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1. Director’s Report 2:00-2:10pm
   
a. Leadership Board approved revision of prioritization questions
b. Housing Problem Solving Work Group
c. BNL/Case Conferencing Work Group
d. Director received one improvement request/request for calendaring from HCSA, item included in already scheduled topic of prioritization policies for 6-13
e. Leadership Board Meeting on 6-21 will have substantive items from SCC

2. Urgent Items 2:10-2:30pm
   
a. Reminder to send any urgent items to Director, Chair, Co-Chair in advance
b. AC3 Eligibility and Enrollment
c. On-Boarding Shelter into Coordinated Entry

3. Action Calendar 2:30-3:55pm
   
a. Coordinated Entry HUD Compliance Review (2:30-2:40)
   
b. Standards and Protocols for Transfers between HRCs (2:40-2:45)
   
c. Countywide Standards for Housing Problem Solving (2:45-3:15)
   
d. Standards for Case Conferencing and By Name List Management (3:15-3:45)
   
e. Plan of Action for 6-13 (Work groups, leaders of work groups, working with other committees) (3:45-3:55)
      i. Standard tools and forms for CE and HCRS, for example, Safety Screening, Housing Crisis Screening, Housing Problem Solving, Resource & Referral Sheets, and Housing Plan
ii. Prioritization and preference policies for all resources. May include: establishing indicators for high-priority households (minimum score, preference scores, etc). Protocol for alignment of regional RRH to county PSH for bridge housing.

4. Discussion Calendar
   a. HCRS Strategies to Increase Affordable Housing

5. Consent
   a. System Manual Updates (none, will have first large revision in June)
FOR CONSIDERATION BY SYSTEM COORDINATION COMMITTEE: May 9, 2018

RECOMMENDATIONS/ACTIONS: Coordinated Entry HUD Compliance Review

DEVELOPED BY: Director of System Coordination

PURPOSE:

To oversee and monitor the operation of Alameda County’s Coordinated Entry, according to federally-defined responsibilities of operating a HUD Continuum of Care as found in the Continuum of Care Program Rule at 24 CFR Part 578 and HUD Notice CPD-17-01

RECOMMENDATION:

Recommend that EveryOne Home, Alameda County’s Continuum of Care Lead, conduct a Coordinated Entry HUD Compliance Review, as follows:

- CE HUD Compliance Review uses a similar format to the HUD published Coordinated Entry Self Assessment Tool
- CE HUD Compliance Review should be used as a Coordinated Entry implementation checklist as well as a tool to evaluate and align with overall system performance measures determined by HUD, with the goal of continually enhancing performance outcomes and competitiveness in the HUD NOFA.
- CE HUD Compliance Review must be conducted, at minimum, annually.
- CE HUD Compliance Review must be submitted to both System Coordination Committee and the HUD CoC Committee.
- Through joint action, the System Coordination Committee and HUD CoC Committee must submit the review to Leadership Board with recommendations for improvement as necessary.
FOR CONSIDERATION BY SYSTEM COORDINATION COMMITTEE: May 9, 2018

RECOMMENDATIONS/ACTIONS: Countywide Standards for Housing Problem Solving

1. Recommendation 1
   a. Definition of Housing Problem Solving
2. Recommendation 2
   a. Standard Minimum Provision of Housing Problem Solving
3. Recommendation 3
   a. Standard Use of Flexible Funds to Support Housing Problem Solving
4. Recommendation 4
   a. Continuation of work group to create standardized tools for Housing Problem Solving

DEVELOPED BY: Working Group of System Coordination Committee, 4-27-18

INTERIM APPROVAL: Director of System Coordination can carry Recommendation 1 until adoption of the next System Manual by Leadership Board on 6-21. Director suggests that Committee discusses Recommendation 2 with appropriate funders before taking further action. Recommendation 3 does not require authority beyond the scope of System Coordination Committee.

PURPOSE:

These recommendations intend to define standard practices for Housing Problem Solving/diversion with the resources currently available in Alameda County and affirm a commitment to track outcomes and develop a strong diversion practice over time.

