
Chapter Five: The Role of DIMIA-Funded Settlement Services

Many of the on-arrival and longer-term needs of migrants are shared with the wider Australian community and, to the extent that a migrant requires government assistance, are most appropriately addressed through mainstream services. DIMIA's settlement services provide some additional assistance to help new arrivals to orient themselves to life in Australia, including to the mainstream service environment. For individual migrants, this includes the provision of pre-embarkation and on-arrival information about life in Australia, as well as more specialised support services for arrivals in need of more assistance. In addition, DIMIA also plays a broader advocacy role in the settlement process through funding projects that facilitate capacity building within migrant communities and helping mainstream service providers to plan for and respond effectively to the needs of migrants and humanitarian entrants.

As they have a specific and limited role, DIMIA's settlement services should focus on building self-reliance, developing English language skills and fostering connections with mainstream services in the early settlement period. They are not intended to become an alternative service network for all migrants.

DIMIA's settlement services for individual migrants are targeted towards migrants in greatest need of settlement assistance. The intersection of settlement need indicators - English Proficiency group, visa category, length of establishment of the migrant community and new arrivals to resident population ratio - can help to pinpoint the new arrivals who are likely to need a higher level of assistance in settling in Australia. The settlement target group comprises permanent residents who have arrived in the last five years as humanitarian entrants or as family stream migrants with low levels of English proficiency. Within this target group, priority is given to providing assistance to migrants and humanitarian entrants from small and emerging communities and to those in rural and regional areas. Funding for community capacity building may extend beyond this five-year period in instances where a community still requires considerable assistance to plan, organise and advocate for its needs, and where it is receiving significant numbers of new arrivals who are in the settlement services target group.

Introduction

This chapter explores the role that DIMIA plays in supporting humanitarian entrants and migrants settling in Australia. The first part of the chapter outlines DIMIA's approach to assisting migrants on their arrival in Australia, while the second part examines the client target group of particular interest to DIMIA. Given the responsibility of mainstream service providers to cater for the needs of their migrant and humanitarian entrant clients,

DIMIA's role in direct service provision is necessarily and appropriately a limited one, targeting those most in need of special assistance. Beyond this, DIMIA has a role to play in helping mainstream agencies to plan for the provision of services to arriving migrants and humanitarian entrants. This role extends to working with mainstream agencies to help them to identify and respond to service gaps or barriers in programs most directly relevant to early settlement success.

The role of settlement services

As chapter four of this report - The Settlement Experiences of New Arrivals, demonstrates, settlement success varies according to a range of factors including English language ability and pre-migration education, employment and other life experiences. Added to these factors are migrants' own personal coping strategies, availability of family and community support, and degree of understanding and exposure to the principles and values that underpin Australian culture and institutions.

Some migrants will make their way in Australian society quickly and independently and will make little or no call on support services. Others may need assistance from a wide range of services over a relatively prolonged period. While there are many different views about how long it takes people to settle, it is the immediate post-arrival period that sees migrants engaged in an intensive process of establishment - finding accommodation, setting up house, enrolling children in school, commencing work, and making social contacts. At the same time they may be learning English, communicating through interpreters, arranging skills recognition, dealing with pre-arrival health or trauma issues, as well as maintaining (and sometimes re-establishing) contacts with family and friends overseas.

Many of these needs, such as employment, education and health care, are shared with the wider Australian community and to the extent that a migrant requires government assistance, are most appropriately addressed through mainstream services. This requires mainstream services to be responsive to the needs of a culturally and linguistically diverse clientele, and to the particular needs of newly-arrived migrants.

However, almost all migrants will have some on-arrival needs that relate directly to their migration experience. At the most basic level, new arrivals will require information about

how to do things in Australia and how to gain access to Australian institutions and services. Consequently, DIMIA's most basic settlement role is in the provision of pre-embarkation and on-arrival information pointing new arrivals in the direction of accurate, timely, and generally State/Territory or regionally specific information about the availability of services and about requirements and responsibilities (such as the need to obtain a driver's licence).

Beyond this, DIMIA-funded settlement services focus on providing some special or additional (to mainstream) support to arrivals most in need of assistance. This includes language support such as English tuition and interpreting and translating, and specialised support, such as counselling for humanitarian entrants to assist them in dealing with torture or trauma related to their pre-migration experiences.

The aim of DIMIA-funded services is to facilitate social and economic participation in Australian society as quickly and fully as possible. DIMIA's role is not to provide separate social support services, particularly where they duplicate services already available in the community to all residents, or to deal with all of the on-arrival needs or longer-term needs of migrants and humanitarian entrants. Consistent with this, the types of DIMIA-funded services provided directly to newly-arrived migrants are limited to:

- *the provision of information about life in Australia*, via pre-embarkation information distributed by overseas posts, settlement information published on DIMIA's web site which is linked with relevant mainstream service providers' web sites, as well as State/Territory and regional settlement information kits (developed in collaboration with mainstream services) for new arrivals;
- *specialised on-arrival support for humanitarian*

entrants, delivered under contract via a suite of services described collectively as the IHSS, that provide on-arrival accommodation, household formation support, information and orientation, early health assessment and intervention and support for proposers (see chapter eight);

- *orientation, information and referral services* delivered by a range of community-based settlement services funded under two grants programs - the CSSS (see chapter nine) and the MRC/MSA program (see chapter ten);
- *English language tuition* delivered under contract in classroom settings, through distance learning and through voluntary home tutors under the AMEP (see chapter eleven); and
- *translating and interpreting services*, provided through TIS for all non-English speaking residents of Australia and for those who need to communicate with them (see chapter twelve).

