European
Commission

**Peer Review
in Social Protection
and Social Inclusion**

Sustainable ways of preventing
homelessness

SYNTHESIS REPORT

Denmark, 22 November 2013

Social Europe

Sustainable ways of preventing homelessness

Suzanne Fitzpatrick
Heriot-Watt University, UK

Synthesis Report

This publication has been prepared for the European Commission by

© Cover illustration: European Union

Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission may be held responsible for use of any information contained in this publication.

Further information on the Peer Reviews is available at:
http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1024&langId=en.

Europe Direct is a service to help you find answers
to your questions about the European Union

Freephone number (*):
00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11

(*) The information given is free, as are most calls
(though some operators, phone boxes or hotels may charge you).

More information on the European Union is available on the Internet (http://europa.eu).
Cataloguing data can be found at the end of this publication.

Table of contents

4

Executive Summary

This Per Review in Copenhagen, Denmark on 22 November 2013, discussed sustainable ways of preventing homelessness, particularly among young people. It considered the outcomes of the Danish National Homelessness Strategy, adopted by the Danish Parliament in 2008, which employs the 'Housing First' model of rapid access to permanent housing and intensive support to reduce homelessness. The Peer Review was hosted by the Danish Ministry of Social Affairs, Children and Integration. Representatives from eleven peer countries attended: Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Finland, France, Ireland, Norway, Romania, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom. They were joined by representatives from two stakeholders: EUROCITIES and FEANTSA (European Federation of National Organisations Working With Homeless People). Two representatives from DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion at the European Commission participated and the thematic expert was Suzanne Fitzpatrick from Heriot-Watt University, United Kingdom. Thematically, this Peer Review was closely linked to six earlier ones focussed on homelessness.[1]

The key transferable lessons and learning opportunities that arise from the Danish National Strategy and Housing First experience are particularly applicable to the most acute end of the support needs spectrum within the homeless population, and can be summarised as follows:

- The Housing First model is very effective at enabling individuals with complex support needs to exit homelessness, with demonstrated housing retention rates of over 90 per cent. This points to independent, scattered site housing with intensive floating support as the appropriate 'default' intervention for this group.

- Other housing forms (i.e. congregate housing) should only be used for those homeless individuals who (repeatedly) do not succeed living on their own even with intensive floating support. For this small minority, it is important to have other options such as high-quality supported accommodation, and in some cases radical alternative models such as the 'skæve huse' idea pioneered in Denmark may be useful.

- The holistic 'Assertive Community Treatment' (ACT) model of floating support seemed particularly effective for those with the most severe support, which suggests that its use should be considered even in other highly developed welfare systems with strong mainstream support services.

- The Danish experience indicates that that Housing First-based models may be as appropriate for young people aged 18-25 as they are for older age cohorts, though there may be a need for further methodological refinement to optimise their effectiveness with this younger age band.

- Achieving a culture change away from a 'treatment first' approach to tackling homelessness can be a long and challenging process, requiring intensive work across a range of relevant housing, health and welfare sectors, with a continual focus on organisational development and implementation.

- It is important to bear in mind that, while Housing First offers a combination of housing and support that facilitates very high levels of sustained exit from homelessness,

[1]   http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1024&langId=en

many challenges still remain in the lives of people with long histories of homelessness and marginalisation, and broader interventions and support are most often needed to promote their social integration and quality of life.

- For countries in central and eastern Europe, the possibilities for implementing Housing First models in the immediate future may be remote, given both the financial and political constraints they face. However, exposure to the experience of countries such as Denmark may help them to avoid the mistakes that north-western European countries have made in investing in institutional solutions to homelessness that then have to be dismantled as poor practice.

- A particular crisis of youth homelessness seems to be developing in many European countries, as a result of young people bearing the brunt of the economic crisis, affordable housing shortages and welfare cut backs. Such problems are increasingly affecting even countries like Denmark with developed welfare states and sophisticated homelessness interventions. There is often a lack of specialist accommodation and support provision for this group, and many are relatively 'hidden' as they are 'sofa surfing' around friends and relatives and difficult for services to reach. This requires a focused response at both national and EU levels.

A. Policy context on European level

The 'Peer Review in Social Protection and Social Inclusion' Programme is carried out in the context of PROGRESS – the EU's Programme for Employment and Social Solidarity. PROGRESS has as its overall aim to financially support the implementation of the objectives of the European Union (EU) in employment, social affairs and equal opportunities, as set out in the Social Agenda. Section two of the PROGRESS programme supports the implementation of the EU Open Method of Coordination in the field of social protection and social inclusion (Social OMC) by – among other things – organising exchanges on policies and good practice and promoting mutual learning in the context of the social protection and inclusion strategy. It has as one of its objectives capacity building amongst key social actors and the promotion of innovative approaches.

This Peer Review hosted by Denmark had as its central aim a review of the results of the National Homelessness Strategy adopted by the Danish Parliament in 2008, with a particular focus on the emerging challenges of youth homelessness. This topic is especially apt and timely given that homelessness is now firmly established on the EU agenda. In 2008 in a Written Declaration the European Parliament asked the EU to address street homelessness as an urgent priority and to assist Member States with the development of winter plans for the homeless. In 2010, in another Written Declaration, MEPs called upon the EU to support Member States in their efforts to reduce and solve the problems of homelessness. In September 2011, the European Parliament adopted a Resolution urging Member States to make progress towards the goal of ending street homelessness by 2015 and calling for a development of an ambitious, integrated EU strategy, underpinned by national and regional strategies with the long-term aim of ending homelessness within the broader social inclusion framework. The Parliament adopted a Resolution on social housing in the EU in 2013, which also aims to improve housing outcomes for homeless people.

In the Social Protection Committee (SPC) Member States, together with the European Commission, work on homelessness-related issues through the Open Method of Coordination (OMC). The SPC chose homelessness as a priority issue in its work plan for 2009 ('homelessness light year'), and all SPC members produced national reports in which they outlined how homelessness was addressed in their country. Also in 2009, the Joint Report of the European Commission and Council on Social Protection and Social Inclusion stated that "sustained work is required to tackle homelessness as an extremely serious form of exclusion." The Network of Independent Experts on Social Inclusion were charged with analysing the "social and economic inclusion of homeless people" and "access to adequate housing" across Member States, and the resulting synthesis report put forward 15 suggestions for addressing the key barriers to making progress at both national and EU levels in the fight against homelessness and housing exclusion. In a particularly significant move, the 2010 Joint Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion called on Member States to develop integrated policies on homelessness, and provided detailed guidance on how to do this, placing a strong emphasis on prevention, effective governance, monitoring and evaluation, and the setting of specific targets (European Commission and the Council, 2010).

In 2010 also, the Committee of the Regions of the EU adopted an Opinion on Combating Homelessness, and in 2011 the European Economic and Social Committee followed suit by

adopting an Opinion on Homelessness. The June 2012 the Employment, Social Policy, Health and Consumer Affairs Council called on Member States and the Commission to develop and promote adequate social schemes for homeless people in accordance with their respective competences, and taking into account the specific situation in each Member State.