BACKGROUND:

Diversion as Best Practice
According to the National Alliance to End Homelessness, the goals of an effective crisis response system are to identify those experiencing homelessness, prevent homelessness when possible, connect people with housing quickly and provide services when needed. Effective crisis response systems achieve these goals through the following common, coordinated components:

- Outreach
- Coordinated entry
Diversion and prevention are important components of a community’s crisis response and can help it reduce the size of its homeless population. Prevention assistance can aid households in preserving their current housing situation while diversion prevents homelessness for people seeking shelter by helping them identify immediate alternate housing arrangements and, if necessary, connecting them with services.

Many communities have experience with prevention programs, while diversion is less widely practiced with standard approaches. However, communities that have developed strong diversion practices, report greater outcomes in resolving homelessness.

**An Example of Diversion: San Francisco**
San Francisco, similar to Contra Costa, has developed a diversion practice called Problem Solving that offers a concentrated, one-time or short-term intervention aimed at empowering the household to identify alternatives to the housing crisis response system to meet their housing needs. The goal is to provide effective assistance to identify immediate, alternate housing arrangements and, if necessary, connect them with services or short-term financial assistance, in order to return to housing. For those who can be successfully assisted with problem-solving, shelter or a long-term housing intervention can be avoided and used to assist someone else.

In San Francisco, Problem Solving assistance is designed to be a brief, “one time” or “short-term” intervention that does not require ongoing case management, but does require some support or limited, targeted interaction to help facilitate the resolution of a household’s housing crisis. Problem-Solving participants may be offered the following range of one-time assistance to address issues related to homelessness or imminent homelessness and employment:

1. Problem Solving Conversation with a specialist to devise an actionable plan
2. Referral to eviction prevention, legal, and financial services
3. Relocation services
4. Family reunification and mediation or conflict resolution
5. Move-in assistance
6. Flexible grants

The key outcome of Problem-Solving is the Housing Resolution Plan that identifies a list of actions, devised by the household and may include one-time Problem-Solving Assistance, to be taken to resolve one’s housing crisis, even if temporarily.
A successful Problem-Solving outcome is when a Housing Resolution Plan is developed, and the household has secured permanent housing or a temporary alternative housing for at least 30 to 60 days:

1. Family: At least 20% of families.
2. Adults: At least 10% of adults.
3. Transition-aged Youth: At least 30% of TAY.

**Housing Problem Solving: Diversion in Alameda County**

Similar to San Francisco and Contra Costa, Alameda County’s Coordinated Entry design included the intention to offer diversion and prevention, with diversion being called Housing Problem Solving. Below is the design diagram of Alameda County’s Housing Crisis Response System with plans for diversion to be offered to both literally homeless and not literally homeless households.

Unlike San Francisco and Contra Costa, the staffing and financial resources available to support a robust Housing Problem Solving practice are limited or are minimally allocated toward these activities. For example, neither 2-1-1 and HRCs are not staffed with a special position that offers concentrated Housing Problem Solving support and expertise. Similarly, other diversion support such as relocation assistance or flexible funds are also limited without clear standards for use of funds and coordination across the various access points.

Therefore, Alameda County has developed a version of the Housing Problem Solving practice that is lighter-touch and focused primarily on helping households to identify immediate action steps to find a safe or safer place to sleep and offering effective referrals. However, the standard practices have not been clearly defined or agreed upon across all jurisdictions.
RECOMMENDATION 1: DEFINITION OF HOUSING PROBLEM SOLVING
Recommend a specific definition of Housing Problem Solving as a diversion practice, distinct from Housing Navigation and Outreach.

Definition: Housing Problem Solving assistance is a brief, focused intervention that does not require ongoing case management, but does require some support or limited, targeted interaction to help facilitate the resolution of a household’s housing crisis. Housing Problem Solving participants may be offered the following range of one-time assistance to address issues related to homelessness or imminent homelessness:

1. A structured Housing Problem Solving Conversation or Session with staff to devise an actionable plan
2. Referral to eviction prevention, legal, and financial services
3. Relocation services
4. Family reunification and mediation or conflict resolution
5. Move-in assistance
6. Flexible funds

RECOMMENDATION 2: STANDARD MINIMUM PROVISION OF HOUSING PROBLEM SOLVING
Recommend that Housing Problem Solving is a standard component of Alameda County’s Coordinated Entry process and requires a minimum provision of housing problem across the system, as follows:

