

Indigenous housing indicators 2003–04

The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare is Australia's national health and welfare statistics and information agency. The Institute's mission is *better health and wellbeing for Australians through better health and welfare statistics and information.*

Please note that as with all statistical reports there is the potential for minor revisions of data in *Indigenous Housing Indicators 2003-04* over its one-year life. Please refer to the online version at <www.aihw.gov.au>.

Indigenous Housing
Number 1

Indigenous housing indicators 2003–04

June 2005

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare
Canberra

AIHW cat. no. HOU 127

© Australian Institute of Health and Welfare 2005

This work is copyright. Apart from any use as permitted under the *Copyright Act 1968*, no part may be reproduced without prior written permission from the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. Requests and enquiries concerning reproduction and rights should be directed to the Head, Business Promotion and Media Unit, Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, GPO Box 570, Canberra ACT 2601.

This publication is part of the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare's Indigenous Housing Series. A complete list of the Institute's publications is available from the Business Promotion and Media Unit, Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, GPO Box 570, Canberra ACT 2601, or via the Institute's website <<http://www.aihw.gov.au>>.

ISSN 1832-7443

ISBN 1 74024 474 5

Suggested citation

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare 2005. Indigenous housing indicators 2003–04. AIHW cat. no. HOU 127. Canberra: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare.

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare

Board Chair

Hon. Peter Collins, QC, AM

Director

Dr Richard Madden

Any enquiries about or comments on this publication should be directed to:

Helen Johnstone

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare

GPO Box 570

Canberra ACT 2601

Phone: (02) 6244 1259

Published by Australian Institute of Health and Welfare

Printed by Pirion Printing

Contents

List of tables	vi
Abbreviations.....	ix
Acknowledgments.....	xi
Symbols used in the tables	xi
Executive summary	xii
Major findings	xii
Data issues and future directions	xiv
Introduction.....	1
Building a Better Future.....	1
The National Reporting Framework.....	2
Outcome 1: Better housing.....	5
Indicator 2. Proportion of improvised dwellings	6
Indicator 3. Proportion of dwellings needing major repairs	9
Indicator 4. Proportion of dwellings needing replacement.....	12
Indicators 5, 6. Mechanisms to ensure that new houses and upgrades meet national minimum standards	14
Indicator 7. Proportion of communities not connected to (a) water (b) sewerage (c) electricity	18
Indicator 8. Proportion of dwellings not connected to (a) water (b) sewerage (c) electricity	20
Indicator 9. Proportion of dwellings meeting the nine FHBH healthy living standards	23
Indicator 22. Total and average number of additional bedrooms required.....	26
Indicator 23. Proportion of overcrowded households	29
Indicator 24. Proportion of households paying 25% or more of income in rent	34
Indicator 35. Proportion of clients satisfied with (a) amenity (b) location of their dwelling.....	36
Outcome 2: Better housing services	37
Indicator 10. Average weekly rent collected.....	38
Indicator 11. Rent collected as a percentage of total rent charged	41
Indicator 12. Total amount spent on maintenance each year	43

Indicator 13.	Average amount spent on maintenance each year.....	45
Indicator 14.	Maintenance expenditure as a proportion of rent collected.....	47
Indicator 15.	Recurrent to capital expenditure ratio.....	49
Indicator 26.	Number of Indigenous community housing organisations.....	51
Indicator 27.	Proportion of organisations that have a housing management plan.....	53
Indicator 28.	What jurisdictions are doing to assist ICHOs to develop and implement housing management plans.....	55
Indicator 29.	Proportion of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who have completed accredited training in housing management and related areas.....	60
Indicator 30.	Proportion of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who are undertaking accredited training in housing management and related areas.....	62
Indicator 36.	Proportion of clients satisfied with quality of the service provided.....	64
Indicator 38.	Proportion of organisations using rent deduction schemes.....	65
Outcome 3: More housing.....		66
Indicator 1.	Total number of dwellings targeted for Indigenous people.....	67
Indicator 19.	Proportion of Indigenous households by tenure type.....	69
Indicator 20.	Proportion of Indigenous households accessing mainstream housing services.....	71
Indicator 21.	Proportion of Indigenous people who are homeless.....	73
Outcome 4: Improved partnerships.....		75
Indicator 31.	Proportion of people employed in housing management who are Indigenous.....	76
Indicator 32.	Strategies and outcomes to increase Indigenous employment in housing services.....	78
Indicator 33.	Mechanisms for Indigenous input to planning, decision making and delivery of services.....	84
Outcome 5: Greater effectiveness and efficiency.....		91
Indicator 17.	Occupancy rates.....	92
Indicator 18.	Turnaround time.....	94
Indicator 25.	Allocation of resources on the basis of need.....	95
Outcome 6: Improved performance linked to accountability.....		103
Indicator 16.	Average cost of providing assistance per dwelling.....	104
Indicator 37.	Proportion of indicators (not Census or CHINS) that jurisdictions could report on.....	106

Outcome 7: Coordination of services.....108
Indicator 34. Coordination of housing and other services that seek to
improve the health and wellbeing of Indigenous people109
Appendix 1.....116
Appendix 2.....122
References127

List of tables

Table 1.1:	Number and proportion of ICH improvised dwellings, by state and territory, 30 June 2004	7
Table 1.2:	Number and proportion of improvised dwellings in discrete Indigenous communities, by state and territory, 2001	8
Table 1.3:	Number and proportion of permanent dwellings managed by Indigenous housing organisations needing major repairs, by state and territory, 2001	9
Table 1.4:	Number and proportion of Indigenous households in dwellings with structural problems, by tenure type, 2002.....	10
Table 1.5:	Number and proportion of Indigenous households in dwellings with structural problems, by state and territory, by tenure type, 2002.....	11
Table 1.6:	Number and proportion of permanent dwellings managed by Indigenous housing organisations needing replacement, by state and territory, 2001	12
Table 1.7:	Number and proportion of discrete Indigenous communities not connected to water, sewerage and electricity, by state and territory, 2001	19
Table 1.8:	Number and proportion of dwellings not connected to water, sewerage or electricity, by state and territory, 30 June 2004	21
Table 1.9:	Number and proportion of Indigenous persons aged 15 years and over in dwellings meeting the nine FHBH healthy living standards, by state and territory, by tenure type, 2002.....	24
Table 1.10:	Total and average number of additional bedrooms required in Indigenous community housing, by state and territory, 30 June 2004.....	27
Table 1.11:	Total and average number of additional bedrooms required for Indigenous households in all tenure types, by state and territory, 2001	27
Table 1.12:	Average number of additional bedrooms required in Indigenous households, by tenure type, 2001.....	28
Table 1.13:	Number and proportion of overcrowded SOMIH and ICH households, by state and territory, 30 June 2004	30
Table 1.14:	Number of people, number of bedrooms and average number of people per bedroom in Indigenous community housing permanent dwellings, by state and territory, 30 June 2004	31
Table 1.15:	Number and proportion of Indigenous households that were overcrowded, by tenure type, by state and territory, 2001.....	32
Table 1.16:	Number and proportion of SOMIH households paying 25% or more of income in rent, by state and territory, 30 June 2004.....	34
Table 1.17:	Number and proportion of low income rental Indigenous households paying 25% or more of their income in rent, by state and territory, 2002	35
Table 2.1:	Average weekly rent (\$) collected for Indigenous community housing and SOMIH, by state and territory, for the year ending 30 June 2004.....	38

Table 2.2: Average weekly rent (\$) collected for permanent dwellings managed by Indigenous housing organisations, by state and territory, 2001	39
Table 2.3: Median weekly rent (\$) paid by Indigenous rental households, by landlord type, by state and territory, 2002	39
Table 2.4: Median weekly rent (\$) paid by Indigenous rental households, by landlord type, by remoteness, 2002	39
Table 2.5: Rent collected, rent charged and rent collected as a percentage of rent charged, for ICH and SOMIH, by state and territory, for the year ending 30 June 2004	42
Table 2.6: Total amount spent on maintenance for SOMIH, by state and territory, for the year ending 30 June 2004.....	43
Table 2.7: Total amount spent on maintenance by Indigenous housing organisations, by state and territory, 2001	44
Table 2.8: Average amount spent on maintenance for SOMIH, by state and territory, for the year ending 30 June 2004.....	45
Table 2.9: Average amount spent on maintenance by Indigenous housing organisations, by state and territory, 2001	46
Table 2.10: Maintenance expenditure, rent collected and maintenance expenditure as a proportion of rent collected for SOMIH, by state and territory, for the year ending 30 June 2004.....	47
Table 2.11: Maintenance expenditure, rent collected and maintenance expenditure as a proportion of rent collected for Indigenous community housing organisations, by state and territory, 2001	48
Table 2.12: Recurrent and capital expenditure and recurrent to capital expenditure ratio for ICH and SOMIH, by state and territory, for the year ending 30 June 2004	50
Table 2.13: Number of Indigenous community housing organisations, by state and territory, 30 June 2004.....	51
Table 2.14: Number of Indigenous community housing organisations, by state and territory, 2001.....	52
Table 2.15: Number and proportion of ICH organisations that have a housing management plan, by state and territory, 30 June 2004	54
Table 2.16: Number and proportion of Indigenous housing organisations that have a housing management plan, by state and territory, 30 June 2001	54
Table 2.17: Number and proportion of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who have completed accredited training in housing management, by state and territory, 30 June 2004.....	61
Table 2.18: Number and proportion of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who were undertaking accredited training in housing management, by state and territory, 30 June 2004.....	63
Table 3.1: Total number of ICH and SOMIH dwellings, by state and territory, 30 June 2004	67

Table 3.2: Number and proportion of Indigenous households by tenure type, by state and territory, 2002	70
Table 3.3: Number and proportion of Indigenous households accessing mainstream housing services, by state and territory, 30 June 2004	72
Table 3.4: Number of Indigenous people who were homeless, by category, by state and territory, 2001	74
Table 4.1: Number and proportion of Indigenous people employed in housing management in SOMIH or ICH organisations, by state and territory, 30 June 2004	77
Table 5.1: Number and rate of ICH and SOMIH dwellings that were occupied, by state and territory, 30 June 2004	93
Table 5.2: Turnaround time for ICH and SOMIH dwellings, by state and territory, for the year ending 30 June 2004.....	94
Table 6.1: Total and average cost of providing assistance per dwelling for ICH and SOMIH, by state and territory, for the year ending 30 June 2004.....	105
Table 6.2: Number and proportion of ICH/SOMIH indicators for which jurisdictions could provide data, by state and territory, 2003-04.....	106
Table 6.3: Number and proportion of ICH indicators for which FaCS ICH could provide data, by state and territory, 2003-04.....	107
Table A.1: National Reporting Framework national summary data by jurisdiction, 2003-04	116

Abbreviations

ABS	Australian Bureau of Statistics
ACDP	Aboriginal Communities Development Program
AFSS	Aboriginal Family Support Services
AHA	Aboriginal Housing Authority
AHBV	Aboriginal Housing Board of Victoria
AHIC	Aboriginal Housing and Infrastructure Council
AHID	Aboriginal Housing and Infrastructure Directorate
AHO	Aboriginal Housing Office
AHST	Aboriginal Housing Services Tasmania
AHSU	Aboriginal Housing Services Units
AHURI	Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute
AIHW	Australian Institute of Health and Welfare
ANIHI	Agreement of National Indigenous housing Information
APOSS	Aboriginal Prisoners and Offenders Support Service
ATAP	Aboriginal Tenancy Advisory Panel
ATSIC	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission
ATSIS	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Services
BBF	Building a better future: Indigenous housing to 2010
BCA	Building Code of Australia
CDEP	Community Development Employment Program
CHINS	Community Housing and Infrastructure Needs Survey
CHIP	Community Housing and Infrastructure Program
CRA	Commonwealth Rent Assistance
CSHA	Commonwealth State Housing Agreement
DAAR	Department of Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation
DATSIP	Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Policy
DCDSCA	Department of Community Development, Sport and Cultural Affairs
DHS	Department of Human Services
FaCS	Family and Community Services
FHBH	Fixing Houses for Better Health Program
FHBH2	Fixing Houses for Better Health Program Phase 2
HACP	Housing Aboriginal Communities Program
HAMS	Housing Asset Management System
HOME	Housing Our Mob Everywhere Program
ICH	Indigenous Community Housing Program

ICHO	Indigenous Community Housing Organisation
IDSC	Intellectual Disability Services Council
IHANT	Indigenous Housing Authority of the Northern Territory
JIHCC	Joint Indigenous Housing Consultative Committee
JPG	Joint Planning Group
JTSHIC	Joint Torres Strait Housing and Infrastructure Committee
NAHS	National Aboriginal Health Strategy
NATSISS	National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Survey
NRF	National Reporting Framework for Indigenous Housing
PAH	Partnership Against Homelessness
RAHC	Regional Aboriginal Housing Committee
SAAP	Supported Accommodation Assistance Program
SOMIH	State Owned and Managed Indigenous Housing Program

Acknowledgments

Many people have contributed to this report, most notably members of the National Indigenous Housing Information Implementation Committee (NIHIIC). The main authors were Helen Johnstone, Fadwa Al-Yaman and Michelle Wallis.

Thanks are extended to the following organisations for providing the data and contributing to the report.

New South Wales

Aboriginal Housing Office

Victoria

Department of Human Services

Queensland

Department of Housing

Western Australia

Department of Housing and Works

South Australia

Aboriginal Housing Authority

Tasmania

Department of Health and Human Services

Australian Capital Territory

Department of Disability, Housing and Community Services

Northern Territory

Department of Community Development, Sport and Cultural Affairs

Australian Government

Department of Family and Community Services

Symbols used in the tables

- nil or rounded to zero
- .. not applicable
- n.a. not available

Executive summary

- The *Indigenous Housing Indicators 2003–04* report is the first Indigenous housing indicator based report compiled by the AIHW. It includes national data on the National Reporting Framework for Indigenous Housing (NRF) that were collected by the AIHW from states and territories and from the Australian Government Department of Family and Community Services (FaCS).
- The report provides data on Indigenous housing that can be used to monitor progress in the seven outcome areas outlined in the Housing Ministers' 10-year statement of new directions for Indigenous housing, *Building a Better Future: Indigenous housing to 2010* (BBF).
- The NRF includes 38 indicators and was developed to provide a framework for reporting on Indigenous housing across Australia. In this report the NRF indicators are grouped according to BBF outcome areas, and data are presented for each of the indicators. (See Table A.1 in Appendix 1 for a list of NRF indicators and a summary of the 2003–04 data.)

Major findings

- Nearly two-thirds of Indigenous households in Australia were in some form of rental housing with 14.8% in housing provided by Indigenous or community organisations, 22.8% renting from state or territory housing authorities and 28.2% renting from private or other landlords. Just over 30% of Indigenous households were homeowners (Indicator 19).
- At 30 June 2004 there were 34,442 dwellings provided through the Indigenous specific housing programs – State Owned and Managed Indigenous Housing (SOMIH) and Indigenous Community Housing (ICH) (Indicator 1). There were 12,725 SOMIH dwellings and 21,717 ICH dwellings (of which 18,735 were state administered and 2,982 administered by the Commonwealth through FaCS).
- In addition to the Indigenous specific programs, Indigenous households can also access mainstream housing programs. At 30 June 2004, 5.9% of households (19,787) in public housing and 5.4% of households (1,316) in mainstream community housing had one Indigenous member or more. A lower proportion of Indigenous households (2.4% or 25,102 households) were receiving assistance through the Commonwealth Rent Assistance Program (Indicator 20).
- On Census night (2001 Census) there were an estimated 7,526 Indigenous people (1.8% of the population) who were regarded as homeless because their accommodation fell below community standards (Indicator 21). These included 2,657 without conventional accommodation, 1,566 in the Supported Accommodation Assistance Program, 1,660 staying with friends and relatives and 1,643 in boarding houses.
- Some 5.5% of Indigenous households lived in overcrowded conditions (Indicator 23). The proportion of overcrowded households was highest for those renting from Indigenous or community organisations (25.7%). Among the jurisdictions, the proportion of overcrowded households was highest in the Northern Territory (23.7%)

which has a large Indigenous community housing sector, followed by Western Australia (7.5%).

- There were 43.2% of low income Indigenous households who paid 25% or more of their income in rent (Indicator 24). The proportion of low income households paying 25% or more of their income in rent varied by jurisdiction ranging from 19.4% in the Northern Territory to 58.3% in the Australian Capital Territory.

Indigenous community housing

- The Northern Territory (6,456) had the largest number of ICH dwellings, followed by Queensland (6,079), New South Wales (4,616) and Western Australia (2,837) (Indicator 1).
- There were 551 Indigenous community housing organisations in Australia (excluding Western Australia which could not provide data) that were responsible for managing ICH programs (Indicator 26). New South Wales (284) had the largest number of organisations followed by Queensland (108). These organisations range in size and can be managing five or six dwellings to several hundred.
- Some ICH permanent dwellings were not connected to an organised supply of water, sewerage or electricity. There were 344 ICH dwellings in Australia not connected to water, 1,618 not connected to sewerage and 380 not connected to electricity (Indicator 8). The Northern Territory had the highest proportion of dwellings not connected to services with 1.6% not connected to an organised water supply, 21.0% not connected to an organised sewerage supply and 2.4% not connected to an organised electricity supply.
- The average weekly rent collected for ICH dwellings was relatively low. For example, average weekly rents for ICH dwellings were \$22 in South Australia and \$31 in the Northern Territory (Indicator 10). These low rents reflect the fact that many of these dwellings are located in more remote areas.
- The occupancy rate for ICH dwellings ranged from 79% in South Australia to 100% in both the Australian Capital Territory and in state managed ICH dwellings in Queensland (Indicator 17).
- Most jurisdictions had strategies in place to assist ICH organisations to develop housing management plans and to improve the effectiveness of organisations in managing Indigenous housing (Indicator 32).
- There were structures in place in all jurisdictions that allowed for consultation with and input from the Indigenous community. In many jurisdictions the consultation process was done through the involvement of ATSIC representatives (Indicator 33).

State owned and managed Indigenous housing

- New South Wales (4,088) had the largest number of SOMIH dwellings followed by Queensland (2,811) and Western Australia (2,325) (Indicator 1). There are no SOMIH dwellings in the Northern Territory or the Australian Capital Territory.
- There are currently no national data available on the condition of SOMIH dwellings. These data, along with dwelling condition data for ICH, will be developed over the next year.

- Average weekly rents collected for SOMIH dwellings were generally higher than for ICH dwellings, and ranged from \$74 in Tasmania to \$91 in New South Wales (Indicator 10).
- The average amount spent on maintenance for SOMIH dwellings was \$2,118 per dwelling (Indicator 13).
- The occupancy rate for SOMIH dwellings was above 90% in all jurisdictions and ranged from 92.2% in South Australia to 98.2% in Tasmania (Indicator 17).
- The average turnaround time for availability of SOMIH, or time taken to fill vacant dwellings, was 46 days (Indicator 18). The turnaround time ranged from 33 days in Tasmania to 58 days in Western Australia.

Data issues and future directions

- The NRF data collection included data on ICH and SOMIH programs and sought data from jurisdictions for 25 of the 38 NRF indicators. Not all jurisdictions could provide all the data requested.
- There were also issues to do with the comparability of the data. The scope of the data collection for ICH, for example, was not consistent across all jurisdictions. Most states and territories reported on ICH programs that were managed by funded or registered Indigenous community housing organisations (ICHOs), which was how the scope of the data collection was defined. Western Australia, however, reported on all ICH dwellings in that state, whether they were managed by funded organisations or not. The Western Australia data are therefore not comparable with the data from other jurisdictions.
- Future data development will focus on the indicators for overcrowding and dwelling condition. The 2003–04 NRF data collection included data on overcrowding for ICH dwellings, but most jurisdictions could not provide these data. Further work with the jurisdictions is required to develop these data and to obtain regular data that can monitor overcrowding levels in ICH dwellings.
- There are currently no national data available on the condition of SOMIH dwellings and the dwelling condition data on ICH dwellings in this report come from the ABS CHINS survey which is conducted every five years. The development of national definitions and data items for the collection of administrative data on conditions of ICH and SOMIH dwellings will therefore be a priority over the next year.
- Further work is also required on the national definitions and data standards for the NRF data collection – both to ensure national consistency and to increase the scope of the data collection. Through further collaboration with the jurisdictions, the quality of the NRF data collection will continue to be improved.

Introduction

There are a number of 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 by the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement
- 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.

SOMIH is the responsibility of the state governments and is funded through the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. SOMIH dwellings are owned and managed by state and territory housing authorities. SOMIH is provided in 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 BBF reporting.

The administrative arrangements for ICH are more complex and vary across the 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 FaCS (formerly ATSIIS), is directly responsible for the administration of ICH in four jurisdictions – Queensland, Australian Capital Territory, Victoria and Tasmania. In Victoria and Tasmania there is only FaCS-administered ICH housing, while in the Australian Capital Territory and Queensland, some ICH housing is administered by FaCS and some by the state or territory government. In the four remaining jurisdictions – New South Wales, Western Australia, South Australia and the Northern Territory – funding from the relevant state and the Commonwealth is pooled and the state or territory government is responsible for the administration of ICH.

Building a Better Future

In May 2001, housing ministers endorsed a 10-year statement of new directions for Indigenous housing, *Building a Better Future: Indigenous housing to 2010* (BBF) (HMC 2001). BBF recognised that Indigenous housing was a major national issue requiring priority action and sought to improve housing and environmental health outcomes for Indigenous Australians.

The focus of BBF was on identifying and addressing outstanding need; improving the viability of Indigenous community housing organisations; establishing safe, healthy and sustainable housing for Indigenous Australians, especially in rural and remote communities; and establishing a national framework for the development and delivery of improved

housing outcomes for Indigenous Australians by state, territory and community housing providers.

There were seven outcome areas identified in BBF:

1. **Better housing** – Housing that meets agreed standards, is appropriate to the needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, and contributes to their health and wellbeing
2. **Better housing services** – Services that are well managed and sustainable
3. **More housing** – Growth in the number of houses to address both the backlog of Indigenous housing need and emerging needs of a growing Indigenous population
4. **Improved partnerships** – Ensuring Indigenous people are fully involved in planning, decision making and delivery of services
5. **Greater effectiveness and efficiency** – Ensuring that assistance is properly directed to meeting objectives, and that resources are being used to best advantage
6. **Improved performance linked to accountability** – Program performance reporting based on national data collection systems and good information management
7. **Coordination of services** – A whole-of-government approach that ensures greater coordination of housing and housing-related services linked to improved health and wellbeing outcomes.

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 and on the implementation and outcomes of BBF. The NRF comprises a set of 38 performance indicators for national reporting on Indigenous housing. The NRF was developed and approved by all states and territories and the Commonwealth in 2003 to assist in the assessment of the impact of BBF. The indicators in the NRF were developed and mapped to the seven outcome areas identified in BBF.

The NRF includes the Indigenous-specific programs ICH and SOMIH, Indigenous access to mainstream housing programs, as well as 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 capital and recurrent expenditure on Indigenous housing.

Data sources

Data for a number of the indicators in the NRF were available from existing Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) surveys such as:

- 2001 Community Housing and Infrastructure Needs Survey (CHINS) for data on Indigenous community housing;
- 2001 Census of Population and Housing for data on homelessness and overcrowding; and
- 2002 National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Survey (NATSISS) for data on tenure type and average rents.