Most recently, in 2013 the SIP stresses the need to tackle homelessness, and devoted one of eight related staff working documents to 'Confronting Homelessness in the European Union', which explores current trends in homelessness in the EU, good practices by Member States and core elements of integrated homelessness strategies, highlighting the potential support role of the EU (European Commission, 2013). The Irish Presidency Roundtable Discussion on Homelessness in March 2013 has led further urgency to the need for concerted action across Europe on this theme[2].

There are a number of other EU-level initiatives relevant to homelessness, including a series of research reports and events, and earlier Peer Reviews. These are outlined briefly below.

Other relevant EU-level Initiatives

1. ETHOS

The ETHOS typology of Homelessness and Housing Exclusion has become the basis for discussion of the definition of homelessness for policy and data collection purposes across many countries in Europe (Edgar & Meert, 2005; European Commission, 2013)[3].

2. Study on the Measurement of Homelessness at European Union Level (2006-2007)

This report, commissioned by DG Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities, reviewed the methods of data collection on homelessness in Europe (Edgar *et al*, 2007)[4].

3. MPHASIS Project (2007–2009)

This project, funded under PROGRESS, was entitled Mutual Progress on Homelessness through Advancing and Strengthening Information Systems. The main objective was to improve the capacity for monitoring information on homelessness and housing exclusion in 20 European countries on the basis of the recommendations of the previous EU study on the Measurement of Homelessness (see above)[5].

---

[2]   http://eu2013.ie/media/eupresidency/content/documents/EU-Ministers-Homelessness-Roundta ble---Information-note.pdf

[3]   http://www.feantsa.org/files/freshstart/Toolkits/Ethos/Leaflet/EN.pdf

[4]   http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/spsi/homelessness_en.htm

[5]   http://www.trp.dundee.ac.uk/research/mphasis/

4. Study on Housing Exclusion: Welfare Policies, Housing Provision and Labour Markets (2009-2010)

This project, also funded under PROGRESS, analysed the interaction between welfare regimes and housing systems, particularly with respect to the generation and amelioration of housing exclusion, including homelessness (Stephens *et al*, 2010)[6].

5. European Consensus Conference on Homelessness (2010)

A 'European Consensus Conference on Homelessness' was organised under the Belgian Presidency in 2010. The Consensus Conference Jury called for a "…a shift from using shelters and transitional accommodation as the predominant solution to homelessness towards increasing access to permanent housing and increasing the capacity for both prevention and the provision of adequate floating support to people in housing on the basis of need." (European Consensus Conference, 2010, p. 14)[7].

6. Housing First Europe (HFE) project (2011-2013)

HFE was a social experimentation project, also funded under PROGRESS, from 2011 to 2013. HFE's aims included the evaluation of, and mutual learning between, local projects in ten European cities which provide homeless people with complex needs with immediate access to long-term, self-contained housing and intensive support (Busch-Geertsema, 2013)[8].

7. Study on Mobility, Migration and Destitution (2012-2013)

The purpose of this study, also funded under PROGRESS, was to identify and analyse the causes of destitution among migrant populations, taking into account the main characteristics of migrants and mobile EU citizens in a situation of destitution, as well as relevant aspects of socio-economic, policy and legal contexts.

8. Hope in Stations (2010-2011) and Work in Stations (2012-2013) projects

These projects, funded under PROGRESS, aimed to strengthen the role of train companies, public authorities and NGOs in helping homeless people in European train stations.

9. Social Innovation to Tackle Homelessness: Re-enforcing the role of the European Structural Funds (2011)

This conference focused on how the structural funds can enhance social innovation in the area of homelessness in EU Member States.

9

---

[6]   The final report can be downloaded at https://www.york.ac.uk/media/chp/documents/2010/Study%20on%20Housing%20Exclusion.pdf

[7]   http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=6489&langId=en

[8]   http://www.socialstyrelsen.dk/housingfirsteurope

In addition, the Commission has recently funded a project on best practice models for monitoring, alleviating and preventing evictions within the EU[9].

Homelessness is a recurrent topic of the Annual Convention for the Platform against Poverty and Social Exclusion. This November, a workshop will be organised on "integrated strategies for re-housing homeless people" in the framework of the Convention.

Six previous SPC Peer Reviews have had homelessness as their topic, including a previous one hosted by Denmark[10], which focused on the programme "Our Common Responsibility", established by the Danish Government in 2002. This programme was targeted at the most socially marginalised people in Denmark, including homeless people, people with alcohol or drug problems, prostitutes, and people with mental disabilities. It focused on homeless people who were difficult to reintegrate into normal living situations, and older homeless people who required some measure of residential care but who, because of their homeless experience and behavioural issues, could not be accommodated in mainstream residential care homes. The Danish Government established special nursing homes and also, under 'skæve huse' scheme, provided an alternative form of housing for homeless people in unconventional small dwellings in which people could behave differently from the norm without having to confront hostile reactions from other people.

10

9   http://www.irishtimes.com/news/ireland/irish-news/nuig-law-lecturer-leads-eu-survey-on-housing-evictions-1.1646271

10   http://www.peer-review-social-inclusion.eu/peer-reviews/2005/preventing-and-tackling-homelessness

B. Host country policy – the Danish National Homelessness Strategy

The National Homelessness Strategy was adopted by the Danish Parliament in 2008, and build upon earlier programmes aimed at strengthening social services for socially-marginalised groups. The programme followed the first national count of homelessness in Demark which was conducted in February 2007. This mapping exercise identified 5,290 Danish citizens who were homeless in the relevant count week, including: approximately 500 people who were sleeping rough; 2,000 people staying in homeless shelters; over 1,000 people staying temporarily with family or friends; and smaller numbers in short-term transitional housing or awaiting institutional release from prison, hospital or other facilities, without a housing solution (Benjaminsen & Christensen, 2007). The count demonstrated that the majority of homeless people were registered in larger cities and towns in Denmark.

Four overall goals were set in the Strategy programme:

1. To reduce rough sleeping;
2. To provide solutions other than homeless shelters for homeless young people;
3. To reduce the time spent in shelters; and
4. To reduce homelessness consequent on institutional release from prison and hospitals without a housing solution.

A total budget of 500 million DKK (65 million €) was allocated to the Strategy programme over a period of four years from 2009 to 2012. Eight Danish municipalities, representing 54% of the registered homeless population, were invited to participate in the first round of the programme, including the three biggest cities in Denmark – Copenhagen, Aarhus and Odense. The largest share of the funding was allocated to these eight municipalities. In a later round of funding, nine additional municipalities – mainly medium-sized towns - were selected to participate and had 30 million DKK allocated to them.

It was possible for the participating municipalities to focus on all or just some of the four overall goals of the Strategy, depending on the local situation. However, an overarching aim of the Strategy was to develop and test internationally evidence-based interventions in a Danish setting, and the decision was taken to make Housing First its overarching principle. Therefore a core criterion for the projects to receive funding from the programme was that they were based on the Housing First principle.

