**REPORTS ON DISCRIMINATION, SEGREGATION AND THE RIGHT TO ADEQUATE HOUSING**

QUESTIONNAIRE

**BASIC INFORMATION**

1. Name of Individual, Organization, Institution, Agency or State: Global Network of Sex Work Projects (NSWP)

Type of Entity\*

[ ]  National Government or federal governmental ministry/agency

[ ]  Inter-governmental organization or UN agency

[ ]  Local or regional government, agency, representative or mayor

[ ]  Association, tenant union or housing cooperative

[x]  NGO network, umbrella organization

[ ]  Community-based NGO

[ ]  Academia

[ ]  Foundation

[ ]  National human rights organization, ombudsperson

[ ]  Real estate, urban planning or construction

[ ]  Real estate investor or investment fund

[ ]  Trade Union

[ ]  Other:

2. Categorization of your Work

Please select one or more responses, as appropriate.

[ ] Public administration

[x] Advocacy

[ ] Funding

[ ] Legal Assistance

[x] Networking

[x] Policy

[ ] Research

[ ] Technical Assistance

[ ] Training

[ ] N/A

[ ] Other:

3. City/Town: **Edinburgh**

4. State/Province: **Scotland, United Kingdom**

5. Country (please indicate your region or “international” if focus the work of your organization covers multiple countries); **international**

**HOUSING DISCRIMINATION**

7. What specific forms of de facto or legal discrimination or barriers towards equal enjoyment of the right to adequate housing do the following groups face in your country (please provide evidence with examples, studies, reports and relevant statistical information):

* People of African Descent, or Roma
* Racial, caste, ethnic, religious groups/minorities or other groups
* Migrants, foreigners, refugees, internally displaced persons
* Women, children or older persons
* Indigenous peoples
* Persons with disabilities
* LGBTQ persons
* Low income persons, including people living in poverty
* Residents of informal settlements; persons experiencing homelessness
* Other social groups, please specify

In countries all over the world, sex workers (the majority of whom are women and many of whom identify as LGBTQ) face significant discrimination and barriers in securing adequate housing, because of their occupation. Sex workers are frequently denied housing or evicted from their homes because of laws and policies that are based on discriminatory, stigmatising and misinformed views of sex work and sex workers. Stigma and discrimination against sex work and sex workers[[1]](#footnote-1) is perpetuated by laws criminalising sex work and activities associated with sex work. For example, third party laws against organising, managing and facilitating sex work often criminalise landlords for renting properties ‘for the purposes of prostitution’ and are used by authorities to harass sex workers and limit their access to housing and services[[2]](#footnote-2). The ‘Nordic Model’ is another example of a legislative framework that has resulted in sex workers being evicted from their homes. Under this model, clients of sex workers and third parties are criminalised. In addition to the many documented, known harms of this model, which include the disruption of the support networks that many sex workers rely on to work safely, it also negatively affects sex workers’ housing situations[[3]](#footnote-3). As landlords are included in the categories of third parties who are criminalised under the ‘Nordic Model’, landlords in countries where this model is in place are often unwilling to rent their property to sex workers or if they are approached by authorities reacting to a suspicion of sex work taking place on a property, landlords are forced to evict tenants who are sex workers[[4]](#footnote-4).

8. Discrimination in housing can affect various dimensions of the right to adequate housing and other human rights. Could you provide more details regarding the specific areas in which housing discrimination is experienced? Below are examples of various forms of discrimination that can be experienced in relation to different dimensions of the right to adequate housing:

*Accessibility*

* Discrimination in relation to access to land, including water and natural resources essential for habitation;
* Discrimination in relation to housing for rental or for acquisition or in accessing public or social housing;
* Access to emergency and/or transitional housing after disaster, conflict related displacement or in case of homelessness, family or domestic violence;
* Accessibility of housing for persons with disabilities or older persons, including access to housing for independent living or to care homes;
* data collection or requirements to furnish certain certifications resulting in the exclusion of particular persons from accessing housing;