These surveys, however, are conducted only every five or six years and are hence not able to report on BBF annually. There were also some administrative data available through the CSHA national data collections on SOMIH, public rental housing and mainstream community housing. Prior to 2002–03, however, there was no national administrative data collection for Indigenous community housing.

NRF administrative data collection

The first NRF administrative data collection was undertaken in 2003 with data collected for the 2002–03 financial year. The AIHW assumed responsibility for the administrative data collection in 2004 with the collection of administrative data for the 2003–04 financial year.

The data collection included data items for ICH that were managed by the states and territories and by FaCS as well as SOMIH data items that were additional to the existing national CSHA SOMIH data collection. 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 registered Indigenous Community Housing Organisations (ICHOs). These data were collected by the AIHW from the states and territories through the NRF data manual, which included national specifications and definitions.

The FaCS data were collected through a special questionnaire that was sent either to regional managers or directly to the ICH organisation (see Appendix 2). The data collected from FaCS were less comprehensive and did not always conform to the national specifications provided to states and territories. The state ICH data and the FaCS ICH data are therefore presented separately in the tables provided in this publication.

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, in particular the data on FaCS Indigenous community 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 FaCS, 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.

Data issues

This is the first report on the BBF through the NRF for which the AIHW collected national data, and the data definitions and collections are still being developed and refined. This report provides either data collected through the NRF or ABS survey data for the majority of the 38 NRF indicators. There were three indicators for which no data were provided. Two of these related to clients' satisfaction with their dwelling and the quality of services provided. Data for these will be collected in the 2005 National Social Housing Surveys and will be available for the 2004–05 report. The remaining indicator related to the number of organisations using rent deduction schemes. This indicator will be reviewed to determine the type of information required, and the usefulness of Centrelink as a data source will be investigated.

For the 2003–04 report, jurisdictions were asked to provide SOMIH data for eight NRF indicators and ICH data for 23 indicators. The jurisdictions were able to provide between 58% and 100% of the data requested. For some of the indicators, each of the jurisdictions was able to provide data; however, because of differing data collections, comparison of data

between the jurisdictions is often complicated. For example, most jurisdictions reported on data from funded or registered ICHOs, whereas Western Australia could report only on all Indigenous community housing, whether funded or not by the state government.

Where no data were available from the NRF data collection, alternative data were provided for indicators from the ABS Census or from the CHINS and NATSISS surveys. While the CHINS and NATSISS surveys are subject to sampling error, they do provide a reasonable estimate of the 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 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.

In order to accurately assess the outcomes of BBF, there is a need to collect nationally consistent data with agreed definitions and standards. The summary NRF table provided in Appendix 1 details information on the indicators which require further work to improve the comparability of data. Through further collaborative efforts with the jurisdictions, the quality of NRF data collection will continue to be improved over time.

Structure of the report

The report is structured according to seven BBF outcome areas, with the relevant NRF indicators presented under each outcome area. The NRF indicators were numbered as they appear in the framework (Table A.1), and not as they are presented under BBF outcome areas. The numbering of indicators under the BBF outcome areas is therefore not sequential.

The layout for each indicator includes the national definition used for the indicator and a data section. The data section includes information on the data sources and whether the data presented differ from those specified in the national definition.

The report concludes with an appendix that contains a summary table of the quantitative indicators and the questionnaire for FaCS funded ICHOs.

Outcome 1: Better housing

Housing that meets agreed standards, is appropriate to the needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and contributes to their health and wellbeing

Indicator 2: Proportion of improvised dwellings

Indicator 3: Proportion of dwellings needing major repairs

Indicator 4: Proportion of dwellings needing replacement

Indicator 5, 6: Mechanisms to ensure that new houses and upgrades meet state and territory minimum standards

Indicator 7: Proportion of communities not connected to (a) water (b) sewerage (c) electricity

Indicator 8: Proportion of dwellings not connected to (a) water, (b) sewerage (c) electricity

Indicator 9: Proportion of dwellings meeting the nine FHBH healthy living standards

Indicator 22: Total and average number of additional bedrooms required across all tenure types

Indicator 23: Proportion of overcrowded households across all tenure types

Indicator 24: Proportion of households paying 25% or more of income in rent

Indicator 35: Proportion of clients satisfied with (a) amenity (b) location of their dwelling

There are 12 indicators in this outcome area. The indicators include the proportion of improvised dwellings for ICH, the condition of ICH dwellings and what mechanisms are in place to ensure new dwellings and upgrades meet minimum standards. This outcome area has two measures for ICH on connection to essential services such as water, sewerage and electricity. These are important indicators because of the strong correlation between inadequate housing and poor health and wellbeing.

Overcrowding can put stress on bathroom, kitchen and laundry facilities as well as on sewerage systems such as septic tanks. Two indicators measure the extent of overcrowding in Indigenous households.

There is one indicator on whether housing is designed and constructed to support the nine healthy living practices. This indicator incorporates all the housing elements essential for healthy living, but it is more difficult to collect data for this indicator. Indicator 24 addresses housing affordability for all tenure types.

No data were collected for the final indicator on whether clients were satisfied with the amenities and location of their dwelling.

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.

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

ICH only.

Data sources

Data for this indicator were collected from jurisdictions in the 2003–04 NRF data collection, but no data on improvised dwellings were collected from FaCS.

Alternative data from the 2001 CHINS are also provided.

Data

Table 1.1: Number and proportion of ICH improvised dwellings, by state and territory, 30 June 2004

	NSW ^(a)	Vic	Qld ^(b)	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
No. of improvised dwellings	—	..	46	347	1	..	—	392	786
Total no. of dwellings	4,616	..	3,721	2,837	1,093	..	12	6,456	18,735
Proportion of improvised dwellings (%)	—	..	1.2	12.2	0.1	..	—	6.1	4.2

(a) Includes all organisations with both 'active' and 'inactive' registration with the Aboriginal Housing Office (AHO).

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

Notes

1. The scope of the ICH data collection is dwellings managed by funded or registered ICHOs. The data for Western Australia, however, cover all ICH in that state and the shading indicates that these data should not be compared with data from other jurisdictions.
2. This table does not include data on ICH dwellings managed by FaCS.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection.

- At 30 June 2004 there were 786 improvised ICH dwellings administered by the states and territories, with 392 of these in the Northern Territory. These data do not include ICH dwellings managed by FaCS.
- Among jurisdictions that can be compared, the Northern Territory had the highest proportion of improvised dwellings comprising 6% of all dwellings.
- There were no improvised dwellings in New South Wales or the Australian Capital Territory and only one in South Australia.
- The high proportion of improvised dwellings in Western Australia (12%) reflects the scope of the collection as the data provided relates to all ICH dwellings in Western Australia and not just dwellings managed by funded or registered ICHOs.

The CHINS collected data on all dwellings in discrete Indigenous communities. The data would include both state and FaCS administered ICH dwellings, as well as any other dwellings in these communities (Table 1.2). The definition of an improvised dwelling used in CHINS is similar to the one used in the NRF data collection as the NRF definition was based on the CHINS definition.

Table 1.2: Number and proportion of improvised dwellings in discrete Indigenous communities, by state and territory, 2001

	NSW	Qld	WA	SA	NT	Aust ^(a)
No. of improvised dwellings	71	429	508	179	679	1,882
Total no. of dwellings	1,308	4,169	3,233	1,148	7,177	17,110
Proportion of improvised dwellings (%)	5	10	16	16	9	11

(a) Total for Australia includes Victoria, Tasmania and the Australian Capital Territory which are not shown separately for confidentiality reasons.

Source: ABS 2001 CHINS (ABS, 2002).

- The CHINS found that there were 1,882 improvised dwellings in discrete Indigenous communities in Australia. The Northern Territory (679) had the largest number of improvised dwellings, followed by Western Australia (508) and Queensland (429).
- Western Australia and South Australia (16% in each case) had the highest proportion of improvised dwellings in discrete communities.

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.

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; and
- \$33,000 to 100,000 in high cost areas.

Scope

ICH only, but in the future will also be reported for SOMIH.

Data sources

The data provided for this indicator were from the 2001 CHINS. Data on dwelling condition were not included in the AIHW 2003–04 NRF data collection.

Alternative data from the 2002 NATSISS on Indigenous households who reported that their dwellings had structural problems are also provided.

Data

Table 1.3: Number and proportion of permanent dwellings managed by Indigenous housing organisations needing major repairs, by state and territory, 2001

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
No. of dwellings needing major repair	741	59	1,326	636	187	33	—	1,042	4,024
Total no. of dwellings	4,079	416	5,673	3,273	1,004	118	9	6,715	21,287
Proportion of dwellings needing major repair (%)	18.2	14.2	23.4	19.4	18.6	28.0	—	15.5	18.9

Source: ABS 2001 CHINS (ABS, 2002).

- The CHINS estimated that there were 4,024 permanent dwellings managed by Indigenous housing organisations that needed major repairs. Queensland (1,326) had

the largest number of dwellings requiring major repair followed by the Northern Territory (1,042).

- Tasmania (28.0%) had the highest proportion of dwellings requiring major repair followed by Queensland (23.4%).

Data from the NATSISS show a high proportion of dwellings with structural problems across all tenure types (Table 1.4). The NATSISS asked households whether the dwelling in which they lived had structural problems. (This included rising damp, major cracks in floors or walls, sinking or moving foundations, sagging floors, walls and windows out of plumb, wood rot/termite damage, major electrical problems, major plumbing problems, major roof defect.)

Table 1.4: Number and proportion of Indigenous households in dwellings with structural problems, by tenure type, 2002

	Home owner/ purchaser	Renter state/ territory housing	Renter Indigenous/ community housing	Private renter	Other	Total
No. of Indigenous households in dwellings with structural problems	11,300	15,700	13,400	13,700	3,900	58,100
Total no. of Indigenous households	50,400	37,700	24,500	40,700	12,200	165,700
Proportion of Indigenous households in dwellings with structural problems (%)	22.3	41.8	54.9	33.7	32.0	35.1

Notes

1. Renter state/territory housing includes households in public housing and SOMIH. Renter Indigenous/community housing includes households in mainstream and Indigenous community housing. Other includes households renting from relatives, employers, caravan park owners/managers and other landlords, as well as those living rent free and those in rent/buy schemes.
2. Numbers are rounded to the nearest hundred.

Source: ABS 2002 NATSISS.

- Across all tenure types there were 58,100 Indigenous households in Australia who reported that the dwelling in which they lived had structural problems. This represented 35.1% of all Indigenous households in Australia.
- The highest proportion of Indigenous households in dwellings with structural problems was among those renting from Indigenous or community housing (54.9%) followed by those renting from state or territory housing authorities (41.8%). The lowest proportion of households with structural problems was among home owners (22.3%).

Table 1.5: Number and proportion of Indigenous households in dwellings with structural problems, by state and territory, by tenure type, 2002

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	NT	Aust ^(a)
No. of Indigenous households in dwellings with structural problems							
Home owner/purchaser	4,700	1,100	2,700	900 *	700	300 *	11,300
Renters ^(b)	14,700	3,100	11,500	6,100	2,800	4,900	44,800
Total tenures ^(c)	20,200	4,500	14,400	7,300	3,600	5,500	58,100
Total no. of Indigenous households							
Home owner/purchaser	17,900	4,500	13,400	4,900	2,800	1,700	50,400
Renters ^(b)	35,700	7,400	29,900	14,700	6,600	10,200	109,100
Total tenures ^(c)	55,900	12,300	44,200	20,900	9,600	12,600	165,700
Proportion of households in dwellings with structural problems (%)							
Home owner/purchaser	26.4	23.4	20.0	19.0 *	26.0	17.6 *	22.3
Renters ^(b)	41.2	42.5	38.4	41.3	41.8	47.9	41.1
Total tenures ^(c)	36.1	36.3	32.5	34.9	37.5	43.9	35.1

* Estimates with a relative standard error between 25% and 50% should be used with caution.

(a) Includes Tasmania and the Australian Capital Territory. Relative standard errors for Tasmania and the Australian Capital Territory were high and therefore these jurisdictions were not reported separately.

(b) Includes renter households in public housing, SOMIH, mainstream and Indigenous community housing, private renters and all other renters.

(c) Includes other tenure types (those living rent free and in rent buy schemes).

Note: Numbers are rounded to the nearest hundred.

Source: ABS 2002 NATSISS.

- The largest number of Indigenous households who reported structural problems was in New South Wales (20,200) followed by Queensland (14,400).
- The proportion of households with structural problems was highest in the Northern Territory (43.9%), in particular among renters (47.9%). This probably reflects the high proportion of community housing in the Northern Territory.

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.

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; and
- \$100,000 or more for high cost areas.

Scope

ICH only, but in the future will also be reported for SOMIH.

Data sources

The data provided for this indicator are from the 2001 CHINS for ICH only. Data for this indicator are not included in the AIHW 2003–04 NRF data collection.

Data

Table 1.6: Number and proportion of permanent dwellings managed by Indigenous housing organisations needing replacement, by state and territory, 2001

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	NT	Aust ^(a)
No. of dwellings needing replacement	91	21	490	427	109	650	1,790
Total no. of dwellings	4,079	416	5,673	3,273	1,004	6,715	21,287
Proportion of dwellings needing replacement (%)	2.2	5.0	8.6	13.0	10.9	9.7	8.4

(a) Includes Tasmania and the Australian Capital Territory.

Source: ABS 2001 CHINS (ABS, 2002).

- In 2001 there were 1,790 (8.4%) permanent dwellings managed by Indigenous housing organisations in Australia that needed replacement. The Northern Territory (650) had

the largest number of dwellings needing replacement followed by Queensland (490) and Western Australia (427).

- Western Australia had the highest proportion of permanent dwellings needing replacement (13%), followed by South Australia (10.9%) and the Northern Territory (9.7%).

Indicators 5 and 6. 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.

Data sources

Qualitative information for this indicator was collected from states and territories, but not from FaCS, in the 2003–04 NRF data collection.

Data

Summary of the qualitative data

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. Jurisdictions noted that the state or territory standards were generally more rigorous than the national standards.

The mechanisms that are in place to ensure that houses and major upgrades conform to the relevant standards

- In New South Wales, the Aboriginal Housing Organisation (AHO) inspects all new houses and a proportion of SOMIH houses upgraded under the upgrade program. The AHO also works with ICHOs to ensure that all completed work meets with the maintenance standards.
- In Queensland inspections occur at several stages of the construction process and final approval is not made until a three-month post-construction inspection has occurred.

- In South Australia there are also regular inspections of new buildings constructed, and upgrades and payments are not processed if the work does not comply with the required standards.

Qualitative data from each jurisdiction

New South Wales

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

The AHO previously developed its own *Standards for Building and Buying Aboriginal Housing in NSW* and this document is referred to in the *National Framework for the Design, Construction and Maintenance of Indigenous Housing*. All properties constructed by the AHO are designed to meet at least the minimum standards and in nearly all cases will be above the minimum standards as set down in this document.

Both the construction and the maintenance standards are currently being reviewed and will become part of a joint standard covering both construction and maintenance. The review involves consultation with ICHOs.

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

All AHO constructions are managed by Residential Technologies Australia (Resitech) which provide designs that are approved by the AHO. If the property is managed by a local ICHO, then it will also be involved in the design process. The AHO has also developed maintenance standards. 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 the AHO believes the standard of work may be questionable. The AHO inspects all new houses and a proportion of SOMIH houses upgraded under the AHO upgrade program.

The AHO has been building up its staff resources to meet the demands from ICHOs to maintain a quality standard of work carried out by contractors under state-wide programs. The staff work with the ICHOs to ensure all completed works meet the developed maintenance standards. Staff inspect the works and either approve them or request that further rectifications be carried out before the works are viewed as complete and final payments approved.

Queensland

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

All construction works undertaken (new or upgrades) must comply with the Building Code of Australia (BCA), appropriate Australian Standards, the *Queensland Building Act 1975* and relevant local Council by-laws or regulations. The minimum building standards of the Department of Housing specify that all dwelling sites must be connected to essential services such as water, sewerage, proper drainage and electricity before building can commence.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Housing seeks to ensure that a consistent framework is applied in the provision of housing. This framework minimises sub-standard construction and the effects of this on communities, such as poor health and inappropriate housing. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Housing applies The National Framework for the Design, Construction and Maintenance of Indigenous Housing.

The minimum standards developed by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Housing seek to take account of conditions on Indigenous communities. Accordingly, factual material is presented in detail so that each individual community can, in conjunction with local knowledge, improve construction standards.

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

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Housing inspectors must approve all pre-construction plans to ensure proposed new dwellings and major upgrades conform to all standards before building or upgrades commence. The inspectors also conduct inspections at several stages during construction to ensure that dwellings conform to approved plans.

Construction that does not conform to standards cannot commence or advance until non-conformance is corrected. As an additional check, a percentage of the capital grant is withheld until construction is completed, and not released until a three-month post-construction inspection insures complete compliance. Additionally, Assistance Agreements specify that payments will be made once work is certified by an appropriately qualified person that all work has been satisfactorily completed.

Western Australia

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

All of new houses built under the Community Construction Program meet Western Australia Code of Practice, which is consistent with the National Framework. All urban construction meets local and state authority standards. All houses are upgraded to the National Framework standard. One hundred and thirty upgrades were undertaken in 2003-2004.

The mechanisms are in place to ensure that houses and major upgrades conform to the relevant standards

Aboriginal Housing and Infrastructure Directorate project managers must approve all pre-construction plans to ensure compliance with minimum standards before building or renovations proceed. For new construction projects, physical inspections are carried out on a minimum of six occasions during the construction process.

A percentage of the total construction costs are retained for the duration of the 'defects liability' period. The funds are released following a final inspection if the inspection report deems the product to be satisfactory.

South Australia

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

All new houses and upgrades must meet the national standards.

The mechanisms are in place to ensure that houses and major upgrades conform to the relevant standards

The Aboriginal Housing Authority (AHA) has continued to undertake the following processes when constructing or upgrading properties:

- extensive consultation with community members on the location, layout, positioning, and construction fabrics for all new buildings;

- ensuring tender documentation reflects the requirements outlined in the National Indigenous Housing Guide, Building Codes, local council guidelines and the Minister's Specification SA 78A – Housing on designated Aboriginal lands; and
- regular inspections by qualified asset officers to ensure new buildings and upgrade works are carried out in accordance with related building codes, specifications and local council and AHA requirements. Payments are not processed if work does not comply with the required standards.

AHA Accommodation Standards for new builds and upgrades in the ICH Program ensures all houses are fitted with air conditioning and rainwater tanks.

Fixing Houses for Better Health

During 2003–04 the AHA was appointed as the Project Licence Holder, and jointly project managed the Fixing Houses for Better Health Program (FHBH) across the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Lands. The FHBH involves a team of people including local Indigenous community representatives and licensed tradespeople conducting a 230-point check of health hardware items in each house in a community. The benefits of the FHBH methodology are:

- assessment of the function rates of health hardware in all houses in a community;
- immediate fixing of urgent or minor health hardware items in houses;
- data that can be used by communities to assist in housing management and maintenance as well as by governments for policy development and evaluation, and program planning;
- community involvement in the projects including paid employment;
- provision of training in health hardware assessment and basic repairs; and
- raised community awareness of the relationship of functioning houses and good health.

Australian Capital Territory

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

In the Australian Capital Territory, all new public housing properties acquired by Housing ACT and all properties newly leased by Housing ACT to community organisations, meet territory and national minimum standards.

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

In managing public housing assets, Housing ACT operates under the Public Housing Asset Management Strategy 2003–2008. A key element of the strategy is to 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 new houses and upgrades conform to national standards.

Indicator 7. 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.

An 'organised system':

- for sewerage, relates to those organised on a community basis. It includes connected to town system, community water borne system, septic tanks, pit or pan toilets, other organised system such as chemical or biological systems.
- for water, relates to a supply that is organised on a community basis. It includes connected to town supply, bore water, rainwater tanks, well or spring, water pumped from a river or reservoir, or other type of organised supply. It does not include individuals bringing water to the community for personal consumption.
- for electricity, relates to an organised electricity supply that can include those organised on a community basis and those organised for individual houses. It includes 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 2001 CHINS for ICH only. Data for this indicator were not included in the AIHW 2003-04 NRF data collection.

Data

Table 1.7: Number and proportion of discrete Indigenous communities not connected to water, sewerage and electricity, by state and territory, 2001

	NSW	Qld	WA	SA	NT	Aust ^(a)
No. of discrete Indigenous communities not connected						
Water	—	1	13	—	7	21
Sewerage	1	10	23	—	57	91
Electricity	—	12	21	2	45	80
Total no. of discrete Indigenous communities						
	60	142	283	96	632	1,216
Proportion of discrete Indigenous communities not connected (%)						
Water	—	0.7	4.6	—	1.1	1.7
Sewerage	1.7	7.0	8.1	—	9.0	7.5
Electricity	—	8.5	7.4	2.1	7.1	6.6

(a) Victoria and Tasmania included in Australian total for confidentiality reasons.

Source: ABS 2001 CHINS (ABS, 2002).

- Throughout Australia there were 21 (1.7%) discrete Indigenous communities not connected to an organised water supply, 91 (7.5%) not connected to an organised sewerage system and 80 (6.6%) not connected to an organised electricity supply.
- In New South Wales, all discrete Indigenous communities were connected to organised water, sewerage and electricity services.
- Western Australia had the highest proportion of communities not connected to a water supply (4.6%), the Northern Territory (9.2%) had the highest proportion not connected to sewerage and Queensland (8.5%) had the highest proportion not connected to electricity.

Indicator 8. 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:

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

divided by the total number of permanent ICH dwellings.

An 'organised system':

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

Scope

ICH only.

Data sources

Data for this indicator were collected from states and territories and from FaCS in the 2003–04 NRF data collection.

Data

Table 1.8: Number and proportion of dwellings not connected to water, sewerage or electricity, by state and territory, 30 June 2004

	NSW	Vic	Qld ^(a)	WA	SA ^(b)	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
No. of dwellings not connected									
Water									
State ICH	n.a.	..	—	190	31	..	—	94	315
FaCS ICH	..	1	28	—	—	..	29
Sewerage									
State ICH	n.a.	..	—	236	31	..	—	1,275	1,542
FaCS ICH	..	—	73	3	—	..	76
Electricity									
State ICH	n.a.	..	—	151	31	..	—	143	325
FaCS ICH	..	1	54	—	—	..	55
Total no. of permanent dwellings									
State ICH	4,616	..	3,676	2,490	1,092	..	12	6,064	17,950
FaCS ICH	..	476	2,358	128	20	..	2,982
Proportion of dwellings not connected (%)									
Water									
State ICH	n.a.	..	—	7.6	2.8	..	—	1.6	1.8
FaCS ICH	..	0.2	1.2	—	—	..	1.0
Sewerage									
State ICH	n.a.	..	—	9.5	2.8	..	—	21.0	8.6
FaCS ICH	..	—	3.1	2.3	—	..	2.5
Electricity									
State ICH	n.a.	..	—	6.1	2.8	..	—	2.4	1.8
FaCS ICH	..	0.2	2.3	—	—	..	1.8

(a) FaCS ICH data for Queensland do not include that for Gladstone, Cunnamulla, Cherbourg and Logan City.

