LIVING ON THE STREET: RETHINKING OUR RESPONSE TO HOMELESSNESS

Report on the results of a systems thinking event

Caroline Leblanc, Kristelle Alunni-Menichini, Christine Loignon, Karine Bertrand

Table of contents

List of collaborators

Caroline Leblanc, *T.S., M.S.W.*

Doctoral student, Department of Community Health Sciences, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Université de Sherbrooke

Kristelle Alunni-Menichini, *Ph. D.*

Postdoctoral Fellow, Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine, McGill University and Douglas Mental Health University Institute Research Centre

Christine Loignon, *Ph. D.*

Full Professor, Department of Family and Emergency Medicine, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Université de Sherbrooke

Karine Bertrand, *Ph. D.*

Full Professor, Department of Community Health Sciences, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Université de Sherbrooke

This document was produced in collaboration with **David King-Ruel,** facilitator at the organization Matière Brute.

Matière Brute specializes in facilitating collective intelligence processes and systemic strategic support, two approaches that enable us to understand the systemic structures at work, to take responsibility for our individual and collective actions, and to empower each other to bring about concerted, effective and profound change. Since 2014, Matière Brute has been supporting organizations and communities as they make their way through the cultural and structural transformations required to keep pace with the complex evolution of our society, with the central mission of contributing to the most important transformation of our time, namely the socio-ecological transition.

It is important to emphasize that the content of this report is based on the words of those present at the event, and is not necessarily endorsed by all the event's partners and organizers. The aim was to highlight the main points that emerged from the discussions at the event, while respecting the words of participants to the greatest possible extent.

Acknowledgements

King, ***Canadian Tire***, ***Le Journal de rue Sherbrooke***, ***L'itinéraire***, ***TOMS***, ***L'injecteur*** and ***Le reflet de société***.

Finally, we would like to thank everyone who joined us for the event. Thanks to all of you, we were able to hold this event, but above all it was a success in terms of intersecting perspectives and results. Your presence and contribution to the event were truly important, and we're grateful to have shared this dialogue with you.

Summary

In spite of our best efforts, homelessness is on the rise in our society. The many faces of homelessness are becoming increasingly more diverse, and many people are unable to meet their basic needs. It is therefore inconceivable to maintain the status quo when people are denied their rights, such as the right to housing, safety, dignity and life. This is why we believe it is essential to rethink our overall response to homelessness, and in particular our response to those living on the street.

The FACE team, made up of Caroline Leblanc, a doctoral candidate in community health, and people who live or have lived through homelessness, under the academic direction of Professors Christine Loignon and Karine Bertrand of the Université de Sherbrooke, conducted a research project on non-utilization of shelter facilities in Montreal. The result of the event "Living in the street: Rethinking our response to homelessness," which was set up to open up a dialogue by taking a systemic view of encampments in Quebec, and to give a voice to people living on the streets, as many had expressed they were not being heard or considered. FACE stands for Forces, Actions, Changes et Equity.

Numerous collaborators from the worlds of politics, homelessness, addiction, research and the community all contributed to the success of this event (see the list of collaborators). Among these collaborators, we must highlight the considerable contribution made by people with lived experience of homelessness, the Office of the Federal Housing Advocate, the Réseau d'aide aux personnes seules et itinérantes de Montréal (RAPSIM), the Association des intervenants en dépendance du Québec (AIDQ), Spectre de rue, the Association pour la promotion de la santé des personnes utilisatrices de drogues (AQPSUD) and Wapikoni in its deployment and spin-offs.

The purpose of this document is to present the results of this systems thinking event. In summary, the results highlight a number of issues: a lack of access to affordable and adequate housing; a complex, bureaucratic and poorly-suited system; an inadequate supply of homelessness services; a lack of humane and suitable interventions; and the presence of political issues, such as a dehumanizing perception of people living on the street, repressive actions that undermine their capabilities, a lack of accountability on the part of governments and inadequate funding that hinder a response focused on the rights of people living on the street. Finally, the results also address courses of action that could bring about positive changes in the lives of people living on the street, such as promoting humanistic approaches, improving homelessness services and access to justice to ensure that their fundamental rights are respected.

Main points

The lack of resources in the current overall response to homelessness is partly offset by the resilience and resourcefulness of those living in the street. It is therefore important to recognize and value their strengths, abilities and autonomy in the actions that are implemented.

The current structure of the overall response to homelessness is vast, complex, bureaucratic and often poorly-suited for and violent towards people living on the street.

Current shelter facilities are not seen as a possible solution for those living on the street, due to the exclusionary measures they generate.

The dehumanizing perception and repressive actions towards people living on the street affect their rights and undermine their capacity to live and exist in this context, namely life on the street.

People living on the street need stability, and forced dismantling of encampments is detrimental to their living conditions and health (e.g., stress, exhaustion, trauma).

The lack of appropriate human support has a major impact on the lives of people living on the street, making them more reluctant to use current homelessness services.

Governments' lack of responsibility for homelessness issues is becoming an obstacle to respecting the fundamental rights of people living on the street.

Inadequate and project-based funding for community organizations is the source of many of the challenges in providing homelessness services, which in turn weakens the community.

There is not just one valid approach to meeting the needs of people living on the street, but several.

Improving homelessness structures can also mean investing in existing resources and developing new ones, opting for approaches that go beyond the walls to meet the needs of people living on the street.

1. Background

According to data from FACE's research into the reality of people living on the street, there are several reasons why people occupy and depend on public and private space to live. First and foremost, the housing crisis has become a central issue in homelessness, as people are unable to find adequate housing in which to live. Then, once on the street, these people are unable to find a shelter facility that suits their life (e.g., pets, relationships, nightlife) and their needs (e.g., autonomy, substance consumption, state of mental and physical health), which means they cannot consider these facilities as a possible alternative and a solution for housing. As a result of the housing crisis and the many exclusionary measures generated by shelter facilities, more and more people are finding themselves living on the streets in various forms.

People living on the street are those who reside alone or in groups in encampment of varying sizes or who use facilities such as vehicles, a bus shelters, a hot-air vent, a building entrances, or shelter wherever they can without a source of protection (e.g. park benches). These are people who live in a place on a temporary or permanent basis, with or without protection from the elements (e.g. using a tent, sleeping bag, tarp, etc.), on private or public buildings or land.

At present, the situation of people living on the street raises many questions, not only in Quebec's major cities, but also in the regions, as they face growing challenges that affect their well-being. The challenges faced by people living on the street include the loss of their homes through forced dismantling of encampments and the dispossession of their things, which leads to stress, exhaustion and trauma, as well as a loss of bearings and community support, as they are constantly on the move. This reality reduces their ability to adapt and their resilience.

In reality, the overall response is failing to prevent homelessness, let alone support those who depend on the street for survival. The lack of responsibility shown by various governments towards these people makes it difficult to provide a real response to their basic needs. It is utopian, even inconceivable, to believe that community organizations alone can solve the situation. Existing community organizations are underfunded, inadequate and stretched to the limit in terms of providing a comprehensive response to the needs of people living on the street. Consequently, the commitment of political bodies is not sufficient to get things moving and improve our practices in order to bring about real change in dealing with homelessness.