*Habitability*

* discrimination in relation to housing conditions, overcrowding or housing maintenance;
* Exposure to health risks within the home, including lack of ventilation, heating or insulation, exposure to fire or housing collapse risk, unhealthy building materials, or other unhealthy housing covered by the WHO Guidelines on housing and health;
* Exposure to other risks which render housing uninhabitable, including sexual or gender-based violence, interference with privacy and physical security in the home and neighbourhood;
* Discrimination in relation to housing renovation or permission of housing extension;

*Affordability*

* Discrimination in relation to access to public benefits related to housing;
* Lack of equal access to affordable housing;
* Discrimination in public and private housing financing;
* Discrimination related to housing and service costs, housing related fees, litigation or taxation;

*Security of tenure*

* Discrimination in relation to ownership or inheritance of housing and land and related natural resources including water including on the basis of a distinction between formal and informal tenure arrangements;
* Discrimination in relation to evictions, resettlement and compensation for loss or damage of housing, land or livelihoods;
* Differential treatment in land or title registration, permission of housing construction;

*Availability of services, materials, facilities and infrastructure*

* Discrimination in relation to access to work, schooling, health care or public benefits based on the residential address or related to a lack of an official address;
* Public transportation services and transportation costs;
* Provision of water, sanitation, energy, waste collection and other utility services; their quality or cost, including interruptions/blackouts including policies relating to disconnection from utility services;
* spatial disparities in access to health care, education, child care, cultural and recreational facilities;

*Location*

* Discrimination in relation to freedom of choice of the place of residency within the country, within a particular region or location;
* Discrimination based on place of residence or address, such as exclusion from invitation to job interviews or access to credit;
* Exposure to environmental health risks, such as external air quality, flooding, toxic ground exposure; noise; risk of landslides etc.;
* Living quality and physical security in the neighbourhood, including geographical disparities in policing and law enforcement;

*Cultural adequacy*

* Discrimination in relation to the recognition of culturally adequate dwellings as housing as well as equal access to public space;
* Prohibition of accessing, maintaining or constructing culturally adequate housing;
* Lack of recognition of mobile forms of residency.
* Discrimination in relation to housing for rental or for acquisition or in accessing public or social housing;

Sex workers face discrimination in accessing housing. Even in countries where the act of selling sex itself is not criminalised, or where legalised frameworks operate some form of regulatory system, sex workers continue to face problems finding accommodation, or live in fear of being evicted if neighbours or the landlord find out about their occupation. The social stigma attached to sex work means that people are unwilling to live near sex workers, even if the sex worker is not working from home[[5]](#footnote-5).

* Exposure to other risks which render housing uninhabitable, including sexual or gender-based violence, interference with privacy and physical security in the home and neighbourhood;

Due to criminalisation, sex workers are at an increased risk of violence and are unable or unwilling to report violence against them for fear of prosecution or being persecuted by authorities for being a sex worker. This interferes with their right to physical security in the home in a number of ways; sex workers may be reluctant to report abuse from neighbours or members of the public; sex workers living with abusive partners or family members may feel unable to report domestic violence because of their criminalised status. The criminalisation of sex work and the accompanying stigma and discrimination, directly affects the level of security in the home that sex workers can demand and enjoy.[[6]](#footnote-6)

* Discrimination in relation to evictions, resettlement and compensation for loss or damage of housing, land or livelihoods;

One example of mass eviction targeting sex workers was called Operation Homeless, which took place in Norway from 2007-2011[[7]](#footnote-7). This operation enforced existing sex work laws and resulted in the rapid eviction of many sex workers from their homes. In 2009, 150 homes of sex workers were raided and closed by Oslo police. In Norway, where client criminalisation is in place, landlords can be prosecuted for the promotion of sex work, and this mechanism was used by the government to evict sex workers from their homes, rendering many sex workers homeless. The Nordic Model, despite claims that it aims to ‘protect’ sex workers, worsens their situation as they lose their homes simply for trying to work. Although Operation Homeless ended in 2011, evictions continue to happen and primarily affect migrant sex workers. Sex workers reported to Amnesty International that eviction was something that they constantly feared. This forced eviction is a human rights violation, with sex workers also being denied adequate information about their evictions or denied legal help. There are obvious and immediate harms to being made homeless and additional financial consequences of, for example, losing large deposits that have been put down on apartments. As Mary, a Nigerian sex worker working in Norway, stated to Amnesty: **“Sometimes, they would just give us a few minutes to get out. We would**

