

1 Introduction

There are several different government programs that provide housing assistance to Indigenous people – both Indigenous-specific programs and mainstream programs. The two main Indigenous-specific forms of social housing are:

- state owned and managed Indigenous housing (SOMIH) – managed by state governments with funding provided under the Commonwealth–State Housing Agreement (CSHA)
- Indigenous community housing (ICH) – managed by Indigenous community housing organisations (ICHOs) with funding provided by both the states and the Commonwealth.

In addition to these Indigenous-specific programs, Indigenous people are also eligible for assistance through mainstream housing programs such as public housing, community housing and Commonwealth Rent Assistance (CRA).

SOMIH dwellings are owned and managed by state housing authorities in the six states – New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania. In Victoria, there are some dwellings that are community managed but owned by the state government. These are counted as SOMIH dwellings for the purposes of this report.

The administrative arrangements for ICH are more complex and vary across jurisdictions. In some jurisdictions, only the states are involved in the administration of ICH; in some only the Commonwealth is involved; and in others both the relevant state and the Commonwealth are involved.

The Australian Government, through the Department of Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaCSIA) (and formerly through Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Services), is directly responsible for the administration of ICH in three jurisdictions – Queensland, Victoria and Tasmania. In Victoria and Tasmania, there is only Australian Government ICH, while in Queensland, some ICH is administered by the Australian Government and some by the state government. In the five remaining jurisdictions – New South Wales, Western Australia, South Australia, the Australian Capital Territory and the Northern Territory – funding from the relevant state and the Australian Government is pooled and the state or territory government has sole responsibility for the administration of ICH.

The National Reporting Framework

The National Reporting Framework (NRF) for Indigenous Housing was developed to provide a framework for reporting across all Indigenous housing programs, as well as to report on the implementation and outcomes of *Building a better future: Indigenous housing to 2010* (BBF). BBF was a 10-year statement of new directions in Indigenous housing endorsed by housing ministers in May 2001 (HMC 2001).

The NRF comprises a set of 36 performance indicators for national reporting on Indigenous housing. The NRF includes indicators on the Indigenous-specific programs ICH and SOMIH, and on Indigenous access to mainstream housing programs; as well as on broader measures such as tenure type and homelessness. There are indicators relating to connection to services,

dwelling condition, overcrowding, affordability of housing, rents collected, and recurrent to capital expenditure on Indigenous housing. This report provides current national data for each NRF indicator. These data are summarised in Appendix A.

In order to report on the outcomes of BBF, the indicators in the NRF were mapped to the seven outcome areas identified in BBF. Appendix B lists the NRF indicators under the seven BBF outcome areas.

Data sources

Data for some of the NRF indicators come from Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) surveys such as the 2006 Community Housing and Infrastructure Needs Survey (CHINS). Most of the data in this report, however, come from the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) administrative housing data collections – the NRF administrative data collection and the CSHA national SOMIH data collection.

NRF administrative data collection

The NRF administrative data collection was developed by the AIHW primarily to collect data on the ICH sector. The scope of the ICH data collection includes those dwellings and households residing in dwellings targeted for Indigenous people that are managed by funded or actively registered ICHOs.

Data on state ICH were collected by the AIHW from the states and territories through the NRF data manual, which included national specifications and definitions. Data on Australian Government ICH were collected through a special questionnaire that was sent either to regional managers or directly to the ICHO (see Appendix C). The data collected through this questionnaire comes from both funded and unfunded organisations. It is less comprehensive and does not always conform to the national specifications provided to states and territories. The state ICH and Australian Government ICH data are therefore presented separately in the tables in this publication.

Data issues

This is the second indicator-based report on the NRF and the data definitions and collections are still being developed and refined. For the 2005–06 report, jurisdictions were asked to provide SOMIH data for 17 NRF indicators and ICH data for 21 indicators. The jurisdictions were able to provide between 82% and 100% of the data requested.

There are issues with the comparability of the administrative data as they come from jurisdictions' own data systems. The scope of the data collections may vary and the data items collected may differ somewhat across jurisdictions.

Where possible, time trend data have been presented; however, caution should be taken when comparing data over time as specific details of the data reported have changed. For example, the data on Australian Government ICH were not consistently provided by the same ICHOs for each year. Also, national totals have not been reported where data were unavailable from two or more jurisdictions. Caution should be taken when comparing national totals when one jurisdiction did not provide data.

As with any Indigenous data, there are issues with the quality of some of the data. Indigenous identification does not pose a problem in SOMIH and ICH data collections, since

these are Indigenous-specific programs; however, in other data collections such as the Census or mainstream administrative data collections, there is likely to be under-identification of Indigenous people.

Alternative data were provided for some indicators from the ABS Community Housing and Infrastructure Needs Survey (CHINS). The CHINS data are provided by key personnel in each community and may be subject to survey error, but provide good estimates for some indicators. The major disadvantage of the survey data is that it is only available every five to six years and is therefore not always as recent an estimate as the NRF administrative data. As administrative data collections are improved, these alternative data sources will no longer be necessary for many of the indicators.

As part of implementation of BBF and reporting through the NRF, there is a commitment by jurisdictions to further develop the administrative data on Indigenous housing. The Agreement on National Indigenous Housing Information (ANIHI) provides a framework for improving the quality of the national data on Indigenous housing. All states and territories are signatories to the ANIHI, along with FaCSIA, the ABS and the AIHW. The role of the AIHW is to assist in the development of this national data collection and to ensure national consistency through the development of national data items, data definitions and standards.

Structure of the report

The report presents the NRF data indicator by indicator. Data were not presented for indicators if there were no updated data available since the publication of the previous version of this report, *Indigenous housing indicators 2003–04*.

The indicators are presented in two sections: Section 2 includes the quantitative indicators and Section 3 includes the qualitative indicators. The layout for each indicator is as follows:

- the national definition for data used to report against the indicator
- the scope of the data collection used to report against the indicator
- information about the data sources
- for quantitative indicators, current estimates for 2005–06 and time trend data where available
- for qualitative indicators, current information reported by each jurisdiction.

Appendix A includes a summary table of the 2005–06 NRF data.

Appendix B shows how the 36 NRF indicator map to BBF outcome areas.

Appendix C provides the questionnaire used to collect data on Australian Government ICH.

2 Quantitative indicators

Indicator 1. Total number of dwellings targeted to Indigenous people

Purpose

This indicator provides a measure of the number of dwellings specifically targeted to Indigenous households, regardless of condition of the dwelling, and an indication of the growth of housing provided to Indigenous people.

Description

The total number of ICH dwellings (permanent and improvised) at 30 June.

The total number of SOMIH dwellings (able to support tenants or not) at 30 June.

Scope

All SOMIH dwellings. ICH dwellings managed by funded ICHOs.

Data sources

Data on state ICH administrative data provided by the states and territories. Data on Australian Government ICH come from a survey of ICHOs undertaken by FaCSIA each year (see Appendix C).

The SOMIH data were collected by the AIHW in the CSHA national data collection.

ABS CHINS data are also provided.

Data

Current estimates

- Administrative data indicate that there were 22,192 ICH dwellings across Australia at 30 June 2006 (Table 2.1).
- Some 15,735 of these dwellings were state ICH dwellings managed by funded ICHOs and 2,033 were Australian Government ICH dwellings.
- The Northern Territory had the highest number of ICH dwellings (6,807), followed by Queensland (5,671).
- There were 12,893 SOMIH dwellings at 30 June 2006.

- New South Wales had the highest number of SOMIH dwellings (4,147), followed by Queensland (2,916).

Table 2.1: Total number of ICH and SOMIH dwellings, by state and territory, at 30 June 2006

Dwelling type	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Total
ICH									
State ICH ^(a)	4,989	..	4,136	3,213 ^(d)	991	..	23	6,807	20,159
<i>Managed by funded orgs^(b)</i>	2,450	..	4,136	1,374	945	..	23	6,807	15,735
Australian Govt ICH ^(c)	..	442	1,535	56	2,033
Total ICH	4,989	442	5,671	3,213 ^(d)	991	56	23	6,807	22,192
SOMIH	4,147	1,291 ^(e)	2,916	2,272	1,915	352	12,893

(a) Includes dwellings managed by funded and unfunded state and territory administered ICHOs. The data for Queensland do not include improvised dwellings.

(b) Includes dwellings managed by funded or actively registered state and territory administered ICHOs. In some jurisdictions all organisations are funded each year, while in others only a subset of organisations is funded. The data for Queensland do not include improvised dwellings.

(c) Includes dwellings managed by funded and unfunded organisations responding to the FaCSIA survey, a subset of total dwellings. The data from Victoria exclude six ICHOs. Queensland excludes 24 ICHOs and Tasmania excludes one ICHO. A separate audit process, for example, found that there were 2,070 Australian Government administered dwellings in Queensland, rather than the 1,535 found in the FaCSIA survey.

(d) Based on Western Australia's Environmental Health Needs Survey 2003, for all Western Australian communities, updated for new houses and demolitions.

(e) In Victoria, there is a very small number of properties managed by Aboriginal Housing Victoria (AHV) which are not owned by the Office of Housing, but for practical purposes are reported under SOMIH with other AHV properties.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection and CSHA data collections; AIHW 2006c.

- The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) 2006 Community Housing and Infrastructure Needs Survey (CHINS) provides estimates of the number of dwellings managed by Indigenous housing organisations (whether funded or unfunded). These numbers are provided by key personnel in Indigenous communities and housing organisations.
- In 2006, CHINS estimated that there were 21,854 permanent dwellings managed by Indigenous housing organisations (Table 2.2).
- The number of dwellings managed by Indigenous housing organisations increased by almost 600 between 2001 and 2006.
- In some jurisdictions there were considerable differences in the number of dwellings estimated in CHINS and the number in the NRF administrative data. The differences are likely to be related to the different methodologies used to collect the data.

Table 2.2: Number of permanent dwellings managed by Indigenous housing organisations, by state and territory, 2001 and 2006

Year	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	NT	Total
2001	4,088 ^(a)	416	5,673	3,273	1,004	118	6,715	21,287
2006	4,176 ^(a)	469	6,230	3,462	935	134	6,448	21,854

(a) Includes the ACT.

Source: 2006 CHINS (ABS 2007).

Time trends

Table 2.3: Total number of ICH and SOMIH dwellings, by state and territory, at 30 June 2004 to 30 June 2006

Year	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Total
ICH									
2004	4,616	476	6,079	2,837	1,093	128	32	6,456	21,717
2005	4,863	471	2,103 ^(a)	2,877 ^(b)	969	133	95 ^(c)	6,750	18,261 ^(a)
2006	4,989	442	5,671	3,213 ^(b)	991	56	23	6,807	22,192
SOMIH									
2004	4,088	1,260 ^(d)	2,811	2,325	1,900	341	12,725
2005	4,148	1,277 ^(d)	2,866	2,315	1,903	351	12,860
2006 ^(d)	4,147	1,291 ^(d)	2,916	2,272	1,915	352	12,893

(a) Total does not include over 3,000 state administered ICH dwellings in Queensland.

(b) Based on Western Australia's Environmental Health Needs Survey 2003, for all Western Australian communities, updated for new houses and demolitions.

(c) Data include Australian Government administered dwellings from Jervis Bay which were not included for other years.

(d) In Victoria, there is a very small number of properties managed by Aboriginal Housing Victoria (AHV) which are not owned by the Office of Housing, but for practical purposes are reported under SOMIH with other AHV properties.

Source: AIHW NRF and CSHA data collections; 2005c, e, f, AIHW 2006c.

- Between 30 June 2004 and 30 June 2006, there was an increase of some 475 in the number of ICH dwellings in Australia (Table 2.3).
- The biggest increase in the number of ICH dwellings was in Western Australia, New South Wales and the Northern Territory. The number of ICH dwellings dropped in all other jurisdictions.
- There was an increase of 168 in the number of SOMIH dwellings across Australia between 2004 and 2006.

Indicator 2. Proportion of improvised dwellings

Purpose

Improvised dwellings are inadequate dwellings and in most cases do not meet the standards required to support healthy living practices. There is a strong correlation between inadequate housing and poor health outcomes.

Description

The number of ICH improvised dwellings at 30 June divided by the total number (permanent and improvised) of ICH dwellings at 30 June, multiplied by 100.

An improvised dwelling is defined as a structure used as a place of residence which does not meet the building requirements to be considered a permanent dwelling. This includes caravans, tin sheds without internal walls, humpies and dongas. Permanent dwellings are buildings designed for people to live in, with fixed walls, a roof and doors. Dwellings were not considered permanent unless they had internal walls dividing the living space into separate rooms.

Scope

Dwellings managed by ICHOs that were funded or actively registered in 2005–06.

Data sources

Data on state ICH are administrative data provided by the states and territories. Data on Australian Government ICH come from a survey of ICHOs undertaken by FaCSIA each year (see Appendix C).

Alternative data from the 2006 CHINS are also provided.

Data

Current estimates

Table 2.4: Number and proportion of ICH improvised dwellings, by state and territory, 30 June 2006

Dwellings	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Total
State ICH^(a)									
No. improvised	—	..	n.a.	n.a.	8 ^(b)	..	—	639	n.a.
Total no.	2,450	..	4,136 ^(c)	1,374	945 ^(b)	..	23	6,807	15,735
% improvised	—	..	n.a.	n.a.	0.8	..	—	9.4	n.a.
Australian Government ICH^(d)									
No. improvised	..	9	28	3	40
Total no.	..	442	1,535	56	2,033
% improvised	..	2.0	1.8	5.4	2.0

(a) Includes dwellings managed by state and territory administered ICHOs that were funded or actively registered in 2005–06.

(b) Data only relate to dwellings managed by both funded and unfunded ICHOs.

(c) Data do not include improvised dwellings.

(d) Includes dwellings managed by funded and unfunded organisations responding to the FaCSIA survey. The data from Victoria exclude six ICHOs. Queensland excludes 24 ICHOs and Tasmania excludes one ICHO.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection.

- The Northern Territory had the highest number (639) and proportion (9%) of improvised dwellings among all jurisdictions (Table 2.4).
- There were no improvised dwellings in state ICH in New South Wales or the Australian Capital Territory and only eight in South Australia.

Table 2.5: Number and proportion of occupied temporary dwellings in discrete Indigenous communities, by state and territory, 2006

Dwellings	NSW ^(a)	Vic/Tas	Qld	WA	SA	NT	Total
No. temporary	53	6	483	311	105	638	1,596
Total no.	1,180	89	5,069	3,504	1,097	7,834	18,773
Temporary (%)	4.5	6.7	9.5	8.9	9.6	8.1	8.5

(a) Includes the ACT.

Note: Victoria and Tasmania are grouped due to small numbers.

Source: 2006 CHINS (ABS 2007).

- The CHINS estimated that there were 1,596 occupied temporary or improvised dwellings in discrete Indigenous communities in Australia (Table 2.5).
- The Northern Territory had the highest number (638) of occupied temporary dwellings, followed by Queensland (438) and Western Australia (311).
- Queensland and South Australia had the highest proportion of temporary dwellings in discrete communities (10%).

Time trends

Table 2.6: Proportion of improvised ICH dwellings, by state and territory, 30 June 2004 to 30 June 2006

Year	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Total
State ICH^(a)									
2004	—	..	1.2 ^(b)	12.2 ^(c)	0.1 ^(c)	..	—	6.1	4.2
2005	—	..	n.a.	n.a.	0.1 ^(c)	..	—	11.2	n.a.
2006	—	..	n.a.	n.a.	0.8 ^(c)	..	—	9.4	n.a.
Australian Government ICH^(d)									
2005	..	1.1	0.6	—	11.0	..	0.9
2006	..	2.0	1.8	5.4	2.0

(a) Includes dwellings managed by state and territory administered ICHOs that were funded in the financial year.

(b) Data are for August 2003 not June 2004.

(c) Includes dwellings managed by funded and unfunded ICHOs.

(d) Includes dwellings managed by funded and unfunded organisations responding to the FaCSIA survey which can vary from year to year and care should therefore be taken in interpreting trends. The data from Victoria exclude one ICHO for 2005 and six ICHOs for 2006; Queensland excludes 21 ICHOs for 2005 and 24 ICHOs in 2006; Tasmania exclude one ICHO for 2006.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection; AIHW 2005f.

- Between 2004 and 2006 the proportion of improvised dwellings increased in state ICH in South Australia and the Northern Territory (Table 2.6).
- There was also an increase in the proportion improvised dwellings in Australian Government ICH in Victoria, Queensland and Tasmania over the same period; though this may reflect changes in the organisations responding to the survey.

Indicator 3. Proportion of dwellings needing major repairs

Purpose

Dwellings needing major repair are likely to be in poor condition and may be both unsafe and lack essential working facilities. This may impact on the health and wellbeing of people living in the dwelling.

Description

The number of ICH dwellings needing major repairs divided by the total number of ICH dwellings, multiplied by 100. Dwellings are regarded as being in need of major repair if the cost of repairs is more than:

- \$20,000 to \$60,000 in low-cost areas
- \$27,000 to \$80,000 in medium-cost areas
- \$33,000 to \$100,000 in high-cost areas.

Scope

ICH only.

Data sources

The data provided for this indicator were from the 2006 CHINS. Data on dwelling condition were not included in the AIHW 2005–06 NRF data collection.

Data

Table 2.7: Number and proportion of permanent dwellings managed by Indigenous housing organisations needing major repairs, by state and territory, 2006

Dwellings	NSW ^(a)	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	NT	Total
No. needing major repair	783	116	1,639	967	209	41	1,356	5,111
Total no.	4,176	469	6,230	3,462	935	134	6,448	21,854
% needing major repair	18.8	24.7	26.3	27.9	22.4	30.6	21.0	23.4

(a) Includes the ACT.

Source: 2006 CHINS (ABS 2007) Table 4.8.

- There were 5,111 permanent dwellings in Australia managed by Indigenous housing organisations that required major repairs (Table 2.7).
- Queensland (1,639) and the Northern Territory (1,356) had the highest number of improvised dwellings needing major repair, while Tasmania had the highest proportion (31%).

Indicator 4. Proportion of dwellings needing replacement

Purpose

Dwellings needing replacement are likely to be in very poor condition and may be both unsafe and lack essential working facilities. This will impact on the health and wellbeing of people living in the dwelling.

Description

The number of ICH dwellings needing replacement divided by the total number of ICH dwellings, multiplied by 100. Dwellings in need of replacement are those needing repairs of:

- \$60,000 or more for low-cost areas
- \$80,000 or more for medium-cost areas
- \$100,000 or more for high-cost areas.

Scope

ICH only.

Data sources

The data provided for this indicator are from the 2006 CHINS for ICH only. Data for this indicator are not included in the AIHW 2005–06 NRF data collection.

Data

Table 2.8: Number and proportion of permanent dwellings managed by Indigenous housing organisations needing replacement, by state and territory, 2006

Dwellings	NSW ^(a)	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	NT	Total
No. needing replacement	112	21	367	349	54	—	660	1,563
Total no.	4,176	469	6,230	3,462	935	134	6,448	21,854
% needing replacement	2.7	4.5	5.9	10.1	5.8	—	10.2	7.2

(a) Includes the ACT.

Source: 2006 CHINS (ABS 2007).

- In 2006, there were 1,563 permanent dwellings managed by Indigenous housing organisations that required replacement. Most of these were in the Northern Territory (660), Queensland (367) and Western Australia (349) (Table 2.8).
- Western Australia and the Northern Territory had the highest proportion (10%) of dwellings needing replacement.

Indicator 6. Proportion of communities not connected to (a) water (b) sewerage (c) electricity

Purpose

Connection to services such as water, sewerage and electricity services is important for both good health and wellbeing. Lack of essential infrastructure is associated with higher rates of infectious diseases.

Description

The number of Indigenous communities not connected to an organised system for:

- (a) water
- (b) sewerage
- (c) electricity

divided by the total number of Indigenous communities, multiplied by 100.

An 'organised system' for:

- sewerage, relates to those organised on a community basis – including those connected to a town system, community waterborne system, septic tanks, pit or pan toilets, or other organised system such as a chemical or biological system
- water, relates to a supply that is organised on a community basis – including those connected to town supply, bore water, rainwater tanks, well or spring, water pumped from a river or reservoir, or other type of organised supply, but not including individuals bringing water to the community for personal consumption
- electricity, relates to an organised electricity supply that can include those organised on a community basis and those organised for individual houses – including state grid/transmitted supply, community generators, domestic generators, solar power or other organised electricity supply.

Scope

ICH only.

Data sources

The data for this indicator are from the 2006 CHINS for ICH only. Data for this indicator were not included in the AIHW 2005–06 NRF data collection.

Data

Table 2.9: Number and proportion of discrete Indigenous communities not connected to an organised supply of water, sewerage and electricity, by state and territory, 2006

Not connected to organised supply:	NSW^(a)	Vic/Tas	Qld	WA	SA	NT	Total
No. communities not connected							
Water	—	—	—	1	1	7	9
Sewerage	—	—	5	8	3	7	23
Electricity	2	—	5	5	2	20	34
Total no. communities							
	57	3	124	271	91	641	1,187
% communities not connected							
Water	—	—	—	0.4	1.1	1.1	0.8
Sewerage	—	—	4.0	3.0	3.3	1.1	1.9
Electricity	3.5	—	4.0	1.8	2.2	3.1	2.9

(a) Includes the ACT.

Note: Victoria and Tasmania are grouped due to small numbers.

Source: 2006 CHINS (ABS 2007).

- The majority of discrete Indigenous communities in Australia were connected to an organised supply of water (99%), sewerage (98%) and electricity (97%) (Table 2.9).
- The Northern Territory had the largest number of communities not connected to an organised supply of these services, with seven not connected to water or sewerage and 20 not connected to electricity.

Indicator 7. Proportion of dwellings not connected to (a) water (b) sewerage (c) electricity

Purpose

Connection to services such as water, sewerage and electricity services is important for both good health and wellbeing. Lack of essential infrastructure is associated with higher rates of infectious diseases.

Description

The number of permanent ICH dwellings not connected to an organised system for:

- (a) water
- (b) sewerage
- (c) electricity

divided by the total number of permanent ICH dwellings, multiplied by 100.

An 'organised system' for:

- sewerage, relates to those organised on a community basis – including those connected to a town system, community waterborne system, septic tanks, pit or pan toilets, or other organised system such as a chemical or biological system
- water, relates to a supply that is organised on a community basis – including those connected to town supply, bore water, rainwater tanks, well or spring, water pumped from a river or reservoir, or other type of organised supply, but not including individuals bringing water to the community for personal consumption
- electricity, relates to an organised electricity supply that can include those organised on a community basis and those organised for individual houses – including state grid/transmitted supply, community generators, domestic generators, solar power or other organised electricity supply.

Scope

Dwellings managed by ICHOs that were funded or actively registered in 2005–06.

Data sources

Data on state ICH is administrative data provided by the states and territories. Data on Australian Government ICH come from a survey of ICHOs undertaken by FaCSIA each year (see Appendix C).

Data

Table 2.10: Number and proportion of ICH dwellings not connected to an organised system for water, sewerage or electricity, by state and territory, 30 June 2006

Not connected to organised supply:	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA ^(a)	Tas	ACT	NT	Total
State ICH^(b)									
<i>Number</i>									
Water	—	..	—	—	—	..	—	292	292
Sewerage	—	..	—	—	—	..	—	396	396
Electricity	—	..	—	—	—	..	—	334	334
Total no. dwellings	2,450	..	4,136	1,374	759	..	23	6,168	14,910
<i>Per cent</i>									
Water	—	..	—	—	—	..	—	4.7	2.0
Sewerage	—	..	—	—	—	..	—	6.4	2.7
Electricity	—	..	—	—	—	..	—	5.4	2.2
Australian Government ICH^(c)									
<i>Number</i>									
Water	..	—	2	—	2
Sewerage	..	—	9	—	9
Electricity	..	—	2	—	2
Total no. dwellings	..	433	1,507	53	1,993
<i>Per cent</i>									
Water	..	—	0.1	—	0.1
Sewerage	..	—	0.6	—	0.5
Electricity	..	—	0.1	—	0.1

(a) Data only relates to those funded ICHOs who provided data, covering 81% of funded dwellings.

(b) Includes permanent dwellings managed by state and territory administered ICHOs that were funded or actively registered in 2005–06.

(c) Includes permanent dwellings managed by funded and unfunded organisations responding to the FaCSIA survey. The data from Victoria exclude six ICHOs. Queensland excludes 24 ICHOs and Tasmania excludes one ICHO.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection.

- The majority of ICH permanent dwellings in Australia were connected to an organised system of water, sewerage or electricity (Table 2.10).
- There were, however, 292 ICH permanent dwellings not connected to an organised water supply, 396 not connected to an organised sewerage system and 334 not connected to an organised electricity supply.
- In the Northern Territory, 5% of ICH dwellings were not connected to an organised water supply, 6% to an organised sewerage system and 5% to an organised electricity supply.

Time trends

Table 2.11: Proportion of ICH dwellings not connected to an organised system for water, sewerage or electricity, by state and territory, 30 June 2004 to 30 June 2006

Not connected to an organised supply:	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Total
State ICH^(a)									
Water									
2004	n.a.	..	—	7.6 ^(b)	2.8 ^(c)	..	—	1.6	2.4
2005	—	..	n.a.	n.a.	—	..	—	n.a.	n.a.
2006	—	..	—	—	—	..	—	4.7	2.0
Sewerage									
2004	n.a.	..	—	9.5 ^(b)	2.8 ^(c)	..	—	21.0	11.6
2005	—	..	n.a.	n.a.	—	..	—	n.a.	n.a.
2006	—	..	—	—	—	..	—	6.4	2.7
Electricity									
2004	n.a.	..	—	6.1 ^(b)	2.8 ^(c)	..	—	2.4	2.4
2005	—	..	n.a.	n.a.	—	..	—	n.a.	n.a.
2006	—	..	—	—	—	..	—	5.4	2.3
Australian Government ICH^(d)									
Water									
2004	..	0.2	1.2	—	—	..	1.0
2005	..	—	—	—	—	..	—
2006	..	—	0.1	—	0.1
Sewerage									
2004	..	—	3.1	2.3	—	..	2.5
2005	..	—	2.0	—	—	..	1.5
2006	..	—	0.6	—	0.5
Electricity									
2004	..	0.2	2.3	—	—	..	1.8
2005	..	0.4	—	—	—	..	0.1
2006	..	—	0.1	—	0.1

(a) Includes permanent dwellings managed by state and territory administered ICHOs that were funded in the financial year, except for 2004 data for WA.

(b) Includes dwellings managed by funded and unfunded ICHOs.

(c) Data relate to the number of permanent dwellings in communities not connected to these services.

(d) Includes permanent dwellings managed by funded and unfunded organisations responding to the FaCSIA survey which can vary from year to year and care should therefore be taken in interpreting trends. The data from Victoria exclude one ICHO for 2005 and six ICHOs for 2006; Queensland excludes 4 ICHOs for 2004, 21 ICHOs for 2005 and 24 ICHOs in 2006; Tasmania one exclude one ICHO for 2006.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection.

- The proportion of dwellings not connected to an organised system for water, sewerage or electricity decreased between 2004 and 2006 (Table 2.11).
- The largest decrease was in the Northern Territory where the proportion not connected to an organised sewerage system fell from 21% in 2004 to 6% in 2006.

