

*6<sup>th</sup> European seminar on local homeless strategies*

# **Governance of homeless service provision at local level**

One-size-fits-all or diversity of models across Europe?

Brussels, 17 June 2011

## **Contents**

Opening session

Session 1: In-house model – Local authorities as homeless service providers

Session 2: Partnership model – Homeless service providers rooted in local communities

Session 3: Market-based model – Market elements in homeless service provision

ETHOS – European typology of homelessness and housing exclusion

Seminar programme

Seminar presentations

# report



The 6<sup>th</sup> European Seminar on Local Homeless Strategies was held on 17 June 2011 in Brussels. It was hosted by the Committee of the Regions, with the support of FEANTSA (European Federation of National Organisations Working with Homeless People) and HABITACT (European Exchange Forum on Local Homeless Strategies).

FEANTSA President **René Kneip** moderated the one-day event, which brought together stakeholders from all governance levels (local, regional, national and European).

René Kneip began by welcoming all participants to the seminar on “Governance of homeless service provision at local level: One-size-fits-all or diversity of models across Europe?” which aimed to analyse and compare three broad models of homeless service provision:

- the in-house model, where all the services are provided by the municipality itself
- the partnership model, where local authorities and NGOs plan and implement homeless services in close cooperation
- the market-based model, which is based on the method of tendering (i. e. buying) services

Each of the seminar sessions focused on one of the three models of service provision, showing a number of local examples and discussing the positive and negative aspects of each model.

## Opening session



The seminar was opened by **Mercedes Bresso**, President of the Committee of the Regions, who gave some general background on EU homeless policies and explained why homelessness occupies an important place on the Committee’s political agenda.

Mercedes Bresso mentioned the 2010 Opinion on Homelessness, in which the Committee of the Regions committed to the fight against homelessness and housing exclusion. She stressed that high levels of homelessness were against the European Treaties. Therefore, and with regard to the EU2020 strategy’s poverty reduction target, homelessness is an important point on the EU agenda.

According to Mercedes Bresso, the main difficulty of the fight against homelessness lies in the fragmentation of responsibilities between local, regional, national and European stakeholders. She underlined the importance of social housing in the fight against homelessness and said that the principle of subsidiarity should not apply to social housing. Instead, social housing should be addressed by European Cohesion Policy.

The second speaker of this session, **Karen Murphy**, Head of Services of the Irish Council for Social Housing, talked about the impact of the economic crisis on the Irish homeless sector.

Since the crisis hit Ireland, mortgage arrears and homeless numbers have risen drastically. The public sector has problems reacting to this development, because it was hit severely by the crisis and now has fewer revenues. Homeless services across the country will have to face budget cuts in 2012.

However, according to Karen Murphy, the Irish Government still is committed to ending homelessness and this commitment is reflected by the work of local authorities. More and more local authorities are shifting focus from homeless service provision to homeless prevention (debt counselling and rent arrear management). The provision of social housing is also becoming increasingly important.

Karen Murphy’s presentation suggests that the economic crisis did not only have negative effects on homeless services – it can also be seen as trigger for change, as local authorities are trying to find more cost-effective approaches to fighting homelessness.





The last speaker of the opening session, **Isobel Anderson**, Chair in Housing Studies of the University of Stirling (Scotland), gave an overview of different forms of service provision in Europe and the reasons that led to their development.

She explained that across Europe there were various national approaches to homelessness: In the Nordic countries, the State and the municipalities traditionally have the leading role in the fight against homelessness. In the UK, there are a variety of mixed approaches and public authorities are working closely with NGOs. In Eastern European countries, NGOs provide the majority of local services.

However, Isobel Anderson underlined that, on a municipal level, in the 1990s traditional service provision split up into a multitude of different approaches, shifting power towards the local government and giving more responsibilities to NGOs. The decentralisation of service provision, as well as the different national and local contexts, led to a diversification of service provision models and the emergence of contractual purchaser/provider-relationships.

