



Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived

Tackling homelessness through FEAD support
13th FEAD Network Meeting

6-7 November 2018, Brussels

This document has been prepared for the European Commission, however, it reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

This service is provided by Ecorys on behalf of DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion of the European Commission. It is financed by FEAD technical assistance.

© European Union, 2018.

1. Introduction

What are homelessness and housing exclusion?

When one thinks about homelessness, the mind often goes to people ‘sleeping rough’ on the streets. Yet homelessness includes a much broader **range of living situations**. The understanding of homelessness, and hence its measurement, varies across Member States, making it difficult to compare situations and exchange on policies. In 2005, FEANTSA developed a **European Typology of Homelessness and housing exclusion (ETHOS)** that has since been tested in various Member States and now guides EU-wide policies on homelessness.

ETHOS distinguishes between four main situations:

- **rooflessness** (without a shelter of any kind; sleeping rough)
- **houselessness** (with a place to sleep but of a temporary nature, in institutions or shelter)
- **living in insecure housing** (threatened with severe exclusion due to insecure tenancy, eviction, domestic violence)
- **living in inadequate housing** (in caravans on illegal campsites, in unfit housing, in extreme overcrowding).¹

Despite this progress in achieving a common framework for understanding homelessness, there is a high degree of **variation** in the way homelessness is & conceptualised defined at local, regional, national and international level.² The OECD has set up a database on housing deprivation, which includes data on homelessness.³ This data is provided by MS and is non-comparable, based on different definitions, periodicities and levels of coverage. Data in most countries (22 countries out of 30) covers people living in accommodation for the homeless and people living in emergency accommodation (21 countries). About half of the surveyed countries also cover people living in non-conventional dwellings and people living temporarily with family and friends due to lack of housing, while only seven countries also include people living in institutions in their homelessness statistics.⁴

A growing concern in EU Member States

In spite of definitional issues, there is evidence that housing exclusion phenomena are significant and **on the rise in most EU countries**. Data from different MS is not comparable but reveals upwards trends within countries. A recent overview by FEANTSA counted 860,000 homeless people in Germany in 2016, with a 150% increase from 2014 to 2016. In the Netherlands, 60,120 people were in homeless accommodation services in 2016 (an increase of 11% since 2011), while an average of 16,437 people per day used emergency shelters in Spain in 2016 (20.5% more than in 2014). In France, 20,845 people called the ‘115’ homeless helpline to request accommodation in 2017 (17% more than in 2016), while in Italy, 50,724 people requested basic assistance (showering facilities, food, shelter) in one of the 768 service

¹ <https://www.feantsa.org/en/toolkit/2005/04/01/ethos-typology-on-homelessness-and-housing-exclusion>

² [ETHOS – Taking Stock](#), 2006

³ The so called “[ETHOS light](#)”

⁴ [OECD Affordable Housing Database – HC3.1 homeless population](#); data refer to 2015 or the latest year available.

providers in the 158 cities concerned by the survey – an increase of 6% between 2011 and 2014.⁵

Worsening affordability in many Member States due to rental prices soaring faster than incomes represents one major structural cause of increased housing exclusion and homelessness. In 2016, 11.1% of the population and 29% of poor households were overburdened by housing costs.⁶

A group particularly at risk of becoming homeless are **young people**, who increasingly struggle to afford housing in many contexts. Among EU citizens aged between 18 and 24 living below the poverty line, 43% – a percentage four times that of the population as a whole – were overburdened by housing costs in Europe in 2016. Foreign nationals (especially those from outside the EU) are more overburdened by housing costs and experience more overcrowding than nationals. Specific categories that are particularly exposed to the risk of becoming homeless are **LGBT people, youth in transition from care, and victims of domestic violence**.