Table 2.12: Permanent dwellings in discrete Indigenous communities not connected to an organised system for water, sewerage or electricity, 2001 and 2006

	Water	Sewerage	Electricity
2001			
No. dwellings in communities with no organised system	13	153	80
Total number of permanent dwellings	16,966	16,966	16,966
Per cent dwellings with no organised system	0.08	0.90	0.47
2006			
No. dwellings in communities with no organised system	10	51	85
Total number of permanent dwellings	17,177	17,177	17,177
Per cent dwellings with no organised system	0.06	0.30	0.49

Note: Data are collected at the community level and relate to the number of permanent dwellings in communities not connected to an organised supply.

Source: ABS 2006 CHINS.

- The CHINS collected data on the number of permanent dwellings in communities that were not connected to an organised system for water, sewerage and electricity. The CHINS numbers are different to those in the NRF, probably due to differences in the scope and methodology of the two data collections.
- The CHINS data show that in 2006 less than 1% of ICH dwellings were in communities that had no organised system for sewerage, water or electricity (Table 2.12).
- Between 2001 and 2006 there was a decrease in the number and proportion of dwellings in communities that had no organised sewerage system or water supply.
- There was a small increase in the number and proportion not connected to an organised electricity supply.

Indicator 8. Proportion of dwellings meeting the 11 critical FHBH healthy living practices

Purpose

This indicator reports on the housing for health approach used in the Fixing Houses for Better Health (FHBH) program funded by FaCSIA. It reports on the functionality of 'health hardware' in a house (before and after the program) in relation to whether it can support 11 critical healthy living practices that are required for good health.

Description

Number of ICH dwellings in FHBH database that support the 11 critical FHBH healthy living practices at Survey 1 (before dwellings have been fixed) and Survey 2 (after being fixed); divided by the total number of ICH dwellings in FHBH database, multiplied by 100.

Healthy living practices (HLPs) come from the *National indigenous housing guide*. There is a total of 36 HLPs that can be described as critical or non-critical.

The 11 critical HLPs are:

- 1.1 Power, water, waste connected
- 1.2 Safety: electrical system is safe
- 1.3 Safety: gas supply is safe
- 1.4 Safety: structure of and access to the house is safe
- 1.6 Safety: fire egress is available and safe
- 2.1 Shower working
- 2.2 Washing children: basin/bath/tub working
- 3.1 Laundry services OK
- 4.1 Flush toilet working
- 4.2 Waste removal from all other areas working (i.e. non-toilet)
- 5.1 Ability to store and prepare and cook food.

Scope

ICH dwellings that were selected for the FHBH program.

Data sources

Data for this indicator were collected by Healthabitat Pty Ltd as part of the FHBH program.

Type of data

In implementing the FHBH program, the 'housing for health' method conducts a survey and fix on each house to determine whether the health hardware and other features of that house

are functioning (FHBH Survey fix 1). The non-functioning elements of the house are then fixed, either on the spot or shortly after the initial survey. Houses are then surveyed again (FHBH Survey fix 2) to assess the functioning of all items and urgent items are fixed. The data collected have been used to calculate a score for each dwelling between 0% and 100% okay (OK) for each of the 36 healthy living practices.

The communities and dwellings included in the FHBH database are not a random sample of dwellings or communities. Communities are either selected or request to participate in the program. The FHBH data are therefore not representative of Indigenous community housing nationally. Instead, they give a measure of the condition of dwellings before and after they participated in the FHBH program.

Data

- At Survey fix 1, some 41% of dwellings in the FHBH program scored less than 25% OK in relation to their ability to meet the 11 critical HLPs, 39% scored between 25 and 50% OK and 20% scored 50% or over OK (Table 2.13).
- At Survey fix 2, there was a significant increase in the proportion of dwellings that could support the 11 healthy living practices, with 74% scoring 50% or over OK.
- For each of the 11 critical HLPs, there was an increase in the proportion of dwellings which scored 50% or over OK between survey fix 1 and survey fix 2.
- At Survey fix 2, over 90% of dwellings scored 75% or over OK for the following critical healthy living practices – 1.1 Power, water and waste connected; 1.2 Safety: electrical system safe; 2.1 Shower working; 3.1 Laundry services and 4.1 Flush toilet working.
- At Survey fix 2, the highest proportion of dwellings that scored less than 25% OK were for critical healthy living practices 2.2 Washing children (21%) and 1.4 Safety fire egress (16%).

Table 2.13: Proportion of dwellings in the FHBH program that support the 11 critical healthy living practices at Survey fix 1 and Survey fix 2, 1999–2005

HLP	HLP score					Not assessed	Total
	<25% OK	25%–<50% OK	50%–<75% OK	75%–<100% OK	100% OK		
Survey fix 1							
1.1 Power, water, waste connected	—	0.3	2.3	31.3	66.1	—	100.0
1.2 Safety: electrical system safe	3.0	15.7	33.9	36.4	11.0	—	100.0
1.3 Safety: gas supply safe	11.4	—	—	—	12.7	75.9	100.0
1.4 Safety: structure/access to house	0.7	9.1	32.3	25.4	32.4	—	100.0
1.6 Safety: fire egress	36.6	18.4	14.2	10.0	3.8	17.0	100.0
2.1 Shower working	2.8	8.1	26.1	27.4	35.3	0.2	100.0
2.2 Washing children	42.4	0.9	4.0	4.1	48.3	0.2	100.0
3.1 Laundry services	2.8	7.2	19.8	43.9	26.2	0.1	100.0
4.1 Flush toilet working	2.4	5.4	10.9	24.4	56.9	0.1	100.0
4.2 Waste removal from all other areas	2.5	11.8	29.0	43.6	13.0	—	100.0
5.1 Store and prepare and cook food	2.7	15.1	48.2	30.1	3.6	0.2	100.0
Overall critical HLP score	41.3	38.5	19.2	1.0	—	—	100.0
Survey fix 2							
1.1 Power, water, waste connected	—	0.1	0.7	10.6	88.7	—	100.0
1.2 Safety: electrical system safe	0.3	1.1	4.9	25.0	68.6	—	100.0
1.3 Safety: gas supply safe	6.6	—	—	—	18.2	75.2	100.0
1.4 Safety: structure/access to house	0.3	2.7	16.7	26.2	54.0	—	100.0
1.6 Safety: fire egress	16.4	7.3	23.5	18.6	17.2	16.9	100.0
2.1 Shower working	0.8	1.3	6.5	13.5	77.7	0.2	100.0
2.2 Washing children	21.1	0.2	1.3	2.6	74.6	0.1	100.0
3.1 Laundry services	1.0	1.3	3.5	31.8	62.3	0.1	100.0
4.1 Flush toilet working	0.7	0.9	3.1	8.3	87.0	—	100.0
4.2 Waste removal from all other areas	0.7	3.6	16.1	36.5	43.1	—	100.0
5.1 Store and prepare and cook food	1.0	6.4	36.5	45.7	10.3	0.1	100.0
Overall critical HLP score	5.2	21.1	47.5	23.5	2.7	—	100.0

Note: The calculation of some HLPs has been refined over time. For example, a new relevant data item has been introduced or the data has been recorded using more detailed categories. Where data items were not collected or the categories could not be mapped to the current categories, dwellings were included in the 'not assessed' group.

Source: AIHW analysis of FHBH data.

Indicator 9. Average weekly rent collected

Purpose

This indicator provides information on the average weekly rent collected. This provides some indication of the sustainability of services, particularly for ICH dwellings, as rental income is required to meet the costs of providing housing.

Description

The rent collected from tenants for the year ending 30 June divided by 52 (for weekly figure) divided by the total number of dwellings or tenant households at 30 June.

Scope

All SOMIH dwellings. ICH permanent dwellings managed by ICHOs that were funded or actively registered in 2005–06.

Data sources

Data on state ICH are administrative data provided by the states and territories. Data on Australian Government ICH come from a survey of ICHOs undertaken by FaCSIA each year (see Appendix C). Alternative data from the 2006 CHINS are also provided.

Data for SOMIH were collected in the CSHA data collection.

Data

Current estimates

Table 2.14: Average weekly rent collected for ICH and SOMIH, by state and territory, 2005–06

Dwelling type	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
	\$ per dwelling per week								
State ICH ^(a)	76	..	52	64	29 ^(b)	..	98	36 ^(c)	49
Australian Government ICH ^(d)	..	75	90	60	86
	\$ per household per week								
SOMIH	106	95	98	97	92	75	98

(a) Includes permanent dwellings managed by state and territory administered ICHOs that were funded or actively registered in 2005–06.

(b) Data were provided by 38 of the 52 funded ICHOs and based on 759 dwellings paying rent.

(c) Data are a projected estimate.

(d) Includes permanent dwellings managed by funded and unfunded organisations responding to the FaCSIA survey. The data from Victoria excludes six ICHOs. Queensland excludes 24 ICHOs and Tasmania excludes one ICHO.

Source: AIHW NRF and CSHA data collections AIHW 2006c.

- Across Australia, the average weekly rent collected was \$49 for state ICH and \$86 for Australian Government ICH (Table 2.14).
- The average weekly rent collected for ICH dwellings ranged from \$29 for South Australia state ICH dwellings to \$98 for the Australian Capital Territory state ICH dwellings.
- For SOMIH dwellings, the average weekly rent was \$98, ranging from \$75 in Tasmania to \$106 in New South Wales.

Table 2.15: Average weekly rent collected, all Indigenous housing organisations, by state and territory, 2004–05

	NSW ^(a)	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	NT	Aust
\$ per week per dwelling	68	63	61	43	30	93	30	48

(a) Includes the ACT.

Source: 2006 CHINS (ABS 2007).

- Data from CHINS show that average weekly rent for dwellings managed by Indigenous housing organisations ranged from \$30 in the Northern Territory to \$93 in Tasmania (Table 2.15).

Time trends

Table 2.16: Average weekly rent collected per dwelling for ICH, by state and territory, 2003–04 to 2005–06

Year	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
State ICH^(a)									
2003–04	63	..	42	n.a.	17 ^(b)	..	118	33	40
2004–05	73	..	n.a.	n.a.	19 ^(b)	..	146	33 ^(c)	n.a.
2005–06	76	..	52	64	29 ^(b)	..	98	36 ^(c)	49
Australian Government ICH^(d)									
2003–04	..	56	76	68	73	..	72
2004–05	..	66	64	88	39	..	65
2005–06	..	75	90	60	86

(a) Includes permanent dwellings managed by state and territory administered ICHOs that were funded in the financial year.

(b) 2003–04 data are for 37 of the 46 funded ICHOs, 2004–05 data for 30 of the 32 funded ICHOs, 2005–06 data are for 38 of the 52 funded ICHOs.

(c) Rent is a projected estimate.

(d) Includes permanent dwellings managed by funded and unfunded organisations responding to the FaCSIA survey which can vary from year to year and care should therefore be taken in interpreting trends. The data from Victoria exclude one ICHO for 2005 and six ICHOs for 2006. Queensland excludes 21 ICHOs for 2005 and 24 ICHOs in 2006; Tasmania exclude one ICHO for 2006.

Note: Previously published data for some jurisdictions were calculated per household. Data previously published for New South Wales have been revised as they previously included unfunded dwellings.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection; AIHW 2005f.

- The average weekly rent collected increased between 2003–04 and 2005–06 in state ICH in New South Wales, Queensland, South Australia and the Northern Territory. Rents also increased in Australian Government ICH in Victoria and Queensland (Table 2.16).

Table 2.17: Average weekly rent collected for SOMIH, by state and territory, 2001-02 to 2005-06

Year	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
\$ per household per week									
2001-02	71	79	81	77	85 ^(a)	67	78
2002-03	83	82	85	84	92 ^(a)	69	85
2003-04	91	90	87	88	85	74	88
2004-05	89	94	94	90	87	73	90
2005-06	106	95	98	97	92	75	98

(a) Rent collected includes additional charges to tenants for excess water and tenant-related maintenance. Therefore, average weekly rent may be overestimated.

Source: AIHW 2003a, b, 2005c, e, 2006c.

- The average weekly rent collected across Australia by SOMIH increased from \$78 in 2002-03 to \$98 in 2005-06 (Table 2.17).
- Rents increased in all jurisdictions, with the largest increase occurring in New South Wales (\$35).

Indicator 10. Rent collection rate

Purpose

This indicator provides some indication of the sustainability of services, particularly for ICH dwellings, as rental income is required to meet the costs of providing housing. It is therefore important that the rent charged to tenants is actually collected.

Description

The total rent collected for the year ending 30 June divided by the total rent charged for the year ending 30 June, multiplied by 100.

Rent collected as a proportion of rent charged may be more than 100% as rents due in one financial year may be paid in the next financial year.

Scope

All SOMIH dwellings. ICH permanent dwellings managed by ICHOs that were funded or actively registered in 2005–06.

Data sources

Data on state ICH are administrative data provided by the states and territories. Data on Australian Government ICH come from a survey of ICHOs undertaken by FaCSIA each year (see Appendix C). Alternative data from the 2006 CHINS are also provided.

Data for SOMIH were collected in the CSHA national data collection.

Data

Current estimates

- For ICH dwellings in 2005–06 most of the rent charged to tenants was collected. For state ICH dwellings, 97% of rent charged was collected and for Australian Government administered ICH 85% of rent charged was collected (Table 2.18).
- The rent collected as a proportion of rent charged ranged from 83% for Australian Government ICH in Queensland to 104% for state ICH in the Northern Territory.

Table 2.18: Rent collected, rent charged and rent collection rate, by state and territory, 2005–06

Rent	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Total
State ICH^(a)									
Collected (\$'000)	9,688	..	11,100	4,547	1,143 ^(b)	..	117	11,600 ^(c)	38,195
Charged (\$'000)	10,831	..	11,400	4,833	1,113 ^(b)	..	117	11,180	39,474
Collection rate (%)	89.4	..	97.4	94.1	102.7 ^(b)	..	100.0	103.8 ^(c)	96.8
Australian Government ICH^(d)									
Collected (\$'000)	..	1,690	7,068	166	8,924
Charged (\$'000)	..	1,849	8,525	163	10,537
Collection rate (%)	..	91.4	82.9	101.8	84.7
SOMIH									
Collected (\$'000)	22,222	6,171	14,398	10,756	8,530	1,358	63,435
Charged (\$'000)	22,111	6,232	14,435	10,309	9,010	1,308	63,405
Collection rate (%)	100.5	99.0	99.7	104.3	94.7	103.8	100.0

(a) Includes permanent dwellings managed by state and territory administered ICHOs that were funded or actively registered in 2005–06.

(b) Data on rent collected were provided by 38 of the 52 funded ICHOs. Data on rent charged were collected from 32 of 52 funded ICHOs. These data were used to estimate the rent charged for 38 of 52 ICHOs for comparison with the rent collected.

(c) Data are a projected estimate.

(d) Includes permanent dwellings managed by funded and unfunded organisations responding to the FaCSIA survey. The data from Victoria exclude six ICHOs. Queensland excludes 24 ICHOs and Tasmania excludes one ICHO.

Source: AIHW NRF and CSHA data collections; AIHW 2006c.

- For SOMIH, the rent collected as a proportion of rent charged was generally higher than for ICH and ranged from 95% in South Australia to 104% in Western Australia (Table 2.18).

Time trends

Table 2.19: Rent collection rate for ICH, by state and territory, 2003–04 to 2005–06

Year	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
State ICH^(a)									
2003–04	85.3	..	100.2	n.a.	51.6 ^(b)	..	100.6	111.2	95.1 ^(c)
2004–05	73.2	..	97.6 ^(d)	n.a.	49.1 ^(b)	..	95.5	95.4 ^(d)	84.5 ^(c)
2005–06	89.4	..	97.4	94.1	102.7 ^(b)	..	100.0	103.8 ^(d)	96.8
Australian Government ICH^(e)									
2003–04	..	91.8	91.6	100.5	100.0	..	92.0
2004–05	..	89.0	92.4	103.0	99.8	..	92.5
2005–06	..	91.4	82.9	101.8	84.7

(a) Includes permanent dwellings managed by state and territory administered ICHOs that were funded in the financial year.

(b) Data were not provided by all ICHOs funded in the financial year: 2003–04 data are for 37 of the 46 funded ICHOs, 2004–05 data for 30 of the 32 funded ICHOs and 2005–06 data are for 38 of the 52 funded ICHOs.

(c) Total does not include Western Australia.

(d) Rent is a projected estimate.

(e) Includes permanent dwellings managed by funded and unfunded organisations responding to the FaCSIA survey which can vary from year to year and care should therefore be taken in interpreting trends. The data from Victoria exclude one ICHO for 2005 and six ICHOs for 2006. Queensland excludes 21 ICHOs for 2005 and 24 ICHOs in 2006; Tasmania excludes ICHO for 2006.

Note: Previously published data for some jurisdictions may differ because average weekly rents were reported per household for both funded and unfunded ICH.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection; AIHW 2005f.

- Across Australia, the rent collection rate for state ICH was 95% in 2003–04, decreasing to 85% in 2004–05 and then increasing to 97% in 2005–06 (Table 2.19).
- The rent collection rate for Australian Government ICH was lower than for state ICH. This rate was 92% in 2003–04 and fell to 85% in 2005–06.

Table 2.20: Rent collection rate for SOMIH, by state and territory, 2001–02 to 2005–06

Year	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
2001–02	99.9	98.8	97.3	103.0	92.6	99.1	98.5
2002–03	102.3	98.1	97.2	101.9 ^(a)	107.9	98.8	101.4
2003–04	104.1	99.8 ^(b)	101.3	103.1	97.0	102.2	101.8
2004–05	97.7	100.6	100.4	103.9	93.8	99.6	99.2
2005–06	100.5	99.0	99.7	104.3	94.7	103.8	100.0

(a) Data for Western Australia are based on different methodology from the other data presented and should be interpreted with caution.

(b) In Victoria, there is a very small number of properties managed by Aboriginal Housing Victoria (AHV) which are not owned by the Office of Housing, but for practical purposes are reported under SOMIH with other AHV properties.

Source: AIHW 2003a, b, 2005c, e, 2006c.

- The rent collection rate for SOMIH increased from just under 99% in 2001–02 to 100% in 2005–06 (Table 2.20).
- Over this period, there were increases in the rent collection rate in all jurisdictions.

Indicator 11. Total amount spent on maintenance each year

Purpose

This indicator relates to the sustainability of housing services, as ongoing expenditure on maintenance is required to maintain the condition of dwellings and ensure that they do not fall into disrepair.

Description

The total amount spent on maintenance for the year ending 30 June.

Maintenance is defined as costs that restore an asset to its original condition. This includes:

- (a) day-to-day maintenance, reflecting general wear and tear
- (b) cyclical maintenance, which is part of a planned maintenance program
- (c) other maintenance, e.g. repairs due to vandalism.

Scope

SOMIH and ICH.

Data sources

SOMIH data were collected in the 2005–06 CSHA national data collection. No administrative data were collected for ICH.

Data for ICH from the 2006 CHINS were provided as an alternative.

Data

Table 2.21: Total amount spent on maintenance for SOMIH, by state and territory, 2003–04 to 2005–06

Year	NSW	Vic ^(a)	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
	(\$'000)								
2003–04	7,220	1,512	5,861	6,142	5,617	604	26,956
2004–05	10,578	1,612	6,750	8,085	4,655	703	32,383
2005–06	11,325	1,779	7,576	7,460	5,783	886	34,809

(a) In Victoria, there are a very small number of properties managed by Aboriginal Housing Victoria (AHV) which are not owned by the Office of Housing, but for practical purposes are reported under SOMIH with other AHV properties.

Source: AIHW 2005e, f, 2006c.

- The total amount spent on maintenance for SOMIH increased from \$27.0 million in 2003–04 to \$34.8 million in 2005–06 (Table 2.21).

- Maintenance expenditure in 2005–06 was highest in New South Wales (\$11.3 million), followed by Queensland (\$7.6 million) and Western Australia (\$7.5 million).

Table 2.22: Total amount spent on maintenance, all Indigenous housing organisations, by state and territory, 2004–05

	NSW ^(a)	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	NT	Total
(\$'000)	6,477	428	11,515	5,266	875	360	12,479	37,400

(a) Includes the ACT.

Source: 2006 CHINS (ABS 2007).

- A total of \$37.4 million dollars was spent on maintenance by Indigenous housing organisations (Table 2.22).
- The amount spent on maintenance ranged from \$0.36 million in Tasmania to \$12.5 million in the Northern Territory.

Indicator 12. Average amount spent on maintenance each year

Purpose

This indicator relates to the sustainability of housing services, as ongoing expenditure on maintenance is required to maintain the condition of dwellings and ensure that they do not fall into disrepair.

Description

The total amount spent on maintenance for the financial year divided by the total number of dwellings at 30 June.

A definition for maintenance is provided under Indicator 11.

Scope

ICH and SOMIH.

Data sources

SOMIH data were collected in the 2005–06 CSHA national data collection. No administrative data were collected for ICH.

Data for ICH from the 2006 CHINS were provided as an alternative.

Data

Table 2.23: Average amount spent on maintenance for SOMIH, by state and territory, 2003–04 to 2005–06

Year	NSW	Vic ^(a)	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Average per dwelling (\$)									
2003–04	1,766	1,200	2,085	2,642	2,956	1,771	2,118
2004–05	2,550	1,262	2,355	3,492	2,446	2,003	2,518
2005–06	2,731	1,378	2,598	3,283	3,020	2,517	2,700

(a) In Victoria, there are a very small number of properties managed by Aboriginal Housing Victoria (AHV) which are not owned by the Office of Housing, but for practical purposes are reported under SOMIH with other AHV properties.

Source: AIHW 2005e, f, 2006c.

- Average maintenance expenditure in 2005–06 was highest in Western Australia (\$3,283), followed by South Australia (\$3,020) and New South Wales (\$2,731) (Table 2.23).
- The average amount spent on maintenance for SOMIH increased from \$2,118 per dwelling in 2003–04 to \$2,700 in 2005–06.
- Between 2003–04 and 2005–06, there was an increase in average maintenance expenditure in all states.

Table 2.24: Average amount spent on maintenance, all Indigenous housing organisations, by state and territory, 2004–05

	NSW^(a)	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	NT	Aust
Average per dwelling (\$)	2,129	2,352	2,225	1,683	1,579	3,432	2,091	2,060

(a) Includes the ACT.

Source: 2006 CHINS (ABS 2007).

- The average amount spent on maintenance for dwellings managed by Indigenous organisations in 2004–05 was \$2,060 (Table 2.24).
- The average ranged from \$1,579 per dwelling in South Australia to \$3,432 per dwelling in Tasmania.

Indicator 13. Maintenance expenditure as a proportion of rent collected

Purpose

This indicator relates to the sustainability of housing services, as ongoing expenditure on maintenance is required to maintain the condition of dwellings and ensure that they do not fall into disrepair. Maintenance expenditure as a proportion of rent collected provides an indication of how much rental income is used to maintain dwellings.

Description

The total amount spent on maintenance for the year ending 30 June divided by the total rent collected for the year ending 30 June, multiplied by 100.

A definition for maintenance is provided under Indicator 11.

Scope

ICH and SOMIH.

Data sources

Data for this indicator for SOMIH were collected in the 2005–06 NRF data collection. No data for ICH were collected.

Alternative data for ICH from the 2006 CHINS are provided.

Data

Current estimates

Table 2.25: Maintenance expenditure, rent collected and maintenance expenditure as a proportion of rent collected for SOMIH, by state, 2005–06

	NSW	Vic ^(a)	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Total
Maintenance expenditure (\$'000)	11,325	1,779	7,576	7,460	5,783	886	34,809
Rent collected (\$'000)	22,222	6,171	14,398	10,756	8,530	1,358	63,435
Maintenance expenditure as a proportion of rent collected (%)	51.0	28.8	52.6	69.4	67.8	65.2	54.9

(a) In Victoria, there is a very small number of properties managed by Aboriginal Housing Victoria (AHV) which are not owned by the Office of Housing, but for practical purposes are reported under SOMIH with other AHV properties.

Source: AIHW 2006c.

- For SOMIH dwellings, maintenance expenditure comprised 55% of the rent collected in 2005–06 (Table 2.25).
- Maintenance expenditure as a proportion of rent collected ranged from 29% in Victoria to 69% in Western Australia.

Table 2.26: Maintenance expenditure, rent collected and maintenance expenditure as a proportion of rent collected, all Indigenous housing organisations, by state and territory, 2004–05

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	NT	Total
Maintenance expenditure (\$'000)	6,477	428	11,515	5,266	875	360	12,479	37,400
Rent collected (\$'000)	11,313	1,126	16,765	7,065	1,386	509	9,382	47,546
Maintenance expenditure as a proportion of rent collected (%)	57.3	38.0	68.7	74.5	63.1	70.7	133.0	78.7

(a) Includes the ACT.

Source: 2006 CHINS (ABS 2007).

- Across Australia, 79% of rent collected by Indigenous housing organisations was spent on maintenance (Table 2.26).
- Maintenance expenditure as a proportion of rent collected ranged from 38% in Victoria to 133% in the Northern Territory.

Time trends

Table 2.27: Maintenance expenditure as a proportion of rent collected for SOMIH, by state, 2003–04 to 2005–06

Year	NSW	Vic ^(a)	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
2003–04	38.2	26.6	47.5	61.6	72.4	46.8	48.2
2004–05	56.5	26.9	50.3	78.8	58.9	54.1	56.2
2005–06	51.0	28.8	52.6	69.4	67.8	65.2	54.9

(a) In Victoria, there is a very small number of properties managed by Aboriginal Housing Victoria (AHV) which are not owned by the Office of Housing, but for practical purposes are reported under SOMIH with other AHV properties.

Source: AIHW 2005e, f, 2006c.

- Maintenance expenditure as a proportion of rent collected for SOMIH increased from 48% in 2003–04 to 56% in 2004–05 and fell slightly to 55% in 2005–06 (Table 2.27).
- In all states, there was an increase in maintenance expenditure as a proportion of rent collected between 2003–04 and 2005–06, except for South Australia where the proportion fell from 72% to 68%.

Indicator 14. Recurrent to capital expenditure ratio

Purpose

A balancing of capital and recurrent expenditure is required to avoid what has been termed the 'build and abandon' approach to Indigenous housing. Some ongoing recurrent expenditure is required to maintain the condition of dwellings. Capital expenditure is required for new dwellings and major upgrades to existing dwellings.

Description

The total recurrent expenditure for the year ending 30 June divided by the total capital expenditure for the year ending 30 June.

Recurrent expenditure includes expenditure on goods and services which does not result in the creation or acquisition of fixed assets. It consists mainly of expenditure on wages, salaries and supplements, purchases of goods and services and consumption of fixed capital (depreciation). It includes operating expenses and tenancy manager revenue and expense components. Capital expenditure is defined as expenditure on the acquisition or enhancement of an asset (excluding financial assets).

Scope

All SOMIH. For ICH, includes ICHOs that were funded or actively registered in 2005-06.

Data sources

Data on state ICH are administrative data provided by the states and territories. Data on Australian Government ICH come from a survey of ICHOs undertaken by FaCSIA each year (see Appendix C).

Data for SOMIH were collected in the CSHA data collection.