Apart from funding direct client services for individual migrants, DIMIA also plays a broader role in assisting newly-arrived migrants as they settle in Australia. It does this through:

- facilitating capacity building within migrant communities; and
- helping mainstream service providers plan for and respond effectively to the needs of humanitarian and migrant intakes.

DIMIA funds community capacity building primarily through the funding of projects under the community-based settlement services grants programs. Community capacity building aims to assist migrant communities to become more self-reliant and better able to organise, plan and work together to create solutions to common problems. It helps communities to develop their capacity to articulate and advocate for

their needs and for services or initiatives to improve service delivery.

DIMIA also has a role to play in helping mainstream agencies to plan for the provision of services to arriving migrants and humanitarian entrants. This role extends to working with mainstream agencies to help them to identify and respond to service gaps or barriers in programs most directly relevant to early settlement success. This role is discussed in chapter seven of this report - Settlement Planning. Through its funding of community grants, DIMIA also funds services that advocate on behalf of migrants for improved access to other government services and programs.

Recommendation 3

That DIMIA-funded settlement services be directed to new arrivals and concentrate on building self-reliance, developing English language skills and fostering connections with mainstream services.

DIMIA's settlement services target group

As chapter four of this report - The Settlement Experiences of New Arrivals, highlights, some new arrivals will require more assistance than others in the settlement process. DIMIA has over recent years developed the concept of a settlement services target group to which most of its settlement service resources are directed. This approach is consistent with other migrant-receiving countries such as Canada, the United States and New Zealand. Like Australia, they recognise the particular vulnerability of humanitarian entrants and provide them with additional, intensive support.

While the concept of targeting those in most

need is not new, DIMIA's settlement services target group has not always been clearly articulated or well understood. The target group is defined by reference to one eligibility criterion - permanent residence - and three indicators of settlement need - recency of arrival, visa category and English proficiency. Each of these are discussed in more detail below. It is a combination of these factors that defines the settlement services target group as permanent residents who have arrived in the previous five years as humanitarian entrants and family stream migrants with low English proficiency.

The settlement services target group definition is not intended to be applied rigidly or definitively but it does provide the basis for identifying the highest needs groups which are the primary focus of DIMIA-funded services. This assists in planning of services and highlights the interplay of factors that influence the allocation of resources for DIMIA's settlement services.

Permanent residence

The most fundamental eligibility requirement for inclusion in the settlement services target group is permanent residence. Consistent with other countries, Australia's settlement services invest in those who are permanent residents, thereby contributing over the longer-term to social and economic development.

Since 1991, Migration Program processes have required migrants in some categories to undergo a two-stage process towards permanent residence. This primarily affects family stream migrants arriving under the spouse, fiancé(e) and interdependent partner categories. Given the high likelihood of achievement of permanent residence, temporary visa holders at the first stage of such a process may also be eligible for some settlement services, depending on the conditions attached to their visas.

Recency of arrival

As discussed above and in chapter four, recency of arrival is an important indicator of settlement need. The settlement services target group that has been used for planning purposes in recent years is restricted to the period of five years after arrival. This is generally considered to be the initial settlement period during which migrants establish themselves in Australia and develop connections to mainstream services.

DIMIA's settlement database (SDB) is an important source of data on new arrivals to Australia, and is the prime source for the analysis below. Further information on the SDB is in appendix VII.

The SDB indicates that 348,025 permanent migrants arrived in Australia in the five-year period from 1 July 1997 to 30 June 2002. Table 5.1 indicates the top twenty-five countries of birth for all new arrivals to Australia over this period. The main source countries were the United Kingdom, China, South Africa, India, Indonesia, the Philippines and Viet Nam, with over 10,000 settlers arriving from each of these countries. Of course, only some of these fall within the settlement services target group (ie those who are humanitarian entrants or family stream migrants with low English proficiency).¹

Distribution

The delivery of settlement services is in part dependent on where newly-arrived migrants settle in Australia. Table 5.2 shows that of the 348,025 new arrivals in the five-year period

¹ The SDB only includes data on permanent migrants arriving under the Migration or Humanitarian Programs. It does not provide figures for New Zealand citizens who settle in Australia under the Trans-Tasman Travel Arrangement. As such, all figures quoted exclude New Zealand.

Table 5.1: Top twenty-five countries of birth for new arrivals, 1997-2002

Country of Birth	Total
United Kingdom	42,716
China (exc Taiwan and SARs)	30,779
South Africa	26,832
India	19,766
Indonesia	16,907
Philippines	15,899
Viet Nam	10,573
South Eastern Europe nfd (a)	9,347
Iraq	8,625
Hong Kong	8,615
Malaysia	8,435
Taiwan	7,150
Fiji	6,952
Sri Lanka	6,926
USA	6,315
Bosnia-Herzegovina (a)	5,788
Lebanon	5,711
Singapore	5,356
Croatia (a)	5,292
Germany	4,146
Former USSR (b)	4,074
Thailand	4,022
Republic of Korea (South)	3,977
Sudan	3,938
Japan	3,845

1997 to 2002, 142,012 or 40.8% of the total settled in New South Wales. This is higher than the proportion of the total Australian population resident in New South Wales (33.7%). Western Australia was the only other State or Territory where the proportion of new arrivals was higher than the proportion of the total Australian population resident in that State or Territory. Western Australia received 45,878 new arrivals in this period (or 13.2% of all new arrivals), that joined a population that accounted for 9.7% of the total Australian population.

The proportion of new arrivals settling in Victoria (23.4%) was about equal to the proportion of the total Australian population already resident in that State (24.8%). Queensland, South Australia and Tasmania all received a disproportionately lower level of new arrivals compared to the proportion of the total Australian population resident in those States, as did the Northern Territory and the Australian Capital Territory.

