



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

SOCIAL FINANCE AS IT RELATES TO CRIME PREVENTION IN CANADA

Report of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security

**Daryl Kramp
Chair**

FEBRUARY 2015

41st PARLIAMENT, SECOND SESSION

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Standing Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site
at the following address: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

**SOCIAL FINANCE AS IT RELATES TO CRIME
PREVENTION IN CANADA**

**Report of the Standing Committee on Public Safety
and National Security**

**Daryl Kramp
Chair**

FEBRUARY 2015

41st PARLIAMENT, SECOND SESSION

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

CHAIR

Daryl Kramp

VICE-CHAIRS

Hon. Wayne Easter

Randall Garrison

MEMBERS

Hon. Diane Ablonczy

Rosane Doré Lefebvre

Ted Falk

Roxanne James

Rick Norlock

LaVar Payne

Jean Rousseau

OTHER MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT WHO PARTICIPATED

Dan Albas

David Anderson

Scott Andrews

Tyrone Benskin

John Carmichael

Corneliu Chisu

Ted Hsu

Hélène Leblanc

Larry Maguire

Ted Opitz

Blake Richards

Bernard Trottier

CLERK OF THE COMMITTEE

Leif-Erik Aune

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Parliamentary Information and Research Service

Tanya Dupuis, Analyst

Havi Echenberg, Analyst

Christine Morris, Analyst

THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

has the honour to present its

NINTH REPORT

Pursuant to its mandate under Standing Order 108(2), the Committee has studied social finance as it relates to crime prevention in Canada and has agreed to report the following:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. INTRODUCTION	1
1. Terms of Reference and Organization.....	1
B. CRIME PREVENTION AND THE CONCEPT OF SOCIAL FINANCE	1
C. CRIME PREVENTION AND ITS SUITABILITY TO A SOCIAL FINANCE APPROACH	4
D. KEY ELEMENTS OF SOCIAL FINANCE INITIATIVES.....	11
1. Social Finance Funding Mechanisms	11
a. Social Enterprise	12
b. Social Impact Bonds.....	12
c. Reduced-interest Loans.....	15
2. Implementation	17
E. RECOMMENDATIONS	19
APPENDIX A: LIST OF WITNESSES	23
APPENDIX B: LIST OF BRIEFS	25
REQUEST FOR GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	27

A. INTRODUCTION

1. Terms of Reference and Organization

On 29 April 2014, the House of Commons Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security (the Committee) undertook a study of social finance as it relates to crime prevention in Canada.

This report summarizes the information obtained by the Committee during this study. Evidence was provided by the Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness (Public Safety Canada), the Department of Employment and Social Development (ESDC), the Center for Law and Social Policy of Washington, Social Capital Partners, Purpose Capital, Deloitte, Finance for Good, MDRC,¹ the Harvard Kennedy School, MaRS Discovery District, the Edmonton Police Service, HomeFront Society for the Prevention of Domestic Violence and several other witnesses who appeared before the Committee as individuals.

B. CRIME PREVENTION AND THE CONCEPT OF SOCIAL FINANCE

The Committee's first witnesses on its study of social finance as it relates to crime prevention were from Public Safety Canada. In her opening remarks to the Committee, Kathy Thompson, Assistant Deputy Minister of the Community Safety and Countering Crime Branch, spoke of the growing costs of crime, the ability of governments to sustain those costs, as well as the impact of crime prevention initiatives on addressing criminal justice issues. She framed her intervention in the following manner:

The growing costs of crime and criminal justice issues concern all levels of government in Canada. Therefore, we have to ask the question whether these costs are viable, especially in the long term, and whether governments can continue to manage all the costs by themselves.

Crime prevention is a key component of efforts to relieve the increasing pressures on the criminal justice system.

Well-designed crime prevention and reduction interventions can have a positive influence on behaviours, and crimes can be reduced or prevented by addressing risk factors that lead to offending.

Strategic interventions can help not only [to] contain the growing costs of the criminal justice system, but also reduce the pressure on other sectors such as social services.²

1 According to its website, "MDRC was founded as the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation." In 2003, the organization adopted "MDRC" as its registered corporate identity.

2 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 13 May 2014, 1530 (Kathy Thompson, Assistant Deputy Minister, Community Safety and Countering Crime Branch, Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness).

In Canada, the National Crime Prevention Centre (NCPC) is responsible for the implementation and policy framework of crime prevention programs. Such initiatives seek to prevent and reduce offending among those most at-risk, especially for:

- children and young adults between 6 and 24 years of age, who show multiple risk factors known to be related to offending behaviour;
- high risk offenders in communities who are no longer under the supervision of correctional services; and,
- Aboriginal and northern communities, particularly those with high crime rates and persistent crime problems.³

The NCPC's mandate includes the funding and monitoring of its crime prevention initiatives and the sharing of practical knowledge gained through program evaluations.⁴ Public Safety Canada officials highlighted two reports released by NCPC on promising and model crime prevention programs, the first in 2008 – [Promising and Model Crime Prevention Programs – Volume I](#) and the second in 2011 – [Promising and Model Crime Prevention Programs – Volume II](#).

According to a written response provided to the Committee by Public Safety Canada, since 2010 the NCPC has conducted 11 evaluations of 10 different prevention models for youth (aged 12 to 17 years) in 16 different sites across Canada. According to Public Safety Canada officials, these models have yielded positive results; notably, measured change in behaviours related to crime.

For example, three programs (Multisystemic Therapy, Velocity, and Youth Inclusion Program) have had a favourable impact on youth arrests or police contacts. Overall, several prevention programs demonstrate positive change across a number of indicators, including improvements in knowledge and attitudes toward substance use, school, and violent/aggressive behaviour. The most positive impact of the programs is on youths' behaviour. Most of the interventions showed a decrease in at least one of the behaviours that led to the youth being referred to the program. Particularly positive was the impact of the program on reductions in police contacts. All of the evaluations that were able to collect data showed an improvement among the program participants.⁵

Despite some of the successes shown, Shawn Tupper, Assistant Deputy Minister of the Emergency Management and Program Branch of Public Safety Canada, told the Committee that crime prevention initiatives in Canada are “continuously challenged by the breadth, scale, complexity and interconnectedness of the issues they're designed to

3 [ibid.](#), 1535 (Kathy Thompson).