In Europe, homeless services are usually funded through public means, however, in recent years, a shift towards more competitiveness and tendering procedures could be observed. The newly emerging relationship between local authorities and NGOs (purchaser/provider-roles) has an impact on the sustainability of funding for the NGO sector.

Isobel Anderson highlighted that there still were gaps in evidence – particularly regarding the effectiveness of homeless services (e. g. Housing First approaches) and inter-professional working.

## Session 1: In-house-model – Local authorities as homeless service providers

The first plenary session focused on the in-house model of homeless service provision, where municipalities plan and implement the majority of homeless services themselves.



**Birthe Povlsen**, from the Danish National Board of Social Services, talked about homeless service provision in Danish cities. She explained that in Denmark, like in most Nordic countries, the Government is responsible for welfare provision. This is called the universal welfare model (cf. the residual welfare model in the US, where the individual carries most responsibility her-/himself).

This results in social and homeless service provision in Denmark being affected by multilevel-governance: The Government develops national strategies, which are then implemented by the municipalities.

Birthe Povlsen underlined that this was the main reason why Danish municipalities provided most of their services in-house. Local authorities in Denmark develop local action plans against homelessness, mostly housing-led policies.

The positive aspect of this is that, if the municipality is solely responsible for all the services, services are coordinated better and the homeless citizen is the centre of attention. However, the system is also bureaucratic and rigid, leaving little space for a more individual approach. This can result in homeless persons being kept in the homeless system longer than necessary.

Answering a question from the floor, Birthe Povlsen explained that housing services were accessible to Danish citizens and foreigners with a recognised legal status only.

In his presentation, **Aldis Strapcans**, Policy Coordinator of Riga Welfare Department, explained why the Latvian Capital has traditionally been providing homeless services in-house and how the traditional model has evolved in recent years.

In 1996, the municipality of Riga opened its first homeless shelter, since at that time there were not many NGOs in the Riga Region. The municipality has had the leading role in administering and implementing all social structures. The only services traditionally provided by NGOs are soup kitchens.

In recent years, the traditional service provision model has been changing and developing into a mix of in-house and market-based model. Riga City still provides many services in-house, but in addition to that also buys shelter services from NGOs.



As defined by the “Strategy for the Development of the Social Service and Assistance System 2008-2013” (approved in 2008), Riga City Council monitors the homelessness situation and determines which services are necessary. These services are then offered by either Riga’s own shelter or by NGOs.

Aldis Strapcans described the increasing cooperation with NGOs as an added value. The competition created between NGOs often leads to a high quality of the services provided. The fact that NGOs often are small structures makes them more flexible than municipal services. However, there is also a risk that NGOs are too small and lack resources to deliver the needed services.



**Emmanuel Cornelius**, from Esch-sur-Alzette (Luxembourg), explained that providing services in-house often is not a spontaneous decision but a development. In Esch-sur-Alzette, the in-house-system developed as a result of diverging views on homeless service provision between the Luxembourg Government and the Municipal Administration. As an example, the Government wished to open one shelter which could accept a high number of clients per social worker, while the municipality wanted smaller structures and different services spread over its territory. The diverging views complicated the process of decision-making and the municipality decided to provide services in-house in order to simplify the decision-

making process.

Another reason for this decision was the fact that the municipality knew the local context better than the Government. By providing services in-house, already existing social services and the question of nimby-reactions in certain neighbourhoods could be taken into account.

Emmanuel Cornelius also underlined that providing services in-house, independently from the Government, enabled Esch-sur-Alzette to work with external partners, like e. g. HABITACT, and adopt a more flexible and innovative approach to homelessness.

Emmanuel Cornelius was asked if Esch-sur-Alzette had a strategy to promote a positive attitude towards the homeless sector. He answered that Esch-sur-Alzette tried to raise awareness for the problem amongst Esch’s population and spread homeless services across the territory. The population also could trust the local authorities to intervene in problematic cases.

In his response to the speakers, **Stephen Barnett**, from ESN, briefly summarised the drawbacks and the strong points of the in-house model of service provision, mentioned by the speakers above: On the one hand, the in-house model allows the municipality to coordinate services well and to take the local context into account – on the other hand, it is often rigid and people might get stuck in the shelter system for too long.

