CIRCLES OF SUSTAINABILITY, LIVERPOOL

Settling Strangers; Supporting Disability Needs

Circles of Sustainability is an approach that supports cities, communities and organizations seeking to understand and act upon basic issues relevant to sustaining positive and vibrant social life. The approach suggests that social life should be understood holistically. This is done by considering sustainability across an intersecting four-domain model: economics, ecology, politics, and culture. The approach is part of the larger methodology called 'Circles of Social Life'.
An Assessment of the Sustainability of Liverpool, 2017

**Assessment Legend**

- **Vibrant**
- **Good**
- **Highly Satisfactory**
- **Satisfactory**
- **Basic**
- **Unsatisfactory**
- **Highly Unsatisfactory**
- **Bad**
- **Critical**
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Western Sydney MRC, located in the heart of the Liverpool CBD, where within a 350-metre radius of the Courthouse are the main commercial, administrative, legal, law enforcement, social, educational and health facilities and services also located.
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1. Executive Summary

This Report seeks to understand Liverpool as a whole urban region, and in relation to the intersection of two major themes:

1. Settlement of migrants and refugees generally; and
2. Settlement and support for migrants and refugees with disability.

Liverpool is home to one of the highest concentrations of Australia’s recent arrivals, and home to many culturally and linguistically diverse communities in their different stages of settlement. As one of the fastest-growing regions in Australia, the city is concurrently going through rapid and significant economic, demographic, infrastructural and environmental change:

- Liverpool’s current population, 204,326 people, has more than doubled since 1991, and according to some forecasts, is expected to rise by nearly half again (41 per cent) over the next fifteen years (Deloitte 2015);
- The City of Liverpool is a central place for the resettlement of refugees, and is expected to become home to the bulk of the announced additional 12,000 Syrian and Iraqi refugees; and,
- The proposed Western Sydney Airport development is expected to transform and drive future investment, jobs reorientation, and settlement patterns.

At the same time Liverpool is an unusually complex setting that requires nuanced profiling techniques to understand its highs and lows:

- Unemployment, particularly youth unemployment, remains high compared to the rest of urban NSW, as does the number of people not participating in the labour force. However, two universities (Western Sydney University and University of Wollongong) have recently opened campuses in the city.
- Disadvantage remains high. Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas (SEIFA) scores consistently point to economic, educational and occupational inequities, particularly in certain concentrated population areas. At the same time, other areas of the city region exhibit comparative affluence.
- As with many areas of Australian cities, indicators of public engagement – the presence of street life, cultural intermingling, close co-operation with local government and industry – are mixed. It appears low in some areas, while in some of Liverpool’s public spaces an irrepressible public presence of communality abounds with chess, dominos, busking, night-markets, long socialising sessions alfresco, and, of late, groups of men bedecked with chairs and beach umbrella, fishing off the weir on the largely neglected Georges River.

These are instances of the many observed complexities and contradictions prevailing across the Liverpool urbanscape. In order to understand how to respond best to settlement needs, this complexity requires that we clearly identify, chart and navigate Liverpool’s uneven and contradictory circumstances. Socially driven considerations are essential to good design and implementation of community development programs and interventions (especially in the settlement and disability space). This project thus applies a methodology that was developed exactly for such complexity – the Circles of Social Life approach (James 2015).
2. Purpose and Methods

This Report was commissioned by the Western Sydney Migrant Resource Centre (Western Sydney MRC) to understand the basic issues concerning the settlement of migrants and refugees, including examining resettlement supports for migrants and refugees with disability. The Centre sought an understanding of the place of those issues within the broad context of major social change economic, ecological, political and cultural. The Report was commissioned to provide a baseline map of Liverpool’s complexity in order for the Western Sydney MRC and other non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and governmental social service providers to better respond to Liverpool’s full social complexity.

One of the most difficult aspects of a service provider’s project planning is to ascertain the context of a project and the parameters for social intervention. Whilst NGOs across the migrant, refugee and disability sectors – such as the Western Sydney MRC and Settlement Services International – are aware of the various issues that arise in Liverpool, discussion with both policy-makers and service providers in Western Sydney MRC and other NGOs in Liverpool have suggested that the local knowledge base is somewhat fragmented and does not systematically encompass the whole urban and suburban landscape in which they operate.

Analysis of local policy and service provision suggests that holistic frameworks have largely fallen by the wayside. Project management is dominated by centre-stage issues, often denoted in issue-specific terms as employment, English-language proficiency, training provision, on-arrival settlement, settlement and integration, social cohesion, housing, youth, families, and social and recreational spaces, and so on. These issue-specific areas reductively compete with each other for attention, without there being a basis for making prioritizing decisions and bringing work in the sector together for enhanced integrated impact.

Preliminary research by the Western Sydney MRC into their service-delivery practices suggests that useful coupling of issues in projects and programs sometimes do arise, but they tend to do so in an ad hoc manner, and without a broader conceptual and integrative framework. This Report therefore applies the Circles of Social Life approach to the City of Liverpool in order to meet the strong need for provision of insight into the cross-cutting ‘critical issues’ of settlement. The reflections of local NGOs on local practice over the past two or three years suggest that we need a method that enables policy-makers and practitioners (and the sector in the general) to more clearly identify and reflect on the socially driven context-based considerations that are required in a community-development project or intervention.

Preliminary research suggests that what we need for policy and service-provision development is a social mapping of Liverpool to provide the following outcomes:

- A baseline dataset from which to work and plan, allowing for understanding of continuities and discontinuities over time;
- A dashboard from which to identify priorities;
- A schema with which to holistically incorporate disparate parts; and,
- A framework that highlights the interconnections across domains – trends, associations, and causal relations—that could better inform problem identification and program design.
Circles of Social Life

The *Circles of Social Life* approach offers an integrated method for practically responding to complex issues of vitality, relationality, productivity and sustainability, and what makes for a flourishing world. The approach, which includes *Circles of Sustainability*, takes an urban area, city, community, organization or individual through the difficult process of responding to complex or seemingly intractable problems and challenges.

The approach provides a way of achieving sustainability and resilience that combines qualitative with quantitative indicators. It sets up a conceptual and technology-supported framework for investigating problems faced by communities, and is intended to be applicable across the very different contexts of a neighbourhood, city or region. It is sensitive to the need for negotiation from the local to the global. The most developed part of our program is *Circles of Sustainability*.

The approach builds upon the strengths of a research development in association with Metropolis, the International Real Estate Federation (FIABCI), the UN Global Compact Cities Programme, World Vision, along with other key international organizations. It was first developed through practical engagement in a number of cities around the world, including Berlin, Porto Alegre, Melbourne, San Francisco, and Milwaukee.

As an approach to assessing city life, *Circles of Sustainability* helps communities respond to a series of questions:

**FIRSTLY**

How are we best to understand and map the sustainability of our cities, communities and organizations in all their complexity—economic, ecological, political and cultural?

**SECONDLY**

What are the central critical issues that relate to making the city or community more sustainable?

**THIRDLY**

What should be measured and how? Instead of designating a pre-given set of indicators, the approach provides a process for deciding upon indicators and analysing the relationship between them.

**FOURTHLY**

How can a positive response be planned? The approach provides a series of pathways for achieving complex main objectives. It offers a deliberative process for negotiation over contested or contradictory critical objectives and multiple driving issues in relation to those main objectives.

**FIFTHLY**

How can the outcomes of a project be monitored and measured? It supports a monitoring and evaluation process and a reporting process.

ABS Census Data

Our report draws upon recently released census data by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) on Liverpool residents’ global region of birth, decade of arrival in Australia, need and provision of assistance, and other demographic variables. Several statistics on labour force and migration were not available at the time of writing, and this report could be supplemented by these data as they are published. For this report, our analysis is limited to summaries and comparisons between data, and does not undertake analysis of, for instance, detailed correlation or future-trend estimation.
We note two details of our analysis. First, the ABS reports findings on Liverpool in several ways: as a ‘state suburb’, a ‘state electoral division’, both Statistical Area 2 and Statistical Area 3, and a Local Government Area (LGA). For convenience, we report upon the LGA statistics, noting residents and others may understand Liverpool as covering different areas and populations.

Second, the ABS provides aggregate 2016 census data in three formats: a ‘General Community Profile’, a snapshot of census figures in 2016; an ‘Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples Profile’; and a ‘Time Series Profile’. Our analysis draws substantially on the General Community Profile to compare Liverpool with Greater Sydney, New South Wales and all of Australia statistics. It uses the ‘Time Series Profile’ to compare changes in Liverpool between 2006, 2011 and 2016.

We also use ABS’ TableBuilder product for more detailed analysis and graphs, supplied in Appendix 4.

Categories of Arrivals: ‘Migrants’ and ‘Refugees’
Recent arrivals to Australia come under various classes of visas, broadly classed ‘family’, ‘humanitarian’, ‘skilled’ or ‘other’. Each of these visa categories generate access to varying government supports, services and income benefit payments. For example, those who come on a humanitarian visa, with the formally recognised status commonly referred to as a refugee, are provided with extensive services upon arrival, such as English language training, housing, social security payments and resettlement support. These services are far more intensive and are not provided to other categories, as it is assumed that migrants outside of the humanitarian / refugee experience have access to a range of financial and social supports such as family, employment, and so forth.

3. Background

Highlights of Liverpool’s History
The Cabrogal clan of the Darug Peoples are the customary custodians of the Liverpool area, originally known as Gunyungalung. The Georges River and the Liverpool region was a place of interchange between the Darug and the coastal tribes of Tharawal to the east. Significant Aboriginal places in Liverpool include the Collingwood Precinct, a high-ground meeting place for the Tharawal, Gandangara and Darug people, and numerous sites around Holsworthy, where artwork, artefacts and scarred trees (deliberate removal of bark or wood for resource harvesting, for example, for canoes or containers, food implements, shields, temporary shelters on initiation sites or as tomb stones for their dead).

Liverpool is one of the oldest urban settlements in Australia and the fourth town to be established in New South Wales. It was founded on 7 November 1810 by Governor Lachlan Macquarie, and named after Robert Banks Jenkinson, the Second Earl of Liverpool, and was then-Secretary of State for the Colonies and War. Liverpool was initially developed with an agricultural focus, and housed a large number of convicts who built roads, bridges and buildings and farmed the land. The construction of the Liverpool Weir in 1836 to supply water to local farmers was one of the many interventions that had consequences for Indigenous use of the river and the region.

The Gold Rush era of the 1850s to 1870s, and an influx of migrants crossing to the west of Liverpool brought massive change to the region. In the 1850s, construction began on the Old Hume Highway (now superseded by the M5 to M31 Motorway) and the Great
Southern Railway, linking Sydney to the Melbourne via Liverpool in the 1880s. This transport corridor transformed the Liverpool area into a major agricultural and transport centre. By the late-nineteenth century Liverpool’s agriculture was changing from livestock – a mixture of cattle, sheep and crops – to dairy farming and the cultivation of fruit and vegetables. Liverpool’s early market gardeners were primarily Chinese, Lebanese, Italian, Maltese and Croatian migrants. Manufacturing industries such as paper mills, brickworks, gasworks and woollen mills also formed part of the landscape, and these attracted migration and provided employment for many different nationalities.

**Engagement Across Two World Wars**

Liverpool was an important region for engagement in the two World Wars of the twentieth century. The Holsworthy military reserve and barracks has operated in the Liverpool area as a major training base and artillery range for the Australian Army since World War I (1914–1918). Part of the 4th Light Horse Brigade, the 12th Light Horse Regiment, was raised at Holsworthy, and set sail for the Middle East in June 1915. Squadrons from the regiment were deployed to various battles, including Gallipoli, Suez Canal, Beersheba and Damascus, before returning to Australia in July 1919. During World Wars I and II, Holsworthy also operated as Australia’s largest internment camp, confining up to 6,000 men and some women primarily of German, Austrian, Hungarian, Italian and Japanese origin. Some Australians of German, Italian and Japanese descent, Aboriginals and naturalised British subjects of enemy origin were also interned. Holsworthy is currently the home of 142 Signal Squadron, 2nd Commando Regiment, 6th Aviation Regiment and the 1st Health Support Battalion, as well as a number of training units and the Defence Force Correctional Establishment. In 2009, the barracks were the target of a failed terrorist plot which triggered a national security review of all Australian military bases.

**As a Focus of Post-War Migration**

Following World War II (1939–1945), migration to Australia increased substantially with people settling in Liverpool from the United Kingdom, Germany, the Netherlands, Poland, Malta, Italy, Greece and the former Yugoslavia. By the 1960s, as urbanization progressed west from central Sydney, the population of Liverpool swelled considerably. The presence of newly arrived migrants and the development of the Green Valley public-housing estate were two significant factors in Liverpool’s changing social fabric. This large-scale residential project facilitated a substantial increase in the number of economically disadvantaged households and a dramatic rise in the youth population, highlighting a chronic lack of public-policy planning, municipal resources and appropriate infrastructure.

**Named as Part of the Western Sydney Priority Growth Area**

The City of Liverpool is now experiencing rapid and significant economic, demographic, infrastructural, and physical change as part of the Western Sydney Priority Growth Area. Western Sydney is Australia’s third largest economy and, in its own right, is Australia’s fourth largest urban region. Over the next two decades, the region is expected to grow from two million to three million people. In 2015, the Australian and NSW governments announced the Western Sydney Infrastructure Plan, commencing with a $3.6 billion financial investment to encourage positive growth in the region. The plan is focused on relieving pressure on existing infrastructure and unlocking the economic capacity of the region by funding major transport upgrades (road and rail), creating thousands of local jobs, improving housing affordability and access to services, strengthening the local economy and the liveability of Western Sydney.

**Highlights of Liverpool Today**

The City of Liverpool is a vibrant multicultural urban region situated on the Cumberland Plain stretching across Western Sydney to
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lower hills before the rise of the Blue Mountains. The commercial centre of the city is 32 kilometres south-west of Sydney’s central activities district, situated on the Georges River, and the Local Government Area encompasses an urban centre, suburban precincts, and semi-rural residential and agricultural areas to the west. Overall, Liverpool comprises 42 suburbs spread across 305.5 km², with a population of 204,326 recorded in the 2016 Census. The LGA of Liverpool comparable in population to the state and territory capitals of Greater Hobart (222,356) and Darwin (136,828).

The commercial centre of Liverpool includes shopping complexes and malls, cafés and restaurants, a teaching hospital, three tertiary institutions, and a growing number of high-rise office buildings. The city is connected to the metropolitan region by the Hume Highway, Cumberland Highway, M5 motorway, and M7 motorway. The local government area is connected to the Sydney Trains commuter rail-network on the Airport, Inner West and South, Bankstown and Cumberland lines. The Liverpool-Parramatta T-way bus-rapid-transit line, built in 2003, links the City of Liverpool with the City of Parramatta. The Badgerys Creek airport is being planned for the western extension of Liverpool. In 2015, the NSW Planning Minister Rob Stokes designated the area around the planned airport as a Priority Growth Area. These developments speak to the availability of education, transport and future employment infrastructure. As we note, there remain key gaps in how this infrastructure serves all residents of Liverpool, especially those with multiple or intersecting challenges: living with disability, developing English-language skills, low local social capital and community ties, and no or weak employment opportunities.


Demography

Overall population of the City of Liverpool stands at 204,326, up from 180,141 (13.4 per cent) in 2011 and 164,601 (24.1 per cent) in 2006. Its population has more than doubled since 1991. Liverpool is now home to one of the highest concentrations of Australia’s recent arrivals, and to many culturally and linguistically diverse communities in their different stages of settlement. The most common immediate ancestries of people living in Liverpool are Australian (13.4 per cent), English (11.3 per cent), Italian (5.4 per cent), Indian (5.2 per cent), and Lebanese (4.8 per cent). Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people make up 1.5 per cent of the population. 41.4 per cent of people spoke only English at home, while other commonly spoken languages include Arabic (11.4 per cent), Hindi (4.0 per cent), Spanish (2.5 per cent) and Serbian (2.4 per cent).

Liverpool has a young as well as diverse population. The median age in the LGA is 33, three years younger than for Greater Sydney (36), and five years younger than averages for New South Wales and Australia. Median age has not changed significantly since 2006. More than two-fifths of residents have completed secondary schooling, comparable to state and national averages, but 17.4 per cent below the average for Greater Sydney. Most Liverpool residents (93 per cent) also live in some form of private housing, slightly above the national average.
Image 5. Local Council announcing new public works for improved social amenity.

Food fare diversity and fusion at Akash Pacific Cuisine, Moore Street, Liverpool.
Figure 2 (above) shows median income, mortgage repayments and rent, and average household size, displayed as percentages. Income (personal, family and household), mortgage repayments and rent are all lower than Greater Sydney figures, while household size is higher. The larger household size also explains why individual and family income is lower than state and national averages, while household income is higher.

Census Trends and Insights
Liverpool Census data on demographics, migration and disability reveals a number of trends and insights:

- Liverpool’s population is growing by more than 10 per cent each five-year period the Census is undertaken, and more than doubled in the twenty-five year period 1991–2016,
- Liverpool’s population is young, diverse, and, in relative terms, experiences higher mortgage repayments and lower income and rent than greater Sydney.
• Relative to national, state and Sydney demographics, Liverpool’s population comprises more migrants and more residents speaking other languages at home. Its level of citizenship is comparable.
• Migrants who arrived in Liverpool pre-1975 largely originate from the United Kingdom and southern Europe. In the period 1975–1995, South-East Asian and Pacific Island migrants made up the majority. Since 1995, the largest migrant groups coming to Liverpool consist of Iraqi and Indian arrivals.
• Iraqi arrivals are mostly too recent to appear in the data on nationalities of ancestry.
• The City of Liverpool houses more people that both need and provide unpaid assistance than city, state or national averages.
• Women are nearly 50 per cent (46.8 per cent) more likely to provide unpaid assistance than men.
• Appendix 4 provides some detail from available Census data on the intersections between new migrants and those who declare themselves needing assistance with activities of everyday life. Available evidence suggests many of those who need assistance do so because of old age and related causes.

4. Liverpool Circles of Social Life Profile: Overview and Summary

In this section we summarise the urban profile created for the city of Liverpool. The profile employs the Circles of Sustainability framework to assess the city according to four key domains of its activity and social life: its economy, ecology, politics and culture. The central activity in building the profile was a workshop conducted with and hosted by the Western Sydney Migrant Resource Centre on 3 May 2017. Approximately 30 experts spent half-a-day reviewing and assessing Liverpool against each of the domains. Each domain is made up by seven subdomains of assessment, illustrated in Figures 5 to 7. A more detailed version of the profile (Appendix 5), reveals the framework and its methods of analysis.

Assessing Liverpool’s Sustainability

Overall, Liverpool is a vibrant and thriving city, though with key challenges in its relationship to environment and infrastructure, to its redistribution of wealth and to provision of rewarding work for all, particularly youth. Its cultural heritage and diversity are strong, though appreciation of that heritage is not widely shared. Processes for political engagement and oversight are robust, though civic participation and engagement is uneven across Liverpool’s population.