4 [Public Safety Canada](#) website.

5 This paragraph was taken directly from Public Safety Canada's written response to SECU dated 4 September 2014.

address”⁶ and that “[g]overnments do not have the level of financial resources required to fund [crime prevention] programs in a long-term, sustainable way.”⁷

Kathy Thompson explained that with respect to some successful crime prevention programs, where cost savings have been demonstrated, the funding is being continued through either provincial governments, municipal governments, community organizations, or foundations, and in some cases, universities. Ms. Thompson also highlighted the jurisdictional responsibility for the administration of justice:

[T]he administration of justice falls back to the provinces, so in a lot of cases, because these initiatives have demonstrated that there is a reduced cost to the courts, to policing, to legal aid, for example, and a lot of those costs are provincial or municipal in some cases, it’s in the interest of provinces and municipalities to continue the funding.⁸

Mr. Tupper described the importance of finding funding from alternative sources:

Leveraging new partnerships that can sustain successful [crime prevention] projects once government time-limited funding ends is key to ensuring the public safety needs of the communities we serve. For instance, a crime prevention program that has been funded by Public Safety and has proven to be successful could potentially be implemented more broadly across the country if new funding partners are secured or new networks may be created providing opportunities to expand the reach of their intervention.⁹

He also told the Committee that “sustainable solutions to social issues cannot be undertaken by single sectors or individual organizations” and “these issues need to be approached in ways that utilize the competencies, capabilities and resources of multiple collaborating partners across various sectors.”¹⁰

In its second meeting on this study, the Committee gained insight on the concept of social finance and the efforts being made towards the use of this approach to address social issues. The following definition of social finance was provided by the ESDC:

Social finance is an approach to mobilizing multiple sources of capital to deliver a social dividend and an economic return in the achievement of social and environmental goals. It provides opportunities to leverage additional investments to increase the available dollars to scale up proven approaches. It also creates opportunities for investors to finance projects that benefit society and for community organizations to access new sources of funds. Social finance includes a new approach to investing, impact investing, which has been described as actively placing capital in businesses and funds that

6 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 13 May 2014, 1540 (Shawn Tupper, Assistant Deputy Minister, Emergency Management and Program Branch, Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness).

7 [Ibid.](#)

8 [Ibid.](#), 1615 (Kathy Thompson).

9 [Ibid.](#), 1540 (Shawn Tupper).

10 [Ibid.](#)

generate social and/or environmental good, and at least a nominal principal to the investor.¹¹

Such efforts here in Canada have led ESDC, in November 2012, to initiate a call for concepts in order to test the level of awareness and interest in social finance.¹² As a result of this process, in May 2013, ESDC released a report entitled [*Harnessing the Power of Social Finance: Canadians Respond to the National Call for Concepts for Social Finance*](#).

Siobhan Harty, Director General of the Social Policy Directorate, Strategic Policy and Research Branch of ESDC, told the Committee that the “emergence of social finance initiatives in Canada is being driven by demand from stakeholders within both the private and the non-profit sectors, where a growing number of organizations are seeking access to capital markets to build more sustainable organizations and scale up their work.”¹³ She noted, however, that the “[g]overnment’s current social finance work represents a cautious incremental approach, testing social finance to see where it works best in Canada, and making adjustments based on early lessons learned.”¹⁴ In her opinion, “[s]ocial finance is potentially another tool in the toolbox. It’s complementary to existing programs that tackle social problems, and it’s not meant to completely replace them, nor would it be appropriate for all social issues.”¹⁵

Over the course of the Committee’s study, witnesses provided wide-ranging information about social finance and its possible application to current and future crime prevention initiatives in an effort to relieve increasing pressures on the criminal justice system. Information provided on the different social finance mechanisms, including social enterprise, social impact bonds and reduced-interest or no-interest loans is summarized in parts C and D of this report concerning the social finance approach and its key elements.

C. CRIME PREVENTION AND ITS SUITABILITY TO A SOCIAL FINANCE APPROACH

Crime prevention by its own very nature is a community effort. It is not simply the responsibility of the police or the courts to address crime, nor is it the responsibility solely of the social sector to respond to the negative effects of crime.¹⁶

Dr. Margaret Shaw, former Director of Analysis and Exchange for the International Centre for the Prevention of Crime, told the Committee that the prevention of crime “has

11 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 15 May 2014, 1530 (Siobhan Harty, Director General, Social Policy Directorate, Strategic Policy and Research Branch, Department of Employment and Social Development).

12 [ibid.](#), 1540.

13 [ibid.](#), 1530.

14 [ibid.](#), 1540.

15 [ibid.](#)

16 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 27 May 2014, 1635, (Norm Tasevski, Co-Founder and Partner, Purpose Capital).

undergone an extraordinary evolution”¹⁷ over the last 30 years and that crime prevention programs now cover multiple approaches that can be grouped into four broad categories:

- Social and educational approaches (which include early intervention projects that work with families, children and schools). Such approaches can be targeted to parents and families at high risk or children at high risk (such as young persons in gangs).
- Community or locally based crime prevention approaches geared towards communities and regions. These approaches engage local communities, the residents, the businesses, and the local services to work together to resolve local problems. Quite often such approaches can include communities that are experiencing significant economic and social problems.
- Situational and environmental approaches, which focus on factors that encourage offending such as no street lighting, or poorly designed parks and buildings. Situational crime prevention is intent on reducing the rewards and the provocations for offenders, and making it much riskier for offenders to commit crimes.
- Reintegration programs, which work with individuals or groups, with children, young people and adults, to help them reintegrate into society and into their communities upon their release from institutions or from care.¹⁸

Given the wide-ranging nature of the causes of crime and the skills and responsibilities required to address them,¹⁹ the Committee was told that co-operation and partnerships are important elements of effective crime prevention initiatives. Crime prevention is now an international movement, supported by two sets of United Nations guidelines, which set out the components for effective prevention and the principles on which they should be based,²⁰ including that everyone in a community – the private sector, the business sector, civil society, NGOs, residents, government departments, agencies and services – has a part to play.²¹

Norm Tasevski, Co-Founder and Partner of Purpose Capital, an impact investment advisory firm in Toronto, explained that social finance encourages such participation: “the idea of social finance is trying to bring us back to a state where the full community is

17 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 12 June 2014, 1535 (Margaret Shaw, Former Director of Analysis and Exchange, International Centre for the Prevention of Crime, appearing as an individual).