Stephen Barnett underlined the importance of the quality issue: Some competition between NGOs could be important in order to increase the quality of services. As small structures, NGOs would always be in some need of help from the municipality in order to guarantee the quality of the services provided.



## Session 2: Partnership model – Homeless service providers rooted in local communities

The second seminar session looked at the partnership model of service provision, where services are planned, implemented and provided jointly by local authorities and NGOs. All speakers of this session agreed that the partnership model was a dynamic and effective way of providing services, which pairs administrative know-how (local authority) with practical experience (NGO).



**Paolo Pezzana**, President of fio.PSD Italy, explained that the lack of a harmonised national framework has led to the development of various kinds of local partnership-models across Italy.

Traditionally, Italy has always been a Mediterranean Welfare System with a low level of de-commodification and a high degree of familisation. Even though the risk of poverty and homelessness is high in Italy, homelessness and housing exclusion was first recognised by Italian National Law only in 2000.

# report

In 2011 a Constitutional Reform passed all the competencies for social issues to the regional level, except the definition of national criteria for service provision. But these criteria were never defined, leaving all responsibilities to the local level, where social services have usually been offered by religious congregations and municipalities. The lack of a National Framework for homeless service provision and of spontaneous movement at local level makes local stakeholders work in an undefinable model, mainly trying to curb homelessness.

A research by fioPSD and Caritas Italia found 30 different kinds of municipal service provision, which can be grouped into six clusters according to scope and timeframe:

1. Services for the management of social emergency in the short term
2. Services for the management of social emergency in the medium-term
3. Services for the management of social emergency in the medium-to-long-term
4. Services for the social support of homeless people in the short term
5. Services for the social support and promotion of homeless people in the medium-to-long-term
6. Services for the enforcement of homeless peoples' basic rights and for the assessment of their situation

In this system, services risk becoming simple administrators of the homeless problem. A strategic framework, based on the OMC (Open Method of Coordination) structure used at EU level<sup>1</sup>, supported by the central level, could help to be more aware of what is happening in the territory and to promote more innovation amongst service providers.



The second presentation of this seminar session was held by **Ing. Jiří Růžička**, from ELIM Vsetín, and **Ing. Petr Kozel** from the City of Vsetín (Czech Republic).

They explained that the Czech Social Law clearly defines the responsibilities and quality standards of homeless services which gives the Government control over quality standards. However, the governments would not finance the standards. For this reason, services are managed on scarce budgets by the municipalities, and they try to shift responsibility back to the Ministries.

As a response to this situation, in order to make homeless services as cost-efficient as possible, community planning was introduced in Vsetín in 2007. Community planning is a tool to improve the quality of services, provided by the city through NGOs. In Vsetín, Community planning is carried out in ten steps (preparation of the environment, analysis of citizens' needs, creation of the plan, implementation of the plan, review of the plan etc.). Service commissioners (local authority), service providers (NGOs) and service users participate equally in the process.

Important elements of community planning are the annual quantitative service provision evaluation through consulting service users and the collection of information at service provider level.

Community planning from the local partnership feeds into the work of the team for quality in public services, who in turn take part in expert planning and strategic development. In this way, the model is constantly in evolution.



In his presentation, **Michel Mercadié**, member of FEANTSA's Employment Working Group and chair of the Social Platform Working Group on Services of General Interest, made clear that the partnership model was very flexible and also gave NGOs the possibility to take the leading role.

The NGO Julienne Javel has been offering services for homeless people in Besançon (France) since 1951.

One of their most important projects is called *Jardins de cocagne*, a gardening project offering training to homeless people.

The homeless people are not seen as service users, but as "consumactors", who actively participate in the project and who consume the goods they produce themselves.

