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I. Introduction

This report presents the key takeaways from the three-day workshop of the Safe Home Programme. The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) organised the workshop to showcase the programme’s accomplishments, assess lessons learned, and explore future steps. The purpose of the workshop was to serve as a critical platform for reflection, collaboration, and progress within the Safe Homes programme, aligning with the broader goal of identifying the conditions that need to be in place to select hosting as an option to accommodate people who have lost their homes.

The report first introduces the programme (Section 1) before providing an overview of the workshops’ outcomes (Section 2) and delving into thematic lessons learned (Section 3). Section 4 provides outlooks on private hosting and finally section 5 recommendations for the Red Cross.

I.1. The Safe Homes Programme

The Safe Homes Program is a yearlong programme – running from February 2023 to April 2024. The aims of the programme are to support the provision of reception through private accommodation to people fleeing Ukraine and to test and operationalise the DG HOME Safe Homes Guidance and EUAA recommendations on organising emergency accommodation in private homes. The programme operates in various EU countries, supported by the European Commission’s “Safe Homes Guidance” and funded by the Asylum Migration and Integration Fund.

The program is composed of two interconnected modules, as displayed in figure 1.

![Figure 1 - The two modules of the Safe Homes Programme](image)

1. Operational module - Facilitates access to accommodation
2. Stakeholder engagement & lessons learnt module - Supports transnational reflection to collect lessons learned and good practices.

National Red Cross societies in different countries have adopted innovative approaches within the Safe Homes programme to effectively implement the activities of the programme. They also captured learnings, recording the diversity of initiatives undertaken across the

---

1 France, Belgium, Luxembourg, Slovakia, Netherlands, Hungary, Ireland, Luxembourg, Poland
country to reach project objectives. This reflects the commitment of the Red Cross to making a positive impact by sharing learnings across the region.

The Programme accounts for a total of 178 activities implemented across the nine countries. As of January 2024, 84 were completed, 80 ongoing and 14 planned. Figure 2 provides an overview of the status of the programme activities in each country.³

Figure 2 - Status of the implementation of the project as reported in December 2023.

I.2. Workshop Objectives & Approach

The specific objectives of the three-day workshop, co-facilitated by Key Aid Consulting and IFRC were to present the Safe Homes programme’s achievements, review the learnings, and discuss the possible next steps. The workshop was an opportunity for participants to:

- Celebrate key achievements.
- Raise important topics for discussion.
- Take stock and institutionalize key lessons learned amongst the different National Societies.
- Identify, develop, and prioritize recommendations.

³ Source: IFRC, January 2024
The workshop took place on January 30th, 31st and February 1, 2024, at the Crowne Plaza Hotel in Budapest, Hungary. It included 48 participants from nine National Societies (NS)\(^4\), the IFRC and the RC EU Office. The full list of participants can be found in Annex 2.

Content for the workshop was based on the terms of reference produced by the IFRC, the input of the National Societies (NS) and RCEU, and the consultant’s review of key documents and understanding of workshop objectives.

The workshop was structured per five thematic topics identified by the IFRC:

- Design & partnerships
- Retaining & engaging hosts
- Aligning expectations of hosts and guests
- Ecosystem of inclusion
- Integration & exit strategies.

Dedicated sessions on celebrating programme achievements and on outlook and recommendations were given special consideration. In addition, the NS\(^5\) identified three cross cutting themes as needing further exploration, which were integrated throughout all sessions:

- Protection & diversity mainstreaming.
- Key contextual factors affecting programme implementation.
- External validity of lessons learnt beyond the Ukraine crisis.

For the full methodology and agenda used during the workshop please refer to annex 1.

For the workshop evaluation results (participant satisfaction and feedback) refer to annex 6.

---

\(^4\) The French Red Cross, Belgium Red Cross, Luxembourg Red Cross, Slovak Red Cross, Netherlands Red Cross, Hungarian Red Cross, Irish Red Cross, Romanian Red Cross & Polish Red Cross.

\(^5\) The input of the NS was captured via an online survey and a 1-hour discussion on the 9th January 2024.
II. Overall Safe Homes reflections

“The project has enabled us to deliver something comprehensively in a timely manner. Even if the project is not great in numbers it is great in experiences.” IFRC

A contextually relevant programme. The activities implemented during the Safe Home programme were sufficiently diverse to cater to each country's contextual specificities and capacities. Activities were mindful of the capacity and motivation of all stakeholders involved ranging from the National Societies (NS) themselves, communities, potential hosts, volunteers, caseworkers and the local authorities. Services provided were holistic, in most cases going beyond implementing a simple “bed-led”6 model to thinking about the bigger, long term picture of integration.