18 [Ibid.](#)

19 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 3 June 2014, 1635 (Gregory Jenion, Professor, Faculty, Criminology Department, Kwantlen Polytechnic University, appearing as an individual).

20 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 12 June 2014, 1535 (Margaret Shaw).

21 [Ibid.](#), 1545.

engaged in solving social problems,”²² and offers “a blended response to crime and its effects, and more powerfully, a blended preventative action that minimizes its occurrence in the first place.”²³

This approach presents the possibility of creating a new dynamic in communities in which the communities themselves address the root causes and after-effects of crime and prevention in a blended manner.²⁴ It also offers the opportunity for funding from sources other than government. Gianni Ciufu, a partner in one of the Deloitte member firms providing financial advisory services, explained that in his opinion:

[T]raditionally taxpayers and citizens looked to the government to solve a lot of society's problems that now are often being solved by the private sector. This may involve an economic return but also benefits them. They are looking for opportunities to earn economic benefits, but also to improve their brand, to be an instigator of social change and improvement, and contribute to the community.²⁵

He further explained the interest of private sector investors in impact investing in the following manner:

[The private investor] might – and probably would – get the most value out of the social benefit that occurs: the contribution to community and the improvement of its brand. Organizations normally contribute back to the community from which they draw a profit, and they provide charitable gifts and donations ... investors who would normally get just a financial return would value and draw benefit from being associated with doing good in their community and the brand and image enhancement, and they would look for those opportunities.²⁶

Shawn Tupper of Public Safety Canada noted “[a] lot of corporations already spend a fair amount of money that is not about return on investment for the corporation, but rather, is about contributing to their communities.”²⁷

According to James Tansey, Executive Director of the ISIS Research Centre at the Sauder School of Business of the University of British Columbia, which focuses on the sustainability of social innovation, the criminal justice system may be particularly well-suited to social finance interventions. He explained that “[t]he failure rate of the conventional system is very high,” therefore, “if the goal is rehabilitation, then the room for

22 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 27 May 2014, 1650 (Norm Tasevski).

23 [Ibid.](#), 1635.

24 [Ibid.](#)

25 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 29 May 2014, 1540 (Gianni Ciufu, Partner, Finance Advisory, Deloitte).

26 [Ibid.](#), 1620.

27 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 13 May 2014, 1640 (Shawn Tupper).

success in this particular area is also very high. If the reoffending rate is 75%, even a 25% reduction in reoffending is a dramatic success compared to the status quo.”²⁸

The Committee heard that lowering recidivism rates would be a feasible objective, allowing for the structuring of sample populations and measurable results.²⁹ In general, social initiatives may have several objectives; positive results for objectives that are easily measured may mask poor results with respect to other objectives, which may be equally or more important, but do not lend themselves to measurement.³⁰

[T]his tool works best when you can measure the outcome that you care about and the thing you can measure is a holistic indicator for what you’re trying to achieve. In an area like criminal justice, where we know that reducing crime and reducing incarceration is our primary goal, I think this is a very good tool.³¹

In his evidence before the Committee, Shawn Tupper of Public Safety Canada commented on the role of government in social finance, noting that: “[t]he government needs to support the development and implementation of social innovation and social finance tools. We need to be innovative and proactive for social finance to flourish in Canada.”³² He added that the government’s role in social finance is “to encourage and facilitate synergies and work across all levels – federal, provincial, municipal, not-for-profit organizations, and the private sector – to develop best practices.”³³

Other witnesses also commented on the roles of government with respect to applying social finance to crime prevention. Norm Tasevski of Purpose Capital told the Committee that, “the government’s role is to incentivize and to create the mechanisms by which social finance could operate, not necessarily to be the one that actually takes the main risk of putting the capital in place.”³⁴ Kevin McNichol, Executive Director of the HomeFront Society a non-profit organization in Calgary which focuses on reducing domestic violence, explained that oversight would still be needed in order to ensure that the entire social safety net is still adequately being supported.³⁵

Witnesses noted that such an approach would not be a substitute for government involvement in crime prevention. Andy Broderick, Vice-President of Community Investment for the Vancity Credit Union in British Columbia, commented that it was “too early to worry

28 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 10 June 2014, 1535 (James Tansey, Executive Director, ISIS Research Centre, Sauder School of Business, University of British Columbia, appearing as an individual).

29 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 5 June 2014, 1625 (Jeffrey Liebman, Director, Social Impact Bond Technical Assistance Lab, Harvard Kennedy School).

30 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 29 May 2014, 1550 (Gianni Ciufu).

31 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 5 June 2014, 1625 (Jeffrey Liebman).

32 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 13 May 2014, 1540 (Shawn Tupper).

33 [Ibid.](#), 1535.

34 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 27 May 2014, 1700 (Norm Tasevski).

35 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 12 June 2014, 1700 (Kevin McNichol, Executive Director, HomeFront Society for the Prevention of Domestic Violence).

about private capital replacing government investment. We're 10 years from ever having to worry about that."³⁶ Similarly, Denise Hearn, Program Development Officer for Finance for Good, a Canadian social impact bond intermediary, told the Committee that: "in no way do we think that social finance or SIBs [social impact bonds] will inherently replace the existing structure. They are simply meant to be an additional source of capital influx into the system, and they're a way to test new, innovative projects and ideas."³⁷ Further, Elizabeth Lower-Basch, Policy Coordinator and Senior Policy Analyst, of the Center for Law and Social Policy in Washington, noted that "[t]hese models, by and large, do not say that governments are now not going to be partners in this and will not pay. I think it's really a question about whether governments are paying upfront for the program, or if they're paying down the road for the outcomes that are achieved."³⁸

Shawn Tupper of Public Safety Canada advised that some areas, such as the integration of lower risk offenders into the community, could easily benefit from strong community partnerships based on significant community investment. In such areas, the role of government could be fulfilled through monitoring and oversight. He cautioned, however, that there are other areas, such as those involving high-risk offenders and offender mental health, where the government must remain more involved.³⁹

[I]t isn't about the government walking away from its obligation to pursue good policy with respect to offender reintegration into the community. It's about expanding the range of partners whom we work with in the community.⁴⁰

Some witnesses questioned the general suitability of social finance initiatives in the context of crime prevention. They raised issues including concerns about "creaming" (i.e. service providers focusing their efforts on individuals who are more likely to succeed, given that pay-outs are tied to performance), whether such initiatives could be effective in all communities,⁴¹ and whether these programs could be transferable to remote locations.⁴²

Will every community be able to benefit from these? I don't think so. But that's where I was saying that we need to look at this as a menu of opportunity. In bringing in additional items on the menu, hopefully the result will be an enhanced ability to provide a broader

36 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 10 June 2014, 1615 (Andy Broderick Vice-President, Community Investment, Vancity Credit Union, appearing as an individual).

