



Homelessness Australia

Creating a framework for ending homelessness

# *WORD FROM THE WISE*

**A REPORT ON THE FINDINGS  
FROM OUR WHITE PAPER  
MEMBERS SURVEY**

**Travis Gilbert**

**Policy and Research Officer**

# ***WORD FROM THE WISE: A REPORT ON THE FINDINGS FROM OUR WHITE PAPER MEMBERS' SURVEY***

By Travis Gilbert, Policy and Research Officer Homelessness Australia

The following report presents the findings from our Members survey which followed the release of the Issues Paper in February. We would like to thank all of our members for taking the time to complete the survey. We will be using the findings from the survey to formulate our advocacy work.

We received 100 responses in total and a great deal of useful feedback about the issues facing your service at the present time and how these could be addressed. The following report includes questions we will be asking you to answer in small group discussions at our White Paper Policy Roundtable at the Face to Face meeting in Alice Springs.

## **1.) BREAKDOWN OF RESPONDENTS BY STATE AND TERRITORY**

**Table 1.1: Location of service providers by state and territory**

<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>Number (n)</b>	<b>%</b>
ACT	5	5%
NSW	25	25%
NT	11	11%
<b>QLD</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>31%</b>
SA	3	3%
TAS	4	4%
VIC	11	11%
WA	6	6%
NOT SPECIFIED	4	4%
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

As table 1.1 above indicates, the highest numbers of responses received were from providers based in Queensland. The response rate from the Northern Territory was also very strong given its population; with more than 1 in 10 responses coming from NT based services. SA had the lowest response rate with just 3 respondents.

## **2.) LOCALITY OF SERVICE PROVIDERS**

**Table 2.1: Locality of Service Providers**

<b>Locality</b>	<b>Number (n)</b>	<b>%</b>
Urban	17	17.3%
<b>Suburban</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>35.7%</b>
Regional	26	26.5%
Rural	13	13.3%
Remote	7	7.1%
Skipped Question	2	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Almost half of all responses were received from providers (46.9%) who indicated that their services were based in, regional (26.5%), rural (13.3%) or remote (7.1%) areas. This was very pleasing as these services are often left out of official consultations because of the 'tyranny of distance' but it is this very distance from mainstream services that can often make their work even more challenging.

Of the five categories the highest response count was from services based in *suburban* locations (35 respondents or 35.7%). Just over one in six respondents (17 respondents or 17.1%) indicated that their service was based in an urban locality, presumably in the inner-city. Overall there was a very good spread of responses across urban, suburban, regional, rural and remote areas and from a social research perspective this adds to the reliability and validity of the findings relative to the sample size.

### **3.) THE MAJOR ISSUES DRAWN FROM THE PRIORITY AREAS OUTLINED IN THE WHITE PAPER**

#### **PRIORITIES FOR THE NEW APPROACH**

The following five priorities were identified as the most important of the 13 items drawn from the White Paper:

- 1.) Creating strong housing options across the housing continuum (around 90% of respondents believed this was very important)
- 2.) Ensuring that new funding for homelessness is effectively distributed (just over 86.3% believed this was very important)
- 3.) Ensuring that no one becomes homeless as a result of exiting state care, hospital settings, custody or correctional services facilities (just over 80% of respondents believed this was very important)
- 4.) Building a strong homelessness sector workforce (Over 72% of respondents believed this was very important)
- 5.) Clarifying future arrangements for SAAP(almost 2/3 of respondents indicated that this was very important)

#### ***Creating Strong Housing Options across the Housing Continuum***

Perhaps unsurprisingly, the priority that received the strongest support was the need to create strong housing options across the housing continuum:

- 89.6% (86 respondents) indicated that this was very important
- 9.4% (9 people) felt it was important
- 1.1% (1 respondent) was unsure
- 4 respondents skipped the question

The notion of a housing continuum is somewhat hierarchical and extends from accommodation without security of tenure (i.e. boarding houses and caravan parks) to social housing, private rental and at the other end of the spectrum sits the great Australian dream of owning a home on a quarter acre block with a picket fence for the blue heeler or kelpie. For specialist homelessness services, this means creating exit points from homelessness at the most affordable end of the housing continuum in the form of social housing and supported accommodation options.