Faced with these growing challenges, we are at a turning point where our society must review our collective actions to ensure the well-being of people who live on the street, by

including them in discussions, actions and changes that will ensure respect for their fundamental rights, such as the right to housing, safety, dignity and life.

This report is therefore a record of the results of the discussions that took place at the systems thinking event "Living on the street: Rethinking our response to homelessness. The aim of this event was to collectively rethink the way in which systems create precarious living and health conditions for people living on the street, by reducing their capacity to live and exist on the street, and thus highlight sustainable and realistic drivers for improving structures to deal with homelessness, by giving them a central place.

2. A systems thinking event to rethink the response to homelessness

2.1. Relevance of a systems thinking event

A systems thinking event aims to enable the stakeholders within a system to acknowledge their interconnectedness, better understand the effect of their action or inaction, more clearly identify their power to influence the situation, and target the effective drivers of change they can collectively bring to bear (Garavito-Bermúdez et al., 2014; Hmelo et al., 2000).

In systems thinking, our current issues are actually problems caused by the solutions we put in place. In fact, all too often, stakeholders invest time, resources and goodwill to overcome the challenges of homelessness without necessarily having a real and effective impact. Often, we tend to adopt an approach focusing on "solutions" without first having a thorough understanding of the situation. In this case, it may appear that the solutions being adopted are not having the desired impact, and that this is creating other, unanticipated issues. These "symptomatic" solutions end up having negative impacts that weaken us collectively in the long term, in addition to being costly in terms of resources, morale and human costs. Faced with this reality, some people may even take counterproductive approaches, for example preferring to work alone and in isolation, constantly blaming others, victimizing themselves in the system and failing to recognize their own power to act. It can also lead stakeholders to believe that certain issues are unresolvable or "too complex", which contributes to their increasing disengagement. Against this backdrop, what can we do to bring about a profound and lasting transformation of our systems?

In reality, we need to give ourselves the capacity as a society to face up to complex issues, enabling us to become aware of multiple realities and thus give ourselves the ability to see and transform our systems. This is what systems thinking is all about. However, thinking from a systems perspective requires us to make a change in the way we view our actions. This requires us to pay attention to both relationships and resources, in qualitative and quantitative terms, in the short and long term. Finally, it requires us to step out of our individual vision as stakeholders and embrace a "systemic" vision in which we have a particular role to play.

In this case, faced with the growing need to act on complex situations such as homelessness, it is vital to exercise our ability to drive effective, lasting change. The systemic approach therefore enables us not only to adopt a new perspective in which we can regain our capacity for action, but also to achieve a profound change in our vision of the world, our individual and collective responsibility, and the transformative power of acting together.

That said, a change of perspective requires us to make a few preliminary assumptions:

- We are all stakeholders in a system that is structured to generate and perpetuate the situation and the inequalities that arise from it;
- We are all, in spite of ourselves, participants in the inequalities, particularly through the structure of our actions, our thoughts, our values, our practices, our relationships and through the beliefs we hold to be "true";
- To act effectively and sustainably, goodwill is not enough, and a change of approach is needed, namely from a mechanical vision of our challenges to a systemic one, to act at the source of inequalities.
- It is only by adopting an attitude of humility that we can truly reflect as a system, with openness, curiosity, courage and conviction, because a system that does not question itself thoroughly is condemned to making only incidental changes aimed at safeguarding comfort rather than upsetting systems and achieving real change to reduce the inequalities in our system.

2.2. Objective of the systems thinking event

"Living on the street: Rethinking our response to homelessness" is a systemic thinking event that aims to open up a conversation with people who live or have lived on the street, and with stakeholders from a variety of backgrounds, adopting a systemic point of view on a societal issue such as the encampments in Quebec. Secondly, it aimed to reflect upon the results of the FACE research undertaken from Caroline Leblanc's thesis: "Critical ethnographic research to address the health needs of people living on the streets: A look at the structural issues that result in the non-use of shelter resources in the winter."

To further investigate the situation faced by people living on the street, we called on a team of systems thinking experts, "Matière brute", to guide us and give us a more holistic understanding of this reality. To do this, several aspects were taken into consideration in planning the event, including:

- bringing together the broad range of system stakeholders, regardless of their scale, status, power of influence or other factors;
- fostering an atmosphere that is conducive to curiosity, listening, exchange, non-judgment, empowerment and courage;
- taking stock of the current situation as objectively as possible, from different points of view;
- becoming aware of how we are currently structured as a community in order to understand how we ourselves create and feed the situation;

11

- gaining a deeper understanding of how our interests, limitations and perceptions restrict our ability to bring about profound system transformation and reduce the inequalities experienced by people living on the streets;
- identifying and targeting the transformative drivers of action that we can, individually and collectively, use to transform the system that creates these inequalities, and commit to carrying out or accelerating this transformation.

To take these elements into account, the event was designed to be inclusive, to create a safe space where everyone could have their say and reflect on our overall response to homelessness, while also identifying the limits of each stakeholder's role and finding sustainable and realistic drivers of transformation to improve the living and health conditions of people living on the street. As a result, we developed an event that encouraged the involvement of those directly concerned, i.e. those who live on the street or have done so in the past, in order to compare their perspectives with those of other stakeholders, such as those from the community, political (municipal, provincial and federal), academia, health and social services and emergency services sectors.

2.3. Organization of the systems thinking event

This event was organized by the FACE research team, led by people who live or have lived on the street, including Caroline Leblanc, a doctoral candidate in community health at the Université de Sherbrooke, several students (n = 6) from four Quebec universities, as well as with the collaboration of the Association des intervenants en dépendance du Québec (AIDQ), the Association pour la promotion de la santé des personnes utilisatrices de drogues (AQPSUD), the Réseau d'aide aux personnes seules et itinérantes de Montréal (RAPSIM), Spectre de rue and Wapikoni. Numerous collaborators from the world of politics, homelessness, addiction and research, as well as many contributions from the community, also contributed to the event's success, in terms of organization, recruitment and spin-offs (see List of collaborators).

It is important to point out that this event was co-constructed to ensure that the knowledge gained from the homeless experience was significant throughout the organization, from planning to publication of the results of the discussions. To achieve this, a participatory process was set up with people who live or have lived on the street, so that they could have a say and influence in the organization and thus develop an event that was suitable and inclusive so that they could have a positive experience during the discussions. For the event organizers, their presence was important at all levels of the event, and it was crucial that their voice was at the forefront. The whole process is described in a second report, entitled "Report on the engagement of people with experiential knowledge of homelessness in the context of an event".

2.4. Sequence of the systems thinking event

The one-day event took place on February 23, 2023, at the Bibliothèque nationale des Archives, Montreal, Quebec. The day began with an acknowledgement of the land we were on, to recognize that Indigenous nations have never ceded their territorial rights, including

12

the Kanien'kehá:ka (Mohawk) nation. It continued with a presentation on the non-utilization of shelter facilities, information derived from FACE research findings, given by Caroline Leblanc, PhD candidate in community health at the Faculté de médecine et des sciences de la santé de l'Université de Sherbrooke. The purpose of this presentation was not only to inform the day's discussions, but also to interpret the results obtained in the course of this research. Those attending the event were then invited to form small groups of 8 on average, and to take part in large-group discussions at various times during the day. A total of six tables were set up, bringing together stakeholders from different homelessness sectors, including people who have lived or are living on the streets. For the organizers, it was important to ensure that the knowledge gained from homelessness was adequately represented at each table: two to three people with such experience were present at each table.