37 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 29 May 2014, 1645 (Denise Hearn, Program Development Officer, Finance for Good).

38 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 15 May 2014, 1700 (Elizabeth Lower-Basch, Policy Coordinator and Senior Policy Analyst, Center for Law and Social Policy of Washington).

39 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 3 June 2014, 1545 (Shawn Tupper); SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 15 May 2014, 1700 (Andrew McWhinnie, Director, Andrew McWhinnie Consulting, appearing as an individual).

40 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 3 June 2014, 1540 (Shawn Tupper).

41 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 12 June 2014, 1725 (Kevin McNichol).

42 [Ibid.](#) (Jacqueline Biollo, Strategic Coordinator, Office of Strategy Management, Edmonton Police Service).

social safety net. The broader the net, the more people we're going to cover, and the greater the benefit across the country, in my opinion.⁴³

Witnesses appearing before the Committee emphasized that it is too early to make any definitive predictions or to reach any general conclusions about social finance models globally.⁴⁴ Internationally, social finance initiatives have not yet come to fruition and the environment for social finance in Canada is just beginning to develop.⁴⁵

Witnesses also suggested that individual social finance initiatives may be more costly to government than traditional funding mechanisms due to increased upfront implementation costs, as well as costs associated with evaluation and providing a return to investors.⁴⁶ In addition, the Committee was advised that any potential cost savings to be achieved through the use of social financing in the case of crime prevention or other complex social issues would not be immediate, as trying to bring about change in individuals may require multiple interventions, often across government departments or jurisdictions.⁴⁷

Siobhan Harty of ESDC further noted that “[t]he savings would potentially accrue over time. We don’t know yet. This has to be proven; it’s new. This is preventive. It’s very much an investment model.”⁴⁸

Other witnesses noted that measures of success may not be limited to cost reduction:

I think it’s a mistake to think about social impact bonds or pay for success as limited to only projects that result in cost savings. So far, primarily that’s been the focus to date, but there are a lot of other goals that in many cases are more important to help the population we care about and that may not lead to cost savings.⁴⁹

[I]t’s important to recognize that in not all cases does investing in prevention save the government money. That said, criminal justice is probably one of the areas where the case is strongest that preventive services can save money in a short timeframe. Putting people in jail is very expensive, so there’s a lot of potential for savings, even in the short term.⁵⁰

43 [Ibid.](#) (Kevin McNichol).

44 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 5 June 2014, 1640 (Adam Jagelewski, Associate Director, MaRS Discovery District).

45 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 10 June 2014, 1610 (Andy Broderick); SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 12 June 2014, 1550 (Margaret Shaw).

46 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 15 May 2014, 1635 (Elizabeth Lower-Basch).

47 [Ibid.](#), 1540 (Siobhan Harty).

48 [Ibid.](#)

49 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 5 June 2014, 1540 (David Butler, Senior Adviser, MDRC).

50 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 15 May 2014, 1635 (Elizabeth Lower-Basch).

Witnesses provided examples where social finance could potentially be applied. Shawn Tupper of Public Safety Canada explained that a possible application could be directed towards integration initiatives for immigrant youth:

[W]e can identify partners and we know that we have individuals who are interested in making investments. For instance, one of the communities that we work with is an immigrant settlement organization. We were interested in funding them because they were working with immigrant youth. It was about capturing immigrant youth before they joined gangs or got into trouble, and ensuring that they had ways of integrating into Canada and becoming successful Canadians. We know a large part of that is about giving them opportunity in Canada. That's a simple example of where you could probably get corporate interest in terms of an employment perspective with a not-for-profit organization working in a community around immigrant settlement, where the government could provide seed funding or actually go to the other extreme and look at a social impact bond and fund only if it's successful.⁵¹

Sarah Doyle, Senior Policy Advisor, of the MaRS Discovery District, a social innovation Hub located in downtown Toronto, told the Committee that good, innovative ideas that have been demonstrated to be successful may need additional funding to replicate in other communities.⁵² She added that examples could be “found in areas ranging from a job training initiative that helps connect ex-offenders into the labour force, a mental health facility that helps address some of the root causes of crime [and] early childhood education that's designed around the principle of teaching.”⁵³

Andy Broderick of the Vancity Credit Union told the Committee that youth at risk would be unlikely candidates for social finance, “until the efficacy of social finance as a way to help solve some of these problems is proven, and then the comfort level will go up among those who are responsible for that very difficult portfolio.”⁵⁴ On the other hand, he went on to state: “There has been success in sectors other than prisons that point to the fact that this kind of financing can allow innovation to take place in ways that straight government funding is more difficult. ... [B]ased on my experience in British Columbia, there is a justification for the federal government investigating a number of pilot projects, a number of test investments, to bring change to the prison approach.”⁵⁵

Andrew McWhinnie, Director, Andrew McWhinnie Consulting, told the Committee that he would recommend a program like Circles of Support and Accountability for a social finance initiative. It is a community-based initiative operating on restorative justice principles that assists individuals who have served a prison sentence for a sexual offence(s) in their effort to re-enter society, and that the program is ready for that kind of investment.⁵⁶

51 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 13 May 2014, 1655 (Shawn Tupper).

52 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 5 June 2014, 1640 (Sarah Doyle, Senior Policy Adviser, MaRS Discovery District).

53 [Ibid.](#)

54 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 10 June 2014, 1550 (Andy Broderick).

55 [Ibid.](#), 1630.

56 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 15 May 2014, 1700 (Andrew McWhinnie).