Questions for discussion at the White Paper Roundtable in relation to this priority are:

- Which housing options (type and tenure) do you believe are most appropriate for your clientele?
- What would be the most effective use of the social housing stimulus funds?
- How can Homelessness Australia best assist you in advocating for the creation of these options and monitoring the allocation of the social housing stimulus funding?

***Ensuring that new Homelessness Funding is effectively distributed***

- 82 respondents (86.3%) indicated that they believed ensuring that new homelessness funding was effectively distributed was very important while the remaining
- 13 respondents (13.7%) felt it was important and
- 5 respondents skipped the question.

Again, this finding will probably surprise no-one and it will be up to state and territory governments to outline how they intend to align Commonwealth funding. We will be advocating that the details of each state and territory's implementation plan be placed on the public record.

Given the strong emphasis on 'rough sleepers' in the White Paper it is likely that a significant proportion of funding will be directed towards assertive community outreach and street to home type initiatives. The main danger in this as I am sure you are all aware is that only 1 in 6 people experiencing homelessness are 'sleeping rough' and very few women and young people are in this category. By focusing heavily on primary homelessness there is a risk that funding will be diverted from programs and services that support 5 out of every 6 people experiencing homelessness. We must remain vigilant and remind government that just because someone is not 'sleeping rough' this does not mean they are any less deserving or less 'at risk'. An additional concern is that the White Paper tended to equate chronic homelessness with 'rough sleeping' when evidence from studies in both Australia and overseas indicates that homelessness is not a static phenomenon and people experiencing homelessness tend to move between the 3 categories in the ABS cultural definition. We will be in a better position to make determinations about the effectiveness or otherwise of the distribution of funding when state and territory implementation plans have been released.

Questions for discussion at the White Paper Roundtable in relation this priority are:

- What role can the sector play in ensuring that homelessness funding is effectively distributed?
- Where would you like to see the new money allocated? E.G. Support \$, workforce development, IT, etc?
- How can Homelessness Australia assist the sector in this process?

### ***Ensuring that no one becomes homeless as a result of exiting state care, hospital settings, correctional facilities or custody***

The ambitious target of 'no exits' into homelessness from state care, hospital; settings, correctional facilities or custody was the third most important priority identified by respondents to our White Paper members' survey. This policy was identified by Homelessness Australia as a critical component of any strategy to reduce homelessness and we are seeking to monitor the process through which states and territories aim to make it happen very closely.

To translate 'no exits' from policy to practice will require significant resources, appropriate pre-discharge and discharge exit planning, collaboration and co-ordination between and within government agencies and additional units of supported accommodation into which people can be exited upon discharge.

All respondents viewed this priority as either very important or important:

- 77 respondents (80.2%) indicating that they felt it was very important
- 19 (19.8%) indicating that it was important.
- 4 respondents skipped the question.

Questions for discussion at the White Paper Roundtable in relation to this priority are:

- If you were in a position to do so, how would you ensure that no one became homeless as a result of exiting state care, hospital settings, correctional facilities or custody?
- Who are the key parties that need to be brought to the table and key people who need to be appointed to ensure this happens?
- What role can Homelessness Australia play in helping to make this worthwhile goal a reality?

### ***Building a strong homelessness sector workforce***

- Almost three quarters (72.6%) of respondents (69 people) identified building a strong homelessness sector workforce as very important
- 26.3% of respondents (25 people) indicated this was important one respondent was unsure.
- 1 respondent (1.1%) was unsure

The White Paper paid limited attention to workforce issues and delegated responsibility for addressing them to the states and territories. Furthermore, the proposal to increase opportunities for career progression and increased skills and expertise that are readily transferrable within the sector was linked to developing agreed national accreditation and service standards and even making funding conditional upon meeting these. There was nothing in the White Paper that indicated that addressing workforce development and/or pay issues would be driven at a national level by the Commonwealth but we will continually advocate for improved pay and conditions for all workers in the sector.

Homelessness Australia will be working with the ASU to commission a jointly sponsored survey aimed at identifying the many workforce development and workplace relations issues (no doubt familiar to you all) of concern to those working in the sector in the coming months.

In addition, the next edition of Parity will be sponsored by the ASU and will seek to highlight both workforce development and workplace relations issues that are facing the sector some of which were identified by members in the final section of the survey.

