



National
LIP
Secretariat

A network of Local Immigration Partnerships



Michael Haan
Consulting, Inc.

The Crucial Role that Local Immigration Partnerships Play in Recent Humanitarian Operations

By Michael Haan (PI), PhD

Dale Ballucci, PhD

Meyer Burstein

Douglas Olthof, PhD

Jennie Choi

Lindsay Finlay, MA

Yuchen Li, MA

Ina Palii, MA

Funded by:

Financé par :



Immigration, Refugees
and Citizenship Canada

Immigration, Réfugiés
et Citoyenneté Canada

1. Executive Summary

In recent years, many refugees have come to Canada from Afghanistan, Syria, and the Ukraine. Canada's history of welcoming refugees is a testament to its commitment to humanitarian values and a willingness to help those in need. The Syrian, Afghan, and Ukrainian refugee crises are just a few examples of the many instances where Canada has opened its doors to provide asylum seekers with either a temporary haven or a chance to build an entirely new life.

Organizing and coordinating the components required to integrate displaced persons is a tremendous amount of work. Local Immigration Partnerships (LIPs) across Canada can and, in many cases, do form a critical part of the 'machinery' that provides rapid-response coordination of services. Local Immigration Partnerships (LIPs) are collaborations funded by Immigration, Refugees, and Citizenship Canada (IRCC)¹ to coordinate local community stakeholders in a community partnership model and are designed to:

- 1) Engage service provider organizations (SPOs) and other institutions in fostering a systematic approach to supporting newcomers.
- 2) Support community-based knowledge-sharing and local strategic planning.
- 3) Improve coordination of effective services that facilitate immigrant settlement and integration.

This report details the range of activities LIPs have engaged in to support large-scale humanitarian resettlement initiatives, the efficacy of those efforts, and the conditions that shaped both the choice of activities and their efficacy. The report will identify a subset of activities that LIPs have engaged in most effectively and describe the conditions that contributed to their success. It will also identify areas where LIPs were less effective and detail the challenges that either constrained LIP engagement or inhibited its effectiveness. This report aims to understand how to improve the integration of refugees and displaced persons and learn from previous efforts so that we can be better prepared for future mass arrivals.

The call for proposals by the National LIP Secretariat to examine the ***role of LIPs in large-scale humanitarian (re)settlement efforts*** requested research that answered four closely related questions:

- (a) Under what conditions are LIPs best placed to succeed?
- (b) In what spheres of activity have LIPs proved to be most effective?
- (c) What was the range and efficacy of LIP activities?
- (d) What partnerships underpinned the work of LIPs?

This report answers these four questions using administrative data analysis, surveys, focus groups, and an analysis of strategic mandates.

We also offer a series of recommendations for individual LIPs, Immigration, Refugees, and Citizenship Canada (IRCC), and the National LIP Secretariat.

¹ Many LIPs receiving additional funding from other sources, but all receive core funding from IRCC.

We recommend a broader dissemination of promising practices for individual LIPs and those who see refugee resettlement as part of their mandate. Too often, it seems, LIPs operate largely in their own microsphere, and enhancing social connectivity across LIPs could help mutual learning. This is not intended to remove individual LIP autonomy but is instead aimed at helping LIPs learn from each other. Many coordinators found our LIP survey to be helpful, because it allowed them to see what other LIPs are doing. This also helps LIPs demonstrate their value.

Although the environment in which each LIP operates will differ, there are some common themes that LIPs should consider. First, health care is a recurring issue with refugees, and is something that LIPs should be mindful of. Some refugees come to Canada after spending months, even years, in refugee camps, and often come to Canada with significant medical needs. This could include dental and eye care.

Refugees also need an acceptable place to live, and this is an area where LIPs can be very helpful. Housing in Canada is expensive, and too often refugees struggle in the housing market with little guidance.

Each wave of refugees also has distinct needs. For some, for example, knowledge of English or French may be a barrier, whereas for others acute mental health needs may surface as a dominant issue. The flexibility of LIPs to attract the required member agencies can be an ideal solution to the dynamic needs of incoming cohorts. Some LIPs have multiple standing committees, which is helpful for selecting the required services.

For IRCC, the main recommendations are as follows. First, IRCC should identify the role, if any, that they expect LIPs to play in humanitarian resettlement. That is not to say that IRCC needs to be prescriptive, but several LIP coordinators expressed a general concern that they lacked guidance when it came to resettlement. Often, this produced delays in service coordination because LIPs were not aware of incoming cohorts of refugees and what their role could/should be in this resettlement.

An extension of this is that IRCC should help develop a crisis response framework to help LIPs understand their role in resettlement. The need for a framework is especially important given the high levels of turnover within several LIPs.

As the primary funder of the iCARE-IMDB, a linked dataset containing settlement service, landing records, and tax data, IRCC could also consider including a field that would allow the possibility of identifying if a settlement service was connected to a broader, LIP-led settlement strategy. As it currently stands, it is very difficult to measure the important contributions that LIPs make in coordinating services.

In many instances, one year is not enough for an individual refugee or family to achieve successful settlement in Canada. This is particularly true with respect to addressing trauma-related mental health issues or when employment opportunities are scarce. IRCC should

therefore consider reevaluating the one-year period of additional settlement support under the Government Assisted and Privately Sponsored Refugee programs.

For the LIP secretariat, there are several important recommendations. As the primary advocate for individual LIPs, it is likely that the Secretariat will be involved in some capacity with implementing all of the above recommendations. Additionally, however, the LIP secretariat can help individual LIPs, particularly those with high levels of turnover, by providing guidance, professional development, and information about the best practices of other LIPs. This needn't be prescriptive but would instead help LIPs acquire the information they feel they need when needed.

Another role the LIP secretariat could play is to initiate a discussion around location-specific information about services and supports in a given community. Refugees often arrive without a clear sense of what services are available and what they are eligible for.

This report and the recommendations contained within it have been developed with the intent of laying the groundwork for a collaborative conversation including LIPs, their partners and IRCC. It is our hope that this research will contribute to improved outcomes for the refugees and displaced persons who will land in Canada in the coming years as well as for the communities that will receive them.

2. Overview

Over the past 15 years, Local Immigration Partnerships (LIPs), which are government-funded, community based strategic planning bodies focused on immigrant and refugee settlement and integration, have played a significant role in three major humanitarian operations: Operation Syrian Refugee, Operation Afghan Safety, and Operation Ukrainian Safe Haven. This report presents results from research that investigates the range of activities LIPs have engaged in and the partnerships that sustained those efforts. This broad-based research identifies the spheres of activity in which LIPs have been most effective and the conditions under which LIPs have been best placed to succeed in this work.

It is important to note that the purpose of LIPS is **not** to provide direct services to newcomers. Instead, LIPs provide support to an array of partners through a secretariat housed in a local organization such as a regional or municipal administration, a settlement agency, or another community organization. LIPs include many different types of organizations amongst their membership, such as settlement agencies, municipalities and other levels of government, school boards, employers, health care providers, universities, civil society groups, police services, ethnic or religious organizations, and others.² The interconnection with varying services and agencies creates great potential for LIPs to play a significant and important role in the integration of refugees and displaced persons.

Even though LIPs don't deliver direct services, it is difficult to imagine Canada welcoming waves of refugees without them. LIPs have become a global model of coordinating services to address newcomers' diverse needs, and they advance Canada's track record as a leader in the orchestration and delivery of immigrant settlement services.

This report presents results from a multi-method research strategy designed to measure the impact of LIPs on recent waves of refugee resettlement. First, we use immigrant settlement service data linked to immigrant landing and tax records to measure refugee characteristics, including location within Canada and retention in initial destinations. Second, we present results from a series of focus groups with refugees connected to three recent large-scale resettlement initiatives. These focus groups help clarify the range of challenges experienced by humanitarian arrivals and the sources of support they either relied on or found wanting. We then shift focus to the approaches LIPs took (or did not take) to support humanitarian resettlement in their communities.

This investigation begins with a summary overview of LIP mandates and strategic plans, with an eye to identifying the level of involvement (if any) that LIPs see as their responsibility. Our study continues with the analysis of responses to a purpose-built comprehensive survey of LIP coordinators that was designed to measure the level of LIP involvement in coordinating refugee resettlement efforts. Finally, we analyze responses to semi-structured interviews with LIP coordinators, heads of settlement service provider organizations (SPOs) and other LIP partners. These interviews provide a more detailed and nuanced perspective from a representative sample of 12 LIPs from across Canada. This 'quadrangulation' of methodologies helps us detail

² Adapted from <http://p2pcanada.ca/files/2014/07/Local-Immigration-Partnerships-Outcomes-2008-2013.pdf>

the many roles that LIPs play in rapid-response resettlement, particularly as they pertain to Afghan, Syrian, and Ukrainian refugees, three recent cohorts of refugees/displaced persons that fled to Canada with short notice. The report concludes with a number of recommendations directed to IRCC, the National LIP Secretariat and individual LIPs.

3. Project Methodologies

Local Immigration Partnerships promote a more holistic and better-coordinated response framework by engaging with governments, quasi-public institutions, not-for-profits (including IRCC-funded settlement agencies), the private sector and local communities to generate a community-wide strategy for immigrant and refugee integration. In executing these responsibilities, many LIPs played a significant role in three major humanitarian operations: Operation Syrian Refugee, Operation Afghan Safety, and Operation Ukrainian Safe Haven. The research project examines the range and effectiveness of the efforts to help settle refugees and seeks to attribute their achievements and failures to the structures and relationships that were built, the resources that were mobilized, the planning mechanisms that were activated, and the measures and activities that were undertaken.

LIPs work by creating, activating, and maintaining numerous multi-faceted partnerships. Hence, this report focuses on determining the efficacy of different approaches to creating, growing, managing and coordinating the relationships and activities that comprise the LIP partnerships. In the conclusion, we also move to identify promising practices and assess the nimbleness of LIPs to shift response characteristics according to refugee movements (characterized by different circumstances, endowments, receptivity and, possibly, mobility patterns). We also shed light on the circumstances and behaviours where LIPs have been less effective and how response performance might be enhanced, keeping in mind that each LIP has different capacities, levels of community engagement, funding structures, and mandates as it pertains to refugee resettlement. One of the biggest attributes of LIPs is their ability to harness local resources to fulfill their mandates, and this report seeks to celebrate this diversity.

To address the various research questions raised in the Call for Proposals, we employ a combination of administrative data, surveys, content analysis, interviews, and refugee focus group analysis to provide a multifaceted and multi-perspective view on refugee integration. We outline these methodologies in greater detail below.

a. Statistical Analysis of Administrative Data

One of the unique components of our evaluation framework is the analysis of administrative data files that contain information on refugee characteristics and selected outcomes. We use the Immigration Contribution Agreement Reporting Environment (iCARE), a dataset that contain information on settlement service delivery, linked to the Longitudinal Immigration Database (IMDB) to identify where humanitarian entrants in Canada live, the types of services they receive, and if these services enhance retention and selected labour market outcomes. Through a special arrangement with the Longitudinal Data on Immigration and Veteran Section of Statistics Canada, our team is one of very few that work with these data to identify settlement services' effect on refugee outcomes.

For this portion of the project, iCARE-IMDB was converted to a hierarchical dataset with different levels. The first level contained individual-level information (admission category, age, sex, country of origin, and postal code of residence). This allowed us to identify Syrian and

Afghan refugees and track their settlement service usage, employment outcomes, and retention in the jurisdiction of the initial settlement. Please note that this analysis component could not identify if refugees actually interacted with LIPs, but we instead identified outcomes in jurisdictions where there is an active LIP (which was nearly all areas where refugees settled).

The analysis focused on identifying the contextual characteristics that impact resettlement success (defined through employment outcomes and retention). Some factors we could look at included age, sex, educational attainment, admission type, etc. We use these data to answer the following questions:

- 1) Where do refugees live? Does it matter if they were privately sponsored versus government-assisted or blended sponsors?
- 2) Who is using services in each jurisdiction?
- 3) Does this affect their retention? Are refugees who received services more likely to stay in the jurisdiction that provided them?

Based on these results, we sampled LIP coordinators for more in-depth engagement through interviews and launched a LIP coordinator survey, which is described more fully below.

b. Refugee Focus Groups

The second component of our research methodology involved discussing settlement with refugees themselves. Although we did not expect that many (or indeed any) participants would be familiar with LIPs, including the first-person experiences of those who arrived in Canada as humanitarian arrivals will provide valuable context for analyzing the supportive activities of many LIPs.

We conducted focus groups to provide a perspective from those who used the services offered by settlement agencies. Using ZOOM, two research team members worked on six focus groups with Ukrainian, Syrian, and Afghan refugees. The selection process for focus group participants emphasized individuals who had recently arrived in Canada as refugees, protected persons, asylum claimants and, in the case of Ukrainians, people who arrived in Canada through the Canada Ukraine Authorization for Emergency Travel (CUAET) program. Participants ranged in age from 20 to 56 years, and with the exception of 2 participants, had all been in Canada for less than 5 years.

Participant recruitment was achieved through a letter of invitation that was sent out to all Local Immigration Partnerships and, through them, to LIP partners, including settlement agencies. Interested individuals were then asked to indicate their availability over a three-week period. Focus groups were scheduled during times when a minimum of three potential participants with matching countries of origin indicated their availability. Participants were also asked to indicate their ability to communicate in English, and interpreters were present to facilitate communication in three of the six focus groups. Participants were paid an honorarium of \$150 for participating in the focus groups and were offered referrals to crisis counsellors following the focus group conversations.

Each participant was informed of the focus group's goals at the beginning of the discussions. Before obtaining verbal consent to record and conduct the interview, each participant was informed of the following:

- a. Their rights. Each participant was free to stop at any time or refuse to answer any question; we explained that we recorded each session for accuracy and detail.
- b. Assured them that anything they said would not be directly attributed to them.
- c. That there was a participant in the interview who was a translator.
- d. That support information would be provided after the interview.
- e. Participants were informed of the project goals, which were 1) to understand the various roles LIPs have played in supporting large-scale humanitarian resettlement initiatives 2) to understand the factors that contributed to the efficacy (of lack of efficacy) of those roles and 3) to develop recommendations for more effective support for future resettlement initiatives.
- f. That they were not required to answer any questions that made them uncomfortable.

The team conducted a total of six focus groups: two involving Syrian refugees, two with Afghan refugees and two with Ukrainian displaced persons. We chose to have homogenous focus groups for several reasons; this provided us with information concerning shared and different experiences from one group, and since the participants were English Language Learners, it allowed for one translator, creating a smooth translation between questions and answers. Each focus group consisted of people who were Private Sponsored Refugees (PSRs), Government Assisted Refugees (GARs), asylum claimants, and temporary residents holding CUAET visas (Ukrainian displaced people). During one focus group, only one participant attended, while the remaining had between three and five participants (excluding the interpreter).

All focus groups were conducted through ZOOM, each approximately two hours long. Each focus group was recorded for analysis, and each participant provided verbal consent for recording. Although all interviewees had some level of English ability, an interpreter was present in three of the six focus groups where one or more participants indicated a limited capacity to communicate in English. In those instances, the interpreter was present to facilitate clear communication, ensure that each participant understood their rights and what they were consenting to, and increase their comfort during the focus group.

Each focus group conversation began with a discussion of the primary challenges of resettlement in Canada and progressed to a discussion of the services and supports that helped (or failed to help) ameliorate these challenges. The focus group data were coded and divided into several themes: previous challenges, current challenges, most helpful services, least helpful services, obtaining information about services, connection to ethnocultural communities (co-ethnic and others), connections to the community more generally, and other important observations. After each focus group, one of the researchers sent a follow-up email to thank

the participants and ensure they were not emotionally affected by the focus group discussions; contact information for support was provided for each participant.

For the analysis to increase accuracy and independence, the two researchers who completed the focus groups analyzed one of the focus group recordings independently. Once the analysis was completed, the analyses were exchanged for cross reference. This exercise resulted in significant overlap between the identified themes. The wording was slightly different for some of the themes, but the content and significant ideas pulled from the same analysis overlapped. Researchers divided the remaining focus groups and coded each using the agreed-upon codes. Both researchers worked on the analysis and the final write-up.

c. Mandates and Strategic Plans

One of the key findings of the LIP Coordinator interviews was the diversity of perspectives around the roles and responsibilities that each LIP bears around refugee resettlement. Some coordinators saw the coordination of refugee resettlement as a central part of what their LIPs did; others stated that they did not coordinate services but that they would if they received adequate resources to do so; still, others did not see refugee resettlement as part of their mandates whatsoever.

It is important to note that with the decentralized nature of LIPs—aside from the National LIP Secretariat, which plays a capacity-building and advocacy role in advancing LIP interests and not a prescriptive role around LIP activities—this diversity is not surprising and instead reflects how many LIPs developed organically in response to local conditions. Identifying and highlighting this diversity is one of the key motivations for this research.

To help identify the source of LIP diversity, we collected and analyzed LIP mandate statements found on most LIP websites. Additionally, some LIPs had shorter-term ad-hoc strategic plans to provide shorter-term directives and aspirations. These documents were summarized to identify if LIPs explicitly mentioned the facilitation of refugee resettlement as part of their short-term or ongoing mission. For those who mentioned the coordination of resettlement efforts in their mandates, we summarized the nature of their involvement.

d. LIP Coordinator Survey

Our evaluation of LIP engagement in coordinating community responses continued with a survey to understand how LIP Coordinators handled the coordination of amenity and service provision to accommodate those seeking temporary or permanent asylum in Canada. The survey also asked specific questions concerning the most and least frequently utilized services. We identify the primary services offered and list each service alongside checkboxes that will allow participants to indicate whether these services have been used and how often. These surveys also captured worker diversity, providing essential information for accurate thematic analysis. The survey was short, can be found in Appendix B, and did not take respondents more than fifteen minutes to complete.

The survey elicited the following information using a combination of closed and open-ended questions.

- Coordinators' views of whether, what, and to what degree LIPs contributed to the resettlement of refugees (distinguishing among the three refugee movements).
- Whether LIPs needed to adapt their strategies and plans depending on whether they dealt with government or privately sponsored refugees.
- Whether LIP contributions to refugee settlement required deliberative measures targeting refugees or universal measures aimed at newcomers, whether transferable 'lessons' emerged (the top three lessons), and which lessons merit consideration as 'promising practices'.
- Which LIP *partners* made the most important contributions and which the least and what these contributions were (e.g. program changes, increased expenditure, mobilizing other partners).
- Which LIP *structures* (e.g., LIP subject matter sub-committees) contributed most to refugee settlement? What was their value-added?
- Which LIP *activities* (e.g. strategic reviews, sub-committee planning, community-welcoming events and broad analytic exercises) contributed to mobilizing support for refugee settlement.
- What contributions have SPOs made to the work of the LIPs, and do they meet LIP expectations?
- Important unintended consequences (open-ended question at the end of the survey).

The short format was intended to facilitate participation. Short-answer open-ended guided questions were added to further prompt details on affiliated LIP worker experiences. Short answers are ideal to provide a space for participants to share their personal voices and experiences. The end of the survey included a yes/no question asking if the participant would be interested in participating in a semi-structured interview. If the participant indicated yes, they were asked to provide their email address or phone number.

Although we sought survey participation from all LIP coordinators, our final sample contained 61 fully or partially completed surveys, equating to a response rate of 70% (59/87=70%). The information garnered from these surveys provided the necessary information to design the interview questions and shape the focus of the focus groups.

e. Interviews with LIP Coordinators, Settlement Service Providers, and other relevant agencies

It is difficult to anticipate all the areas that need to be discussed in a questionnaire to understand the range of activities that LIPs engaged in during Operation Syrian Refugee, Operation Afghan Safety, and Operation Ukrainian Safe Haven. To learn more about the activities that LIPs engaged in most effectively, we interviewed nine LIP coordinators, six settlement service providers, and eleven LIP partner agencies.

To choose the agencies for this portion of the research, we created a list of all LIPs across Canada. We reviewed the list and chose our locations, a representative sample of locations—rural and urban areas, etc.

The interviews within this research project used open-ended semi-structured interview questions, which elicited stories and case-oriented narratives (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). These interviews allowed for rapport building and the ability to create an environment that enabled people to feel comfortable sharing their ideas, experiences and concerns as they pertained to refugee resettlement. These interviews were conducted in two forms, in-person and online, by primarily two research team members. Before recording and conducting each interview, participants were informed of the project goals and their right to refuse to answer the questions and leave the interview at any time. Verbal consent was attained by each participant in the recorded interview. Each interviewee was assured that their responses were de-identified and that they would not impact their employment. They received a Letter of Information (Appendix C) outlining the study's goals and confidentiality measures.

The interviews were recorded, and after reviewing the data and the literature in the area, the researchers identified common themes in the responses. There were six stages in the thematic analysis process: (1) familiarizing yourself with your data, (2) generating initial codes, (3) searching for themes, (4) reviewing themes, (5) defining and naming themes, (6) producing the report (Braun and Clarke, 2006, 87). A thematic analysis was chosen for this research project because the overall project did not have a theoretical framework – it was instead a fact-finding project – and using thematic analysis added considerable flexibility for organizing and presenting findings.

For the analysis, three of the report authors reviewed and examined the data. Over several team meetings, the goals and focus were discussed and collapsed into themes. The interview data was then coded and analyzed with a set of specific questions that the themes addressed. The process of developing the themes was iterative; the researcher engaged in independent analysis and then met virtually consistently to discuss their interpretation. The themes and structures were agreed upon, and consistent discussions ensued until the analysis was completed.

4. IMDB Results

In the sections below, we present the results produced by the methodologies outlined above. Although each is presented separately, they should be viewed as complementary.

A. Demographic vignette of Afghan and Syrian Refugee flows

This section presents several characteristics of Afghan and Syrian refugee flows. Ideally, we would have been able to include information about Ukrainian refugees, but the data we used was not recent enough to include them. Although it is not possible to identify if individuals received services that were LIP-coordinated, we still believe that the analysis is useful. The purpose of these vignettes is to:

- 1) Provide an overview of the size and location of these cohorts within Canada.
- 2) Identify the timing of the arrival of these cohorts.
- 3) Showcase the diversity of refugee cohorts to demonstrate how difficult a task it is for LIPs to coordinate settlement services.
- 4) Demonstrate what the data can and can't do, and make recommendations for improved data collection. It is unlikely that Canada will stop welcoming refugees, and creating an infrastructure for coordinating more effective service delivery includes data development.

Table 1: Characteristics of Syrian and Afghan refugees who landed in Canada between 2014 and 2018, aged 18 or older (N=26,330)

	Number	Percent
Refugee admission category		
Government Assisted Refugees (GAR)	11,285	42.87
Privately Sponsored Refugees (PSR)	12,785	48.57
Blended Sponsorship Refugees (BSR)	2,255	8.56
Country of birth		
Syria	23,770	90.28
Afgahnistan	2,560	9.72
Country of last residence		
Lebanon	11,040	41.92
Jordan	5,740	21.81
Turkey	4,070	15.47
Pakistan	1,075	4.09
UAE	675	2.57
Egypt	745	2.83
Tajikistan	235	0.89
India	325	1.23
Saudia Arabia	420	1.6
Iraq	370	1.41
Other	1,625	6.18
Intended destination (CMA)		
Toronto	8,475	32.18
Vancouver	2,010	7.64
Ottawa	1,745	6.63
Calgary	1,625	6.16
Edmonton	1,450	5.51
London	1,180	4.49
Hamilton	1,115	4.23
Kitchener-Cambridge-Waterloo	1,125	4.27
Winnipeg	895	3.4
Windsor	795	3.03
Halifax	680	2.59
Saskatoon	405	1.53
Regina	325	1.23
Victoria	315	1.2
Saint John	290	1.11
Other CMA	2,145	8.15
CA	1,000	3.8
non-CA	745	2.83
Landing year		
2014	610	2.31
2015	3,430	13.04
2016	13,550	51.47
2017	4,300	16.34
2018	4,435	16.84
Tax Filer at year T+2		
Yes	695	2.64
No	25,635	97.36
Total	26,330	100.00

Source : Statistics Canada, 2021 Longitudinal Immigration Database (IMDB)

Table 1 provides an overview of the characteristics of Syrian and Afghan refugees who landed in Canada between 2014 and 2018, as taken from the Statistics Canada Longitudinal Immigration Database. Please be advised that the sample only includes those who are aged 18 and over. Looking at the refugee admission category, we can see that most refugees were admitted through the privately sponsored (PSR) (49%) and government-assisted (GAR) (43%) admission categories. The blended sponsored group (BSR) formed the smallest admission category group

(9%). In terms of country of birth, an overwhelming majority of refugees (90%) was born in Syria, while less than 10% of refugees were born in Afghanistan. Before arriving in Canada, most refugees resided in Jordan (42%), Lebanon (22%) and Turkey (15.5%). Other prominent countries of last residence, in descending order, include Pakistan (4%), Egypt (2.83%), UAE (2.57%), Iraq (1.41%) and India (1.23%). After arriving, nearly one-third of all refugees intended to reside in Toronto. Other notable destinations, in descending order, include Vancouver (8%), Ottawa (7%), Calgary (6%) Edmonton (5.5%) and London (4.49%). In terms of landing year, the majority of refugees (52%) arrived in 2016. Conversely, 2014 saw the lowest levels of refugee landings, representing only 2% of total arrivals. Lastly, we can see that an overwhelming majority of refugees were not tax filers within two years of their arrival in Canada. More specifically, less than 3% of refugees filed their taxes within two years of their arrival. Although it is not certain as to why a refugee did not file their taxes, the most likely reason is that they were not employed.

Table 2: Settlement service usage within 12 months after admitted to Canada across admission category and intended destination (N=25,635)

	Settlement Services Usage (%)			Total N
	Resettlement Assistance Program	Employment Services	Language Training	
Refugee admission category				
Government Assisted Refugees (GAR)	93.36	20.01	83.79	11,055
Privately Sponsored Refugees (PSR)	65.9	22.97	57.11	12,365
Blended Sponsorship Refugees (BSR)	54.81	16.61	73.14	2,215
Intended destination (CMA)				
Toronto	70.79	18.06	59.57	8,205
Vancouver	98.32	23.02	80.91	1,960
Ottawa	58.43	21.61	67.53	1,705
Calgary	53.65	34.35	79.68	1,575
Edmonton	70.20	26.77	82.57	1,425
London	85.34	14.92	64.31	1,145
Hamilton	89.78	24.36	76.55	1,095
Kitchener-Cambridge-Waterloo	81.93	13.49	67.98	1,090
Winnipeg	90.01	15.38	81.40	870
Windsor	90.76	15.53	82.16	780
Halifax	84.77	34.69	84.62	665
Saskatoon	91	11	86	395
Regina	84	3	86	325
Victoria	90	16	74	310
Saint John	92	21	39	285
Other CMA	83.87	30.11	77.41	2,090
CA	76.14	22.84	67.72	985
non-CA	71.25	14.44	56.54	735
Total	76.78	21.14	70.00	25,635

Source: Statistics Canada, 2021 Longitudinal Immigration Database (IMDB)

Note: Settlement services usage refers whether or not refugees used the settlement services within 12 months after they landed to Canada

Table 2 provides an overview of refugee settlement service usage rates based on their admission category and intended destination within twelve months of their arrival. Here, we describe the general usage rates of all three programs. The resettlement assistance program showed the highest usage rates, ranging from approximately 55% to upwards of 93%, across the three admission category groups. This was followed by the language training program, which also showed high usage rates, ranging from approximately 57% to 84%. Conversely, the use of employment services was low across all three groups, ranging from 17-23%. This reflects findings from Table 1, which showed that many refugees did not file their taxes and, thus, were likely to be unemployed their first two years in Canada. During this period, it is possible that

refugees were more focused on settling into their new lives and learning English, rather than attempting to find employment. This notion is reflected in the service usage rates, showing that the resettlement assistance and language training programs were the most demanded out of all three services. At the same time, it may be that refugees intend to move to other regions, and thus did not partake in employment service programs, but partook in language programs because of the transferable nature of language skills. Lastly, we can see that those in the government assisted (GAR) had the highest rates of service usage, followed by those in the privately sponsored group (PSR), and blended sponsorship group (BSR).