However, Shawn Tupper of Public Safety Canada told the Committee that in Canada, a social impact bond in the context of the criminal justice system may not achieve the early results seen in the United Kingdom:

I've been working in this area for the last eight years. Indeed I think social impact bonds are kind of the far end of the spectrum in terms of the kinds of tools that are available when one talks about social financing.

We spent two years looking at that model, particularly in the context of public safety and have concluded that we probably could not achieve a social impact bond in the context of the criminal justice system. The primary difference between our system and the British system, where they have several of these bonds going, is simply that we have actually achieved an awful lot in the context of our criminal justice system in terms of reducing recidivism rates and being able to work with offenders in ways that other criminal justice systems have not. So they have much more spread that they can actually achieve outcomes using this kind of tool. We have a much smaller gap in terms of what we might be able to achieve through those kinds of investments. So our conclusion is that they may be a bit risky.⁵⁷

Nevertheless, he went on to state that currently the government is looking at pay-for-performance social finance models as an approach to adjusting current grants and contributions programs.⁵⁸

The Committee was advised that there is a high level of interest and an emerging preparedness for the participation of the private sector in the social finance market. Gianni Ciufu of Deloitte informed the Committee that "Deloitte and the MaRS Centre for Impact Investing looked at and consulted with 80 potential investors in the social finance market and found, across banks, credit unions, foundations, and benevolent individuals that they are prepared to participate in this market and are looking for opportunities."⁵⁹

D. KEY ELEMENTS OF SOCIAL FINANCE INITIATIVES

1. Social Finance Funding Mechanisms

Social finance is described as "an approach to managing money that delivers both a social benefit and an economic return for investors."⁶⁰ It was explained that there are a range of funding mechanisms under the umbrella of social finance which could be successful in Canada.⁶¹ Examples of those investment tools would include social enterprise models, social impact bonds, and loans.

57 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 13 May 2014, 1610 (Shawn Tupper).

58 [Ibid.](#), 1600.

59 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 29 May 2014, 1545 (Gianni Ciufu).

60 ESDC, [Harnessing the Power of Social Finance: Canadians Respond to the National Call for Concepts for Social Finance, \(2013\) "Glossary", at p. 9.](#)

61 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 13 May 2014, 1610 (Shawn Tupper).

a. Social Enterprise

A social enterprise is a company whose goal is to provide goods and services while also addressing a social agenda.⁶²

Speaking about social enterprise, Siobhan Harty of ESDC noted that “[t]his emerging business model helps increase the financial strength of community organizations by providing an alternate source of revenue to tackle complex social problems.”⁶³ Some witnesses described to the Committee particular approaches to supporting social enterprise models that have already been implemented. Such examples brought to the Committee’s attention include a new corporate forum for social enterprises created in British Columbia,⁶⁴ as well as a social enterprise strategy and fund to provide grants and investments recently launched in Ontario.⁶⁵

Social enterprise can be a vehicle for delivery of social results and a revenue stream that could either make the enterprise sustainable or be of interest to up-front investors. According to Shawn Tupper, “social enterprises that are provided seed money by government and private sector investors would eventually become sustainable as the business thrives and revenue is reinvested in the enterprise.”⁶⁶

b. Social Impact Bonds

A social impact bond (SIB) is an instrument for funding projects where a prearranged amount of money is paid out if performance results are achieved. SIBs combine a pay-for-performance element with an investment-based approach: private investors provide up-front capital to fund interventions, and can expect to get back their principal investments and a financial return if the results are achieved.⁶⁷

Essentially, in a social impact bond contract, the government partners with what is known as an intermediary. The intermediary raises and manages capital from investors such as banks, financial institutions, foundations, and private individuals, and invests those funds in the service providers that then deliver the social programs. This reduces the need for government to provide upfront funding for the program. If the program is successful and results in the expected savings, the government partner uses part of the savings to repay the investors at a predetermined level of interest.⁶⁸

62 ESDC, [Harnessing the Power of Social Finance: Canadians Respond to the National Call for Concepts for Social Finance, \(2013\) “Glossary”, at p. 9.](#)

63 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 15 May 2014, 1530 (Siobhan Harty).

64 [Ibid.](#), 1535.

65 [Ibid.](#)

66 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 13 May 2014, 1540 (Shawn Tupper).

67 ESDC, [Harnessing the Power of Social Finance: Canadians Respond to the National Call for Concepts for Social Finance, \(2013\) “Glossary”, at p. 9.](#)

68 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 27 May 2014, 1635 (Norm Tasevski).

Lars Boggild, Program Development Officer of Finance for Good, a Canadian SIB intermediary, described to the Committee that an SIB “is really two things.”⁶⁹ The first is an “outcomes payment contract, which says that for a certain performance, government would pay as has been indicated” and the “second is actually the financing itself: providing the working capital up front such that organizations and non-profits can actually deliver these interventions in pursuit of these valuable social outcomes.”⁷⁰ Mr. Boggild added that “in many cases, social impact bonds are something that is publicly led, in processes such as requests for proposals that actually delineate exactly these parameters: which population, where, which communities, and why that’s a policy priority.”⁷¹

Several witnesses provided information concerning the key components of SIBs, including, the contracts negotiated and signed by all of the participants, the role of investors and intermediaries and the rigour of evaluations.

Jeffrey Liebman, Director of the Social Impact Bond Technical Assistance Lab of the Harvard Kennedy School, described the contract arrangements among the parties to an SIB:

[U]nder the most common social impact bond model, the government contracts for social services from a local service provider, or sometimes a team of providers, and the government pays entirely or almost entirely based on the results that are achieved, such as a 10% increase in employment, a 30% reduction in recidivism, or a 50% reduction in emergency room visits. The performance is rigorously evaluated ... by comparing the results of the people being served to the results of some sort of comparison group, so that impacts can be assessed.⁷²

The intermediary in such arrangements, as illustrated by Lars Boggild, uses the SIB “as a tool to allow communities across Canada to invest in prevention of various sorts. ... [A]s an intermediary ... we work with ... non-profits and commissioning governments, as well as investors, to structure, help, raise the capital for, and monitor the performance and implementation around social impact bonds.”⁷³ He added that while the monitoring is usually done by an intermediary such as Finance for Good, independent assessors determine whether outcome thresholds that would trigger payment are met.