(b) Data for South Australia relate to the number of permanent dwellings in communities not connected to these services.

Note: The scope of the ICH data collection is dwellings managed by funded or registered ICHOs. The data for Western Australia, however, cover all ICH in that state and the shading indicates that these data should not be compared with data from other jurisdictions.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection.

- The majority of ICH permanent dwellings were connected to water, sewerage and electricity (Table 1.8). Across Australia, however, there were 344 ICH permanent dwellings not connected to water, 1,618 not connected to sewerage and 380 not connected to electricity.
- Western Australia had the highest proportion of dwellings not connected to an organised water supply (7.6%) and the highest proportion not connected to an organised electricity supply (6.1%). This is likely to be partly related to the broader scope of ICH data which includes all ICH dwellings not just those managed by funded or registered ICHOs.

- Of the remaining jurisdictions, the Northern Territory (21%) had the highest proportion of dwellings not connected to an organised sewerage system and South Australia (2.8%) had the highest proportion not connected to an organised water or electricity supply.

Indicator 9. Proportion of dwellings meeting the nine FHBH healthy living standards

Purpose

This indicator reports on the national framework for the design, construction and maintenance of Indigenous housing. The framework states that houses should be designed, constructed and maintained to support nine healthy living practices that are essential for good health.

Description

The number of permanent ICH dwellings that meet the nine FHBH healthy living practices divided by the total number of ICH permanent dwellings.

Principle 2 of the national principles states that, 'Houses will be designed, constructed and maintained to support the nine healthy living practices,' (in order of priority):

1. Washing people, particularly children under five years of age
2. Washing clothes and bedding
3. Removing waste safely from the living area
4. Improving nutrition – the ability to store, prepare and cook food
5. Reducing crowding and the potential for the spread of infectious disease
6. Reducing negative contact between people and animals, vermin or insects
7. Reducing the negative impact of dust
8. Controlling the temperature of the living environment
9. Reducing trauma (or minor injury) around the house and living environment.

Scope

All Indigenous households and ICH.

Data sources

Data for this indicator were not included in the AIHW 2003–04 NRF data collection.

Alternative data from the 2002 NATSISS for all tenure types were provided for the following three healthy living practices:

1. Washing people, particularly children under five years of age
2. Washing clothes and bedding
4. Improving nutrition – the ability to store, prepare and cook food.

For healthy living practice 5 see Indicator 23 – Proportion of overcrowded households.

Data

- The majority of Indigenous people in all jurisdictions reported that they were in houses that had working facilities for washing people, washing clothes or bedding, and for storing and preparing food.
- The proportion of Indigenous people with working facilities for these three FHBH healthy living standards was lowest in the Northern Territory, with:
 - 94.4% of people having working facilities for washing people;
 - 93.9% of people having working facilities for washing clothes/bedding; and
 - 68.5% of people having working facilities for storing/preparing food.
- The proportion of people with these three working facilities did not vary significantly by tenure type, except that renters of social housing (87.7%) were less likely to have working facilities for storing/preparing food than were home owners (98.2%) or other renters (97.1%).

Table 1.9: Number and proportion of Indigenous persons aged 15 years and over in dwellings meeting the nine FHBH healthy living standards, by state and territory, by tenure type, 2002

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
No. of persons in dwellings meeting standards									
Has working facilities for washing people									
Home owner/purchaser	26,800	6,000	20,200	7,300	4,300	6,200	1,100	2,700	74,600
Renters social housing	28,900	5,600	33,500	21,100	8,200	2,200	800	27,700	127,900
Private and other renters	23,900	5,200	20,100	8,700	2,800	2,100	700	2,600 *	66,200
Total	83,200	17,400	75,300	39,000	15,600	10,900	2,500	34,200	278,200
Has working facilities for washing clothes/ bedding									
Home owner/purchaser	26,900	6,000	20,000	7,200	4,300	6,200	1,100	2,700	74,400
Renters social housing	28,500	5,600	34,100	21,100	8,200	2,200	800	27,500	127,800
Private and other renters	23,600	5,100	19,700	8,500	2,800	2,100	700	2,600 *	65,100
Total	82,800	17,100	75,300	38,800	15,600	10,800	2,500	34,000	276,800
Has working facilities for storing/ preparing food									
Home owner/purchaser	26,200	5,900	20,100	7,100	4,300	6,200	1,100	2,600	73,500
Renters social housing	28,000	5,500	32,800	18,100	7,400	2,100	800	19,400	113,900
Private and other renters	23,700	5,200	19,400	8,300	2,800	2,100	700	2,500 *	64,600
Total	81,400	17,000	73,800	35,500	14,700	10,700	2,500	24,800	260,400
Total no. of persons									
Home owner/purchaser	27,000	6,000	20,200	7,300	4,300	6,200	1,100	2,700	74,800
Renters social housing	28,900	5,600	34,200	21,500	8,300	2,200	800	28,500	129,900
Private and other renters	24,100	5,200	20,100	8,800	2,800	2,100	700	2,700 *	66,600
Total	83,800	17,400	76,000	39,600	15,800	10,900	2,600	36,200	282,200

(continued)

Table 1.9 (continued): Number and proportion of Indigenous persons aged 15 years and over in dwellings meeting the nine FHBH healthy living standards, by state and territory, by tenure type, 2002

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Proportion of persons in dwellings meeting standards (%)									
Has working facilities for washing people									
Home owner/purchaser	99.1	100.0	100.0	99.9	99.7	100.0	99.3	100.0	99.6
Renters social housing	100.0	100.0	98.0	98.0	98.9	100.0	100.0	97.2	98.5
Private and other renters	99.3	100.0	99.8	98.8	99.6	100.0	100.0	98.4 *	99.4
Total	99.4	100.0	99.0	98.6	99.1	99.8	99.7	94.4	98.6
Has working facilities for washing clothes/ bedding									
Home owner/purchaser	99.6	99.6	99.2	99.2	99.6	99.4	99.3	100.0	99.4
Renters social housing	98.6	99.3	99.6	98.0	98.9	100.0	96.7	96.5	98.4
Private and other renters	98.2	96.7	97.9	96.8	97.7	97.5	97.2	98.4 *	97.8
Total	98.9	98.0	99.1	98.0	98.8	99.0	98.0	93.9	98.1
Has working facilities for storing/ preparing food									
Home owner/purchaser	97.1	97.2	99.7	98.0	99.3	99.5	99.3	96.5	98.2
Renters social housing	97.0	97.5	95.8	84.0	89.1	95.2	99.4	68.2	87.7
Private and other renters	98.3	98.9	96.5	94.6	97.1	99.6	96.9	93.2 *	97.1
Total	97.1	97.2	97.1	89.7	93.4	98.5	98.7	68.5	92.3

* Estimate with a relative standard error between 25% and 50% should be used with caution.

Notes

1. Renters social housing includes persons in public housing, SOMIH, mainstream and Indigenous community housing. Private and other renters includes all other renters. Total includes other tenure types.
2. Numbers are rounded to the nearest hundred.

Source: ABS 2002 NATSISS.

Indicator 22. 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 or more children – four bedrooms.

Scope

All Indigenous households, and both ICH and SOMIH.

Data sources

Data for this indicator for ICH were collected from states and territories (but not from FaCS) in the 2003–04 NRF data collection, though most jurisdictions could not provide data on total number of bedrooms required or number of households requiring additional bedrooms.

Data for all tenure types from the ABS 2001 Census and 2002 NATSISS are also provided.

Data

For the AIHW NRF data collection, only South Australia and Queensland could provide ICH data on the total and average number of additional bedrooms required.

Table 1.10: Total and average number of additional bedrooms required in Indigenous community housing, by state and territory, 30 June 2004

	NSW	Vic	Qld ^(a)	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Total no. of additional bedrooms required									
State ICH	n.a.	..	4,656	n.a.	2,569	..	—	n.a.	n.a.
Average no. required per household									
State ICH	n.a.	..	2.9	n.a.	3.3	..	—	n.a.	n.a.

(a) Queensland data is for August 2003 not June 2004.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection.

- In South Australia there were 2,569 additional bedrooms required, an average of 3.3 per household.
- In Queensland a total of 4,656 additional bedrooms were required, an average of 2.9 per household.

Table 1.11: Total and average number of additional bedrooms required for Indigenous households in all tenure types, by state and territory, 2001

	NSW/ACT	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	NT	Aust
No. of additional bedrooms required	7,282	1,488	9,998	5,687	1,937	534	11,451	38,377
No. of households requiring additional bedrooms	5,470	1,143	6,111	3,082	1,137	459	3,873	21,275
Average no. of additional bedrooms required	1.3	1.3	1.6	1.8	1.7	1.2	3.0	1.8

Source: ABS 2001 Census.

- Using the Census data for all tenure types, there were an estimated 38,377 additional bedrooms required to meet the Proxy Occupancy Standard. The greatest number was required by the Northern Territory (11,451), followed by Queensland (9,998).
- The average number of additional bedrooms required ranged from 1.2 in Tasmania to 3.0 in the Northern Territory.

Table 1.12: Average number of additional bedrooms required in Indigenous households, by tenure type, 2001

	Home owner/ purchaser	Renter state / territory housing	Renter Indigenous/ community housing	Private renter	Rent free/other	Total
No. of additional bedrooms required	4,579	6,578	17,300	6,373	3,547	38,377
No. of households requiring additional bedrooms	3,480	4,519	6,423	5,004	1,849	21,275
Average no. of additional bedrooms required	1.3	1.5	2.7	1.3	1.9	1.8

Note: Renter state/territory housing in households in public housing and SOMIH, Renter Indigenous/community housing includes households in mainstream and indigenous community housing. Rent free/other includes households renting from relatives, employers, caravan park owners/managers and other landlords as well as those living rent free and those in rent/buy schemes.

Source: ABS 2001 Census.

- The number of additional bedrooms required to meet the Proxy Occupancy Standard differed by tenure type with households in Indigenous community housing (17,300) requiring the largest number of additional bedrooms.
- The average number of additional bedrooms required ranged from 1.3 per household for home owners and private renters to 2.7 per household for those living in Indigenous or community housing.

Indicator 23. Proportion of overcrowded households

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

The number of Indigenous households that require two or more additional bedrooms to meet the Proxy Occupancy Standard, divided by the total number of Indigenous households. For information on the Proxy Occupancy Standard (see Indicator 22). Households that require two or more additional bedrooms to meet the standard are regarded as overcrowded.

Scope

All Indigenous households, and both ICH and SOMIH.

Data sources

Data for this indicator for ICH were collected from states and territories and from FaCS in the 2003–04 NRF data collection, though many jurisdictions could not provide these data. Alternative data on the average number of bedrooms were therefore provided. The SOMIH data were collected by the AIHW in the national CSHA data collection.

Alternative data for all tenure types from the ABS 2001 Census and 2002 NATSISS are also provided.

Data

Table 1.13: Number and proportion of overcrowded SOMIH and ICH households, by state and territory, 30 June 2004

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
No. of overcrowded households									
State ICH	n.a.	..	1,169	n.a.	518	..	—	n.a.	n.a.
FaCS ICH ^(a)	..	24	660 ^(b)	2	10 ^(c)	..	696
SOMIH ^(d)	39	21 ^(e)	178	21	22	1	282
Total no. of households^(f)									
State ICH	n.a.	..	3,676	n.a.	n.a.	..	12	n.a.	3,688
FaCS ICH ^(a)	..	476	2,358 ^(b)	128	20 ^(c)	..	2,982
SOMIH ^(d)	3,176	1,041 ^(e)	2,642	2,079	1,548	299	10,785
Proportion of overcrowded households (%)									
State ICH	n.a.	..	31.8	n.a.	n.a.	..	—	n.a.	n.a.
FaCS ICH ^(a)	..	5.0	28.0 ^(b)	1.6	50.0 ^(c)	..	23.3
SOMIH ^(d)	1.2	2.0 ^(e)	6.7	1.0	1.4	0.3	2.6

(a) FaCS data for all jurisdictions were the estimated numbers of overcrowded households.

(b) FaCS ICH data for Queensland do not include that for Gladstone, Cunnamulla, Cherbourg and Logan City.

(c) FaCS ICH data for the Australian Capital Territory do not include that for Southside.

(d) SOMIH data are for 30 June 2003. Data include multi-family households in Victoria and Queensland, but not in other jurisdictions.

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

(f) Refers to total number of households for which household groups and dwelling details were known.

Sources: AIHW NRF data collection and CSHA SOMIH data collection.

- In Queensland there were 1,169 overcrowded households in state administered ICH dwellings and 660 overcrowded households in FaCS administered ICH dwellings.
- The proportion of overcrowded ICH households ranged from 5% for FaCS administered ICH dwellings in Victoria to 50% of FaCS administered ICH dwellings in the Australian Capital Territory.
- There were 282 overcrowded SOMIH households at 30 June 2003. The largest number of overcrowded households was in Queensland (178) followed by New South Wales (39).
- The proportion of overcrowded SOMIH households was relatively low, ranging from 0.3% in Tasmania to 6.7% of households in Queensland.

Table 1.14: Number of people, number of bedrooms and average number of people per bedroom in Indigenous community housing permanent dwellings, by state and territory, 30 June 2004

	NSW	Vic	Qld ^(a)	WA	SA	Tas	ACT ^(b)	NT	Aust
No. of people in permanent dwellings									
State ICH	12,032	..	18,188	11,300	7,186	..	36	46,908	95,650
FaCS ICH	..	1,340	5,154	430	38	..	6,962
No. of bedrooms in permanent dwellings									
State ICH	10,526	..	9,906	6,881	2,855	..	36	17,556	47,760
FaCS ICH	..	1,056	5,928	354	58	..	7,396
Average no. of people per bedroom									
State ICH	1.1	..	1.8	1.6	2.5	..	1.0	2.7	2.0
FaCS ICH	..	1.1	0.8	1.1	0.6	..	0.8

(a) Data for Queensland state ICH were collected in April 2003 not June 2004. FaCS ICH data for Queensland do not include that for Gladstone, Cunnamulla, Cherbourg and Logan City.

(b) FaCS ICH data for the Australian Capital Territory do not include that for Southside.

Note: The scope of the ICH data collection is dwellings managed by funded or registered ICHOs. The data for Western Australia, however, cover all ICH in that state and the shading indicates that these data should not be compared with data from other jurisdictions.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection.

- There were 95,650 people living in ICH permanent dwellings in Australia and 47,760 bedrooms in these dwellings.
- The average number of people per bedroom was 2.0 for state administered ICH dwellings and 0.8 for FaCS administered ICH dwellings.
- The average number of people per bedroom in ICH dwellings was highest in the Northern Territory (2.7), followed by South Australia (2.5).

Table 1.15: Number and proportion of Indigenous households that were overcrowded, by tenure type, by state and territory, 2001

	NSW/ACT	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	NT	Aust ^(a)
No. of overcrowded Indigenous households								
Home owner/ purchaser	273	57	223	107	36	23	68	787
Renter state/ territory housing	298	71	344	325	100	20	139	1,297
Renter Indigenous/ community housing	210	15	866	633	187	—	2,041	3,952
Private renter	354	80	432	97	29	18	52	1,062
Other	137	34	239	142	35	9	224	820
Total	1,272	257	2,104	1,304	387	70	2,524	7,918
Total no. of Indigenous households								
Home owner/ purchaser	17,407	4,665	11,259	4,812	2,627	3,835	1,619	46,224
Renter state/ territory housing	10,795	2,232	6,084	4,829	2,629	1,218	1,605	29,395
Renter Indigenous/ community housing	3,075	351	4,506	2,118	779	53	4,499	15,381
Private renter	14,495	3,253	13,546	3,446	1,758	1,678	1,065	39,244
Other	4,189	1,035	4,080	2,088	800	455	1,864	14,511
Total	49,961	11,536	39,475	17,293	8,593	7,239	10,652	144,755
Proportion of overcrowded households (%)								
Home owner/ purchaser	1.6	1.2	2.0	2.2	1.4	0.6	4.2	1.7
Renter state/ territory housing	2.8	3.2	5.7	6.7	3.8	1.6	8.7	4.4
Renter Indigenous/ community housing	6.8	4.3	19.2	29.9	24.0	—	45.4	25.7
Private renter	2.4	2.5	3.2	2.8	1.6	1.1	4.9	2.7
Other	3.3	3.3	5.9	6.8	4.4	2.0	12.0	5.7
Total	2.5	2.2	5.3	7.5	4.5	1.0	23.7	5.5

(a) Total for Australia includes 'not stated' state/territory.

Notes

1. Renter state/territory housing includes households in public housing and SOMIH. Renter Indigenous/community housing includes households in mainstream and Indigenous community housing. Private renter includes those renting privately with landlord not in same household and those renting from a real estate agent. Other includes households renting from relatives, employers, caravan park owners/managers and other landlords not elsewhere classified as well as those living rent free and those in rent/buy schemes.
2. Overcrowding is measured using the Proxy Occupancy Standard.

Source: ABS 2001 Census.

- Based on the 2001 Census it was estimated that there were 7,918 (5.5%) overcrowded Indigenous households in Australia. The highest number of overcrowded households was in the Northern Territory (2,524) followed by the Queensland (2,104).
- The highest proportion of overcrowded Indigenous households was in the Northern Territory where just under one-quarter (23.7%) of households were overcrowded.

Western Australia (7.5%) and Queensland (5.3%) also had relatively high proportions of overcrowded households.

- In relation to tenure type, the highest proportion of overcrowded households were renters of Indigenous or community housing (25.7%).
- There were particularly high rates of overcrowding among renters of Indigenous or community housing in the Northern Territory (45.4%) and Western Australia (29.9%).

Indicator 24. Proportion of households paying 25% or more 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 25% or more of their income in rent.

Description

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

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 as well as SOMIH households. Data for ICH will be collected in the future.

Data sources

The SOMIH data provided for this indicator were from the CSHA data collection. Data on low income Indigenous rental households are from the ABS 2001 Census.

Data

Table 1.16: Number and proportion of SOMIH households paying 25% or more of income in rent, by state and territory, 30 June 2004

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
No. of households paying 25% or more of income in rent	—	2	—	85	21	119	227
Total no. of households ^(a)	3,425	1,080	2,006	1,923	1,395	282	10,111
Proportion of households paying 25% or more of income in rent (%)	—	0.2	—	4.4	1.5	42.2	2.2

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

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

Source: CSHA SOMIH data collection.

- There were 227 SOMIH households in Australia who paid 25% or more of their income in rent. Most of these households were in Tasmania (119).
- The proportion of SOMIH households who paid 25% or more of their income in rent was less than 5% in all jurisdictions except Tasmania where 42.2% of households paid 25% or more of their income in rent.

Table 1.17: Number and proportion of low income rental Indigenous households^(a) paying 25% or more of their income in rent, by state and territory, 2002

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust ^(b)
No. of households with affordability need	5,443	1,140	4,527	1,678	938	579	144	561	15,013
Total no. of low income households	11,569	2,139	19,483	4,588	2,342	1,481	247	2,898	34,799
Proportion of households with affordability need (%)	47.1	53.3	47.7	36.6	40.1	39.1	58.3	19.4	43.2

(a) Includes households in the bottom 40% of all Australian gross household incomes paying more than 25% of their incomes in rent. There were 15,013 Indigenous households in the Census who met this definition. Most of these (13,524) were private renters.

(b) Total for Australia includes households in other territories.

Source: ABS 2001 Census – Customised tables.

- Across Australia there were 15,013 Indigenous low income households were paying more than 25% of their gross income in rent.
- Approximately one-third of these households were in New South Wales (5,443) and one-third in Queensland (4,527).
- There were 43.2% of low income Indigenous households paying more than 25% of their income in rent.
- The highest proportions of Indigenous households paying more than 25% of their income in rent were in the Australian Capital Territory (58.3%) and Victoria (53.3%).
- The lowest proportion of Indigenous households paying 25% or more of their income in rent was in Northern Territory (19.4%).

Indicator 35. Proportion of clients satisfied with (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 number of Indigenous tenants satisfied with amenity or location of dwelling divided by the total number of Indigenous tenants.

Scope

ICH and SOMIH.

Data sources

No data were collected for this indicator. Data for Indigenous public housing tenants and SOMIH tenants will be collected in the 2005 National Social Housing Surveys and will be available for the 2004–05 report.

Outcome 2: Better housing services

Services that are well managed and sustainable

- Indicator 4:** Proportion of dwellings needing replacement
(Data provided under Outcome 1)
- Indicator 10:** Average weekly rent collected
- Indicator 11:** Rent collected as a percentage of total rent charged
- Indicator 12, 13:** Total, and average, amount spent on maintenance each year
- Indicator 14:** Maintenance expenditure as a proportion of rent collected
- Indicator 15:** Recurrent to capital expenditure ratio
- Indicator 26:** Number of Indigenous community housing organisations
- Indicator 27:** Proportion of organisations that have a housing management plan
- Indicator 28:** What jurisdictions are doing to assist ICHOs to develop and implement housing management plans
- Indicator 29:** Proportion of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who have completed accredited training in housing management and related areas
- Indicator 30:** Proportion of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who are undertaking accredited training in housing management and related areas
- Indicator 36:** Proportion of clients satisfied with quality of the service provided
- Indicator 38:** Proportion of organisations using rent deduction schemes

This outcome area contains 14 indicators that relate to the management and sustainability of housing services. The proportion of dwellings needing replacement is included in this outcome area, as well as under Outcome 1 where the data were reported.

Five indicators in this outcome area relate to the financial management of housing services. These include the average weekly rent collected, rent collected as a proportion of rent charged, the amount spent on maintenance and the recurrent to capital expenditure ratio.

There are a number of indicators that relate specifically to ICHOs. These are the number of ICHOs, the proportion of organisations that have a housing management plan, and the proportion of Indigenous employees who are undertaking or have completed accredited training. Increasing the numbers of Indigenous employees provides employment for Indigenous Australians, as well as enabling them to participate in improving housing services. One indicator asks what jurisdictions are doing to assist ICHOs in developing and implementing housing management plans.

For this report, no data were collected on the last two indicators – the proportion of clients satisfied with the quality of service provided and the proportion of organisations using rent deduction schemes.

Indicator 10. 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 tenant households at 30 June.

Scope

ICH and SOMIH.

Data sources

Data for ICH were collected from jurisdictions and from FaCS in the 2003–04 NRF data collection. Data for SOMIH were collected in the CSHA data collection. Alternative data for ICH from the 2001 CHINS are also provided.

Data on median weekly rent paid by households from the 2002 NATSISS are also provided.

Data

Table 2.1: Average weekly rent (\$) collected for Indigenous community housing and SOMIH, by state and territory, for the year ending 30 June 2004

	NSW ^(a)	Vic	Qld ^(b)	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
	\$per week								
State ICH ^(c)	39	..	45	n.a.	22 ^(d)	..	118	31	n.a.
FaCS ICH ^(c)	..	56	76	68	73	..	72
SOMIH	91	90 ^(e)	87	88	85	74	88

(a) New South Wales data based only on organisations registered with the AHO in the current year.

(b) FaCS ICH data for Queensland do not include that for Gladstone, Cunnamulla, Cherbourg and Logan City.