During the discussions, questions were oriented to understand systemic issues: 1) Does it match your vision of reality and if so, how? ; 2) In spite of our efforts, why are we still unable to resolve the encampment situation? 3) What would we like to do, what is stopping us from doing it, and what is already working or, on the contrary, not working? 4) What needs to change and what do we need to let go of so that we can all succeed? and 5) What concrete actions are in line with our desired changes?

To end the event on a unifying note, a closing circle was set up at the end of the activity: everyone present was invited to sit in a large circle and express in a few words their thoughts on the event and what they were leaving with (see Appendix 2).

2.5. People attending the systems thinking event

The stakeholders present at the systems thinking event had been invited on the basis of their in-depth knowledge of the realities experienced by people living on the street. Thirty-five people from different backgrounds and bodies were personally invited to create a friendly environment and encourage more in-depth discussions (see Table 1). Several people were unable to attend the event, either because they had health issues, were unavailable, or just didn't have the capacity to be present for an entire day without impacting the services offered to people experiencing homelessness. Others did not agree to take part, either because they might have political issues related to their mandate, or because they didn't see the relevance despite their close link with the issues faced by people living on the street.

Tableau 1: People attending the systems thinking event "Living on the streets: rethinking the response to homelessness"

People who have experienced homelessness	6	Grouping in situation of homelessness	3
People who live on the street	5	Legal	1
Street work	3	Public safety	3
Shelter facilities	3	Municipal	2
Day centre	2	Government	3
Healthcare field	2	University	2

It should be noted that the people with experience of homelessness who attended the event came from a variety of backgrounds: some had links with the FACE research project, while others with community organizations or associations.

Finally, it's important to point out that some of the people who were invited to take part in the event in a professional capacity also had experience of homelessness in their past. Although they were not present from the angle of their personal experience of homelessness, this still helped to influence and provide context for certain remarks during the discussions.

3. Overview of the current situation: Part 1 of the event results

The in-depth, holistic discussions that emerged from the systems thinking event brought together the perspectives of different homelessness stakeholders and highlighted the challenges of a comprehensive response to homelessness. However, there was general agreement at the event that the current shortcomings in the overall response to homelessness are partly made up for by the resilience and resourcefulness of people living on the street who survive and exist in a context where the social safety net is crumbling. This reminds us of the importance of recognizing and valuing not only their strengths and abilities, but also their autonomy of action, in spite of a range of factors that make the conditions in which they have to live every day extremely difficult.

Therefore, in order to further our understanding of the reality experienced by people living on the street, the next sections will present the results of the exchanges that took place within the various discussion tables of the systemic thinking event. The first section will address the issues related to the lack of adequate housing for people living on the street. The second section focuses on the challenges of a complex, bureaucratic and unsuitable system. The third section will look at issues related to intervening at the heart of homelessness. The fourth section proposes a number of improvements to homelessness services. The fifth and sixth sections raise the political issues that stand in the way of a human rights-based response to the needs of people living on the streets. Finally, the seventh and eighth sections will look at possible actions and access to justice.

3.1. Inaccessible housing for people living on the street

Participants at the event pointed out the difficulties involved in accessing housing. The stigma attached to their social identity, employment references, judicial or credit checks, as well as the stigma attached to their appearance and social status, become significant obstacles to accessing housing. Furthermore, access to social housing is a lengthy and arduous process. Indeed, the complex system and cumbersome administration make access to social housing difficult, particularly for people experiencing homelessness, including those living on the street. According to what they was shared, the system suffers from long

14

delays and administrative barriers that reduce and slow down access to housing. The waiting lists are endless, and the rules and procedures are not only often deemed poorly-suited to their reality, but also difficult to understand, even for the social workers [*intervenant.es*]. Furthermore, social housing has discriminatory criteria (e.g., having a fixed address, no debts with the Société d'habitation du Québec in the last 5 years, etc.) and requires a lot of paperwork, which often makes access impossible.

It is important to point out that the shortage of social housing is steadily worsening. In reality, housing limitations are leading many people to live on the streets for the first time, due to a number of factors, including the crisis in social, affordable, accessible and safe housing, as well as gentrification and "renovictions". It was also felt by some of those present at the event that access to housing is becoming more difficult for people experiencing homelessness, as refugees and new arrivals often benefit from priority access. This perception demonstrates that governments are not investing in homelessness prevention, that they are neglecting their responsibilities to provide an urgent social housing response, and that they are not being fair in adopting measures to meet the needs of all.

It was emphasized during the discussions that calling on the private sector to provide social, affordable, accessible and safe housing does not appear to be an effective or viable solution. In addition to creating a dependency on the private sector, some real estate investors have used their partnerships with non-profit organizations to promote themselves, without actually delivering on their promises to build adequate housing for people at risk of living in precarious conditions and poverty. It was also pointed out at the event that when people are able to access housing through social programs, it is not uncommon for them to find themselves far from their communities and isolated from the facilities they previously used to meet their basic needs. This situation has led to a displacement of the homeless population to neighbourhoods that do not have the capacity to accommodate them, which can create significant tensions with other residents in the area.

It was therefore suggested that government action be taken to improve access to social, affordable, accessible and safe housing, in order to respect the rights of all. It was also suggested that greater collaboration be developed between organizations to accelerate the construction of diversified social real estate projects adapted to the needs of people who find themselves living on the street. It was also pointed out that it would be essential to set up a rental register in order to curb inflation in housing costs, and to facilitate access to social housing, for example, by allowing couples to have access and by not imposing psychosocial monitoring as a condition of access. According to those present at the event, it was also stated that we need to move away from the view that housing is the only solution, and that housing is the only goal that can meet the needs of people living on the streets. In this sense, all those present at the event agreed that new projects are needed that focus on approaches that do not create exclusion and that think outside the box (e.g., mini-homes, community parking for people living in their cars).

3.2. A complex, bureaucratic system poorly suited to people living on the street

15

Today, a wide range of actions are deployed to support people experiencing homelessness, but they are not adapted to the real needs of those people, especially the ones living on the street. At the event, it was pointed out that the current structure of the response to homelessness is vast, complex, bureaucratic and often violent towards people living on the street. According to participants, this complexity creates major obstacles to accessing the care and resources they need for their health. Many of them therefore have difficulty navigating the system, and are all too often confronted with bad experiences (e.g., stigmatization and discrimination) that result in a significant loss of trust in the facilities and professionals who work there.