**have to run around and get things. We would lose the money we had paid.”**

Eunice, a Nigerian woman, told Amnesty International of her experience of eviction: **“I have been given minutes to leave my apartment. You don’t have time to**

**get all your things. [I had to go and] sleep in the train station.”**

* Discrimination in relation to freedom of choice of the place of residency within the country, within a particular region or location;

In 2014, another mass eviction of a sex worker residential community took place in Bangladesh. At the time, sex workers were forcibly evicted from the Kandapapra brothel in Tangail. 1000 sex workers and their families were removed from the historic red light district, which had been a working and living area for sex workers for over 300 years. The sex workers were given only three days to vacate the district under the threat of their homes being set on fire. 39 sex workers owned property in Tangail, and none of them were reimbursed after the demolition of their houses. The closing of the Tangail brothel district had a disastrous impact on sex workers, as they not only lost their homes, but also the main centre where they organised and where their main sexual health clinic was located. Reasons for the eviction were moral as well as economic. Former residents of the Tangail district reported that the eviction was motivated by a local religious leader wanting to gentrify the district by getting rid of activities considered immoral in the area, with support from the mayor of Tangail who wanted to develop the land[[8]](#footnote-8),[[9]](#footnote-9).

* Living quality and physical security in the neighbourhood, including geographical disparities in policing and law enforcement;

In the United States, where sex work is criminalised in most states, sex workers are repeatedly and disproportionately harassed by law enforcement authorities who carry out raids in areas where sex workers operate. In Sacramento in 2016, for example, police raids of massage parlours left many migrant sex workers without work and therefore unable to pay rent. Homeless sex workers who had lost their jobs because of these raids were eventually able to seek shelter in outdoor living spaces set up by the Hmong community in Northern California. However, these outdoor settlements were also evacuated and destroyed by police authorities, resulting in the homelessness of sex workers and those who tried to support them.[[10]](#footnote-10) The closing of massage parlours in California are an example of how laws that criminalise sex work venues directly affects sex workers’ living security. Without regular and stable income, they cannot afford housing and are pushed into even more precarious circumstances. As many of the sex workers who were victims of the massage parlour raids in Sacramento were migrants from southeast Asian countries, the closure of their workplaces and subsequent eviction from their outdoor community living space demonstrates how they face intersecting marginalisation both as sex workers and as (undocumented) migrants.

The COVID-19 pandemic and resulting lockdowns have resulted in even more economic and social hardship for sex workers. Sex workers all over the world are experiencing a total loss of income and increased discrimination and harassment.[[11]](#footnote-11) The criminalisation of various aspects of sex work in the majority of countries serves to magnify the already precarious situation of sex workers in the informal economy. As sex workers and their clients self-isolate, sex workers are left unprotected, increasingly vulnerable and unable to provide for themselves and their families. Sex worker-led organisations from all regions are reporting a lack of access to national social protection schemes and exclusion from emergency social protection measures being put in place for other workers, particularly where sex work is criminalised. Discrimination and stigma that led to problems such as lack of housing security for sex workers have significantly worsened since the start of the pandemic.

In the United States, sex workers are actively excluded from federal relief funding, even in states where sex work is legal[[12]](#footnote-12). Undocumented sex workers face even more exclusion and rights violations, particularly as the government (Immigration and Customs Enforcement) has started to use the pandemic as an excuse to violate the privacy of the home by posing as public health officials to enter sex workers’ homes. Not only are they forced out of housing for no longer being able to afford the rent, their homes are also being invaded by authorities.

In El Salvador, one of NSWP’s member organisations LIQUIDAMBAR reported the precarious situation that many sex workers find themselves in, as they are unable to work, and lack any kind of alternative support. With many sex workers finding themselves in this difficult position, there is much uncertainty over their ability to earn money to cover essentials such as food and housing. LIQUIDAMBAR reported that, rather than receiving assistance with emergency housing provisions, many sex workers are being removed from their homes: “We do not have an emergency residence, on the contrary they are removing us from our rental housing… which most of the time we are renting precariously.”[[13]](#footnote-13)

9. Are there any particular current laws, policies or practices in your country, region or town/community that contribute to or exacerbate discrimination in relation to the right to adequate housing?