Housing Problem Solving Conversation (Brief, 5-10 mins): A light-touch version of a Housing Problem Solving Conversation should be used by anyone across the system, with the goal of assisting someone to identify immediate actions steps for a safe or safer place to sleep that night. At minimum, Every Access Point must offer this version of Housing Problems Solving, together with health and safety screening, to anyone experiencing a housing crisis (literally homeless and non literally homeless). Access Points are: Outreach, Housing Workshops, HRC Walk-ins, HRC Phones, and 211. All Access Points must use the standard Housing Problem Solving Conversation Questions to conduct the brief conversation, make effective referrals, and document the outcome.

Housing Problem Solving Session (Concentrated, 1 hour): An in-depth version of a Housing Problem Solving Session should be used by staff in the system who have an hour of dedicated time to administer a more concentrated Housing Problem Solving Session with the goal of identifying any support that could immediately end the household’s housing crisis and establishing a focused Housing Plan. Staff offering a Housing Problem Solving Session could include Outreach Workers, Housing Navigators, Housing Workshop staff, and staff providing homelessness prevention services. All staff conducting a Housing Problem Solving Session must use the standard Housing Problem Solving Session Guide and Housing Plan to conduct the session, establish clear action, make effective referrals and document the outcome.
RECOMMENDATION 3: USE OF FLEXIBLE FUNDS TO SUPPORT HOUSING PROBLEM SOLVING

Recommend standard use and management of flexible funds to support Housing Problem Solving. Determine appropriate action to discuss with funders.

Use of Flexible Funds for Housing Problem Solving: Flexible Funds should be used when, in the course of a Housing Problem Solving Conversation or Session, staff assesses and determines that an individual/family would avoid homelessness and/or immediately truncate a homeless episode, and would not require ongoing support (housing navigation, case management, rapid rehousing interventions).

Staff that conduct Housing Problem Solving should assess the appropriateness of flexible funds using the following criteria:

- The individual/family has a one-time need that poses a barrier to accessing or maintaining housing
- Flexible funds are needed due to the barrier
- The individual/family has a mechanism to solve for the same need with their own resources and/or natural community supports in the future.

Funds are one-time, and categorized as follows:

- Move-In Costs – Eligible move-in costs including application fees, security deposit, first/last month rent, furniture set up, utilities start, etc.
- Other Flexible Support Expenditures – any immediate need for an individual/family that presents as a barrier to maintain housing or access immediate housing utilizing a life domains approach (physical, environmental, occupational, etc.). Examples of flex funds could include relocation support, legal fees, an outfit or tools to access employment, a public transportation ticket to get to an appointment, an out of pocket copay for a prescription; etc.

If Flexible Funds are deemed appropriate:

- A Flexible Funding Request is made by the direct staff to the manager for review and approval.
- For move-in costs related to fees, deposit, rent, and utilities, payment will be made directly to the primary vendor. For other items the housing team will determine the most appropriate mechanism for payment.
RECOMMENDATION 4: CONTINUATION OF WORKING GROUP
Request that Housing Problem Solving Work Group meet again or a Tools Work Group is re-established to develop standardized tools to be used for Housing Problem Solving. Working group could also tackle other needed tools for Housing Navigation and Outreach. Working group should include EOH Staff Analyst and HMIS staff as necessary to align with development of the HMIS software and workflow. Tools to be developed should include:

*Housing Problem Solving Conversation Questions (Brief, 5-10 mins):* A tool that is a very brief set of questions that is combined with triage/screening with goal of identifying immediate actions steps for a safe or safer place to sleep. To be used by all Access Points.

*Housing Problem Solving Session Guide (Concentrated, 1 hour):* A tool that is used for in-depth Housing Problem Solving. The tool can be used by Outreach, Housing Navigators, Housing Workshop staff, and staff providing homelessness prevention services. The Guide should work in combination with an ongoing, staff supported Housing Plan or as a stand-alone, one-time intervention.