(c) The state ICH data for New South Wales and the Northern Territory, and the FaCS data for all jurisdictions are for average rent per dwelling not per household.

(d) Data are for 37 of the 46 ICH organisations.

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

Sources: AIHW NRF data collection and CSHA SOMIH data collection.

- The average weekly rent collected for ICH dwellings ranged from \$22 for South Australia state administered ICH dwellings to \$118 for the Australian Capital Territory state administered ICH dwellings.
- For SOMIH dwellings average weekly rents were higher and ranged from \$74 in Tasmania to \$91 in New South Wales.

Table 2.2: Average weekly rent (\$) collected for permanent dwellings managed by Indigenous housing organisations, by state and territory, 2001

	NSW/ACT ^(a)	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	NT	Aust
Average weekly rent	46	58	50	38	23	61	25	38

(a) Australian Capital Territory included in New South Wales for confidentiality reasons.

Source: ABS 2001 CHINS (ABS, 2002).

- Average weekly rents collected in 2001 for permanent dwellings managed by Indigenous housing organisations ranged from \$25 in the Northern Territory to \$61 in Tasmania.

Table 2.3: Median weekly rent (\$) paid by Indigenous rental households, by landlord type, by state and territory, 2002

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	NT	Aust ^(a)
	\$ per week						
State/ territory housing authority	81	79	83	71	81	80	80
Indigenous/community organisation	81	75	76	41 *	70	30	61
Private and other landlord	150	150	140	125	150	155	140
Total renters	105	107	111	88	91	44	100

* Relative standard error between 25% and 50%. Estimates should be used with caution.

(a) Includes households renting in Tasmania and the Australian Capital Territory.

Source: ABS 2002 NATSISS.

- Across Australia the median weekly rent for all tenure types was \$100.
- Median weekly rent was highest for private and other landlord renters (\$140), followed by renters of state/territory housing (\$80). Median rents were lowest for households in Indigenous or community housing (\$61).
- Median weekly rents were highest in Queensland (\$111), followed by Victoria (\$107) and lowest in the Northern Territory (\$44).

Table 2.4: Median weekly rent (\$) paid by Indigenous rental households, by landlord type, by remoteness, 2002

	State/territory housing authority	Indigenous/community organisation	Private and other landlord	Total renters
	\$ per week			
Non-remote	81	89	141	111
Remote	76	40	101	55
Total	80	61	140	100

Source: ABS 2002 NATSISS.

- Median weekly rent was considerably lower in remote areas (\$55) compared with non-remote areas (\$111).
- The lowest median rents were paid by renters in Indigenous/community housing remote areas (\$40) and the highest median rents were paid by private and other renters in non-remote areas (\$141).

Indicator 11. Rent collected as a percentage of total rent charged

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.

Scope

ICH and SOMIH.

Data sources

Data for this indicator were collected from jurisdictions and from FaCS in the 2003–04 NRF data collection. Data for SOMIH were collected in the CSHA data collection.

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.

Data

Table 2.5: Rent collected, rent charged and rent collected as a percentage of rent charged, for ICH and SOMIH, by state and territory, for the year ending 30 June 2004

	NSW ^(a)	Vic ^(b)	Qld ^(c)	WA	SA ^(d)	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Total rent collected (\$'000)									
State ICH	9,399	..	9,736	n.a.	983	..	73	10,419	28,808 ^(e)
FaCS ICH	..	1,388	9,287	453	76	..	11,204
SOMIH	18,918	5,678	12,346	9,970	7,754	1,291	55,957
Total rent charged (\$'000)									
State ICH	11,019	..	9,714	n.a.	1,906	..	73	9,370	30,290 ^(e)
FaCS ICH	..	1,512	10,136	451	76	..	12,175
SOMIH	18,170	5,691	12,191	9,669	7,991	1,263	54,974
Rent collected as a percentage of rent charged (%)									
State ICH	85.3	..	100.2	n.a.	51.6	..	100.6	111.2	95.1 ^(e)
FaCS ICH	..	91.8	91.6	100.5	100.0	..	92.0
SOMIH	104.1	99.8	101.3	103.1	97.0	102.2	101.8

(a) New South Wales data based only on organisations registered with the AHO in the current year.

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

(c) FaCS ICH data for Queensland do not include that for Gladstone, Cunnamulla, Cherbourg and Logan City.

(d) SA state ICH data are from 37 of the 46 ICH organisations.

(e) Total does not include Western Australia.

Sources: AIHW NRF data collection and CSHA SOMIH data collection.

- For ICH dwellings in 2003–04 most of the rent charged to tenants was collected. The rent collected as a proportion of rent charged ranged from 51.6% for state administered ICH dwellings in South Australia to 111.2% for state administered ICH dwellings in the Northern Territory.
- For SOMIH dwellings the rent collected as a proportion of rent charged was higher than for ICH dwellings and ranged from 97.0% in South Australia to 104.1% in New South Wales.

Indicator 12. 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; and
- (c) other maintenance, e.g. repairs due to vandalism.

Scope

ICH and SOMIH only.

Data sources

Data for this indicator for SOMIH were collected in the 2003–04 NRF data collection. No data for ICH were collected.

Alternative data for ICH from the 2001 CHINS are provided.

Data

Table 2.6: Total amount spent on maintenance for SOMIH, by state and territory, for the year ending 30 June 2004

	NSW	Vic ^(a)	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Total (\$'000)	7,220	1,512	5,861	6,142	5,617	604	26,956

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

Source: CSHA SOMIH data collection.

- There was a total of nearly \$27 million spent on maintenance for SOMIH dwellings in 2003–04.
- The amount spent on maintenance ranged from \$604,000 in Tasmania to \$7.2 million in New South Wales.

Table 2.7: Total amount spent on maintenance by Indigenous housing organisations, by state and territory, 2001

	NSW/ACT ^(a)	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	NT	Aust
Total (\$'000)	7,683	1,052	10,611	7,771	1,277	337	10,837	39,568

(a) New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory combined for confidentiality reasons.

Source: ABS 2001 CHINS (ABS, 2002).

- Indigenous housing organisations spent \$39.6 million on maintenance in the financial year prior to 2001.
- The amount spent on maintenance ranged from \$337,000 in Tasmania to \$10.8 million in the Northern Territory.

Indicator 13. 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 12.

Scope

ICH and SOMIH.

Data sources

Data for this indicator for SOMIH were collected in the 2003–04 NRF data collection. No data for ICH were collected.

Alternative data for ICH from the 2001 CHINS are provided.

Data

Table 2.8: Average amount spent on maintenance for SOMIH, by state and territory, for the year ending 30 June 2004

	NSW	Vic ^(a)	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Average per dwelling (\$)	1,766	1,200	2,085	2,642	2,956	1,771	2,118

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

Source: CSHA SOMIH data collection.

- The average amount spent on maintenance for SOMIH dwellings was \$2,118.
- The average amount spent per dwelling ranged from \$1,200 in Victoria to \$2,956 in South Australia.

Table 2.9: Average amount spent on maintenance by Indigenous housing organisations, by state and territory, 2001

	NSW/ACT ^(a)	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	NT	Aust
Average per permanent dwelling (\$)	1,879	2,529	1,870	2,387	1,272	2,856	1,641	1,870

(a) New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory combined for confidentiality reasons.

Source: ABS 2001 CHINS (ABS, 2002).

- In 2001 the average amount spent on maintenance by Indigenous housing organisations was \$1,870 per permanent dwelling. This was lower than the average amount spent for SOMIH (see Table 2.8).
- The average ranged from \$1,272 per dwelling in South Australia to \$2,856 in Tasmania.

Indicator 14. 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 2004 divided by the total rent collected for the year ending 30 June 2004.

A definition for maintenance is provided under Indicator 12.

Scope

ICH and SOMIH.

Data sources

Data for this indicator for SOMIH were collected in the 2003–04 NRF data collection. No data for ICH were collected.

Alternative data for ICH from the 2001 CHINS are provided.

Data

Table 2.10: Maintenance expenditure, rent collected and maintenance expenditure as a proportion of rent collected for SOMIH, by state and territory, for the year ending 30 June 2004

	NSW	Vic ^(a)	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Maintenance expenditure (\$'000)	7,220	1,512	5,861	6,142	5,617	604	26,956
Rent collected (\$'000)	18,918	5,678	12,346	9,970	7,754	1,291	55,957
Maintenance expenditure as a percentage of rent collected (%)	38.2	26.6	47.5	61.6	72.4	46.8	48.2

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

Source: CSHA SOMIH data collection.

- For SOMIH dwellings, maintenance expenditure comprised 48.2% of the rent collected in 2003–04 .
- Maintenance expenditure as a proportion of rent collected ranged from 26.6% in Victoria to 72.4% in South Australia.

Table 2.11: Maintenance expenditure, rent collected and maintenance expenditure as a proportion of rent collected for Indigenous community housing organisations, by state and territory, 2001

	NSW/ACT ^(a)	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	NT	Aust
Maintenance expenditure (\$'000)	7,683	1,052	10,611	7,771	1,277	337	10,837	39,568
Rent collected (\$'000)	9,742	1,261	14,586	6,428	1,214	376	8,461	42,068
Maintenance expenditure as a percentage of rent collected (%)	79	83	73	121	105	90	128	94

(a) New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory combined for confidentiality reasons.

Source: ABS 2001 CHINS (ABS, 2002).

- Maintenance expenditure as a proportion of rent collected was higher for ICH dwellings than for SOMIH dwellings.
- Expenditure on maintenance as a proportion of rent collected by Indigenous housing organisations ranged from 73% in Queensland to 128% in the Northern Territory.

Indicator 15. 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

ICH and SOMIH.

Data sources

Data for both ICH and SOMIH were collected by the AIHW from states and territories and from FaCS in the 2003–04 NRF data collection.

Data

Table 2.12: Recurrent and capital expenditure and recurrent to capital expenditure ratio for ICH and SOMIH, by state and territory, for the year ending 30 June 2004

	NSW	Vic ^(a)	Qld ^(b)	WA	SA ^(c)	Tas	ACT ^(d)	NT	Aust
Recurrent expenditure (\$'000)									
State ICH	17,794	..	n.a.	n.a.	5,032	..	133	13,513	n.a.
FaCS ICH	..	1,611	9,241	1,886	300	..	13,038
SOMIH	17,066	9,592	20,430	13,718	7,867	1,168	69,841
Capital expenditure (\$'000)									
State ICH	39,006	..	31,030	n.a.	5,021	..	—	22,063	n.a.
FaCS ICH	..	2,387	22,092	1,404	350	..	26,233
SOMIH	18,529	10,953	19,300	6,382	12,537	1,662	69,363
Recurrent to capital ratio									
State ICH	0.46	..	n.a.	n.a.	1.00	..	— ^(e)	0.61	n.a.
FaCS ICH	..	0.67	0.42	1.34	0.86	..	0.50
SOMIH	0.92	0.88	1.06	2.15	0.63	0.70	1.01

(a) FaCS ICH data for Victoria were imputed for Dandenong and Njemda from the average for each item over all other organisations.

(b) FaCS ICH data for Queensland do not include that for Gladstone, Cunnamulla, Cherbourg and Logan City.

(c) The recurrent expenditure data for SA are for 37 of the 46 ICH organisations.

(d) FaCS ICH data for the Australian Capital Territory do not include that for Southside.

(e) There was no capital expenditure for ICH for the ACT in 2003–04.

Sources: AIHW NRF data collection and CSHA SOMIH data collection.

- The recurrent to capital expenditure ratios varied considerably across jurisdictions for both ICH and SOMIH dwellings.
- For ICH dwellings the recurrent to capital ratio ranged from nil for state administered ICH dwellings in the Australian Capital Territory to 1.34 to 1 for FaCS administered ICH dwellings in Tasmania.
- For SOMIH dwellings the recurrent to capital expenditure ratio ranged from 0.7 to 1 in Tasmania to 2.15 to 1 in Western Australia.
- The recurrent to capital expenditure ratio was highest for SOMIH compared to ICH in all jurisdictions except Tasmania and South Australia. This indicates that for ICH dwellings a greater proportion of expenditure is on capital expenditure.

Indicator 26. Number of Indigenous community housing organisations

Purpose

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

Description

The number of Indigenous community housing organisations.

An Indigenous community housing organisation 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 registered with the jurisdictions or FaCS.

Scope

ICH only.

Data sources

Data for this indicator were collected by the AIHW from states and territories and from FaCS in the 2003–04 NRF data collection. Alternative data for this indicator from the 2001 CHINS are also provided.

Data

Table 2.13: Number of Indigenous community housing organisations, by state and territory, 30 June 2004

	NSW ^(a)	Vic	Qld ^(b)	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
State ICH	284	..	34	n.a.	46	..	1	85	450 ^(c)
FaCS ICH	..	21	74	3	3	..	101

(a) New South Wales state ICH data include all organisations with both 'active' and 'inactive' registration with the AHO.

(b) FaCS ICH data for Queensland do not include that for Gladstone, Cunnamulla, Cherbourg and Logan City.

(c) Total does not include Western Australia, which who did not provide data.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection.

- In 2004 there were 450 ICHOs in state administered ICH (excluding Western Australia) and 101 in FaCS administered ICH.

- New South Wales had the highest number of ICHOs (284 for state administered ICH) followed by Queensland (34 for state administered ICH and 74 for FaCS administered ICH) and the Northern Territory (85 for state administered ICH).

Table 2.14: Number of Indigenous community housing organisations, by state and territory, 2001

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
No. of ICHOs	203	25	116	125	31	3	2	111	616

Source: ABS 2001 CHINS (ABS, 2002).

- In 2001 the CHINS found that there were 616 ICHOs in Australia.
- The number of ICHOs was highest in New South Wales (203) followed by Western Australia (125).

Indicator 27. Proportion of organisations 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.

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; and
- financial practices and reporting systems that link resources to outcomes.

Scope

ICH only.

Data sources

Data for this indicator were collected by the AIHW from states and territories and from FaCS in the 2003-04 NRF data collection. Alternative data for this indicator from the 2001 CHINS are also provided.

Data

Table 2.15: Number and proportion of ICH organisations that have a housing management plan, by state and territory, 30 June 2004

	NSW	Vic	Qld ^(a)	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
No. of ICH organisations with a housing management plan									
State ICH	n.a.	..	—	n.a.	31	..	1	35	n.a.
FaCS ICH	..	12	52	3	2	..	69
Total no. of ICH organisations									
State ICH	284	..	34	n.a.	46	..	1	85	450 ^(b)
FaCS ICH	..	21	74	3	3	..	101
Proportion of ICH organisations with a housing management plan (%)									
State ICH	n.a.	..	—	n.a.	67	..	100	41	n.a.
FaCS ICH	..	57	70	100	67	..	68

(a) FaCS ICH data for Queensland do not include that for Gladstone, Cunnamulla, Cherbourg and Logan City.

(b) Total does not include Western Australia.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection.

- In most jurisdictions, the development and implementation of a housing management plan was a condition of funding, though not all organisations had completed a housing management plan at 30 June 2004.
- No state administered ICHOs in Queensland had a housing management plan, while 41% of state administered ICHOs in the Northern Territory, 57% of FaCS administered ICHOs in Victoria and 67% of state administered ICHOs in South Australia had a housing management plan.

Table 2.16: Number and proportion of Indigenous housing organisations that have a housing management plan, by state and territory, 30 June 2001

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
No. of ICHOs with a housing management plan	131	11	48	68	22	3	1	55	339
Total no. of ICHOs	203	25	116	125	31	3	2	111	616
Proportion of ICHOs with a housing management plan (%)	65	44	41	54	71	100	50	50	55

Source: ABS 2001 CHINS (ABS, 2002).

- In 2001 the CHINS found that 55% of ICHOs in Australia had a housing management plan.
- The proportion of organisations with a plan ranged from 41% in Queensland to 100% in Tasmania.

Indicator 28. What jurisdictions are doing to assist ICHOs to develop and implement 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 27.

Scope

ICH only.

Data sources

Qualitative information for this indicator was collected from jurisdictions, but not from FaCS, in the 2003–04 NRF data collection.

Data

Summary of qualitative data

The policy or legislative requirement for the provision of assistance to ICHOs to develop and implement housing management plans

In most jurisdictions (for example, in Queensland, Western Australia and South Australia) 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:

- the creation of two positions in the Northern Territory to assist in the development of plans and the capacity of organisations to implement plans;

- the development of a manual in South Australia to assist ICHOs to develop the necessary policy and procedures to make the day-to-day management of houses easier; and
- an accredited housing management training package for housing officers in Western Australia and the Australian Capital Territory.

A number of jurisdictions noted the importance of maximising the income of ICHOs through effective rent setting and collection policies. New South Wales, for example, was promoting the use of direct debit for rent payments to ICHOs.

Qualitative data from each jurisdiction

New South Wales

The policy or legislative requirement for the provision of assistance to ICHOs to develop and implement housing management plans

In order to be considered for funding, organisations need to be registered with the Aboriginal Housing Office as well as demonstrating good management practices. In order to demonstrate good housing management practices, organisations are assessed against the Key Indicators for Assessing Aboriginal Housing Management. These indicators are chiefly designed as a means of establishing the acceptable performance level for organisations to be eligible for funding for new housing to ensure new housing assets are maintained in the longer term. The performance levels were reviewed by the Aboriginal Housing Board and there are now ten key indicators including a new training indicator. In order for an organisation to be considered for the full range of program components, it must meet seven of these ten indicators, including three mandatory indicators – rates arrears, liquidity and insurance. The remaining indicators, four of which need to be met, are development of policies, procedures and systems; rent levels; rent collection; rent arrears management; repairs and maintenance; audit status; and training.

The strategies that have been implemented to assist organisations

The AHO has continued to strengthen the management capacity of Indigenous housing organisations. During 2003–04 the major achievements included:

- implementation of mandatory key performance indicators pertaining to liquidity, insurance, and rates arrears;
- finalisation of 14 housing agreements with funded organisations under the HACP. These agreements included additional conditions or performance targets intended to improve service delivery and are in accordance with the NSW Aboriginal Housing Policy; and
- assistance to organisations in developing their own policies and procedures. This assistance was provided through such means as the HOME training package, special funding for policy development, and the distribution of an AHO sample policy document which organisations can further develop with community input.

The Management Model Project aggregates small providers in New South Wales in selected areas to provide more effective management and a reduction in operating costs. There are seven management models in various stages of development, incorporating 955 dwellings (approximately one-quarter of the ICHO dwellings in New South Wales). A funding agreement between the AHO and the Management Model Project includes clear benchmarks

for provision for repairs and maintenance to ensure investment in upgraded assets is maintained. During the past 12 months the AHO was successful in establishing three organisations under its Management Models Program. These are made up of 25 smaller Aboriginal Housing Organisations which manage 395 dwellings in the areas.

The year 2003–04 saw the AHO providing continuing systems support to Aboriginal housing organisations which were the recipient of computers and software aimed at building the information technology capacity of Aboriginal community housing management.

Service improvement and accreditation

During 2001–2002 the AHO undertook the development of a set of standards for the New South Wales Aboriginal housing sector. These standards are the basis of best practice in managing the housing business of community based Aboriginal organisations.

Following the development of the standards a team of three Aboriginal staff was established within the AHO to finalise the standards and implement the development of a service improvement and accreditation system. This system, as the title suggests, has two distinct processes; service improvement and accreditation.

During 2003–04 the Service Improvement and Accreditation team supported six organisations in completing an internal self-assessment using the self-assessment kit, which includes the developed standards, service improvement manual and self-assessment workbooks. The team is now in the process of evaluating a trial of both the standards and the service improvement process. The main aim of the service improvement process is, using the standards, to assist and advise Aboriginal housing providers on management processes, including planning, to ensure better outcomes for their tenants and the community that are based on a best practice model.

Training

The AHO's Housing Our Mob Everywhere (HOME) Program aims at improving Aboriginal Housing workers' tenancy and property management skills and has been continuously delivered for a number of years now. The HOME program now leads to a TAFE qualification for those who choose this option. The accredited name for HOME training and qualification is Certificate IV – Community Services (Social Housing).

Maximising the income of Aboriginal Housing Organisations

Direct debit of rent continues to improve the AHO's rental income stream and the overall viability of the Aboriginal housing sector. Commonwealth benefit recipients are encouraged to use CentrePay for direct debit of rental payments to Aboriginal housing organisations. Housing organisations are also required under their AHO agreements to establish and promote direct debit payment. The AHO conference in 2003, held during the reporting period, provided a further opportunity to promote the CentrePay scheme.

As the performance statistics for 2003–04 show, the number of tenants using the CentrePay option rose by 204 from the previous year to 1331, while the number of Aboriginal housing organisations with CentrePay agreements are maintained at 12%.

Queensland

The policy or legislative requirement for the provision of assistance to ICHOs to develop and implement housing management plans

The *Queensland Housing Act 2003* requires housing management plans as a pre-requisite for funding. The Assistance Agreements with 34 discrete Indigenous communities also requires that all councils develop and implement housing management plans.

All 34 of Queensland's discrete communities have commenced the development of housing management plans.

The strategies that have been implemented to assist organisations

Strategies to assist Queensland Deed Of Grant In Trust communities are drawn from the Queensland Department of Housing's Community Housing Management Strategy. The goal of the strategy is to improve the effectiveness of community organisations as managers of community housing services.

Western Australia

The policy or legislative requirement for the provision of assistance to ICHOs to develop and implement housing management plans

Development and implementation of housing management plans is a funding condition for those community organisations which receive operational support funding from AHID (Aboriginal Housing and Infrastructure Directorate).

The strategies that have been implemented to assist organisations

The Indigenous Housing Management System is being promoted as a tool to assist organisations manage their housing. Western Australia is also in the final stages of developing an accredited housing management training package for community housing officers.

South Australia

The policy or legislative requirement for the provision of assistance to ICHOs to develop and implement housing management plans

In undertaking a review of the Community Housing Policy, the Aboriginal Housing Authority (AHA) has established funding formulas to support housing services to ICHOs. The AHA will visit with all ICHOs to explain the updated version of the Community Housing Policy. The policy format has been modified to incorporate a training kit to enable housing officers to better understand and apply practices required by the AHA.

The AHA will continue to work with ICHOs that have yet to develop the required housing management plans. During 2003-04 a further three ICHOs developed plans, bringing the total to 31 communities with housing management plans.

The strategies that have been implemented to assist organisations

The AHA developed a manual 'Managing Our Housing' to assist community councils, homelands and ICHOs develop the necessary policies and procedures to make the day-to-day management of housing easier.

In 2004–05, 38 ICHOs will receive a grant for Community Administration; the AHA has allocated \$400,000 for this purpose. This funding can be expended for salaries for housing officer positions, worker's compensation insurance, superannuation contributions, office expenses and travel costs. ICHOs will be expected to demonstrate, on a six-monthly basis, where the funding has been spent, using the Community Housing Reporting template developed by the AHA.

Rent based on income will be promoted to ICHOs, based on a formula endorsed by the AHA Board of Management.

Australian Capital Territory

The strategies that have been implemented to assist organisations

To assist in the development of the community housing sector in the Australian Capital Territory, including Indigenous community housing, the ACT government conducted a Skills Audit in 2003–04 to identify the training needs of community housing providers. The government plans to implement a training program in 2004–05 to respond to the needs identified by the audit. This is to include imparting the skills needed to develop and implement housing management plans.