### ***Clarifying future arrangements for Specialist Homelessness Services***

Since the commitment to develop a *new approach* to homelessness some 12 months ago, there has been considerable uncertainty as to the future arrangements (both legislative and operational) for the sector formerly funded through the Supported Accommodation Assistance Program.

Initially the Commonwealth announced it would repeal the *Supported Accommodation Assistance Act 1994*. Having taken into account content from submissions to the Green Paper and legal advice, it became clear that repealing the Act would result in more complications than initially anticipated so it was decided it would remain on the statute books pending amendments made in consultation with state and territory governments.

The Green Paper/White Paper process has consequently generated considerable uncertainty for the sector formerly known as SAAP:

- 63.2% of respondents (60) indicated that clarifying future arrangements for SAAP was very important for their service
- 33.7% (32 respondents) believed it was important
- 2.1% (2 people) did not believe it was important
- 1 respondent (1.1%) was unsure.

Questions for discussion at the May White Paper Roundtable are:

- What information about the new legislative arrangements are you seeking?
- What kinds of resources need to be factored into the provision of funding for services formerly funded under SAAP?
- What would you like to see included in any new homelessness legislation?
- How can Homelessness Australia assist?

Homelessness Australia will convey these concerns to FaHCSIA and seek clarification on what the legislative framework for specialist homelessness services will look like and the impact this will have on operational arrangements and reporting requirements for services formerly funded through SAAP.

### ***Strengthening Centrelink services for people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness***

- The majority of respondents (61.5% or 59 people) believed that strengthening Centrelink services for people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness was very important
- 35.4% (34 people) believed this was an important priority
- 2.1% (2 people) did not believe it was important
- 1 respondent was unsure.

Homelessness Australia is working directly with Centrelink to provide advice on issues relating to homelessness and how Centrelink can alter its operational arrangements to maximise the assistance it provides to clients who are either at risk of becoming homeless or who are already experiencing homelessness.

### ***Building Strong Homelessness and Mainstream Service Coordination***

This will no doubt prove to be a long and drawn out process and even in the longer term may come to fruition with varying degrees of success:

- Nearly three-fifths of respondents (59.6% or 56 people) indicated that increased co-ordination between mainstream agencies and specialist homeless services was a very important priority
- 38.3% (36 people) felt it was important
- 2.1% (2 people) felt this was not an important issue for their service.

Homelessness Australia will be working in collaboration with other national peak bodies to monitor the implementation of much heralded joined-up service delivery by state and territory governments. The monitoring process will evidently be a long term and on-going one as the co-ordination of mainstream services alone, let alone mainstream and specialist services is an enormous challenge facing both Governments and the sector. Given that the concept of *joined-up service delivery* is a cornerstone of the *new approach to homelessness* outlined in the White Paper, this will be the 5<sup>th</sup> item on the agenda at the White Paper roundtable in May. Questions for discussion are:

- What are the main barriers to accessing mainstream services for your clients?
- What changes need to be made to the way that mainstream and specialist homeless services operate in order to facilitate *joined-up service delivery* and overcome these barriers?
- What role can Homelessness Australia play in this process?

### ***Ensuring that the White Paper Response Aligns with other Government Priorities***

The next most important priority identified by members was the need to ensure that the White Paper response aligns with other government priorities. The White Paper states that the key to joined up service delivery is 'joined up policy', while I am still somewhat uncertain about exactly what that means or what it might look like, in essence it means that to be effective, the White Paper response must align to other Government priorities, or at the very least, not be hindered by them.

- Just under half (48.4% or 46 people) of all respondents believed this was very important
- 45.3% (43 people) felt it was important
- 4.2% (4 people) felt it was not important
- 2.1% (2 people) were unsure.

The extent to which other government policy aligns with the White Paper response could have a significant impact on the success of our efforts to reduce homelessness.

### ***Ensuring Accountability of Funding Bodies and the Government***

- Just under half (46.3% or 44 people) of respondents felt that the need to ensure funding bodies and the Government were accountable was very important
- Just over half (50.5% or 48 people) felt this was important
- 2 people (2.1%) felt it was not important
- 1 respondent was unsure.

Bold and worthwhile targets are one of the cornerstones of the *new approach to homelessness*. Measuring progress towards meeting the targets will require the development of reliable indicators that can accurately measure the extent to which goals and targets are being achieved. As a sector we will need to pay due consideration to how we can hold both the Commonwealth and state and territory governments accountable for their responsibilities under the NAHA, the National Partnership on Homelessness and the White Paper.