The next section will describe the use of the resettlement assistance program, in terms of refugee admission category groups. The resettlement assistance program was the most frequently used program, reaching nearly a 94% usage rate amongst the GAR group. This highly contrasts those in the PSR and BSR group, which used the same program, but to a much less frequent extent, with usage rates of 67% and 55%, respectively. There seems to be a negative relationship between enrolment in the resettlement assistance program and higher levels of refugee sponsorship. Put differently, those who had higher levels of external support (outside of government) demonstrated lower usage rates of the resettlement assistance program. Those in the PSR and BSR groups likely had access to support from family, sponsors or friends, which those in the GAR did not have.

There is a general trend in service usage rates across intended destinations. As previously mentioned, the resettlement program and language training services are most heavily used, while employment services are less heavily used. Generally, all intended destinations follow this pattern of service usage.

Table 3: Retention rates of refugees across admission category, intended destination and settlement services usage (N=25,635)

	Retention Rate (%)	Total N
Refugee admission category		
Government Assisted Refugees (GAR)	84.50	11,055
Privately Sponsored Refugees (PSR)	81.56	12,365
Blended Sponsorship Refugees (BSR)	79.10	2,215
Intended destination (CMA)		
Toronto	81.53	8,205
Vancouver	87.44	1,960
Ottawa	90.37	1,705
Calgary	88.32	1,575
Edmonton	91.15	1,425
London	93.28	1,145
Hamilton	86.59	1,095
Kitchener-Cambridge-Waterloo	82.48	1,090
Winnipeg	76.12	870
Windsor	89.99	780
Halifax	92.01	665
Saskatoon	68	395
Regina	82	325
Victoria	70	310
Saint John	82	285
Other CMA	76.21	2,090
CA	67.61	985
non-CA	56.40	735
Used Employment Services		
Yes	84.56	5,420
No	82.10	20,215
Used Language Training		
Yes	84.69	17,945
No	77.78	7,690
Total	82.62	25,635

Source: Statistics Canada, 2021 Longitudinal Immigration Database (IMDB)

Note: Retention indicates whether or not refugees stay at their intended destination at the year T+2 (e.g., for refugees landed in 2014, retention rates measures the percentage of refugees stayed at their intended destination in 2016).

Table 3 reports the retention rates of refugees across their admission categories and briefly summarizes service usage rates. It is important to note that *retention* refers to whether or not refugees stayed at their intended destinations two years after their arrival. Generally speaking, all three admission category groups had similar retention rates, ranging between about 79% to 85%. More specifically, though, those in the GAR group exhibited the highest retention rates, while those in the BSR group showed the lowest retention rates. Now, looking at the retention rates of each destination, London demonstrated the highest retention rate of 93%. This is followed by Halifax, Edmonton, Ottawa, and Windsor, which all had retention rates of about 90% but below 93%. Other notable destinations include Calgary and Hamilton, which showed retention rates above 85%, but below 90%. Conversely, destinations with the lowest retention include non-Census Agglomeration (CA), CA, Saskatoon, Victoria, Winnipeg and other Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs). Next, we can see that those who used employment services had slightly higher retention rates, of about 2%, than those who did not. However, this difference in retention is more apparent with language training; those who used language training showed about a 7% higher retention rate than those who did not.

Table 4: Employment income of refugees across admission category, intended destination and settlement services usage (N=11,365)

	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Total N
Refugee admission category				
Government Assisted Refugees (GAR)	14816	10453	14145.06	2,985
Privately Sponsored Refugees (PSR)	23421.09	20954	17330.05	7,490
Blended Sponsorship Refugees (BSR)	18322.72	15038	14788.45	890
Intended destination (CMA)				
Toronto	22830.05	20326	17341.18	4,460
Vancouver	21453.64	19620	15779.32	935
Ottawa	16789.14	12211.5	16088.86	715
Calgary	23857.27	21763.5	17206.55	730
Edmonton	18912.81	15458	16185.24	480
London	19038.97	16958	15700.82	420
Hamilton	17859.84	12871	15999.87	420
Kitchener-Cambridge-Waterloo	20114.14	15575	17284.39	470
Winnipeg	15393.16	10677	14048.6	210
Windsor	15707.04	11673	13715.87	255
Halifax	16476.5	13595.5	13222.97	215
Saskatoon	20679.45	18063.5	18867.1	100
Regina	22622.22	15121	21130.96	60
Victoria	22278.13	19537	22012.82	165
Saint John	10314.39	7637	9960.76	90
Other CMA	18922.51	15625	15649.17	860
CA	19170.77	15950	15167.53	430
non-CA	20913.22	17485	16396.8	355
Used Employment Services				
Yes	21483.02	18215.5	17453.7	3,470
No	20444.43	17199.5	16484.17	7,895
Used Language Training				
Yes	19595.26	16391.5	15973.83	7,200
No	22775.57	19449	17942.87	4,170
Total	20761.5	17532.5	16792.15	11,365

Source: Statistics Canada, 2021 Longitudinal Immigration Database (IMDB)

Note: Employment income only includes refugees who have positive employment income at the Year T+2 (e.g., for refugees admitted to Canada in 2014, only include those who earned positive employment income in 2016).

Table 4 describes the employment income of refugees, specific to their admission category, intended destination and service usage rates. First, in terms of admission category, there seems to be a pattern across a refugee's level of support (outside of government) and the average (mean) income. The lowest to highest average incomes are in the GAR, BSR, and PSR categories. In other words, those with higher levels of support outside of the government trended towards higher average incomes. We can see a similar pattern when looking at the median incomes of the three admission category groups. Explicitly said, the GAR category had the lowest median income, followed by the BSR category, and finally, the PSR category, which showed the highest median income.

Moving on, the following section will describe the employment income of refugees, specific to their intended destinations. Across all intended destinations, Calgary has the highest average income at approximately \$23,860. This is followed by Toronto, Regina, Victoria, Vancouver, non-CA regions, Saskatchewan and Kitchener-Cambridge-Waterloo (listed in descending order of income), which all show average incomes above \$20,000. On the other hand, Saint John has the lowest average income of approximately \$10,315. Other regions with lower average incomes include Winnipeg, Windsor, Halifax and Ottawa (listed in ascending order of income), all exhibiting average incomes ranging between \$15,395 to \$16,790. Comparing the highest and

lowest average incomes in Calgary and Saint John, respectively, there appears to be a difference of about \$13,500.

Next, this section will describe the employment income of refugees relative to whether or not they used settlement services. At first glance, it can be seen that those who used employment services had higher average incomes, of approximately \$21,485. Comparatively, those who did not use employment services had lower average incomes of approximately \$20,445. This represents a difference of approximately \$1000. In terms of language training, those who used language training had lower average incomes than those who did not. It may be that those who use settlement services are already at a disadvantage in the labour market and, therefore, are associated with lower average incomes. Alternatively, those who were successful may have arrived in Canada with a greater grasp of English or French, making the transition into the labour market much easier.

5. Results from Refugee Focus Groups

Our focus group analysis shows that refugees and displaced persons in the three cohorts under investigation experience a range of broadly similar challenges and shortfalls with their settlement in Canada. With LIPs sharing broadly similar mandates (described in the following section), multiple opportunities exist to address these challenges, improving newcomers' experiences and transition to life in Canada.

Our analysis identified 6 themes under the heading of "challenges" that we describe in detail below. Several common challenges newcomers face when they arrive in Canada include housing, employment (including education, experience, and credential recognition), language barriers, mental health, healthcare more generally, and establishing social connections. The most significant and frequently referenced challenges are described in detail below (in order of commonality). When analytically significant, distinctions are made between the three groups. The status of each respondent - government assisted, privately sponsored, asylum claimant or displaced persons - is also noted when important for the analysis.

Following the discussion of challenges, we explore some focus group participants' comments about the most and least helpful services they received, how they obtained information about services, and additional concerns and ideas the participants expressed.

i. Challenges

Theme 1: Housing: Housing was identified as a major challenge by virtually every focus group participant. Several common barriers were noted: Participants identified a shortage in housing supply and affordable housing. This issue is even more pronounced in large cities like Vancouver and Toronto. Participants also repeatedly stated that they faced challenges with meeting what sometimes seemed like impossible requirements (e.g., landlords requiring references, credit scores, guarantors and past rental history to ensure renters were responsible tenants). Further, some participants confided that landlords had asked for illegal requirements, such as demanding several months of rent paid in advance. Some also found that they faced racism and discrimination from landlords who were not interested in renting to newcomers. Notably, one participant repeated the increasingly prevalent sentiment that the shortage of housing availability was a direct result of high levels of immigration to Canada.

In addition to the challenges associated with securing rental housing, several participants referred to the immediate challenges associated with stays in temporary housing during their first days and weeks in Canada. These included short-term housing that was too small or otherwise inappropriate for families and stays in temporary housing that lasted far longer than expected. One participant reported serious problems that resulted from poor access to healthcare while living in temporary housing. The problems associated with temporary housing were particularly relevant to Government Assisted Refugees and Ukrainians who had arrived on CUEAT visas.

Challenges specific to particular humanitarian cohorts:

Afghans: All focus group participants who originated from Afghanistan were Government Assisted Refugees or asylum claimants. As such, many had experiences with temporary housing in hotels or shelters in the early stages of their resettlement in Canada. The experience of temporary accommodation for members of this cohort ranged from mildly uncomfortable to deeply traumatic. One respondent referred to a situation of completely overwhelmed resettlement staff struggling to provide food to Afghan arrivals, who were concerned about eating in accordance with religious requirements. Another relayed a deeply traumatic experience of having experienced a miscarriage while living in a housing shelter and being treated dismissively by a nurse who was on duty at the shelter. A third participant told us that, upon leaving temporary housing, many Afghan refugees experience major challenges with affordability, resulting in families spending nights in city parks and a large portion of refugees living in poorly lit and sometimes pest-infested basement suites, with negative impacts on their mental and physical health. This was found to be more common in expensive provinces such as British Columbia (where the cost of rent is very high).

Syrian: Many of the Syrian participants in the focus groups arrived in Canada as Privately Sponsored Refugees and, therefore, did not share the same experiences with temporary housing upon arrival in Canada. Many of these participants expressed deep gratitude to their sponsors and repeatedly noted the important support they had received from them. At the same time, several participants in these groups reported challenges in obtaining housing following the end of their one-year sponsorship period. In addition to the high cost of housing, one of the most commonly reported reasons was landlords who require references and financial assurances because, as one participant states, “no one trusts us”. One respondent reported having benefited from a loan program that provided support for a down payment on a house, which would be forgiven after 10 years if the individual continued living in the home.

Ukraine: Participants from Ukraine found it difficult to find housing for the same reasons noted above.

Theme 2: Suitable Employment: Across all focus groups—Syrians, Afghans, and Ukrainian—participants struggled with obtaining employment, specifically employment that reflected their skills or occupation in their countries of origin. More than any other challenge mentioned, discussions on obtaining suitable employment elicited expressions of frustration and disappointment. Most often, these challenges centred around the two issues of credential recognition and the “*Canadian Experience*” requirement.

Credential recognition was a constant challenge for members of all three groups. An overwhelming majority of focus group participants were not employed in the field they had worked in prior to coming to Canada or for which they were educated or trained. One reason commonly cited is that employers would not readily accept their educational qualifications and employment experience. Both the credential recognition problem and the “Canadian

experience” barrier are well known in the newcomer settlement literature and amongst practitioners. Participants in these focus groups had relatively high levels of education, and many had years of experience in high-level administration, technical fields, and other professions. The problems that resulted from their inability to find work commensurate with their skills and experiences included financial challenges associated with low-wage employment, practical difficulties associated with transitioning to unrelated, primarily manual labour occupations, and psychological difficulties related to the loss of confidence and professional identity. As one participant from Afghanistan stated, “[w]e are not mentally ready to shift our career to do manual labour or work in construction!”

Impact of underemployment: As a result of these requirements, all groups shared experiences of being encouraged to take jobs outside of their field, and others, after trying to obtain work in their field, resigned themselves to taking on low-skilled labour jobs. This was a common source of frustration with employment service providers, with several participants from different cohorts complaining of front-line staff who did not understand the job markets in more specialized fields and defaulted to recommending “low-skill” positions. One participant recalled that they presented their CV to the employment office hoping to find help in transferring their professional experience into the Canadian job market, only to be told, “Why don’t you become a taxi driver?” This led to a widely shared dissatisfaction with employment-related services and the perception of “a gap between what they offer and the job market.” The immense challenge of finding suitable employment was cited by several participants as a major contributor to their overall disillusionment with the promise of resettlement in Canada.

The suggestion and, oftentimes, the practical necessity that newcomers take on low-skill, low-wage employment outside of their chosen field was also a major source of psychological stress for several focus group participants. One participant noted that when refugees see the qualifications and responsibilities of the employment opportunities that are available to them, they might lose morale and become depressed. They emphasized that job seeking takes a lot of energy and time from people who are already struggling with adjusting to life in a new country while taking care of their families. One Ukrainian respondent explained in detail the toll that underemployment is having on her husband and their family.

“My husband is a psychologist who had his own private practice in Ukraine. It was his dream job. When we came to Canada, his dream was closed because his credentials were not recognized....He works very hard (in construction) from 7 am to 11 PM 3 days a week and 7-5 on other days. It is a huge struggle because we don’t see each other.”

Comments like this illustrate how refugee and displaced persons' efforts to rebuild their lives in Canada are circumvented by the lack of opportunity to reestablish a level of normalcy and regularity in their lives.

The following comments provide specific context for these challenges.

“Even if you know how to use computers and you don’t have language barriers, it is very difficult to get into the market and find a job. I have been applying for jobs for more than one year and I am not able to get a job here” (Afghan participant).

“There is no understanding of how to transfer the skills that people bring in a useful way” (Syrian participant)

Others emphasized the challenges of taking positions that required skills that were not within their realm. “They [employers] want people with (labour) skills, but many people come here only knowing office work, so it is very difficult to adjust.” For some participants, this led to a perception that the integration of newcomers into the Canadian economy was chaotically taking place, with the result being that “everything is mixed: mechanics are working in restaurants and people with admin backgrounds are working as mechanics.” Another respondent recalled struggling on the first day of work at a construction site and being told by the foreman, “You don’t know what you are doing!” The frustrated employee (who had many years of high-level administrative experience and two master’s degrees) could only agree.

Participants in each focus group also cited the demand for “Canadian experience” as a major barrier to suitable employment. This widespread requirement was the source of considerable confusion and frustration for several focus group participants. Participants expressed incredulity at the suggestion that the Canadian experience was somehow different from the experience gained in similar positions in other countries. As one participant argued, “[it is not the case] that Afghan offices are so different, or that Afghan cars are so different that we cannot work without Canadian experience!” The significant barrier presented by Canadian experience requirements resulted in some participants being advised by other newcomers to revise their resumé. As one participant put it, “I was told by a fellow Afghan that I need to lie on my resume and tell them that I have 10 years of Canadian experience”.

The necessity of Canadian education and experience to enter into a career path similar to that in their home country created challenges and stress for newcomers, especially those who were in established careers. A participant tells us: “We don’t have much time in this world. If we spent 20 years in Afghanistan working in one field, how can we spend the time and energy to start again in a new field?” The pressure to reorient toward a different career path places extreme strain on refugees who arrive in Canada in middle age or midway through their careers. This condition is exacerbated in the case of Ukrainian arrivals who lack clarity on their long-term immigration status.

The lack of credential recognition for some participants impacted females and males differently. One female participant identified a gender dynamic to this issue. She explained how her husband is affected by his inability to provide the level of family support that he did in the past due to being underemployed. Although her husband has a professional job in his home country, he cannot do the job he did there because he needs a Canadian education. One participant explains that “he works for meals and to rent a house”, and says, “I want to do what I like.”

“For men, the problem is finding a job according to your profession.” “For me, I am a teacher. It actually does not matter for me; what will I do? I have my children and my home; I have work to do. It is not difficult to find a job for me. But for a man, a husband, it is very difficult to change what he did.”

Male participants commonly mentioned their struggles with switching careers and how it negatively impacted their adjustment to living in Canada.

One female participant also highlighted the lack of access to childcare as an impediment to employment, stating that “finding daycare was difficult, so I stayed home.”

On the Job Safety and Security: Since there are limits/job shortages to job opportunities in Canada, some discussed taking on “cash jobs.” This presented several problems, including the fact that safety protocols were not followed, the employees did not receive benefits, and employers took advantage of the newcomers. One participant explains, “There are some employers who will hire you even if you don’t speak English. Indian and Pakistani business owners will hire you if you speak Urdu. These are cash jobs and there are many problems that come with doing cash jobs”. All people working in Canada deserve safety and security on the job, making this need for suitable employment a larger problem.

Theme 3: Language Barriers: The majority of participants identified language as a challenge and identified multiple barriers to language learning. Specifically, many people found it difficult to manage the time to learn English while adjusting to their new life, finding employment and supporting their families. For example, a Ukrainian participant explained that she does not have enough time to improve her English, which she feels is very important, but she also works a lot, so it is difficult (Group 6). Another participant expressed that the English classes provided through the Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC) program were oriented toward helping newcomers pass their citizenship exams rather than making them capable of communicating effectively with other English speakers. Another participant suggested that many Afghan refugees struggle with English and don’t know how to access language instruction. This was a major barrier for them, specifically because a lack of English language capability impedes employment. Finally, another participant recounted feeling ashamed and afraid to speak English due to her accent. Only over time and through considerable personal resilience was she able to embrace her accent and take some measure of pride in her achievement as an English language learner.

Theme 4: Mental Health/Living in Limbo: Several factors impact participants' mental health. One, the lack of successful employment impacts the mental health of the newcomers. Not achieving their employment goals contributes to feeling unsuccessful and makes newcomers feel less hopeful of achieving normalcy and stability in their lives. All three groups of newcomers referenced experiencing “sadness, “depression,” and “feelings of helplessness” and expressed “difficult to do all [find a job and settle in Canada] of this and take care of your family”.

One distinction exists for the Ukrainians, who face some unique challenges when arriving in Canada as displaced persons without permanent residency status. Without clarity on if and when they might return to Ukraine, it is exceedingly difficult for many Ukrainian arrivals to make decisions about the investment of time and resources into reorienting their lives and careers to the Canadian context. The participants were either beginning careers or had long-standing careers in their previous country of residence. Many expressed concerns about uncertainty in their future, specifically whether they should begin building new lives in Canada, which entails finding a new occupation and enrolling in new training or education programs. As a result, many Ukrainian arrivals struggle to make decisions about the “return on investment” of time and effort to adjust their lives and careers to the Canadian context. This creates stress since many of them were involved in professional careers in their home country and did not expect to have to change careers in their later years.

Theme 5: Healthcare: Participants noted that the Healthcare system in Canada is of high quality and offers an array of services from physical to mental health support. Unsurprisingly, however, all focus group participants raised difficulties in gaining access to health care. Participants mentioned commonly that the wait times in emergency are very long and access to a family doctor is extremely difficult. As one participant states, “It’s so complicated/difficult to find a family doctor”. These structural challenges in the Canadian healthcare system are only exacerbated for newcomers because the system is different. Some comments illustrating their challenges include: “It took a long time to understand because it is so different from our system (in Syria) and “We are not used to this system; we usually see people in person, or they come to our house”. Newcomers also expressed frustration because they are not able to speak the language (particularly upon arrival), and they found that there were limited options for language translation. We were told that some healthcare providers did not want to use interpreters. The inability to communicate health-related issues is a serious concern for newcomers. Many have been in unhealthy living conditions and require attention. Without access to an interpreter, newcomers are prevented from accessing health services. The frustration with their difficulties gaining access to doctors is further enhanced by the fact that there is a failure to employ internationally trained healthcare professionals in the Canadian healthcare system.

Theme 6: Social Integration and Community Connections: To understand how best to improve services for humanitarian arrivals, we asked a series of questions concerning their connections to communities. We observed that most participants referred positively to the experience of being welcomed into Canada and their adoptive communities. However, it was equally common for participants to refer to difficulties establishing deeper personal connections and friendships with their Canadian-born neighbours and co-workers. Some participants were resigned to the fact that Canadians would never view them as friends but only as refugees. As one participant put it, “I will [never] be Canadian in their eyes.” This theme speaks to the general challenge of “inclusivity”, or the development of networks of social connection. Notably, there were several

exceptions to this experience. One exception was for Privately Sponsored Refugees, whose relationships with their sponsorship groups sometimes developed into long-lasting, deeply personal friendships. Several Ukrainian participants also expressed the view that Canadians are very friendly and helpful, with one noting that “once they know you are Ukrainian, they will help you with anything.” This observation sits in stark contrast with the lament offered by another participant (Syrian): “As immigrants, we come from other cultures, we have rich cultures and skills. Maybe in the future, the community will see that and understand that we are human.” As such, there exists sufficient evidence to conclude that achieving genuine social inclusion remains a significant challenge for many humanitarian arrivals.

The research team also asked directly whether focus group participants had established connections with members of other newcomer communities. Notably, some informed us that they made more connections with people outside their groups rather than within their own co-ethnics. Several respondents referred to connecting with other newcomers through shared experience, with one remarking that “with other immigrants, it is so easy. I can ask them anything about their immigration process, and they will tell me honestly.”

Importance of networks and communities from within their ethnic group: Connection to networks and communities from their own ethnic group was considered by many participants to be valuable in several ways. Participants discussed how having friends from their ethnic group eased their transition to Canada. Co-ethnics provided information to newcomers about Canadian culture, services, supports and general lessons learned. One participant referred to previously settled co-ethnics who accompanied them to appointments, while another referred to the psychological benefits of having someone to speak to in your mother tongue. A respondent who came to Canada from Afghanistan highlighted the proliferation of online Afghan communities and their value in providing new members with information about the “Canadian culture and society” as well as providing connections to settlement organizations, food banks and other supports. Social network applications such as “WhatsApp”, are also used to keep connections and organize social events like “picnics” and “parties”. Social connections within their ethnic groups are also used to share information about how to apply for jobs and available services. Creating and maintaining connections through social events and using social media created opportunities to both share information and connect new arrivals to the community.

At the same time, some participants expressed reservations about the practice of fostering social connections within the ethnocultural community. One participant opined that developing strong connections within one’s own ethnic community can make it harder to build connections outside of the community. Another noted that socializing within the ethnic community was concentrated around the Mosque, which created a barrier for people who were not inclined to participate in religious practice. Another expressed the view that “just because people come from the same country does not mean they have the same mind.”

ii. Services and Supports

Most Helpful Services:

Employment Services: Participants' responses regarding employment programs were generally positive, with some employment programs and services being identified as being extremely helpful. As an example, a program to provide free training and work boots provided to one respondent's husband by Work BC, was highlighted as significantly impactful. Some participants also found support to help prepare their resumes and navigate the Canadian employment market. However, other participants expressed struggles navigating the employment system, completing a resume, and identifying potential employment opportunities. These concerns were in conjunction with participants' language and technology challenges. With notable exceptions (described below), several participants articulated that they were happy with the amount of support and information provided by employment services in developing their resumes.

Settlement services: Settlement services providers were consistently identified as supportive in several ways. Participants stated that the service providers "helped us with all of the online applications, which we were not familiar with." The overall sentiment indicated that participants found settlement service workers welcoming and supportive. One participant stated, "They welcomed us very warmly, and I didn't feel any kind of discrimination." Of note, our focus group participants highlighted the important role of co-ethnic settlement workers; some of our participants were themselves employed by settlement service agencies. First, newcomers who earned these positions expressed great satisfaction from working in them, even if it was unrelated to their original training and education. Second, participants who accessed co-ethnic settlement service providers expressed that having someone who can relate to their situation first-hand was very helpful. It should be recognized, however, that these personalized relationships also create risk for both the client and the frontline settlement worker.

Healthcare: Participants generally considered the quality and array of healthcare services offered in Canada impressive. The health care system was identified as "high quality," and the free mental health support and access to dental care available to some were identified as very helpful. However, this generally positive view was tempered by complaints about long wait times and difficulties finding a family doctor (discussed below).

Legal Services: legal aid and related services were characterized as providing fast, friendly, and useful service. Several participants who arrived in Canada as asylum seekers were given referrals to attorneys to assist them with their legal status in Canada.

Community Support: The experience of community support was notably different for each of the three humanitarian cohorts, which is at least partially explained by the different humanitarian programs through which the focus group participants arrived (i.e., GARs, PSRs and

CUAET visa holders). For Ukrainians in particular, support from community organizations and volunteers positively impacted their experience. As displaced people and given the public the response to Russia's invasion of Ukraine, many Ukrainian arrivals enjoyed support from community organizations and volunteers, which positively impacted their experience. The Ukraine participants consistently discussed how the Ukrainian and non-Ukrainian communities provided support in various ways, including information, clothing, furniture, food, and housing. The focus groups heavily noted the positive impact of the many grassroots initiatives provided to Ukrainian displaced people.

Least Helpful Services:

Notably, several of the service categories identified as “least helpful” were the same as those identified as “most helpful.” To some degree, this reflects the varied experiences of different focus group participants. It may also reflect that many humanitarian refugees are at once grateful for the support they receive and frustrated by the multiple barriers they face in the process of establishing a new life for themselves and their families.

Employment Services: While some participants identified employment support programs as among the most helpful services they received (specifically with respect to accessing training programs and subsidized safety equipment), several others indicated that job-seeking support programs were particularly unhelpful.

Participants mentioned several shortcomings, including a lack of focused support for developing resumes and cover letters, a lack of support in finding suitable employment opportunities, and a tendency for frontline staff to direct clients to low-skill, low-wage employment, regardless of their qualifications and experience.

According to one participant, “I visited [a provincially funded employment services centre] twice a week for two months, and we didn't even write a resume. The counsellor would just open the computer and show me other people's resumes for examples, but everything she showed me was something I could do at home on my own!” They attributed some of these challenges to a lack of experience on the part of some frontline staff, a lack of individualized support and the failure to follow up basic resume writing support with help in finding suitable employment opportunities. One participant expresses the limits of the program in their mind, “after they are done – they follow up with you, but they cannot find a job for you.”