The ACT government has assisted the Billabong Aboriginal Corporation to increase its capacity to manage more properties. This will involve the employment and training of additional Indigenous staff.

Northern Territory

The strategies that have been implemented to assist organisations

Two positions have been created in northern and southern regions to assist ICHOs develop housing management plans and deliver programs aimed at increasing the capacity of organisations to implement such plans.

The Indigenous Housing Authority of the Northern Territory (IHANT) conducted community workshops with ICHO-elected members and key staff on the development of housing management plans. More specifically, IHANT developed a housing management plan template that can be provided electronically to ICHOs to assist them implement the planning process.

Indicator 29. Proportion of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who have completed accredited training in housing management and related areas

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.

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 undertaking training at a higher level.

Scope

ICH only.

Data sources

Data for this indicator were collected by the AIHW from states and territories and from FaCS in the 2003–04 NRF data collection.

Data

Table 2.17: Number and proportion of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who have completed accredited training in housing management, by state and territory, 30 June 2004

	NSW ^(a)	Vic ^(b)	Qld ^(c)	WA	SA	Tas	ACT ^(d)	NT	Aust
No. of Indigenous employees who have completed accredited training									
State ICH	32	..	28 ^(e)	n.a.	51	..	1	180	n.a.
FaCS ICH	..	—	31	4	1	..	n.a.
Total no. of Indigenous employees									
State ICH	131	..	n.a.	n.a.	53	..	4	465	n.a.
FaCS ICH	..	16	137	11	6	..	170
Proportion of Indigenous employees who have completed accredited training (%)									
State ICH	24.4	..	n.a.	n.a.	96.2	..	25.0	38.7	n.a.
FaCS ICH	..	—	22.6	36.4	16.7	..	n.a.

(a) New South Wales data based only on organisations registered with the AHO in the current year.

(b) FaCS ICH data for Victoria do not include that for Coranderrk Koori, Mungabareena or Winda Mara.

(c) FaCS ICH data for Queensland do not include that for Gladstone, Cunnamulla, Cherbourg, Logan City or some ICHOs in Cairns.

(d) FaCS ICH data for the Australian Capital Territory do not include that for Ghibba Gunya.

(e) Data are for 2002–03.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection.

- The proportion of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who had completed accredited training in housing management was fairly low, except for South Australia where 96.2% of employees had completed accredited training.
- The proportion who have completed training was lowest for FaCS administered ICH dwellings in Victoria (0%), followed by FaCS administered ICH dwellings the Australian Capital Territory (16.7%) and in Queensland (22.6%).

Indicator 30. Proportion of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who are undertaking accredited training in housing management and related areas

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.

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 undertaking training at a higher level.

Scope

ICH only.

Data sources

Data for this indicator were collected by the AIHW from states and territories and from FaCS in the 2003–04 NRF data collection.

Data

Table 2.18: Number and proportion of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who were undertaking accredited training in housing management, by state and territory, 30 June 2004

	NSW ^(a)	Vic ^(b)	Qld ^(c)	WA	SA	Tas	ACT ^(d)	NT	Aust
No. of Indigenous employees who were undertaking accredited training									
State ICH	8	..	n.a.	n.a.	29	..	3	258	n.a.
FaCS ICH	..	7	34	6	3	..	50
Total no. of Indigenous employees									
State ICH	131	..	n.a.	n.a.	53	..	4	465	n.a.
FaCS ICH	..	16	137	11	6	..	170
Proportion of Indigenous employees who are undertaking accredited training (%)									
State ICH	6.1	..	n.a.	n.a.	54.7	..	75.0	55.5	n.a.
FaCS ICH	..	43.8	24.8	54.5	50.0	..	29.4

(a) New South Wales data based only on organisations registered with the AHO in the current year.

(b) FaCS ICH data for Victoria do not include that for Coranderrk Koori, Mungabareena or Winda Mara.

(c) FaCS ICH data for Queensland do not include that for Gladstone, Cunnamulla, Cherbourg, Logan City or some ICHOs in Cairns.

(d) FaCS ICH data for the Australian Capital Territory do not include that for Ghibba Gunya.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection.

- There was a relatively high proportion of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who were undertaking accredited training. For example, 55.5% of employees in state administered ICHOs in the Northern Territory and 75% in state administered ICHOs in the Australian Capital Territory were undertaking accredited training.
- The lowest proportion undertaking training was in state administered ICHOs in New South Wales (6.1%) and FaCS administered ICHOs in Queensland (24.8%).

Indicator 36. 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.

Scope

ICH and SOMIH.

Data sources

No data were collected for this indicator. Data for Indigenous public housing tenants and SOMIH tenants will be collected in the 2005 National Social Housing Surveys and will be available for the 2004–05 report.

Indicator 38. Proportion of organisations using rent deduction schemes

Purpose

This indicator is intended to provide a measure of how many ICH organisations use rent deduction schemes.

Description

The number of ICH organisations using rent deduction schemes divided by the total number of ICH organisations.

Scope

ICH only.

Data sources

No data were collected for this indicator.

Outcome 3: More housing

Growth in the number of houses to address both the backlog of Indigenous housing need and emerging needs of a growing population

- Indicator 1:** Total number of dwellings targeted for Indigenous people
- Indicator 19:** Proportion of Indigenous households housed by tenure type
- Indicator 20:** Proportion of Indigenous households accessing mainstream housing services
- Indicator 21:** Proportion of Indigenous people who are homeless
- Indicator 22:** Total and average number of additional bedrooms required across all tenure types (Data provided under Outcome 1)
- Indicator 23:** Proportion of overcrowded households across all tenure types (Data provided under Outcome 1)
- Indicator 24:** Proportion of households paying 25% or more of income in rent (Data provided under Outcome 1)
- Indicator 38:** Proportion of organisations using rent deduction schemes.
No data were collected for this indicator.

Outcome 3 has eight indicators which attempt to measure growth in the number of houses to address Indigenous housing need. Three of the indicators were also included under Outcome 1 and one under Outcome 2. Two of the indicators reported under Outcome 1 relate to overcrowding and one to housing affordability. The proportion of organisations using rent reductions schemes was reported under Outcome 2.

The indicators for this outcome include the number of dwellings targeted for Indigenous people, the tenure type of Indigenous households and the proportion of Indigenous households accessing mainstream housing services. These provide a measure of the amount and type of housing available to Indigenous people.

The indicator on the proportion of Indigenous people who are homeless, the two indicators on overcrowding and the indicator on affordability provide broad measures of Indigenous housing need in these three areas.

Indicator 1. Total number of dwellings targeted for Indigenous people

Purpose

This indicator provides a measure of the number of dwellings specifically targeted for 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

ICH and SOMIH.

Data sources

Data for this indicator for ICH were collected from states and territories and from FaCS in the 2003–04 NRF data collection. The SOMIH data were collected by the AIHW in the national CSHA data collection.

Alternative data for ICH from the 2001 CHINS are also provided.

Data

Table 3.1: Total number of ICH and SOMIH dwellings, by state and territory, 30 June 2004

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
State ICH	4,616 ^(a)	..	3,721 ^(b)	2,837	1,093	..	12	6,456	18,735
FaCS ICH	..	476	2,358 ^(c)	128	20	..	2,982
<i>Total ICH</i>	<i>4,616</i>	<i>476</i>	<i>6,079</i>	<i>2,837</i>	<i>1,093</i>	<i>128</i>	<i>32</i>	<i>6,456</i>	<i>21,717</i>
SOMIH	4,088	1,260 ^(d)	2,811	2,325	1,900	341	12,725
Total	8,704	1,736	8,890	5,162	2,993	469	32	6,456	34,442

(a) Includes all organisations with both 'active' and 'inactive' registration with the AHO.

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

(c) FaCS ICH data for Queensland do not include that for Gladstone, Cunnamulla, Cherbourg and Logan City.

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

Note: The scope of the ICH data collection is dwellings managed by funded or registered ICHOs. The data for Western Australia, however, cover all ICH in that state and the shading indicates that these data should not be compared with data from other jurisdictions.

Sources: AIHW NRF data collection and CSHA SOMIH data collection.

- At 30 June 2004 the total number of dwellings targeted for Indigenous people across Australia was 34,442 (21,717 ICH dwellings and 12,725 SOMIH dwellings).

- Queensland (8,890) had the highest number of dwellings targeted for Indigenous people followed by New South Wales (8,704).
- The largest number of ICH dwellings was in the Northern Territory (6,456).
- New South Wales had the highest number of SOMIH dwellings (4,088) followed by Queensland (2,811). There are no SOMIH dwellings in the Northern Territory or the Australian Capital Territory.
- Between 30 June 2003 and 30 June 2004 the number of SOMIH dwellings increased by 162 (Table 3.1, AIHW, 2003).

Indicator 19. 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:

- (a) home owners/purchasers
- (b) private renters
- (c) public renters
- (d) 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 2002 NATSISS.

Data

Table 3.2: Number and proportion of Indigenous households by tenure type, by state and territory, 2002

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	NT	Aust ^(a)
	Number						
Home owner	17,900	4,500	13,400	4,900	2,800	1,700	50,400
Renter state/territory housing	12,500	2,600	9,100	6,600	2,600	2,200	37,700
Renter Indigenous/community housing	5,300	1,100	6,900	2,900	1,900	6,100	24,500
Private and other renter	17,800	3,700	13,900	5,200	2,100	1,900	46,800
Rent free/other	2,300	400	900	1,300	200	700	6,200
Total	55,900	12,300	44,200	20,900	9,600	12,600	165,700
	Proportion (%)						
Home owner	32.0	36.6	30.3	23.4	29.2	13.5	30.4
Renter state/territory housing	22.4	21.1	20.6	31.6	27.1	17.5	22.8
Renter Indigenous/community housing	9.5	8.9	15.6	13.9	19.8	48.4	14.8
Private and other renter	31.8	30.1	31.4	24.9	21.9	15.1	28.2
Rent free/other	4.1	3.3	2.0	6.2	2.1	5.6	3.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

(a) Includes households in Tasmania and the Australian Capital Territory.

Note: Renter state/territory housing includes households in public housing and SOMIH; renter Indigenous/community housing includes households in mainstream and Indigenous community housing. Private and other renter includes all other renters. Rent free/other includes those living rent free and those in rent/buy schemes.

Source: ABS NATSISS 2002.

- The 2002 NATSISS estimated that there were 165,700 Indigenous households across Australia.
- Most Indigenous households were renters with 22.8% renting from state or territory housing authorities, 14.8% from Indigenous or community organisations and 28.2% for private or other renters. Just over 30% of Indigenous households were home owners.
- The Northern Territory had the lowest proportion of Indigenous households who were home owners (13.5%) and the highest proportion of Indigenous or community housing households (48.4%).
- The proportion of home owners was highest in the eastern states of Victoria (36.6%), New South Wales (32.0%) and Queensland (30.3%).
- The proportion of private and other renters was also highest in New South Wales (31.8%), Queensland (31.4%) and Victoria (30.1%).
- Western Australia (31.6%) and South Australia (27.1%) had a high proportion of Indigenous households renting from the state housing authority.

Indicator 20. Proportion of Indigenous households accessing mainstream housing services

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.

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

Scope

Public housing, community housing and Commonwealth rent assistance programs.

Data sources

The data on public housing and community housing were collected by the AIHW in the national CSHA data collections. Commonwealth Rent Assistance data comes from FaCS.

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. The response rates vary across jurisdictions from 49% in Tasmania to 100% in the Australian Capital Territory.

Table 3.3: Number and proportion of Indigenous households accessing mainstream housing services, by state and territory, 30 June 2004

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust ^(a)
No. of Indigenous households									
Public housing	8,700 ^(b)	1,078	2,633	4,041	1,171	494	172	1,498	19,787
Community housing	588	12	419	212	65	4	16	n.a.	1,316
Commonwealth Rent Assistance ^(c)	9,006	1,611	8,997	2,387	1,214	744	n.a.	1,032	25,102
Total no. of households									
Public housing	123,106	62,647	48,490	30,016	44,529	11,375	10,823	5,269	336,225
Community housing	9,770	3,582	3,779	2,232	3,828	401	392	n.a.	23,984
Commonwealth Rent Assistance ^(c)	316,541	206,041	235,145	87,405	66,483	23,737	8,355	5,636	949,698
Proportion of Indigenous households (%)									
Public housing	7.1	1.7	5.4	15.0	2.6	4.3	1.6	28.4	5.9
Community housing	6.0	3.9	11.1	9.5	1.7	1.0	4.1	n.a.	5.4
Commonwealth Rent Assistance ^(c)	2.8	0.8	3.8	2.7	1.8	3.1	n.a.	18.3	2.4

(a) Total for Australia includes postcodes that could not be classified.

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

(c) Commonwealth Rent Assistance (CRA) data are number of income units receiving CRA at 11 June 2004.

Note: These data are based on self identification of Indigenous status.

Source: AIHW CSHA national data collection, FaCS.

- At 30 June 2004 there were 19,787 Indigenous households identified in public housing in Australia and 1,316 in community housing.
- There were 25,102 Indigenous income units receiving assistance through the Commonwealth Rent Assistance Program.
- The Northern Territory (28.4%) and Western Australia (15.0%) had the highest proportion of Indigenous households accessing public housing, followed by New South Wales (7.1%).
- Queensland (11.1%) had the highest proportion of Indigenous households accessing mainstream community housing, followed by Western Australia (9.5%).
- The proportion of Indigenous income units receiving Commonwealth Rent Assistance ranged from 0.8% in Victoria to 18.3% in the Northern Territory.

Indicator 21. 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 Chamberlain & MacKenzie (2004a, 2004b, 2004c, 2004d, 2004e, 2004f, 2004g, 2004h) and is based on the ABS 2001 Census and AIHW Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP) data.

Data

The data provided includes the following three categories of homelessness, as defined by Chamberlain & Mackenzie(2004a, 2004b, 2004c, 2004d, 2004e, 2004f, 2004g, 2004h):

- primary homelessness – experienced by people without conventional accommodation ,such as those who were living in cars, squats or improvised dwellings;
- secondary homeless – refers to people who have no other usual address and are staying for less than three months in boarding houses, with friends or relatives or in SAAP services; and
- tertiary homelessness – refers to people living in sub-optimal accommodation without basic amenities or security of tenure, which was defined as people living in boarding houses.

Table 3.4: Number of Indigenous people who were homeless, by category, by state and territory, 2001

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Number									
No conventional accommodation	227	62	486	442	162	16	5	1,257	2,657
SAAP ^(a)	391	260	395	210	158	27	28	97	1,566
Friends/ relatives	518	127	406	249	171	91	16	82	1,660
Boarding house	240	115	631	153	53	17	6	428	1,643
Total homeless	1,376	564	1,918	1,054	544	151	55	1,864	7,526
Total population	124,773	25,949	116,967	62,149	24,028	16,376	3,647	54,170	428,059
Proportion of the population (%)									
No conventional accommodation	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.7	0.7	0.1	0.1	2.3	0.6
SAAP ^(a)	0.3	1.0	0.3	0.3	0.7	0.2	0.8	0.2	0.4
Friends/ relatives	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.7	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.4
Boarding house	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.8	0.4
Total homeless	1.1	2.2	1.6	1.7	2.3	0.9	1.5	3.4	1.8

(a) Only includes those SAAP clients who were accommodated on Census night.

Sources: Chamberlain & MacKenzie 2004a, 2004b, 2004c, 2004d, 2004e, 2004f, 2004g, 2004h.

- It was estimated that there were 7,526 Indigenous people who were homeless on the night of the 2001 Census. This includes 2,657 with no conventional accommodation, 1,566 in SAAP supported services, 1,660 staying with friends or relatives and 1,643 in boarding houses.
- The largest number of Indigenous homeless people was in the Queensland (1,918) where the largest category was 'boarding houses'.
- The second largest number of Indigenous homeless people was in the Northern Territory (1,864) where the largest category of homelessness was 'no conventional accommodation'.

Outcome 4: Improved partnerships

Ensuring Indigenous people are fully involved in planning, decision making and delivery of services

- Indicator 15:** Recurrent to capital expenditure ratio (Data provided under Outcome 2)
- Indicator 29:** Proportion of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who have completed accredited training in housing management and related areas (Data provided under Outcome 2)
- Indicator 30:** Proportion of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who are undertaking accredited training in housing management and related areas (Data provided under Outcome 2)
- Indicator 31:** Proportion of people employed in housing management who are Indigenous
- Indicator 32:** Strategies and outcomes to increase Indigenous employment in housing services
- Indicator 33:** Mechanisms for Indigenous input to planning, decision making and delivery of services

Outcome 4 has six indicators that relate to self-management and capacity building for Indigenous people. The first three indicators were reported under Outcome 2 – one on the recurrent to capital expenditure ratio and the other two on the proportion of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who are undertaking or have completed accredited training in housing management and related areas. Along with the fourth indicator on the proportion of people employed in housing management who are Indigenous, the indicators on accredited training provide a measure of the extent to which Indigenous people are currently employed in housing management and their level of qualifications.

Two indicators provide qualitative information on the strategies and outcomes to increase Indigenous employment in housing services, as well as mechanisms for Indigenous input to planning, decision making and delivery of housing services.

Indicator 31. 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 for the following categories – senior management, tenancy management and construction.

Scope

ICH and SOMIH.

Data sources

Data for this indicator were collected by the AIHW from jurisdictions and from FaCS in the 2003–04 NRF data collection. Jurisdictions could not provide data by senior management, tenancy management or construction categories.

Data

Table 4.1: Number and proportion of Indigenous people employed in housing management in SOMIH or ICH organisations, by state and territory, 30 June 2004

	NSW ^(a)	Vic ^(b)	Qld ^(c)	WA	SA	Tas	ACT ^(d)	NT	Aust
No. of Indigenous people employed in housing management									
State ICH	131	..	n.a.	n.a.	53	..	4	465	n.a.
FaCS ICH	..	16	137	11	6	..	170
SOMIH	6	11	80	95	39	3	234
Total no. of people employed in housing management									
State ICH	171	..	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	..	4	687	n.a.
FaCS ICH	..	25	177	13	6	..	221
SOMIH	6	18	119	1,126	79	4	1,352
Proportion of Indigenous people employed in housing management (%)									
State ICH	77	..	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	..	100	68	n.a.
FaCS ICH	..	64	77	85	100	..	77
SOMIH	100	61	67	8	49	75	17

(a) New South Wales state ICH data based only on organisations registered with the AHO in the current year.

(b) FaCS ICH data for Victoria do not include that for Coranderrk Koori, Mungabareena or Winda Mara.

(c) FaCS ICH data for Queensland do not include that for Gladstone, Cunnamulla, Cherbourg, Logan City or some ICHOs in Cairns.

(d) FaCS ICH data for the Australian Capital Territory do not include that for Ghibba Gunya.

Sources: AIHW NRF data collection and CSHA SOMIH data collection.

- Among those jurisdictions which could provide data, the Northern Territory (465 in state administered ICH) had the largest number of Indigenous employees in ICH organisations, followed by Queensland (137 in FaCS administered ICH) and New South Wales (131 in state administered ICH).
- The proportion of employees in ICH organisations who were Indigenous ranged from 64% in FaCS administered ICH in Victoria to 100% for both state and FaCS administered ICH in the Australian Capital Territory.
- There were 234 Indigenous people employed in housing management in SOMIH.
- The proportion of Indigenous people employed in SOMIH ranged from 8% in Western Australia to 100% in New South Wales.

Indicator 32. 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; and
- (c) construction.

Scope

ICH and SOMIH.

Data sources

Qualitative data for this indicator were collected from jurisdictions, but not from FaCS, in the 2003–04 NRF data collection.

Data

Summary qualitative data

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 there was a strategy to increase Indigenous employment through the roll-out of the housing management program, which required the employment and accredited training of at least one Indigenous person for each ICHO.

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 and 50% of this group must undertake formal training of some kind. In New South Wales, Victoria, Western Australia and South Australia preference is given to local Aboriginal companies who 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.

Preferential tender systems were also used in relation to the construction of SOMIH housing in Victoria and South Australia.

Qualitative data for each jurisdiction

New South Wales

Strategies used to increase Indigenous employment in ICHOs

The AHO's Housing Our Mob Everywhere (HOME) Program, which aims to improve Aboriginal Community Housing workers' tenancy and property management skills, has been continuously delivered for a number of years now. The HOME program now leads to a TAFE qualification. The accredited name for HOME training and qualification is Certificate IV – Community Services (Social Housing).

The Repairs and Maintenance Community Asset Program provides funding through an expression of interest process to Indigenous community housing organisations to help address the backlog of repairs and maintenance works and health and safety issues that significant numbers of ICHOs continue to face. The Asset Management Unit has endeavoured to provide employment and training outcomes where possible and, as such, a number of contractors and labourers were employed.

There was also a range of other projects employing Aboriginal workers across the state. Employment opportunities were provided directly in 2003–04 by the AHO, contracting 26 Aboriginal building companies for a series of projects. These were:

- the construction of nine houses;
- the upgrading of 37 houses purchased under the HACP; and
- the upgrading of 126 AHO houses under the AHO Upgrade Program.

Inclusion of a requirement in tender documentation relating to employment of Aboriginal people again proved effective in opening up work opportunities, as demonstrated by non-Aboriginal builders engaging Aboriginal trainees and apprentices in the construction of 19 units.

The AHO supports and encourages Aboriginal participation in the construction industry and has organised and facilitated conferences based around this issue. The Aboriginal Builders' Directory, launched in 2002 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; once registered with the directory, builders can change their details online.

Strategies used to increase Indigenous employment in SOMIH housing services.

Approximately 4000 AHO properties are at present managed by the Department of Housing under a management agreement. The future direction of the management of these properties is for them to be transferred over to Indigenous community housing organisations once

these organisations are capable of sustaining the management infrastructure required to successfully deal with all the issues surrounding social housing.

The AHO properties are currently undergoing an upgrade program, with Resitech involved as the Project Manager. This program has also been targeted towards Aboriginal employment and, where possible, the tender preference process has been utilised. This 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 outlooks and expand and look into other programs run by other government bodies and also to pursue any opportunities that may arise within the private sector.

Within the AHO Upgrade Program, Aboriginal builders completed 33% of the program, representing 126 dwellings, in the previous year.

Victoria

Strategies used to increase Indigenous employment in SOMIH housing services

The following strategies and achievements have been in place or occurred during 2003–04:

- An Employment and Training Strategy developed by the AHBV was finalised in 2000–2001. This strategy aims to increase the number of Indigenous people employed in the housing sector (including Indigenous housing, community housing and public housing program areas). The strategy addresses all areas of housing from maintenance and construction to businesses that supply housing or housing-related products and services.
- In line with the Indigenous employment strategy, all management positions within the AHBV are now occupied by Indigenous staff members who were appointed following an advertising, interview and selection process.
- It is not generally a requirement of employment selection processes that applicants be Indigenous, but the selection criteria would normally require applicants to have a knowledge of Indigenous issues and experience in working with Indigenous communities.
- In 2003–04, a range of management, leadership and technical training courses have been completed by AHBV staff and board members on governance, risk management and key performance indicators.

In relation to construction and maintenance work, preferential contract and tender systems are utilised to employ Indigenous people; however, it is still a requirement that contractors meet all necessary standards that would normally apply for non-Indigenous contractors.