*Standard Referral to Resources (for LH and NLH) and Housing Plan:* Standard tools to be used in combination with Housing Problem Solving.
FOR CONSIDERATION BY SYSTEM COORDINATION COMMITTEE: May 9, 2018

RECOMMENDATIONS/ACTIONS: Standards for Case Conferencing and Management of the Countywide By Name List

1. Recommendation 1: Standards of Practice for Countywide Case Conferences
2. Recommendation 2: Standards for Management of the Countywide By Name List
3. Recommendation 3: Standards for Determining Active/Inactive Status on the By Name List
4. Recommendation 4: Form Work Group to Determine Privacy and Security Standards for By Name List and Case Conferencing

DEVELOPED BY: System Coordination Committee Chair, Committee Member Sharon Leyden, and Working Group of System Coordination Committee held on 5-3-18

AUTHORITY: Director of System Coordination can carry Recommendations 1-3 until adoption of the next System Manual by Leadership Board on 6-21. System Coordination Committee has the authority to conduct Recommendation 4.

PURPOSE:

To establish standards guiding the management of a countywide by name list and practices of countywide case conferences in order to ensure collaboration of services, updated information, and system performance. The standards contained in this set of recommendations are partial and should be understood as additions to what exists in the System Manual and will continue to be built upon through practice, improvement, and further policy and procedure development.

BACKGROUND:

By Name Lists and Case Conferencing:
A By-Name List is an up-to-date list of all people experiencing homelessness that can be segmented in various ways to allow communities to know every person experiencing homelessness by name and facilitate efficient decisions around how best to refer them to housing resources. A By-Name List serves as the centerpiece of Coordinated Entry and fosters collaboration and communication among teams involved in the process of housing people.

Case conferences using the By Name List allow teams to focus resources, actively contribute to discussions, and work in an interdependent manner with the goal of housing the highest priority
households. Case conferencing is also used to gather up-to-date information in order to fairly and accurately prioritize households.

By-Name Lists and Case Conferences are key to developing actionable, real-time datasets that can help communities reach the goals of ending homelessness. A strong By-Name List can be used to plan estimations of future rates of homelessness, including inflow and refining performance targets.

**Alameda County’s Countywide By Name List:**
Alameda County previously had a handful of distinct By Name Lists that were used locally or for matching to a specific resource. With the move to a countywide Coordinated Entry, the County is now moving to a single Countywide By-Name List that is used to prioritize and match homeless households to services and housing resources. All literally homeless households that are assessed through the Coordinated Entry process are included on the Countywide By-Name List and ranked according to countywide prioritization policies. Prioritization of the Countywide By-Name List is dynamic; meaning a person’s position on the list may change due to their circumstances or the circumstances of others. The Countywide By Name List is centrally managed by the Continuum of Care Lead, EveryOne Home, in HMIS and governed by all applicable privacy and security policies.

**Resource Zones:**
Due to the geographic scale and varying needs of certain subpopulations, Alameda County’s Coordinated Entry is organized into the following Resource Zones:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE ZONES</th>
<th>ZONE COORDINATORS</th>
<th>GEOGRAPHY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Adults</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>Oakland, Piedmont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Adults</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>Albany, Berkeley, Emeryville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Families</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>Albany, Berkeley, Emeryville, Oakland, Piedmont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid County Adults +</td>
<td>Abode Services</td>
<td>Alameda, San Leandro, Hayward, Castro Valley, San Lorenzo, Cherry Land,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ashland, unincorporated areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County Adults +</td>
<td>Abode Services</td>
<td>Dublin, Livermore, Pleasanton, and unincorporated areas east of foothills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County Adults +</td>
<td>Abode Services</td>
<td>Fremont, Newark, Union City, Sunol, and unincorporated areas around Fremont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Adults +</td>
<td>Alameda County Health Care Services Agency,</td>
<td>Countywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>Home Stretch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resource Zones are responsible for using segmented or filtered subsets of the Countywide By Name List to match the highest priority people to the appropriate services and housing resources. Resource Zone Coordinators focus on the homeless households on the Countywide By Name List that are assigned to/served by their Zone, including ensuring that the information necessary to fairly and accurately prioritize the household on the list is entered, updated, and monitored in HMIS.

Resource Zone Coordinators are also responsible for coordinating the services and housing programs located in or associated with their Resource Zone, including coordination meetings and case conferences. Resource Zone Coordinators must ensure that the activities of the Resource Zone are coordinated countywide and across zones, as necessary.