Participants also commented on the level of support that those working at employment services can offer. Some complained that those working at the settlement services were not effectively trained to be helpful. Some examples that reflect this sentiment are:

“Most of the people I worked with knew nothing about information technology, so they told me themselves they had no idea what kind of jobs to look for. They just told me to let them know if I get a job”.

“The case worker couldn't differentiate between IT jobs and administrative jobs.”

These concerns centred around feeling they were not receiving the information they needed to enter the job market. Although these services provide the information and skills to begin entering the job market, participants had the following to say:

“They are able to help you build a resume and write a cover letter, but after that, they cannot help you find a job.”

“There are programs to pay for your training, but after it’s finished they can’t help you find a job, so the training is wasted”.

English Language Instruction For those who were able to complete the program, there were positive aspects to it. But the difficulty was access. There are long wait lists for online English language classes, which makes learning English much more challenging. Access to online classes is especially important for people who cannot attend in-person classes, such as mothers of young children or those who are working multiple jobs or shift work.

The Language Instruction to Newcomers to Canada (LINC) class was also identified as having limited value. Participants told us that they found the classes to be oriented toward helping people pass their citizenship test but not necessarily providing the skills that people would require on a daily basis.

Healthcare: Many challenges were raised with respect to accessing healthcare. Participants discussed how they needed a family doctor and how the wait lines at Emergency rooms were long. One participant told us, “I have been waiting for 5 months for a family doctor. I have some health problems. When you are faced with health problems, you can go to the hospital, and you will have to wait for 6-8 hours.” Participants also spoke of their experience visiting dentists. They explained this was a stressful process because of language barriers. One participant relayed an experience of having two teeth removed without understanding that she had given consent. In the wake of this traumatic experience, she recalled, “I told my husband ‘Don’t say “yes” if you don’t know what the doctor is saying!’” These experiences create distress and anxiety for newcomers who were unable to understand and, therefore, consent to the procedures the dentists were requesting.

As part of the Interim Federal Health Program, newcomers are eligible for mental health services. Participants discussed counselling sessions and how they were helpful in addressing their trauma. One participant explained that these services help them understand the impact that their traumatic experience has had on their lives. They explain, “The mental health part, when I went to the first counselling session, my goal was to prove to them that I was ok. Over time, you learn about trauma and how it affects you, but the IFHP only lasts a year, which is not enough time to work through trauma.” The positive impact of mental health services offered through “The Interim Federal Health Program” suggests that these programs could be useful for over a year.

Learning about services

Our focus groups identified important differences in people's experiences based on their entry status into Canada.

Participants with family members living in Canada or who arrived with private sponsorship had a distinct advantage in learning how to navigate the Canadian system because they had people with experience in the country to help them. They shared how invaluable it was to be able to seek guidance and receive information about available services from their family or sponsor. The support they received from their connections in Canada was evident in their conversations, with one participant stating, "everything we learned about the system, what we need to do, what not to do, we learned from our sponsors." (FG2)

As asylum claimants, participants who arrived in Canada were introduced to services haphazardly. Some received brochures at their hotels, whereas others used the internet, and still others relied on their co-ethnic networks. Settlement agencies would also often visit the hotels where claimants were staying. The information provided varied widely but included legal services and other government supports, which, while beneficial, led to a more independent and less personal process. Notably, Settlement Service Provider Organizations (SPOs) emerged as a vital source of information for humanitarian entrants. As one participant expressed, "without the information given by settlement agencies, we would be lost." (FG4). This highlights the significant role of SPOs in facilitating the integration of newcomers into Canadian society. Other resources identified by this group included school counsellors (Settlement Workers in Schools program) (FG3), previously settled co-ethnics (FG 3), and the Internet.

Theme: Criticisms, Concerns, and Ideas Presented by Participants:

Regardless of how they entered Canada, participants expressed concerns about how some of the programs operated. Although we directly speak to the most helpful and unhelpful services in the report, it was important to note a few specific suggestions from their personal experiences. These concerns were either commonly raised or agreed upon by focus group members. Regarding the employment program, participants, reflecting on their comments on the limitations of this program, suggested that it would be helpful if the program had a recruiter and/or specialist. This suggestion supported the challenges around credentials recognition and finding employment opportunities suited to their education and skill set. – such as IT. It was a common concern that those working in these employment programs knew little about how to search for jobs specific to their skills and that many did not understand the IT industry, limiting their ability to support newcomers in this regard. The second program that participants offered suggestions concerning was housing services; many relayed the challenges of finding housing and specifically the inability to secure housing with limited income and without a previous rental history. The last major hurdle that participants offered suggestions on was concerning language training. Participants suggested that this program requires improvement because the

women who work in the home do not have exposure to the workforce or other Canadian speakers, limiting their opportunities to improve their English. The solution for this challenge was simple: although there are many in-person classes, online courses need more space.

6. Analysis of LIP Mandates and Strategic Plans

According to the lipdata.ca website³, there are 87 LIPs across Canada that offer support for newcomer settlement and integration in various capacities. Breaking this down further, the country's Northern territories see 1 LIP each in the Yukon and the Northwest Territories. In the West, there are 18 LIPs in British Columbia, 11 in Alberta, 6 in Saskatchewan, and 6 in Manitoba. Ontario has the greatest number, at 36, while the East Coast sees 4 LIPs in both New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and 1 each in Newfoundland and Labrador and Prince Edward Island.

While all LIPs share the same broad objectives (i.e. “the fostering of more welcoming and inclusive communities for newcomers.”), the mandates directing them allow for significant leeway and a wide expanse of manners in which support is made accessible to newcomers to the country. While this generates a space for differences to exist across the various LIPs, there are also numerous similarities in the overall goals of these initiatives. An overlap in core ideals became evident after investigating the information available for each LIP. In particular, 74% of LIPs (64 out of 87) use “inclusion” as a keyword in the description of their support goals, 71% stress the importance of generating “welcoming” communities (62 out of 87), and 61% seek to build acceptance and support for increasing “diversity” (53 out of 87). Other keywords that are common across LIPs are “collaboration” (72% or 63 out of 87), “integration” (54% or 47 out of 87), “belonging” (23% or 20 out of 87), “vibrancy” (15% or 13 out of 87), and “well-being” (10% or 9 out of 87). Additionally, some of the core areas that the various LIPs across the country focus on include housing, employment, health, education, economics, politics, and social cohesion. Thus, upon investigation, it appears that LIPs, while operating on their own foundation, tend to follow, to differing extents, a pre-existing framework that defines the main focal points for aiding newcomer settlement and integration.

Moreover, when considering which immigrant groups these partnerships focus their directives on it becomes evident that, of the 87 LIPs in Canada, only 50 explicitly state, in their action plans or on their websites, that they focus on refugees. This is approximately 57% of all LIPs. Breaking this down by provinces, Ontario has the largest number of LIPs supporting refugee resettlement in their strategic plans, at nearly 81%, or 29 out of 36 locations. This is followed by Alberta, at about 55% (6 out of 11), British Columbia (9 out of 18), New Brunswick (2 out of 4), and Nova Scotia (2 out of 4) at 50%, and Manitoba with 33% (2 out of 6). The remaining provinces and territories either do not have active LIPs or do not explicitly state a focus on refugee settlement and well-being. Most LIPs instead focus their efforts on the broader category of permanent residents (which includes refugees and protected persons) and, to a lesser extent, temporary foreign workers and international students, making sure to indicate that they do not offer services directly, but rather bring together and coordinate community supports.

³ Lipdata.ca is maintained by the National LIP Secretariat in partnership with the International Institute for Sustainable Development.

7. Results from the LIP Coordinator Survey

The evaluation of LIP engagement with large-scale refugee resettlement continued with data collection obtained from surveying LIP Coordinators. The survey was administered to LIP coordinators across Canada in September 2023. The survey aimed to ask specific questions regarding the provision of services targeted towards Syrian, Afghan and Ukrainian humanitarian entrants. The multiple-choice and short-answer open-ended questions allowed us to quantify and elaborate on the engagement level of LIPs. For those who helped with refugee resettlement, we gained valuable insights into the types of services coordinated, the partners engaged, and the lessons learned when LIPs coordinated service delivery.

Characteristics of LIPs

Based on the information received from the National LIP Secretariat, we classified the LIPs whose coordinators answered the survey by whether they are municipal or non-municipal and what population centre sizes they serve. Due to small numbers of small population centre LIPs, small- and medium-sized population centre LIPs were combined into one category. Although the total response for the survey was 62, there is missing data that prevented us from identifying if some LIPs were municipal or non-municipal, as well as the population centre size they serve.

Table 1 indicates the breakdown of LIPs by municipal status (municipal versus non-municipal). The table shows that almost 62% of the LIPs surveyed were non-municipal. This is roughly comparable to a list of LIPs maintained by the NLS, which indicates a 37%/63% split between municipal and non-municipal LIPs.

Table 1: Breakdown of LIPs by municipal/non-municipal

	Frequency	Percent
Municipal	21	38.2%
Non-municipal	34	61.8%
Total	55	100%

Next, Table 2 shows the breakdown of LIPs by population centre size. The breakdown between large and small/medium population centre size LIPs is almost equal, with slightly more LIPs serving large population centres (51.9%). This sample is slightly skewed toward small and medium centre LIPs, with 59% of the total population of LIPs existing in large centres, per the NLS.

Table 2: Breakdown of LIPs by population centre size

	Frequency	Percent
Large population centre	28	51.9%
Small/Medium population centre	26	48.2%
Total	54	100%

In the remaining output from the LIP coordinator survey, we focus primarily on overall response patterns. In Appendix B, we present results separately for municipal and non-municipal LIPs and by population centre size.

LIP Coordinators:

A total of 62 coordinators responded to the survey. However, not all questions were answered by all respondents. The response rate for the survey was roughly 70%. Out of the total, 61 respondents indicated that they were LIP Coordinators, and 1 respondent indicated that they were a LIP Project Manager. In the following tables, we discuss some of the characteristics of LIP Coordinators.

Table 3 indicates the year the respondents began their roles as LIP Coordinators. The majority of respondents began their roles in 2021 or after (30 respondents), well after the majority of Afghan and Syrian refugees came to Canada. This high level of turnover posed challenges throughout the project (particularly the coordinator survey and the coordinator interviews), as many coordinators simply did not know the answers to many of our questions.

Table 3: What year did you begin your role as LIP Coordinator?

	Frequency	Percent
2009	3	5.08%
2011	3	5.08%
2012	1	1.69%
2014	4	6.78%
2016	3	5.08%
2017	3	5.08%
2018	5	8.47%
2019	2	3.39%
2020	4	6.78%
2021	10	16.95%
2022	12	20.34%
2023	8	13.56%
Total	59	100%

Table 4 measures this directly, by asking if their start date as a LIP Coordinator impacted their ability to answer questions about the humanitarian movements and the role of their LIP. The results indicate that 41.7% percent of respondents had difficulty answering questions regarding the humanitarian movements of Syrian, Afghan and Ukrainian humanitarian entrants. It is interesting that more coordinators did not indicate difficulty since nearly all of them started their jobs after at least one wave of entrants had come to Canada. This is likely due to the fact that many coordinators came from the settlement sector, and may have had experience with refugee resettlement from their previous positions.

Table 4: Does your start date (as LIP Coordinator) make it difficult to answer questions about any of the humanitarian movements?

	Frequency	Percent
No	35	58.3%
Yes	25	41.7%
Total	60	100%

Further, in Table 5 the respondents indicated about which particular humanitarian movements they had difficulty answering questions about (this information was only sought by those that indicated that their recency impacted their ability to respond to questions). Not surprisingly, the majority of respondents had difficulty answering questions about both the Syrian and Afghan humanitarian movements (52%), which began in 2009 and 2015, respectively. This category is followed by Syrian humanitarian movements, specifically (32%). As mentioned above, this is likely explained by the start date in the LIP Coordinator roles.

Table 5: Which humanitarian movements is it difficult to answer questions about, due to your start date?

	Frequency	Percent
Syrian	8	32%
Syrian & Afghan	13	52%
Afghan & Ukrainian	1	4%
Syrian & Afghan & Ukrainian	3	12%
Total	25	100%

More coordinators of non-municipal and large population centre LIPs indicated that they had difficulty in answering questions regarding the particular humanitarian movements (Appendix B, Tables 1 - 4).

Level of Involvement/Collective Efforts

The following section shows results for the level of involvement and the roles the LIPs played in the collective efforts to help Syrian, Afghan, and Ukrainian humanitarian entrants resettle. Table 6 shows the perceived level of involvement by LIPs with each of the humanitarian movements. The results indicate that extensive involvement was highest for the Ukrainian entrants, while the highest level of no involvement was reported for Afghan entrants. For Syrian entrants, a

moderate level of involvement was most common. Again, the perceived level of involvement might be slightly skewed due to start dates of many LIP coordinators.

Table 6: How would you characterize the level of involvement by your LIP for each of the movements listed below?

	Syrian	Afghan	Ukrainian
Extensive	6 (11.3%)	3 (5.5%)	14 (25.0%)
Moderate	20 (37.7%)	17 (30.9%)	24 (42.9%)
Slight	13 (24.5%)	17 (30.9%)	15 (26.8%)
No	14 (26.4%)	18 (32.7%)	3 (5.4%)
Total	53 (100%)	55 (100 %)	56 (100%)

Looking at the differences by municipality (Appendix B, Tables 5a – 5c), non-municipal LIPs were less likely to assist with the humanitarian efforts than municipal LIPs were, particularly for Afghan humanitarian entrants. Examining the differences by population centre sizes, small/medium population centre sizes LIPs were less likely to assist compared to large population centre sizes LIPs (Appendix B, Tables 6a – 6c). This was further elaborated in the open-ended questions, where LIP Coordinators of small/medium sized population centres confirmed that very few (or no) Afghan humanitarian entrants have resettled in their areas after arrival to Canada. This is consistent with the iCARE-IMDB results shown above.

Tables 7, 8, and 9 showcase the results on the specific roles that the LIPs played in helping humanitarian entrants resettle. The response options included “Not significant”, “Significant”, and “Not Applicable”.

Table 7: What role did your LIP play in the collective effort to resettle Syrian humanitarian entrants?

	Not significant	Significant	Not Applicable	Total
Engaged in advocacy to boost the willingness of local organizations to help in the resettlement effort	10 (32.3%)	15 (48.4%)	6 (19.4%)	31 (100%)
Sensitized mainstream and community organizations to the resettlement needs of humanitarian entrants	7 (22.6%)	18 (58.1%)	6 (19.4%)	31 (100%)
Engaged in anticipatory projects to establish working relationships that allowed organizations to work together quickly and efficiently	12 (40.0%)	12 (40.0%)	6 (20.0%)	30 (100%)
Mobilized community support for resettlement	11 (36.7%)	13 (43.3%)	6 (20.0%)	30 (100%)
Used the LIP's convening capacity to bring together organizations to help with resettlement	6 (19.4%)	20 (64.5%)	5 (16.1%)	31 (100%)
Coordinated the participation of organizations in the overall effort to resettle humanitarian entrants	10 (33.3%)	15 (50.0%)	5 (16.7%)	30 (100%)
Helped settlement service provider organizations coordinate their resettlement efforts	11 (36.7%)	14 (46.7%)	5 (16.7%)	30 (100%)
Helped immigrant settlement service providers (SPOs) enlist other organizations to help resettle humanitarian entrants	12 (40.0%)	11 (36.7%)	7 (23.3%)	30 (100%)
Other	3 (21.4%)	3 (21.4%)	8 (57.1%)	14 (100%)

As shown in Table 7, LIP coordinators were more likely to report their LIPs as having a significant role across various collective efforts for Syrian humanitarian entrants. The most notable roles included bringing together organizations (64.5%), sensitizing mainstream and community

organizations to the needs of humanitarian entrants (58.1%), and, coordinating the participation of various organizations (50%).

Similar roles were reported by Coordinators in municipal and non-municipal LIPs, however, for non-municipal LIPs, the likelihood of significantly engaging in the aforementioned roles was lower (Appendix B, Tables 7a & 7b). An interesting pattern occurs when looking at differences across population centre sizes. Small/medium population centre LIPs reported less activity in the collective efforts to resettle Syrian humanitarian entrants compared to the large population centre LIPs (Appendix B, Tables 7c & 7d). Once again, as shown in the iCARE-IMDB results, a possible explanation for these patterns is that small/medium population centre and non-municipal LIPs did not receive as many Syrian humanitarian entrants, and as a result, had less opportunity to coordinate resettlement efforts.

Table 8: What role did your LIP play in the collective effort to resettle Afghan humanitarian entrants?

	Not significant	Significant	Not Applicable	Total
Engaged in advocacy to boost the willingness of local organizations to help in the resettlement effort	21 (53.9%)	11 (28.2%)	7 (18.0%)	39 (100%)
Sensitized mainstream and community organizations to the resettlement needs of humanitarian entrants	18 (45.0%)	15 (37.5%)	7 (17.5%)	40 (100%)
Engaged in anticipatory projects to establish working relationships that allowed organizations to work together quickly and efficiently	18 (46.2%)	12 (30.8%)	9 (23.1%)	39 (100%)
Mobilized community support for resettlement	19 (50.0%)	12 (31.6%)	7 (18.4%)	38 (100%)
Used the LIP's convening capacity to bring together organizations to help with resettlement	14 (35.0%)	18 (45.0%)	8 (20.0%)	40 (100%)
Coordinated the participation of organizations in the overall effort to resettle humanitarian entrants	17 (43.6%)	13 (33.3%)	9 (23.1%)	39 (100%)
Helped settlement service provider organizations coordinate their resettlement efforts	16 (42.0%)	15 (38.5%)	8 (20.5%)	39 (100%)
Helped immigrant settlement service providers (SPOs) enlist other organizations to help resettle humanitarian entrants	18 (46.2%)	11 (28.2%)	10 (25.6%)	39 (100%)
Other	5 (35.7%)	1 (7.1%)	8 (57.1%)	14 (100%)

Table 8 shows LIPs' roles in the collective efforts to resettle Afghan humanitarian entrants. In the case of Afghan humanitarian entrants, LIPs were more likely to report 'not significant' roles in the collective efforts to aid in their resettlement. The only role that LIPs reported higher

‘significant’ role with respect to Afghan refugees versus Syrian refugees involved LIP’s capacity to bring organizations together.

Examining LIPs by municipality, municipal LIPs were more likely than non-municipal LIPs to report ‘not significant’ roles in the collective resettlement efforts of Afghan humanitarian entrants (Appendix B, Tables 8a & 8b). Non-municipal LIPs reported more significant roles in bringing together organizations to help with resettlement and in helping settlement service provider organizations coordinate their resettlement efforts. It is not surprising that large population centre LIPs reported more significant roles in the collective resettlement efforts of Afghan entrants compared to small/medium population centres since they were less likely to receive Afghan entrants to begin with (iCARE-IMDB and Appendix B, Tables 8c & 8d).

Table 9: What role did your LIP play in the collective effort to resettle Ukrainian humanitarian entrants?

	Not Significant	Significant	Not Applicable	Total
Engaged in advocacy to boost the willingness of local organizations to help in the resettlement effort	13 (25.5%)	32 (62.8%)	6 (11.8%)	51 (100%)
Sensitized mainstream and community organizations to the resettlement needs of humanitarian entrants	11 (21.6%)	29 (56.9%)	11 (21.6%)	51 (100%)
Engaged in anticipatory projects to establish working relationships that allowed organizations to work together quickly and efficiently	22 (44.0%)	20 (40.0%)	8 (16.0%)	50 (100%)
Mobilized community support for resettlement	19 (38.0%)	24 (48.0%)	7 (14.0%)	50 (100%)
Used the LIP's convening capacity to bring together organizations to help with resettlement	15 (30.6%)	29 (59.2%)	5 (10.2%)	49 (100%)
Coordinated the participation of organizations in the overall effort to resettle humanitarian entrants	15 (30.6%)	23 (46.9%)	11 (22.5%)	49 (100%)
Helped settlement service provider organizations coordinate their resettlement efforts	22 (44.0%)	17 (34.0%)	11 (22.0%)	50 (100%)
Helped immigrant settlement service providers (SPOs) enlist other organizations to help resettle humanitarian entrants	21 (42.9%)	20 (40.8%)	8 (16.3%)	49 (100%)
Other	2 (11.8%)	8 (47.1%)	7 (41.2%)	17 (100%)

Table 9 shows the roles that LIPs played in the collective efforts to resettle Ukrainian humanitarian entrants. For most collective efforts, LIP Coordinators reported 'significant' roles in resettlement of Ukrainian humanitarian entrants (with a few exceptions). The most notable

roles include advocacy engagement (62.8%); bringing together organizations (59.2%); and, sensitizing mainstream and community organizations to the needs of humanitarian entrants (56.9%).

Looking at the differences by municipality, in the case of Ukrainian entrants, non-municipal LIPs reported significant engagement in 7 out of the 8 roles suggested (Appendix B, Tables 9a & 9b). Similar levels of engagement were reported by municipal LIPs. Comparing LIPs by population centre size, large centres reported more significant engagement in the collective efforts of resettling Ukrainian entrants, compared to small/medium centres (Appendix B, Tables 9c & 9d).

It is worth noting that the number of 'significant' responses was highest for the Ukrainian humanitarian entrants, which might be explained by the start date in the current roles of most LIP coordinators. Additionally, for Syrian and Afghan humanitarian entrants, there were lots of roles that were 'not applicable' to the resettlement efforts of these groups. Some explanations could be a lack of familiarity of LIP Coordinators of the activities of their predecessors, or, as previously mentioned, their particular LIP did not participate in the resettlement efforts of these groups.

Contributions

This section presents results regarding the contributions LIPs have made in the resettlement efforts of each humanitarian group.

Table 10: How would you rate the OVERALL importance of your contribution to each resettlement effort?

	Syrian	Afghan	Ukrainian
Very important contribution	9 (17.3%)	6 (10.9%)	12 (21.4%)
Important contribution	12 (23.1%)	7 (12.7%)	20 (35.7%)
Moderate contribution	11 (21.2%)	14 (25.5%)	13 (23.2%)
Not very important contribution	9 (17.3%)	12 (21.8%)	7 (12.5%)
No contribution	11 (21.2%)	16 (29.1%)	4 (7.1%)
Total	52 (100%)	55 (100%)	56 (100%)

Table 10 describes the perceived overall importance that LIP Coordinators have regarding their contribution to resettlement efforts. LIP Coordinators were more likely to report no contributions to the resettlement efforts of Syrian and Afghan humanitarian entrants (21.2%, and 29.1% respectively), while only 7.1 % of LIP Coordinators reported no contribution in the resettlement efforts of Ukrainian humanitarian entrants.

In the case of Syrian and Afghan entrants, non-municipal and small/medium centres were more likely to rate their overall contribution to the respective resettlement efforts as “no contribution” or as “not very important contribution” (Appendix B, Tables 10a – 10d). The resettlement efforts of Ukrainian entrants was rated as ‘important’ or ‘very important’ across LIPs regardless of municipality or population centre size (Appendix B, Tables 10e & 10f).

Table 11: Factors that played a significant contributory role to making an 'important' or 'very important' contribution to Syrian humanitarian efforts

	Did Not	Did	Total
Factor 1: Previous experience by your LIP in mobilizing help	8 (40.0%)	12 (60.0%)	20 (100%)
Factor 2: The ability of your LIP to draw on the capacities of local settlement agencies	1 (5.0%)	19 (95.0%)	20 (100%)
Factor 3: Skills and capacities of the refugees and humanitarian entrants	11 (57.9%)	8 (42.1%)	19 (100%)
Factor 4: Previous local involvement/experience in humanitarian resettlement that your LIP was able to draw on	9 (47.4%)	10 (52.6%)	19 (100%)
Factor 5: The ability of your LIP to mobilize co-ethnics in the resettlement destination	5 (26.3%)	14 (73.7%)	19 (100%)
Factor 6: Access by your LIP to local champions with prior involvement/experience in resettlement	3 (16.7%)	15 (83.3%)	18 (100%)
Factor 7: Ability of the LIP to readily access additional resources	5 (25.0%)	15 (75.0%)	20 (100%)

Table 11 describes which factors had an ‘important’ or ‘very important’ impact on the resettlement of Syrian humanitarian entrants. The most common factors were the ability to draw on the capacity of local settlement agencies (95%), access to local champions with previous involvement in resettlement (83.3%), and the ability to readily access additional resources (75%).

Further, for municipal LIPs, the ability of the LIP to draw on capacities of local settlement agencies was the most significant factor. The non-municipal LIPs reported that all the factors listed had a significant contribution to the Syrian resettlement (Appendix B, Tables 11a & 11b). Additionally, regardless of the size of the population centre, all LIPs reported that all the

aforementioned factors had a contributory role in the resettlement of Syrian entrants (Appendix B, Tables 11c & 11d).

Table 12: Factors played a significant contributory role to making an 'important' or 'very important' contribution to Afghan humanitarian entrants.

	Did Not	Did	Total
Factor 1: Previous experience by your LIP in mobilizing help	4 (33.3%)	8 (66.7%)	12 (100%)
Factor 2: The ability of your LIP to draw on the capacities of local settlement agencies	2 (16.7%)	10 (83.3%)	12 (100%)
Factor 3: Skills and capacities of the refugees and humanitarian entrants	8 (72.7%)	3 (27.3%)	11 (100%)
Factor 4: Previous local involvement/experience in humanitarian resettlement that your LIP was able to draw on	4 (33.3%)	8 (66.7%)	12 (100%)
Factor 5: The ability of your LIP to mobilize co-ethnics in the resettlement destination	4 (36.4%)	7 (63.6%)	11 (100%)
Factor 6: Access by your LIP to local champions with prior involvement/experience in resettlement	2 (16.7%)	10 (83.3%)	12 (100%)
Factor 7: Ability of the LIP to readily access additional resources	2 (18.2%)	9 (81.8%)	11 (100%)

Table 12 describes which factors had an 'important' or 'very important' contribution in the resettlement of Afghan humanitarian entrants. The factors with most contributory roles are the ability to draw on the capacity of local settlement agencies (83.3%), access to local champions with previous involvement in resettlement (83.3%), and the ability to readily access additional resources (81.8%).

For municipal LIPs, the skills and capacities of humanitarian entrants was not a significant contributing role, while a majority of the non-municipal LIPs reported that all the factors listed had a contributory role to the resettlement of Afghan entrants (Appendix B, Tables 12a & 12b). Based on the size of the population centre, in large centre LIPs, all the factors contributed to the resettlement of Afghan entrants (except for the skills and capacities of the refugees and humanitarian entrants). Keep in mind, however, that the sample of responses for the small/medium centre LIPs was of only one respondent, making it difficult to make assumptions

of the importance of these factors in the resettlement of Afghan entrants (Appendix B, Tables 12c & 12d).

Table 13: Factors played a significant contributory role to making an 'important' or 'very important' contribution to Ukrainian humanitarian entrants.