It was also decided that floating support interventions employed within this Housing First-based model should follow one of three methods:

- **Assertive Community Treatment (ACT)**: a multi-disciplinary form of floating support intended for those with the most complex support needs, such as severe addiction and/or mental health problems, which make it difficult for them to access mainstream support services. ACT teams will typically include social workers, nurses, psychiatrists and addictions counsellors.

- **Individual Case Management (ICM)**: this method involves a 'case manager' whose function it is to provide practical and social support to clients, and to coordinate their use of existing support and treatment services, for as long as they need this assistance. ICM support is aimed at individuals with less acute support needs than those targeted by the ACT method, but who may nonetheless require assistance for an extended period of time.

- **Critical Time Intervention (CTI)**: as with ICM, the focus here is on the provision of support via a 'case manager', but in this instance the case manager offers support for a limited time period of 9 months, viewed as the 'critical transition period' for individuals moving from shelters to independent housing. This method is aimed at people assessed as requiring only shorter-term, transitional support before being integrated with mainstream services[11].

The most widespread of these methods within the Danish Strategy was ICM, established in almost all of the participating municipalities, whereas ACT provision was made available only in the two largest cities (Copenhagen and Aarhus).

Other key aspects of the Danish programme included strengthening street outreach work and implementing a method for needs assessment in homeless shelters, and some of the Strategy funding was set aside to provide additional housing units for homeless people. In total, 457 new housing or accommodation places were provided, about a third of which were in independent scattered site housing, and the remainder split across a range of congregate, institutional, transitional or alternative ('skæve huse') forms of accommodation[12]. Resources were also distributed to a range of other local services and initiatives.

12

In all, over 1,000 homeless people were assisted by the floating support schemes provided under the Danish Homelessness Strategy, making it one of the few European examples of a large-scale Housing First programme.

The start up and implementation process at local level took longer than anticipated and most Strategy-funded interventions commenced at the beginning of 2010. As a consequence the programme period was extended until September 2013. The second phase of the Strategy will begin in 2014, focused on 40 municipalities, which will sign contracts specifying their obligation to implement Housing First and to adopt evidence-based methods. The target set for this second phase of the Strategy is to reduce the number of homeless people by 25% by 2020.

---

[11]   Some may question whether it is correct to include CTI as a 'Housing First' model, as one of the core principles of Housing First is that support is made available for as long as it is needed (Busch-Geertsema, 2013). CTI clearly departs from this principle.

[12]   In this context it should be noted that independent scattered housing can also be provided in Denmark through the municipal priority access system to public housing (25% of new vacancies are assigned to vulnerable groups). However, many groups besides homeless people 'compete' for housing through this mechanism, e.g. lone parents, disabled people and vulnerable older people. Particularly in larger cities, demand outstrips supply of vacant flats for municipal referral, and in most municipalities there are extended waiting times to get assigned to a flat through this priority access mechanism.

Assessment of the Danish Strategy

The effectiveness of the interventions used in the Danish strategy is well evidenced by the extensive monitoring that took place with regard to both the support received and outcomes achieved (Rambøll & SFI, 2013). The persuasiveness of the Danish evaluation is considerably enhanced by the complementary focus on both quantitative and qualitative methodologies. This evidence base provides firm grounds for supporting the overall efficacy of the models tested in Denmark.

First, outcomes on housing retention were very positive across all three floating support methods tested in the Danish Strategy. Fewer than 10% of individuals rehoused lost this housing during the monitoring period, a finding which is highly consistent with the 90% retention rates reported in many other (mainly smaller-scale) Housing First projects elsewhere in Europe (Busch-Geertsema, 2013). However, there was a distinction between the different methods employed in the Danish Strategy in that a larger proportion (15%) of the ICM-supported individuals were not housed at all during the monitoring period. Qualitative investigations suggested that this was partly attributable to a lack of affordable housing in relevant localities, but in some cases there also appeared to be a 'culture change' barrier with respect to difficulties in detaching local housing providers from the 'housing readiness' model. These findings also pointed to a potential mismatch between the level of support offered by ICM and the needs of some clients, who may have instead benefited from the more intensive support offered by ACT methods.

Second, a critical finding to emerge from the Danish programme was that independent, scattered site housing works better for most homeless people than congregate models, and that with intensive floating support even individuals with the most complex support needs are capable of living on their own in such housing. At the same time, the Danish results add to a growing body of international evidence about the 'institutionalising' tendencies of congregate housing models which concentrate relatively large numbers of vulnerable people at close quarters, often having unintended negative consequences, such as generating conflict-ridden environments and making it more difficult for residents to overcome substance misuse problems (Busch-Geertsema and Sahlin, 2007; Hansen-Löfstrand 2010; Pleace, 2012; Parsell et al, 2013). Similar points were made in the Peer Review for Finland conducted in 2010 (Busch-Geertsema, 2010), and indeed more recent Finnish evidence supports the contention that individuals living in 'Communal Housing First' model still think of themselves as homeless and living in an institution (Kettunen, 2013). Such considerations have meant that the original Pathways Housing First model in New York was based on scattered housing with off-site support, and a key principle was not to rent more than 20% of the units in any one building to Housing First clients (Tsemberis, 2010; Johnsen & Teixeira, 2010; Johnson et al., 2012).

Third, the non-housing outcomes for people assisted under the Danish Homelessness Strategy - with respect to matters such as substance misuse, physical health, mental health, financial well-being, social support networks and daily functioning - are more mixed. On the majority of these items the situation of most service users remained unchanged over the monitoring period, and where there had been change, those with a more positive assessment by the end of the period more or less equalled the number with a more negative assessment. These findings are very much in keeping with the results of evaluations of Housing First elsewhere in Europe (Busch-Geertsema, 2013). The qualitative research undertaken in the

Danish evaluation indicated that, while service users continued to face severe challenges in their lives associated with many years of experience of homelessness and marginalisation, they expressed great relief at finally becoming housed and emphasised that if they did not receive the floating support they would lose their housing again.

Fourth, experiences from the ACT programme implemented in Copenhagen and Aarhus has shown that this method is a particularly strong way of providing support for homeless individuals with the most complex support needs, as the method enables the provision of holistic and highly focused support. This model was only available in these two largest Danish cities, and there is some suggestion that it would have been helpful to have had it available elsewhere for some of those for whom ICM did not appear to offer intensive enough support.

Fifth, the Danish Strategy provides novel evidence of the use of Housing First with young people, as a substantial proportion (approximately one quarter) of the individuals who received housing and support were aged between 18-24 years (these young people received either CTI or ICM support, with the ACT model used almost exclusively with overt 25s). An impressive two-thirds (66%) of these young people were rehoused and sustained this housing over the monitoring period, albeit that this percentage is lower than the 89% of clients aged over 25 who sustained rehousing. But a higher proportion of under 25s (23 per cent) were never housed during the study period despite being attached to the programme (the corresponding figure for over 25s is only 6 per cent), and 11% lost their housing (only 5% of the over 25s lost their's). This somewhat higher (but still small) number of under 25s that lost their housing was thought by service providers interviewed to be a consequence not only of unmet support needs, but also of difficulties in paying rent out of a relatively lower income than that available to older adults.