Future developments in Badgerys Creek, the expansion of universities, ongoing housing construction, rapid population growth and the reshaping of Liverpool’s downtown areas have the potential to generate economic opportunities and possibilities for greater civic engagement. But they also place greater stresses upon transport infrastructure, affordable housing, natural habitats and the availability of support services. Pockets of Liverpool appear to experience these stresses disproportionately.

How the city works to integrate existing areas of disadvantage, new arrivals and their needs, including vulnerable populations such as the elderly and people with disability, will be crucial to its long-term cohesion, vibrancy and sustainability.
Liverpool’s economy, overall, is moderately strong. As discussed in the detailed Profile (Appendix 5), Liverpool’s thriving downtown area has a growing mix of low-cost budget and exclusive shopping, catering to the economic diversity that exists in the city. Its many cultures provide access to flows of capital and finance in other areas of Sydney, Australia and overseas.

Government, business and university investment in new buildings and transport links can accommodate the kinds of training, entrepreneurship and investment needed to respond to a changing economic landscape. Developments such as the Badgerys Creek airport and the rollout of the National Broadband Network lay foundations for new kinds of employment and business ventures, especially in the service sector.

Equally, Liverpool experiences striking differences in incomes among its residents, and these differences appear concentrated spatially.

Measured by the ABS Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage, postal areas such as Green Valley (IRSAD decile: 1; percentile: 8) are nearly at the opposite end of the spectrum from neighbouring Hoxton Park (IRSAD decile: 9; percentile: 82). While these differences may stem from historical
Figure 3: Assessment of Subdomains for the City of Liverpool

**Economic Profile Summary**

Liverpool’s economy, overall, is moderately strong. As discussed in the detailed Profile (Appendix 5), Liverpool’s thriving downtown area has a growing mix of low-cost budget and exclusive shopping, catering to the economic diversity that exists in the city. Its many cultures provide access to flows of capital and finance in other areas of Sydney, Australia and overseas.

Government, business and university investment in new buildings and transport links can accommodate the kinds of training, entrepreneurship and investment needed to respond to a changing economic landscape. Developments such as the Badgerys Creek airport and the rollout of the National Broadband Network lay foundations for new kinds of employment and business ventures, especially in the service sector.

Equally, Liverpool experiences striking differences in incomes among its residents, and these differences appear concentrated spatially.10 Measured by the ABS Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage, postal areas such as Green Valley (IRSAD decile: 1; percentile: 8) are nearly at the opposite end of the spectrum from neighbouring Hoxton Park (IRSAD decile: 9; percentile: 82). While these differences may stem from historical planning decisions about locations and zoning of social housing, present-day Liverpool will need to find ways to ensure the benefits of wealth flow more evenly through its suburbs. In addition to boosting the city’s overall economic productivity, greater equity will likely reduce pressures on governance, welfare and service-delivery systems.
Diversity of local employment is also an area of concern, and will be assisted with the presence of new airport, health and education centres. Overall, there appear to be positive prospects for economic development. For long-term sustainability, these need to benefit Liverpool’s more disadvantaged citizens, and also take into account wider ecological, political and cultural impacts.

Ecological Profile Summary

The Cumberland Plain and the Georges River make this region an attractive area. However, Liverpool has a number of ecological challenges, exacerbated by recent rapid low-density urban development, poorly served by public transport. For example, convulsive building of new housing estates has left little remnant indigenous biodiversity. The Cumberland Plain Woodland was listed in 2009 as a ‘Critically Endangered Ecological Community’ under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act). The Council is now putting a much stronger emphasis on ecologically sensitive development, and parks are being upgraded.

The area has a heavy dependence on fossil fuels, including coal-powered electricity, for transport, cooling and heating. Despite an electric train and diesel bus service, there is a heavy reliance on petrol-consuming cars for all transport, particularly across the city. Bus
Diversity of local employment is also an area of concern, and will be assisted with the presence of new airport, health and education centres. Overall, there appear to be positive prospects for economic development. For long-term sustainability, these need to benefit Liverpool’s more disadvantaged citizens, and also take into account wider ecological, political and cultural impacts.

Ecological Profile Summary
The Cumberland Plain and the Georges River make this region an attractive area. However, Liverpool has a number of ecological challenges, exacerbated by recent rapid low-density urban development, poorly served by public transport. For example, convulsive building of new housing estates has left little remnant indigenous biodiversity. The Cumberland Plain Woodland was listed in 2009 as a ‘Critically Endangered Ecological Community’ under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act). The Council is now putting a much stronger emphasis on ecologically sensitive development, and parks are being upgraded.

The area has a heavy dependence on fossil fuels, including coal-powered electricity, for transport, cooling and heating. Despite an electric train and diesel bus service, there is a heavy reliance on petrol-consuming cars for all transport, particularly across the city. Bus routes link to the Liverpool CBD, but do not serve the cross-cutting needs for local transport beyond the CBD. According to the 2016 Census, 28.8 per cent of homes had one registered motor vehicle garaged or parked at their address, 36.5 per cent had two motor vehicles and 23.0 per cent had three or more motor vehicles (significantly higher than the Australia-wide average of 18.1 per cent).

New housing developments are reliant on air conditioning with massive consumption of electricity. There is very little local production of energy; the subsidy for solar panels was only taken up by those who could afford the initial outlay. There were 4,130 small-scale solar panel system installations in Liverpool over the 14-year period 2001–2014 (ABS). This is in a city of 53,595 households and is much lower than the Sydney average. Moreover, in 2012, according to the latest available ABS figures, there were only 774 generating meters as against 37,145 non-generating meters. Most electricity in NSW comes from the grid, with 79 per cent from black-coal-powered plants, 14 per cent from renewable sources, and 7 per cent from gas (Renewable Energy Action Plan annual report, 2016), and Liverpool is no exception.

Turning to the ecology of people’s physical health, there are high levels of obesity in Liverpool. The figures for South Western Sydney (encompassing the City of Liverpool and other LGAs) have been slowly rising across the decade or so from 17.2 per cent obese and 51.0 overweight and obese in 2002 to 24.1 obese and 55.8 overweight and obese in 2016 (11.9 and 10.7 percentage points higher respectively than Northern Sydney). Other issues include asthma, and tobacco-use and alcohol consumption. Local people do not tend to exercise regularly, despite outdoor gyms and recreation spaces being developed more recently. This is partly a question of time poverty and financial stress, two factors which appear to correlate to poor physical health measures.

Political Profile Summary
Overall, Liverpool’s political profile was scored positively by the workshop’s reference group. An exception to this, however, was the subdomain relating to governance. Underwriting this overall positive characterisation is the robust operation of Australia’s system of three tiers of government, comprising federal, state / territory, and local levels. It is at the local level particularly that Liverpool’s democratic structures and processes, together with its legal system and law-enforcement institutions, articulate and operate most closely with its citizens.
Local Council elections for the position of Mayor and ten Councillors are held every four years. In August 2016, there were 130,536 persons enrolled and eligible to vote in Liverpool. However, in the Local Council’s election in the September 2016, only 101,906 persons voted, a participation rate of only 78 per cent. Compared to a 91 per cent participation rate in the 2015 NSW State election, Liverpool’s Local Council election participation rate appeared decidedly low. However, these rates are comparable to other local councils which conducted elections at the same time, which averaged 79 per cent.

Examining more closely the voting numbers, 9.6 per cent of the Liverpool Local Council election votes cast were deemed ‘informal’. Again, when compared to the 2015 NSW State election figure of 6 per cent informal votes, Liverpool’s rate stands excessively high. Liverpool’s high proportion of recent arrivals and residents from CALD backgrounds may contribute to the high number of informal votes, on account of non-English speaking backgrounds and unfamiliarity with the electoral process. Similar discrepancies between Liverpool and NSW’s participation rates and informal voting rates can be found with respect to the local council election of 2012 and the state election of 2011.

The spectrum of political views supported across Liverpool can be gauged from first preferences in the mayoral election, based on direct and popular vote. First preference results across the 2008, 2012, and 2016 election cycles are charted below in Figure 6.

---

Figure 6: ALP – Australian Labor Party, LP – Liberal Party, IND – Independent candidates, LCIT – Liverpool Community Independents Team, DLP – Democratic Liberal Party, GRN – Greens.
The following diagram depicts the 2008, 2012 and 2016 political composition of Liverpool Council Chambers across three election terms. Liverpool City’s local government is composed of the office of the mayor, and five councillors elected from the North Ward electoral division and another five councillors from the South Ward electoral division.

Figure 7: The Political Composition of Liverpool Council Chambers, 2008, 2012 & 2016

Until the 2008 Local Council election, political preferences tended toward social-democratic and centre-left positions articulated and represented by the Australian Labor Party. Conservative centre-right, independent and minor party policies and parties have been less popular. The 2012 election saw Liverpool’s first Liberal Mayor come to office, with 43 per cent of the ‘first-preference’ popular vote. Other Liberal candidates won five of the ten Councillor seats, giving them an absolute majority as a party bloc. This Liberal victory ended 21 years of Labor dominance of Council, and interestingly reflected a broader trend across Greater Sydney Local councils that witnessed a general swing from Labor (and the Greens) towards the Liberal party. Blacktown City Council provided the Liberals with another ‘big’ and neighboring western Sydney Council. Labor’s massive defeat at the NSW state election of 2011 may explain some of these shifts within subsequent local council elections.16

Following the tumult of corruption allegations against the Mayor (subsequently investigated by ICAC and finally finding no further action to pursue), the 2016 local council elections saw a return to Labor with 38 per cent of first preference popular votes. The result exceeded its 2008 win (35 per cent), but fell short of Liberal’s 2012 win (43 per cent).

Historically, governance, ethics and accountability issues appear to be political touchstone issues in Liverpool. Indeed, the Labor-dominated council was sacked by the NSW Government on the cusp of 2004 local elections. It was then placed under administration until 2008 over material concerns around mismanagement and corruption. Disaffected by this past and present history, the Liverpool electorate appears to express its opprobrium at the ballot to any suggestion or perception of probity being violated. These notions seem to be supported by the Reference Group workshop, with the ‘Organization and Governance’ subdomain being rated ‘unsatisfactory’, due to concerns about governance and probity.
The issues that the 2016 Labor candidate for mayor campaigned on related to stable and ethical local government, the over-development of Liverpool that mainly benefits the ‘big end of town’, and rising rate costs without the commensurate public spending on essential services. Conversely, the Liberal candidate emphasised returning the budget to surplus, being able to deliver quality services in tandem with economic growth, and admonishing the roll-out of ‘ice-rooms’ as a measure to combat drug-taking. The Liverpool Community Independents Team, who showed moderate gains in the popular Mayoral-vote, ran with a platform of upholding environmental issues surrounding the Georges River, more communitarian initiatives including pride of locale and good urban design, and admonishing untrammelled growth and development initiatives (such as the Badgerys Creek Airport) without considering impacts to environment and amenity. The current split of seats (Labor: five; Liberal: four; Others: two) shows the degree to which all of these issues - political, but also economic, ecological and cultural – strike chords within Liverpool’s community.

A cornerstone to a democratic polity is a strong civil society. The institutional core of civil society can be regarded as being made up of those voluntary associations outside the sphere of the state and economy. According to the Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission’s Charity Register data, there were 307 not-for-profits (NFP) registered in the Liverpool LGA. To put some perspective to this it can be said that in Liverpool for every 1000 persons there are 1.1 NFPs, whilst in Greater Sydney the number is 2.3 NFPs.

Therefore, Liverpool has half the ratio of NFPs compared to that of the Greater Sydney region. According to these NFPs the top-ten stated charitable purposes related to the following, in descending order (NB. in brackets are the number of NFPs making the claim of charitable purpose, noting that each NFP can make multiple claims):

**NFP charitable purposes**

1. General Community In Australia (206)
2. Advancing Religion (148)
3. Another Purpose Beneficial To The Community (106)
4. Advancing Education (60)
5. Children (49)
6. Youth (46)
7. Advancing Social Or Public Welfare (45)
8. Ethnic Groups (37)
9. Women (36)
10. Men (31)

Table 1: Most-Stated (Top-Ten) Charitable Purpose Amongst Liverpool NFPs.
Further, the least-stated charitable purposes related to the following:

1. Promoting Or Protecting Human Rights (7)
2. Veterans Or Their Families (6)
3. Advancing Natural Environment (5)
4. Advancing Security Or Safety Of Australia Or Australian Public (5)
5. Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual (5)
6. Preventing Or Relieving Suffering Of Animals (5)
7. Promote Or Oppose A Change To Law Government Poll Or Prac (4)
8. Pre Post Release Offenders (1)

Table 2: Least-Stated Charitable Purpose Amongst Liverpool NFPs.

Noticeable patterns were that there were proportionately more NFPs in Liverpool than in Greater Sydney indicating the ‘advancement of religion’ (+3.3 per cent), ‘ethnic grouping’ (+1.2 per cent), and ‘general community in Australia’ (+3.4 per cent) as a charitable purpose. Also, there were proportionately fewer NFPs advancing ‘people with disabilities’ (i.e., a slight, -0.7 per cent) in Liverpool than in Greater Sydney.

With regards to the population of Liverpool at large participating in voluntary activities, the ABS Census 2016 showed that fewer persons spent time doing unpaid voluntary work through an organisation or group (11 per cent), compared to the Greater Sydney population (17 per cent), and across all of NSW (18 per cent). The pattern of participation by gender and by age group are largely similar across the Liverpool, Greater Sydney, and the NSW regions. That is more females tend to volunteer than males, volunteering peaks at the 15–19 years, 40–44 years, and 45–50 years age-groups.

Figure 8: The Percentage Of Persons Who Did Voluntary Work For An Organisation Or Group Comparing Liverpool With Greater Sydney, and New South Wales.
Community media is an interesting arena of voluntary activity. Indeed, community media is also a useful gauge of citizen communication and critique, as well as of representation and negotiation, within the political domain. It is more likely to operate with relatively few employed staff, relying mainly on individual volunteers and/or a community of volunteers for the creation, production, and distribution of content.

Community media encourages participatory decision-making structures, and practices, similar to voluntary associations more so than commercial or public service media outlets.\(^{18}\) A glance at Community Radio 89.3FM which is narrowcast to the Liverpool and Fairfield catchment provides some useful insight. A cursory purview of annual program schedules over a 5 year period\(^{19}\) shows the following attributes (Table 3).

**Programmed Content As A Percentage Of Total Air Time (Averaged P.A.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk Show</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Uncategorised)</td>
<td>(11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News &amp; Current Affairs</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young People</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture &amp; Settlement</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture &amp; Identity</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lgbtqi</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian History And Geography</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property, Finance And Small Business</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight Disability Access - Radio Reading Service</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3 above: Program Content Of Community Radio Broadcasting In Liverpool.*
Cross-cutting this program content were language-specific broadcasts in community languages. The majority of programs were broadcast in English, which comprised 72 per cent of the air-time. The remaining 28 per cent denoted non-Anglophone cultures or languages. These are tabled below in descending order indicating the percentage of air-time against the language / cultural group (Table 4).

**Descending Order Indicating The Percentage Of Air-Time Against The Language / Cultural Group.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assyrian</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khmer</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celtic</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maltese</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepali</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonian</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4: Percentage Of Broadcast Time In Languages Other Than English.**

Other than the ‘music’ and ‘sport-oriented’ programs, ‘talk show-based’ programs lend themselves to genuine community expressions on public affairs. ‘Talk shows’ comprised 27 per cent of airtime and comprised a mix of music, plus relaying and commentary on news and current affairs, as well as on popular culture, health, wellbeing and family. While there was a diversity of thematic content in the programming, it is also arguable that the airtime provided to some slots appear skewed towards some groups over others. It is further arguable that airtime to certain other themes are not represented at all. Similarly from the language aspect, disproportions are evident when considering the broader linguistic makeup of the Liverpool LGA. Arabic and Vietnamese surprisingly show a very low percentage of airtime or none at all, respectively. On the other hand, Assyrian and, to a lesser extent, Samoan show high percentages of airtime. Perhaps community radio in Liverpool reflects, at this particular point in time, stages in a community’s development where Assyrians and Samoans can be categorised as a ‘small and emerging’ group, having arrived more recently or in smaller numbers; whilst the Arabic (especially Lebanese) and Vietnamese populations, who arrived in the mid-1970s and 1980s, have well-established and diversified institutions (community and business) that increasingly provide for their respective communities’ aspirations.

The incidence of crime provides some perspective to the security and concord in a locale. Indeed, how secure and peaceful an area is regarded is influenced by prevailing levels and types of infractions against person or property. Crime statistics recorded for the Liverpool LGA, together with those of Greater Sydney and NSW, were summarily examined across a ten-year span from 2007 to 2017.

Across the ten year span from 2007 to 2017 there was a downward trend of recorded incidents of eight of 17 major offences in the Liverpool LGA. This was also the case in the Greater Sydney Region and in all of NSW. These major offences were: assault—non-domestic violence related; break and enter—dwelling; break and enter—non-dwelling; malicious damage to property; motor vehicle theft; robbery with a weapon not a firearm; robbery without a weapon; and, steal from person.

While the major offence of ‘steal from motor vehicle’ trended downward in Greater Sydney and in all of NSW, it remained ‘stable’ in Liverpool, i.e., neither worsening nor improving. Further, while the major offence of ‘murder’ trended as stable in Greater Sydney and downward in NSW, a Liverpool trend was not calculated as there were fewer than 20 incidents in any one 12-month period (NB. Liverpool ‘averaging’ 2.3 per period). A Liverpool trend similarly was not calculated with regard to the major offence of ‘robbery with a firearm’ (NB. annually averaging 16.5 in the 2007–2015 period, but dramatically dropping to an average of 2.5 in the 2015–2016 period).
As regards another six of the 17 major offences, however, there was an upward trend of recorded incidents in the Liverpool LGA. This was also the case in Greater Sydney Region and in all of NSW. These other major offences were: assault—domestic violence related; fraud; indecent assault, act of indecency and other sexual offences; sexual assault; steal from dwelling; and, steal from retail store. It is noteworthy that regarding the ‘assault—domestic violence related’, ‘indecent assault, act of indecency and other sexual offences’, and ‘steal from dwelling’ major offences, the Liverpool upward trend rate exceeded manifold that of Greater Sydney and NSW.

Indeed, offences that trended upwardly across the ten-year span and those which would have direct personal affect related very much to sexual and/or domestic violence. On the other hand those that trended upwardly and did not necessarily have direct personal affect related more to ‘petty crime’ (e.g., ‘steal from dwelling’; and, ‘steal from retail store’).

**Cultural Profile Summary**

As our review of 2016 census data shows, Liverpool is a welcoming, creative place. Residents have opportunities to participate in and experience the cultural life of the city. Culture is a central dimension to the liveability of Liverpool, adding meaning and quality to the lives of the residents, and connecting them to land, people and place.