During 2003–04:

- Negotiations were underway with an Indigenous construction company in the Goulburn Murray Region to purpose-build three properties. This is expected to deliver three new properties in the Shepparton area during 2004–05.
- The East Gippsland Aboriginal Community Development Education Program was contracted by the Office of Housing to construct 3 three-bedroom houses at the Lake Tyers Aboriginal Trust during 2003–04.
- The AHBV has created networks to look at developing potential partnerships with regional Community Development Employment Programs (CDEP) teams to work on housing projects.

Queensland

Strategies used to increase Indigenous employment in ICHOs

The Indigenous Employment Policy represents part of the Queensland Government's commitment to the reconciliation process and improved economic development and employment outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.

This policy requires contractors to government, either directly, or through subcontractors, in consultation with the local Indigenous community, to employ a minimum of 20% of the on-site construction labour force from the local community. Contractors must also ensure that 50% of this group undertake a formal apprenticeship or traineeship or such other training as deemed appropriate by the relevant state government agency where it is acting as a contractor undertaking building or civil construction and maintenance works. Where applicable, this may include pre-project skilling and training provided to local people who will be employed on an approved project.

Decisions about tendering and registers for the construction and maintenance relating to dwellings managed under the Queensland Deed Of Grant In Trust are left up to each of the 34 councils. Some councils opt to perform building and maintenance work themselves. Some use a tendering process, while others request the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Service Area to arrange tenders for them.

Strategies used to increase Indigenous employment in SOMIH housing services.

The Department of Housing has an Equity and Diversity Management Plan (2002-05) which has a range of strategies and activities to increase employment at all levels of the organisation. It also applies the whole-of-government Breaking the Unemployment Cycle initiative, to identify opportunities to recruit apprentices and trainees from all target groups.

The Queensland Department of Housing has developed the 'Reconciliation Action Plan 2002-2007' to make reconciliation a part of the Department of Housing's working culture. It derives from key commitments by the Queensland Government and the Australian Housing Ministers' 10-year statement of new directions for Indigenous housing, *Building a Better Future: Indigenous Housing to 2010*. The plan commits to increasing the level of employment of Indigenous staff.

SOMIH construction and maintenance are managed by Property Portfolio Management within the Queensland Department of Housing. Tendering is therefore managed in accordance with departmental policy.

Western Australia

Strategies used to increase Indigenous employment in ICHOs

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

The Aboriginal Housing and Infrastructure Directorate (AHID) continues to provide opportunities for local Aboriginal companies to win construction and upgrade contracts, through utilisation of an Indigenous Preferential Tender Policy, as a development of the existing State Supply Commission policy. This policy will ensure preference is given to local Aboriginal companies, who employ and train local Aboriginal people.

The AHID 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 in ICHOs and SOMIH

The Aboriginal Housing Authority (AHA) provides direct development opportunities by encouraging young Indigenous students to complete work experience at the AHA. The AHA has had the pleasure of hosting three young Indigenous students undertaking work experience during the financial year. The AHA provided four traineeship opportunities throughout the year. The traineeships were located in Coober Pedy, Ceduna, Port Augusta and the Adelaide offices. This financial year 39 staff identified themselves as Indigenous. This represents 49% of total staff, an increase of 6% over the previous year.

The AHA will continue to provide opportunity for ICHOs, Community Development Employment Programs (CDEPs) and other Indigenous organisations to provide 'in house bids' for maintenance and construction work.

The AHA chooses to use either Indigenous contractors, contractors who employ Indigenous workers, or contractors who actively create apprenticeship opportunities in all maintenance and capital works for Aboriginal people.

Through the National Aboriginal Health Strategy Program (NAHS), contractors have provided 576.5 hours of employment for Indigenous workers.

Discussions have taken place with Indigenous service providers in Ceduna and Port Augusta to develop and implement a pilot program to provide an assessment and recognition of current skills and needs of Indigenous employees in ICHOs. This process will continue during 2004-05.

Fixing Houses for Better Health (FHBH)

During 2003-04 the AHA was appointed as the Project Licence Holder, and jointly project managed the Fixing Houses for Better Health Program across the Anangu Pitjantjatjara lands. The FHBH involves a team of people, including local Indigenous community representatives and licensed tradespeople, conducting a 230-point check of health hardware items in each house in a community. Employment opportunities were provided for six Indigenous community members to survey properties and provide data entry.

Doorways 2 Construction

A partnership has been formed between the AHA, Construction Industry Training Board and the Regency Institute of TAFE to construct two-bedroom sleepouts for the AHA's properties in the rental program.

Aboriginal students from various local schools work on the project and, in doing so, achieve a Certificate I in Construction.

Tasmania

Strategies used to increase Indigenous employment in SOMIH housing services

At 30 June 2004 there were 341 SOMIH homes administered by Aboriginal Housing Services Tasmania (AHST), and all occupants of positions within that program are Aboriginal. The 'identified' position of Manager, Aboriginal Housing Services Tasmania was re-advertised and filled during the year, with the successful applicant taking up the position early in the 2004-2005 financial year. Aboriginal Tenancy Advisory Panels (ATAPs) are established within each region, and have responsibility for allocations, tenant transfers, and the

acquisition of AHST homes. Members of the ATAPs are paid sitting fees and all are Aboriginal.

The Department of Health and Human Services has recently launched an Aboriginal Employment Strategy, in which Housing Tasmania will participate.

Australian Capital Territory

Strategies used to increase Indigenous employment in ICHOs

Under the Indigenous Housing Funding Program the ACT government is seeking to develop and implement strategies to increase community housing options for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, and for Indigenous community housing capacity building. With the growth of the Indigenous community housing sector, Indigenous employment in housing services in the Australian Capital Territory is increasing. As at 30 June 2004, ICHOs in the Australian Capital Territory had four Indigenous employees.

Northern Territory

Strategies used to increase Indigenous employment in ICHOs

During 2003–04 the Department of Community Development, Sport and Cultural Affairs (Program Manager for IHANT) developed an Indigenous Employment and Career Development Strategy. This strategy has been recently endorsed by the Senior Management Board.

Currently there are three Indigenous employees working in the central office of the Indigenous Housing Branch, which comprises 12 people. The Executive Director of the Housing and Infrastructure Division also identifies as Indigenous.

At the conclusion of 2003–04 there were 258 Indigenous people undertaking accredited housing-related training and 504 employed in housing-related activities (138 in housing management). This information is based on a survey of ICHOs undertaken by the IHANT Program Manager.

Strategies implemented included:

- the continued roll-out of the Housing Management Program, requiring employment and accredited training of a least one Indigenous person per eligible ICHO;
- putting in place the current Central Remote Employment and Training Strategy, which has provided accredited training opportunities for 20 local Indigenous people to date. In addition, the expansion of the Central Remote Employment and Training Strategy principles to the Amoonguna community has facilitated the engagement of four Indigenous apprentices;
- negotiations to implement an employment and training strategy through the Thamarrurr Regional Council, which were commenced during 2003–04;
- agreement to the expansion of the Central Remote Regionalised Construction Program in all ATSIC regions; and
- re-alignment of policy to ensure that local building teams have a majority of local Indigenous employees and are not merely non-Indigenous contractors that are long term residents of a particular community. These teams will now be known as Indigenous building teams.

Indicator 33. 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 jurisdictions, but not from FaCS, in the 2003–04 NRF data collection.

Data

Summary of qualitative data

Jurisdictional approach/policy with regard to Indigenous input into housing programs and decision making

There were structures in place in all jurisdictions that allowed for consultation with and input from the Indigenous community. In many jurisdictions the consultation with Indigenous people was done through the involvement of ATSIC representatives.

How Indigenous input feeds directly into planning and service delivery processes for both SOMIH and ICHO

- In Queensland there were two separate Housing and Infrastructure Agreements which established the framework for partnerships between the Queensland and Australian Government and Indigenous people and communities.
- 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 South Australia, Victoria, the Northern Territory and New South Wales. ATSIC was represented on these boards, providing an avenue for broader consultation with the community.

- In South Australia there was an Aboriginal Housing Policy Advisory Forum with Aboriginal community members whose main role was to provide advocacy on behalf of Aboriginal customers and to provide policy advice on the rental program.

Qualitative data for each jurisdiction

New South Wales

Jurisdictional approach in relation to Indigenous input into housing programs and decision making

The AHO has an all-Aboriginal Board which is responsible for providing strategic and policy directions. The Board is also supported by a network of six Regional Aboriginal Housing Committees. The role of the committees is to advise on the development of Aboriginal housing programs and policies and establish effective links with ATSIC, land councils and other key stakeholders at a regional level.

How Indigenous input feeds directly into planning/service delivery processes (for both SOMIH and ICHO)

The planning process for the 2003–2004 Aboriginal Housing Program involved:

- the AHO Board, which endorsed the planning process and recommended the plan to both state and Commonwealth ministers and ATSIC. Members of the Board also chaired Regional Aboriginal Housing Committees;
- the AHO administration, which assisted in the development of the planning process and facilitated its implementation; and
- Regional Aboriginal Housing Committees, which established regional priorities and developed regional plans for 2003–2004 and presented them to the Board for endorsement.

At the end of the reporting period, 71% of staff employed by the AHO were Aboriginal. The AHO's Housing Our Mob Everywhere (HOME) Program, which aims at improving Aboriginal housing workers' tenancy and property management skills, has been continuously delivered for a number of years now.

Victoria

Jurisdictional approach in relation to Indigenous input into housing programs and decision making

The primary means of Indigenous input into SOMIH is the Aboriginal Housing Board of Victoria (AHBV), which consists of community-elected Indigenous representatives. The Board manages the Aboriginal Rental Housing Program in Victoria and provides advice to government on all Indigenous housing matters.

The AHBV maintains a high level of consultation with Indigenous organisations, communities and tenants on housing related matters. In 2003–04 it:

- held consultations on the AHBV Elders and Housing Study. The final report from this study has been completed and was circulated throughout the Indigenous community network in August 2003; and
- held community meetings in Warrnambool and Melbourne.

How Indigenous input feeds directly into planning/service delivery processes for SOMIH

The AHBV works directly in partnership with the Aboriginal Housing Services Units (AHSU), which performs the day-to-day tenancy and property management for the SOMIH program.

The Board conducts annual policy workshops, strategic planning workshops and stock planning workshops to determine outcomes and policies for the year. The outcomes of each workshop are fed back to the Office of Housing via the Transition to Ownership meetings and direct partnership with the Aboriginal Housing Services Unit.

Additionally, the ABHV works directly with the Office of Housing to provide significant input to national planning (via the annual statewide Indigenous Housing Plan) and to national reporting processes. The Implementation Working Group and Transition to Ownership Group also meet regularly with the Office of Housing to provide input to business planning processes that inform service delivery.

The Board works directly in partnership with the Aboriginal Housing Services Units (AHSU) which performs the day-to-day tenancy and property management for the SOMIH program. Indigenous housing officers are also employed in direct service delivery to Indigenous clients, with four Indigenous housing officers currently employed in direct tenancy management within the AHSU.

Queensland

Jurisdictional approach in relation to Indigenous input into housing programs and decision making

Queensland has two separate Indigenous Housing and Infrastructure Agreements which establish frameworks for partnerships between the Queensland and Australian Governments and Indigenous people and communities. These are:

- Torres Strait Housing and Infrastructure Agreement, signed in 2000, between the Queensland and Australian Governments, the Torres Strait Regional Authority, and the Island Co-ordinating Council; and
- Queensland Housing and Infrastructure Agreement (excluding the Torres Strait region) signed in 2001, between the Queensland and Australian Governments, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission and the Aboriginal Co-ordinating Council.

The Agreements commit their respective parties to joint planning and coordination, effective program management and coordinated service delivery for Indigenous housing and infrastructure.

The Joint Torres Strait Housing and Infrastructure Committee (JTSHIC), established under the Torres Strait Housing and Infrastructure Agreement comprises the chairpersons of both the Torres Strait Regional Authority and the Island Co-ordinating Council, as well as Queensland and Australian Government representatives. The Joint Planning Group (JPG), established under the Queensland Housing and Infrastructure Agreement (excluding the Torres Strait), comprises ATSIC representatives, Queensland representatives (including from the Aboriginal Co-ordinating Council), community members with expertise in environmental health and housing, and a Regional Housing Body representative.

Under the Agreements, the parties recognise the JTSHIC and the JPG as the principal sources of advice on appropriate policies and strategies to improve housing and related infrastructure outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in Queensland.

As required under the CSHA, new Indigenous housing and infrastructure agreements will be negotiated between the Queensland and Australian Governments to commence 1 July 2005.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Housing has continued to engage in capacity building activities with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander councils through projects and activities that include:

- Housing Regulation 2003 workshops;
- consultations on capital works planning and reporting;
- the Island Coordinating Council Housing Resource Workers project;
- the Island Coordinating Council Housing Policy and Research project;
- the Total Asset Management Strategy pilot project; and
- the Homeownership on Discrete Indigenous Communities project.

How Indigenous input feeds directly into planning/service delivery processes (for both SOMIH and ICHO)

Planning processes for both SOMIHs and ICHOs are part of the wider planning processes conducted with the Department of Housing. These include high-level strategic planning, capital works, capital grants and portfolio planning, and service-level operational planning. Indigenous input occurs at all levels of planning through the department's consultative arrangements, including focus groups, tenant participation groups and community engagement activities, as well as through policy research, both within the department and through input from other agencies and the research agenda of the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute (AHURI).

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Housing maintains close contact with the 34 discrete Indigenous communities through its Community Program and receives continuous input from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander councils.

Tenants in the Rental Program are consulted through policy and program reviews and tenant participation activities.

The Queensland Department of Housing has developed the 'Reconciliation Action Plan 2002-2007' to make reconciliation a part of the Department's working culture. It derives from key commitments made by the Queensland Government and in the Australian housing ministers' 10-year statement of new directions for Indigenous housing, *Building a Better Future: Indigenous Housing to 2010*.

The plan commits to involving Indigenous people in assisting the department in improving service delivery to clients and employment of Indigenous staff. Measures include:

- extending efforts to employ Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples across all service areas;
- developing processes to improve promotion of community housing programs to Indigenous communities;
- holding policy forums and arranging for wide-ranging information sharing on policy issues that are significant to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples;
- providing grant funds to the Aboriginal Coordinating Council and the Island Coordinating Council to employ housing policy and research officers and housing resource workers to provide direct assistance to councils;

- conducting extensive training of client service staff in Indigenous cultural awareness, including a requirement for staff to have knowledge of Indigenous issues as part of generic duty statements; and
- requiring every staff member of the Department of Housing to undertake Indigenous cultural awareness training.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Housing regularly conducts workshops with community councils on the 34 discrete Indigenous communities.

Tenants and applicants of the rental program are included in consultations review, and in the development and evaluation of policy and programs. Newsletters are also distributed to tenants biannually to inform them of departmental activities and provide updated information on available products and services.

Western Australia

Jurisdictional approach in relation to Indigenous input into housing programs and decision making

A needs-based planning process seeks input from ATSIC Regional Councils via their Regional Housing and Infrastructure Plans. These Plans guide the Aboriginal Housing and Infrastructure Directorate (AHID) in developing the annual program.

The Aboriginal Housing and Infrastructure Council (AHIC) is a 100% Indigenous organisation which oversees strategic policy development to inform the Western Australia Housing and Infrastructure Agreement.

Communities are extensively consulted during the delivery of housing and infrastructure products and services.

South Australia

Jurisdictional approach in relation to Indigenous input into housing programs and decision making

The Aboriginal Housing Authority (AHA) Board of Management comprises five ministerial appointments from the South Australian Aboriginal community, and four ATSIC nominations. It is a requirement that all members are Indigenous. With the abolition of ATSIC, the AHA will consider how it can maximise Indigenous input in relation to housing. The representation of ATSIC on the AHA Board of Management has contributed positively to the AHA's delivery of services and programs across the state.

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 it considers need adapting for the community of South Australia.

Tasmania

Jurisdictional approach in relation to Indigenous input into housing programs and decision making

The Joint Indigenous Housing Consultative Committee (JIHCC) continues to be the primary mechanism for intergovernmental coordination of housing and related services for Indigenous people in Tasmania. Membership of the JIHCC includes the Office of Aboriginal Affairs, ICHOs, Aboriginal Housing Services Tasmania (AHST) and FaCS. To date, the

group has been unable to agree on an Indigenous Housing Agreement due to the ICHOs' request for mutual recognition by FaCS, the Office of Aboriginal Affairs and the AHST.

Aboriginal Tenancy Advisory Panels (ATAPs) are charged with the allocation and acquisition of AHST homes. ATAP members are elected through the Tasmanian Aboriginal Corporation and consult broadly with the community in their region.

How Indigenous input feeds directly into planning service delivery processes for SOMIH

The AHST meets annually with Housing Tasmania to discuss annual plans and the distribution of SOMIH resources, as well as meeting at regular intervals throughout the year with the Manager Housing Services to review strategic and operational issues. Similarly, meetings occur with Aboriginal Customer Services Officers and ATAPs to set targets and to review codes of conduct and operational guidelines. Close links are also maintained with the Office of Aboriginal Affairs, a division of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Provision of advice or training to staff responsible for providing services to Indigenous clients is undertaken through the Manager AHST, the Office of Aboriginal Affairs and the Manager Housing Services.

Australian Capital Territory

Jurisdictional approach in relation to Indigenous input into housing programs and decision making

The ACT has established a mechanism for input by the Indigenous community to planning, decision making and delivery of services. The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Trilateral Steering Committee was established in September 2003, under the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Trilateral Housing Agreement, which was signed in July 2002 by the Australian Government, the ACT Government and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC).

The committee comprises ACT government-appointed representatives from the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community, community organisations and housing providers, as well as representatives from the Commonwealth and ACT governments.

The committee's main roles are to advise on the annual plan for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Housing and to identify longer term priorities. The committee also advises the ACT Government on options for improving housing outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in the Australian Capital Territory and on the implementation of housing projects for the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community.

The committee met on four occasions during 2003–04 and drafted an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Trilateral Steering Committee Work Plan. It held three housing forums to seek community input and considered a range of measures to improve housing outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in the Australian Capital Territory.

Northern Territory

Jurisdictional approach in relation to Indigenous input into housing programs and decision making

The primary vehicle is Indigenous Housing Authority of the Northern Territory (IHANT). Its structure for 2003–04 comprises:

- seven ATSIC regional chairs;
- two ATSIC zone commissioners;
- one representative from ATSIS;

- one representative from FaCS; and
- six Northern Territory Government representatives.

This structure allows for high-level input from key Indigenous leadership throughout the Northern Territory, with the ATSIC regional councils providing the conduit between IHANT and the ICHOs to ensure 'grass roots' input is provided throughout policy and program development.

How Indigenous input feeds directly into planning/service delivery processes

The IHANT Program Manager (the Department of Community Development, Sport and Cultural Affairs) also has a significant regional presence through attendance at all ATSIC regional council meetings and cyclical community visits by either technical officers and/or community development officers and program staff. These visits are further supported through the facilitation of annual regional workshops for ICHO staff.

Outcome 5: Greater effectiveness and efficiency

Ensuring that assistance is properly directed to meeting objectives and that resources are being used to best advantage

- Indicator 1:** Total number of dwellings targeted for Indigenous people (Data provided under Outcome 3)
- Indicator 17:** Occupancy rates
- Indicator 18:** Turnaround time
- Indicator 19:** Proportion of Indigenous households housed by tenure type (Data provided under Outcome 3)
- Indicator 20:** Proportion of Indigenous households accessing mainstream housing services (Data provided under Outcome 3)
- Indicator 25:** Allocation of resources on the basis of need
- Indicator 36:** Proportion of clients satisfied with quality of the service provided (Data provided under Outcome 2)

This outcome area has seven indicators that provide measures of whether assistance is directed to meeting objectives and that resources are used to the best advantage.

Four of these indicators were in previous outcome areas – the total number of dwellings targeted to Indigenous people, the tenure type of Indigenous households, the proportion of Indigenous households accessing mainstream housing services and the proportion of clients satisfied with quality of the service provided.

Two of the remaining indicators, occupancy rates and turnaround time, provide measures of the efficiency of the housing services. Indicator 25 reports qualitative data on the allocation of resources on the basis of need, providing an indication of the effectiveness of housing services and whether resources are being used to best advantage.

Indicator 17. 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

ICH and SOMIH.

Data sources

Data for this indicator for ICH were collected from states and territories and from FaCS in the 2003–04 NRF data collection. The SOMIH data were collected by the AIHW in the national CSHA data collection.

Data

Table 5.1: Number and rate of ICH and SOMIH dwellings that were occupied, by state and territory, 30 June 2004

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
No. of occupied dwellings									
State ICH	4,485 ^(a)	..	3,676 ^(b)	n.a.	861	..	12	n.a.	n.a.
FaCS ICH	..	447	2,071 ^(c)	124	20	..	2,662
SOMIH	4,007	1,219 ^(d)	2,720	2,187	1,751	335	12,219
Total no. of dwellings									
State ICH	4,616 ^(a)	..	3,676 ^(b)	2,490	1,092	..	12	6,064	17,950
FaCS ICH	..	476	2,358 ^(c)	128	20	..	2,982
SOMIH	4,088	1,260 ^(d)	2,811	2,325	1,900	341	12,725
Occupancy rate									
State ICH	97.2 ^(a)	..	100.0 ^(b)	n.a.	78.8	..	100.0	n.a.	n.a.
FaCS ICH	..	93.9	87.8 ^(c)	96.9	100.0	..	89.3
SOMIH	98.0	96.7 ^(d)	96.8	94.1	92.2	98.2	96.0

(a) Includes all organisations with both 'active' and 'inactive' registration with the AHO. A total of 1,734 of the ICHO dwellings are assumed to be occupied as the actual status at 30 June 2004 is unknown due to the organisation not being actively registered in 2003–04.

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

(c) FaCS ICH data for Queensland do not include that for Gladstone, Cunnamulla, Cherbourg and Logan City.

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

Sources: AIHW NRF data collection and CSHA SOMIH data collection.

- The number of ICH dwellings that were occupied ranged from 12 for state administered ICH in the Australian Capital Territory to 4,485 for state administered ICH in New South Wales.
- The occupancy rates ranged from 78.8% for state administered ICH in South Australia to 100% for state administered dwellings in the Australian Capital Territory and Queensland.
- Occupancy rates were also high for SOMIH dwellings ranging from 92.2% in South Australia to 98.2% in Tasmania.

Indicator 18. Turnaround time

Purpose

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

Description

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

Scope

ICH and SOMIH.

Data sources

Data for this indicator for ICH were collected from states and territories (but not from FaCS) in the 2003–04 NRF data collection. Only one jurisdiction could provide these data. The SOMIH data were collected by the AIHW in the national CSHA data collection.

Data

Table 5.2: Turnaround time for ICH and SOMIH dwellings, by state and territory, for the year ending 30 June 2004

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
	No. of days								
State ICH	n.a.	..	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	..	— ^(a)	n.a.	n.a.
SOMIH	36	45 ^(b)	46	58	44	33	46

(a) There were no vacancies in the ACT in 2003–04 so turnaround time was nil days.

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

Note: There were no ICH data collected from FaCS.