6 “Bed-led” refers to placing displaced people driven by the availability of supply rather than matching individuals with the best-suited location based on factors such as employment opportunities, healthcare accessibility or school availability.
Hosting assistance as one solution amongst many - Hosting assistance should not be a default choice, for all affected populations and/or over time. Hosting assistance can complement other accommodation options such as local authority collective centres and reception facilities, contributing to the well-being of all involved and serving as a foundation for deriving alternative solutions.

Strong protection mainstreaming - Particular attention was paid to protection mainstreaming and safeguarding throughout the activities to mitigate the risks of exploitative relationships, such as through the involvement of child protection services in the response. Beyond the programme level, the protection discourse raised questions towards the applicability of private hosting for the most vulnerable populations, and how to adapt the target group to the context and potential risks of private hosting.

“We wanted to implement quickly, but the caseworkers refused. They insisted on doing it right, not quickly. That is a lesson for me.” - Irish Red Cross

Coordination as a key element - To secure a future for hosting assistance, an important step highlighted during the workshop was the importance of coordinating with other initiatives, including government-led efforts such as social protection schemes. This can help ensure integrated access to services and reduce duplication of existing work. Collaborative efforts between the IFRC and National Societies are essential to address questions regarding the future direction of hosting assistance and overcome obstacles to scaling. This coordination also involves navigating GDPR/data protection regulatory frameworks and agreeing on data sharing protocols and agreements (which takes time), as some NSs have encountered difficulties in sharing data, impacting the quality and effectiveness of referrals.

Willingness to extend the service beyond the Ukraine crisis - An aspiration of the Safe Homes project is to expand similar services to other people regardless of migration or other status beyond those affected by the Ukraine crisis. Whilst this has previously been achieved in some countries such as in Ireland, insights from the Safe Homes Programme suggest that the feasibility of expanding the programme is dependent upon external factors such as willingness of the host community, involvement of the government and cultural barriers. Beyond the target group, the concern of limited replicability of hosting assistance as a whole to other countries and crisis are linked to availability of resources (some crises attract more funds than others), political incentives and local laws and regulations.

Wealth of lessons learnt - Hosting offers numerous benefits, and there are valuable insights to gain from the successes, challenges, and lessons learned from the Safe Homes Programme. Lessons learned and research from the Safe Homes programme also provide valuable content for advocacy and reflections on the way forward.
III. Lessons Learnt

This section highlights key lessons learnt and best practices identified across five themes: design & partnerships, retaining & re-engaging hosts, aligning expectations, ecosystem of integration and exit strategies.

III.1. Design & Partnerships

The below are key lessons learnt related to the design of hosting schemes and how to best work on multi-level and cross-sectoral partnerships.

1. **Apply a multi-stakeholder approach in the programme design.**
   Hosting assistance should have a multi-stakeholder approach, involving CSOs, local authorities, the host community etc. While local authorities play a crucial role, their levels of resources and ability to support and commit to accepting displaced people can vary, influencing how they interact with a hosting assistance programme. It is especially important to capture learnings from and link to other community led initiatives and local NGOs doing similar work but which may fall “under the radar” of the traditional humanitarian systems.

2. **Conduct a comprehensive needs assessment.**
   Comprehensive assessments present an opportunity to identify the needs of different target groups to best tailor assistance and grasp the diverse requirements of guests. For example, in the context of the Ukraine response, a key challenge identified was that single men were not always easy to place as hosts were mainly expecting to host women and children. Another lesson is to recognize that hosting is not universally suitable and may not be appropriate to the most vulnerable who may not be able to achieve their desired exit pathway after the hosting period. This emphasizes the importance of understanding diverse needs within the broader context of accommodation and support.

3. **Design a robust vetting process.**
   It was acknowledged amongst the NSs that there is often a lack of adequate tools to carry out careful vetting of hosts and guests, evaluate expectations and thus foster sustainable matches. A good practice in Luxembourg’s program design is that it prioritizes high-quality interviews with hosts as a key moment to determine suitability. Emphasis is placed on the depth of the interview (lasting two hours and conducted by experts) and the subsequent reflection period.