English language proficiency

A large body of research confirms that the most significant indicator of settlement need is English language proficiency. English is Australia's national language, used in commerce and everyday life. A good command of the English language is essential for full participation in Australian society.

Source: Settlement Database, as at November 2002. (a) Country of birth data relating to the former Yugoslavia which cannot be clearly assigned to the new countries of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia or Serbia and Montenegro (formerly the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia) has been included under the higher level category of South Eastern Europe nfd (not further defined). The SDB records 9347 arrivals in the period 1997-2002 as having been born in this region. If this total count were to be notionally apportioned between the countries that have replaced Yugoslavia then it is likely that some increase would be seen in the totals shown for Bosnia-Herzegovina and for Croatia. Not shown in this list are two other countries, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (1883 arrivals) and Serbia and Montenegro (1570). It is likely that some increase in these counts would occur, perhaps resulting in either or both of these countries moving into the top 25 list, displacing some of those shown. (b) Similarly the table shows 'former USSR' as a significant country of birth with the SDB recording 4074 arrivals in the period 1997-2002 as having been born there. Of the former republics that became independent countries on the dissolution of the USSR, none is shown in this table but the SDB records people born in the Russian Federation (547 arrivals), Ukraine (447), Lithuania (117), Latvia (99), Uzbekistan (64), Belarus (58), Armenia (49), Estonia (48) and lower numbers for other Central Asian Republics. If the total of 4074 shown for the USSR were to be apportioned across these countries the numbers for each would increase. However, it is doubtful that the increase for any one country would be sufficient to raise the country into the top 25 list.

Table 5.2: New arrivals by State/Territory, 1997-2002

State/Territory	Population at 2001 Census (a)	Population as a % of Australia's total population	Number of new arrivals in 1997-2002 (b)	New arrivals as a % of all new arrivals in 1997-2002
New South Wales	6,326,445	33.7	142,012	40.8
Victoria	4,660,917	24.8	81,266	23.4
Queensland	3,522,015	18.8	42,209	12.1
Western Australia	1,828,237	9.7	45,878	13.2
South Australia	1,470,020	7.8	17,523	5
Tasmania	460,750	2.5	2,507	0.7
Australian Capital Territory	310,077	1.7	4,862	1.4
Northern Territory	188,071	1	2,046	0.6
Unknown/not stated	2,542	0.01	9,722	2.8
Totals	18,769,074(c)	100%(d)	348,025	100%(d)

Sources: (a) ABS 2001 Census DIMIA Customised Matrix C01_11. (b) Settlement Database as at November 2002. (c) There may be slight differences between census figures in different tables in this report and between this report and those published elsewhere by both the ABS and DIMIA. These occur because of random adjustments made at the individual cell level by the ABS to avoid the risk of releasing identifiable information. These fine level adjustments result in slight differences in aggregated totals when using Census data provided by the ABS in different formats. The total population figure listed in this table is the 7 August 2001 census figure. This figure differs from the Estimated Resident Population (ERP) figure used in chapter three. The ERP has been adjusted for net underenumeration (or undercount), to include Australian residents who are temporarily overseas on census night, and to back date to 30 June. (d) Percentages have been rounded and this may result in a slight inconsistency in the total.

DIMIA has classified the source countries for Australia's migrant intake according to an English Proficiency (EP) index. The EP index is constructed using the percentage of migrants arriving in the five years before the most recent Census who identified themselves as speaking English only or another language and English 'very well' or 'well'. The index is updated with the completion of each Census.

The EP index has been calculated for each country using the 2001 Census data and countries have then been classified into four groups as follows:

- EPI - countries with an EP index rating of 98.5% or higher of respondents who rated themselves as speaking English only or another language and English well or very well, and which have at least 10,000 usual residents in Australia;
- EP2 - countries with an EP index rating 84.5% or higher, other than those in EPI;

- EP3 - countries with an EP index rating of 57.5% to less than 84.5%; and
- EP4 - countries with an EP index rating less than 57.5%.

Table 5.3 shows that in the five years between 1997 and 2002, 24.7% of new arrivals to Australia came from countries in the EPI group. These are the main English-speaking countries of the world, and include the United Kingdom, Ireland, Canada, the United States, South Africa and Zimbabwe. Another 31.6% of new arrivals came from EP2 countries with the largest numbers from Indonesia, India and the Philippines. Although migrants from EP2 country groups have, overall, a good level of English proficiency, some individuals from EP2 countries may have low English proficiency.

In this period, 38.2% of arrivals came from countries in the EP3 group, with the largest numbers from China, Iraq, Taiwan and Hong

Kong and the countries of South Eastern Europe. A further 4.5% of new arrivals came from countries in the EP4 group, the main source country being Viet Nam. Many new arrivals from EP3 and EP4 countries can be expected to have low levels of English language proficiency.

Visa category

Visa category is a key indicator of the level

of assistance that new arrivals may require as it can point to pre-migration experiences and characteristics that facilitate successful settlement or make the settlement experience more difficult. Table 5.4 shows the breakdown by visa category and State/Territory of arrivals in the period from 1997 to 2002.

Some 13.2% of arrivals in that period came to Australia under the Humanitarian Program. Humanitarian entrants are selected on the basis of their need and eligibility for protection, rather than their skills and employment prospects. As illustrated in chapter four of this report - The Settlement Experiences of New Arrivals, they are less likely to have the skills and experience that will enable early settlement success, particularly in the labour market. The nature of humanitarian crises that lead to the need for international protection are such that humanitarian entrants will often have experienced trauma associated with family separation, discrimination and displacement; poverty and loss of possessions; and disruptions to education and working life. Some have suffered from torture, malnutrition,

Table 5.3: Numbers of new arrivals by English Proficiency Groups, 1997-2002

EP Groups	Number of new arrivals in 1997-2002	Percentage of all 1997-2002 new arrivals in EP group
EP 1	86,106	24.7
EP 2	109,900	31.6
EP 3	133,113	38.2
EP 4	15,821	4.5
<i>Other/ unknown</i>	3,085	0.9
Total	348,025	100%(a)

Source: Settlement Database as at November 2002 (a) Percentages have been rounded and this results in a slight inconsistency in the total.