	Did Not	Did	Total
Factor 1: Previous experience by your LIP in mobilizing help	7 (24.1%)	22 (75.9%)	29 (100%)
Factor 2: The ability of your LIP to draw on the capacities of local settlement agencies	3 (9.4%)	29 (90.6%)	32 (100%)
Factor 3: Skills and capacities of the refugees and humanitarian entrants	17 (56.7%)	13 (43.3%)	30 (100%)
Factor 4: Previous local involvement/experience in humanitarian resettlement that your LIP was able to draw on	8 (25.8%)	23 (74.2%)	31 (100%)
Factor 5: The ability of your LIP to mobilize co-ethnics in the resettlement destination	8 (28.6%)	20 (71.4%)	28 (100%)
Factor 6: Access by your LIP to local champions with prior involvement/experience in resettlement	6 (19.4%)	25 (80.7%)	31 (100%)
Factor 7: Ability of the LIP to readily access additional resources	6 (20.0%)	24 (80.0%)	30 (100%)

Table 13 describes which factors had an 'important' or 'very important' contribution in the resettlement of Ukrainian humanitarian entrants. The most important factors were the ability to draw on the capacity of local settlement agencies (90.6%), access to local champions with previous involvement in resettlement (80.7%), and the ability to readily access additional resources (80%).

LIP Coordinators reported that all factors, except for the skills and capacities of the refugees and humanitarian entrants, were significant in the resettlement of Ukrainian entrants, regardless of municipality or population centre sizes (Appendix B, Tables 13a – 13d).

Overall, the same three factors had the most contributory roles in the resettlement efforts of Syrian, Afghan, and Ukrainian humanitarian entrants.

LIP Organization & Planning

The following section focuses on the internal organization and planning of LIPs that contributed to the resettlement efforts of humanitarian entrants.

Table 14: Did you receive significant help for your involvement in humanitarian resettlement from the following sectors/institutions?

	No	Yes	Total
Universities or Colleges	35 (70.0%)	15 (30.0%)	50 (100%)
Businesses or employers	26 (49.1%)	27 (50.9%)	53 (100%)
Settlement Umbrella Associations	17 (34.0%)	33 (66.0%)	50 (100%)

Table 14 indicates that most LIPs received significant help with their involvement in humanitarian resettlement from Settlement Umbrella Associations (66%), followed by Businesses or employers (50.9%). Only 30% of LIPs reported receiving significant help in humanitarian resettlement from Universities or Colleges. Municipality and population centre size did not impact these results – Settlement Umbrella Associations were still the partner that offered the most help in the resettlement of Syrian, Afghan, and Ukrainian entrants (Appendix B, Tables 14a – 14d).

Table 15: Did your agreement significantly help or hinder your resettlement involvement?

	Frequency	Percent
Significantly helped	27	77.1%
Significantly hindered	8	22.9%
Total	35	100%

Table 15 indicates that 77.1% of LIP Coordinators suggested that their agreement significantly helped with their humanitarian resettlement involvement. The same patterns were observed regardless of municipality or population centre size (Appendix B, Tables 15a & 15b).

Table 16: Did your LIP's prior planning activities and pre-existing committees contribute to the shape or scale of your community's resettlement response?

	Frequency	Percent
No	9	19.6%
Yes	37	80.4%
Total	46	100%

Table 16 indicates that 80.4% LIPs had prior activities and committees that contributed to the community's engagement with the resettlement response. The same patterns were observed regardless of municipality or population centre size (Appendix B, Tables 16a & 16b).

Overall, these results have several implications. First, LIPs appeared to have different levels of involvement with each humanitarian cohort. This may be because several LIPs did not exist at the time these entrants arrived, or that their coordinators did not know if their LIPs were involved. As we'll see in the next section on interviews with LIP coordinators, it may also be because LIPs do not see coordinating services for humanitarian flows as part of their mandate. Third, the work of LIPs is multifaceted when it comes to coordinating services. Many coordinators reported that their LIPs engaged new partners, ensured that existing partners helped with resettlement efforts, and solicited help from members of the same ethnic group. This high level of coordination makes a clear case for the centrality of LIPs with refugee resettlement. It is unlikely that any other body could have assumed this role.

Although there is a very important role that LIPs can and should play in the settlement of newcomers, there are areas of operations that can be improved. In our study, nearly a quarter of all LIP coordinators stated that the LIP funding agreement significantly hinders resettlement efforts.

Finally, there is a tremendously high level of turnover, making it difficult to maintain continuity on several levels. LIP partners, for example, must develop new relationships with LIP coordinators on a fairly regular basis. Furthermore, unless careful records are kept, large tasks like coordinating humanitarian resettlement would have to start from scratch. Even in the event that there is careful record-keeping, many coordinators may not have the time needed to review and familiarize themselves with all practices, notes and protocols. This could prevent LIPs from building and maintaining a repository of best practices. Since many coordinators had experience in the settlement sector, which also has high levels of turnover, this may only be easily addressed with a significant increase in resources.

8. Interviews with LIP coordinators, settlement agencies, and other agencies involved with refugee resettlement

In this section, we supplement the results presented thus far by drawing on interviews we conducted with LIP coordinators, the heads of settlement agencies, and other LIP participants. We organize our results by question, using the order as it appears in the interview guide (Appendix D).

Before embarking on the analysis, there are several points to clarify regarding our interpretation of our four guiding questions:

- (a) Under what conditions are LIPs best placed to succeed?
- (b) In what spheres of activity have LIPs proved to be most effective?
- (c) What was the range and efficacy of LIP activities?
- (d) What partnerships underpinned the work of LIPs?

In our analysis, we distinguish between ‘conditions’ and ‘spheres of activity’ by using spheres of activity to refer to policy areas, and to different orders of government and the public, private and civil society domains. ‘Conditions’ refer to demographic, locational and other circumstances, including prior local experience with refugee movements and the quality of working relations among key institutions. ‘Partnerships’ and ‘spheres of activity’ are used interchangeably to refer to policy and practice fields. Both terms can be used to describe the broad range of LIP initiatives.

Concerning impact assessment, the Call for Proposals asks about the efficacy of LIP activities. Our analysis refers to two kinds of LIP efficacy. The first concerns *strategic efficacy*, which includes effective partnership formation and mobilization, consultations and planning to guide service delivery, and background measures to enhance public and partner support for immigrants and refugees. The second refers to *operational efficacy*, which involves helping to coordinate service delivery to immigrants and refugees and providing logistical support, such as convening partners when needed. Both forms of efficacy are crucial to the success of LIPs.

(a) Who do LIPs partner with? A general overview

LIP partnership formation and mobilization are at the core of what LIPs do to advance the program’s strategic interest in newcomer integration and associated high-level goals. To nourish the relationships, LIPs must be responsive to the needs and interests of partners who control the resources needed for successful newcomer settlement. External events that suddenly bring many people to Canada can stress and distort relationships, particularly when there is tension around how involved LIPs could/should be in refugee resettlement.

The basis of any organizational partnership is to achieve shared objectives that organizations cannot attain on their own. This point is essential for thinking about LIPs and LIP capacities: partners are at the LIP table to further their own concerns, as opposed to those of the LIPs, even where interests are at times coincident. What this means is that shared actions are not ‘favours’ but intersections of interests whose durability (i.e. the durability of the intersections) depends on the persistence of the circumstances that gave rise to their existence. If circumstances or goals change, so too may the strength and permanence of partnerships. This is

a key point in our analysis because LIP partnerships were primarily built to address immigrant integration as opposed to refugee resettlement. This is an argument that is reflected in the comments of numerous LIP coordinators who do not feel they are resourced to take on a major role in promoting and managing humanitarian settlement. *Similarly (but to an unknown extent), LIP partners may also feel that focusing on large-scale refugee intake diverts attention from what many see as their primary interest and mandate in supporting the settlement and integration of immigrants.*

The composition and orientation of each LIP constitutes a marriage of convenience that may be broadly or narrowly founded depending on the organizations at the table, the extent to which partner agendas intersect with those of LIP and with each other – think of a complex Venn diagram - and the local context in which they are operating. In the Greater Toronto Area, to pick an extreme example, nearly fifty percent of clients, regardless of program and policy field, will be immigrants, increasing the likelihood of shared interests among organizations and between those organizations and LIPs.

The government partners most frequently mentioned by LIP coordinators during our interviews were agencies concerned with housing, health, education, employment and settlement. The majority of these partners were recruited to address immigrant concerns and were only later enlisted to help meet refugee needs (housing is the exception and has, from the start, occupied a central role in responding to refugee admissions). Repurposing partners - that is, persuading partners who were recruited to help newcomers in general get involved in refugee resettlement specifically - is a necessary consequence of engagement with large-scale humanitarian admission. Some LIPs have done this more effectively than others.

An important factor governing the ability of LIPs to enlist partners to assist immigrants and humanitarian entrants is co-location. This allows partners to be engaged in working groups and LIP committees, which results in higher levels of participation and commitment. Larger centres benefit from the presence of numerous federal and provincial agencies staffed by senior officials. Smaller centres offer more limited opportunities to recruit provincial and federal decision-makers, and while municipal agencies remain accessible, they offer a more limited palette of services for newcomers.

The range of partners and corresponding services tapped by LIPs is extremely broad. In education, LIPs have worked with school boards to elicit support for student counselling, language training, and tutoring; LIPs have also engaged post-secondary institutions in professional training, skills upgrading, and credentialing issues. Similarly, regarding health, LIPs have successfully engaged community health centres and hospitals around primary health care, mental health services and health equity issues, and municipal public health authorities have worked with LIPs on issues such as access to medication, vaccine rollouts, diabetes counselling, dental care (especially for refugees), and community health concerns. On the economic front, LIPs were involved with settlement service providers and federal and provincial agencies to elicit support for job searches, employment workshops, and job-related language training. LIPs also

engaged employer groups and regional and municipal economic development agencies to promote employment opportunities for new arrivals.

Apart from supporting government organizations and drawing on them for assistance, we found that many LIPs engaged extensively with community organizations such as the United Way and Community Foundations, with religious and ethnic institutions, with local leaders, with employer groups, with organizations that focused on the needs of particular population segments (such as refugee women, seniors and youth), and with volunteers and donors. In large centres, all of the groups cited above were tapped for assistance by the LIPs; in smaller centres, especially when refugees were involved, LIPs relied more heavily on help from religious institutions and ethnic organizations (etc. homeowners willing to offer lodging, employers willing to offer jobs and training, and a host of volunteers helping with transportation, translation, recreational activities and so forth). We found that many LIPs also helped community organizations and volunteers by providing vital information and training (with the help of settlement organizations), and by following up with volunteers, employers, and hosts to offer additional assistance as required. LIPs also linked community groups and refugees to the formal service infrastructure.

The final set of institutions listed in this overview of organizations that LIPs worked closely with and relied on are settlement service providers that deliver direct federal and provincial services to newcomers and refugees. In most regions, settlement service providers supported the LIPs by sharing knowledge and information and participating in LIP committees and working groups concerned with planning, service delivery and coordinating information provision, housing, health, education and employment services. Some settlement service organizations were also involved in the provision of specialized refugee services under the Refugee Assistance Program (RAP) and assisted and benefitted from LIP efforts to mobilize community support. Eligibility for the RAP program requires formal designations that were in place for Syrian and Afghan refugees but absent (at least early on) for the Ukrainian movement, leading to significant challenges.

Box 1: Reflections on actions and behaviours that led to partner support

... The relationships developed through working groups, committees, years of community outreach, the collaboration we've led over the years on priorities, and the events we've hosted or joined [ensured that] our partners are quick to respond to us when there is a need, just like we are quick to respond to them. Whenever there is an emergency - we have someone to call on.

... Our LIP's recognized role in convening meant we could pull together the ad-hoc cross-sectoral refugee resettlement support working group with relative ease (access to contacts, established relationship with co-chair of the working group ... who had rapport with IRCC and provincial government directly.)

... Established networks made it easier to coordinate and identify partners needed [while] experience with previous humanitarian efforts provided lessons learned/pitfalls to avoid.

... The history of relationships and collective knowledge through the work of the partnership enabled us to act quickly and smartly to [implement] a whole of community response during the Syrian initiative ... and we have been able to leverage the same with Afghan and Ukrainians efforts.

... [Partners] contributed to the resettlement effort because it was easier to mobilize the resources for employment, education, social services and housing since there are already working groups that focus on each of those areas.

... Keep strong relationships with regional and local governments as they are important liaisons to federal and provincial governments; Consider a top area of contribution (beyond communication/convening) and focus on that to avoid being overstretched.

... I think the biggest piece of advice I can give is building those relationships with organizations in the community.

(b) LIP Mandates and Practices

For those that see it as a part of their mandate or a potential part of their mandate, expanding their role regarding large-scale humanitarian migration would likely require deepening existing relationships with government bodies, resulting in possible changes at the strategic and, almost certainly, at the expenditure level. Many agencies stressed how resource-intensive helping irregular migrants can be and that they often lacked the resources to help adequately.

At the community level, expanding the role of LIPs would similarly deepen relationships, but it would also result in LIPs casting a wider net in terms of systematizing various relationships and widening existing connections. Below, we raise questions about the sustainability of such a shift and its possible impact on support for the immigration program as a whole. The concerns and issues we raise, however, do not imply that expanding the role of LIPs in large-scale humanitarian movements is ill-advised; in fact, we found in our interviews that many LIPs are well-suited and willing to assist in refugee integration. As part of our study, we have devised a broad set of questions and factors to consider in relation to a LIP's decision to expand its humanitarian role (possibly at the cost of other activities). These concerns are elaborated:

- (a) The number and range of institutions that actively and seriously engage with LIPs across the country indicate that LIPs are important to multiple organizations across all levels of government and to many civil society organizations. This observation and the numerous forms of engagement that were offered as examples, in a substantive and tangible way, answer the National LIP Secretariat's questions about spheres of activity, partnerships and the range of LIP actions (subject to a caveat that we take up below).

Further evidence of importance is supplied by the stability of LIP partnerships. Neither the LIP coordinators nor the partners we interviewed gave any signs whatsoever that they were considering abandoning the partnerships they'd worked so hard to nurture. In fact, the discussions had a forward-looking focus that spoke to general satisfaction with the opportunities afforded to partners by the LIPs to pursue important issues. Moreover, it would be reasonable to extend the inference to claim that the partners were also satisfied with the LIP 'machinery'; that is, with the medium that hosted their deliberations and the actions that flowed from these discussions. This once again speaks to the LIPs' strength through diversity and implies that a once-size-fits-all framework would not be effective across all LIPs.

- (b) As noted earlier, complex partnerships such as the LIPs are not bound together and stabilized by simple binary intersections between the interests of LIPs and the paired interests of individual institutions. Instead, they are bound by complex overlaps between individual institutions and multiple other partners at various LIP tables, in ways that are not always symmetrical or reciprocal. There is an important strategic lesson in this, namely that the value and stability of LIP partnerships are not simply a function of the intersecting interests of LIPs and their partners; they also depend on the intersections among its members. As currently configured, LIPs have a broad mandate that embraces a large proportion of the Canadian population, including immigrants, refugees, and other entrants, thus ensuring intersecting interests among a broad swathe of LIP partners. Narrowing this mandate – a likely consequence of asking LIPs to take on a larger role for a smaller population segment (refugees) - could weaken not only the primary partnerships between LIPs and other institutions but also the secondary intersections that attract partners to the LIP table. This is the caveat we referred to earlier.

To accurately assess the possibilities and consequences associated with a stronger embrace of humanitarian migration would require a clear description of the problems that LIPs would be expected to address. These include a discussion of possible displacement effects on the time and energy that the LIPs devote to immigrant concerns (as a result of focusing attention on refugees). Crucially, it also requires considering how such a shift would affect the interests and behaviours of current partners.

On the need for a clear description of the LIP role regarding large-scale humanitarian inflows and an assessment of possible displacement effects, several coordinators expressed the

view that LIPs would be more effective if IRCC would provide them with a clear understanding of what was expected, along with funding to support the role. During our interviews, the coordinators emphasized the fact that sudden influxes of refugees demanded rapid responses that quickly exceeded their capacities, as well as the capacities of some partners. Many coordinators indicated that a shift in focus towards humanitarian migration would require them to recruit partners other than (or in addition to) those engaged in traditional settlement support. Some of the existing partner organizations that were mentioned included the Red Cross, Children's Aid Society, RAP service providers, housing and health organizations (to a greater extent than is currently the case) and various community organizations.

To answer the question of what additional and/or new organizations would need to be engaged, several LIPs suggested that an Emergency Response Framework would help LIPs identify which agencies they should recruit and what precise role they should be asked to provide. This suggestion, which was brought up several times during our interviews, was always posed as an accretion to existing duties. This adds another dimension to the question of whether LIPs should play a bigger role in large-scale resettlement. In at least one instance, IRCC was approached with a request for additional resources for incremental support, but the LIP in question was turned down. Other requests appear to have been supported.

On the crucial issue of whether a shift in direction to emphasize humanitarian immigration would affect the interests and behaviours of current partners, we did not interview a sufficient number of partner organizations and are, unfortunately, unable to provide a direct answer. To do so would have required a more explicit reference question, possibly along the lines of a specific scenario. That said, we regard the issue as fundamental for forming an opinion as to the consequences of reorienting the LIPs to shift some emphasis to humanitarian entrants as opposed to immigrants. The likely response to a request to shift emphasis, particularly without additional resources from IRCC, would likely be met with some resistance by some LIPs (especially those that do not see resettlement assistance as part of their mandate). To illustrate with a hypothetical question, would regional economic development agencies that play an active role in many LIPs located in smaller urban regions be willing to invest the same energy if the focus were to from economic and business migrants to refugees?

We are not aware of attempts to think through what an optimal LIP partnership portfolio would consist of if it were purpose-built to assist in the reception of large-scale humanitarian movements. We are also not aware of the overall level of receptivity to a suggested partnership portfolio. In the following sections, we address different aspects of this question and what it implies for LIPs, other IRCC-funded institutions, and partners.

(c) Need to clarify the role LIPs are expected to play in humanitarian migration

As noted above, refugees comprise a relatively small part of Canada's overall intake of newcomers but command a disproportionately large emotional and symbolic footprint. Refugees also make disproportionately large claims on settlement services as well as other economic and social supports. Moreover, their impact has been amplified by the rapidity with which successive waves of refugees followed each other, not providing service and community organizations much respite from their efforts. In this context, the National LIP Secretariat has asked the study team to consider the role of LIPs in respect of large-scale humanitarian movements. Could or should LIPs play a significant role in large-scale humanitarian resettlement initiatives? If they could, what would be required from them? Partners? Governments?

The interviews revealed a significant degree of confusion, or perceived lack of clarity, regarding role and purpose, relations with other IRCC-funded institutions, and what was expected of LIPs in terms of working with other institutions, eliciting support and settling refugees and humanitarian entrants. LIPs were uncertain whether their involvement should be regarded as an exceptional response to unusual circumstances or an ongoing requirement for which they should prepare. Quite a few LIP coordinators, both in interviews and in their survey responses, indicated a need for clarity regarding what IRCC expects LIPs to do to enhance support for refugees and humanitarian entrants. They felt that a clear articulation of the LIP role would guide them in shaping their activities, as well as helping to calibrate the expectations of government agencies and other partners as to the LIP role. It is noteworthy that, at one end of the spectrum of responses, a significant number of LIPs took the position that they were not in the 'resettlement business'.

While the need to clarify the role of LIPs in respect of humanitarian migration is important, the comments in the box make it clear this should be done in conjunction with a broader effort to clarify the expected contributions of all IRCC-funded entities. In particular, the boundaries of what constitutes direct versus indirect services - and whether the definition applies only to IRCC-funded services and clients eligible for these services - is unclear.

In addition to clarifying the roles of IRCC-funded organizations, it will also be important to clarify expectations of support by other federal ministries, other levels of government, and other institutions that have previously contributed to efforts to settle refugees and humanitarian entrants. This would equip LIPs with baseline expectations as to what contributions they might hope to elicit, the mechanisms and supports they would need to deploy, and the resources they would need to do so.

Box 2: Comments indicating a lack of clarity or disagreement with objectives:

- *LIP's can be activated for emergencies, especially when broad support is needed ... but we do not have capacity to lead all refugee responses or there will be no one to lead housing, mental health, and other emergency responses ... however, we have been uniquely positioned, capable, and successful in some support to the Syrian crisis and significant support [for] ... the Ukrainian response, before handing the lead role back over to the settlement association ... we are not uniquely positioned or equipped to respond to regular refugee responses which are fully supported and staffed through RAP programs in settlement associations.*
- *The role of our LIP is to help all immigrants not just one group of people. We don't do projects or events specifically for one group of people.*
- *LIPs are funded to provide indirect service ... it would be helpful going forward if this could be clarified with the Secretariat and the LIPs. There seems to be confusion over what the roles/funding are ...*
- *It is the role of the settlement providers, not the LIPs.*
- *We are not a direct service provider, so we could not take action beyond convening, coordinating, advocating. It was also tricky to act without direction from our funder (IRCC), especially with the Syrian arrivals. At that time, there was considerable hesitancy to act outside our funding mandate*
- *We did not have anything set up specifically for this eventuality ... however, we do have certain strategic priorities and principles that we could refer to (e.g. ensuring that basic needs of newcomers are met) ...*
- *Our action plan did not include space for any humanitarian crisis ...*
- *We created a new LIP role to engage with both community and Ukrainians*

One suggestion that was shared a number of times with the assessment team concerned the creation of a 'crisis response framework' clarifying the Ministry's expectations regarding the roles and contributions of various actors. This idea, which has advantages and shortcomings, is discussed in greater detail in section 'f' below. At a minimum, it would help to identify the actors that LIPs would need to develop relationships with, which would also provide a partial answer to what capacities they would require. As the box entitled 'Comments regarding perceived pressures to assume a larger role' makes clear, any expansion in the LIP role will need to be accompanied by a review of capacity and assets.

Box 3: Comments regarding perceived pressures to assume a larger role

- *We couldn't have been more involved without having another staff member ... and without our contract saying we can provide direct services.*
- *We have limited space in our schedule to do anything more than what we did.*
- *Probably, but I'm not sure where the capacity to 'do more' is supposed to come from.*
- *We did/are doing the most we could/can with the resources we had/are available to us.*
- *There is always the possibility to be more involved; however, funding plays a major role in the inability to offer more.*
- *If we had the human resources and financial supports [we] could have been more involved*
- *Our program officer was flexible but we needed ... more funding and ... time.*

(d) Collaboration with other IRCC-funded agencies

The LIP surveys and the interviews with LIP coordinators, service provider representatives (SPOs) and other partners told two stories about relations within the family of IRCC-funded organizations. On the one hand, between ninety and ninety-five percent of LIPs stated that their ability to draw on Service Provider Organizations (SPOs) contributed to their success in helping to address (re)settlement needs. On the other hand, both our survey and the interviews we conducted revealed tensions within the IRCC-funded network.

We begin by describing the network of IRCC-funded institutions. The menagerie consists of:

- (i) Settlement service provider organizations (SPOs) are amalgamated organizations contracted by IRCC to deliver newcomer settlement services. Many SPOs also seek and obtain additional support from other federal and provincial sources for services or client populations outside IRCC's reach. In addition to the 'regular' package of services offered to newcomers, a proportion of SPOs also provide specialized reception, financial assistance and initial accommodation services to refugees under the RAP program (refugee assistance program). Many SPOs are also multi-service agencies, for whom settlement services represent only a portion of a broader suite of community services.
- (ii) LIPs are a complicated set of institutions of varying size that take on multiple forms, including LIPs that cover cities and towns ranging in size from large metropolitan areas to small centres and rural regions; geographically-based LIPs that carve up the GTA; zonal LIPs in Alberta and the Atlantic that engage a number of small communities; and a satellite arrangement in which three LIPs are supported by a single SPO.
- (iii) Provincial and regional umbrella associations – are coordinating bodies that support SPOs and, to a minor extent, LIPs, advocate for newcomers, speak on behalf of the settlement sector with IRCC and other institutions, provide training, and sponsor operational research;

- (iv) The National LIP Secretariat pilot (NLS) – is a compact body that exists to help improve the efficacy of LIPs and to build LIP capacity through professional development, information sharing and tool development, as well as representing LIPS at the NSIC (the National Settlement Council - a collaborative forum operated by IRCC) and at various other forums, and with umbrella associations. The NLS was not intended to tell LIPs what they could or should do, but to instead represent LIP interests where necessary.

The surveys and interviews revealed a series of omissions and transgressions that are inconsistent with efficacious, productive relations among organizations that draw core support from the same ministry and are intended to operate in a mutually supportive manner. As reported by our interviewees, the challenges range from a reluctance to participate in or attend LIP activities to the (seemingly) systematic exclusion of LIPs from meetings with IRCC and SPO partners. The failure to share information diminishes the ability of LIPs to conduct their business efficiently and effectively, and it diminishes them in the eyes of the organizations they need to mobilize and work with. By way of contrast, in successful jurisdictions, there were extensive overlaps – leading to mutual advantage - in terms of the ministries and institutions that both SPOs and LIPs engaged.

The pockets of tension between SPOs and LIPs also extended to organizations that have GAR/RAP funding and were reluctant to share information or clients with other programs. If this situation persists, it will impede efforts to increase the role of LIPs in large-scale humanitarian entry (some of the reported problems may stem from uncertain eligibility for services and the changing status of Ukrainian entrants).

Another area that needs attention concerns the focus and operations of umbrella associations. A review of the strategic plans of all the provincial and regional umbrella organizations (the oldest such plan being initiated in 2019) turned up only one passing reference to the LIPs (notwithstanding the 66 percent affirmation by LIPs of receiving support from the provincial/regional umbrella associations). The absence of references to the LIPs was noteworthy since many of the plans identified strengthening partner relations as a strategic priority but did not connect this objective to LIPs in their jurisdiction.

The interviews and surveys with LIP coordinators and SPOs also revealed numerous examples of mutual support and assistance among IRCC-supported institutions that are instructive for the potential they demonstrate. These include a network of settlement agencies that together identify pilot projects that are developed by the LIP with funding secured by either the LIP or one of the agencies. This same group pools training funds that the LIP organizes on their behalf based on surveys, establishing priorities, and hiring appropriate trainers. Training support comes, in part, from the umbrella agency's fund for professional development. The LIP also organizes an annual planning day attended by SPO heads and managers, by IRCC and by the provincial immigration agency. A consultant is

brought in to help identify issues and establish priorities. The process is felt to have enhanced IRCC support.

In other jurisdictions, LIPs have been credited with boosting municipal involvement and support by city departments and agencies for the (re)settlement work by SPOs. LIPs have also successfully worked with SPOs to amplify support for immigrants and refugees by regional health organizations and local school boards. LIPs have also spoken positively about the advocacy work by umbrella associations, which has helped them mobilize support for refugees among a variety of institutions.

(e) acquisition, dissemination and production of information

This section discusses information and data needs of LIPs in two distinct domains: (1) LIP information and data needs to support partner mobilization and coordination and (2) LIPs as producers of data and information. Recommendations for the uses of data for improved operations and evaluations can be found in the following section (*recommendations*).

- *Information and data needs to support LIP partner mobilization and coordination.*

LIPs spoke repeatedly about the need for better and more timely data to support partner mobilization, advance planning, better matching of clients and services, and improved inter-agency coordination. Without accurate and timely data, the crisis response framework that is discussed in the following section would be inconsequential and without practical import. This point was backed by a senior figure in Ontario's (soon-to-be defunct) service systems integrator network.