As discussed in the previous section, the lockdown policies in response to the COVID-19 pandemic have resulted in a loss of income for sex workers all over the world and have exacerbated the stigma and discrimination already faced by this marginalised group prior to the pandemic. Sex worker-led organisations from all regions are reporting a lack of access to national social protection schemes and exclusion from emergency social protection measures being put in place for other workers. Whenever and wherever possible, sex workers are responsibly self-isolating in response to governments’ calls. However, when they are excluded from social and economic protection, sex workers are faced with putting their safety, their health and their lives at increased risk to survive. For those who are driven to the streets by homelessness, as has become the case for many brothel and migrant sex workers, the lack of support means little safety or means to comply with government requirements.

The criminalisation of sex work in most countries poses particular challenges for accessing government support and magnifies the already precarious position of sex workers in the informal economy. In the United States, SWOP-Tucson (the Sex Workers Outreach Project) explained that, “many of these schemes require proof that employment has been lost or reduced as a result of COVID-19. Because sex work is criminalised, it’s not possible to provide necessary paperwork and proof of unemployment or hardship. Thus, sex workers can’t get rent/mortgage relief, utility payment abatements or unemployment checks.”

In 2014 in Oakland, California, a law was amended that forced landlords to evict sex workers. At the time, the city council amended the Nuisance Eviction Ordinance (originally passed to order evictions of tenants dealing drugs or weapons) to include “prostitution-related crimes.” The main problem with the amendment to this ordinance was that there was no burden of proof stipulated for a landlord to evict someone suspected of engaging in sex work. Thus, a tenant could be evicted from their home simply for being under suspicion of sex work. According to Red Light Legal, an advocacy organisation for sex workers in California, the amended ordinance “threatens the housing stability of people who are already operating at the margins of society.”[[14]](#footnote-14)

10. Can you explain exemptions in national law that allow (certain) public, private or religious housing providers to give preferential or exclusive access to housing to members of a particular group, for example based on membership, employment contract, public service, age, disability, civil status, sex, gender, religion, income or other criteria?

Click here to enter text.

11. In case there may be differential treatment of particular groups in relation to housing, please explain why such treatment could be justifiable according to international human rights standards - for example positive measures benefiting a particular group to overcome systematic discrimination or disadvantage-or if it would amount to discrimination?

Click here to enter text.

**SPATIAL AND RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION**

12. What forms of spatial segregation along racial, caste, ethnicity, religion, nationality, migration status, heritage, economic status/income or other social grounds can be observed in urban and urban-rural contexts in your country?

Historically and to date, sex work has generally been segregated from the rest of society in the form of red-light districts in urban spaces. For sex workers around the world who also live where they work[[15]](#footnote-15), the segregation of their work areas from the rest of society inevitably becomes an issue of housing segregation for discriminatory reasons related to their occupation. Segregation of sex work in the form of red light zones becomes problematic when these zones are designated in peripheral areas that are more desolate and may therefore harbour a greater risk of violence occurring, and going unnoticed, against those living and working in these areas. Even though red light areas are segregated places for sex workers to operate in urban contexts, sex workers continue to be under threat of red light areas being closed and having their work and living spaces taken away from them. In 2013, sex workers’ flats in London’s Soho red light district were raided and closed after the city council issued an order to the police to tackle crime[[16]](#footnote-16). As in Norway under Operation Homeless, landlords were first put under pressure to evict their tenants. 19 flats where sex workers lived and worked were evicted on the basis of wanting to stop “immoral activities” and also for the desire to gentrify the district[[17]](#footnote-17). As a result, many sex workers were driven into homelessness and forced to turn to working alone or on the street, in more unsafe working conditions. The Soho raids are an example of how urban gentrification measures, together with the stigma against sex workers and the criminalisation of activities associated with sex work in the UK, affect sex workers’ right to housing and subject them to constant fear of being made homeless.

13. What impacts do these forms of spatial and residential segregation have on affected communities? Please point to indicators such as rates of poverty, un-employment and under-employment; prevalence rates of malnutrition; disparities in access to services and facilities (such as access to schooling, health care or other public benefits); disparities in access to infrastructure (lack of and/or poor quality provision of water, sanitation, transportation, energy, waste collection and other utility services); rates of exposure to environmental health risks (poor air quality, flooding, toxic ground exposure, etc).