Table 5.4: New arrivals by State/Territory and visa category, 1997-2002

	Humanitarian	Family	Skill - Dependants	Skill - Principal Applicant	Other	Total
New South Wales	18,119	58,305	36,889	28,463	236	142,012
Victoria	13,541	33,382	19,502	14,628	213	81,266
Queensland	3,892	16,058	14,091	8,037	131	42,209
Western Australia	5,228	12,049	18,650	9,794	157	45,878
South Australia	3,586	5,667	5,041	3,144	85	17,523
Tasmania	625	941	559	366	16	2,507
Australian Capital Territory	478	1,880	1,418	1,080	6	4,862
Northern Territory	276	1,054	407	303	6	2,046
<i>Unknown/not stated</i>	229	3,334	3,509	2,638	12	9,722
Total	45,974	132,670	100,066	68,453	862	348,025
% of total new arrivals	13.20%	38.10%	28.80%	19.70%	0.20%	100%

Source: Settlement Database as at November 2002

disease and ill health. Recovering from these experiences is an essential part of the settlement process that is likely to be realised more quickly if appropriate support is provided by government and the community. Humanitarian entrants receive the highest priority for DIMIA-funded settlement services.

Another 38.1% of arrivals from 1997 to 2002 came to Australia as family stream migrants. Family stream migrants are sponsored by a spouse, fiancé(e) or family member. They are not selected on the basis of their employability but on the basis of their relationship to an Australian citizen or permanent resident. Government policy requires sponsors to support those that they bring to Australia. However, settlement policy also recognises that some family stream migrants with low English proficiency will be helped to participate earlier if they receive some additional support from specialist settlement services.

A further 48.5% of new arrivals in this period came to Australia under the skilled stream, either as principal applicants or dependants of principal applicants. Generally speaking, migrants under the skilled stream are selected for migration because they have very good employment and settlement prospects and

very good English language skills. As such, they are largely self-reliant, and generally able to negotiate Australia's social and economic systems quickly, effectively and independently. However, some spouses and children of skilled stream migrants may not be proficient in English and may require some additional assistance, such as English language tuition, for which a charge is applied before visa grant.

Of the 1997 to 2002 arrivals, 28.8% were the immediate family of skilled stream migrants. As shown in table 5.5, 22,600 people or around 6.5% of all arrivals in this period were the dependants of skilled stream migrants from EP3 and EP4 countries. During this period, 9,241 adult dependants of skilled stream migrants were assessed as part of the migration process as not being proficient in English.

The settlement services target group

As explained above, and demonstrated in chapter four of this report, recency of arrival, English language proficiency and visa category, when used in combination, can help to pinpoint the new arrivals most in need of settlement assistance. This broadly defined target group for DIMIA-funded settlement services, comprising newly-arrived,

Table 5.5: New arrivals by EP group and visa category, 1997-2002

EP Group	Visa category						Settlement services target group: Humanitarian and EP3 & 4 Family	
	Humanitarian	Family	Skill – Dependant	Skill - Principal Applicant	Other	Total	Number	% of EP group in settlement services target group
EP4	1,107	13,735	454	482	43	15,821	14,842	93.8
EP3	40,632	52,234	22,146	17,997	104	133,113	92,866	69.8
EP2	3,402	40,327	39,574	26,455	142	109,900	3,402	3.1
EP1	31	25,786	36,440	23,294	555	86,106	31	0.04
<i>Other/ unknown</i>	802	588	1,452	225	18	3,085	802	25.9
Total new arrivals	45,974	132,670	100,066	68,453	862	348,025	111,943	32.20%

Source: Settlement Database as at November 2002

permanent residents who are humanitarian entrants and family stream migrants with low English proficiency, made up 32.2% of all arrivals in the period 1997 to 2002. Table 5.5 shows that the settlement services target group included 93.8% of arrivals from EP4 countries, 69.8% of arrivals from EP3 countries, 3.1% of arrivals from EP2 countries and less than 1% of arrivals from EP1 countries.

Table 5.6 shows that settlement services target group arrivals were most strongly concentrated in New South Wales and Victoria.

Support to communities

While DIMIA's settlement support for individuals is generally limited to five years after arrival, it is recognised that it may take longer for communities to develop and evolve and so funding for community capacity building may extend beyond this period. Nonetheless it is not intended that DIMIA funding be used to support communities

which are well developed and able to organise, plan and advocate for services to meet their own needs, or which have very few new arrivals in the settlement services target group.

Recommendation 4

That DIMIA-funded settlement services focus on:

- the provision of services to individual migrants in the settlement services target group, ie permanent residents who arrived in the previous five years as humanitarian entrants and family stream migrants with low English proficiency; and
- communities that require assistance to develop their capacity to organise, plan and advocate for services to meet their own needs and which are receiving significant numbers of new arrivals who are in the settlement services target group.

Table 5.6: State/Territory distribution of settlement services target group arrivals, 1997-2002

State/Territory	Humanitarian arrivals	Family: EP 3+4 arrivals	State/Territory settlement services target group arrivals	% of total settlement services target group in the State/Territory
New South Wales	18,119	32,216	50,335	45
Victoria	13,541	19,265	32,806	29.3
Queensland	3,892	5,321	9,213	8.2
Western Australia	5,228	4,224	9,452	8.4
South Australia	3,586	2,577	6,163	5.5
Tasmania	625	256	881	0.8
Australian Capital Territory	478	861	1,339	1.2
Northern Territory	276	329	605	0.5
Other/Unknown	229	920	1,149	1
Total	45,974	65,969	111,943	100.0%(a)

Source: Settlement Database as at November 2002 (a) Percentages have been rounded and this results in a slight inconsistency in the total.