In terms of possible weaknesses of the Danish Strategy, the evaluation seems to imply that, ideally, ACT support should have been available in all of the participating municipalities. However, as the evidence-based approach adopted in Denmark was to test the efficacy of different models of support within the parameters of the overall Housing First paradigm, this could not have been known at the outset of the programme. Likewise, it became apparent during the course of the programme that scatter site housing worked better than congregate models, and a switch in the accommodation focus was accordingly made. It may be the case that more effort could have been made in the Danish Housing First to supplement the core model with other interventions, such as access to meaningful social activities to facilitate contact to other people and help counteract loneliness, though it is only fair to point out that the same could be said for any other Housing First programme on which evidence has been collated at European level (Busch-Geertsema, 2013). It must always be borne in mind that the Danish programme was mainly a large-scale social experimentation project aimed at developing evidence-based and effective methods for providing support to homeless people with complex support needs. In this sense the programme has been very successful and the results are very valuable.

However, while the interventions implemented under the Danish National Strategy on Homelessness appear to be highly successful at the individual service user-level, the overall goal of reducing homelessness in Denmark was not met. In fact, there was a 16% increase in registered homelessness over the period 2009-2013, and a particularly strong (80%) increase in homelessness amongst 18-24 year olds (discussed further below). While there

were local variations, and positive results in some areas, none of the four strategic aims of the national programme (reducing rough sleeping, reducing the need for young people to stay in a shelter, reducing the general length of shelter stays and reducing homelessness due to institutional release) were met overall.

The evaluation suggests that a range of barriers on both micro and macro level developments explain this paradox. One key issue seems to have been a tightening in the supply of affordable housing in Denmark's two largest cities, Copenhagen and Aarhus, as a result of population growth. In Odense, in contrast, which has experienced little recent population growth, and where the municipality reports a reasonable supply of affordable housing, and well developed methods for allocating dwellings to marginalised groups, it has been possible to halve the level of homelessness over the Strategy period. Another contributory factor, given the typically complex support needs of homeless people in Denmark, may be problems with coordination between the psychiatric and addiction service systems. There were also said to be organisational and cultural challenges in implementing Housing First Challenges in some municipalities, with the 'treatment first' philosophy still widespread in addiction services, housing allocation procedures, and shelter systems in some areas.

Another, perhaps more fundamental, issue is that the Danish Strategy was not in actual fact much focused on homelessness prevention, but rather on providing sustainable solution for those who are already homeless (see **EUROCITIES** comments below). While reductions in the 'stock' of existing homelessness are clearly relevant to reducing its overall levels, a comprehensive prevention strategy must also try to minimise the 'inflow' of new people into homelessness. It could reasonably be argued that the Danish Strategy fell somewhat short in this respect.

At the same time, in considering these possible weaknesses in the Danish approach we must be mindful that the 'counter-factual' is unknown, i.e. might the rise in homelessness in Denmark have been considerably higher without the efforts associated with the National Strategy? Certainly, the fact that the increase in homelessness since the baseline year of 2009 has been considerably lower in the municipalities that have been part of the Strategy, suggests that this may well have been the case.

Youth homelessness

As just noted, there has been a particularly sharp increase in youth homelessness in Denmark over the period of the National Strategy, hence the focus on this theme in the Peer Review. The explanations offered for this rise in youth homelessness in Denmark include a sharp increase in youth unemployment, and that cash benefit levels are relatively lower for under 25s than for those over this age. The increasing shortage of affordable housing in larger cities also impacts disproportionately on young people trying to enter tight housing markets.

Denmark is far from being alone in experiencing a rise in youth homelessness in recent years, with similar trends recorded in a range of other European countries[13]. Young people have been particularly badly affected by high rates of unemployment and shortages of affordable housing in many EU Member States, and in some cases are also the target of

---

[13]   http://www.feantsa.org/spip.php?article705&lang=en

radical welfare benefits cuts. Networks of specialist services for young homeless people seem underdeveloped in many countries, so that young people often end up inappropriately accommodated in adult shelters (Stephens *et al*, 2010; Fitzpatrick & Stephens, 2013). There also appear to be particular dangers of 'falling between stools' for young people in some countries as they reach 18 and move from childcare to adult support systems (Benjaminsen & Busch-Geertsema, 2009).

While FEANTSA has recently expressed concern about a rise of youth homelessness in many EU Member States[14], and recently organised a conference on this topic[15], the last major investigation of this topic by the European Observatory on Homelessness was in 1998 (Avramov, 1998), and there is a dearth of recent evidence and data in many European countries (Quilgars, 2010), with only one significant comparative study available (Smith *et al*, 2009). This all reinforces the relevance of the special focus of this Peer Review on responses to youth homelessness in EU Member States and the sharing of good practice in this regard.

[14]   http://www.feantsa.org/spip.php?article705&lang=en

[15]   http://www.feantsa.org/spip.php?article1596&lang=en

C. Policies and experiences in peer countries and stakeholder contributions

This Peer Review hosted by Denmark focused on the results of the National Homelessness Strategy adopted by the Danish Parliament in 2008, with a particular emphasis on the emerging challenges of youth homelessness. Thus peer countries and stakeholder organisations were asked to provide their perspective on the development and content of the Danish Strategy, in the context of their own policy and strategic frameworks and experiences[16].

As one would expect, the Nordic peer review countries reported the strongest resonance with experiences in Denmark. Thus the homelessness challenges faced in **Finland** were said to be very similar to those in Denmark, and there are plans for further cooperation between the two countries in applying the Housing First model in a Nordic context. Inspired by the Danish experience, there is to be investment in ACT teams to work with those with the most severe difficulties in Finland, and Danish evidence on the preferability of scattered housing solutions has been valuable in refining the Finnish model. Preventing youth homelessness through measures such as housing counselling is one key target in the Finnish National Homelessness Strategy (2012–2015). But homelessness amongst young people is growing nonetheless, particularly amongst immigrant youth, and it is recognised that large-scale solutions are needed to address the structural problems they face, including a severe lack of affordable housing.

A national homelessness coordinator has been appointed in **Sweden**, with a brief to pay particular attention to the prevention of evictions, especially amongst families with children. There has been fairly limited development of Housing First services in Sweden thus far, with a 'treatment first' principle still predominant, though some relevant local schemes have been established. The lessons from Denmark are important in confirming the more limited Swedish experience pointing to high housing retention rates in Housing First services, and the advantages of scattered site over congregate housing. Youth homelessness in Sweden is more a question of difficulties in entering the housing market rather than acute street homelessness, and the Swedish Government has initiated a number of measures to improve young people's housing options, including a new financial instrument to promote the supply of housing specifically for this group.

Previous national initiatives have prompted a move from 'staircase' models to more housing-led approaches in **Norway**, providing the foundation for a Housing First-based programme to be included in the new national strategy commencing in 2014. The guidelines on Housing First associated with this strategy emphasise the importance of avoiding large clusters of dwellings for former homeless people with multiple problems, and recommend ACT teams as the preferred model of support, although the Danish evidence is valuable in highlighting the merits of also having available ICT and CTI interventions. The key challenge in tackling homelessness in Norway is a lack of affordable rental housing for vulnerable groups, with home ownership rates close to 80%. Recent research has indicated that mainstream

---

[16] The comments papers can be downloaded at http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1024&langId=en&newsId=1884&furtherNews=yes

homelessness services in Norway do not adequately cater for the needs of young homeless people.

