# National Affordable Housing Agreement performance reporting

## Framework for National Agreement reporting

COAG endorsed a new Intergovernmental Agreement on Federal Financial Relations (IGA) in November 2008 (COAG 2009a) and reaffirmed its commitment in August 2011 (COAG 2011a). The IGA includes six National Agreements (NAs):

* *National Healthcare Agreement*
* *National Education Agreement*
* *National Agreement for Skills and Workforce Development*
* *National Affordable Housing Agreement*
* *National Disability Agreement*
* *National Indigenous Reform Agreement*.

Five of the NAs are associated with a national Specific Purpose Payment (SPP) that provides funding to the states and territories for the sector covered by the NA. These five SPPs cover schools, vocational education and training (VET), disability services, healthcare and affordable housing. The National Indigenous Reform Agreement is not associated with a SPP, but draws together Indigenous elements from the other NAs.

At its 7 December 2009 meeting, COAG agreed to a high level review of the NAs, National Partnership Agreements (NPs) and implementation plans. On 13 February 2011, COAG noted a report on this review and agreed to further reviews of the NA performance reporting frameworks (COAG 2011b). The review of the National Affordable Housing Agreement(NAHA) performance reporting framework was completed and the review recommendations were endorsed by COAG on 25 July 2012 (and subsequently amended on 7 December 2012 to incorporate performance benchmarks). This report reflects the COAG-endorsed outcomes of the review.

### National Agreement reporting roles and responsibilities

The Standing Council for Federal Financial Relations (SCFFR) has general oversight of the operations of the IGA on behalf of COAG [IGA para. A4(a)].

The COAG Reform Council (CRC) is responsible for monitoring and assessing the performance of all governments in achieving the outcomes and benchmarks specified in each NA. The CRC is required to provide to COAG the NA performance information and a comparative analysis of this information within three months of receipt from the Steering Committee [IGA paras. C14-C15].

The Steering Committee has overall responsibility for collating and preparing the necessary NA performance data [IGA para. C9]. Reports from the Steering Committee to the CRC are required:

* by end-June on the education and training sector (Agreements on Education and Skills and Workforce Development), commencing with 2008 data
* by end-December on the other sectors (Agreements on Healthcare, Affordable Housing, Disability and Indigenous Reform), commencing with 2008-09 data
* to include the provision of quality statements prepared by the collection agencies (based on the Australian Bureau of Statistics’ [ABS] data quality framework)
* to include comment on the quality of the performance information based on the quality statements.

The CRC has also requested the Steering Committee to collate data on the performance benchmarks for the reward components of selected NP agreements. The Steering Committee’s reports to the CRC can be found on the Review website ([www.pc.gov.au/gsp](http://www.pc.gov.au/gsp%20)).

## Performance reporting

The Steering Committee is required to collate performance information for the NAHA and provide it to the CRC no later than 31 December 2012. The CRC has requested the Steering Committee to provide information on all performance categories in the NAs (variously referred to as ‘outputs’, ‘performance indicators’, ‘performance benchmarks’ and ‘targets’).

The NAHA includes the performance categories of ‘outputs’, ‘performance indicators’ and ‘performance benchmarks’. The links between the objectives, outcomes and associated performance categories in the NAHA are illustrated in figure 1.

Figure 1 National Affordable Housing Agreement performance reporting**a, b**

|  |
| --- |
| **Objective**  *All Australians have access to affordable, safe and sustainable housing that contributes to social and economic* *participation*  **Outputs**  *eg Number of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who are assisted to secure and sustain their tenancies*  **Performance benchmarks**  *eg From 2006 to 2013, a seven per cent reduction nationally in the number of homeless* *Australians*  **Outcomes**  *eg People who are homeless or at risk of homelessness achieve sustainable housing and social inclusion*  **Performance indicators**    *eg Proportion of Australians who are homeless* |

a Shaded boxes indicate reportable categories of performance information included in this report. b Although the NAHA has multiple outcomes, outputs, performance indicators and performance benchmarks, only one example of each is included in this figure for illustrative purposes.

This report includes available data for the following:

* NAHA outputs
* NAHA performance indicators
* NAHA performance benchmarks.