Table 5.7: Birthplace groups with 50% or more of arrivals over thirty years ago

Birthplace (b)	Years Since Arrival (a)									
	0-5		6-Sep		Oct-19		20-29		30+	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
EP1										
United Kingdom	67,467	6.8	34,302	3.5	134,510	13.6	176,903	17.9	573,262	58.1
EP2										
Latvia	200	3.1	129	2	119	1.8	124	1.9	5,891	91.1
Slovenia	156	2.4	113	1.7	283	4.4	380	5.9	5,552	85.6
Malta	284	0.6	205	0.5	1,661	3.7	5,187	11.6	37,569	83.7
Netherlands	3,211	4	1,157	1.4	4,577	5.7	5,740	7.1	65,846	81.8
Austria	701	3.8	334	1.8	1,391	7.5	1,438	7.7	14,733	79.2
Finland	408	5.1	175	2.2	530	6.6	876	10.9	6,057	75.3
Germany	6,773	6.5	2,659	2.5	10,913	10.5	8,768	8.4	75,169	72.1
Eastern Europe, nfd (c)	160	2.4	221	3.3	1,159	17.3	600	9	4,545	68
Spain	522	4.3	204	1.7	1,322	11	2,758	22.9	7,261	60.2
Belgium	682	14.5	227	4.8	695	14.7	614	13	2,498	53
Seychelles	149	6.3	69	2.9	525	22.3	400	17	1,208	51.4
EP3										
Estonia	65	2.8	29	1.3	47	2	21	0.9	2,148	93
Italy	2,379	1.2	1,185	0.6	3,791	1.8	10,606	5.2	187,867	91.3
Greece	1,526	1.4	820	0.8	3,454	3.2	9,487	8.7	93,746	86
Lithuania	168	4.7	109	3.1	199	5.6	68	1.9	3,000	84.7
Hungary	662	3	439	2	2,915	13.3	2,031	9.2	15,921	72.5
Croatia	4,789	9.6	2,932	5.8	3,216	6.4	4,478	8.9	34,717	69.3
Libya	140	10.2	62	4.5	157	11.4	179	13	837	60.9
Egypt	2,346	7.3	2,187	6.8	5,900	18.3	3,479	10.8	18,343	56.9
Serbia and Montenegro (d)	7,744	14.5	4,568	8.6	5,568	10.4	6,702	12.6	28,732	53.9

Source: ABS 2001 Census DIMIA Customised Matrix C01_27. (a) Only includes birthplace groups with a population of 1,000 or more and with 50% or more of arrivals 30+ years ago. (b) There may be slight differences between census figures in different tables in this report and between this report and those published elsewhere by both the ABS and DIMIA. These occur because of random adjustments made at the individual cell level by the ABS to avoid the risk of releasing identifiable information. These fine level adjustments result in slight differences in aggregated totals when using Census data provided by the ABS in different formats. (c) Eastern Europe not further defined. (d) At the time of the collection of 2001 Census data, Serbia and Montenegro was known as the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY). On 4 February 2003, the name of the country was changed by the Assembly of the FRY to Serbia and Montenegro.

Priority setting within the settlement services target group

Visa category and English proficiency are useful statistical tools for identifying broad patterns of settlement need among new arrivals. However, there are a number of other factors that can either reduce or intensify the level of assistance that some individuals or groups may require. Two of these are discussed below. The first relates to the level of support that new arrivals can expect to receive from similar language, religious or

ethnicity-based communities in Australia; and the second relates to access to services in rural and regional Australia. Of course, within particular services, more sophisticated prioritising is possible based on assessment of individuals’ needs or the needs of particular communities in particular local environments.

Level of support from a migrant community

Support for new arrivals from migrant communities already well established in

Table 5.8: Birthplace groups with 50% or more of arrivals in the last ten years

Birthplace (b)	Years Since Arrival (a)									
	0-5		6-Sep		Oct-19		20-29		30+	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
EP2										
Nepal	1,689	67.1	506	20.1	253	10.1	53	2.1	15	0.6
Bangladesh	4,685	53.8	1,743	20	1,676	19.2	466	5.3	143	1.6
Saudi Arabia	696	45.6	324	21.2	406	26.6	46	3	54	3.5
Samoa	4,910	39.3	2,670	21.3	4,047	32.4	716	5.7	164	1.3
United Arab Emirates	637	48.2	162	12.3	485	36.7	28	2.1	10	0.8
Indonesia	22,217	49.6	4,837	10.8	8,626	19.2	4,117	9.2	5,038	11.2
Cook Islands	2,101	47.3	473	10.6	1,405	31.6	387	8.7	79	1.8
Pakistan	4,804	42.2	1,563	13.7	3,072	27	1,088	9.5	870	7.6
Norway	2,103	50.5	133	3.2	328	7.9	314	7.5	1,283	30.8
Nigeria	633	38.2	253	15.3	383	23.1	179	10.8	210	12.7
Brazil	1,731	39.5	496	11.3	1,048	23.9	616	14	496	11.3
Ghana	599	31	370	19.2	629	32.6	180	9.3	153	7.9
EP3										
Somalia	2,064	59.4	1,084	31.2	292	8.4	19	0.5	18	0.5
Iraq	11,430	49.1	7,162	30.8	1,544	6.6	1,683	7.2	1,458	6.3
Bosnia and Herzegovina	10,829	46.8	7,328	31.7	1,277	5.5	866	3.7	2,852	12.3
Sudan	2,669	57	969	20.7	488	10.4	200	4.3	359	7.7
Eritrea	621	40.3	573	37.2	276	17.9	26	1.7	46	3
Ethiopia	1,544	45.7	951	28.1	567	16.8	191	5.6	129	3.8
South Eastern Europe, nfd (c)	2,199	47.7	1,044	22.6	267	5.8	242	5.2	859	18.6
Afghanistan	4,734	48.4	2,101	21.5	2,690	27.5	221	2.3	33	0.3
Japan	11,504	49.8	3,298	14.3	5,220	22.6	1,519	6.6	1,537	6.7
Kuwait	983	42.6	473	20.5	604	26.2	146	6.3	99	4.3
Taiwan	8,775	41.5	3,994	18.9	7,694	36.4	556	2.6	141	0.7
Korea, Republic of	16,351	45.9	4,259	12	11,542	32.4	3,220	9	238	0.7
Colombia	1,782	43.8	417	10.3	876	21.5	823	20.2	169	4.2
Albania	543	39.9	166	12.2	124	9.1	97	7.1	431	31.7
Thailand	7,973	36.4	3,093	14.1	8,196	37.4	2,141	9.8	488	2.2