Moreover, according to Jeffrey Liebman, Director of the Social Impact Bond Technical Assistance Lab “[t]hese contracts seem to be enabling governments to do a more effective job of working on complex problems with private sector service providers, and to do so with a four-to-six-year time horizon, which is often how long it takes to actually make a dent in a social problem.”⁷⁴ Under the social impact bond model, the role of the investor is to bridge the gap between when the services are delivered and when the

69 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 29 May 2014, 1635 (Lars Boggild, Program Development Officer, Finance for Good).

70 [Ibid.](#)

71 [Ibid.](#), 1705.

72 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 5 June 2014, 1540 (Jeffrey Liebman).

73 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 29 May 2014, 1635 (Lars Boggild).

74 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 5 June 2014, 1550 (Jeffrey Liebman).

results can be measured by providing the “operating funds to the social service providers so that they can deliver services up front and then wait to get repaid down the road after results have been demonstrated.”⁷⁵

Examples of the use of SIBs in Canada include the province of Saskatchewan which launched Canada’s first social impact bond focused on supportive housing for at-risk single mothers and the province of Ontario which recently launched a call for social-impact-bond ideas in the areas of housing, youth at risk, and barriers to employment.⁷⁶

Other witnesses described some of the potential benefits that accrue from the SIB. For instance, Jeffrey Liebman of the Social Impact Bond Technical Assistance Lab noted that SIBs can enable governments to enter into multi-year partnerships and shift resources from remediation to preventative measures:

The SIB model brings important market discipline to government decisions about which of all the interventions out there should get scaled up and provided with more resources, because only interventions that have a strong enough track record to be able to attract the interest of private investors can get funded by this model. ...

[I]t’s helping governments shift resources from remediation towards prevention, so rather than waiting for bad outcomes down the road and incurring the budgetary costs for those, this model is allowing governments even in tight budget times to make additional investments, and preventive investments, which, in addition to providing better outcomes, will hopefully down the road yield some budget savings because we won’t be paying for remediation.

The last thing this model seems to be doing – and I think this is actually the most important thing – is enabling governments to enter into much more effective multi-year collaborations with service providers to tackle tough social problems.⁷⁷

Adam Jagelewski, Associate Director of the MaRS Discovery District explained that the SIB could be useful in prevention where “there is a potential to save money or improve service delivery. Non-profit organizations are interested in exploring social impact bonds with us because they offer a revenue model to pay for operational growth or to sustain service delivery, and impact investors are attracted to the dynamism of connecting outcomes and a financial return.”⁷⁸

Although the SIB is often more expensive and a more complex way to fund a service than through a direct grant, Mr. Jagelewski noted that, in his opinion, the SIB could be used where government resources are not available to test, scale, or replicate innovative programs.⁷⁹

75 [Ibid.](#), 1540.

76 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 15 May 2014, 1535 (Siobhan Harty).

77 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 5 June 2014, 1545 (Jeffrey Liebman).

78 [Ibid.](#), 1635 (Adam Jagelewski).

79 [Ibid.](#), 1640.

Andy Broderick of the Vancity Credit Union cautioned the Committee that SIBs success is still unproven and represents one of several social finance options available.

Social bonds offer some promise, but based on my experience in B.C. and the United States, I remain skeptical of the current enthusiasm for the deployment of social impact bonds as a financial instrument to address intransigent social problems in Canada. My first concern is the general lack of clarity about what is meant by social impact bond. Most of what people are considering is not really in the form of a bond. I'm much more comfortable with pay for performance, or pay for success, but even those terms tend to have a jingoistic quality of a slogan ... From an investment point of view, we're talking about contracted payment schemes. Again, these can make for very successful investment structures, but I think we should call them what they are.⁸⁰

David Butler Senior Adviser at MDRC, an American social impact bond partner, advised the Committee that in the United States, there is as of yet no consensus on the effectiveness of SIBs and that the prevailing view is "[l]et's see whether any of these things really can produce what they claim they can produce, and make our judgments there."⁸¹

Jeffrey Liebman of the Social Impact Bond Technical Assistance Lab explained that although "[the social impact bond], around the U.S., is allowing some innovative governors and mayors to tackle some problems that they don't think they can tackle with conventional mechanisms", it remains "an experimental tool that we are learning how to use, learning whether or not it truly will give us better results than the other tools within government tool kits."⁸² Elizabeth Lower-Basch of the Center for Law and Social Policy advised the Committee that because SIBs are still in the experimental stage, further analysis is required before governments adopt the model more broadly:

The first is to be realistic about what can be accomplished by SIBs, or social impact bonds. Don't oversell them. Recognize it's a new approach, that it's still in the experimental stages. None of them in the world have reached the payment stage yet, so there's still a lot to learn. For that reason, I'd say they should not displace existing spending, and that you should recognize that they're not a panacea to cure the problem of underinvestment in social programs. I'd also specifically urge you to start with the analysis of the desired outcomes, and how much you are willing to pay to achieve them, whether because of savings that will be achieved or because of the value to society. This framework is core to a successful SIB. You can't move forward without it. But it's also a really important conversation to have that adds value to your budgeting and to your decision-making process, whether or not you decide to move ahead with social impact bonds.⁸³

c. Reduced-interest Loans

Witnesses appearing before the Committee identified reduced-interest loans as another type of social finance funding mechanism. Siobhan Harty of ESDC explained that

80 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 10 June 2014, 1530 (Andy Broderick).

81 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 5 June 2014, 1530 (David Butler).

82 [Ibid.](#), 1550 (Jeffrey Liebman).

83 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 15 May 2014, 1635 (Elizabeth Lower-Basch).

such loans are currently being used as a mechanism to attract private-sector funding by offering both a social and a financial return.