The need for accurate anticipatory data is also strong at the micro level. For example, a landlord in the GTA expressed interest in housing Ukrainian refugees but found there needed to be a better match between the accommodation he offered and the demographic profiles of arrivals. He suggested that the LIP develop and maintain projections of arrivals and anticipated housing needs, but developing and maintaining such a system was beyond the LIP's capacity.

In addition to using information for operational and planning purposes, LIPs also employ information symbolically to establish their credibility with the organizations they seek to mobilize, thus signalling they can be relied upon for early warnings and accurate impact assessments. Coordinators underlined that IRCC and IRCC-funded organizations have a role to play in empowering LIPs by systematically referring to them and including them when communicating with the key players that LIPs engage (This point is discussed in the "recommendations" section on integrating the missions of IRCC-funded organizations).

- *LIPs as producers of data and information*

LIPs are not only data users but also data producers. LIPs across the country have conducted surveys and commissioned analyses to gauge their communities' welcoming capacity and signal the work that needs to be done. LIPs have also commissioned discrete analyses and

negotiated arrangements with community institutions for access to operational data to shed light on newcomer receptivity. By and large, these data have thus far had more symbolic than practical or operational value, largely because it is difficult to combine community-level data elicited through different sampling frames at different times for different purposes. Moreover, data are often most useful when comparing changes over time, which means that complex and costly exercises must be repeated to show value. Despite this, respondents felt that their efforts had been useful in terms of keeping groups engaged: in fact, one coordinator enthusiastically stated that the LIP's survey was a 'game changer.' Its value would be further enhanced if follow-up surveys could be launched and the data could be analyzed and compared to make informed policy decisions.

In addition to developing their own data, LIPs have also purchased data and analyses from academic researchers who produce community-level datasets that combine information from multiple sources to yield community welcome or receptivity indices. These datasets and the indicators they offer (these are commercial products) tend to have larger and more representative samples than LIP surveys but they are not sufficiently focused on operational themes to support their use for planning (other than, perhaps, at a strategic level) and, crucially, they do not offer insight into attribution – that is, insight into whether there is a causal relationship between the actions of community partners and community-level outcomes. That is not to say that these data are without value, but that instead making some small changes to the datasets could yield considerable value. We return to this proposition in the recommendations section of this report.

(f) Anticipatory planning and the need for an emergency preparedness framework

The interviews with LIP coordinators revealed strong interest in and support for developing crisis response frameworks, also referred to as emergency preparedness plans or templates. Successive, closely spaced waves of humanitarian entrants have driven home the importance of anticipatory actions to be initiated long before refugees begin to arrive at Canadian airports and borders. Coordinators also underlined that pre-existing investments – by the LIPs and service providers - in constructing collaborative partnerships paved the way for developing and putting action plans that can be triggered as soon as humanitarian arrivals are anticipated. Some of the comments in Box 4 below illustrate this point of view.

Box 4: The Importance of prior relationships

... Establish strong relationships ... to have support and advice when unexpected and challenging situations arise.

... We [already] had strong relationships with everyone ... so we just needed to plug in new players and a new population.

... We were used to communicating ... regularly and were able to transmit information and resources ... quickly. The community organizations were ... better prepared to serve their refugee clients.

... [We] could have been more involved ... if we'd had better information about what to expect, better connections to players organizing provincial or regional resettlement plans ... and more clarity about LIPs expected role in this work.

... Parties were already familiar with one another and were able to mobilize more rapidly and coordinate with each other.

... Respond immediately, when the public first hears about the humanitarian disaster ... that is the time to create a call to action ... that is when you have to mobilize efforts (call to action, call for donations, collaboration, etc.).

Both the survey of LIP coordinators and subsequent interviews produced a series of suggestions for constructing a crisis response framework and related handbook or action guide. The suggestions have been distilled and ordered and are set out below as a reflection of the 'lived experience' of LIP coordinators and service partners:

1. Identify key organizations and resources in the community relevant to addressing large-scale humanitarian intake with respect to particular groups.
2. Identify the ministries and officials that 'control' access to essential resources and services that humanitarian entrants need to access immediately or shortly after arrival. Enlist these officials in developing the crisis response framework and ensure that they validate their response plans within their ministries.
3. Ensure that partners have access to the appropriate decision-makers so actions and decisions can move quickly in critical areas like education, health and housing.
4. Create a committee that can be mobilized quickly and establish a 'lead face' so partners know whom to call to obtain support (commensurate with the capacities of LIPs and their access to decision-makers).
5. Work with partner agencies to develop anticipatory training capacity for service providers.
6. Pre-plan how to engage the broader community to assist in providing services to newcomers.
7. Seek assistance from municipal and provincial staff coordinating emergency responses to develop tools, protocols and scenario options.
8. Create checklists to engage various audiences, convey information, and seek assistance.

9. Create translated content to assist community partners and invest in translation tools and online translation capacity.
10. Adopt and regularly update a coordinated emergency response plan to be shared with partners, community leaders and interested community members.

(g) Misalignment of resources with the size and complexity of the LIP mission

LIPs are typically small organizations, ranging from one person to six or seven employees, that rely on collaborative structures for success. These structures span organizational governance, high-level leadership engagement, planning and consulting, advisory structures and issue-based working groups. Typically, the larger the community in which LIPs operate and the more complex their working environment (meaning more potential partners), the more elaborate the structural machinery and the greater the effort needed to manage partner engagement, partner coordination and convening activities in aid of planning and service delivery.

Box 5: Need for alignment between mission complexity and LIP resources

- *A large immigrant service provider organization that works closely with the LIP commented on the fact that there was only a loose relationship between community size, newcomer and refugee intake, and the capacity of the LIP. LIPs situated in areas receiving very large numbers of humanitarian entrants were no larger (or barely larger) than LIPs operating in areas with small numbers of refugees.*
- *The coordinator of a LIP located in a large metropolitan region spoke about being unable to maintain weekly briefings with partners ... meeting frequency dropped from weekly, to bi-weekly and to monthly as activity levels rose and overwhelmed the LIP's capacity. Meeting frequency is essential to maintain engagement and influence.*
- *A LIP coordinator in an area receiving large number of refugees indicated that the LIP had to abandon tailored alerts and communications with 211 agencies and fall back on general announcements.*

What LIPs say they need:

... increase in funding for staffing ... to support hosting of community events
... more staff; more money to pay staff
... additional funding [for] language translation and interpretation; additional staff
... funding to hire support ... trauma training, cultural training
... funding for translation services
... additional staff; funding to prepare employers, homeowners, landlords and other non-settlement agencies; funding for introductory programs and events for newcomers
... funding to hire supporting staff ... EDI training coordinator, communications ... grant and funding proposal writer ... support for translation and interpretation ... funding for community networking that supports women
... [capacity funding to enlist] ... government representatives to explain necessary steps for school aid
... for kids to be vaccinated ... [for] recruiting doctors providing on demand service ... we are significantly limited in terms of staff capacity ... [it is a] primary barrier

As it stands, the prevailing view among LIP coordinators and settlement service providers is that funds have been allocated without sufficient regard to local potentialities, scale of operations, partners needing to be engaged, and the challenges that regions face, especially in times of crisis such as when facing waves of humanitarian entrants. As noted above, if LIPs are to play a greater role in humanitarian immigration, there would need to be a significant increase in funding in regions where large-scale humanitarian migration is likely to occur and LIPs are willing to help with resettlement.

LIPs and SPOs both commented on LIP resourcing and pressures during our interviews. The box below describes some of the comments, followed by the coordinator's responses concerning the resources that would be needed to scale up their efforts.

Based on our interviews, it seemed clear that the resource under the greatest pressure and requiring the most support was the time of LIP coordinators. Coordinators repeatedly spoke about the strain of needing to 'invest' in the ongoing cycle of partner mobilization, partner support, communication with other implicated organizations, leadership engagement to maintain support, etc. Moreover, to be effective and credible, coordinators must constantly invest in themselves to communicate with partners' concerns across multiple policy domains, notably housing, health, employment, education, justice and settlement. Acquiring and maintaining this expertise is essential to earning the trust of partners, clients, and stakeholders so that they can enlist them in LIP activities. This, too, requires ongoing investments of time and effort.

(h) Coordinator turnover and the resulting loss of knowledge and social capital

In organizing and conducting interviews with LIP coordinators, we encountered a surprising amount of turnover. New coordinators proved willing but limited in their knowledge of the existing landscape, partner relations, and prior activities. In several of our interviews, the coordinators who were new to the job were joined by their former colleagues who had direct experience with one or more of the refugee movements in which we had expressed interest.

Box 6: Responses indicating LIP turnover

..... 42% of coordinators indicated that their start date interfered with their ability to respond to the questionnaire

..... 52% of coordinators found it difficult to answer questions about the Syrian and Afghan refugee movements

..... 50% of coordinators had been in the job for less than three years

Coordinator and staff turnover is a significant problem for LIPs maintaining continuity with partner relations, an essential feature of the emergency response to unanticipated (or barely anticipated) humanitarian inflows. The problem is especially acute where LIPs are concerned because of their small size and inability to draw on retained expertise within their structure due to turnover.

At the heart of the problem is a mismatch between the wages and benefits available to coordinators and the skills required to execute a coordinator's job. Better-paying employment opportunities await coordinators in both the public and private sectors, in part because the nature of their job is a testament to their ability to engage with and build consensus among partners, manage highly complex and multifaceted tasks, and work under often extreme pressure. This is also a widespread problem within the settlement sector, and absent significant upward adjustments in wages and benefits, the problem will likely continue.⁴

(i) Promising Practices

The presence of numerous LIP coordinators at conferences organized by Metropolis (which has a long tradition of NGO and practitioner-led workshops) and Pathways to Prosperity (which has maintained a longstanding interest in the LIP program) attests to strong interest in research related to LIP practices and outcomes. This was affirmed by LIP coordinators who spoke about the value of research collaborations and the importance of exchanging ideas with other LIPs in their survey responses and during our interviews: Forty-six percent of LIPs listed promising practices on the survey that were submitted. It is also noteworthy that coordinators and the National LIP Secretariat have been capitalizing on Metropolis and P2P conferences to organize workshops and special learning sessions. This could extend to a session where LIPs share promising practices with other LIPs, such as the dedicated "LIP and RIF day" that has followed the Pathways to Prosperity Conference over the past several years.

Below is a sample of promising practice examples offered by LIP coordinators in our survey or during our interviews. Many of these issues came up through our focus groups and our interviews.

- a. To serve Afghan refugees, it was necessary to quickly recruit trainers who spoke Dari or Pashto. However, these trainers needed a social service background and needed training themselves to understand their role as de facto settlement officers. To address this need, a trainer training program was developed with the involvement of a local college and financial support from IRCC. The resulting micro-credentialing course, in addition to training the required settlement workers, also improved staff retention by requiring early

⁴ We should acknowledge, as was pointed out to us, that many of the people who fill coordinator positions come from a settlement background, which is an asset.

leavers to repay the investment in their education so replacement staff could be trained. The college has also maintained the program as it offers a financial benefit.

- b. An incubator program was created to brainstorm critical issues and identify innovative solutions. In the housing area, the program developed the idea of using social impact bonds to persuade landlords to offer rental accommodation.
- c. A group of LIPs decided to pair employer outreach for potential jobs in one location with wraparound support for refugees who cross service jurisdictions to take advantage of the jobs being provided by a different location.
- d. *Community Capacity* information graphs were developed and handed out to refugees at organized gathering locations. The graphs offered specific community capacity information about available employment, housing, recreation, childcare, education, and population. The descriptions were in plain language and contained phone numbers of landlords and schools, etc. Future versions will be translated for refugees with little English. Newcomer organizations reacted very positively to the community capacity sheets.
- e. A group of LIPs representing small communities compiled jobs and available housing profiles to facilitate matching and improve the fit between refugees (willing to locate outside major centres) and the opportunities available within their community collective. The LIPs also managed to find creative temporary housing solutions for groups of refugees and combined their placements with support through 'circles of care'.
- f. The LIP joined the local Lions Club (along with three community representatives who were members) to launch a community committee that offers newcomers access to emergency funding for unforeseen expenses. Thousands of dollars were donated and directed to the Club for the Newcomer Fund, which was predominantly accessed by Ukrainian newcomers.
- g. The local settlement organisation developed and trialed a model consisting of volunteer teams that supported the resettlement of GARs in the same manner as private sponsorship groups operate, minus the financial commitment. This proved to be a great way for newcomers to experience the community.

10. Recommendations and next steps

We expect that this report will be of interest to several audiences. We can imagine at least three distinct groups for which the findings from our project may be of interest: Individual LIPs, the National LIP Secretariat, and Immigration, Refugees, and Citizenship Canada (IRCC), all of whom share an interest in both learning more about LIPs and identifying where improvements can be made. We offer our recommendations in this spirit, and we also conclude by issuing some overall recommendations for improving the efficacy and accountability of LIPs.

Recommendations for Individual LIPs

One of the strengths of Local Immigration Partnerships is their ability to morph into coordinating bodies, regardless of size, local capacity, and experience with immigrant and refugee integration. By being decentralized, this coordination of services is nimble, decisions are made quickly, and newcomers receive support when they need it most.

That does not mean there aren't areas that can be improved, and that LIPs cannot learn from other LIPs and other organizations. Many LIPs across Canada engage in interesting and innovative initiatives, and many of these initiatives could be exported to other jurisdictions. This may be one area where the LIP secretariat could help.

Enhanced focus on social connectivity: One of the core functions that LIPs serve is to engage with community partners to develop opportunities for social connection between newcomers and established community members (both newcomer and Canadian-born). Some LIP coordinators mentioned these connections in their interviews, but a particular focus on this work with respect to humanitarian arrivals could be expanded across the LIP network. This is especially important for Government Assisted Refugees, as they do not have the built-in mechanisms for generating social connections that Privately Sponsored Refugees do. As our IMDB results and our refugee focus groups suggest, strengthening social connections will improve a broad range of outcomes.

Support the development of Ethno-cultural and Multicultural societies: LIP support for the development of ethno-cultural communities and multi-cultural societies that can function as a source of grass-roots support and social connection. This was mentioned during our focus groups, specifically regarding Ukrainians and Afghans, where there were pre-existing networks of organizations and communities that aided significantly in supporting resettlement. This likely lightened the coordination load that LIPs had to bear, and allowed Canada to welcome many more asylum seekers than it otherwise would have been able to.

Enhanced engagement with healthcare providers: LIPs in many communities could engage more purposefully with healthcare providers to ensure awareness of the specific needs of refugees and the supports available to meet those needs (e.g., interpretation services, N4 network healthcare provider toolkits, etc.). Given the situations they are fleeing, many refugees require urgent health care, and many participants in our focus groups expressed concern that Canada's health care system was often ill-equipped to provide the necessary support. LIPs are well

positioned to connect healthcare providers with the additional supports required to provide quality healthcare services (including mental health services) to this vulnerable population.

Refugee-focused engagement with employers and employment service providers: Although Canada is a leader in refugee resettlement, our focus groups showed there are areas for improvement. LIPs could be a driving force in this regard. Refugees continue to have relatively poor labour market outcomes in comparison with other categories of newcomers, and LIP engagement with employers and employment service providers could help develop strategies for increasing suitable employment for refugees, pathways to credential recognition, and the fostering of inclusive workplaces. These services would spread recognition of the unique challenges and barriers brought about by forced migration. Some LIP coordinators mentioned that they already do this, but the practice could be more widespread.

Development of alternative approaches to evaluating refugees' credibility in the housing rental market: With fairly dramatic changes to Canada's housing market, many refugees have faced difficulties securing suitable housing. Many arrive in Canada without recent employment and rental histories, credit scores, or a guarantor, items that many landlords require as prerequisites for signing a lease. Furthermore, many asylum seekers do not know how long they will be in Canada, and are therefore hesitant to sign leases that lock them in for a period of time. Many landlords are likely unaware of these challenges, and LIP engagement with landlords and housing authorities to develop alternative approaches to evaluating the credibility of tenants would be invaluable. As one of the promising practices referred to in the previous sections indicates ('social impact bonds'), LIPs can play a leading role in helping alleviate these critical barriers to accessing housing.

Strengthen LIPs' curation function with a view to strengthening partner 'returns': While the convening and mobilizing activities undertaken by LIPs are universally regarded as key to LIPs achieving their mandate, less attention has been focused on their role in curating partnerships. The premise behind this point is that partner engagement and mobilization constitute scarce resources that must be tended. As well, the number of partners at a table must be managed in the interests of efficiency. Curation can also be thought of as the application of learning. After all, it would be oddly lucky if the initial grouping of partners proved to be optimal forever, particularly when the source regions of humanitarian flows change over time. LIPs could use their curation experience to establish new partnerships more easily should they choose to include refugee resettlement as part of their mandate.

Curation – meaning attracting new members and culling less effective ones – could be strengthened in various ways. First, LIPs could be encouraged to periodically assess their leadership councils, advisory committees and working groups to analyze exchanges of information and whether new actors are needed; second, inter-LIP forums could be constructed where coordinators would share information about partners' productivity as a basis for adjusting and improving the utility of partnership tables; and, third, inter-LIP forums could focus

on the curation process itself: how it should be conducted; when it should be conducted; how it might be improved; and how new members and ideas might be introduced.

A recommendation of this report is that the LIP Secretariat conduct an informal sounding of LIP coordinators to determine if the topic of curation and returns to partner engagement should be pursued and, if so, how. If the interviews are any guide, coordinators will recognize the problem with a number of respondents mentioning that some of their advisory tables might not be the best group for handling an impending flow of irregular migrants.

*Applying a “social capital” lens to partner recruitment*⁵: The ability of LIPs to mobilize those resources depends on the relationships they forge with the ‘resource owners’ and the value those owners derive from participating in the LIPs and aligning their actions and services in support of shared objectives. With time, the associated interactions produce mutual trust and a greater willingness to collaborate with other institutions. In short, the LIPs can be regarded as machinery for building and maintaining social capital.

Recognizing the social capital characteristics of LIPs means seeing them as machines for eliciting support, building trust, and establishing coherence, coordination, and collaboration with regard to interventions by public and private institutions implicated in supporting refugee reception and settlement.

The use of this lens should result in a broader set of questions (better reflecting partner interests) to inform the actions of the LIPs. It should also result in closer attention to the longer-term investments needed by the LIPs (and by the larger set of IRCC-funded institutions) to address partner interests, which should stabilize and strengthen the coalition. The result will be more durable partner support for developing and maintaining a sustainable crisis response framework.

Adjusting LIPs’ footprint to improve alignment with key organizations: While technology is whittling away the strictures of geography, it remains true, especially in periods of crisis, that collaboration requires decision-makers to physically work together, once again testifying to the importance of the LIPs’ convening capacity. Equally significant is the challenge presented by misaligned jurisdictions that make it difficult to construct conversations and organize interventions. In the case of LIPs, engaging government ministries responsible for regional or (large) district policies presents itself as a challenge. It is inefficient for these ministries to engage in a protracted set of consultations with a swarm of smaller organizations ... and it is equally difficult to assess impacts and tweak policies or programs when confronted by a distributed network of practitioners.

Based on our interviews with LIP coordinators, the problem is widely recognized and various solutions have evolved out of necessity. In one instance, a LIP coordinator indicated that the LIP

⁵ This section draws on two papers, ‘Social Capital: A Tool for Public Policy’ released by the Policy Research Initiative in 2005 and ‘Managing Immigration and Diversity: The Case for Social Capital Policy’, prepared for the Policy Research Initiative (PRI) in 2003 by one of the authors of the current report.

would shift from operating within the confines of a municipal boundary to extend its reach to the surrounding region. In another area, a group of LIPs worked together to produce an information system that captured and pooled information about housing and employment opportunities in their communities. This information was then advertised to Ukrainian entrants who were interested in settling outside a large metropolitan centre.

As noted in the section concerning collaboration among IRCC-funded entities, a number of regional and associative groupings of LIPs have been constructed and operated for extended periods. This is most readily apparent in the recent establishment of the BC-Yukon LIPs network and in emergent conversations regarding the development of similar sub-national LIP networks. It is also evident in more established LIP arrangements, including the Toronto quadrant model, zonal LIPs (a more recent innovation) and a LIP cluster that is attached to a single SPO. This leads us to the following suggestions for an evaluative study built around the following components and queries:

- (1) A survey of LIPs to establish their perception of the misalignment problem and the potential advantages and challenges that would accrue from creating collaborative networks such those highlighted above.
- (2) A formal evaluation of existing inter-LIP collaborations from the following perspectives:
 - a. Ease of consulting government and community stakeholders (separating the two)
 - b. Ease of access to decision-makers and projected impact
 - c. Challenges and complexities of collaboration ... implications for stakeholder engagement ... and implications for the work of LIP coordinators
 - d. Projected impact of collaboration on absorptive capacity in refugee crises
- (3) An assessment of alternative alignment strategies for optimizing linkages with federal and provincial institutions
- (4) An assessment of the effects of alternative alignment strategies for recruiting volunteers and civil society organizations
- (5) An assessment of overall alignment potentialities and implications for LIP management and relations with other IRCC-funded program structures

Improved documentation and showcasing of LIP Activities: As a general statement, the LIP program as a whole would benefit from better communication of LIP activities and effectiveness. Individual LIPs would also be well served by better methods for measuring their impacts and strategies for communicating their impacts to existing and potential community partners. Although it is obvious to many that LIPs are essential, it is currently difficult to demonstrate their value objectively. Maintaining an information database would both highlight the breadth and depth of LIP activities, as well as form the foundation for the development of an updated handbook, something that several coordinators mentioned, and we discuss further below.

Diversification of LIP funding sources: All LIPs are funded, some entirely, by IRCC. Although IRCC clearly sees value in the LIPs (as demonstrated by funding this project), having only a single funding source, particularly when that source is led by an elected official, presents potential risks to funding continuity. Welcoming immigrants and refugees into a region enhances the social, cultural and economic characteristics of that region, and the sustainability of LIPs' contributions to that effort would benefit from funding from other local and provincial sources. Any effort to diversify the sources of LIP funding would benefit as well from improvements to LIPs' capacities to document and communicate their effectiveness.

Recommendations for IRCC

Clarifying the role(s) for LIPs: There is an urgent need to clarify the role, if any, that LIPs are expected to play in humanitarian migration. While this clarification may consist of confirming individual LIP responsibility for determining their level of engagement in humanitarian resettlement, clear messaging from IRCC would be welcomed by many of the LIP coordinators who participated in this study. In their survey and interview responses, LIP coordinators expressed an astounding diversity of perceived roles for LIPs; some saw themselves as responsible for coordinating services for only immigrants, others stated that they would be willing to coordinate services for refugees if their funding levels were increased, and still others declared that refugee resettlement was the biggest part of what their LIP does. In most instances, any mention of refugee resettlement was absent from LIP mandate statements, yet many LIPs were coordinating services nonetheless. It is worth repeating that this recommendation is not an assertion that IRCC should tell LIPs to start supporting refugee resettlement, but that it is instead a plea for clarity that many LIP coordinators made during their interviews with us.

Developing a crisis response framework: Both the survey of LIP coordinators and subsequent interviews produced a series of suggestions for constructing a crisis response framework and related handbook or action guide. Given the high levels of turnover of LIP coordinators identified in our survey, this recommendation is of especial importance. Ideally, this action guide would be tailored at the local level, but funding a national guide would be an important first step. This is particularly important given the high level of personnel turnover within LIPs. Many LIP coordinators had been in their roles for a relatively short period of time, and having a guide would help them hit the ground running. The framework needn't be voluminous, but many coordinators described being forced to coordinate services 'on the fly', because they had no idea what was required. This work often required long hours from dedicated LIP coordinators, and a framework would help with planning to reduce the just-in-time nature of how LIPs help with refugee resettlement.

Improve Collaboration between IRCC-funded agencies: As a first step, IRCC should invest in trying to identify the circumstances where inter-agency collaboration is most urgently required (such as large-scale humanitarian entry) and the specific benefits (such as support for housing, health and so forth) it would like to obtain. With regard to these specific circumstances and

benefits, it should then clarify its expectations regarding interchanges among the organizations it supports and offer examples of how this might be achieved. This would also provide a de facto template for gauging degrees of collaboration.

At a minimum, expectations should be created for mutual involvement, extensive sharing of information (this would be the default position), collaborative knowledge investments, invitations to participate in events and meetings, and shared projects aimed at building social capital and trust among organizations (in our example, those involved in refugee resettlement). To advance this integration, IRCC might experiment by supporting forums to discuss these ideas and how to move them forward.

Development of LIP coordinators as a strategic asset: Given how essential partner engagement is to the success of the LIPs, it is recommended that LIP coordinators be viewed as a strategic asset to be tended and supported through expansion, particularly in areas with high levels of immigrant and refugee intake. Additional LIP staff would relieve administrative pressures, provide support for inter-LIP partnerships to distribute workload, and encourage greater involvement by other parts of the IRCC-funded network, including the National LIP Secretariat and the provincial immigrant umbrella associations. Our survey results showed, for example, that some LIPs rely heavily on partners like the umbrella associations, but that there were also difficulties in trying to develop formal mechanisms to ensure sustained engagement. Also, as noted below, secondments could play a useful role in expanding LIP capacity, as well as educating a corps of practitioners. This would ease some of the difficulties that happen in a sector with extremely high employee turnover. Although economic considerations no doubt factor into turnover, so too does recognition and job stress.

Address high levels of staff turnover and their impacts on LIP sustainability: In the absence of a long-term structural solution, various workarounds and offsets need to be invented and tested. A number of partial 'solutions' are proposed below:

- a. Risk mitigation with respect to turnover challenges and the accompanying erosion of social capital could include better documentation, activity checklists and systematic efforts to deepen the involvement of other IRCC-funded institutions, including SPOs and regional umbrella associations, in the web of organizations that LIPs engage to build a whole-of-community response to newcomer (re)settlement.
- b. Consideration could be given to establishing a set of formal record-keeping protocols for documenting contacts and meetings, for documenting partner interests, for recording strategic plans, and so forth. This information would need to be kept up-to-date for transmission to new jobholders in the event of a handover. This would go some distance to formalizing the documentation needed to smooth job handovers.

Consider different/complementary roles for LIPs in small, medium and large centres: While the reference by the National LIP Secretariat was framed in terms of clarifying the role of LIPs in

large-scale humanitarian admissions, there is a more specific policy question that needs to be posed in advance of considering the role LIPs should play and how they should be equipped. The question is this: Should large-scale humanitarian admissions – particularly when they are concentrated in a short period of time – be directed to small and even mid-sized centres? Smaller centres lack the absorptive capacity and resources to make a significant difference impact on the immediate flow, which raises two questions: First, could LIP resources be better spent if they were concentrated in larger centres where the bulk of the refugee intake will flow; and, in the event this is so, would it make more sense for LIPs in smaller communities to focus on building a medium to long(ish) term capacity to attract and absorb *secondary* migrants (both refugees and other immigrants), which tends to reflect the internal migration patterns of immigrants and refugees (Haan and Prokopenko, 2016). This would also appear to be more consistent with the capacities of LIPs in smaller centres, many of which ‘threw parties that ended up with few guests.’ Contrasting the activities of small LIPs with the melee occurring in metropolitan centres where provincial agencies were, in some cases, spending millions of dollars on housing and employment offers a stark comparison as illustrated in Box 5 below.

