family Reunion under the Humanitarian Program: Guide for Migration Agents and Volunteers***, RAILS, Brisbane.**
RAILS have developed a resource for volunteers assisting people who are applying to bring family members to Australia under the offshore Humanitarian Program, and particularly as 'immediate family' members ('split family' applications). The plain English guide is designed for use by registered migration agents; community volunteers assisting in form-filling; and as a 'self-help' kit for those able to prepare their own applications.
www.rails.org.au/education/RefugeeFamilyReunionGuide.pdf

RRAC/RCOA (2010). Annotated bibliography of *Regional Settlement Reports*
www.refugeecouncil.org.au/docs/current/Regional_Settlmt_bibliography.pdf

Shepley, C. (2007). *Regional Settlement in Australia: Research into the settlement experience of humanitarian entrants in regional Australia, 2006-07,* **DIAC**
www.immi.gov.au/living-in-australia/delivering-assistance/government-programs/settlement-planning/_pdf/evaluation-regional-settlement-australia.pdf

Taylor-Neumann, L. V. N . and Balasingam (2009). *Sustaining Settlement in Murray Bridge, South Australia,* **Lutheran Community Care**
www.murraybridge.sa.gov.au/webdata/resources/files/Sustaining_Settlement_in_Murray_Bridge.pdf

Victorian Settlement Planning Committee (2009). *Drivers and success factors in regional refugee settlement***, VSPC, Melbourne.**
www.cmy.net.au/Assets/1148/1/DriversandsuccessfactorsforRuralVIC-VSPC2009.pdf