It was emphasized during the discussions that the division of services and the lack of coordination and collaboration between the various organizations in the system make the whole situation more complex. Indeed, this becomes an obstacle to achieving the targeted objectives of making care and health equitable for all. This in turn slows down the implementation of measures that could have a real impact on the living and health conditions of people living on the street. It was also pointed out that the initiatives put in place to support people experiencing homelessness, including those living on the street, are lacking in attentiveness, flexibility and adaptability, and even humanity. This engenders new forms of marginality by creating exclusionary measures that reduce access to available services. Some also pointed out that they could not understand why, after investing so much money during the COVID-19 pandemic, so few new approaches and initiatives emerged and even fewer were sustained. As a result, people living on the street face a multitude of obstacles that lead, among other things, to their non-utilization of current shelter solutions, and highlight the need to rethink the supply of homelessness services.

3.2.1. Non-utilization of current shelter solutions

During the event, it was repeatedly pointed out that the strict requirements for accessing current shelter facilities often make them difficult to access, and that the services they offer are often perceived as inadequate to improve the situation of people living on the street. Although shelter facilities are a great help, it is not unusual for some people to prefer not to use them and to choose to live on the streets. In this sense, those present at the event also shared, with great transparency and emotion, their perceptions of the shelter facilities on offer. They put forward a number of reasons why they are unsuitable and do not meet the needs of people living on the street.

Firstly, shelter facilities are often at maximum capacity, especially in times of cold weather, which reduces the possibilities and choices for people experiencing homelessness. It was also pointed out that the rules governing access and operation are deemed too restrictive, such as the restrictive opening hours, long and difficult queues, the impossibility of bringing pets, and the compulsory early morning departure times. These are barriers that affect their ability to find shelter for one night that is suitable to their reality. A number of comments made during the discussions also raised the point that people living on the street would like to find a certain stability which allows them to have access to a shelter, for example by being able to stay in the same facility every day, without fear of losing their bed. However, many facilities still require people to leave around 7:00 AM without having

a place to go, since in most cases, day centres are still closed and less and less of them exist. Other resources that allow people to stay during the day require counts several times a day, preventing people from leaving for fear of losing their bed and thus their personal effects. In addition, it was also pointed out that shelter facilities are small for the number of people housed, and that those who use them often feel overcrowded. Places are often considered unsafe, unhealthy, with foul odours, insect infestations (e.g., bedbugs), and an environment where many can experience allergic reactions as well as health problems (e.g., respiratory, skin).

It was clear from what was said at the event that people who live on the street and use substances face major constraints in accessing shelter facilities. It was pointed out that most of the shelter facilities currently available require sobriety, which means that the people who use them have to hide in order to consume, and live in fear of having their consumption materials and substances seized, or of being evicted. It was also pointed out that it is difficult to have sex on the streets, and that there are few shelters that accept couples and offer an intimate environment. Those present at the event pointed out that women and trans people often feel a sense of insecurity in shelter facilities, but that men may also be inclined to experience insecurity, and that the mix of people of all genders and ages is not suitable. It was reported that people who use shelter facilities may also experience intimidation, theft and violent assaults (e.g., stabbings). In addition, it was pointed out that for First Nations and Inuit people, shelter facilities are perceived as standardized prisons and places that remind them of the traumas experienced in residential schools.

According to many people who participated at the event, shelter facilities often place people in boxes to which they do not fit. In this sense, it was said that, for many people living on the street, being placed in the care of these overly supervised structures could systematically confront them with their own shortcomings and cause them to feel like failures, particularly by not being able to meet the expectations of the facilities. It was also pointed out that people may feel more invisible when they use the current shelter system than when they are on the street and find their own resources to organize themselves. Those present at the event also pointed out that the strengths of people who use shelter facilities are never recognized in existing organizational processes. For example, shelter facilities do not allow people to self-manage their emotions and moods, because the staff on duty refuse to accept the way people choose to achieve this (e.g., allowing them to go out for air at night), and this leads to exclusion. In this sense, it was pointed out that people who resort to shelter facilities often experience violent and inappropriate exclusions when shelters fail to take their health needs into consideration which can leave them without resources in difficult conditions (e.g., in winter, being sick).

During the discussions, it was pointed out that there is no "one size fits all" model, i.e. one that is good for all people experiencing homelessness, including those living on the street. It was also pointed out that many people living on the street do not perceive the currently available shelter services as an alternative to the street. The discussions highlighted the fact that many of them have a great lack of confidence in these facilities, which are often the

17

only ones available, and that many feel that the support offered does not meet their needs in terms of intervention. That said, despite the many initiatives designed to meet the needs of people living on the street, current shelter facilities are not able to adequately support those who wish to use them, and that many people are unable to access them.

3.2.2. Rethinking the offering of homelessness services

Despite the quantity of resources currently devoted to dealing with homelessness, it is clear that they are still deemed insufficient and ineffective, especially in a context where homelessness is on the rise and needs are becoming increasingly varied. The lack of resources was considered a major issue in the fight against homelessness by those present at the event.

Indeed, it was pointed out during the discussions that people experiencing homelessness, including those living on the street, appear to lack resources that are appropriate to help them cope with their daily lives. Many spoke of unreasonable delays in accessing services, a lack of places for socializing and rest during the day, and a glaring lack of availability of social workers, resulting in poor quality of service. Lack of information and transportation was also cited as making access to homeless resources and health care more difficult.

However, participants at the event did not share the same view regarding the need for additional resources. Instead, some questioned how we use current resources. For example, it was discussed that warming centres, an alternative winter resource for people who do not use shelters, were not necessarily suitable for everyone. The current conditions of the warming centres do not make it possible to reach either the objective or the target population. On the one hand, some of those present at the event said that, warming centre have become an overflow service for shelter facilities, over the years and are now seen as waiting rooms. This is an organizational reality that stems from the initial objective of the warming centres, which was to offer a place where people who do not have recourse to shelter facilities due to the constraints and exclusions that restrict their access could come and go without constraints, have access to social workers when needed, and find a source of warmth. On the other hand, it was pointed out that access conditions and the current atmosphere of the warming centres are detrimental to their accessibility. For example, it was pointed out that there is a certain amount of confusion regarding opening hours and the temperature at which the warming centres opens their doors (measured or felt temperature), and that these facilities are often deemed unhealthy or unsafe for women, a reason why many avoid them. In this sense, it was suggested to stop thinking of services in terms of seasons, in order to perpetuate facilities with a view to offering a continuum of services to people living on the street year-round.

Finally, those present at the event repeatedly raised the point that we should think outside the box, creatively and upstream, in order to reduce barriers to access to resources and housing. However, this requires a great deal of commitment on the part of stakeholders from the homelessness sector, including governments. As a result, it was suggested that divergent opinions should be set aside in order to foster better collaboration and thus bring about new projects that truly meet the needs of people living on the streets. It was also

pointed out that a change is needed in the way we see the overall response to homelessness, including our interventions, towards people living on the street. It was pointed out that these paradigm shifts would enable a better response to their needs and the deployment of support facilities adapted to their reality and which promote their safety.

3.3. Intervention at the heart of homelessness issues

The current intervention to deal with homelessness was discussed as a major issue that reduces the quality of services, but above all the living and health conditions of people living on the street. Event participants pointed to the lack of humane support as an obstacle to a comprehensive response to homelessness that is adapted to the needs of street people, including access to compassionate interventions, and a range of approaches to achieve this.