Source: ABS 2001 Census DIMIA Customised Matrix C01_27. (a) Only includes birthplace groups with a population of 1,000 or more and with 50% or more of arrivals within the last 10 years ago. (b) There may be slight differences between census figures in different tables in this report and between this report and those published elsewhere by both the ABS and DIMIA. These occur because of random adjustments made at the individual cell level by the ABS to avoid the risk of releasing identifiable information. These fine level adjustments result in slight differences in aggregated totals when using Census data provided by the ABS in different formats. (c) South Eastern Europe not further defined.

Australia can help to make the settlement transition much easier. Many of the arrivals between 1997 and 2002 joined large and established communities from their country of birth. However, some found very few people from their country of birth in Australia, or those they joined were also recent arrivals. They may receive only limited support from such communities.

Tables 5.7 and 5.8 show the periods of arrival in Australia for migrants from various countries. When analysed by the proportion of the population who arrived more than thirty years ago, and the proportion who arrived less than ten years ago, this data helps to indicate how well established a migrant community is likely to be. The groups which had 50% or more of their population

Table 5.9: New arrivals as a proportion of resident population: less than 1 %

Country of Birth (c)	New arrivals in 2001-02 (a)	Resident population - 2001 Census (b)	2001-02 arrivals as a % of resident population in Australia
EP1			
Ireland	470	50,211	0.94%
United Kingdom	7,257	1,036,261	0.70%
EP2			
Mauritius	159	17,005	0.94%
Norway	29	4,349	0.67%
Germany	690	108,214	0.64%
Finland	46	8,269	0.56%
Spain	65	12,651	0.51%
Netherlands	355	83,290	0.43%
Papua New Guinea	99	23,620	0.42%
Austria	77	19,335	0.40%
Samoa	32	13,199	0.24%
Malta	23	46,978	0.05%
EP3			
Egypt	316	33,425	0.95%
Argentina	68	10,732	0.63%
Chile	135	23,424	0.58%
Poland	223	58,093	0.38%
Hungary	80	22,759	0.35%
El Salvador	26	9,678	0.27%
Uruguay	25	9,486	0.26%
Cyprus	47	19,481	0.24%
Portugal	37	15,407	0.24%
Italy	270	218,722	0.12%
Greece	103	116,431	0.09%
EP4			
Laos	37	9,580	0.39%

Sources: (a) Settlement database as at November 2002. Figures for the period July 1 2001 to June 30 2002. (b) ABS 2001 Census - DIMIA customised Matrix CO1_11. There may be slight differences between Census figures in different tables in this report and between this report and those published elsewhere by both the ABS and DIMIA. These occur because of random adjustments made at the individual cell level by the ABS to avoid the risk of releasing identifiable information. These fine level adjustments result in slight differences in aggregated totals when using Census data provided by the ABS in different formats. (c) Only includes birthplace groups with a population of 1,000 or more. Birthplace groups from the countries of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and Serbia and Montenegro (formerly the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia) have not been included in this analysis because of the likely understating of new arrivals from these countries on the SDB. Similarly, birthplace groups from countries of the former USSR have not been included in this analysis as there may also be some understating of new arrivals for these individual countries.

Table 5.10: New arrivals as a proportion of resident population: greater than 5%

Country of Birth (c)	New arrivals in 2001-02 (a)	Resident population - 2001 Census (b)	2001-02 arrivals as a % of resident population in Australia
EP1			
Zimbabwe	1,033	11,733	8.80%
South Africa	5,189	79,389	6.54%
EP2			
United Arab Emirates	217	1,458	14.88%
Indonesia	4,239	47,166	8.99%
Nigeria	116	1,739	6.67%
Pakistan	744	11,875	6.27%
Nepal	145	2,605	5.57%
Kenya	369	6,868	5.37%
EP3			
Sudan	1,069	4,911	21.77%
Ethiopia	376	3,574	10.52%
Eritrea	133	1,598	8.32%
Somalia	251	3,726	6.74%
Taiwan	1,364	22,422	6.08%
Afghanistan	639	11,264	5.67%
Thailand	1,252	23,595	5.31%
Iraq	1,282	24,819	5.17%

Sources: (a) Settlement database as at November 2002. Figures for the period July 1 2001 to June 30 2002. (b) ABS 2001 Census - DIMIA customised Matrix CO1_11. There may be slight differences between census figures in different tables in this report and between this report and those published elsewhere by both the ABS and DIMIA. These occur because of random adjustments made at the individual cell level by the ABS to avoid the risk of releasing identifiable information. These fine level adjustments result in slight differences in aggregated totals when using Census data provided by the ABS in different formats. (c) Only includes birthplace groups with a population of 1,000 or more. Birthplace groups from the countries of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and Serbia and Montenegro (formerly the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia) have not been included in this analysis because of the likely understating of arrivals from these countries on the SDB. Similarly, birthplace groups from countries of the former USSR have not been included in this analysis as there may also be some understating of arrivals for these individual countries on the SDB.

arrive in Australia over thirty years ago are predominantly European. In contrast, the migrant groups that have had 50% or more of their population arrive in the last ten years are primarily from countries in Africa, Asia and the Middle East.