In doing so we must be careful that in the process of ensuring that Government and funding bodies are held accountable, we must be careful not to trigger a response from Government that places additional reporting requirements on NGOs which serve to increase the already heavy administrative burden.

### ***Developing a Strong Legislative Framework for Homelessness***

- 46.2% of respondents (43 people) felt that developing a strong legislative framework for homelessness was very important,
- Just under half (49.5% or 46 people) felt it was important
- 3 respondents (3.2%) felt it was not important
- 1 respondent was unsure.

What would a strong legislative framework for homelessness look like? Would it enshrine in legislation commitments made under the national partnership or targets set out in the White Paper? Would it commit Governments to deliver on 'no wrong doors' and 'joined up service delivery'? Would a strong legislative framework include rights and

responsibilities or service charters? The legislative arrangements developed by the Commonwealth will constitutionally supersede state and territory legislation in relation to homelessness so it is important that whatever legislation underpins the new approach to homelessness is effective and commits all parties to work towards the ultimate goal of ending homelessness in Australia.

### ***Building a Strong Research Base to Underlie the Homelessness Response***

- Just over two-fifths of respondents (41.5% or 39 people) indicated that they believed building a strong research base to underlie the homelessness response was very important
- Just over half (54.3% or 51 people) felt it was important
- 3 respondents (3.2%) felt it was not important \
- 1 respondent was unsure.

The Australian Government has committed to developing a national homelessness research strategy to support the White Paper which it states will build on existing research and data collection efforts. I support the development of a national research strategy as long as the research undertaken and data collected are used to measure progress towards White Paper targets and/or to modify initiatives, programs and strategies aimed at improving outcomes for people experiencing homelessness. It would seem that too often data is collected for the sake of collecting data or subjecting services to reporting requirements for the sake of it.

Much of that data is collected and reported on but not put to effective use, especially when it indicates that there is a need for the provision of increased funding and resources to over-stretched providers or the abandonment of time honoured but increasingly ineffective approaches and programs.

As a sector we need to get on the front foot and decide for ourselves the kind of national research strategy we believe will be necessary to facilitate the development of a service delivery system that maximises positive opportunities and generates the best possible outcomes for both clients and the workers who support them. This will include developing appropriate information sharing protocols and common access, assessment and referral procedures for services providing assistance to similar target groups and common clients.

### ***Developing a Common Definition of Homelessness***

- Less than a quarter (24.5% or 23 people) felt that developing a common definition of homelessness was very important
- Just over three-fifths (60.6% or 57 people) felt it was important.
- 11.7% of respondents (11 people) felt developing a common definition of homelessness was not important, the highest response rate for that category of any of the 13 questions asked
- 3 respondents were unsure.

As members are no doubt aware there are two definitions of homelessness commonly referred to in literature and policy documents on the subject in Australia. One is the so-called *cultural definition* used by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) to distinguish

between primary homelessness ('rough sleeping'), secondary homelessness (SAAP/couch surfing) and tertiary homelessness (insecure tenure, boarding houses, caravan parks, etc). The other commonly cited definition pertains to the *standard of accommodation* and is contained in the *Supported Accommodation Assistance Act 1994*. Neither of these serves Indigenous Australians well. How would we word a common definition of homelessness? Who is best served by developing a common definition of homelessness? In doing so, whose definitions of homelessness will be excluded?

There are no doubt many ways in which we can define homelessness and my concern with any moves by Government to develop a so called *common definition* of homelessness is that it will inevitably exclude some groups. For example, how would the concept of 'spiritual homelessness' as experienced by many Australians who identify as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islanders fit into a *common definition*?

### ***Developing Strong National Accreditation and Service Standards***

The proposal briefly touched on in the White Paper is to develop *National Service Charters* for mainstream services and accreditation for funded specialist homelessness services. The *national service standards and accreditation system* referred to in the White Paper includes a vague commitment to quality improvement that will contribute to: Place clients at the centre of the response in both the mainstream and homelessness service settings, a greater ability to attract and retain a highly trained, multi-skilled and well-educated workforce, career paths for the workforce with skills and expertise that are easily transferable within the sector, continuous service improvement to ensure that clients receive a service offer focussing on achieving sustainable housing and employment outcomes and stronger connections between government, business and non-government services. The White Paper states that:

*The Australian Government and state and territory governments will work with homelessness services and people who are homeless to develop national homelessness service standards and a system for accrediting services focused on improving quality.*

- Less than a quarter of respondents (22.9% or 22 people) regarded the proposal to develop agreed national accreditation and service standards as very important.
- Just under two-thirds (65.6% or 63 respondents) felt this was important
- 1 in 12 (8.3% or 8 respondents) felt it was not important
- 3 respondents (3.1%) were unsure.