<sup>1</sup>The Open Method of Coordination is an EU soft law mechanism which aims to spread good practices that help Member States reach the main EU goals:

<http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/areas/industrialrelations/dictionary/definitions/openmethodofcoordination.htm>

# report

*Jardins de cocagne* is carried out by Julienne Javel in partnership with the local authorities and its representatives are involved in policy-making on many levels (local, regional and national). The project's name is a registered trademark and can be seen as a tool for sustainable development. *Jardins de cocagne* is a mostly self-financed, but also receives funding from the European Social Fund.

Michel Mercadié highlighted that, from the perspective of this project, the EU seemed like a Damocles sword. State aid, in the opinion of Michel Mercadié, rarely reaches the homeless people who are in need of it. According to him, the partnership approach should be recognised and supported by the EU framework, since it is more useful than tendering procedures. In his opinion, it can only be an advantage if this local project is independent from the EU. Nevertheless, Michel Mercadié also underlined that similar projects could be set up in other cities and regions.

In her response to this session's presentations, **Concetta Cultrera**, Head of Sector for Social Services in the Commission's DG Employment and Social Affairs, underlined that EU interventions should not be seen as a threat by social services. She mentioned that the European Commission has published a guide to the application of EU rules on State Aid<sup>1</sup>, a tool to help public authorities ensure transparency of tendering procedures. Question 5.2. of this guide explains the conditions for establishing provider-procurer/public authority relations:



"a) the aim of the contract is to meet needs previously defined by the public authority within the framework of its competences

b) the nature of the service and the way in which it is to be provided are specified in detail by the public authority

c) the contract provides for remuneration of the service (payment of a price or granting of the right to operate the service in return for a fee payable by users)

d) the public authority takes the initiative of finding a provider to whom to entrust the service

e) the contract lays down penalties for failure to meet contractual obligations, in order to guarantee that the service entrusted to the third party is provided properly in such a way as to meet the public authority's requirements (penalties, compensation for damages, etc.)"

These are the factors that indicate that public procurement rules apply. Concetta Cultrera also said that *Jardins de Cocagne* was clearly a civil society initiative and as such monopolising a large amount of resources. According to her, for this project public procurement rules did not apply.

She also highlighted that public authorities have to look for service providers in transparent ways and that national rules might sometimes pose more difficulties to this than EU rules, as they can be more restrictive. Well-intentioned public authorities would ensure quality even if they buy services through public procurement. However, Concetta Cultrera agreed with the previous speakers that familiarity with the local context could be introduced as a criteria for public procurement, to ensure quality services.

---

<sup>1</sup><http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/11/106&format=HTML&aged=1&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>

## Session 3: Market-based model – Market elements in homeless service provision

The last plenary session was dedicated to the market-based model of service provision. This model is based on tendering procedures: The local authority publishes a call for tender to which different stakeholders can then reply. Usually, the most cost-effective offer is then bought by the municipality. Three local models of homeless service provision, very different from one another but all containing market elements, were presented in this session: Edinburgh (UK), Berlin (Germany) and Helsinki (Finland).



In his presentation, FEANTSA board member **Robert Aldridge**, Chief Executive of the Scottish Council for Single Homeless, spoke about the model of service provision of the City of Edinburgh. He explained that the fact that Edinburgh was tendering services was a strategic response, not an “evangelical desire”. Scottish Councils are very committed to reducing homelessness, but in recent years have been faced with budget cuts. In order to reach the aim of ending street homelessness, Edinburgh City Council decided to disengage with services no longer relevant and to refocus services based on the changed situation.

Which services are tendered in Edinburgh depends on the risks, costs and benefits connected with them. Accommodation services are not tendered in Edinburgh, most services still remain in-house. After a call for tender is published, Edinburgh Council involves service users, service providers and front line staff in the decision about which service to buy. The evaluation criteria are 70% quality and 30% price.

According to Robert Aldridge, the tendering has an impact on all parties involved:

- Service users: Services now are better adapted to the needs of the users and more people can be helped. However, some customers are at risk, when services are transferred to another service provider.
- Service providers: The tendering procedure creates competition and tensions between some organisations. It is interesting that larger and national organisations often were not successful in getting a contract. This shows how important familiarity with the local context is for the provision of a good service. Only one contract (accommodation) went to the private rented sector. In general, NGOs win the contracts, being the best combination of cost and quality.
- Service commissioners: In Edinburgh, service commissioners maintain a good relationship with successful service providers. If the local authority knows a service provider well, they are given more flexibility and projects are more innovative.