Besides the fundamental rights dimension of the issue, governments have much to gain from preventing and reducing homelessness. Homelessness generates significant costs for society. Homelessness and housing exclusion are associated with poor health outcomes, which can engender societal costs.⁷ This is one reason why a growing number of countries have adopted **integrated strategies** to reduce homelessness.⁸ In a survey by the OECD at the end of 2016, 12 countries out of the 35 surveyed had an active national strategy to combat homelessness, and in an additional four countries there were regional homelessness strategies.⁹ There were remarkable successes; for example, Finland managed to reduce its number of homeless individuals by 10% from 2013 to 2016. In Norway, there was a 36% drop observed in the number of homeless people between 2012 (6,259) and 2016 (3,909 – the lowest figure since 1996). Both countries treated homelessness as a solvable issue related to a (general) housing problem and not to personal inadequacies of homeless people. They devised integrated and decentralised strategies with specific, measurable and reachable targets, set in a clear time frame.¹⁰

However, in some countries there were **steps back and contradictory developments** in policies affecting homelessness. These were identified by the Abbé Pierre Foundation and FEANTSA in: “Light-touch policy: scaling down goals, resources, continuity and stakeholder responsibility”; “Paper policies: developing a strategy and not acting on it”; “Developing an ambitious policy and sabotaging the outcomes in practice by criminalising homeless people”;

⁵ Abbé Pierre Foundation – FEANTSA, [Third Overview of Housing Exclusion in Europe 2018](#), March 2018

⁶ Ibidem, p. 55

⁷ [SWD\(2013\)42final](#).

⁸ Ibidem, p. 27

⁹ Australia, Canada, Chile, the Czech Republic, Finland, Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg, Poland, Portugal, Spain and the United States all had an active national homelessness strategy in place. Due to the distribution of competences across levels of government, Austria, Germany, New Zealand and the United Kingdom did not have one single homelessness strategy at national level, but they did have different ones at regional level. France, the Netherlands, Norway and Sweden all had national homelessness strategies in the past, which had since come to an end. Bulgaria, Cyprus, Estonia, Greece, Croatia, Hungary, Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Switzerland did not report having any homelessness strategies in place, with the exception of Lithuania, where the capital municipality had recently set up its own homelessness programme. Source: <http://www.oecd.org/els/family/H3-2-Homeless-strategies.pdf>

¹⁰ Abbé Pierre Foundation – FEANTSA, [Third Overview of Housing Exclusion in Europe 2018](#), March 2018, p. 16.

and “Policy silos: the risk of having a homeless strategy separate from an efficient policy on decent and affordable housing for all”.¹¹

2. Fighting homelessness: European policy context

The right to housing

Protecting housing rights is a fundamental part of the EU’s rights-based approach to development. The EU has committed to the **UN Sustainable Development Agenda**¹², and one of the targets of Goal 11 (“*Make cities inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable*”) is to ensure access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing and basic services and upgrade slums by 2030. Housing assistance can be considered as a basic service, the access to which for women, men, the poor and the vulnerable is a target under Goal 1 (“*End poverty in all its forms everywhere*”).

The EU recognises and respects the right to social and housing assistance so as to ensure a decent existence for all those who lack sufficient resources, according to the **Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU** (Article 34.3).¹³ The **Social Investment Package** required Member States to “*confront homelessness through comprehensive strategies based on prevention, housing-led approaches and reviewing regulations and practices on eviction; make use of the Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived (FEAD) as appropriate to address material deprivation and homelessness, including through the support of accompanying measures promoting social inclusion*”.¹⁴

Furthermore, the **European Pillar of Social Rights**, proclaimed in 2017,¹⁵ sets out as a specific priority the right to housing and assistance for homeless people, including the provision of access to social housing or housing assistance of good quality for those in need; appropriate assistance and protection against forced eviction for vulnerable people; and adequate shelter and services to promote the social inclusion of the homeless.¹⁶ Although homelessness & housing exclusion is not (yet) well covered by the scorecard with which the Commission monitors the European Pillar of Social Rights, there is increasing sensitivity towards the issue. In the context of the European Semester, housing exclusion and homelessness have been dealt with in a number of analyses of country social situations. In 2018, the Annual Growth Survey covered homelessness for the first time.¹⁷

The role of EU Funding

The European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF) contribute to addressing social exclusion, including housing exclusion. While the **European Regional Development Fund** (ERDF) tackles the problem from an infrastructural point of view, the **European Social Fund** (ESF) and the **Fund for European aid to the most deprived** (FEAD) are important in terms

¹¹ Ibidem, p. 30.

