Phase 5 Report

Building for Recovery CMHC Solutions Lab

May 26, 2026

Overlap Associates
Lisa Grogan, CEO
lisa@overlapassociates.com

I Sky Consulting
Iona Sky, CEO
isky@iskyconsulting.com

Table of Contents

Introduction **4**

From Prototype to Implementation **5**

- What Phase 4 Confirmed 5
- Key Implementation Questions 6

Activities and Learnings Overview **7**

From Conceptual Validation into Implementation Reality **8**

Validation and Refinement in Phase 5 ..... **11**

Implementation Roadmap: Structure and Approach **12**

- Phase 1: Immediate Implementation Readiness (0–12 Months) 12
- Phase 2: Pilot Development and Launch (12–24 Months) 14
- Phase 3: Stabilization and Refinement (24–36 Months) 16
- Phase 4: Replication and Scale (36+ Months) 17

Key Enablers of Implementation **19**

Scaling Strategy **21**

- What Scaling Could Look Like 21
- Core Elements That Should Remain Consistent 21
- Elements Intended to Remain Adaptable 22

Positioning for the Next Phase **24**

Introduction

Phase 5 marks the final stage of the Recovery Village development process, shifting the work from prototype exploration and concept validation toward implementation planning, scalability, and systems readiness.

Earlier phases of the Lab established a strong foundation grounded in lived and living experience, systems analysis, community engagement, and iterative prototype development. Through this work, several core realities consistently emerged: recovery is not linear, housing alone is insufficient to sustain long-term stability, and meaningful recovery requires environments that integrate housing, relationships, community, autonomy, practical supports, and opportunities for connection and contribution.

Through ongoing engagement and refinement, the Recovery Village concept emerged as a community-rooted model designed to respond to these intersecting realities through a more human-centred, relational, and flexible approach. The proposed model moves beyond traditional emergency, treatment, or transitional responses by envisioning recovery-oriented communities that prioritize dignity, stability, inclusion, belonging, and long-term connection.

This work has been explicitly shaped by the perspectives of individuals with lived and living experience, whose insights consistently challenged traditional assumptions around readiness, permanence, compliance, and recovery design.

In Phase 5, the focus shifted toward the practical realities of implementation and long-term sustainability across housing, recovery, and community systems. This phase concentrated on:

- translating prototype concepts into actionable implementation pathways,
- identifying governance, partnership, operational, and policy considerations,
- exploring financial and sustainability implications,
- assessing feasibility within current systems contexts,
- clarifying the conditions required for pilot implementation,
- identifying pathways for replication and adaptation across communities.

The Recovery Village model continues to be grounded in a strengths-based, human-centred, and systems-informed philosophy. It is also informed by the principles of Equity, Diversity, Inclusion, Accessibility, and Belonging (EDIAB), recognizing that recovery experiences are shaped by identity, intersectionality, trauma, systemic inequities, access to support, and community inclusion.

Phase 5 ultimately clarified both the strength of the model and the realities of implementation. While the work demonstrated strong alignment around the vision and direction of the Recovery Village concept, it also surfaced the level of partnership, operational readiness, funding strategy, and long-term coordination that will be required to move the model into practice sustainably.

From Prototype to Implementation

Earlier phases of the project focused on understanding the realities of recovery, surfacing lived and living experience insights, identifying system gaps, testing assumptions, and iteratively developing prototype concepts.

Phase 5 marked a significant shift from conceptual exploration toward implementation planning. The focus moved from developing and validating the model to understanding what would be required to move it into practice.

The central question shifted from **"What should this model be?"** to **"What would it take to move this model from vision to implementation?"**

This phase focused on translating a validated conceptual model into a more actionable implementation pathway while remaining grounded in the project's core principles: dignity and autonomy, non-linear and flexible recovery pathways, lived experience leadership, and human-centred design rooted in EDIAB principles.

Phase 5 focused on refining the Porchlight Recovery Community model into a more implementation-ready concept while advancing the partnerships, feasibility discussions, operational considerations, and funding conversations required to support future development.

This work resulted in a more clearly articulated implementation pathway, stronger understanding of development and funding realities, early partnership alignment, and the initial framing of an implementation roadmap intended to support future adaptation and replication.