Data

Current estimates

Table 2.28: Recurrent and capital expenditure and recurrent to capital expenditure ratio for ICH, by state and territory, 2005–06

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Total
State ICH^(a)									
Recurrent expend (\$'000)	14,072	..	5,300 ^(b)	1,132	6,074	..	515	21,200	48,293
Capital expend (\$'000)	20,976	..	34,600	60,053	7,023	..	1,447	25,970	150,069
Recurrent/capital expend ratio	0.67	..	0.15 ^(b)	0.02	0.86	..	0.36	0.82	0.32
Australian Government ICH^(c)									
Recurrent expend (\$'000)	..	2,654	5,488	49	8,191
Capital expend (\$'000)	..	8,491	8,236	89	16,817
Recurrent/capital expend ratio	..	0.31	0.67	0.55	0.49

(a) Includes permanent dwellings managed by state and territory administered ICHOs that were funded or actively registered in 2005–06.

(b) Data for recurrent expenditure are from 31 of 34 councils.

(c) Includes permanent dwellings managed by funded and unfunded organisations responding to the FaCSIA survey. The data from Victoria exclude six ICHOs. Queensland excludes 24 ICHOs and Tasmania excludes one ICHO.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection.

- The national recurrent to capital expenditure ratio for ICH in 2005–06 was 0.32 for state ICH and 0.49 for Australian Government ICH. This indicates that for every \$1 spent on capital expenditure, 32 cents was spent on recurrent expenditure for state ICH and 49 cents was spent for Australian Government ICH (Table 2.28).
- The recurrent to capital expenditure ratio for ICH varied considerably across jurisdictions which may reflect the impact of large capital expenditure in some jurisdictions. The ratio ranged from 0.02 for state ICH in Western Australia to 0.86 in South Australia.

Table 2.29: Recurrent and capital expenditure and recurrent to capital expenditure ratio for SOMIH, by state and territory, 2005–06

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Total
Recurrent expenditure (\$'000)	65,197	11,287	73,741	117,886	16,679	1,954	286,744
Capital expenditure (\$'000)	23,724	10,087	32,673	12,759	9,037	1,007	89,287
Recurrent to capital ratio	2.75	1.12	2.26	9.24	1.85	1.94	3.21

Source: AIHW 2006c.

- For SOMIH dwellings, the recurrent to capital expenditure ratio was 3.21, indicating higher relative amounts of recurrent expenditure than for ICH (Table 2.29).
- The recurrent to capital expenditure ratio for SOMIH ranged from 1.12 in Victoria to 9.24 in Western Australia.

Time trends

Table 2.30: Recurrent to capital expenditure ratio for ICH, by state and territory, 2003–04 to 2005–06

Year	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
State ICH^(a)									
2003–04	0.46	..	n.a.	n.a.	1.00 ^(b)	..	— ^(c)	0.61	n.a.
2004–05	0.81	..	n.a.	n.a.	1.00 ^(b)	..	0.64	0.51	n.a.
2005–06	0.67	..	0.15 ^(d)	0.02	0.86 ^(b)	..	0.36	0.82	0.32
Australian Government ICH^(e)									
2003–04	..	0.67	0.42	1.34	0.86	..	0.50
2004–05	..	0.75	0.83	1.61	1.11	..	0.86
2005–06	..	0.31	0.67	0.55	0.49

(a) Includes permanent dwellings managed by state and territory administered ICHOs that were funded in the financial year.

(b) Data were not provided by all ICHOs funded in the financial year: 2003–04 data are for 37 of the 46 funded ICHOs, 2004–05 data for 30 of the 32 funded ICHOs and 2005–06 data are for 38 of the 52 funded ICHOs.

(c) There was no capital expenditure for ICH for the Australian Capital Territory.

(d) Data for recurrent expenditure are from 31 of 34 councils.

(e) Includes permanent dwellings managed by funded and unfunded organisations responding to the FaCSIA survey which can vary from year to year and care should therefore be taken in interpreting trends. The data from Victoria exclude one ICHO for 2005 and six ICHOs for 2006. Queensland excludes 21 ICHOs for 2005 and 24 ICHOs in 2006; Tasmania exclude one ICHO for 2006.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection; AIHW 2005f.

- The recurrent to capital expenditure ratio for ICH varies across years in part due to the lumpy nature of capital expenditure (Table 2.30).
- Overall, this ratio increased between 2003–04 and 2004–05, but decreased in 2005–06. The exception to this was state ICH in the Northern Territory, where the ratio decreased in 2004–05 and increased in 2005–06.

Table 2.31: Recurrent to capital expenditure ratio for SOMIH, by state and territory, 2003–04 to 2005–06

Year	NSW	Vic ^(a)	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
2003–04	0.92	0.88	1.06	2.15	0.63	0.70	1.01
2004–05	5.38	1.15	2.52	5.02	1.01	0.92	3.02
2005–06	2.75	1.12	2.26	9.24	1.85	1.94	3.21

(a) In Victoria, there is a very small number of properties managed by Aboriginal Housing Victoria (AHV) which are not owned by the Office of Housing, but for practical purposes are reported under SOMIH with other AHV properties.

Source: AIHW 2005e, f, 2006c.

- Across Australia the recurrent to capital expenditure ratio for SOMIH increased considerably between 2003–04 and 2005–06 (Table 2.31).

Indicator 15. Direct cost per unit

Purpose

This indicator measures the administrative costs of providing SOMIH and ICH.

Description

Total direct costs (excluding capital) for SOMIH/ICH divided by the total number of SOMIH/ICH dwellings.

Direct costs are the total administrative costs of maintaining the operation of the dwellings. The following should be excluded – rental subsidies, capitalised administration costs, depreciation, bond loans, profit/loss on sales, cost of sales.

Scope

All SOMIH. For ICH, includes ICHOs that were funded or actively registered in 2005–06.

Data sources

Data on state ICH are administrative data provided by the states and territories. Data on Australian Government ICH come from a survey of ICHOs undertaken by FaCSIA each year (see Appendix C).

Data for SOMIH were collected in the CSHA national data collection.

Data

Current estimates

- The direct costs of ICH ranged from \$0.1 million in Australian Government ICH in Tasmania to \$12.1 million in Queensland (Table 2.32).
- The direct cost per dwelling ranged from \$567 per dwelling in state ICH in the Northern Territory to \$22,391 in state ICH in the Australian Capital Territory.
- In 2005–06 the total direct costs for SOMIH were \$81.9 million, with a direct cost per dwelling of \$6,354.
- The direct costs per dwelling ranged from \$5,364 in New South Wales to \$7,589 in Western Australia.

Table 2.32: Total direct costs and direct cost per unit for ICH and SOMIH, by state and territory, 2005–06

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
State ICH^(a)									
Total direct costs (\$'000)	17,062	..	n.a.	n.a.	6,074	..	515	3,500	n.a.
No. of dwellings	2,450	..	n.a.	n.a.	937	..	23	6,168	n.a.
Direct cost per unit (\$)	6,964	..	n.a.	n.a.	6,482	..	22,391	567	n.a.
Australian Government ICH^(b)									
Total direct costs (\$'000)	..	1,466	12,113	131	13,710
No. of dwellings	..	433	1,507	53	1,993
Direct cost per unit (\$)	..	3,386	8,038	2,472	6,879
SOMIH									
Total direct costs (\$'000)	22,244 ^(c)	8,014 ^(d)	19,194	17,243 ^(e)	13,273	1,954	81,922
No. of dwellings	4,147	1,291 ^(d)	2,916	2,272	1,915	352	12,893
Direct cost per unit (\$)	5,364 ^(c)	6,208 ^(d)	6,582	7,589 ^(e)	6,931	5,551	6,354

(a) Includes permanent dwellings managed by state and territory administered ICHOs that were funded or actively registered in 2005–06.

(b) Includes permanent dwellings managed by funded and unfunded organisations responding to the FaCSIA survey. The data from Victoria exclude six ICHOs. Queensland excludes 24 ICHOs and Tasmania excludes one ICHO.

(c) Cost increase in 2005–06 is mainly due to higher expenditure on repairs and maintenance and other operating costs, offset by charging tenants for water usage.

(d) In Victoria, there is a very small number of properties managed by Aboriginal Housing Victoria (AHV) which are not owned by the Office of Housing, but for practical purposes are reported under SOMIH with other AHV properties. Direct costs for 2005–06 include a \$1.8 million grant that the Office of Housing made to AHV to administer the SOMIH program. Similar grants have been excluded in previous years, therefore direct comparisons cannot be made with previous years' data.

(e) Data should be interpreted with caution as they include the costs for dwellings leased to other organisations that are excluded in the total number of dwellings.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection; AIHW 2006c.

Time trends

- It is difficult to determine the trends in direct cost per unit for SOMIH because of changes in the scope and definitions used (Table 2.33).

Table 2.33: Direct cost per unit for SOMIH, by state and territory, for the year ending 30 June 2002 to the year ending 30 June 2006

Year	NSW	Vic^(a)	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
2001–02	9,192 ^(b)	4,963	5,654 ^(c)	4,800	4,540	2,958	6,297
2002–03	5,096	4,682	6,028	5,397	7,917	3,686	5,703
2003–04	5,684	4,737	6,296	6,059 ^(d)	5,469	3,425	5,702
2004–05	5,057	4,794	6,134	6,857 ^(d)	4,116	4,886	5,451
2005–06	5,364 ^(e)	6,208 ^(f)	6,582	7,589 ^(d)	6,931 ^(g)	5,551	6,354

- (a) In Victoria, there is a very small number of properties managed by Aboriginal Housing Victoria (AHV) which are not owned by the Office of Housing, but for practical purposes are reported under SOMIH with other AHV properties.
- (b) Includes \$22.285m 'capital upgrade' expenditure. This is one-off expenditure resulting from maintenance liabilities incurred before the Aboriginal Housing Office took possession of the stock. Sixty-one per cent of the direct cost per dwelling is attributable to capital upgrading. Excluding expenditure on upgrading, the direct cost per dwelling is \$3,567.
- (c) Expenditure on maintenance influenced the reduction in direct costs reported. Overexpenditure in the maintenance budget in 2000–01 resulted in a cutback to the maintenance budget in 2001–02.
- (d) Data should be interpreted with caution as they include the costs for dwellings leased to other organisations that are excluded in the total number of dwellings.
- (e) Cost increase in 2005–06 is mainly due to higher expenditure on repairs and maintenance and other operating costs, offset by charging tenants for water usage.
- (f) Direct costs for 2005–06 include a \$1.8 million grant that the Office of Housing made to AHV to administer the SOMIH program. Similar grants have been excluded in previous years, therefore direct comparisons cannot be made with previous years' data.
- (g) The definition of direct costs was modified for 2005–06, and therefore comparisons should not be made with previous years' data.

Source: AIHW 2003a, b, 2005c, e, 2006c.

Indicator 16. Occupancy rates

Purpose

This indicator provides a measure of whether SOMIH and ICH dwellings are occupied and therefore whether the dwellings are being used effectively.

Description

The total number of SOMIH/ICH permanent dwellings that were occupied at 30 June divided by the total number of SOMIH/ICH permanent dwellings, multiplied by 100.

Scope

Permanent dwellings managed by funded ICHOs.

Data sources

Data on state ICH are administrative data provided by the states and territories. Data on Australian Government ICH come from a survey of ICHOs undertaken by FaCSIA each year (see Appendix C).

Data for SOMIH were collected in the CSHA national data collection.

Data

Current estimates

- In 2006, there were 14,775 state ICH dwellings that were occupied, representing 89% of all dwellings. Occupancy rates ranged from 78% in Western Australia to 97% in New South Wales (Table 2.34).
- Across Australia, occupancy rates were higher for Australian Government ICH dwellings (94%) and for SOMIH dwellings (96%).

Table 2.34: Number and rate occupied dwellings for ICH and SOMIH, by state and territory, at 30 June 2006

Dwellings	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Total
State ICH^(a)									
No. occupied	2,367	..	3,960 ^(b)	2,233 ^(c)	827 ^(d)	..	22	5,366 ^(e)	14,775
Total no.	2,450	..	4,136	2,866 ^(c)	937	..	23	6,168	16,580
% occupied	96.6	..	95.7 ^(b)	77.9 ^(c)	88.3 ^(d)	..	95.7	87.0 ^(e)	89.1
Australian Government ICH^(f)									
No. occupied	..	406	1,421	48	1,875
Total no.	..	433	1,507	53	1,993
% occupied	..	93.8	94.3	90.6	94.1
SOMIH									
No. occupied	4,041	1,248 ^(g)	2,822	2,138	1,791	346	12,386
Total no.	4,147	1,291 ^(g)	2,916	2,272	1,915	352	12,893
% occupied	97.4	96.7 ^(g)	96.8	94.1	93.5	98.3	96.1

(a) Includes dwellings managed by state and territory administered funded ICHOs, except for WA where data relate to dwellings managed by funded and unfunded ICHOs.

(b) Based on vacant dwellings reported by councils at 30 December 2006.

(c) Data are an estimate based on the 2004 Environmental Health Survey and relates to funded and unfunded dwellings.

(d) Data are likely to be an underestimate.

(e) Based on the Indigenous community housing survey.

(f) Includes dwellings managed by funded and unfunded organisations responding to the FaCSIA survey. The data from Victoria exclude six ICHOs. Queensland excludes 24 ICHOs and Tasmania excludes one ICHO.

(g) In Victoria, there is a very small number of properties managed by Aboriginal Housing Victoria (AHV) which are not owned by the Office of Housing, but for practical purposes are reported under SOMIH with other AHV properties.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection; AIHW 2006c.

Time trends

- Between 2004 and 2006, occupancy rates decreased in state ICH dwellings in Queensland and the Australian Capital Territory, and in Australian Government ICH dwellings in Tasmania (Table 2.35).
- There were, however, increases in the occupancy rates of state ICH dwellings in South Australia and Australian Government ICH dwellings in Queensland between 2004 and 2006.

Table 2.35: Occupancy rate for ICH dwellings, 30 June 2004 to 2006

Year	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
State ICH^(a)									
2004	97.2 ^(b)	..	100.0 ^(c)	n.a.	78.8	..	100.0	n.a.	n.a.
2005	96.1 ^(b)	..	n.a.	n.a.	97.8	..	100.0	n.a.	n.a.
2006	96.6	..	95.7	77.9 ^(d)	88.3 ^(e)	..	95.7	87.0 ^(f)	89.1
Australian Government ICH^(g)									
2004	..	93.9	87.8	96.9	100.0	..	89.3
2005	..	91.6	68.8	93.2	98.6	..	74.6
2006	..	93.8	94.3	90.6	94.1

(a) Includes dwellings managed by state and territory administered funded ICHOs.

(b) New South Wales data for these years are estimates of occupancy rate for dwellings managed by actively registered and non-active registered organisations.

(c) Queensland data are for August 2003, not June 2004.

(d) Data are for dwellings managed by funded and unfunded ICHOs.

(e) Data are likely to be an underestimate.

(f) Based on the Indigenous community housing survey.

(g) Includes dwellings managed by funded and unfunded organisations responding to the FaCSIA survey which can vary from year to year and care should therefore be taken in interpreting trends. The data from Victoria exclude one ICHO for 2005 and six ICHOs for 2006. Queensland excludes 21 ICHOs for 2005 and 24 ICHOs in 2006; Tasmania exclude one ICHO for 2006.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection; AIHW 2005f.

Table 2.36: Occupancy rate for SOMIH dwellings, by state and territory, 30 June 2002 to 2006

Year	NSW	Vic ^(a)	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
2002	97.9	96.6	94.6	95.2	91.2	92.7	95.4
2003	97.6	96.1	94.2	94.4	91.8	95.8	95.2
2004	98.0	96.7	96.8	94.1 ^(b)	92.2	98.2 ^(b)	96.0
2005	97.4	95.8	96.1	94.2	91.8	97.7	95.5
2006	97.4	96.7	96.8	94.1	93.5	98.3	96.1

(a) In Victoria, there is a very small number of properties managed by Aboriginal Housing Victoria (AHV) which are not owned by the Office of Housing, but for practical purposes are reported under SOMIH with other AHV properties.

(b) May be an overestimate.

Source: AIHW 2003a, b, 2005c, e, 2006c.

- Across Australia, there was a small increase in the average occupancy rate of SOMIH dwellings from 95% in 2002 to 96% in 2006 (Table 2.36).
- There were larger increases in the occupancy rate for SOMIH in Tasmania and Queensland over this period.

Indicator 17. Turnaround time

Purpose

This indicator provides a measure of how long SOMIH dwellings remain unoccupied and is therefore a measure of efficiency.

Description

Total number of days that SOMIH dwellings are vacant divided by the total number of SOMIH vacancy episodes.

Scope

SOMIH.

Data sources

Data for SOMIH were collected in the CSHA national data collection.

Data

- In 2005–06, the average turnaround time for SOMIH dwellings across Australia was 36 days (Table 2.37).
- The turnaround time for SOMIH in 2005–06 ranged from 26 days in Western Australia to 47 days in South Australia.
- Because of changes in methodology in some jurisdictions, it is difficult to compare the changes in turnaround time between 2002 and 2006.

Table 2.37: Turnaround time for SOMIH dwellings, by state and territory, for the year ending 30 June 2002 to the year ending 30 June 2006

Year	NSW	Vic ^(a,b)	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
No. of days									
2001–02	38	43 ^(b)	62	52 ^(c)	86 ^(c)	50	54
2002–03	39 ^(d)	43 ^(b)	66	52 ^(d)	44 ^(d)	42	49
2003–04	36	45 ^(b)	46 ^(d)	58 ^(c)	44	33	46
2004–05	34	43 ^(b)	41	44 ^(d)	41 ^(e)	36	40
2005–06 ^(d)	36 ^(f)	41 ^(b)	35	26	47	42	36

(a) In Victoria, there is a very small number of properties managed by Aboriginal Housing Victoria (AHV) which are not owned by the Office of Housing, but for practical purposes are reported under SOMIH with other AHV properties.

(b) Data should be interpreted with caution as the legal tenancy start data (date from which rent is paid) is used as the vacancy end date. In practice, tenants may sign tenancy agreements and receive keys several days earlier.

(c) Includes time vacant due to redevelopment.

(d) Due to changes in methodology, data are not comparable with previous years' data.

(e) Excludes some vacancy days where it is not clear whether major maintenance or redevelopment work was undertaken.

(f) Data are not comparable with previous year's data as properties in zones where no applicants are waiting or properties that are hard to let are excluded.

Source: AIHW 2003a, b, 2005c, e, 2006c.

Indicator 18. Proportion of Indigenous households by tenure type

Purpose

This indicator gives a measure of the distribution of all Indigenous households across various tenure types. Home ownership provides the most secure form of tenure. Private renters are the most likely to experience affordability stress and insecure tenure, while renters of ICH dwellings are the most likely to live in dwellings in poor condition or not connected to essential services.

Description

The number of Indigenous households that are:

- home owners/purchasers
- private and other renters
- renters state and territory housing
- renters Indigenous or mainstream community housing
- other

Divided by the total number of Indigenous households.

An Indigenous household is one that contains one or more Indigenous people.

Scope

All Indigenous households.

Data sources

Data for this indicator were from the ABS Census of Population and Housing.

It should be noted that compared with the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Survey, the Census data understates the numbers and proportion of Indigenous households renting from Indigenous or mainstream community housing organisations. This is because the Census data are not adjusted at the household level.

Data

Current estimates

- In 2006 there were 166,671 Indigenous households, representing 2.3% of all Australian households (ABS 2007).
- Some 34% of Indigenous households were home owners or purchasers (Table 2.38).
- The proportion of home owners was highest in the eastern states of Tasmania (52%), Victoria (39%) and New South Wales/ Australian Capital Territory (38%).
- Most Indigenous households were renting some form of housing. This includes 30% who were private and other renters, 20% renting from state or territory housing authorities and 9% renting from Indigenous or community organisations in 2006.
- The proportion of private and other renters was highest in Queensland (37%), New South Wales/ Australian Capital Territory (34%) and Victoria (31%).
- South Australia (29%) and Western Australia (26%) had a relatively high proportion of Indigenous households renting from the state housing authorities (in public housing).
- The Northern Territory had the highest proportion of Indigenous households renting from Indigenous or community housing organisations (41%) and the lowest proportion who were home owners (18%).

Time trends

- Both the number and proportion of Indigenous households who were home owners or purchasers increased between 2001 and 2006 (Table 2.38).
- The number of home owners increased by nearly 10,000 from 46,224 in 2001 to 56,027 in 2006, with the proportion increasing from 32% of all Indigenous households to 34%.
- The number and proportion of Indigenous households renting from Indigenous or mainstream organisations decreased between 2001 and 2006.

Table 2.38: Number and proportion of Indigenous households by tenure type, by state and territory, 2001 and 2006

	NSW & ACT	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	NT	Aust
2001								
Number								
Home owner/ purchaser	17,407	4,665	11,259	4,812	2,627	3,835	1,619	46,224
Private and other renter	16,133	3,618	15,248	4,251	2,108	1,816	1,475	44,652
Renter state/territory housing	10,795	2,232	6,084	4,829	2,629	1,218	1,605	29,395
Renter Indigenous/ mainstream comm housing	3,075	351	4,506	2,118	779	53	4,499	15,381
Other/not stated	2,551	670	2,378	1,283	450	317	1,454	9,103
Total	49,961	11,536	39,475	17,293	8,593	7,239	10,652	144,755
Per cent								
Home owner/ purchaser	35.6	40.4	28.5	27.8	30.6	53.0	15.2	31.9
Private and other renter	32.1	31.4	38.6	24.6	24.5	25.1	13.8	30.8
Renter state/territory housing	21.0	19.3	15.4	27.9	30.6	16.8	15.1	20.3
Renter Indigenous/ mainstream comm housing	4.9	3.0	11.4	12.2	9.1	0.7	42.2	10.6
Other/not stated	6.4	5.8	6.0	7.4	5.2	4.4	13.7	6.3
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
2006								
Number								
Home owner/ purchaser	21,151	5,563	14,469	5,396	3,319	4,115	2,005	56,027
Private and other renter	18,845	4,353	16,764	4,451	2,350	2,001	1,559	50,340
Renter state/territory housing	12,510	2,764	7,499	4,735	2,868	1,314	1,600	33,294
Renter Indigenous/ mainstream comm housing	2,827	343	3,955	1,998	625	77	4,609	14,458
Other/not stated	3,727	1,128	3,252	1,801	788	418	1,426	12,552
Total	59,060	14,151	45,939	18,381	9,950	7,925	11,199	166,671
Per cent								
Home owner/ purchaser	35.8	39.3	31.5	29.4	33.4	51.9	17.9	33.6
Private and other renter	31.9	30.8	36.5	24.2	23.6	25.2	13.9	30.2
Renter state/territory housing	21.2	19.5	16.3	25.8	28.8	16.6	14.3	20.0
Renter Indigenous/ mainstream comm housing	4.8	2.4	8.6	10.9	6.3	1.0	41.2	8.7
Other/not stated	6.3	8.0	7.1	9.8	7.9	5.3	12.7	7.5
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Note: Total includes other territories.

Source: ABS 2001 and 2006 Census of Population and Housing.

Indicator 19. Proportion of households accessing mainstream housing services that are Indigenous

Purpose

This indicator provides a measure of the extent to which Indigenous households are accessing mainstream housing services.

Description

The number of Indigenous households accessing the following at 30 June:

- (a) public rental housing
- (b) community housing
- (c) Commonwealth Rent Assistance program

divided by the total number of households in these programs at 30 June, multiplied by 100.

An Indigenous household is one that contains one or more Indigenous people.

Scope

Public housing and community housing households and recipients of Commonwealth Rent assistance.

Data sources

Data for public and community housing were collected by the AIHW in the CSHA national data collection. Commonwealth Rent Assistance (CRA) data comes from FaCSIA.

Data

There is considerable under-identification of Indigenous households in mainstream public and community housing so the data presented are an undercount of the actual numbers in these programs. New South Wales has provided an estimate of the number of Indigenous households in public housing based on Census data because of the extent of under-identification of Indigenous households in their administrative data.

The community housing data are based on a survey of providers, which affects the reliability of the data reported. For the 2005–06 survey, response rates range from 68% in Tasmania and Queensland to 96% in Victoria.

Current estimates

Table 2.39: Number and proportion of Indigenous households accessing mainstream housing services, by state and territory, at 30 June 2006

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Total
No. Indigenous households									
Public housing	8,700 ^(a)	1,233	3,122 ^(b)	4,399	1,210 ^(c)	639	191 ^(c)	1,647	21,141
Community housing	661	56 ^(b)	725 ^(d)	121	65	11	24	n.a.	1,663
Commonwealth Rent Assistance ^(e)	11,692	1,945	10,377	2,612	1,368	1,007	124	1,031	30,168 ^(f)
Total no. households									
Public housing	121,529	63,159	49,011	29,819	43,096	11,487	10,712	5,155	333,968
Community housing	11,844	4,176	4,791	2,800	3,817	467	687	n.a.	28,582
Commonwealth Rent Assistance ^(e)	319,370	205,359	229,917	81,985	67,335	23,991	7,716	5,387	941,306 ^(f)
Per cent Indigenous households									
Public housing	7.2 ^(a)	2.0	6.4 ^(b)	14.8	2.8 ^(c)	5.6	1.8 ^(c)	31.9	6.3
Community housing	5.6	1.3 ^(b)	15.1 ^(d)	4.3	1.7	2.4	3.5	n.a.	5.8
Commonwealth Rent Assistance ^(e)	3.7	0.9	4.5	3.2	2.0	4.2	1.6	19.1	3.2 ^(f)

(a) Estimate based on the 2001 Census of Population and Housing.

(b) Data should be interpreted with caution.

(c) Data should be interpreted with caution as the recording of Indigenous status is mandatory.

(d) May be an underestimate, as only 98 out of a possible 362 responses were received for this question.

(e) Data are number of income units receiving CRA at 3 March 2006. Income units are classified as Indigenous if either partner self-identifies as an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander.

(f) Includes other territories and unknown addresses.

Source: AIHW 2006b, c, 2007.

- At 30 June 2006, there were 21,141 Indigenous households in public housing in Australia that identified as Indigenous (Table 2.39).
- The Northern Territory (32%) had the highest proportion of Indigenous households accessing public housing, followed by Western Australia (15%) and New South Wales (7%).
- At 30 June 2006, there were 1,663 households accessing community housing that identified as Indigenous.
- Queensland (15%) had the highest proportion of Indigenous households accessing mainstream community housing, followed by New South Wales (6%).
- There were 30,168 Indigenous income units receiving assistance through the CRA program.
- The proportion of Indigenous income units receiving CRA ranged from 0.9% in Victoria to 19% in the Northern Territory.