Click here to enter text.

14. Have any particular historical or current laws, policies or practices in your country, region or town/community caused or exacerbated segregation?

In general, the stigma of sex work results in sex workers being clustered in red light districts, as the rest of society prefers not to have sex work businesses operating alongside other businesses deemed ‘respectable’, or to be visible at all in urban spaces. In countries where sex work has been legalised with regulation, such as in the Netherlands, Germany, Austria and Switzerland, there are still laws and policies restricting the spatial distribution of sex work businesses. In Germany, for example, there are so-called “locked zones” in which sex work is not allowed to take place. Everywhere else, sex work businesses are allowed. Recently, urban gentrification reforms in German cities have resulted in an expansion of locked-zone areas, pushing brothels and other sex work venues out of inner cities and into more peripheral areas[[18]](#footnote-18). This has had a negative effect on the businesses due to their reduced visibility, resulting in lower income for sex workers operating in venues affected by gentrification reforms. Lower income for sex workers in turn reduces their scope of purchasing or renting housing in areas that are most convenient or safe for their individual life circumstances.

15. In your view, what factors (current or historical) are the principal *drivers* of spatial and residential segregation in urban and urban-rural contexts in your country?

Stigma and criminalisation are the main current and historical factors that drive the segregation of sex work and sex workers in both urban and urban-rural contexts, and these factors reinforce each other. Stigma, resulting from misconceptions and harmful stereotypes about sex work and sex workers, results in criminal laws being passed and in turn, the implementation of these laws perpetuates the stigma against sex workers. As evidenced in the previous responses, evictions of sex workers and the segregation of their workplaces into red light districts is motivated by social stigma and legislative approaches that criminalise sex work and cast sex workers as victims, ‘social deviants’, vectors of disease and therefore as undesirable residents and neighbours. Operation Homeless in Norway (as noted above) was an initiative based on the criminalisation of third parties, which includes landlords as potential facilitators of sex work, simply by entering into a tenancy agreement with a sex worker. The criminalisation of sex work is therefore directly used to deny sex workers the basic right to housing.

16. Are there examples in your country of where spatial and residential clustering has been a result of voluntary choices of residence by members of particular groups?

Click here to enter text.

17. The preservation of cultural identity, the right to self-determination of indigenous peoples and the protection of minority rights are examples of grounds for which groups may choose to live separately. Can you comment on how these forms spatial/territorial separation are evidenced in your country, if these communities they are subject to discrimination and suffer adverse consequences from spatial segregation such as through disparities in access to services, infrastructure, living conditions, etc.?

Click here to enter text.

18. In your view, are certain forms of observed residential separation/voluntary clustering compatible with human rights law and if so why? (for example to protect rights of minorities or to respect the freedom of choice of individuals to decide with whom to live together).

Click here to enter text.

19. Are there any laws or policies requiring certain individuals (and their families) to live in particular housing provided to them or in a particular geographical area (e.g. asylum seekers, migrants, IDPs, refugees, ethnic, religious, linguistic or other minorities, indigenous peoples, persons with disabilities, public service and military personnel)?

Click here to enter text.

20. In your view, what are the principal *barriers* to diminishing spatial, including residential segregation?

Click here to enter text.

**MEASURES AND GOOD PRACTICES TO CURB DISCRIMINATION AND REDUCE SEGREGATION**

21. What laws, policies or measures exist at national or local level to prevent or prohibit discrimination in relation to the right to adequate housing?

Click here to enter text.

22. Have your State, regional or local Government adopted any positive measures, such as measures of affirmative action, to reduce discrimination, segregation or structural inequality in relation to housing? To what extent have such initiatives been successful to address housing discrimination and segregation?

Click here to enter text.

23. Have any particular laws, policies or measures been implemented to limit or reduce residential segregation? To what extent have such policies raised human rights concerns?

Click here to enter text.

24. What is the role of the media, as well as other non- governmental organizations, of religious and governmental institutions, in fostering a climate that reduces or exacerbates discrimination in relation to housing and segregation?