What Phase 4 Confirmed

Several foundational elements validated in Phase 4 remained consistent through Phase 5.

Recovery in Community: Participants consistently reinforced the importance of a recovery-oriented community model that balances autonomy, support, stability, and belonging. Recovery in community, rather than isolation, remained a central principle throughout the work.

Flexible Housing Pathways: Prototype testing validated the importance of multiple housing configurations, including both private and shared living arrangements. This reflected the reality that recovery journeys, comfort levels, and support needs vary significantly.

Non-Linear Recovery Pathways: Participants consistently reinforced that healing is not linear, and that rigid timelines or compliance-based approaches can undermine recovery. The model therefore requires flexibility across both duration and intensity of support.

Connection to Broader Community: Participants emphasized that integration must remain foundational. The model should not create isolated service environments disconnected from neighbourhood life, employment, relationships, culture, or broader community participation. Intentional pathways into community connection therefore remain essential.

Human-Centred Recovery Design: The prototypes reinforced a broader understanding of recovery as relational, dignity-centred, identity-informed, and shaped by environment, connection, autonomy, and belonging.

Key Implementation Questions

As the work moved closer to implementation, several practical questions emerged as central to Phase 5:

- What would implementation realistically require across development, operations, and partnerships?
- How could the model be financially and operationally sustained over time?
- What aspects of the model were essential, and where was flexibility possible?
- What conditions would need to exist for adaptation and replication in other communities?

These questions shaped the partnership discussions, feasibility exploration, funding conversations, and implementation planning undertaken throughout this phase.

Activities and Learnings Overview

Phase 5 was organized around three interconnected areas of work: **refining the Recovery Community model**, **exploring site and development feasibility**, and **building the partnerships required to support implementation**.

The model refinement work focused on moving the project from broad prototype concepts toward a more cohesive and implementation-oriented framework. This included clarifying recovery pathways, strengthening operational and governance considerations, exploring the relationship between housing and programming, and further developing approaches to community integration, wraparound support, and phased growth over time. As the work progressed, it became increasingly clear that implementation would require not only a strong program model, but also clear operational structures capable of supporting long-term sustainability.

Alongside this work, Phase 5 explored the practical realities connected to the Wanner site and the broader development opportunity. Conversations and exploratory work focused on questions of site readiness, development feasibility, infrastructure, zoning, construction considerations, and the potential for phased implementation over time. This work helped ground the vision in a more realistic understanding of what development could require in practice, while also identifying areas where additional expertise and due diligence will be necessary moving forward.

A significant shift in Phase 5 was the move from broad exploratory engagement toward more focused implementation-oriented partnership development. Rather than continuing conceptual discussions alone, the work increasingly centred on identifying organizations, leaders, and systems partners capable of influencing implementation feasibility, operational design, cultural grounding, and long-term sustainability.

Through these conversations, partnerships emerged not simply as supporting relationships, but as core implementation infrastructure. Discussions focused on several interconnected areas, including development and implementation partnerships, local service integration, Indigenous perspectives and reconciliation, recovery housing and operational learning, and funding and capital readiness.

Together, these activities helped move the project beyond conceptual validation and toward a more grounded understanding of what implementation could require across systems, partnerships, operations, development, and funding.

From Conceptual Validation into Implementation Reality

Phase 5 focused on testing the practical realities of implementation across development, operations, partnerships, funding, and systems integration. As the work moved closer to implementation, conversations shifted from validating the concept itself toward understanding what conditions, structures, relationships, and resources would be required to support long-term sustainability and delivery.

Several consistent themes emerged through this work.

Development Feasibility

Conversations explored questions related to architectural feasibility, site readiness, construction considerations, zoning, infrastructure, development phasing, and broader property conditions. Together, this work helped move the project from conceptual vision toward a more grounded understanding of development realities and implementation constraints.

Support Ecosystem and Service Integration

Partnership conversations also reinforced that long-term recovery stability cannot be achieved through housing alone.

Local and national service providers emphasized the importance of building a coordinated support ecosystem around residents, including wraparound care, referral pathways, recovery programming, healthcare connectivity, and broader community partnerships. These conversations reinforced that recovery-oriented housing is most effective when paired with relational, service, and community supports that remain accessible over time.