Our heritage and histories identify who we were, who we are, and how we might build our collective futures. Liverpool has an astonishingly rich indigenous, convict and migrant history. Today, this history needs improved curation. While some protections are in place for the cultural heritage assets of the municipality, Liverpool’s heritage sites are also under threat from the pressures of new developments.

Cultural awareness helps foster acceptance and respect for a diverse range of cultural practices, and is a key asset among Liverpool’s residents. Especially for people that experience isolation due to resettlement, economic deprivation, disability, removing barriers that limit participating in cultural activities is critical. Liverpool’s recent arrivals from Iraq and India complement its existing Indigenous, Anglo Saxon, southern European, South East Asian and Pacific Islander populations, and offer opportunities for Liverpool to continue to develop as a hub for food, fashion and other forms of culture.

Participation in cultural activities benefits community health and well-being creates a strong sense of community identity. Liverpool already offers a dynamic calendar of cultural events through the year, and this comprises a critical asset in its overall sustainability and wellbeing.
How is Liverpool Performing?

For each of these four domains – economy, ecology, culture and politics – we asked workshop participants to tell us the issues that matter most to the city overall, and also how they felt the city of Liverpool was performing against them. The three subdomains that stand out in terms of importance are ‘Wealth’ and ‘Distribution’ (the economic domain), and ‘Identity’ and ‘Engagement’ and ‘Enquiry’ and ‘Learning’ (both in the cultural domain).

In terms of performance, Liverpool scores well on important subdomains such as ‘Exchange’ and ‘Transfer’, ‘Technology’ and ‘Infrastructure’, ‘Identity’ and ‘Engagement’ and ‘Enquiry’ and ‘Learning’. It performs less well on ‘Labour’ and ‘Welfare’ and, in particular, ‘Wealth’ and ‘Distribution’. While ecological issues had not been rated as important, the city also performs poorly on a number of identified subdomains, such as ‘Materials’ and ‘Energy’, ‘Flora’ and ‘Fauna’ and ‘Built-form’ and ‘Transport’. 
Figure 10: Assessment of Subdomains for the City of Liverpool, Weighted by Importance
5. Critical Issues for Settlement and Disability

Critical Issues for Migrants and Refugee Settlement

Background
Liverpool is popularly known as a city with a high number of recent migrants, and Census figures bear this out. More than two-fifths of its population were born outside of Australia (Table 5), 50 per cent greater than the national average, and also significantly greater than New South Wales and Greater Sydney.

Comparatively, Liverpool’s Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population is on par with Sydney, and nearly one-third lower than New South Wales and national averages. At 82.4 per cent, more than four-fifths of Liverpool residents are Australian citizens, equal to the national average and ahead of the equivalent figure for Greater Sydney (79.5 per cent).

Liverpool’s migrant intake is significant, and in terms of category of visa provision, differs from the rest of the country. When surveying the total number of the more recent arrivals across the last ten years (July 2007 to July 2017) an average of 188,731 per annum were settled nationwide. This concurs with currently stated planning figures for the Federal Government’s migration program of 190,000 places. Nationwide, skilled entrants comprised the majority of the intake (37 per cent), followed by family reunion entrants (30 per cent), a miscellany of other (25 per cent), and lastly humanitarian entrants (eight per cent). The composition of recent arrivals to Liverpool, however, is markedly different with the majority being humanitarian entrants (33 per cent) and family entrants (37 per cent), followed by skilled entrants (18 per cent) and a miscellany of other entrants (11 per cent). Indeed, Liverpool ranks third amongst all Australian LGAs as the destination where humanitarian arrivals settle into most. It therefore suggests that the migrant population of Liverpool are likely to have higher or more specific settlement needs on account of both recency of arrival and the humanitarian circumstances occasioning their arrival, a point highlighted in our recommendations.

Table 5: Percentage of People Whose Birthplace is Outside of Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace Outside of Australia</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Sydney</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Birthplace Outside of Australia
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Figure 11: Percentage of People Living in Australia at the Time of the 2016 Census Who were Born Outside of Australia
Figure 12 and Figure 13 show most common countries of birth for people living in Australia and Liverpool respectively (the figures exclude those born in Australia). Australia’s non-Australian born population are most likely to arrive from England, New Zealand, China or India, with no other country of birth making up more than one per cent. Comparatively, Liverpool has a very high number of people born in Iraq (4.8 per cent, 16 times the national level), while its population also comprised more than 1 per cent from Vietnam, Fiji, India, Lebanon, Philippines, New Zealand, Italy and China.

Over the past ten years, Iraq-born migrants make up three-in-ten new migrants in Liverpool, double that of the next country of origin – India, with 15.9 per cent of new migrants.

Figure 12. Percentage of People Living in Australia at the Time of the 2016 Census Who were Born Outside of Australia

![Top 20 Countries by Birth (Australia)](image)
Census data for ancestry by country of (at least one) parent’s birth, shown in Figure 14 (below), further accentuates the diversity of Liverpool’s population. After categories of ‘Other’, ‘Australian’ and ‘Ancestry not stated’, English is the origin claimed most often (14.0 per cent), followed by Italian (6.7 per cent), Indian (6.5 per cent), Lebanese (6.0 per cent), Vietnamese (5.2 per cent) and Chinese (5.1 per cent).

Liverpool’s cultural composition shows both continuity and change. Historically as well as today, Iraqi, Italian, Indian, Vietnamese, Lebanese and Chinese migrants have been settling in the area. However, its older migrant residents, as well as countries of ancestry, feature the United Kingdom and Southern European countries of Italy, Malta, Croatia, and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Broadly, Liverpool arrivals fall into three groups: those arriving prior to 1975, predominantly from Europe; those arriving between 1975 and 1995 from South East Asia and the Pacific; and those arriving since 1995, from Iraq and India. There remains considerable diversity in migration patterns: in 2016, the top five countries of arrival were Iraq, India, Vietnam, Fiji and New Zealand.
Figure 14 (below) shows equivalent figures for all of Australia. English remains the most prominent, though much higher (33.5 per cent), while Irish (10.2 per cent), Scottish (8.6 per cent), Chinese (5.2 per cent), Italian (4.3 per cent) and German (4.2 per cent) make up the next five most common non-Australian ancestries.

From the list overleaf, Indian, Lebanese and Vietnamese ancestry is significantly more common in Liverpool than in all of Australia. Other highly represented ancestries include: Serbian (8.6 times more common), Macedonian (3.3 times more common), Turkish, Spanish, on Croatian and Maltese (all more than two-times more common).

Liverpool’s breadth of cultural backgrounds is reflected in the range of languages spoken. More than half of Liverpool’s residents state that a language other than English is spoken at home, compared with just over one-third for Sydney overall, a quarter for New South Wales, and one-fifth for Australia overall.
Table 6. Percentage of People who Speak a Language Other than English at Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Language other than English spoken at home</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Sydney</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>106.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>149.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15. Percentage of Residents Speaking a Language Other than English at Home
Appendix 5 shows a more detailed analysis of arrivals in financial years 2012–17, obtained from the DIBP’s (Department of Immigration and Border Protection) Settlement Reporting Facility. As Figures A5.1–3 illustrate, three trends appear to dominate recent new arrival numbers. First, in terms of total numbers, the majority of migrants arrive on family reunion or skilled migration rather than humanitarian grounds. Second, most of these arrived in 2012, and came from China and India. Third, of those accepted on humanitarian grounds, the majority come from, in descending order, Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, and Syria (mostly in 2017). Numbers of arrivals are heavily skewed towards years 2012 and 2017, suggesting a pattern of yearly spikes rather than continuous growth or decline. This final point bears upon our recommendations, since spikes in arrivals on humanitarian grounds especially place unusual and acute pressures on service providers.

Elaborating Critical Settlement Issues

Figure 16 below illustrates what workshop participants thought were the critical issues facing newly arrived settlers. While economic and political issues are prominent, overwhelmingly the issues appeared to relate to the cultural subdomains.

The language of cultural issues often includes terms indicating psychological distress: isolation, anxiety, tension, unfulfilled expectations, fear, trauma, and mental health services. More concrete issues relate to learning English, intergenerational changes (especially for children born in Australia, or arriving in the country at a young age), adapting to new Australian institutions and social norms, and acknowledging the settlement experience is slow and multi-layered. The last point was reinforced by one of our interview participants, who stated some of the greater challenges occur after the initial six-to-twelve months of settlement.

The political issues reinforce those concerning culture, and reference the lack of understanding and trust in Australian legal and political institutions. The main economic issues are largely practical, dealing with finding fair and meaningful work, affordable housing, and breaking out of cycles of welfare dependency. None of the issues relate directly to the ecological subdomains, though a number of cultural issues concerning geography, housing and school could be recategorised as such. For new arrivals, questions of wealth and distribution (a set of economic issues) and enquiry and earning (a set of cultural issues) proved the most important areas. In line with the number of issues, other cultural, political and economic areas are also significant.

Overall, the most critical issues for settlement can be summarised as follows:

- Being anxious about settlement, both for new arrivals and existing communities;
- Learning English, and learning how to adjust to Australian institutions and culture in schools, government services, law and workplaces;
- Finding fair, meaningful and rewarding work opportunities;
- Coping with financial hardship;
- Developing trust and understanding of Australia’s laws, police, schools, history and culture; and
- Retaining a sense of cultural identity, while managing residual trauma experienced in the home country and during transition to Australia.
Figure 16: Settlement – Critical Issues Organized by Subdomains
Figure 17: Settlement – The Importance of Different Critical Issues Organized by Subdomains
Critical Issues for Disability and the Settlement Process

Background

The Australian Immigration Law is exempt from the provisions of discrimination as established within Section 52 of the Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (Cth) (Crepeau 2016). Additionally, the health requirement administered under the Migration Act 1958 (Cth) imposes screening to ascertain the health and disability of the applicant to ‘assess on the potential cost and impact on the Australian community resulting from the possible use of health and community services’ (DoIBP 2017). While persons with certain visa subclasses within the family and humanitarian migration programs and the skilled migration category may seek a waiver from the cost-impact assessment, they are still required to undertake the health-screening requirements prior to a waiver being granted by the relevant authorities. The Department of Immigration and Border Protection states that:

*The waiver allows the visa decision-maker to waive the health requirement after the visa applicant has been assessed by a MOC if they are satisfied that granting a visa would not result in ‘undue’ health care or community services costs, or ‘undue’ prejudice to Australians’ access to such services (DoIBP 2017).*

As a result, it has been noted in a range of national and international forums that the combined effects of both of these legislative requirements results in the screening out of persons with disabilities in Australia’s migration program. There are a small number of new migrants and refugees with disability who have been granted exemptions. Such exemptions are often difficult to obtain, and frequently, rely upon Ministerial discretion (Hunter and Ikonomou 2016). Moreover, exemptions are often granted after extensive lobbying on behalf of the individual and their families, including additional pressure facilitated by a range of civil society organisations working in the area of disability and migration. Children with a disability face unique vulnerabilities by the combined effects of these regulatory requirements (Balint 2017) as the cost of community care and service needs across the child’s life-course often exceeds the cost-impact assessment threshold outlined within the Migration Act 1958 (see Harris-Rimmer and Natalier, 2009).

Despite these legislative requirements, a relatively significant number of residents of Liverpool (6.2 per cent) reported having a ‘need for assistance’, defined as ‘one or more of the three core activity areas of self-care, mobility and communication, because of a permanent disability, a long-term health condition (lasting six months or more), a disability (lasting six months or more), or old age’. This figure is comparatively high relative to Greater Sydney (by 27.6 per cent), New South Wales (by 16.2 per cent) and national averages (by 21.5 per cent). It appears only partly compensated for by Liverpool’s comparatively young population. Indeed, in the eldest demographic group of 85 years and older, a similarly higher proportion of people also need assistance in Liverpool compared to other areas. The percentage of women (6.6 per cent) who need assistance is slightly higher than the combined figure, which may be explained by the greater proportion of women in higher age-brackets (65–74 years, 75–84 years, and 85 years and over).

Figure 18 (below) illustrates the percentages of those who need assistance, by geographical scale and age. Liverpool’s relative percentages rise dramatically across the cohort 45–54 years, a trend that is not consistent with the younger demographic of recent migrants. This partly reflects the immigration restrictions on disability as outlined above and its greater impact on younger persons with disability seeking resettlement in Australia. Greater representation of disability for those migrants above 45 years, is also consistent with previous analysis undertaken by NEDA (2010: 8) whose analysis of historical census data suggests that:

*There is a higher prevalence of impairment for people born in a non-English speaking country aged over 45 years of age, especially for ‘first wave’ non-English speaking migrants, up to 3 times that of the Australian-born population.*
The number of people with disability living in the Liverpool LGA was 12,758 (ABS Census 2016). From the Census data we are able to ascertain that people who had a need for assistance with core activities and arrived between 2006 and 2015 totalled 1,296. The number of people who had a need for assistance and recently arrived in the LGA between January and August 2016 was 33.

While many new migrants are likely to need assistance, the bulk of the demand for the need for assistance appears to be generated by older Liverpool residents. Census data does not distinguish the underlying conditions. However, the finding is consistent with health sociology research that strongly suggests that older first-wave migrants are more likely to acquire early onset disability (pre-retirement norms of 65 years) due to the combined effects of migration, the types of jobs and work typically available to new migrants, and the prolonged legislative requirements for residency to become eligible for relevant disability social security payments and associated supports. For example, the Australian Disability Support Pension (DSP) currently has a ten-year permanent residency requirement (NEDA 2017). This ten-year requirement is currently being reviewed by the Senate with the aim to push the eligibility requirement to a wait period of 15-years (see Social Services Legislation Amendment (Payment Integrity) Bill 2017). While those who are granted refugee status are exempt from this waiting period, the medical evidence requirements to illustrate level of impairment for DSP eligibility is not only extremely costly, but requires extensive treatments and/or referrals to medical specialist supports and interventions over a lengthy period of time to firmly establish a recognised diagnosis. Therefore, migrants and refugees with disabilities are required to wait for significant periods of time prior to gaining access to disability payments, supports and services, which in effect, denies access to early interventions and supports to minimise disability onset and impact. This potentially explains the heavy reliance upon informal supports, that is, unpaid assistance within the familial household, as depicted below.

*Figure 18: Percentage of those Who Need Assistance, by Locale and Age*
Unpaid assistance show a similar, though much less dramatic pattern: 11.9 per cent of Liverpool adults provide unpaid assistance, an increase of 7.4 per cent over Greater Sydney, 2.5 per cent over state, and 5.9 per cent over national averages. Women (14.2 per cent) are more likely than men (9.6 per cent) to provide unpaid assistance. As Figure 19 shows, much of this unpaid work is carried out by those aged 35 to 84.

Figure 19: Percentage of those who Provide Unpaid Assistance, by Locale and Age

Elaborating Critical Disability Issues

Participants at the workshops were well informed of many of the resettlement issues to emerge for new migrants with disability. Gathering and summarising their insights, we can identify a set of critical issues highly relevant to persons with disability who are recent arrivals, and new migrants who have acquired a disability since arriving in Australia. These include the following critical issues, also shown in Figure 20 overleaf:

- Supporting difference and cultural identity in the face of social stigma;
- Getting appropriate diagnosis for new arrivals and its long-term implications for disability support, health and wellbeing;
- Securing ongoing employment that is flexible and responsive to the person’s needs;
- Facilitating welfare distribution and responding to issues of poverty, including the impact upon individuals and communities in relation to issues such as housing affordability, limits to physical accessibility and mobility, and lack of financial resources to participate in community events and networks; and
- Getting access to a range of disability, ethno-specific and mainstream services that can respond to the intersection of disability, migrant arrival and resettlement.
While issues of employment, labour market participation and distribution of wealth were pertinent for all groups, the onset of disability post resettlement posed numerous challenges. In particular, this was largely associated with the following issues:

- Receiving appropriate disability income payments;
- Getting access to disability employment service-providers with the relevant cultural knowledge and expertise in culturally competent service-provision;
- Accessing inclusive English language classes that allowed for differing learning abilities alongside sufficient time to integrate the necessary language skills required for securing and sustaining employment; and, finally,
- Having a range of personal disability supports, in the short term to support effective resettlement and the long term, to enable individuals and their families to plan for the future.
In Appendix 4, we include a number of figures that tabulate dimensions of age, location, disability (expressed in the Census as ‘needing assistance’ or ‘providing unpaid assistance’), region of origin and year of arrival in Australia. Overall, several patterns stand out:

- Liverpool migrants in the same age decadal bracket are in greater need of assistance if they arrived more recently (Figure A4.1). This may be explained by the reasons for migration, including refugee status, which could indicate prior symptoms requiring assistance.

- Migrants from Southern and Eastern Europe and North Africa and the Middle East regions appear to have greater needs for assistance than migrants from other regions, across all age brackets (Figures A4.2-3). This pattern is more striking for migrants who have arrived in the past 50 years, since 1966 (Figure A4.3).

- With respect to proximate LGAs of Campbelltown, Fairfield, Canterbury-Bankstown, Blacktown, Penrith and Parramatta, numbers of migrants in need of assistance are broadly consistent in both relative percentile (Figure A4.4) and absolute number of person (Figure A4.5) terms.

- Until 1975, Canterbury-Bankstown received the highest number (in absolute terms) of migrants who today need assistance (Figure A4.5). Since 1985, all the LGAs are broadly similar with respect to number of persons who today need assistance.

- In terms of those who provide unpaid assistance, again all LGAs are comparable. Two exceptions are migrants in Fairfield born in South East Asia, and migrants in Blacktown born in North East Asia. Both cohort are more likely to provide support than other groups in the same and in all other LGAs (Figure A4.7).

- Campbelltown and to a lesser degree Liverpool are more likely to house migrants born in North Africa and the Middle East, South East Asia and South and East Europe who provide unpaid assistance (Figure A4.8-10 respectively). The cause of this may be the semi-rural and peri-urban nature of these LGAs, which mean access to assistance for certain community groups is cost prohibitive, or undesirable for other reasons.
Vignette: Mahmod’s Experience

Mahmod, a thirty-five year old man born in Iraq, arrived in Australia two years ago. He has a diabetic condition, and used to experience severe pain in his legs and feet. His condition, whilst debilitating, meant he was not eligible for a Disability Support Pension. Further, for Mahmod to prove the level of debility of his condition in his daily activities, would require extensive medical testing, over an expansive period of time, all of which he could not afford.

Mahmod wanted to work, and decided to apply for work in the public transport system. He needed funding to train as a bus driver, and was able to obtain a small amount of money from the local Iraqi business community in Liverpool. After three months, Mahmod obtained the appropriate driver’s license for ‘Heavy Rigid’ vehicles, along with his NSW Bus Driver Authority. The Western Sydney Migrant Resource Centre was able to help him with Internet access and the necessary applications and paperwork.

It took longer than he hoped, but after six months, Mahmod successfully applied for a bus driver position with the State Transit Authority. Fortunately, his job was based in Liverpool, which meant he didn’t have far to travel. After starting work, he soon found he was able to help a number of other Iraqi arrivals with directions around the city, and enjoyed talking with other Liverpool residents with different backgrounds.