Time trends

Table 2.40: Proportion of Indigenous households in mainstream housing services, by state and territory, at 30 June 2002 to 2006

Year	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Public housing^(a)									
2002	6.9 ^(b)	1.2	4.7	6.8	1.8	3.8	1.3	24.5	4.9
2003	7.1 ^(b)	1.6 ^(c)	5.1	7.8	2.5	3.8	1.7	26.5	5.3
2004	7.1 ^(b)	1.7	5.4	13.5	2.6	4.3	1.6	28.4	5.9
2005	7.1 ^(b)	1.8	5.6	14.6	2.7	5.0	1.7	30.2	6.1
2006	7.2 ^(b)	2.0	6.4	14.8	2.8	5.6	1.8	31.9	6.3
Community housing									
2002	5.7	n.a. ^(d)	11.1	34.2	1.0	n.a.	3.9	n.a.	7.6
2003	6.6	n.a. ^(e)	12.8	3.8	1.8	2.2	2.6	n.a.	4.5
2004	6.0	0.3	11.1	9.5	1.7	1.0	4.1	n.a.	5.5
2005	5.9	0.8	21.2 ^(f)	6.6	1.7	0.9	3.7	n.a.	7.1
2006	5.6	1.3 ^(a)	15.1 ^(g)	4.3	1.7	2.4	3.5	n.a.	5.8
Commonwealth Rent Assistance^(h)									
2002	2.3	0.6	3.4	2.6	1.3	2.7	1.1	16.7	2.3 ⁽ⁱ⁾
2003	2.6	0.7	3.7	2.7	1.6	2.9	1.4	18.1	2.5 ⁽ⁱ⁾
2004	2.8	0.8	3.8	2.7	1.8	3.1	n.a.	18.3	2.4 ⁽ⁱ⁾
2005	3.1	0.9	4.3	3.0	1.9	3.7	1.3	20.1	2.9 ⁽ⁱ⁾
2006	3.7	0.9	4.5	3.2	2.0	4.2	1.6	19.1	3.2 ⁽ⁱ⁾

(a) Data should be interpreted with caution as the recording of Indigenous status is not mandatory in some jurisdictions.

(b) Estimate based on the 2001 Census of Population and Housing.

(c) The increase from 2001–02 is due to identification of additional Indigenous households through use of individual client data.

(d) Not applicable to Community Housing Program as Indigenous households access accommodation through the General Rental Program and housing managed by the Aboriginal Housing Program.

(e) Indigenous households primarily access long-term accommodation through the General Rental Program and housing managed by the Aboriginal Housing Board of Victoria. They are also eligible for community-managed housing programs; however, Indigenous status is not recorded for these programs.

(f) Changes to the structure of the survey question resulted in the identification of a higher number of Indigenous households. Therefore, results cannot be compared with those of previous years.

(g) May be an underestimate, as only 98 out of a possible 362 responses were received for this question.

(h) Data are number of income units receiving CRA. Income units are classified as Indigenous if either partner self-identifies as an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander.

(i) Includes other territories and unknown addresses.

Source: AIHW 2003a–f, 2005a–e, 2006a–c, 2007; SCRGSP 2003–2007.

- In 2002, 5% of households in public housing were identified as Indigenous. This increased slightly to 6% in 2006 (Table 2.40). The increase in the number and proportion of Indigenous households is in part due to better identification of Indigenous people.
- The proportion of Indigenous households in community housing decreased from 8% in 2002 to 6% in 2006.
- The proportion of income units receiving CRA that were Indigenous increased from 2% in 2002 to 3% in 2006.

Indicator 20. Proportion of Indigenous people who are homeless

Purpose

The proportion of Indigenous people who are homeless provides a measure of the number of people who are the most disadvantaged in relation to housing.

Description

The number of Indigenous people who are homeless divided by the total number of Indigenous people.

Scope

All Indigenous persons.

Data sources

The estimate of the number of Indigenous people who were homeless comes from the ABS Census of Population and Housing. There were no recent data available from the 'Counting the Homeless' reports.

The Census gives a point in time estimate of homelessness by counting the number of people who were homeless on Census night. The count includes those defined as being primary and secondary homeless, that is:

- Primary homeless: people sleeping rough or living in improvised dwellings
- Secondary homeless:
 - People using emergency accommodation (such as hostels for the homeless or night shelters); young people staying in youth refuges; women and children escaping domestic violence (staying in women's refuges)
 - People residing temporarily with other families, acquaintances and friends (because they have no accommodation of their own).

Data

Table 2.41: Number and proportion of Indigenous people who were homeless, by category, by state and territory, 2001

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
2001									
Number									
No conventional accommodation	203	64	441	150	344	9	1,066	5	2,282
Hostel, night shelter etc	229	60	291	89	183	13	92	11	968
Friends/ relatives	220	49	166	47	68	33	37	6	626
Total homeless	652	173	898	286	595	55	1,195	22	3,876
Total population	119,868	25,075	112,773	23,426	58,495	15,773	50,785	3,576	410,002
Per cent Indigenous population									
No conventional accommodation	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.6	0.1	2.1	0.1	0.6
Hostel, night shelter etc	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.2
Friends/ relatives	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2
Total homeless	0.5	0.7	0.8	1.2	1.0	0.3	2.4	0.6	0.9
2006									
Number									
No conventional accommodation	250	55	469	402	152	24	4	927	2,283
Hostel, night shelter etc	206	38	198	76	39	9	14	82	662
Friends/ relatives	315	70	352	171	67	43	19	134	1,171
Total homeless	771	163	1,019	649	258	76	37	1,143	4,116
Total population	138,506	30,142	127,579	58,709	25,556	16,769	3,874	53,662	455,024
Per cent Indigenous population									
No conventional accommodation	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.7	0.6	0.1	0.1	1.7	0.5
Hostel, night shelter etc	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.4	0.2	0.1
Friends/ relatives	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.2	0.3
Total homeless	0.6	0.5	0.8	1.1	1.0	0.5	1.0	2.1	0.9

Notes: These numbers are based on Census data only and use the simple definition of homelessness. 'No conventional accommodation' includes people who were at home when enumerated and were living in an improvised home, tent or were sleeping out; 'Hostel, night shelter etc' includes people who were living in a hostel for the homeless, night shelter or refuge and were a guest, patient, inmate or other resident; 'Friends/relatives' includes persons who were a visitor to a private dwelling and who also reported having no usual address.

Source: ABS 2001 and 2006 Census of Population and Housing.

Current estimates

- There were 4,116 Indigenous people who were counted as homeless in the 2006 Census (Table 2.41).
- This included 2,283 with no conventional accommodation, 1,171 in emergency accommodation and 662 staying with friends or relatives because they have no accommodation of their own.
- The largest number of Indigenous homeless people was in the Northern Territory (1,143) followed by Queensland (1,019).
- In 2006, around one per cent of all Indigenous people were homeless.

Time trends

- The number of Indigenous homeless people increased between 2001 and 2006 from 3,867 to 4,116 (Table 2.41).
- The proportion of Indigenous people who were homeless, however, was similar in 2001 and 2006 (around one per cent).

Indicator 21. Total and average number of additional bedrooms required

Purpose

Overcrowding places stress on kitchen, bathroom and laundry facilities as well as on sewerage systems such as septic tanks. Overcrowding increases the risk of the spread of infectious diseases such as meningococcal disease, rheumatic fever, tuberculosis, skin infections and respiratory infections (Howden-Chapman & Wilson 2000).

Description

The total number of additional bedrooms required to meet the Proxy Occupancy Standard.

The average number required is the total number of additional bedrooms required divided by the total number of households requiring additional bedrooms.

The Proxy Occupancy Standard is a measure of the appropriateness of housing related to the household size and composition which specifies the number of bedroom requirements of a household. The standards are:

- Single adult – one bedroom
- Single adult group – one bedroom per adult
- Couple with no children – two bedrooms
- Sole parent or couple with one child – two bedrooms
- Sole parent or couple with two or three children – three bedrooms
- Sole parent or couple with four children – four bedrooms.

For sole parents or couples with more than four children, the number of bedrooms required is the same as the number of children in the household.

Scope

All SOMIH households and for ICH, households in dwellings managed by funded ICHOs.

Data sources

Data on state ICH are administrative data provided by the states and territories. No data were collected for Australian Government ICH.

Data

Current estimates

Table 2.42: Total and average number of additional bedrooms required, for state ICH^(a), by state and territory, 30 June 2006

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA ^(b)	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Total number required	n.a.	..	4,565	n.a.	102	..	n.p.	n.a.	n.a.
Average number required	n.a.	..	2.4	n.a.	3.8	..	2.0	n.a.	n.a.

(a) Includes households in dwellings managed by state and territory administered ICHOs that were funded or actively registered in 2005–06.

(b) Data are available for only 285 dwellings. Significant under-reporting of the number of occupants in dwellings is known to occur, so that the total and average numbers of additional bedrooms required are likely to be underestimates.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection.

- In South Australia, there were 102 additional bedrooms required, an average of 3.8 per household; while in Queensland, there were 4,656 additional bedrooms required, an average of 2.4 per household (Table 2.42).

Indicator 22. Proportion of Indigenous households that are overcrowded

Purpose

Overcrowding places increased stress on kitchen, bathroom and laundry facilities as well as on sewerage systems such as septic tanks. Overcrowding increases the risk of the spread of infectious diseases such as meningococcal disease, rheumatic fever, tuberculosis, skin infections and respiratory infections (Howden-Chapman & Wilson 2000).

Description

For administrative data, the Proxy Occupancy standard is used. For information on the Proxy Occupancy Standard, see Indicator 21). Households that require two or more additional bedrooms to meet the standard are regarded as overcrowded.

For Census data, the Canadian Occupancy standard is used. Households that require one more bedroom to meet the standard are considered to experience 'a moderate degree of overcrowding', whereas households requiring two or more bedrooms are said to experience a 'high degree of overcrowding'. The Canadian National Occupancy Standard states that:

- no more than two people shall share a bedroom
- parents or couples may share a bedroom
- children under 5 years, either of the same sex or opposite sex may share a bedroom
- children under 18 years of the same sex may share a bedroom
- a child aged 5 to 17 years should not share a bedroom with a child under 5 of the opposite sex
- single adults 18 years and over and any unpaired children require a separate bedroom.

Scope

For ICH, households in dwellings managed by funded ICHOs. All SOMIH households. For Census data, all Indigenous households.

Data sources

Data on state ICH is administrative data provided by the states and territories. Data on Australian Government ICH comes from a survey of ICHOs undertaken by FaCSIA each year (see Appendix C).

SOMIH data were collected by the AIHW in the national CSHA data collection.

Data on all Indigenous households are from the Census of Population and Housing.

Data

Current estimates

- Data on households across all tenure types show that in 2006 there were 20,736 (12.4%) overcrowded Indigenous households across all tenure types (Table 2.44).
- Rates of overcrowding were highest among those living in Indigenous or mainstream community housing where 39% of households were overcrowded.
- Among jurisdictions, the Northern Territory had the highest proportion of Indigenous households that were overcrowded (34%).
- Only Queensland, Tasmania and the Australian Capital Territory could provide data on overcrowding in state administered ICH.
- In Queensland there were 1,438 overcrowded households in state ICH dwellings and 341 overcrowded households in Australian Government ICH dwellings (Table 2.43).
- The proportion of overcrowded ICH households ranged from 5% for state ICH dwellings in the Australian Capital Territory to 37% of state ICH dwellings in Queensland.

Table 2.43: Number and proportion of overcrowded ICH households^(a), by state and territory, at 30 June 2006

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
State ICH^(b)									
No. overcrowded households	n.a.	..	1,438	n.a.	16 ^(d)	..	n.p.	n.a.	n.a.
Total no. households	n.a.	..	3,933	n.a.	285 ^(d)	..	22	n.a.	n.a.
% overcrowded households	n.a.	..	36.6	n.a.	5.6 ^(d)	..	4.5	n.a.	n.a.
Australian Government ICH^(c)									
No. overcrowded households	..	38	341	5	384
Total no. households	..	433	1,507	53	1,993
% overcrowded households	..	8.8	22.6	9.4	19.3
SOMIH									
No. overcrowded households	115	29	260	250	105	7	766
Total no. households	3,358	1,092	2,822	2,137	1,791	330	11,530
% overcrowded households	3.4	2.7	9.2	11.7	5.9	2.1	6.6

(a) Includes households where household composition and dwelling details were known.

(b) Includes dwellings managed by state and territory administered ICHOs that were funded or actively registered in 2005–06.

(c) Includes dwellings managed by funded and unfunded organisations responding to the FaCSIA survey. The data from Victoria excludes six ICHOs. Queensland excludes 24 ICHOs and Tasmania excludes one ICHO. These data are an estimate of the number of overcrowded dwellings.

(d) Data were only available for 285 households.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection, AIWH 2006c

Table 2.44: Number and proportion of Indigenous households that were overcrowded by tenure type and state and territory, 2001 and 2006

	NSW & ACT	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	NT	Aust ^(a)
2001								
Number								
Home owner/ purchaser	1,290	339	901	390	204	175	192	3,491
Private and other renter	2,036	432	2,215	485	218	147	257	5,790
Renter state/territory housing	1,335	275	1,108	989	372	118	317	4,514
Renter Indigenous/ mainstream comm housing	563	47	1,624	1,041	297	7	2,835	6,414
Other/not stated	224	43	272	185	50	16	275	1,065
Total	5,448	1,136	6,120	3,090	1,141	463	3,876	21,274
Per cent								
Home owner/ purchaser	7.4	7.3	8.0	8.1	7.8	4.6	11.9	7.6
Private and other renter	12.6	11.9	14.5	11.4	10.3	8.1	17.4	13.0
Renter state/territory housing	12.4	12.3	18.2	20.5	14.1	9.7	19.8	15.4
Renter Indigenous/ mainstream comm housing	18.3	13.4	36.0	49.2	38.1	13.2	63.0	41.7
Other/not stated	8.8	6.4	11.4	14.4	11.1	5.0	18.9	11.7
Total	10.9	9.8	15.5	17.9	13.3	6.4	36.4	14.7
2006								
Number								
Home owner/ purchaser	1,326	317	1,078	367	193	187	219	3,687
Private and other renter	1,995	425	2,092	411	207	178	258	5,569
Renter state/territory housing	1,353	323	1,510	894	390	133	366	4,969
Renter Indigenous/ mainstream comm housing	478	50	1,253	811	224	6	2,744	5,569
Other/not stated	184	56	300	133	47	26	190	939
Total	5,336	1,171	6,233	2,616	1,064	530	3,777	20,736
Per cent								
Home owner/ purchaser	6.3	5.7	7.4	6.8	5.8	4.5	10.9	6.6
Private and other renter	10.6	9.8	12.5	9.2	8.8	8.9	16.6	11.1
Renter state/territory housing	10.8	11.7	20.1	18.9	13.6	10.1	22.9	14.9
Renter Indigenous/ mainstream comm housing	16.9	14.6	31.7	40.7	35.7	8.0	59.5	38.5
Other/not stated	4.9	5.0	9.2	7.4	6.0	6.2	13.3	7.5
Total	9.0	8.3	13.6	14.2	10.7	6.7	33.7	12.4

(a) Total includes other territories.

Note: Canadian Occupancy standard was used to assess overcrowding. Data includes households that require one or more extra bedroom.

Source: ABS 2001 and 2006 Census of Population and Housing.

Table 2.45: Number of people, number of bedrooms and average number of people per bedroom in ICH permanent dwellings, by state and territory, 30 June 2006

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
	State ICH^(a)								
No. of people	17,816 ^(c)	..	20,501	n.a.	4,822 ^(d)	..	74	52,887	96,100
No. of bedrooms	9,985 ^(c)	..	13,065	n.a.	2,269	..	73	18,037	43,429
No. people per bedroom	1.8 ^(c)	..	1.6	n.a.	2.1 ^(d)	..	1.0	2.9	2.2
	Australian Government ICH^(b)								
No. of people	..	1,268	5,282	122	6,672
No. of bedrooms	..	1,265	4,366	144	5,775
No. people per bedroom	..	1.0	1.2	0.8	1.2

(a) Includes dwellings managed by state and territory administered ICHOs that were funded actively registered in 2005–06.

(b) Includes dwellings managed by funded and unfunded organisations responding to the FaCSIA survey. The data from Victoria excludes six ICHOs. Queensland excludes 24 ICHOs and Tasmania excludes one ICHO.

(c) The data relate to actively and inactively registered organisations.

(d) Occupancy is currently under-reported, therefore estimates have been made from 2004–05 estimates.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection

- There were 766 overcrowded SOMIH households at 30 June 2006. The largest number of overcrowded households was in Queensland (260) followed by Western Australia (250) (Table 2.43).
- The proportion of overcrowded SOMIH households ranged from 2% in Tasmania to 12% of households in Queensland.
- The average number of people per bedroom was 2.2 for state ICH dwellings and 1.2 for Australian Government ICH dwellings (Table 2.45).
- The average number of people per bedroom in ICH dwellings was highest in the Northern Territory (2.9), followed by South Australia (2.1).

Time trends

- The proportion of overcrowded Indigenous households across all tenure types decreased from 14.7% in 2001 to 12.4% in 2006 (Table 2.44).
- The largest decrease was in the proportion of overcrowded households in Indigenous and mainstream community housing which fell from 42% to 39%.
- Among jurisdictions, the largest decrease in the proportion of overcrowded Indigenous households was in Western Australia where they fell from 18% to 14%.
- Between 2004 and 2006, the average number of people per bedroom in state ICH dwellings increased from 2.0 to 2.2 (Table 2.46).
- The number of people per bedroom in Australian Government ICH increased from 0.8 in 2004 to 1.2 in 2006, though care should be taken in interpreting these data because not all dwellings are included in these data.
- Comparison of levels of overcrowding in SOMIH households between jurisdictions and over time is difficult because of changes to the inclusion of mixed composition households and for 2006 data, changes to the Proxy Occupancy Standard (Table 2.47).

Table 2.46: Average number of people per bedroom in ICH permanent dwellings, by state and territory, 30 June 2004 to 30 June 2006

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
State ICH^(a)									
2004	1.1	..	1.8	1.6 ^(d)	2.5	..	1.0	2.7	2.0
2005	1.6 ^(c)	..	n.a.	1.7 ^(d)	2.1 ^(e)	..	1.1	2.8 ^(g)	2.1
2006	1.8	..	1.6	n.a.	2.1 ^(f)	..	1.0	2.9	2.2
Australian Government ICH^(b)									
2004	..	1.1	0.8	1.1	0.6	..	0.8
2005	..	1.1	0.8	1.0	1.1	..	0.9
2006	..	1.0	1.2	0.8 ⁽ⁿ⁾	1.2

(a) Includes dwellings managed by state and territory administered ICHOs that were funded in the financial year.

(b) Includes dwellings managed by funded and unfunded organisations responding to the FaCSIA survey which can vary from year to year and care should therefore be taken in interpreting trends. The data from Victoria excludes one ICHO for 2005 and six ICHOs for 2006; Queensland excludes 21 ICHOs for 2005 and 24 ICHOs in 2006; Tasmania excludes one ICHO for 2006.

(c) The number of bedrooms was not reported for over 250 dwellings. This may result in an overestimation of the number of people per bedroom.

(d) Based on data from Western Australia's Environmental Health Needs Survey 2003, for all Western Australian communities whether funded or unfunded. The 2005 data is an estimate based on the 2004 data updated for new houses and demolitions and a population increase of 3%.

(e) The number of people is an estimate based on data provided by 27 ICHOs. The total number of bedrooms is an estimate based on data provided by 28 ICHOs.

(f) Occupancy was under-reported in 2005–06 and data was therefore estimated from 2004–05 data.

(g) The number of people in ICH dwellings is estimated from the community population from the Northern Territory Grants Commission.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection, AIHW 2005f.

Table 2.47: Proportion of overcrowded SOMIH households, by state and territory, 30 June 2002 to 30 June 2006

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
2002	2.3	2.8	8.0	0.6 ^(a)	2.3 ^(a)	—	3.4 ^(b)
2003	1.2 ^{(a)(c)}	2.0	6.7	1.0 ^(a)	1.4 ^{(a)(d)}	0.3 ^(a)	2.6 ^(b)
2004	0.8 ^{(a)(e)}	— ^(a)	3.3 ^(a)	1.7 ^(a)	1.9 ^{(a)(d)}	1.3 ^(a)	1.7 ^(a)
2005	0.7 ^{(a)(f)}	1.7	6.7	1.6 ^(a)	2.2 ^{(a)(g)}	1.2 ^(a)	2.8 ^(b)
2006 ^(h)	3.4	2.7	9.2	11.7	5.9	2.1	6.6

(a) Mixed composition households excluded.

(b) Mixed composition households excluded from some jurisdictions.

(c) For New South Wales the definition of multiple family households changed in 2002–03 and where households are excluded from the calculation and therefore data are not comparable to previous years.

(d) The implementation of a new computer system resulted in the loss of information regarding occupants in non-rebated households therefore South Australia data are not comparable to other years data.

(e) New South Wales data are not fully comparable with data from 2002–03 due to a different methodology used to derive household type.

(f) New South Wales data are not comparable with previous years as some households that were previously identified as group households are now identified as mixed composition households.

(g) South Australia provided information on an income unit basis and therefore the data are not comparable to previous years.

(h) Data are not comparable with previous years' data as the Proxy Occupancy Standard was revised for 2005–06.

Source: AIHW 2003a, b, 2005c, e, 2006c

Indicator 23. Proportion of households paying more than 25% of income in rent

Purpose

Housing affordability takes into account the ability of a household to pay rent or mortgage payments while still being able to afford other basic living costs. This indicator provides a measure of the proportion of households in affordability stress, which is defined as low-income Indigenous households paying more than 25% of their income in rent.

Description

The number of SOMIH/ICH households paying more than 25% of assessable income in rent divided by the total number of SOMIH/ICH households, multiplied by 100.

The number of Indigenous households in the bottom 40% of Australian incomes paying 25% or more of assessable income in rent divided by the total number of Indigenous households on the bottom 40% of incomes paying rent.

Scope

Low-income Indigenous renter households. All SOMIH households. Data for ICH will be collected in the future.

Data sources

Data for SOMIH were collected in the CSHA national data collection.

Data

Current estimates

- There were 366 SOMIH households in Australia who paid 25% or more of their income in rent. Most of these households were in New South Wales (284) (Table 2.48).
- The proportion of SOMIH households who paid 25% or more of their income in rent was highest in New South Wales and Tasmania where 9% and 11% of households paid 25% or more of their income in rent, respectively.

Table 2.48: Number and proportion of SOMIH households paying more than 25% of income in rent, by state and territory, 30 June 2006

Households	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Total
No. paying more than 25% of income in rent ^(a)	284	4	2	20 ^(b)	27 ^(c)	29	366
Total no. ^(d)	3,354	1,090	2,381	1,797	1,496	270	10,388
% paying more than 25% of income in rent	8.5	0.4	0.1	1.1 ^(b)	1.8 ^(c)	10.7	3.5

(a) Some households may be in this category because rent and/or income details were not updated.

(b) Data are based upon gross income (not assessable income).

(c) Data should be interpreted with caution as updated income details are not available for these households. They are reported as paying a rebated rent due to a policy of capping rent increases for full-rent households.

(d) Refers to households for which income details are known.

Source: AIHW 2006c.

Time trends

Table 2.49: Proportion of SOMIH households paying more than 25% of income in rent, by state and territory, 30 June 2002 to 30 June 2006

Year	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
2002	—	0.3 ^(a)	0.1 ^(a)	2.7 ^(a)	1.3	— ^(a)	0.7
2003 ^(b)	—	—	0.1	3.7	0.8	47.0	2.1
2004 ^(b)	—	0.2	—	4.4 ^(a)	1.5	42.2	2.2
2005 ^(b)	—	0.2	—	1.1 ^(a)	1.5 ^(c)	34.4	1.3
2006 ^(b)	8.5 ^(d)	0.4	0.1	1.1 ^(a)	1.8 ^(c)	10.7	3.5

(a) Data are based upon gross income (not assessable income).

(b) Some households may be in this category because rent and/or income details were not updated.

(c) Data should be interpreted with caution as updated income details are not available for these households. They are reported as paying a rebated rent due to a policy of capping rent increases for full-rent households.

(d) Moderate income renters are now charged 25–30% of their income as rent. In addition, some SOMIH tenants were deemed eligible to receive CRA. The CRA component of a tenant's income is assessed at 100% for rent.

Note: Based on the households for which income details are known.

Source: AIHW 2003b, 2005c, e, 2006c.

- The proportion of SOMIH households paying more than 25% of income in rent has increased from 1% in 2002 to 4% in 2006 (Table 2.49).

Indicator 25. Number of Indigenous community housing organisations

Purpose

This indicator reports on the number of ICHOs, which provides information on the number of housing services managed by Indigenous people.

Description

The number of ICHOs.

An ICHO is any Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander organisation that is responsible for managing housing for Indigenous people. This includes community organisations such as resource agencies and land councils that have a range of functions, provided they manage housing for Indigenous people. To be included in the data collection, ICHOs must be funded by or actively registered with the state or Australian governments.

Scope

Includes funded ICHOs.

Data sources

Data on state ICH are administrative data provided by the states and territories. Data on Australian Government ICH come from a survey of ICHOs undertaken by FaCSIA each year (see Appendix C).

Alternative data from the 2006 CHINS are also provided.

Data

Current estimates and time trends

- Funding arrangements for ICHOs vary across jurisdictions. In some jurisdictions, most organisations within the jurisdiction receive funding (e.g. Queensland and the Northern Territory) while in others only a subset of organisations are funded each year (New South Wales and Western Australia).
- At 30 June 2006, there were 559 state ICHOs (328 that were funded) and 85 Australian Government ICHOs (Table 2.50).
- New South Wales had the largest number of organisations (268) in 2006, followed by Western Australia (122).
- The number of state ICHOs funded in the financial year increased from 311 in 2004 to 328 in 2006.

- The number of Australian Government ICHOs responding to the survey decreased from 101 in 2004 to 85 in 2006. This was due to a decrease in the number of ICHOs in Queensland responding to the survey.

Table 2.50: Number of ICHOs, by state and territory, at 30 June 2004 to 2006

Year	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Total
State ICH									
<i>Total no. organisations</i>									
2004	284	..	34	n.a.	46	..	1	85	450 ^(a)
2005	294	..	34	n.a.	46	..	1	84	459 ^(a)
2006	268	..	34	122	58 ^(b)	..	1	76	559
<i>No. organisations funded/actively registered</i>									
2004	145	..	34	n.a.	46	..	1	85	311 ^(a)
2005	134	..	34	n.a.	32	..	1	84	285 ^(a)
2006	126	..	34	39	52 ^(b)	..	1	76	328
Australian Government ICH^(c)									
2004	..	21	74	3	3	..	101
2005	..	23	67	3	3	..	96
2006	..	25	57	3	85

(a) Total does not include Western Australia.

(b) The method of counting ICHOs changed in 2005–06. Fifteen ICHOs on the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Lands are now counted as individual administrative units, rather than as one.

(c) Includes funded and unfunded ICHOs administered through the Australian Government.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection; AIHW 2005f.

- The ABS CHINS provides estimates of the number of Indigenous housing organisations (whether funded or unfunded).
- The CHINS estimated that there were 496 Indigenous housing organisations in 2006 (Table 2.51).
- Between 2001 and 2006, there was a decrease of 120 in the total number of Indigenous housing organisations. The number of organisations decreased in all jurisdictions except South Australia and Tasmania.
- In some jurisdictions, there were considerable differences in the number of organisations estimated in CHINS and the number in the NRF administrative data. The differences are likely to be related to the different methodologies used to collect the data.

Table 2.51: Number of Indigenous housing organisations, by state and territory, 2001 and 2006

Year	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	NT	Aust
2001	205	25	116	125	31	3	111	616
2006	169	22	91	92	37	3	82	496

Source: 2006 CHINS (ABS 2007) Table 4.6.

Indicator 26. Proportion of ICHOs that have a housing management plan

Purpose

This indicator gives a measure of whether ICHOs are well managed, with a plan outlining objectives, financial management, tenancy management and human resource management.