Indigenous and Reconciliation Partnerships

Conversations with Indigenous and reconciliation partners further reinforced the importance of culturally grounding the model in trust-based relationship building, Indigenous-informed healing perspectives, and meaningful approaches to reconciliation. Repeated feedback emphasized that reconciliation cannot be approached symbolically or as an add-on to the model. Rather, it must be reflected through sustained partnership, governance inclusion, cultural grounding, and ongoing accountability.

Recovery Housing Operator Insights

Engagement with recovery housing operators across Canada provided important operational insight drawn from direct implementation experience. These conversations highlighted the realities of staffing, sustainability, governance, community integration, and long-term operational pressure.

Feedback consistently reinforced the importance of balancing structure with flexibility, ensuring staffing approaches align with program philosophy, and creating pathways that

support connection to culture, identity, and community. Several operators also emphasized the importance of exploring social enterprise and revenue-generating approaches as part of long-term sustainability planning.

Funding and Capital Readiness

This emerged as one of the most significant implementation considerations throughout Phase 5. Conversations with individuals and organizations working across philanthropy, finance, impact investment, community development, and fundraising strategy helped clarify both the credibility of the project and the complexity of moving from concept to implementation.

There was consistent recognition that Porchlight enters this work with several important strengths, including an established program foundation, strong community relationships, and a significant land opportunity. Multiple stakeholders noted that this combination creates a strong starting position relative to many comparable projects.

At the same time, a multi-million-dollar capital development requires broader donor development capacity, campaign readiness, and long-term funding strategy.

While Porchlight has established significant credibility through its programming and community relationships, the current fundraising base and organizational infrastructure are not yet aligned with the scale of a multi-million-dollar capital development. This does not limit the long-term potential of the project, but it does reinforce the need for deliberate preparation, sequencing, and expanded fundraising capacity.

Stakeholders emphasized that capital campaigns are increasingly difficult within the current funding environment due to increased competition for philanthropic dollars, shifting donor behaviour, and pressure across traditional funding sectors. Feedback consistently cautioned against moving prematurely into campaign activity before stronger financial modelling, strategy development, donor readiness, and leadership infrastructure are in place.

There was also strong consensus that this level of fundraising requires experienced leadership and cannot be approached informally. While Porchlight has established significant credibility through its programming and community relationships, a multi-million-dollar capital development requires broader donor development capacity, campaign readiness, and long-term funding strategy.

Conversations also reinforced that implementation will likely require a blended capital structure involving philanthropy, financing, government programs, community investment, and mission-aligned lending. Several stakeholders identified social enterprise and revenue-generating components as potential mechanisms to strengthen long-term sustainability and reduce reliance on traditional fundraising alone.

Systems Alignment

Beyond funding, Phase 5 also reinforced the complexity of systems alignment required to support implementation. The proposed model intersects with housing, public health, recovery services, planning, accessibility, social care, and municipal development systems that do not naturally operate in coordination with one another. While this creates opportunities for

innovation, it also introduces implementation complexity that will require intentional planning, partnership alignment, and governance clarity.

Operational Design

Operational design also emerged as one of the most important determinants of long-term success. Conversations throughout this phase reinforced that the model cannot simply replicate conventional housing operations with recovery programming layered on top. Instead, the operating approach must reflect the core principles that shaped the Recovery Community concept, including non-linear recovery pathways, dignity-centred practice, autonomy, shared accountability, lived experience-informed design, and community integration.

This introduces important operational questions related to onboarding, individualized recovery pathways, accountability processes, conflict resolution, transition planning, and how community culture is intentionally developed and sustained over time.

Wraparound Integration

A defining feature of the model continues to be the integration of housing with coordinated wraparound support. Phase 5 conversations consistently reinforced that housing stability alone is insufficient to support long-term recovery outcomes without accessible and integrated supports surrounding residents. These supports may include peer support, healthcare access, counselling pathways, mental health partnerships, social service navigation, employment and skills development, cultural supports, and broader community connection pathways.

Validation and Refinement in Phase 5

Phase 5 reinforced that the core principles of the Recovery Community model remained strong as the work moved closer to implementation. Across partnership, operational, funding, and systems conversations, there continued to be strong alignment around the importance of a human-centred, community-based recovery approach grounded in flexibility, dignity, belonging, and long-term stability.