Despite significant advantages enjoyed in **Austria**, in particular the very large public sector housing stock in Vienna and the availability of extensive social services, the number of homeless people seeking assistance has been growing. This is a result of the economic crisis, coupled with rising rent levels and a shortage of affordable housing, and indicates a requirement to focus on eviction prevention. Austrian peer reviewers were impressed by the Danes' capacity to implement a nationwide strategy on homelessness, which would be difficult in the Austrian context because of the decentralisation of governance arrangements.

Similar comments were made in **Spain**, where the decentralisation of governmental competencies would make a national approach difficult. More positively, it was reported that homelessness had received a much higher profile in recent years as a result of the political momentum at EU level, although the focus was still on social service responses rather than housing-led approaches. Most homelessness services in Spain continue to adhere to a staircase model, and the Housing First approach is still relatively unknown, though dissemination of this idea has begun to percolate through via contact with European networks such as FEANTSA. The poverty rate in Spain has reached such a high level since the crisis that it threatens the cohesion of Spanish society as a whole, and homelessness is strongly associated with major structural problems and weak welfare protection. Youth unemployment is a much more significant issue than youth homelessness, with most young people living at home until their 30s, though there are particular difficulties faced by young homeless migrants.

In **France** a three-year Housing First research programme ("Un chez soi d'abord"), has been developed in four cities (Paris, Lille, Marseille and Toulouse). This large-scale experimental programme allows for comparisons between randomly selected homeless people given direct access to scattered site public or private rental housing (on a sub-letting contract), together with tailored floating support, and a control group who are given traditional shelter/temporary accommodation. Half way through this research, the results are very similar to those in Denmark: very high housing retention rates (86%) and strong indications that most homeless people manage fine in independent accommodation if they are given the right support. There is no specific focus on youth homelessness in the French national homelessness programme launched in 2009, but youth homelessness is rising in France, exacerbated by the fact that under 25s are not entitled to any minimum income scheme.

Homelessness policy in **Ireland** is said to be housing-led, with the stated goal of ending long-term homelessness by 2016 (with a particular focus on youth homelessness). Similar to Denmark, the homeless population is characterised by a large proportion of individuals with relatively high support needs, and the key challenge to implementing a housing-led approach is attaining an adequate supply of housing units, particularly in Dublin and larger cities. The extensive monitoring and evaluation undertaken in Denmark is not as well developed in Ireland, and there was said to be scope to learn from the Danish model in rectifying this. A review of the youth homelessness strategy in Ireland reported positive progress but highlighted difficulties in young people transitioning to adult services at age 18. Legislation in Ireland gives young people leaving care the right to public support until age 21.

Preventing youth homelessness is an important policy priority in **England**, and considerable emphasis is placed on mediation services to enable young people to remain in/return to the family home where it is safe to do so. There is also a network of specialist supported accommodation, including supported lodging schemes that enable vulnerable young people to live in 'normal' family settings rather than in institutionalised environments. Despite these interventions, the numbers of young homeless people have been rising since 2010, as general homelessness has risen. Local authorities in England are obliged to secure accommodation for eligible households who are unintentionally homeless and in priority need, but most young homeless people (unless they are care leavers) will not be considered to be in priority need. The Government has established a number of initiatives to address rising youth homelessness, including promoting a model 'youth accommodation pathway' with local authorities.

General homelessness has declined in **Scotland** over the past three years, although the proportion of young people in the homeless population has remained constant, despite considerable prevention efforts. Young people over 16 are eligible for social housing in Scotland and proposals have recently been developed to improve the network of specialist supported accommodation available to them. Young people who were in care at age 16 are entitled to aftercare support until they reach age 21, and new legislation is planned to extend their rights to remain in care until this age, and to receive aftercare support till age 26. All unintentionally homeless households in Scotland are entitled to be rehoused by local authorities. A new 'housing options' model was introduced in Scotland in 2010 with a much stronger focus on homelessness prevention, and intensive work has been undertaken with local authorities to achieve the culture change necessary to deliver this new 'outcomes-focussed' approach.

The Central and Eastern European countries faced very difficult structural conditions which makes the application of the Danish Housing First- inspired approach unfeasible, at least in the short-term. In **Romania**, for example, it was stressed that poverty reduction remains a fundamental challenge, with severe material deprivation affecting 29% of the entire population (EU average 8%). Poverty, debt and eviction rates have been adversely affected by the economic crisis. There is a legal definition of homelessness in Romania, but it has only recently become a topic for research, and data is scarce. The primary response to homelessness remains night shelters, mainly run by NGOs, sometimes in partnership with local authorities. A key priority is to establish reliable statistics on homelessness, based on methodologies endorsed at European level. Increasing the awareness amongst Romanian professionals of good practice from elsewhere in Europe is also a priority, and this may enable Romania to 'skip' the 'treatment first' paradigm altogether.

Similarly in **Croatia,** concerns focus primarily on high rates of poverty, unemployment and social exclusion, and there is no single strategy at national level addressing homelessness. Many families face the risk of eviction, and there is very little social housing, as most people are owner occupiers. As in Romania, there is a legal definition of homelessness, but very little statistical data, and measures to address homelessness consist primarily of attempts to expand shelter capacity and the provision of food. A survey of shelters in 2012 established that most residents are single men, with an average age of 50 years old, and it seems that most do not have complex support needs (so very different to the situation in Denmark). There are some local examples of good practice in addressing homelessness, and there are plans to pilot the Housing First model in Rijeka and Split. Establishing strong

political commitment to the Housing First concept is a key challenge, and access to EU Structural funds will be crucial given that Croatia's current economic state does not allow for substantial new expenditure in the social welfare sector.

The establishment of a statistical database on homelessness and a national strategic framework is now on the political agenda in **Bulgaria**. Bulgarian policy in the field of homelessness is primarily aimed at providing social services, with Bulgaria's social service system expanding considerably in recent years as a result of actions aimed at deinstitutionalisation. Various community-based social services provide shelter and support for homeless persons, young people and children, and local authorities have duties to combat homelessness via, for example, the provision of crisis accommodation and "public canteens'. The risks of homelessness have increased as a result of the economic crisis, with more people having insufficient financial resources to access the housing market. Lessons drawn from the Danish experience include the superiority of housing-led over staircase approaches – this maps well onto the traditional emphasis on 'home' amongst Bulgarian people – and the importance of early intervention in preventing homelessness.

FEANTSA, European Federation of National Organisations Working with Homeless People, reflecting on the lessons of the Danish experience, stressed the need for strong political commitment to drive policy evolution, as well as effective governance and monitoring systems. FEANTSA further highlighted three overall learning points: most homeless people do better in scattered housing; floating support needs to be clearly defined and operationalised for a range of support profiles; and training and capacity building are critical in scaling up Housing First. FEANTSA further stressed that EU Structural funds can play an important role in this scaling up process (see further below).