The White Paper cites accreditation systems used in aged care and child care as potential examples that could be drawn from in seeking to develop accreditation and national service standards for specialist homelessness services. Homelessness Australia will be seeking a commitment from both the Australian and state and territory governments that the sector will be fully involved in any process aimed at developing an accreditation process and national service standards.

#### **4.) ISSUES FACING YOUR SERVICES & POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS**

The third component of the survey focused on the issues facing your service and what you would do to solve the issue/s if you were in charge of developing policy for the government.

There was some variation in terms of issues raised and this was largely due to two variables, the locality of the service and the client group you serve. These will be dealt with in section 5. Section four presents a summary of the information received from the 86 respondents to the question:

*In your opinion, what is the most important issue facing your service in particular?*

I have drawn out the following key issues of most concern to service providers at the present time.

##### ***1.) A lack of exit points and medium and long term housing options for clients***

Two thirds of respondents (57/86) listed a lack of exit points and insufficient accommodation/housing options for clients as the biggest issue facing their service. For Crisis Accommodation providers this meant either exiting clients into homelessness or back into unsafe living situations.

The lack of exit points and available accommodation options was common to urban, suburban, regional, rural and remote services. It was the overwhelming issue facing services for women and children escaping domestic violence, crisis accommodation providers and youth. A lack of transitional accommodation while clients wait to be allocated public housing was another commonly cited issue facing services.

#### **PROPOSED SOLUTIONS:**

- Build more public housing
- Increase the stock of social housing
- Stop selling off public housing
- Transfer public housing to community organisations
- Initiate partnerships between government and the community sector to increase social housing stock
- Funding for partnerships between the Housing Industry Association, homelessness services and government to build more properties at low cost.
- Build more flats/units, this would get around the problem of a lack of available land
- Release more land for building
- One off funding for the purchase of properties
- Allocate more properties with wraparound support packages attached
- Build stronger, culturally appropriate houses for our people

##### ***2.) A Lack of Funding and Resources***

The second most often cited issue facing services was having insufficient resources to cope with demand that many respondents indicated was increasing. 41% of respondents (35 people) indicated that their service lacked the funding and resources to meet

demand, forcing them to turn away clients. Around 50% of respondents (43 people) stated that insufficient funding and resources prevented them from providing the level of service or intensity of support they would like to or that they believed was necessary for their clients.

### **PROPOSED SOLUTIONS:**

- Increase funding
- Allocate more resources
- Provide funding over a 3 or 5 year cycle to provide more surety
- Develop more flexible funding models and service agreements
- Stop flashing money around on projects like Common Ground and Foyer
- Provide more support dollars as a priority, we are being asked to support increasing numbers of very complex clients but have no extra funding to do it
- Allocate more workers to the homelessness service system instead of Centrelink. 90 Community Engagement Workers (10 per state) will not be enough if you look at the role they're being asked to do. Don't take this job from us, WE DO A GOOD JOB!
- Greater flexibility in service agreements to allow for greater resource allocation when the intensity of client needs demands it. I.E. Support for as long as is necessary at the level of intensity necessary.
- An understanding of the value of homeless services is needed. The Federal Government has stated it costs over \$1000 a day to house a homeless person in a hospital bed yet they continue to see funds they spend on homeless services as a cost. Needs to be seen as an investment to save millions of dollars and free up hospital beds.
- Independent organisation needs to be funded to do a cost-benefit-analysis to document the cost of homelessness to the community then funding homeless services will be seen as an investment not a cost.

### ***3.) Workforce Issues- Recruitment, Retention, Pay and Conditions***

Difficulties recruiting and retaining staff due to comparatively low levels of remuneration, stressful working conditions and an acknowledged lack of career opportunities were the third most pressing set of issues facing members who responded to the survey.