Occasionally Mahmod continues to experience some anxiety, brought about by his diabetes condition, and concern about family members living in Iraq. His employer and the Western Sydney MRC work to help him manage these periods, and his growing contacts with other Iraqis mean he continues to enjoy the music, food and other cultural aspects he misses from his home country. Meanwhile he has begun to follow the Liverpool Rangers Soccer Club, and regularly attends local games. He enjoys meeting people from other cultures, and hearing about their stories of life in Liverpool.

Mahmod acknowledges the experience of moving to Australia has been, at times, bewildering and isolating. He tells other new arrivals they need patience, particularly in dealing with Australia’s complex legal and support services. Today, he looks toward the future with optimism, and hopes to continue to support other new arrivals to Liverpool.
Vignette: Zara’s Experience

Zara, a six year old girl born in Syria, arrived last year with her family. The family have been in areas of high conflict and have had little stability since her birth, constantly moving to different towns and villages prior to being resettled in Australia. Zara is the youngest child of three children.

Upon arrival in Australia, the family raised concerns about Zara’s health and wellbeing as she appeared to have severe developmental delay. This was initially diagnosed as a result of the trauma that she had experienced living with protracted conflict. Despite several interventions, it became apparent that in fact, Zara had an intellectual disability. The family found little comfort in this new diagnosis as they had little exposure to the label and what this may mean for Zara and their family. Zara’s behaviour affected them in a myriad of ways, lack of speech, slow responses to questions and high levels of misunderstanding of parental and sibling instruction, making home life difficult. The mother found that she did not have time to attend to the government funded English classes and supports, after organising the two children for school along with Zara’s personal care.

Enrolment at the local primary school made the family very anxious as they did not fully understand that the questions asked by teaching staff, the school counsellor and disability support staff were aimed at ascertaining Zara’s developmental support needs to assess appropriate funding support and identify relevant educational interventions. Given their years of ongoing mobility due to the protracted Syrian conflict, they found the questions to be particularly intrusive, generating an increased sense of uncertainty about the potential impact of Zara’s intellectual disability and severe cognitive delay upon their resettlement in Australia.

After some time, the family were contacted by the locally situated disability officer of the NSW Government funded ‘Ability Links’ program, contracted to Settlement Services International. The Ability Linker began to work with the family to ascertain Zara’s support needs within the household, and those additional therapies and interventions that she required to enable Zara and her family to participate in the broader community. The family found this process extremely difficult. Over the past five years or so, they have not planned for more than three months at a time, as they were constantly on the move. Additionally, they had little understanding of disability support and services, as they had no previous exposure to government and non-government services in the area. Moreover, they found it extremely difficult to understand that home and educational services for Zara, administered or funded by the government, would not monitor their behaviours and household activities.

After several months of ongoing support, enabling the family to build trust with the Ability Linker, the school staff and local disability service-providers, the family has begun to build a level of trust and communicate more frequently about their concerns for Zara and her future. The family now have some support at home to help with Zara’s daily care, alongside special assistance at school to promote her educational development. Zara’s mother has more time to attend to the needs of the other children and also begin to explore opportunities of her own.
The family remains concerned about Zara's long-term future, as they have not been exposed to the full range of opportunities and supports that disability services provides. The Ability Linker continually works with the family in an attempt to develop their understanding of Australian disability supports and services, and the long-term benefits such supports can provide. Most significantly, the Ability Linker is working closely with the family to build a life-long plan that incorporates their aspirations for Zara, mapping out key transitional points, alongside necessary supports to promote her participation and inclusion within the broader community.

**Critical Themes**

In our workshops and interviews, several themes that cut across and affect settlement and disability issues emerged:

- Transport, technology and information
- Stigma and specificity of disability
- Psychological well-being
- Service and support systems for disability resettlement
- Employment, training and welfare dependency

**Transport, Technology and Information**

A common theme cutting across discussions of settlement and disability is access to affordable and efficient transport. Liverpool's size and distance from the Sydney CBD make mobility essential for employment and education.

The eastern part of the LGA area is serviced by the south western train-lines running to Leppington and Campbelltown, and which offer alternative routes via either Granville or Bankstown. Developed in 2003 and operating along Hoxton Park Road and Banks Road, the Liverpool-Parramatta T-way offers an alternative rapid bus transit route through many of Liverpool’s central suburbs to Parramatta, another emerging hub for work and learning. A network of local bus services complements these major public transport systems. The M5, M7 and Hume Highway are the major corridors for cars to the city's CBD and other key areas, and are significant for taxis and ride-sharing services such as Uber.

Despite these options, both workshops and interviews emphasised transport and mobility as key challenges faced by both new arrival and disability groups. As reported in *The Daily Telegraph* in January 2017, average commute times for many residents can be as high as 70–105 minutes. Commute times also appear longer the further residents live from the railway line and Liverpool, Casula and Warwick Farm stations. Certain areas like Green Valley, historically an underprivileged area, seem less well-serviced by public transport options.

Access also featured heavily in relation to information. While information relevant to settlement and disability services is often available, issues include the need for plain language; translations in relevant dialects (particularly for Arabic); options for braille and other accessibility improvements; and general appropriateness to audience. Moreover, considering the significant levels of low literacy and illiteracy in refugee populations even translated information poses challenges to effective communication.
Technology can mediate access to information and, through access to real-time information about public transport, traffic reports and ride-sharing services like Uber, also speed up commute times. As noted below in relation to the New Roots app, technology support needs to be tested and promoted through key groups to increase awareness and use. Nor should technologies be seen as effective substitutes to face-to-face human communication. Our interviews emphasised the critical role of interpersonal communication with professional staff, who act as critical conduits through the complexities of Australia’s legal and service networks.

**Related Domains: Ecology, Economy.**

Related Issues: Segregated housing, computer access, cost of technology, Difficulties in accessing services, isolation, barriers to transport and access, accessing correct information about services.

**Stigma and the Specificity of Disability**

The workshops highlighted a number of issues that illustrated the significance of cultural stigma in relation to disability for many new ethno-specific communities in addition to, the impact of specific disability types in community engagement and participation. Our interviews therefore aimed to explore these issues in greater depth and to distill the particular challenges for this group when undergoing resettlement in the Liverpool LGA.

All respondents interviewed with the relevant expertise in the area raised the issue of disability diagnosis and its relationship to generating particular cultural practices and behaviours. For example, one interviewee identified three key barriers for new migrants with disabilities and their family members and/or support networks. The first involved issues of cultural perceptions of disability, particularly in relation to the difference between a mental health issue and an intellectual disability. Another respondent stated that due to their previous living experience in refugee camps, or the political situation of their home country, often intellectual disability was not previously identified. Moreover, there are situations in countries of origin where basic health services, in normal circumstances, are quite limited in their capacity to identify and/or address this. Often in these circumstances, disability is defined purely in terms of medical and curative intervention, rather than seeking to implement inclusive social systems of support, as outlined within the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2006). Families often assume that a recent diagnosis of intellectual disability is not quite accurate as they have assumed that the behaviours are associated with the trauma of war, political uncertainty and refugee mobility.

Appropriate diagnosis was seen by most respondents as critical as it provided the basis for vital supports and resources for the individual and their family for immediate interventions and long-term planning. This was confirmed by one interviewee, who stated that often she had many referrals for clients in regards to torture and trauma needs even though the individual had an intellectual disability. They also stated that increasingly, they sent applicants for additional medical screening to gain clarity on the diagnosis. This, in effect, relates to the second issue of disability-type and the forms of cultural stigma that may be generated surrounding a particular disability. One respondent identified that for many families having someone with an intellectual disability was a greater cause of shame, than, for example, a mental illness or a physical disability, as mental illness and physical disability were easily identifiable as an outcome of refugee experience. Therefore, responsibility for the disability was easily identifiable and clearly not a result of familial lineage or genetic structures passed from parent to child.
The cultural stigma generated by the presence of disability, particularly intellectual disability, for many families often resulted in increased isolation for all household members. To protect the family from cultural shame, often families minimised contact with their ethno-specific communities, alongside the broader community. This isolation was often further compounded by cultural expectations around care and support, as established cultural norms in regards to the care of children did not necessarily support behaviours and actions that would promote help seeking behaviours, such as in-home assistance through government services, especially for mothers of young children with disability. As one respondent explained, the effects of cultural stigma and shame in relation to disability and appropriate familial care meant that families often under reported the level of support required, and in turn, struggled with daily living activities within the household. Lack of support within the familial home further impeded their ability to go out into the community due to tiredness, exhaustion and disorganisation. The impact was thus not only upon the household member with a disability and their primary carer, but also the other household members including siblings.

**Related Domains: Culture**
Related Issues: Access to services; isolation; carers unable to engage in employment; Isolated by families; stigma linked to cultural differences.

**Psychological Well-being**
Both workshops and interviews frequently referenced psychological issues. The issues noted in relation to settlement include terms like ‘isolation’, ‘anxiety’, ‘tension’, ‘unfulfilled expectations’, ‘fear’, and ‘trauma’, along with explicit reference to ‘mental health services’. As our interviews elaborated, these stem from many sources: trauma experienced in home countries or while in transit; disorientation and the complex process of adjustment in Australia; disconnection and concern for family members; frustrations finding work and housing; and a sense that their optimistic hopes for life in Australia were not being realised.

Compounding issues for new arrivals include those relating to mental illness and disability. Cultural background can accentuate the difficulties people with such conditions experience. As one example, an interviewee told us Down’s syndrome was a commonly acknowledged medical condition in Iraq, and was not associated with negative stigma among newly arrived communities. Conversely, autism and other intellectual conditions were less understood, and families would often hide people with these disabilities from public view. In a similar vein, it had been difficult to help people experiencing psychological illness or symptoms such as anxiety or depression due to a sense of shame and embarrassment.

These emotional responses often further complicate underlying conditions, and require sensitivity and awareness from support service-providers, with attention given to family members and community groups as much as to those affected directly. Psychological distress is, in short, a family, community and social issue as much as an individualised one.

**Related Domains: Culture**
Related Issues: No formal diagnosis for health issues, disability; isolation; anxiety about losing culture; culture of fear of new arrivals; capacities, not disabilities; Isolated by families.
Service and the Support Systems for Disability Resettlement

A very strong theme to emerge from the workshops was that of access to service and support systems for newly arrived migrants with disabilities. The findings within this theme are directly interrelated to the issues identified above.

Access to the disability service system posed significant challenges for new migrants with disabilities and their families. Throughout the interviews, four key areas in relation to service systems and supports emerged: diverse disability eligibility criteria, access to relevant information, issues of trust in relation to professional contact and supports, and finally, cultural barriers about disability as outlined above in the sections on cultural stigma and psychological well-being.

Importantly, it should be noted that within the Liverpool LGA, it appears that only one service is readily available to all migrants with disability, no matter their visa category (temporary protection, refugee, new migrant, permanent resident) or disability type: the NSW Government ‘Ability Links’ service. However, this service is an advisory and referral service only, and does not provide case management or direct services and supports.

All the respondents noted the level of confusion generated by the multiple service systems and points of access in relation to mental health and disability pensions and payments, supports and services. Each of the service systems are administered by different government institutions and use different disability and visa criteria to determine eligibility and access. For example, one interviewee noted that the Disability Support Pension ten-year residency waiting period was not consistent with the new National Disability Insurance System visa requirements. Additionally, disability determination was assessed against a different criterion. That same person noted that families often assume that eligibility to one part of the disability system means access to all disability supports and services.

読んで容易でアクセス可能なサービスシステムの情報は、ワークショップ内に示された懸念であるが、それに応じた質問を説明した。また、政府機関によって異なる制度があるため、利用可能であるかどうかは、視覚障害者含む障害を持つ人々に対するサービスとして、情報を提供するアプリケーションがあり、New Rootsなど、見栄えが良いが、広く知られていない場合もある。これまでは、詳しくは報告書で説明があります。
This short-term focus disadvantages individuals and families particularly in relation to the new National Disability Insurance Scheme, which requires individuals and their families to map out future aspirations and opportunities, over the long term, including identifying key transition points across the life-course. Respondent A stated that he often noted this particular difference when working with long-standing Australian families in other suburbs who had extensive experience and understanding of the possibility of disability in Australian society.

These issues were compounded by issues of trust in relation to personal disclosure to professional staff and networks. Previous experiences with government officials within their home countries and refugee camps impacted upon new migrants’ willingness to disclose issues of mental illness, disability and personal and family need. Disability disclosure is especially complex, due to the extremely personal nature of the information, the focus upon the ‘lack’ of physical, sensory, cognitive and intellectual capacities of the person, alongside cultural stigma. Lack of disclosure however generates a range of hardships as the individual and family often undermine their access to appropriate services, resources and support through withholding such highly intimate information. Such disclosure therefore requires the development of deep levels of trust, built over a period of time, to overcome high levels of distress that can be present when working with government and non-government services and employees. These combined effects mean that many migrants with disabilities, families and carers, are not receiving the services and supports that they may be eligible for.

Finally, due to the cultural stigma often attached to disability, many individuals, families and informal carers will not seek out help, support and services. Another respondent stated that to overcome these cultural barriers he encouraged families to utilise the ‘privilege of disability’, that is, flipping disability from burden, lack and hardship to one of advantage that can generate additional services and supports.

**Related Domains: Politics, Ecology, Economics.**

Related Issues: Eligibility for NDIS; rollout of NDIS; carers unable to engage in employment; privatization of services; long wait-list for housing.

**Employment, Training and Welfare Dependency**

The workshops highlighted a number of economic issues, with the issue of ‘Wealth and Distribution’ being rated particularly important. Our interviews focused on specific challenges in relation to employment and welfare dependency for both groups of new arrivals and people with disabilities.

One interviewee discussed the challenges recent migrants faced in gaining employment. The Western Sydney MRC planned to build upon existing and established migrant networks to develop opportunities for recent arrivals. For recently arrived refugees and migrants, English-language teaching institutions like Navitas play a vital role in gaining skills to join Australia’s workforce.

Specific bureaucratic constraints limit the delivery of support services. Offered by Navitas and other service providers, the Skills for Education and Employment (SEE) program prepares students for further study or employment. In one case, a young Iraqi refugee with a severe visual disability needed her mother to attend classes as part of a Skills for Education and Employment program. Despite
having the same needs as her daughter, and also being present in the classroom, the mother could not receive the same training, as
other students might object. While the organisation was able to accommodate the mother, the lack of formal recognition of the need
for carers to obtain the same training as those they care for limits employment opportunities for both persons.

In another case, a 29-year-old man asylum-seeker who arrived by boat and was diagnosed with severe depression and other serious
health issues was granted a disability pension. He subsequently wanted to train as a bus driver, and without money to pay for his
license, he was prepared to borrow funds. He was unable to do so until eventually a charity provided him with money. Having obtained
his license, he is now working full-time.

Both examples point to the need for greater institutional flexibility in recognising the complex economic situations of migrants with
disabilities. Even apparent severe disability does not prevent workforce participation in all cases; conversely, in addition to providing
often-unacknowledged work, carers often have comparable educational needs to those they care for, and need to be accommodated
within referral systems and training institutes.

**Related Domains: Economy.**
Related Issues: Cash jobs equal no benefits; financial hardship; meaningful job opportunities; breaking the cycle of welfare
dependence
6. Recommendations for Action in Liverpool

Our report suggests new arrivals resettling in Australia, particularly for those new arrivals with a disability, face a raft of issues. While some relate to personal adjustment to Australian cultural norms and expectations, many of their concerns are directly related to national resettlement and disability policy, payments, programming and services. These include access to, and length of, free English-language classes, eligibility for the Disability Support Pension, and so forth, as outlined in the above report. The delivery and provision of these services and supports are provided within the City of Liverpool region, however, jurisdictional responsibility fall outside of the purview of the local council.

There are, however, a number of areas that can be directly addressed by the City of Liverpool to actively facilitate the long-term inclusion, engagement and resettlement of new arrivals that do not necessarily involve the uptake of State and Commonwealth responsibilities. The recommendations outlined below are targeted at the local level, and aim to facilitate the inclusion of new arrivals through providing a range of supports and services. The aim of these recommendations is to ‘fill the gaps’ of national resettlement and disability policy, yet aim to provide pathways for new arrivals, particularly those with disability, to State and Commonwealth services and programs for which they are eligible.
We recommend:

1. That opportunities be explored to establish disability peer-support groups for new arrivals, facilitated by a locally situated community-inclusion officer, to enable new arrivals with disabilities and their families to build connections with others in similar situations and stages within the resettlement process.

2. That working partnerships are developed with ethno-specific groups within the City of Liverpool, and potentially with surrounding local councils, to design, develop and implement educational awareness in relation to disability access and inclusion.

3. That opportunities are developed with local sporting and community clubs to create culturally appropriate disability awareness education and messaging, targeting local language groups, that can be delivered at key community events.

4. That specific resettlement issues are included within the City of Liverpool disability-inclusion action plan, particularly in relation to language accessibility, information supports, transport, and community-engagement processes, practices and events.

5. That positive disability messaging resources are designed, produced and made freely available in a range of local community languages for cultural and community organisations, including sporting clubs.

6. That educational training programs are implemented for local businesses, sporting clubs, and community organisations, to alert the broader Liverpool community to the complexity of the presence of disability within the resettlement process.

7. That opportunities are identified to build broad cross-sectoral knowledge on unique needs and requirements of new arrivals with disability.

8. That effective communication pathways are established between the City of Liverpool’s disability inclusion and access committee, NSW Family and Community Services, and the National Disability Insurance Agency to ensure that local issues in relation to resettlement and disability are specifically included in the national rollout.

9. That a range of disability resettlement forums are provided for new arrivals with disabilities and their families to actively facilitate information pathways and awareness on disability supports, services and programming.

10. That disability-accessible information technologies are implemented, ensuring their availability within local community languages to capture up-to-date information on City of Liverpool community resources, facilities and events.

11. That opportunities are examined to partner with local groups to actively promote disability events held by the City of Liverpool, particularly those events that aim to celebrate the contributions and achievements of persons with disabilities within the City.

12. That possibilities are explored to implement a Disability Ambassador program to promote disability inclusion within the City of Liverpool, with a specific sub-theme dedicated to new arrivals.

13. That local disability champions are identified and resourced to facilitate the active inclusion of new arrivals and migrants with disability within their own ethno-specific community and the broader one of Liverpool.

14. That further work be undertaken to identify specific new arrival groups need assistance, such as older persons, those who have arrived more recently, and arrivals from Southern and Eastern Europe and North Africa and the Middle East regions. Needs are expected to be especially acute among recent humanitarian arrivals from Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan and Syria.

15. That contingency funding be set aside to deal with sudden peaks in arrivals, particularly for those arriving on humanitarian grounds (with 2012 and 2017 being two examples in the past decade).