EUROCITIES congratulated the Danish Government and municipalities on having the courage to implement a paradigm shift from treatment first to Housing First. They note that the thoroughness of the evaluation convincingly shows that this was a necessary and effective move. They stress the importance of attention to the quality of life of people rehoused, and in particular to programmes and activities that enable them to avoid social isolation and participate to an optimal degree in the neighbourhoods in which they are resettled. One of the challenges in rehousing homeless people was that the available housing is often in neighbourhoods with the most acute social issues, but when municipalities try to use other neighbourhoods they are faced with objections from local residents and 'NIMBYISM'. EUROCITIES also note, however, that the Danish programme did not succeed in reducing overall levels of homelessness and suggest that insufficient attention to preventative measures, particularly eviction prevention, may provide some explanation.

D. Main issues discussed during the meeting

A number of key themes emerged in the peer review meeting discussions, as now summarised.

Housing First v Housing-led

There was some initial discussion about the distinction between a 'Housing First' and a 'Housing-led' approach to tackling homelessness. It was clarified that the former refers to a specific model of rapid access to permanent housing with wrap-around support for those with more complex needs, whereas the latter is a broader term encompassing all those approaches to tackling homeless which emphasise access to mainstream housing.

Scatter site v congregated housing

While there appeared to be general acceptance amongst peer reviewers of the superiority of scatter site over congregated models, reinforced by this new Danish evidence, there was some discussion about what 'scattered' actually meant. In Norway, for example, 'scattered' housing units for homeless people are sometimes all located in the same building, rather than being dispersed around a neighbourhood. In Denmark, on the other hand, scattered housing is distributed among public housing stock rather than being concentrated in one block.

Political context and support

Political support was critical to the success of Danish Housing First, and in particular in getting the different departments in municipalities (housing, social work, children's services) to work together. A steering group from the municipalities worked closely with the Ministry of Social Affairs in the first eight municipalities involved in the Strategy, with the Director of Social Services from each of these municipalities joining the Ministerial Steering Group. Political support was particularly helpful when resources had to be redirected to Housing First from other budgets. The nine municipalities which joined the programme at a later date did not enjoy the same high-level political support for their Housing First initiatives so experienced more difficulties accessing the services they needed.

Culture change

A major theme in discussion was the requirement to change the mind-set of staff working with homeless people - to focus them on empowering homeless people and respecting their autonomy - which required skills development and training. The Housing First model implies a very different service user/provider relationship from that which prevails in institutional settings where residents cannot 'close the door' on staff, and thus requires a profound philosophical change in approach.

Training

Strongly linked to the issue of culture change is training, which was a prominent theme in the Danish Strategy. It was suggested that organising training on an EU basis using

structural funds, such as the European Social Fund, or through the Erasmus programme, would add considerable value to the training efforts of individual Member States.

Reforming incentives and financial models

Several peer reviewers stressed the importance of shifting from a provider-orientated homelessness system, to a more client-focused one. There may be resistance to this amongst some service providers, who are invested both financially and philosophically in the current models. Thus, in addition to promoting positive culture change at individual staff level (see above), systemic reform was also said to be required with respect to the financial incentives impacting on service providers, and support offered to them to reform their business models so that they redirect effort and resources towards the most effective approaches.

NGOs

It was noted that both NGOs and service user organisations has participated in the development and implementation of the Danish Strategy, and were represented on the steering groups in all municipalities. However, in the context of the Danish welfare state, municipalities directly provide most services, so NGOs did not play as significant role in the Strategy as they would in many other Member States where most homelessness services are delivered by the voluntary sector.

Shelters

There was extensive debate around the continuing role, if any, for shelters in the context of a significant shift across Europe towards Housing First-style approaches. Some participants argued that shelters play an important role in providing temporary accommodation for those who suddenly become homeless, and it was acknowledged that there will always be an 'inflow' of new homeless people who will need some form of emergency accommodation (though whether this ought to take the form of shelters remains open to question). A key difficulty is that in many countries there is a history of people moving from one shelter to another for many years, so it effectively becomes their long-term accommodation. The point was also made that shelters are different in different countries, with the Danish shelters argued to offer higher standards and better support than in some other European countries. Nonetheless, it was acknowledged that the long-term solution is to provide appropriate permanent housing.

Gender

Only about 20% of homeless people in Denmark were reported to be women (a similar proportion is reported amongst the street homeless population in other European countries, see Busch-Geertsema, 2013). It was remarked that it is often easier for single women to get rehoused by the Danish municipalities than single men as they may be viewed as more 'vulnerable'.

Prevention

As noted above, the point was made that the Danish Strategy is actually not much focused on prevention, but rather on providing sustainable solutions for those who are already homeless. In this context, attention was drawn to the usefulness of the work of the European Observatory and others in defining three levels of prevention: primary prevention – such as welfare support measures which reduce general societal risks of homelessness; secondary prevention – targeting support on those with specific risk factors, such as institutional backgrounds; and tertiary prevention – preventing the re-occurrence of homelessness (see also Busch-Geertsema & Fitzpatrick, 2008).

Youth homelessness

As the Danish hosts had requested a special focus on the growing crisis of youth homelessness in the Peer Review, there was extensive discussion on this theme.

It was noted that the predominant trigger to homelessness for young people is conflict with family, and that they often 'sofa surf' for several years before coming into contact with the formal homelessness system. This often means that young homeless people are relatively 'invisible' and it can be difficult for support agencies to reach them. In the Danish case there is a national homelessness count, based on figures from social services, the psychiatric services and local authorities who are in contact with homeless people. However, it is more difficult to keep track of young people staying with families and friends who may not think of themselves as 'homeless'. It was noted that, despite targeted efforts to prevent youth homelessness, structural barriers like the housing shortage, and cuts in social benefits, continue to exacerbate homelessness among young people in Denmark.

As access to both affordable housing and housing allowances are critical in preventing and resolving youth homelessness, consideration was given to the arrangements in different countries. The UK has significantly reduced housing benefit for young people in the private rented sector, and the Coalition Government says that if it is re-elected it will withdraw housing benefits from most under 25s. There are no age restrictions on housing benefits in Finland, which can cover up to 80% of an approved rent. Youth housing associations manage a dedicated housing stock of between 6,000 and 7,000 units in the major cities for young people up to 29 years.

In Spain, which has a very small rental market, the government abolished the basic rate of rental support, as they found landlords raised the rent to match the allowance. It was also noted in Norway, another country with very small social and private rental sectors, that it is possible that private landlords set the rent according to housing allowance levels. Start-up loans are available for young people on low incomes to enter the owner occupied housing market.

The need for effective interventions to support the transition to adulthood was stressed by FEANTSA, particularly for those young people leaving the care system. Targeted prevention and early intervention are important, but challenging to operationalise in ways which are non-stigmatising and cost-effectie. There is relatively little evidence at EU level about effective interventions to tackle youth homelessness, and the need for such evidence is becoming more urgent.