**RECOMMENDATION 1: STANDARDS OF PRACTICE FOR COUNTYWIDE CASE CONFERENCES**

**Convening:**

1. Resource Zone Coordinators are responsible for ensuring that Case Conferences are held and that the necessary agencies, organizations, and service providers participate. If necessary to ensure participation, a Resource Zone Coordinator could determine or seek support from another entity with convening power or authority. Conveners may include EveryOne Home, County government agencies, City government agencies, elected officials or trusted service providers. This also may include funders making Case Conference participation required by contract.

2. Resource Zones Coordinators should convene Case Conferences, at minimum, one time per month, and best practice would be bi-weekly. Resource Zone Coordinators may convene Case Conferences focused on a specific sub-population (families, chronic homeless, etc) or resource (PSH, shelter, etc) if necessary, however sub populations and specific resource matchers should be included in the primary Case Conference for the zone. For example, domestic violence providers, veteran service providers, and countywide zone coordinator/matchers should attend the primary Case Conference, in addition to any subpopulation meeting.

**Staffing:**

1. The Case Conference should be staffed and facilitated by the Resource Zone’s Matcher or other designated staff. One person with sufficient knowledge of the system and of client cases should facilitate. Staff with data entry capability should be on hand to perform HMIS updates and document case notes in real-time.

2. The countywide Zone Coordinator and/or Matchers should be in attendance for each zone case conference in order to coordinate matching to countywide resources such as permanent supportive housing, tenancy sustaining services, etc.

3. EveryOne Home staff should be in attendance to represent countywide system performance and analysis, manage countywide by name list issues, and support cross-zone communication and coordination.
Representing Organizations:

1. Each Resource Zone should determine which organizations/zones should be represented in Case Conferences based on who serves the people for that zone. This may be a mix of agencies providing shelter, TH, housing navigation, outreach, and drop-in/ancillary services, and at a minimum those agencies participating in Coordinated Entry matching.

2. Resource Zones should work with stakeholders to determine which specific staff should be present at Case Conferences. Ideal attendees are those who have in-depth knowledge about the status, needs and preferences of each person being reviewed and who are also able to make decisions regarding provision of shelter, services or housing assistance. This may be a program director, program manager, coordinator, housing specialist or case manager. There should be at least one attendee from each organization.

3. Representatives should participate in all of their agencies’ cases, specifically describing who works with each client, where each client is in the housing process, and what issues or barriers they are encountering.

Meeting Structure and Agendas:

1. Structure and agenda of the Case Conferences may change and should be responsive to the shifting needs of a region’s homeless population and available resources at any time.

2. All efforts should be made to structure agendas and provide remote technology to support effective, efficient, and broad participation of key providers and stakeholders. For example, by structuring the first section of each meeting to deal with issues of a subpopulation or providing a teleconference number or screen sharing.

3. Case Conference agendas should be standardized, simple, and to the point. The primary focus of case conference meetings are the individuals who are being discussed.

Suggested Best Practices

1. Identification of Persons to Review: With limited time, it is important to keep the primary focus on reviewing the most vulnerable people on the by-name list and/or those with greatest barriers to shelter and rapid placement in permanent housing.

2. Standard Agenda: A standard agenda may include the following suggested items and topics:
   a. Welcome & Introductions
   b. Key System Updates: Be sure to keep these brief and include any critical system indicators, such as average length of time for all persons to access housing.
   c. Case Conferencing: Person-specific updates and discussion.
   d. Follow Up Items: General follow-up or action items identified during the meeting.

3. Client-Level Review: Consider creating a standard set of elements to review for each person so providers can be prepared to effectively discuss cases. Below are suggested elements to review:
   a. Current status: For example: active in shelter, active unsheltered, missing and whether that status has changed since the last case conference review
b. Person Preferences: Housing plans and next steps should be guided by the person’s preferences.

c. Critical Housing Placement Barriers: Review and problem-solve any barriers to housing placement.

d. Critical Service Barriers: Review and problem-solve any challenges to connecting persons to critical services.

e. Current Safety: To the extent possible, ensuring any unsheltered person has a relatively safe place to stay tonight and in near term.

f. Next Steps: Identify any immediate or critical action items related to the person, including roles and timelines.