¹² https://ec.europa.eu/info/strategy/international-strategies/global-topics/sustainable-development-goals/eu-approach-sustainable-development_en

¹³ [Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union](#) (2012/C 326/02)

¹⁴ [COM\(2013\) 83 final](#)

¹⁵ The European Pillar of Social Rights was jointly signed by the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission on 17 November 2017 at the Social Summit for Fair Jobs and Growth in Gothenburg, Sweden.

¹⁶ https://ec.europa.eu/commission/priorities/deeper-and-fairer-economic-and-monetary-union/european-pillar-social-rights/european-pillar-social-rights-20-principles_en#chapter-iii-social-protection-and-inclusion

¹⁷ [COM\(2017\) 690 final](#)

of social inclusion opportunities, material assistance and accompanying measures for the homeless.

Although comprehensive data on ESIF funding related to housing exclusion are not available, one of the ESIF-measured indicators shows that at the end of 2017 there were 14,873 housing units planned for renovation by Member States in the 2014–2020 period, of which the largest shares were in Italy (5,599), Spain (5,219) and Hungary (2,019).¹⁸

Many EU-funded projects involve an integrated approach (see example in box below).

Case study example: 5Bridges (Nantes, France)

The ERDF co-funded 5Bridges project in Nantes, western France, is developing **innovative solutions to homelessness and urban poverty which involve tackling the links between the main factors behind the problems**. The project aims to break the cycle of poverty by focusing on five main areas: jobs, housing, health, inclusion and empowerment of beneficiaries through sustained active involvement.

5Bridges is implemented from the ground upwards, with beneficiaries actively involved in designing the services. The centrepiece will be a building in Nantes which is already home to healthcare facilities, solidarity-focused businesses and private and social housing. The building will operate as a one-stop-shop, bringing together people from different social groups, and providing job opportunities through a neighbourhood restaurant, a collective urban farm and a solidarity shop. It will also include social housing, healthcare and tailored social services available 24/7.

5Bridges is funded through the Urban Innovative Actions programme.

Source: https://cohesiondata.ec.europa.eu/projects/row-xtzr~z8hk_q49v

Co-financed by the ERDF, URBACT is the European territorial cooperation programme aiming to foster sustainable integrated urban development in cities across Europe. In the framework of URBACT, housing-related issues are treated in the context of urban development.¹⁹ URBACT participates, together with other public and non-profit organisations, in the Urban Agenda Partnership on Housing, aimed at fostering affordable housing of good quality.²⁰

3. Examples of existing practices

This section provides examples of projects, some of which funded through FEAD and/or other EU funding programmes, which address homelessness and housing exclusion in EU Member States. Projects address homelessness and housing exclusion at different stages and from different angles: outreach to homeless people; interventions to provide them with the necessary assistance; follow-up with reintegration projects that ensure the sustainability of interventions; and prevention of falling (back) into homelessness.

¹⁸ <https://cohesiondata.ec.europa.eu/themes/9> (data 13/12/2017)

¹⁹ <http://urbact.eu/housing>

²⁰ <https://ec.europa.eu/futurium/en/node/1710#Objectives>

Outreach

In many large cities, homeless people who live on the streets in small groups are a particularly hard-to-reach target group for social work. They include a wide range of vulnerable people. There is often a need for a flexible outreach service that could provide assistance to these people. Outreach includes **going to visit homeless people where they are in public space**, talking to them, and offering them opportunities in a respectful manner which guarantees anonymity.

Case study example: StreetBer (Berlin, Germany)

The **FEAD** StreetBer project aims to improve the access of homeless people, people at risk of becoming homeless, and particularly disadvantaged newly arrived EU citizens to the provision of guidance and assistance from the regular support system. The key feature of StreetBer is that **its team works everywhere in the city – including parks, streets and other public areas – not just in particular “hotspots”**. Once the homeless person is located and contacted, counselling is then provided. There are **no language barriers**, since the team is multilingual. The counselling is short term and the client is often referred to other institutions and groups. The contact with the client is **anonymous** – no data are registered and there is no long-term case management. Sometimes people are only known by their first name or even a nickname.