16. That Western Sydney MRC augment its critical role in this intersectional space of settlement and disability, by strategically broadening and operationalizing its networks, cooperation, and collaborations, with initiatives and agencies (government, NGO, and grassroots) across all four Circles of Social Life domains (politics, economics, ecological, and cultural), especially those in non-traditional areas, where new opportunities and synergies can unfold and develop.
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Appendix 1: Key Terms and Definitions

ABS: Australian Bureau of Statistics
CBD: Central Business District
DSP: Disability Support Pension
DoIBP: Department of Immigration and Border Protection
FIABCI: International Real Estate Federation
LGA: Local Government Authority
MOC: Medical Officer of the Commonwealth
NDIS: National Disability Insurance Scheme
NEDA: National Ethnic Disability Alliance
NFP: Not-for-Profit
IRSAD: Index of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage
SA1: Statistical Area Level 1 (i.e., the second smallest geographic area defined in the Australian Statistical Geography Standard)
SEE: Skills for Education and Employment
SEIFA: Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas
SRF: Settlement Reporting Facility
SSI: Settlement Services International

Appendix 2: Research Methodology: Circles of Social Life

_Circles of Social Life_ approach treats all complex problems as necessarily affecting all domains of social life – economics, ecology, politics, and culture.

The approach guides urban engagement with the objective of making a significant difference on the ground through an unusual combination of careful focus, negotiation of tensions and an integrated sense of the whole. It supports the process of deciding on the main issue and the main goal in relation to that issue. It brings out and refines the critical issues associated with that main issue. It allows for a systematic understanding of competing issues and tensions. It then provides continuing feedback and monitoring in relation to implementation difficulties and successful outcomes.

While it seems complex on first presentation, the _Circles of Sustainability_ approach attempts to reverse the privileging of technique over reflexively engaging in the world. Indicators-based projects often seem to perpetuate particular sets of assumptions concerning our place in the world. At risk of caricaturing important and helpful efforts aimed at achieving sustainability, it does seem that some current approaches embed uninterrogated ideas or beliefs about the social within the research task. Themes such as inclusion, participation, identity, and security are treated as if they can directly be translated into substantive empirical claims. Moreover, some approaches tend to see the social world as a closed system or a unit possessing system-like properties. Of course, at one (very abstract) level, the world is for all intents and purposes a closed system. However, we argue that such a perspective privileges the possibility that the world and its parts are objectively knowable as a closed system, and that pulling the levers up or down will give relatively automatic and predictable outcomes.
The approach is issue-driven and aims to have the following features:

**Accessible**
At one level, the approach should be readily interpretable to non-experts, but at deeper levels it needs to be methodologically sophisticated enough to stand up against the scrutiny of experts in assessment, monitoring and evaluation and project management tools;

**Graphic**
The approach needs to be simple in its graphic presentation and top-level description, but simultaneously have consistent principles carrying through to its lower, more complex, and detailed levels;

**Cross-locale**
The approach needs on the one hand to be sufficiently general and high-level to work across a diverse range of cities and localities, big and small, but at the same time sufficiently flexible to be used to capture the detailed specificity of each of those different places;

**Learning-based**
The approach should allow cities to learn from other cities, and provide support and principles for exchange of knowledge and learning from practice;

**Comparable**
The approach should allow comparison between cities, but not locate them in a league table or hierarchy;

**Tool-generating**
The approach needs to provide the basis for developing a series of tools—including web-based electronic tools (compatible with various information and communications technology platforms). These range from very simple learning tools to more complex planning, assessment, and monitoring tools;

**Indicator-generating**
The approach needs to provide guidance for selecting indicators as well as methods for assessing their outcomes;

**Relational**
The approach needs to focus not only on identification of critical issues, indicators that relate to those critical issues, but also the relationships between them;

**Cross-domain**
The approach needs to be compatible with new developments that bring ‘culture’ in serious contention in sustainability analysis – such as the United Cities and Local Governments four pillars of sustainability. The approach therefore uses a domain-based model which emphasizes interconnectivity of economic, ecological, political, and cultural dimensions, each of which are treated as social domains;
Participatory
Even if it is framed by a set of global protocols, the approach needs to be driven by stakeholders and communities of practice;

Cross-supported
The approach needs to straddle the qualitative/quantitative divide, and uses just enough quantification to allow for identification of conflicts.

Standards-oriented
The approach (and its methods) should connect to current and emerging reporting and modelling standards.

Curriculum-oriented
The approach needs to be broad enough to provide guidance for curriculum development, and therefore useful for training.
The Process Pathway

The Process Pathway provides a map to guide urban-change groups through the practice of making a significant impact upon a designated locale, such as a city, a town or an urban region. Linked to guidelines for each of the stages, the Pathway provides a broad management overview that can be used for small or big projects. It can be used to guide a focussed and discrete project or to frame a general sustainability plan that includes many sub-projects.

The Process Pathway is organized around an iterative Process Pathway with defined stages of activity: commitment, engagement, assessment, definition, implementation, measurement, and communication. Each of the process stages is divided into a series of phases, organized in a logical sequence of activities as part of the broader Circles of Social Life approach. The various phases of the Pathway are linked to associated tools and methods. These tools are designed as part of an integrated, cross-referenced set that can be used as a comprehensive guide or as singular tools, each of which can be taken out of the toolbox and used with or without reference to the other tools.
Appendix 3: Interview Schedule

Introduction
The Western Sydney MRC partnered with Western Sydney University to explore issues of settlement and disability in the City of Liverpool. We conducted two workshops in April and May 2017 to discuss a number of these issues, and also to assess how the city performs overall against a number of dimensions. The research team also conducted a series of interviews with professionals in the settlement and disability sectors to understand some of these issues in greater depth.

A series of individuals were invited to participate in these interviews on the basis of their organisational experience and professional expertise. We were particularly interested in the institutional context: what challenges and opportunities face recent settlers and people with disabilities in navigating systems and participating in social life.

The interviews lasted approximately an hour.

Question Overview

Question 1. Could you tell us about your organisation, and the services it provides to settlers or those with disability?

Question 2. [Settlement] During our first workshop, we were struck by the number of issues relating to settlement and what we termed ‘Culture’. The kinds of issues people identified included ‘Isolation’, ‘Anxiety about losing culture’, the ‘expectations of new arrivals’, ‘Access to interpreters’, ‘No formal diagnosis for disabilities’. What particular issues has your organisation faced with people settling into Australian and local Liverpool culture?

Question 2a. Are there additional issues people with disabilities, or families including members with disabilities, might face during settlement?

Question 3. [Settlement] The workshop also raised specific issues of wealth and distribution: ‘Breaking the cycle of welfare dependency’, creating ‘meaningful job opportunities’ and ‘affordable housing’, and dealing with ‘financial hardship’. [These issues also might relate to disability]. Could you tell us more about the specific economic challenges that your organisation encounters with new arrivals? Are there system-related causes of these difficulties? For instance, complex procedures, lack of communication between agencies, or difficulties with policies?

Question 4. [Disability] In your experience, how does having a disability or having a family member with a disability change or alter the settlement of new migrants into Liverpool? Does having a disability / family member with disability generate different kinds of disadvantages / hardships as a new migrant? What things could be put in place to address this / more effectively support the resettlement process?

Question 5. [Disability] During the focus groups a number of issues were raised around the engagement and participation of persons with disabilities from new communities, being included in community gatherings and events, both in their own communities and more broadly in the Liverpool LGA. Could you tell us a little more about this and maybe, some of the kinds of supports new communities rely upon / may require to enable participation?
Question 6.
Could you tell us more about specific challenges at the intersection of settlement and disability?
What specific challenges do new arrivals with disability face?
Are there difficulties in integrating services from different agencies specialising in settlement and disability?
Are there any conflicting policy, funding or social needs between settlers and those with disabilities?

Question 6a.
Transport – both public and private – often enables both new settlers and people with disabilities. Liverpool is large LGA, quite distant from Sydney’s CBD, and therefore from certain options for employment, health and education. Could you tell us more about any specific challenges Liverpool poses in terms of mobility and transport? Are there ways these challenges might be addressed to improve access to services, jobs and other beneficial aspects of living in Sydney? Issues might include obtaining license.

Question 7.
Could you tell us about any specific future plans or directions your organisation is examining to address these challenges and opportunities? [AND/OR:] How is your organisation adapting to a changing economic and policy landscape in relation to settlement and disability?

Question 8.
We would also like to know any general observations about the City of Liverpool. Is it better or worse equipped to deal with new settlers than other LGAs in Sydney? How about with disability?

The workshops confirm general statistics showing the City of Liverpool struggles with relative socioeconomic disadvantage. Are there other assets that communities and agencies do or could use to combat lack of economic resources: better coordination, greater social awareness and action, etc?

Question 9.
Before we conclude, is there anything else you think we should know? And is there anything you would like to ask us?
Appendix 4: Detailed Analysis of ABS 2016 Census Statistics on Settlement and Disability

Figures A4.1-10 show various intersections of ABS 2016 Census data relating to migration and disability. Percentile figures (A4.1-10) all represent the percentage of Liverpool and related LGA residents who replied they have a “need for assistance with core activities”, segmented by categories of age, year of arrival, LGA, and region of birth.

Figure A4.1: Percentage Of Liverpool Migrants Needing Assistance, By Age And Year Of Arrival

Figure A4.1: Percentage Of Liverpool Migrants Needing Assistance, By Age And Year Of Arrival
Figure A4.2: Percentage of Liverpool Migrants Needing Assistance, By Region Of Origin And Year Of Arrival
Figure A4.3: Percentage of Liverpool Migrants Needing Assistance, By Age And Region Of Origin
Figure A4.4: Percentage of migrants needing assistance, by Liverpool and related LGAs and region of origin.

Figure A4.5: Number of persons in Liverpool and related LGAs with need of assistance, by age and year of arrival.
Figure A4.6: Percentage Of Persons Providing Assistance In Liverpool, Related LGAs And Greater Sydney, By Age

Figure A4.7: Percentage Of Persons Providing Assistance In Liverpool, Related LGAs And Greater Sydney, By Age And Place Of Birth
North Africa and the Middle East

South-East Asia

Figure A4.8: Percentage Of Persons Born In North Africa And The Middle East, Providing Assistance In Liverpool, Related LGAs And Greater Sydney, By age

Figure A4.9: Percentage Of Persons Born In South-East Asia, Providing Assistance In Liverpool, Related LGAs And Greater Sydney, By age
Figure A4.10: Percentage Of Persons Born In Southern And Eastern Europe, Providing Assistance In Liverpool, Related LGAs And Greater Sydney, By Age

Southern and Eastern Europe
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Liverpool (C) Provided unpaid assistance
Fairfield (C) Provided unpaid assistance
Parramatta (C) Provided unpaid assistance
Campbelltown (C) (NSW) Provided unpaid assistance
Blacktown (C) Provided unpaid assistance
Greater Sydney Provided unpaid assistance
Appendix 5: Detailed Analysis from DIBP Settlement Reporting Facility

Figures A5.1 to A5.3 below are compiled from DIBP’s Settlement Reporting Facility (SRF), using figures for the number of Settlers in Liverpool LGA by Migration Stream (i.e. family, humanitarian, other, skilled, unknown), by country of birth (i.e., all, and top 20), and by Year (i.e., for each year between 2007 to 2017).

While the ABS Census 2016 underscores the particular feature of Liverpool LGA as having a high proportion of recent arrivals (or overseas born, or NESB), the DIBP-SRF figures show the high concentration of humanitarian entrants (over and above family, skilled, other and unknown visa classes) arriving here, within the combined years between the beginning of 2013 and the end of 2017.

As shown in Figure A5.2, when disaggregating the years, 2017 is a standout year when the number of humanitarian entrants spike sharply following the entry of the announced additional places (12,000) made in September 2015 by IBP Minister, Dutton.
However, as shown in Figure A5.3, which uses a longer term time-frame of 10 years, the more notable pattern is one dominated by family reunion and skilled migration (and the various historical/obsolete visas). The countries-of-birth India and China especially standout.

Figure A5.3: Number Of New Arrivals To Liverpool LGA By Country Of Birth (Top 20), By Migration Stream (Family, Humanitarian, Skilled, Unknown), And By Year (Fy08-Fy17)
Appendix 6: Liverpool Urban Profile

The Urban Region Being Assessed

| The name of urban area in question (That is, the name of the city, town, or municipality, etc., that is being assessed.) | Liverpool, Australia (Using the Local Government Area (LGA) as the basis of the assessment.) |
| Geographical spread of the urban area in km² | 305.5 km² |
| Population of the urban area | 204,326 (according to the 2016 Census) |
| Date or period of the assessment | 2017 |

The Circles of Sustainability approach offers an integrated method for practically responding to complex issues of sustainability, resilience, adaptation, and livability. It is being used to guide Liverpool through the difficult process of responding to complex or seemingly intractable problems and challenges associated with building long-term sustainability. The approach builds upon the strengths of a research program developed in association with Metropolis, the UN Global Compact Cities Programme, World Vision and a number of other key international organizations. It was developed through practical engagement in cities around the world including Berlin, Melbourne, Milwaukee, New Delhi, Porto Alegre, San Francisco, and Valletta, to name a few.

The Circles of Sustainability profile process is intended as a way of developing an interpretative description of the sustainability of an urban region and its immediate hinterland. Here sustainability is understood in relation to local, national, and global processes: ecological, economic, political and cultural. The Circles of Sustainability process is considered part of the more general Circles of Social Life assessment process, which includes considerations of vitality, productivity, relationality and sustainability (including resilience and adaptation).

The sustainability profile template is intended as way of developing a more comprehensive understanding of an ‘urban region’—in this case, Liverpool. By responding to the questions in the Urban Profile Question it is possible to generate a clear and simple graphic representation of the sustainability profile of that region. Examples are shown in Figure 2 for representative cities around the world.

Each of these figures represents a qualitative self-assessment by local and other experts of the sustainability of the respective urban areas. The assessment group should define the precise nature of the urban area in question before the assessment begins (see Table 1 above). For example, in Figure 2 above ‘Sao Paulo’ refers to the greater Sao Paulo Metropolitan region. Similarly, ‘Melbourne’ in this case is assessed across the metropolitan region of Melbourne – rather than the Municipality of Melbourne, which is much smaller geographically and demographically.
Figure 2. Circles of Sustainability Assessments

**DELHI 2012**

**HYDERABAD 2012**

**JOHANNESBURG 2013**

**MELBOURNE 2011**

**SAO PAULO 2012**

**TEHRAN 2012**

*San-Paulo Macro-Metropolitan Region, 2012*
The Level of the Assessment Process

The Liverpool Assessment Panel met initially in a half-day workshop in 2017 to conduct the Liverpool assessment. It was done initially as a Rapid Assessment (see Table 8 below) by approximately 30 people in Liverpool, part of the larger Critical Reference Group, each with expertise across the four domains of ecology, economics, politics and culture. We divided in these four groups with facilitators and scribes in each group, and responded to the main question in each of the subdomains with reference to the third-level aspects, roughly annotating the assessment as we went along. The core team from Western Sydney University and the Migrant Resource Centre, Liverpool, then went through the assessment refining and developing both the annotations and assessment details. This draft was then circulated to the whole Critical Reference Group for further discussion and refinement, building towards an Annotated Assessment Profile.

Each of the first four levels can be done as a registered assessment. This involves registering the assessment with either the Cities Programme or Metropolis, including a description of the process that your team went through to complete the assessment. Registration verifies that the process was conducted thoroughly and well.

Table 8: The Level of the Assessment Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The profile mapping process can be done at five levels:</th>
<th>Please indicate which profile exercise you intend to complete by ticking the box or boxes below.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Rapid Assessment Profile</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By responding to the single ‘general question’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under each ‘perspective’ by marking the 9-point scale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Aggregate Assessment Profile</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By responding to the ‘particular questions’ under each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘perspective’ by marking the 9-point scale).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Annotated Assessment Profile</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By completing the exercise at level 2 and writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detailed annotations about how the points on the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scale were derived.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Comprehensive Assessment Profile, I</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By completing the exercise at level 3 and writing a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major essay on the urban area using the questions to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guide the writing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensive Assessment Profile, II</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By completing the exercise at level 3 and assigning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metrics-based indicators to each point on the scale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>A Certified Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By completing an Assessment Profile at one of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>previous levels, and then negotiating with the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Cities Programme Secretariat to have their Global</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisors critical respond and certify that assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Definitions for the Purposes of this Questionnaire

- ‘Sustainability’ is defined as activity that ‘meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs’. This is the minimal definition of what in the questionnaire calls a level of ‘satisfactory sustainability’.
- ‘Positive sustainability’ is defined as practices and meanings of human engagement that make for an ongoing life-world that projects natural and social flourishing, vibrancy, resilience, and adaptation.
- ‘Urban area’ or ‘area’, as used in the questionnaire means the area that you have defined as the basis for making this assessment. The concept of ‘local’ is used to mean the space within the urban area.
- ‘Urban region’ means the urban area and its immediate hinterlands, including its peri-urban extensions, adjacent agricultural and rural land, and its water catchment areas if they are in the immediate vicinity of the urban area.
- ‘Broader region’ is taken to mean within two-three hour’s land transport from the urban region.
- Concepts such as ‘good’ and ‘appropriate’ are to be defined in terms of the values of the sustainability assessment respondents, but in an Annotated Assessment these are the sorts of issues that would need to be defined by the Assessment Panel.

The Scale for Critical Judgement

The questionnaire asks for critical judgement on a nine-point scale of sustainability from critical sustainability to vibrant sustainability. The period in question is the present (unless otherwise specified), and the limits of projection are the next 30 years or one generation, using the United Nations’ definition of ‘sustainable development’ as development that meets the needs of the people now, without compromising the needs of the next generation.

Critical sustainability, at the least-sustainable end of the sustainability spectrum, means a level of sustainability that requires critical or urgent change now in order to be assured of continuing basic viability over the next thirty years and thus into the adult lives of the next generation.

Vibrant sustainability, at the other end of the spectrum, means a level of sustainability that is currently active in reproducing vibrant social and environmental conditions that augur well for long-term positive flourishing for the next generation and beyond.

Basic sustainability, the mid-point on the scale, signifies a level of sustainability that allows, all other pressures being equal, for a basic equilibrium over the coming period meeting the ‘needs’ of the next generation. See Table 3 below.

The Scale of Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vibrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a qualitative survey, but it can be linked to any comprehensive indicator set that measures sustainability, wellbeing, resilience, prosperity and adaptability. Below as an example of what is possible, we have linked the different subdomains of the Circle of Sustainability to UN-Habitat’s City Prosperity Index.
The Issues in Contention

The Urban Profile process works on the basis of a four-domain model. Each domain is divided into seven perspectives (as set out in Table 9 below), and seven questions are asked about each perspective (see the questionnaire below).