At the same time, Phase 5 clarified the level of coordination, operational readiness, financial planning, partnership development, and governance capacity required to move the model from concept into practice. The work reinforced that the strength of the model alone is not sufficient for successful implementation. Long-term success will depend on the systems, relationships, operational structures, and sustained supports surrounding it.

Phase 5 also reaffirmed the importance of grounding implementation decisions in lived and living experience perspectives. Throughout the process, lived experience continued to function not simply as consultation input, but as an essential source of implementation insight, accountability, and design guidance.

Implementation Roadmap: Structure and Approach

Purpose of the Roadmap

The implementation roadmap is intended to translate prototype learning into a practical and phased pathway toward implementation. Rather than functioning as a rigid blueprint, the roadmap is designed as a strategic framework to support decision-making, readiness, sequencing, and long-term sustainability as the Porchlight Recovery Community model moves from concept toward implementation.

The roadmap is intended to:

- identify immediate implementation priorities,
- clarify foundational requirements,
- sequence key decision points,
- identify governance and partnership needs,
- surface implementation risks early,
- support phased feasibility planning, and
- create pathways for future adaptation, replication, and scale.

Phase 5 reinforced that implementation is not a single event, but an ongoing process requiring readiness, alignment, learning, and adaptation over time. The roadmap therefore reflects implementation as a phased journey rather than a one-time launch.

A Roadmap Rooted in Relationship, Readiness, and Replication

An important insight emerging through Phase 5 was that implementation cannot be understood as a purely technical exercise. The roadmap also reflects the relationships, trust-building, lived experience leadership, faith-based stewardship, and systems collaboration required to support long-term success.

Phase 5 consistently reinforced that replication depends not only on transferring a model, but on building the relational and community conditions capable of supporting it. The roadmap, alongside the accompanying Thought Companion, is therefore intended to support both implementation planning and broader systems learning for communities interested in adapting similar approaches within their own contexts.

Phase 1: Immediate Implementation Readiness (0–12 Months)

Focus

This phase focuses on strengthening implementation readiness and moving from concept toward actionable feasibility. Priority areas include governance clarity, site validation, financial feasibility, partnership development, and operational planning. The objective is to ensure that implementation decisions are grounded in operational realism rather than momentum alone.

Priority Areas

Final Model Refinement

Further refinement of the model should focus on clarifying:

- housing configurations and resident pathways,
- duration flexibility and recovery philosophy,
- wraparound support design,
- accountability approaches,
- community integration,
- accessibility and inclusion requirements.

Site and Development Feasibility

Development-related work during this phase includes:

- site readiness assessment,
- property and infrastructure review,
- zoning and legal analysis,
- construction feasibility exploration,
- phased development scenarios,
- preliminary municipal application discussions.

Financial Feasibility

Implementation readiness will also require the development of stronger financial assumptions and sustainability planning, including:

- capital cost modelling,
- operating projections,
- partnership funding assumptions,
- contingency and risk planning,
- relationship development with potential operational funders.

Partnership Formalization

This phase also focuses on strengthening and formalizing relationships with:

- development partners,
- wraparound service providers,
- health system partners,
- Indigenous and reconciliation partners,
- municipal stakeholders,
- funding and capital partners,
- recovery housing operators.

Policy and Systems Alignment

Implementation planning will require further clarity related to:

- zoning and planning pathways,
- accessibility requirements,
- regulatory implications,
- service integration barriers across systems.

EDIAB Readiness
Implementation planning should continue to explicitly address:

- accessibility and inclusion,
- anti-oppression governance,
- trauma-informed implementation,
- disability inclusion,
- 2SLGBTQIA+ inclusion,
- Indigenous partnership and reconciliation,
- culturally safe approaches to recovery and care.

Phase 2: Pilot Development and Launch (12–24 Months)

Focus

This phase focuses on moving from implementation readiness into active development and early operations. The priority during this stage is to translate planning into action while preserving flexibility, learning, and alignment with the core philosophy of the Recovery Community model.

This phase will require balancing development activity, operational preparation, partnership coordination, and ongoing community engagement. It is also the stage where many implementation assumptions begin to be tested in practice.