This is the fourth NAHA report prepared by the Steering Committee. The previous three reports provided performance information for the previous NAHA performance indicator framework (COAG 2009b). This report provides performance information for the revised NAHA (COAG 2012a). The CRC has requested the Steering Committee collate data for new and/or revised indicators backcast to the baseline NAHA reporting period (2008-09 or most recent available data at the time of preparing the baseline NAHA performance report).

This report contains the original data quality statements (DQSs) completed by relevant data collection agencies, and comments by the Steering Committee on the quality of reported data (based on the DQSs). This report also includes Steering Committee views on areas for development of NAHA ‘outputs’, ‘performance indicators’ and ‘performance benchmarks’. Box 1 identifies the key issues in reporting on the performance categories in the NAHA.

A separate appendix (*National Agreement Performance Information 2011–12: Appendix*) provides general contextual information about each jurisdiction, to assist interpretation of the performance data. Contextual information is provided on population size and trends, family and household characteristics and socioeconomic status.

|  |
| --- |
| Attachment tables |
| Data for the performance indicators in this report are presented in a separate set of attachment tables. Attachment tables are identified in references throughout this report by a ‘NAHA’ prefix (for example, table NAHA.3.1). |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 1 Key issues in reporting against the NAHA |
| General comments   * This is the first NAHA performance report for the revised NAHA. The revised NAHA has seven outputs and eight performance indicators (endorsed by COAG at its July 2012 meeting) and four performance benchmarks (endorsed by COAG at its December 2012 meeting). * At the request of the CRC, data have been backcast (where available) to the baseline reporting period of 2008-09 (or the most recent available data at the time of preparing the baseline NAHA performance report) for new and/or revised indicators. * Survey data on housing outcomes for Indigenous people are drawn from alternating ABS Indigenous surveys. These surveys were originally conducted on a three‑yearly cycle, but the survey scheduled for 2011 has been delayed until  2012-13: * The most recent available data (sourced from the 2008 Indigenous social survey) were included in the baseline 2008-09 NAHA performance report * The next survey will be undertaken in 2012‑13, with data available for the 2012‑13 NAHA performance report * The ABS has advised that the next Indigenous survey after 2012-13 is anticipated to be conducted according to the original schedule in 2014, with data available for the 2014-15 NAHA performance report. The Steering Committee supports the return to the original three yearly schedule, to enable more regular reporting. * The Specialist Homelessness Services (SHS) data collection commenced on 1 July 2011, and replaces the Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP) data collection. Data from both the last year of the SAAP collection (2010‑11) and first year of the SHS collection (2011-12) are provided in this report. * Multiple data sources have been used to construct measures for some indicators. Comments on the comparability of different data sources within a measure have been provided where applicable.   Outputs   * Data have been provided for five of the seven outputs. Of the five reported outputs, one is reported using a main measure and two supplementary measures, asno single measure provides comprehensive information on this output: * *Number of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who are assisted to secure and sustain their tenancies*   Main measure — *Number**of Supported Accommodation Assistance**Program (SAAP)/Specialist Homelessness Services (SHS) clients who had house/flat accommodation with tenure after support*  Supplementarymeasure — *Number of households assisted in social housing that were homeless or at risk of homelessness at time of allocation*  (Continued next page) |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 1 (continued) |
| Supplementary measure — *Number of households assisted in social housing that were homeless or at risk of homelessness at time of allocation and who sustain their tenancies for 12 months or more*.   * Specifications have not been developed for two of the seven outputs: * *Number of zoned lots available for residential construction* — no national data collection currently contains relevant information for this output * *Number of Indigenous households provided with safe and appropriate housing* — the concepts of ‘safety’ and ‘appropriateness’ have not been defined, and there is inconsistency between the terms used in this output and the related outcome.   Performance indicators   * Of the eight reported performance indicators, two did not have new data available: * *Proportion of low income renter households in rental stress* * *Proportion of Indigenous households owning or purchasing a home.* * Two of the six indicators for which new data were available did not have new data for the main measure. Supplementary administrative data have been provided: * *Proportion of Indigenous households living in houses of an acceptable standard including in remote and discrete communities* * *Proportion of Indigenous households living in overcrowded conditions including in remote and discrete communities.* * Of the eight indicators, data were backcast for two indicators: * *The number of homes sold or built per 1000 low and moderate income households that are affordable by low and moderate income households* — measures changed from previous NAHA * *Proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness* — change in definition of homelessness used for reporting*.*   Performance benchmarks   * Data for the four performance benchmarks have been sourced from related performance indicators. New data are available for only one performance benchmark, with data for the remaining three benchmarks included in previous NAHA reports against associated performance indicators: * Performance benchmark A relates to performance indicator 1; no new data are available for reporting * Performance benchmark B relates to performance indicator 3; 2006 data are reported * Performance benchmark C relates to performance indicator 5; no new data are available for reporting * Performance benchmark D relates to performance indicator 6; no new data are available for reporting. |
|  |
|  |