The project started in March 2016 as an initiative of Gangway e.V., a volunteer association. It is supported by donations and sponsored by the senate and district offices, FEAD and the Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

Source: *Reducing deprivation, supporting inclusion: FEAD case studies, 2017*

Providing a facility as simple as a locker room to leave one's belongings can be a first step for reaching out to homeless people who, being unemployed, experiencing mental health problems, suffering from drug and/or alcohol abuse, or being challenged by high levels of debt, are likely to be excluded from many parts of social life. The objective is to **build bridges** between them and mainstream society.

Case study example: UDENFOR (Copenhagen, Denmark)

The **FEAD** UDENFOR project supports vulnerable individuals through outreach initiatives, social support and counselling services. The teams carry out outreach activities, with **volunteers and staff going out into the streets and speaking with homeless individuals**. The “locker room” in Copenhagen consists of a room with a number of storage boxes where homeless people can leave their belongings. The volunteer overseeing the room can then **engage with the homeless person and offer them support or advice** relating to finding employment, food, access to healthcare services, administrative support, etc. The project in Copenhagen gives 50 to 70 homeless people access to a locker annually, as well as helping 12 to 15 individuals receive intensive help. The project also aims to support one to five individuals a year by providing temporary paid jobs in the locker room, and between 15 and 20 homeless people are helped to reconnect with their country of origin each year.

The UDENFOR project is co-financed by FEAD and run by the homonymous Foundation

(Foundation projekt UDENFOR) established by Dr. med. Preben Brandt in 1996.

Source: [Reducing deprivation, supporting inclusion: FEAD case studies, 2016](#).

Intervention

Responses to homelessness are evolving. The provision of housing is increasingly seen to be at the heart of interventions to address homelessness. While the predominant idea has generally been that accommodation in regular housing should be the last of a series of reintegration steps whereby the person would gradually become able to live independently (the so called “staircase approach”), some state-of-the art approaches now choose to provide “**Housing First**”. According to this approach, the person is immediately enabled to live in their own home, while the intervention focuses on improving health and well-being and (re)creating social connections. The Housing First approach has been central to the successful national homelessness strategy in Finland, but is also applied to some degree in other countries.²¹

Case study example: Väinölä Housing First (Finland)

Väinölä Housing First is run by the Salvation Army, with housing provided by Y-Foundation, an organisation that develops new social housing for rent in Finland. **The housing is in individual apartments**, which are all located in a single apartment block. The support services provided are present on site on a 24/7 basis. There is a staff team of 11 people, including social workers, health professionals, volunteer coordinators and a work coach, who helps users achieve social integration through paid work. The approach used is a **case-management model**, both drawing on the staff team within Väinölä Housing First and involving external service providers as necessary.

Housing First service users have the option – though they of course are not required – to participate in a therapeutic community. Alongside offering case management and support, Väinölä Housing First encourages **voluntary participation in the running of the service**. All the cleaning and gardening work within the Housing First project is undertaken by the people who live there. People living in Väinölä Housing First are also involved in events designed to promote their **social integration within the community**. There are open house events in which neighbours are invited into the Housing First building, and other work centred on informing and educating the neighbourhood about Housing First. People using Housing First also volunteer to keep the neighbourhood tidy, which is designed to promote positive relationships with the surrounding community.

Source: N. Pleace, [Housing First guide – Europe, 2016](#)

The fact that housing is provided from the outset does not mean that the health, mental health and social circumstances of beneficiaries are not paid due consideration; in fact, the opposite is true. Put simply, the provision of housing is not conditional on the resolution of such issues.

²¹ N. Pleace, [Housing First guide – Europe, 2016](#).

A number of FEAD funded projects, such as UDEFOR (Denmark) and StreetBer (Germany), also pay attention to aspects relating to health and well-being.