Table 9: Summary of the Structure of the Urban Profile Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Perspectives (or Subdomains)</th>
<th>Possible issues to consider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>• Materials and Energy</td>
<td>• Sources of energy including petroleum, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Water and Air</td>
<td>• Air quality, climate change adaptation, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Flora and Fauna</td>
<td>• Parks and gardens, tree coverage, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Habitat and Settlements</td>
<td>• Habitat destruction, land-use, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Built-form and Transport</td>
<td>• Urban spatial development, housing, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Embodiment and Sustenance</td>
<td>• Physical human health, nutrition, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Emission and Waste</td>
<td>• Pollution, recycling and waste disposal, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>• Production and Resourcing</td>
<td>• Industry and commerce, resources, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Exchange and Transfer</td>
<td>• Money, trade in goods and services, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accounting and Regulation</td>
<td>• Regulatory systems, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consumption and Use</td>
<td>• Consumption patterns, use of goods, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Labour and Welfare</td>
<td>• Labour markets, economic provision, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Technology and Infrastructure</td>
<td>• High-tech to low-level technologies, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wealth and Distribution</td>
<td>• Poverty, unemployment, inequality, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>• Organization and Governance</td>
<td>• Legitimacy, system of governance, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Law and Justice</td>
<td>• Legal system, political justice, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Communication and Critique</td>
<td>• The press, media, news, dissent; protest, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Representation and Negotiation</td>
<td>• Participation by citizens, voting civility, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Security and Accord</td>
<td>• Political tensions, military presence, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dialogue and Reconciliation</td>
<td>• Customary rights, truth commissions, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ethics and Accountability</td>
<td>• Corruption issues, public ethics, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>• Identity and Engagement</td>
<td>• Ethnicities, cultural identities, images, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Creativity and Recreation</td>
<td>• Celebrations, events and rituals, sport, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Memory and Projection</td>
<td>• Indigenous history; museums; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Belief and Meaning</td>
<td>• Religions and spiritualities; ideologies, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gender and Generations</td>
<td>• Gender relations; family; generations, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enquiry and Learning</td>
<td>• Education and training systems, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wellbeing and Health</td>
<td>• Emotional and mental health, wellbeing, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rather than just picking up on issues that happen to be relevant now, this systematic structure is intended to cover all issues relevant to the human condition.
1. Materials and Energy

General Question: How sustainable is energy production for the urban area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vibrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Particular Questions**

- How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban area?

  1. The availability of material resources in the broader region.  
  2. The availability of food grown in the immediate urban region.  
  3. The availability of minerals and metals sourced from the broader region.  
  4. The proportion of electricity produced for the urban area by renewable means.  
  5. The dependence of the urban area on fossil fuels.  
  7. The translation of resource-use monitoring into resource-reduction strategies.

- Many basic material resources, including water and food, are readily available in the broader region, but a lot of materials are imported from across the globe.
- Liverpool has a long history of market gardens, but local agriculture is being overtaken by development, and there is little food production within the LGA. In 2014/2015 agriculture, forestry and fishing constituted less than 1 per cent of the Gross Regional Product of the LGA.
- Concrete, steel and timber tends to be sourced from beyond the broader region (that is, two to three hours by land transport). Base metals such as copper and tin are mined in New South Wales. The state has copper-rich deposits where copper is produced as either the principal commodity or as a secondary product.
- There is very little local production of energy; the subsidy for solar panels was only taken up by those who could afford the initial outlay. There were 4,130 small-scale solar panel system installations in Liverpool over the 14-year period 2001–2014 (ABS). In 2012, according the last-available ABS figures, there were only 774 generating meters as against 37,145 non-generating meters. Most electricity comes from the NSW grid, with 79 per cent from black-coal-powered plants, 14 per cent from renewable sources, and 7 per cent from gas (Renewable Energy Action Plan annual report, 2016).
- There is a heavy dependence on fossil fuels, including coal-powered electricity, for transport, cooling and heating. While Liverpool has an electric train and diesel bus service, there is a heavy reliance on petrol-consuming cars for all transport, particularly across the city.
- New housing developments are heavily reliant on air conditioning with massive consumption of electricity.
Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that support considerations:

3.2.3p Jobs in the manufacturing of local building materials. The term ‘locally available building materials’ is used to refer to materials of which the entire lifecycle (including all steps of the production chain: 1. extraction of raw materials, 2. manufacturing into building products, 3. sale and 4. use of building products, 5. recycling/end-of-life) takes place within the same region. (repeat)

4.2.1. Percentage of population with access to electricity, defined as either being connected to the grid (or reliable alternative sources) and receiving a continuous supply of electricity.

4.2.1p Percentage of population with a primary reliance on clean fuels and technology at the household level (rather than solid carbon-producing fuels).

6.2.1p Newly registered vehicles, defined as number of newly registered vehicles, including cars and trucks, per year (acting as a proxy for use of energy).

2. Water and Air

General Question: How sustainable are the levels of air quality and water quality in the urban environment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vibrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Particular Questions

How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban area?

1. The bodies of water in the urban region. 4
2. The ready access of all to potable water distributed with minimum energy-use. 6
3. The continuous presence of good quality air in the urban region. 4
4. The liveability of the urban region’s climate. 8
5. The carbon footprint of the urban area. 3
6. The development of climate-change adaptation strategies for the urban area. 3
7. The translation of air-and-water quality monitoring in the urban area into quality-improvement strategies. 2

- Liverpool asthma hospitalization rates are going up, against the trend of NSW which is going down. The change from a base around 150 per 10,000 population in 2001–2003 to around 220 in 2015–2016 suggests issues of air-quality degradation in the city. http://www.healthstats.nsw.gov.au/Indicator/res_asthos/res_asthos_lga_trend
- Motor vehicles and light industry increasingly contribute to air pollution as the population of Liverpool grows.
- Pollution is compounded by patterns of air circulation and a basin-like topography bounded by the Blue Mountains.
- Storm water run-off in Liverpool is heavily contaminated with litter, sediment, nutriments, oil and grease.
- There is a lack of base-line measurement to determine changing levels of water pollution.
- Austral development of residential areas.
The proposed Eastern Creek Incinerator has untested consequences for Liverpool (NB. This was not considered in the current 2017 assessment.)

The development of the intermodal transport hub (an inland port development with increased traffic by freight trucks) and the construction of the Badgerys Creek airport will contribute to making the water and air pollution worse than currently experienced. (NB. This was not considered in this 2017 Urban Profile assessment.)

**Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that might support your considerations:**

6.2.1. Air quality, defined as annual mean levels of fine particulate matter (less than 2.5 microns, PM2.5) in cities (population weighted).

6.2.3. Proportion of waste-water, including sewerage and sullage, that is safely treated.

6.2.4. CO2 emissions per capita, per annum.

**3. Flora and Fauna**

General Question: To what extent is biodiversity sustainable across the urban region?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vibrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Particular Questions**

How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban region?

1. The resilience of regional eco-systems to past and present urbanization.
   2

2. The biodiversity of the region now by comparison with the time of its first major settlement.
   2

3. The rate of native plant species' extinction in the urban region across the last hundred years.
   2

4. The tree coverage of the urban region—native or otherwise.
   4

5. The continuing viability of native species of birds and animals in the urban region.
   4

6. The relation of people in the urban region to non-domesticated animals and birds.
   4

   4

Convulsive development makes this a problematic area with little remnant indigenous biodiversity.


A species of hitherto-thought extinct hibbertia, (last documented in 1823), found on the Moorebank site for Stage 1 of the Intermodal development, was announced days after the development was approved by the Minister for Planning in December 2016. Allegedly, staff in the Office of Heritage and Environment were told to keep the discovery secret until after the approval.
‘An Environment spokesman said it was not his department’s role to inform the planning commission of the fumana rediscovery.’ (Fairfield City Champion, 23 January 2017).

- There are some good signs: Riverpark Drive along the Georges River used to be a rubbish dump, and was improving (albeit with set-backs more recently).

**Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that might support your considerations:**

2.3.1. Proportion of urban space that is green (NB. This indicator is a subsection of the ‘proportion of open space in public use’).

### 4. Habitat and Settlements

**General Question:** How well does the urban area relate ecologically to the landscape on which it is built?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vibrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Particular Questions**

**How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban region?**

1. The human liveability of the regional topography. 7
2. The extent of original habitat still viable in the urban region. 4
3. The existence of natural spaces—either original habitat or parks and gardens—as integral and accessible to all local neighbourhoods. 4
4. The limiting of building in areas prone to natural risks such as flooding and landslides. 6
5. The use of appropriate materials in buildings. 4
6. The retrofitting of buildings and infrastructure to respond to environmental issues. 3
7. The translation of habitat monitoring in the urban area into robust conservation strategies. 5

- The region has a temperate climate, though with marginally more intense urban heat in summer than coastal Sydney, and with marginally colder temperatures in winter. The topography of the Cumberland Plain is covered with sparse eucalypt forest and dry sparse grasses.
- The Macquarie grid overlay the natural environment from the beginning of Liverpool’s settlement, colonial farming had significant impact on original habitat, and more recent economic and political pressures to build housing estates has meant that there is little indigenous bushland left. The NSW Government land has declared a number of release areas that fall either fully or partially within the Liverpool area. These include the South West Priority Growth Area, the Western Sydney Employment Area and the Western Sydney Priority Growth Area.
- Liverpool was built with its back to the Georges River, now while the city is refocusing on the river, the old industrial sites along the riverfront are being replaced by high-rise apartments.
- Edmonton Park was rezoned for urban development in 2008, and is now being suburbanized.
• Woodward Park: sporting facilities given priority over natural spaces.
• Twenty-five years ago, Bigge Park had more open space.
• There are zoning restrictions to limit building on flood-prone or fire risk areas. (See https://eplanning.liverpool.nsw.gov.au/Pages/lcc.maps/maps.aspx.)

**Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that might support your considerations:**

2.3.1. Proportion of open space in public use, defined as the average share of the built-up area of cities that is open space for public use for all—by sex, age and persons with disabilities.

2.1.2. Land-use mix, defined as the diversity of land-use per square kilometre, within a city or urban area (balanced through complementary uses and activities within a local area).

2.2.2. Population density, defined as the total city population divided by the total urban area in square kilometers.

2.3.2. Accessibility to open public space, defined as the proportion of city population (or total urban area) living (or located) less than 400 metres away from the open public spaces. Public space includes parks, squares, recreational green areas, and recreational facilities (not streets).

**5. Built-Form and Transport**

**General Question:** Does the form of the urban area and its transport system support sustainable living?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vibrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall - SCORE OF 3**

**Particular Questions**

**How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban area?**

1. The spread of the urban area—with particular concern in relation to urban sprawl. 3
2. The access of people to the different social amenities across the urban area through overlapping transport modes. 3
3. The accessibility of mass-transit systems in the urban area—particularly as extending to the urban fringes and non-formal zones. 3
4. The degree of dependence on cars. 3
5. The level of support for using non-motorized transport such as bicycles and walking through provision of safe walking paths, protected bike-lane networks, low-speed residential zones, etc. 4
6. The implementation of energy-use reduction practices for air and sea transport. 3
7. The translation of transport monitoring into quality-improvement strategies. 3

• Low-density residential urbanization across is spreading across Liverpool, with a number of suburban settlements being established in areas that were once semi-rural. These suburbs have smaller block sizes that the classical quarter acre block, but they tend to be one and two-story standalone houses, including around town centres beyond Central Liverpool.
Liverpool is car-dependent. Bus routes link to the Liverpool CBD, but do not serve the cross-cutting needs for local transport beyond the CBD. According to the 2016 Census 28.8 per cent of homes had one registered motor vehicle garaged or parked at their address, 36.5 per cent had two motor vehicles and 23.0 per cent had three or more motor vehicles (significantly higher than the Australia-wide average of 18.1 per cent).

The Council has no funds for ecological transport.

The city is putting in some bike paths, and there is some support for protected bike-lane networks, but it is not strong. There was a 2009 plan, but this has not been updated. Bicycles and cycling is barely mentioned in the 93-page 4-Year Delivery Program Operational Plan and Budget, 2016–17 published by Liverpool Council in 2016. In a capital works budget for 2015/2016 of $104 million there are only a couple of bicycle path projects amounting to a few hundred thousand dollars’ expenditure. The line item for roads is $30.1 million.

In August 2015, the City of Liverpool introduced a ‘Social Impact Assessment Policy’. This, in conjunction with the ‘Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 Sec. 79 C (1) might achieve much more sustainable outcomes in the future.

Further issues, not considered in the present assessment include the construction of Badgerys Creek Airport. There is currently no commitment for a rail link to the airport.

**Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that might support your considerations:**

2.1.1. Street Connectivity
2.1.1a. City-street intersection-density, defined as the number of street intersections per one square kilometre of land.
2.1.1b. Street density is defined as the number of kilometres of urban streets per square kilometre of land.
2.1.1c. Proportion of total area of urban surface allocated to streets.
2.2.1. Land-use efficiency (as opposed to urban sprawl), defined as the ratio of the land-consumption rate to the population growth rate.
4.3.1. Proportion of the population that has convenient access to public transport disaggregated by age group, sex, and persons with disabilities.
6. Embodiment and Sustenance

General Question: How sustainable is the urban area in supporting the physical health of people? 39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vibrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Particular Questions**

**How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban area?**

1. The general physical health of residents.  
2. The rate of infant mortality in the urban area.  
3. The level of physical exercise enacted regularly by all people in the urban area.  
4. The hygiene of urban streets for all people.  
5. The nutrition of food generally eaten by residents.  
6. The level of urban agriculture in the urban area, including in people's home sites.  
7. The translation of physical health monitoring into quality-improvement strategies.

- In relation to physical health there are high levels of obesity in Liverpool. The figures for Western Sydney have been slowly rising across the decade or so from 12.9 per cent obese and 44.7 overweight and obese in 2002 to 16.1 obese and 49.8 overweight and obese in 2015, (7.6 and 6.5 percentage points higher respectively than Northern Sydney in 2015. (http://www.healthstats.nsw.gov.au/Indicator/beh_bmi_age/beh_bmi_lhn_trend)
  Other issues include asthma, and tobacco use and alcohol consumption.
- Infant mortality in Western Sydney has fluctuated across the 4-5 range of deaths per 1,000 live births over the period 2001 to 2013. By comparison, Northern Sydney has gone steadily down over the same period from 4 to 2. (http://www.healthstats.nsw.gov.au/Indicator/bod_infdth/bod_infdth_lhn_trend)
- Local people do not tend to exercise regularly despite outdoor gyms and recreation spaces being developed. This is partly a time question; but also, urban infill is leading to more restricted spaces for active leisure; some accessible outdoor spaces are next to six-lane freeways and rail-lines; and there may be a need for gender-sensitive zones and exclusion to encourage other inclusion.
- Streets are generally clean, although there are problems of litter.
- Fast food is an issue, and this is linked in part to low income (see the Economic domain).
- Vegetable gardening at home is not a strong local practice. Backyards are now smaller in the new suburbs, and apartment living is becoming more prevalent.

**Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that might support your considerations:**

4.3.2. Death rate due to road traffic injuries.
5.1.1. Life expectancy at birth.
5.1.3. Under-five mortality, defined as the probability of a child born in a specific year or period dying before reaching the age of five, subject to age-specific mortality rates of that period.
7. Emission and Waste

General Question: How sustainable is the way that the urban area deals with emissions and waste?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vibrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Particular Questions

How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban area?

1. The level of carbon emissions in the urban area.
2. The amount of hard waste produced by the urban area.
3. The treatment of sewerage, including the subsequent dispersal of the treated products.
4. The storm-water drainage system in the urban area.
5. The composting of household green and vegetable waste.
6. The level of hard-waste recycling in the urban area.

- Carbon emissions in Liverpool are high. There are no LGA-level statistics on this, and the assessment is based on electricity use, dependence on motor vehicles, and commodity consumption rates. The poor rating is extrapolated on the basis that on national figures Australia is ranked one of the highest emitters of carbon gases per capita in the world. (Put in a different way, while Australia only produces 1.3 per cent of the world’s carbon gases, this still places it as one of the top 15 carbon emitters in the world, and of those 15 countries it is the highest emitter on a per capita basis. http://www.abc.net.au/news/2015-08-11/climate-change-what-top-15-emitters-are-promising/6686548).
- Hard waste disposal is high.
- Storm-water drainage is dealt with well, but the increasing proportion of hard surfaces, and prior treatment of creeks as drainage lines brings this assessment down.
- According to a recent survey, residents of Western Sydney tend to use the green recycling bins for garden waste, but not compost kitchen waste on their own properties (Waste Management Market Research Project WSROC, March 2017). Kemp’s Creek Advanced Resource Recovery Centre (opened in 2009, close to Badgerys Creek) separates out compostable waste delivered green-lidded bins (however, there are high levels of contamination).
- Residents receive a 240-litre commingled recycling bin (yellow-lid), a 240-litre garden waste bin (green-lid) and a 140-litre garbage bin (red-lid). Residents living in the rural areas where garden waste can be managed on-site receive a 240-litre commingled recycling bin (yellow-lid) and a 240-litre garbage bin (red-lid), (http://www.liverpool.nsw.gov.au/environment/waste-and-recycling/your-resource-recovery-service). From this collection, paper, cardboard, plastics, glass containers, and metal containers, are taken to the VISY Recycling Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) located at Smithfield for recycling.
- Liverpool is placing a strong emphasis on mitigating and managing emissions and waste.

Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that might support your considerations:

6.2.2. Solid-waste collection and disposal, defined as the proportion of urban solid waste that is regularly collected and with adequate final discharge, out of total urban solid waste generated by cities.
Economics
Economics

1. Production and Resourcing

General Question: How sustainable are the broad patterns of production and resource-access in the urban area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vibrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Particular Questions**

**How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban area?**

1. The general prosperity of the urban area. 4
2. The local manufacturing base of the urban area for producing basic goods. 3
3. The access in the urban area to necessary primary resources. 5
4. The arts communities in the urban area. 4
5. The level of design expertise in the urban area. 4
6. The labour resources of the urban area. 5
7. The translation of the monitoring production practices into quality-improvement strategies. 6

- Liverpool experiences comparative disadvantage relative to other areas of Western Sydney.
- It is well positioned for future economic development, particularly with the construction of the Badgerys Creek airport.
- Arts representation is strong through institutions like Casula Powerhouse, but arts practices and work are not well integrated through Liverpool’s diverse communities. And Liverpool lacks the kind of spaces/centres for creative production (such as the Bankstown art centre).
- The city has a large potential labour force, but there is a need for ongoing training and opportunity for its young population.
- Proximity of major transport routes mean access to development resources is adequate.
- The history of Liverpool has been entwined with successful manufacturing businesses. However there appear far fewer opportunities for manufacturing in its near-future.

Overall, Liverpool has experienced declining production in certain areas, but shows potential for economic growth through the secondary revitalization effects produced by the airport and continued expansion of housing and construction.

**Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that might support your considerations:**

3.1.1. City Product (GDP) per capita (considering purchasing power parity), defined as the sum of the gross value added (wages plus business surplus plus taxes less imports), or the total final demand (consumption plus investment plus exports), relative to the city’s total population.
2. Exchange and Transfer

General Question: How sustainable is the current movement of money, goods and services into and through the urban area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vibrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Particular Questions

How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban area?