The size of a particular migrant population relative to the number of new arrivals is

relevant to the level of community support available to a new arrival. Tables 5.9 and 5.10 show the arrivals in the year July 1 2001 to June 30 2002 by country of birth as a proportion of the migrants from that country already resident in Australia. A low figure indicates the groups where the community resident in Australia is large relative to the

numbers of new arrivals; a high figure indicates the groups where the community in Australia is small relative to the numbers of new arrivals. These tables show only the groups at the low and high end of this scale.

The new arrival to resident population ratio can serve only as a general guide to the level of support that may be available from a resident community. Generally speaking, migrant groups from European countries have a low new arrival to resident population ratio, combined in most instances with a large resident population. These communities also tend to be longer-established, with a high proportion of the resident population having arrived in Australia over thirty years ago. Among EP3 countries, the migrant groups from Italy and Greece have the lowest new arrival to resident population, and it is likely that new arrivals from these countries could expect to receive assistance and support from an established community in Australia.

Some migrant groups with smaller resident populations, such as those from the EP3 and EP4 countries of Laos, El Salvador, Uruguay, and Argentina, have a low new arrival to resident population ratio because the number of new arrivals in 2001 to 2002 was very small.

Migrant groups with a high new arrival to resident population ratio include many communities that arrived more recently from Central Asia, Africa and the Middle East. Some of these migrant groups are reasonably large, such as those from Taiwan and Iraq, but have a high new arrival to resident ratio due to the large numbers of new arrivals during the past year. Other groups, most notably those from countries in sub-Saharan Africa, have small resident populations and large numbers of arrivals during the year. These migrant groups are also very new, with a high proportion of the community having arrived less than ten years ago. Consideration of these groups should also take factors such as predominant visa

category and the demographic, social and political structure of an individual community into account.

The intersection of settlement need indicators (ie EP group, visa category, length of establishment of the migrant community and new arrival to resident population ratio) can help to pinpoint the new arrivals who are likely to need a higher level of assistance settling in Australia.

For example, within the EP3 group, the migrant groups from Sudan, Ethiopia, Eritrea and Somalia have the highest new arrival to resident population ratio. These migrant groups may face difficulties in providing support and assistance to new arrivals, not only due to the ratio of new arrivals to residents, but also because the resident communities are very small and largely composed of migrants who are themselves recently arrived. There are also high numbers of humanitarian entrants amongst the new arrivals and longer-term residents. These factors, when combined, mean that new arrivals from these countries are likely to require higher levels of government support and assistance than many other groups.

In the context of funding for settlement services, migrant groups like these are referred to as small and emerging communities. These are broadly defined as communities from EP3 or EP4 countries with an Australia-wide population of between 1,000 and 15,000, of whom 30% or more have arrived in the last five years.

Groups can also be considered small and emerging if characterised by weakness of support structures and difficulty in accessing mainstream services.

Analysis at the national level does not reflect the local variations that occur in the distribution and composition of migrant groups across Australia. Local variations must also be considered when prioritising resources for settlement service provision.

Regional arrivals

Settlement services target group arrivals who live outside the main metropolitan areas of Australia may have higher needs for settlement assistance than those who settle in the metropolitan areas. They share issues such as a less diverse range of services, unemployment, fewer educational opportunities and difficulties with transport in common with Australian-born residents in regional areas. Additionally, they face limited access to specialist settlement services, distance from metropolitan networks of their communities and community-based services, and unfamiliarity with ways of seeking out information about Australia.

Table 5.11 shows that of the 348,025 arrivals in the five years from 1997 to 2002, an estimated 33,004 settled in non-metropolitan Australia. This represents less than 10% of all arrivals during that period (well below the

36.3% of Australian residents who live in non-metropolitan Australia). It is estimated that 0.6% of arrivals settled in remote Australia, where 2.9% of the Australian population lived. The highest estimated number of new arrivals going to non-metropolitan areas was in Queensland. Tasmania, Queensland and the Northern Territory had the highest proportions of estimated non-metropolitan settlement of new arrivals.

Table 5.12 indicates that a high proportion (53% in the period 1997 to 2002) of the estimated non-metropolitan settlers entered Australia under the family stream. The relatively high proportion of family stream migrants settling in non-metropolitan areas can be attributed to the tendency for these migrants to settle near their families and friends. 35.3% of the estimated non-metropolitan arrivals were from the skilled stream and 10.4% were humanitarian entrants.

Table 5.11: Estimated new arrivals in non-metropolitan areas, 1997-2002

State/ Territory	Estimated total new arrivals for the State/ Territory (a)	Estimated new arrivals in non-metropolitan areas (b)	Estimated % of new arrivals in non-metropolitan areas	% of total Australian population in non-metropolitan areas (c)
New South Wales	142,012	9,275	6.5	37.4
Victoria	81,266	4,400	5.4	27.8
Queensland	42,209	13,913	33	54.3
Western Australia	45,878	2,857	6.2	26.9
South Australia	17,523	1,036	5.9	27
Tasmania	2,507	1,024	40.8	58.3
Australian Capital Territory	4,862	0	0	0.4
Northern Territory	2,046	499	24.4	46.7
Other	9,722	0	0	-
Total	348,025	33,004	9.50%	36.30%

Sources: (a) Settlement Database at November 2002 (b) Estimate based on data from Settlement Database (c) ABS 2001 Census.