Furthermore, it is important to note the existence of tailored services to cater for special needs of **homeless youth**. Young people often become homeless following conflicts with their families that lead them to run away from home. A number of specialised organisations in EU countries have developed specific approaches to this target group.

Case study example: Centrepoint (United Kingdom)

Centrepoint is a charity providing support for homeless **young people aged between 16 and 25. Accommodation is available for up to two years**, after which support continues to be available for a further six months to support independent living. Alongside accommodation, other services are offered such as health support (e.g. counselling) and the **development of life skills**; for example, basic, one-to-one maths and English lessons, information on budgeting and work experience opportunities and advice are provided, with the aim of facilitating [re]entry into education, training or employment.

Centrepoint supports more than 9,200 homeless young people a year into a home and a job in London, Manchester, Yorkshire and the North East. It provides 1,057 bed spaces via 60 accommodation services that include hostels and flats. Since being established in 1969, Centrepoint has supported 125,000 homeless young people.

Source: *Eurofound, Access of young people to information and support services: case studies (unpublished report)*; <https://centrepoint.org.uk/>

Sometimes, the intervention needs to be more specific because of additional dimensions of exclusion and discrimination. **Young LGBTI people** are at a heightened risk of homelessness arising from family conflict who are in conflict with their families because of their sexuality or gender identity. Mainstream reception centres for homeless and runaway youth are often inadequate because young people can again find themselves discriminated against, and staff are not always trained to understand the needs of this target group. Specialised organisations have therefore step in.

Case study example: Le Refuge (France)

The association Le Refuge was established in order to cater for the specific needs of young people in the 18-24 age group who are in distress because of anticipated or real rejection by their families due to their sexual orientation and/or gender identity. Through a hotline, counselling and sheltering services, as well as support with administrative procedures, housing and job seeking, young LGBT users are **accompanied towards independence**. In some cases, when possible, family ties are re-established through family mediation. Professional psychologists, social workers and volunteers work in the association. About 70 sheltering places are made available to an average of 200 to 250 young people a year. In addition, the association conducts awareness-raising activities against homophobia in schools and among the wider public.

Source: www.le-refuge.org

Sustainability and reintegration

The provision of housing and social, mental health and health support is insufficient if there are no long-term solutions for the social inclusion and reintegration of homeless people. Some projects aim to make interventions sustainable, for example by supporting **employment integration**. Linking housing assistance to employment services is an example of how policy silos can be broken down to achieve sustainable results through a more holistic approach.

Case study example: Housing and Reintegration (Greece)

In 2013, the then Prime Minister of Greece Antonis Samaras announced that €20 million of the primary surplus resulting from the budget cuts stipulated by the bailout programmes was to be used for measures to help the poor and unemployed. The General Directorate for Social Welfare of the Ministry of Labour, Social Insurance and Social Solidarity was requested immediately to design a programme that would aim to house homeless people living on the streets or in hostels. The programme targets: families and people who are accommodated in social homeless hostels and shelters or who have made use of the homeless day centre services; families and individuals who are registered as homeless by Municipalities or Centres for Social Welfare; women accommodated in shelters for victims of violence; and young people who are hosted in child protection structures, are at least 18 years of age and are not in education.

The programme is based on two pillars: housing and reintegration. The specific objective of the housing pillar is the **direct transition to autonomous forms of living through the provision of housing and social care services**. The specific objective of the reintegration pillar is the return to the community through the provision of **services for reintegration into employment**. Such services include traineeships in private sector enterprises, support in building enterprises/self-employment, employment in the agricultural sector and vouchers for training services. The programme is implemented through NGOs, church foundations, municipalities and regional authorities. Although not immune from difficulties (e.g. bureaucratic and administrative burden that limits absorption capacity), the programme is considered groundbreaking in Greece as it offers a complete plan that starts with independent housing and ends with the placement of beneficiaries in subsidised jobs.