1. The opportunity to participate in ethical trade—for example, locally through community gardens and produce-markets, or globally through fair-trade networks.  
   - Ethical trade and low-cost goods are extremely accessible.  
2. The availability of basic goods, including through non-commercial and low-cost outlets.  
   - Strong international networks and proximity to Sydney mean there is access to financial resources.  
3. The fair redistribution of financial resources through processes such as the tax system.  
   - Debt is a problem for individuals, though not necessarily for public and private institutions.  
4. The resilience of external trade relations, including through bilateral exchange agreements between cities.  
   - City governance is quite strong, and accounting practices do indeed flow into quality improvement strategies.  
5. The provision of material aid and social support to people in need beyond the immediate the urban area.  
   - Liverpool hospital and construction work provide current employment opportunities, which translates into financial flows and distribution. The Badgerys Creek airport development is expected to increase these in the medium and long-term.  
6. The levels of debt carried by different sectors of the urban area—both public and private.  

Overall, Liverpool performs very well against exchange and transfer criteria.

Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that might support your considerations:

3.1.2. Growth rate per employed person, defined as the annual city growth rate of real GDP per employed person.
3. Accounting and Regulation

General Question: How robust are the various accounting and regulatory frameworks in the urban area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Highly Un satisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vibrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Particular Questions**

**How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban area?**

1. The transparency of public spending.  
   7
2. The robustness of financial auditing systems that apply in the urban area.  
   6
3. The appropriateness of regulation of goods and services.  
   6
4. The application of consistent land-use regulation.  
   5
5. The appropriate regulation of financial systems that affect the urban area.  
   6
6. The appropriate regulation of labour practices, including health-and-safety considerations.  
   6
7. The translation of the monitoring of regulative practices into quality-improvement strategies.  
   6

- Liverpool's public accountability is strong.
- Other dimensions of regulation and auditing appear adequate, though inappropriate land-use is a concern.
- The city was not considered better or worse than other LGA areas.

Overall, Liverpool's economic regulating environment appears satisfactory, though greater transparency and oversight particularly in relation to planning and land use would be desirable.

**Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that might support your considerations:**

3.3.1. City-based revenue collection (as percentage of the total city revenue). This concerns the capacity of local government to manage and collect its resources.
4. Consumption and Use

General Question: How sustainable are the current consumption patterns of the urban area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vibrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall - SCORE OF 4

Particular Questions

How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban area?

1. The re-use of goods, including through personal exchange and second-hand outlets. 
2. The development of responses to food security and vulnerability to seasonal shortages of food. 
3. The ongoing availability to all of goods and services deemed necessary for good living. 
4. The ongoing availability to all of basic utilities—such as water, electricity, and gas. 
5. The capacity of local people to respond to peak-oil issues, including rising costs. 
6. The accuracy of advertising circulated locally in providing information about consumption goods. 
7. The translation of the monitoring of consumption into strategies for enhancing good consumption.

Annotations explaining why you have scored general question (or particular questions) as you have:

- Food security is reasonably strong, boosted by the presence of local farmer markets. However dietary intake is less than adequate. As one indicator, according to National Diabetes Services Scheme, Liverpool has ‘High’ diabetes levels.
- Goods and services are readily available, though they not always affordable to significant groups in the community.
- Local populations may be vulnerable to sudden price rises, and certain segments already struggle with electricity and gas costs.
- Sustainable consumption—use of renewable energy, goods recycling, public transport—is rising but could be improved considerably. The city is highly car-dependent, despite the prominent presence of bus and train lines.

Overall, the sustainability of consumption and use shows considerable scope for improvement.

Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that might support your considerations:

3.3.2. Capital expenditure per capita, defined as the investment in city assets such as roads, education, health, power, housing etc., as a ratio of total population.
5. Labour and Welfare

General Question: How sustainable are the conditions of work across the urban area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vibrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Particular Questions**

**How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban area**

1. The range of livelihoods available in the area to those with appropriate skills. 4
2. The possibility for all of meaningful productive vocations. 2
3. The relative equity of access to secure employment in the area across differences of gender, age and ethnicity. 3
4. The capacity of the labour force to work productively. 3
5. The safety of workers. 5
6. The comprehensiveness of general welfare support processes across the urban area. 4
7. The translation of the monitoring labour practices into strategies for enhancing good working conditions. 5

- Many migrants possess skills, but lack the opportunities to employ them. Liverpool hospital is a large employment provider. Construction provides employment opportunities. The service industry is supported by immigration waves: Italian, Indian, Vietnamese, etc. Youth unemployment is up to 65 per cent in Liverpool.
- Diversity of conditions for local work is low, with many residents commuting to central city. As one example, Liverpool does not possess a strong IT industry, and professionals in this field are highly likely to commute for work.
- Meaningful work and welfare support is adequate for many, but pose considerable complications for new migrants, people with disabilities and other vulnerable populations. The experience of many new migrants is there are not sufficient opportunities.
- Work safety and monitoring practices appear adequate.

Overall, Liverpool’s labour opportunities are relatively limited, particularly for certain types of professional industries, and the welfare system is difficult for many of its residents to navigate.

**Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that might support your considerations:**

3.2.1. Employment to population ratio, defined as the proportion of a country’s working age population that is employed.
3.2.2. Proportion of informal employment in non-agriculture employment, by sex.
3.2.3. Manufacturing employment as a proportion of total employment.
3.2.3p Jobs in the manufacturing of local building materials. The term ‘locally available building materials’ is used to refer to materials of which the entire lifecycle (including all steps of the production chain: 1. extraction of raw materials, 2. manufacturing into building products, 3. sale and 4. use of building products, 5. recycling/end-of-life) takes place within the same region. (repeat)
6. Technology and Infrastructure

General Question: To what extent is basic infrastructure in urban area appropriate and supportive of a broad cross-section of needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vibrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Particular Questions**

How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban area?

1. The appropriateness of technologies and public infrastructure used to support the ongoing development of the urban area. 6
2. The robustness of information storage systems available to people in the urban area. 6
3. The adoption of new technologies in transport such as hybrid vehicles and intelligent transport systems. 5
4. The quality of the building stock, both commercial and housing, in the urban area? 6
5. The resourcing of the education system with appropriate technologies and infrastructure readily available to locals. 6
6. The resourcing of the health system with appropriate technologies and infrastructure readily available to locals. 6
7. The translation of the monitoring of technology-use into strategies for enhancing technological application. 5

- Both hard and soft infrastructure appear satisfactory for economic development and social support. Public transport is one area that could be improved, particularly in certain pockets of the LGA.
- Specific platforms for advanced research and manufacturing appear to be under development, especially in areas like health and education.
- Both Western Sydney University and Wollongong University are developing campuses, which will improve access to technology facilities.

Overall, Liverpool's technology and infrastructure appears satisfactory, but appears uneven, with some areas of the LGA comparatively disadvantaged in terms of access to infrastructure.

**Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that might support your considerations:**

3.3.2p The amount of investment on infrastructure as a proportion of the total urban investment. Infrastructure is defined as physical structures and essential services that connect society and facilitate its orderly operation.
7. Wealth and Distribution

General Question: Is the wealth of the urban area sustainable; and is it distributed in way that benefits all?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vibrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Particular Questions

How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban area?

1. The public use of wealth of the urban area for maximum social benefit for all.  
2. The maintenance of the inherited social wealth of the urban area—for example, the maintenance of heritage buildings or public spaces for maximum social benefit.  
3. The relative equity of wage levels for different groups—as categorized by job, but also across difference of gender, age and ethnicity, etc.  
4. The affordability of local housing for all.  
5. The relative equity of accumulated wealth of the residents of the urban area.  
6. The effectiveness of processes for redistributing wealth in the urban area.  
7. The translation of the monitoring of wealth accumulation into strategies for enhancing the social benefits for all.

Overall - SCORE OF 3

There was an initial tendency to score Liverpool down to ‘bad’ on this overall area of wealth and distribution, but further reflection, based on global comparisons, the score was lifted by one category to ‘Highly Unsatisfactory’.

- Private wealth distribution is uneven, and highly concentrated in certain parts of the LGA. Most social wealth is located in roads and economic infrastructure, and current state and municipal budgets continue that trend.
- The distribution of wage levels is uneven with respect to certain groups, such as recently arrived migrants. This is part of an Australia-wide trend. Australia’s Gini Co-efficient for income has risen from 0.302 in 1994/1995 to 0.333 in 2013/2014 (1.0 is the highest inequality with one person having all the income and 0 is perfect equality). There was a short-term decrease in inequality during the Global Financial Crisis, but this has more recently been reversed again to follow a general trend towards increasing inequality.
- Housing affordability is poor across all of Sydney, and recent ABS figures suggest mortgage repayments in Liverpool are higher relative to average income than in greater Sydney overall. This was rated ‘bad’, but could fall to ‘critical’ as the baby-boomer generation who experienced ‘good’ housing affordability in the 1950s to 1970s. Apart from the period of the 1980s, low interest rates have kept affordability ‘manageable’ for those with two professional incomes (see ABS Housing Affordability Index), but this is very uneven for Liverpool.
- The Australia-wide trend is for wealth to be more and more unevenly spread. The Gini Co-efficient for wealth in Australia in 2013/2014 was almost double that of the Co-efficient for incomes at 0.605. Those people who own their own houses and have significant superannuation are part of the increasingly wealthy. This obviously leaves non-business migrant and refugees on the poor side of the ledger. Liverpool is experiencing a heightened version of this Australian trend to increasing inequality.
- Beyond standard tax and rates mechanisms, there are few additional processes for monitoring or redistributing high accumulations of wealth into benefits for all.
Overall, Liverpool has a highly unequal distribution of wealth, and its benefits do not appear to flow down to disadvantaged members of the community.

**Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that might support your considerations:**

4.1.1 The proportion of people living in households lacking at least one of the following five conditions: having access to improved water; having access to improved sanitation facilities; having sufficient living area (not be overcrowded); having durable housing; and having security of tenure.

4.1.2 Housing affordability, defined as households with housing costs 30 per cent or more of gross income expressed as a percentage of all households in a city.

5.2.1 Poverty rate, defined as the proportion of population below the international poverty line of $1.25 per day (or necessary to meet basic needs), by sex, age, employment status and geographical location (urban/rural).

5.2.2 Growth rates of household expenditure or income per capita among the bottom 40 per cent of the population and the total population.

5.2.2p GINI coefficient. A Gini coefficient of zero expresses perfect equality, where all values are the same i.e. where everyone has the same income. A Gini coefficient of one (or 100 per cent) expresses maximal inequality among values i.e. a city in which one person has all the income.
Politics

1. Organization and Governance

General Question: How well does the current system of governance function to maximize benefits for all?46

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vibrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall - SCORE OF 4

Particular Questions

How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban area?

1. The political legitimacy of the various levels of government relevant to the urban area. 4
2. The capacity of the leaders of the various kinds of governance relevant to the urban area. 6
3. The visions projected by the relevant levels of government for positively managing the form of the urban region—
   for example, in relation to managing urban growth. 3
4. The capacity of the administrative staff in the various levels of bureaucracy. 4
5. The authority of the various levels of governance to carry out policy. 4
6. The transparency of decision-making processes. 2
7. The translation of the monitoring of administrative practices into strategies for enhancing the quality of governance. 3

- The political legitimacy of the various levels of government relevant to the urban area, the capacity of the administrative staff in the various levels of bureaucracy; and the authority of the various levels of governance to carry out policy, were deemed unsatisfactory, though here a distinction was made between local, state and federal governments. The local government has good authority to carry out policy. Additionally, the administrative staff of the local council receive positive feedback for their capacity to fulfill their roles satisfactorily. The state and federal governments have only passive legitimacy amongst many citizens of Liverpool, with comments suggesting a general disengagement.
- The capacity of the leaders of the various kinds of governance relevant to Liverpool was deemed satisfactory.
- The visions projected by the relevant levels of government for positively managing the form of the urban region in Liverpool was rated as basic. This not to discount the detailed planning documents of the municipal and state levels of government, but they tend to be procedural and lacking in vision.
- The transparency of decision-making processes is bad. Decisions, once made, are widely reported and well-documented, but the processes themselves are opaque, and decisions are made behind closed doors. For example, there is a recent paralysis of the Council with regards to allegations of corruption and/or mismanagement. This has led consequentially to forensic audits and ICAC
investigation. Politicking for procedural impasses at Council Meetings is rife.

• The translation of the monitoring of administrative practices into strategies for enhancing the quality of governance was viewed adversely, being rated highly unsatisfactory.

**Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that might support your considerations:**

1.1.1. Level of development and implementation of a national urban policy or regional development plans that (a) respond to population dynamics, (b) ensure balanced territorial development, and (c) increase local fiscal space.

### 2. Law and Justice

**General Question:** How well does the dominant legal system work?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vibrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Particular Questions**

**How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban area?**

1. The protection of human rights in the urban area.  
2. The civil order of the urban area.  
3. The responsiveness of local residents to legal requirements.  
4. The treatment of all locals as equal before the law—this includes the specified articulation of complementary systems of justice such as customary or traditional law.  
5. The fairness and circumspection of the dominant legal system.  
6. The appropriateness of legal judgements in relation to various levels of penalty and punishment.  
7. The translation of the monitoring of legal practices into strategies for enhancing the quality of legal administration.  

- Protection of human rights in the urban area (while formally acknowledged), the civil order of the urban area (while upheld for the most part), and the responsiveness of local residents to legal requirements (while positive in some areas), were viewed overall at a basic level.
- Perspectives on the translation of the monitoring of legal practices into strategies for enhancing the quality of legal administration, and the fairness and circumspection of the dominant legal system, were favourable giving it a satisfactory rating. Closely following was a basic/satisfactory view on appropriateness of legal judgements in relation to various levels of penalty and punishment.
- Vacillating between unsatisfactory and basic was the viewpoint around how well the legal system worked around the treatment of all locals as equal before the law including consideration of indigenous matters.
- An overall score of basic to satisfactory was ascribed to the area of law and justice.
In relation to the UN-Habitat indicators below car thefts in Liverpool dropped by 30.4 per cent across the 2015–2016 to 2016–2017 period from 510 to 355, dropping Liverpool to the ninth worst area in NSW (https://carsafe.com.au/dashboard#tab4). The 2016–2017 crime statistics for non-domestic assault incidents are up 11.1 per cent on a two-year trend in Liverpool, with the rate per 100,000 population of 351.9 against the overall NSW rate of 415.2 (http://crimetool.bocsar.nsw.gov.au/bocsar/).

Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that might support your considerations:

5.4.2. Theft rate, defined as the number of reported thefts affecting people, places of residence and commerce; and of vehicles and motorcycles, expressed in thefts per 100,000 inhabitants.

5.4.1. Homicide rate, defined as number of victims of intentional homicide per 100,000 population, by sex and age.

3. Communication and Critique

General Question: How sustainable is social communication access in the urban area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vibrant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall - SCORE OF 6

Particular Questions

How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban area?

1. The level of positive freedom for political expression in the urban area. 5
2. The range of newspapers, broadcasters and public communications systems circulating information relevant to people living in the urban area. 7
3. The proportion of households with open access to mediated communications— including radio, television, internet and other social communications. 8
4. The quality of public political analysis— both mainstream and alternative— easily accessible in the urban area, and with content pertaining to local issues. 5
5. The openness of the urban region to non-violent political protest being enacted and heard. 6
6. The level of respect for privacy by public and private information gatherers. 4
7. The translation of the monitoring of media practices into strategies for enhancing the quality of media communication. 5

- The level of ‘positive freedom’ for political expression in the urban area was seen as qualified and restricted. In Liverpool, the high-level access and range of media does not necessarily equate with active political expression by locals. This rating recognizes that positive freedom requires active engagement, not just the potential for political expression. It is not a ‘freedom of expression’ rating.
- Discussants rated highly the range of newspapers, broadcasters and public communications systems circulating information relevant to people living in the urban area.
• The proportion of households with open access to mediated communications—including radio, television, internet and other social communications—is relatively high. There was an initial tendency to rate the question lower based on use-levels, but the question is actually about access, not use-levels, and the assessment was adjusted accordingly.
• Quality public political analysis—both mainstream and alternative—is easily accessible in Liverpool urban area through the web, but local analysis is weak.
• There is an openness in Liverpool to non-violent political protest being enacted. This is protected by law. But whether or not protests are 'heard' or have significant impact is a different question—hence the 'basic' rating.
• The level of respect for privacy by public and private information gatherers was deemed unsatisfactory. Certainly, formal safeguards are in place, but these regulations do not currently work well in a complex digital setting.
• The translation of the monitoring of media practices into strategies for enhancing the quality of media communications was rated at a basic level.

In relation to the UN-Habitat indicators, the household figure for Liverpool's internet access according to the 2016 ABS figures is 82.4

**Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that might support your considerations:**

4.2.2. Proportion of individuals using the internet.

### 4. Representation and Negotiation

**General Question:** How well are citizens of the urban area represented politically?

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall - SCORE OF 5**

### Particular Questions

**How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban area?**

1. The active membership of residents in non-governmental organizations and advocacy groups—trades unions, professional associations, clubs, religious affiliations, etc. 5
2. The active participation of local people in the political processes of the urban area. 4
3. The power of local people to affect political decision-making processes relevant to the urban area. 4
4. The availability of municipal representatives for consultation with residents. 6
5. The active possibility of civil negotiation between groups with different interests—such unions and business. 5
6. The active and legitimate contestation of political power and office. 6
7. The translation of the monitoring citizen's engagement into strategies for enhancing the quality of public participation. 4
• Membership of residents in non-governmental organizations and advocacy in Liverpool is basic. Membership is low.
• Seen as operating at an even lower level – that is, unsatisfactory level – was the engagement of people at the grassroots level. Local people tend not to have sufficient time for active participation in the political processes of the urban area. There is also a lack of awareness of opportunities and methods of being politically active, particularly for newly arrived migrant communities.
• Local people do not tend to affect political decision-making processes relevant to the urban area in more than a marginal way through elections, in part because of their lack of participation, and in part because of the state-level imperative for economic development and housing infrastructure sometimes overrides local concerns.
• There is a vigorous and legitimate contestation of political power and office, even if this is partly oriented and confined to a few. The level of contestation was generally regarded positively, and rated as satisfactory.
• Municipal representatives are readily available for consultation with residents. The Council is active and makes efforts to reach its diverse constituency through translated materials, and organization of events and novel means of public communication such as the recently installed screen in Macquarie Mall for art, movies, etc.
• There is clearly the open possibility of civil negotiation between groups with different interests, such unions and business, but whether or not this is actively taken up or supported institutionally in Liverpool is a different question.
• The translation of the monitoring citizen’s engagement into strategies for enhancing the quality of public participation is unsatisfactory. There is a self-reinforcing circle of non-participation.

**Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that might support your considerations:**
1.2.2. Level of participation of local government, NGO and civil society in urban planning and decision-making.