Box 7: Comments regarding LIP activities in smaller centres

- *Shared information with SPOs, volunteers, and evacuees about opportunities and barriers to resettlement in our community*
- *Helped community agencies connect with settlement. This was under the leadership of the municipality. Shared information with SPOs, volunteers, and evacuees about opportunities and barriers to resettlement in our community*
- *Operated a community donation collection and grant making fund to support of Ukrainian resettlement efforts*
- *As a very rural LIP, our response was volunteer driven, rather than organization or settlement service driven.*

Another way to think about this is that LIPs situated in mid- to large metropolitan areas would address the policy objective of building a rapid response to chaotic, large-scale humanitarian migration, while LIPs in smaller centres and rural areas would address the policy objective of attracting and integrating secondary migrants to offset demographic losses in small communities. Each group would direct itself to mobilize different partners that are consistent with local interests and policy aims. In large centres, housing ministries would be front and centre, while in smaller centres, the prime targets might be economic development agencies.

Of course, the distinction would not need to be absolute, and if a smaller centre can assist in the initial absorption, it could be shifted from one category to another—or it could assume a dual role. The point concerns the need to clarify policy objectives and align capacities and expectations with those objectives.

Develop a temporary asylum strategy: Additional consideration should be given to refugee groups that are granted temporary asylum versus those that relocate to Canada permanently. As our focus group conversation with Ukrainian displaced persons indicated, the condition of temporary residence status in the context of an ongoing conflict generates uncertainties that undermine the efficacy of standard settlement and integration services and strategies. If similar approaches to emergencies are enacted in the future, LIPs could play a central role in coordinating community responses that address the unique challenges associated with temporary residence. This may include greater support for LIP engagement with grassroots initiatives and community-level volunteerism, up to and including additional funding to support coordination and aligning grassroots initiatives with sector priorities.

Evaluate the benefits of more closely aligning LIP investment with patterns of refugee resettlement vs. general immigrant settlement: Canada's ten-largest population centres receive roughly eighty percent of all refugees. These refugees can be divided into three more or less equal tranches: protected persons (who essentially select themselves by claiming asylum status), privately sponsored refugees, and government-sponsored refugees. The latter two groups – government-sponsored and privately-sponsored refugees – are subject to locational policies that lead them to be more heavily distributed to *smaller* population centres, as compared with self-directed immigrants and protected persons. This asymmetry produces a situation whereby LIP investments aimed at supporting general immigrant integration would favour *larger* centres, while investments favouring the resettlement of GARs and PSRs specifically would tilt towards (somewhat) *smaller* urban regions. This has implications for LIP actions and efficacy.

Basing LIP investments more heavily on the distribution of refugees – in other words, directing more investment to smaller centres than would be the case if the distribution of immigrants guided the investments - would accentuate the ability of smaller-centre LIPs (relative to LIPs in larger centres) to mobilize community-based partners, to convene working groups and meetings, and to conduct analysis and research. It would not, however, correspondingly boost the ability of LIPs to strengthen relations with federal and provincial policy and planning partners because these functions tend to be concentrated in larger metropolitan centres. Conversely, reversing the investment 'bias', would produce the opposite result, thus establishing a 'Sophie's Choice' between strengthening federal and provincial policy connections and strengthening community and practice connections.

Before closing out the argument, we should draw attention to an observation that is *potentially* at odds with the suggestion that increasing LIP capacity in smaller centres may be less productive than 'investing' in larger cities insofar as inducing government agencies to pay more policy attention to refugees is concerned. Counter-intuitively, it would appear that not only is there a tendency for GARs and PSRs to initially locate in smaller centres (a function of locational policies) but also, as our IMDB results show, to remain there (a function of local receptivity). Recent cohorts of government and privately-sponsored refugees in smaller urban centres show

higher retention rates than other immigrants, suggesting that they may receive the help they need in smaller centres.

As Statistics Canada has not yet updated the IMDB to provide us with insight into the full surge of Ukrainian migration (the most recent data we can access covers up to 2020), we are unable to fully test this observation for the most recent large-scale refugee movement to determine if the previously observed trends persist.

Enhancing the iCARE-IMDB dataset: The administrative dataset used in this report (iCARE-IMDB) is an extremely powerful tool with great potential. This potential could be further enhanced by adding a few key pieces of information. First, iCARE currently captures only services that were federally funded. This removes many education, employment, and healthcare-related services since these are all provincial jurisdictions. Second, it is not possible to identify if the settlement service provider that provided the service is a member of a Local Immigration Partnership. This would be an easy fix, as it would require the development of an entry field that would allow settlement workers to specify if a service was connected to a LIP-led community settlement strategy. As it currently stands, quantitatively, it is very difficult to assess the effectiveness of SPO engagement with LIPs. Knowing more about LIP activity would also facilitate the development of a best practices repository, since iCARE-IMDB has very good outcomes data (particularly labour market related).

Re-evaluate the one-year term of additional support for refugees and displaced persons: our focus groups, iCARE-IMDB analysis, and interviews with SPOs and coordinators all revealed the need for flexibility in the levels of support given to refugees beyond the typical one-year period. Some groups, like the Ukrainians, have been in Canada for more than a year and still do not know when or if they will return. As a result, they may have hesitated to avail themselves of services like credential recognition services in the first year. The misalignment of refugee needs with the one-year period of support was also pointed out to us, specifically concerning mental health support.

Extend the available options for English language training. As seen in our analysis, there is a high correlation between employment success and newcomers' language abilities in English and French. Our focus groups revealed that many newcomers are eager to learn Canada's official languages and understand the importance of effectively integrating into the job market and Canada. However, many face difficulty accessing English programs due mostly to the long waitlist to access programming and the limitations of online programming in some regions. According to newcomers, online programming provides the flexibility they need to learn English. Online classes provide more options to learn English while balancing other responsibilities and stresses of moving a family to a new country. The fact that a waitlist exist and that newcomers see the value and are committed to learning English suggest that these particular services requires more funding and support.

Recommendations for the National LIP Secretariat

The National LIP Secretariat has an established mandate that was developed through consultation with the LIPs. Though it is decidedly non-prescriptive (both of the NLS co-chairs emphasized this during our interviews), there are recommendations around how the NLS can help LIPs become more effective. The overarching goal is to improve the efficacy of the LIPs through sustainable networks, shared resources, capacity building, and the amplification of diverse LIP voices. Specifically, it has the following five goals.

Strengthen the capacities and acquired knowledge of LIP Coordinators: This could include the continuation of NLS-organized professional development webinars, which in recent years have focused on anti-racism work and research/data analysis capacity. These webinars could be developed with input from various NLS-facilitated working groups; in its most recent funding proposal, the NLS proposed to increase in number to include working groups on Indigenous engagement, newcomer engagement, workplace inclusion, and small/rural LIPs. The NLS also supports the development of tools, templates and other supports with input from the working groups, for use by all LIPs.

Aggregate policy and practice solutions and challenges/owner-led promising practices regime: Building on widespread interest in promising practices and sector ingenuity, the following section sets out a proposal for a regime in which LIPs and related institutions - notably the National LIP Secretariat and, possibly, provincial, and regional umbrella associations - would preside over a promising practice evaluative machinery. Objectivity would be maintained through the involvement of Metropolis, Pathways to Prosperity, and interested researchers.

At the front end of the proposed process, on a biennial basis, the National LIP Secretariat would undertake a national canvass of LIPs to identify promising practices. As a first step, the Secretariat would vet and pare down submissions to a manageable number. This would be followed by the creation of one or more evaluation teams made up of LIP coordinators, researchers and officials (drawn from IRCC and other agencies and organizations) who would vet the proposals according to mutually agreed criteria. The assessment process would include an interview between members of the research team and the coordinator (including, where possible, project participants). Once the assessments are complete, the evaluation team(s) would choose a small number of practices for a more detailed assessment.

Practices chosen for more detailed assessment would be presented at purpose-built seminars at one or more of the chosen academic venues by a team consisting of the LIP coordinator, partners in the initiative, and one or more members of the evaluation group. The focus would be on: (a) The evidence for concluding that the practice was indeed promising; (b) The potential importance of the practice in terms of the difference it could make across the program; and (c) The transferability of the practice and what would be needed to adapt it to different circumstances and venues.

Practices deemed to be promising practices following this two-stage review would be endorsed by the National LIP Secretariat and advanced for funding by IRCC.

A number of other ideas could be associated with this proposal or advanced on their own.

These are listed below:

- a. The National LIP Secretariat could build on its Research Working Group to identify common challenges faced by LIPs in particular spheres and identify tools and strategies that have proved effective and could be transferred to different contexts. Additional working groups could be struck to focus on specific challenges in other contexts (for example, employer engagement in small centres and rural LIPs). The topics would be chosen by LIPs overall or by a research committee comprised of LIP representatives.
- b. The National LIP Secretariat could sponsor sessions at academic venues to ‘brainstorm’ potential solutions to problems put forward by *partner* organizations seeking advice with regard to integration concerns associated with immigrants generally or with refugees in particular.
- c. The National LIP Secretariat could create a repository of practices and experiences by LIPs that have adopted and implemented promising practices. The Secretariat could also preside over an effort to disseminate best practice information nationally (based on one of the processes that have been described) and to evaluate what worked and what didn’t in different regions and settings (a way of assessing the long-term implications of various ‘solutions’).
- d. IRCC could be encouraged to take an active role in the discussion of promising practices by organizing or commissioning forums on topics of particular interest to the Ministry at conferences attended by LIPs.
- e. Financial support could be sought for various aspects of the promising practice regime by encouraging academic researchers to seek SSHRC funding for research related to certain practices. As well, the National LIP Secretariat, in collaboration with its Research Working Group, could seek support for scaling-up a small number of promising practices through demonstration projects that draw support from United Way organizations or foundations such as the Trillium Foundation.
- f. The development of a forum for sharing best practices would enhance the efficiency of all LIPs, rather than just one. Although this recommendation is often made in the settlement sector, real or perceived impressions that agencies are in competition for funding often scuttle the transmission of knowledge. LIPs are different, however, because each operates in a different jurisdiction, removing the possibility of real or perceived competition. Other than the occasional ad-hoc meetings of LIPs that occur after gatherings and conferences where LIPs happen to be in attendance (Metropolis, Pathways to Prosperity, etc.), this seems to rarely occur. The NLS also convenes an annual LIP Network summit, but several

LIP coordinators explicitly expressed a desire for more regular meetings during their interviews with us. As one coordinator put it, “it seems at times as though we are all alone.” Presently, this is accomplished through the working groups, but that work is limited to anti-racism and research/data analysis. Plans are in place to expand the range of working groups, but no specific plans exist for a LIP refugee resettlement working group. The NLS website is a natural home for a promising practices regime/repository. Presently, it operates as a passive repository of LIP materials, but with proper resourcing and supports, the analysis and identifications of promising practices could be incorporated into the existing website. The proposed LIP handbook will also contain an aggregation of common challenges and promising/demonstrated solutions for adaptation and use by all LIPs.

Develop a practical guide to LIP engagement with large-scale humanitarian resettlement: Based on this study and the discussions that will follow from it within the LIP network and IRCC, the NLS could develop a practical guide to LIP engagement with large-scale humanitarian resettlement. This guide would be a complement to the “promising practices regime” described above, with a focus on describing the range of activities that are available to LIPs in this work, providing practical tips on how to initiate that work and drawing on “real world” examples of successful LIP initiatives. This practical guide could constitute a section or chapter of an updated handbook for LIPs, which the National LIP Secretariat has proposed to develop in consultation with the network of LIPs.

Evaluate what works and doesn't work in different regions and settings: This is similar to the above. The most pertinent example of this kind of work is this project itself. The goal of this research project is to identify what has been effective in various regions and settings in terms of LIPs' work to support the resettlement of refugees and displaced persons. More projects of this kind could help identify the range of possible interventions/initiatives and the factors that help support their success in various regions and settings. This work could be aggregated in the proposed LIP handbook, described above.

Disseminate information nationally/improving the acquisition, dissemination and production of information: The NLS maintains a website that functions as the primary conduit for disseminating information to the LIPs. This happens through a weekly newsletter that alerts LIPs to new information that is available through the website. LIPs are also able to post documents, announcements and other information to the website and have their announcements included in the weekly update. We recommend that this website continue and, if possible, develop an ecosystem where LIPs can share what worked and what didn't, what a LIP has learnt about a recent arrival cohort (ie. what type of accommodation does a cohort prefer?), etc. LIPs do not

compete with one another, so this information can only help the greater good. Naturally, not all LIPs engage in refugee resettlement, but it appears that enough of them do that this might be helpful.

Addressing LIP sustainability/funding/staffing: In recent years, the NLS has conducted surveys of LIPs to gain a more fulsome understanding of the staffing and retention issues facing LIPs and has addressed those concerns to IRCC. This is part of the NLS's role as the representative of LIPs at national tables and will continue. In order to help address the impact of staff turnover within LIPs, the NLS could include generalized onboarding guidance in the proposed updated LIP handbook described above. This would be consistent with the Secretariat's role in supporting the professional development of LIP coordinators, including support for new LIPs and LIP staff. This could include an online training module for all coordinators regarding "best practices" for documenting their work. The goal of this handbook is to streamline services and make clear the goals of LIPs for the ease of coordinators (particularly given the turnover). Such guidelines would allow for individual provincial responses and practices to meet the needs of their clients and the resources of their locations but through structured decision-making policies.

In addition, the Secretariat could explore the idea of creating a roster of candidates for possible secondments from settlement service providers, IRCC, partner organizations, and students (as a negotiated part of their academic program). The secondees could work with the LIPs for agreed periods of time on specified tasks to acquire a better knowledge of the settlement sector and LIPs, how LIPs operate, and the opportunities that exist for working collaboratively across programs. The trainees could offer a recruitment pool for LIPs, they could be used to temporarily fill vacancies, and they would add to existing LIP capacity.

Encourage the LIPs that help resettle refugees to establish a dedicated advisory committee. A recommendation of this report is that the LIP Secretariat conduct an informal sounding of LIP coordinators to determine if the topic of curation and returns to partner engagement should be pursued and, if so, how. If the interviews are any guide, coordinators will recognize the problem with a number of respondents mentioning that some of their advisory tables might not be the best group for handling an impending flow of irregular migrants. It may be necessary to construct a new advisory table, one that focuses specifically on refugees for LIPs that plan to coordinate services. Its value would be further enhanced if follow-up surveys could be launched. Several respondents indicated that they would very much like to see these surveys becoming a regular event to ensure continuity.

Initiate strategic partnerships toward the development of locally specific handbooks for the organizations that sponsor Privately Sponsored Refugees (all organizations that support churches, universities and families): These could be developed in coordination with some

organizations that have successfully sponsored refugees in the past. In 2016, for example, Western University sponsored a refugee family, and, to our knowledge, none of the learnt lessons have been documented. Quite often, private organizations sponsor refugees. Although these refugees tend to integrate into the Canadian society more quickly, that does not mean that their sponsoring organizations would not benefit from a reference guide.

Initiate a discussion around pre-landing services: A discussion amongst LIPs might be initiated by the Secretariat around whether LIPs would see value in coordinating locally specific pre-landing services. To our knowledge, no LIPs are yet doing this, but several of our respondents indicated that location-specific pre-landing services would be valuable for their integration into Canadian society. What, for example, should refugees expect on day one when they enter a new community? What are they responsible for and entitled to? During our focus groups, many refugees reported that they felt completely lost when they first came to Canada. After the trauma that many experienced, this would likely help immensely.

Consider mining unexplored data sources: Operational data (from ministries and community partners) relating to interventions involving humanitarian entrants should be compiled and assessed with a view to producing a composite picture of the societal effort to help new arrivals.

11. Conclusion

Clearly, none of these recommendations would have arisen had so many people not contributed their time, insights, and energy to this project. Our project team wishes to thank the LIP coordinators, settlement service workers, other agency employees and our refugee focus group volunteers for helping us produce this report. To our knowledge, this is the first overall evaluation of the important work that many LIPs do concerning refugee resettlement.

Given how diverse and decentralized the LIP network is, it is clear that some or all of our recommendations will not be relevant for all LIPs. As our analysis of LIP strategic plans show, many LIPs see their roles differently, and this no doubt contributes to their nimbleness. In areas where housing is very expensive, for example, LIPs may need to provide greater coordination around finding suitable housing than they would in a jurisdiction with plenty of affordable housing.

LIPs are in fact so diverse that some do not see refugee resettlement as part of their mandate at all. The purpose of this report is not to try to persuade them that they should be involved with refugees. Our goal is to instead document the differences and provide some recommendations for LIPs that do work with refugees.

In closing, Canada has a long and proud history of accepting people from other parts of the world who needed to escape their country for various reasons. It is our earnest and sincere desire in this report to help extend our legacy, particularly concerning the role that LIPs could, and perhaps should, play in this regard. In our opinion, we would be remiss to dismiss the contributions that refugee and other forced migrants have made to Canadian society. Our recommendations aim to provide insights into newcomers' experiences so that they can be better prepared for the next wave of newcomers, thereby further enhancing the contributions that refugees can make to Canadian society, even if they eventually return to their home country. LIPs are an essential part of the current ecosystem in Canada.

12. APPENDICES

Appendix A: About our Team (in alphabetical order)

Dale Ballucci

Dr. Dale Ballucci is a qualitative researcher. She has over 15 years of experience conducting interviews and focus groups. Her work primarily examines the administration of governing institutions such as the Immigration and Refugee and Criminal Justice System. She studies the decision-making process in a context, such as the unaccompanied refugee child applications, to provide insights for policy revisions. She also examines police responses to various crimes and criminality to suggest best practices. She is a member of Western University's Research Ethics Board. These experiences qualify her to engage in evaluation research.

Jennie Choi

Jennie Choi is a fourth-year undergraduate student at Western University with extensive skills in survey design and implementation.

Meyer Burstein

Meyer Burstein works as a consultant with a particular focus on providing an evidence base for policy and operational decisions. His more recent work has been with the settlement sector, both in Ottawa and at the national level, centred on building the sector's strengths through innovation. This includes work for CISSA-ACSEI (the national settlement umbrella association) on reconfiguring the settlement sector, establishing a national entity to identify and transfer promising practices and bolstering the national body. He has also led a consortium of major settlement organizations, drawn from across the country, to investigate the market for incremental commercial settlement services, part of a broader effort to conceptualize the 'agency of the future'.

Meyer is a former Director-General of Citizenship and Immigration Canada who was responsible for the department's strategic planning function and for research and analysis, including the re-design of the immigrant selection system. Meyer was a co-founder of the International Metropolis Project and served as its co-chair for seven years. He also played an important role in conceptualizing and initiating the Pathways to Prosperity (P2P) initiative.

Meyer has advised domestic (both federal and provincial) and foreign governments, as well as major organizations such as the IOM, the World Bank, and the UN on a variety of policy, research and organizational issues, linked to migration. His work has included strategic reviews, evaluation studies, and policy analyses.

Meyer has been involved in numerous studies about LIPs, many done in collaboration with policy and academic colleagues. These include:

- Local Immigration Partnerships and the Réseaux en immigration francophone: Strategies for Increasing Harmonization and Developing Performance Measurement Tools

- Northeastern Ontario LIP Immigration Project (an interim evaluation study with recommendations for improvement)
- Evaluation of the Thunder Bay LIP (also with recommendations for strategic and operational amendments)
- LIP-Municipal Interactions and CICs Strategic Interests (an early LIP study focusing on the role and contributions of municipalities in different circumstances)
- Open Method of Coordination (a proposal for using a promising European Commission approach to study LIPs)
- Producing Ottawa's initial LIP strategy and developing sector plans
- Ottawa-OLIP Progress-Report - 2011-2015 (reviewing the progress of various sectors and updating sector plans)
- Organizational best practices report (an early study of LIPs and apparent best practices)
- Working within P2P to produce a series of promising practice interviews with LIP coordinators.

Lindsay Finlay

Lindsay Finlay is currently a PhD student in the Sociology department at Western University. She is a quantitative researcher and works under the supervision of Dr. Michael Haan.

Michael Haan

Dr. Michael Haan (PhD, University of Toronto, 2006) is an Associate Professor at Western University. From 2005-2010, Dr. Haan held an academic appointment at the University of Alberta, where he was Winspear-Archer Research Fellow in Immigration and Social Policy. From 2010-2015, he was Canada Research Chair in Population and Social Policy at the University of New Brunswick. He is also research associate at the Prentice Institute for Global Population and Labour at the University of Lethbridge, and at the McGill Centre for Population Dynamics. He is also the recipient of the Metropolis Canada 2023 Immigration Researcher of the Year.

His research interests intersect the areas of demography, immigrant settlement, labour market integration, and data development. Dr. Haan is widely consulted by provincial and federal governments for policy advice in the areas of immigration, settlement services, the Canadian labour market, and population aging. Dr. Haan is currently investigator or co-investigator on over ten million dollars of research focused on immigrant settlement, developing welcoming communities, and identifying the factors that predict successful retention of newcomers. Since receiving his PhD in 2006, he has already published over 75 articles and reports on these topics.

Yuchen Li

Yuchen Li is currently a PhD in the Sociology department at Western University. He is a former immigration consultant, and holds Master's degrees in Economics and Sociology. He is a quantitative researcher and works under the supervision of Dr. Michael Haan.

Ina Palii

Ina Palii is currently a PhD student in the Sociology department at Western University. She is a quantitative researcher and works under the supervision of Dr. Yoko Yoshida.

Taylor Noriko Paul

Taylor Paul is currently a PhD student in the Sociology department at Western University. She is a mixed methods researcher and works under the supervision of Dr. Patrick Denice.

Appendix B. Additional tables from the LIPs Coordinators' Survey

Table 1: Does your start date (as LIP Coordinator) make it difficult to answer questions about any of the humanitarian movements?

	Municipal	Non-municipal
No	13 (61.9%)	20 (58.8%)
Yes	8 (38.1%)	14 (41.2%)
Total	21 (100%)	34 (100%)

Table 2: Which humanitarian movements is it difficult to answer questions about, due to your start date?

	Municipal	Non-municipal
Syrian	3 (37.5%)	5 (35.7%)
Syrian & Afghan	4 (50%)	7 (50%)
Afghan & Ukrainian	0	1 (7.1%)
Syrian & Afghan & Ukrainian	1 (12.5%)	1 (7.1%)
Total	8 (100%)	14 (100%)

Table 3: Does your start date (as LIP Coordinator) make it difficult to answer questions about any of the humanitarian movements?

	Large	Small/Medium
No	15 (53.6%)	17 (65.4%)
Yes	13 (46.4%)	9 (34.6%)
Total	28 (100%)	26 (100%)

Table 4: Which humanitarian movements is it difficult to answer questions about, due to your start date?

	Large	Small/Medium
Syrian	7 (53.8%)	1 (11.1%)
Syrian & Afghan	3 (23.1%)	8 (88.9%)
Afghan & Ukrainian	1 (7.7%)	0.00
Syrian & Afghan & Ukrainian	2 (15.4%)	0.00
Total	13 (100%)	9 (100%)

Level of Involvement/Collective Efforts

Table 5a: How would you characterize the level of involvement by your LIP for each of the movements listed below? (Syrian)

	Municipal	Non-municipal
Extensive	3 (16.7%)	3 (9.7%)
Moderate	8 (44.4%)	12 (38.7%)
Slight	5 (27.8%)	7 (22.6%)
No	2 (22.2%)	9 (29%)
Total	18 (100%)	31 (100%)

Table 5b: How would you characterize the level of involvement by your LIP for each of the movements listed below? (Afghan)

	Municipal	Non-municipal
Extensive	2 (10.5%)	1 (3.1%)
Moderate	5 (26.3%)	12 (37.5%)
Slight	9 (47.4%)	8 (25%)
No	3 (15.8%)	11 (34.4%)

Total	19 (100%)	32 (100%)
-------	-----------	-----------

Table 5c: How would you characterize the level of involvement by your LIP for each of the movements listed below? (Ukrainian)

	Municipal	Non-municipal
Extensive	7 (35%)	7 (21.9%)
Moderate	7 (35%)	14 (43.8%)
Slight	6 (30%)	9 (28.1%)
No	0	2 (6.3%)
Total	20 (100%)	32 (100%)

Table 6a: How would you characterize the level of involvement by your LIP for each of the movements listed below? (Syrian)

	Large	Small/Medium
Extensive	5 (20.8%)	1 (4.2%)
Moderate	11 (45.8%)	9 (37.5%)
Slight	5 (20.8%)	5 (20.8%)
No	3 (12.5%)	9 (37.5%)
Total	24 (100%)	24 (100%)

Table 6b: How would you characterize the level of involvement by your LIP for each of the movements listed below? (Afghan)

	Large	Small/Medium
Extensive	3 (12%)	0

Moderate	12 (48%)	5 (20%)
Slight	9 (36%)	6 (24%)
No	1 (4%)	14 (56%)
Total	25 (100%)	25 (100%)

Table 6c: How would you characterize the level of involvement by your LIP for each of the movements listed below? (Ukrainian)

	Large	Small/Medium
Extensive	7 (26.9%)	6 (24%)
Moderate	12 (46.2%)	9 (36%)
Slight	7 (26.9%)	8 (32%)
No	0	2 (8%)
Total	26 (100%)	25 (1000%)

Table 7a: What role did your LIP play in the collective effort to resettle Syrian humanitarian entrants?

	Municipal			Total
	Not significant	Significant	Not Applicable	
Engaged in advocacy to boost the willingness of local organizations to help in the resettlement effort	5 (45.5%)	5 (45.5%)	1 (9.1%)	11 (100%)
Sensitized mainstream and community organizations to the resettlement needs of humanitarian entrants	2 (18.2%)	8 (72.7%)	1 (9.1%)	11 (100%)
Engaged in anticipatory projects to establish working relationships that allowed	5 (45.5%)	5 (45.5%)	1 (9.1%)	11 (100%)

organizations to work together quickly and efficiently				
Mobilized community support for resettlement	3 (27.3%)	7 (63.6%)	1 (9.1%)	11 (100%)
Used the LIP's convening capacity to bring together organizations to help with resettlement	1 (9.1%)	9 (81.8%)	1 (9.1%)	11 (100%)
Coordinated the participation of organizations in the overall effort to resettle humanitarian entrants	4 (36.4%)	6 (54.5%)	1 (9.1%)	11 (100%)
Helped settlement service provider organizations coordinate their resettlement efforts	3 (27.3%)	7 (63.6%)	1 (9.1%)	11 (100%)
Helped immigrant settlement service providers (SPOs) enlist other organizations to help resettle humanitarian entrants	6 (54.5%)	4 (36.4%)	1 (9.1%)	11 (100%)
Other	0	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	4 (100%)

Table 7b: What role did your LIP play in the collective effort to resettle Syrian humanitarian entrants?