4. **Mainstream protection into the project design.**
   Examples of protection risks include insecure tenure, uncertain legal status and trauma experienced by guests which pose a risk of exploitative relationships to develop between hosts and guests. The fear of being evicted/ ending up homeless may refrain guests from speaking out if they are mistreated. In this case, mitigation measures to address such protection risks need to be included in the project design. Key mitigation strategies
employed involve vetting hosts by authorities/police, conducting interviews with hosts to detect any potential concerns, and implementing a policy that prevents households composed of single men from hosting single women. Other measures include collaborating with anti-trafficking agencies, child protection authorities, and local social services departments. A popular solution discussed was including sessions on how to manage trauma for both hosts and guests.

5. **Incorporate information management systems right from the project design.**
A robust information management system is essential to ensure seamless support during emergency response efforts and to the extent possible should be established as a preparedness measure.

6. **Proactive management of host incentives for project success and risk mitigation.**
Addressing host incentives is a delicate matter that requires attention from the project’s inception, given its significant impact on project sustainability, but also on potential risks. See the [section below](#) for a wider discussion on financial incentives.

Workshop participants showcased key innovative good practices applied throughout the program in their countries. The following good practices are those that were considered as the most replicable regionally\(^7\). They are examples of practices that can be considered and integrated during the design phase of future programs.

1. **Coordination with other NGOs/ CSOs** – as implementing a comprehensive hosting response goes beyond the capacity of a single organization, especially if the goal is to support integration.
2. **Speaking groups for hosts** – for networking and discussion
3. **Use of mediation tools to understand the culture of people displaced** – engaging the diaspora & community engagement.
4. **Motivational interviews for hosts/ reflection period** – to ensure that potential hosts are up for the task and know that they have a period to ‘opt out’. Use of protection professionals for the interviews in the case of children.
5. **Making use of governmental/ municipality support**
6. **Centralised data management system** – to support with preparedness & matchmaking – the 510 platform addresses such needs.
7. **Provision of subsidies** and other incentives
8. **Having a strong exit strategy from the start** to support people to depart hosting and become self-reliant with clear criteria and in agreement with the government

\(^7\) From a score out of five – see [annex 4](#) for results
Figure 3 - Innovative best practice showcased by Belgium on day 1 of the workshop
Retaining & re-engaging hosts

Numerous factors should be considered in retaining and re-engaging hosts, from financial, to legal and social factors and overall programme effectiveness. The below presents key best practices/lessons learnt identified across the nine countries.8

Financial compensation: “a double-edged sword?”

1. When employing financial compensation in hosting programs, it is advisable to view it as a tool for sustaining hosting rather than a means to spark initial interest. This perspective acknowledges that the state has a responsibility to fulfil which cannot be replaced with private hosting. However, it also acknowledges the potential pressures between hosts and guests, alleviating the financial burden associated with accommodating additional individuals in their homes. Direct financial incentives may lead to an income-oriented approach in hosting, whereas a study in Ireland showed that only 20% of hosts were motivated by money in the first place. Emphasizing financial compensation for sustainability aligns with broader goals of fostering solidarity and voluntarism in hosting programs.

2. Careful consideration should be given to the nuanced impact that financial compensation can have, positive or negative. Questions arose about defining financial compensation and distinguishing between a host program and a rental program. For example, if guests are contributing to household payments does that provide them with some tenancy rights? The delicate balance between financial incentives and maintaining the voluntary nature of hosting was a recurring theme. For example, if hosts keep hosting for money when they would have otherwise stopped, it can increase the chance of guests being exposed to protection risks. The flip side is that some countries highlighted that financial compensation alleviates the pressure off guests, with 80% of guests in Ireland reporting never being asked to contribute to household expenses. Yet concerns were raised about potential host dependency when guests did not contribute to household expenses.

3. To maintain a more solidaristic approach, it is suggested to explore incentives such as covering utility bills and providing tax benefits. Practical measures, such as utility bill subsidies, tax benefits and damage recovery payment guarantee, were discussed as ways to support hosts without being the primary motivation for hosting. The payment of incentives, vary across countries, with some directing payments to guests and others to hosts. This practice is influenced by local regulations, seasonal factors such as increased expenses in winter, and the ease of administration by authorities.