Sources: AIHW NRF data collection and CSHA SOMIH data collection.

- In 2003–04 the average turnaround time for SOMIH dwellings across Australia was 46 days. This was less than the turnaround time for SOMIH in 2002–03 when the average was 49 days.
- The turnaround time for SOMIH in 2003–04 ranged from 33 days in Tasmania to 58 days in Western Australia.

Indicator 25. 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; and
- whether resources were allocated on the basis of need, including what needs criteria are used to allocate:
 - (a) capital funding for new acquisitions and upgrades, and
 - (b) houses to tenants.

Scope

ICH and SOMIH.

Data sources

Data for this indicator were collected from jurisdictions (but not from FaCS) in the 2003–04 NRF data collection.

Data

Summary of qualitative data

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:

- Queensland used three measures – stock condition, overcrowding and homelessness.
- The Northern Territory calculated bedroom need based on number of people in a dwelling, and whether dwellings were improvised or in need of repair or replacement.
- South Australia used a wide range of different factors based on statistical data, technical information, risk assessment and social assessment. Needs measures used were overcrowding, affordability, condition of houses and connection to services.
- Western Australia used a needs-based formula including homelessness, overcrowding, affordability and dwelling condition.

- The Australian Capital Territory analysed homelessness data.

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 houses 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 New South Wales ICHOs were required to assess applicants against the standard AHO criteria used for SOMIH. It was based on Aboriginality, income and any exceptional circumstances.
- In Queensland ICHOs had their own standard allocation practices and formal allocation policies.

Qualitative data for each jurisdiction

New South Wales

The criteria used to allocate capital funding for Indigenous housing

Allocation of resources under the Aboriginal Housing Program (AHO) is informed by two processes which are described below.

1. The AHO Board undertakes an analysis of comparative need on a regional basis, which informs the allocation of funds to regions taking into account:
 - all households in need, weighted for depth of overcrowding (e.g. required number of bedrooms) and depth of affordability (affordability deficit), as established at the 2001 Census;
 - dwellings completed under AHO, ACDP, HACP and NAHS programs in previous years;
 - an estimate of future funding under non-AHO programs;
 - an equal proportion of total need being met in each region; and
 - the average regional cost of housing acquisition, both construction and spot purchase.
2. An analysis is undertaken at a regional level by the Regional Aboriginal Housing Committees (RAHCs) in relation to the allocation of funds to projects on the basis of need, which assesses:
 - 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 organisational planning and development; and

- forward commitments of other government housing programs for Aboriginal people.

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

- severity of need in relation to housing adequacy and affordability at an Indigenous Area level;
- the demand for housing;
- the supply of housing;
- communities where serious environmental health issues exist;
- the lack of access to other housing options, (e.g. rural and remote communities and communities with limited availability of mainstream housing options, including public housing, community housing and private rental); and
- the extent and nature of funding being provided through the Aboriginal Communities Development Program. This is a critical consideration as program planning is coordinated to ensure program responses are not duplicated.

The RAHCs prioritise communities on the basis of need and then assess the management performance of organisations to determine which housing organisation(s) in prioritised communities are to be allocated housing.

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

To assist RAHCs in assessing the performance of Aboriginal housing organisations, organisations were assessed against the Key Indicators for Assessing Aboriginal Housing Management. In order for organisations to be considered for the full range of program components the organisation must meet seven of ten indicators, including three mandatory indicators which are rates arrears, liquidity and insurance. The remaining indicators, four of which need to be met, are development of policies, procedures and systems; rent levels; rent collection; rent arrears management; repairs and maintenance; audit status; and training.

In assessing organisations 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.

In developing projects for community and organisational planning and development, the following factors are taken into consideration:

- the relative need for the project;
- the potential impact of the project in relation to improvements to property and tenancy management procedures and policies; and
- the potential impact of the project in relation to accessing alternative funding sources, (e.g. ACDP).

The RAHCs then prioritised projects in accordance with regional priorities and targets and established notional budgets. Housing budgets were developed based on advice provided through Resitech (a commercial division of the Department of Housing which is contracted by the AHO to provide program and project management services.) AHO (SOMIH) projects

were identified where there were no Aboriginal housing organisations that could demonstrate effective housing management in areas of high need.

The criteria used to allocate houses to tenants.

The 'NSW Aboriginal Housing Policy, Housing for Aboriginal Communities Program' contains the criteria for allocation of new housing for ICHO houses. Eligibility is based on Aboriginality, income and any exceptional circumstances, with special provision for those over 55 years of age. Eligibility for SOMIH housing is in accordance with AHO policy, also based on Aboriginality, income and any exceptional circumstances, with special provision for over 55 years of age.

Allocation of housing is then based on date of application and locational preference along with any prioritisation based on exceptional circumstances. Households are matched to appropriately sized housing. ICHOs may have additional criteria for eligibility, such as active membership of the organisation. ICHOs must ensure that applicants are assessed and prioritised against the criteria, and the Department of Housing must likewise ensure that applicants for SOMIH housing are assessed and prioritised against AHO criteria.

Victoria

The criteria used to allocate capital funding for Indigenous housing

The Aboriginal Housing Board of Victoria (AHBV) utilises a needs based model to set stock acquisition targets on a state-wide basis. Inputs to the model include demand expressed through new Indigenous applicants on the waiting list over the past three years (75%), together with Indigenous households receiving Commonwealth Rent Assistance (CRA) (25%). These figures are calculated on a regional basis and capital money is divided between regions relative to highest need. The model also guides acquisition planning in relation to household size.

The AHBV holds stock planning forums each year with asset management decision making also occurring through monthly board meetings, a strategic planning workshop and policy workshops.

The allocation of capital funding for upgrade is based on property condition. The AHBV has overseen the implementation of a state-wide 'Leasing Plan' database for this purpose in 2003-04. Under this system, properties are 'rated' and data is used to inform AHBV asset management planning, including capital upgrades, programmed maintenance and disposal planning.

In terms of the national Multi-measure Needs Model, the above methodology effectively addresses the affordability, overcrowding and dwelling condition aspects of housing need. In Victoria all public and SOMIH housing is connected to services, so this is not a focus of the needs analysis.

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 who 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 housing needs. 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

To allocate capital funding in 2004–05 across the 34 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities under the Five Year Capital Grants Program Plan, the Department of Housing used the following three of the five multi-measures of need:

- Stock Condition – recorded directly from the Department of Housing’s Housing Asset Management System (HAMS) for the 34 discrete communities. The HAMS database is updated biennially using a house-to-house audit, which measures housing stock condition by detailing the cost of all work required to renovate or restore each house in each community to the minimum standard for new construction.
- Overcrowding – derived from the overcrowding index recorded in the HAMS. The overcrowding index indicates the number of additional dwellings required in each community.
- Homelessness – derived from the 2001 Census records of persons living in improvised homes and boarding houses.

The above three measures identified the total housing need across the discrete Indigenous communities so funds could be allocated proportionally, relative to the need of each community.

Capital Works funding for SOMIH dwellings is allocated under a five-year Capital Works Program, using a modified needs formula. Overcrowding, homelessness and waitlist data are the three criteria used.

The criteria used to allocate houses to tenants.

SOMIH houses are allocated on wait turn basis with 10% for priority allocation. Priority allocation can be made under the following circumstances:

- at risk (e.g. domestic violence);
- experiencing health problems or disability;
- homeless through natural disaster;
- needing to gain access to employment and/or education;
- homeless or living in sub-standard housing through economic circumstances (e.g. condemned);
- discrimination; and
- cultural reasons;

For Indigenous Community Housing, all 34 Queensland Deed of Grant In Trust communities used standardised allocation practices, and many now also have formalised allocation policies. Allocation practices are set out in the *Queensland Housing Act 2003* and the associated Housing Regulation 2003, with which all councils are required to comply.

Western Australia

The criteria used to allocate capital funding for Indigenous housing

Under the Western Australia Housing and Infrastructure Agreement signed in 2002, all projects to be undertaken are selected on the basis of prioritised need. A needs based funding formula including homelessness, overcrowding, affordability and dwelling condition was developed to determine how funds are dispersed between ATSI regions.

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

In assessing applications for community housing funding allocations, the Aboriginal Housing Authority (AHA) considers

- statistical information such as:
 - current housing number by population;
 - the number of people currently waiting for housing;
 - previous allocation of resources from Community Housing and Infrastructure Program (CHIP) housing funds;
 - funds received from other sources (eg National Aboriginal Health Strategy);
 - the number of people currently living in Wiltjas or substandard accommodation; and
 - the number of properties currently unoccupied (and reasons why).
- technical information such as:
 - property condition report (particularly for upgrades);
 - housing asset condition;
 - standards forum requirements;
 - property amenity;
 - need for disabled modifications;
 - financial assessment of costs;
 - health and safety of existing properties;
 - appropriateness of request (within current standards and guidelines); and
 - value for money (e.g. 100 bathroom upgrades or 50 bathrooms and 20 kitchens).
- risk assessment including:

- capacity of the community to undertake/facilitate the building proposed, if appropriate;
 - the current housing management development program;
 - rent collection methodology (e.g. action if rent not collected);
 - community impact statement; and
 - feasibility of project within timeframe (for the community and for the AHA).
- Social assessment in order to ensure a holistic and comprehensive assessment that strives for an equitable and fair allocation of funds.

The criteria used to allocate houses to tenants

All applicants for the AHA rental program are assessed against housing need categories prior to joining the waiting list. The assessment of housing need is a complex process which requires the applicant to demonstrate their housing need against all measures. Once analysed by the housing officer against AHA guidelines, the applicant's housing need is assessed as follows:

- Category 1 – applicants in most urgent housing need. Housing issues of extreme difficulty and seriousness. Applicants are homeless or at severe risk of homelessness and have complex needs;
- Category 2 – applicants who are not in urgent need, but for whom other housing options are not suitable as long-term options;
- Category 3 – applicants who meet the income and assets test but who do not meet the needs criteria for categories 1 or 2; and
- Category 4 – applicants who pass the basic eligibility test but do not pass the income and assets test, have no housing need, and can be registered for low-demand areas.

Currently 75% of applicants are requesting housing in the metropolitan area of Adelaide. Allocations to properties are made on the basis of an applicant's requirements for location, housing need category and the suitability of the vacant property for the household type.

Tasmania

The criteria used to allocate capital funding for Indigenous housing

Due to a lack of data, capital funding for SOMIH in Tasmania is divided equally between the North, North West and Southern regions. Work is currently being undertaken on available data to ensure future distribution of funds is determined on a needs basis.

The criteria used to allocate houses to tenants

Allocation of homes is undertaken by the Housing Tasmania Aboriginal Customer Services Officer in each region, in conjunction with the regional Aboriginal Tenancy Advisory Panels, with priority given to applicants in highest need. Though the specific factors which lead to an allocation are not currently recorded on Housing Tasmania's information system, deliberations consider an applicant household's ill health/medical requirements, the affordability and adequacy of current housing, whether an applicant is experiencing domestic or family violence, and the length of time the household has been waiting for a home.

Australian Capital Territory

The criteria used to allocate capital funding for Indigenous housing

Indigenous housing need in the Australian Capital Territory is determined through analyses undertaken by the government (for example, under the ACT Homelessness Strategy) and by the community (for example, by the ACT Aboriginal and Torres Islander Housing Steering Committee).

The ACT Government in 2003–04 allocated considerable additional resources to social housing and homelessness services. The government targeted these resources at those most in need.

Funding was provided in 2003-04:

- to increase the capacity of the Billabong Aboriginal Corporation to manage additional properties;
- to assist in the establishment of a new provider, Ghibba Gunya; and
- for capacity building and training initiatives in the Indigenous community housing sector under a joint initiative of the Billabong Aboriginal Corporation and the Havelock Housing Association.

Northern Territory

The criteria used to allocate capital funding for Indigenous housing

The primary strategy is the annual application of the IHANT Needs Measurement Model endorsed prior to the 2002–03 financial year. This model makes calculates bedroom need by community and ATSI region, utilising data from the Community Information Access System database.

A review of this model has commenced with a view to refining the allocating process through greater recognition of issues around mobility, urban drift, emerging need and the possible strategic allocation of a smaller pool of funds to achieve economies of scale, employment and training outcomes etc. The review is scheduled to be completed in November 2004.

Outcome 6: Improved performance linked to accountability

Program performance reporting based on national data collection systems and good information management

Indicator 16: Average cost of providing assistance per dwelling

Indicator 37: Proportion of indicators (not Census or CHINS) that jurisdictions could report on

Outcome area 6 contains two indicators. The first is average cost of providing assistance per dwelling, as a measure of the program performance. The second indicator is the proportion of indicators that jurisdictions could report on. This provides a measure of the quality of data collection in the jurisdictions which is essential to assess both the current status of Indigenous housing as well as to report on the outcomes of policy initiatives.

Indicator 16. Average cost of providing assistance per dwelling

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

ICH and SOMIH.

Data sources

Data for this indicator were collected from jurisdictions (but not from FaCS) in the 2003–04 NRF data collection. Data for SOMIH were collected in the national CSHA data collection.

Data

Table 6.1: Total and average cost of providing assistance per dwelling for ICH and SOMIH, by state and territory, for the year ending 30 June 2004

	NSW	Vic ^(a)	Qld	WA	SA ^(b)	Tas	ACT	NT	Aust
Total direct costs (\$'000)									
State ICH	17,058	..	n.a.	n.a.	5,032	..	n.a.	2,020	n.a.
SOMIH	23,238	5,969	17,699	14,088	10,391	1,168	72,553
Total no. of dwellings									
State ICH	4,616	..	3,676	2,490	1,092	..	12	6,064	17,950
SOMIH	4,088	1,260	2,811	2,325	1,900	341	12,725
Average cost per dwelling (\$)									
State ICH	3,695	..	n.a.	n.a.	4,608	..	n.a.	333	n.a.
SOMIH	5,684	4,737	6,296	6,059	5,469	3,425	5,702

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

(b) Direct costs data for SA relate to 37 of the 46 ICH organisations.

Sources: AIHW NRF data collection and CSHA SOMIH data collection.

- Among the three jurisdictions which could provide data, the direct costs of state administered ICH ranged from \$2.02 million in the Northern Territory to \$17.06 million in New South Wales.
- For ICH, the average cost of providing assistance ranged from \$333 per dwelling in the Northern Territory to \$4,608 in South Australia.
- For SOMIH average costs ranged from \$3,425 per dwelling in Tasmania to \$6,296 in Queensland.

Indicator 37. Proportion of indicators (not Census or CHINS) that jurisdictions could report on

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.

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 6.2: Number and proportion of ICH/SOMIH indicators for which jurisdictions could provide data, by state and territory, 2003–04

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	ACT	NT
No. for which data were provided	22	8	20	14	23	8	22	20
No. for which data were requested	26	8	26	26	26	8	23	23
Proportion (%)	85	100	77	58	88	100	96	87

Notes

1. The scope of the state ICH data collection varies across jurisdiction and the data should not be compared. Western Australia reports on all ICH in their jurisdiction while New South Wales, Queensland, South Australia, the Australian Capital Territory and the Northern Territory report only on ICH managed by ICHOs that are funded by or registered with the state government.
2. In Victoria, there are a very small number of properties managed by the Aboriginal Housing Board of Victoria (AHBV) which are not owned by the Office of Housing, but for practical purposes are reported under SOMIH with other AHBV properties.
3. For some indicators there are data quality issues with some of the data provided.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection.

- Jurisdictions were asked to provide SOMIH data for eight NRF indicators and ICH data for 23 indicators in 2003–04 NRF data collection. For jurisdictions with both ICH and SOMIH dwellings, data were requested for a total of 26 indicators; for jurisdictions with only ICH dwellings data were requested for 23 indicators, and for jurisdictions with only SOMIH dwellings, data were requested for eight indicators.

- Victoria and Tasmania provided all the data requested, but these jurisdictions do not administer ICH housing and did not have to provide any ICH specific data.
- Western Australia provided data on all ICHOs, not only those funded/registered by the state government; it provided 58% of the data requested.
- Of the remaining jurisdictions who reported only on funded/registered ICHOs, Queensland provided 77% of the data requested, New South Wales provided 85%, the Northern Territory provided 87%, South Australia provided 88% and the Australian Capital Territory provided 96%.

Table 6.3: Number and proportion of ICH indicators for which FaCS ICH could provide data, by state and territory, 2003-04

	Vic	Qld	Tas	ACT
No. for which complete data were provided	9	—	13	7
No. for which incomplete data were provided	13	13	13	13
No. for which data were requested	13	13	13	13
Proportion for which complete data were provided (%)	69.2	—	100.0	53.8

Notes

1. Incomplete data refers to situations where data were provided for some ICHOs, but not all ICHOs in the jurisdiction. It does not relate to the quality of the data.
2. For some indicators there are data quality issues with some of the data provided.

Source: AIHW NRF data collection.

- All jurisdictions provided data for the majority of indicators; however, for some indicators, the data provided by Queensland, Victoria and the Australian Capital Territory did not include some ICHOs and was classified as incomplete data (Table 6.3).
- Complete data was provided for 100% of the indicators by Tasmania, for 69.2% by Victoria, for 53.8% by the Australian Capital Territory and for none of the indicators by Queensland.

Outcome 7: Coordination of services

A whole-of-government approach that ensures greater coordination of housing and housing related services linked to improved health and wellbeing outcomes

Indicator 34: Coordination of housing and other services that seek to improve the health and wellbeing of Indigenous people

This outcome area has only one indicator – the coordination of housing and other services that seek to improve the health and wellbeing of Indigenous people. This provides information on the coordination of services for Indigenous people across different government departments and between the state and Commonwealth. Examples of collaborations between housing and other services are given.

Indicator 34. Coordination of housing and other services that seek to improve the health and wellbeing of Indigenous people

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 jurisdictions (but not from FaCS) in the 2003–04 NRF data collection.

Data

Summary of qualitative data

While the administrative arrangements for Indigenous housing and infrastructure services varied across jurisdictions, activities were coordinated between the state and the Commonwealth governments through a range of different agreements. For example:

- In New South Wales, the trilateral agreement between the NSW government the Australian government and ATSIC provided the framework for partnership in planning, delivery and management of housing and related programs for Indigenous people.
- In Victoria, the Victorian Housing Indigenous Agreement was between the Victorian Office of Housing, ATSIC and FaCS. Under this agreement, joint planning arrangements were used to coordinate Indigenous housing activities.
- In Queensland, there were bilateral agreements between the Queensland and Australian governments, and between ATSIS and both the Aboriginal Co-ordination Council and the Torres Strait Island Regional Authority. Joint planning committees were established under these agreements which were responsible for advice on policies and strategies to improve housing and related infrastructure.
- In South Australia, the Aboriginal Housing Authority has overall responsibility for planning, coordination and service delivery and for the evaluation of housing provision for Indigenous people.

In 2003–04 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 the Northern Territory, IHANT was participating in the Thamarrurr Indigenous Community Coordination Pilot which aimed to integrate government and other services to assist in developing community capacity.
- In South Australia, the AHA was involved in the Youth on Remand Project aimed at placing youth on remand in a less institutionalised environment. In addition, a domestic violence centre was being established in Adelaide for women requiring transitional accommodation to escape domestic violence.
- In New South Wales, the AHA was involved in the development of a resource kit for people with mental illness living in Aboriginal, public or community housing.
- In the Australian Capital Territory, the government and the Aboriginal Hostels Limited jointly funded the first Indigenous SAAP service in the territory which provides accommodation for young Indigenous women aged 12 to 17 years.

Qualitative data for each jurisdiction

New South Wales

The Trilateral Agreement between the NSW Government, Commonwealth Government and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC) on the Provision and Management of Housing and Housing Related Infrastructure for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People in New South Wales expired on 30 June 2004. The Agreement provided the framework for partnership between these three bodies for the planning, delivery and management of housing and related programs for Aboriginal people in New South Wales. The Agreement provides for the pooling of Aboriginal housing funding into one body, the AHO, and specifies the outcomes to be achieved, the principles under which they will be achieved, and the role and functions of each party.

Other initiatives include the delivery of the first community workshop in western Sydney by the Joint Guarantee of Service for People with Mental Health Problems and Disorders Living in Aboriginal, Public and Community Housing. A second workshop is currently being planned, to be held in conjunction with the Southern Area Health Service. Consultants have been contracted to develop a Resource and Information Kit for Housing Providers to assist in the ongoing implementation of the initiative.

The research project on Inner City Aboriginal Homelessness is a Partnership Against Homelessness (PAH) Project, led by the NSW Aboriginal Housing Office (AHO). The AHO put the project to public tender in late 2003, with Paul Memmott & Associates subsequently selected as the successful tender. Work commenced in May 2004.

Victoria

The primary mechanism for the coordination of housing services for Indigenous people in Victoria is the Victorian Housing Indigenous Agreement, which was signed in 2003–04. Parties to the Agreement include the Victorian Office of Housing, the former ATSI, ATSIC and FACS. Joint planning arrangements under this agreement are designed to ensure ongoing improved coordination across Indigenous housing programs.

The Aboriginal Housing Board of Victoria (AHBV) and the Office of Housing are working to improve coordination between SOMIH housing and other housing related support services

through effective inter-agency communication and partnership. In 2003–04, the AHBV participated in the following:

- the Department of Human Services (DHS) Aboriginal Services Forum, which allows for information exchange between senior representatives of the DHS, state and Australian government departments and representatives from statewide and local Aboriginal community organisations;
- the deliberations of the Brotherhood of St Laurence (BSL) Indigenous Advisory Group. The AHBV has a representative on this group. The group's main focus is to advise the BSL on how it can form partnerships with Indigenous agencies, which will enable the BSL to contribute to address poverty in Indigenous communities. This forum allows for dissemination of information to occur through a variety of peak Indigenous organisations and mainstream services; and
- considerations of the City of Yarra Advisory Group. The AHBV continues to be an active member of this group and has strengthened relationships with staff members from the City of Yarra.

The AHBV and the Office of Housing have also increased emphasis on homelessness assistance and coordination with support services. In 2003–04, the following activities were undertaken:

- recommendations from the Victorian Indigenous Homelessness Study were followed up, with liaison with various state and commonwealth agencies;
- the AHBV and the Office of Housing continued work on a pilot project designed to provide case management and support services to tenants at risk of homelessness. This involved the creation of three Housing Support Worker positions for an initial period of 18 months; and
- a steering committee was implemented for Improving Access and Sustaining Outcomes in SAAP for Young Koories. This research program is to be auspiced to another Indigenous organisation, with support and representation from the AHBV. The program's focus is to look at what can be done to improve access and sustain outcomes within SAAP for young Indigenous people. The project seeks to identify why the data for Indigenous and non-Indigenous young people vary so significantly and to make recommendations to address issues arising from the findings.

Queensland

The Bilateral Agreements commit their respective parties to joint planning and coordination, effective program management and coordinated service delivery for Indigenous housing and infrastructure. Under the Agreements, the parties recognise the JTSHIC and the JPG as the principal sources of advice on appropriate policies and strategies to improve housing and related infrastructure outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in Queensland.

The Department of Housing works in partnership with other agencies such as the Department of Local Government and Planning and Sports and Recreation and the Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Policy (DATSIP). Under a proposed policy framework, Strategic Partnerships Queensland, DATSIP has prime responsibility for integrating and consolidating current government policies for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples into a single framework. Under this framework, the Department of Housing will continue to work closely with DATSIP to improve coordination and service planning.