Priority Areas

Development and Construction
This phase includes advancing the physical development of the site and preparing the environment for operational launch. Key areas of work may include:

- site servicing and infrastructure completion,
- phased construction,
- accessibility integration,
- development of shared and community spaces,
- environmental and landscape design considerations,
- preparation of operational and program spaces.

Operational Launch Preparation
Operational planning will need to move from conceptual design into implementation-ready structures and processes. This includes further development of:

- staffing structures and role clarity,
- operational policies and procedures,
- peer support models,
- resident onboarding and intake pathways,
- conflict resolution and accountability approaches,
- safety and crisis planning,
- partnership protocols and communication processes.

Throughout this work, maintaining alignment between operational design and the broader recovery philosophy of the model will remain essential.

Wraparound Support Activation
A central priority during this phase will be operationalizing the wraparound support surrounding residents. This may include formalizing:

- referral and intake pathways,
- care coordination approaches,
- healthcare and mental health partnerships,
- recovery programming,
- peer support integration,
- crisis response relationships,
- cultural and community-based supports.

Phase 5 consistently reinforced that a coordinated support ecosystem is critical to long-term stability and successful implementation.

Community Integration and Relationship Building
This phase will also require continued focus on community integration and relationship development surrounding the site. Areas of focus may include:

- neighbourhood engagement,
- community education and communication,
- stigma reduction efforts,
- volunteer and community participation structures,
- partnership visibility,
- strengthening integration with the local service ecosystem.

This work will be important in supporting long-term community trust, relationship-building, and broader integration into neighbourhood life.

Learning and Evaluation
As implementation begins, establishing mechanisms for ongoing learning and adaptation will be critical. This may include:

- implementation monitoring,
- resident feedback processes,
- lived experience advisory structures,
- operational learning reviews,
- adaptation and continuous improvement processes.

Phase 5 reinforced that successful implementation will require ongoing learning, flexibility, and responsiveness as the model moves from planning into lived operational reality.

Phase 3: Stabilization and Refinement (24–36 Months)

Focus

This phase focuses on strengthening operational stability, refining the model based on implementation learning, and building the conditions required for long-term sustainability.

As the Recovery Community model becomes operational, this stage centres on understanding what is working well, where adaptation is required, and how the model can continue evolving while remaining grounded in its core principles and philosophy.

Priority Areas

Operational Refinement
Early implementation experience will likely surface areas requiring adjustment and refinement. Ongoing operational learning during this phase may include review and adaptation of:

- staffing structures and support intensity,
- partnership effectiveness and coordination,
- governance and decision-making processes,
- resident engagement approaches,
- accountability practices,
- community-building and conflict resolution processes.

This phase should prioritize continuous learning while maintaining consistency, safety, dignity, and flexibility within the model.

Long-Term Sustainability
Strengthening long-term sustainability will become an increasing focus during this stage. Areas of continued development may include:

- refinement of financial sustainability assumptions,
- funding diversification strategies,
- partnership cost-sharing opportunities,
- governance resilience and succession planning,
- operational efficiency and resource allocation.

Phase 5 reinforced that sustainability must be intentionally designed into the model over time rather than addressed reactively after implementation.

Resident Leadership and Community Stewardship
As the community stabilizes, there may be increasing opportunities to strengthen resident participation, leadership, and stewardship within the model. This could include:

- peer leadership pathways,
- lived experience advisory participation,
- governance involvement,
- mentorship opportunities,

- community stewardship and contribution roles.

This work supports the broader philosophy that lived experience is not only valuable, but essential to the long-term strength and integrity of the model.

EDIAB Review and Continuous Improvement
This phase should also include ongoing reflection and review related to Equity, Diversity, Inclusion, Accessibility, and Belonging (EDIAB) considerations across implementation and operations.

Areas for continued assessment may include:

- accessibility effectiveness,
- inclusion and belonging outcomes,
- representation and participation gaps,
- unintended barriers or exclusionary practices,
- policy and governance equity impacts,
- cultural safety and reconciliation commitments.

Phase 5 reinforced that inclusive and equitable implementation requires ongoing accountability, reflection, and adaptation over time.

Phase 4: Replication and Scale (36+ Months)

Focus

This phase focuses on translating implementation learning into broader opportunities for adaptation, replication, and sector learning.