3.3.1 Lack of appropriate humane support

The facilities in place suffer from a lack of staff, a lack of time to respond to the needs of people living on the street, as well as a lack of expertise in homelessness. For example, the traumas that many people living on the street have experienced in the course of their lives are often too great for the capacity and skills of the social workers available. The same applies to crisis management. It was suggested that people living on the street may be afraid to talk about their mental health issues, and may not have the space to express their anger and frustrations. This can lead them to explode and adopt behaviours that result in exclusion from homeless facilities. Discussions also highlighted the fact that social workers do not have enough knowledge and tools to defuse crises, and that support is not systematic and equitable when they turn to a homelessness resource.

One hypothesis put forward at the event to explain this lack of expertise is that the hiring process for social workers is too diploma-oriented, even though this is not always the skill needed to work effectively with people living on the street. Furthermore, a number of people felt that social workers lacked the life experience and understanding of homelessness needed to meet real intervention needs. This is in addition to the lack of transparency, the many prejudices, false beliefs, racism, intolerance, contempt and violence experienced by people living on the street in the context of their interactions with health, social services and public safety institutions, as reported by all those present at the event. Some of them therefore stressed the importance of social workers acquiring more knowledge about the reality of people who live on the street and becoming aware of their own judgements, in order to reduce their intolerance and contempt towards them.

Finally, despite some people's desire to implement changes to improve homelessness services, it was pointed out that this can take an extremely long time, especially within large organizations, such as the Centres intégrés universitaires de santé et de services sociaux (CIUSSS), where internal culture and bureaucratic systems are entrenched. As a result, archaic and inappropriate practices are perpetuated over the years. As a result, the support offered is not holistic and does not reach the people who live on the street, making it difficult to meet their needs. As with the social workers, some participants felt that institutions need to realize that their culture, practices and policies can create institutional

19

violence against people living on the street, and that concrete, sustainable action is needed to counter it.

3.3.2. The need for caring interventions that respect people's needs

During discussions at the event, it was strongly argued that interventions should be more respectful of the pace of the person living on the street, as it is ineffective to force someone to move too fast. It was pointed out that not going at their own pace would systematically push them into failure situations, making them even more vulnerable. It is important to understand that not everyone has the ability or condition to identify their needs and accept support. It is also important to bear in mind that access to homelessness services is a complex and time-consuming process. People living on the street do not always have the knowledge to navigate the system or the ability to apply for it, as they face a complex administrative process and an almost endless waiting list. That is why it is important not to close the door and to continue supporting them, even when they are not able to identify their needs, cannot follow up properly or refuse services.

In this sense, event participants wanted to remind us that, in addition to the systems put in place for the overall response to homelessness, it is the human beings who work in the system and with whom people living on the street interact that make a difference. It is through their humanity that we can positively influence the situation and contribute to the well-being of people living on the street. Building trust, empathy, open-mindedness, transparency and flexibility makes all the difference in their interventions. To do this, it is vital to nurture connections with people living on the street and maintain them over time, respecting their rhythm as described above, but also accompanying them according to their wishes and needs. A stable relationship is a prerequisite for quality support.

Beyond technocratic solutions, supporting this humanity on the ground is what should guide everything. To this end, it was stressed that the needs of the people living on the street should serve as a guiding principle. It was suggested that making empty promises, for example regarding housing or simply helping them but not succeeding, can affect their trust in the authorities. It was also stated out that we must stop believing that we know the needs of people living on the street better than they do. In this sense, it was pointed out that we need to act more with kindness, taking the time to take an interest in them and putting in place personalized interventions adapted to each situation. For example, it is important to put in place facilities to support people living on the street so that they can maintain their relationship with their pet, as this can be a significant support in their lives. This can be achieved, for example, by making the environment of the facilities suitable for animals, as well as by providing veterinary care and pet-sitting resources to free them up to do paperwork, or in the event of an emergency (e.g., incarceration, hospitalization). `

Finally, in order to achieve a comprehensive response to homelessness that is adapted and personalized, we must not only be flexible in our interventions to meet the real needs of people living on the street, but we must also ensure that we develop resources with clinical support so that social workers can acquire better knowledge and skills in how to deal with homelessness. Above all, we need to reduce the administrative issues that create major

barriers to truly supporting people living on the street and promote practices that ensure the safety of all facilities.

3.3.3. The need for a diversity of humane and adapted approaches

As mentioned above, the overall response to homelessness is often perceived as bureaucratic, whereas the strength of successful interventions lies in humanity and stability. So, to further humanize homelessness services, those present at the event emphasized the need to prioritize a multidisciplinary offer, but also to propose a diversity of approaches that offer flexible choices to meet the needs and desires of people living on the street. In addition, it was emphasized that it would be to our advantage for homelessness resources to be on a human scale, in order to foster and develop a support approach that places people living on the street at the centre of interventionsé This approach should include them outstanding listening and consideration, that relies more on effective individual support and that favours a humanistic approach focused on self-determination.

In this sense, it is important to focus on approaches that will enable us to reach out to people living on the street, by giving greater value to outreach work. Event participants pointed out that although this approach has gained ground over the years, the fact is that it is not sufficiently recognized and considered at fair value. In addition, it was pointed out that it is important to facilitate the role of outreach workers, which includes supporting people experiencing homelessness, including those living on the street, with an unconditional welcome and a helping relationship that adapts to their real needs so that they can achieve what they want, at their own pace. In this sense, it was proposed that outreach workers should be given more power to act and opportunities to support them. For example, it would be useful to create "fast tracks" between outreach workers and institutions. Although such links are created, it is an informal practice that needs to be formalized: all too often, the personalized links and informal agreements that are developed to meet the needs of people living on the street are precarious and disappear with staff turnover (e.g., the departure of a professional). This can have a major impact on the support offered to people living on the street.

The "by and for" approach was also seen by event participants as exceptional. In this sense, it was pointed out that allowing peer helpers [*aidant.es*] to become social workers could be an effective approach to meeting the needs of people living on the street. To this end, it was agreed that it is important to recognize the experience of peer helpers, to offer support and new knowledge to enable them to do their job, to offer pay equity and to stop using them to fill tasks that other social workers do not want to do. It was also pointed out that including more peer helpers in the various intervention teams would be an asset in forging links with people living on the street and thus better meeting their needs.

Finally, it was emphasized during the discussions that it is important to train and support people who live on the street so that they are better equipped to prevent and intervene in situations when social workers are absent (e.g. suicide training). The aim is to boost peers' potential for action in their own environment, by encouraging informal peer-to-peer intervention and enabling them to develop collective autonomy.

21

3.4. Political issues hinder a rights-based response

In discussions during the event, many of those present pointed out that the overall response to homelessness is not based on a real strategy to implement the many action plans that have been put on paper over the years. While others have pointed out that there is no real conversation between the decision-makers and the people targeted by the measures, such as those living on the street. It was therefore pointed out that it would be useful to open up more dialogues between a diverse and representative range of stakeholders, including people living on the street, since at the moment the real issues are not being addressed or even discussed.