According to Robert Aldridge, tendering procedures have positive as well as negative sides: On the one hand, the services are more focused on the desired outcomes. On the other hand, it is difficult to empower service users in the process and the transition between providers can be difficult for the homeless individual.

Questions were asked about how quality of services in the market-system could be guaranteed. Robert Aldridge answered that the City of Edinburgh works with tendering experts who assess the quality of a service.

**Prof. Dr. Susanne Gerull**, teacher at Alice Salomon University of Applied Sciences in Berlin, presented the German capital’s service provision model. This model also contains many market elements; however it is very different to the model in Edinburgh. In Berlin, accommodation services for homeless people are usually tendered.

Homeless accommodation services, like most other social services in Berlin, are defined by the Social Security Code XII § 67 which guarantees help to people in „particular social difficulties“.

Homeless services in Berlin are usually offered by the NGOs, there are only few commercial providers. If an NGO is an accepted service provider, the City of Berlin pays them a predefined rate per homeless client per day. The costs differ from service to service, shelter services are more expensive than more permanent accommodation and they are only paid for up to six weeks.



# report

In order for a service provider to be accepted, there needs to be a master agreement at the Federal State Level, which is a framework for the conclusion of contracts, and an individual agreement between service provider and the City of Berlin with more specific content (nature of service, remuneration of staff and control mechanisms).

The service providers are either contacted by the clients themselves or clients are referred by the social welfare office (2/3 of clients contact the service providers themselves).

The model in Berlin and in many other German cities is often referred to as the “triangular model” with the social welfare department (funding agency), the service provider and client (paid for by the welfare department).

According to Susanne Gerull, the City of Berlin chose to work in this way in order to fight the uncontrolled growth of services. The system allows for the city to keep control over daily rates and to control the services. However, the specified prices block innovation and there is no free user choice. Susanne Gerull underlined that more control leads to less flexibility.

Questions were raised about possible alternatives - one idea to improve the system might be for the city to pay modules for specific target groups (e. g. people with mental health problems).



The last presentation of this session was held by **Maria Degerman** from the City of Helsinki. She explained that traditional competitive tendering, as it was used in Helsinki, has led to higher prices and a loss of user perspective. For this reason and in the context of the Finnish Government’s Strategy to Reduce Long-Term-Homelessness, the City decided to purchase housing services for homeless people in through an alternative to competitive tendering.

The new model is called “Public Service Obligation Model”. This means that certain services which are considered to have a high social significance (SGEI – services of general economic interest) fall under the public service obligation.

An NGO or company thus has to provide a service predefined by the local authority. Even if initially there are no potential service providers, SGEI services have to be provided.

In order to be accepted as service provider by the Municipality, interested service providers register in the procurement procedure. Their know-how and resources are then evaluated in order to determine possibilities of organising the service by means of competitive tendering or by implementing it as a public service obligation.

If the supply for certain services exceeds the demand, the housing service will be procured by means of competitive tendering. If the demand exceeds the supply, the service will be developed and implemented as a public service obligation.

For both ways, potential candidates are assessed and chosen on the basis of a fixed set of criteria (financial situation, performance, experience, etc.).

When a service falls under the public service obligation, the provision costs follow the at-cost principle added with reasonable profit of about 2.5%. The Municipality of Helsinki is very involved in monitoring the services: initial agreements are made for fifteen years but revised regularly.

According to Maria Degerman this provides the service provider with security. The security and the long-term interactions between service buyer and service provider helps concentrate on providing good-quality services for the homeless.

In her response to the presentation on the market-based model, **Miriana Girdali**, from EASPD (The European Association of Service Providers for Persons with Disabilities), highlighted that an essential difference between the homeless sector and the disability sector was the time-frame: Homeless services ideally are no long-term services.

Miriana Girdali underlined that from the perspective of EASPD, the short-term perspective of public procurement approaches would be difficult. It would make it hard to plan those services and not allow for innovation.

Another aspect Miriana Girdali mentioned is the fact that most people in charge of drawing up tenders do not know much about the social sector and thus the voices of service users are not always heard. According to the UN Convention, people have the right to decide how they want to live and the type of support they need. Rigid buyer-provider contracts might make this impossible.



# report

Moreover, Miriana Giraldi stressed that the creation of competition has caused a shift in the type of service providers entering the market – larger commercial ones might find it easier to win large contracts.

Ensuring quality in the market-based system might not always be less costly, tendering experts cost money, too.

However, Miriana Giraldi said that public procurement procedures and competition could also be used to drive up quality, if the focus lied on good outcomes and if the contracts were long enough to ensure service providers the security to make investments.

## Conclusions



In his conclusions, FEANTSA director **Freek Spinnewijn** highlighted that a certain amount of partnership was important for any model to work. He stressed that Paolo Pezzana's presentation showed that even where there is no model, there is a local partnership. Space for profit can be provided but should stay marginal.

Political action and the development of integrated homeless strategies are important for the development of proper local governance models. It is also important that the EU works out a strategic framework for this, but that the EU's impact should be reduced where it is not necessary for the funding and running of services. As long as these elements are in place, a variety of models can exist.

Finally, Freek Spinnewijn highlighted the lack of research on the user perspective on service provision, where he sees an opportunity for future cooperation.

## Annex I: ETHOS – European Typology of Homelessness and housing exclusion

		Operational Category	Living Situation	Generic Definition
Conceptual Category	ROOFLESS	1 People Living Rough	1.1 Public space or external space	Living in the streets or public spaces, without a shelter that can be defined as living quarters
		2 People in emergency accommodation	2.1 Night shelter	People with no usual place of residence who make use of overnight shelter, low threshold shelter
	HOUSELESS	3 People in accommodation for the homeless	3.1 Homeless hostel	Where the period of stay is intended to be short term
			3.2 Temporary Accommodation	
			3.3 Transitional supported accommodation	
	4 People in Women's Shelter	4.1 Women's shelter accommodation	Women accommodated due to experience of domestic violence and where the period of stay is intended to be short term	
	5 People in accommodation for immigrants	5.1 Temporary accommodation / reception centres 5.2 Migrant workers accommodation	Immigrants in reception or short term accommodation due to their immigrant status	
	6 People due to be released from institutions	6.1 Penal institutions	No housing available prior to release	
		6.2 Medical institutions (*) 6.3 Children's institutions / homes	Stay longer than needed due to lack of housing No housing identified (e.g by 18th birthday)	
	7 People receiving longer-term support (due to homelessness)	7.1 Residential care for older homeless people	Long stay accommodation with care for formerly homeless people (normally more than one year)	
		7.2 Supported accommodation for formerly homeless people		
	INSECURE	8 People living in insecure accommodation	8.1 Temporarily with family/friends	Living in conventional housing but not the usual or place of residence due to lack of housing
			8.2 No legal (sub)tenancy	Occupation of dwelling with no legal tenancy illegal occupation of a dwelling
8.3 Illegal occupation of land			Occupation of land with no legal rights	
9 People living under threat of eviction	9.1 Legal orders enforced (rented)	Where orders for eviction are operative		
	9.2 Re-possession orders (owned)	Where mortgagee has legal order to re-possess		
10 People living under threat of violence	10.1 Police recorded incidents	Where police action is taken to ensure place of safety for victims of domestic violence		
INADEQUATE	11 People living in temporary / non-conventional structures	11.1 Mobile homes	Not intended as place of usual residence	
		11.2 Non-conventional building	Makeshift shelter, shack or shanty	
		11.3 Temporary structure	Semi-permanent structure hut or cabin	
12 People living in unfit housing	12.1 Occupied dwellings unfit for habitation	Defined as unfit for habitation by national legislation or building regulations		
13 People living in extreme overcrowding	13.1 Highest national norm of overcrowding	Defined as exceeding national density standard for floor-space or useable rooms		

Note: Short stay is defined as normally less than one year; Long stay is defined as more than one year.  
This definition is compatible with Census definitions as recommended by the UNECE/EUROSTAT report (2006)

(\*) Includes drug rehabilitation institutions, psychiatric hospitals etc.

## Annex II: Seminar programme

**Seminar Chair:** René Kneip, FEANTSA President

### 9.00-9.30 Introduction

*Welcome by the Committee of the Regions and EU context of the seminar*  
Mercedes Bresso – President – Committee of the Regions

*Rethinking homeless service provision in an economic recession*  
Karen Murphy – Head of Services – Irish Council for Social Housing (Ireland)

*A European overview of different models of homeless service provision*  
Prof. Isobel Anderson – Chair in Housing Studies – University of Stirling (UK)

### 9.30 -11.00 In-house model – Local authorities as homeless service providers

*Homeless services in Danish cities – Municipal service provision as a tool for effective policy implementation*  
Birthe Povlsen – Policy Consultant – Servicestyrelsen/Danish National Board of Social Services (Denmark)

*Leading by default when the third sector has traditionally played a small role in tackling homelessness*  
Aldis Strapcans – Policy Coordinator – Welfare Department – Riga City Council (Latvia)

*Providing in-house homeless services to simplify the policy process and respect the local context*  
Emmanuel Cornelius – Social Development Service – Esch-sur-Alzette City Council (Luxembourg)

**Response:** Stephen Barnett – Senior Policy Officer – European Social Network

### 11.00-11.30 Coffee break

### 11.30-13.00 Partnership model – Homeless service providers rooted in local communities

*A harmonised national framework vs. diversity in the implementation of local models*  
Paolo Pezzana – President of fioPSD (Italy)

*Municipality, Service providers and Service users on an equal footing*  
Ing. Jiří Růžička and Ing. Petr Kozel – Head of local homeless hostel and Policy Coordinator City of Vsetín (Czech Republic)

*NGOs take the initiative and work as partners with local authorities to provide homeless services*  
Michel Mercadié – Jardins de Cocagne – Besançon (France)

**Response:** Concetta Cultrera – Policy coordinator on social services – European Commission

### 13.00-14.00 Lunch break

### 14.00-15.30 Market-based model – Market elements in homeless service provision

*Use of formal tender procedures to ensure best value for taxpayers' money*  
Robert Aldridge – Chief Executive of the Scottish Council for Single Homeless (UK)

*Service provider competition for homeless clients within a restricted market – the case of Berlin*  
Prof. Dr. Susanne Gerull – Researcher – Alice Salomon Hochschule Berlin, University of Applied Sciences (Germany)

*An alternative to competitive tendering in purchasing housing services for homeless people*  
Maria Degerman – Project Manager – Social Services Department – Helsinki City Council (Finland)

**Response:** Miriana Giraldi – Policy Officer – European Association of Service Providers for people with Disabilities

### 15.30-16.00 Conclusions & Drinks reception

Freek Spinnewijn, FEANTSA Director

# report



## **FEANTSA is supported by the European Community Programme for Employment and Social Solidarity (2007-2013).**

This programme was established to financially support the implementation of the objectives of the European Union in the employment and social affairs area, as set out in the Social Agenda, and thereby contribute to the achievement of the Lisbon Strategy goals in these fields.

The seven-year Programme targets all stakeholders who can help shape the development of appropriate and effective employment and social legislation and policies, across the EU-27, EFTA and EU candidate and pre-candidate countries.

To that effect, PROGRESS purports at:

- providing analysis and policy advice on employment, social solidarity and gender equality policy areas;
- monitoring and reporting on the implementation of EU legislation and policies in employment, social solidarity and gender equality policy areas;
- promoting policy transfer, learning and support among Member States on EU objectives and priorities; and
- relaying the views of the stakeholders and society at large.

For more information see:

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=327&langId=en>

**FEANTSA is supported financially by the European Commission. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained herein.**