Phase 5 consistently reinforced that scaling should not be understood as replicating the Porchlight model identically in every setting. Rather, the goal is to identify the core elements that are transferable while allowing communities to adapt the model to their own local realities, partnerships, cultures, and systems contexts.

This phase therefore centres on documenting implementation learning, clarifying what is essential to the model, and supporting future communities interested in adapting similar approaches.

Priority Areas

Model Documentation and Learning Capture
As implementation matures, documenting learning and operational experience will become increasingly important. Areas of focus may include:

- implementation lessons and adaptation processes,
- governance and operational structures,
- funding and sustainability approaches,
- development and partnership insights,
- EDIAB and cultural safety learnings,
- operational challenges and responses,
- resident and lived experience perspectives.

This documentation can help strengthen both internal learning and broader sector knowledge.

Replication Framework Development
This phase also includes clarifying what aspects of the model are foundational and what elements may remain adaptable depending on community context.

Areas requiring further articulation may include:

- core model principles and non-negotiables,
- adaptable implementation elements,
- community readiness conditions,
- partnership and governance expectations,
- land and development considerations,
- operational prerequisites for implementation.

Phase 5 reinforced that successful replication depends less on copying a fixed blueprint and more on understanding the conditions required to support implementation in different contexts.

Knowledge Mobilization and Sector Learning
The implementation process may also create opportunities to contribute to broader conversations related to recovery-oriented housing, community integration, and systems innovation.

Potential knowledge-sharing activities may include:

- presentations and sector engagement,
- webinars and community conversations,
- publications and implementation reflections,
- implementation storytelling and case studies,
- cross-sector learning exchanges.

This work may help strengthen broader sector understanding of recovery-oriented community models and implementation realities.

Future Partnership and Site Exploration
Longer-term opportunities may also emerge to explore additional partnerships, sites, or adaptation models informed by implementation learning.

This could include exploration related to:

- future faith-based land partnerships,
- regional adaptation opportunities,
- community-led implementation approaches,
- partnerships with existing recovery housing providers,
- future expansion or multi-site models.

Phase 5 reinforced that future growth, if pursued, should remain grounded in readiness, relationships, and long-term sustainability rather than rapid expansion alone.

Key Enablers of Implementation

Phase 5 reinforced that successful implementation of the Porchlight Recovery Community model depends on more than a compelling concept, available land, or strong community support. Moving from prototype to implementation will require coordinated readiness across governance, partnerships, development feasibility, financial sustainability, operational planning, policy alignment, and long-term community integration.

Several key enablers consistently emerged throughout Phase 5 as foundational to implementation success.

Strong and Sustained Partnerships: The model is inherently collaborative and sits at the intersection of housing, recovery, health, philanthropy, faith-based stewardship, reconciliation, and community development. As a result, implementation cannot be advanced by a single organization acting in isolation.

Phase 5 reinforced the importance of building strong implementation partnerships capable of supporting development, wraparound care, governance, funding, operational delivery, and long-term sustainability. These relationships will require ongoing coordination, trust-building, and shared accountability over time.

Governance and Leadership Readiness: Implementation will also require governance structures capable of supporting complexity, long-term planning, operational accountability, and cross-sector collaboration.

Conversations throughout Phase 5 reinforced the importance of clear decision-making structures, experienced leadership, lived experience inclusion, and governance approaches aligned with the values and philosophy of the model.

Financial Readiness and Sustainability: Financial readiness emerged as one of the most significant implementation requirements identified during this phase.

Implementation will require a realistic understanding of development costs, operational sustainability, fundraising capacity, financing pathways, and long-term revenue strategies. Phase 5 consistently reinforced the importance of phased financial planning, blended funding approaches, and experienced fundraising leadership.

Operational Clarity: Operational design will be critical to long-term success.

Phase 5 reinforced that the operating model must reflect the underlying philosophy of the Recovery Community concept, including dignity-centred practice, non-linear recovery pathways, lived experience leadership, flexibility, accountability, and community integration.

This will require intentional operational planning related to staffing, onboarding, conflict resolution, partnership coordination, recovery supports, and community-building processes.

Community and Systems Integration: Implementation will also depend on the model's ability to remain connected to the broader community and service ecosystem.