There is already an innovation out there related to that, a microloan program for new Canadians who are seeking to get accreditation in the country but can't necessarily afford to take all the tests that are sometimes required to do that.⁸⁴

In addition to microloans, Gianni Ciufu of Deloitte observed that government loans are sometimes effectively social finance funding mechanisms:

[F]rom time to time government has been [involved in social finance of a type when it supports, for example, particular industries via low-income or no-income loans or grants that aim to strengthen an industry, or help to preserve jobs or employment in a community.⁸⁵

Andy Broderick of the Vancity Credit Union, told the Committee about a resilient capital program, created through the Vancity Credit Union with the help of the Vancouver Foundation, that is used to provide social enterprises and blended value businesses with access to capital.⁸⁶

Bill Young, President of Social Capital Partners (SCP) in Toronto, described how SCP sought to find innovative ways to provide meaningful employment opportunities for people facing employment barriers. "[W]e played the role of social venture capitalists, whereby we provided funding, sometimes in the way of loans and sometimes in grants, but only to organizations where at least 50% of their employees come from disadvantaged populations."⁸⁷

SCP co-operated with local community service agencies to provide the employers with a pool of employees. In this way, the employer could easily meet the hiring conditions imposed by the loans, and the employees could receive any needed support by the community organizations putting their names forward. Mr. Young described the attractiveness of this approach for employers:

We effectively de-risked it for the private sector. We thought that was the way to get them to buy in. We tie our interest rates to the number of community hires, so as they hire more, their interest rates come down. We link our financial return to our social mission.⁸⁸

Mr. Young explained how this could contribute to crime prevention: "the key for all of us in many ways is that employment is as important a thing that we can do for not only our economic outcomes but for our self-esteem and confidence. I think that lends very much to a public safety or recidivism issue as well."⁸⁹

84 [Ibid.](#), 1600 (Siobhan Harty).

85 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 29 May 2014, 1600 (Gianni Ciufu).

86 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 10 June 2014, 1530 (Andy Broderick).

87 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 27 May 2014, 1530 (Bill Young, President. Social Capital Partners).

88 [Ibid.](#)

89 [Ibid.](#), 1535.

2. Implementation

[T]here is much potential for an upside with social finance; however, the magic is not in the what of social finance – in other words, the structures – but in the how, or the implementation. In Canada we are still learning about how to do the how really well, and it is a work in progress.⁹⁰

Implementation is a key element of social finance projects. Key to a successful initiative are the partners in the project – those designing the intervention, the organizations delivering services, and the evaluators who must establish performance measures and ensure that data are available to support such measures and the coordinators for the initiative – and the commitment and skills they bring to the project.⁹¹

To determine the pay-out that investors will receive, social finance mechanisms require accountability measures and the ability to track and measure performance over time.⁹²

[G]overnments and philanthropic donors alike are increasingly focused on shifting performance standards away from reporting on programs and towards outcomes. Appropriate metrics measuring social change are being prioritized yet still remain elusive.⁹³

Part of the move towards social finance and social impact bonds is also a move towards measuring outcomes that tend to be longer-term outcomes and essentially the things governments and people care about.⁹⁴

Moreover, the development of social finance mechanisms requires new skill sets, namely: the ability to negotiate new outcomes that makes sense on the basis of repayment, the ability to build financial models and the understanding of the target population.⁹⁵

The ability to find appropriate partners in the context of particular social finance initiatives was also identified as an important consideration.⁹⁶ For instance, Andrew McWhinnie, who has worked with Circles of Support and Accountability, a community-based initiative that assists individuals who have served a prison sentence for a sexual offence(s) in their effort to re-enter society, explained:

90 [Ibid.](#), 1640 (Norm Tasevski).

91 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 12 June 2014, 1540 (Margaret Shaw); SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 29 May 2014, 1650 (Lars Boggild); SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 29 May 2014, 1550 and 1655 (Gianni Ciufu); SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 15 May 2014, 1610 (Siobhan Harty).

92 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 5 June 2014, 1650 (Adam Jagelewski).

93 [Ibid.](#), 1635.

94 [Ibid.](#), 1700 (Sarah Doyle).

95 [Ibid.](#), 1650 (Adam Jagelewski).

96 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 15 May 2014, 1620 (Siobhan Harty).

It has occurred to us that if we were to have a corporate investor, along with government, in Circles of Support and Accountability, they might hesitate. ... We go after the tough guys, the guys who are high-risk people. Let's just ask ourselves the question: who is going to invest in support services for sexual offenders? I mean honestly, really.

And if they did, are they going to have a say, stating that we want you to pick this guy but not that guy? He is really high profile and if our company or our organization is associated with support services to him, that's not going to look good on us. So I think there is a concern. Or it could be: we do not want you to recruit these volunteers but only this type of volunteer, or we don't want you to recruit from the faith community – where we spend a lot of time recruiting volunteers

Yes, in short, I do have concerns about what those partnerships would be. We'd have to select partners who can get along together very well and understand and share a vision together... .⁹⁷

However, other witnesses clarified the relationship of parties involved, ensuring that intermediaries are the ones working to find suitable investors based on the work of the service provider, and that investors would not be micro managing projects.

When speaking on the role of intermediaries, Lars Boggild of Finance for Good stated that:

The first is working directly with organizations, usually non-profits, towards a position to feasibly engage in these sorts of instruments and really to get to a state where they can engage in these sorts of contracts and receive investment. It's something that's somewhat temporary, but we work with organizations developmentally against these various challenges, such as measurement, impact attribution, financial modelling, etc. This upfront effort is really necessary if policy priorities or areas of interest, including crime prevention, are to intersect, really, with a social sector that is equally able to step up and begin to deliver on these sorts of outcomes.

The second function that is really involved as an intermediary is that we work with both those non-profits and commissioning governments, as well as investors, to structure, help raise the capital for, and monitor the performance and implementation around social impact bonds. It's something that's more ongoing, and it really lasts over the life cycle of a social impact bond.⁹⁸

Denise Hearn, also from Finance for Good, went on to further clarify that:

I think one of the concerns people have is that the investors will have some sort of capability or jurisdiction over the actual implementation of programs such that they could influence with their personal preferences the delivery of these services.

That's not the case at all. We actually see one of our primary functions as an intermediary organization is to be the neutral party that is facilitating the agreements between those three stakeholder groups – the organization, the investors themselves, and the

97 [Ibid.](#), 1705 (Andrew McWhinnie).

98 [SECU, Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 29 May 2014, 1635 (Lars Boggild).

government. So because of the way the actual governance structure is set up, I think it would be difficult for private interests to influence the actual delivery of the services.⁹⁹

According to Shawn Tupper of Public Safety Canada, social finance is about expanding the range of community partners.¹⁰⁰ As such, in his opinion, partnering in the social finance context goes beyond the securing of financial partners. It can also involve community partners who leverage resources that aren't necessarily financial.