Table 5.12: Estimated new arrivals in non-metropolitan areas by visa category and State/Territory, 1997-2002

State/ Territory (a)	Humanitarian	Family	Skilled	Other	Total
New South Wales	1,105	5,173	2945	52	9,275
Victoria	833	2,390	1156	21	4,400
Queensland	957	7,369	5539	48	13,913
Western Australia	130	1,440	1287	0	2,857
South Australia	71	681	285	0	1,036
Tasmania	290	444	284	6	1,024
Northern Territory	41	287	171	0	499
Total (b)	3,426	17,783	11667	128	33,004
% of all estimated new arrivals in non-metropolitan areas	10.40%	53.90%	35.30%	0.40%	100%

Source: Estimates based on data from Settlement Database. (a) The ACT is not included in this table as there were no non-metropolitan new arrivals. (b) These figures are estimates and due to rounding, there may be slight inconsistencies in totals.

Table 5.13: Estimated new arrivals in non-metropolitan areas: settlement services target group, 1997-2002

State/ Territory (a)	Humanitarian	Family (EP3,4)	Family (EP1,2)	Skill - Dependant	Skill - Principal Applicant	Other	Total new arrivals	New arrivals in the settlement services target group
New South Wales	1,105	1,695	3,478	1,726	1,220	52	9,275	2,800
Victoria	833	866	1,525	694	462	21	4,400	1,698
Queensland	957	2,352	5,017	3,507	2,032	48	13,913	3,309
Western Australia	130	447	992	797	490	0	2,857	577
South Australia	71	197	483	176	109	0	1,036	268
Tasmania	290	116	328	178	106	6	1,024	406
Northern Territory	41	90	197	99	72	0	499	131
Total (b)	3,426	5,764	12,019	7,176	4,491	128	33,004	9,190

Source: Estimates based on data from Settlement Database. (a) The ACT is not included in this table as there were no non-metropolitan new arrivals. (b) These figures are estimates and due to rounding, there may be slight inconsistencies in totals.

Table 5.14: Estimated new arrivals in non-metropolitan areas: % in settlement services target group, 1997-2002

State/ Territory (a)	Humanitarian	Family (EP3,4)	Family (EP1,2)	Skill - Dependant	Skill - Principal Applicant	Other	Total new arrivals	New arrivals in the settlement services target group %
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
New South Wales	11.9	18.3	37.5	18.6	13.2	0.6	100	30.5
Victoria	18.9	19.7	34.7	15.8	10.5	0.5	100	18.5
Queensland	6.9	16.9	36.1	25.2	14.6	0.3	100	36
Western Australia	4.6	15.6	34.7	28	17.2	0	100	6.3
South Australia	6.8	19.1	46.7	16.9	10.5	0	100	2.9
Tasmania	28.3	11.3	32	17.3	10.3	0.6	100	4.4
Northern Territory	8.2	18.1	39.5	19.8	14.4	0	100	1.4
Total (b)	10.40	17.50	36.40	21.70	13.60	0.40	100	100

Source: Estimates based on data from Settlement Database. (a) The ACT is not included in this table as there were no non-metropolitan new arrivals. (b) These figures are estimates and due to rounding, there may be slight inconsistencies in totals.

For the purposes of identifying the non-metropolitan settlers who are most likely to require settlement assistance, it is useful to examine this group according to the settlement services target group. Tables 5.13 and 5.14 separate visa and EP categories. Of the estimated non-metropolitan settlers, 27.9% or 9,190 were in the settlement services target group. Queensland and New South Wales had the highest proportions of target group arrivals in non-metropolitan areas.

Recommendation 5

That DIMIA-funded settlement services continue to give priority within the settlement services target group to providing assistance to members of small and emerging communities and to those in regional areas.

Aligning settlement services to settlement need

As discussed earlier in this chapter, DIMIA's settlement services focus on the immediate and specific needs of people arriving in Australia, where they arise as a result of the migration process. These services are targeted

towards those arrivals in greatest need of settlement assistance. This includes permanent residents who arrived in the previous five years as humanitarian entrants or as family stream migrants with low English proficiency.

In providing on-arrival services, DIMIA aims broadly to align services to migrant need by:

- providing some services only to specific categories of high needs arrivals (for example, humanitarian settlement services);
- providing some services free of charge to some migrants, but on a user-pays basis to others (for example, English language tuition); and
- directing funding to organisations or locations where there are greater concentrations of arrivals with higher levels of need, in terms of visa category, English proficiency and support needs.

The broad alignment of DIMIA funded services to migrant need is illustrated in the following diagram. Chapters eight to twelve of this report discuss these services in more detail.

Conclusion

The settlement process for new arrivals is determined by far more than the passage of time. However, it is neither feasible nor desirable for DIMIA-funded settlement services to provide an alternative service network for all migrants. DIMIA services should be focused on meeting the migration-specific, on-arrival needs of the settlement services target group. As they have a specific and limited role, they should therefore concentrate on building self-reliance developing English language skills and fostering connections with mainstream services. In doing so, targeting support to those with the greatest needs will maximise the use of limited resources and help these groups work towards economic independence and social participation. Complementing this role, DIMIA also has a role to play in helping mainstream service providers to understand the characteristics of annual migrant and humanitarian intakes and to identify mainstream service delivery issues that may require resolution in order to maximise the settlement prospects of new arrivals.

Figure 5.1: DIMIA-Funded Services for Permanent New Arrivals