8 Refer to annex X for a full breakdown of the factors identified which encourage host engagement and the extent to which they are applicable.
“We provided a damage recovery payment guarantee, a measure easily implementable by the government. The Salvation Army and other NGOs also offered guarantees for damages caused by guests. These measures were not employed as incentives but as assurances to sustain host engagement.” Netherlands Red Cross (NLRC)

Legal & Social factors

4. Ensure that there are clear means of accountability towards hosts. Hosts need to be provided assurance by the government or the Red Cross that there is a framework in place to support them. This can be through a welcome package, dedicated website and/or information line which clearly stipulates expectations, rights, how to access social support, what do in case of an issue and most importantly, having a well resourced team in place able to provide social support. Written agreements with defined duration of engagement can help avoid frustration in the case of prolongation.

5. Implement a framework for conflict resolution. It is crucial for guests to be aware that they have someone to turn to in case of problems, not necessarily a lawyer/official legal support, but a reliable third party. This emphasizes the importance of a support framework that includes a structured system for conflict resolution, mediation, assistance, and support, with mechanisms like referral support and a helpline in place for immediate assistance.

6. Peer support is considered as the most meaningful social benefit, relative to social prestige, community events and access to training which are a “bonus” rather than essential.

Programmatic Support

7. The importance of dedicated caseworkers is paramount. Having a trusted, reliable source of support on a regular basis is key to maintaining engagement of hosts and, more generally, nurturing the guest-host relationship. This should be complemented with more specialised types of support such as psychological support upon request.

8. Low cost, high impact, simple and non-bureaucratic practices are the most effective to retain and engage hosts.

III.2. Aligning expectations of hosts & guests, navigating living together

There will never be a perfect alignment between all guests and hosts expectations, yet there are several lessons learnt/ good practices which help to anticipate issues and ensure that
potential sources of contention are avoided. These build upon good practices identified in thematic topic 2, engaging, and retaining hosts.

1. Create a triangle of trust between hosts, guests & National Societies with clear communication and division of roles and responsibilities between the three parties. Trained caseworkers are essential for follow up and can act as the first point of contact for conflict resolution. Close relationships, such as those with caseworkers can cause people to hesitate in sharing concerns, hence the importance of an available third party for mediation beside the case worker. An external mediator or a safe channel to raise feedback, complaints and concerns may offer a more comfortable environment for both parties to communicate.

2. Ensure a strong vetting process is in place to ensure the safety of both hosts and guest. This can be a combination of criminal record checks by the police and due diligence by the Red Cross – including visiting the households. This is a time-consuming aspect of the programme that is considered necessary and where it is important to “not cut corners”. For example, in Ireland it is mandatory for anyone sharing a home with a child to obtain a background check by the police, and there were no objections to undergoing this process during the Safe Homes Programme.

Example of successful hosting: In Ireland, four Ukrainian families have been willed the homes of their hosts when they pass away.

3. Enforce mutual respect for everyone’s life and projections for the future. It is important to make hosts understand that guests may not want to adopt their lifestyle, routine, and aspirations. They need to be able to live their own lives. For example, hosts may expect to have meals altogether at a certain time and sleep early while the guest prefers to go out and go to bed late or vice versa. In some countries, hosts were shocked that children were not attending school, or guests not wanting to work. A good practice in Luxembourg is to set a first appointment to discuss expectations from both parties, identifying what can be and cannot be done and potential points of contention.

4. Myth busting: managing cultural differences between hosts and guests. Effectively managing cultural differences in hosting is crucial, as evidenced by findings from various perspectives. In the Netherlands, some Ukrainians are hesitant to be hosted by diverse groups, like the LGBTI community, resulting in rejections based on these differences. In Ireland, challenges were encountered when guests from different origins (e.g. Roma community) did not fit the traditional stereotype of a Ukrainian refugees. Luxembourg has proactively addressed cultural distinctions by forming a group of social workers dedicated to deconstructing stereotypes and aiding individuals in adapting to different lifestyles.

5. Language barriers have emerged as a significant constraint in all countries, where the responsibility for translating predominantly falls to the youth. Controversy surrounds the mandatory imposition of language classes to participate in such a programme as this is contingent on guests’ abilities, age, and willingness to stay or work in the country. Having
telephone interpreters on standby is good practice identified to mitigate language barriers.

6. Engaging the diaspora to facilitate intercultural exchange. Engaging Ukrainians already residing in the host country has been seen to offer significant support and bring additional value to hosting initiatives throughout the Safe Homes programme.