One important issue to bear in mind in discussing 'youth' homelessness is the need to clarify definitions: in some countries 'youth' refers to those aged 18-22, in others it is understood as extending up to age 29, and in yet others the focus is on those aged under 18. The age range under discussion is critical as it determines which kind of approaches are appropriate. For example, general agreement was reported from the recent FEANTSA conference on youth homelessness that models such as foyers (which integrate housing with education/training) are more suited to very young homeless people, while Housing First was a better fit for those over 18.

Homeless migrants and ethnic minorities

Homeless migrants, including young migrants, from both EU and non-EU countries, are a major issue in many countries. In London, for example, it was reported that migrants comprise more than 50% of rough sleepers, and the situation is similar in France. A growing concern in Sweden is female migrants from Eastern Europe who are vulnerable to involvement in prostitution and rough sleeping. In Denmark about one fifth of young homeless people are second generation migrants – a group who have been hit particularly badly by deteriorating structural conditions. There was a general sense that the whole area of homelessness and migration requires much greater policy development and thinking, including at EU level.

E. Conclusions and lessons learned

The National Danish Homelessness Strategy provides an important example of European good practice in tackling homelessness. The relevance of the Danish Strategy to other Member States and at European level lies not only in the success of the specific interventions employed, but also in the systematic monitoring and evaluation of outcomes which allows us to have confidence in the successes claimed.

It is important to bear in mind that homelessness in Denmark is heavily concentrated amongst people with complex support needs, with the Rambøll & SFI (2013) evaluation indicating that four out of five homeless Danes have a mental illness and/or a substance misuse problem. The key transferable lessons and learning opportunities that arise from the Danish experience are therefore best considered as applicable to the most acute end of the support needs spectrum, rather than to the entire homeless population, which in some other countries may include many more people who 'only' have an economic affordability problem (Shinn, 2007; Stephens & Fitzpatrick, 2007).

With that caveat in mind, the key lessons for other European countries arising from the National Danish Homelessness Strategy appear to be as follows:

- Housing First with floating support interventions is a very effective approach to enable individuals with complex support needs to exit homelessness, with demonstrated housing retention rates of over 90 per cent. This points to Housing First being the appropriate 'default intervention' for this group, meaning that independent, scattered site housing with intensive floating support should be tried as the first-line intervention for the rehousing of homeless people, including those with the most complex support needs.

- Other housing forms (i.e. congregate housing) should only be used for those individuals who (repeatedly) do not succeed living on their own even with intensive floating support. For this small minority of homeless individuals it is important to have other options such as high-quality supported accommodation, and in some cases radical alternative models such as the 'skæve huse' idea pioneered in Denmark may be useful.

- The holistic ACT model seemed particularly effective for those experiencing the most severe support needs in the Danish context, which suggests that its use should perhaps be considered even in other highly developed welfare systems with strong mainstream support services. The importance of target group clarification – ensuring that the type and intensity of support offered matches need – was another important lesson emerging from the Danish experience.

- A novel and very important lesson from the Danish programme is that Housing First-based models may be as appropriate for young people under 25 as they are for older age cohorts[17], with the floating support methods of CTI and ICM appearing well-suited

---

[17]   Though see some other discussion on this point from Canada, in a recent publication entitled Housing First in Canada: Supporting Communities to End Homelessness http://www.homelesshub.ca/Library/View.aspx?id=56275. Also note that there has recently been a first call under ESF for Housing First projects for young people (aged 18-21) leaving care.

for giving support to the young homeless, though there may be a need for further methodological refinement to optimise their effectiveness with this younger age band.

- Achieving a culture change ('mind shift') away from treatment first/housing readiness model can be a long and challenging process, requiring intensive work across a range of relevant housing, health and welfare sectors, with a continual focus on organisational development and implementation.

- The success of Housing First is also dependent on a sufficient number of permanent homes being available that are affordable for this target group.

- It is always important to bear in mind that, while Housing First offers a combination of housing and support that facilitates very high levels of sustained exit from homelessness, many challenges still remain in the lives of people with long histories of homelessness and marginalisation, and broader interventions and support are most often needed to promote their social integration and quality of life.[18]

- For some countries in central and eastern Europe, the possibilities for implementing Housing First models in the immediate future are remote, given both the financial and political constraints they face. In particular, it is very difficult to generate enough political will to force through measures which only affect a small proportion of the population. However, exposure to the experience of countries such as Denmark may help them to avoid the mistakes that north-western European countries have made in investing in institutional solutions to homelessness that then have to be dismantled as poor practice.

- A particular crisis of youth homelessness seems to be developing in many European countries, as a result of young people bearing the brunt of the economic crisis, affordable housing shortages and welfare cut backs. Such problems are increasingly affecting even countries like Denmark with developed welfare states and sophisticated homelessness interventions. There is often a lack of specialist accommodation and support provision for this group, and many are relatively 'hidden' as they are 'sofa surfing' around friends and relatives and difficult for services to reach. This requires a focused response at both national and EU levels.

---

[18]   These conclusions are in line with the results from the Housing First Europe social experimentation project (see Busch-Geertsema, 2013).

F. Contribution of the Peer Review to Europe 2020 and the SIP

These lessons from Denmark's success in tackling homelessness amongst those with the most complex needs is highly relevant to the Europe 2020 strategy, which integrates the social dimension into the overarching European strategic framework, setting an independent target for social inclusion by lifting 20 million people out of the risk of poverty by 2020. All European structural and investment Funds will contribute to implementing the Europe 2020 priorities and objectives and in particular the European Social Fund will be a key instrument to overcome the social consequences of the crisis. As noted above, the SIP published by the European Commission in February 2013 to support Member States in achieving the national-level necessary reforms[19] focuses quite heavily on homelessness, and one of eight accompanying 'staff working documents' is dedicated to this issue (European Commission, 2013). It is particularly relevant to note that the SIP stresses the importance of investing in early intervention to make it possible to avoid the consequences, and the costs, of homelessness.

This offers a very favourable context to take forward measures to prevent and address homelessness across Europe, particularly in those Member States where significant political weight is attached to European policy imperatives. These results from Denmark add to the growing weight of evidence that, within the Europe 2020 Strategy and homelessness-related actions taken in the context of the SIP, there should be a strong emphasis on Housing First and broader 'Housing-led' approaches, and a move away from more traditional staircase, congregate and treatment-first approaches.

It is also important to make better use of EU funds to tackle homelessness. The European Social Fund could be used to fund better access to social services and to set up Housing First models, while European Regional Development Funds could be used to enlarge countries' housing stock. These funds can play a role in 'scaling up' Housing First to a pan-European level, and the European Semester's architecture could be used to monitor Member States' policies. Member States are currently designing their operational programme for the European Social Fund 2014-2020 and it will be important to take advantage of the Danish experience to ensure that the programmes get a strong social inclusion dimension. Other EU Funds, such as European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development, are also available to finance actions to further better social integration of homeless people, including improved access to quality services and social housing. Another European financial instrument which can be used to upscale the national homelessness strategies is the Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived. The Commission has proposed, under the next multiannual financial framework, to further increase funds to promote social inclusion and combat poverty. There are also relevant EU programmes, including the Annual Convention on the Platform Against Poverty and Social Exclusion, which features a workshop on housing, and the European Commission's Knowledge Bank, which will be a tool to exchange ideas and experiences and will include evidence from this Peer Review.