3.4.1. Lack of accountability from political bodies

In fact, those present at the event pointed out that ministers from different levels of government are often unaware of the reality of people living on the street, and the details of the programs that can support them. It was pointed out that their responsibilities are not clearly defined when it comes to homelessness, which leads to a lack of accountability on the part of political bodies. In other words, the stakeholders "pass the buck", with the result that no one takes responsibility for implementation, and this is detrimental to our response to homelessness and to the living and health conditions of people exposed to these issues. To achieve this, it was suggested that governments at all levels should adopt better ethics and ensure that they form partnerships with well-defined roles and responsibilities, roles and responsibilities that must be known by the organizations and people who live on the street. Indeed, in order to improve the self-determination of people living on the street, it is important for them to able to better understand the drivers of each stakeholder in the homelessness issue.

Finally, it was pointed out that it is important to act with due consideration for the human costs that political inaction can have on people experiencing homelessness (e.g., deteriorating health), including those living on the street, as well as the material and economic costs that this can have on the resources that support them (e.g., health costs). To this end, it was stressed that it is important to promote concrete action, in particular by ensuring that policies are easily applicable. In this vein, it was suggested that a Minister of Precariousness, Homelessness and Social Justice should be created to promote coherence between all policies affecting people living on the street. Such a ministry would provide a more global and comprehensive view of these issues. Finally, for a comprehensive response to homelessness that respects the rights of people living on the street, it is important to apply the national homelessness policy through the creation of a law.

3.4.2. Lack of funding for homelessness resources

At the event, participants spoke of how the community is being squeezed like a lemon to meet the needs of people experiencing homelessness, including those living on the street. It was pointed out that funding by project rather than by mission has the effect of creating

unproductive competition between organizations and makes them even more precarious. Indeed, organizations that are dependent on public funding find themselves competing for the same funds, which leads them to underestimate their real financial needs when submitting their applications. This underestimation inevitably creates problems in maintaining projects, even if they are adapted and effective in meeting homelessness needs. Furthermore, it was pointed out that the lack of resources makes management difficult and cumbersome, with the result that many organizations no longer want to take on certain projects. As a result, organizations end up withdrawing or abandoning certain projects because they no longer have the capacity to maintain and manage them.

Participants also pointed out that the fragile and precarious financial structure of these organizations makes it difficult to retain qualified staff. It was pointed out that social workers often start their careers in community organizations, only to be recruited by the public health and social services system (e.g., CISSS and CIUSSS), which offers higher salaries. It was therefore proposed that project-based funding should be abolished in favour of mission-based funding, that indicators to assess program effectiveness should be adapted, that recurrent and stable funding should be provided, and that resources adapted to the needs of people living on the street need be made permanent. For example, it was pointed out that several organizations do not want to support warming centres, because funding is lacking and the burden of commitment is too great for their current resources.

3.5. A socio-political context that harms people living on the street

According to several people present at the event, the current socio-political context makes it difficult to implement actions to prevent and deal with homelessness. In this sense, it was pointed out that the dominant culture, i.e. the current status quo, can be an obstacle to change and the implementation of new actions to combat homelessness. This includes the dehumanizing perception of people who live on the streets, and the management of public space by means of repression rather than by adopting an approach that fosters true co-existence.

3.5.1. Dehumanizing perceptions of people living on the street

The current perception of people living on the street has been identified as a central issue in the response to homelessness. Some at the event said that society's response to homelessness is downright dehumanizing. For example, the discussions raised the point that society's intolerance of people living in the street, in terms of accepting and living with their presence in the public space, had significant consequences that reduced these people's ability to find a home and feel supported by the community.

In this sense, it was repeatedly pointed out that people living on the street often find themselves rejected, repressed and attacked by society's system (e.g., having their camps forcibly dismantled, their possessions taken away, being denigrated by the authorities). It was reported that they can often feel humiliated and completely devalued by the various interactions with other people in the community. It was therefore pointed out that labelling people who live on the street causes stigmatization and dehumanization, and is all too often

23

a source of abuse, which they experience repeatedly in their daily lives. In the discussions, it was pointed out that judging people who live on the street can disparage them, and the fact that we give them little importance makes them invisible. It was therefore suggested that this current lack of consideration can lead people living on the street to internalize the stigmas attached to them, making it difficult to break free and change their situation (e.g., the ignorance they face can cast doubt on their human worth and thus affect their self-esteem). As a result, participants also wanted to emphasize that the lack of social acceptability is a factor that creates significant tension and can reduce their ability to be and exist in such a context, namely life on the street.

According to what was said at the event, social acceptability can be improved by putting resources in place so that people who live on the street can keep their space clean (e.g., access to toilets and a garbage collection service close to their home), and by giving more support to those who do not have the capacity to do so. It was also pointed out that awareness raising is needed among community members to change their perceptions of people living on the street, to reduce fear of the unknown and to encourage people to live together. To achieve this, it would be useful to educate and raise awareness through immersive activities or encounters that foster a two-way dialogue and respect between people living on the street and others who share the space with them.

3.5.2. Repressive actions that affect the capabilities of people living on the street

During the discussions, it was stated that people living on the street feel abused, coerced, controlled and divided, and that the abuse and oppression they experience forces them to hide and isolate themselves further and further from public view. It was pointed out that the oppression experienced is driven not only by the political and police authorities, but also by society as a whole, whose intolerance fuels political decisions that denigrate and abuse people living on the street.

Many people at the event agreed that municipal policies and urban facilities have a direct impact on the lives and health of people living on the street. It was pointed out that it is not uncommon for urban facilities to be used as repressive actions to control the presence of people living on the street in public space (e.g., bars on benches to prevent people from lying on them, closing water fountains in parks). These repressive actions affect their ability to meet their basic needs (e.g., access to water and sanitation, stability and security).

As far as the encampments themselves are concerned, there is a divergence in dismantling practices. According to the people present at the event, some are tolerated, but others are dismantled to avoid the spread of tents and the installation of a larger encampment. It was therefore pointed out that this divergence in practices and the zero tolerance attitude in some places limit the possibilities for people living on the street to set up somewhere. The event also heard that many police officers show a lack of respect for people living on the street, and that it is not uncommon for many to throw away the personal belongings of people living on the street, including ID cards and family photos. It was also pointed out that city employees can also take part in inhumane practices by confiscating their belongings, often while they are away from their tents. It's not uncommon for people to

24

have to isolate themselves out of sight or even move to other neighborhoods to find some peace and quiet, exposing them to imminent dangers to their safety and lives (e.g. violence, overdose, etc.). What's more, these people are constantly on the move to neighborhoods that don't have the necessary capacity to accommodate them, which can increase tensions with the other residents in the neighborhood.

In this sense, it was pointed out that the repression faced by people living on the street when their camps are forcibly dismantled further weakens the trust they have in the authorities. That said, it was pointed out that the normalization of oppressive bad practices, such as the forced dismantling of encampments, the confiscation of their personal and survival items, and hostile urban planning, contribute to homelessness issues. According to several people present at the event, to deal with this repression, a moratorium on encampments would be necessary.

The question we need to ask ourselves in order to put appropriate actions in place is "why do people end up living on the streets?" with a view to identifying the real shortcomings of our current system, so that we can better understand what needs to be done to prevent this form of homelessness and support those who experience it.