## Changes from the previous National Affordable Housing Agreement performance report

### COAG review of the performance indicator frameworks

At its 25 July 2012 meeting, COAG endorsed a revised NAHA. A separate process was conducted for considering revised NAHA benchmarks, with COAG endorsing the revised benchmarks at its meeting in December 2012. This report provides data for the outputs, performance indicators and performance benchmarks specified in the revised NAHA performance indicator framework (COAG 2012a).

Table 1 details changes to indicator specifications, measures or data from the previous NAHA performance report.

### CRC advice to the Steering Committee on data requirements

Under the IGA, the CRC ‘may advise on where changes might be made to the performance reporting framework’ [IGA para C30]. The CRC recommended changes to indicators in its first three NAHA reports (CRC 2010, 2011 and 2012), as well as providing additional advice to the Steering Committee. Where practicable, the Steering Committee has incorporated the CRC recommendations and advice in this Report.

Table 1 Changes from the previous NAHA performance report

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Change | Indicator |
| New (provisional) performance benchmarks | NAHA Benchmark A — relates to measure for performance indicator 1  NAHA Benchmark B — relates to measure for performance indicator 3  NAHA Benchmark C — relates to measure for performance indicator 5  NAHA Benchmark D — relates to measure for performance indicator 6 |
| Performance indicator title has changed. Backcasting not required as no impact on measures or data | Performance indicator 1  Performance indicator 6 (old indicator 7)  Performance indicator 7 (old indicator 8)  Performance indicator 8 (old interim indicator 9) |
| Performance indicator title and measures have changed. Data have been backcast to the baseline reporting year | Performance indicator 2 |
| A revised methodology for estimating the prevalence of homelessness, based on the ABS statistical definition of homelessness, has been implemented. | Performance indicator 3 |
| Data for this indicator from the new SHS data collection are not directly comparable to data from the previous SAAP collection, creating a break in series. Additional data have been provided on a reduced scope (restricted age range) to provide a more comparable time series | Performance indicator 4 |
| Performance indicator has been removed from the NAHA performance indicator framework | [old] NAHA performance indicator 1 (supplementary)  [old] NAHA performance indicator 1(a)  [old] NAHA performance indicator 5  [old] NAHA interim performance indicator 10 |

## Context for National Affordable Housing Agreement performance reporting

The objective of the NAHA is ‘ … that all Australians have access to affordable, safe and sustainable housing that contributes to social and economic participation’ [para. 6]. The NAHA aims to contribute to the following outcomes:

1. people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness achieve sustainable housing and social inclusion
2. people are able to rent housing that meets their needs
3. people can purchase affordable housing
4. people have access to housing through an efficient and responsive housing market
5. Indigenous people have the same housing opportunities (in relation to homelessness services, housing rental, housing purchase and access to housing through an efficient and responsive housing market) as other Australians
6. Indigenous people have improved housing amenity and reduced overcrowding, particularly in remote areas and discrete communities. [para 7]

Due to the large size and scope of the housing sector, the information provided in this section focuses on a broad overview of the key factors that should be considered when interpreting the performance information in this report.

### Roles and responsibilities

The NAHA outlines the roles of the Commonwealth [para. 11], the states and territories [para. 12] and local government [para. 13]. Shared roles and responsibilities are also clarified. [para. 14].