One suggested approach going forward is the development of a caseworker model that engages the relevant diaspora who are already integrated into the cultural fabric of the host country, as recommended in Ireland.

III.3. Ecosystem of integration & inclusion

Below are the main lessons when it comes to supporting guests in their integration and inclusion in the host communities. This covers support to various aspects including accessing employment, education, health and other services, taking into account the role of the RC, volunteers, and other agencies, differences in needs between people with different legal statuses and sharing of responsibilities between guests, hosts, caseworkers, while acknowledging that the responsibility is ultimately that of the state.

1. Red Cross National Societies are in a uniquely strong position to facilitate meaningful and safe referrals across agencies to support newcomers in accessing the four pillars of integration, portrayed in figure 4 below. A key challenge to cooperation and data sharing are GDPR regulations. Practical strategies include creating agreements that cover consent for client referral, partnerships with the RC and implementing a centralized data management system.

Figure 4 - The Four Pillars of integration
2. **Efforts to integrate individuals within a private hosting program should consider diverse legal statuses.** Undocumented migrants face barriers in accessing essential services and increased vulnerability; unaccompanied children encounter challenges in family reunification without proper documentation; in the context of Ukraine-related displacement, third country nationals faced obstacles in accessing Temporary Protection. While working on integration and inclusion, it is important to understand applicable legal status, frameworks and entitlements in the different contexts. To overcome the challenge, and not leave anyone behind, there is a need for tailored solutions, including safe accommodation for undocumented migrants and other groups in specific vulnerable situations. This situation presents an advocacy opportunity for the RC to emphasize the importance of recognizing and addressing the need for everyone to access essential services, regardless of their status.

3. **Build a pool of committed hosts, where there are integration services in the area and who have the network to support a person beyond providing a bed.** The power of social networks is immense, and the host network can play a crucial role in supporting integration. When selecting hosts, consideration could be given to prioritizing those with prior experience. Their potential willingness to go beyond shelter provision could be explored in the assessment and vetting process.

4. **Engagement of volunteers: a big network that can be capitalised upon if maintained and adequately engaged.** The challenge with engaging volunteers is maintaining the dynamic over time and anchoring them into the Red Cross. To maintain engagement, factors such as volunteer motivation, location, and the potential for regular or one-off commitments need consideration. The IFRC plays a pivotal role in developing handbooks and providing central support to the NS, offering guidelines and facilitating necessary processes. In Belgium, efforts are underway to train volunteers to embrace the diversity of individuals supported by the RC, emphasizing the importance of a diverse range of profiles, including through caseworkers and by the implementation of a buddy program. These initiatives can contribute to a more comprehensive and effective approach to volunteer engagement within the RC.

5. **The recognition of foreign credentials and language support initiatives are essential components to enhance the overall success of integration activities.** Addressing employment and livelihoods within integration efforts involves tackling barriers related to unrecognized accreditation by national systems, often limiting individuals to lower-level roles. Language proficiency is a key component of successful integration as well as ensuring access to education for children.
III.4. Exit strategies

Exit strategies\(^9\) will vary depending on the context, and there is no one-size-fits-all approach. While ad hoc solutions relying on the goodwill and connections of hosts and guests exist, structural solutions should be state-led. Despite facing constraints in identifying solutions, the following reflections provide examples that can shape the development of exit strategies.

Exit pathways should play a significant role in influencing the program design through a bottom-up approach which includes the voices of people affected. For example, there can be greater guest engagement in the project design where they are consulted on what they envisage an exit pathway to look like in that context.

From the design stage, account for varied individual aspirations in the range of exit strategies proposed. The initial step can involve clarifying the legal status of different refugee groups and identifying those who wish to remain in the locations where they are hosted.

Intention surveys can be a crucial tool during exit strategy assessments, potentially impacting the target group. For instance, among Ukrainian women, only 40% expressed a desire to permanently stay in Belgium. Intention surveys can also identify reasons why some individuals want to stay for certain durations, for example waiting for a child to finish school. Once there is greater clarity on people's migratory projects, the focus can shift to understanding how to best support them and addressing barriers hindering their aspirations in advocacy efforts. With the correct information, individuals may be able to make more informed decisions about their chosen pathways.

Some types of exit pathways are very context dependent, and cannot be applied to all hosting programmes, crises or population groups. For instance, Ukrainians were swiftly granted the right to work, a circumstance that may not necessarily extend to refugees from other countries in future crises. In most crises, individuals lack the means to self-sustain, rendering some highly vulnerable.