4. Options for providing appropriate support: Part 2 of the event results

First of all, it was pointed out during the event that it is important, even essential, to depoliticize the debate on homelessness, to take the blame for their situation away from those living on the street, and do more to promote their rights, for example by opting for a humanist, human rights-based approach. Consequently, the next part of this report presents the various drivers that were raised during the event and that would be useful to improve the overall response to the needs of people living on the street.

4.1. A humanistic approach to people who live on the street

Participants at the event suggested it is necessary for a humanistic, human rights-based approach to be adopted. In this sense, they discussed the importance of putting in place an inclusive urban plan by encouraging the participation of people living on the street in its implementation. Discussions also raised the idea of making legal squats available and developing a pilot encampment project based on the self-management and self-determination of the people who live there, taking into account their strengths and abilities, and valuing the mutual help and support of the citizens around them. For example, encampments could be organized and secured, without controlling the lives of the people who live there. Residents could receive support in accessing resources to meet their basic needs (e.g., running water, toilets, showers, food services), measures to keep their homes clean (e.g., waste management), and tools and knowledge to reduce safety risks such as fire, theft or assault. However, it's important to mention that these should not be the only areas where shelters should be accepted, as not all people living in the street are willing or able to cohabit with other people. What's more, they may not be able to access them

because they don't feel safe there (e.g. aggressor present), or because they are forbidden to contact anyone living in the acceptable area.

It was also stated during the discussions that it is important to minimize constraints on access to shelter facilities. In this sense, it was suggested to create an environment that promotes the safety and privacy of women and trans people (e.g., private rooms and toilet), as not everyone is able to stay in close proximity to other people. It was also suggested that more humane interventions could be used to reduce exclusion. It was emphasized that shelter facilities must also innovate by ceasing to discriminate against substance use and opting for a harm reduction approach (e.g., making a 24/7 substance consumption centre accessible). The comments made during the event underlined the fact that it is all the more important, indeed crucial, to offer an environment that could accommodate more couples as well as pets, and to do so in a more adapted way. It was also pointed out that facilities should offer adapted support to help people living on the street with their various tasks, by making a computer, printer, etc. accessible.

In addition, it was pointed out during the discussions that it is important to invest more in homeless facilities that promote a high threshold of acceptability, i.e. that reduce exclusionary measures as much as possible, in order to offer more possibilities and alternative choices to people living on the street. In the same vein, it was agreed that it was important to set up secure environments, i.e. with social workers rather than security guards, since the latter's approach is not adapted to the needs of people living on the street and their life situation. In addition, the comments raised the point that it would be important to set up a street café to socialize, do laundry and wash, store personal belongings, sleep during the day and even plan services for the pets of people living on the street, so that this resource would be welcoming and supportive, and that it could be managed with an approach "by and for" the people living on the street. It would also be interesting to set up a parking lot equipped with resources such as electricity, water, internet and leisure facilities to meet the needs of people experiencing homelessness in a vehicle, such as a car or van, for example.

In this sense, it was also stressed that it can be difficult to identify the real needs of people living on the street, but that involving them in the implementation of various initiatives would help to do so. As a result, it was stressed that it was important to trust them and recognize them as experts in their own lives and needs, but above all to enable them to dream about a life project.

4.2. Improving the offering of homelessness services

An important course of action mentioned by those present at the event was to improve the homelessness services being offered. However, improving structures can mean both investing in existing resources and developing new ones, opting for out-of-the-box approaches to reach out to the people who live on the street. However, it was recognized during the discussions that for structural changes to be effective, they must be accompanied by cultural changes within organizations, but also more broadly within society. According to many of the comments we received, humanity, flexibility and deinstitutionalization are

26

essential pillars in achieving this. Moreover, individual self-determination, self-management and transparency should be at the heart of this new culture.

It was pointed out that the current system lacks humility, and that it is not uncommon for it to normalize practices that exacerbate the problem of homelessness. As a result, it was suggested by participants at the event that it is appropriate for the various stakeholders involved in setting up the structures to be open to recognizing what works well and not so well at the current facilities. Therefore, according to those present, high-level decisions must be based on a "*bottom up*" approach in order to better represent the real needs of people who use homelessness services or wish to do so.

According to the comments made at the event, we need to increase the number of suitable and accessible services for people living on the street, such as mental health care, outreach services, substance consumption centres, day work and rest during the day and also promote greater tolerance in public services such as subway stations. There is also a need for more 24/7 facilities, including on weekends, and for these facilities to be staffed by bilingual or even multilingual people, in order to adequately serve all people living on the street. The need to ensure that resources are equitably distributed across the city was also raised, as gaps in services have an impact on the quality of life and health of people living on the streets.

In fact, many have stressed the importance of offering an effective referral and communication service for the facilities that are available. In this respect, it was suggested that there should be a one-stop shop, with a single telephone number, that would put everyone in touch quickly with available facilities and thus promote greater autonomy for the people who live on the street. It was also pointed out that better communication between the various departments and homelessness services is an inspiring approach that should be promoted to encourage better access to healthcare services. Finally, although the process has been improved in recent years, there is an urgent need to improve the access procedure for obtaining health insurance cards, and to change some of the rules (e.g., lengthen the renewal period).

As a result, participants at the event also stressed that for a truly comprehensive response to homelessness, we need to map the ecosystem and plan and coordinate services by working more closely with people living on the street, in order to join forces and focus services on their real needs.

4.3. Improving access to justice: A right still violated and difficult to access

When someone is living on the street, the justice system is often absent, which means that the rights of those who live there are not always respected. In this sense, it was pointed out that people should have more information about the regulations and their rights to live in safety and dignity. To achieve this, participants at the event stressed the importance of creating associations with a strong relationship with the government, and of making stakeholders accountable. It was also pointed out that it is important to set up accessible

27

and effective complaint mechanisms so that people living on the street can assert their rights. This also includes setting up accessible and effective complaint mechanisms within the shelters themselves, to enable them to adopt a human rights-based approach to continuous improvement.

Discussions at the event also highlighted the fact that decisions are often made without access to the right information, and without any real dialogue with those affected by homelessness issues. In this sense, it was pointed out that it is crucial to put in place the necessary processes so that people living on the street can engage in the discussions that concern them, and so that they can act on the transformation of our overall response to homelessness. This is far from being a mere democratic duty: it is a central driver for putting all the experience and knowledge of these people at the service of concrete improvements in practices and political actions to improve living and health conditions.

It is therefore important, according to participants, to create spaces and set up mechanisms for inclusive dialogue where people living on the street can feel free to tell the truth without suffering consequences. Moreover, a number of people pointed out that setting up collaborative events with a plurality of stakeholders, including street people, is an approach that should be pursued. The systems thinking event, on which the results presented in this report are based, has greatly demonstrated the relevance and power of collective thinking. That said, valuing experience by engaging people with a life experience of homelessness, including those who are currently in that situation, is a strong idea that has emerged in intervention, education, governance and research circles alike.