Phase 5 consistently reinforced that long-term recovery stability is strengthened through connection rather than isolation. As a result, implementation will require intentional

integration across healthcare, recovery supports, housing systems, municipal planning, cultural supports, employment pathways, and broader community life.

EDIAB and Reconciliation Commitments: The model's long-term credibility and effectiveness will also depend on the degree to which Equity, Diversity, Inclusion, Accessibility, and Belonging (EDIAB) principles remain embedded throughout implementation.

This includes ongoing attention to accessibility, cultural safety, anti-oppression approaches, Indigenous partnership and reconciliation, trauma-informed practice, and inclusive governance and operational design.

Phase 5 reinforced that these commitments cannot function as secondary considerations, but must remain integrated throughout implementation planning, operations, and long-term growth.

Scaling Strategy

Phase 5 reinforced that scaling should not be understood as replicating the Porchlight Recovery Community model identically in every context. Successful adaptation will require flexibility, responsiveness to local conditions, and strong community partnerships.

The goal is therefore not uniform replication, but transferable implementation learning.

The Porchlight model is best understood as a flexible framework that can be adapted to reflect local community needs, available partnerships, land opportunities, cultural contexts, and recovery ecosystems while remaining grounded in a shared set of core principles.

What Scaling Could Look Like

Potential future pathways for adaptation or replication may include:

- single-site demonstration leading to future replication,
- adaptation through faith-based land partnerships,
- regional hub models,
- community-led adaptations,
- partnerships with existing recovery housing providers,
- hybrid implementation partnerships across organizations and sectors.

Phase 5 reinforced that future growth should remain grounded in readiness, sustainability, and local relationship-building rather than rapid expansion alone.

Core Elements That Should Remain Consistent

While implementation approaches may vary across communities, several foundational elements consistently emerged as essential to the integrity of the model:

- lived experience leadership,
- recovery as non-linear and individualized,
- dignity-centred design,
- community integration and belonging,
- coordinated wraparound supports,
- EDIAB-informed implementation,
- culturally safe and reconciliation-informed approaches,
- accessibility and inclusion,
- governance accountability,
- humane and relational accountability practices.

These elements reflect the core philosophy that shaped the model throughout the Solutions Lab process.

Elements Intended to Remain Adaptable

At the same time, Phase 5 reinforced that several aspects of implementation will need to remain flexible depending on local context and community conditions.

Adaptable elements may include:

- site scale and built form,
- housing configurations,
- staffing structures,
- partnership arrangements,
- operational delivery approaches,
- integration with local recovery ecosystems,
- social enterprise and sustainability models,
- governance structures.

This flexibility is intended to support local responsiveness while maintaining alignment with the broader principles and intent of the model.

A ROADMAP ROOTED IN RELATIONSHIP, READINESS, AND REPLICATION

The roadmap is more than a technical tool—it is the story of how community relationships, faith-based stewardship, lived experience leadership, and systems collaboration create the conditions for implementation.

Replication requires relationships, which was the foundation of this model.

The roadmap and accompanying Thought Companion support both implementation planning and broader systems learning for communities looking to replicate this model.

PHASE 1
Immediate Implementation Readiness
0–12 Months

FOCUS

Strengthening implementation readiness and moving from concept toward actionable feasibility.
Ensure decisions are grounded in operational realism.

PRIORITY ACTIONS

Final Model Refinement
Clarify configurations, pathways, supports, philosophy, accountability, integration, accessibility, and inclusion.

Site & Development Feasibility
Site readiness, infrastructure, zoning, legal, construction feasibility, phased scenarios, and Preliminary Building Application.

Financial Feasibility
Capital costs, operating projections, funding assumptions, sustainability, risk scenarios, contingency planning, and relationships with funders.

Partnership Formalization
Advance relationships with development partners, service providers, health partners, Indigenous partners, operators, municipality, and funders.

Policy & Systems Alignment
Zoning, planning pathways, accessibility, service integration, and regulatory considerations.

EDIAB Readiness
Accessibility, cultural safety, anti-oppression governance, disability inclusion, 2SLGBTQIA+ inclusion, Indigenous partnership, and trauma-informed implementation.

PHASE 2
Pilot Development and Launch
12–24 Months

FOCUS

Translating readiness into active pilot development and operational launch while preserving flexibility, learning, and model fidelity.