Source: *N. Kourachanis, Homelessness Policies in Crisis Greece: The Case of the Housing and Reintegration Program, European Journal of Homelessness Volume 11, No. 1, May 2017*

Prevention

Finally, *preventing* homelessness is also an important intervention area. There are many structural factors involved in homelessness, from the situation of the housing market to socioeconomic crises. Addressing such structural issues remains the most important form of prevention. However, sometimes direct psychological and social support in the right moment can help vulnerable people to avoid falling into the spiral of homelessness and exclusion. For instance, there are **hotlines and other information and support services** that aim to avoid that young people in distress end up living on the streets.

Case study example: Inter-AKT (United Kingdom)

The Albert Kennedy Trust (AKT) is an LGBT youth homeless charity aimed at young people between the ages of 16 and 25 who identify as LGBT. Inter-AKT is a digital support service launched by the organisation in 2017 that allows young people to speak directly to trained **digital mentors**. Mentors are available to speak on the following topics via chat, messaging, video calls or audio: housing and homelessness; developing skills; coming out to friends and family; bullying and abuse; looking after personal well-being; and finding local services and groups. Access to trained mentors is a way for young people to overcome barriers to specific information related to their situations, having perhaps faced stigmatisation or family rejection due to their sexuality or gender identity.

Source: <https://www.akt.org.uk/>

4. Challenges in addressing homelessness and way forward in relation to FEAD

Limitations

As some of the above project examples show, the topic of homelessness and housing exclusion is well present among the key concerns addressed by FEAD. FEAD implementation data shows that food aid and basic material assistance (OP I) is provided to the homeless in the majority of Member states, and that social inclusion measures (OP II) often target the homeless specifically, as part of groups not reached by the welfare state. The 10th FEAD Meeting in Copenhagen already provided an opportunity to learn about several homelessness-focused OP II projects²².

FEAD is used to address the needs of homeless people within the limitations of its **scope of FEAD** according to Regulation No 223/2014. Although housing is not considered part of the “basic material assistance” provided in OPI (and the volume of FEAD funding would not allow to meet the cost of housing), advice on housing can be provided as an accompanying measure. Furthermore, advice on healthcare and social services that are important in the fight against homelessness can be provided. In OP II, social inclusion measures refer to non-financial, non-material assistance, which equally prevents any direct support to housing infrastructure; yet, well-designed inclusion measures can contribute strategically towards ending homelessness.

Although the FEAD addresses the homeless as a key target group, most implementing partners are not equipped to deal with homelessness according to state-of-the-art approaches and **lack relevant expertise and skills**. At the same time, contact with more specialised organisations is not always possible, or such organisations are not part of the current network of implementing partners.

As a consequence, the approach taken towards homeless people often **risks being limited to temporary emergency solutions**, like the provision of food and shelter. These interventions undoubtedly provide assistance to some of the most deprived people in Europe.

²² <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=1089&newsId=9106&furtherNews=yes>

There is however also scope to use the FEAD as a strategic instrument for the social inclusion of homeless people. For example, in Italy FEAD-ESF OP has been developed to support a transition towards housing-led and Housing First responses to homelessness. In Germany, the OP II approach has been used to address unmet needs amongst disadvantaged mobile EU citizens and people who are (at risk of becoming) homeless. These inspiring practices show the potential of the EU's first-ever instrument for the most deprived to make a real difference in the area of homelessness.

Furthermore, it cannot be ignored that FEAD partners have **little or no influence on national and local housing policies**, including their exclusionary character towards some target groups (e.g. the requirement of being registered as a resident in order to be entitled to housing assistance). They are confronted with the consequences of such policies, but have no means to go against them or change them.

Even when local or national policies are not exclusionary, the context in which FEAD operates is often characterised by policy silos and a **lack of integrated social, health and housing strategies** to prevent homelessness and housing exclusion, which makes addressing the issue more difficult.

Solutions adopted

Despite these limitations, the FEAD community retains its ambition to contribute to the social inclusion of the homeless, as one of the most deprived population groups in the EU. How can these limitations be overcome? Which options are available to FEAD members?