Finally, it was pointed out that listening to and taking into account the knowledge and issues experienced by First Nations and Inuit people is crucial to meeting the needs of these communities, which, it should be remembered, are disproportionately represented in the homeless population according to the National Protocol on Homeless Encampments in Canada[1]. It was also pointed out that it is necessary to consider the particular needs of women from these communities, and that urgent action is needed to protect them from all forms of violence and discrimination, since they are exposed to disproportionate violence, in a way that is compatible with Indigenous self-determination and autonomy.

Conclusion

The resilience and resourcefulness that people living on the street demonstrate in order to live and exist in a context where the social safety net is crumbling is helping to offset the current shortcomings in homelessness services. However, the dehumanizing perception of street people and the repressive actions to which they are exposed on a daily basis undermine respect for their rights and thus undermine their capacities, such as those to live in a safe context and with human dignity. This reminds us of the importance that, despite a range of factors making their living conditions extremely difficult, it is important to

---

[1] Farha, L. and Schwan, Initiales. (2020) A National Protocol for Homeless Encampments in Canada: A Human Rights-Based Approach. UN Special Rapporteur on the Rigth to Housing, 30 April 2020. p.42

recognize and value their strengths, their abilities, but also their autonomy, an aspect that is often sidelined in the current response to homelessness.

Today, this report recognizes that the overall response to homelessness is complex, bureaucratic and often violent towards people living on the street, and that the current services and shelter facilities available are not a solution that is suitable for people living on the street. These people should be able to access adapted services - that is, services that are humane, flexible and geared towards autonomy - and be able to navigate the system to find a real response to their basic needs. To achieve this, we need to review our overall response to homelessness, to ensure that the facilities we put in place are equitable, and that the human rights of people living on the street are respected.

First and foremost, we need to take the responsibility for the situation away from people living on the street, and stop relying on the contribution of community organizations, which are squeezed like a lemon, to provide a comprehensive response to homelessness. For many years, funding for community organizations has been deficient and inadequate, in particular through access to project-based rather than mission-based grants. It makes no sense that this is still the case today. It is therefore vital to change this financing system.

It is time for governments at all levels to make a real commitment to this response to homelessness, and municipalities need to give more thought to the roles and powers they need to support people living on the street in their cities, based on their context. We also need the whole sector, including community agencies and the health and social services that make up the overall response to homelessness, to put aside their differences and work together towards a service offering that enables people living on the street to trust them and use them more easily. Also, the authorities need to be able to truly understand the reality of people living on the street, so that they can intervene appropriately. Homelessness should not be a politicized issue that depends on the wishes of politicians, but a humanistic and long-term cause.

At present, disengaged decision-makers are hindering the implementation of an appropriate response to the basic needs of people living on the street. To achieve this, we need to set up a real channel of communication between community and political bodies, so that we can make decisions that truly meet the needs of people living on the street and those of the facilities that support them. We need to create spaces where the people who live on the street can be heard and considered, so that they can really influence the decisions that affect them. We no longer have time to wait for the system to change on its own. We need to shake it up to ensure that the rights of people living on the street are respected and to put an end to the current repressive and dehumanizing response that undermines their capacity to live and exist and that further entrenches them in homelessness.

Finally, knowing that there is not just one valid approach, but many, it is crucial to have the space and resources to be creative and think outside the box in order to develop new ways of doing things and new facilities that really meet the needs of people living on the street. For this to happen, governments need to fund a wide range of initiatives, and

different bodies, including the public sector, need to be willing to take risks and try new things.

The comments made at this event sound the alarm and reflect the urgent need to act on our vision and the structures we put in place as a society for people living on the street by changing the paradigm of homelessness, focusing our interventions on people's rights and adapting the policies that concern them. It is important that people living on the street feel respected, valued and supported, and that they feel part of a community. Homelessness is a symptom of our own deficient system, and we have a duty to act to ensure that the safety, dignity and lives of people living on the street are respected.

References

Garavito-Bermúdez, D., Lundholm, C., & Crona, B. (2016). Linking a conceptual framework on systems thinking with experiential knowledge. *Environmental Education Research*, *22*(1), 89-110.

Hmelo, C. E., Holton, D. L., & Kolodner, J. L. (2000). Designing to learn about complex systems. *The journal of the learning sciences*, *9*(3), 247-298.

Farha, L. and Schwan, K. (2020). A national protocol for homeless encampments in Canada: A human rights-based approach. UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Housing, April 30, 2020. p. 42.

Appendix 1: Collaborators

HABITER LA RUE

REPENSER NOTRE RÉPONSE À L'ITINÉRANCE

Appendix 2: Event schedule

CE MOMENT EST RENDU
POSSIBLE GRÂCE AU
SOUTIEN DE NOS
PARTENAIRES

THIS MOMENT IS MADE POSSIBLE
THANKS TO OUR PARTNERS

DÉROULEMENT DE LA JOURNÉE
SCHEDULE FOR THE DAY

Heure	Activité
9h40	**Présentation** / Presentation
10h00	**Exploration des réussites et des limites actuelles** / Exploration of current successes and limitations
10h25	- PAUSE 15 minutes
12h30	**Dîner** / Lunch
13h40	**Identification des leviers de changement** / Identification of levers of change
14h45	- PAUSE 15 minutes
17h00	**Fin de l'activité** / End of activity

CONDITIONS DE SUCCÈS

Utiliser un langage commun
Use a common language

Écouter avec attention la personne qui parle
Listen attentively to the person speaking

Donner priorité à ceux qu'on entend moins
Give priority to those who are less heard

Avoir de la curiosité et de l'ouverture pour ce que disent les autres
Be curious and open about what others are saying

Se faire confiance et parler du cœur
Trust yourself and speak from the heart

R1

Est-ce que ça correspond à votre vision de la réalité?

(Si oui, comment? Si non, pourquoi?)

Does this correspond to your vision of reality?

(If it does how? If it doesn't why?)

RETOUR EN GRAND GROUPE

FEEDBACK IN LARGE GROUP

R2

Malgré nos efforts, pourquoi sommes-nous toujours incapables de résoudre la situation des campements?

Despite our efforts, why are we still unable to solve the issue of homeless camps?

R3

Qu'est-ce qui fonctionne déjà bien?

What works well already?

Qu'est-ce qui ne fonctionne pas?

What's not working?

Qu'est-ce qu'on voudrait faire?

What would we like to do?

Qu'est-ce qui nous empêche de le faire?

What's preventing us from doing it?

BON APPÉTIT!

On se retouve ici à 13h30

Enjoy your meal break

We'll meet back here again at 1:30 pm

36

R4

Sur quoi devons nous lâcher prise pour mieux agir ensemble?

(Qu'est ce qui doit profondément changer?)

What should we let go of to better act together?

(What needs to change?)

R4

Quelles actions concrètes vont dans le sens de nos changements souhaités?

What concrete actions align with our desired changes?

Identifier 3 actions prioritaires

Identify 3 priority actions

En tant qu'acteur, que pourriez contribuer afin de soutenir ces actions

As an actor, what could you contribute to support these actions?

UN MOT QUI EXPRIME COMMENT TU REPARS AUJOURD'HUI.

One word that expresses how you are leaving today.

-

Soutien financier

Partenaires

Exposition d'art

Collaboration

Et encore +++