

## BRIEF · 02

# Replication Framework

How to adapt the Minnesota Model in another state or region — what's portable, what's local, and where the model breaks if you skip steps.

## Four levers of replication

### 1. Coordinated Entry & By-Name List

Stand up one front door for veterans across the geography, with a shared by-name list maintained across all partner organizations. Without this, the rest of the system optimizes for the wrong things.

### 2. Right-Sized Housing Inventory

Inventory must match actual demand across prevention, rapid re-housing, transitional, and permanent supportive housing. Imbalance — too much of one type, too little of another — is the most common failure mode.

### 3. Wraparound Enablement Services

Housing alone does not produce stability. Legal, employment, benefits, behavioral health, and case management must be funded as part of the housing investment, not as separate line items.

### 4. Governance & Shared Accountability

A backbone organization with the authority and trust to convene the VA, state government, counties, CoCs, and providers around shared outcomes. This is the single most underestimated requirement.

## Phased adaptation

### Phase 1 — Diagnose

Map current inflow, inventory, partners, data, and gaps against the five components. Identify the weakest link — that's where to start.

### Phase 2 — Convene

Establish the backbone organization role, by-name list, and shared performance metrics. Get the VA and state housing agency to the same table on a recurring cadence.

### Phase 3 — Build

Close inventory and service gaps in priority order. Fund enablement services on parity with housing.

### Phase 4 — Sustain

Move from project funding to system funding. Tie public and philanthropic dollars to system outcomes, not provider activity.

## Where the model breaks

- No single front door — veterans bounce between providers and fall through.
- Housing inventory built without matching service capacity — placements fail.
- Data fragmented across agencies — no one can see the system.
- Governance treated as a meeting, not a mandate — coordination decays under pressure.

*Lessons from peer geographies (e.g., Houston) reinforce the same pattern: the technical components are well known; the durable advantage comes from governance and data discipline.*