	Non-municipal			
	Not significant	Significant	Not Applicable	Total
Engaged in advocacy to boost the willingness of local organizations to help in the resettlement effort	5 (26.3%)	10 (52.6%)	4 (21.1%)	19 (100%)
Sensitized mainstream and community organizations to the resettlement needs of humanitarian entrants	5 (26.3%)	10 (52.6%)	4 (21.1%)	19 (100%)

Engaged in anticipatory projects to establish working relationships that allowed organizations to work together quickly and efficiently	7 (38.9%)	7 (38.9%)	4 (22.2%)	18 (100%)
Mobilized community support for resettlement	8 (44.4%)	6 (33.3%)	4 (22.2%)	18 (100%)
Used the LIP's convening capacity to bring together organizations to help with resettlement	5 (26.3%)	11 (57.9%)	3 (15.8%)	19 (100%)
Coordinated the participation of organizations in the overall effort to resettle humanitarian entrants	6 (33.3%)	9 (50%)	3 (16.7%)	18 (100%)
Helped settlement service provider organizations coordinate their resettlement efforts	8 (44.4%)	7 (38.9%)	3 (16.7%)	18 (100%)
Helped immigrant settlement service providers (SPOs) enlist other organizations to help resettle humanitarian entrants	6 (33.3%)	7 (38.9%)	5 (27.8%)	18 (100%)
Other	3 (33.3%)	0	6 (66.7%)	9 (100%)

Table 7c: What role did your LIP play in the collective effort to resettle Syrian humanitarian entrants?

	Large			Total
	Not significant	Significant	Not Applicable	
Engaged in advocacy to boost the willingness of local organizations to help in the resettlement effort	3 (20%)	11 (73.3%)	1 (6.7%)	15 (100%)

Sensitized mainstream and community organizations to the resettlement needs of humanitarian entrants	1 (6.7%)	13 (86.7%)	1 (6.7%)	15 (100%)
Engaged in anticipatory projects to establish working relationships that allowed organizations to work together quickly and efficiently	6 (40%)	7 (46.7%)	2 (13.3%)	15 (100%)
Mobilized community support for resettlement	4 (26.7%)	10 (66.7%)	1 (6.7%)	15 (100%)
Used the LIP's convening capacity to bring together organizations to help with resettlement	2 (13.3%)	12 (80%)	1 (6.7%)	15 (100%)
Coordinated the participation of organizations in the overall effort to resettle humanitarian entrants	3 (30%)	11 (73.3%)	1 (6.7%)	15 (100%)
Helped settlement service provider organizations coordinate their resettlement efforts	6 (40%)	8 (53.3%)	1 (6.7%)	15 (100%)
Helped immigrant settlement service providers (SPOs) enlist other organizations to help resettle humanitarian entrants	5 (33.3%)	8 (53.3%)	2 (13.3%)	15 (100%)
Other	1 (16.7%)	3 (50%)	2 (33.3%)	6 (100%)

Table 7d: What role did your LIP play in the collective effort to resettle Syrian humanitarian entrants?

	Small/Medium			
	Not significant	Significant	Not Applicable	Total

Engaged in advocacy to boost the willingness of local organizations to help in the resettlement effort	7 (50%)	4 (28.6%)	3 (21.4%)	14 (100%)
Sensitized mainstream and community organizations to the resettlement needs of humanitarian entrants	6 (42.9%)	5 (35.7%)	3 (21.4%)	14 (100%)
Engaged in anticipatory projects to establish working relationships that allowed organizations to work together quickly and efficiently	6 (46.2%)	5 (38.5%)	2 (15.4%)	13 (100%)
Mobilized community support for resettlement	7 (53.8%)	3 (23.1%)	3 (23.1%)	13 (100%)
Used the LIP's convening capacity to bring together organizations to help with resettlement	4 (28.6%)	8 (57.1%)	2 (14.2%)	14 (100%)
Coordinated the participation of organizations in the overall effort to resettle humanitarian entrants	7 (53.8%)	4 (30.8%)	2 (15.4%)	13 (100%)
Helped settlement service provider organizations coordinate their resettlement efforts	5 (38.5%)	6 (46.2%)	2 (15.4%)	13 (100%)
Helped immigrant settlement service providers (SPOs) enlist other organizations to help resettle humanitarian entrants	7 (53.8%)	3 (23.1%)	3 (23.1%)	13 (100%)
Other	2 (33.3%)	0	4 (66.7%)	6 (100%)

Table 8a: What role did your LIP play in the collective effort to resettle Afghan humanitarian entrants?

	Municipal			Total
	Not significant	Significant	Not Applicable	
Engaged in advocacy to boost the willingness of local organizations to help in the resettlement effort	9 (60%)	4 (26.7%)	2 (13.3%)	15 (100%)
Sensitized mainstream and community organizations to the resettlement needs of humanitarian entrants	9 (60%)	5 (33.3%)	1 (6.7%)	15 (100%)
Engaged in anticipatory projects to establish working relationships that allowed organizations to work together quickly and efficiently	9 (60%)	4 (26.7%)	2 (13.3%)	15 (100%)
Mobilized community support for resettlement	10 (71.4%)	3 (21.4%)	1 (7.1%)	14 (100%)
Used the LIP's convening capacity to bring together organizations to help with resettlement	7 (46.7%)	5 (33.3%)	3 (20%)	15 (100%)
Coordinated the participation of organizations in the overall effort to resettle humanitarian entrants	10 (66.7%)	2 (13.3%)	3 (20%)	15 (100%)
Helped settlement service provider organizations coordinate their resettlement efforts	10 (66.7%)	3 (20%)	2 (13.3%)	15 (100%)

Helped immigrant settlement service providers (SPOs) enlist other organizations to help resettle humanitarian entrants	9 (60%)	3 (20%)	3 (20%)	15 (100%)
Other	2 (40%)	1 (10%)	2 (40%)	5 (100%)

Table 8b: What role did your LIP play in the collective effort to resettle Afghan humanitarian entrants?

	Non-municipal			Total
	Not significant	Significant	Not Applicable	
Engaged in advocacy to boost the willingness of local organizations to help in the resettlement effort	12 (52.2%)	7 (30.4%)	4 (17.4%)	23 (100%)
Sensitized mainstream and community organizations to the resettlement needs of humanitarian entrants	9 (37.5%)	10 (41.7%)	5 (20.8%)	24 (100%)
Engaged in anticipatory projects to establish working relationships that allowed organizations to work together quickly and efficiently	9 (39.1%)	8 (34.8%)	6 (26.1%)	23 (100%)
Mobilized community support for resettlement	9 (39.1%)	9 (39.1%)	5 (21.7%)	23 (100%)
Used the LIP's convening capacity to bring together organizations to help with resettlement	7 (30.4%)	13 (56.5%)	4 (17.4%)	24 (100%)
Coordinated the participation of organizations in the overall effort to resettle humanitarian entrants	7 (30.4%)	11 (47.8%)	5 (21.7%)	23 (100%)

Helped settlement service provider organizations coordinate their resettlement efforts	6 (26.1%)	12 (52.2%)	5 (21.7%)	23 (100%)
Helped immigrant settlement service providers (SPOs) enlist other organizations to help resettle humanitarian entrants	9 (39.1%)	8 (34.8%)	6 (26.1%)	23 (100%)
Other	3 (37.5%)	0	5 (62.5%)	8 (100%)

Table 8c: What role did your LIP play in the collective effort to resettle Afghan humanitarian entrants?

	Large			Total
	Not significant	Significant	Not Applicable	
Engaged in advocacy to boost the willingness of local organizations to help in the resettlement effort	10 (45.5%)	10 (45.5%)	2 (9.1%)	22 (100%)
Sensitized mainstream and community organizations to the resettlement needs of humanitarian entrants	6 (27.3%)	14 (63.6%)	2 (9.1%)	22 (100%)
Engaged in anticipatory projects to establish working relationships that allowed organizations to work together quickly and efficiently	8 (36.4%)	10 (45.5%)	4 (18.2%)	22 (100%)
Mobilized community support for resettlement	8 (36.4%)	11 (50%)	3 (13.6%)	22 (100%)
Used the LIP's convening capacity to bring together organizations to help with resettlement	6 (27.3%)	13 (59.1%)	3 (13.6%)	22 (100%)

Coordinated the participation of organizations in the overall effort to resettle humanitarian entrants	8 (36.4%)	10 (45.5%)	4 (18.2%)	22 (100%)
Helped settlement service provider organizations coordinate their resettlement efforts	7 (31.8%)	12 (54.5%)	3 (13.6%)	22 (100%)
Helped immigrant settlement service providers (SPOs) enlist other organizations to help resettle humanitarian entrants	9 (40.9%)	8 (36.4%)	5 (22.7%)	22 (100%)
Other	2 (33.3%)	1 (16.7%)	3 (50%)	6 (100%)

Table 8d: What role did your LIP play in the collective effort to resettle Afghan humanitarian entrants?

	Small/Medium			Total
	Not significant	Significant	Not Applicable	
Engaged in advocacy to boost the willingness of local organizations to help in the resettlement effort	11 (73.3%)	1 (6.7%)	3 (20%)	15 (100%)
Sensitized mainstream and community organizations to the resettlement needs of humanitarian entrants	12 (75%)	1 (6.3%)	3 (18.7%)	16 (100%)
Engaged in anticipatory projects to establish working relationships that allowed organizations to work together quickly and efficiently	10 (66.7%)	2 (13.3%)	3 (20%)	15 (100%)
Mobilized community support for resettlement	11 (73.3%)	1 (6.7%)	3 (20%)	15 (100%)

Used the LIP's convening capacity to bring together organizations to help with resettlement	8 (50%)	5 (31.3%)	3 (18.7%)	16 (100%)
Coordinated the participation of organizations in the overall effort to resettle humanitarian entrants	9 (60%)	3 (20%)	3 (20%)	15 (100%)
Helped settlement service provider organizations coordinate their resettlement efforts	9 (60%)	3 (20%)	3 (20%)	15 (100%)
Helped immigrant settlement service providers (SPOs) enlist other organizations to help resettle humanitarian entrants	9 (60%)	3 (20%)	3 (20%)	15 (100%)
Other	3 (50%)	0	3 (50%)	6 (100%)

Table 9a: What role did your LIP play in the collective effort to resettle Ukrainian humanitarian entrants?

	Municipal			Total
	Not significant	Significant	Not Applicable	
Engaged in advocacy to boost the willingness of local organizations to help in the resettlement effort	6 (33.3%)	11 (61.1%)	1 (5.6%)	18 (100%)
Sensitized mainstream and community organizations to the resettlement needs of humanitarian entrants	4 (22.2%)	11 (61.1%)	3 (16.7%)	18 (100%)
Engaged in anticipatory projects to establish working relationships that allowed	9 (50.0%)	6 (33.3%)	3 (16.7%)	18 (100%)

organizations to work together quickly and efficiently				
Mobilized community support for resettlement	10 (55.6%)	7 (38.9%)	1 (5.6%)	18 (100%)
Used the LIP's convening capacity to bring together organizations to help with resettlement	6 (33.3%)	10 (55.6%)	2 (11.1%)	18 (100%)
Coordinated the participation of organizations in the overall effort to resettle humanitarian entrants	5 (29.4%)	7 (41.2%)	5 (29.4%)	17 (100%)
Helped settlement service provider organizations coordinate their resettlement efforts	10 (55.6%)	3 (16.7%)	5 (27.8%)	18 (100%)
Helped immigrant settlement service providers (SPOs) enlist other organizations to help resettle humanitarian entrants	10 (58.8%)	4 (23.5%)	3 (17.6%)	17 (100%)
Other	1 (12.5%)	5 (62.5%)	2 (25.0%)	8 (100%)

Table 9b: What role did your LIP play in the collective effort to resettle Ukrainian humanitarian entrants?

	Non-municipal			Total
	Not significant	Significant	Not Applicable	
Engaged in advocacy to boost the willingness of local organizations to help in the resettlement effort	6 (20.0%)	19 (63.3%)	5 (16.7%)	30 (100%)

Sensitized mainstream and community organizations to the resettlement needs of humanitarian entrants	7 (23.3%)	16 (53.3%)	7 (23.3%)	30 (100%)
Engaged in anticipatory projects to establish working relationships that allowed organizations to work together quickly and efficiently	13 (44.8%)	13 (44.8%)	3 (10.3%)	29 (100%)
Mobilized community support for resettlement	7 (24.1%)	16 (55.2%)	6 (20.7%)	29 (100%)
Used the LIP's convening capacity to bring together organizations to help with resettlement	7 (25.0%)	18 (64.3%)	3 (10.7%)	28 (100%)
Coordinated the participation of organizations in the overall effort to resettle humanitarian entrants	9 (31.0%)	15 (51.7%)	5 (17.2%)	29 (100%)
Helped settlement service provider organizations coordinate their resettlement efforts	11 (37.9%)	12 (41.4%)	6 (20.7%)	29 (100%)
Helped immigrant settlement service providers (SPOs) enlist other organizations to help resettle humanitarian entrants	10 (34.5%)	14 (48.3%)	5 (17.2%)	29 (100%)
Other	1 (11.1%)	3 (33.3%)	5 (55.6%)	9 (100%)

Table 9c: What role did your LIP play in the collective effort to resettle Ukrainian humanitarian entrants?

	Large			
	Not significant	Significant	Not Applicable	Total

Engaged in advocacy to boost the willingness of local organizations to help in the resettlement effort	4 (16.7%)	17 (70.8%)	3 (12.5%)	24 (100%)
Sensitized mainstream and community organizations to the resettlement needs of humanitarian entrants	4 (16.7%)	18 (75%)	2 (8.3%)	24 (100%)
Engaged in anticipatory projects to establish working relationships that allowed organizations to work together quickly and efficiently	12 (50%)	8 (33.4%)	4 (16.7%)	24 (100%)
Mobilized community support for resettlement	8 (33.4%)	14 (58.3%)	2 (8.3%)	24 (100%)
Used the LIP's convening capacity to bring together organizations to help with resettlement	6 (25%)	15 (62.5%)	3 (12.5%)	24 (100%)
Coordinated the participation of organizations in the overall effort to resettle humanitarian entrants	6 (26.1%)	13 (56.5%)	4 (17.4%)	23 (100%)
Helped settlement service provider organizations coordinate their resettlement efforts	10 (41.7%)	9 (37.5%)	5 (20.8%)	24 (100%)
Helped immigrant settlement service providers (SPOs) enlist other organizations to help resettle humanitarian entrants	8 (34.8%)	10 (43.5%)	5 (21.7%)	23 (100%)
Other	2 (22.2%)	3 (33.3%)	4 (44.4%)	9 (100%)

Table 9d: What role did your LIP play in the collective effort to resettle Ukrainian humanitarian entrants?

	Small/Medium			Total
	Not significant	Significant	Not Applicable	
Engaged in advocacy to boost the willingness of local organizations to help in the resettlement effort	8 (34.8%)	12 (52.2%)	3 (13%)	23 (100%)
Sensitized mainstream and community organizations to the resettlement needs of humanitarian entrants	7 (30.4%)	8 (34.8%)	8 (34.8%)	23 (100%)
Engaged in anticipatory projects to establish working relationships that allowed organizations to work together quickly and efficiently	9 (40.9%)	10 (45.5%)	3 (13.6%)	22 (100%)
Mobilized community support for resettlement	10 (45.5%)	7 (31.8%)	5 (22.7%)	22 (100%)
Used the LIP's convening capacity to bring together organizations to help with resettlement	8 (38.1%)	11 (52.4%)	2 (9.5%)	21 (100%)
Coordinated the participation of organizations in the overall effort to resettle humanitarian entrants	9 (40.9%)	9 (40.9%)	4 (18.2%)	22 (100%)
Helped settlement service provider organizations coordinate their resettlement efforts	11 (50%)	7 (31.8%)	4 (18.2%)	22 (100%)
Helped immigrant settlement service providers (SPOs) enlist other organizations to help resettle humanitarian entrants	12 (54.5%)	8 (36.4%)	2 (9.1%)	22 (100%)

Other	0	5 (62.5%)	3 (37.5%)	8 (100%)
-------	---	-----------	-----------	----------

Contributions

Table 10a: How would you rate the OVERALL importance of your contribution to each resettlement effort? (By municipality)

	Syrian	
	Municipal	Non-municipal
Very important contribution	3 (16.7%)	6 (20%)
Important contribution	8 (44.4%)	4 (13.3%)
Moderate contribution	4 (22.2%)	7 (23.3%)
Not very important contribution	2 (11.1%)	7 (23.3%)
No contribution	1 (5.6%)	7 (23.3%)
Total	18 (100%)	30 (100%)

Table 10b: How would you rate the OVERALL importance of your contribution to each resettlement effort? (By population centre size)

	Syrian	
	Large	Small/Medium
Very important contribution	8 (32%)	1 (4.5%)
Important contribution	6 (24%)	6 (27.3%)
Moderate contribution	8 (32%)	3 (13.6%)
Not very important contribution	2 (8%)	4 (18.2%)
No contribution	1 (4%)	8 (36.4%)
Total	25 (100%)	22 (100%)

Table 10c: How would you rate the OVERALL importance of your contribution to each resettlement effort? (By municipality)

	Afghan	
	Municipal	Non-municipal
Very important contribution	2 (10.5%)	4 (12.5%)
Important contribution	3 (15.8%)	4 (12.5%)
Moderate contribution	6 (31.6%)	8 (25%)
Not very important contribution	6 (31.6%)	6 (18.75%)
No contribution	2 (10.5%)	10 (31.25%)
Total	19 (100%)	32 (100%)

Table 10d: How would you rate the OVERALL importance of your contribution to each resettlement effort? (By population centre size)

	Afghan	
	Large	Small/Medium
Very important contribution	6 (22.2%)	0
Important contribution	6 (22.2%)	1 (4.3%)
Moderate contribution	11 (40.7%)	3 (13%)
Not very important contribution	2 (7.4%)	8 (34.8%)
No contribution	2 (7.4%)	11 (47.8%)
Total	27 (100%)	23 (100%)

Table 10e: How would you rate the OVERALL importance of your contribution to each resettlement effort? (By municipality)

	Ukrainian	
	Municipal	Non-municipal
Very important contribution	4 (20%)	7 (21.9%)
Important contribution	9 (45%)	10 (31.3%)
Moderate contribution	3 (15%)	9 (28.1%)

Not very important contribution	4 (20%)	3 (9.4%)
No contribution	0	3 (9.4%)
Total	20 (100%)	32 (100%)

Table 10f: How would you rate the OVERALL importance of your contribution to each resettlement effort?

	Ukrainian	
	Large	Small/Medium
Very important contribution	6 (21.4%)	4 (17.4%)
Important contribution	11 (39.3%)	8 (34.8%)
Moderate contribution	9 (32%)	3 (13%)
Not very important contribution	2 (7.1%)	5 (21.7%)
No contribution	0	3 (13%)
Total	28 (100%)	23 (100%)

Table 11a: Factors played a significant contributory role to making an 'important' or 'very important' contribution to Syrian humanitarian entrants. (By municipality)

	Municipal		Total
	Did Not	Did	
Factor 1: Previous experience by your LIP in mobilizing help	5 (50%)	5 (50%)	10 (100%)
Factor 2: The ability of your LIP to draw on the capacities of local settlement agencies	0.0	10 (100%)	10 (100%)
Factor 3: Skills and capacities of the refugees and humanitarian entrants	7 (77.8%)	2 (22.2%)	9 (100%)
Factor 4: Previous local involvement/experience in humanitarian	7 (77.8%)	2 (22.2%)	9 (100%)

resettlement that your LIP was able to draw on			
Factor 5: The ability of your LIP to mobilize co-ethnics in the resettlement destination	3 (33.3%)	6 (66.7%)	9 (100%)
Factor 6: Access by your LIP to local champions with prior involvement/experience in resettlement	0.0	8 (100%)	8 (100%)
Factor 7: Ability of the LIP to readily access additional resources	3 (30%)	7 (70%)	10 (100%)

Table 11b: Factors played a significant contributory role to making an 'important' or 'very important' contribution to Syrian humanitarian entrants. (By municipality)

	Non-municipal		Total
	Did Not	Did	
Factor 1: Previous experience by your LIP in mobilizing help	3 (30%)	7 (70%)	10 (100%)
Factor 2: The ability of your LIP to draw on the capacities of local settlement agencies	1 (10%)	9 (90%)	10 (100%)
Factor 3: Skills and capacities of the refugees and humanitarian entrants	4 (40%)	6 (60%)	10 (100%)
Factor 4: Previous local involvement/experience in humanitarian resettlement that your LIP was able to draw on	2 (20%)	8 (80%)	10 (100%)
Factor 5: The ability of your LIP to mobilize co-ethnics in the resettlement destination	2 (20%)	8 (80%)	10 (100%)
Factor 6: Access by your LIP to local champions with prior involvement/experience in resettlement	3 (30%)	7 (70%)	10 (100%)
Factor 7: Ability of the LIP to readily access additional resources	2 (20%)	8 (80%)	10 (100%)

Table 11c: Factors played a significant contributory role to making an 'important' or 'very important' contribution to Syrian humanitarian entrants. (By population centre size)

	Large		Total
	Did Not	Did	
Factor 1: Previous experience by your LIP in mobilizing help	6 (46.2%)	7 (54.8%)	13 (100%)
Factor 2: The ability of your LIP to draw on the capacities of local settlement agencies	1 (7.7%)	12 (92.3%)	13 (100%)
Factor 3: Skills and capacities of the refugees and humanitarian entrants	8 (66.7%)	4 (33.3%)	12 (100%)
Factor 4: Previous local involvement/experience in humanitarian resettlement that your LIP was able to draw on	6 (50%)	6 (50%)	12 (100%)
Factor 5: The ability of your LIP to mobilize co-ethnics in the resettlement destination	2 (16.7%)	10 (83.3%)	12 (100%)
Factor 6: Access by your LIP to local champions with prior involvement/experience in resettlement	2 (16.7%)	10 (83.3%)	12 (100%)
Factor 7: Ability of the LIP to readily access additional resources	4 (30.1%)	9 (69.9%)	13 (100%)

Table 11d: Factors played a significant contributory role to making an 'important' or 'very important' contribution to Syrian humanitarian entrants. (By population centre size)

	Small/Medium		Total
	Did Not	Did	
Factor 1: Previous experience by your LIP in mobilizing help	2 (28.6%)	5 (71.4%)	7 (100%)
Factor 2: The ability of your LIP to draw on the capacities of local settlement agencies	0.0	7 (100%)	7 (100%)

Factor 3: Skills and capacities of the refugees and humanitarian entrants	3 (42.9%)	4 (57.1%)	7 (100%)
Factor 4: Previous local involvement/experience in humanitarian resettlement that your LIP was able to draw on	3 (42.9%)	4 (57.1%)	7 (100%)
Factor 5: The ability of your LIP to mobilize co-ethnics in the resettlement destination	3 (42.9%)	4 (57.1%)	7 (100%)
Factor 6: Access by your LIP to local champions with prior involvement/experience in resettlement	1 (16.7%)	5 (83.3%)	6 (100%)
Factor 7: Ability of the LIP to readily access additional resources	1 (14.3%)	6 (85.7%)	7 (100%)

Table 12a: Factors played a significant contributory role to making an 'important' or 'very important' contribution to Afghan humanitarian entrants. (By municipality)

	Municipal		Total
	Did Not	Did	
Factor 1: Previous experience by your LIP in mobilizing help	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	5 (100%)
Factor 2: The ability of your LIP to draw on the capacities of local settlement agencies	1 (20%)	4 (80%)	5 (100%)
Factor 3: Skills and capacities of the refugees and humanitarian entrants	4 (100%)	0.0	4 (100%)
Factor 4: Previous local involvement/experience in humanitarian resettlement that your LIP was able to draw on	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	5 (100%)
Factor 5: The ability of your LIP to mobilize co-ethnics in the resettlement destination	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	4 (100%)
Factor 6: Access by your LIP to local champions with prior involvement/experience in resettlement	1 (20%)	4 (80%)	5 (100%)

Factor 7: Ability of the LIP to readily access additional resources	0.0	4 (100%)	4 (100%)
---	-----	----------	----------

Table 12b: Factors played a significant contributory role to making an 'important' or 'very important' contribution to Afghan humanitarian entrants. (By municipality)

	Non-municipal		Total
	Did Not	Did	
Factor 1: Previous experience by your LIP in mobilizing help	2 (28.6%)	5 (71.4%)	7 (100%)
Factor 2: The ability of your LIP to draw on the capacities of local settlement agencies	1 (14.3%)	6 (85.7%)	7 (100%)
Factor 3: Skills and capacities of the refugees and humanitarian entrants	4 (57.1%)	3 (42.9%)	7 (100%)
Factor 4: Previous local involvement/experience in humanitarian resettlement that your LIP was able to draw on	1 (14.3%)	6 (85.7%)	7 (100%)
Factor 5: The ability of your LIP to mobilize co-ethnics in the resettlement destination	3 (42.9%)	4 (57.1%)	7 (100%)
Factor 6: Access by your LIP to local champions with prior involvement/experience in resettlement	1 (14.3%)	6 (85.7%)	7 (100%)
Factor 7: Ability of the LIP to readily access additional resources	2 (28.6%)	5 (71.4%)	7 (100%)

Table 12c: Factors played a significant contributory role to making an 'important' or 'very important' contribution to Afghan humanitarian entrants. (By population centre size)

	Large		Total
	Did Not	Did	
Factor 1: Previous experience by your LIP in mobilizing help	4 (36.4%)	7 (63.6%)	11 (100%)

Factor 2: The ability of your LIP to draw on the capacities of local settlement agencies	2 (18.2%)	9 (81.8%)	11 (100%)
Factor 3: Skills and capacities of the refugees and humanitarian entrants	8 (80%)	2 (20%)	10 (100%)
Factor 4: Previous local involvement/experience in humanitarian resettlement that your LIP was able to draw on	4 (36.4%)	7 (63.6%)	11 (100%)
Factor 5: The ability of your LIP to mobilize co-ethnics in the resettlement destination	4 (40%)	6 (60%)	10 (100%)
Factor 6: Access by your LIP to local champions with prior involvement/experience in resettlement	2 (18.2%)	9 (81.8%)	11 (100%)
Factor 7: Ability of the LIP to readily access additional resources	2 (20%)	8 (80%)	10 (100%)

Table 12d: Factors played a significant contributory role to making an 'important' or 'very important' contribution to Afghan humanitarian entrants. (By population centre size)

	Small/Medium		Total
	Did Not	Did	
Factor 1: Previous experience by your LIP in mobilizing help	0.0	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Factor 2: The ability of your LIP to draw on the capacities of local settlement agencies	0.0	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Factor 3: Skills and capacities of the refugees and humanitarian entrants	0.0	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Factor 4: Previous local involvement/experience in humanitarian resettlement that your LIP was able to draw on	0.0	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Factor 5: The ability of your LIP to mobilize co-ethnics in the resettlement destination	0.0	1 (100%)	1 (100%)

Factor 6: Access by your LIP to local champions with prior involvement/experience in resettlement	0.0	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Factor 7: Ability of the LIP to readily access additional resources	0.0	1 (100%)	1 (100%)