The National Housing Supply Council (NHSC) was established in May 2008 to monitor Australian housing demand, supply and affordability. The NHSC produces an annual *State of Supply* report (NHSC 2009, 2010, 2011) examining housing supply needs up to 20 years into the future.

### Profile of housing

The ABS 2011 Census of Population and Housing (the Census) reported 8.7 million private dwellings, of which 89.3 per cent were occupied (ABS 2012a). At the time of the 2011 Census, most people in Australia were counted in private dwellings (19.9 million people or 92.3 per cent), which included 7843 people in improvised dwellings (for example, tents and sleeping out). The remaining 1 651 730 people were counted in other dwellings.[[1]](#footnote-1)

In 2011, 34.9 per cent of dwellings were owned with a mortgage and 32.1 per cent of dwellings were owned outright. The proportion of dwellings rented was smaller at 29.6 per cent (ABS 2012a). However, information on housing tenure from the Census does not represent a comprehensive picture, as it captures the occupancy of dwelling stock on Census night (households may be away from their usual residence on Census night).[[2]](#footnote-2)

Data on housing are also available from the Survey of Income and Housing (SIH), a biennial household level survey (the most recent available data are in respect of 2009-10). Estimates from the SIH show both households that own the dwelling in which they currently reside and the ownership of other dwellings. Table 2 provides a breakdown of households by tenure and landlord type from the SIH, for usual residence. The 2009-10 SIH results show that 68.8 per cent of all households own (with or without a mortgage) the dwelling in which they currently reside (table 2). However, when those who are in tenures other than owner-occupation but also own residential property are added, the proportion of households that own residential property rises to 72.8 per cent (ABS 2012b).

Table 2 Proportion of households by tenure and landlord type, 2000-01 to 2009-10 (per cent)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tenure and landlord type | 2000-01 | 2002-03 | 2003-04 | 2005-06 | 2007-08 | 2009-10 |
| Owner without a mortgage | 38.2 | 36.4 | 34.9 | 34.3 | 33.2 | 32.6 |
| Owner with a mortgage | 32.1 | 33.1 | 35.1 | 35.0 | 35.1 | 36.2 |
| Renter |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| State/Territory housing authority | 5.0 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 4.7 | 4.5 | 3.9 |
| Private landlord | 21.0 | 22.0 | 21.2 | 22.0 | 23.9 | 23.7 |
| Total rentersa | 27.4 | 28.2 | 27.6 | 28.5 | 29.7 | 28.7 |
| **All households**b | **100.0** | **100.0** | **100.0** | **100.0** | **100.0** | **100.0** |

a Includes other landlord type, which accounts for about 4 per cent of all renters in 2009-10. b Includes other tenure type, which accounts for about 3 per cent of all households in 2009-10.

*Source*: ABS (2011) Housing Occupancy and Costs, 2009-10, Cat. No. 4130.0, Canberra.

Home ownership rates increase with age. In 2009-10, the home ownership rate (with and without a mortgage) for 25 to 34 year olds was 44.6 per cent, compared with 81.7 per cent for 55 to 64 year olds (ABS 2011a). The Reserve Bank of Australia (RBA) (Battellino 2009) found a notable decline in home ownership for the typical first home owner cohort (those under 35 years of age) over the preceding 10 to 15 years.

Home ownership rates also vary according to household composition. In 2009-10, home ownership rates (with and without a mortgage) were 78.2 per cent for couples, 76.5 per cent for couples with dependent children, 60.1 per cent for lone persons and 39.9 per cent for one parent families with dependent children (ABS 2011a).

Data from the 2009-10 SIH illustrate the traditional tenure cycle. Most young lone persons (under 35 years) were renting (59.3 per cent). Couple families with dependent young children (eldest child 5 to 14 years) were the life cycle group most likely to own their home with a mortgage (64.1 per cent). A large proportion (50.4 per cent) of couple families with non‑dependent children owned their home outright, while 84.0 per cent of couples aged 65 years or over owned their home outright (ABS 2011a)[[3]](#footnote-3).