The media plays a crucial role in exacerbating the stigma and discrimination against sex work and sex workers, which in turn worsens the discrimination that they face in relation to housing and segregation of their workplaces. Media reports, stories and documentaries about sex work often reproduce negative images and stereotypes about sex work that influence public opinion of sex workers. As described previously, stigmatising views of sex workers contribute significantly to the passing of laws that criminalise some or all aspects of sex work, which in turn are used to deny sex workers housing or to evict them from their homes. As a powerful force of public opinion, the media can directly shape the way sex work is viewed and the way sex workers are treated in society. Likewise, governmental institutions that implement laws, policies and practices that criminalise sex work, or that infringe upon sex workers’ enjoyment of basic human rights, also exacerbate discrimination in relation to housing and segregation. As described in earlier responses, urban gentrification reforms and policies that criminalise third parties in sex work are used to justify evictions of sex workers and the separation of sex work from the rest of society. Conversely, non-governmental organisations that support sex workers’ rights, including sex worker-led organisations, may help to mitigate the stigma against sex workers by highlighting alternative perspectives of sex work, with the media and government institutions, that take a rights-affirming approach to sex work. By platforming evidence directly from sex worker communities on the harms of criminalisation, the work of non-governmental organisations can contribute to the de-stigmatisation of sex work and the recognition of sex work as work. Changing the way sex work and sex workers are perceived and treated in society, accompanied by the full decriminalisation of sex work and the recognition of sex work as work, will in turn impact sex workers’ access to housing and the protection of their housing rights.

25. Which institutional mechanisms exist to report, redress and monitor cases of discrimination or segregation in relation to the right to adequate housing and how effective have they been to address discrimination?

Click here to enter text.

26. In your view, what are the principal barriers to seek justice for discrimination/segregation in relation to the right to adequate housing?

In the cases of eviction highlighted in Norway and the United States, the sex workers who were evicted were unable to seek justice for the violation of their housing rights. This was largely due to intersecting marginalisations and disadvantages that they faced, such as their migration or undocumented status. When sex workers lack documentation they are unable to access the justice system when they face violence or when their rights are violated. In countries where they are criminalised for being sex workers or where their work is criminalised, this further discourages them from going to authorities to seek justice for discrimination in relation to their right to adequate housing. Thus, laws and policies that on the one hand, criminalise sex work and on the other hand, restrict the rights of migrants, who make up a large proportion of sex workers in many countries, are the principal barriers to sex workers being able to seek justice when faced with discrimination in relation to housing.

27. Can you specify how individuals and groups subject to structural discrimination or experiencing segregation can submit complaints to administrative, non-judicial or judicial bodies to seek relief? Please share any leading cases that have been decided by your courts or other agencies in this respect.

In Bangladesh, prior to the mass eviction of the Tangail brothel in 2014 (see response to Question 8), the Bangladesh High Court had ruled in the favour of sex workers’ rights during a case conducted by BSEHR vs. Government of Bangladesh (2001). In the ruling, the Court “upheld the fundamental right to the protection of privacy of sex workers” and “that the eviction of sex workers had deprived them of their livelihood.”[[19]](#footnote-19) Based on this judgment, the sex workers of Kandapara who had been evicted, were able to take their case to court and reclaim their right to live and work in Tangail. Their claims were initially dismissed, but then recognised because they had title deeds for the majority of land seized. The brothel district was re-established in 2016 with support of the judicial court and currently there are about four hundred female sex workers living there.[[20]](#footnote-20)

**DATA ON DISCRIMINATION IN HOUSING AND SPATIAL/RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION**

28. Is any data on housing disparities, housing discrimination and spatial segregation collected and publicly available? If so where can it be accessed? Are there any practical or legal barriers to collect and share such information in your country?

Click here to enter text.

29. Can you kindly share any studies or surveys by local, regional or national Governments or by other institutions to understand better housing disparities, housing discrimination and spatial segregation and how it can be addressed (e.g. title and link, or kindly submit document).

The following links, provided in addition to the footnotes provided throughout this submission, provide supplementary information, including studies and reports about criminalisation and sex workers’ experiences in the pandemic, that are directly related to the issue of sex workers’ access to housing.