4. Participating Agencies:

   a. Due to HIPAA and other privacy issues and until these issues are resolved, including police in case conferencing is not considered a best practice.

5. Sample Agenda:

North County Housing Resource Center Case Conference
2180 Milvia Street, 1st Floor, Cypress Conference Room
March 8, 2018 10-noon

Purpose:

1) Share information about people’s housing status and barriers as well as other service needs.

2) Identify people who are interested in shelter

3) Identify people who need to be prioritized for assessment

AGENDA

1. Welcome/Introductions 10:00

2. BNL Review

   a. Focused/strategic discussion on top 20 10:10

   b. Review of 21-50 11:00

   c. Quick look at 51+ (identified by agencies) 11:30

   d. Who isn’t on list that should be 11:40

   e. Confirm Outreach and Shelter Plan 11:55

3. Next Meeting: Thursday, April 12th 10-noon
RECOMMENDATION 2: STANDARDS FOR MANAGEMENT OF THE COUNTYWIDE BY-NAME LIST

As stated above, the standards contained in this recommendation are partial and should be understood as additions to what exists in the System Manual and will continue to be built upon through practice, improvement, and further policy and procedure development.

1. **Countywide By Name List Management:** The Countywide By Name List is managed in HMIS or a comparable database by EveryOne Home. Any issues or troubleshooting related to status or prioritization on the list or the information technology required to maintain the list can be directed to EveryOne Home Staff.

2. **Routine List Management:** Issues that may impact a client’s case progress or current situation but do not necessarily require an assessment update (i.e., moving from being sheltered to unsheltered) should be reflected with routine updates to existing clients in the by-name list. The mechanics of such updates are highly depending on the HMIS platform supporting the by-name list. This issue will be deferred until Clarity is online and can support CE assessments and list prioritization.

RECOMMENDATION 3: STANDARDS FOR DETERMINING ACTIVE/INACTIVE STATUS ON THE BY NAME LIST

**PURPOSE**

To establish a standard practice and procedure for determining a household’s status as “active” or “inactive” on the Countywide By-Name List. The mechanics of By Name List management are highly dependent on the HMIS platform supporting the By-Name List. Changes to this standard will be reviewed when Clarity is online and can support CE assessments and list prioritization.

**BACKGROUND**

Labelling households on the By Name List as “active” and “inactive” helps stakeholders manage workflow in the event a prioritized household is outreached but cannot be located. This proposal is based closely on protocols utilized for the federal Criteria and Benchmarks for Achieving the Goal of Ending Veteran Homelessness, with some modifications. Labeling a client or household as “inactive” on the BNL does not remove them from the list, nor does it render them ineligible for future referrals or services.

1. Any household that has completed a Coordinated Entry Assessment, is included on the Countywide By Name List under the head of household’s name. Households will remain “active” on the BNL if they are still homeless in Alameda County.

2. If the household is no longer homeless or no longer living in Alameda County, they will be removed from the BNL. Only the following events will result in a household’s removal from the BNL:
   a. A documented exit to permanent housing;

b. A documented move out of county;
c. A documented move to an institutional setting where they will be residing for more than 90 days;
d. They are deceased.

3. Households will be changed to “inactive” on the list if:
   a. HRC staff or matchers have made 5 unsuccessful attempts to outreach them for service enrollment.
   b. Outreach attempts are diligent, exhaustive, and documented in HMIS with case notes explaining each outreach effort.

4. If a household who has previously been labeled “inactive” is re-engaged or makes contact again with the system, they will become “active” again, and retain their prioritization score prior to becoming inactive unless an assessment update is warranted, i.e.²
   a. The household has experienced a significant or life changing event with the potential to impact the household’s prioritization; and/or
   b. New and relevant information is reported by household or verified by 3rd party.

5. In the event an assessment update is warranted, it will be performed in accordance with current assessment update policies.

6. The list status of clients who refuse referrals to housing or other services will be governed by other policies developed by the Systems Coordination Committee.

RECOMMENDATION 4: FORM WORK GROUP TO DEVELOP PRIVACY AND SECURITY STANDARDS FOR CASE CONFERENCING

² Cf. “Standards for Updating Assessment Information in Service Point”