Table 13a: Factors played a significant contributory role to making an 'important' or 'very important' contribution to Ukrainian humanitarian entrants. (By municipality)

	Municipal		Total
	Did Not	Did	
Factor 1: Previous experience by your LIP in mobilizing help	3 (23.1%)	10 (76.9%)	13 (100%)
Factor 2: The ability of your LIP to draw on the capacities of local settlement agencies	2 (15.4%)	11 (84.6%)	13 (100%)
Factor 3: Skills and capacities of the refugees and humanitarian entrants	7 (58.3%)	5 (41.7%)	12 (100%)
Factor 4: Previous local involvement/experience in humanitarian resettlement that your LIP was able to draw on	3 (23.1%)	10 (76.9%)	13 (100%)
Factor 5: The ability of your LIP to mobilize co-ethnics in the resettlement destination	5 (41.7%)	7 (58.3%)	12 (100%)
Factor 6: Access by your LIP to local champions with prior involvement/experience in resettlement	2 (15.4%)	11 (84.6%)	13 (100%)
Factor 7: Ability of the LIP to readily access additional resources	2 (16.7%)	10 (83.3%)	12 (100%)

Table 13b: Factors played a significant contributory role to making an 'important' or 'very important' contribution to Ukrainian humanitarian entrants. (By municipality)

	Non-municipal		Total
	Did Not	Did	
Factor 1: Previous experience by your LIP in mobilizing help	3 (20%)	12 (80%)	15 (100%)
Factor 2: The ability of your LIP to draw on the capacities of local settlement agencies	1 (5.9%)	16 (94.1%)	17 (100%)
Factor 3: Skills and capacities of the refugees and humanitarian entrants	9 (56.3%)	7 (43.7%)	16 (100%)
Factor 4: Previous local involvement/experience in humanitarian resettlement that your LIP was able to draw on	4 (23.5%)	13 (76.5%)	17 (100%)
Factor 5: The ability of your LIP to mobilize co-ethnics in the resettlement destination	3 (21.4%)	11(78.6%)	14 (100%)
Factor 6: Access by your LIP to local champions with prior involvement/experience in resettlement	4 (25%)	12 (75%)	16 (100%)
Factor 7: Ability of the LIP to readily access additional resources	4 (25%)	12 (75%)	16 (100%)

Table 13c: Factors played a significant contributory role to making an 'important' or 'very important' contribution to Ukrainian humanitarian entrants. (By population centre size)

	Large		Total
	Did Not	Did	
Factor 1: Previous experience by your LIP in mobilizing help	4 (25%)	12 (75%)	16 (100%)
Factor 2: The ability of your LIP to draw on the capacities of local settlement agencies	2 (11.8%)	15 (88.2%)	17 (100%)
Factor 3: Skills and capacities of the refugees and humanitarian entrants	9 (52.9%)	8 (47.1%)	17 (100%)

Factor 4: Previous local involvement/experience in humanitarian resettlement that your LIP was able to draw on	4 (23.5%)	13 (76.5%)	17 (100%)
Factor 5: The ability of your LIP to mobilize co-ethnics in the resettlement destination	5 (33.3%)	10 (66.7%)	15 (100%)
Factor 6: Access by your LIP to local champions with prior involvement/experience in resettlement	4 (25%)	12 (75%)	16 (100%)
Factor 7: Ability of the LIP to readily access additional resources	3 (20%)	12 (80%)	15 (100%)

Table 13d: Factors played a significant contributory role to making an 'important' or 'very important' contribution to Ukrainian humanitarian entrants.(By population centre size)

	Small/Medium		Total
	Did Not	Did	
Factor 1: Previous experience by your LIP in mobilizing help	2 (18.2%)	9 (81.8%)	11 (100%)
Factor 2: The ability of your LIP to draw on the capacities of local settlement agencies	1 (8.3%)	11 (91.7%)	12 (100%)
Factor 3: Skills and capacities of the refugees and humanitarian entrants	8 (80%)	2 (20%)	10 (100%)
Factor 4: Previous local involvement/experience in humanitarian resettlement that your LIP was able to draw on	4 (33.3%)	8 (66.7%)	12 (100%)
Factor 5: The ability of your LIP to mobilize co-ethnics in the resettlement destination	2 (20%)	8 (80%)	10 (100%)
Factor 6: Access by your LIP to local champions with prior involvement/experience in resettlement	2 (16.7%)	10 (83.3%)	12 (100%)
Factor 7: Ability of the LIP to readily access additional resources	2 (16.7%)	10 (83.3%)	12 (100%)

LIP Organization & Planning

Table 14a: Did you receive significant help for your involvement in humanitarian resettlement from the following sectors/institutions?

	Municipal		Total
	No	Yes	
Universities or Colleges	10 (55.6%)	8 (45.4%)	18 (100%)
Business or employers	9 (50%)	9 (50%)	18 (100%)
Immigrant Umbrella Associations	7 (38.9%)	11 (61.1%)	18 (100%)

Table 14b: Did you receive significant help for your involvement in humanitarian resettlement from the following sectors/institutions?

	Non-municipal		Total
	No	Yes	
Universities or Colleges	22 (78.6%)	6 (21.4%)	28 (100%)
Business or employers	16 (51.6%)	15 (48.4%)	31 (100%)
Immigrant Umbrella Associations	9 (31%)	20 (69%)	29 (100%)

Table 14c: Did you receive significant help for your involvement in humanitarian resettlement from the following sectors/institutions?

	Large		Total
	No	Yes	
Universities or Colleges	14 (58.3%)	10 (41.7%)	24 (100%)
Business or employers	10 (40%)	15 (60%)	25 (100%)
Immigrant Umbrella Associations	8 (32%)	17 (68%)	25 (100%)

Table 14d: Did you receive significant help for your involvement in humanitarian resettlement from the following sectors/institutions?

	Small/Medium		
	No	Yes	Total
Universities or Colleges	18 (85.7%)	3 (14.3%)	21 (100%)
Business or employers	13 (56.5%)	10 (43.5%)	23 (100%)
Immigrant Umbrella Associations	8 (38.1%)	13 (61.9%)	21 (100%)

Table 15a: Did your agreement significantly help or hinder your resettlement involvement?

	Municipal	Non-municipal
Significantly helped	10 (83.3%)	15 (71.4%)
Significantly hindered	2 (16.7%)	6 (28.6%)
Total	12 (100%)	21 (100%)

Table 15b: Did your agreement significantly help or hinder your resettlement involvement?

	Large	Small/Medium
Significantly helped	15 (83.3%)	9 (64.3%)
Significantly hindered	3 (16.7%)	5 (15.7%)
Total	18 (100%)	14 (100%)

Table 16a: Did your LIP's prior planning activities and pre-existing committees contribute to the shape or scale of your community's resettlement response?

	Municipal	Non-municipal
No	3 (16.7%)	5 (20%)
Yes	15 (83.3%)	20 (80%)
Total	18 (100%)	25 (100%)

Table 16b: Did your LIP's prior planning activities and pre-existing committees contribute to the shape or scale of your community's resettlement response?

	Large	Small/Medium
No	3 (13%)	6 (31.6%)
Yes	20 (87%)	13 (68.4%)
Total	23 (100%)	19 (100%)

Table 17a: Was your LIP involved with any promising practices that you would like to draw to our attention?

	Municipal	Non-municipal
No	10 (55.6%)	14 (56%)
Yes	8 (44.4%)	11 (44%)
Total	18 (100%)	25 (100%)

Table 17b: Was your LIP involved with any promising practices that you would like to draw to our attention?

	Large	Small/Medium
No	12 (52.2%)	10 (52.6%)
Yes	11 (47.8%)	9 (47.4%)
Total	23 (100%)	19 (100%)

Appendix C: Letter Of Information and Consent Form

Letter of Information and Consent

Project Title: The Crucial Role that Local Immigration Partnerships Play in Recent Humanitarian Operations

Document Title: Letter of Information and Consent – Participant

Principal Investigator: Dr. Michael Haan

Co-Investigators: Meyer Burstein, Dr. Dale Ballucci

Invitation to Participate

You are invited to participate in this research study that explores the challenges and benefits of deploying services to newcomers through Local Immigration Partnerships (LIP). You have been chosen because of your position in assisting LIP.

1. Why is this study being done?

Over the last five years, there has been an influx of refugees landing in Canada. In response, Canada has initiated several programs to help support and integrate these newcomers. These programs offer an array of opportunities to newcomers, and the diversity and complexity of their needs can present significant challenges for program delivery. To increase support for the agents and tailor responses, we need to hear from them, given their essential role in facilitating these programs.

We want to talk with agents across Canada regarding their experiences with delivering LIP services to newcomers to learn about the particular challenges encountered when attempting to support newcomers.

2. How long will you be in this study?

This study involves one interview that will take approximately 45 to 60 minutes of your time.

3. What are the study procedures?

If you agree to participate, you will be interviewed about your experiences supporting newcomers through LIP and your opinions about Canada's program practices and resources.

With your consent, the interview will be audio recorded. The interviewer will take notes if you do not wish to be audio-recorded. The interviews will take place at a time and location that is convenient to you, and the option to have the interview in-person or via ZOOM, depending on your site. There will be a total of approximately 10-15 participants in this study.

4. What are the risks and harms of participating in this study?

There are no known or anticipated risks or discomforts associated with participating in this study. If your experiences in LIP have been negative, it is possible that recounting these experiences may cause distress. You may refuse to answer any question that you find distressing and can halt the interview anytime.

5. What are the benefits of participating in this study?

You may not directly benefit from participating in this study, but the insights gained will provide a greater understanding of how to improve services to newcomers. The information gathered could be used to inform policies and services provided to newcomers in Canada.

6. Can participants choose to leave the study?

If you decide to withdraw from the study, you have the right to request the withdrawal of information collected about you. If you wish to have your information removed, please let the researcher know.

7. How will participants' information be kept confidential?

Pseudonyms and codes will be used in the transcripts of the interviews, as well as in any reports that will be generated from the data and analysis. Any personal information about you (name and contact information) will be kept in a secure and confidential location. A list linking your study number with your name will be held in a secure place, separate from your study file. A separate form will be completed for participants who wish to be entered into the draw. The personal information gathered (name and contact information) will only be used for contact purposes if you are selected as a winner.

While we do our best to protect your information, there is no guarantee that we will be able to do so. If data is collected during the project, which may be required to report by law, we have to report.

8. Are participants compensated for being in this study?

There will be no compensation for your participation.

9. What are the rights of participants?

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may decide not to be in this study. Even if you consent to participate, you cannot answer individual questions or withdraw from the study at any time. If you choose not to participate or to leave the study at any time, it will not affect you.

You do not waive any legal right by signing this consent form.

10. Whom do participants contact for questions?

Suppose you require any further information regarding this research study or your participation. In that case, you may contact the Principal Investigator, Dr. Michael Haan, at mikehaan1@icloud.com or the co-investigators Dale Ballucci at daleballucci@me.com, and Meyer Burstein, at mburstein@.

This letter is yours to keep for future reference.

Consent Form

Project Title: The Crucial Role that Local Immigration Partnerships Play in Recent Humanitarian Operations

Principal Investigator: Dr. Michael Haan

Co-Investigator: Meyer Burstein, Dr. Dale Ballucci

I have read the Letter of Information and have had the nature of the study explained to me, and I agree to participate. All questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

Participant's Name (please print): _____

Participant's Signature: _____

Date: _____

I am aware that it is not mandatory to be audio-recorded to participate in this study.

I agree to be audio-recorded in this research.

YES NO

Date: _____

Was the participant assisted during the consent process?

YES NO

If **YES**, please check the relevant box and complete the signature space below:

The person signing below acted as a translator for the participant during the consent process and attests that the study as set out in this form was accurately translated and has had any questions answered.

Print Name of Translator

Signature

Date (DD-MMM-YYYY)

Language

Person Obtaining Informed Consent (please print): _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix D: LIP Coordinator Interview Guide

Follow-up interview Guide for LIP coordinators

Introduction

Since the formal inception of the program in 2012, Local Immigration Partnerships have played a crucial role in the settlement and integration of newcomers to Canada, including refugees, protected persons and displaced persons. While LIPs do not provide direct services to newcomers, they nevertheless do important work in drawing together traditional and non-traditional settlement partners and ensuring broad-based, coordinated support for newcomer settlement. Over the past decade, Canada has been a major actor in several large-scale humanitarian resettlement efforts, and LIPs have stepped up to help address the specific challenges that accompany the arrival of refugees and displaced persons. The purpose of this research is to develop a more robust understanding of the various approaches LIPs have used to address these challenges and to ascertain the conditions and factors that determine the efficacy of those efforts. Its findings will help clarify roles for LIPs in future large-scale humanitarian resettlement efforts and assist in the development of tools, resources and supports that will help make LIPs more effective in those roles.

Ask if they have any questions.

Have the participant sign the consent form (if applicable)

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Your questionnaire indicates that your LIP undertook significant initiatives to help support the resettlement of Syrian, Afghan or Ukrainian humanitarian entrants. Could you describe these actions (for roles deemed 'significant'): activities undertaken, partner organizations involved, results, and evidence of success?

*We will want to be clear on how participants define significance. To get at this information, we ask them a series of probing questions about why they felt their contributions were significant. This will also yield more detailed answers concerning their roles and challenges. Their understanding of significance is important for both coding and analysis.

REFERS TO QUESTION BELOW:

Role played by the LIP in the effort to resettle Syrian, Afghan or Ukrainian humanitarian entrants	Significant	Not significant
Engaged in advocacy to boost the willingness of local organizations to help in the resettlement effort		
Sensitized mainstream and community organizations to the resettlement needs of humanitarian entrants (by, for example, organizing presentations to LIP sub-committees on the needs of humanitarian entrants in the area addressed by the sub-committee)		
Engaged in anticipatory projects to establish working relationships that allowed organizations to work together quickly and efficiently (by, for example, undertaking community endowment surveys in key areas such as housing, translation services, etc.)		
Mobilized community support for resettlement		
Used the LIP's convening capacity to bring together organizations to help with resettlement		
Coordinated the participation of organizations in the overall effort to resettle humanitarian entrants		
Helped settlement service provider organizations coordinate their resettlement efforts		
Helped immigrant settlement service providers (SPOs) enlist other organizations to help resettle humanitarian entrants		
Other (please list in the space below) _____ — _____ —		

-		
---	--	--

2. Does your LIP employ or foster different strategies and activities to support refugee and humanitarian settlements as opposed to immigrant settlements? If so, what are the differences? Why are different approaches needed? Is it necessary to work with different organizations or draw on them differently when dealing with humanitarian entrants?
3. What are the specific ways in which your LIP has helped SPOs? Does the support offered by the LIP differ if the target population consists of refugees or humanitarian entrants as opposed to immigrants? If so, how does it differ? Does it change the organizations that the LIP engages with? Does it change the policy 'targets', and the ministries and levels of government that you attempt to engage? Does it shift the focus of private sector and NGO recruitment? Are there areas in which SPOs have sought LIP support where the LIP has been unable to help or has decided to invest its efforts elsewhere?
4. Are there grassroots organizations that support refugees (Syrian, Afghan and Ukrainian refugees) in the community that are not connected with LIPs?

ASK THE LIP COORDINATOR FOR THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION RE: SPO INTERVIEWS

- Which grassroots organizations participate actively in the LIP?
 - Could the coordinator suggest (up to) three SPO EDs for interviews? (ideally, the SPOs should have been active in settling /humanitarian entrants, and the ED should have been in the position during each movement).
5. Does the episodic and urgent nature of humanitarian admissions and assistance require LIPs to modify their strategies toward partner recruitment and the responses and support they seek from partners (in anticipation of subsequent inflows)?
 6. What contributions did they make towards helping settle refugees and humanitarian entrants? Were they different from the partners needed to help settle newcomers?
 - What contributions did they make?
 - Which partner engagement activities yielded the biggest refugee settlement 'payoffs'?
 - Which LIP initiatives yielded the most significant outcomes?
 - What were the most successful strategies for recruiting/engaging these partners?

ASK THE LIP COORDINATOR FOR THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION RE PARTNER INTERVIEWS

- Which partners participate actively in the LIP and make the largest contributions?
 - Could the coordinator suggest (up to) three partners (names and contact information) for interviews (ideally, the partners should have been active in supporting the settlement of Syrian, Afghan and Ukrainian refugees/humanitarian entrants, and the partner representatives would have been in place during each refugee movement?)
7. The questionnaire identified various factors that contributed to the LIP's effectiveness in helping support the settlement of refugees. How can the most important factors be strengthened?

REFERS TO THE QUESTION BELOW:

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORY FACTORS	Factor played a significant contributory role to the positive rating	
	Yes	No
Factor 1: Previous experience by your LIP in mobilizing help		
Factor 2: The ability of your LIP to draw on the capacities of local settlement agencies		
Factor 3: Skills and capacities of the refugees and humanitarian entrants		
Factor 4: Previous local involvement & experience in humanitarian resettlement that your LIP could draw on		
Factor 5: The ability of your LIP to mobilize co-ethnics in the resettlement destination		
Factor 6: Access by your LIP to local champions with prior involvement/experience in resettlement		
Factor 7: Ability of the LIP to readily access additional resources		
Other factors that played a significant role ...		

8. The questionnaire indicated that your LIP received help from certain sectors/institutions. How did this help manifest itself, and what advice would you offer regarding recruiting and working with these institutions? Specific examples should be sought.

REFERS TO THE QUESTION BELOW:

Sector	Yes	No
--------	-----	----

Universities or colleges		
Business or employers		
Immigrant Umbrella Associations		

9. The questionnaire asked what additional resources/assets would have allowed the LIP to expand or enhance its humanitarian settlement efforts. Could the LIP would have done with the additional resources? This could include broader spending authorities for the LIPs (including discretionary 'top-up' resources).

10. This should be followed up if strong and interesting responses are received.

The questionnaire asked if the agreement holder helped or hindered the resettlement effort. (Some possible angles to explore: (i) Should the choice of agreement holder be linked to local circumstances (e.g. choose a municipality where economic development is paramount or a-PO where engagement of the co-ethnic community is key to success); (ii) Should certain agreement holder behaviour be curbed (e.g. could weaknesses in oversight or biased direction be addressed through guidelines on the structure and membership of an executive committee); (iii) Could the set of agreement holders be enlarged to expand leverage.

11. The questionnaire asked about the top three lessons produced by experience with humanitarian settlement. Similarly, it asked about the advice that should be passed on to a successor. We will pursue two angles with regard to these questions:

- (i) Look for overlapping responses among coordinators and investigate these to determine if there are angles that have NOT been covered in our previous questions.
- (ii) Look for outliers that signal genuine innovation or unique circumstances and opportunities.

12. Attribution of benefits resulting from broad community events is often problematic (in part because they may not exist). Coordinators whose responses cite specific and measurable goals (partner behaviours and client outcomes) will be asked about the lessons learned and applied to subsequent community activities.

13. With regard to the question about promising practices, our follow-up questions should focus on three points: (i) What is 'promising' about the practice (what makes it special)? (ii) Is there any evidence to support the 'claim'? (iii) How easily could the practice be transferred ... what would need to be replicated?

Appendix E: Service Provider Organization (SPO's) Interview Guide

As discussed, we will conduct a focus group with up to three settlement agencies/organizations in each location. The focus groups will last between one and two hours, during which we will conduct a detailed follow-up interview with an LIP coordinator.

The SPO focus groups will provide a *client* perspective on what LIPs contribute to refugee settlement and how their contributions might be improved. The focus groups will also let us 'test' the claims for success and contributions advanced by LIP coordinators. Specifically, the LIP questionnaire asks coordinators about the type of assistance LIPs provide and how it is 'produced.' It will be interesting to see if SPOs mirror the views and assertions offered by LIPs. (We must carefully distinguish between genuine insights and long-standing tensions in the settlement sector whereby all new players are regarded as competitors for a fixed pool of resources.)

We will need certain baseline information about the SPOs participating in the focus groups. We can either collect this at the start of each focus group, or we can ask participants to respond to the following six questions ahead of the meeting:

1. Type of SPO (classic settlement agency or an organization such as a Y or educational institution)
2. Organization/division size (both the number of clients served annually and organizational FTEs)
3. Refugee proportion in SPO caseload (for comparison with shares in immigration levels and iCARE)
4. SPO involvement in each humanitarian movement (yes/no) and parallel ED involvement (yes/no)
5. Services currently offered by the SPO to refugees.
6. Whether agency services were consistent across the three refugee movements or shifted

Questions to explore with each SPO's focus group

1. What contributions did the LIP make to the efforts by your agency(ies) to settle and integrate refugees from the three humanitarian movements we're examining? Probe the importance of these contributions.
2. (Depending on the response) What contributions did the LIP make to the efforts by other organizations to support the settlement and integration of refugees from the three humanitarian movements?
3. What other actions might the LIP have undertaken, or what assistance might the LIP have provided, that would have significantly contributed to refugee settlement?

4. What are the leading organizations - federal, provincial, municipal, voluntary, etc. – that you work with and rely on for help settling and integrating refugees? What do these organizations provide?
5. Did you have relationships with these organizations that predate the LIP?
6. Has the LIP changed your relationships with the organizations/institutions active in the refugee settlement space, and if so, how? (strengthened, expanded the range of participating organizations, increased contact frequency, broadened the scope of interactions, improved leverage about other organizations' resources, no change, distanced the relationships)
7. (If the response to Q5 is positive ...) What LIP structures help you leverage refugee assistance? (policy sub-committees, multi-level forums for different orders of government, university participation, empirical support, etc.....)
8. (If the response to Q5 is positive ...) What LIP activities help you leverage refugee assistance? (regular sub-committee meetings, convening strategic planning sessions to shift organizational priorities, community benchmarking, other activities that facilitate connections with federal, provincial and municipal institutions, etc.....)
9. Has the level of involvement and effectiveness of the LIP in humanitarian movements changed over time? How? What accounts for this?
10. What changes to the structure or behaviour of the LIP would allow your organization(s) to leverage more help for refugee settlement from the LIP and from other organizations?
11. What changes have you made, or could you make, within your agencies to capitalize more on the LIPs? (internal reorganization, more time invested in LIP activities, greater spending on LIP activities)
12. What were the top areas where LIPs helped regarding settlement for the three humanitarian movements? Please list these below:
13. What LIP activities, if any, would you regard as promising practices that are worth replicating elsewhere?

Appendix F: Other Agency Interview Guide

A. Interviews with partner organization representatives

We will conduct one-on-one interviews with two partnering organization representatives drawn from ten LIPs whose coordinators have also participated in in-depth interviews. (The ten LIPs will be part of the pool of twenty LIPs whose coordinators are interviewed.) The organizational representatives will be chosen to achieve coverage of crucial policy fields and urban-rural differences. If warranted, the schedule may also be adjusted to cover organizational types.

Questions/topics to pursue with partner organization representatives

14. How do you participate in the LIP: as a member of the executive committee, as a member of a subject matter sub-committee, or some other mechanism?
15. How often do you participate in LIP meetings?
16. Do you represent your organization or participate as a subject matter expert?
We should limit our interviews to participants who represent their organizations. We can establish this during our detailed LIP coordinator interviews. Question 3 would merely verify the point.
17. Why does your organization participate in the LIP? What organizational interests are served by participating in the LIP? What does your organization hope to achieve by participating in the LIP?
18. Do you coordinate your actions within the LIP with organizations with similar interests? For example, some LIPs have a roundtable or sub-committee that looks at a particular topic like health.
19. Did you (or another organization member) participate in the LIP during the Syrian, Afghan and Ukrainian humanitarian movements?
20. What was your organization's involvement in the community's response to these movements? How did your organization support the settlement of these groups?
21. Does your organization distinguish between support for newcomers in general and support for humanitarian entrants? In other words, are different interests engaged for the two populations?
22. More generally: Has your organization's involvement in the LIP resulted in (or been associated with) changes in your organization's strategic priorities that benefit humanitarian entrants, shifts in eligibility criteria that offer humanitarian entrants better access to programs or benefits, program modifications that serve humanitarian needs; spending increases on settlement and integration for humanitarian entrants; etc.
23. Did the LIP play a direct or indirect role in inducing the organizational changes or improvements in support listed in question '8'? If yes, did the changes or improvements

play a role in your organization's response to the three humanitarian movements we're examining? Specifics?

24. Did the LIP play a similar (catalytic) role to other organizations that participate alongside you in the LIP and are similarly interested in promoting humanitarian settlement and integration?
25. Was your organization involved with local settlement organizations (SPOs) before your involvement in the LIP? If so, what was the nature of that involvement?
26. Has your participation in the LIP changed your relationships with local settlement organizations? (Increased contact frequency; broadened the scope of interactions; strengthened relationships; led to joint projects; increased financial contributions; no change; distanced the relationships or substituted for the direct connections, etc.)
27. Which LIP actions (including creating partnerships) were especially conducive to attracting and maintaining support for humanitarian settlement from your organization?
28. What actions or changes in structure or partnerships by the LIP might induce your organization or organizations like yours to increase their support for refugee settlement?

Appendix G: Refugee Focus Group Interview Guide

As discussed, we will conduct a focus group with refugees who used various settlement services. The duration of the focus groups will be between one and two hours. The goal is to gain a *client* perspective on settlement services to learn what services the LIPs provide impact refugee settlement and how their contributions might be improved.

Introduction points and information:

Before attaining verbal consent to both record and conduct the interview,

- a. Inform the participant of their rights. Each participant is free to stop at any time or refuse to answer any question; explain that we are recording for accuracy and detail.
 - b. Anything you say will not be directly linked to your or your name and will not affect the services you receive.
 - c. Inform the participants that the interview has a translator; support information will be provided afterward.
 - d. Inform the participants of the project goals: to understand how LIPs can improve, how it helped them and what was not useful*.
12. We want to begin by having each of you:
- a. Stating your name
 - b. Age
 - c. Education level (we need this for analysis reasons and to track who to pay and who has completed the focus group).
 - d. When did you arrive in Canada?
13. What were the largest challenges that you have had when you arrived in Canada?
14. Of the services you were referred/received, which were the most helpful?
- a. Why?
15. Of the services you were referred/received, which were the least helpful?
- a. Why?
16. Did you find the settlement workers could support and communicate with you usefully?
17. What connections do you have with various communities WITHIN your ethnic group?
- a. Ethnocultural communities (e.g. Ukrainian, Afghan, Syrian, Community),
 - b. Schools,
 - c. Health clinics,
 - d. Settlement agencies.

18. How did you receive information about services?

- a. How did you learn about the food bank?
- b. Employment office
- c. Health clinic, etc.

19. What connections do you have with various communities OUTSIDE your group?

20. Are you currently employed?

- a. How soon did you find/receive employment?
- b. Did the services you received help you get this position?

Additional probing Questions concerning settlement services (if needed)

21. If you had to rank the services you received, which are the top settlement services that were most helpful?

22. What other actions might the settlement workers have undertaken, or what assistance might the settlement workers have provided, that would have significantly contributed to your refugee settlement?

23. What did you expect to get from settlement services?

24. Did you get what you expected? Why or why not?

25. What challenges, if any, did you find with using settlement services?