Description

The number of ICHOs that have a housing management plan divided by the total number of ICHOs, multiplied by 100.

A housing management plan is a written document used by ICHOs to outline strategies and activities by which the objectives of the organisation will be achieved. It could be referred to as a management plan or a business plan (CHINS). Under BBF, a housing management plan should contain:

- objectives for housing assistance delivery
- an asset management plan, including provision for client consultation and feedback mechanisms and appropriate information and training for tenants to ensure tenants' responsibilities are understood and their rights protected
- rent collection policies and systems
- financial practices and reporting systems that link resources to outcomes.

Scope

ICHOs that were funded or actively registered in 2005–06.

Data sources

Data on state ICH are administrative data provided by the states and territories. Data on Australian Government ICH come from a survey of ICHOs undertaken by FaCSIA each year (see Appendix C).

Alternative data from the 2006 CHINS are also provided.

Data

Current estimates

Table 2.52: Number and proportion of ICHOs that have a housing management plan, by state and territory, 30 June 2006

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
State ICH^(a)									
No. with HM plan	72	..	34	32	37	..	1	71	247
Total no. ICHOs	126	..	34	39	52 ^(b)	..	1	76	328
% with a HM plan	57.1	..	100.0	82.1	71.2	..	100.0	93.4	75.3
Australian Government ICH^(c)									
No. with HM plan	..	17	22	2	41
Total no. ICHOs	..	19	33	2	54
% with a HM plan	..	89.5	66.7	100.0	75.9

(a) Includes state and territory administered ICHOs that were funded or actively registered in 2005–06.

(b) The method of counting ICHOs changed in 2005–06. Fifteen ICHOs on the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Lands are now counted as individual administrative units, rather than as one. In addition, ICHOs not directly funded through the Office for Aboriginal Housing have been counted, although the scope of the data available is restricted.

(c) Includes funded and unfunded organisations responding to the FaCSIA survey. The data from Victoria exclude six ICHOs. Queensland excludes 24 ICHOs and Tasmania excludes one ICHO.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection.

- In most jurisdictions, the development and implementation of a housing management plan was a condition of funding, though only 75% of state ICHOs and 76% of Australian Government ICHOs had completed a housing management plan at 30 June 2006 (Table 2.52).
- The proportion of organisations with a housing management plan ranged from 57% for state ICHOs in New South Wales to 100% for state ICHOs in Queensland, the Australian Capital Territory and for Australian Government ICHOs in Tasmania.

Time trends

Table 2.53: Proportion of ICHOs that have a housing management plan, by state and territory, at 30 June 2004 to 2006

Year	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
State ICH^(a)									
2004	n.a.	..	—	n.a.	67	..	100	41	n.a.
2005	27	..	n.a.	n.a.	100	..	100	88	n.a.
2006	57	..	100	82	71	..	100	93	75
Australian Government ICH^(b)									
2004	..	57	67 ^(c)	100	67	..	66
2005	..	100	46 ^(c)	100	100	..	66
2006	..	89	67	100	76

(a) Includes dwellings managed by state and territory administered ICHOs that were funded or actively registered in the financial year.

(b) Includes dwellings managed by funded and unfunded organisations responding to the FaCSIA survey which can vary from year to year and care should therefore be taken in interpreting trends. The data from Victoria exclude one ICHO for 2005 and six ICHOs for 2006. Queensland excludes 21 ICHOs for 2005 and 24 ICHOs in 2006; Tasmania excludes one ICHO for 2006.

(c) Data may differ from previously published data as these percentages have been recalculated based on the number of organisations providing data.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection; AIHW 2005f.

- Between 2004 and 2006 the proportion of ICHOs with a housing management plan either remained steady or increased in most jurisdictions that could provide data (Table 2.53).

Indicator 28. Proportion of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who have completed accredited training

Purpose

Increasing the number of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who have completed training will increase the capacity of Indigenous people to be actively involved in planning and delivering housing services.

Description

The number of Indigenous employees who have completed accredited training in housing management and related areas divided by the total number of Indigenous employees in ICH organisations, multiplied by 100.

Accredited training is defined as training that results in the issuing of a nationally recognised qualification or statement of attainment following the full or partial completion of that training. The acceptable Australian Qualification Framework levels are AQF levels 2-5 (i.e. Certificates II-IV, and Diploma level). The training must be related to the management of housing.

Employees can have completed some form of accredited training and also be undertaking training at a higher level.

Scope

ICHOs that were funded or actively registered in 2005-06.

Data sources

Data on state ICH are administrative data provided by the states and territories. Data on Australian Government ICH come from a survey of ICHOs undertaken by FaCSIA each year (see Appendix C).

Data

Current estimates

Table 2.54: Number and proportion of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who have completed accredited training, by state and territory, at 30 June 2006

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
State ICH^(a)									
No. completed training	59	..	21	n.a.	7	..	2	41	130
Total no. employees	294	..	259 ^(b)	n.a.	10	..	4	338	905
% completed training	20.1	..	8.1 ^(b)	n.a.	70.0	..	50.0	12.1	14.4
Australian Government ICH^(c)									
No. completed training	..	16	39	2	57
Total no. employees	..	42	90	2	134
% completed training	..	38.1	43.3	100.0	42.5

(a) Includes dwellings managed by state and territory administered ICHOs that were funded or actively registered in 2005–06.

(b) Data on the number of Indigenous employees are from 11 of 34 councils.

(c) Includes dwellings managed by funded and unfunded organisations responding to the FaCSIA survey. The data from Victoria exclude six ICHOs. Queensland excludes 24 ICHOs and Tasmania excludes one ICHO.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection.

- Overall, only 14% of employees in state organisations and 43% of employees in Australian Government organisations had completed accredited training in housing management (Table 2.54).
- The proportion who had completed training was lowest for state ICHOs in Queensland (8%), the Northern Territory (12%) and New South Wales (20%).

Time trends

Table 2.55: Proportion of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who have completed accredited training, at 30 June 2004 to 30 June 2006

Year	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
State ICH^(a)									
2004	24.4	..	n.a.	n.a.	96.2	..	25.0	38.7	n.a.
2005	19.1	..	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	..	25.0	35.6	n.a.
2006	20.1	..	8.1 ^(b)	n.a.	70.0	..	50.0	12.1	14.4
Australian Government ICH^(c)									
2004	..	—	22.6	36.4	16.7	..	21.2
2005	..	47.8	21.6	28.6	57.1	..	28.8
2006	..	38.6	43.3	100.0	42.7

(a) Includes dwellings managed by state and territory administered ICHOs that were funded in the financial year

(b) Data on the number of Indigenous employees are from 11 of 34 councils.

(c) Includes dwellings managed by funded and unfunded organisations responding to the FaCSIA survey which can vary from year to year and care should therefore be taken in interpreting trends. The data from Victoria exclude one ICHO for 2005 and six ICHOs for 2006. Queensland excludes 21 ICHOs for 2005 and 24 ICHOs in 2006; Tasmania excludes ICHO for 2006.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection; AIHW 2005f.

- Between 2004 and 2006, the proportion of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who had completed accredited training increased in some jurisdictions (Table 2.55).

Indicator 29. Proportion of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who are undertaking accredited training

Purpose

Increasing the number of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who are undertaking training will increase the capacity of Indigenous people to be actively involved in planning and delivering housing services.

Description

The number of Indigenous employees who are undertaking accredited training in housing management and related areas divided by the total number of Indigenous employees in ICH organisations, multiplied by 100.

Accredited training is defined as training that results in the issuing of a nationally recognised qualification or statement of attainment following the full or partial completion of that training. The acceptable Australian Qualification Framework levels are AQF levels 2-5 (i.e. Certificates II-IV, and Diploma level). The training must be related to the management of housing.

Employees can have completed some form of accredited training and also be undertaking training at a higher level.

Scope

ICHOs that were funded or actively registered in 2005-06.

Data sources

Data on state ICH are administrative data provided by the states and territories. Data on Australian Government ICH come from a survey of ICHOs undertaken by FaCSIA each year (see Appendix C).

Data

Current estimates

- In 2005-06, state ICHOs in the Northern Territory had the highest proportion of Indigenous employees who were undertaking accredited training (45%), followed by Australian Government ICHOs in Queensland (43%) and Victoria (31%) (Table 2.56).

Table 2.56: Number and proportion of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who are undertaking accredited training, by state and territory, 30 June 2006

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Total
State ICH^(a)									
No. undertaking training	14	..	12	n.a.	1	..	1	152	180
Total no. employees	294	..	259 ^(b)	n.a.	10	..	4	338	905
% undertaking training	4.8	..	4.6 ^(b)	n.a.	10.0	..	25.0	45.0	19.9
Australian Government ICH^(c)									
No. undertaking training	..	13	39	—	52
Total no. employees	..	42	90	2	134
% undertaking training	..	31.0	43.3	—	38.8

(a) Includes dwellings managed by state and territory administered ICHOs that were funded or actively registered in 2005–06.

(b) Data on the number of Indigenous employees are from 11 of 34 councils.

(c) Includes dwellings managed by funded and unfunded organisations responding to the FaCSIA survey. The data from Victoria exclude six ICHOs. Queensland excludes 24 ICHOs and Tasmania excludes one ICHO.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection.

Time trends

Table 2.57: Proportion of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who are undertaking accredited training in housing management, 30 June 2004 to 30 June 2006

Year	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
State ICH^(a)									
2004	6.1	..	n.a.	n.a.	54.7	..	75.0	55.5	n.a.
2005	10.1	..	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	..	100.0	50.8	n.a.
2006	4.8	..	4.6 ^(b)	n.a.	10.0	..	25.0	45.0	19.9
Australian Government ICH^(c)									
2004	..	43.8	24.8	54.5	50.0	..	29.4
2005	..	4.3	31.8	9.5	—	..	22.3
2006	..	31.3	43.3	—	39.0

(a) Includes dwellings managed by state and territory administered ICHOs that were funded in the financial year.

(b) Data on the number of Indigenous employees are from 11 of 34 councils.

(c) Includes dwellings managed by funded and unfunded organisations responding to the FaCSIA survey which can vary from year to year and care should therefore be taken in interpreting trends. The data from Victoria excludes one ICHO for 2005 and six ICHOs for 2006. Queensland excludes 21 ICHOs for 2005 and 24 ICHOs in 2006; Tasmania excludes one ICHO for 2006.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection; AIHW 2006c.

- Between 2004 and 2006, the proportion of Indigenous employees who were undertaking accredited training decreased in most organisations (Table 2.57).

Indicator 30. Proportion of people employed in housing management who are Indigenous

Purpose

This indicator provides a measure of the extent to which Indigenous people are involved in the management of SOMIH and ICH services.

Description

The number of Indigenous employees in housing management for SOMIH/ICH divided by the total number of employees in housing management for SOMIH/ICH, multiplied by 100.

Scope

All SOMIH. ICHOs that were funded or actively registered in 2005-06.

Data sources

Data on state ICH are administrative data provided by the states and territories. Data on Australian Government ICH come from a survey of ICHOs undertaken by FaCSIA each year (see Appendix C).

Data for SOMIH were collected in the CSHA national data collection.

Data

Current estimates

Table 2.58: Number and proportion of people employed in ICH housing management who are Indigenous, by state and territory, 30 June 2006

Employees	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Total
State ICH^(a)									
No. Indigenous	294	..	259 ^(b)	n.a.	10	..	4	338	905
Total no.	343	..	272 ^(b)	n.a.	16	..	6	470	1,107
% Indigenous	85.7	..	95.2 ^(b)	n.a.	62.5	..	66.7	71.9	81.8
Australian Government ICH^(c)									
No. Indigenous	..	42	90	2	134
Total no.	..	57	126	6	189
% Indigenous	..	73.7	71.4	33.3	70.9

(a) Includes dwellings managed by state and territory administered ICHOs that were funded or actively registered in 2005–06.

(b) Data on the number of employees are from 11 of 34 councils.

(c) Includes dwellings managed by funded and unfunded organisations responding to the FaCSIA survey. The data from Victoria exclude six ICHOs. Queensland excludes 24 ICHOs and Tasmania excludes one ICHO.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection.

- The Northern Territory had the largest number of Indigenous employees (338) in state/territory organisations, followed by New South Wales (294) and Queensland (259) (Table 2.58).
- The proportion of employees in ICHOs that was Indigenous ranged from 33% in Australian Government ICHOs in Tasmania to 95% for state ICHOs in Queensland.

Table 2.59: Number and proportion of people employed in SOMIH housing management who are Indigenous, by state and territory, 30 June 2006

Employees	NSW ^(a)	Vic	Qld ^(b)	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Total
No. Indigenous	165	18	13	84	41	4	323
Total no.	191	18	284	1,168	79	4	1,605
% Indigenous	86.4	100.0	4.6	7.2	51.9	100.0	20.1

(a) Includes 126 Indigenous workers employed under Aboriginal Housing Office's Aboriginal Employment in Construction Policy.

(b) Data updated from previously published data to include capital works and maintenance staff.

Source: AIHW 2006c.

- There were 323 Indigenous people employed in housing management in SOMIH across Australia (Table 2.59).
- The proportion of Indigenous people employed in SOMIH ranged from 5% in Queensland to 100% in both Victoria and Tasmania.

Time trends

Table 2.60: Proportion of people employed in ICH housing management who are Indigenous, at 30 June 2004 to 30 June 2006

Year	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
State ICH^(a)									
2004	77	..	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	..	100	68	n.a.
2005	80	..	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	..	100	72	n.a.
2006	86	..	95 ^(b)	n.a.	63	..	67	72	82
Australian Government ICH^(c)									
2004	..	64	77	85	100	..	77
2005	..	43	70	72	70	..	64
2006	..	73	71	33	71

(a) Includes dwellings managed by state and territory administered ICHOs that were funded in the financial year.

(b) Data on the number of Indigenous employees are from 11 of 34 councils.

(c) Includes dwellings managed by funded and unfunded organisations responding to the FaCSIA survey which can vary from year to year and care should therefore be taken in interpreting trends. The data from Victoria exclude one ICHO for 2005 and six ICHOs for 2006. Queensland excludes 21 ICHOs for 2005 and 24 ICHOs in 2006; Tasmania exclude one ICHO for 2006.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection; AIHW 2005f.

- Between 2004 and 2006, the proportion of Indigenous people employed in ICH housing management increased in state organisations in New South Wales and the Northern Territory and in Australian Government organisations in Victoria (Table 2.60).

Table 2.61: Proportion of people employed in SOMIH housing management who are Indigenous, by state and territory, at 30 June 2004 to 30 June 2006

Year	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
2004	100	61	67	8	49	75	17
2005	52 ^(a)	69	31 ^(b)	59 ^(c)	55	100	49
2006	86 ^(d)	100	5 ^(e)	7 ^(f)	52	100	19

(a) Includes both direct and indirect employment to manage SOMIH (i.e. by the New South Wales Aboriginal Housing Office (AHO) and the New South Wales Department of Housing).

(b) Includes some staff members who support independent Indigenous community housing.

(c) In addition to these, a large proportion of other staff members spend a percentage of their time in the planning, delivery and management of SOMIH.

(d) Includes 126 Indigenous workers employed under the AHO Aboriginal Employment in Construction Policy.

(e) Data updated from previously published data to include capital works and maintenance staff. Data are not comparable with previous years' data as the methodology has changed. In 2005–06, the data relate to all staff whose duties included work on SOMIH. The majority of these staff also worked on other social housing programs.

(f) Data are not comparable with previous years' data as the methodology has changed or with those of other jurisdictions as they relate to the whole of the Department of Housing and Works. Staff whose duties include work on SOMIH are not separately identifiable in 2005–06.

Source: AIHW 2005c, e, 2006c

- Because of changes in methodology in some jurisdictions, it is difficult to compare changes in the proportion of employees in SOMIH who are Indigenous between 2004 and 2006 (Table 2.61).

Indicator 34. Proportion of clients whose needs were met in relation to the (a) amenity (b) location of their dwelling

Purpose

Provision of housing that meets Indigenous needs is important. The purpose of this indicator is to measure whether clients are satisfied with the amenities and location of their dwelling.

Description

The National Social Housing Survey (NSHS) of SOMIH tenants asked tenants about the importance and adequacy of the following amenities:

- size of the dwelling
- modifications for special needs
- ease of access and entry
- car parking
- yard space and fencing
- privacy
- safety/security.

The indicator is calculated from the number of Indigenous tenants who said the amenity aspect is important and meets their needs divided by the number of tenants who said the amenity aspect is important and gave a valid answer to the needs question, multiplied by 100.

The NSHS of SOMIH tenants also asked tenants about the importance and adequacy of the location of their dwelling in relation to the following facilities and services:

- shops and banking
- public transport
- parks and recreational facilities
- child care facilities
- emergency services, medical services/hospitals
- educational and training facilities
- employment/place of work
- community and support services
- family and friends
- safety/security of neighbourhood.

The indicator is calculated from the number of Indigenous tenants who said the location aspect is important and meets their needs divided by the number of tenants who said the location aspect is important and gave a valid answer to the needs question, multiplied by 100.

Scope

SOMIH only. Data on ICH will be collected in the future.

Data sources

Data were collected in the 2005 SOMIH National Social Housing Survey.

Data

Current estimates

Table 2.62: Number and proportion of SOMIH tenants whose needs were met in relation to the amenity of their dwelling, by state and territory, 2005

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Total
Sample size	168	147	167	157	157	101	897
Weighted count	288	90	197	165	134	23	897
No. tenants who said this amenity aspect is important and meets their needs									
Size of dwelling	214	62	146	95	89	17	623
Modifications for special needs	50	18	55	21	31	7	182
Ease of access and entry	197	72	142	102	93	19	625
Car parking	187	64	127	92	91	17	578
Yard space and fencing	199	64	143	84	79	14	583
Privacy of home	237	71	149	99	99	19	674
Safety/security of home	190	64	146	92	84	16	592
No. tenants who said this amenity aspect is important and gave a valid answer to needs question									
Size of dwelling	265	81	184	143	127	22	822
Modifications for special needs	91	28	95	40	54	11	319
Ease of access and entry	231	83	182	127	110	22	755
Car parking	223	80	182	124	111	20	740
Yard space and fencing	274	88	193	138	129	22	844
Privacy of home	283	87	183	145	132	24	854
Safety/security of home	283	88	197	157	131	24	880

(continued)

Table 2.62 (continued): Number and proportion of SOMIH tenants whose needs were met in relation to the amenity of their dwelling, by state and territory, 2005

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Total
	Per cent								
Size of dwelling	80.8	76.5	79.3	66.4	70.1	77.3	75.8
Modifications for special needs	54.9	64.3	57.9	52.5	57.4	63.6	57.1
Ease of access and entry	85.3	86.7	78.0	80.3	84.5	86.4	82.8
Car parking	83.9	80.0	69.8	74.2	82.0	85.0	78.1
Yard space and fencing	72.6	72.7	74.1	60.9	61.2	63.6	69.1
Privacy of home	83.7	81.6	81.4	68.3	75.0	79.2	78.9
Safety/security of home	67.1	72.7	74.1	58.6	64.1	66.7	67.3
Average	77.2	77.6	74.7	66.9	71.3	75.2	74.0

Note: Care needs to be taken in interpreting small differences in the results that are affected by various sampling issues. For more information on errors and data caveats, see <<http://www.aihw.gov.au/indigenous/somih.cfm>>.

Source: 2005 SOMIH National Social Housing Survey.

- Across Australia, of those SOMIH tenants for whom amenity was important, 74% said that their needs were met (Table 2.62).
- This proportion was highest in Victoria (78%) and lowest in Western Australia (67%).
- SOMIH tenants were least likely to say that their amenity needs were met in relation to modifications for special needs, with 57% of tenants who felt this was important, reporting that their needs were met.

Table 2.63: Number and proportion of SOMIH tenants whose needs were met in relation to the location of their dwelling, by state and territory, 2005

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Total
Sample size	168	147	167	157	157	101	897
Weighted count	288	90	197	165	134	23	897
	No. tenants who said this location aspect is important and meets their needs								
Shops and banking	209	68	151	94	96	16	634
Public transport	192	67	132	61	96	17	565
Parks and recreational facilities	153	48	111	68	73	13	466
Emergency services, medical services/hospitals	199	61	152	91	95	15	613
Child care facilities	87	28	55	28	30	5	233
Educational/training facilities	180	54	110	86	65	13	508
Employment/place of work	103	44	72	41	46	10	316
Community and support services	161	56	103	62	62	13	457
Family and friends	207	63	136	71	79	15	571
Safety/security of neighbourhood	230	77	177	119	104	18	725

(continued)

Table 2.63 (continued): Number and proportion of SOMIH tenants whose needs were met in relation to the location of their dwelling, by state and territory, 2005

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Total
No. tenants who said this location aspect is important and gave a valid answer to needs question									
Shops and banking	238	75	163	120	106	19	721
Public transport	204	68	141	81	99	19	612
Parks and recreational facilities	182	55	123	90	87	16	553
Emergency services, medical services/hospitals	245	74	172	120	106	20	737
Child care facilities	96	32	63	35	36	6	268
Educational/training facilities	201	59	121	100	77	14	572
Employment/place of work	124	51	83	47	55	12	372
Community and support services	183	61	115	79	71	15	524
Family and friends	234	69	150	87	93	19	652
Safety/security of neighbourhood	280	87	192	156	130	23	868
Per cent									
Shops and banking	87.8	90.7	92.6	78.3	90.6	84.2	87.9
Public transport	94.1	98.5	93.6	75.3	97.0	89.5	92.3
Parks and recreational facilities	84.1	87.3	90.2	75.6	83.9	81.3	84.3
Emergency services, medical services/hospitals	81.2	82.4	88.4	75.8	89.6	75.0	83.2
Child care facilities	90.6	87.5	87.3	80.0	83.3	83.3	86.9
Educational/training facilities	89.6	91.5	90.9	86.0	84.4	92.9	88.8
Employment/place of work	83.1	86.3	86.7	87.2	83.6	83.3	84.9
Community and support services	88.0	91.8	89.6	78.5	87.3	86.7	87.2
Family and friends	88.5	91.3	90.7	81.6	84.9	78.9	87.6
Safety/security of neighbourhood	82.1	88.5	92.2	76.3	80.0	78.3	83.5
Average	86.6	89.7	90.6	78.8	86.7	82.8	86.5

Note: Care needs to be taken in interpreting small differences in the results that are affected by various sampling issues. For more information on errors and data caveats, see <<http://www.aihw.gov.au/indigenous/somih.cfm>>.

Source: 2005 SOMIH National Social Housing Survey.

- Across Australia, of those SOMIH tenants for whom location was important, 87% said that their needs were met (Table 2.63).
- This proportion was highest in Queensland (91%) and lowest in Western Australia (79%).
- SOMIH tenants were least likely to say that their location needs were met in relation to emergency services, medical services/hospitals, with 83% of tenants who felt this was important, reporting that their needs were met.

Indicator 35. Proportion of clients satisfied with quality of the service provided

Purpose

This indicator is intended to provide a measure of whether Indigenous people are satisfied with the quality of service provided for SOMIH and ICH dwellings.

Description

The number of SOMIH/ICH tenants satisfied with the quality of service provided divided by the total number of SOMIH/ICH tenants who gave a valid answer to the satisfaction question, multiplied by 100.

Scope

SOMIH only. Data on ICH will be collected in the future.

Data sources

Data were collected in the 2005 SOMIH National Social Housing Survey.

Data

Current estimates

Table 2.64: Number and proportion of SOMIH tenants who were satisfied with the quality of service provided, by state and territory, 2005

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Sample size	168	147	167	157	157	101	897
Weighted count	288	90	197	165	134	23	897
% of tenants reporting overall satisfaction									
Very satisfied	17.4	21.1	26.4	12.7	10.4	21.7	17.9
Satisfied	45.8	48.9	44.7	44.8	43.3	47.8	45.4
<i>Subtotal: satisfied or very satisfied</i>	<i>63.2</i>	<i>70.0</i>	<i>71.1</i>	<i>57.6</i>	<i>53.7</i>	<i>69.6</i>	<i>63.3</i>
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	7.6	7.8	10.7	21.8	15.7	13.0	12.3
Somewhat dissatisfied	22.6	11.1	13.7	9.1	19.4	13.0	16.3
Very dissatisfied	6.6	11.1	4.6	10.9	10.4	4.3	7.9
<i>Subtotal: somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied</i>	<i>29.2</i>	<i>22.2</i>	<i>18.3</i>	<i>20.0</i>	<i>29.9</i>	<i>17.4</i>	<i>24.2</i>
Don't know/no opinion	—	—	—	0.6	0.7	—	0.2

Note: Care needs to be taken in interpreting small differences in the results that are affected by various sampling issues. For more information on errors and data caveats, see <<http://www.aihw.gov.au/indigenous/somih.cfm>>.

Source: 2005 SOMIH National Social Housing Survey.

- Across Australia, 63% of SOMIH tenants were satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of service provided (Table 2.64).
- The proportion of SOMIH tenants who were satisfied was highest in Queensland (71%) and lowest in South Australia (54%).

Indicator 36. Proportion of indicators (not Census or CHINS) on which jurisdictions could report

Purpose

This indicator provides a measure of the capacity of jurisdictions to report on SOMIH and ICH.

Description

Number of SOMIH/ICH indicators for which jurisdictions could provide data divided by the total number of SOMIH/ICH indicators for which data were requested, multiplied by 100.

Scope

ICH and SOMIH.

Data sources

This indicator was calculated from the data provided to AIHW in the NRF and SOMIH data collections.

Data

Table 2.65: Number and proportion of ICH/SOMIH indicators for which jurisdictions could provide data, by state and territory, 2005–06

	State/territory governments								Australian Government
	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	
No. indicators data provided	24	17	23.5	20.5	25	17	21	19.5	20.5
No. indicators data requested	25	17	25	25	25	17	21	21	21
% ind. data provided	96.0	100.0	94.0	82.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	92.9	97.6

Note: This table does not assess the quality of the data provided by jurisdictions. The Australian Government, for example, could not provide data on a number of their organisations.

- Jurisdictions were asked to provide SOMIH data for 17 NRF indicators and ICH data for 21 indicators in 2005–06, so the amount of data requested varied across jurisdictions.
- Victoria, South Australia, Tasmania and the Australian Capital Territory provided all the data requested, while Western Australia provided 82% of the data requested (Table 2.65).

3 Qualitative indicators

Indicator 5. Mechanisms to ensure that new houses and upgrades meet national minimum standards

Purpose

All jurisdictions have standards that new houses and upgrades must meet before they can be inhabited. There are also national minimum standards for Indigenous dwellings. This indicator describes the mechanisms that are in place to ensure that these standards are met for ICH dwellings.

Description

Qualitative information was required on the strategies and mechanisms jurisdictions have in place to ensure houses were built to standards or to detect failures in the system.

Scope

ICH only, therefore no information is provided for Victoria and Tasmania as these states do not administer ICH.

Data sources

Qualitative information for this indicator was collected from states and territories and from FaCSIA, in the 2005–06 NRF data collection.

Summary

Whether new houses and upgrades are required to meet the national standards

New houses and upgrades must comply with relevant state or territory standards and with national standards in all jurisdictions. In many jurisdictions, standards were developed that took account of conditions in Indigenous communities.