Just over a quarter of respondents (22 people) cited difficulties with recruiting and retaining skilled staff and high staff turnover as major problems affecting their ability to provide the level of service they felt was necessary and/or that their clients deserved. Low remuneration and lack of career opportunities were cited as major issues by just over a fifth of respondents (20 people) as the main reasons for this.

### **PROPOSED SOLUTIONS**

- Pay parity with the public service for equivalent work
- Re-structuring SACS classification bands across states and territories
- Increased pay and "realistic" caseloads
- Work out a realistic means of funding homeless services that includes opportunities for annual pay increases.
- Improve wages and conditions of staff in homelessness services.

- Increase wages nationally via an agreed (consultation with current workers) national standard award. Get rid of state SACS awards (so that it doesn't matter if you're gov't or non-gov't) so that professionally qualified persons stay and are recruited to the sector.

#### ***4.) A Moment of Clarity? Uncertainty in the face of change***

Around 10% of respondents (8 people) listed uncertainty about future legislative and funding arrangements as a major issue affecting their service. This is not surprising given the significant changes in policy direction being embarked upon at the present time. Services previously funded under the SAAP Bi-lateral agreements will now be funded under the National Partnership on Homelessness (NP). The future of the Crisis Accommodation Program (CAP) also requires clarification from government.

#### **PROPOSED SOLUTIONS:**

- Develop legislation ASAP
- Need to see details of implementation plans.
- Decide on exact strategies that will be implemented and how and when this will occur and that way we can prepare for and respond to changes which in turn will not impact negatively on service delivery.

#### ***5.) Drowning in Paperwork: The Administrative and Reporting Burden***

A handful of respondents (5 people) listed the burden of administration and reporting tasks as a major issue for their service. Experience tells me this issue is far more widespread than this and Homelessness Australia can certainly advocate that any new data collection and research strategies adopted at a national level aim to reduce rather than increase reporting requirements.

#### **PROPOSED SOLUTIONS:**

- Simplify reporting requirements. Trust us to do our job well
- Go back to basic, simple, across the board structure
- Provide funding for admin worker(s)

### **5.) LOCALITY & SECTOR SPECIFIC ISSUES**

#### ***Urban and Suburban Services***

The biggest issues facing services based in inner-city and suburban localities were:

- Extreme difficulty securing referrals to specialist services such as; mental health and specialist health professionals
- The lack of transitional accommodation upon exit from services
- The lack of appropriate housing stock

### ***Regional, Rural and Remote Services***

The key issues facing regional, rural and remote services were:

- Lack of crisis accommodation forcing services to exit people into either rough sleeping or back to unsafe situations
- Extreme lack of housing for people on income support
- Lack of services to refer clients with needs unable to be met by the service

### ***Women***

The biggest issues facing providers of services to women were:

- Lack of exit points from crisis accommodation. Almost no affordable medium and long term housing options for women seeking to escape domestic violence
- Lack of crisis/emergency accommodation for women seeking to escape domestic/family violence in rural and remote areas forcing them to return to acutely unsafe living situations
- A pressing need for legislative change to enforce ouster orders and engage law enforcement and child protection services in helping to make it safe for women and children to remain in their homes
- Acute shortage of accommodation for single mothers, particularly young single mothers.

### ***Youth***

The major issues identified by providers of youth services were:

- An acute shortage of transitional and medium term accommodation that is suitable for young people who require support to help them make the transition to independent living
- Acute shortage of crisis accommodation. Beds need to be accessible 24/7
- The lack of a whole of government approach leading to blame shifting
- Inability to provide sufficiently intensive support for increasingly complex clientele, particularly young people with significant mental health and psychological issues. Waiting lists are too long!
- In rural and remote localities there are almost no complimentary mainstream services for young people. These are up to 300km away
- We are increasingly being asked to accept clients below school leaving age. This is not in our mandate!

### ***Men***

The key issues facing providers of services to men were:

- Lack of sustainable exit options forcing services to place clients' safety at risk by exiting them into unsafe situations, most often 'rough sleeping'.
- Lack of support funding for male clients with increasingly complex needs
- Increased demand on pre-homeless services due to the current economic downturn
- An alarming lack of responses for single adult men. Just because SAAP responds to 50% of homeless families, does not mean that 50% of the homeless population are families!
- No funding for education, employment or training we need to find this ourselves

### ***Families***

- Lack of suitable accommodation either crisis, medium or long term