Nationally in 2011, 75.6 per cent of households in occupied private dwellings lived in separate (stand-alone) houses, ranging from 67.6 per cent in the NT to 86.4 per cent in Tasmania. A further 13.6 per cent of households lived in flats, units or apartments, ranging from 7.5 per cent in Tasmania to 18.8 per cent in NSW (table 3).

Table 3 Proportion of all households by dwelling structure, by State and Territory, 2011 (per cent)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dwelling structure | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT | Aust |
| Separate house | 69.5 | 76.9 | 78.5 | 80.4 | 79.9 | 86.4 | 72.8 | 67.6 | 75.6 |
| Semi-detached/row or terrace house/townhouse | 10.7 | 9.6 | 8.4 | 10.6 | 10.7 | 5.4 | 14.5 | 11.3 | 9.9 |
| Flat/unit/apartment | 18.8 | 12.9 | 11.7 | 7.9 | 8.9 | 7.5 | 12.4 | 16.6 | 13.6 |
| **All households**a | **100.0** | **100.0** | **100.0** | **100.0** | **100.0** | **100.0** | **100.0** | **100.0** | **100.0** |

a Includes other dwellings and dwelling structure not stated.

*Source*: ABS (2012) *Census of Population and Housing — Expanded Community Profile*, Cat. No. 2005.0, Canberra.

### Indigenous housing

The average Indigenous household is larger than the average non-Indigenous household. In 2007-08, the average non-Indigenous Australian household was 2.6 people, while in 2008, the average household with at least one Indigenous person was 3.4 people (table 4).

Table 4 Average number of usual residents in household, by Indigenous status of household, by State and Territory, 2008 (number)**a**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT | Aust |
| Indigenous | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 2.9 | 3.2 | 4.5 | 3.4 |
| Non-Indigenousb | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.6 |

a Indigenous data are sourced from the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Survey and relate to 2008. Non-Indigenous data are sourced from the Survey of Income and Housing and relate to 2007-08. b SIH data exclude households in collection districts defined as very remote, accounting for about 23 per cent of the population in the NT.

*Source*: ABS (unpublished) 2007-08 Survey of Income and Housing; ABS (unpublished) 2008 National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Survey.

Although data for the Indigenous status of households are available from the Census, the preferred data source for national reporting on Indigenous housing circumstances is the NATSISS/NATSIHS due, in part, to the following issues with the Census:

* data only relate to housing circumstances on Census night
* the net undercount of Indigenous persons (estimated at 17.2 per cent in the 2011 ABS Post Enumeration Survey)
* the relatively higher item non-response for Indigenous people.

In 2008, 28.6 per cent of Indigenous people aged 15 years or over were living in a dwelling that was owned by a member of the household (with or without a mortgage) compared with 72.3 per cent of non-Indigenous people aged 15 years or over. Indigenous people aged 15 years or over had correspondingly higher rates of living in rented dwellings (68.5 per cent) compared with non‑Indigenous people aged 15 years or over (26.1 per cent) (table 5).

Table 5 Household tenure type, Indigenous and non-Indigenous persons aged 15 years or over, 2008 (per cent)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tenure type | Indigenous personsa | Non-Indigenous personsb |
| Owner with or without a mortgage | 28.6 | 72.3 |
| Renter | 68.5 | 26.1 |
| Otherc | 2.9 | 1.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| **Total persons (‘000)** | **327.1** | **16 373.3** |

a Data from the 2008 National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Survey. b Data from the 2007-08 Survey of Income and Housing. c Includes life tenure scheme, participant of rent/buy (or shared equity) scheme, rent free, other tenure and arrangements that were not stated.

*Source*: ABS (2009) *National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Survey 2008*, Cat. no. 4714.0, Canberra; ABS (2009) *Survey of Income and Housing 2007-08*, Cat. no. 6541.0.30.001, Canberra.

#### Overcrowding

Overcrowding places pressure on the household infrastructure that supports health and can contribute to poor education outcomes. The Canadian National Occupancy Standard (CNOS) for housing appropriateness is the preferred standard used by the ABS to measure overcrowding. It determines overcrowding by comparing the number of bedrooms with the number and characteristics of people in a dwelling. The CNOS will reflect the culture and preferences of some but not all Indigenous people, as cultural and social factors influence the way housing is used by different communities. For example, the CNOS does not account for the influence of climate and culture on living arrangements. It also does not take into account the number of bathrooms and toilets, and the size of kitchens, bedrooms and other living spaces.