Mechanisms in place to ensure that houses and major upgrades conform to the relevant standards

- In New South Wales, the Aboriginal Housing Office (AHO) inspects all new houses and SOMIH houses repaired under the AHO Repairs and Maintenance Community Assets Program. The AHO also works with ICHOs to ensure that all completed work meets with the maintenance standards.

- In Queensland, approval of pre-construction plans is necessary for all new dwellings and major upgrades. In addition, certification is required before final payment.
- In South Australia, all capital works are monitored on a monthly basis by Aboriginal Housing Authority (AHA) Asset Officers.
- The Northern Territory Government conducts technical audits and assessments of numerous completed construction projects to ensure the standards and contract conditions are met.

Qualitative data from each jurisdiction

New South Wales

Whether new houses and upgrades are required to meet the national standards

New houses and upgrades are expected to meet national standards. The AHO developed its *Standards for building and buying Aboriginal housing in NSW* which is part of, and was referred to, in the *National framework for the design, construction and maintenance of Indigenous housing*. The AHO's standard is known as the *Housing guidelines, 2004*. It includes processes and standards for the design and construction and acquisition of properties as well as maintenance standards. The guidelines incorporate the standards formerly adopted by the Murdi Paaki Regional Housing Corporation for remote area housing.

Mechanisms in place to ensure that houses and major upgrades conform to the relevant standards

The construction component of the Aboriginal Housing Program is managed by Residential Technologies Australia (Resitech) which provides designs which are approved by the AHO in accordance with the *Housing guidelines*. If the property is targeted to a local ICHO for management, the ICHO is also involved in the design process. Where possible within the budget, local conditions are allowed for in the design. The AHO relies on Resitech to maintain a high level of quality control in the management of the construction of ICHO and SOMIH properties. The AHO can and does request Resitech to revisit properties where AHO believes the standard of works may be questionable.

The acquisition component of the Aboriginal Housing Program is also managed by Resitech. The AHO *Housing guidelines* form the basis of all AHO design work, and are adopted wherever possible in the acquisition of houses. Acquisition through spot purchase sometimes entails some concessions, however in every case, reduction of long-term maintenance costs is a priority. Properties which are considered to be insufficiently robust would not be considered for purchase.

The AHO maintenance standards are incorporated in the *Housing guidelines*. The standards provide guidance regarding works which should be deemed as a priority and provides guidance regarding recommended solutions to maintenance issues.

The AHO, through its Asset Management Branch, manages a Repairs and Maintenance Community Asset Program which addresses maintenance issues of ICHOs through a grant process. AHO staff provides project management of these works to assist ICHOs in identifying the works required and also in engaging building contractors and in monitoring the quality of work to ensure that they conform to the *Housing guidelines*. Through this

program, housing providers are now better able to manage their properties and address ongoing maintenance issues.

The AHO continues to build staff resources to meet the demands from ICHOs to maintain a high standard of works carried out by contractors over the state wide programs. The staff works with the ICHOs to ensure all completed works meet the maintenance standards. Staff members inspect the works and either approve or request further rectifications be carried out before the works are approved for final payments. Skills transfer to the ICHOs is a key aspect of this work. The AHO inspects all new houses and SOMIH houses repaired under the AHO Repairs and Maintenance Community Assets Program.

Queensland

Whether new houses and upgrades are required to meet the national standards

To minimise substandard construction and its effects, such as poor health and inappropriate housing, all construction is required to comply with the Department of Housing's Minimum Construction Standards. These are designed to ensure a consistent framework is applied in the provision of housing. The Minimum Construction Standards comply with the National Indigenous Housing Guide, focusing on health hardware components essential for safe, healthy and sustainable housing.

Mechanisms in place to ensure that houses and major upgrades conform to the relevant standards

The department's Program Support Officers approve all pre-construction plans, to ensure that proposed new dwellings and major upgrades conform to all standards before building or upgrades commence. Before the final payment is processed, the certification of a Queensland Building Services Authority registered certifier is required to the effect that all work has been satisfactorily completed.

Western Australia

All new houses built under the Community Construction program meet the Western Australian Code of Practice, which is consistent with the *National Indigenous housing guide*. In addition, all urban construction meets local and state authority standards.

All houses are upgraded to the national standard. There were 137 upgrades undertaken in 2005-06.

South Australia

Whether new houses and upgrades are required to meet the national standards

All contract documentation for new housing reflects the requirements outlined in the *National Indigenous housing guide*. Under the *Development Act 1993*, all documentation for new housing must be in accordance with the Building Code of Australia (BCA) and the standards which are called up by the BCA. Where housing is built on Aboriginal land, the houses must also comply with the Minister's Specification SA 78A, January 2000 *Housing on designated Aboriginal Lands*. All wet area upgrades are built to the BCA standard and the Minister's Specification SA 1.7, *Waterproofing of wet areas in buildings*. Land Council requirements are also taken into account during construction and upgrading of properties.

AHA Accommodation Standards for new building and upgrades ensure all houses in the far north of the state are fitted with air conditioning and all houses are fitted with rainwater tanks.

Mechanisms in place to ensure that houses and major upgrades conform to the relevant standards

All capital works are monitored on a monthly basis by AHA Asset Officers. AHA Asset Officers inspect all properties for which capital works have been completed for compliance with all specifications. Payments to contractors are not processed until work complies with the required standards.

The FHBH program is a nationally accredited maintenance initiative delivered by the AHA to survey and repair houses in accordance with the National Indigenous Housing Guide on behalf of FaCSIA.

The AHA has received funding for FHBH projects in eight communities across the state (2003–06) to help reduce the backlog of emergency maintenance and improve the functionality of housing for Aboriginal people living in rural and remote areas. These FHBH projects are targeted to surveying and fixing critical ‘health hardware’ items in houses occupied by Aboriginal people in rural and remote locations. Projects were encouraged to align monies with local initiatives to improve the safety, health and sustainability of Aboriginal housing. In addition to employment and training, local community members in each community were employed and trained to survey over 250 ‘health hardware’ items in community houses.

Australian Capital Territory

Mechanisms to ensure new houses and major upgrades meet national minimum standards

In the Australian Capital Territory (ACT), all new public housing properties acquired by Housing ACT, all upgrades of public housing properties and all properties newly leased by Housing ACT to community organisations, meet territory minimum standards – which are consistent with national minimum standards.

In managing public housing assets, Housing ACT operates under the Public Housing Asset Management Strategy 2003–2008. Key elements of the strategy are to:

- align the housing portfolio with changing social structures and tenant and prospective tenant needs, and respond to environmental standards particularly in the areas of energy and water efficiency,
- protect the territory’s investment in its public housing assets, including management of the preventative and regular maintenance and upgrade programs.

Northern Territory

Whether new houses and upgrades are required to meet the national standards

All upgrades, renovations and new constructions are completed according to National Standards for Indigenous Housing (as per the Building Better Future – BBF) as well as the *Environmental health standards for remote communities in the Northern Territory* and the *Building code of Australia*.

Mechanisms in place to ensure that houses and major upgrades conform to the relevant standards

All Northern Territory Indigenous Housing Construction Program activity is undertaken according to the above conditions and standards, regardless of which construction program delivery model is used.

Methods by which the Northern Territory ensures these standards are complied with include:

- implementation of standard design model featuring two important benefits – firstly, cost and supply efficiencies associated with using standardised health hardware, fixtures and fittings; and secondly, economies of scale associated with tendering larger numbers of houses across a number of communities and bulk material purchasing which attracts tenders from the larger construction companies at more competitive prices
- it is a condition of each construction activity contract that the above standards are adhered to, and contracts are managed in line with these requirements
- conduct of external and internal audits – the Northern Territory Government conducts technical audits and assessments of numerous completed construction projects to ensure the above standards and contract conditions are met
- all consultants and sub-contractors must be registered with Contractor Accreditation Limited and accredited in their relevant field to a level commensurate with the proposed work.

If completed construction projects are deemed below the acceptable standards, and therefore breach contractual conditions, action will be taken. A defect liability period follows the completion of construction activities, and it is the responsibility of the consultant (the project manager) to identify defects within a predetermined time frame. Failure on the part of the contractor to rectify any fault, defect or omission identified during the defects liability period results in an adverse performance report being forwarded to Contractor Accreditation Limited.

Australian Government

The Operational Plans report to FaCSIA that they are meeting standards by adhering to state building codes and the Healthy Living Practices in the National Indigenous Housing Guide.

Indicator 24. Allocation of resources on the basis of need

Purpose

The aim of this indicator is to examine whether resources for SOMIH and ICH are allocated on the basis of need and if so what kinds of needs measures are used. The indicator also provides information on how housing is allocated to tenants.

Description

The indicator required qualitative information on:

- how need is defined and whether there are any links to the multi-measure needs model for Indigenous housing
- whether resources were allocated on the basis of need, including what needs criteria are used to allocate:
 - capital funding for new acquisitions and upgrades
 - houses to tenants.

Scope

ICH and SOMIH.

Data sources

Data for this indicator were collected from the states and territories and from FaCSIA in the 2005–06 NRF data collection.

Summary

The criteria used to allocate capital funding for Indigenous housing

Most jurisdictions used some form of multi-measure needs model to allocate capital funding for Indigenous housing:

- Overcrowding, affordability, number of dwellings completed, dwellings condition and cost of new dwellings were used by New South Wales.
- Queensland used three measures – stock condition, overcrowding and homelessness.
- Victoria uses a composite measure to allocate capital funding for SOMIH. This includes need measures for overcrowding, dwelling condition and affordability, as well as demand measures such as waiting lists and Commonwealth Rent Assistance data.
- The needs measures used by South Australia were homelessness, overcrowding, dwellings requiring repairs or replacement and connection to services.

- The Northern Territory currently uses homelessness, overcrowding and dwelling condition, but intends to include emerging need and isolation factors in the future.

The criteria used to allocate houses to tenants

The allocation of SOMIH housing to tenants generally involved similar processes to those used for the allocation of public housing. In addition to being Indigenous, priority was given for those identified as being in the greatest need, with waiting lists used for other allocations. The criteria for identifying those in greatest need varied across jurisdictions but generally included homeless people, those experiencing disability or health problems and those escaping domestic violence.

ICHOs were responsible for allocating ICH to tenants. In some cases, these organisations had developed their own criteria to use in the allocation of housing, while others used similar criteria to those used for SOMIH:

- In Queensland, ICHOs had their own standard allocation practices and formal allocation policies.
- ICHOs in the Northern Territory maintain a waitlist and allocate dwellings to households in most need.

Qualitative data from each jurisdiction

New South Wales

The criteria used to allocate capital funding for Indigenous housing

Allocation of resources under the Aboriginal Housing Program is informed through two processes:

1. The AHO Board undertakes an analysis of comparative need on a regional basis, which informs the allocation of funds to regions.
2. Regional Aboriginal housing committees (RAHCs) then undertake analyses at the regional level to allocate funds to projects on the basis of need.

The AHO's Resource Allocation Methodology, which informs the board's decision on allocation of available funds to the AHO regions to meet housing needs, draws from elements of the multi-measure model of assessing housing need, including overcrowding, affordability deficit and condition of dwellings. The factors taken into account by the board in the regional allocation for 2005–06 included:

- overcrowding – an assessment of the number of bedrooms required to meet accommodation need was assessed using 2001 ABS Census data
- affordability deficit – measured by the amount of money required to eliminate the affordability stress in each of the regions. ABS Census data are used and 'weighted' to measure the 'severity' of need
- number of dwellings completed – compiling dwellings completed under AHO and non-AHO programs in the last 12 months such as Aboriginal Communities Development Program, Housing Aboriginal Communities Program and National Aboriginal Housing Strategy in each region
- dwellings in need of maintenance – using 2001 CHINS and 2001 ABS data

- cost of new dwellings in the regions measured by regional median house prices – median prices for AHO acquisition and construction and Office of Valuer General sales data are compared for consistency.

In determining regional priorities for new housing, the RAHCs considered the following factors:

- severity of need in relation to housing adequacy and affordability in an Indigenous local area
- demand for housing
- supply of housing
- existence of serious environmental health issues
- lack of access to other housing options, for example, rural and remote communities and communities with limited availability of public housing, community housing and private rental options
- extent and nature of funding being provided through the Aboriginal Communities Development Program. This was a critical consideration in planning, as program planning is coordinated to ensure program responses are not duplicated.

ICHOs must be actively registered with the AHO in order to be eligible to receive funding. Additionally, registration allows the AHO to collect and update such matters as tenant numbers, waiting lists, rent collected and the condition of housing, and this information is used to inform the allocation of housing to organisations.

The management performance of ICHOs was assessed to determine which ICHO in prioritised communities would be allocated housing. To assist RAHCs in assessing the performance of ICHOs, they were assessed against the Key Indicators for Assessing Aboriginal Housing Management.

In assessing ICHOs for repairs and maintenance funding, RAHCs were required to identify priority communities with a substantial backlog of repairs and maintenance. This was undertaken through an analysis of registration data, the availability of alternative funds and local knowledge.

The criteria used to allocate houses to tenants

Eligibility for SOMIH housing is in accordance with AHO policy. The New South Wales Aboriginal Housing office's policy, *Housing for Aboriginal Communities Program*, contains the criteria for allocating new housing for ICHOs. Eligibility is based on Aboriginality, income and any exceptional circumstances, with special provision for people over 55 years of age.

Allocation of houses is based on the date of application and location preference along with any prioritisation based on exceptional circumstances. Households are matched to appropriately sized housing. Some ICHOs may have additional criteria for eligibility, such as active membership of their organisation. Both ICHO housing applicants and the applicants for SOMIH housing are assessed and prioritised against AHO criteria.

Victoria

The criteria used to allocate capital funding

Aboriginal Housing Victoria (AHV, formerly known as the Aboriginal Housing Board of Victoria), together with the Office of Housing, utilises a composite demand index (CDI) to

quantify relative levels of housing need by local government area (LGA) and household type. Relative need in the CDI is defined through a process of calculating demand indicators using AHV waiting list and Commonwealth Rent Assistance data, along with supply indicators in each LGA.

In calculating need, the CDI takes into account several of the measures contained in the multi-measure needs model including overcrowding, affordability and dwelling condition. However, given all SOMIH dwellings in Victoria are connected to essential services, the measures pertaining to essential services are not considered in the allocation of capital funding.

The CDI is used in conjunction with factors such as AHV and regional priorities, state government policies, market conditions and local knowledge. These factors inform the development of stock acquisition targets in terms of location and stock size and the consequent allocation of capital funding for acquisitions.

Allocation of upgrade funding is based on property condition information and regional and AHV priorities.

The criteria used to allocate houses to tenants

In Victoria, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous households are given priority access to mainstream public housing when they are deemed to be in urgent need of housing assistance. This includes households that are homeless or at risk of homelessness, those with other special needs such as people with a disability, women and children escaping domestic violence or overcrowded households. Indigenous housing need in relation to homelessness is therefore primarily addressed through mainstream public rental housing.

As Indigenous clients in urgent need of housing are effectively assisted under mainstream housing programs, SOMIH housing is allocated on a 'wait turn' basis to eligible clients on the waiting list. Clients are eligible for SOMIH housing only if they meet the income and eligibility limits for public housing, resulting in allocation of SOMIH properties to clients with affordability issues. Indigenous clients are also eligible for the wait turn housing in mainstream housing programs; however, mainstream housing programs generally have longer waiting times for wait turn clients than SOMIH housing. Indigenous clients may lodge an application form for SOMIH and mainstream housing and be placed on both waiting lists.

Queensland

The criteria used to allocate capital funding for Indigenous housing

In 2005-06, the Department of Housing used the following three multi-measure need criteria for the allocation of capital funding across the 34 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities:

- stock condition, from 2003 Department of Housing administrative data for the 34 Indigenous communities – the data include the cost of all work required to renovate or restore each house in each community to the minimum construction standards
- overcrowding, from the Department of Housing administrative data that records the number of additional bedrooms required in each community
- homelessness, as derived from the 2001 Census of Population and Housing.

The department used these measures to identify the total housing need across the 34 Indigenous communities and allocated funds proportionate to the need in each community.

The department allocated capital works funding for SOMIH dwellings in 2005–06 according to the needs formula used for the Five-Year Capital Works Program, which commenced in 2004–05. The three criteria used in the allocation process were overcrowding, homelessness and the waitlist.

The criteria used to allocate houses to tenants

As a condition of funding under the *Housing Act 2003 (Qld)*, all councils are required to maintain an allocations policy. The Housing Regulations 2003 outline generic criteria for developing allocations policies, however specific allocations policies vary from one community to another.

SOMIH houses are generally allocated to applicants on a wait turn basis, but with approximately 10% of allocations being made on the basis of specific needs, including:

- risk of homelessness
- escaping domestic violence
- experiencing health problems or disability
- living in substandard housing through economic circumstances (e.g. condemned)
- persistent harassment
- child safety issues.

Western Australia

The criteria used to allocate capital funding for Indigenous housing

Under the Western Australian Housing, Infrastructure and Essential Services Agreement signed in 2006, all projects to be undertaken are selected on the basis of prioritised need.

The criteria used to allocate houses to tenants

SOMIH is allocated from public housing waitlists. A priority list exists alongside the normal waiting list, to enable cases of exceptional need to be met. Only Aboriginal tenants are allocated SOMIH.

South Australia

The criteria used to allocate capital funding for Indigenous housing

The AHA consults with communities and has a responsibility to the Aboriginal community of South Australia to ensure funding and resources are targeted to those areas and communities experiencing the greatest need.

Recurrent and capital project grants funding is available to ICHOs through the Community Housing Program. Recurrent funding includes administration funding, insurance rebates, and a repairs and maintenance top-up grant funding.

The AHA allocates capital resources based on demonstrated Aboriginal housing need. This includes the five agreed measures of housing need:

- homelessness

- overcrowding
- dwellings requiring repairs
- dwellings requiring replacement
- connection to services.

Both CHINS and ABS Census data are used as a basis for determining need at a regional level. From this needs assessment, priority was given in 2005–06 to areas in the far north areas and far west of South Australia. Further information based on AHA administrative data at community level was then used to determine the amount of allocations required for each area, and the capacity of AHA to deliver.

This process relied on a synthesis of data analysis across:

- condition of current housing stock per ICHO/community
- capital works currently underway per ICHO/community
- capital works programmed and yet to be commenced per ICHO/community
- existing number of bedrooms per ICHO/community dwelling against reported population numbers (using the Northern Territory model of 1.8 persons per bedroom)
- reported number of people on ICHO/community housing waiting lists.

In addition to this level of data, qualitative evidence was submitted by both Asset Planning and Country Services staff who deliver services to the Communities and have considerable knowledge of ICHO/Community activity. This information encompassed dwelling condition, population movement and community capacity and health. An assessment of each community was compiled, submitted and approved by the AHA Board of Management.

The criteria used to allocate houses to tenants

In the AHA, SOMIH is allocated on the basis of need whereby those who are homeless or at risk of homelessness are allocated housing as a priority. A segmented waiting list which determines priority is followed as a way of identifying those who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. This includes:

- Category 1: Applicants of utmost housing need. These are extreme cases of housing need and homelessness.
- Category 2: Applicants who are in urgent need, but for whom current housing options are not suitable for long term housing.
- Category 3: Applicants who meet basic income and asset testing but for whom do not have urgent housing need.
- Category 4: Applicants who pass basic eligibility testing but do not pass income and asset tests, have no urgent housing need and can be registered for low-demand areas.

The AHA continued to house those tenants most in need, with 81% of applicants housed in Category 1 need of housing and a further 1% as Category 2 Applicants. Allocation processes have been reviewed to ensure the best match and use of resources with existing need.

Tasmania

The criteria used to allocate capital funding for Indigenous housing

Allocation of capital funding for SOMIH in Tasmania is premised on a number of factors:

- the housing median price as established by the Real Estate Institute of Tasmania is used to determine the number of capital acquisitions available within the budget
- annual property inspections identify problems with dwelling condition, and inform priorities for the capital upgrade program
- identified need presented by the Aboriginal Tenancy Advisory Panels
- priorities and waiting lists for each respective region.

Due to significant variation between Census and Office of Aboriginal Affairs numbers of Aboriginal people in Tasmania, for the most part, resource allocation for SOMIH is premised on expressed rather than potential demand.

The criteria used to allocate houses to tenants

The criteria for allocating properties are based upon relative priority at the point of assessing the application, measured against a range of housing-related and cultural factors.

Assessment of an applicant's circumstance includes, but is not restricted to, factors such as:

- homelessness
- improvised dwellings
- access to accommodation (private rental market)
- income
- health
- family structure
- family violence
- employment
- cultural dislocation (broken links with family/community).

Australian Capital Territory

Criteria used to allocate capital funding for Indigenous housing

In 2005-06, the Australian Capital Territory Government did not allocate any capital funding for Indigenous-specific housing.

Criteria used to allocate housing

The Australian Capital Territory's (ACT's) primary response to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander housing need continues to be via mainstream public housing. In May 2006, the ACT Government introduced reform to housing eligibility criteria aimed at improving access to public housing for those most in need. The ACT Priority Housing category identifies those applicants who demonstrate urgent housing needs and experience a range of complex social issues – these applicants are to be housed within 3 months. This category gives consideration to the needs of Indigenous individuals and families who may be having difficulty accessing private rental accommodation and/or who may be experiencing complex needs.

Northern Territory

The criteria used to allocate capital funding for Indigenous housing

In 2005-06, the Northern Territory Indigenous Housing Program's Needs Measurement Model, an objective measure used to allocate funding, determined Construction Program funding need to Northern Territory Indigenous communities. The model allocates funding under the Construction Program according to need for new housing construction and major upgrades and renovations.

Need is currently measured using the following dimensions of need:

- homelessness
- overcrowding
- dwelling condition.

More specifically, the current needs model determines the number of bedrooms required to house community populations at an occupancy rate of two people per bedroom. The result is then multiplied with the average cost of constructing 'bedrooms' to determine the cost of assessed needs. Construction Program funds are allocated to communities based on their assessed housing need as a proportion of the total need for the Northern Territory.

The Northern Territory has reviewed the existing housing needs measurement model. As a result of this review, the Northern Territory intends to include additional dimensions in the measurement of housing need. A future needs model will incorporate 'emerging need' (to be calculated by population projections), and account for regionally or locally based bedroom cost variations or 'isolation factors' (as opposed to a Northern Territory average).

The criteria used to allocate houses to tenants

ICHOs are required to maintain a waitlist and allocate dwellings when they become vacant, or recently built, according to households most in need. The Department of Local Government, Housing and Sport also prescribes that larger ICHOs develop and implement an allocations policy that gives priority to people in need, but it may also give preference to people who have demonstrated that they can keep a house in good order, and pay rent regularly.

Typical criteria that ICHOs use in allocations policies/processes would include the following:

- establishment of eligibility criteria (considering an applicant's residential history in the community, whether they have good records in maintaining tenancies etc.)
- establishment and maintenance of a housing wait list
- development and implementation of a housing allocations policy incorporating a priority consideration process, for example:
 - current living conditions
 - overcrowding
 - history of tenancy performance/care of current dwelling
 - family/social stability
 - household composition
 - suitability of location of vacant dwelling

- using a rating system against some of the above priority considerations and allocating dwellings to those households rated as being highest in need.

Australian Government

The criteria used to allocate capital funding for Indigenous housing

The five endorsed measures of need (homelessness, overcrowding, affordability, dwelling conditions and connection to essential services) were used to allocate funding under the 2005 Healthy Indigenous Housing Initiative.

A multi-measure approach is addressed in the bilateral negotiations between the Australian Government and states/territories, with the requirement for needs-based analysis written into the new Indigenous Housing and Infrastructure Agreements for 2005–08.

In regard to taking account of need, FaCSIA's direct funding under the Community Housing and Infrastructure Program to ICHOs is underpinned by the ICHO adequately justifying the need with a supporting business plan.

Indicator 27. What jurisdictions are doing to assist ICHOs in developing and implementing housing management plans

Purpose

The purpose of this indicator is to ensure that jurisdictions are supporting ICHOs and that strategies are in place to assist ICHOs in developing and implementing housing management plans. Achieving good management practices will improve the quality of housing services delivered to Indigenous people and facilitate the efficient running of ICHOs.

Description

Qualitative information was required on what each jurisdiction was doing to assist ICHOs to develop and implement housing management plans.

The definition of a housing management plan is outlined under Indicator 26.

Scope

ICH only, therefore no information is provided for Victoria and Tasmania as these states do not administer ICH.

Data sources

Qualitative information for this indicator was collected from the states and territories and from FaCSIA, in the 2005–06 NRF data collection.

Summary

Policy or legislative requirements for the provision of assistance

In all jurisdictions, the development and implementation of housing management plans were conditions of funding. There were, however, still a significant proportion of organisations that did not have a housing management plan.

Strategies that have been implemented to assist organisations

Strategies outlined by jurisdictions to assist organisations to develop housing management plans included:

- completion of a monitoring and compliance framework in New South Wales which assists regional staff in ensuring the development of plans is monitored and that remedial action is taken

- regular visits and communication with the Aboriginal communities by the Queensland Department of Housing
- delivery of housing management training through Social Housing Certificates III and IV courses in Western Australia
- promotion of the use of community administration grant funds as a financial means of assisting ICHOs renew or develop housing plans and strategies in South Australia
- development of clear guidelines on how to develop and implement housing management plans in the Northern Territory.

Qualitative data from each jurisdiction

New South Wales

Policy or legislative requirements for the provision of assistance to ICHOs

The Housing Aboriginal Communities Program (HACP) policy was reviewed and the new policy, which the AHO Board has endorsed, sets out the minimum requirements for management of rental property by ICHOs. It is a starting point for ICHOs to develop their own policies and procedures. All ICHOs must comply with the policy to be considered for HACP funding.

Under the new policy, ICHOs must meet 7 out of the 10 key performance indicators (KPIs), 4 of which are mandatory KPIs by 2007–08 rather than 3 as at present. The four mandatory KPIs relate to liquidity, insurance, rates and development of housing policies and procedures.

By 2008–09, two more additional KPIs, rent levels and rent collection – bringing mandatory KPIs to six – must be met by ICHOs to be considered for HACP funding.

Organisations that have been assisted to develop management plans

The Management Models project aggregates small providers in New South Wales in selected areas to provide more effective management, including reduction in operating costs and economies of scale. There are four Management Models incorporating 954 dwellings, namely:

- Murdi Paaki Management Model – incorporates 9 ICHOs with 415 dwellings
- Mid Lachlan Aboriginal Housing Management Co-operative – incorporates 9 ICHOs with 225 dwellings
- South Eastern Aboriginal Regional Management Services – incorporates 6 ICHOs with 144 dwellings
- Macleay Aboriginal Housing Association – incorporates 7 ICHOs with 170 dwellings.

The establishment of the Management Models has led to improved housing management services in some areas. However, two models are experiencing some administrative difficulties and the AHO has engaged external assistance to ensure the models meet compliance requirements. Some reviews of the Management Models have been undertaken and the lessons learnt on elements of good practice will inform the development of the next generation of proposed regional housing management model services under AHO's Sector Reform Strategy.

Strategies that have been implemented to assist organisations

The trial of the Management Standards, service improvement process, and associated tools is now complete. Outcomes from the trial have been incorporated into a revised version of the New South Wales Aboriginal Housing Standards which were endorsed by the AHO Board in October 2006. The New South Wales Aboriginal Housing Standards and Service Improvement and Accreditation System are critical elements that will contribute to service improvement and organisational capacity across the sector. The Standards and the Service Improvement and Accreditation System provide the strong foundations for the implementation of AHO's Sector Reform Strategy.