1) ICRSE, 2021 “[Sex Workers on the Frontline](http://www.sexworkeurope.org/news/news-region/icrse-launches-its-new-report-sex-workers-frontline#overlay-context=news/news-region/icrse-launches-its-new-report-sex-workers-frontline)”

2) Lam, “[Pandemic sex workers’ resilience: COVID-19 crisis met with rapid responses by sex worker communities](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0020872820962202)” International Social Work (2020): 777-781.

3) Breakstone, [“I don’t really sleep”: Street-based sex work, public housing rights and harm reduction](https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1384&context=clr) City University of New York Law Review (2015): 338-372.

4) Sebastian Kohn, “[The false promise of “end demand” laws](https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/voices/false-promise-end-demand-laws)” Open Society Foundation Voices, 02.06.2017

30. Can you provide information and statistics related to complaints related to housing discrimination, how they have been investigated and settled, and information on cases in which private or public actors have been compelled successfully to end such discrimination or been fined or sanctioned for non-compliance?

1. #  NSWP, 2018, “[Policy Brief: The Impact of Stigma and Discrimination on Key Populations and Their Families](https://www.nswp.org/resource/policy-brief-the-impact-stigma-and-discrimination-key-populations-and-their-families).”

 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. NSWP, 2016, “[Policy Brief: The Decriminalisation of Third Parties](https://www.nswp.org/resource/policy-brief-the-decriminalisation-third-parties),” p2,7. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. NSWP, 2017, “[Smart Sex Workers' Guide: Challenging the Introduction of the Nordic Model](https://www.nswp.org/resource/smart-sex-workers-guide-challenging-the-introduction-the-nordic-model).” [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. NSWP, 2019, “[Twenty Years Of Failing Sex Workers: A community report on the impact of the 1999 Swedish Sex Purchase Act](https://www.nswp.org/resource/member-publications/twenty-years-failing-sex-workers-fuckforbundet-impact-1999-swedish-sex-purchase-act).” [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Lyons, T. et al, “[The Impacts of Intersecting Stigmas on Health and Housing Experiences of Queer Women Sex Workers in Vancouver, Canada](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31774383/),” Journal of Homosexuality 68 (2021): 957-972. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. NSWP, 2010, “[Research for Sex Work 12: Sex Work and Violence](https://www.nswp.org/resource/research-sex-work-12-sex-work-and-violence).” [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Amnesty International, 2016, “[Norway: The human cost of ‘crushing’ the market: Criminalization of sex work in Norway](https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/eur36/4034/2016/en/).” [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Pantha, “[Bangladesh Authorities Shut Down a 200-Year-Old Brothel, Evicting Hundreds of Sex Workers](https://globalvoices.org/2014/07/28/bangladesh-authorities-shut-down-a-200-year-old-brothel-evicting-hundreds-of-sex-workers/),” Global Voices, 28.07.2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. NSWP, 2014, “[Evicted Tangail Sex Workers: What Happened and Where We are Now](https://www.nswp.org/news/evicted-tangail-sex-workers-what-happened-and-where-we-are-now)” [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. NSWP, 2016, “[Massage Parlour Raids in Sacramento, California Have Devastating Effects on Sex Workers](https://www.nswp.org/news/massage-parlour-raids-sacramento-california-have-devastating-effects-sex-workers).” [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. UNAIDS & NSWP, 2020, “[Sex workers must not be left behind in the response to COVID-19](https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/presscentre/pressreleaseandstatementarchive/2020/april/20200408_sex-workers-covid-19).” [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. NSWP, 2020, “[COVID-19 Impact – United States](https://www.nswp.org/news/covid-19-impact-united-states).” [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. NSWP, 2020, “[COVID-19 Impact – El Salvador](https://www.nswp.org/news/covid-19-impact-el-salvador).” [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. NSWP, 2014, “[Oakland Landlords are Now Required to Evict Sex Workers](https://www.nswp.org/news/oakland-landlords-are-now-required-evict-sex-workers).” [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Sanhati Banerjee, “[Sex Workers Of Sonagachi: Social Distancing & Stigma During COVID-19](https://feminisminindia.com/2020/04/15/sex-workers-sonagachi-social-distancing-stigma-covid-19/),” Feminism in India, 15.04.2020. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
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