**5. Security and Concord**

General Question: How secure and peaceful is the urban area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vibrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall - SCORE OF 6

**Particular Questions**

**How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban area?**
1. The level of personal security in relation to human security issues—such as food security, natural disaster, economic crisis or military threat. 6
2. The physical safety of work places. 6
3. The level of personal security in relation to domestic violence or day-to-day street-conflict.
4. The provision of shelter for residents of the urban area without homes or those leaving behind difficult circumstances such as domestic violence.

5. The provision of active support for immigrants from outside the urban area escaping conflict, persecution or poverty.

6. The provision of affordable insurance processes supported by formal guarantees.

7. The translation of the monitoring of security threats into strategies for enhancing the quality of personal security for all.

- Personal security in relation to human security issues, such as food security, natural disaster, economic crisis or military threat, is satisfactory overall. However, food security sometimes an issue for those with uneven incomes, and physical violence remains a low-level issue.

- The physical safety of work places was deemed satisfactory. Health-and-safety legislation is effective and well monitored though there are occasional local examples of anomalies. Migrants and refugees might be a key constituency. An article entitled ‘Fears over Rise in Migrant Workers Killed, Injured in Industrial Accidents’, Sydney Morning Herald, a confidential report from Safe Work Australia suggested that 91 per cent of employers with staff from non-English-speaking backgrounds had failed to provide safety information translated into other languages.

- The provision of active support for immigrants from outside the urban area escaping conflict, persecution or poverty (#5.5) was deemed basic to satisfactory. So too was it regarded that the translation of the monitoring of security threats into strategies for enhancing the quality of personal security for all (#5.7) was at basic to satisfactory levels.

- However, as regards the provision of shelter for residents of the urban area without homes or those leaving behind difficult circumstances such as domestic violence (#5.4) discussants viewed this at an unsatisfactory level.

- An overall score of basic to satisfactory was ascribed to security and concord.

**Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that might support your considerations:**

6.1.1. Adoption and implementation of local disaster risk-reduction strategies (in line with the Sendai framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030).

6.1.2. Population affected by hazardous events, defined as the number of deaths, missing persons and persons affected by disaster per 100,000 people in a city.

5.4.3. Proportion of women (15 years and older) subjected to physical or sexual harassment in public spaces, in the last 12 months, by perpetrator and place of occurrence. (repeat)
6. Dialogue and Reconciliation

General Question: Is meaningful dialogue possible between groups with significant political difference in the urban area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vibrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Particular Questions**

**How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban area?**

1. The recognition of differences of identity—including, in particular, recognition of the original inhabitants of the urban region.
2. The existence of active processes for negotiating different understandings of past events and histories of conflict.
3. The existence of active processes—formal and informal—for handling tensions between communities distinguished by ethnic, racial, religious, class, gender or sexual difference.
4. The level of social trust in other people.
5. The possibilities for enacting rituals and processes of remembrance and renewal.
6. The existence of processes—formal and informal—for welcoming new arrivals.
7. The translation of the monitoring of political tensions into strategies for enhancing the reconciliation processes.

- There is satisfactory recognition of differences of identity – including, recognition of Aboriginal peoples.
- There are active processes for negotiating different understandings of past events and histories of conflict.
- There are active processes for handling tensions between communities distinguished by ethnic, racial, religious, class, gender or sexual difference. A prolific set of community-based organisations, associations, and NGOs allowed for active articulation of different positions and allowing meaningful dialogue between very diverse groups.
- The level of social trust in other people is satisfactory.
- The possibilities for enacting rituals and processes of remembrance and renewal are satisfactory.
- There are processes - formal and informal -for welcoming new arrivals.
- The translation of the monitoring of political tensions into strategies for enhancing the reconciliation processes is satisfactory.

**Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that might support your considerations:**

N/A
7. Ethics and Accountability

General Question: How ethical is social life in the urban area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vibrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Particular Questions**

How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban area?

1. The grounding of municipal policies in clearly enunciated ethical principles. 5  
2. The public accountability of powerful public figures—e.g., corporate, media, and union leaders. 5  
3. The general integrity brought to day-to-day transactions in public and private life. 5  
4. The active role of public integrity and anti-corruption offices and organizations. 5  
5. The possibility of meaningful public debate over ethical principles and their interpretation. 5  
6. The institution of processes for responding consequentially to breaches in accountability. 5  
7. The translation of the monitoring of corruption issues into strategies for enhancing integrity processes. 5

- This was scored basic across the board, but revisiting this item might be necessary to develop a more evidence-based response to this set of questions.

**Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that might support your considerations:**

1.1.2. Level of adoption of urban planning principles in the city-management process.
## Culture

### 1. Identity and Engagement

General Question: To what extend does the urban area have a positive cultural identity that brings people together over and above the various differences?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vibrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Particular Questions

**How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban area?**

1. The active cultural diversity of different local communities and groups. 8
2. The sense of belonging and identification with the local area as a whole in a way that connects across community and group differences. 6
3. The tolerance and respect for different language groups and ethnic groups in the urban area. 6
4. The tolerance and respect for different religions and communities of faith in the urban area. 6
5. The possibility of strangers to the urban area establishing and maintaining personal networks or affinity groups with current residents. 5
6. The sense of home and place. 6
7. The translation of the monitoring of community relations into strategies for enhancing identity and engagement. 5

- There are many cultural opportunities, both large and small, available in the LGA which was deemed as a positive attribute of the area.
- Attendance at cultural events is ad hoc; some things very well attended and others not. There needs to be research done by the Council and other agencies to understand why.
- There is general tolerance in the community for different religions and cultures.
- There is a reasonable sense of home and place amongst residents. It is stronger for residents who have lived in the Liverpool LGA for a long period of time.

**Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that might support your considerations:**

N/A
2. Creativity and Recreation

General Question: How sustainable are creative pursuits in the urban area—including sporting activities and creative leisure activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vibrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Particular Questions**

**How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban area?**

1. The level of participation in and appreciation of the arts—from painting to story-telling. 5
2. The level of involvement in performance activities such as music, dance and theatre as participants and spectators. 6
3. The level of cultural creativity and innovation. 6
4. The level of support for cultural events—for example, public festivals and public celebrations. 6
5. The level of involvement in sport and physical activity as participants and spectators. 8
6. The affordance of time and energy for creative leisure. 5
7. The translation of the monitoring of creative pursuits into strategies for enhancing creative engagement. 6

- There are many creative and recreation opportunities in the Liverpool LGA.
- Participation for arts events is basic, but depends substantially on an interest in the specific art form and the levels of publicity. Involvement is qualified by language barriers, costs, access, and lack of recreational time.
- More marketing for both art and recreation events is required to increase attendance and general awareness in the community. Strategies to engage parents is essential.
- Parental involvement is important to cultural engagement, and impacts on attendance at cultural events. Lack of recreation time for parents can prohibit their involvement and/or their children’s participation in culture and recreation activities – particularly on a regular basis.
- Participation is generally ‘good’ for sporting activities, and there is keenness for more. In particular, the lack of a professional sport team based in Liverpool is seen as negative and long overdue.
- There are no on-going professional development programs for artists and very limited professional opportunities in the LGA.

**Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that might support your considerations:**

N/A
3. Memory and Projection

General Question: How well does the urban area deal with its past history in relation to projecting visions of possible alternative futures?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vibrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Particular Questions**

How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban area?

1. The level of respect for past traditions and understanding of their differences. 3
2. The protection of heritage sites and sacred places. 5
3. The maintenance of monuments, museums and historical records. 5
4. The active recognition of indigenous customs and histories. 5
5. The sense of hope for a positive future for the urban area as a whole. 6
6. The level of public discussion that actively explores possible futures. 4
7. The translation of the monitoring of themes of past and future into strategies for enhancing positive engagement. 4

- The level of knowledge and understanding of the history of Liverpool was deemed to be appalling. The Liverpool library makes material available, and there are documents on the LGA website (http://www.liverpool.nsw.gov.au/council/the-liverpool-area/history-of-liverpool/a-detailed-history-of-liverpool), but active knowledge of Liverpool’s history is very weak.
- As there are many ethnic groups living in the LGA, it is difficult to acknowledge all. The various festivals and events (largely organized by Council) work well to introduce people to another cultures and communities and for that community to connect with one another.
- The convict history is completely ignored and thus there is limited knowledge of heritage buildings and the significance of Liverpool in Australian history.
- Recent efforts by the council and other agencies to educate the community on the Indigenous history of the area is commended.
- It was agreed Liverpool was in a state of transition, with much development going on. However, with transition came a level of disconnect for some members of the community who for financial or other social reasons do not feel part of it or are unable to be part of it.

**Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that might support your considerations:**

1.2.1. Total expenditure (public and private) per capita spent on the preservation, protection and conservation of all cultural and natural heritage, by type of heritage (cultural, natural, mixed and World Heritage Centre designation); the level of government (national, regional and local/municipal) expenditure; the type of expenditure (operating expenditure/investment); and the type of private funding (donations in kind, private non-profit sector and sponsorship).
4. Belief and Meaning

General Question: Do residents of the urban area have a strong sense of purpose and meaning?

![Belief and Meaning Chart]

**Particular Questions**

*How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban area?*

1. The level of knowledgeable engagement in cultural pursuits in the urban area.  
2. The possibilities for counter-ideologies being discussed and debated publicly.  
3. The level of thoughtful consideration that lies behind decisions made on behalf of the people of the urban area.  
4. The sense of meaning that local people have in their lives?  
5. The extent to which people of different faiths or spiritualities feel comfortable practicing their various rituals, even when their beliefs are not part of the dominant culture.  
6. The possibility that passions can be publicly expressed in the urban area without descending into negative conflict.  
7. The translation of the monitoring of ideas and debates into strategies for enhancing positive engagement.

- It was agreed that in general people had more ‘purpose’ than ‘meaning’ in the LGA. Here ‘purpose’ was defined as active projected activities for making a life. However, this purpose tended to be narrowed to basic priorities of employment and access to services such as housing, transport, education. Social meaning tended to be privatized to questions of family and personal beliefs.
- Issues such as language barriers, socio-economic disparity, unemployment, access to technology, and lack of recreational time, all contribute to people’s inability to engage in meaningful ways with cultural and recreational opportunities on a regular basis.

**Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that might support your considerations:**

N/A
5. Gender and Generations

General Question: To what extent is there gender and generational wellbeing across different groups?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vibrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Particular Questions**

**How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban area?**

1. The equality of men and women in public and private life.  
2. The positive expression of sexuality in ways that do not lead to intrusion or violation.  
3. The contribution of both men and women to bringing up children.  
4. The availability of child-care in the urban area—whether formal or informal, public or private.  
5. The positive engagement of youth in the life of the urban area.  
6. The availability of aged-care in the urban area—whether formal or informal, public or private.  
7. The translation of the monitoring of gender and generational relations into strategies for enhancing positive engagement.

- The wellbeing across gender and generational lines in Liverpool is varied across the many different ethnic groups residing in the LGA.
- Overall it was agreed there was a disconnect with youth. Truancy is a big issue in primary and secondary schools. Youth unemployment is an ongoing problem.
- Domestic violence has increased and the isolation of women causes issues within families and has cultural implications.
- While there are many social opportunities offered in the LGA across gender and generational lines, there are multiple barriers to people attending: financial, cultural, generational, lack of time.
- Availability of childcare and aged-care facilities in the Liverpool LGA is good, but visa status determines the amount you have to pay and if you are eligible.

In relation to the UN-Habitat indicators, domestic assault incidents have been stable in Liverpool on a two-year trend, with a rate of 479.5 assaults per 100,000 population 2016–2017, against the NSW rate of 379.7 (http://crimetool.bocsar.nsw.gov.au/bocsar/).

**Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that might support your considerations:**

5.3.2. Proportion of seats held by women in national parliaments and local governments.
5.3.2p Women in managerial positions, including public administration and private sector enterprises.
5.3.3. Proportion of women in the workforce.
5.4.3. Proportion of women (15 years and older) subjected to physical or sexual harassment in public spaces, in the last 12 months, by perpetrator and place of occurrence. (repeat)
6. Enquiry and Learning

General Question: How sustainable is formal and informal learning in the urban region?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vibrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Particular Questions**

How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban region?

1. The accessibility of active centres of discovery—ranging formal scientific research institutes to places of playful discovery for children. 7
2. The active participation of people in the urban area in deliberation and debate over ideas. 5
3. The accessibility of active centres of social enquiry—both formal and informal—ranging in focus from scientific research to interpretative and spiritual enquiry. 7
4. The active participation of people in formal and informal education, across gender, generation, ethnicity, and class differences. 5
5. The existence of local cultures of writing—from philosophical and scientific to literary and personal. 5
6. The setting aside of time in the various education processes—both formal and informal—for considered reflection. 5
7. The translation of the monitoring of education practices into quality-improvement strategies. 6

- Overall the group agreed that learning opportunities were satisfactory with two universities, a TAFE college, high schools and primary schools (public and private), and kindergartens and other informal learning opportunities operating in the LGA.
- It was agreed that the current level of educational offerings should be sustainable due to current participation and population growth of the LGA.
- Like most LGAs, access to affordable child care and aged care was a priority, as well as access to learning English in formal and informal situations.
- The recent opening of both Western Sydney University and University of Wollongong along with the long-established TAFE college provided citizens with the opportunity of access to tertiary education within the LGA, which is deemed important as the cost of travel often is prohibitive to attending universities outside the LGA boundaries.

**Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that might support your considerations:**

5.1.2. Adult literacy rate, defined as the percentage of population aged 15 years and older who can read and write a statement related to his/her everyday life.

5.3.1. Proportion of youth (aged 15–24 years) not in education, employment or training.
7. Wellbeing and Health

General Question: What is the general level of wellbeing across different groups of residents?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Vibrant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Particular Questions

How sustainable are the following aspects of the urban area?

1. The sense of control that people have in the urban area over questions of bodily integrity and wellbeing.  
2. The level of knowledge that people in the urban area have in relation to basic health issues.  
3. The availability of consulting professionals or respected community elders to support people in time of hardship, stress or grief.  
4. The capacity of the urban area to meet reasonable expectations that people in the urban area hold about health care or counselling.  
5. The participation of people in practices that promote wellbeing.  
6. The cultural richness of cuisine and good food.  
7. The translation of the monitoring of health and wellbeing practices into quality-improvement strategies.

• It was agreed the while there were many services and activities available regarding health and well-being, the general level in the LGA was considered to be ‘basic’, with a number of factors contributing to this rating:
  • Language barriers prevent people from seeking medical support or accessing services available;  
  • Lack of time due to employment hours can stop people seeking medical services;  
  • The cost of consulting medical professionals is prohibitive or discouraging for some people;  
  • Social stigma (disabilities) can prevent people from accessing services; and  
  • Cultural customs can prevent women seeking medical services.

• It was acknowledged while there are considerable problems with obesity and hygiene issues across different communities, the cultural richness of different cultures and foods made the LGA vibrant and diverse.

• There is a broad consensus across much of the Liverpool community that the current rate of development and construction has the potential to make for an unlivable city in the future.

Indicators from the UN-Habitat City Prosperity Index that might support your considerations:

N/A
Appendix 6. Participants

Participants comprised of many local residents, AND members of the following organisations:

AbilityLinks (SSI)
Archbishop, Mandaean Congregation
Australia Fijian Community Integration
City of Liverpool & District Historical Society
Councillors, Liverpool City Council
Humanitarian Settlement Services (SSI)
Igbo Community Australia
Lebanese Community Council
Liverpool Chamber of Commerce
Liverpool City Council
Liverpool Genealogy Society
Liverpool Library
Local Residents
Mission Australia
National Ethnic Disability Alliance (NEDA)
Navitas
Police & Citizens Youth Club, Liverpool
Refugee Health
SCRAP - School Communities Recycling All Paper
South West Sydney Health Promotion Service
Student (WSU)
Sydney South West Area Health Service
TAFE NSW
The Greens
Think & Do Tank
Volunteer Youth & Community Workers
Western Sydney Community Forum
Western Sydney MRC (staff)
Your Liverpool Lifestyle Magazine
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32. See www.circlesofsustainability.org


34. Remember here that ‘broader region’ here means within two-three hours’ land-transport. ‘Material resources’ includes all resources from water, food, and energy to concrete and steel.

35. Remember here that ‘urban region’ means the urban area and its immediate hinterlands.

36. Here ‘natural spaces’ means vegetated spaces–either original habitat or created natural settings such as parks.

37. Here ‘appropriate materials’ might be taken to mean such things as materials that appropriate to the climate or materials that are recycled, locally sourced, or sustainably produced.

38. Here ‘mass-transit systems’ should be taken to include both public and private transport systems such rail and bus networks.

39. Here in the ecological domain the emphasis is on physical health. Mental health is considered in the cultural domain.

40. ‘Arts communities’ might be taken to include different artists from musicians and painters to craft workers.

41. ‘Design expertise’ might be taken to include architects and planners to graphic designers and jewelry designers, etc.

42. ‘Labour’ includes both manual and intellectual labour resources from artisans and physical workers to doctors and engineers.

43. Here consideration of the question should take in both public and private auditing systems.

44. Here, as elsewhere, the question of ‘appropriateness’ should be judged in relation to general public outcomes, including the poor or vulnerable, rather than outcomes pertaining to any one sectional interest.

45. Welfare’ is broadly defined here to include, on the one hand, social security, pensions, and in-kind state support to individuals or families, and, on the other hand, support that comes from social networks, philanthropy and personal relations.

46. Here the ‘current system of governance’ includes nationally, regionally, municipally and locally.

47. Here the ‘dominant legal system’ includes the national, municipal, and local levels of law, and their intersection.
Liverpool city is home to one of the highest concentrations of Australia’s recent arrivals—many of them from refugee backgrounds. Further, it is also home to many culturally and linguistically diverse communities in their differing stages and experiences of settlement. As one of the fastest-growing regions in Australia, the city is concurrently going through rapid and significant economic, demographic, infrastructural and environmental change. There are many observed complexities and contradictions prevailing across the Liverpool urban-scape.

This study seeks to understand Liverpool city as a whole urban region, with particular attention to the intersection of two major themes: (i) Settlement of refugees and migrants generally; and, (ii) Settlement and support for refugees and migrants with disabilities. In order to understand how to respond best to settlement needs, this complexity requires that we clearly identify, chart and navigate Liverpool’s uneven and contradictory circumstances. “Ground-up” considerations are essential to good design and implementation of community development programs and interventions (especially in the settlement and disability space). The study, thus, applied the Circles of Social Life approach which was developed exactly for such complexity. It was originally developed by the UN Global Compact Cities Program and Metropolis.

The Circles approach provides tools to capture and measure subjective and ‘ground-up’ responses to sustainability across four key domains: Economics, Ecology, Politics, and Culture. Overall, we are interested in the question of urban sustainability, resilience, and adaptation because ‘cities have become the unlikely but crucial zones for the survival of humanity.’