For instance, with high-risk offenders, we are working with the John Howard Society to look at potential employment programs for those offenders who otherwise find it difficult to find employment. The society is able to make arrangements in the city, for instance, working with the city in the context of social housing where these offenders could be doing maintenance and care, or where the society is running a small enterprise and the individual offenders are earning income. They're supervised by John Howard and there's a benefit to the city, because through a contractual arrangement they are able to get services into social housing, and so there's a positive cycle there.¹⁰¹

Another example is in the City of Calgary, where prevention programs pair a police officer and a social worker together to respond to non-charge domestic violence calls. Their social return on investment analysis identified savings in the area of \$100,000 per year in officers' time per district. These savings were reinvested into under-supported or previously unserved police work.¹⁰²

[I]f we are going to embark on this journey, we need to change the conversation from one of cost savings to one of value added. In reality what happens is not a cost saving but a reallocation of existing resources to address previously unaddressed issues and areas, and/or to better address those already identified issues.¹⁰³

E. RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

With the acknowledgement that crime prevention allows for significant savings to the justice system, as well as the incalculable toll that crime takes on victims, the Committee recommends that crime prevention funding from the government remain steady, and that social finance models be used to enhance and expand total funds put towards crime prevention in Canada.

99 [Ibid.](#), 1655 (Denise Hearn).

100 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 3 June 2014, 1540 (Shawn Tupper).

101 [Ibid.](#)

102 SECU, [Evidence](#), 2nd Session, 41st Parliament, 12 June 2014, 1630 (Kevin McNichol).

103 [Ibid.](#)

Recommendation 2

The Committee recommends that the Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness seriously consider integrating models of social finance into its crime prevention programming, done through the National Crime Prevention Centre (NCPC).

Recommendation 3

The Committee recommends that the Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness seek to introduce a pilot project of crime prevention programming developed through a social financing model described to the Committee during the course of its study.

Recommendation 4

The Committee recommends that the Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness work towards enhancing the body of knowledge on social financing options in Canada, and create a roadmap to how those models may be best applied to various crime prevention program interventions in Canada.

Recommendation 5

The Committee recommends that the Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness work to build relationships with the various partners of social finance models, namely, investors, intermediaries and service providers, to develop best practices in building models of social financing to leverage additional investments into crime prevention.

Recommendation 6

The Committee recommends that the Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness begin to work closely with the Department of Employment and Social Development to look at options of partnering to merge crime prevention program interventions with employment and skills training partnerships under social finance models.

Recommendation 7

The Committee recommends that the Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness create an advisory panel of stakeholders to seek input into the development of social finance models of funding to enhance crime prevention programming in Canada.

Recommendation 8

The Committee recommends that the Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness work with intermediaries to identify organizations, currently financed by NCPC, which have successful models that may be transitioned to social financing mechanisms and have their five-year contract of funding through NCPC ending in the next two years, or have had their funding end, to consider if their intervention programming could be transitioned to a social finance model to become sustainable moving forward.

Recommendation 9

With the acknowledgment that many benefits of early intervention and crime prevention have significant savings for the provinces and territories through the justice system, policing and health care, that the Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness seek partnerships with the provinces and territories in the development of social finance models of crime prevention.

Recommendation 10

The Committee recommends that the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness amend the Terms and Conditions of the NCPC program to allow for partnering with businesses, corporations and intermediary organizations through social financing models.

APPENDIX A LIST OF WITNESSES

Organizations and Individuals	Date	Meeting
<p>Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness</p> <p>Kathy Thompson, Assistant Deputy Minister, Community Safety and Countering Crime Branch</p> <p>Shawn Tupper, Assistant Deputy Minister, Emergency Management and Program Branch</p>	2014/05/13	23
<p>As an individual</p> <p>Andrew McWhinnie, Director, Andrew McWhinnie Consulting</p> <p>Center for Law and Social Policy of Washington</p> <p>Elizabeth Lower-Basch, Policy Coordinator and Senior Policy Analyst</p> <p>Department of Employment and Social Development</p> <p>Siobhan Harty, Director General, Social Policy Directorate, Strategic Policy and Research Branch</p> <p>Blair McMurren, Director, Social Innovation, Strategic Policy and Research Branch</p>	2014/05/15	24
<p>Purpose Capital</p> <p>Norm Tasevski, Co-Founder and Partner</p> <p>Social Capital Partners</p> <p>Bill Young, President</p> <p>Deloitte</p> <p>Gianni Ciufu, Partner, Finance Advisory</p> <p>Finance for Good</p> <p>Lars Boggild, Program Development Officer</p> <p>Denise Hearn, Program Development Officer</p>	2014/05/27	25
<p>As an individual</p> <p>Gregory Jenion, Professor, Faculty, Criminology Department, Kwantlen Polytechnic University</p> <p>Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness</p> <p>Bobby Matheson, Director General, National Crime Prevention Centre</p> <p>Shawn Tupper, Assistant Deputy Minister, Emergency Management and Program Branch</p>	2014/06/03	27

Organizations and Individuals	Date	Meeting
<p>Harvard Kennedy School Jeffrey Liebman, Director, Social Impact Bond Technical Assistance Lab</p> <p>MaRS Discovery District Sarah Doyle, Senior Policy Advisor Adam Jagelowski, Associate Director</p> <p>MDRC David Butler, Senior Advisor</p>	2014/06/05	28
<p>As individuals Andy Broderick, Vice-President, Community Investment, Vancity Credit Union Gordon Hogg, Member of the Legislative Assembly of British Columbia, Surrey-White Rock James Tansey, Executive Director, ISIS Research Centre, Sauder School of Business, University of British Columbia</p>	2014/06/10	29
<p>As an individual Margaret Shaw, Former Director of Analysis and Exchange, International Centre for the Prevention of Crime</p> <p>Edmonton Police Service Jacqueline Biollo, Strategic Coordinator, Office of Strategy Management</p> <p>HomeFront Society for the Prevention of Domestic Violence Kevin McNichol, Executive Director</p>	2014/06/12	30

APPENDIX B LIST OF BRIEFS

Organizations and Individuals

McWhinnie, Andrew

Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness

REQUEST FOR GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the Committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this Report.

A copy of the relevant *Minutes of Proceedings* ([Meetings Nos. 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 44 and 48](#)) is tabled.

Respectfully submitted,

Daryl Kramp

Chair