Western Australia

The Aboriginal Housing and Infrastructure Directorate (AHID) actively engages state and commonwealth agencies to achieve joint program outcomes. For example, it has collaborated with:

- the Western Australian Department of Health and the Department of Indigenous Affairs to conduct the 2003 Environmental Health Needs Survey. This survey is providing more up-to-date community data for planning purposes;
- the Office of Energy, the Department of Indigenous Affairs and other agencies to implement the Power Procurement Pilot Project, which aims to normalise power supplies in selected major communities; and
- a range of state and commonwealth agencies to establish the Tjurabalan COAG trial site in the Kimberley.

The Department of Housing and Works also collaborates with other agencies (government and non-government) in the provision of services which support tenants in public housing. These services include:

- Aboriginal Tenant Support Service;
- Supported Housing Assistance Program; and
- mainstream community housing programs where support services are essential for continued tenancy.

South Australia

The South Australian Aboriginal Housing Authority (AHA) was established in 1998 to be the lead provider of housing to the Aboriginal community in South Australia. The AHA has overall responsibility for planning, coordination, service delivery and evaluation of housing provision for Aboriginal people in South Australia. The AHA also provides policy advice to the State Government regarding access to housing services and programs for Aboriginal people.

Social Inclusion Unit

As a result of the Social Inclusion report *Everyone's responsibility: reducing homelessness in South Australia*, the State Government funded the AHA for a Supported Tenancies Program.

The AHA, together with the Trust, has engaged two non-government organisations to provide a range of integrated and collaborative services that meet the needs of families and individuals at risk of homelessness, through the provision of appropriate support services and by assisting clients to achieve self-reliance and independence. These programs will target a minimum of 35 AHA tenants residing in the Parks region of Adelaide and the Murray and south east regions of South Australia for the 2004–05 financial year.

Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara (APY) Lands Task Force

The AHA will continue to be actively involved in the APY Lands Task Force during 2004–05. The Task Force was established in 2003 as a result of an urgent request to the Deputy Premier from the Commissioner of Police and the Chief Executive, Department of Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation that conditions on the lands had deteriorated. The urgent response consisted of three actions, one being the establishment of a Task Force to identify programs for immediate delivery and develop a comprehensive and coordinated strategic plan for improving socio-economic conditions on the lands.

Transitional Accommodation Program

The Wangka Wilurrara Accommodation Centre delivers transitional accommodation in the Ceduna region. The centre was formally opened in April 2004 and has been established to meet the needs of a transient Indigenous population. The centre is designed for those who have no other-short term housing options available.

A range of policies and procedures have also been developed for the centre. The purpose of the facility is to assist people who are chronically transient or homeless and to ensure that these individuals are assisted into suitable housing options that will result in improved health and wellbeing. The AHA developed the centre following extensive community consultation. This ensured that the service, practices and processes within the program would be transparent and appropriate to both the local community and the diverse Aboriginal cultures of individuals who use the facility.

Special projects

The AHA has assisted in support accommodation for specific groups; in order to do so, it linked services to produce service outcomes. The number of supported accommodation projects it has participated in have increased over the past financial year. These projects included:

- working with the Aboriginal Prisoners and Offenders Support Service, in sourcing sites to provide accommodation for Indigenous women exiting prison;
- entering into a joint venture with the Intellectual Disability Services Council (IDSC). A four-bedroom property in Thebarton will be used by a caretaker and three intellectually disabled Indigenous tenants who require access to services within the city;
- working with FAYS in setting up the Youth on Remand Project (Marni Wodli), which was fully operational in 2003-04. Youth on remand are placed in a less institutionalised environment;
- setting up a domestic violence centre in Adelaide CDB for women requiring transitional accommodation to escape domestic violence. The tender process is now completed with the successful applicant to be notified. Project completion for the implementation of the program is estimated to be 12 months; and
- working with Aboriginal Family Support Services to provide accommodation for Indigenous persons from the AP Lands suffering from substance abuse who need accommodation in order to help them to rehabilitate. Part of the accommodation houses the Indigenous customers; the other is currently being renovated to accommodate counsellors and staff.

Tasmania

Aboriginal housing Services Tasmania (AHST) and Housing Tasmania worked with the Office of Aboriginal Affairs throughout the year, on a range of general and specific issues. As previously mentioned, Housing Tasmania will participate in the Aboriginal Employment Strategy launched by the Department of Health and Human Services during 2004-2005. The AHST will await the establishment of new administrative arrangements through the Australian Government to investigate new avenues of engagement.

Australian Capital Territory

The ACT Government funds the Winnunga Nimmityjah Aboriginal Health Service which provides a range of services. These include an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Housing

Liaison Service, which seeks to improve the health and wellbeing of Indigenous people. An evaluation of the Housing Liaison Service commenced in 2003–04. Initial findings were that the service performs a valuable role for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in the territory. It employs an holistic approach which recognises safe, stable and secure housing as important to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health outcomes. The review also indicates the service has improved the capacity of clients to negotiate bureaucratic processes to gain access to housing

Within the public housing system, the ACT Government has enhanced the role of the Housing Manager Specialists (HMSs) 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 HMSs 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. Training in the areas of diversity and discrimination is planned for 2004–05 as part of a broader Human Rights training package.

The Department of Disability, Housing and Community Services undertook significant policy development work in 2003–04 in relevant areas, including homelessness, recognition of and support for those providing care, disability reform and community and supported housing. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people were included in these processes and their issues and support needs were reflected in the policies and commitments adopted by the ACT Government.

A key achievement of the Department in 2003–04 was the completion and launch of Breaking the Cycle – The ACT Homelessness Strategy in April 2004. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people were closely involved in the extensive community consultation that occurred in developing the strategy. It includes a number of specific measures to address the needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people who were homeless or at risk of homelessness, including the establishment of a supported accommodation service for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander families and an outreach service to support people in their transition from homelessness. The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Reference Group continues to work with the ACT Government to establish these services.

The ACT Government and Aboriginal Hostels Limited joined in 2003 to fund the first Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander SAAP funded service in the territory. In December 2003, Diyramal Migay was opened under the management of the Winnunga Nimmityjah Aboriginal Health Service. It provides supported accommodation for six young Indigenous women aged 12–17 years.

Northern Territory

During 2003–04 joint management of IHANT/NAHS projects continued, as agreed by the respective parties. IHANT has been involved in a total of six joint projects to date, through which there has been savings in project administration.

With the transfer of Indigenous essential services functions to the Department of Community Development, Sport and Cultural Affairs (DCDSCA) the opportunity was created for IHANT and DCDSCA to implement more holistic policy development and service delivery frameworks in relation to land-use planning and development strategies. This includes greater integration of housing, planning, land servicing and essential services provision (power, water, airstrips, barge landings and local/community roads).

IHANTs continued its participation in the Thamarrurr Indigenous Community Coordination Pilot in the Wadeye region. This program is looking at the integration of government and other services to assist in developing community capacity. In addition, IHANT is participating in the Fixing Houses for Better Health Program Phase 2 (FHBH2) in the Borroloola Region.

Appendix 1

Table A.1: National Reporting Framework national summary data by jurisdiction, 2003-04

NRF no.	Indicator	NSW	Vic		Qld		WA	SA	Tas		ACT		NT	Aust	
		State data	State data ^(a)	FaCS data	State data	FaCS data ^(b)	State data	State data	State data	FaCS data	State data	FaCS data	State data	State data	FaCS data
1	Total no. of dwellings targeted for Indigenous people														
	ICH	4,616	..	476	3,721	2,358	2,837 ^(c)	1,093	..	128	12	20	6,456	18,735	2,982
	SOMIH	4,088	1,260	..	2,811		2,325	1,900	341				..	12,725	..
2	Proportion of improvised dwellings ICH (%)	0.0	..		1.2		12.2 ^(c)	0.1	..		0.0		6.1	4.2	
3	Proportion of dwellings needing major repairs (%)	No admin. data collected in 2003–04, data from 2001 CHINS provided													
4	Proportion of dwellings needing replacement (%)	No admin. data collected in 2003–04, data from 2001 CHINS provided													
5, 6	Mechanisms to ensure new houses and upgrades meet minimum standards ICH	Qualitative indicator													
7	Proportion of communities not connected to (a) water, (b) sewerage, (c) electricity (%)	No admin. data collected in 2003–04, data from 2001 CHINS provided													
8	Proportion of dwellings not connected to (%):														
	Water	n.a.	..	0.2	0.0	1.2	7.6 ^(c)	2.8 ^(d)	..	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	1.8	1.0
	Sewerage	n.a.	..	0.0	0.0	3.1	9.5 ^(c)	2.8 ^(d)	..	2.3	0.0	0.0	21.0	8.6	2.5
	Electricity	n.a.	..	0.2	0.0	2.3	6.1 ^(c)	2.8 ^(d)	..	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	1.8	1.8
9	Proportion of dwellings meeting the nine FHBH healthy living standards (%)	No admin. data collected in 2003–04, data from 2002 NATSISS provided													

(continued)

Table A.1(continued): National Reporting Framework national summary data by jurisdiction, 2003-04

NRF no.	Indicator	NSW	Vic		Qld		WA	SA	Tas		ACT		NT	Aust	
		State data	State data ^(a)	FaCS data	State data	FaCS data ^(b)	State data	State data	State data	FaCS data	State data	FaCS data	State data	State data	FaCS data
10	Average weekly rent collected (\$pw)														
	ICH ^(e)	39	..	56	45	76	n.a.	22	..	68	118	73	31	n.a.	72
	SOMIH	91	90	..	87	..	88	85	74	88	..
11	Rent collected as a percentage of total rent charged (%)														
	ICH	85.3	..	91.8	100.2	91.6	n.a.	51.6	..	100.5	100.6	100.0	111.2	95.1	92.0
	SOMIH	104.1	99.8	..	101.3	..	103.1	97.0	102.2	101.8	..
12	Total amount spent on maintenance each year (\$'000)														
	ICH	No admin. data collected in 2003-04, data from 2001 CHINS provided													
	SOMIH	7,220	1,512	..	5,861	..	6,142	5,617	604	26,956	..
13	Average amount spent on maintenance each year (\$)														
	ICH	No admin. data collected in 2003-04, data from 2001 CHINS provided													
	SOMIH	1,766	1,200	..	2,085	..	2,642	2,956	1,771	2,118	..
14	Maintenance expenditure as a proportion of rent collected (%)														
	ICH	No admin. data collected in 2003-04, data from 2001 CHINS provided													
	SOMIH	38.2	26.6	..	47.5	..	61.6	72.4	46.8	48.2	..
15	Recurrent to capital expenditure ratio														
	ICH	0.46	..	0.67	n.a.	0.42	n.a.	1.00	..	1.34	0.00 ^(f)	0.86	0.61	n.a.	0.50
	SOMIH	0.92	0.88	..	1.06	..	2.15	0.63	0.70	1.01	..

(continued)

Table A.1(continued): National Reporting Framework national summary data by jurisdiction, 2003-04

NRF no.	Indicator	NSW	Vic		Qld		WA	SA	Tas		ACT		NT	Aust	
		State data	State data ^(a)	FaCS data	State data	FaCS data ^(b)	State data	State data	State data	FaCS data	State data	FaCS data	State data	State data	FaCS data
16	Average cost of providing assistance per dwelling (\$)														
	ICH	3,695	n.a.	..	n.a.	4,608	n.a.	..	333	n.a.	..
	SOMIH	5,684	4,737	..	6,296	..	6,059	5,469	3,425	5,702	..
17	Occupancy rates (%)														
	ICH	97.2	..	93.9	100.0	87.8	n.a.	78.8	..	96.9	100.0	100.0	n.a.	n.a.	89.3
	SOMIH	98.0	96.7	..	96.8	..	94.1	92.2	98.2	96.0	..
18	Turnaround time (days)														
	ICH	n.a.	n.a.	..	n.a.	n.a.	0	..	n.a.	n.a.	..
	SOMIH	36	45	..	46	..	58	44	33	46	..
19	Proportion of Indigenous households by tenure type (%)														
20	Proportion of Indigenous households accessing mainstream housing services (%)														
	Public housing	7.1	1.7	..	5.4	..	15.0	2.6	4.3	..	1.6	..	28.4	5.9	..
	Community housing	6.0	3.9	..	11.1	..	9.5	1.7	1.0	..	4.1	..	n.a.	5.4	..
	Commonwealth Rent Assistance	2.8	0.8	..	3.8	..	2.7	1.8	3.1	..	n.a.	..	18.3	2.4	..
21	Proportion of Indigenous people who are homeless (%)														

Table A.1(continued): National Reporting Framework national summary data by jurisdiction, 2003-04

NRF no.	Indicator	NSW	Vic		Qld		WA	SA	Tas		ACT		NT	Aust	
		State data	State data ^(a)	FaCS data	State data	FaCS data ^(b)	State data	State data	State data	FaCS data	State data	FaCS data	State data	State data	FaCS data
22	Total and average no. of additional bedrooms required														
	Total no.	n.a.	..		4,656		n.a.	2,569	..	—		n.a.		n.a.	
	Average per household	n.a.	..		2.9		n.a.	3.3	..	—		n.a.		n.a.	
	<i>No. of people per bedroom</i>														
	ICH	1.1	..	1.1	1.8	0.8	1.6 ^(c)	2.5	..	1.1	1.0	0.6	2.7	2.0	0.8
23	Proportion overcrowded households (%)														
	ICH ^(g)	n.a.	..	5.0	31.8	28.0	n.a.	n.a.	..	1.6	—	50.0	n.a.	n.a.	23.3
	SOMIH ^(h)	1.2	2.0	..	6.7	..	1.0	1.4	0.3	2.6	..
24	Proportion of households paying 25% or more of income in rent (%)														
	ICH ⁽ⁱ⁾	No admin. data collected in 2003-04, 2002 NATSISS data provided													
	SOMIH	0.0	0.2		0.0		4.4	1.5	42.2	2.2	..
25	Allocation of resources on the basis of need	Qualitative data													
26	No. of Indigenous community housing organisations	284	..	21	34	74	n.a.	46	..	3	1	3	85	450	101
27	Proportion of organisations that have a housing management plan (%)	n.a.	..	57	—	70	n.a.	67	..	100	100	67	41	n.a.	68

(continued)

Table A.1(continued): National Reporting Framework national summary data by jurisdiction, 2003-04

NRF no.	Indicator	NSW	Vic		Qld		WA	SA	Tas		ACT		NT	Aust	
		State data	State data ^(a)	FaCS data	State data	FaCS data ^(b)	State data	State data	State data	FaCS data	State data	FaCS data	State data	State data	FaCS data
28	What jurisdictions are doing to assist ICHOs to develop and implement housing management plans	Qualitative data													
29	Proportion of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who have completed accredited training in housing management and related areas (%)	24.4	..	—	n.a.	22.6	n.a.	96.2	..	36.4	25.0	16.7	38.7	n.a.	n.a.
30	Proportion of Indigenous employees in ICHOs who are undertaking accredited training in housing management and related areas (%)	6.1	..	43.8	n.a.	24.8	n.a.	54.7	..	54.5	75.0	50.0	55.5	n.a.	29.4
31	Proportion of people employed in housing management who are Indigenous (%)														
	ICH	77	..	64	n.a.	77	n.a.	n.a.	..	85	100	100	68	n.a.	77
	SOMIH	100	61	..	67	..	8	49	75	17	..
32	Strategies and outcomes to increase Indigenous employment in housing services	Qualitative data													
33	Mechanisms for Indigenous input to planning, decision making and delivery of services	Qualitative data													

(continued)

Table A.1(continued): National Reporting Framework national summary data by jurisdiction, 2003-04

NRF no.	Indicator	NSW	Vic		Qld		WA	SA	Tas		ACT		NT	Aust		
		State data	State data ^(a)	FaCS data	State data	FaCS data ^(b)	State data	State data	State data	FaCS data	State data	FaCS data	State data	State data	FaCS data	
34	Coordination of housing and other services that seek to improve the health and wellbeing of Indigenous people															
35	Proportion of clients satisfied with (a) amenity															
	(b) location of their dwelling															
36	Proportion of clients satisfied with quality of the service provided															
37	Proportion of indicators (not Census or CHINS) that jurisdictions could report on (%)	85	100		77		58	88	100		96		85			
38	Proportion of organisations using rent deduction schemes															

(a) In Victoria there were a small number of properties managed by the Aboriginal Housing Board which were counted under SOMIH.

(b) FaCS data do not include all data from all ICHOs.

(c) ICH data for WA include all ICH dwellings, not just those managed by funded or registered ICHOs.

(d) These data relate to the number of dwellings on communities not connected to services.

(e) The state data for NSW and NT and the FaCS data for all jurisdictions are average rent per dwelling not per household.

(f) There was no capital expenditure for ICH for the ACT in 2003-04.

(g) The FaCS data for all jurisdictions were estimated numbers of overcrowded households.

(h) SOMIH data are for 30 June 2003.

Note: Shading indicates that administrative data requires further development. The darker the shading the more work required to collect nationally consistent data.

Appendix 2

Questionnaire for FaCS funded Indigenous Community Housing Organisations (ICHO)

Housing Stock

Q1. Number of dwellings at 30 June 2004	
- Total number of ICHO managed dwellings	<input type="text"/>
<i>Comments</i>	

Q2. Number of new dwellings in 2003-2004	
- Total number of new ICHO managed dwellings acquired or completed in 2003-2004	<input type="text"/>
<i>Comments</i>	

Q3. Number of major upgrades (over \$5000) completed in 2003-2004	
- Total number of major upgrades completed in 2003-2004 Note: A 'major upgrade' is a change to improve the amenities of a dwelling, costing \$5000 or more.	<input type="text"/>
<i>Comments</i>	

Q4. Number of dwellings not connected to water at 30 June 2004	
- Total number of ICHO managed dwellings not connected to water Note: 'water' refers to any community-organised system that supplies water for human consumption.	<input type="text"/>
<i>Comments</i>	

Q5. Number of dwellings not connected to electricity at 30 June 2004

- Total number of ICHO managed dwellings not connected to electricity

Comments

Q6. Number of dwellings not connected to sewerage at 30 June 2004

- Total number of ICHO managed dwellings not connected to a sewerage system

Note: 'Sewerage system' refers to any system organised on a community basis.

Comments

Q7. Total number of ICHO managed dwellings at 30 June 2004 by:

- 5 or more bedrooms
- 4 bedrooms
- 3 bedrooms
- 2 bedrooms
- 1 bedroom

Comments

Income & Expenditure

Q8. Total rent charged to all tenants for the year 2003-2004

- Total amount of rent charged to all tenants \$'000

Note: 'Rent charged' refers to the total amount of rent payable/collectable.

Comments

Q9. Total rent collected from tenants for the year 2003-2004

- Total amount of rent collected from tenants \$'000

Note: 'Rent collected' refers to the total amount of rent paid by all tenants.

Comments

Q10. Total recurrent expenditure for the year 2003–2004	
- Total amount of recurrent expenditure \$'000 Note: 'Recurrent expenditure' refers to the expenditure on goods and services, which does not result in the creation or acquisition of fixed assets. It consists of mainly expenditure on wages, salaries and supplements, purchases of goods and services and consumption of fixed capital (depreciation). It includes operating expenses and tenancy management and expense components.	\$ <input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
<i>Comments</i>	

Q11. Total capital expenditure for the year 2003–2004	
- Total amount of capital expenditure \$'000 Note: 'Capital expenditure' refers to expenditure on the acquisition or enhancement of an asset (excludes financial assets).	\$ <input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
<i>Comments</i>	

Note – Questions 10 & 11 should account for all expenditure.

Dwelling Occupancy

Q12. Total number of dwellings occupied at 30 June 2004	
- Total number of ICHO managed dwellings occupied	<input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
- Total number of ICHO managed dwelling unoccupied	<input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
<i>Comments</i>	

Q13. Total number of persons living in dwellings at 30 June 2004	
- Total number of persons living in ICHO managed dwellings	<input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
<i>Comments</i>	

Q14. Total number of weeks vacant for the year 2003–2004	
<p>- Total number of weeks vacant</p> <p>Note: Refers to the total number of weeks vacant for all dwellings that were vacated and subsequently re-tenanted during the year ending 30 June 2004, excluding those vacant due to major repairs or cultural reasons, and those still vacant at 30 June 2004.</p>	<input style="width: 100px; height: 30px;" type="text"/>
<i>Comments</i>	

Q15. Number of dwellings with overcrowding at 30 June 2004	
<p>- Total number of dwellings with overcrowding</p> <p>Note: ‘Overcrowding’ refers to dwellings where 2 or more additional bedrooms are required to meet the proxy occupancy standard. The proxy standard indicates that each single adult should occupy 1 bedroom; couple with no children, two bedrooms; sole parent or couple with 1 child, two bedrooms; sole parent or couple with 2 or 3 children, three bedrooms; sole parent or couple with 4+ children, four bedrooms.</p>	<input style="width: 100px; height: 30px;" type="text"/>
<i>Comments</i>	

References

- ABS (Australian Bureau of Statistics) 2002. Housing and infrastructure in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities, Australia 2001. Cat. No. 4710.0. Canberra: ABS.
- Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) 2003. Australia's welfare 2003. Canberra: AIHW.
- Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) 2003. Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement national data reports 2002-03: State and territory owned and managed Indigenous housing. Canberra: AIHW.
- Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) 2005. Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement national data reports 2003-04: Community housing. Canberra: AIHW.
- Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) 2005. Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement national data reports 2003-04: Public rental housing. Canberra: AIHW.
- Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) 2005. Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement national data reports 2003-04: State owned and managed Indigenous housing. Canberra: AIHW.
- Chamberlain C & MacKenzie D 2003. Australian Census analytic program counting the homeless. Canberra: ABS.
- Chamberlain C & MacKenzie D 2004a. Counting the homeless 2001 Australian Capital Territory. Melbourne: Swinburne & RMIT.
- Chamberlain C & MacKenzie D 2004b. Counting the homeless 2001 New South Wales. Melbourne: Swinburne & RMIT.
- Chamberlain C & MacKenzie D 2004c. Counting the homeless 2001 Northern Territory. Melbourne: Swinburne & RMIT.
- Chamberlain C & MacKenzie D 2004d. Counting the homeless 2001 Queensland. Melbourne: Swinburne & RMIT.
- Chamberlain C & MacKenzie D 2004e. Counting the homeless 2001 South Australia. Melbourne: Swinburne & RMIT.
- Chamberlain C & MacKenzie D 2004f. Counting the homeless 2001 Tasmania. Melbourne: Swinburne & RMIT.
- Chamberlain C & MacKenzie D 2004g. Counting the homeless 2001 Victoria. Melbourne: Swinburne & RMIT.
- Chamberlain C & MacKenzie D 2004h. Counting the homeless 2001 Western Australia. Melbourne: Swinburne & RMIT.
- HMC (Housing Ministers' Conference) 2001. Australian housing ministers' ten year statement of new directions in Indigenous housing: building a better future: Indigenous housing to 2010.
- Howden-Chapman P & Wilson N 2000. Housing and health. In: Howden-Chapman P and Tobias M (eds). Social inequalities in health: New Zealand 1999. Wellington: Ministry of Health.