Queensland

Policy or legislative requirement for the provision of assistance to ICHOs

To be eligible for funding, registered providers under the *Housing Act 2003 (Qld)* are required to develop a number of policies and procedures associated with housing governance and tenancy and asset management. These include policies relating to conflicts of interest, confidentiality, employment, eligibility, allocations and referrals.

Organisations that have been assisted

The Department of Housing has assisted all 34 Indigenous communities in Queensland to develop their policy and procedures manuals, which are required under the Housing Act.

Strategies that have been implemented to assist organisations

Under the Capital Grants Program, the Department of Housing, through regular visits and communication assists Aboriginal communities to:

- develop policy and procedures manuals
- meet the requirements of the *Housing Act 2003* and *Housing Regulation 2003*
- implement housing management strategies for effective asset and tenancy management
- improve reporting under the department's capital grants program.

The department provides an additional annual grant to the Island Coordinating Council to provide similar support to the Torres Strait communities and funds a dedicated worker to ensure that the advice and resources provided to the Torres Strait councils are consistent with those provided to Aboriginal councils.

It is the responsibility of each council to employ appropriately qualified project managers to coordinate all housing activities. To support councils, the department has developed a guide to ensure that an appropriate level of service is provided by project managers. The guide also helps councils to understand what the expectations and obligations are on all parties. These strategies have improved building processes on the ground and also ensure that housing programs comply with the National Indigenous Housing Guide.

Under new arrangements, it is also the responsibility of councils to engage appropriate and suitably qualified people to undertake the certification of new capital works.

Western Australia

Policy or legislative requirement for the provision of assistance to ICHOs

Development and implementation of housing management plans is a funding condition for those community organisations who receive operational funding support through the Indigenous Housing Agreement.

Strategies that have been implemented to assist organisations

The Indigenous Housing Management System (IHMS) is being utilised as a tool to assist organisations manage their housing. All ICHOs funded by the Department of Housing and Works are being trained in the use of the IHMS.

Western Australia is delivering housing management training through Social Housing Certificates III and IV courses.

South Australia

Policy or legislative requirement for the provision of assistance

The Community Housing Program Senior Project Officers (SPOs) continue to work with ICHOs across critical aspects of housing management, including business plan development. More specifically, housing plans have featured as an area of continued interest and SPOs have maintained discussions with ICHOs within their respective jurisdictions to ensure that these plans reflect the essential elements contained in Community Housing Program guidelines. These include:

- objectives, strategies and activities – of the ICHO in relation to the provision of housing and related infrastructure
- tenancy management – details of how the ICHO will administer tenancy arrangements including
 - policy on tenant selection that gives priority to families without housing or in significant housing stress
 - means of complying with state/territory legislation (where applicable) and landlord/tenant relationships
 - rent setting policy
 - rent collection and arrears management policy
 - maintenance of the Community Management System database
- needs assessment – documentation of the needs of the ICHO's clients by reference to a waiting list, number of houses and required, and repairs and maintenance requirements
- asset (property) management – identification of how assets will be managed and maintained
- human resource management – details of ICHO staffing that should include salaries, duties, and training strategies
- financial management – systems in place to meet accountability requirements, and the identification of resources required to meet operational budgets, taking into consideration tenancy management practices identified.

Strategies that have been implemented to assist organisations

The extent to which the SPOs become involved in assisting with the development of ICHO housing plans varies across the sector and is largely dependent upon individual ICHO capacity. Larger ICHOs either possess in-house resources from which to draw the necessary skillsbase to effect housing plans, or enlist the services of external consultants to produce business and housing plans. SPOs, by and large, contribute to these consultation processes.

A number of ICHOs (10) are operating with outdated housing plans, however the intent of these plans continues to apply and provide frameworks in which housing pursuits are followed. SPOs have identified ICHOs in their respective jurisdictions requiring updated housing plans, or wholesale renewal and restructuring of housing plans to more accurately reflect ICHO structures and relevant Australian and state government policy alignment.

Given the Indigenous housing sector reform agenda, the Office for Aboriginal Housing has promoted the use of community administration grant funds (within the Community Housing Program) as a financial means of assisting ICHOs renew or develop housing plans and strategies. Some ICHOs have obtained Indigenous Land Council funds for this purpose, engaging private consultants in the process. The Office for Aboriginal Housing has identified a specific budget requirement for the 2006–07 program activity period to address ICHO housing plans in order that these reflect the pending National Indigenous Housing Standards Framework requirements that were implemented 1 January 2007.

Australian Capital Territory

In 2005–06, additional funding was approved for Coalition of Community Housing Organisation of the Australian Capital Territory (ACT) to undertake a range of sector development activities and initiatives including assisting community housing organisations (including Indigenous housing organisations) with business planning and organisational viability.

The 2005–06 funding was approved for capacity building for ICHOs. This will be expanded in 2006–07, and ACT Council of Social Service has been engaged by the ACT Government to provide training in governance, property management, finance and other capacity-building activities.

Northern Territory

Policy or legislative requirements for the provision of assistance

As a condition of housing management funding, the Northern Territory Government requires ICHOs use housing management plans as tools to improve the performance of the organisation in relation to housing management, and to outline individual ICHO direction and priorities. Housing management plans also guide ICHOs in making decisions regarding the allocation of resources, management of stock, improving maintenance and identifying future goals.

For the DLGHS, the housing management plan process builds commitment to particular outcomes to help guide the future allocation of housing management grants to the community/organisations housing management principles.

In 2005–06, the DLGHS submitted a funding proposal to the Australian Government under the HIII to develop a program that would provide ICHOs with intensive support to develop and implement effective housing management planning processes. The project will

provide funding for the engagement of consultants to facilitate workshops planning strategies for new and existing ICHOs. This project will also improve ICHO performance management strategies and accountability.

Organisations that have been assisted and strategies that have been implemented

All ICHOs were provided with some level of support from DLGHS officers in the development of their housing management plans. This assistance was provided through:

- one-on-one DLGHS officer site visits
- provision of advice over the phone and email
- facilitation of a number of regional ICHO workshops
- commencement of a process to engage additional regional officers.

The implementation of the HIIHI project Planning Capacity Projects will ensure ICHOs receive more intensive assistance in the development and implementation of planning processes.

The DLGHS has begun to devise clear guidelines on how to develop and implement housing management plans, proformas and templates to simplify processes for ICHOs, and ensure DLGHS requirements are accounted for.

Australian Government

Policy or legislative requirements for the provision of assistance to ICHOs

BBF Strategy 2.6 is to support organisations to develop housing management plans containing:

- objectives for housing assistance delivery
- an asset management plan, including client consultation and feedback mechanisms and appropriate information and training for tenants to ensure tenants' responsibilities are understood and their rights protected
- rent collection policies and systems
- financial practices and reporting systems that link resources to outcomes.

Strategies that have been implemented to assist organisations

FaCSIA supports ICHOs to develop housing management plans or business plans and also provides a comprehensive business plan template to assist ICHOs in this area. FaCSIA has provided funding to some ICHOs to engage skilled consultancy support to develop their business plans.

In the 2005-06 Budget, the Australian Government allocated \$14 million year over four years to HIIHI to encourage Indigenous housing reforms through improved governance and asset and tenancy management practices of Indigenous community housing providers.

Indicator 31. Strategies and outcomes to increase Indigenous employment in housing services

Purpose

The purpose of this indicator is to ensure that there are strategies in place to increase Indigenous employment in the management and delivery of Indigenous-specific housing services.

Description

The indicator required qualitative information on strategies to increase opportunities for Indigenous employment in SOMIH and ICHO housing services including:

- (a) senior management, policy and program development
- (b) tenancy management and property management
- (c) construction.

Scope

ICH and SOMIH.

Data sources

Qualitative data for this indicator were collected from the states and territories and from FaCSIA, in the 2005–06 NRF data collection.

Summary

Strategies used to increase Indigenous employment in ICHOs

There was a relatively high proportion of Indigenous employees in ICHOs in those jurisdictions which could provide data. Only the Northern Territory, however, noted that it is a requirement of funding that at least one ICHO employee is Indigenous and a guarantee that once other Indigenous staff have completed their training, ongoing employment is offered to them.

A number of jurisdictions noted that they had some type of preferential system for companies with Indigenous employees in relation to contracts for building or repairing properties. In Queensland, for example, a minimum of 20% of the construction labour force must come from the local community. In New South Wales, Western Australia, South Australia and the Northern Territory, that preference is given to local Aboriginal companies that employ and train Aboriginal people.

Strategies used to increase Indigenous employment in SOMIH housing services

South Australia, Tasmania and Queensland noted that their jurisdictions had policies in place to increase Indigenous employment in government agencies that are responsible for SOMIH. For example, in Queensland there was the Indigenous Employment Policy and in Tasmania the Aboriginal Employment Strategy. In Victoria, all staff employed at Aboriginal Housing Victoria are Indigenous.

Preferential tender systems were also used in relation to the construction of SOMIH housing in New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria, Western Australia and South Australia.

Qualitative data from each jurisdiction

New South Wales

Strategies used to increase Indigenous employment in ICHOs

The AHO has a number of strategies to increase Indigenous employment in the Indigenous community housing sector.

The Housing our Mob Everywhere (HOME) program improves Aboriginal community housing workers' tenancy and property management skills. The AHO's HOME Training Program now leads to a TAFE Certificate IV qualification. The program demonstrates skills in theory and practical application and aligns to AHO policy requirements.

The Repairs and Maintenance Community Asset Program provides funding through an expression of interest process to ICHOs to help address the backlog of repair and maintenance works and health and safety issues that significant numbers of ICHOs continue to experience. The Asset Management Branch has endeavoured to provide employment and training outcomes for Aboriginal people where possible. In the New South Wales north coast, Aboriginal builders were engaged to undertake minor repairs on approximately 50 properties for Macleay Aboriginal Housing Association. In the south coast, the number of properties was 45, belonging to South Eastern Aboriginal Regional Management Services.

The AHO has a policy to support and encourage the engagement of Aboriginal builders and tradespeople for the construction of new houses or the repair and maintenance of existing houses. This policy has been endorsed by the AHO Board and is reinforced in the AHO Housing Guidelines. During 2005–06, 10 Aboriginal building companies were engaged under the AHO Aboriginal Employment in Construction Policy. In 2005–06, 83 Aboriginal people were employed by Aboriginal building companies working on AHO projects, while another 43 were engaged by subcontractors.

ICHOs are encouraged to adopt single select tendering to ensure engagement of Aboriginal builders, particularly if they receive grant funds from AHO. Where mainstream builders have a positive Aboriginal employment strategy, they may also participate in the single select policy. In cases where the AHO manages grant funds (80% of the Repairs and Maintenance Community Asset Program), the single select policy is applied for work to ICHO properties.

The AHO supports and encourages Aboriginal participation in the construction industry and has organised and facilitated conferences based around this issue. The AHO organised and supported the formation of the Aboriginal Participation in Construction Working Group.

The group has met a number of times over the last 3 years and organised training workshops for Aboriginal builders.

The Aboriginal Builders' Directory on the AHO website offers a region-by-region contact listing of licensed Aboriginal builders and tradespeople. Already a useful resource for the community housing sector, the directory was expanded during the reporting year following an advertising campaign in the Koori Mail to attract additional listings. The listings are free and, once registered with the directory, builders can change their details online. There were 40 builders in the directory during 2005-06.

Strategies used to increase Indigenous employment in SOMIH housing services

The AHO has a policy of single select tendering for Aboriginal builders where the Aboriginal builder submits a price in the absence of competition. The price must be below the estimated cost of the works or within an acceptable margin above the estimate. Where mainstream builders have a positive Aboriginal employment strategy, they may also participate in the single select policy.

The AHO adopts a proactive approach in encouraging the employment of Aboriginal contractors, builders and people. Approximately 4,000 AHO properties are at present managed by the Department of Housing under a management agreement. The Department of Housing which manages SOMIH comes under New South Wales's Aboriginal Participation in Construction Policy.

The AHO properties are currently undergoing an upgrade program with Resitech involved as the project managers. This program has also been targeted towards Aboriginal employment and, where possible, the tender preference process has been utilised, and as such has given a number of Aboriginal builders/enterprises the opportunity to 'break into the building industry'. These Aboriginal contractors have also been encouraged to broaden their outlook and expand and look into other programs run by other government bodies and also any opportunities that may arise within the private sector.

Within the AHO Upgrade Program, Aboriginal builders completed 43% of the program, representing 106 dwellings, in 2005-06.

Victoria

Strategies used to increase Indigenous employment in SOMIH housing services

Aboriginal Housing Victoria (AHV, formerly known as the Aboriginal Housing Board of Victoria) has over recent years developed and implemented an Employment and Training Strategy. The success of this strategy resulted in 100% of staff employed at AHV being Indigenous as at June 2006.

In line with the AHV Employment and Training Strategy, this level of Indigenous employment was achieved via the secondment and subsequent transfer of Office of Housing staff to Aboriginal Housing Victoria and the recruitment of Indigenous staff (including a new Indigenous Chief Executive Officer) using competitive selection processes.

Consistent with individual staff development training plans, all Aboriginal Housing Officers employed by AHV have completed accredited training in housing management and related areas.

The Wur-Cumbarra Strategy was the overall Victorian Government policy for the employment of Indigenous people in the Victorian Public Service during 2005-06.

Indigenous specific recruitment and scholarship strategies were progressed at the Office of Housing, resulting in the employment of an Indigenous graduate recruit.

The Public Tenant Employment Program (PTEP) is a state-wide initiative of the Office of Housing that is designed to create employment opportunities for people who live in public housing (including SOMIH) through Department of Human Services programs. The program has been operating for 2 years, with major outcomes including the employment of 25 Indigenous tenants (including 15 during 2005–06) and the establishment of a small Indigenous business enterprise during this period. This represents 16% of employment outcomes for the PTEP program for the year. The enterprise that was established as an initiative of the PTEP currently employs three Indigenous people and is based on cleaning Office of Housing properties after major renovation work.

In addition, while it is a necessary that all contractors (Indigenous and non-Indigenous) meet required standards, preferential contract and tender systems are utilised to encourage Indigenous employment.

Queensland

Strategies used to increase Indigenous employment in ICHOs

The Indigenous Employment Policy (IEP) represents the Queensland Government's commitment to the reconciliation process and improved economic development and employment outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. All building contracts prepared by councils include specific attachments and clauses detailing the training responsibilities as per the 20% IEP. The Department of Housing requests all contractors to report compliance with the IEP.

Eighteen Cape York communities (including 13 Deed of Grant in Trust communities) participated with other government agencies in the development of the Cape York Indigenous Employment Strategy: Local Jobs for Local People. The strategy examines what local employment opportunities exist or have the potential to be developed in Cape York Indigenous communities. The intention is ultimately for the strategy to be fully implemented across the rest of Queensland.

On 24 October 2005, Cabinet endorsed a new service delivery model for the 34 Indigenous communities, to be implemented in 2006–07. The model adopts a total asset management approach and gives priority to engaging tradespersons and apprentices residing within the council area, who have appropriate qualifications, skills and experience.

Strategies used to increase Indigenous employment in SOMIH housing services

Among the strategies the Department of Housing uses to increase Indigenous employment in SOMIH housing services are:

- application of an Equity and Diversity Management Plan (2002–05), which includes a range of strategies and activities to increase employment at all levels of the organisation
- the whole-of-government Breaking the Unemployment Cycle initiative, to identify opportunities to recruit apprentices and trainees from all target groups
- Building a Better Future: Indigenous Housing to 2010, which commits to increasing the level of employment of Indigenous staff
- Indigenous Employment Policy for Queensland Government Building and Civil Construction Projects – IEP (20% Policy).

Employment of Indigenous people in SOMIH housing services is managed in accordance with these overarching government strategies and departmental policies.

Western Australia

Training and employment opportunities are available for community members associated with the construction, repair and maintenance of buildings within their community.

The Department of Housing and Works (DHW) continues to provide opportunities for local Aboriginal companies to win construction and upgrade contracts, through utilisation of the Indigenous Preferential Tender Policy. This policy ensures preference is given to local Aboriginal companies, that employ and train local Aboriginal people.

The DHW continues to utilise the Construction Tender Waiver policy, where communities are able to construct their own housing.

South Australia

Strategies used to increase Indigenous employment

AHA Regulations state that the AHA must carry out its functions in a way that:

- promotes the economic development and empowerment of Aboriginal people and encourages self-determination and self-management by Aboriginal people
- maximises skill development, employment and training opportunities for Aboriginal people.

Within the AHA

Delivering employment and training opportunities for Aboriginal staff continues to be a high priority. In 2005–06, the AHA commenced negotiations with other agencies to allow Aboriginal trainees to move across organisations to further develop their knowledge and skills. During 2005–06, 45% of AHA staff identified as being of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent. Career development opportunities are provided throughout the AHA.

Traineeships

In order to encourage the use of Aboriginal workers and to provide training opportunities for them, a provisional sum for Indigenous Training and Employment is included in contracts awarded to AHA contractors. This amount is used for the reimbursement of claims for Aboriginal training and employment costs incurred by the contractor for the period of the contract. AHA Asset Officers are active in mentoring trainees and employees who are working on these building projects.

In addition to the availability of a provisional sum, contractors working on the west coast are required to participate in a supervised work placement program for an Aboriginal building trainee or apprentice during the course of the project. Aboriginal building trainees and apprentices are employed by a placement agency and made available to work on the program via an employment pool. The trainees and apprentices are selected from the pool by a TAFE building trades lecturer who acts as a mentor to the individuals concerned, both on and off the work site.

Construction contracts

The AHA includes evaluation criteria within its building and upgrade contracts which acknowledge opportunities, in the form of supplementary funding, for contractors in the

employment and training of Aboriginal people and provides ongoing support and involvement to those contractors in their employment of Aboriginal workers. Of the approximately 50 houses currently under contract to builders, 20 of these have an Aboriginal employment or training component.

In order for an Aboriginal community to contract to undertake building work it needs to apply to become a contractor pre-qualified for the AHA Capital Works Program. This provides eligibility to receive select tender invitations sent to all pre-qualified contractors approved for a particular region.

The AHA encourages ICHOs, Community Development and Employment Projects (CDEPs) and other Aboriginal organisations to apply for their building contractor's licence in order to perform construction work for AHA. The provisional sum provided for Aboriginal employment and training in AHA contracts enables Aboriginal communities to submit competitive pricing and increase their success in being awarded work.

Employment in communities

The AHA has supported economic development through building works and employment opportunities within the housing industry. The AHA endeavours to promote employment and training on Aboriginal lands within the AHA and aims to connect with existing programs and services in the area to ensure that works delivered in day-to-day activity also provide Aboriginal South Australians, as well as the state, with economic benefits.

Community Housing Program (CHP) grants, provided to eligible ICHOs through the AHA's annual application process, are intended to address independent housing management in these discrete communities and homelands. Housing is maintained through locally managed repairs and maintenance regimes. ICHOs strive to maintain appropriate housing standards and affordable rental housing for community residents. CHP community administration grant funds contribute to sustaining employment of housing officers to oversee local community rental housing operations.

Aboriginal employment in FHBH

Aboriginal employment has been a key focus for the FHBH program which hires local community members and trains them to undertake repairs as they survey houses across Aboriginal communities. One hundred and seven houses were surveyed and repaired in Amata, Davenport and Fregon by a team of 72 people, 45 (62.5%) of whom were Aboriginal employees. This included 40 local CDEP workers. A total of 121 Aboriginal people were employed during the three to four FHBH projects (2003-06).

Development of building teams in regional centres

Discussions have taken place with service providers to Aboriginal people in Ceduna and Port Augusta to develop and implement a pilot program to provide an assessment and recognition of current skills and needs of Aboriginal employees in ICHOs. Feedback from field officers involved in the support and delivery of programs involving ICHOs indicates a need and willingness to utilise the management and maintenance of housing to provide further learning and job opportunities within rural and remote Aboriginal communities.

Tasmania

Strategies used to increase Indigenous employment in SOMIH

The Tasmanian Government has an Aboriginal Employment Strategy aimed at increasing the level of Aboriginal employment within the Tasmanian Government. All customer service positions are Aboriginal-identified positions and the Manager of Aboriginal Housing Services Tasmania (AHST) is a Tasmanian Aboriginal person.

Australian Capital Territory

The size of the Australian Capital Territory's (ACT's) Indigenous community housing sector provides for modest growth opportunities, and as a result Indigenous employment in housing services in the ACT is increasing. Housing ACT has investigated an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander trainee program in partnership with its Total Facility Manager to encourage employment opportunities in housing services.

Northern Territory

Strategies used to increase Indigenous employment in ICHOs

The Northern Territory promotes Indigenous employment in all subprograms of the Northern Territory Indigenous Housing Program.

In the Management and Maintenance Programs, the DLGHS provides support through housing management funding, HHHI funding and Life Skills funding for local Indigenous employees. It is a requirement of Indigenous housing management funding that at least one ICHO employee be Indigenous and a guarantee that once other Indigenous staff have completed their training, ongoing employment is offered to retain them.

There are also strategies being investigated for the improvement of Indigenous representation in employment and training in the Maintenance Program. These opportunities will most likely arise from completed training in the construction program as maintenance activities provide more opportunities for ongoing employment.

Significant employment and training achievements have been facilitated by the Northern Territory Indigenous Housing Construction Program. For example:

- the current Central Remote Employment and Training Program has provided accredited General Construction training courses to 28 Indigenous apprentices in 6 communities in the southern region
- commencement of General Construction training courses to 12 apprentices in Wadeye in 2005
- 13 apprentices in southern regions have completed Certificate II in General Construction – 11 of these apprentices are currently achieving various levels of competencies in Certificate III in General Construction
- 10 apprentices are at different levels of competencies in Certificate II in General Construction in the southern region
- in Wadeye, 4 apprentices are completing Certificate II in General Construction.

In the letting of tenders for construction program activities, preference is given to those consultants and contractors that employ and train local Indigenous people.

Australian Government

Under the National Aboriginal Health Strategy (NAHS) delivery arrangements, the Contracted Program and Project Managers have been charged with optimising the opportunities for Indigenous people to be involved in housing and infrastructure construction. Strategies used include:

- utilising 'in-house bid' arrangements where Indigenous building teams exist
- involvement of CDEP workers or teams for parts of the work
- facilitating the involvement of Indigenous workers in training in conjunction with Commonwealth and state agencies' employment and training programs in construction works.

In assessing commercial tenders for construction works under the NAHS, the level of Indigenous employment proposed by the respective tenderers is considered in the context of assessing the best value tender – in other words, best value is not necessarily equated with the lowest tender.

The FHBH program has, in part, been premised on community member involvement in the house survey, initial fix and data collection and, where possible, involvement of Indigenous tradespersons. This is an explicit strategy of FHBH as it leaves an increased level of maintenance skills in the community.

Indicator 32. Mechanisms for Indigenous input to planning, decision making and delivery of services

Purpose

Indigenous input into all aspects of housing services is important to ensure not only that the services are appropriate to the needs of Indigenous people but also to provide opportunities for self-management. This indicator outlines the mechanisms that enable Indigenous participation in the planning and delivery of Indigenous-specific housing services.

Description

The indicator required qualitative information on the mechanisms jurisdictions have in place for Indigenous input to planning, decision making and delivery of services.

Scope

ICH and SOMIH.

Data sources

Qualitative data for this indicator were collected from the states and territories and from FaCSIA, in the 2005–06 NRF data collection.

Summary

Policies in relation to Indigenous input

There were structures in place in all jurisdictions that allowed for consultation with and input from the Indigenous community.

Indigenous input to planning processes

- There were boards that provided an important mechanism for consultation and decision making in relation to Indigenous housing, with high levels of Indigenous representation in New South Wales, South Australia, Tasmania and the Northern Territory.
- The Queensland Government engages with Indigenous people using negotiation tables which involve a sustained process of consultation, planning and negotiation between community leaders and government agency representatives.
- Victoria runs a Joint Planning Committee to provide Indigenous input to SOMIH. In 2005–06, the committee and Aboriginal Housing Victoria held forums to consult the Victorian Indigenous community.

Indigenous input to service delivery processes

- In Queensland, the Tenant Participation Program enables Indigenous public housing and SOMIH tenants to participate in decision making relating to the delivery of housing services.
- Regional ICHO workshops are held in the Northern Territory which provide an avenue for the canvassing of ICHO input into service delivery processes.

Qualitative data from each jurisdiction

New South Wales

Indigenous input to housing programs and decision making

The AHO Board sets the strategic directions and develops and approves Aboriginal housing and housing-related infrastructure policies at a state-wide level. All board members are Aboriginal people. The AHO Board is supported by a network of six RAHCs, and all RAHC members are Aboriginal people representing various areas/communities of the state.

RAHCs provide input into policy and planning and aim to establish effective links and the sharing of information with other funding agencies at a regional level to ensure a coordinated approach to planning Aboriginal housing programs. There are formal mechanisms that have been developed through the AHO between RAHCs, the Department of Aboriginal Affairs and the Department of Housing.

Indigenous input to planning processes (for both SOMIH and ICHOs)

The planning process for the 2005–06 Aboriginal Housing Program involved:

- the AHO Board, which endorsed the planning process for both SOMIH and ICHOs and recommended the plan to both the State and Commonwealth Ministers – members of the board also chaired RAHCs
- RAHCs, which established regional priorities and developed regional plans and presented them to the board for endorsement
- the AHO, which employs staff including 69% Aboriginal people, assists in the development of the planning process and facilitated its implementation.

Indigenous input to service delivery processes (for both SOMIH and ICHOs)

In developing the 2005–06 regional plans, the RAHCs undertook a multi-step approach which included establishing regional priorities and targets by undertaking an assessment of the following:

- key government strategies
- housing need and supply at an Indigenous area level
- relative need for repairs and maintenance or upgrading of community-managed housing
- need for housing-related infrastructure
- need for community and ICHO organisational planning and development
- forward commitments of other Government housing programs for Aboriginal people.

RAHCs also play important roles in determining regional priorities for new housing after considering factors such as: severity of need; the demand for housing; the supply of housing; communities where serious environmental health issues exist; and the lack of access to other housing options as well as the extent and nature of funding being provided through the Aboriginal Communities Development Program.

Victoria

Indigenous input to housing programs and decision making for SOMIH housing

Under current arrangements, Aboriginal Housing Victoria (AHV, formerly known as the Aboriginal Housing Board of Victoria) is the primary vehicle of Indigenous input into SOMIH in Victoria. Since 2000, AHV and the Office of Housing have worked together to implement the Transition to Independence under the AHV's Strategic Plan. The ultimate goal of the Transition to Independence is to achieve full Aboriginal community management of SOMIH in Victoria. In line with this vision, AHV is currently moving into tenancy management of SOMIH while also providing advice to government on Indigenous housing matters.

In addition to the work of AHV, Victoria has an Indigenous Housing Joint Planning Committee (JPC). The JPC is an elected body with an Indigenous chair that was formed in 2005 to improve Indigenous housing in Victoria. It comprises AHV, FaCSIA, Indigenous community representatives and the Office of Housing.

In 2005–06, both AHV and the JPC held forums with the Victorian Indigenous community. During 2005–06, community forums followed regional AHV board meetings while the JPC also conducted a community forum following a regional meeting in Morwell. AHV also implemented a communications strategy including a quarterly newsletter and website redevelopment.