The federation needs to further clarify its collective role in supporting exit strategies in its advocacy messaging and its strategic planning. It is important for the IFRC to acknowledge ways it can contribute to refugee’s situation, whilst remaining aware of its limitations.

---

\(^9\) Differentiation of terms between Exit Pathways and Exist Strategies: The term “Exit Pathways” describe the route for exiting hosting, whereas “Exit Strategy” is used to highlight the whole suite of support activities to support people to achieve their various exit pathways. Successful exit strategies will require a range of activities that need to be appropriately joined up to support guests on their exit pathway.
Significant strides have been made in integrating various activities that support guests on their exit pathway in the Red Cross programmes. Many existing initiatives, like translation, language support, and home improvement (which increases the number of homes that join the rental market), can be perceived as activities that support successful exit pathways. There is a case for “repackaging” and joining these activities as a package to support exit pathways.

IV. Outlook

IV.1. Threats and challenges of private hosting

The table below outlines the main threats and challenges associated with hosting assistance, beyond the Safe Homes Programme. It’s important to factor in these considerations when contemplating the replication or continuation of hosting assistance as a solution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political risks</th>
<th>Suitability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reputational risks for the government as encouraging hosting can be perceived as neglect from the state.</td>
<td>• “One size does not fit all”- hosting assistance is not the only solution, it must be complementary to government activities and other shelter/housing support offered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If hosting is to be implemented country wide, it is hard to ensure co-ordination and collaboration.</td>
<td>• Motivation may be connected to certain target groups. It may be difficult to place all groups (e.g. single men not as welcomed in some situations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In cases where hosting is unsuccessful, a key threat is bad press in the media which can lead to a fuelling of anti-migrant sentiments.</td>
<td>• Not always suitable for the most marginalised/vulnerable groups, who may not be able to achieve their desired exit pathway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic impact</th>
<th>Protection risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Hosting assistance is very time consuming with high preparation and investment requirements for caseworkers and hosts.</td>
<td>• Despite extensive vetting there is never certainty over how guests and hosts will react, leaving individuals exposed to protection risks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It risks having a negative impact on the housing market if financial incentives outweigh rental costs.</td>
<td>• Hosting is based on empathy; it is difficult to predict how welcoming communities will be vis a vis other groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A threat in many countries is the lack of available infrastructure, community willingness and organisational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
capacity in place to scale up hosting programmes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Risk of dependency on hosts instead of integration and independence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If successful, there is a risk that the state will continue to ignore the need for durable solutions, leaving fundamental issues surrounding the integration and opportunities of refugees unresolved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IV.2. Opportunities going forward**

Hosting assistance presents several strengths as a viable solution for supporting displacement in the short term. It gives the state the necessary time to identify a comprehensive durable solution. Hosting has also been shown to positively impact communities and social cohesion whilst alleviating pressure on limited state resources. When executed effectively, hosting is an adaptable tool which can be catered to the needs of different vulnerable groups. Furthermore, private hosting promotes dignity, and plays a role in deconstructing stereotypes and building empathy within groups.

“The door has been opened with the Ukraine crisis; we must ensure that it remains open for future crisis”
Workshop participant

The opportunities of hosting which need to be explored further are that in the long term it can be cost-efficient, particularly in comparison to state led alternatives such as collective centres. In the longer term, hosting can be linked to social housing programmes and increase the availability of housing units for more members of the population if proved to be successful. If the risk of creating dependency on hosts is carefully mitigated, the approach can facilitate a quicker integration into the community for guests. Beyond individual benefits, private hosting can help sensitize communities to broader humanitarian issues, contributing to social cohesion and understanding. It also helps to addresses social challenges like loneliness, contributing to overall community well-being. Hosting assistance can also be adapted to different types of crisis and issues in the future such as tackling homelessness.

During the workshop, participants identified some questions which need to be addressed in forward looking conversations to seize the opportunities provided by private hosting and position it as a sustainable solution:
1. Should private hosting be limited to crisis situations, or could it potentially operate as a network of homes with ongoing support?
2. Who should be the primary target groups of private hosting for it to be a viable solution?
3. How can better preparation enhance the success of private hosting initiatives?
4. How can the advantages for citizens be more emphasised in advocacy to shift the mindset towards engaging in hosting assistance?