---

[19]   http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1044&langId=en

With respect to the growing crisis of youth homelessness in particular, the single most important priority is to resist restrictions on access to welfare benefits and services for young people. The current EU focus is mainly on youth employment rather than housing. The SIP advocates investing in children and inclusive education, while other relevant policy areas include health and inclusive development. However, the Commission is preparing a document on youth inclusion, which includes housing. The EU's Youth Guarantee, in which Member States committed to ensuring that young people up to 25 receive a high quality offer of a job, apprenticeship or traineeship within four months of becoming unemployed, could be extended to better address the needs of marginalised and homeless young people, and consideration could be given to an EU Aftercare Guarantee.

References

Benjaminsen, L & I. Christensen (2007): *Hjemløshed i Danmark 2007. National kortlægning.* [Homelessness in Denmark 2007. National mapping]. Copenhagen: SFI, report 07:22.

Benjaminsen, L. & Busch-Geertsema, V. (2009) 'Labour market reforms and homelessness in Denmark and Germany: dilemmas and consequences, *European Journal of Homelessness,* 3: 127-153.

Busch-Geertsema, V. (2010) *The Finnish National Programme to reduce long-term homelessness* (Synthesis Report for European Peer Review).Vienna: OESB.

Busch-Geertsema, V. (2013): *Housing First Europe. Final Report.* Bremen/Brussels: GISS & The Danish National Board of Social Services.

Busch-Geertsema, V. and Sahlin, I. (2007) The Role of Hostels and Temporary Accommodation. *European Journal of Homelessness*, 2, pp. 67-93.

Busch-Geertsema, V. & Fitzpatrick, S. (2008) 'Effective homelessness prevention? Explaining reductions in homelessness in Germany and England', *European Journal of Homelessness*, 2: 69-95.

European Commission (2013) *Social Investment Package: Commission Staff Working Document. Confronting Homelessness in the European Union.* Brussels: European Commission.

European Commission and the Council (2010) *Joint Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion 2010.* Brussels: EC.

European Consensus Conference on Homelessness (2010*) Policy Recommendations of the Jury.* Brussels: European Commission.

Fitzpatrick, S. & Stephens M. (2013) 'Welfare regimes, social values and homelessness: comparing responses to marginalised groups in six European countries', *Housing Studies,* DOI*:* 10.1080/02673037.2014.848265.

Hansen Löfstrand, C. (2010) Reforming the work to combat long-term homelessness in Sweden, *Acta Sociologica*, 53, pp. 19-34.

Johnsen, S. and Teixeira, L. (2010) *Staircases, Elevators and Cycles of Change: 'Housing First' and Other Housing Models for Homeless People with Complex Support Needs*. London: Crisis.

Johnson, G., Parkinson, S. and Parsell, C. (2012) *Policy Shift or Program Drift? Implementing Housing First in Australia*, AHURI Final Report No. 184. Melbourne: Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute.

Kettunen, M. (2013) Asunto ensin – malli Yhdysvalloista ja soveltaminen Suomessa. *Yhteiskuntapolitiikka* 5. http://www.thl.fi/fi_FI/web/fi/ajankohtaista/lehdet/yhteiskuntapolitiikka/arkisto/5_2013

Parsell, C, Fitzpatrick, S & Busch-Geertsema, V. (2013) 'Common Ground in Australia: An Object Lesson in Evidence Hierarchies and Policy Transfer' *Housing Studies*, pp. 1-19. DOI:10.1080/02673037.2013.824558.

Pleace, N. (2012). *Housing First.* FEANTSA/DIHAL/MEDDTL: Brussels and Paris. Available at www.feantsa.org/files/freshstart/Policy%20documents/2012_04_27_FINAL_EN.pdf (accessed 24 January 2013).

Quilgars, D. (2010) 'Youth homelessness', in O'Sullivan, E., Busch-Geertsema, V., Quilgars, D. and Pleace, N. (Eds) *Homelessness Research in Europe.* Brussels: FEANTSA.

Rambøll & SFI (2013): *Hjemløsestrategien. Afsluttende rapport.* [The homelessness strategy. Final report.]. Copenhagen: Rambøll & SFI.

Shinn, M. (2007) 'International homelessness: policy, socio-cultural, and individual perspectives', *Journal of Social Issues*, 63(3): 657-677.

Smith, J. (2009) *A Comparative Report on Youth Homelessness and Social Exclusion in the Czech Republic, the Netherlands, Portugal and the UK* (Deliverable under European Union 7th Framework Programme under the Social- economic Sciences and Humanities theme). (http://www.movisie.nl/118836/eng/).

Stephens, M. & Fitzpatrick, S. (2007) 'Welfare regimes, housing systems and homelessness: how are they linked?', *European Journal of Homelessness,* 1: 201-212.

Stephens, M., Elsinga, M., Fitzpatrick, S., van Steen, G. and Chzhen, Y. (2010) *Study on Housing and Exclusion: Welfare Policies, Housing Provision and Labour Markets.* Brussels: European Commission.

Tsemberis, S. (2010) *Housing First. The Pathways Model to End Homelessness for People with Mental Illness and Addiction.* Minnesota: Hazelden.

30

HOW TO OBTAIN EU PUBLICATIONS

Free publications:
- one copy:
  via EU Bookshop (http://bookshop.europa.eu);
- more than one copy or posters/maps:
  from the European Union's representations (http://ec.europa.eu/represent_en.htm);
  from the delegations in non-EU countries (http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/index_en.htm);
  by contacting the Europe Direct service (http://europa.eu/europedirect/index_en.htm) or calling 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11 (freephone number from anywhere in the EU) (*).
  (*) The information given is free, as are most calls (though some operators, phone boxes or hotels may charge you).

Priced publications:
- via EU Bookshop (http://bookshop.europa.eu).

Priced subscriptions
- via one of the sales agents of the Publications Office of the European Union (http://publications.europa.eu/others/agents/index_en.htm).

Sustainable ways of preventing homelessness

Host country: **Denmark**

Peer countries: **Austria – Bulgaria – Croatia – Finland – France – Ireland – Norway – Romania – Spain – Sweden – United Kingdom**

Stakeholders: **Eurocities, FEANTSA**

Across the EU homelessness stands at an unprecedentedly high level, particularly among young people. On 22 November, Peer Review participants met in Copenhagen to learn how Denmark has tackled homelessness using an integrated housing-first strategy.

The EU Social Investment Package (SIP) includes a call toward Member States to implement comprehensive strategies for tackling homelessness "based on prevention, housing-led approaches and reviewing regulations and practices on eviction". The Danish National Homelessness Strategy (2009-2013) offers an example of how to implement the "housing first" principle – where access to permanent housing with support precedes other interventions – in a cost-effective manner.

Publications Office