Indigenous Victorian input into national SOMIH decision-making processes is achieved through AHV participation and membership on the Standing Committee on Indigenous Housing.

Indigenous input to planning processes for SOMIH housing

Planning for SOMIH in Victoria is done in partnership between AHV and the Office of Housing and aims to provide accessible, appropriate, secure and affordable housing to Indigenous Victorians while progressing the full Indigenous community management and ownership of the SOMIH in Victoria. As part of the initial stage of this transition, AHV has developed the governance capability of the organisation and produced an independent business plan.

In 2005–06, the JPC had input into the strategic planning processes for the sector and was responsible for the development of the Indigenous Housing Plan 2005–08. This document was the first strategic plan to include targets for both the SOMIH and Community Housing and Infrastructure Program sectors in Victoria and defined overall strategic actions to be undertaken during the life of the plan.

The Indigenous community can also have input into the process by attending AHV or JPC community forums where community members are given the opportunity to provide comment and raise issues they have regarding Indigenous housing in Victoria.

Indigenous input to service delivery for SOMIH housing

Following the successful implementation of AHV's Employment and Training Strategy, 100% of staff employed at AHV were Indigenous as at June 2006. This figure includes both Aboriginal Housing Officers working in direct service delivery roles as well as AHV head office staff.

Consistent with departmental-wide moves to make mainstream services more appropriate to Indigenous people, a Cultural Respect Training program was developed and rolled out during 2005-06. The program, which was developed and is now conducted by the Koori Heritage Trust, aims to improve departmental and funded agency staff knowledge of Indigenous people, culture and society so they can be more responsive to Indigenous clients' needs.

A complementary Communication Guide (entitled Building better partnerships: working with Aboriginal communities and organisations) has also been developed to provide staff with some basic tools to establish and improve working relationships with Indigenous people and organisations.

Queensland

Indigenous input to planning/service delivery processes (for both SOMIH and ICHOs)

The Queensland Government engages with Indigenous people using a range of mechanisms including negotiation tables. Negotiation tables involve a sustained process of consultation, planning and negotiation between community leaders and government agency representatives. They provide the opportunity for partnership arrangements and agreements that support mutual planning and goal setting, shared responsibility and accountability and shared ownership of agreed outcomes, as outlined in Community Action Plans. Negotiation tables operate at both regional and state levels.

The Department of Housing regularly engages with councils through workshops and visits to develop and improve policies and procedures. In addition to tenancy matters, consultation processes between the department and individual councils help to capture and include specific housing needs and priorities in community capital work plans. This helps achieve value for money and produces accommodation which is specific to the needs of each community.

The Tenant Participation Program also enables Indigenous public housing and SOMIH tenants to participate in decision making relating to the delivery of housing services.

Western Australia

The needs based planning process seeks input from a wide variety of stakeholders, including communities themselves via questionnaires and surveys, and Indigenous regional stakeholders. The planning process directly informs development of the Aboriginal Housing annual works program/operational plan.

Communities are extensively consulted during the delivery of housing and infrastructure products and services.

South Australia

Indigenous input to housing programs and decision making

Board members are appointed to the Aboriginal Housing Authority Board of Management for their personal skills and knowledge. Members must have a good understanding of the principle of legislation relevant to the AHA in order to ensure that their actions are effective, lawful and justifiable.

The AHA Board of Management is appointed by the Governor on the nomination of the Minister according to requirements stated in the AHA Regulations.

The Board of Management is constituted of up to nine members of whom:

- (a) at least two must, in the opinion of the Minister, be appropriate representatives of Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara, Maralinga Tjarutja or the Aboriginal Lands Trust
- (b) at least one must, in the opinion of the Minister, be an appropriate representative of the Patpa Warra Yunti (Adelaide) region
- (c) at least one must, in the opinion of the Minister, be an appropriate representative of the Wangka Wilurrara (Ceduna) region
- (d) at least one must, in the opinion of the Minister, be an appropriate representative of the Nulla Wimila Kutju (Port Augusta) region.

The Aboriginal Housing Policy Advisory Forum membership consists of Aboriginal community members from across the state. Their role is to provide advocacy on behalf of Aboriginal customers of the AHA and advice in relation to the policies administered by the AHA for the Rental Program. All policy documents being reviewed are provided to the Policy Advisory Forum for comment and endorsement. The Policy Advisory Forum has the ability to engage the AHA in the review of policies they consider require adapting for the community of South Australia.

In 2005-06, the AHA collaborated with the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) in undertaking the first National Housing Survey of SOMIH tenants. Whilst the AHA has participated in the survey for 6 years now, this was the first time it has been undertaken across all jurisdictions. The results will influence policy directions and staff training and will provide an indication of customer satisfaction with services provided by the AHA.

Tasmania

AHST has three regional-based Aboriginal Tenancy Allocation Panels (ATAPs), which are elected by the Aboriginal community. Those ATAPs as previously indicated provide specific advice to AHST with regard to policy, planning, allocation, purchase and sale of properties.

The ATAPs have the ability to provide advice on matters such as training and service delivery. Also the Aboriginal CSOs and the manager of AHST regularly attend community meetings to provide information and receive feedback.

Australian Capital Territory

On 21 October 2005, the Australian Capital Territory (ACT) and Australian Government signed a new bilateral agreement for the Provision of Housing for Indigenous People. The purpose of the agreement, which operates until June 2008, is to ensure that the ACT's Indigenous people have a standard of housing and related services that provide a safe

environment, complement healthy-living practices and contribute to improved health outcomes and quality of life. It is intended to be a catalyst for improving housing outcomes for Indigenous people in the ACT.

The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander working group has been created, under the auspices of the ACT Homelessness Committee, to drive the implementation of actions arising around Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander issues. In addition, this group provides advice and recommendations on the establishment of a range of housing and homelessness responses.

Northern Territory

Indigenous input to housing programs and decision making

The Indigenous Housing and Infrastructure Agreement (IHIA) between the Northern Territory Government and the Australian Government, and the Common Policy Framework, outline the delivery of Indigenous housing programs. All projects encourage and promote local Indigenous involvement.

The IHIA also provides for the establishment of a Northern Territory Indigenous Housing Advisory Board (NTIHAB). The NTIHAB is the principle source of advice to the Northern Territory Minister for Housing on policies and strategic plans to improve housing and related infrastructure outcomes for Indigenous people in the Northern Territory. The board consists of five Ministerial-appointed Indigenous members, one Northern Territory Government representative, and one Australian Government representative. There are two other members with observer status; a representative from the Department of Planning and Infrastructure and a representative from the Local Government Association of the Northern Territory.

The DLGHS facilitates regional ICHO workshops which provide opportunities for two-way (ICHO/DLGHS) interaction and communication regarding Indigenous community housing issues. ICHOs are informed of the latest developments and events in the Indigenous housing sector and other operational issues, such as new housing management and maintenance grant requirements and responsibilities. The workshops also provide the DLGHS with the opportunity to canvass ICHO views and advice on certain policy directions/initiatives.

Indigenous input to planning processes

In the planning of construction programs, allocations are determined through a needs measurement model. A 4 year rolling program for construction is developed from the results of the model and presented to the NTIHAB for consideration.

The DLGHS is developing a revised needs measurement model, with the advice of the NTIHAB, to include measures such as those in the multi-measure needs model (homelessness, overcrowding, affordability, and connection to services).

The regional ICHO workshops provide the DLGHS with the opportunity to involve service deliverers in informing DLGHS planning processes.

Indigenous input to service delivery processes

The regional ICHO workshops also provide an avenue for the canvassing of ICHO input into service delivery processes.

The DLGHS manages a Life Skills Program which provides funds to ICHOs for the administration of projects aimed at improving the standard of living for Indigenous people through culturally appropriate community-based life skills projects. The program encourages whole-of-community involvement, partnerships and networks in the community and with surrounding areas, and maximise employment and training opportunities.

The Australian Government funded HIII has provided opportunities for the Northern Territory Government to implement a number of projects aimed at building governance capacity of ICHOs and communities in the delivery of housing. These projects will be implemented in consultation with ICHOs and communities and include:

- provision of intensive assistance in the development of housing management plans
- implementation of a Regional ICHO Establishment fund to assist newly formed regional ICHOs in their establishment phase
- implementation of a Tenancy Support Scheme – provision of funding to ICHOs to deliver tenancy support services to encourage better management of tenancies by tenants
- provision of funding to develop training programs and schemes for housing and infrastructure related services
- provision of funding through a grants program encouraging ICHOs to focus on a strategic maintenance strategy and tenants on maintaining a healthy living environment.

Australian Government

Indigenous input is addressed in the IHIA process with the requirement for strategic plans to be submitted by state and territory Indigenous housing providers. FaCSIA's involvement with state and territory housing agencies' strategic and annual operational plans and annual reports is an important activity in ensuring Indigenous housing needs and aspirations are considered.

A major platform for Indigenous people and communities effectively having their needs and aspirations included in policy, plans and service provision is the effectiveness of the ICHOs that represent them. The capacity building element of the 2005-06 HIII will be important in improving the ICHO sector's performance. Networking of ICHOs at regional, state and national levels will also be encouraged under this initiative and will contribute to more coordinated input from the sector.

It is envisaged that the capacity building funding provided in the 2005 Health Housing Budget initiative be used to supplement state and territory housing agency effort in planning, decision making and delivery of services. The increased rigour of FaCSIA in requiring the development of comprehensive business plans by ICHOs goes some way in encouraging ICHOs to apply appropriate principles and standards to their service delivery.

Indicator 33. Coordination of housing and other services

Purpose

The purpose of this indicator is to demonstrate the partnerships developed between housing and other services aimed at improving the quality of life of Indigenous Australians.

Description

This indicator required qualitative information on the coordination of housing and other services that seek to improve the health and wellbeing of Indigenous people.

Scope

ICH and SOMIH.

Data sources

Data for this indicator were from states and territories and from FaCSIA in the 2005–06 NRF data collection.

Summary

While the administrative arrangements for Indigenous housing and infrastructure services varied across jurisdictions, activities were coordinated through the Indigenous Housing and Infrastructure Agreements negotiated with each state/territory government and the Australian Government.

In 2005–06, jurisdictions undertook a range of different activities that involved the coordination of housing with other services to improve the health and wellbeing of Indigenous people. For example:

- In New South Wales, the AHO was involved with the Joint Guarantee of Services strategy to guide the coordinated delivery of mental health, support and housing services between the participating agencies in New South Wales.
- The Queensland Government launched Partnerships Queensland which is a whole-of-government policy framework to improve health, prosperity and quality of life of Indigenous Queenslanders.
- The Department of Housing and Works in Western Australia collaborated with the Office of Energy, Department of Indigenous Affairs and other agencies for in the Power Procurement pilot project, which aims to normalise power supplies in selected major communities.
- In South Australia, the AHA provided properties to Aboriginal Prisoners and Offenders Support Services to support prisoners after release to re-establish family and community

connections. In addition, a family violence centre was completed in Adelaide for women requiring transitional accommodation to escape family violence.

Qualitative data from each jurisdiction

New South Wales

The AHO avoids duplication of services by entering into a number of agreements with other government agencies and service providers. The following initiatives that involve coordination with other services have been undertaken.

Joint Guarantee of Services (JGOS)

The JGOS is an inclusive strategy to guide the coordinated delivery of mental health, support and housing services between the participating agencies in New South Wales. The AHO worked closely with people with mental health problems and disorders living in Aboriginal, public and community housing. Coordinated service better assists and enhances the social and emotional wellbeing and mental health of existing social housing tenants whose tenancy may otherwise be at risk. It also assists housing applicants who may be homeless or at risk of homelessness to successfully establish a tenancy.

Partnership Against Homelessness (PAH)

PAH is a network of 11 New South Wales Government agencies that focuses on improving services to homeless people. The aims include: to help homeless men and women to access services; to assist agencies to coordinate support services to enable quicker and easier access to services; to improve access to temporary or crisis accommodation; and to assist clients in such accommodation to secure and settle in long-term housing.

The Inner-City Sydney Aboriginal Homeless Research Project was completed in March 2005. The AHO is in the process of developing an action plan to progress some of the recommendations. The recommendations will be considered in the Department of Housing's Phase 2 of the Inner City Homelessness Action Plan (ICHAP) as was agreed by the members of PAH.

Two Ways Together (TWT)

TWT is the New South Wales Government's Aboriginal Affairs Plan. It is based on a whole-of-government approach to the planning and delivery of policy and services. This approach is supported at a state level by the CEO Group on Aboriginal Affairs, four multi-agency cluster groups and the Aboriginal Affairs Plan Coordinating Committee. Each of the cluster groups is chaired by a lead agency.

Through the housing and infrastructure component of TWT in the Families and Community cluster, the government and its partners will be working in the areas of overcrowding, access to social housing, housing standards and conditions, home ownership, homelessness, water, sewerage and waste collection, environmental health, transport, energy, and information technology.

To assist with the implementation of TWT, the AHO has developed an action plan to inform AHO regional offices, RAHCs and ICHOs of the role of the AHO in the implementation of TWT.

Training

The AHO's Kungala Training and Career Development Unit delivered the Certificate IV Social Housing, Housing our Mob Everywhere (HOME) training program in partnership with TAFE New South Wales under the Memorandum of Understanding 2002-05 utilising two AHO-registered Aboriginal accredited trainer/assessors as the social housing industry experts in all course delivery. This training was delivered in a number of TAFEs throughout the state.

IBA Homes/AHO Home Purchase Scheme

The AHO currently provides a home ownership scheme in partnership with Indigenous Business Australia (IBA). The objectives of the scheme are to expand home ownership opportunities for New South Wales AHO tenants and to enable AHO tenants to purchase the home in which they are living. Eligible tenants were invited to participate in the scheme which totalled approximately 400 households.

In line with the Australian Government and the New South Wales Government's commitment to develop Aboriginal home ownership products through partnerships with key stakeholders, the AHO is seeking input from government departments and the general community on the development of new home ownership products and enhancing existing (current) products. In May 2006, the AHO convened a workshop attended by the New South Wales Centre for Affordable Housing, FaCSIA, IBA, and the New South Wales Aboriginal Land Council on Aboriginal home ownership.

Victoria

The Indigenous Housing and Infrastructure Agreement 2005-08 (IHIA) between the Commonwealth and Victorian Government is the primary mechanism for the coordination of Indigenous housing services in Victoria. The Victorian Indigenous Housing Joint Planning Committee that was formed under the current IHIA takes a whole-of-state approach while acting as the principal source of advice on policies and strategies to improve housing and essential services outcomes for Indigenous people in Victoria.

As a member of the Aboriginal Services Forum, which comprises of senior representatives from state and Australian Government departments and state-wide and local Indigenous organisations, AHV is able to contribute to the coordination of services aimed at improving the health and wellbeing of Indigenous Victorians.

New initiatives in Victoria indicating a continued and coordinated state-wide focus on Indigenous homelessness during 2005-06 included the development of a state-wide Housing Support for Indigenous Tenants program. This program uses an intensive case management and support service model to assist Indigenous people living in Office of Housing or AHV properties whose tenancies are at risk as a result of emerging issues such as financial difficulty, neighbourhood disputes, drug and alcohol abuse, or mental health issues. The program involves AHV, community housing and support organisations and Indigenous community housing providers.

Funds were provided for a dedicated worker to support the Indigenous Homelessness Network to develop strategies to respond to homelessness within Indigenous communities.

The Indigenous Young People Leaving Care initiative was developed, which aims to prevent homelessness amongst young Indigenous Victorians leaving care through the creation of culturally appropriate pathways to independent living including sustainable long-term housing options. This initiative fosters links to Indigenous culture and identity, assists in the

development of culturally appropriate life skills and provides links to education, employment and training options.

A new integrated family violence system was introduced, that will create better immediate support, a choice of housing options, longer-term advice for victims and strong police response and behavioural change programs for the perpetrators of the violence.

Queensland

In 2005–06, the key mechanism for coordination of housing and other services was through joint planning arrangements under the IHIA. These agreements commit the signatories to joint planning and coordination, effective program management and coordinated service delivery for Indigenous housing and infrastructure. The plans are then delivered by working cooperatively with other service providers, including Queensland Health, FaCSIA, Department of Local Government, Planning, Sport and Recreation, Department of Main Roads, Department of Natural Resources and Mines, Department of Employment and Training and Ergon Energy.

In September 2005, the Queensland Government launched Partnerships Queensland, a whole-of-government policy framework to improve the health, prosperity and quality of life of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Queenslanders. The framework integrates all government activities into a single overarching framework, focusing on the four key Partnerships Queensland goals of:

1. strong families, strong cultures
2. safe places
3. healthy living
4. skilled and prosperous people and communities.

A key component of Partnerships Queensland is the development of cross-agency response plans to address priority action areas which impact on the health and wellbeing of Indigenous Queenslanders. The cross-agency Response Plan for Housing, Infrastructure and Environmental Health brings together five key agencies and several partner agencies to identify issues and agree on priority responses to the housing, infrastructure and environmental health issues which impact on the health and wellbeing of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Queenslanders.

Western Australia

The Department of Housing and Works (DHW) actively engages state and Commonwealth agencies to achieve joint program outcomes. For example:

- the DHW collaborated with the Western Australian Department of Health and Department of Indigenous Affairs to conduct the 2003 Environmental Health Needs Survey. This survey has provided more up-to-date community data for planning purposes.
- collaboration with the Office of Energy, Department of Indigenous Affairs and other agencies is resulting in the Power Procurement pilot project, which aims to normalise power supplies in selected major communities.
- collaboration has occurred with a range of state and Commonwealth agencies to establish the Tjurabalan Council of Australian Governments (COAG) trial site in the Kimberley.

The DHW also collaborates with other agencies (government and non-government) in the provision of services that support tenants in public housing. These services include:

- Aboriginal Tenant Support Service
- Supported Housing Assistance Program
- mainstream community housing programs where support services are essential for continued tenancy.

South Australia

The AHA has overall responsibility for planning, coordination, service delivery and evaluation of housing provision for Aboriginal people in South Australia. In identifying the relationship between housing and health and wellbeing outcomes for Aboriginal people, AHA programs incorporate a range of specific social support activities. These programs include the Aboriginal Rental Housing Program, the Community Housing Program and the Transitional Accommodation Program.

Aboriginal Rental Housing Program

Supported Tenancies Program

To ensure tenancies are maintained, the AHA continued to engage tenants of the Aboriginal Rental Housing Program who were at risk of homelessness due to debt, disruptive behaviour or other issues with the Supported Tenancy Program funded by the Social Inclusion Unit. The program provides intensive case management services in partnerships with AHA housing officers and agencies. The Supported Tenancy Program is available to AHA tenants residing in the Parks/Port Adelaide region and the Murraylands region. During 2005-06, 18 tenants were referred to the program, with a total of nine engaged in the service through the year.

Family support worker

The AHA employed an outreach worker funded through SAAP. The SAAP outreach worker provide advocacy and assistance for applicants to obtain emergency accommodation and provides specialised services to support applicants by assisting with complex health, social and family needs. During 2005-06, 41 clients were assisted through the program with 26.9% living in improvised dwellings or sleeping rough at time of presentation. Of the 41 clients who were assisted, 51.3% had a support period greater than 6 months.

Pathway housing

Five independent living units are currently under construction to support individuals and families progressing from the Wangka Wilurrara Accommodation Centre in Ceduna. The independent living units are part of a staged housing experience from transitional accommodation to independent living units to eventually accessing public housing. Each stage has differing levels of support and responsibilities and length of stay. Transitional accommodation offers short-term accommodation, pathway housing offers medium-term accommodation and public housing or private rental accommodation provides a more long-term housing solution.

Having recognised a special need for housing for Aboriginal women and children experiencing family violence and homelessness in the inner city areas, the AHA received funding for 3 years from the Commonwealth to establish a facility and service model that connected and supported at-risk customers.

As a result, a facility was purpose-built in inner-city Adelaide and completed in March 2006. The facility was funded through the Crisis Accommodation Program and provides pathway housing for six families. A committee which includes key inner city service and support providers works collaboratively with the AHA to identify suitable applicants. Tenants are intensively supported and case managed to ensure they acquire the support and independent living and life skills to facilitate their integration into either public housing or the private rental market.

Partnerships

The AHA has previously developed partnerships with Aboriginal Family Support Services (AFSS). The AHA lease two properties which have been upgraded to AFSS specifications for the purpose of providing specialised support to Anangu people who are suffering from substance abuse. This program has now been extended to capture other at-risk client groups. AFSS now run a range of wellbeing and life skills programs from the facility.

The AHA has provided properties to Aboriginal Prisoners and Offenders Support Service (APOSS) to support prisoners after release to re-establish family and community connections. APOSS also provided the AHA with assistance and access to programs to improve with tenancy management skills.

The properties were provided to enable supported accommodation and supervision for young offenders being re-integrated into community. Given the success of this project, Children Youth and Family Services have now purchased the properties provided by the AHA and this is now a mainstream program.

The AHA has partnered with the Intellectual Disability Services Council to provide appropriate accommodation for three Aboriginal men who require high-level supervised care. The project has been operational for over one year and the arrangement has continued successfully. The AHA provided one property for this purpose and will seek to provide an additional four properties once appropriate properties are located.

Community Housing Program

Aged accommodation for the north-western town of Kalka is under construction in Adelaide and is nearing completion with the steel framing, roof and internal linings already completed. It has yet to be transported to the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara (APY) Lands. There will be three double living units and a kitchen provided in the first stage.

The AHA has participated in assisting the management of social issues within Aboriginal communities. The AHA participates in a multi-agency, whole-of-government series of interventions into Yalata as a designated 'community-in-crisis'. The AHA is represented at regular monthly forums convened at the Ceduna Indigenous Coordination Centre to ensure a coordinated approach to service provision and community sustainability is managed. The Office of Indigenous Policy Coordination is the lead agency, but relies on agencies such as the AHA to continue its commitment and investment in the Yalata community for the pursuit of improved individual, family and community housing, health and wellbeing outcomes.

The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Services Division of the Department for Families and Communities is responsible for the coordination of whole-of-government activities on the APY Lands. The AHA connects with the this division and the community of the APY Lands to provide a coordinated approach to the delivery of housing and housing services included under the Indigenous Community Housing Program.

Transitional Accommodation Program

The AHA, in conjunction with the Ceduna District Council and the Wangka Wilurrara Regional Council, has developed the Wangka Wilurrara Accommodation Centre at Ceduna. The centre provides safe accommodation and offers pathways out of an itinerant lifestyle for Aboriginal people. This is achieved through the provision of appropriate accommodation together with intervention programs and services which collectively respond to the identified needs of transient Aboriginal people. The service model is under continual review to ensure effective management and the provision of safe, secure accommodation. The centre provided accommodation to 254 residents this financial year.

The Lakeview Accommodation Centre in Port Augusta was completed by the scheduled date of December 2005. This was a major achievement for the AHA and key stakeholders who partnered the AHA in delivering this second transitional accommodation facility.

Tasmania

Housing Tasmania (including AHST) belongs to part of the Department of Health and Human Services Aboriginal Health and Wellbeing Steering Committee which is charged with the responsibility of identifying mechanisms to address issues such as service delivery, cultural awareness training and provide advice and direction on matters such as consultation processes with the Aboriginal community.

The Aboriginal Health and Wellbeing Steering Committee has recently employed an Aboriginal person to commence a process for development of a cultural awareness program for delivery across the state public sector along with the establishment of an Aboriginal contact officer network which will, wherever possible, assist Aboriginal community members in understanding government processes by acting as an advice and referral service.

Australian Capital Territory

Following a recommendation of the ACT Homelessness Strategy, the Australian Capital Territory (ACT) Government allocated funding of \$3.2 million in May 2004 for construction of an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander boarding house network.

A consultation process was completed in December 2005 to clarify issues surrounding the Indigenous Supported Accommodation Service (ISAS) proposal. The ISAS proposal was advice received by the department based on general consensus from Indigenous organisations working in the service sector on how it should proceed with implementing an appropriate and relevant funding strategy for crisis supported accommodation for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander families. At this stage, Inanna, an organisation that provides crisis accommodation for women, has agreed to continue providing the ISAS and are developing an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander program within its existing structure. The department has allocated two properties to Inanna under the auspices of the ISAS proposal. Another four have been planned for 2006–07 financial year.

Following the establishment of the first Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander SAAP services in December 2003, the ACT Government has continued to consult with the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community about the establishment of supported accommodation services for families and a general outreach service to support people who are at risk of experiencing or transitioning from homelessness. The ACT Government allocated additional funding to Winnunga Nimmityjah Aboriginal Health Service for 2005–06 to enhance the provision of housing support and advocacy services to assist clients to access and maintain

suitable accommodation. This service assists Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to access safe, stable and secure housing that will contribute to improved health outcomes.

The ACT Government funds the Winnunga Nimmityjah Aboriginal Health Service to provide a range of services to improve the health and well being of Indigenous people. Among these services is the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Housing Liaison Service. It provides information and support to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander social housing applicants and tenants.

The ACT Government has provided additional funding of \$59,405 to expand this service in 2006–07. This initiative will improve Aboriginals' and Torres Strait Islanders' access to Housing ACT services and increase opportunities for the early identification and support of housing stress, rental arrears and other issues that may impact on sustainable tenancies.

Within the public housing system, the ACT Government has enhanced the role of the Client Support Coordinator (CSC) by working closely with clients, community organisations and other Housing ACT staff to develop better outcomes and protocols for the management of tenancy issues. The CSCs work with housing managers and liaise with the providers of other services to improve the health and wellbeing of clients, including Indigenous people.

The ACT Government also provides public housing and other staff with training to assist them to take account of cultural sensitivities in responding to client needs.

Northern Territory

During 2005–06, the pooled management of the National Aboriginal Health Strategy with former Indigenous Housing Authority of the Northern Territory programs commenced as specified under the IHIA. The Northern Territory Government has worked closely with the Australian Government, namely FaCSIA, as well as other Northern Territory Government agencies to achieve service efficiencies, particularly in remote Indigenous communities.

Examples of these partnerships include:

- Governance Division (of the DLGHS) – the majority of ICHOs are also local governing bodies, and hence the Indigenous Housing Branch ensures significant service delivery developments are communicated to local government. Joint ventures also occur, for example, the continuation of interventions at Wadeye.
- Department of Health and Community Services – the Indigenous Housing Branch keeps close contact with the Environmental Health Unit for the application and revision of environmental health standards, and implementation of the ICH surveys.
- Department of Planning and Infrastructure (DPI) – the DLGHS and DPI developed and signed a service agreement that sets out responsibilities for the delivery of the Northern Territory Indigenous Housing Construction Program; associated land planning and land development; related training programs; and development of sustainable Indigenous employment in housing construction and maintenance.
- Department of Business, Economic and Resource Development (DBERD) – ensuring integration of Indigenous housing in the Northern Territory Indigenous Economic Development Strategy.
- Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET) – to develop options for the role of housing in improving employment opportunities in remote Indigenous communities.

- Australian Government Department of Employment and Workplace Relations – together with DPI, DEET and DBERD – is developing a strategy for the integration of employment and training into Indigenous housing programs.
- Department of the Chief Minister’s Office of Indigenous Policy – working together so that the Indigenous Housing Program can contribute to whole-of-government Indigenous policies.