PRIORITY ACTIONS

Development & Build Implementation
Site servicing, phased construction, accessibility, community space, environmental design, and infrastructure completion.

Operational Launch Preparation
Staffing, policies, peer support, onboarding, conflict resolution, safety planning, and partnership protocols.

Wraparound Supports
Referral pathways, care coordination, health & mental health supports, recovery programming, peer supports, and crisis response relationships.

Community Integration Work
Neighbour engagement, stigma mitigation, education, volunteer roles, partnership visibility, and local ecosystem integration.

Learning & Evaluation Framework
Monitoring, resident feedback, advisory input, learning reviews, and adaptation processes.

PHASE 3
Stabilization and Refinement
24–36 Months

FOCUS

Refining and stabilizing operations and strengthening long-term sustainability.

PRIORITY ACTIONS

Operational Refinement
Adjust staffing, support intensity, partnerships, governance, resident engagement, and accountability based on implementation learning.

Sustainability Strengthening
Refine financial sustainability, operating assumptions, funding diversification, partnership cost-sharing, and governance resilience.

Resident Leadership Development
Strengthen peer leadership, advisory roles, governance participation, community stewardship, and lived experience pathways.

EDIAB Review & Continuous Improvement
Assess inclusion outcomes, accessibility, belonging, representation gaps, unintended barriers, and policy equity impacts.

PHASE 4
Replication and Scale
36+ Months

FOCUS

Using learnings from implementation to inform broader scaling or adaptation opportunities.

PRIORITY ACTIONS

Model Documentation
Capture lessons from implementation, governance models, operational frameworks, funding pathways, development insights, and EDIAB design learnings.

Replication Framework Development
Clarify core essentials, adaptable elements, community readiness, land partnership models, and implementation prerequisites.

Knowledge Mobilization
Presentations, publications, community sessions, storytelling, and sector engagement.

Future Site Exploration
Explore additional land partnerships, community-led adaptation, regional expansion, and partnership-led implementation.

5. KEY ENABLERS OF IMPLEMENTATION

Moving from prototype to implementation requires the right conditions. These enablers are the foundation of success.

RELATIONSHIP AND TRUST
Strong relationships and trust across partners, residents, and communities.

SHARED VISION AND PURPOSE
A unified commitment to recovery, dignity, and community well-being.

RESOURCES AND SUSTAINABILITY
Adequate financial, human, and infrastructure resources.

LIVED EXPERIENCE LEADERSHIP
Meaningful leadership and decision-making by people with lived experience.

SYSTEMS COLLABORATION
Integrated partnerships across health, housing, social services, and community systems.

EDIAB & CULTURAL SAFETY
Embedded equity, inclusion, accessibility, belonging, and cultural safety.

ADAPTABILITY & LEARNING
Flexibility, continuous learning, and willingness to evolve and improve.

Rooted in relationship. Grounded in readiness. Guided by wisdom. Built for replication.

Positioning for the Next Phase

The work completed through this Solutions Lab has established a strong foundation for the Porchlight Recovery Community model. The project has been shaped through lived and living experience perspectives, strengthened through community engagement, and refined through ongoing partnership, systems, operational, and implementation conversations.

Phase 5 reinforced that there is meaningful alignment around both the need for this work and the broader direction of the model. The land opportunity is significant, community relationships are strong, and the Recovery Community concept has evolved into a more clearly articulated and implementation-oriented framework.

At the same time, Phase 5 also clarified that moving from concept to implementation introduces a different level of complexity, coordination, and readiness. Important work remains related to governance, development feasibility, operational planning, financial readiness, partnership formalization, and long-term sustainability.

Rather than weakening the project, this clarity strengthens it. One of the most important outcomes of Phase 5 was a more grounded understanding of what implementation will realistically require and where additional preparation, expertise, and alignment are still needed.

The work completed through the Lab positions Porchlight to move into the next stage of development from a more informed and credible foundation. The organization enters this next phase with a well-developed model, strong community relationships, meaningful implementation learning, and a continued commitment to creating recovery-oriented environments rooted in dignity, belonging, flexibility, and long-term stability.

Phase 5 ultimately reinforced that successful implementation will depend not only on the strength of the concept itself, but on the strength of the relationships, partnerships, systems coordination, and long-term stewardship surrounding it.