A first possible course of action is to develop **synergies between FEAD and the ERDF to fund innovative housing projects**. In Italy, the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs launched a call for innovative projects aimed at reducing homelessness. The government committed to investing €50 million into sustainable actions to fight homelessness, including Housing First programmes in large and medium-sized cities. The budget comes from both FEAD and the ERDF (Social Inclusion Investment Priority).²³

A second option is to **use ESF to extend the inclusion intervention beyond the emergency phase**. The winners of the FEANTSA Ending Homelessness Awards 2017 provide interesting examples of using ESF to combat homelessness – with a focus on specific risk categories (e.g. young people, Roma and families with complex needs) – as well as discrimination and exclusion.

Case study example: Winners of the Ending Homelessness Awards 2017 – using ESF to combat homelessness

In **Brno**, the municipality has used ESF funding to test the Housing First approach with a group of 50 families, two-thirds of which belong to the Roma community. The 50 homeless families have been provided with housing and intensive Housing First case management. So far, the project has demonstrated positive impacts on family well-being, children's behaviour, security and employment. The project also contributes to changing the narrative regarding Roma families, which is essential to preventing discrimination on the housing market.

²³Abbé Pierre Foundation – FEANTSA, [Third Overview of Housing Exclusion in Europe 2018](#), March 2018, p. 28

In **Helsinki**, a small ESF grant has been used by the Helsinki City Youth Department to co-fund a project to facilitate access to housing for young people aged 18–25. The project does this through innovative solutions such as communal housing, living with the elderly, seasonal housing combined with summer jobs, housing combined with working for the neighbourhood, and a digital platform combining housing, work and social interaction.

In **Glasgow**, the Homelessness Network has used ESF as a leverage to attract social investors to a project to reduce the use of temporary accommodation for homeless people. The intervention has been designed specifically for people with complex needs. Homelessness NGOs and social landlords are assisted in their transition towards Housing First. They are also supported in care management, allowing them to provide the appropriate clinical and social care support for new tenants.

Source: [*FEANTSA Ending Homelessness Awards: A Handbook on Using the European Social Fund to Fight Homelessness, 2017*](#)

A third possible response to the challenge of addressing homelessness involves **networking with specialised organisations** to include them in the referral network used for accompanying measures delivered to FEAD beneficiaries. These might include public sector agencies, but also NGOs such as those mentioned earlier (Inter-AKT, Centrepoint and Le Refuge).

Finally, in order to become more effective in modifying the contextual and structural conditions that contribute to the increase in homelessness, FEAD implementing partners may consider joining other organisations and networks in **advocacy** campaigns for integrated local and national strategies to end homelessness.

5. Conclusions

Combating homelessness and housing exclusion requires a multidimensional and holistic approach, which entails the use of specialised expertise and the pooling of different funding resources under integrated and well-thought-out strategies. FEAD, although limited by its legally mandated scope, can play an important role and should continue to do so, as homelessness represents one of the worst forms of material deprivation. There is scope for FEAD to be better used as a strategic instrument to improve the living situations of people experiencing or at risk of homelessness.

In this context, a number of questions arise, including – but not limited to – the following:

- What is the specific contribution that FEAD projects can make to combating homelessness, under OP I and OP II respectively?
- Which approaches work best to address the homeless, and to ensure that people get out of homelessness?
- Which synergies are needed with other projects and organisations in order to make such contributions more effective?
- How can FEAD be combined with other EU funds in order to achieve sustainable results in housing inclusion?

- In view of the future MFF, what are the threats and opportunities when it comes to making effective use of the FEAD to address homelessness?

The 13th FEAD **Network Meeting on 6-7 November 2018** provides a valuable opportunity to raise awareness and address these issues. By combining the experience of the FEAD community in this area with that of specialised organisations, the Network will search for, and hopefully find, innovative ways to make FEAD work for homeless people.

Contact us

Visit our website: <http://ec.europa.eu/feadnetwork>

Or email us with your questions: FEAD.Network@ecorys.com

We look forward to hearing from you!

This service is provided by Ecorys on behalf of the European Commission. It is financed by FEAD technical assistance¹⁴ DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion.