

2005

Fourth Review of Statistics on Homelessness in Europe

The ETHOS Definition of Homelessness

By

Bill Edgar and Henk Meert

**in collaboration with the correspondents
of the European Observatory on Homelessness**

November 2005



FEANTSA

European Federation of National Organisations Working with the Homeless

Contents

Acknowledgements	5
1. Introduction	6
1.1 BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT	6
1.2 POLICY PURPOSES FOR MEASURING HOMELESSNESS	7
1.3 NATIONAL FACTORS	8
1.4 MEASUREMENT ISSUES	9
2. Homelessness and Social Exclusion	10
2.1 THE CONTEXT OF THE EU SOCIAL INCLUSION STRATEGY	10
2.2 THE COMMON OBJECTIVES, VULNERABLE GROUPS AND THE HOMELESS	11
3. The FEANTSA ETHOS definition	14
3.1 DEVELOPING THE DEFINITION	14
3.2 COMPARING DIFFERENT NOMENCLATURE OF LIVING SITUATIONS	17
4 Roofless and Houseless	18
4.1 INTRODUCTION	18
4.2 DEFINITIONS OF LIVING CIRCUMSTANCES	18
4.2.1 People living rough (ETHOS Category 1)	18
4.2.2 People living in accommodation provided for the homeless (ETHOS Categories 2 and 3)	22
4.2.3 People living in specialist (temporary) accommodation (ETHOS Categories 4 and 5)	33
4.2.4 People living in institutions (for whom no accommodation is available in the community) (ETHOS Category 6)	41
4.2.5 People receiving support in order to be re-settled or to prevent homelessness (ETHOS Category 7)	46
4.3 DATA MATRICES	55
4.3.1 Data on Homelessness and Housing Exclusion using the ETHOS typology ..	55
4.3.2 Matrices	56
5 Insecure and Inadequate Housing	62
5.1 INTRODUCTION	62
5.2 DEFINITIONS OF LIVING CIRCUMSTANCES	63
5.2.1 People living in situations at imminent risk of homelessness (ETHOS Categories 8, 9, 10)	63
5.2.2 People living in accommodation that fails to meet national norms (ETHOS Categories 11, 12 and 13)	69
5.3 DATA MATRICES	78
6 Conclusions	80
6.1 USING ETHOS FOR DATA COLLECTION AND FOR POLICY PURPOSES	80
6.2 REVISING ETHOS	81

Figures and Tables

FIGURES

Figure 3.1 The Domains of Homelessness and Housing Exclusion	14
Figure 4.1 Supported Accommodation for Homeless People	48

TABLES

Table 2.1 Factors of Vulnerability and Risk of Housing Exclusion.....	12
Table 3.1 Seven theoretical domains of homelessness.....	15
Table 3.2 Operational Categories of Homelessness and Housing Exclusion	16
Table 4.1 Generic Description of Characteristics of Homeless Accommodation	22
Table 4.2 Criteria for Defining Homeless Accommodation Forms.....	23
Table 4.3 Generic Classification of Homeless Accommodation	23
Table 4.4 Accommodation in France for the Homeless Population	26
Table 4.5 Homeless Accommodation in the Czech Republic.....	31
Table 4.6 Accommodation for Immigrants in France	36
Table 4.7 Prison Population in Belgium	42
Table 4.8 Reasons for homelessness citing institutional release in the UK	44
Table 4.9 Accommodation and Support	46
Table 4.10 Generic Definition of Supported Accommodation Provided for Homeless (or formerly homeless) People.....	47
Table 4.11 Types of Supported Accommodation in Flanders.....	49
Table 4.12 Types of Supported Accommodation for Homeless in France.....	50
Table 4.13 Supported Accommodation for Homeless Client Groups - England	53
Table 4.14 Roofless (Categories 1 and 2)	56
Table 4.15 Houseless (Category 3)	57
Table 4.16 Houseless (Category 4)	58
Table 4.17 Houseless (Category 5)	59
Table 4.18 Houseless (Category 6)	60
Table 4.19 Houseless (Category 7)	61
Table 5.1 Evictions Proceedings and Executions in Austria	64
Table 5.2 Intentional domestic violence - Belgium 2004	65
Table 5.3 Households in Extreme Overcrowding in Austria (2001)	70
Table 5.4 Definition of Fitness for Habitation in the UK.....	75
Table 5.5 Definitions of Over-crowding in the UK.....	75
Table 5.6 Insecure Housing (Categories 8, 9,10).....	78
Table 5.7 Inadequate Housing (Categories 11, 12, 13)	79
Table 6.1 ETHOS European Typology on Homelessness and Housing Exclusion Revision 2005.....	82

Acronyms Used

<i>BAG W</i>	Bundesarbeitsgemeinschaft Wohnungslosenhilfe e.V (National Federal Association of Homeless Assistance)
<i>BAWO</i>	Bundesarbeitsgemeinschaft Wohnungslosenhilfe (Austria)
<i>B&B</i>	Bed and Breakfast
<i>BME</i>	Black and Minority Ethnic Groups
<i>CECODHAS</i>	European Liaison Committee for Social Housing
<i>EIYAAPOE</i>	National Institution of Reception and Rehabilitation of Emigrants and Greek Repatriates (Greece)
<i>EKAKB</i>	Emergency Social Care Unit (Greece)
<i>ETHOS</i>	European Typology of Homelessness
<i>EU</i>	European Union
<i>EU-SILC</i>	European Union Survey on the Improvement of Living Conditions
<i>FEANTSA</i>	Fédération Européenne d'Associations Nationales Travaillant avec les Sans-Abri (The European Federation of National Organisations Working with the Homeless)
<i>FIOpsd</i>	Italian Federation of Organisations Working with the Homeless
<i>HLM</i>	Organisations d'habitations à loyer modéré
<i>INSEE</i>	French National Institute for Statistical and Economic Research
<i>ISTAT</i>	Italian Statistics Office
<i>MPSV</i>	Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (Czech)
<i>NAP</i>	National Action Plan
<i>NBHW</i>	National Board of Health and Welfare (Sweden)
<i>NGO</i>	Non-Government Organisation
<i>OPDM</i>	Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (UK)
<i>PNA</i>	Piano nazionale asilo (National asylum programme) (Italy)
<i>RSI</i>	Rough Sleepers Initiative
<i>RSU</i>	Rough Sleepers Unit
<i>SCSH</i>	Scottish Council for Single Homelessness
<i>Y-Foundation</i>	Y-säätiö Foundation (Finland)

Acknowledgements

This report has been based upon the National Homeless Statistics Reports of the 22 correspondents of the European Observatory on Homelessness. The report would not have been written without their diligence and effort in preparing these national reports. The authors are also indebted to the correspondents for the time and effort they took to comment in detail on the draft versions of the report. However, the authors take full responsibility for any errors in the report whether of fact or interpretation.

The correspondents of the Observatory on Homelessness who are in effect co-authors of the report are:

Heinz Schoibl (Austria), Pascal de Decker (Belgium), Ilja Hradecky (Czech Republic), Inger Koch-Neilsen and Lars Benjaminsen (Denmark), Sirkka-Liisa Kärkkäinen (Finland), Dalila Zidi (France), Volker Busch-Geertsema (Germany), Aristides Sapounakis (Greece), Péter Györi (Hungary), Eoin O'sullivan (Ireland), Antonio Tosi (Italy), Ilze Trapenciere (Latvia), Vita Karpuskiene (Lithuania), Roland Maas (Luxembourg), Judith Wolf (Netherlands), Julia Wygnanska (Poland), Isabel Baptista (Portugal), Masa Filipovic (Slovenia), Pedro Cabrera (Spain), Ingrid Sahlin (Sweden), Isobel Anderson (the UK).

Staff in the FEANTSA office have also been instrumental in shaping the final version and identifying mistakes and inconsistencies during the drafting process. Freek Spinnewijn and Liz Gosme gave valuable comments on early drafts. The members of the FEANTSA Data Collection Working Group also gave valuable comment and support during the writing process and in commenting on an early draft of the report. Finally, the report translation and proof-reading and printing is co-ordinated in the FEANTSA office by Christine Lambert without whom it would not get to print in time.

1. Introduction

1.1 BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

It is impossible to enumerate homelessness if it is not defined. It is equally impossible to compare 'levels' of homelessness unless there is a common definition and sub-definitions to allow for national and regional population differences. Homelessness can be defined narrowly to include only people without a roof over their heads or it can be defined more broadly. The continuing use of narrow definitions in many countries makes it impossible for those countries to develop 'good practice' programs and policies that acknowledge the range of different groups, the pathways and trajectories into and out of homelessness, and the need to foster independence (Greenhalgh et al, 2004).

FEANTSA has, for a number of years, argued that homelessness needs to be understood within a broader understanding that includes, as well as people who are roofless, people who are houseless and people who live in insecure and inadequate housing. This broader definition reflects the causes of homelessness and the need to understand the processes of exclusion which can lead to people living under the threat of homelessness for long periods of their lives as well as experiencing actual homelessness.

FEANTSA has developed and adopted the ETHOS typology of homelessness in an attempt to reflect the diversity of experience across the member states and welfare regimes that make up the European Union and to provide a more harmonised approach to understanding the nature of the problems of homelessness and housing exclusion at European and national level. ETHOS therefore represents a compromise between different national perspectives and realities. It is also an evolving process of refining both the categories of the typology and their definition. Although ETHOS is intended to assist in improving data collection and comparison, it provides a tool that can be used flexibly at national level and that can assist in the policy discourse on the changing nature of homelessness and the policies that address it. It is, therefore, a pragmatic approach to deal with a complex issue.

The purpose of this review of homeless statistics in Europe is to examine the definitions of homelessness in relation to the categories of the ETHOS typology developed in the previous edition of this review (Edgar et al, 2004). This is the main focus of the report in relation to the evolution of the ETHOS typology. The report also presents the latest available data in relation to this definition but this was not the primary focus of the brief to the correspondents of the Observatory. The issues of measurement and data collection will form the focus of the next review of European statistics on homelessness.

1.2 POLICY PURPOSES FOR MEASURING HOMELESSNESS

The difficulty of defining homelessness impacts on the ability of governments to adequately and appropriately respond to homelessness. The purpose of collecting data on homelessness should be to provide the information necessary to improve the provision of services in order to prevent and alleviate homelessness. The information collected on homeless people should be adequate to inform national and local governments who, in the framework of the EU Social Inclusion Strategy, should be developing strategies to:

- > prevent homelessness;
- > tackle the causes of homelessness;
- > reduce the level of homelessness;
- > reduce the negative effects on homeless people and their families
- > ensure that formerly homeless people can sustain permanent independent housing.

There is no correct single definition of homelessness or single count of the phenomenon that will be an accurate reflection of reality. Rather, different counts will be required for different policy purposes. Hence the definition adopted and the numbers counted as homeless will be a reflection of the policy context and policy purpose.

MacKenzie and Chamberlain (2003) argue that homelessness should be viewed as a 'career process' as this 'draws attention to the process of becoming homeless. Viewing homelessness in this way (a pathway or a trajectory) has implications for policy, particularly for prevention, early intervention, crisis intervention and long term support (Greenhalgh et al, 2004). This view also stresses that homelessness has both a housing dimension and a social welfare dimension. Any measurement of homelessness needs to have relevance to the housing and social welfare dimensions of policy as well as to inform policies of prevention, intervention and support.

The Esping-Andersen typology of European welfare regimes (Esping-Andersen, 1990) does not provide a robust framework to explain the differences in policy approach across the new enlarged Europe in relation to homelessness. However, from a data collection perspective it is important to bear in mind that different policy contexts will affect the measurement of homelessness in a number of ways. The extent to which homelessness is perceived as a housing problem or a social

problem has an impact. Equally, the impetus to develop integrated strategies to deal with homelessness at national and local level may be, in part, a reflection of the welfare regime context to the extent that the role of the state and of civil society impact on policy development and service provision. However, our evidence indicates that countries that share similarities in welfare policies, according to the Esping-Andersen typology, can have very different approaches to homelessness (see for example the proceedings of the Nordic network of homelessness research) as well as to data collection.

To achieve policy objectives that aim to prevent homelessness and reduce its impact on vulnerable households requires information that reflects the reality of the process of homelessness and housing exclusion. Thus hidden homelessness should be visible to policy makers and service providers. This means having an understanding and measurement of homelessness which includes the situation of people who live in insecure housing, are forced to move constantly between inadequate housing situations and those who are forced to live in housing which is unfit for habitation by commonly accepted norms. If policy intends to ensure that no person should have to sleep rough then information is needed to monitor the number of rough sleepers, the number of clients of homeless services and the number of accommodation places available. Where policies aim to ensure that fewer people should become homeless, information is needed to monitor accurately the total number of homeless households, the number living in temporary or insecure / inadequate housing and the number who are potentially homeless or are threatened with homelessness. If the policy objective is to prevent homelessness then it is important also to have information on the number of people vulnerable to eviction and the number of people about to leave an institution who do not have a home. The prevention of homelessness also requires the provision of sustainable permanent accommodation for formerly homeless people. This requires information on the number of homeless people who gain access to supported accommodation.

1.3 NATIONAL FACTORS

The way in which homeless people are enumerated varies from country to country, dependent upon the definition utilised in that particular country and the understanding of the nature of the problem. National factors and governance factors affect both the perception of homelessness and the enumeration of the phenomenon.

At a very basic level, governance factors affect the availability of data on homelessness. A number of countries do not have national data but do have information at regional or local level. In particular this relates to countries with a federal or devolved structure of government (Austria, Germany, Italy, Spain, the UK). In Belgium, the process of federalization has developed according to two principles: territorial (resulting in regions) and cultural (resulting in language communities). As service provision for the homeless is mainly organized and subsidized according to the cultural principle, most reliable data are available not for regions, but for language communities. In Brussels, both community groups provide services for the homeless, in Flanders so does the Flemish community, in Wallonia the French community. The extent to which responsibility for housing (and social services) is decentralised to lower executive tiers of government also affects the availability and nature of information. Governmental reform can also affect the nature and availability of data collected (see for example the shift to devolved government in the UK and the impending local government reform in Denmark). Whatever the basis of these governance factors, the lack of national and annual data on homelessness makes it difficult for both government and non-government agencies to strategically respond to homelessness.

The legislative framework related to housing and social services, and the lack of statutory responsibility for homelessness in many countries, also acts as a barrier to the creation of effective data collection systems. Responsibility for the homeless can lie with housing authorities or with social welfare authorities and legislative responsibility shapes the nature and type of information collected pursuant to these duties. Among the new member states legislation establishing responsibility in this policy area is recent in origin and central-local relations are evolving.

The nature of the welfare system in each country also affects where the line is drawn between social welfare, housing and homelessness. For example, this can affect whether young people living in temporary accommodation provided by the state are perceived as homeless or as clients of the youth welfare department. Many of the statistics are based on those who are 'accepted' as being homeless by a service provider. This makes it difficult to fully appreciate who is homeless when a number of groups are excluded from accessing services. These excluded groups include many of those now identified as the 'new homeless' (Greenhalgh et al, 2004).

The provision of support in housing is understood to be a key element in the integration of homeless people into permanent housing in a sustainable manner. The de-institutionalisation process and the emergence of community treatment (Edgar et al, 2000) and the shift from a medical model to a social model of treatment (Ericsson and Mansell, 1996) have been a feature of the changing nature of health service and social service provision across Europe for some years. However, the availability of support in housing is not well developed in all countries in Europe (Edgar et al, 2000). The diversity of policy response in relation to the provision of housing and support highlights the difference in policy development and context between countries.

Such national factors affect the nature and profile of homelessness as well as the perception of homelessness among policy makers which in turn affect the approach to data collection. Many countries do not have an official system of data collection in relation to homelessness (even where the state is the main provider or purchaser of services). Even taking the narrowest definition of homelessness (as rough sleeping), only one country in Europe conducts regular (annual or bi-annual) counts and the majority of countries do not have reliable data on the number of people staying in night shelters.

1.4 MEASUREMENT ISSUES

Homelessness is, of course, particularly problematic to measure. Both defining precisely what is meant by homelessness and then capturing that empirically are difficult in any country, and doing so in a consistent fashion across countries is even more challenging (Atkinson et al, 2005). People who are homeless or living in very precarious and temporary accommodation tend not to be included in household surveys and other statistical data sources, which is why many countries rely on administrative sources and service providers for data, though this may give a partial or even misleading picture depending on the structures in place in the country.

A key difficulty in measuring homelessness is that it is not a static experience. Some people move between different living situations (e.g. sleeping in a public place, to staying for short periods with family and friends or to prison or hospital). Some people experience repeated episodes of homelessness (e.g. women experiencing domestic violence may leave the perpetrator on numerous occasions to live with friends, in a homeless hostel or in a women's shelter or refuge). The benefit of viewing homelessness as a dynamic process is that it enables a much greater reflection on 'severely problematic life events and associated care and support needs' (Anderson 2001). However this means that, depending upon the policy purpose for which the information is required, it is necessary to have measures of the stock, flow and prevalence of homelessness.

The measurement of homelessness at a European level is further complicated by the fact that it involves a number of different sources of data including:

- > rough sleeper counts (and surveys)
- > service providers
- > population and household census
- > housing surveys
- > housing assistance applicants and recipients (and homeless applicants)
- > institutional data sources
- > special surveys.

In the context of measuring homelessness, however, this understanding stresses that a single count at one point in time (a stock measure) is insufficient to capture the dynamics of homelessness. Furthermore, the hidden nature of much of this process or trajectory into homelessness should be reflected in a measure that identifies the vulnerability to homelessness. Finally, it points to the fact that any measure of homelessness is going to underestimate the true scale of the problem.

NOTE:

Correspondents from some of the EU-10 countries have participated in the work of the European Observatory on Homelessness over the last two years during the accession process. However, funding has not been available to fully involve them in the work of the Observatory. This represents a transition year to the full integration of these countries into the research programme of the Observatory. This report includes six of the EU-10 countries who were able to participate and provide national reports in time for this review. These include: the Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Slovenia.

The information from these countries is described here in a separate section for two reasons. First, the researchers were working to a slightly modified research brief. Second it is easier, in this way, to capture the common issues shared by countries as well as the diversity of experience in this transition stage to membership of the European Union. This approach to presentation of the information is for ease of description only this year and in future the issues across the new enlarged EU will be treated in common.

2. Homelessness and Social Exclusion

2.1 THE CONTEXT OF THE EU SOCIAL INCLUSION STRATEGY

Homelessness is increasingly viewed within the context of social exclusion (or social inclusion). Rather than being linked to poverty or 'deviance' homelessness is now regarded as a 'dimension and expression of social exclusion' (Edgar and Doherty 2001). This understanding brings together explanations of homelessness that recognise the importance of structural and institutional factors as well as relationship and personal factors.

The perception of homelessness as one expression of social exclusion means that solutions need to be more comprehensive than if homelessness was seen solely as an issue of rough sleeping. Policy solutions for homelessness in this context need to consider accommodation but also the social circumstances and welfare of homeless people. As components of social integration policies they need to provide for successful re-integration and consider issues of social participation, personal security, control and empowerment (Edgar et al 2000).

The EU Social Inclusion Strategy refers to homeless people in the context of both preventing exclusion and of the need to protect the most vulnerable in society. However, the Joint Report by the Commission and the Council on Social Inclusion (2005) comments that:

"In the absence of clear, common definitions, and given the difficulties of counting a population which slips under the radar of the normal censuses, it is difficult to establish precise and comparable figures. The efforts made since 2001 by certain Member States (Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Netherlands, United Kingdom) and by Eurostat have still not yielded harmonised statistics, and despite the recommendations of the Laeken European Council many Member States do not present "tertiary indicators" of homelessness in their NAPs/incl. "(p.82)

Atkinson et al (2005) argue that reliable and timely indicators, reflecting the multi-dimensionality of poverty and social exclusion, are indispensable for monitoring Member States' performance in promoting social inclusion as well as for mutual policy learning and identification of good (and bad) practices. This, they argue, means that having the required statistical infrastructure and capacity in place at both the national and EU levels is a necessary condition for the Social Inclusion Process to achieve its aims. The statistics on income and living conditions (the EU-SILC launched in 2003 under Regulation (EC) No 1177/2003) for all 25 Member States will not be available until the end of 2006 and longitudinal data will not be available until 2010 (Atkinson et al, p101). However, even if the EU-SILC becomes the main EU reference for poverty and social exclusion, it only covers people living in private households and hence the institutional population and homeless people will remain invisible in social exclusion statistics at this level.

It is therefore important that better statistical information on those vulnerable to homelessness and housing exclusion is available at national level to inform policy at all levels of government.

2.2 THE COMMON OBJECTIVES, VULNERABLE GROUPS AND THE HOMELESS

The European Social Agenda, agreed at Nice in December 2000, recognised the dual role of social policy both as a productive factor and as a key instrument to reduce inequalities and promote social cohesion. In agreeing the European Social Agenda at Nice, the member states agreed to develop their National Action Plans on Social Inclusion within the framework of four common objectives in order to:

- > facilitate participation in employment and access by all to the resources, rights, goods and services;
- > prevent the risks of exclusion;
- > help the most vulnerable;
- > mobilise all relevant actors.

The objective of preventing the risks of social exclusion also refers explicitly to the need for policies to prevent life crises which can lead to situations of social exclusion such as “indebtedness.. and becoming homeless”. The objective to help the most vulnerable refers to those who belong to a ‘group experiencing integration problems’. However, the understanding of vulnerability in this context is interpreted in different ways in the member states.

It may be helpful to reflect upon the causes and nature of vulnerability as it affects the risk of homelessness and housing exclusion since this will influence our understanding of the definition of homelessness and of the nature of service provision to meet the needs of vulnerable groups and so prevent homelessness. However, different terms are commonly in use which reflect different and perhaps discrete understanding of the nature of vulnerability - for example, ‘socially vulnerable people’, ‘marginalised people’, ‘neglected people’, ‘excluded people’, the ‘disadvantaged’ and the ‘underprivileged’ are terms to be found in different documents and national action plans.

Some countries define vulnerable groups for targeted assistance within their social inclusion strategy. For example, in 2002, the Danish government presented a programme for coordinated action targeting the most disadvantaged groups in Danish society entitled “Our Collective Responsibility” which defines disadvantaged groups as: drug mis-users, adults and children from families with alcohol misuse, the mentally ill, the homeless and prostitutes. In the Netherlands panels of experts, which included representatives of agencies and institutions, client organisations and an organisation of patients’ relatives, have characterised this group more specifically (Bransen et al, 2001) as people who:

- > are not sufficiently capable of providing for their own necessities of life (shelter, food, income, social contacts, proper self-care)
- > have several problems at once, which may include inadequate self-care, social isolation, squalid housing or living environments, lack of permanent or stable accommodation, large debts, mental health problems and substance dependency
- > do not, from the viewpoint of care professionals, receive the care and support they need to sustain themselves in society, and
- > do not express care needs that readily fit into the mainstream care system (help is usually requested by relatives, neighbours or onlookers), and therefore often experience unsolicited care or interference.

Table 2.1 Factors of Vulnerability and Risk of Housing Exclusion		
CAUSE	FACTOR OF VULNERABILITY	COMMENT
STRUCTURAL	Economic Processes	Affect on income, unstable employment
	Increasing immigration	Effects of xenophobia, racism and discrimination
	More rigorous definition of full citizenship	Growing importance of eligibility in relation to access to social protection
INSTITUTIONAL	Available mainstream services	Do not match care needs
	Lack of available services	To meet demand
	Allocation mechanisms (services and publicly allocated housing)	inappropriate to needs (spatial concentration, delivery procedures)
	Shortages of appropriate services	Prevention, outreach etc
	Lack of co-ordination between existing mainstream services (including housing)	Affects continuum of support and housing careers
RELATIONSHIP	Family Status	Single people more vulnerable
	Relationship situation	Abusive partners; step-parents
	Relationship breakdown	Death, divorce, separation
PERSONAL	Economic / employment status	Disposable income
	Ethnic status	Likelihood of facing discrimination
	Citizenship status	Access to social protection
	Disability / long-term illness	Includes mental health and learning disability
	Educational attainment	Low attainment
	Addiction	Alcohol, drugs, gambling
	Age / Gender	Young / old, female
	Immigrant situation	Refugee status / recent arrival

A recent study examining the profile of vulnerable people in different sectors - community health, homeless, mental health care and addiction services - argued that they had just two things in common: care needs that did not match the available services, and involvement in problems with institutions (Bransen et al, 2001). This suggests that ‘depending on where we lay the yardstick (that is, in which sector or at which location), a different specific profile of vulnerable, hard-to-reach people emerges’ (Wolf, 2005; p3).

Adapting this line of argument we may suggest a generic approach to understanding the causes of vulnerability that affect the risk of homelessness.

Structural factors affect the vulnerability or risk of exclusion arising mainly from the effects of poverty (affected by a person’s position in the labour market) and the factors that act as barriers to access to housing, services or social protection. Vulnerability is also affected by the extent to which social protection is dependent upon a person’s employment situation or citizenship status, hence women and immigrants may be more vulnerable. Despite legislation to ensure equality of access to services, discrimination can create vulnerability to exclusion from the housing market for some groups.

Institutional factors can influence vulnerability. People who require support will be vulnerable to exclusion from the housing market if support is not available or does not meet their needs. Support may not be available because services do not exist (e.g. in rural areas) or are not available for particular needs. People can also lack support if their medical or psychiatric condition is undiagnosed (e.g. if they have a mild learning disability) or if they do not have contact with medical or social services (e.g. some young people). Lack of social support networks also creates an increased vulnerability for some (e.g. single people or recently arrived immigrants). Lack of affordable housing or regulation of housing allocation is an important aspect of vulnerability for those on low income and immigrants. Often homeless people are vulnerable because they have complex or multiple problems which fall through the net of existing services. Mechanisms of resource allocation (including housing) and gate-keeping by service providers and housing managers can also leave some people vulnerable to homelessness. For example, people with an addiction may be denied access to some services (including homeless services and housing) and people who avoid or refuse to take medical prescription (e.g. for a diagnosed mental health problem) may also be excluded from services and housing.

Relationship problems or breakdown are often associated with housing exclusion or can create a vulnerability to homelessness. In particular the increase in domestic violence is associated with episodes of homelessness or temporary housing for many women and their children. Equally the increase in divorce and separation can create difficulties for the adult partners as well as for young people who may be forced to leave home at an early age. Recent research has demonstrated an increase in homelessness among older men often associated with relationship breakdown or loss of a partner later in life.

Personal problems can, of course, be a key factor leading to homelessness. However, personal circumstances can create vulnerability in other ways. Some people may simply lack knowledge about opportunities available to them (e.g. immigrants, young people). Personal problems may often be unrecognised (for example gambling addiction or personal debt) until a problem becomes manifest in the loss of a home. Even then the scale of such problems may go unrecognised by service providers. People develop coping strategies to hide the real nature of their situation.

3. The FEANTSA ETHOS definition

3.1 DEVELOPING THE DEFINITION

In order to define homelessness in an operational way, we identified three domains which constitute a home, the absence of which can be taken to delineate homelessness. Having a home can be understood as: having a decent dwelling (or space) adequate to meet the needs of the person and his/her family (*physical domain*); being able to maintain privacy and enjoy social relations (*social domain*) and having exclusive possession, security of occupation and legal title (*legal domain*).

Undoubtedly, homelessness is amongst the worst examples of social exclusion. Therefore, it is a valuable exercise to consider the varying “extent and depth” of different forms of homelessness, according to their relation to the three domains of homelessness. Figure 3.1 visualises seven theoretical types of homelessness and housing exclusion, varying between rough sleeping on the one side and living within a decent and legally occupied dwelling without safety (e.g. women who experience domestic abuse) on the other side (see Table 3.1). These are explained in the Third Review of Homeless Statistics (Edgar et al, 2004) and form the basis of the ETHOS typology of homelessness.

Figure 3.1 The Domains of Homelessness and Housing Exclusion




Table 3.1 Seven theoretical domains of homelessness

	Conceptual Category	Physical Domain	Legal Domain	Social Domain
Homelessness	1 Rooflessness	No dwelling (roof)	No legal title to a space for exclusive possession	No private and safe personal space for social relations
	2 Houselessness	Has a place to live, fit for habitation	No legal title to a space for exclusive possession	No private and safe personal space for social relations
Housing exclusion	3 Insecure and Inadequate housing	Has a place to live (not secure and unfit for habitation)	No security of tenure	Has space for social relations
	4 Inadequate housing and social isolation within a legally occupied dwelling	Inadequate dwelling (unfit for habitation)	Has legal title and/or security of tenure	No private and safe personal space for social relations
	5 Inadequate housing (secure tenure)	Inadequate dwelling (dwelling unfit for habitation)	Has legal title and/or security of tenure	Has space for social relations
	6 Insecure housing (adequate housing)	Has a place to live	No security of tenure	Has space for social relations
	7 Social isolation within a secure and adequate context	Has a place to live	Has legal title and/or security of tenure	No private and safe personal space for social relations

Using this conceptual understanding of homelessness, FEANTSA adopted a conceptual definition of homelessness and housing exclusion outlined in Table 3.2. This conception of homelessness is still being discussed within the European Observatory on Homelessness (EOH) and the FEANTSA Data Collection Working Group. The purpose of this report is to examine the operational categories and sub-categories (see Table 3.2) in order to confirm the nature of living situations and the differences in nomenclature and understanding

between countries so that the operational categories can be more generic definitions that will allow application to different national contexts. Although the aim of this exercise is to elaborate a tool to allow more harmonised comparison of data, the very act of comparing definitions at this operational level contributes to the policy debate in relation to the purpose of accommodation and support to prevent and alleviate homelessness.

Table 3.2 Operational Categories of Homelessness and Housing Exclusion			
CONCEPTUAL CATEGORY		OPERATIONAL CATEGORY	sub cat. DEFINITION
ROOFLESS	1	Living in a public space (no abode)	1.1 Sleeping Rough 1.2 Contacted by outreach services
	2	Stay in a night shelter and/or forced to spend several hours a day in public space	2.1 Low-threshold / direct access shelter 2.2 Arranged (e.g. low budget hotel) 2.3 Short-stay hostel
HOUSELESS	3	Homeless hostel / temporary accommodation	3.1 Short-stay homeless hostel 3.2 Temporary housing (no defined time) 3.3 Temporary housing (transitional defined) 3.4 Temporary (longer stay)
	4	Women's shelter / refuge	4.1 Shelter accommodation 4.2 Supported / dispersed accommodation
	5	Accommodation for asylum seekers and immigrants	5.1 Reception centres (asylum) 5.2 Repatriate accommodation 5.3 Migrant workers hostels
	6	Institutional Release	6.1 Penal institutions (period defined nationally) 6.2 Institutions (care and hospital)
	7	Specialist Supported Accommodation (for homeless people)	7.1 Supported accommodation (group) 7.2 Supported accommodation (individual) 7.3 Foyers 7.4 Teenage parent accommodation
	8	No tenancy	8.1 Living temporarily with family or friends (not through choice) (Housing / Social Service records) 8.2 Living in dwelling without a standard legal (sub)tenancy (excludes squatting)
	9	Eviction Order	9.1 Legal orders enforced (rented housing) 9.2 Re-possession orders (owned housing)
INSECURE HOUSING	10	Violence	10.1 Living under threat of violence from partner or family (police recorded incidents)
	11	Temporary structure	11.1 Mobile home / caravan (which is not holiday accommodation) 11.2 Illegal occupation of a site (e.g. Roma / Traveller / Gypsy) 11.3 Illegal occupation of a building (squatting)
INADEQUATE HOUSING	12	Unfit Housing	12.1 Dwellings unfit for habitation under national legislation (occupied)
	13	Extreme Overcrowding	13.1 Highest national norm of overcrowding

3.2 COMPARING DIFFERENT NOMENCLATURE OF LIVING SITUATIONS

In recognition of the lack of statistics on homelessness EUROSTAT convened a Task Force on Statistics on Homelessness and commissioned a report from INSEE (Brousse, 2004). The Task Force recognised the need for a more harmonised approach to data collection on homelessness. The INSEE report made a number of recommendations to the European Commission and to National Statistics Institutes of which the following are pertinent here:

INSEE Report recommendations to the Commission

1. Establish a comprehensive harmonised nomenclature for housing / homelessness statistics;
2. Propose a standardised register of variables for use by homeless service providers;
3. Drafts a module for EU-SILC (or other household surveys) covering retrospective episodes of homelessness;
4. Draft a module for EU-SILC (or other household surveys) covering persons staying temporarily with family and friends.

In this report we address, in an interim manner, one aspect of these recommendations by mapping the nomenclature of homeless accommodation services unto the ETHOS typology for each member state. Chapters 4 and 5 examine these definitions in relation to the ETHOS typology and present the data available for each operational category. Chapter 6 uses this knowledge to revise and refine the ETHOS typology.

4 Roofless and Houseless

CONCEPTUAL CATEGORY		OPERATIONAL CATEGORY
ROOFLESS	1	Living in a public space (no abode)
	2	Stay in a night shelter and/or forced to spend several hours a day in public space
HOUSELESS	3	Homeless hostel / temporary accommodation
	4	Women's shelter / refuge
	5	Accommodation for asylum seekers and immigrants
	6	Institutional Release
	7	Specialist Supported Accommodation (for homeless people)

4.1 INTRODUCTION

A number of significant issues emerge from our review of the operational categories of ETHOS. First, only a few countries have undertaken surveys of rough sleeping and these have adopted different methodologies which prevent easy comparison. Only one country has regularly reviewed rough sleeping in a consistent manner over time from a baseline date to allow monitoring of policies. Second, in a number of countries, it is difficult to distinguish between overnight hostels and accommodation with more transitional functions. Often the same accommodation is used for emergency night shelter and for generalist homeless accommodation (categories 2 and 3 in the ETHOS typology). Third, similar difficulties arise in identifying temporary accommodation for homeless families. Finally, there are difficulties in identifying supported accommodation provided for homeless people from that provided for other vulnerable groups either because the funding and management arrangements do not separately distinguish the homeless from other vulnerable families or because the data is not collected in relation to client groups.

For that reason, this section considers the Roofless and Houseless categories together. For ease of discussion the section will consider the ETHOS sub-categories in relation to different groups of vulnerable homeless people:

- > *People living rough (Category 1)*
- > *People living in accommodation provided for the homeless (Categories 2 and 3)*
- > *People living in specialist (temporary) accommodation (Categories 4 and 5)*
- > *People living in institutions (Category 6)*
- > *People receiving support in order to be re-housed or sustain a tenancy (Category 7)*

4.2 DEFINITIONS OF LIVING CIRCUMSTANCES

4.2.1 People living rough (ETHOS Category 1)

A review of the information in the member states indicates a range of issues related to the definition and measurement of the narrow definition of rough sleeping.

Although all countries should be able to agree on the notion of rough sleeping as a core definition of homelessness, there is a lack of information in almost all countries on the size and nature of the population. A number of countries have conducted national surveys of the roofless population (France, Italy, Sweden) but these are now some years old. Furthermore, they have not been carried out with a frequency or in a consistent manner that would allow meaningful comparison over time. In some countries regional or major city counts are available (e.g. Germany, Ireland, Netherlands, Czech Republic). In the UK local authorities are expected to conduct regular (annual or six-monthly) counts of people sleeping rough and annual estimates are published.

Where surveys of rough sleeping have been conducted approaches to undertaking these surveys vary substantially and this affects the overall count. For example, whether the count is carried out on a single night of the year or averaged over a week, and whether the survey is conducted on one night in the year or is repeated at different times in the year to account for seasonal change will all affect the scale of the count involved.

Although the definition of sleeping rough is similar in most countries there are differences in interpretation that would affect the final result. One difference relates to the places included as public spaces for the purposes of defining rough sleeping in surveys or counts. This difference arises partly because people who are sleeping rough move around between sleeping on the street, in makeshift shelters, in places not meant for habitation, and in night shelter or emergency accommodation provided by homeless agencies. Some countries include people sleeping in tents or cars while others do not. A number of countries (e.g. Poland, Hungary) define containers / huts / barracks and buildings not intended for habitation as non-conventional property. It is evident that, in some countries, there are people who live (almost permanently) in non-conventional properties not intended for habitation. Whether non-conventional properties and makeshift or temporary structures are included in counts of rough sleeping differs between countries.

Another difference relates to the time-scale linked to the survey period. Some surveys count only those sleeping rough in defined places between certain hours on the night of the count (e.g. 5pm to midnight in Poland, overnight in Italy). Other surveys count those who had slept rough or relied upon night shelters during a given period. For example, the INSEE survey in France included those who had slept the previous night in a hostel or place not meant for habitation; while in Scotland, rough sleeping is defined as - "have slept outside in a place not specifically designed for human habitation, at least once in the last seven days".

Taking these differences into account a generic definition of rough sleeping may include people who:

- > have to spend (part of) the daytime in a public place / space (i.e. does not have access to 24-hour accommodation) and / or
- > have no fixed abode - move around between and spend the night in the street / public places / places not designed for habitation / rooms (of friends) / night shelters.

Regular surveys of rough sleepers are expensive to conduct and their reliability depends on the issues referred to above as well as the difficulty of finding all the people sleeping rough on any given night. It is unrealistic therefore to expect regular surveys in each country that can be used to provide comparative data. Hence, alternative approaches are required to estimate the size of the population. One approach would be to make better use of existing service level or register (or administrative) data. Although further research is required to evaluate methods (and reliability) of enhancement of service level data, our review indicates that there is a lack of even very basic information in many countries. The following examples illustrate this. One way to achieve an estimate of rough sleepers would be to count the number of people coming into contact with outreach services. Our review indicates that no reliable statistics on outreach services are currently maintained in a manner that would allow these to be used to estimate the size of the population sleeping rough in any country except at a local or city level. It would also be possible to use the figures on night shelter users to estimate the number of people living rough. However, in many countries it is difficult to find consolidated figures for users of emergency or night shelter hostels. Indeed, many countries do not even have registers of hostel facilities. Equally a fundamental problem that occurs in Europe as elsewhere is that if homelessness data are collected mainly from service providers, then countries with the best service provision also record the highest levels of homelessness (the 'service statistics paradox').

EU-15 COUNTRIES

Among the EU-15 countries, definitions of rough sleeping are given in countries where official surveys (or estimates) have been conducted. These include Finland (annual Housing Market Survey), France (INSEE national survey 2001), Ireland (triennial national survey and a specific survey of rough sleeping in the greater Dublin Region), Italy (national survey in 2000), Sweden (NBHW surveys in 1993, 1999 and 2005) the UK (rough sleeper counts).

The annual Housing Market Survey in **Finland** defines rough sleeping as "living outdoors, staircase, night shelters" and includes those without permanent accommodation, who live in various types of temporary shelters and places and who move around from one kind of a shelter to another. The information is gathered for a single day - normally the 15th of November.

In **France**, the INSEE survey was taken from 15 January to 15 February 2001 among a sample of 4,084 users in 1,801 facilities in 80 towns (of over 20,000 population). The survey used the concept of “houseless”, which is broader than “shelterless” because it includes people who drift from one form of shelter to another without necessarily living on the street. The operational definition used was:

“anyone sleeping in a location not meant for human habitation or taken in charge by an organization providing accommodation free or for a small co-payment”.

The range of locations not meant for human habitation included, for example, public spaces, the street, gardens, tube stations, mainline railway stations, airports, derelict buildings, huts, caves, warehouses, factories, cars, trains, cellars, and car parks but excludes improvised shelters (temporary structures, building site sheds, immobilized caravans). Free and low co-payment accommodation services are defined as emergency accommodation centres (CHU). The survey did not include “sofa surfers” (people staying with family or friends), young worker hostels and migrant worker hostels, and people in self-pay hotel rooms.

The survey estimated the number of people who had used emergency accommodation or meal site service at least once during the week prior to the survey as 93,000 adults, of whom 86,000 were homeless users.

In **Ireland**, although there is no definition of rough sleeping in the 1988 Housing Act, the Government publication ‘Homeless - An Integrated Strategy’ clarifies that the definition of homelessness includes:

- > people living in temporary insecure accommodation;
- > people living in emergency bed and breakfast accommodation and hostels/health board accommodation;
- > rough sleepers;
- > victims of domestic violence.

In official surveys, such as that undertaken in the Dublin region, respondents self report on the number of nights spent rough sleeping for the previous week.

In **Italy**, the last national count was produced by the Zancan Foundation for the *Commissione di indagine sull’esclusione sociale* in 2000 (Commissione 2002). The 2000 survey was based on a “strict definition” of the phenomenon:

“Only those who at the time did not have a permanent roof over their heads, even in the form of a hostel or protected accommodation were included. Consequently the only persons included are those who spent the night of the survey (14 March 2000) on the streets or in parks or in the so-called low threshold accommodation (i.e. dormitories that offer a bed and a shower for short periods of time but which do not require and do not allow any participation in daily routine)”.

The definition corresponds to the prevailing concept of the homeless in Italy, that of the “person of no abode”. The survey employed an *s-night* approach (a count of persons on the street on a particular night and who sleep in a first level dormitory on the same night).

In **Sweden**, the NBHW has mapped homeless clients with social, health, and criminal justice authorities and NGO service providers on three occasions (most recently in 2005). The respondent social workers complete a form for each of their homeless clients on key information including their current housing situation. The NBHW survey only gives information on the number of rough-sleepers known by and in touch with the respondents during the week of the survey and on the number of people staying in “emergency or low threshold shelter (hostels etc.)”. Respondents are also asked to categorise the homeless individual in four different situations, where the fourth one, “a person is reduced to emergency housing, hostel or is sleeping rough (*akutboende, härbärge, jourboende eller är uteliggare*)” roughly covers the roofless category.

In the **UK**, figures for rough sleeping are provided separately for England, Scotland, Wales and N.Ireland. In England, the ODPM publishes a national figure of people sleeping rough annually, based on a combination of street counts and estimates to establish the position against the 1998 baseline (of 1,850 people sleeping rough - the first detailed estimate of rough sleeping in England). Rough Sleeping counts are conducted by local authorities in partnership with local homeless agencies.

Street counts provide a snap-shot of the number of people sleeping rough in a given geographical area on a single night. The most recent data (2005) indicates that 106 local authorities (of 354) undertook a street count. Where no recent counts have taken place local authorities must submit an estimate. Any estimates of more than 10 rough sleepers provided by local authorities (in their annual Housing Investment Programme statistical returns to ODPM) should be validated by a count. For all other areas, zero estimates are assumed on the basis of authorities' statistical returns. Using this methodology, it is estimated that, at June 2005, there were 459 people sleeping rough in England on any single night. This is the lowest recorded level. The rough sleeping estimates are published annually in September. The ODPM encourages areas where there is a known rough sleeping problem to undertake street counts at appropriate intervals as shown, depending on the size of the counted local rough sleeping population in areas with:

- (a) 20 or more rough sleepers; at least two street counts a year;
- (b) between 10 and 19; at least one street count a year;
- (c) under 10; local authorities report estimates through housing statistical returns.

The definition of rough sleeping employed in England and N.Ireland refers to "People sleeping, or bedded down, in the open air (such as on the streets, or in doorways, parks or bus shelters); and people in buildings or other places not designed for habitation (such as barns, sheds, car parks, cars, derelict boats, stations, or bashes / makeshift shelters)".

In Scotland the definition refers to people who 'slept outside in a place not specifically designed for human habitation, at least once in the last seven days'. Scotland has operated a twice yearly count of rough sleepers during the lifespan of its' Rough Sleepers Initiative. The Rough Sleeping Initiative formerly ended in 2003 and, although local authorities continued to support projects, no further statutory counts have been completed after October 2003 when 328 people were recorded as sleeping rough.

EU-10 COUNTRIES

In the EU-10 countries counts of rough sleeping and homelessness have mainly been conducted by the NGO sector and the definitions employed have varied. However, official counts have been undertaken in Lithuania (by the Department of Statistics) and Poland (by the National Population and Housing Census). It is also the case that people live in places not meant for habitation and in non-conventional buildings. Whether these are counted as rough sleepers or as people living in inadequate accommodation differs between countries.

In the **Czech Republic**, a field census of *rough sleepers* in Prague was conducted in 2004 using three methods:

1. in tramway and metro wagons (323 persons),
2. in the streets, parks and other public places in 83 districts (1054 persons),
3. self-census method (491 persons).

During winter, many rough sleepers look for places to sleep in the warm and make use of day centres that, in Prague, stay open throughout the night. They sleep seated on chairs or make their bed on the floor. During the night of the census, 411 persons were found to be staying overnight in such centres. The census also included municipal transport facilities including tramlines and metro terminuses.

The field census took place in public places in 83 districts, covering the majority of the city area. The field self-census was conducted using cooperating homeless persons in poorly accessible or dangerous locations and the data was adjusted in order to avoid duplication. The homeless census revealed that a certain group of the homeless is virtually unidentifiable living in poorly accessible and hidden places, especially in sewerage, heat distribution systems, ventilating shafts, underground tunnel systems and abandoned houses.

In **Hungary**, a survey of the homeless population has been conducted in Budapest (annually) since 1999 on 3rd of February (between 5 pm and 12 pm). Almost all service providers in the capital participated and involved clients in all night and temporary shelters, the stations of the 'mobile tea-services', street social workers and Shelter Foundation staff of the 'crisis car'.

In 2005 a new initiative was implemented to provide a census of rough sleepers and people living in homeless institutions (shelters, hostels, day-time facilities). The census involved nine cities apart from the capital. The registration of rough sleepers was carried out only through personal inspection. Budapest was divided into 134 districts to count rough sleepers and homeless service users. This counted 3,000 rough sleepers, 1,800 in homeless shelters and 2,800 in hostels providing temporary accommodation.

In **Lithuania**, the Department of Statistics (2003) records 1,250 people living in a public space. People sleeping rough were recorded in random places for example: in underground sewerage and heating pipeline constructions, and rubbish dumps.

In **Poland**, the Pomeranian Forum on Homelessness conducted a head count of rough sleepers in a range of living places including homeless facilities (night shelters and shelters combined), places not meant for habitation (empty and abandoned buildings, railway and bus stations, spaces around heating pipes), people living with friends / family, in drying-out units and in gardening lots. “Workers Gardening Lots”, as defined in the Workers Gardening Lots Act 1981, are deemed to be “agricultural grounds divided into small lots for the gardening purposes of private users/tenants and others, equipped with gardening and rest facilities”. Lots were usually equipped with a small shed-like structure for gardening tools. Many abandoned lots have become an attractive refuge for homeless people.

The National Population and Housing Census on “People with no Place in which to Live” included two homeless categories that might be used to estimate some part of the homeless population: people “with no place in which to live” (for which data has not yet been published) and people ‘staying in places not meant for habitation’. The places not meant for habitation were mostly places located in industrial and merchandise buildings, semi-permanent structures and temporary structures such as sheds and mobile structures such as railway wagons, caravans, boats, barracks.

In **Slovenia** information on rough sleepers comes from estimates made by NGOs since no counts of homelessness have been undertaken.

4.2.2 People living in accommodation provided for the homeless (ETHOS Categories 2 and 3)

TYPES OF PROVISION

The third review of homelessness statistics (Edgar et al, 2004) identified that

- > in no country is there a clear or agreed definition of a homeless hostel;
- > differences in nomenclature for accommodation with similar functions (e.g. emergency, transition, re-settlement) makes comparison between countries difficult.

That review therefore identified the need to develop a generic classification of accommodation for homeless people. Using the three domains employed in developing our conceptual model it is possible to specify the characteristics of accommodation used for homeless people (see Table 4.1).

Table 4.1 Generic Description of Characteristics of Homeless Accommodation	
Physical space	Communal in form (normally larger than normal dwelling). Shared space (living eating and/or food preparation).
Social space	Staff supervision on premises. Limited (or no) private space (i.e. from which others can be excluded).
Legal space	Temporary occupancy No tenancy or occupancy agreement. Exclusion (eviction) without court action.

While staff services are provided in all hostels, these can take different forms ranging from supervision, to the provision of advice (e.g. on housing), to the provision of support services (common to all residents rather than being individualised).

Given this understanding of the characteristics of homeless accommodation, it is then necessary to present an approach to enable different forms of accommodation provision to be classified generically (i.e. independent of specific nomenclature used in different countries). We understand the development of services for homeless people (see Edgar et al, 1999) to have involved a range of accommodation forms including - emergency, transitional and (re-settlement) supported accommodation. These different forms can probably be captured by reference to three criteria of access, period of stay and purpose or intention of accommodation (see Table 4.2).

Access Criteria	Direct Referral	In person From agency or statutory body
Period of Stay	Overnight Short (not defined) Short (defined) Longer term	Normally not 24-hour stay While awaiting assessment / re-housing Period linked to training, support or move-on Linked to re-settlement support, rehabilitation
Purpose / Intention	Emergency Interim Transitional Specialist	Crisis situation Assessment for support or re-housing Receiving support or training Re-settlement, rehabilitation or refuge

Thus, a night shelter can be defined using these criteria:

Access criteria: direct access is possible without referral from another agency.

Period of Stay: the premises are (normally) vacated during some part of the daytime. Although people may return on successive nights, the intention of the accommodation is for overnight stay.

Purpose: to provide accommodation for people who would otherwise have to sleep rough (or are in a crisis situation).

We present, in Table 4.3, one approach to a generic classification of homeless accommodation that can be made using these criteria (adapted from Rosengard et al, 2001).

Generic Description of Provision	Access Criteria	Intended period of stay	Aims and Purpose
Emergency / Overnight Shelter	Direct access no referral required	Overnight	To provide a direct route to a bed for the night for homeless people, including those who may be excluded from access to other accommodation. Main purpose is emergency accommodation but practical advice and assistance or low level support may also be offered.
Homeless hostel	Direct access and by referral	Short stay	To provide accommodation to people on the basis of planned-entry criteria or where access may be dependent on referral from another agency or an assessment by homeless caseworkers. This includes those hostels that have an explicit aim of providing temporary accommodation for priority / vulnerable groups. Purpose of accommodation is short stay although some people may be long-term residents through lack of alternatives. Support provision is variable but normally intended to be assistance with re-housing or move on to supported housing.
Temporary / transitional or interim accommodation ⁽¹⁾	Planned access or by referral	Short stay (intended to be less than six months)	To provide temporary accommodation while awaiting re-housing; To provide accommodation while support needs or housing needs are assessed.
Hostel for a specific client group	Direct and by referral	Short stay (intended to be less than six months)	The accommodation is targeted at a specific client group (e.g. women's shelters, foyers for young people) and access is restricted to that group. While the accommodation is intended to be temporary, the service may emphasise transitional objectives of the accommodation and support in enabling access to positive move-on arrangements and / or independent living. Support can vary from 24-hour staff cover to visiting workers.
Supported Hostel / Lodgings / Accommodation	Planned access	Longer term	As above with the exception that accommodation will be provided on a more permanent basis and not necessarily targeted at a specific client group. To provide supported accommodation for rehabilitation, re-settlement or supported tenancy.

Adapted from Rosengard et al 2001

⁽¹⁾ This may include low budget hotels or bed and breakfast.
Temporary accommodation includes housing let as a temporary solution to accommodate homeless people / households as an alternative to low-budget hotels, bed and breakfast or hostel accommodation until a settled solution is found.

Although this generic classification can be defined, it is generally not possible to distinguish the different categories statistically. It is difficult even to separately identify data for emergency hostels (ETHOS category 2) from general homeless (short stay) hostels (ETHOS category 3) in most countries. Furthermore it is difficult to distinguish short stay hostels from temporary accommodation in many countries. In homeless hostels, the available length of stay is normally intended to be up to six months (though this does vary by country). This is deemed to be enough time to clarify the housing and legal situation of the average service user. However, some people are allowed to stay in the same shelter for much longer than initially planned. Particularly in countries which possess limited transitional housing services, or that lack social housing or supported housing in order to move people on into more appropriate or more permanent housing, generalist homeless hostels are obliged to accommodate people for relatively long periods of time even though this is not the intention of the homeless provision. The point to be emphasized is that in many short stay shelters, individual clients are, in fact, receiving a temporary housing service. This means that both kinds of service are present but it is not possible to provide separate data for both.

EU-15 COUNTRIES

The picture of provision among the old member states is diverse but reflects the forms of hostel accommodation identified in the generic classification above. Although most countries rely upon NGO provision, municipal provision exists and many countries also use private low-budget hotels for emergency and/or temporary accommodation to supplement these other sectors when required. Some countries have a broader range of provision than others and where the range of provision is broader then the distinctive role of different forms of hostel is more definitely articulated. In some countries there is a clear separation between emergency provision and other forms of hostel (for reception, assessment, transitional living or temporary accommodation), while in other countries there is more of a continuum of provision. In some countries (e.g. Denmark) this division is a reflection of social services provision; in other countries (e.g. France) it is more a reflection of funding; and elsewhere it is a reflection of the structure of the (confessional and non-confessional) historical sources of provision (e.g. Portugal, Belgium).

In **Austria**, the only evidence available is a national survey undertaken by BAWO in 1998 which estimated about 21,000 people were homeless and in contact with services for the homeless (around 2,000 of whom were estimated to be sleeping rough). For a more detailed view on the extent and structure of homelessness in Austria it is still necessary to look at additional surveys on homelessness at local and / or regional level to build up nationwide estimations.

The survey described different facets of the situation of services for the homeless differ between the nine counties. In some counties like Vienna, Salzburg, Tyrol and Vorarlberg there are chain like structures of services in force such as centres for counselling and prevention of eviction, emergency shelters and day care institutions, supported housing and provisions for re-housing. In the counties Styria, Upper Austria and Nether Austria emergency services are dominant and provision for resettlement are less developed. In the counties Carinthia and Burgenland there are only very few services for homeless persons provided - especially emergency services like shelters and asylums. In some counties (like Vienna, Tyrol, Styria) some old fashioned asylums are still working and can be characterized by low standards and very low provisions of individual support. In addition to the professional emergency services, in most counties of Austria, cheap boarding houses and private hostels are accessible also for homeless persons and used for temporary shelter.

Belgium has only a small-scale provision of direct access night shelters (provided free). For example, in Flanders, the care sector resisted the foundation of night shelters for a long time though some have recently been established in the larger cities. Otherwise homeless accommodation is provided by a combination of '*crisis reception centres*' (where access is by referral but is intended for short stay normally of 21 days) and by '*reception centres*' focussed either at all homeless (including places for children), homeless males, young adults, people with children or addicts. Access to reception centres is also by referral, the period of stay is limited providing temporary accommodation (and support) with the aim of achieving independent living.

In **Denmark** the most important type of service is the ‘§94 boformer’ accommodation provided under the Social Services Act for a range of vulnerable groups including the homeless. The term “boformer” might be translated into *forms of living or forms of accommodation* and essentially the term indicates that the concept of “institution” no longer exists in the legislation. The physical form of the accommodation does not imply anything about the legal category. As a rule the boformer are targeted at ‘those without a place to live, or who are not able to live in the place they have got, and who furthermore have a need for support, care and follow-up’. In this sense all accommodation is supported housing of different physical forms and target groups. It is difficult to distinguish homeless hostels, temporary accommodation and supported accommodation.

The datasets of the social appeal board regarding §94-boformer cover a range of different types of accommodation service but primarily relate to county services and also municipal services based upon an agreement with the county. The statistics cover those private services that are based upon an agreement, and where part of the expense is reimbursed by the state. The statistics only cover boformer that offer (24-hour) accommodation *around the clock*. It does not cover day shelters (*væresteder*) or similar services such as overnight emergency hostels. Furthermore shelters for victims of domestic violence without any supplementary problems are not included either. However, six of the §94-boformer in Copenhagen are almost exclusively for women. The statistics cover “udflytterboliger” (halfwayhouses) if those are part of a §94 boform. Therefore although Denmark has some night shelter accommodation (*natherberg*) there is very limited information available from official sources.

Under social service legislation temporary or transitional accommodation is provided (called §91 and §93 Boform) as halfway-houses for the treatment and rehabilitation of people with a mental illness or addiction problem or other special need. Longer term temporary housing is also provided under §92 for mentally ill people or mentally ill with drug addiction problems (*alternative plejehjem*) for those whose behaviour is too deviant to be accommodated in municipal care. Access to these situations is always by referral and the accommodation may take the form of smaller units like staircase communities (*bofællesskaber*) with a range of communal living and staffing arrangements. Specialist supported accommodation is provided for people without a place to live or who are unable to live there without support under §94 (*For-sorgshjem og herberger*).

In **Finland**, the most common concept is *emergency shelter* (*ensisuoja*) but the term *night shelter* (*yömaja*) has been used, to describe direct access hostels for short term stay for people who would otherwise have to sleep rough. Nowadays many of the municipal shelters are named as service centres for the homeless (*asunnottomien palvelukeskus*), because the quality of the premises provided is good and they provide different kind of social services as well as arranging housing services for their clients. Hostels (*Asuntola*) are the primary category of accommodation for homeless people. The majority of hostel services are provided by NGOs, but privately run hostels also exist. Hostels run by municipal social welfare agencies, are meant to provide temporary accommodation while alternative accommodation is arranged (e.g. rooms in the emergency shelters). These hostels are provided under the social welfare legislation.

Although the category of temporary housing is difficult to define exactly in Finnish, homeless families are usually housed in temporary / crisis flats, while waiting for ordinary housing. As in other countries these are dwellings (often flats) without a normal tenancy contract provided by the municipal welfare authority or an NGO.

In France, a range of forms of accommodation for homeless people and families are provided including emergency, short stay and temporary housing (for up to two years). This is in addition to specialist accommodation for immigrants described below. Emergency accommodation centres can be in dormitory type structures but can also include hotel rooms that associations rent and make available to homeless fami-

lies. In winter, a specific programme called the '*plan hivernal*' (Winter Plan) is deployed to palliate the lack of supply of places in the permanent facilities. Thus certain centres, such as the Mie de Pain, are opened for the winter period from 1st November until the 31st of March and sometimes outside of these dates when the temperatures require it. Table 4.4 summarises the nature of this accommodation.

Table 4.4 Accommodation in France for the Homeless Population ⁽¹⁾	
D'hébergement D'urgence (Emergency Accommodation Centres) (CHU)	The law does not state the meaning of 'hébergement d'urgence' except that the facilities must offer 'conditions of hygiene and comfort respecting human dignity'. Three elements distinguish it from other types of accommodation: the short duration of stay, the method of admitting the public and the status of its users. The duration of the stay can be between one night and seven nights, possibly extended to 14 nights.
Services d'Accès Direct (Low Threshold / Direct Access Shelters)	To be admitted to an emergency centre in France, it is necessary to pass through the 115 hotline, which centralises the demands and refers people to a given centre. No centres that are open all year are accessible directly.
Les Hôtels Meublés (Furnished Hotels)	These accommodate urgently roofless families for whom accommodation in collective structures or dormitories are not adapted. Although single people in collective structures must re-apply through the 115 hotline every night, families can benefit from emergency aid for several days or even months in a furnished hotel.
L'Hôtel Social (Social Hotel)	Dispersed accommodation, is one of the modalities of the emergency accommodation centres (CHU). They accept homeless individuals or families for one night or for a few months. They differentiate themselves from the CHU by the fact that they offer private space for each family or individual (bedrooms instead of dormitories), and provide sanitary facilities and private kitchens or shared with only a few families.
Les CHRS or Centres d'Hébergement et de Réinsertion Sociale (Social Reinsertion Accommodation Centres)	90% of these are managed by associations and 10% by local collectives (CCAS). The facilities are of the collective type and the users contribute to the costs of the accommodation and the assistance provided in proportion to their means. The length of stay in a CHRS is limited by the law to a period of 6 months renewable if necessary. The difficulty of finding an independent solution often necessitates a prolongation of the stay in the accommodation centres. The social assistance is provided by a multidisciplinary team, social workers, psychologists, and institutional partners. Although the CHRS are designed to accept all people in difficulty, some specialise in receiving a specific sub-group.
Les Logements ALT: Housing financed by the ALT (Financial Help for Temporary Accommodation)	These are housing units dispersed amongst the private and public housing stock, managed by associations or local collectives. They receive financial aid to provide housing units to the public in difficulty. The people received are those in the process of reinsertion, most of which are families. The length of stay is limited by the guidelines to 1 year, renewable, but this duration is seldom respected because of the difficulties in finding another type of accommodation. The association can ask the family to make a financial contribution towards the cost of the accommodation. The families do not have a tenancy agreement since the housing is under the name of the association
Les Résidences Sociales (Social Residences)	This is collective accommodation of the hostel type (i.e. individual furnished bedrooms or apartments with collective services and common spaces such as dining room, laundry, meeting room). They are for the most part the property of controlled rent organisations (HLM). The management is undertaken by the associations who have a rental contract with the HLM. Access to this housing is means tested. The individuals or families have residential status and pay rent. They sign a lease which, like all tenancy agreements, is monthly and renewable. However, the duration of occupation of tenants in social residences cannot exceed 2 years in principle. Associations do not always enforce this rule because of the difficulty of finding normal housing.
⁽¹⁾ Excludes specialist accommodation for immigrants and migrant workers and for women fleeing domestic violence and young people which are discussed under separate categories below.	

In **Germany**, the landscape of hostel provision is so diverse that it is difficult to provide a national definition. The ETHOS categories for direct access and short stay hostels (2.1 to 2.3 and 3.1) therefore need to be considered together. Overnight accommodation, which should include winter accommodation, is available throughout Germany and short-term arrangements with commercial providers are also made. However, it is difficult to make a distinction between different forms of direct access, short stay or transitional hostels. Many short stay hostels are low threshold and allow direct access. The distinction between short stay hostels and those where people may stay for a longer period of time, in which there is no exclusion during day time hours (category 2.3 *Tagesschließung*; and Category 3.1 *Kurzzeitunterkunft für Wohnungslose*), is not an easy one to make in Germany. In some cities there are so-called 'reception-houses (or departments)', which allow people to stay for some months and provide more time for the clearing process involved in moving on (including regular housing). So the definition of "short" could be different between the two types of short stay hostels (2-3 days or up to a week in case of 2.3 and up to 6 months in case of 3.1).

Equally it is not possible to make a statistical distinction between different forms of temporary accommodation. In current regional statistics all types of temporary accommodation are included under the category '*without regular tenancy and temporarily accommodated by institutions*'. The main distinction to make in Germany is rather between accommodation which is provided by municipalities under laws on social security in order to prevent rooflessness and accommodation which is mainly provided by NGO service providers (without a rental contract) and which is financed by social welfare authorities (either under the law for social assistance, SGB XII or under the new law providing minimum benefits for long term unemployed, SGB II). Accommodation provided by NGOs is, to a large extent, excluded from regional statistics. However, in North Rhine-Westphalia financing bodies for social welfare (*überörtliche Träger der Sozialhilfe*) finance the costs.

The types of temporary accommodation used by municipalities, are dwellings which they own or rent, hotels and pensions, shelters and hostels (larger buildings with communal facilities and different intensities of support). A special form of temporary accommodation by municipalities is the temporary confiscation of the dwelling, which was rented before by a household threatened with eviction (*'Wiedereinweisung'*). The household is no longer the tenant of the dwelling and is officially defined as a homeless ('roofless') household which is temporarily accommodated in its former flat (for which the municipality guarantees payment of rent and any damages to the landlord). All regional statistics on homelessness in Germany count these households as an important category of the homeless, but no data are available on a national level.

It depends on the local practice whether municipal temporary accommodation is provided with or without a specific time-limit. Hotel accommodation is usually limited for some days or weeks only; however, confiscations are often limited for six months. All forms of temporary accommodation are usually provided on condition that the homeless household looks for regular housing as soon as possible, but longer stays are often possible and frequently occur.

Temporary accommodation by NGO service providers for the homeless is usually provided as transitional with a given time-limit. Cost statements of welfare authorities for stationary institutions are often limited, in the first instance, for six months (but prolongations up to 36 months are possible). There is no maximum time defined by law and in (few and special) individual cases longer periods of stay are possible. There are also some NGO hostels for longer stays (e.g. for elderly homeless people and those with serious health and mental problems), which are usually financed by municipalities.

In **Greece**, no night shelters operate to provide emergency accommodation for people who sleep rough. Although some people occupy low budget hotels these are arrangements financed from their own precarious earnings and not, as in other countries, accommodation used (and paid for) by local authorities to supplement a lack of emergency or overnight accommodation. The state and municipalities (mainly Athens) have begun to provide homeless shelters. These operate as accommodation centres run by the Ministry of Health and Welfare and converted hotels run by the municipality of Athens providing communal dormitory style accommodation. The voluntary sector provides a range of types of shelter and guesthouse providing temporary accommodation including a sizeable number providing accommodation for older people without a home. The conditions of access, purpose and function vary according to the provider agency.

In **Ireland**, Section 2 of the *Housing Act, 1988* defines the circumstances in which a person shall be regarded by a housing authority as being homeless as follows:

“A person shall be regarded by a housing authority as being homeless for the purposes of this Act if - (a) there is no accommodation available, which in the opinion of the authority, he, together with any other person who normally resides with him or who might reasonably be expected to reside with him, can reasonably occupy or remain in occupation of, or (b) he is living in a hospital, county home, night shelter or other such institution, and is so living because he has no accommodation of the kind referred to in paragraph (a) and he is, in the opinion of the authority, unable to provide accommodation from his own resources”.

Circular N2/05 issued by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government notes:

‘The definition (of homelessness), therefore, covers not only people actually without accommodation but also people living in hospitals, county homes, night shelters or similar institutions solely because they have no suitable alternative accommodation. Equally, people who are unable to occupy or remain in occupation of otherwise suitable accommodation due, for example, to domestic violence come within the scope of the definition... The term “night shelter or other such institution” (paragraph (b) of section 2 of the 1988 Act) should be taken to include hostels, shelters, refuges, Bed and Breakfast accommodation and any similar accommodation which, of their nature, provide basic shelter for the night’.

In **Italy**, there is a vast range of terms for the accommodation facilities that correspond to the criteria for night shelters. These are termed in various ways: “dormitories” (“night shelters even on a rotating basis”: FIOpsd 2000), “first level (night) shelter” (designed to provide an immediate answer to primary needs). Some of these terms are traditional (e.g. *asilo notturno*: night asylum, *albergo popolare*: people’s hotel, dormitory). There are however some more recently introduced terms such as “first reception centre”, “reception centre” and “reception structure” and, although they are often used indiscriminately to indicate different types of hostels, they are also used to refer to night shelters of both the *low threshold* and the *short stay hostel type*.

In general the range of services provided in this conceptual category and the relative distinctions are all substantially present, given partly by the current distinction between “first reception” and “second reception”, and they are also contained in the legislation and in official documents. However, partly as a consequence of how this type of provision has developed over the years (Tosi, Ranci and Kazepov 1998), it is difficult to distinguish between them and most types of the hostels provided for the *Houseless*. Equally, different functions and types of provision and support with differing lengths of stay may co-exist in the same facility.

The terms and definitions employed by workers and the legislation do not discriminate between forms. If we consider the criteria for identifying the condition of Houselessness - to be temporary in nature, institutional in nature, occupied on condition that they receive appropriate support - then both the temporary nature and the support that constitutes the condition create problems. The duration of stays generally helps to distinguish *short stay homeless hostels* from both *night shelters* and from *supported accommodation*: but progress in the development of services has blurred the dividing lines considerably in both directions (Tosi, Ranci and Kazepov 1998).

Generally speaking, the difference between “first” and “second” reception, which correspond to emergency, easy access, facilities on the one hand and to facilities in which social support is provided on the other hand, helps to maintain this distinction. Nevertheless the difference between first and second reception and between night shelters and hostels is not clear-cut. The notion of emergency does not always relate to rooflessness. Emergency intervention may give rise to solutions classified under houselessness.

Although it is difficult to distinguish between *short-stay homeless hostels* and *temporary housing*, the distinction is applicable with the contents specified below. Although homeless hostels may overlap with night shelters (short stay hostel: 2.3), the distinction is conceptually clear and has been made operative in Italy in different ways. Generally the function and the support provided count more than the period of time. For example, the Italian Caritas (2004) uses the following definition:

“First level night reception: designed to give an immediate response to primary needs. Second level night reception: provides accommodation in a community context, characterised by some factors: the unitary nature, relationships, discussion, organised personal and learning spaces in which a dimension of normality is provided. Access is after two or three interviews designed to assess the real possibilities of success, but above all the willingness of the person to follow the agreed plan. The period of stay is limited and varies from person to person in relation to the plan and its actual implementation”.

This type of accommodation is provided for by various regional laws which classify the intervention as of the emergency type. This type of intervention is variously termed “emergency welfare” services, “emergency intervention/services and rapid welfare intervention”, “rapid intervention centres/services” or “rapid reception centre/intervention” and is targeted at people who “because of sudden and unforeseeable contingent, personal or family situations are without the necessary means to satisfy their primary living needs or they are incapable or in any case unable to find an appropriate place autonomously”, or “people without family support or whose existence in the family creates tensions and hardship such as to require them to leave immediately” (regional laws of Piemonte 2004, Lazio 1996, Marche 1998, Molise 2000, Puglia 2003).

Temporary housing corresponds to two main forms in Italy:

1. Transitional housing with support or in which the accommodation is based on an individual reintegration plan often as a further phase after that of the “second reception”. Third level reception in a social protection apartment is defined in the Caritas classification “as the possibility to offer a place where further autonomy can be developed through placement for a determined period in an apartment with non continuous social work support”. This also corresponds to *supported accommodation* (ETHOS category 7 from the viewpoint of the objectives and the functions), except that the accommodation is in ordinary housing.

2. Temporary placements in housing or hotels. In addition to mainstream public housing, a number of social measures are aimed at situations of serious hardship or at emergency situations (variously defined: “serious housing hardship”, “particular housing emergency”, “welfare cases”, “persons at risk”, “situations of particular social importance”). Among the measures employed by local authorities there is temporary placement in more or less precarious emergency accommodation (hotels, boarding houses, etc.).

Although there is no figure for rough sleeping in **Luxembourg**, the Caritas street work outreach project recorded a monthly average of 260 registered address services offered in 2004. The ‘Stëmm vun der Strooss’ (‘voice of the street’) provides aid to homeless people in cooperation with the Luxembourg Red Cross; in 2003, the association had contact with 851 different people in the city of Luxembourg (an increase of 36%). They opened a branch in Luxembourg’s second biggest city in 2004 and, after 3 months, reported that 154 different people used their services.

There is no agreed definition of a homeless hostel however a study commissioned by the Ministry for Family and Integration is using the ETHOS typology to develop a national nomenclature for homeless accommodation. The annual report (2004) by Caritas night shelter “Foyer Ulysse” indicates an average occupation of 60 beds of 64 (2 crisis beds left unused for emergency intervention). The Caritas winter campaign reported 279 individuals housed in bed and breakfast hotels. The “Ennerdach asbl” provides 17 apartments and 3 single rooms for overnight shelter. There is a range of temporary accommodation, partly dependent upon provider. The National Social Action committee (CNDS) provided ‘foyers et services de l’entraide’ (30 beds in 2004); the Abridado (‘Nuetseil’ crisis hostel) which opened in 2003 to offer accommodation for drug abusers has 42 beds.

In **Portugal**, there are no exclusively direct access hostels or night shelters. Most shelters have characteristics that relate to the three ETHOS categories 2.1/2.3/3.1 (crisis, short stay and temporary by referral from an agency). Some shelters have a time limit so that, for example, people have to leave after two weeks and can only return after three days; some people operate on this basis for years. The majority of people rely upon temporary shelter in hostels where the period of stay may or may not be defined. Low budget accommodation in the major cities comprises two types of situations: rented rooms in private houses which are paid for by social services and hostels (*pensões*) also paid for by social services. In some cases within these "*pensões*" people living there are obliged to leave in the morning and can only return in the afternoon.

The **Swedish** word '*Härbärge*' can be translated as "shelter" or "hostel" and is used in many places for the lowest rank of accommodation for the homeless. In Sweden *akut-* or *jour-* as a prefix implies immediate access in emergency cases, but mostly this kind of housing still requires approval by social workers. The categorisation in the NBHW survey, suggests that this criterion is supposed to come together with not only "short-term" (*korttids-*) stay, but also with "low threshold" (*lågtröskel*). This is probably relevant in most cases, but with two exceptions: emergency housing can sometimes be integrated, self-contained flats (*jourlägenhet*), intended primarily for women with children; these are then not "low threshold". The other exception refers to hostels that have adopted stricter terms of access. For instance in Göteborg, some *jour- och korttidsboenden* require that the "guests" have proved their sobriety for some time before entering and during their stay in the unit.

Compared with the criteria for a night shelter outlined above, the purpose "to provide accommodation for people who would otherwise have to sleep rough" and the intention of only short-term stay (although this may be more than just one night) hold well for all shelters (open either only nights or day-and-night). However, in many sites the local social authorities act as gatekeepers and prevent people from direct access also to night shelters, even if these are run by voluntary organisations. This is possible if the provider is dependent on the local social authorities paying for the bed.

Hotels are used in many places instead of, or as a complement to, shelters and hostels. Three kinds could be distinguished: permanent hotels for homeless people only, hotels with agreements on special low-budget terms for homeless people and regular hotels. Hotels are used for a variety of reasons. Some municipalities have a shelter for men but nowhere to place homeless women. Some hostels require sobriety or reject the mentally ill who are then candidates for a hotel room. Many municipalities have no shelters at all. Homeless people in need of emergency accommodation are then referred to the cheapest hotels of the town at the cost of the local social authorities or they may be placed in youth hostels. The term *ungkarshotell* (literal translation: 'bachelor's hotel') has reappeared in the NBHW 2005 questionnaire.

Sahlin (1993) defined 'training flat' (*träningslägenhet*) as a furnished, self-contained flat, integrated in regular housing but subleased to homeless persons on special terms and not intended to be converted into a regular tenancy. In most cases the period of let is related to the individual's needs and the availability of move-on accommodation but, in a minority of municipalities the leasehold is only for a determined period of time that cannot be prolonged.

The local social authorities in most municipalities in Sweden rent a number of dispersed flats and sublease them to clients on special terms. The contract period is in most cases much shorter than the intended (12-18 months) duration of the residence. This type of transitional housing, where the intention is that the subtenant eventually will rent the flat on his/her own with a regular contract, has many different names, such as *övergångslägenhet* (Malmö), *socialt kontrakt* or *kommunalt kontrakt* (Göteborg) and *försökslägenhet* (Stockholm).

Other varieties of self-contained, non-furnished, integrated flats are *referenslägenheter* ('reference flats') in Göteborg, intended to be 'normal housing' in all ways except for the contract and hence provide proof that the tenant is capable of managing as a decent tenant ('housing reference') when applying for their own housing. The NBHW, Stockholm and Göteborg City do not include those staying in trial and transition flats as 'homeless', while staying in a 'training flat' is 'homeless' according to Stockholm City. Malmö City includes those staying in 'transitional flats' and 'training flats' among the 'houseless' (*bostadslösa*) but not among the 'homeless' (*hemlösa*).

In the **UK** a night shelter is generally distinguished from a hostel by a lack of day-time provision and in being direct access, with self-referral and/or any agency referral. Readily available national statistics for people using night shelters does not exist. Johnson et al (2002) estimated that there were 5,917 bed spaces for emergency provision in the UK, outside of London. However this included emergency access hostels as well as night shelters fitting the above definition. Indeed only 18% (39 projects) classified themselves as night shelters.

The diversity of temporary service provision in the UK results in a blurring of temporary provision categories with only 'bed and breakfast' provision sitting uneasily under the operational category of roofless. In England a recent ODPM study gathered data for 'bed and breakfast hotels and other shared facility annexes' (ODPM National Statistics Statistical release 13 June 2005, SH-Q1). This provided a snap-shot figure for the end of March 2005 of 6,780 people. Examination of raw ODPM data provides a higher figure that is illustrative of turnover rates, with 72,238 referrals to bed and breakfast hostels in the 2004.

The 'best fit' of available data to ETHOS categories is achieved by presenting the data for temporary accommodation (i.e. to use hostel figures to address categories 3.1 to 3.3 and periods in local authority or other landlord dwellings as aligning with category 3.4). However an element of overlap is unavoidable as the ODPM published summary figures for short stay homeless hostels encompass reception centres, emergency units and women's refuges. In England there were 10,280 households in hostel accommodation (March 2005) and 1,624 in Scotland (December 2004).

Longer stay temporary housing is typically provided by local authorities or housing associations and private landlords working in conjunction with local authorities. Such housing can be distinguished by the fact that the household has accepted the accommodation under the auspices of the homelessness legislation. The most recent data for England (March 2004) is that there were 27,880 households in social landlord accommodation and 56,140 in private sector accommodation (mainly rented by local authorities). In Scotland 4,121 households were provided longer stay temporary housing in local authority accommodation and 117 households in 'other accommodation' (housing associations or private landlords).

EU-10 COUNTRIES

The emergence of homeless accommodation during the 1990s has, in the main, been driven by the NGO sector in all of the new member states. These NGOs have also been responsible for initiating censuses and research on homelessness though, for the most part, these have concentrated on capital cities or specific regions. Co-operation with government and statistics offices has led to the creation of new and systematic approaches to data collection in a number of countries (e.g. Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland) which will bear fruit in the coming years.

A key source of information on the homeless in the **Czech Republic** is derived from a census of homeless people undertaken in Prague in 2004. During the night of the census, 719 persons, of whom 610 (85%) were males and 109 (15%) females, were accommodated in overnight facilities provided by social services for the homeless (night shelters, hostels, half-way houses etc).

The data obtained from the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs shows the situation in social services intended for the homeless for the whole state (see Table 4.5).

Type of service	Number	Bed capacity
Hostels	32	500
Shelters	208	4,000
Half way houses	61	500

Source: Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs

According to the 2001 Census in **Hungary**, almost 4,000 people lived in social care centres for the homeless on census night. The Census defines an institutional household as a group of people living in an institution and accommodated by the public sector; where the dwelling unit is a room or group of premises suitable for lodging, or boarding and lodging five or more people. However, it is not possible to distinguish night shelter accommodation from other forms of homeless care centres. However, service registers show that, in 2005, there are 1,800 places in night shelters in Budapest and 200 places in special low-threshold shelters.

Temporary accommodation institutions in **Latvia** are institutions of the social services with the objective to provide social support to persons who do not have a living space or cannot live in it. There are several types of temporary accommodation - night shelters, shelters (24-hour), crisis centres for children who have suffered from violence and crisis centres. Night shelters for homeless persons or persons in crisis situation provide short term shelter for 1 night or up to 90 days. The majority of night shelters are opened only during the winter season and start operating in mid November. According to the report of Riga City Council, the number of people who have used night shelters has increased dramatically - to 1,716 in 2004¹.

The first night shelter was established in Riga in 1994. The establishment of night shelters in other cities started in 1997-1998. It is the municipal responsibility to establish night shelters and to finance the development and services of night shelters and day shelters. There are also shelters which provide daily (24hrs) services for men, women with children and families with children. The number of places for families is limited - 64 during the winter seasons, and 33 during spring-autumn.

Temporary residence services for longer stay in various shelters and crisis centres could be defined as "hostels for homeless". The establishment of such centres started in the mid-1990s. Temporary housing includes: crisis centres, temporary housing for persons after imprisonment, short term housing for persons with problems of mental development, disorders, group housing for persons with problems of mental development, centres for teenage mothers.

According to the **Lithuanian** Social Service Law, the ETHOS category 'Staying in a night shelter: direct access shelter/low budget hotel/short stay hostel' belongs to a temporary accommodation service group. Social services temporary accommodation institutions exist to provide social support for persons who do not have a place to live or can not live in it. Temporary accommodation institutions comprise: lodging homes (*nakvyn_s namai*) and crisis centres. In addition there is a temporary accommodation agency for under-age mothers with children, a refugee reception centre and social integration centres.

Lodging homes in Lithuania were established in 1993-1994. Since 1995 the Department of Statistics has collected and published (annually) statistical data on the number of lodging homes, the number of places, the lodgers and length of stay. The lodging home provides two types of service: shelter for a single night (from 6 p.m. to 8 a.m.) and accommodation for a longer period. The data on the number of one night stay places and the number of lodgers is available annually since 2000 and has increased during that period to 280 places in 2004 (averaging 100 people per night). In 2004 a total of 22 lodging homes provided 995 beds and provided accommodation to 1,762 people during the year. Of these one-third stayed for more than six months.

In **Poland**, a large proportion of services for the homeless are provided by the non-profit sector and these services are not reported in social welfare records. In the KLON/JAWOR database on Organizations and Institutions Working for the Homeless, there are 241 records of organizations and institutions classified as being of the "night shelter/ shelter" type. No data on the quantity of service users or stock is available. NGO shelter services are provided in a rich variety of forms and are adjusted on a regular basis to match the client's needs. Unfortunately this is not reflected in any national data source.

Some homeless centres are trying to adjust the services they provide to the needs of clients who they recognize as genuinely attempting to break with homelessness. A section of the shelter is separated to create a "hostel" and designated to provide home-like conditions for clients who are "on their way out of homelessness" but have no means of acquiring an apartment. Hostel rooms usually have individual bathrooms and kitchen equipment and are shared by no more than two people. Hostel inhabitants are usually allowed to stay for a year or more, are required to pay a token rent and are still entitled to use all of the support measures available at the shelter. Hostel rooms are almost never located outside the shelter. However, data is not available on the total number of hostel rooms in shelters.

According to the 2004 Social Welfare Act, a night shelter is a support centre which is semi-residential (as opposed to a round-the-clock service), the goal of which is to retain a vulnerable person in a more natural environment and thus prevent institutionalization. If statistics of the number of night shelters are based on such a definition, then a substantial group of shelters providing round-the-clock service are excluded. It is unclear how night shelters were defined for the sake of statistics and there may have been regional differences in reporting.

¹ Riga City Council, *Report of the Welfare department, according to the Regulations on National Action plan to decrease poverty and social exclusion, 2005.*

Each social welfare centre is required to report on how its resources are allocated among the differing benefit, allowance and support instruments. All reports are aggregated by the Ministry of Social Policy and published (most recently for 2003). According to these statistics, there were 163 night shelters, with 5,123 available beds (stock); accommodating 14,893 people during the whole year. Separate statistics are available for night shelters run by *gminas*² and other institutions (NGOs included). These indicate a further 3 night shelters with 181 available beds (stock) accommodating 707 people during the year.

The Polish Census defines a 'Collective Accommodation Facility' as a set of chambers / rooms / apartments localized in one or more buildings used by an institution providing services to numerous inhabitants, and which include three kinds of facility, depending on the length of stay (permanent stay, long stay, and short stay). Collective accommodation facilities for the homeless are deemed to be comparable to shelters and night shelters (although it is not possible to distinguish between them). The Census data recorded 771 collective accommodation facilities for the homeless, with 13,997 inhabitants. However, this was a first attempt to include this category and there is some doubt on the reliability of the information. The full Census evaluation, along with an extensive evaluation of the plight of homeless people is expected to be published by the Polish Central Statistical Office in November 2005.

A distinction can be made in **Slovenia** between centres offering an overnight stay and other services (e.g. day centres), but the majority of centres that offer accommodation do not limit the duration of stay. For example, in the centre for the homeless in Ljubljana half of the users have been there for more than five years. In order to cope with increased need this centre has recently opened (2004) short stay overnight accommodation (18 beds). While the municipality of Ljubljana has a program for emergency shelters these tend to cater for families (100 emergency dwellings are available in 2005).

4.2.3 People living in specialist (temporary) accommodation (ETHOS Categories 4 and 5)

The concept of 'houselessness' is intended to capture the situation where people have a physical space to live - a roof over their heads - but this is a temporary situation in which they do not have a legal or permanent basis of residence. Often the living situation will also have limitations in terms of social space and lack of privacy since it is provided, for the most part, in shared or communal forms of accommodation. In a number of countries particular forms of accommodation have emerged to provide temporary solutions for specific groups for which the provider agency has a specialist role or knowledge. This type of specialist accommodation has been developed, in particular, for women escaping domestic abuse and for migrants / refugees (or particular groups of refugees such as repatriates or torture victims).

While these groups are often not considered to be homeless by all countries, their situation reflects the condition of 'houselessness' or of housing exclusion. It is relevant to include them in the ETHOS typology both because conceptually they can be defined as a houseless group of people and also because the shortage of specialist accommodation for these groups has resulted in recent years in a significant increase in the proportion of women and immigrants using traditional homeless hostel services. Thus both for policy analysis and service planning purposes the failure to count this form of accommodation provision would result in a partial picture of need.

The sub-categories identified in the ETHOS typology attempted to reflect different forms of accommodation across Europe identified by previous studies. Hence, not all of these sub-categories are relevant for each country.

Two types of accommodation for women experiencing domestic abuse are evident in some countries. These include shelter accommodation in shared dwellings, hostels or other communal living situations; this is the more traditional form of provision (category 4.1). The second type of accommodation is dispersed self-contained dwellings with support (category 4.2). While the specific forms of accommodation in each category can vary, the distinction between shared or hostel accommodation and individual supported accommodation aims to capture a generic difference in approach.

2 A *gmina* is the lowest level of local government and smallest administrative unit in Poland. There is almost 2,500 *gminas* in Poland.

Three categories of accommodation for migrants and asylum seekers is identified in the ETHOS typology. The first relates to accommodation for asylum seekers; the physical form of this can vary from reception centres to dispersed dwellings (category 5.1). The second category relates to provision for repatriates (category 5.2). This is a specialist category that is mainly relevant to specific countries (e.g. the *Aussiedler* in Germany, the Ingrian repatriates in Finland and the Pontos repatriates in Greece). The third category relates to hostels provided under specific legislation for migrant workers (Category 5.3). This is often an historic form of provision more prevalent during the wave of labour migration in the 1970s and is more prevalent in some countries (most notably in France). It would also include migrant workers' hostels in former communist countries. In France significant numbers of (often single male) migrant workers who remain living for many years in such accommodation are now ageing and have particular needs for housing and support. In the new member states migrant workers' hostels are being replaced or re-designed for alternative purposes and this has been identified as a cause of homelessness.

The section below summarises the nature and availability of each of these forms of provision in each member state.

EU-15 COUNTRIES

Although information is available in all countries on the scale of accommodation available for women escaping from domestic abuse or violence, it is not always possible to distinguish different forms of provision (e.g. more traditional hostel accommodation from dispersed self-contained and supported housing). It is evident that, in some countries, women with additional problems (e.g. drug or alcohol dependency) must rely on homeless accommodation or, in a very few countries, specialist provision. In some countries legislation that excludes the perpetrator from the common home may have an effect on reducing the needs for refuge accommodation for women. All countries maintain information on accommodation provided to asylum-seekers; however, the split between different forms of reception accommodation and the increase in people living in ordinary housing, in some countries, creates issues of interpretation and reliability.

In **Austria** the law against domestic violence means that offenders can be ordered to leave the common accommodation allowing the victims (women and children) to remain in the accommodation. So in many events of domestic violence there is no homelessness involving women. Only a small number of women experiencing domestic violence leave the home in order to get individual support in women's shelters or refuges. In homes for female victims of domestic violence there are 600 living places (mostly women have to stay with their children in one common room, kitchen and sanitary rooms are shared with the other residents). In 2004, 2,767 persons (1,430 women and 1,337 children) stayed for some time in a shelter for abused women (for an average of 56 days).³ In 2004 the police had to intervene in 17,000 events of domestic violence.⁴

In Austria about 10% of the inhabitants (one million people) are immigrants, most of whom find accommodation in the private housing market. In the context of the services for homeless persons and families, migrant workers are under-represented because access to housing provided by social services is restricted by law. In addition to these migrant workers (mainly from former Yugoslavia and Turkey) there are also many refugees seeking asylum. In 2004 about 25,000 refugees sought asylum and found accommodation in large refugee camps provided by the federal government. About 5,000 proceedings were decided positively and more than 5,000 were denied. In May 2004 a contract between the federal government and the counties was realized which means that the counties are obliged to provide special accommodation for asylum seekers outside the refugee camps in smaller facilities. At the end of 2004 a total of 27,700 asylum seekers had moved into residual homes in the counties.

Women's shelter accommodation is to be found in all three regions of **Belgium**. Although asylum accommodation can be described, repatriate accommodation and migrant workers hostels are not a feature of Belgian provision for immigrants. For asylum seekers three main forms of provision are evident - emergency reception, large scale reception organised in Federal reception centres and centres organised by the Red Cross, and small scale reception centres organised by either NGOs or by local social services.

³ *Statistik der autonomen Frauenhäuser, 2004*

(www.aoeff.at/dokumente/AOEF_Statistik_2004.pdf)

⁴ *police - statistics 2004, Vienna 2005*

There are approximately forty refuges for women escaping domestic abuse in **Denmark**. These women's refuges (*krise-centre*) are provided under §93a of the Law of Social Services. Most are private self-governing bodies with a financial agreement with the counties. They are open to victims of domestic violence, but some of them are registered under §94 and thus demand that the woman also has some social problems (abuse of different kinds). This corresponds to the fact that most of the refuges are only staffed to handle family problems, so that women with severe social problems might be turned down or referred to other refuges. The refuges are staffed and many provide pre-school teachers, social workers, nurses and psychologists attached to the refuges.

The crisis centres were established in their present form between the years of 1979 and 2001, most of them in the beginning of the 1980's. Approximately two-thirds of them originally emerged from the Women's Movement, whereas local organisations, local politicians, and charitable organisations have initiated others. In the crisis centres throughout the country, there is room to accommodate about 272 women and 285 children.

Asylum seekers are required to remain in reception centres until their application has been determined for refugee-status. If they are granted refugee status they will be moved to an ordinary flat by the local authority. They are thus not threatened by homelessness due to release from a reception centre. There are no repatriate accommodation or migrants worker hostels.

Women's shelters have not been regarded (or counted) as places for homeless people in **Finland**. The Federation of Mother and Child Homes and Shelters provide a total of 14 shelters for women who are escaping from family violence. These are the most numerous shelters, but other municipalities and organisations also have crisis flats providing, between them, a total of between 20-30 shelters for women fleeing domestic violence. The Federation also has, in addition, 17 homes for mothers and children, mainly intended for mothers with substance abuse problems. Recently, the numbers of immigrant women in the shelters have increased. A third of the women in shelters are estimated to be immigrants. Thus it would be time to include this category as a homelessness category, because immigrant women do not have any other options.

Asylum seekers are housed in reception centres (2,500 places) until their application for refugee status is determined at which time housing is provided by the municipality. Hence the degree of homelessness remains the number each year in the temporary accommodation provided in the reception centres. Those who leave municipal housing provided (for example to move to the main employment centres in the Helsinki region) may subsequently become homeless and will be counted in the homeless statistics.

Repatriate Ingrian Finns have, in the past, been a significant feature of immigration in Finland, however the scale has diminished in recent years (518 in 2004). One change in immigration arrangements is that they must have accommodation arranged prior to their acceptance and so there is no specific temporary accommodation provision or homelessness among this group.

There are around 700 shelters in **France**, in the national federation of centres for social reinsertion (FNARS). These are either generalist structures or specialised organisations focusing on specific problems and vulnerable groups. Thus, the Fédération Nationale Solidarité Femmes (FNSF) does not cover the whole of the sheltering services available in France for women and children experiencing domestic violence. The FNSF network groups 54 associations which provide accommodation in 243 shelters for women experiencing domestic violence. There are mainly two types of accommodation available for this specific group of the population: emergency accommodation (welcoming women for a limited duration, from several days to several weeks, one month on the average) and insertion refuges (aiming at longer stays, generally 6 months renewable, based on a joint definition of a project which will help women and children achieve their autonomy).

A range of accommodation is available in France for immigrants including migrant workers hostels, reception centres for asylum seekers and temporary accommodation for refugees (see Table 4.6).

Table 4.6 Accommodation for Immigrants in France

Centres d'Accueil des Demandeurs d'Asile (CADA, Asylum Seekers Reception Centres):	222 hostels provide 15,440 places and receive people for the duration of the processing of their asylum applications by the French Office for reception of Refugees (OFPRA). The CADA are assimilated within the regime of accommodation centres and social reinsertion.
Centres Provisoires d'Hébergement (CPH, Provisional Accommodation Centres):	When asylum seekers obtain refugee status, they are transferred into Provisional Accommodation Centres. In addition to their objective of housing, the CPH play a role in assisting refugees with their insertion into society for six months renewable. To benefit from a place in the CPH, one must be recognised by OPFRA as a refugee and be without housing. The application must be made to the France Terre D'Asile association. A 10-year residence permit is provided and permits the residents to the same rights as citizens. There are 28 CPH with 1,028 places reserved for refugees.
Foyers de Travailleurs migrants (FTM):	650 buildings, 140,000 people housed and originally considered as temporary accommodation, the FTM have become permanent accommodation for single immigrant workers. The Law opened them to everybody in difficulty but the occupants are still mainly immigrant men. Some FTM are being renovated and their status will become that of social residences.

In **Germany** provision for women threatened by domestic violence is administered separately from services for the homeless. However there are an increasing number of hostels for homeless women in the homelessness sector, the dividing line is not always easy to draw. Usually the latter would mainly provide for homeless women with special social difficulties and for women who can not access the crisis accommodation.

Both categories of accommodation are evident:

- > *Frauenhaus, Frauenschutzwohnung, Kriseneinrichtung für Opfer häuslicher Gewalt*: Crisis accommodation for victims of domestic violence, where they can stay until they can either move back to their former address or have found alternative regular housing.
- > *Betreutes Wohnen für Frauen*: Follow-up transitional accommodation for victims of domestic violence. Still temporary, but conditions are more "normal" than in crisis shelters.

Some of the regional states which provide funding for women's refuges, also collect (annual) data. For example, in North Rhine-Westphalia 63 such hostels (with 625 places for women and 731 places for their children) were funded by the regional state government in 2003. In 1999 the federal government gave the total number of women's hostels funded by regional states as totalling 389 (plus 46 "crisis dwellings" for women). Provision which was not funded by regional states (but by municipalities and other agencies) are not included.

Two main types of accommodation are available in Germany for immigrants. First, specific temporary accommodation is provided for asylum seekers and other refugees while their applications are determined (*Aufnahmeinrichtungen für Flüchtlinge, Asylbewerber*). First stay is in central reception centres, later municipalities provide temporary accommodation. Specific temporary accommodation is provided by municipalities for repatriates until they have found regular housing (*Aufnahmeinrichtungen für Flüchtlinge, Asylbewerber (Spät-)Aussiedlerunterkünfte*). Hostels which are specifically reserved for migrant workers are very rare in Germany.

Regional states are responsible for centralised reception centres (for the first period after arrival), but after some time asylum seekers are referred to municipalities and are accommodated by these in communal accommodation or in "dispersed accommodation". It is not clear to what extent this dispersed accommodation (where an additional 157,000 recipients had lived in 2001) is still temporary accommodation. Asylum seekers are usually excluded from regional and municipal statistics on homelessness, but the homeless research network recommended the inclusion of those refugees who stay in special temporary accommodation and have a legal status which allows them to stay for more than a year in Germany.

There are currently three shelters for women escaping domestic violence in **Greece**; two of them are located in Athens, one run by the Municipality and another one by the Emergency Social Care Unit (EKAKB), and one in Thessaloniki. Their occupancy is around 40 women who are allowed to stay for a period of up to two weeks. Apart from these hostels, two more shelters, similar in size, run by bodies of the voluntary sector which cater for the needs of victims of trafficking. There are no supported accommodation services for women in Greece.

According to recent surveys, the proportion of immigrants amongst the total homeless population in Greece is high (Arapoglou and Ligdopoulou, 2002; Arapoglou, 2004). Statutory responses are lacking in terms of substantial facilities for housing and social support. The Ministry of Health and Social Solidarity recognizes and partly finances NGO initiatives, which developed on an ad-hoc basis to provide shelter and other support services to refugees. Consequently, most of the schemes in operation make use of European Union funds and constitute an unstable network for the reception of refugees. Nonetheless, large reception centres across the country are overcrowded and lack the necessary facilities and personnel to service the residents. Political refugees who have been granted asylum stay in the transitory accommodation camps organised by the State with the contribution of the Red Cross and other voluntary organisations. Nine out of 14 reception centres are now in operation servicing nearly 1,000 immigrants in mid 2005.

The housing and social inclusion programme for repatriate Greeks from Pontos has been organised by the Ministry of the Exterior through the National Institution of Reception and Rehabilitation of Emigrants and Greek Repatriates (EIYAAPOE). This programme is currently at its last phase and only a small number of (perhaps 200) people still await permanent accommodation. It must be noted that the program has faced severe criticism as its complexities restricted application to a mere tenth of the target group of repatriates from Pontos (who number nearly 160,000 people).

A reasonably well-developed range of smaller scale schemes often target the needs of particular groups (e.g. women refugees, juveniles) with or without state financial assistance. Although reception centres are spread all around the country the great majority of smaller services are located in the greater Athens area.

According to a recent report on domestic violence in **Ireland**, 2,813 women sought refuge accommodation in 2003 and 60 percent (1,687) were actually accommodated. Nearly half of those admissions were Traveller women. Most services provide emergency short stay accommodation and take referrals 24 hours a day. There are eighteen refuges in the Republic of Ireland in sixteen counties. Their total capacity is 464 beds. They have an overall capacity for 111 women and 353 children.

The Reception and Integration Agency (RIA) is responsible for coordinating the provision of services to both asylum seekers and refugees and coordinating the implementation of integration policy for all refugees and persons granted leave to remain in the State. The Reception and Integration Agency was also assigned responsibility for supporting the repatriation, on an ongoing basis for the Department of Social and Family Affairs of nationals of the ten new EU Member States who fail the Habitual Residency Condition attached to Social Assistance payments. At the end of March 2005, there were 7,280 asylum seekers in 68 direct provision centres (4 reception and 64 accommodation centres) of whom 1,678 asylum seekers (21%) had been residing in direct provision for over 2 years.

In **Italy**, the reason for treating arrangements for women separately is well justified because this separation is culturally and institutionally consolidated and it corresponds to specific forms of accommodation. Accommodation services for women include the provision of lodging, help and protection. The forms include: refuges, community accommodation, a group apartment and reception centres. Although Category 4 relates to women experiencing domestic abuse, three distinct target groups could be considered in Italy (Tosi, 2000):

- > *women of no abode*: persons suffering from the most explicit form of homelessness
- > *risk situations*: connected with family crises, violence, single parenthood
- > *women immigrants at risk*: where immigration constitutes an additional risk factor.

As regards the service supply system targeted at persons of no abode the basic distinction is between dormitories or places that offer emergency (short stay) accommodation on one hand and transitional accommodation or supported accommodation on the other. However, frequently even low threshold services like dormitories also provide some elements of social support. This is a consequence of the evolution of the provision. Faced with the clear inadequacy of dormitories for women, attempts were made to invent appropriate formulas and to develop a culture of provision suitable for women of no abode. The traditional forms of the emergency services have evolved, with the result that they have become more complex. Accommodation services for women in difficulty/at risk (small hostels or ordinary housing/apartments) is the most diffuse form of provision for women, usually classified in terms of emergency, transitional and protected accommodation.

There are services specifically targeted at women immigrants. The distinction between emergency and transition accommodation seen for the other target groups is reproduced with the same blurred borderline. The services are almost never limited to only shelter for the night.

Immigrants are considered and counted separately from other homeless and from occupants of facilities for the homeless and there is specific provision for them (though this does not mean that immigrants are not to be found in large numbers, in other homeless facilities). National projects have been implemented for refugees and asylum seekers such as the *Piano nazionale asilo* (National asylum programme). PNA started in 2001 on the basis of an agreement between Ministry of the Interior, High Commissioner for the Refugees (UNHCR), and the association of municipalities (ANCI). The National asylum programme network consists of a series of reception centres that operate throughout most of the country, similar to “first reception centres” (Cologna; Zanuso, 2001)]. These centres provide accommodation and protection to asylum seekers waiting for their refugee status recognition applications to be decided. The implications for homeless services is indicated by the fact that 1,500-2,000 beds have been provided, as against a demand of about 15,000 persons each year.

Reception centres are provided for foreign immigrants, usually with a distinction between “first reception” and “second reception” provision. First reception (*Centri di prima accoglienza*) are accommodation facilities (both public and private sector) designed for temporary accommodation (short to medium term) of immigrants. The definition includes both refuges/night shelters for the more serious housing emergencies and also temporary first reception centres as defined in the two laws on immigration (1990 and 1998). Second reception accommodation facilities, both public and private sector, are designed for continuous accommodation with medium to long term stays for persons in difficulty or waiting for permanent placement in normal housing.

Responsibility for setting up these facilities was delegated to the regional authorities, municipalities, voluntary associations and NGOs. As far as types of accommodation are concerned, public sector provision consists mainly of special purpose facilities (of differing housing quality and type including caravans and hostels) while private sector welfare provision consists more often of apartments (sometimes group apartments).

The reception centres were based on the idea that the difficulties of immigrants - including finding accommodation - were temporary and that in time immigrants would be able to find normal solutions to their problems. This was unrealistic in a context of scarce social or affordable housing supply. The result is that today the function of both the first reception centres and that of the second reception centres is uncertain. While some fulfil the need for emergency accommodation, in other cases the actual length of stay is indeterminate, which is to say they are permanent arrangements.

In **Luxembourg**, figures are provided by the Ministry for Advancement of Women (for organisations approved by them) for women’s organisation accommodation services. In 2004, 458 women booked in (and a further 311 women were turned away). According to the Ministry for Equal Opportunities annual report, the legislation regarding domestic violence has not had a visible impact on the number of women seeking refuge in the housing services. Ministry for Family Affairs, Youth and Solidarity annual report 2003 indicates 2,300 asylum seekers in 65 temporary accommodation centres. However, the report indicates that the issue for housing asylum seekers is the lack of medium sized temporary accommodation offering the necessary environmental health and security guarantees.

In **Portugal** there were 24⁵ refuges specifically working with women and children experiencing domestic violence (in December 2003). The most common type of accommodation provided is shared accommodation although there are a few examples of NGO’s providing self-contained accommodation. The type of support available generally includes social and psychological support, professional integration and training and support with the integration of children. However, several obstacles have been identified at the organisational and operational level, namely the lack of regular and adequate funding, the lack of professionals, the low level of inter-agency work and the lack of follow-up work.

A Shelter for Immigrants opened in June 2003 to provide temporary (shared) accommodation and “intends to be a transition point between humanitarian emergency situations and a co-ordinated response aiming at social inclusion”. The available provision includes accommodation, food, social and psychological support, juridical counselling and employment support.

5 According to Baptista, Isabel (coord) (2004) “National Report Portugal” developed under the DAPHNE project Shelters@net (www.shelters-net.com).

In **Spain**, the only source of information on accommodation for women escaping from domestic abuse is the Government's Women's Institute. There are no unified statistics about the number of women who are now in accommodation programmes of this kind, but we can get close to that number from the number of places available at the 293 Centres of Accommodation and Assistance to Battered Women, which have been registered by the Women's Institute, with a total of 4,418 places in 2003.

If the available statistics for other groups are scarce, in the case of the asylum seekers, refugees, or temporary workers, they are simply non-existent. The only figures provided by the State Secretary of Immigration is the number of accommodation places available for asylum seekers, the displaced, the stateless and immigrants, whether they are directly managed by the General Sub-office of Social Intervention or co-ordinated with social entities through subsidies, with a total of 1,094 places. The Short Stay Centres of Ceuta and Melilla are not included in these figures each of which has around 500 places.

In **Sweden**, there are two networks of voluntary associations working for and with women's refugees. *Riksorganisationen för kvinnojourer och tjejjourer i Sverige* (ROKS) provides statistics on cases and number of bed-nights (of the 126 associated refuges, 86 offer shelter). Published information indicates an average number of 219 occupied beds per night. According to the published statistics of the competing national organisation, *Sveriges kvinnojourers riksförbund* (SKR) in 2003, an average of 32 women and 30 children were housed each night. There are nowadays a few special refuges for young girls at risk of 'honour killing' sometimes called 'girls refuges' (*tjejjourer*).

The Migration Board (www.migrationsverket.se) publishes each month statistics on the number of asylum seekers in the country (33,779 in June 2005) and the number of them staying in reception centres (15,307 same date). The number of people seeking asylum is rapidly decreasing; figures for 2005 were almost half those in the previous two years.

In the **UK**, the national federations of Women's Aid (in each country) have autonomous affiliated refuge agencies that provide different forms of accommodation and support. Women's aid refuges can be considered a distinct sector in the UK with data available direct from respective Women's Aid organisations. However most data available from organisations provides an indication of flow, whereas an examination of stock would be the most readily available indicator of the number accommodated on any given date. In England accommodation is available in the form of shared accommodation and flats. In 2004 women's refuge accommodation in England consisted of 2,755 rooms and 435 flats, 147 and 112 of these were for emergency use respectively. In Scotland the categories of accommodation are refined further. In total there are 142 refuges providing 478 spaces, these spaces are comprised of 61 in shared accommodation, 24 in cluster accommodation, 138 cluster flat spaces and 155 accommodation places described as dispersed. Although organisational figures are unavailable for Wales, published local authority figures surpass those of the other nation states by providing quarterly statistics. These show that there were 95 households accommodated in women's refuge accommodation at the end of September 2004. Although stock figures are unavailable for Northern Ireland, women's refuges there housed 1,138 women and 1,090 children in the year 2003/04.

Under the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999, the UK wide National Asylum Support Service (NASS) became responsible for the majority of new asylum applicants. While Home Office figures for asylum seekers receiving NASS accommodation and support can be included, it must be recognised that these households do not fall within a legal or official definition of homelessness within the UK. While their immigration status is not secure, their housing situation is relatively stable and secure (though quality may be variable) pending a decision on their asylum application. At the end of June 2005 there were a total of 57,485 asylum seekers in receipt of NASS support of whom 36,855 were supported in NASS dispersed accommodation and 2,960 were supported in initial accommodation and the remainder received assistance-only support. These figures include dependents but not the estimated 6,000 unaccompanied children seeking asylum that were supported by local authorities in March 2005.

EU-10 COUNTRIES

Although data has been provided in all countries (see matrices), description of the provision of accommodation for women fleeing domestic violence and for different categories of immigrant are only included for countries where specific issues have been raised in the national reports. Some general features are common to most EU-10 countries. Facilities for women fleeing domestic violence are limited and mainly of the communal hostel form. Levels of immigration are relatively low but asylum accommodation centres are provided in all countries. The closure of the migrants' worker's hostels (common during the time of the communist regimes) has been cited as a cause of homelessness in a number of countries.

In **Lithuania**, crises centres are the equivalent of women's shelter. A crisis centre is a social care institution which provides a support and temporary accommodation for women and children who suffer violence from the partner or family or under other circumstances can not live at home. The Department of Statistics began collecting data about crisis centres in 2003. The data for 2004 showed that 1,678 women and children were provided with accommodation (of whom 70% stayed for a period of less than one month).

Two types of specialist provision for immigrants exist in Lithuania. Refugee reception centres provide temporary accommodation for asylum seekers while their application is determined. A total of 187 people were housed in these centres in 2004. Social Integration centres provide temporary accommodation and integration services to immigrants granted refugee status.

In **Poland**, according to the "Blue line" database administered by the National Helpline for Victims of Domestic Violence, there are 251 institutions which provide overnight shelter for women and children who are victims of domestic violence. There is no information on the stock, number of beds which each institution is able to provide or the number of people using them. In the course of the 2002 Census, enumerators located 2,271 women who were living in "social welfare homes for women with children or/and single pregnant women". The length of stay is not defined and may vary from, for example, a temporary stay for the final months of pregnancy and a three-month post birth period to a longer stay, of over a year, for victims of domestic violence awaiting a social housing apartment. However, there are well known limitations in using census data to monitor the provision of collective accommodation facilities such as these so figures need to be treated with some caution.

A total of 8,079 people applied for refugee status in 2004, of whom 90% came from the Russian Federation. According to Office for Repatriation and Aliens statistics (UNHCR web pages, May 2004) 3,153 people were accommodated in 16 refugee centres. There is no accommodation specifically for repatriates since, under the Repatriation Act 2002, entry visas are only issued to people who can prove that they can be provided for either by a relative or, pursuant to a local government resolution, that the *gmina* will provide a place to live and monthly benefits for one year. According to the Office for Repatriation and Aliens, in the period 1997 to 2004, 5,573 people settled under a repatriate visa. Although workers' hostels were popular in the People's Republic of Poland, their destruction in the years after 1989 is cited as one of the most often declared reasons for homelessness in the 1990s.

In **Slovenia**, the most recent information identifies safe houses for women experiencing domestic violence, in all major cities, with a total capacity of 153 beds. Although the period of stay is limited to 3 months this can be prolonged to one year. The accommodation consists of rooms; there are no cases where accommodation would mean a larger unit (a small apartment or similar). The shelters accept women who do not have Slovenian citizenship, but do not accept women who misuse drugs and alcohol and those who have been using psychiatric services (Leskošek and Boškič, 2004). Maternity homes are similar to shelters but are intended for women with children who are socially and economically vulnerable and unable to solve their housing situation. The stay is limited to one year and can be extended to two years. There are seven maternity homes with a capacity of 129 beds.

During the Balkan war immigration into Slovenia from the former Yugoslav republics increased. However, the Law on Temporary Refuge has allowed these refugees to obtain permanent residence permits since 2002 and accommodation centres provided were closed in 2004. There is only one Asylum seekers centre (located in Ljubljana with 203-bed capacity). Workers' hostels have been the most common accommodation for immigrants in the past; it was a very well developed form of temporary accommodation prior to 1990. During the 1990's many of the workers' hostels closed and this has been stated to be a cause for homelessness for this specific group of people (Černi Mali, 2000).

4.2.4 People living in institutions (for whom no accommodation is available in the community) (ETHOS Category 6)

This section discusses the category of the ETHOS typology related to those people who are defined as homeless because they live in institutions. Two distinct living situations are reflected in this aspect of the typology:

- > those who are about to be released from an institution for whom no accommodation has been found within a defined period of their release (normally 3 months prior);
- > those who remain living in an institution because no suitable accommodation (or accommodation with support) is available in the community.

While it may be possible to capture administrative information on the scale of patient or prisoner release or discharge, it is more difficult to identify (from administrative statistics) those who remain in institutions due to a lack of available accommodation. An understanding of this latter situation may only be achieved from research and surveys.

Three institutional sectors are involved in this category and the issues related to definition and to data collection are different in each. These sectors involve institutions in the criminal justice system, the health system and the social welfare system.

In the criminal justice system, release from a penal institution relates to a release date that is (normally) fixed or known some time in advance. It should therefore be possible to provide data on the number of prisoners who are due to be released within a defined time (e.g. within 3 months) at a given date (e.g. survey date of 31st March each year). However, it appears that even this information is not available in many countries. It is more difficult to identify the proportion of prisoners due for discharge who do not have accommodation to go to on release. However, in some countries temporary accommodation in hostels is provided for prisoners after their release. This accommodation is distinct from facilities such as 'bail hostels' where offenders may be placed for a custodial sentence, as an alternative to prison or while awaiting sentencing, and would thus be regarded as part of the criminal justice provision.

Where the number of prisoners to be released is known but no regular information is collected on their post-release housing situation, it would be possible to estimate the number who may be homeless during a given census or survey period using either historic (i.e. trend) data or survey data. For example, research in Ireland (Seymour and Costello, 2005) indicates that 25% of people entering prison do not have accommodation and this relates to a figure of 30% in research in the UK (Social Exclusion Unit, 2001). Other research suggests that three-fifths of prisoners are homeless on release from prison (Social Exclusion Unit, 2002).

The situation in the health system and social welfare system is more complex. First, it is necessary to establish which institutions are relevant to the discussion. Mental health institutions are clearly relevant since many people with mental health problems released from psychiatric institutions, without appropriate housing or support, become homeless. Facilities related to addiction treatment vary widely between countries. Some are within the health system and some in the social welfare system and many are already developed as community based facilities (e.g. of the supported accommodation type rather than the institutional type). It is less certain that older people's residential care institutions are relevant. However, it would appear there is a need for alternative residential care facilities for older homeless people (as evidenced in Belgium, Denmark and France). Second, release from a medical institution does not relate to a pre-fixed date but to a medical and social assessment of need and relevant care plan. However the issue of 'bed-blocking', where people remain longer than necessary in an institutional environment due to a lack of suitable accommodation, is a major problem for health service managers (and planners). Third, policies of de-institutionalisation have progressed in many countries to provide community support and community psychiatric services with, or in addition to, designated supported accommodation but people remain in institutions due to a shortage of available support services or supported accommodation. Each of these issues create difficulties in estimating the number of people who are due for imminent release from medical institutions who do not have a home (with appropriate support) to go to.

This requires more detailed research of an interdisciplinary nature examining different groups of people affected (e.g. people with mental health problems, people with learning disabilities, people with physical disabilities, older people, and people with addiction problems). This is an area where FEANTSA could collaborate with other European NGOs to promote the need for such research.

This section reviews the policy visibility of these issues in different countries by reviewing the extent to which these population groups are evident in the national (or regional) data systems. Following sections will consider the actual numbers involved.

EU-15 Countries

While all countries have information on the prison population and most have data on the numbers of prisoners to be released in a given period, few countries have information on the housing situation of prisoners or on the housing outcome after release. In this review we have been unable to find any country where pre-release data is regularly and publicly available in relation to medical institutions. A number of countries have information on the community-based wards or supported accommodation provided for people with mental health problems or drug addiction and rehabilitation needs.

In **Austria**, in December 2004, there were at all 9,043 persons in prison and during that year 8,764 prisoners were released, but there is no information available about the housing situation of prisoners in the period following their release.⁶ In Austria there are no new data available related to persons about to be released from institutional care or community based wards for people with mental health problems. However, government reports indicate the total number of people living in institutional households in 2001 at 67,600 persons⁷, and that (in 1999) 47,134 persons were released from psychiatric wards⁸.

The prison population in **Belgium** remains consistent at around 15,000 per annum with a capacity of between 7,500 and 8,000. The yearly number of releases is about 14,500 (see table 4.7).

	2002	2003	2004
Capacity	7,436	7,866	8,092
Number of prisoners (1st of March)	8,605	9,308	9,249
Total number of persons imprisoned (year)	15,695	15,398	15,260
Total number of releases	14,541	15,411	14,682

Information on hospital institutions is only available for Flanders. No information is provided for the numbers who are due for release within a given period. However, there are 65 hospitals and institutions with a population of approximately 13,000.

In **Denmark** it is difficult to obtain data on the housing situations of pre-release prisoners (average of 3,641 prisoner population). However, an average annual number of 181 people are in probation hostels or wards in the community receiving treatment and training.

The process of de-institutionalisation has probably progressed further in Denmark than in other countries. Hence, the average stay in a *somatic hospital* is 5 days (2003). Housing for the elderly established since 1989 will be ordinary housing with support of varying degree and with ordinary tenancy protection. The same goes for disabled persons. Hence hospital release issues are not a significant issue in relation to homelessness or houselessness.

In **Finland**, the category “prisoners soon to be released who have no housing” includes prisoners for whom no ordinary or supported housing has been arranged and is a recognised category in the annual housing market survey. The number of these homeless people was 280 in November 2004. This is a number estimated by the municipal authorities. They include all the persons of which they have knowledge. However, the actual number is obviously higher. According to the prison officials, 29% of all prisoners who have been in the prison more than six month, have housing problems. Applying this ratio to the prison population suggests that about 500 prisoners have housing problems. Most prisoners stay in prison for only a short time and it is unclear whether the municipalities include these in their estimates for the annual housing market survey. It is estimated that there are 1,264 people in institutional care provided both by the health care and social welfare system.

6 Ministry of internal affairs, Security report 2004

7 census 2001, Ö-Stat. report 2, 2002

8 Heinz Katschnig u.a. Österreichischer Psychiatriebericht, Wien 2001

In **France** the Emergency Shelters with Nursing Care (*Centres d'Hébergement d'Urgence avec Soins Infirmiers*, CHUSI) are CHU which have nursing beds reserved for the homeless who need nursing care or medical observation. There are, in Paris, 180 nursing beds of which 140 are split in 3 CHU managed directly by the Samu Social and 40 beds are controlled by the 115, but managed by an association called "Habitat et Soins". There are around 60,000 detainees released from prison in France each year. A federation of 50 associations (FARAPEJ) provide accommodation and support for detainees who leave prison with nowhere to go.

Definitions related to both these client groups exist in **Germany**. The term *Bevorstehende Entlassung aus dem Gefängnis* includes prisoners who are due to be released in next four weeks and no regular housing is available; the term *Bevorstehende Entlassung aus Institutionen (Krankenhaus, Heim)* includes residents who are in such institutions or care homes longer than needed (because of lack of other accommodation) and those, who are due to be released in next four weeks and no regular housing is available.

The German Federal Statistical Office had classified these categories under "threatened with homelessness" instead of "houseless". However, recently the housing research network recommended the re-classification of the people concerned as homeless, because they have no regular tenancy and no regular housing to be released to. However, whatever the definition no data are available for either category.

There are specific services for the resettlement and integration of (ex-)prisoners and the preparation of discharge includes housing advice and support for finding suitable housing. But official statistics of discharges do not distinguish those without arranged accommodation after discharge.

Although the temporary accommodation of ex-prisoners and ex-offenders has been reported in **Greece**, there is no record of relevant institutions and shelters. Voluntary sector bodies, such as Arsis, occasionally accommodate a small number of ex-offenders.

The de-institutionalisation programme 'Psychargos', which now finds itself in its middle development phase, has reached the stage of providing temporary accommodation in the form of shelters and boarding houses across the country for nearly 2,500 users not all of whom are homeless.

No systematic data is available in **Ireland** on the number of individuals leaving institutions annually, such as prisons or psychiatric hospitals, nor the subsequent housing career of those released / discharged. Some localised information is available on the number of individuals who approach Homeless Person's Units (HPU) seeking emergency accommodation who have recently been discharged from institutional care. For example, the HPU in the greater Dublin region suggest that upwards of 80 percent of those presenting to their service came directly from prison.

In **Italy** as in other countries, (ex-)prisoners are structurally exposed to housing risk on leaving prison either because their network of support has been broken or because they have never had a network of support - immigrants constitute a large component of the prison population. Many initiatives have been organised to manage this risk both by the public and the voluntary sector or jointly between the two (see regional laws of Puglia 2003, Toscana 1997, Piemonte 2004). Provision consists of housing (usually small apartments, small communities or reception centres, or more individually customised solutions) and of support to facilitate integration into work and society (*Un tetto per tutti*, 2005). The length of stay varies and may even be medium to long term, in apartments or collective facilities. The Region of Tuscany provides stays of 3-4 months in apartments. A joint project between the Municipality of Milan and voluntary associations provides accommodation (in apartments) both occasional and short term up to 6 months.

For those coming from long stay institutions the most well defined provision, subject also to legislative measures, concerns patients released from psychiatric hospitals and more generally the creation of residential and semi-residential facilities subsequent to the process of de-institutionalisation of the mentally ill (closure of psychiatric hospitals) that started in the 1970s.

In **Portugal** there is no information on prisoner discharge or their housing situation. Equally there is no information on people released from long stay health institutions. There is specific supported accommodation for mentally ill homeless people but this is better included under category 7.1.

The current figure of those confined in penitentiary institutions in **Spain** is 61,163 people (September 2005). Manzanos (1991) estimated that between 3% and 4% of these prisoners would not have a home to live in at the time of their release from prison. This suggests a figure of around 2,140 homeless currently confined in penitentiary institutions.

In **Sweden**, statistics on prisoners in various kinds of prisons are readily available (see www.kvs.se; average 4,712 prisoners in 2004) but the number of prisoners who lack housing is unknown. The NBHW 2005 count will provide some information since prisons are among the surveyed institutions. Time periods spent in psychiatric hospitals have decreased substantially in the last decades. Statistics on the number of people staying in hospitals on an average day and the total number of inpatients and available beds during a year exist but not on their housing situation.

The NBHW reports annually on the number of people staying in 'housing with special service for people with disabilities or functional impairment' (*bostäder med särskild service för funktionshindrade*). Special housing for persons, aged below 65, with functional impairment is also provided according to the Social Services Act and Health and Medical Care Act (*särskilt boende för funktionshindrade*). There is, finally, special housing for the elderly (*särskilda boendeformer för äldre*) provided according to the Social Services Act. All of these three kinds of special housing are intended to be permanent accommodation.

The National Board of Institutional Care (*Statens institutionsstyrelse, SiS*) provides monthly statistics on the average number of occupied places in institutions for forced custody

of substance abusers (*LVM-hem*) and juvenile delinquents (*särskilda ungdomshem*), both stock and flow and average prevalence (www.stat-inst.se). In 2004, 976 individuals were placed in *LVM-hem* and the average number of occupied places was 357. Discharge data (from *SiS*) indicates that, of 668 individuals leaving an *LVM-hem* in 2004, two-fifths moved to a home of their own, half went to another institution (hospital, jail or foster home), and one-tenth went to stay with parents, friends or relatives or became homeless (Knudsdotter, Vanström, Palmgren, Langlet & Björk, 2005, p. 26).

In the **UK** there are no official statistics that distinguish those threatened with homelessness prior to discharge from prison. The risk of homelessness is, however, recognised and procedures are in place to provide housing advice and support on discharge. Evidence with respect to discharge from care or hospital is even less complete and there are no UK statistics for those living in such institutions and threatened with homelessness.

Further insight into the effect of penal and institutional release can be gained from UK homelessness application statistics which provide data based on a local authority's reason for acceptance of homelessness. Often summarised under different headings they nevertheless provide a useful indication of the flow and number of people experiencing related homelessness (Table 4.8).

Table 4.8 Reasons for homelessness citing institutional release in the UK			
	Time Period	Homelessness Reason	Number
Northern Ireland	2003/04	Release from hospital/prison/other institution	341
Scotland	2004 (Qtr 2)	Discharge from hospital/prison	1,734
Wales	2004 (Qtr 1)	Institution/ care	225
England	2005 (Qtr 2)	Release from care	91
		Release from custody	225

Sources: relevant homeless statistical returns in each country

EU-10 COUNTRIES

In **Hungary**, during the early years of regime change, the numbers of people leaving prison decreased from 28,000 to 12,000. However, homelessness is reported to be a significant problem for people leaving the penal system. In 2001, the number of people in prison was 17,000.

In **Latvia**, Regulations on Probation Service and a Law on Probation service was adopted (in 2003 and 2004 respectively) as a result of which several regional probation service centres were established. These centres provide rehabilitation programs and in some cases help released persons with temporary housing for persons without permanent housing. There is no data regarding how many of the 2,500 prisoners released on average each year do not have accommodation after release from imprisonment. Municipalities are responsible to provide housing and social rehabilitation for persons after imprisonment. Riga City council reports that during 2004 the municipality financed temporary housing for 19 persons after imprisonment.

In **Lithuania**, information about alcohol and drugs addicted patients and convicts released from places of imprisonment has been published annually in the Yearbook of Statistics since 1996. However, it is not possible to identify how many have no accommodation available. In 1999 the government approved the “Social adaptation programme for convicts released from places of imprisonment and psychological rehabilitation institutions” (2001-2004). As a result of this programme 13 psychological and social rehabilitation centres were established which provide temporary accommodation. In 2004 the Department of Statistics began to collect data about residence in these centres which shows that they accommodated 421 residents. The databases on lodging houses and crisis centres also identify the reason for provision of services to people and record that almost one-third of people in lodging houses (489 residents) and 3% in crisis centres (41 people) came from prison or psychiatric institutions.

The number of people within **Polish** penal institutions has increased rapidly since the year 2000 (by almost 50%) and so it may be expected that the effect of imprisonment on homelessness has also increased. Every individual entering a penal institution is required to complete a set of documents and, among other personal details, is asked to declare whether he/she has a place to stay and a legal place of residence. In 2003, there were 3,120 prisoners who - on entering prison - declared that they did not possess a place to live and did not have a legal place of residence.

In the year 2004, 50,000 prisoners were released but the prison administration system does not gather data on how many of these had no place to live. However, the Penitentiary Office is responsible for preparing prisoners for life after release from prison. Each prisoner who is to be released in six months is entitled to the support of Penitentiary Office workers. In 2004, 1,310 prisoners who were to be released within six months asked Penitentiary Office staff to contact various agencies in order to clarify and solve their housing problems. Among these prisoners, 980 agreed to have a place arranged in a specialist shelter for ex-prisoners, and 45 were referred to social welfare homes.

The Penitentiary Office runs a database on institutions and organizations which specialize in supporting ex-prisoners. A database is used for internal purposes at every penal institution and both prison rehabilitation staff and prisoners are entitled to access it. In addition to address and contact information, the database gathers details on service provision (shelters, permanent or temporary support).

The system of children’s homes in Poland is still very institutional, meaning that children live in large homes rather than foster families. Being brought up in a children’s home is a significant cause of homelessness especially since the 1990s. However, there is no data available on the number of children released from such institutions at the time of writing.

In **Slovenia**, the average number of prisoners in 2004 was 1,131 persons (although the turnover was high with 3,802 people leaving the penal system during the year). In recent years the number of people in the post penal situation has been fairly stable, around 1,100 people, and homelessness is reported to be a problem for many of them. There are no NGOs specialising in helping this specific group of people and there is no specific accommodation available to them.

Although homelessness after long periods of hospitalisation does occur, both as a result of early discharge and a lack of sheltered or supported accommodation, there is no data on this subject. However, the Human Rights Ombudsman does mention this problem as very pressing in his 2003 report.

4.2.5 People receiving support in order to be re-settled or to prevent homelessness (ETHOS Category 7)

Some (low-level) support services are often provided in homeless hostels and in some temporary accommodation. However, this category is intended to capture those situations where support is linked to accommodation in order to re-settle a homeless person or to sustain a tenancy and where the support and/or the accommodation is funded or managed for that purpose. For the purposes of clarifying an operational definition of the role of supported accommodation for homeless people, two specific aspects require clarification: the nature of support provision involved and the client groups to be included.

The nature of supported accommodation for homeless people has been changing in recent years in response to different forms of funding of services and changing approaches to the delivery of services for the re-settlement or re-integration of homeless people. The nature of supported housing, the evolution in policy and the emergence of different forms of provision across Europe are described in detail elsewhere (see Edgar et al, 2000). The point to stress here is that the evolution of policy in many countries means that it is often difficult to distinguish support provided to homeless (or formerly homeless) people from other forms of supported accommodation.

In most countries a distinction is made between stationary support (provided in designated supported accommodation) and ambulatory or floating support (provided to the client wherever they live). This distinction often reflects a change in policy from one where funding is used to provide specific forms of accommodation for vulnerable target groups who need support to one where the funding follows the client who needs support in order to live independently in the community. Although this distinction is clear the evolution in policy is not evident in all countries. This distinction, however, means that people can receive care or support in three accommodation settings - in more traditional institutional environments, in designated (purpose built or managed) supported accommodation and in ordinary housing with support.

The nature of the support provided can be identified in relation to three broad aspects: housing support (advice and assistance to sustain a tenancy), life skills (or training) and personal care (see Edgar et al, 2000). More intensive support, such as personal care, is more normally associated with designated and institutional forms of accommodation provision, though even this distinction is changing in some countries as policies of care in the community evolve.

This understanding of the nature of support in housing is summarised in Table 4.9. Clearly, supported accommodation has developed within the context of de-institutionalisation and provision of care services within the community. Hence the different forms of support and housing are captured within the columns of the table related to intermediate and community support.

	<i>Community Support</i>	<i>Intermediate Support</i>	<i>Institutional Support</i>
Physical / Accommodation	shared housing self-contained housing	Residential accommodation Staffed group homes Supported accommodation	Institutional accommodation
Social / Support	Transitional support visiting, floating flexible / individualised irregular housing, skills	Transitional or Permanent Support on premises planned / and flexible up to 24 hours housing, skills, personal care	Permanent Support on premises planned / prescribed 24 hour skills, personal care
Legal / Client	Full tenancy rights Personal control over daily decision	Limited tenancy rights Limited personal decision-making	No tenancy rights Professional control over daily decisions

Source: adapted from Edgar et al (2000)

Taking the conceptual model of the three (physical, legal and social) domains allows us to identify some of the issues in relation to supported accommodation and homelessness to arrive at a generic definition appropriate for the ETHOS typology.

With regard to the physical domain, three settings suggested by the conceptual model are evident. First, there is a more institutional (or residential care) setting in which the living arrangements are larger than normal household or ‘homely’ setting (and the individual does not necessarily occupy private space). Second there is the situation where a person has space within a shared accommodation environment in which there are some communal living situations (e.g. meals and living space). Thirdly, there is ordinary housing occupied as a single person dwelling or as a shared household (e.g. two or three people sharing household decisions).

With regard to the legal domain people may either have normal tenancy rights (in the form of a permanent tenancy), some tenancy rights linked to the provision of support (either an occupancy agreement tied to the support or a temporary tenancy), or they have no tenancy rights at all (as in institutional accommodation or purpose built supported accommodation).

With regard to the social domain, the support people receive can again be understood in relation to three approaches. The support may be provided in a particular accommodation setting with the support delivered on the premises (either over 24 hours or more limited time) in a planned fashion. Secondly, the support may be regular planned support but not tied to a specific accommodation milieu. Thirdly, the support may be irregular and provided as required.

Using this understanding, it is possible to define generically a range of supported living situations provided for homeless or formerly homeless people. Table 4.10 describes four distinct support and housing living situations all of which can be regarded as ‘houseless’ in the ETHOS typology. An example of category one, ‘residential care or supported hostel’, is the type of (alternative) residential care for older homeless people being established in Denmark (and similar projects in France and the UK). Designated supported accommodation, transitional accommodation with support and re-settlement accommodation with (floating) support are to be found in a number of countries and examples are evidenced in the pages below.


Table 4.10 Generic Definition of Supported Accommodation Provided for Homeless (or formerly homeless) People

HOUSELESS		Generic Definition	Physical	Legal	Social
	①	Residential Care or Supported Hostel (for homeless people)	Communal living	No legal title to a space for exclusive possession	Planned and on premises support
	②	Designated supported accommodation	Designated Supported accommodation	Occupancy depends on support	Planned on premises support
	③	Transitional Accommodation with support	Accommodation (shared or self-contained)	Temporary or transitional tenancy / lease	Support planned / floating or on premises
	④	Accommodation with support (for the re-settlement of homeless people)	Self-contained dwelling allocated for target group	Lease or tenancy	Support floating

It is also apparent that, in some countries, it is not possible to identify the client groups living in supported housing or receiving support. Equally, supported accommodation provided to homeless people may often be provided (i.e. funded by or staffed under provisions) in relation to their mental health or addiction problems rather than to prevent their homelessness. In this situation the complexity of the nature of homelessness creates a situation of policy blurring. Hence the question to be addressed is whether it is possible to identify support provided to homeless people in order to enable their reintegration and/or prevent homelessness.

Conceptually it is possible to identify different situations in which support may be provided in relation to a person's homeless (or housing exclusion) status in order to normalise either their housing situation or their lifestyle (Sahlin, 1999). This understanding is used to identify different client groups who are provided with support or supported accommodation in order to prevent their homelessness, to re-house them in independent accommodation or to enable them to sustain a tenancy. These groups are presented here (in Figure 4.1) to illustrate the issue and the fuzzy nature of the policy problem. At the core are single homeless people and homeless families who require support in order to be re-settled in ordinary housing (category 1 in figure 4.1).

Figure 4.1 Supported Accommodation for Homeless People



Accommodation that is funded or managed as supported accommodation for the purpose of re-settlement of homeless people or the prevention of homelessness lies at the core of this description. Beyond that, what is counted as relevant (and what client groups are catered for) is dependent upon national situations and the policy purposes for which the data is collected.

EU-15 COUNTRIES

A range of situations concerning supported housing for homeless people can be discerned across Europe. There are countries where supported housing has specifically emerged for homeless people and can be counted as such, countries where supported accommodation occupied by homeless people can not be distinguished or counted separately from that provided for any vulnerable person with support needs and there are countries where the support provision has developed from forms of transitional homeless hostels. Denmark represents a situation, at one extreme, where all homeless accommodation (except for night shelters) is provided under social services legislation and it is difficult to statistically separate generalist hostels, temporary or transitional housing and supported housing. England represents a situation, at the other extreme, where the Supporting People Client Record Database allows detailed descriptions of client groups and living situations to be described for different administrative areas and spatial scales. Elsewhere the types of accommodation and the extent of available information are varied.

In **Austria** there is a range of support and housing services provided to alleviate and to fight homelessness including stationary and ambulatory support. Stationary support is provided in houses or shared accommodation, some with 24

hours service, some with floating support; in any event most of these provisions are temporarily limited (3 to 12 months). Mostly the tenancy contract is bound to individual or group support, so that the fact of withdrawal from support leads to an eviction. Most of these services are situated in the larger cities, in the most rural parts of Austria supported housing is not provided. In 1998 (BAWO survey on services for the homeless, Vienna 1998) there were 171 services providing supported housing, offering 6,568 places to stay regularly and 760 places in emergency (on a day to day basis).

Ambulatory support is provided in many counties and cities in single or family accommodation with floating support provided. Mostly the tenancy in this supported accommodation is limited to 6 or 12 months, and bound to the floating support; otherwise the tenants have to leave the supported accommodation. The provisions of supported single / family accommodation are frequently changing and never counted systematically. So it is not possible to provide a single statistic of accommodation with floating support in Austria.

In **Belgium** a distinction needs to be made between four main forms of accommodation. All four relate to people who are homeless or may be considered at risk of homelessness without support.

Table 4.11 Types of Supported Accommodation in Flanders	
Category	Description
general supported accommodation	reception without limited time for people who are not able to live independently and need permanent support
supported accommodation for young adults	idem but limited to 1 year
pension housing	although the services generally are oriented at independent living, it is observed that people stay longer in the services, because they lack the skills to live independently or because they are old but not old enough for an old peoples home.
care housing	is an answer to the ageing of the population in supported accommodation. It aims at keeping older and ill persons in the community

In **Denmark**, §94 boform (*Forsorgshjem og herberger*) is provided for those without a place to live or who are not able to live there without support or care. In addition, the homeless action plan of the Danish program ‘Our Collective Responsibility’ identifies six priority areas, a number of which refer specifically to support provision for homeless people -

1. *Housing assistance*: to move residents at reception centres to permanent dwellings, including special housing for alienated people.

2. *Alternative nursing homes*: for (older homeless) people that existing residential facilities for older people cannot accommodate due to the physical and mental nursing needs involved and active misuse.
3. *Special services for the young homeless*: young people aged 18-29 who are mis-users and/or severe social problems.

The Ministry of Social Affairs, which has overall responsibility for programmes aimed at the homeless, identifies a number of specific initiatives which have been developed and/or piloted in recent years. These include:

- > Alternative Care Homes (80 places)
- > Alternative Supported Housing (185 of 300 planned dwellings)
- > Specialised permanent dwellings (300 *skæve huse til skæve eksisterer*)
- > Support and Contact Person Scheme (50 people in 3 pilot regions; the scheme is called *støtte- og kontaktarbejdet for hjemløse*)

A special scheme for homeless people is the *Skaeve huse*, where those who might otherwise live in a §94-boform are instead offered a proper tenancy, but in a low cost and low quality bungalow in an estate with 10-20 houses. *Skaeve huse* are run by §94-boformer, NGO's, the municipality or a non profit housing association. Most of the estates have a part-time social caretaker, and the necessary social and health services will be provided from the municipal floating services.

The **Finnish** concept *Asumispalvelu* (housing service) generally describes support services. However, in practice there is a very large variety of names and concepts in use. These include - *tukikoti* (support home), *puolimatkankoti* (half-way home), *hoitokoti* (care home) and *perhekoti* (family home). Most of the housing services for former homeless people bear simply the name of *tukiasunnot* (supported dwellings). The concept *palveluasunto* (service housing/sheltered hous-

ing) is also used. According to the Social Welfare Act, "Housing services mean the provision of service housing and supported accommodation". "Housing services are provided in the case of persons who, for special reasons, need help or support with organising housing or their living conditions" (Social Welfare Act).

This is the main category of housing homeless people who are not considered to be capable of living independently. The housing is arranged either for a defined term or for a longer stay. If this form of housing is appropriate for the particular person, he or she is not homeless any more. However, if he or she needs to stay in this kind of housing longer that is necessary, due the lack of other options, the lack of ordinary independent housing or supported housing, a person is considered to be homeless - or houseless.

According to the statistics provided by Stakes the housing services are divided into two categories, housing services with 24-hour assistance and housing services with part-time assistance. The former are counted in the same group as institutional care. However, as there is no specific category in those statistics, former homeless people are counted either in the housing services of substance abusers, mental health persons or elderly people.

In **France**, different forms of supported housing are provided for vulnerable families (*résidences sociales, maisons relais*), for young people (*foyers*) and for vulnerable teenage mothers (*centres maternels*); see Table 4.12 for a detailed description.

Table 4.12 Types of Supported Accommodation for Homeless in France

Résidences sociales (Social Residences)	collective accommodation of the hostel type (individual furnished bedrooms or apartments with collective services and common spaces). They are mainly the property of controlled rent organisations (HLM) that benefit from financial aid from the state. The management is assured by the associations who have a rental contract with the HLM.
Maisons-relais (Relay Houses)	previously called 'pensions de famille', these are small community facilities, which consist of around 20 small studios with common shared spaces for meals and relaxation. Management is provided by a paid host or a host couple that are responsible for the functioning of the facility and the allocation of housing units and the managers sign a lease with the owner. The length of stay can be longer than in a social residence. The maisons-relais were conceived for individuals with meagre resources who need specific support and follow-up because of the difficulties that they face living alone in ordinary housing. The social support provided is light and flexible.
Foyers de jeunes travailleurs or FJT (young people's hostels)	collective facilities for young people aged under 30. These hostels have individual bedrooms. Those staying in the hostel can also benefit from the APL. FJT offer accommodation in hostels and in dispersed areas. 463 hostels provide 53,000 places for young people.
Centres maternels (Mother's Centres)	the organisational form can be collective hostels or a network of apartments. These facilities are under the responsibility of the Counsel General (District Government). Their management is provided either directly by the District government or through an association. These centres receive pregnant women (from the fifth month of pregnancy) or single mothers with children aged under 3. Women can access these facilities directly or through social workers of the ASE (Aide Social à l'Enfance: Social Welfare for children) of the conseil general. The women in these centres are considered a priority group in terms of access to ordinary housing in the public sector.

In **Germany**, a recent study on supported housing in the sector of services for the homeless also had to deal with the problem of defining such provision in order to distinguish it from traditional hostels, stationary institutions and shelters for the homeless on the one hand and on the other hand from advice centres, which do not provide a more intensive and continuous type of support (including visits of clients at their homes). For the purpose of the study, supported housing was defined as a provision, which is located in self-contained dwellings. If the dwellings were used as group housing they had to have at least one private room for each occupant and not more than five such rooms per dwelling. Support had to be individually planned and targeted, visits of clients at their home had to be at least a conceptual element of support and a minimum intensity of support available (not more than 16 clients per social worker) was laid down (see Busch-Geertsema and Evers, 2004; 13f).

While the study included modern forms of “decentralised stationary living” (where intensive stationary support is provided in dispersed individual dwellings), such provision is regularly excluded from the definition of supported housing by regional financing agents of social welfare. For the purpose of counting homeless people it poses a problem, that about half of those 5,782 clients of supported housing in Germany covered by the survey of September 2003 (stock data) had a regular tenancy without restrictions (Busch-Geertsema and Evers, 2004; 77). This means that they were still users of services for the homeless, but were not (any longer) homeless as usually defined in Germany.

The study excluded supported housing which was provided by other sectors of the German system of welfare services (e.g. youth welfare, services for disabled persons, mental health patients, frail older people). The study focused on the structure of supported housing and did not provide a total number (response rate among potential service providers was 72%; support in housing is provided almost exclusively by NGO-services in Germany). Such a number is not available for Germany nor is their any continuous data collection on supported housing at regional level.

Accommodation for disadvantaged young people which is tied to training and job schemes and has a social work component is widespread in Germany. However, this is a part of the youth welfare system and residents are not defined as homeless.

Similarly homes for teenage mothers exist in Germany (no national or regional data available), but they are usually not part of the service sector for homeless people (rather classified as part of youth welfare services) and it would at least cause controversial debates if all residents would be counted as homeless.

There is no organised form of supported accommodation in **Greece** other than that which falls into other categories (e.g. temporary accommodation for repatriates). Additionally, the de-institutionalisation programme (‘Psychargos’) for people from psychiatric institutions provides supported housing in the form of protected flats (for about 400 clients).

In **Ireland**, transitional housing providing both accommodation and support is available in the Greater Dublin region (507 units) and an additional provision of (around 415 units) of longer term supported housing. One Foyer for young people has been developed to assist young homeless people and others are in the process of construction.

In **Italy**, supported accommodation for the homeless (single people and families) are designed to respond to two main objectives: protection and prevention for “persons in difficulty” or “at (high) risk of marginalisation”; and reintegration of the ‘no abode’. Both types are covered by regional legislation.

All regions provide “services of a residential character”. The objectives and circumstances are defined in different ways: to meet needs that are not adequately met by other types of intervention; to meet the need for the removal of a person from her/his social environment due to exceptional circumstances, to prevent exposure to particular risk factors; to care for persons either temporarily or permanently unable to look after themselves; to care for persons suffering from marginalisation who need long term intervention that substitutes the family. The forms of accommodation vary according to the type of housing (apartments, group apartments, hostels) and the intensity of the support provided (see for instance the regional laws of Piemonte 2004, Lazio 1996, Molise 2000, Puglia 2003).

The main distinction in the Italian situation - which is a consequence of the overall supply system - is between intervention aimed at "serious marginalisation", an area which includes the no abode, and intervention aimed at persons and families in difficulty or at risk of marginalisation. The function assigned to social support is different, and the notion of (re)insertion assumes different meanings in the two cases (see Tosi, Ranci and Kazepov 1998). The main type of supported accommodation for persons in difficulty/at risk consists of special services provided by voluntary associations or local authority offices. The interventions combine in different ways the objectives of prevention, protection, cushioning of crisis situations, housing and/or social reinsertion.

With regard to the area of "serious marginalisation", the most common objective of intervention is social reintegration of the persons involved or the achievement of an independent life. Along with transitional accommodation for reintegration, action has also aimed at improving the quality of life (or at damage reduction) for persons unsuitable for or unwilling to follow reintegration plans (by means of low level social work tied to shelter type accommodation).

The main tendency followed by services for the no abode in recent years has been to differentiate between emergency and transitional accommodation services. While this distinction is quite clear at a theoretical level, in practice the borderline between the two dimensions is much more blurred. Even dormitories have equipped themselves in recent years to meet a range of needs by adding social support services to the supply of accommodation.

In addition to (supported accommodation) services designated for women, immigrants and situations of institutional release, different types of supported accommodation are also provided for special groups or special needs. A variety of intervention has been instituted more specifically for cases in which discharge from an institution is imminent and no dwelling is available. This may occur, for example, for drug addicts (and ex drug addicts) in social rehabilitation facilities and for minors who must leave institutions at 18 years of age (FIO.psd, 2004).

One important specialist provision relates to the young 'no abode' and young at risk, for whom specific services are provided in many cities (Tosi, 1996). Young people constitute one of the categories at which the projects/the shelter system provided for marginalised/homeless people and people "at risk" (emergency and "non-emergency" shelter) is targeted. Non-emergency projects aimed at young people are currently underway in various cities.

Luxembourg has a range of types of supported accommodation including the Caritas re-socialisation centre which is an assisted housing project for 80 people (2004). In addition the Ministry of Health approved accommodation includes a psychiatric supported housing project (14 places), mental health supported housing (25 places). The Wunnengshëllef provides low-cost accommodation with support (123 places) and the Jugend-an Drogenhëllef (JDH) ran 21 homes in 2003 through a project called 'Les Niches reintegration and housing project' and Neudorf halfway houses have places for 7 people leaving residential treatment).

In **Portugal** a programme (*Habitação Assistida*) provides municipal housing and support addressed at prevention and reinsertion situations. The project *Ajuda de mãe* provides temporary accommodation addressed at pregnant teenagers but is not normally regarded as homeless accommodation. There are also NGO's providing supported accommodation, namely housing communities, which provide temporary accommodation and support. Some of them operate on the basis of transitional stages corresponding to different types of accommodation and support which are supposed to correspond to the insertion trajectory of the individual (similar to the staircase model).

In **Sweden**, legislation regulates 'homes for care or living' (*hem för vård och boende*; HVB), which is the formal term for institutions run by or for social authorities. Running a HVB requires permission from NBHW and entails being monitored by the authorities. All treatment institutions and some supported or sheltered accommodation, as well as some shelters and hostels, are defined and registered as HVB. Another form of accommodation still in use (e.g. in Stockholm and Västerås) is *inackorderingshem*, the literal meaning of which is 'lodging home'. This refers to collective housing (mostly with single rooms), often with common meals and staff available at least part of the day. *Gruppboende* (group homes /group housing) is another general concept that may include intensive care and services. However, the term is also used for what others call 'lodging homes' where no care or treatment is provided. Finally, category housing (*kategoriboende*)

is a traditional concept referring to many people staying in separate dwellings but in the same building or staircase because they are viewed as belonging to the same category. Today such housing is mainly reserved for people with substance abuse and/or mental problems. Category housing may or may not have support staff but in general, the tenant has a self-contained flat and there is often no common space or living area. The tenants may have a regular tenancy with the local social authority, but more often the latter rents the whole building and sublet the flats on special terms. In the 2005 NBHW count collective housing / group housing / category housing / lodging home (*boendekollektiv / gruppboende / kategoriboende / inackorderingshem*) are lumped together as one of 12 housing situations.

In the **UK**, the most comprehensive database is that provided in England under the Supporting People program. Table 4.13 provides a summary extract for allocations undertaken in one quarter (April to June 2005) for a selection of client groups related to the homeless categories identified above and for a selection of relevant supported accommodation situations. This distinguishes three support situations - supported housing (provided for 60% of clients), floating support (33%) and re-settlement support / supported lodgings (7%).

Table 4.13 Supported Accommodation for Homeless Client Groups - England

Primary Client Group by Service Type									
April-June 2005	Service Type								
	Supported Housing		Supported Lodgings		Floating Support		Resettlement Support		Total
	Tot.	%	Tot.	%	Tot.	%	Tot.	%	
Client Group Primary	Tot.	%	Tot.	%	Tot.	%	Tot.	%	
Single homeless with support	4,617	40.7	98	0.9	1,241	10.9	403	3.5	6,359
Homeless families with support	1,182	43.5	11	0.4	963	35.4	129	4.7	2,285
Rough Sleeper	377	29.5	10	0.8	28	2.2	16	1.3	431
Alcohol problems	479	36.1	13	1.0	357	26.9	20	1.5	869
Drug problems	644	42.3	13	0.9	401	26.3	28	1.8	1,086
Offenders/at risk of offending	645	56.9	6	0.5	363	32.0	33	2.9	1,047
Young people at risk	1,074	52.6	36	1.8	540	26.4	54	2.6	1,704
Young people leaving care	129	51.8	28	11.2	69	27.7	2	0.8	228
Women at risk of domestic violence	271	7.6	1	0.0	776	21.6	96	2.7	1,144
Teenage parents	171	32.3	2	0.4	277	52.3	8	1.5	458
Refugees	235	42.6	2	0.4	262	47.5	3	0.5	502
Traveller / Gypsy	17	26.2	1	1.5	29	44.6	0	0.0	47
Total	9,854	60.7	222	1.4	5,357	33.0	795	4.9	16,228
Note: Excludes Women's Refuges, Foyers and Teenage Parent Accommodation Note: Direct Hostels and Outreach Services funded under Supporting People are also excluded Source: Supporting People Client Record System, ODPM / St Andrews University (www.spclientrecord.org.uk)									

Although all of these client groups may be understood to be vulnerable, they may not all be considered to be homeless. This table suggests that 56% of supported accommodation is provided to currently homeless people, a quarter to people who have specialist needs in order to be re-housed and a fifth to people who are at risk of homelessness due to their dependency problems. Similar data is not available for Scotland, Wales or N.Ireland.

The UK Foyer movement is highly established across the UK, catering for young people aged 16-25 years. Foyers provide accommodation for young people combined with training, job search, personal support and motivational assistance. Data is available for the number of bed spaces provided and is as follows: England, 4,747; Northern Ireland, 128; Scotland, 74 and Wales, 58 bed spaces.

EU-10 COUNTRIES

Supported accommodation is generally an emerging concept in the new member states and the provision of support for homeless people is equally in its infancy.

In **Hungary**, a pilot program was started in 2004 to subsidise those homeless people who leave shelters and move into ordinary rented accommodation. The subsidy covers about half of the cost of the cheapest rental flats in the private rental market for six months. This can be increased with additional subsidies. There are approximately 700 subsidised 'outside accommodation' for homeless people in the country.

Supported Accommodation is in its infancy in **Poland** and NGO service providers are increasingly involved in its provision. The only legally defined category of supported accommodation is "protected housing". The Social Welfare Act states that "protected housing is a social welfare tool which prepares people to live an independent and self-sufficient life under the protection of specialist support. It is established in order to prevent institutionalization and to keep vulnerable people in their local communities, thus strengthening their integration." Traditionally, protected housing is addressed to mentally ill people as an alternative to a mental health institution. It has also been tested by a number of organizations⁹ as a means of providing training homes for the homeless. Such housing cannot be addressed directly to the homeless as such, and is therefore channeled to, for example, homeless senior citizens. In addition a number of post-shelter support projects can be identified and described although there is no comprehensive data available on these initiatives.

The following illustrate the emergence of different projects which are mainly concerned with provision of inexpensive housing and employment training or support:

a. *The "Second Chance" Wola Social Reintegration Project*

The inhabitants are monitored by social workers and supported in their attempts to find and stay in work, along with other day to day challenges. This model is very simple and is implemented without stretching the boundaries of actions prescribed to major actors (local government, NGOs, business) and therefore gives hopes for mainstreaming.

b. *Contract/Training Apartments*

Individual initiatives have been developed providing training or contract apartments. These are usually located in temporary structures such as container barracks which

were donated, either by construction enterprises or local government, and subsequently renovated by their future inhabitants. "Training apartment" is an expression also used to describe protected housing¹⁰ provision for mentally challenged people and adolescents about to leave the institutionalized foster care system. The goal is the same: to prepare an individual for an independent life of their own.

c. *Communities*

The model of a community was established by the Barka Foundation. Such Communities are located in rural areas and usually consist of about 25 people of different origins irrespective of age or sex and may include evicted families, single mothers, people who have left psychiatric or penal institutions, or orphanages. There are around 20 Communities in Poland, most of which are supported by the Barka Foundation.

Supported accommodation in **Slovenia** is mainly provided by NGOs. In 1999 approximately 40-45 people lived in eight housing communities and this has increased to an estimated 23 communities with 96 people. These communities are intended to provide temporary or transitional accommodation and support. However, following de-institutionalisation of mental hospitals provision falls well short of need.

4.3 DATA MATRICES

4.3.1 Data on Homelessness and Housing Exclusion using the ETHOS typology

The following matrices provide data (if available) for each country, for each sub-category of ETHOS, for the latest date available. This segment of the report was compiled in September 2005 and only data published prior to that date is included.

Countries are listed alphabetically and only countries which became member states of the European Union prior to 2005 are included. Reports are not available for the following countries - Estonia, Slovakia, Cyprus and Malta.

The layout of the matrices follows the convention that each cell contains the relevant data followed by the date in brackets. The data refers to persons (or beds) unless otherwise specified.

The sub-categories refer to the ETHOS typology as described in 2004 (see Table 3.2). Where data is only available for several related sub-categories this is shown by merging cells.

Missing data is referenced by the following notation: 'n.a.' means not available; 'n.app.' means not applicable category. Where data relates to an estimate rather than administrative or survey data this is indicated in the table ('est.').

In some countries national data is given as the aggregate of regional data. This is the case for the UK (England, Scotland, Wales and N.Ireland). Where data is not available for one or more regions this is explained in the notes to the table. In the case of Belgium, most of the data are aggregated at community level (Flemish community and French community), while only some data exist at regional level.

4.3.2 MATRICES

Table 4.14 Roofless (Categories 1 and 2)				
Country	1.1	2.1	2.2	2.3
	Rough Sleeper	Direct access hostel	Arranged low budget hotel	Short-stay hostel
Austria	2,000 (1998) (est)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Belgium ⁽¹⁾	n.a.	52 beds ⁽¹⁾	n.a.	n.a.
Czech ⁽²⁾	1868 ^(2a)	267 ^(2b)	n.app.	n.a.
Denmark	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Estonia				
Finland		500	n.app	n.a.
France		68,000	n.a.	n.a.
Germany				
Greece	6,000 (2005) (estimate)			
Hungary ⁽³⁾	10,000	200 (3)	n.a.	n.a.
Ireland ⁽⁴⁾		1696 (1999)	1301 (4)	n.a.
Italy ⁽⁵⁾	17,000 (2000) (5)			
Latvia				
Lithuania ⁽⁶⁾	1250	280	n/a	273 ⁽⁶⁾
Luxembourg	n.a.			
Netherlands	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	2,195 (2002)
Poland ⁽⁷⁾	11,500 (2002) ⁽⁷⁾	See 3.1	n.app.	See 3.1
Portugal ⁽⁸⁾	3057 (2003)	2202 ⁽⁸⁾ (2003)	2319 (2003)	n.app
Slovakia				
Slovenia	1140	18	n.a.	n.app
Spain	3,200 (2003)	2,990 (2003)		
Sweden				
UK ⁽⁹⁾	836 ^(9a)	5,917 (2001) ^(9b)	6,780 ^(9c) (2005)	n.a.
<p>⁽¹⁾ no data for French Community</p> <p>⁽²⁾ ^(2a) Homeless census Prague 2004 (19.2.2004, 20.00-22.00 h); ^(2b) Direct access Prague only</p> <p>⁽³⁾ Budapest only</p> <p>⁽⁴⁾ Dublin region; includes children</p> <p>⁽⁵⁾ information relates to all roofless categories (including rough sleeping); arranged low budget hotels do not apply. Source is Commissioned indagine sull'esclusione sociale 2002.</p> <p>⁽⁶⁾ staying in lodging homes for less than one month.</p> <p>⁽⁷⁾ 2002 National Census figure for living in places not meant for habitation; figure for no place to live not yet available.</p> <p>⁽⁸⁾ includes 2.1 / 2.3 and 3.1</p> <p>⁽⁹⁾ ^(9a) England (2004) and Scotland (2003) only; ^(9b) 2001 Survey outside London only; ^(9c) England only</p>				

Table 4.15 Houseless (Category 3)				
Country	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4
	Short stay hostel	Temporary housing (longer stay)	Temporary housing (no defined time)	Temporary housing (transitional)
Austria	n.a.	12,000 (1998)		
Belgium ⁽¹⁾	158 beds	1165		
Czech ⁽²⁾	610 ^(2a) 3986 ^(2b)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Denmark ⁽³⁾	7000 (2003) ^(3a)		n.a. ^(3b)	n.a. ^(3c)
Estonia				
Finland	1436 (2004)	Not applicable		
France	32,375 (2005)	n/a	765 CHRS 33,000 places (2005)	7675 rooms 6986 dwellings 103626 persons (2000)
Germany				
Greece ⁽⁴⁾	300 (2005)			2,500 ⁽³⁾
Hungary	4,000	n.a.	n.a.	200,000
Ireland	See 2.1	No national data		
Italy	No national data available			
Latvia				
Lithuania ⁽⁵⁾	1491 (2004) ⁽⁵⁾			
Luxembourg				
Netherlands ⁽⁶⁾	n.a.	1,462 (2002/2003) ⁽⁶⁾		3,317 (2002)
Poland	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Portugal	See above	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Slovakia				
Slovenia	n.a.	100 emergency dwellings (2005)		
Spain	3053 (2003)	6582 (2003)		
Sweden				
UK	n.a.	84,020 (England only / 2005)		

⁽¹⁾ no data for French Community
⁽²⁾ ^(2a) Homeless census Prague 2004 (19.2.2004, 20.00-22.00 h); ^(2b) MPSV hostels bed capacity CR
⁽³⁾ ^(3a) §94 boform; ^(3b) = §91 and §93 (rehabilitation and halfway houses); ^(3c) = §92-boform for mentally ill and drug abuse.
⁽⁴⁾ Includes shelters for the elderly many of which house older people without a home
⁽⁵⁾ staying in lodging homes for more than one month
⁽⁶⁾ includes generic (short stay) crisis services (43 in 2002); (short stay) sick bays (14 facilities in 2002) and specialised hostels for homeless youth (zichtpensions)- 7 services (2003)

Table 4.16 Houseless (Category 4)		
Country	4.1	4.2
	Women's Shelter Refuge	Women's Shelter Dispersed / Supported
Austria	2,200 (2004)	
Belgium ⁽¹⁾	80 ⁽¹⁾	n.a.
Czech ⁽²⁾	109 ⁽²⁾	n.a.
Denmark	1800 (enrolments)	
Estonia		
Finland	14 shelters	No information
France	Not given	Not given
Germany		
Greece	40	Not applicable
Hungary	1,800	700
Ireland	1687 (2003) (2813 applications)	
Italy	No data available	
Latvia		
Lithuania	1678 (inc children)	n.a.
Luxembourg		
Netherlands ⁽³⁾	1,900 (2002)	564 (2002) ⁽³⁾
Poland ⁽⁴⁾	251 institutions / 2271 (2002) ^(3,4)	
Portugal	194 places (2004)	
Slovakia		
Slovenia	10 shelters / (56 spaces)	n.a.
Spain	4,400 (2003)	
Sweden		
UK	2867 rooms (England) 478 spaces (Scotland)	435 flats (England) 155 dispersed (Scotland)
⁽¹⁾ no data for French Community ⁽²⁾ Homeless census Prague 2004 (19.2.2004, 20.00-22.00 h) ⁽³⁾ includes supported housing (25 projects) and (11) independent living support services ⁽⁴⁾ National Census 2002 - women staying in social welfare centres		

Table 4.17 Houseless (Category 5)			
Country	5.1	5.2	5.3
	Reception Centre (Asylum)	Repatriate	Migrant Worker Hostel
Austria	27,702	n.app.	n.app.
Belgium	15,531	n.a.	n.a.
Czech ⁽¹⁾	484 (2001) ⁽¹⁾	n.app.	n.a.
Denmark	3736	n.app.	n.app.
Estonia			
Finland ⁽²⁾	2,500 places ⁽²⁾	n.a.	n.app.
France ⁽³⁾	18 centres 123,480 places (2004) ⁽³⁾	n.app.	650 foyers 140,000 people (2002)
Germany	30,000 reception	128,000 municipal	(2001)
Greece ⁽⁴⁾	9 centres operational 1,000 (2005)	200 ^(4a)	200 ^(4b)
Hungary	1,700	n.app.	10,000
Ireland	68 centres 7280 places (2005)	n.app.	n.app.
Italy ⁽⁵⁾	2,000 ^(5a)	n.app.	1325 facilities / 26269 beds ^(5b) 12925 persons ^(5c)
Latvia			
Lithuania	187	n.app.	n.app.
Luxembourg			
Netherlands	40,761 (2004)	2 services	n.a.
Poland ⁽⁶⁾	8079 (2004)	372 (2004) (6)	n.app
Portugal	125 (2004)	n.app	n.app
Slovakia			
Slovenia	203 beds	n.a.	All closed
Spain	2,100 (205)	n.a.	n.app.
Sweden	15307 people in reception centres (2005)	n.app	n.app
UK	155 persons (2003)	n.app	n.app

⁽¹⁾ Data published on www.czso.cz (Czech Statistics Office). The number of persons residing in the CR on a long-term basis (484 persons) who have no other abode (2001). In addition to them, asylum facilities house asylum seekers but the CSU does not have the total figures at its disposal.

⁽²⁾ Finland - homeless immigrants are included in other categories of homeless people (282 single homeless and 80 families)

⁽³⁾ France - CPH for migrant population includes 28 CPH and 1043 places (2003)

⁽⁴⁾ ^(4a) final phase; ^(4b) people in specialist schemes only

⁽⁵⁾ ^(5a) only includes public facilities provided by PNA; ^(5b) Italy - Census of reception facilities / ^(5c): 2001 Census;

⁽⁶⁾ number of repatriate visa applications granted; repatriate accommodation no longer applicable

Table 4.18 Houseless (Category 6)		
Country	6.1	6.2
	Penal Institution	Health Institution
Austria	8.764 (2004)	67,600 persons
Belgium	15260 (annual) 8096 (capacity)	65 institutions 13027 (beds) (Flanders only)
Czech ⁽¹⁾	37 (2004) ^(1a)	61 (2004) ^(1b)
Denmark	181 (2003)	n.a.
Estonia		
Finland	283	1264
France	n.a.	(CHUI = 180 beds)
Germany		
Greece ⁽²⁾	n.a.	2,500 (Psychargos places) ⁽²⁾
Hungary	17,000 (2000)	3,600 (2000)
Ireland	No national data available	No national data available
Italy	n.a.	n.a.
Latvia	n.a.	n.a.
Lithuania ⁽³⁾	5296 released (2004) 120 places in rehab centres 489 in lodging homes	⁽³⁾ 30 places in rehab 26 in lodging homes
Luxembourg		
Netherlands	63,056 prison population	n.a.
Poland ⁽⁴⁾	1,310 (2004) ⁽⁴⁾	n.a.
Portugal ⁽⁵⁾	11,765 (2000)	n.a.
Slovakia		
Slovenia	n.a.	n.a.
Spain	2,100	n.a.
Sweden ⁽⁶⁾	4712 prisoners (2004 average)	19,000 ^(6a) 5,300 ^(6b)
UK	Average daily prison population (2003) 83,988	n.a.

⁽¹⁾ ^(1a) Homeless census Prague 2004 (19.2.2004, 20.00-22.00 h). 19,398 persons are incarcerated in all prisons of the CR. ^(1b) there are no records of the number of persons having nowhere to go following release.

⁽²⁾ temporary accommodation for discharged patients.

⁽³⁾ 69,031 patients in health care institutions in 2003; a lodging home is social care institution for people who do not have a dwelling or, due to family problems or other reasons, can not live there.

⁽⁴⁾ number of applications for housing assistance to the Penitentiary Office; 50,000 prisoners released during the year

⁽⁵⁾ refers to domestic violence registered crimes

⁽⁶⁾ ^(6a) housing with special service for people with disabilities or functional impairment' (bostäder med särskild service för funktionshindrade) according to the 'law on special support and services'. ^(6b) Special housing for persons, aged below 65, with functional impairment is also provided according to the Social Services Act and Health and Medical Care Act (särskilt boende för funktionshindrade).

Table 4.19 Houseless (Category 7)				
Country	7.1	7.2	7.3	7.4
	Supported Accommodation (Group)	Supported Accommodation (individual)	Foyers	Teenage parent Accommodation
Austria	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Belgium	1576		n.a.	n.a.
Czech ⁽²⁾	n.app.	n.app.	498 (2004) ⁽²⁾	n.a.
Denmark ⁽³⁾	7000 (2003)	n.app.	n.app.	
Estonia				
Finland	n.a. (for homeless persons)	n.app.	n.app.	
France	200 maison relais 5000 places (2002)	352 residences sociales 23971 houses (1999)	n.a.	100 centres 4000 places (2004)
Germany				
Greece	136 protected flats 400 users (2005)		n.app.	n.a.
Hungary	n.a	n.a	n.app	n.app
Ireland	507 units (transitional) 415 (long-term)		1 foyer 48 young people (2004/5)	n.a.
Italy	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Latvia				
Lithuania	n.a.	n.a.	n.app.	⁽¹⁾
Luxembourg				
Netherlands	3,415 (2002)		n.app.	n.a
Poland	n.a.		n.app.	n.a.
Portugal	85 apartments (2004)		n.app	2 (temporary) centres
Slovakia				
Slovenia	23 communities (96 people)		n.app	6 centres
Spain ⁽⁴⁾	n.a	n.a	n.a.	14,064 (2003) ⁽⁴⁾
Sweden				
UK	16,228 allocations (England / 2005:Q1)		5,007	n.a.

⁽¹⁾ no data for French Community

⁽²⁾ bed capacity in the Czech Republic supported by MPSV

⁽³⁾ §94 boform - this category includes both supported housing (7.1 and 7.2) and hostels and temporary accommodation (3.1 and 3.2)

⁽⁴⁾ refers to minors only

5 Insecure and Inadequate Housing

CONCEPTUAL CATEGORY		OPERATIONAL CATEGORY
INSECURE HOUSING	8	No tenancy
	9	Eviction Order
	10	Violence
INADEQUATE HOUSING	11	Temporary structure
	12	Unfit Housing
	13	Extreme Overcrowding

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This section discusses the situation of those people who live in insecure or in inadequate housing. Policy makers in some countries often do not regard such people as ‘homeless’ since they ‘have a roof over their heads’. However, the conceptual approach underlying the ETHOS typology is to understand that homelessness is not a static phenomenon and that the condition of ‘rooflessness’ or ‘houselessness’ is associated with life events that lead through a process of housing exclusion.

In recent years there has been a shift in academic literature (see Anderson 2001) and in policy (see for example recent English and Scottish homelessness legislation) to view homelessness as a dynamic process whereby people shift from one situation to another. In this view homeless is understood as a pathway or trajectory. The benefit of viewing homelessness in this way is that it enables the focus to lie upon ‘severely problematic life events and associated care and support needs’ (Anderson, 2001) that lead to or sustain homelessness.

In essence the pathways approach identifies three key processes linked to the creation (or continuation) of homelessness arising from changes (or crisis) in housing status, family status or stage in the life cycle. Pathways into homelessness are associated with changes (or crisis) in status in relation to these components. These categories reflect the exclusion from secure and decent housing as people experience a change in housing status (resulting from eviction or move to less secure or inadequate housing), family breakdown (often associated with domestic violence) or transition from youth to adulthood.

This dynamic process has been referred to as an iterative process involving the ‘repeated and ongoing loss of or movement through accommodation in both the short and long term context of homelessness (Robinson 2003 quoted in Greenhaigh et al, 2004). Specifically it refers to the repeated movement associated with cycling through a range of more or less tenuous housing situations during the process of housing exclusion rather than to the type of accommodation or to its time frame. These categories of the ETHOS typology are intended to capture these tenuous housing situations.

5.2 DEFINITIONS OF LIVING CIRCUMSTANCES

5.2.1 People living in situations at imminent risk of homelessness (*ETHOS* Categories 8, 9, 10)

The *ETHOS* typology identifies three situations where people live in insecure housing and face the loss of their home:

- > People living in insecure accommodation or without a normal tenancy (category 8);
- > People facing (imminent) eviction from their home by a landlord or mortgage company (category 9);
- > People living under the threat of violence (category 10).

Category 8 is intended to include people in the housing market and is distinct from accommodation provided by local authorities for homeless people (e.g. temporary accommodation) where a normal tenancy is also not provided. A fourth group of people live in situations that involve insecurity and inadequate housing (in the current *ETHOS* typology these are identified as categories 11.2 and 11.3). This includes people who live in squats, and people (e.g. travellers, Roma) who live illegally on land:

- > People living illegally in buildings or
- > People living illegally on land (in temporary structures or caravans).

Most of these situations involve the hidden face of homelessness and hence there are few official sources of information available. However, in many countries either register data or survey data can provide some estimate of the numbers of people living in these situations.

For those on a pathway into homelessness living temporarily with family and friends is often a stage in the process and people of 'no abode' often move around between family and friends and sleeping rough or in night shelters. Although this is understood through research and survey information to be a significant segment of people and of hidden homelessness (especially among women, see Edgar et al 2001), it is difficult to capture in official statistics. Some information can be used to provide a guide to the nature and scale of this category of vulnerability. For example, applications for social housing or for social assistance often record the current living situation of applicants. In Finland, the annual housing survey records the number of people known to municipal housing authorities or social services who are in this category on a given day.

In the UK, applications to local authorities under homeless persons' legislation record the current living circumstances of people. These sources obviously underestimate the situation since an unknown proportion of people do not go through these routes.

The right to housing as a basic human right has been expressed in international, European and national human rights instruments for more than fifty years, and most European states have adopted these rights. One aspect of the right to housing is the right to due process in law in relation to eviction (or re-possession). In most countries summary eviction by a landlord without court procedure is illegal. Court action and representation prior to the eviction of a tenant or the re-possession of a dwelling by a mortgage company should be a basic component of human and housing rights. Hence court records should provide a basic source of information in relation to this aspect of housing insecurity. Three distinct types of situation can be identified: orders declaring evictions, requests for execution and evictions executed. The risk of homelessness is different at the different stages and the degree of insecurity is likewise different. Data on evictions executed (or re-possession orders carried out) provides the clearest indication of the effect on homelessness. The relationship between the different categories could, if it can be reliably established, provide an indicator of the risk of homelessness. However, national factors come into play in interpretation of this information since, in some countries an eviction notice is served at the ending of a tenancy or as a method of managing rent arrears. Hence the fact that an eviction order is served is not always a reliable indicator of homelessness.

Domestic violence is an important (and increasing) route into homelessness for many (primarily though not exclusively) women. The number of places for women in temporary refuge and shelter accommodation is discussed in an earlier section (*ETHOS* category 4). However, women often remain in the home with the perpetrator for some years for a variety of reasons including a lack of secure and safe alternative accommodation for themselves and their children. In a number of countries police forces have created specialist units for domestic abuse and have become more consistent in their approach to recording incidents. These records (either on their own or in conjunction with survey information) can also provide a measure of the scale of vulnerability to housing exclusion and hidden homelessness arising from this problem.

EU-15 COUNTRIES

Although there is some survey information and administrative data in some countries on the number and profile of people who are forced to live temporarily with family and friends, for the most part this hidden route into homelessness goes unrecorded. Most countries provide regular data on evictions but fewer have reliable data on repossession of mortgaged dwellings. The tenure structure of the housing market has a role to play here. Furthermore there is considerable variation at national level between the number of eviction orders taken out and those executed and leading to homelessness. A number of member states have instituted recent legislation to create a climate of zero-tolerance of domestic violence and have tightened procedures for police action and recording of incidents. This should allow some understanding of the impact of domestic violence and the need for increased provision of women’s shelters. However, the evidence here suggests that this information is seldom available in a manner that could inform policy.

In **Austria** there is no nationwide survey or data on the number of homeless people staying temporarily with family or friends. The only reliable data relates to the annual surveys carried out in the city of Salzburg. This survey gives evidence that this form of hidden homelessness is much higher than there are places to provide supported housing, especially among women. Using the Salzburg survey as a base it is possible to estimate the number of persons living temporarily with friends in the country as a whole to be around 8,800 people.

The services for the homeless in Austria, and the umbrella organisation BAWO, began to develop measures and methods to prevent eviction more than ten years ago. However, until recently it has been impossible to quantify the scale of evictions. The Ministry of Justice released evidence on the numbers of eviction proceedings in 2002. This statistic covers all counties and regions of Austria and gives evidence on the regional and local aspects of eviction but gave no evidence about the execution and individual consequences of these legal acts. Therefore it was impossible to answer the

important question if and how many persons had to leave the former household and / or how many of them became homeless as a result of an eviction order. Following a parliamentary request on the issue, the ministry of justice gave statistical evidence about proceedings and executions of evictions for the years 1999 until 2003. This information, for nine counties in Austria, illustrates that the situation is worse in larger cities compared to smaller cities and rural areas. It also demonstrates a wide variation in the ratio of proceedings and executions so that the risk of homelessness arising from a proceeding of eviction is not the same everywhere in the country.

Table 5.1 Evictions Proceedings and Executions in Austria

County	Proceedings 2003	Executions	%	Proceedings
		numbers		1999-2005 % change
Vienna	17,993	7,063	39%	+ 60.6%
Nether Austria	2,660	1,134	43%	+ 10.6%
Burgenland	243	104	43%	+ 5.4%
Upper Austria	1,699	1,393	82%	+/- 0%
Salzburg	1,652	672	41%	- 0.8%
Styria	3,111	1,444	46%	+ 11.9%
Carinthia	1,109	577	52%	+ 9.6%
Tyrol	1,285	677	53%	- 46.3%
Vorarlberg	419	347	83%	- 80.1%
Austria	30,171	13,411	44%	+ 7.3%

Source: Ministry of Justice

The housing market in **Belgium** is primarily owner-occupied with a substantial private rented sector and a very small residual social rental sector. The small social rented sector means that housing application records can not be used to estimate the number of people requiring housing who are living with family or friends. Nor is it possible to use the registration of private landlord contracts to estimate insecurity of occupancy. Neither the Federal nor regional governments record the numbers of evictions of re-possession. However, the Bureau of Credit has been required by law to monitor mortgage arrears since 1993. Only 31% of Belgian households own their home using a mortgage or loan. In the last five years an average of 59,000 households are in mortgage arrears (approximately 6% of mortgagees). There has been academic

in-depth research on caravan dwellers (Meert and Bourgeois 2005), revealing that at present about 3,000 households live in caravans in Flanders. Further, a survey performed among the local public welfare agencies of Flanders has raised a tip of the veil concerning illegal occupancies of land or buildings (Meert et al 2002).

The Belgian federal police publish annually detailed statistics regarding domestic violence. For the whole of the country 21,000 cases of domestic violence were registered in 2004 (table 5.2). This is an increase of 15%, compared with the data of 2000. A break down of these figures shows that 48% of the cases concerns violence between (ex-)partners, while general domestic violence (without demonstrable involvement of specific household members) counts for 43%; 4% of the cases concerns violence against parents, while children under 16 suffer from violence in 3.5% of the cases. Table 5.2 also shows the number of cases per non-single household. In general, 7 households out of 1,000 suffered from domestic violence in 2004.

Table 5.2 Intentional domestic violence - Belgium 2004

	National 2004	Cases per 1,000 non-single households
Against parents	793	0.27
Against children under 16	735	0.25
Between (ex-) partners	10,128	3.42
General intra-familial	9,082	3.07
Other cases	295	0.10
Total	21,033	7.10

Source: <http://www.fedpol.be/police/fedpol/statistiek/>

Although there are no national statistics for evictions in **Denmark**, monthly and annual records are published relating to *Tvangsauktioner* (compulsory auction of the housing due to mortgage arrears). In 2004, 2,121 auctions were held involving all categories of residency: single family houses, apartments, multi-family homes, and combined dwelling/occupational use. With regard to people living under threat of violence (*Partner vold/ægtefælle vold / Vold i hjemmet*), police and hospital records have been used in a recent report to conclude that within a year 0.3 per cent of all adult women have experience of physical violence, that has either been reported to the police, treated in a hospital or both. Women are not without legal protection, as they might well be a formal tenant or even owner of the dwelling. However, there are no national police figures on this aspect.

In **Finland**, the definition in the housing market survey: "Living temporarily with relatives or friends" includes persons who, according to the municipality's information or estimate, are living temporarily with relatives or friends due to lack of housing or who go around by relatives and friends. This figure is either an estimate or is based on housing applications. This item does not include young people living in their childhood home but there are an increasing number of very vulnerable young people in this group. In November 2004 the number was estimated to be around 4,200 single persons (although homeless families are also affected - especially homeless immigrant families). In 2003, 7,767 evictions applications were made to the court and eviction was realised in 1,262 cases.

In **France**, INSEE defines two categories of people living with family and friends (*Hébergement chez des tiers*). The first one includes adult children who come back to their family home after leaving it (457,000 in 2002 in this situation). The second category is what the INSEE called "les vrais hébergés", these numbered 408,000 in 2002. This category includes students who live in their parent's house but also people who have financial problems or health problems and live with family or a friend. Most people who are in this situation live with benefits.

In **Germany**, having no standard legal (sub)tenancy (or owner occupied housing) is one of the main elements to define homelessness. Hence both categories 8.1 and 8.2 are classified under the Houseless category in Germany. Notwithstanding this, no national or regional data is available. For people living with family/friends (*Vorübergehend bei Verwandten oder Freunden lebend unfreiwillig*), local data from housing departments show considerable variety and it depends on local practice of allocation of social housing, if and to what extent such data are collected.

Bailiffs are obliged to inform municipalities of the dates for planned evictions in order to enable municipalities to take action for the prevention of rooflessness which is defined as a breach of public security and order by regional police laws. But this information is not systematically collated at regional or national level.

Juridical statistics provide information on compulsory auction proceedings (*Zwangsversteigerungen (selbstbewohntes Wohneigentum)*) but do not distinguish between proceedings concerning owner occupied housing and others (e.g. commercial properties and rental housing). A recent study estimates the number of owner occupier households who had received repossession orders during the year 2000 at about 30,000 (published estimate based on juridical statistics and interview information from selected courts; Höbel/Kloth/Berenth 2004: 30 ff.).

The new legislation against domestic violence emphasises that the offender should be the one who should leave the common accommodation and that victims of violence (mostly women and their children) should be enabled to stay in the home. Unfortunately the consequences of reported delicts for the housing situation of victims and offenders are not recorded (except if offenders were banned temporarily from their homes by "Platzverweis"). Regional crime statistics provide information on the annual number of police recorded incidents in connection with domestic violence. In a number of regional states this specification was introduced recently following the new legislation against domestic violence. No national data is collated.

No official records exist in **Greece** in relation to any of these categories

The national assessment of housing need in **Ireland**, conducted in 2002, enumerated 4,421 households under the category 'persons sharing accommodation involuntarily and having requirements for separate accommodation' in 2002. Currently no national reliable data exists on legal evictions. However, the Private Rented Tenancies Board, established in late 2004, will begin to collate such data. For a range of reasons, re-possession orders were rarely used in Ireland, particularly for the 'family home'. Despite increasing reports of indebtedness, the most recent data (2001) suggests only 25 homes were repossessed in Ireland by the key lenders, down from 193 in 1995. Since the reorganisation of the IMSA into the Irish Mortgage Council (IMC), no data on mortgage repossessions have been published. Some data has been published by the Courts Service, but is many years out of date.

In 2003, an Garda Síochána recorded 8,452 domestic violence incidents (93% of complainants were female) in Ireland. However, recent research has argued that "the official figures on domestic abuse from the Garda statistics represent the tip of the iceberg, since most of those affected have never reported the behaviour. This makes it difficult to draw conclusions about underlying trends in domestic abuse on the basis of figures dealing with incidents reported to the Garda" (National Crime Council / ESRI 2005: 26). In addition, under the Domestic Violence Act, 1996, the District Court granted 1,295 barring orders, 987 safety orders, 2,810 protection orders and 604 interim barring orders in 2004.

In **Italy**, the 2001 census provides information on co-habiting families (236,446 families and 199,392 persons). An approximate estimate of how many are living temporarily with family or friends not through choice could be obtained by applying the percentage of forced co-habitation (on the basis of the reasons adopted for co-habitation or of the level of satisfaction) resulting from local or national surveys to these figures.

The situation of living with no legal contract is widespread in Italy and affects both Italian and immigrant households (but is endemic among the latter). There are some local surveys, either on the whole population or on immigrant populations. At national scale 'living in dwellings without a standard legal (sub)tenancy' is subject to periodical estimates by tenants unions who indicate that perhaps one-third of all tenancies fall into this category.

Data on evictions has been systematically collected since 1983 by the Ministry of Interior for administrative purposes. The data relating to procedures to vacate residential properties concerns: executive eviction orders issued by the courts; requests for eviction presented to the courts, evictions executed through the courts. The figures are furnished monthly by police headquarters to the Central Department for Documentation and Statistics of the Ministry who publish the data (*Andamento delle procedure di rilascio di immobili ad uso abitativo*). In 2003 (January-December) 38,543 eviction orders were issued, with 81,404 requests for eviction and 21,714 evictions executed. January-December 2004 (some provinces missing): eviction orders issued: 24,082; requests for eviction 42,656, evictions executed 11,331. However, the connection between eviction procedures and homelessness in Italy is uncertain. Legal enforceable notice to quit as such may mean some sort of homelessness (or risk of it) only if associated with other elements of risk. In many cases eviction has been a condition for obtaining public housing for many years.

Although the subcategories 8.1 and 8.2 exist there is no way to obtain data on them at the moment in **Portugal**. Social Service records will contain information but they are not collected in a systematic way. The Housing Sector has no data on any of these situations. Moreover, there has been no provision of data regarding any of the housing measures which were included in the NAP/incl 2003-2005, which means that there is no information on the achievement of the targets indicated.

The terms eviction and repossession are not distinguished in Portugal. The only data available relates to “despejo”, which translates into eviction but always includes people who have either been evicted because they were not paying the rent (rented housing), or because they were not paying the bank instalments (owned housing). The only data available comes from the emergency help line 144 and include both categories. No other data is available and the word used for both situations is the same.

A survey conducted by ISS (2004) obtained information for local services from all Portuguese districts concerning the number of situations involving domestic disputes and identified 1,075 people who have a home but who occasionally had to sleep rough or in a temporary shelter due to intense pressure within the family (e.g. domestic violence).

In **Sweden**, as elsewhere, living with family and friends is probably the most common housing situation for homeless people but is only occasionally included in national and local counts. The NBHW survey defines this as ‘temporarily staying without contract with family / relatives (including staying with children). As there are no housing queues in most municipalities and the local social authorities do not provide regular housing, these households are seldom registered. The following categories of housing situations cover this situation:

- > Temporarily staying without contract with family / relatives (including staying with children) (NBHW, one week in April)
- > Temporary lodging (*tillfälligt inneboende*), staying in parents’ home, with relatives (675, Stockholm)
- > Temporarily lodging (*Tillfälligt inneboende*), parents’ home, relatives (Malmö; September 2004 - 60 adults, 61 children)

In addition, asylum-seekers who do not stay in a reception centre are also mainly living in insecure housing with no tenancy or with family or friends. The number of asylum-seekers not in reception centres in June 2005 was 18,472.

Statistics are available on both ‘registered evictions’ (i.e. applications and decisions), and ‘implemented’ evictions (i.e. those that were realised). This data shows that, in 2004, of 11,027 registered evictions only 3,916 resulted in actual eviction. Most relate to rented flats and some to tenant owners’ dwellings (TOS-flats) but business localities and offices are also included and their share of the total number is not regularly assessed. There are few re-possession orders for owned dwellings; 75 houses, farms or apartments (TOS-flats) are registered for sale through the Enforcement Administration in October 2005.

It is not possible from Swedish police statistics to infer how many people live in their own home under threat of violence.

In the **UK**, living temporarily with family or friends is quantified only for households accepted as homeless when an inability to continue staying with family or friends is recorded as a reason for homelessness. It therefore presents an incomplete picture of those living in such circumstances. The available government summary figures adopt slightly different categories between the countries. In England figures are recorded for people as homeless due to ‘parents no longer willing to accommodate’ and due to ‘other relatives or friends no longer willing to accommodate’ (7,840 and 5,430 respectively in the first quarter of 2004). In Scotland figures are recorded for homeless due to ‘loss of accommodation with relatives/friends’ and for ‘dispute within household’ (9,734 and 6,281 respectively in first quarter 2004).

At present no data is available for people living in a dwelling without a standard legal tenancy or sub-tenancy. However, information on evictions and mortgage re-possession is available. In England and Wales information can be obtained on the use of Notices of Proceedings for Possession (NOP), Suspended Orders (SO) and Outright Possession Orders (OPO). In 2003 Registered Social Landlords and Local Authorities in England and Wales served 1,358,209 NOPs, 62,217 suspended orders, and had 29,825 OPOs granted. The high figure of NOPs reflects the use of such notices as a method of reducing revenue loss through rent arrears. This illustrates the disparity between legal action and actual physical home loss. The Council of Mortgage Lenders’ information provides ample information on re-possession that have been carried out by the UK’s major mortgage lenders and this is published regularly. In 2004, excluding Northern Ireland, there were 6,230 properties taken into possession in the UK, with 2,370 in the actual possession of lenders at the year end; a ratio of almost three to one.

The definition of violence and the threat of violence used by the Association of Chief Police Officers includes any incident of threatening behaviour, violence or abuse (psychological, physical, sexual, financial or emotional) by people who are, or have been, intimate partners or family members. Although some data is available from the British Crime Survey this is likely to be unreliable. Records of domestic violence incidents are available at police force level in England but it is difficult to find reliable aggregate national data. Scottish police domestic abuse statistics record repeat victimisation as well as who holds the tenancy; they can be thus be used to estimate threat of homelessness arising from domestic abuse. Applications for housing under homelessness legislation conflate domestic dispute and domestic violence, but trend data suggests that around 15% of applications fall within this category. However, women escaping domestic abuse are a priority category for housing under recent legislation.

EU-10 COUNTRIES

The ETHOS category ‘living temporarily with family and friends’ is intended to capture the situation of the pathway to homelessness (e.g. people leaving institutions with no accommodation, women fleeing domestic violence). However, in many of the EU-10 countries this category has reflected the extent of ‘hidden homelessness’ arising from families sharing accommodation as a result of housing shortage. It is difficult to obtain a clear understanding of the nature and quality of data on housing evictions in all countries. However, it is clear that there are different causes of eviction from those understood among the EU-15 countries including the loss of a home due to property restitution. As in the EU-15 countries, the availability of data on women living under threat of violence is patchy and difficult to interpret. However, the Polish system of Blue Cards appears to provide a more robust approach to the issue.

In **Hungary**, the number of households registered as sub-tenants or night-lodgers has decreased in the period following the transition (to 21,000 households presently). However, during the same period, the number of dwellings inhabited under the classification of ‘other titles’ has doubled. These relate to households where people stay with friends or relatives as a favour and occupy the dwelling without paying rent as well as those dwellings where people live with no title (representing 34,271 households).

In **Lithuania** there is no available information on the number of people living with family and friends but some indication is given by waiting list for social housing. The most likely residence places of these people during the waiting period are dwellings of the relatives or friends. A list of persons (families) having the right to rent social housing has been compiled since the Law on State Support to Acquire and Rent housing of the Republic of Lithuania came into force in 2003. This shows that 8,818 families are on waiting lists for social housing of whom 3,219 are young families and 481 are children without parental care.

In Soviet times every citizen had to be registered to a certain living place. In 2003 the Law of the Declaration of the Place of Residence was passed according to which people have to declare their place of residence. In this transitional situation there is no information about any legal sub-tenancy.

In 1991 the Law on Restitution of ownership rights for residential properties came into force and data is available from 1993. Under this law tenants of dwellings subject to restitution have to be evicted. Since 1991 4,571 tenant families have been evicted and in 2004 249 owners have been awarded restitution.

In **Poland**, the Central Statistical Office Report on Housing Conditions of Households and Families (based on the 2002 National Population and Housing Census) records that 4.6% of all households consist of two or more families and it is reasonable to conclude that this is caused by a deficiency in the housing market. There is no information on the numbers of ‘no abode’ staying with friends temporarily. Although the category “other legal title” is recognized in statistical publications, it is not possible to disaggregate the data to identify how many of the 93,316 households have no legal title.

An “Administrative Eviction Order” based on tenancy law may be issued to people who regularly abuse tenancy rules (disturbing the lives of other inhabitants, non-payment of rent are among the major causes). As a result of opposition to the procedure of evictions, since February 2005 a person may only be evicted if a social housing apartment or “substitute apartment” is provided. The new regulations are strict on not allowing eviction to a homeless shelter or night shelter. However, the standards of substitute apartments are so low that activists argue that eviction to a substitute apartment is in fact eviction to the street due to the fact that, sooner or later,

its victims move into shelters. Prior to the new regulations coming into force, among those evictions without social housing apartment provided (so called evictions to the street) 5,264 were executed in 2004 and a further 7,137 were to be executed.

In 1999, the Polish police began the implementation of the “Blue Cards” procedure which has, it is claimed, improved both intervention in and the recording of incidents of domestic violence. The “Blue Cards” are records which have to be completed for each intervention. The reporting procedure includes the possibility of tracking people repeatedly victimized by an aggressive partner and passing their details to specialist support services. According to police “Blue Cards” statistics, the number of domestic violence victims in 2004 was 150,266 (88,380 women, 35,137 children under 13 years of age). The total number of all home interventions undertaken related to domestic violence was 92,495.

As in other countries, there is no data in **Slovenia** on the number of people living with family and friends. The European Quality of Life Survey (2003) indicates that the proportion of adults (18-34) living with parents is higher among the EU-10 countries and in Slovenia young families are cited as a specific vulnerable group.

The rented sector in Slovenia is very small (9%) in total and the private rented sector is only 1.2%. A legal tenancy contract is a necessary condition to get a rent subsidy. The most recent information, for Ljubljana (1993) indicates that one-fifth of private tenants are illegal renters. The Director of the Housing Fund in Ljubljana identifies 50-60 cases of eviction but the housing programme also provides 100 dwellings to prevent homelessness as a result of eviction.

According to Police data there were 4,169 legal offences with elements of family violence in an eighteen month period (2000-2002).

5.2.2 People living in accommodation that fails to meet national norms (*ETHOS Categories 11, 12 and 13*)

The EU strategy to combat poverty and social exclusion recognises that all households should have access to decent and affordable housing. What constitutes decent housing is not a scientific absolute. Rather, it reflects social norms which vary between countries and change over time in response to political priorities and improved standards of living. Within this context people may be understood to endure housing hardship or housing exclusion if they do not enjoy minimum standards of housing as established in legislation or commonly accepted norms in their country.

At the most basic level, buildings should be approved for residential purpose and intended for human occupation. This could also be taken to imply that dwelling structures should not be temporary structures but be intended to be fit for permanent occupancy. A decent dwelling should also then be fit for human habitation. This suggests at least that it is structurally sound and does not pose a threat to life or health. Beyond that it should possess facilities that society regards as the basic requirement for normal social and family life (e.g. potable water supply, means of cooking, lighting and heating). Once basic standards of fitness are provided societal norms may also require that a household has sole access to these facilities and that sharing of basic facilities (toilet, bathroom, kitchen) would constitute housing hardship.

Finally, social norms in relation to decent housing can be determined in relation to occupancy standards. At the most basic level standards would aim to ensure that households do not have to (involuntarily) share a dwelling with people to whom they are not related. In dwellings with a single household occupancy, society then establishes an acceptable level of accommodation provision that is compatible with family life or physical or mental health. This allows a definition of an acceptable density of occupancy regarded as a minimum or norm.

This section discussed these aspects in relation to the ETHOS categories for each member state:

- > People living in temporary structures, non-standard structures or mobile dwellings;
- > People living in over-crowded conditions defined as unacceptable in national laws;
- > People living in sub-standard accommodation

EU-15 COUNTRIES

The information provided in different countries in relation to Category 11 varies significantly. This indicates that the categories relating to illegal occupancy of a dwelling or of land is more clearly an issue of insecure rather than inadequate housing (although both issues apply). Secondly, the issues affecting people living in caravans or makeshift dwellings are treated differently depending upon the causes of the phenomenon. While it is possible to distinguish between caravans (e.g. in Belgium), illegal occupancy of summer homes (e.g. in Denmark) and non-conventional or improper housing (e.g. in Italy) the precise nature of these situations need to reflect the national context. Despite the fact that the EU Strategy on Social Inclusion aims to ensure access to decent housing for all, many countries do not have clear official or legal definitions of fitness for habitation or of overcrowding. It is also apparent that there are significant differences in relation to the accepted standards of unfitness and, more particularly, of extreme overcrowding. Different approaches to the definition of overcrowding relate to the use of room or occupancy standards and floor-space standards. Differences in the source of information (e.g. housing surveys, censuses) also make it difficult to compare levels of housing deprivation between countries arising from these indicators.

In **Austria** there is no legal definition of housing standards, therefore it is not possible to give a legally based definition of “unfit for habitation” or the number of people living in dwellings unfit for habitation. The law on tenancy contracts defines the lowest standard level of dwellings (with no central heating, no water inside, no toilet inside the flat). In Austria 3.3% of all dwellings fall into this category (109,406) and 2,6% of households living in such dwellings. The most recent housing survey (2001) provides information on the number of households living in overcrowded circumstances (2 persons and more in 1 room), concerning dwellings with one or two room (including kitchens with a size of 4 square metre).

In **Belgium**, information provided by the *Toerisme Vlaanderen* (2004) and the *Ministère Région Wallonne* (1999) regarding the number of people living in recreation areas in caravans and permanent structures suggests that approximately 4,000 households (almost 10,000 people) rely upon such accommodation. Census information can be used to identify dwellings falling below the standard of fitness for habitation. The definition shows that 2% of properties (77,704 dwellings) are in very bad condition in the whole country (Vanneste et al 2004). A very bad condition was defined by the fact that the dwelling, according to its occupants, needs at least 4 out of 6 serious repairs (such as roof, windows, electric installation).

The Flemish housing code (1997) stipulates that a dwelling should not be overcrowded. Census data has been used by researchers to develop norms using the number of persons in a dwelling and the floor-space. This suggests that 6.4% of dwellings are seriously overcrowded in 2001 (an increase from 3.4% in 1991).

It has been common practice in **Denmark** to live permanently in so called summer houses not meant for permanent residency. The quality of such housing can be of a varied standard. In 1998/99 the law was tightened to prevent residents claiming ordinary social benefits from local municipalities. According to the new law municipalities are required to foresee that every one illegally living permanently in a summer house must move within 14 days or fines will be imposed. Pensioners and people above the age of 60 who receive early retirement benefits are allowed to live legally in their summer house if it has been in their possession for at least 8 years.

Table 5.3 Households in Extreme Overcrowding in Austria (2001)

number of persons per dwelling	flats with 1 or 2 rooms	rooms per person	m ² per person	number of persons
4 persons	13,391	0.4	12.4m ²	53,564
5 persons	4,315	0.4	10.0m ²	21,575
6 persons	1,332	0.3	8.4m ²	7,992
7 persons	437	0.2	7.0m ²	3,059
8 persons	248	0.2	5.6m ²	1,984
number of persons in overcrowded flats				88,174

Source: Housing Survey

Up until the change of the law, a research report showed that in 1998 9,000 lived illegally in such areas and 5,000 legally. A remarkable result was that 20% of the illegal residences were not owner occupied but rental property and a substantial proportion of the occupants were single or divorced men, an indication that a real housing problem and insecure housing situation was involved.

As a result of extensive housing improvement policy measures there are in general only a few cases of substandard housing. When incidents come to the knowledge of the authorities improvement requirements are imposed or residence forbidden. There are thus no statistics on occupied housing unfit for habitation. Around the country there are also still a few homes built for the houseless (usually dating from the 1940s) which can be of a relatively low standard. Most, however, have been taken over by public housing corporations and are being gradually upgraded.

There is no national norm to define over-crowding. In a recent study a statistical norm was set of over-crowding when the area of residence was below $25 \text{ m}^2 + 10 \text{ m}^2$ per person. On this basis 4.0% of dwellings were over-crowded in 1998 according to Statistics Denmark. This includes households in shared dwellings; in public housing 3% of dwellings are overcrowded.

In **Finland**, situations of people living in caravans, temporary structures and squats are uncommon and no statistics are compiled as a result. The definition of extreme overcrowding (Norm 1) is more than two persons per room, with kitchen included in the number of rooms (Statistics Finland). Overcrowded dwellings according to this norm amounted to 20,600 (0.1% of all households) in 2002.

In **France**, an inquiry made by the DRE (*Direction Régionale de l'Équipement*) and the DDE (*Directions Départementales de l'Équipement*) revealed that, after an evaluation of needs in thirty or so districts, there is a need for sites for 53,000 travelling families (an average of 175 families per district). The Foundation Abbé Pierre listed in its report 1,600 Roma who live in caravans and old temporary shacks without heat and electricity illegally occupying pieces of waste ground; 2,000 flats are squatted especially in Paris and in Seine Saint Denis.

The term *L'Habitat Indigne* covers all situations which do not meet basic housing standards and violates human dignity. This notion covers insalubrious houses and buildings, the insalubrious premises or premises where lead is accessible (lead poisoning), unsafe buildings, unsafe furnished hotels, precarious dwellings for which demolition or renovation is ordered by the police authority. According to an estimate of the ANAH (National Agency for the Improvement of Habitat (private), the number of dwellings in this category of housing has risen from 600,000 to 1.2 million. It affects tenants but also poor owner-occupiers, especially in rural departments and in old jointly owned properties.

According to a report of the National Housing Counsel (2002) a little more than 600,000 (2.5%) of all domiciles did not have a shower, bath or inside toilet. Housing affected by Lead Poisoning (*Saturnism*) is deemed to be injurious to life and affected around 85,000 children aged 1 to 6 years old in 2002.

Overcrowding (*Surpeuplement*) is defined by INSEE such that the habitable surface should be at least of 18 m^2 per head of household, 12 m^2 for each other person over 14 years old, and 9 m^2 for each child less than 14 years. It is estimated that 130,000 dwellings fall below this standard.

Inadequate housing in **Germany** would also include households with inadequate sanitary equipment (no bath/shower or toilet inside), households with low income and excessive rent burden, households in social or health distress, but no recent data are available for those categories

Persons living permanently in mobile homes (because of lack of housing) would usually be classified as homeless. It is more difficult with those who have chosen to live in mobile homes as alternative form of housing. But numbers are very low in Germany.

Many Sinti and Roma live in regular and permanent housing in Germany, but some are also provided as homeless with temporary accommodation by municipalities. There are very few sites and few who live illegally on land. Squatting had played a more important role in 1980s, but current numbers are low and municipalities probably know about the few remaining squatted houses.

Households living in dwellings unfit for habitation are no longer recorded by census data and numbers are quite low in Germany. There are many norms and regulations for buildings and health conditions, but no national list of a general "Fitness Standard" or "Tolerable Standard". All regional states have a building code (*Landesbauordnung*) in which standards for new constructions are laid down. Some of these building codes stipulate that existing buildings, which do not comply with the regulation of the building code have to be modified according to these regulations, "if this is necessary in individual cases for the safety of life and health" (North Rhine-Westphalia; *Landesbauordnung*, sect. 87), "if there is a danger to life and health" (Baden-Württemberg, *Landesbauordnung*, sect. 76).

Some regional Acts on the control of dwellings (*Wohnungsaufsichtsgesetz*, *Wohnungsgesetz*) stipulate in greater detail the conditions for defining housing provision as unacceptable. For example in Berlin the *Gesetz zur Beseitigung von Wohnungsmissständen* (*Wohnungsaufsichtsgesetz - WoAufG Bln*) stipulates in section 4 that action must be taken if:

- > there are no or insufficient cooking or heating facilities or provision with water and drainage inside the dwelling,
- > there is no or only an insufficient toilet, especially if the toilet is outside of the house
- > there is no sufficient thermal insulation and sound insulation
- > the headroom of living rooms is less than 2 m
- > there is not at least one living room with at least 9 square meters of floor space available
- > floors, ceilings or walls are permanently damp or
- > no sufficient daylight and ventilation is available.

Similar regulations exist in other regional states (e.g. in North Rhine-Westphalia and in Hesse). However, such regulations are currently considered to be unnecessary and have been abolished in other regional states. For example the Bavarian *Wohnungsaufsichtsgesetz* was abolished in 2004 in order to reduce legal regulations on municipalities. In a press statement (from 16 December 2004) the responsible Minister of the Interior (Beckstein) argued that municipalities should fulfil such tasks like the control of housing standards in their own responsibility and without legal regulations of details. In Munich between 1998 and 2003 only four municipal orders were issued under the old legislation to remedy constructional deficiencies. Beckstein argued that other laws (especially those on public security and order and the Länder-constitution) provide municipalities with enough power to intervene in cases of dampness, mould or vermin. This is one of the reasons why similar regional state legislation does not exist in every Bundesland.

There is no national definition of overcrowding. According to the housing research network it is defined as: 1-person households with less than 20 m²; households with two persons and less than 29 m² (or two persons have to share one room flat); households with three and more persons: number of persons exceeds number of rooms (without kitchen) by two or more. The latest attempts to produce estimates about the number of persons living in overcrowded dwellings (defined as at least two persons more than rooms including kitchen) was made by the Federal Statistical Office in 1998 using census data from 1993. On 30.9.1993 a total of 1,075,500 persons in Germany lived in overcrowded dwellings (König 1998, p 166). Some of the regional laws quoted above (*Wohnungsaufsichtsgesetze*) stipulate that a minimum floor space has to be provided, if dwellings are used for human habitation (Berlin and Hesse: at least 9 square meters per person).

In **Greece** official statistics (ESYE, 2001 housing statistics) indicate that 'not normal' or non-conventional housing (i.e. mobile homes, tents, caravans) amounts to 0.20% of the total number of dwellings in the country. Despite the recently aroused public interest on the issue, the Roma communities in Greece still endure serious deficiencies of bad quality housing as well as social exclusion. The rehabilitation programs that have been put forward a few years ago have not managed to bear a distinct positive impact on their living standards as yet.

An estimated number of 1,000 people occupy a deserted yard, hut or even house, which they do not own. It should be noted however that since there is no research on the matter, this estimate is the outcome of a combined appraisal of the housing situation expressed by the social workers.

According to National housing statistics, in 2001 43.8% of the total number of regular dwellings in the country had no central heating, while 1.2% no kitchen and 3.9% no bathroom or shower inside the dwelling. However, there is no national definition of unfit housing.

According to the most recent national housing statistics (ESYE, 2001), almost 5,600 households with 6 or more members have been forced to cohabitate to the level of more than 3 persons per room. The lowest national norm for area per person in a regular dwelling is 28 square metres.

In **Ireland**, 1,321 traveller families were living in caravans / mobile homes on authorized local authority sites in November 2004 (down slightly from the 2003 figure of 1,398) and there were 601 traveller families living in caravans / mobile homes on unauthorized sites (down from 788 in 2003).

The Housing Act, 1996 sets out the matters to which a housing authority are to have regard in considering whether a house is unfit for human habitation. These include: stability; resistance to spread of fire; safety of staircases and common passages including the state of paving in any yard or open space appurtenant to the house; resistance to moisture; resistance to transmission of heat; resistance to transmission of sound; resistance to infestation; water supply, sanitary arrangements and drainage; air space and ventilation; natural and artificial lighting; facilities for preparing, storing and cooking food and the extent to which the house does not comply with any standard or requirement (other than a standard or requirement relating to any matter hereinbefore mentioned) of building bye-laws in force in the area under the Local Government (Sanitary Services) Acts, 1878 to 1964, or building regulations in force in the area under the Local Government (Planning and Development) Act, 1963. The national assessment of housing need conducted in 2002 enumerated 4,065 households under the category 'persons living in accommodation that is unfit or materially unsuitable' in 2002.

Section 63 of the Housing Act, 1966 states 'A house shall, for the purposes of this Act, be deemed to be overcrowded at any time when the number of persons ordinarily sleeping in the house and the number of rooms therein either-(a) are such that any two of those persons, being persons of ten years of age or more of opposite sexes and not being persons living together as husband and wife, must sleep in the same room, or (b) are such that the free air space in any room used as a sleeping apartment, for any person is less than four hundred cubic feet (the height of the room, if it exceeds eight feet, being taken to be eight feet, for the purpose of calculating free air space), and "overcrowding" shall be construed accordingly. The national assessment of housing need conducted in 2002 enumerated 8,513 households under the category 'persons living in overcrowded accommodation' in 2002.

In **Italy**, the census defines as "other type of accommodation" conditions which are close to "dwelling unfit for habitation". The reference is to a conception of a dwelling, according to which a dwelling (flat, lodging) is a group of spaces or even a single useful space, intended to be lived in permanently by one or more persons, which has an independent entrance onto the street or onto a landing, yard, or terrace, and is separated from other housing units by walls. Housing units without these characteristics are classified as "other types of accommodation". Examples include: caravans, campers, containers, shacks, sheds, cabins, caves; depots, garages, lofts, basements; accommodation contained in constructions that are not buildings" (Istat 2001). Other types of accommodation (occupied) affects 23,581 households (58,138 people).

Official and legal definitions, or those with administrative validity, are found in national and regional legislation, in municipal regulations and in census regulations. National legislation (Ministerial Decree 1975) defines a series of requirements (termed "hygienic-health") which include:

- > the minimum height of rooms set at 2.70 m. (2.55 m. for mountain municipalities)
- > a surface living area of not less than 14 sq. m. for each inhabitant for the first 4 inhabitants and 10 sq. m. for each subsequent inhabitant
- > minimum requirements are also laid down for heating, sanitary facilities.

The minimum requirements can also be obtained from the criteria (points) employed to select applicants for public sector housing. In Lombardy points are given for:

- > improper housing conditions: premises not originally destined for residential housing, or in premises that are uninhabitable according to municipal hygiene regulations;
- > co-habitation, overcrowding;
- > poor housing conditions: accommodation without indoor sanitary amenities or with internal sanitary amenities not up to standard, or accommodation for which it is considered that unhygienic conditions cannot be eliminated with normal maintenance work;
- > accommodation with no heating or for which the unhygienic condition has been ascertained.

Categories such as “improper housing” or “other type” as defined above identify situations of homelessness and housing exclusion. The other dimensions (lack of services and state of disrepair) may constitute differing degrees of gravity and while the most serious situations identify homelessness or housing exclusion, the others form part of the broader phenomenon which in Italy goes under the name of “housing hardship”.

There is no single official definition to refer to with regard to overcrowding. The Ministerial Decree (1975), states that each inhabitant must have a living surface area of not less than 14 sq. m. for the first 4 inhabitants and 10 sq. m. for each subsequent inhabitant. Other criteria are provided by Regions for access to public sector housing. The Region of Lombardy, for example, defines a range of thresholds for “severe overcrowding” depending upon the number of persons and the number of habitable rooms (Regione Lombardia, 2004). The Istat standard measure of overcrowding used in surveys is over 1.6 persons per room for serious overcrowding (Istat 1996).

In **Portugal**, according to the 2001 Census, there are an estimated 15,779 precarious dwellings (defined as wooden rudimentary housing, mobile dwellings, improvised dwellings) and a further 2,001 non-conventional dwellings. The Portuguese National Statistics Office defines non-conventional dwellings as places ‘occupied by people and which does not comply entirely to the conditions of conventional dwellings’ including - “shanties, mobile houses, improvised lodging, and other places which are not functionally adapted for housing purposes”. Conventional dwellings are defined as: “a room or group of rooms and respective annexes which, being part of a permanent dwelling or being structurally separated from it, by the way it was built, rebuilt or reconverted is aiming at the permanent lodging of a family, and which is not at the moment of the census being totally used for other purposes”.

There is only one statistical definition of overcrowding which must be interpreted carefully since the statistical definition of overcrowded dwellings is very wide. In Portugal the National Statistic Institute defines an index of occupation of the dwelling, according to which it determines whether the situation is under or overcrowding. The calculations are made on the basis of the following criteria which are considered to be “normal”: 1 room for the living room; 1 room for the couple; 1 room for any non-single adult; 1 room for any single person over 18 years old; 1 room for two single persons of the same sex aged between 7-18 years old; 1 room for every single person of different sex aged between 7-18 years old; one room for two people aged less than 7 years old.

In **Spain**, according to the 2001 Census, 20,090 dwellings (occupied by 52,051 people) were without running water, in a ruined, bad or deficient condition. These relate to a condition classed as shanty dwellings. Taking an occupancy rate of under 0.5 rooms per person then 263,900 homes, or 3.2% of the Spanish population, are beneath this standard.

Serious overcrowding has been increasingly recognised as a housing problem in **Sweden**, especially on the local level and among large immigrant families who also might house asylum-seeking relatives (see Popoola 1999). Only 2.5% of rental flats in the country (in 2002) had five rooms or more and large apartments are often too expensive for families with many children. Hence, 60% of single parent families and almost one-third of people of foreign background are overcrowded (ibid.).

Since the mid-1970s the highest norm for overcrowding in Sweden increased the space per individual so that each child should have a room of its own, while parents could share one room but no one should have to sleep in the kitchen or the living-room. Hence, a single person would need a two room flat and a family of four a four room flat in order not to be overcrowded. Within Statistics Sweden, a randomised sample of the population is surveyed each year on their living conditions (ULF). The number of members in the household and the area of their dwellings are among the regular questions, so it is possible to get an estimate on the number of people in overcrowded housing and their qualities. In December 2004, however, the NBHBP made an analysis of the frequency and distribution of overcrowding in Sweden according to the national norm and concluded that, since the 1980s, about 15% of the population have been living in overcrowded housing (NBHBP 2004). Of these, 60% are single people living in one room flats, but one third are families with children, most of whom are tenants.

The definition of a mobile home under **UK** homelessness legislation centres on not having a site, pitch or, in the case of house boats, a mooring where it can be legally placed. The use of other temporary structures would be designated as roofless. Additional figures for caravan use can be obtained from the (twice yearly) counts that are carried out in Scotland, England and N.Ireland (though not Wales). These counts provide a breakdown of caravans on authorised sites and caravans on unauthorised encampments or on the roadside.

Two definitions of inadequate housing currently operate in the UK. In England and Wales the current fitness standard was introduced by the Local Government and Housing Act 1989. A dwelling is unfit if, in the opinion of the authority, it fails to meet one of the statutory requirements (see table 5.4). The requirements constitute the minimum deemed necessary for a dwelling house (including a house in multiple occupation) to be fit for human habitation. The Tolerable Standard in Scotland (Section 86(1) of the Housing (Scotland) Act 1987) defines a dwelling as meeting the Tolerable Standard if it meets a test of adequacy on one of a range of statutory requirements (see Table 5.4). The House Condition Survey estimates indicate 7% of the housing stock is unfit for habitation on this basis.

Table 5.4 Definition of Fitness for Habitation in the UK

<i>The Fitness Standard (England and Wales)</i>	<i>The Tolerable Standard (Scotland)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > be free from serious disrepair; > be structurally stable; > be free from dampness prejudicial to the health of the occupants; > have adequate provision for lighting, heating and ventilation; > have an adequate piped supply of wholesome water; > have an effective system for the drainage of foul, waste and surface water; > have a suitably located WC for exclusive use of the occupants; > have a bath or shower and wash-hand basin, with hot and cold water; and > have satisfactory facilities for the preparation and cooking of food including a sink with hot and cold water. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > is structurally stable; > is substantially free from rising or penetrating damp; > has satisfactory provision for natural and artificial lighting, for ventilation and for heating; > has an adequate piped supply of wholesome water available within the house; > has a sink provided with a satisfactory supply of wholesome water available within the house; > has a water closet available for the exclusive use of the occupants of the house and suitably located within the house; > has an effective system for the drainage and disposal of foul and surface water; > has satisfactory facilities for the cooking of food within the house; > has satisfactory access to all external doors and outbuildings.

The current national statutory overcrowding standards (the Room Standard and the Space Standard) are set out in Part X of the Housing Act 1985 which restates standards that have remained unchanged since 1935. Under the Housing Act a dwelling is overcrowded if either of the standards is contravened. The recent Housing Bill intends to update this definition. The approach taken to overcrowding in the Census has

been to calculate a simple room rate by dividing the number of persons in a dwelling by the number of habitable rooms. The census definition of overcrowding adopts a two-tier approach with a room rate of greater than 1 considered as being overcrowded and greater than 1.5 as seriously overcrowded. Using these definitions 5% of dwellings are overcrowded, of which just over 1% are seriously overcrowded.

Table 5.5 Definitions of Over-crowding in the UK

<p><i>The Room Standard</i> is breached if two people of opposite sexes who are not living together as husband and wife must sleep in the same room. Living rooms and kitchens, as well bedrooms can be treated as available sleeping accommodation. Children under 10 do not count for the purpose of determining whether the Room Standard has been contravened.</p> <p><i>The Space Standard</i> specifies the maximum number of people who may sleep in a dwelling according to the number of rooms available as sleeping accommodation and the floor area of each room.</p> <p><i>The Bedroom standard</i> was developed as an indicator of occupation density by the Government Social Survey in the 1960's for use in social surveys. The bedroom (or occupancy) standard is a measure of overcrowding relating the actual number of rooms to the number of rooms 'required' by the members of the household. All households are assumed to require two common rooms plus a certain number of bedrooms, calculated from the number and ages of household members and the relationships between them.</p>

EU-10 COUNTRIES

The situation of housing shortage and poor housing conditions in the countries in transition from former communist economies is documented in detail elsewhere (See country profiles on the housing sector ECE, web site <http://www.unecce.org>; Tsenkova, 2001). Housing markets characterised by severe housing shortage, poor conditions and space standards are common features in many of the transition countries. In this context the ETHOS approach of describing insecure and inadequate housing conditions related to national housing norms, as a measure of housing deprivation, needs to be treated with caution in these countries. While it is possible to measure both relative and absolute income poverty using an average (equivalised) household income, this is more difficult to achieve in relation to housing consumption. Hence measurement against absolute norms needs to be interpreted in the light of national circumstances.

In **Hungary**, at least 500,000 people (according to Census data) live in 'apartments' which can not be deemed to be of a space standard fit for habitation. About 300,000 people live in dwellings without normal amenities and with a space of no more than 12 square metres, or inhabited single premises of no more than 6 square metres. In addition, about 462,664 people live in wooden-, adobe-, or 'other'-walled dwellings having no proper foundation. There are 1.5 million people living in substandard dwellings which either lack basic amenities or are unfit for habitation. Although the number of dwellings lacking basic amenities has decreased, it still represents 20% of the dwelling stock. Almost 800,000 people live in dwellings without an internal bathroom or shower; nearly 100,000 have no internal running water or have neither bathing nor cooking facilities and 10,000 inhabited dwellings have no form of heating. Over-crowding is also a major issue and Census data indicates that there are 200,000 people living in extremely over-crowded conditions.

In **Lithuania**, the population and dwelling census collects data on dwelling type. Dwellings are classified as a conventional and non-conventional dwelling. A conventional dwelling is an individual house or part of individual house, or apartment. Non-conventional dwelling is a dwelling which is not adapted to human habitation over the whole year (e.g. caravan, summerhouse, other structure), but at the time of census was used as a usual place of residence of one or several persons. The number of people living in non-conventional dwellings can provide an estimate of the subgroups 11.1 to 11.3. Census data indicates a figure of 554 non-conventional dwellings and more than one thousand people occupying them. The Law on State Support to Acquire or Rent housing defines as fit for habitation a dwelling:

'the useful floor space of which is not less than 14 sq. meters per person and it meets the construction, hygiene and fire prevention requirements and fits for family or single person habitation'.

This definition provides both the habitable standard and occupancy standard for dwellings. However, no information is available on the numbers of dwellings that do not meet this standard.

In **Poland**, the 2002 Housing Report from the National Statistical Office, based on the National Population and Housing Census presents statistics for occupied "substandard dwellings" in three categories:

1. The low technical condition of a building:
 - a. Apartments in buildings constructed before 1979 with one-room apartments.
 - b. Apartments in buildings constructed before 1945 without a sewage system.
 - c. Apartments in buildings constructed before 1971 without any water supply system.
2. Apartments without adequate fittings (water supply system present but without toilet or no water supply system and without toilet) in buildings not counted in the first category.
3. Overcrowded apartments (with 3 and more occupants per room) counted in neither the first nor the second category.

Using these national definitions a total of 6,481,200 people lived in substandard dwellings. That is 17.1% of the population of accommodated people; 20.1% of people in substandard dwellings lived in buildings of low technical condition; 41.1% lived without adequate fittings; and 38.8% lived in extremely overcrowded dwellings.

Apart from the definition of overcrowding given above, it is difficult to determine national occupancy norms. Social housing apartments are substandard apartments owned by *gminas*, which are rented to low income families who cannot afford to pay rent on any alternative housing. The usable area of social housing apartments cannot be smaller than 10m² for a person living alone and must increase by 5m² for each additional inhabitant. According to the 2002 Housing Report, the number of people permanently residing in apartments with 7m² or less of usable area per person is 225,828; while 0.9% of all people living in apartments in Poland have less than 5m² of usable area per person.

In **Slovenia**, the Director of Ljubljana Housing fund records one shanty town in the municipal ownership (Tomaševska-Koželjeva), where approximately 96 families live. The municipality is trying to solve the issue. The issue of the illegal occupation of a site is predominantly linked to the Roma problem in Slovenia. There are 3,246 Roma in Slovenia, according to the last population census (2002); seen by some to be an under-estimate. The majority of Roma live in settlements isolated from the Slovene population and in substandard accommodation. According to the Governmental Commission for Assistance to the Roma, 58% live in makeshift housing (barracks, containers or trailers) and 30% in illegally constructed dwellings.

There is no clear definition of adequate housing and in different contexts different criteria are used. In the 1991 Housing law an adequate dwelling was defined as a dwelling if it has, along with living room, kitchen, sanitary facilities and corridors also enough rooms to satisfy the housing need of the household. In the Housing law (2003) an adequate dwelling is defined as dwelling that was built in accordance with the minimal technical conditions for building and has been licensed for use. Homelessness can also be classified as people living in occupied business premises (such as shops, offices, rooms in hotels) and people occupying provisional premises (huts, garages, basements, wagons, trailers, tents). Under these two categories according to the Census 2002 there are 1,194 dwellings occupied by 3,068 persons. There are no national standards of overcrowding in Slovenia.

5.3 DATA MATRICES

Table 5.6 Insecure Housing (Categories 8, 9,10)					
Country	8.1	8.2	9.1	9.2	10.1
	Family and Friends	No legal Tenancy	Evictions	Repossessions	Threat of Violence
Austria	8.800 (est)	n.a.	24,502 (2003)	n.a.	2,200 (2004)
Belgium	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	22,170 (2004)	n.a.
Czech ⁽¹⁾	n.a. ^(1a) 17,213 ^(1b)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Denmark	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	2,121 (2004)	n.a.
Estonia					
Finland	4,200 (2004)	n.a.	1262 realised (2003)	n.a.	n.a.
France ⁽²⁾	408,000 ⁽²⁾	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Germany					
Greece	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Hungary	400,000 (2000)	57,000 (2000)	1,500 (2005)	n.a.	n.a.
Ireland	4421 (2002)	n.a.	n.a.	25 (2001)	8,420 (2003)
Italy	n.a.	n.a.	21,714 executed (2003)	n.app	n.a.
Latvia					
Lithuania ⁽³⁾	8818 (2003) ⁽³⁾	n.a.	n.a.	249 (2003)	n.a.
Luxembourg					
Netherlands					
Poland ⁽⁴⁾	586,000 (2002) ^(4a)	(4b)	8,045 (2004) ^(4c)	n.a.	92,495 (2004) (4d)
Portugal ⁽⁵⁾	n.a.	n.a.	341 (2004) ⁽⁵⁾		1075 (2003)
Slovakia					
Slovenia	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	4169 (2000/2002)
Spain	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Sweden ⁽⁶⁾	n.a. ^(6a)	n.a.	3,916 enforced (2004)	n.a.	n.a. ^(6b)
UK ⁽⁷⁾	n.a.	n.a.	33,056 (2003) ^(7a)	12,701 (2004) ^(7b)	20,624 (2003) ^(7c)

⁽¹⁾ ^(1a) A non-related person lives in 110,775 households (Czech Statistics Office 2001); ^(1b) sub-tenants; Czech Statistics Office (2001)
⁽²⁾ See definition - includes also non-vulnerable groups
⁽³⁾ based on the housing waiting list
⁽⁴⁾ ^(4a) Census figure of households of 2 or more families; ^(4b) 93,316 'Other legal title' in Census - includes category of no legal title but no specific breakdown.
^(4c) Administrative evictions executed; 5,264 evictions to the street executed; ^(4d) refer to home intervention incidents for domestic violence recorded under Blue Card statistics
⁽⁵⁾ evictions and re-possession are not distinguished; data comes from the ISS social emergency help line 144.
⁽⁶⁾ ^(6a) no national data; Stockholm (675), Malmö; (60); ^(6b) - figures given for refuge spaces but no data for police recorded incidents.
⁽⁷⁾ ^(7a) excludes N. Ireland ^(7b) refers to repossession actions ^(7c) Police recorded incidents of recorded domestic abuse crime Scotland only.

Table 5.7 Inadequate Housing (Categories 11, 12, 13)					
Country	11.1	11.2	11.3	12.1	13.1
	Caravans Temporary structure	Illegal Occupancy of a site	Illegal Occupancy of a building	Dwellings unfit for habitation	Overcrowding
Austria	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	205,195 (2001)	88,174 (2001)
Belgium	3942	No data	No data	77,704 (2001)	6.4% (10,787)
Czech ⁽¹⁾	222 (2001) ^(1a)	0 (2001) ^(1b)	n.a.	3232 (2001) ^(1c) 12,519 (2001) ^(1d)	446,208 380,052 (households) ^(1e)
Denmark ⁽²⁾	n.a.	n.a.	9,000 (1998) ⁽²⁾	None occupied	4% (1998)
Estonia					
Finland	n.app.	n.app.	n.app.	n.app.	20,600 (0.1% households 2002)
France	1,600 (2002)		2,000 (2002)	41,000 (2005)	130,000 (2001)
Germany					
Greece	n.a.	n.a.	1,000 (est.)	n.a.	
Hungary	1,300 (2000)	n.a.	1,000 (2005)	670,000 (2000)	140,000 (2000)
Ireland ⁽³⁾	1,321 (2004) ⁽³⁾	601 (2004)	n.a.	4,065 (2002)	8,513 (2002)
Italy ⁽⁴⁾	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	23,581 (2001) ⁽⁴⁾	n.a.
Latvia					
Lithuania	554 (2003)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Luxembourg					
Netherlands					
Poland ⁽⁵⁾	n.a.	^(5a)	n.a.	6,481,200 (2002) ^(5b)	225,828 (2002) ^(5c)
Portugal ⁽⁶⁾	15,779 (2001) ⁽⁶⁾	n.a.	n.a.	2001 (2003)	568,886(2001)
Slovakia					
Slovenia ⁽⁷⁾	n.a.	3246 ^(7a)	n.app.	1194 (2002) ^(7b)	n.a.
Spain	52,051 (2001)	n.a.	n.a.	112,824 (2001)	1,310,162 (2001)
Sweden	n.a.	n.a.	0	0	
UK ⁽⁸⁾	102,655 (2001) ^(8a)	3,259 (2004) ^(8b)	n.a.	^(8c) (2001)	1,767,779 (2001)

⁽¹⁾ ^(1a), ^(1b) 2001 Census; ^(1c) Distress housing, 3,232 (Czech Statistics Office 2001); ^(1d) Weekend house, cottage, 12,519 (Czech Statistics Office 2001);
^(1e) An overcrowded household means 2 persons per room (there are 446,208 such households) or fewer than 10 m² of living floor space per person (there are 380,052 such households). There may be both criteria for the same household.
⁽²⁾ Illegal occupancy of summer homes - though not meant for permanent occupancy these are regular structures of variable standard.
⁽³⁾ authorised local authority sites for travellers
⁽⁴⁾ Source: Census 2001. The figure is according to Census definition, not properly "under national legislation".
 Census also indicates 49,021 families have no drinking water or toilet
⁽⁵⁾ ^(5a) persons declaring to be Roma in census= 12,731 {{do we include?}}; ^(5b) Housing Report National Statistics Office; ^(5c) 7m² or less of usable area per person
⁽⁶⁾ figure for non-conventional dwellings - shanties, caravans, improvised shacks etc.
⁽⁷⁾ ^(7a) official number of Roma to whom this situation relates ^(7b) refers to dwellings not intended for habitation
⁽⁸⁾ ^(8a) 7,694 traveller families on authorised sites; ^(8b) families on unauthorised sites: ^(8c) percentage of dwellings unfit in Census - England (5%); Wales (8.5%); Scotland (1%); N.I. (4.9%)

6 Conclusions

6.1 USING ETHOS FOR DATA COLLECTION AND FOR POLICY PURPOSES

The ETHOS typology has been developed to provide a basis for data collection. However, as a conceptual model framed within an understanding of the pathways into homelessness and the nature of vulnerability to housing exclusion, the typology also has relevance for policy purposes.

Policies to address homelessness include three main elements - prevention, accommodation and support. Prevention policies imply an understanding of both the causes of homelessness and the pathways into homelessness. Accommodation provision involves elements of emergency or temporary accommodation and transitional accommodation as well as permanent housing (with or without support). Increasingly policies to address homelessness recognise the need for support as well as housing and that support is needed for people who are homeless, have been homeless or may become homeless. This understanding of the policy basis indicates the need for an understanding of the process of homelessness and housing deprivation as well as the profiles of homeless people. ETHOS has been developed using this pathways approach.

Good practice indicates that policies must be evidence based. ETHOS directs attention to the gaps in evidence both in relation to homelessness indicators and to indicators of housing adequacy and exclusion. It also indicates areas where better use could be made of existing administrative information. For example, one important pathway into homelessness is among offenders released from prison. While most countries have information on the numbers of prisoners due to be released in a given time period, few countries have clear or available information on the housing needs of prisoners within three months of their discharge date.

The new realities in homelessness are reflected in both the changing profile of the homeless population and in changing priorities for policy. The increase in homelessness, in some countries, among more vulnerable young people, older people, immigrants and women are examples of the changing basis of need. Equally as policies begin to take effect, needs shift and policy priorities also change. For example, as street homelessness is reduced the priority may change to ensure that people do not have to spend a long time in temporary accommodation awaiting re-housing.

The common objectives of the EU strategy to combat poverty and social exclusion include the protection of vulnerable groups and the need to mobilise all actors. ETHOS recognises the wide range of groups who may be vulnerable to homelessness (or housing deprivation) including young people, older people, women fleeing domestic violence, prisoners about to be discharged, people with mental health problems, people with addiction problems, people with high levels of debt and asylum seekers and refugees. ETHOS should also have relevance in inter-agency working and mobilisation of actors since it provides a common basis for interchange between the tiers of government as well as inter-departmental co-ordination and highlights the context within which NGO information can assist public sector policy-makers.

6.2 REVISING ETHOS

The ETHOS typology of homelessness and housing exclusion has been developed from a conceptual understanding of homelessness that reflects both the dynamic nature of the phenomenon and the housing and non-housing domains by which it is manifest. The aim has been to develop a typology that allows for a more harmonised system of data collection and for a more comparable approach to data collection and analysis at a European level. That is to say, it is not intended to provide a European data collection approach but rather to allow for a more effective comparison of national level data at a European level. Hence, ETHOS also has important value at national level in identifying limitations in data available to guide policy development in relation to homelessness and housing exclusion.

The development of the typology has been approached as an iterative process by which the typology can be refined as our understanding of the data collection and measurement issues improve. Our approach is that the conceptual model is robust and the four conceptual categories remain the basis of the typology. However, the operational categories and sub-categories can be reviewed, and more accurately defined, in order to make the typology fit for the primary purpose of data collection for which it is designed.

This review has examined the operational categories of the typology in the light of national definitions and data availability. This knowledge can now be used to revise the operational categories and sub-categories proposed in the previous edi-

tion of this review. The aim of this revision is, wherever possible, to simplify the typology by focussing on the generic definition of terms. It is also the aim to allow the typology to be used flexibly at national level by nesting national nomenclature and classifications within these more generic definitions of categories of accommodation provision and living situation. Hence the proposed revision allows for national sub-categories to be included.

The proposed revision of the ETHOS typology is presented in Table 6.1. This table will be reproduced in the ETHOS page of the FEANTSA web-site in national languages.

The main changes to the typology include a revision to the labels used in the operational categories, the introduction of a generic definition of the operational categories using key elements identified in the report and the introduction of the column for national sub-categories. The generic definitions are explained in the relevant sections in the report. The generic definition provides a standard definition that is not specific to any one country and is derived from the conceptual model that underpins the ETHOS typology. The intention of the national sub-categories column is to allow each country to specify specific categories and nomenclature for each generic category as relevant. For example, the different forms of homeless hostel or temporary accommodation can be defined in each country as appropriate providing the national descriptions of the generic categories 3.1 and 3.2. This should allow ETHOS to be adapted to each country and to allow comparison on a more consistent basis. In due course the national ETHOS for each country will be available on the FEANTSA web site in the national language and in English.

Table 6.1 ETHOS European Typology on Homelessness and Housing Exclusion Revision 2005					
Conceptual Category		Operational Category		Generic Definition	National Sub-Categories
ROOFLESS	1	People Living Rough	1.1	Rough Sleeping (no access to 24-hour accommodation) / No abode	
	2	People staying in a night shelter	2.1	Overnight shelter	
HOUSELESS	3	People in accommodation for the homeless	3.1 3.2	Homeless hostel Temporary Accommodation	
	4	People in Women's Shelter	4.1	Women's shelter accommodation	
	5	People in accommodation for immigrants	5.1 5.2	Temporary accommodation / reception centres (asylum) Migrant workers accommodation	
	6	People due to be released from institutions	6.1 6.2	Penal institutions Medical institutions	
	7	People receiving support (due to homelessness)	7.1 7.2 7.3 7.4	Residential care for homeless people Supported accommodation Transitional accommodation with support Accommodation with support	
INSECURE	8	People living in insecure accommodation	8.1 8.2 8.3 8.4	Temporarily with family/friends No legal (sub)tenancy Illegal occupation of building Illegal occupation of land	
	9	People living under threat of eviction	9.1 9.2	Legal orders enforced (rented) Re-possession orders (owned)	
	10	People living under threat of violence	10.1	Police recorded incidents of domestic violence	
INADEQUATE	11	People living in temporary / non-standard structures	11.1 11.2 11.3	Mobile home / caravan Non-standard building Temporary structure	
	12	People living in unfit housing	12.1	Unfit for habitation (under national legislation; occupied)	
	13	People living in extreme overcrowding	13.1	Highest national norm of overcrowding	

REFERENCES

- Anderson I (2001) 'Pathways through homelessness: towards a dynamic analysis', *Urban Frontiers Program*, University of Western Sydney, Housing Policy and Practice, University of Stirling
- Ann Rosengard Associates (2001) *The Future of Hostels for Homeless People*, Scottish Executive Central Research Unit, Edinburgh
- Atkinson A.B, Cantillon B, Marlier E, and Nolan B (2005) *Taking forward the EU Social Inclusion Process*, an independent report commissioned by the Luxembourg Presidency of the Council of the European Union, Luxembourg
- Bransen, E., Boesveldt, N., Nicholas, S., Wolf, J. (2001). *Openbare Geestelijke Gezondheidszorg voor sociaal kwetsbare mensen*. Utrecht: Trimbos-instituut.
- Brousse C 2004, *The production of data on homelessness and housing deprivation in the European Union: survey and proposal*, European Commission-Eurostat.
- Busch-Geertsema, V and Evers, J (2004) *Auf dem Weg zur Normalität. Bestandsaufnahme der persönlichen Hilfen in Wohnungen im Bereich der Hilfen in Wohnungsnotfällen*. Bremen (GISS), download under www.forschungsverbund-wohnungsnotfaelle.de or www.giss-ev.de
- Caritas Italy (2004) *Così lontani così vicini. Le persone senza dimora: processi di esclusione, percorsi di prossimità*, EDB, Bologna, 2004.
- Černi Mali, B (2000): Programi stanovanjske oskrbe s cenovno dosegljivimi stanovanji in podpore brezdomcem. In MANDIČ, S.: *Programi stanovanjske oskrbe posebnih družbenih skupin - kakovost in nove povezave*. Poročilo. Ljubljana.
- Commissione d'indagine sull'esclusione sociale (2002) *Rapporto sulle politiche contro la povertà e l'esclusione sociale 1997-2001*, a cura di C. Saraceno, Carocci, Roma
- Edgar W, Doherty J and Mina-Coull A (1999) *Services for Homeless People: Innovation and Change in the European Union*, Policy Press, Bristol
- Edgar W, Doherty J and Mina-Coull A (2000) *Support and Housing in Europe*, Policy Press, Bristol
- Edgar W, Doherty J and Meert H (2001) *Access to Housing: Homelessness and Vulnerability in Europe*, Policy Press, Bristol
- Edgar W, and Meert H (2004) *Review of Statistics on Homelessness in Europe*, FEANTSA, Brussels
- Ericsson, K. and Mansell, J. (1996) *De-institutionalisation and community living*, Chapman & Hall, London
- Esping-Andersen G (1990) *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, Polity Press, Cambridge
- FIO.psd (2000) *Indagine e mappatura delle realtà pubbliche e private che lavorano per assistere le persone senza dimora*, FIO.psd (Federation of organisations that work with the no abode) e Ministero degli Affari Sociali
- Greenhalgh E, Miller A, Mead E, Jerome, K and Minnery J (2004) *Recent International and National Approaches to Homelessness*, AHURI, Queensland
- Höbel, R, Kloth, M, Berendt, U (2004) *Zahlungsschwierigkeiten von Wohneigentümern*. Forschungsvorhaben der allgemeinen Ressortforschung im Auftrag des Bundesministeriums für Verkehr, Bau- und Wohnungswesen und des Bundesamtes für Bauwesen und Raumordnung, Bochum (InWIS)
- Johnson, S., Cloke, P. and May, J. (2002) *Homeless Places Project. Direct Access Hostel and Night Shelter Survey. Summary of Findings*. University of Bristol and Queen Mary, University of London.
- European Commission (2005) *Joint Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion*, document adopted by the Council 3rd March 2005, Brussels
- Knudsdotter Vanström, Linda, Palmgren Langlet, Ann-Christine & Björk, Stina (2005), *SiS statistik år 2004 (SiS Statistics in the Year 2004)*. SiS-Report 2005:7. Stockholm: Statens institutionsstyrelse

Leskošek, V., and Boškič, R. (2004): *Slovene national report on sheltering services for women victims of domestic violence*. Ljubljana: CESIS.

MacKenzie D and Chamberlain C (2003) *Homeless Careers: Pathways in and out of homelessness*, Melbourne, Swinburne and RMIT Universities, Melbourne

Meert, H. and Bourgeois M. (2005), Between rural and urban slums: A geography of pathways through homelessness. *Housing Studies* 20 (1), pp. 107-125

Meert H., Bourgeois M. & De Rijck T. (2002), *Omvang en ruimtelijk-economische dimensie van het grijze woongecircuit in Vlaanderen: een experimenteel onderzoek naar methodiekbepaling*. Brussels: Vlaamse Gemeenschap

National Crime Council / Economic and Social Research Institute (2005) *Domestic Abuse of Men and Women in Ireland*. Dublin: NCC / ESRI.

National Housing Counsel (2002) 'The establishment of a right to housing and disposition of the law against exclusion', Paris

Robinson C (2003) *Understanding Iterative Homelessness: the case of people with mental disorders, Final Report*, Melbourne, Australian Housing and Research Institute, UNSW-UWS Research Centre

Sahlin, I (1993), *Socialtjänsten och bostaden* (Social Authorities and Housing) Research report. Lund University, Department of Sociology.

Sahlin I (1999) Support in Housing: National Report for Sweden, FEANTSA, Brussels

Sahlin, I (2005) *National Report on Homeless Statistics in Sweden*, FEANTSA, Brussels

Seymour, M & Costello, L (2005) *A Study of The Number, Profile and Progression Routes of Homeless Persons before the Court and in Custody*, Centre For Social And Educational Research, Dublin Institute Of Technology, Government Of Ireland, Dublin

Social Exclusion Unit (2001) *Preventing Social Exclusion*, Cabinet Office, London

Social Exclusion Unit (2002) Reducing Re-offending by Ex-Prisoners, Social Exclusion Unit, London

Tosi A, Ranci C, (1999) *Support in housing in Italy. National report 1998*, Feantsa, Bruxelles

Tosi A, Ranci C, Kazepov Y, (1998) *Italy 1997 National Report*, Bruxelles, Feantsa.

Tsenkova, S. (2000) *Housing in Transition and Transition in Housing: The Experience of Central and Eastern Europe*, Sofia: Kapital Reclama

Vanneste D., Thomas I. & I. Laureysen (2004), Fysische staat van de woning. In: *Ruimte en Planning*, 24 (4), pp. 12-36.

Wolf, J (2005) Interagency Working In Policies And Services For Vulnerable People In The Netherlands, FEANTSA, Brussels

APPENDIX 1

Correspondents of the European Observatory on Homelessness

Austria

Heinz Schoibl – Helix Research and Consulting
Heinz.schoibl@helixaustria.com

Belgium

Pascal de Decker – Antwerp University
Pascal.dedecker@ua.ac.be

Czech Republic

Ilija Hradecky – Nadeje
hradecky@nadeje.cz

Denmark

Inger Koch-Neilsen and Lars Benjaminsen
Social Forsknings Institutet
ikn@sfi.dk; lab@sfi.dk

Estonia

Jüri Kõre – University of Tartu
Juri.Kore@ut.ee

Finland

Sirkka-Liisa Kärkkäinen – Stakes
Sirkka-liisa.karkkainen@stakes.fi

France

Dalila Zidi – Housing Research Consultant
Dalila.zidi@fireflyuk.net

Germany

Volker Busch-Geertsema – GISS.e.v
Giss-bremen@t-online.de

Greece

Aristides Sapounakis
Aristidis Sapounakis, KIVOTOS
arsapkiv@mail.hol.gr

Hungary

Péter Györi – HAJZOLT
gyori_peter@yahoo.com

Ireland

Eoin O’Sullivan
Department of Social Studies Trinity College Dublin
tosullvn@tcd.ie

Italy

Antonio Tosi – DIAP Politecnico di Milano
antonio.tosi@polimi.it

Latvia

Ilze Trapenciene – Institute of Philosophy and Sociology
ilze.trapenciene@sociology.lv

Lithuania

Vita Karpuskiene – Vilnius University
Vita.Karpuskiene@ef.vu.lt

Luxembourg

Roland Maas
Centre d’Etudes de Populations, de Pauvreté
et de Politiques Socio-Economiques
Roland.Maas@ceps.lu

Netherlands

Judith Wolf – Trimbos-instituut Utrecht
and Radboud University Nijmegen
Judith.Wolf@wx.nl

Poland

Julia Wygnanska
julkiw@interia.pl

Portugal

Isabel Baptista – CESIS, Lisbon
isabel.baptista@cesis.org

Slovenia

Masa Filipovic
University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences
masa.filipovic@fdv.uni-lj.si

Spain

Pedro Cabrera – Universidad Pontificia Comillas 3
pcabrera@chs.upco.es

Sweden

Ingrid Sahlin – Department of Sociology Gothenburg University
Ingrid.sahlin@sociology.gu.se

United Kingdom

Isobel Anderson and Stephen Thomson
Housing Policy and Practice Unit University of Stirling
Isobel.Anderson@stir.ac.uk; st11@stir.ac.uk.