Data from the 2011 Census of Population and Housing are presented here as contextual information to provide the most recent information on overcrowding. However, these results are not comparable with the NATSISS data and should not be used for performance measurement against performance indicator 6 due to the issues with Indigenous housing data from the Census discussed above.

Census data indicate that, in 2011, the overcrowding rate for Indigenous people of all ages (11.8 per cent) was higher than for non‑Indigenous people (3.2 per cent). However, overcrowding rates varied across jurisdictions (table 6).

Table 6 Dwellings that need one or more extra bedrooms, by Indigenous status, by State and Territory, 2011 (per cent)**a**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT | Aust |
| **Proportion of people in overcrowded households** | | | | | | | | | |
| Indigenous | 9.1 | 8.2 | 12.6 | 14.0 | 9.8 | 6.0 | 6.5 | 33.9 | 11.8 |
| Non-Indigenous | 4.3 | 3.3 | 2.5 | 1.9 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 4.6 | 3.2 |

a Households requiring at least one additional bedroom, based on the Canadian National Occupancy Standard for housing appropriateness.

*Source*: ABS (2012) *Census of Population and Housing — Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples (Indigenous) Profile*, Cat. No. 2002.0, Canberra.

### Housing affordability

Factors affecting the demand, supply and affordability of housing are outlined in figure 2. Housing affordability is the result of the price, quantity, quality and type of housing available, and the cost and availability of housing finance.

Data on the number of building approvals, building commencements and building completions are provided as contextual information in table NAHA.CI.1.

Figure 2 Factors influencing housing supply, demand and affordability

|  |
| --- |
| The picture depicts the interactions between different factors that can affect housing supply, demand and affordability. Such as prices, quantity, type/ quality, costs and availability of finance, new dwellings, existing dwellings, construction costs, infrastructure costs, land availability, land release and development processes including fees and registrations, taxes and transfers, demographics, economic circumstances, investor demand, consumer preferences, rental prices and availability. |

*Source*: National Housing Supply Council (2010) *State of Supply 2009*, Figure 1.1, page 5, www.nhsc.org.au/content/state\_of\_supply/2009\_ssr\_rpt/sosr\_ch1.html#ch1\_2 (viewed 25 September 2012).

There are numerous measures of housing affordability, with different concepts and estimations.

A widely accepted method for assessing housing affordability is the ratio of housing cost to income as an indicator of affordability, with a simple ‘rule of thumb’ ratio standard for assessing housing affordability. The most basic indicator (the 30 only rule) assumes that households paying more than 30 per cent of their gross income on housing are in ‘housing stress’. This rule has been criticised for including households who choose, and can afford, to spend more than 30 per cent of their income on housing.

The ‘30/40 rule’ recognises that lower income households are likely to have insufficient resources to meet their non‑housing needs if they spend more than 30 per cent of their income on housing. This rule restricts housing stress to those households in the bottom 40 per cent of the income distribution paying more than 30 per cent of their income on housing.

Data on housing affordability are detailed in NAHA performance indicator 1 ‘proportion of low income renter households in rental stress’, with rental stress measured using the ‘30/40 rule’ (the proportion of households in the bottom two income quintiles that spend more than 30 per cent of their income on rent).

The 30/40 rule is simple to use, as it depends on few variables and requires limited subjective assumptions about an individual’s consumption. However, it does not consider the capacity of particular households to meet both their housing and non‑housing costs, and thereby maintain adequate housing and an adequate standard of living. It also applies the same measure across all tenures, locations and household types, without accounting for differences, and does not consider issues of housing quality and overcrowding (Gabriel et al. 2005). Rowley and Ong (2012) explore the limitations of the 30/40 rule in terms of household wellbeing.

Data on housing affordability are also provided for NAHA performance indicator 2 ‘The number of homes sold or built per 1000 low and moderate income households that are affordable by low and moderate income households’. For this indicator:

* *Low* income households are those with equivalised disposable household incomes (EDHI) in the bottom two income quintiles using median gross incomes (that is, households from zero up to the 39th–41st percentiles).
* *Low and moderate* income households are those with EDHI in the bottom three income quintiles using median gross incomes (that is, households from zero up to the 59th–61st percentiles).

Estimates of EDHI take household size into account. EDHI is the amount of disposable cash income that a single person household would require to maintain the same standard of living as the household in question, regardless of the size or composition of the latter (ABS 2011b).

An alternative approach to assessing housing affordability is the residual income approach, which looks at what different household types can afford to spend on housing after taking into account the other necessary expenditures of living. Stone, Burke and Ralston (2011) provide a comprehensive review of the housing affordability literature and different methods for assessing housing affordability, including the residual income approach.

Fluctuations in housing prices and ‘affordability’ are inherent features of housing markets. Housing prices (and affordability) fluctuate over time, partly as a result of slow supply responses to periodic surges in demand (PC 2004). Interest rates are also a key determinant of housing affordability for low and moderate income households (Flynn 2011). Since June 2006, the standard variable interest rate has varied from 9.60 per cent in July and August 2008, to 5.75 per cent in April and May 2009, and is currently 6.65 per cent (December 2012) (table NAHA.CI.7).

### Homelessness

Under the NAHA, governments have committed to undertake reforms in the housing sector to improve integration between homelessness services and mainstream services, and reduce the rate of homelessness.

The NAHA includes an indicator on homelessness (performance indicator 3). For this reporting cycle, data on homelessness are available from the 2011 Census based on the ABS official definition and methodology of estimating homelessness from the Census, developed following consultation with the homelessness sector and released in September 2012 (ABS 2012c; 2012d).

The ABS definition applies to the general population and includes aspects of adequacy, security, stability, and privacy. A person is considered homeless when that person does not have suitable accommodation alternatives if their current living arrangement:

* is in a dwelling that is inadequate
* has no tenure, or if their initial tenure is short and not extendable
* does not allow them to have control of, and access to space for social relations (ABS 2012d).

#### Limitations of Census data on homelessness

Observing homeless people in any data collection is a challenge, and the homeless circumstance may mean that these people are not captured at all in datasets used to count people generally. The Census is the only collection that aims to go to all persons in Australia, and is therefore the best source to get an estimate of the number of homeless people at any one point in time. However, ‘homelessness’ itself is not a characteristic that is directly measured in the Census. Instead, estimates of the homeless population have been derived from the Census using analytical techniques, based on both the characteristics of people observed in the Census and assumptions about the way people may respond to Census questions.

However, some groups of people are more likely to be under‑enumerated in the Census (ABS 2012c). Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are both under‑enumerated in the Census and over represented in the homeless population. Rough sleepers and people staying in supported accommodation for the homeless are also at risk of being under‑enumerated in the Census.

#### Potential data sources for estimating different aspects of homelessness

* *ABS Census of Population and Housing*: The Census provides the most comprehensive point in time or prevalence estimate of homelessness for trend estimation. These data are used to report against performance indicator 3.
* *Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) Specialist Homelessness Services (SHS) collection*: The SHS provides data about the pathways people take in and out of homelessness, and the kinds of services provided by homelessness agencies. These data only identify people who access formal homelessness services, and are used to report against performance indicator 4.
* *Centrelink ‘homelessness flag’*: Centrelink includes homelessness flags in its recording system, which help customer service officers provide appropriate services to people experiencing homelessness or who are at risk of homelessness.
* *ABS 2010 General Social Survey (GSS)*: The 2010 GSS included a new homelessness module that identifies previous experiences of homelessness, including the reasons for these circumstances and about their use of services during periods of homelessness. The ABS plans to repeat this module in the 2014 GSS.
* *ABS Personal Safety Survey 2012*: The 2012 survey included questions on the type of accommodation used by people who have separated from violent partners including homeless situations. The results will be released in late 2013.
* *Other ABS surveys*: The ABS has included an improved module on homelessness in the 2012 Survey of Disability, Ageing and Carers (SDAC) which will provide an understanding of disability and homelessness. The results will be released in late 2013. The ABS is also considering the development of a culturally appropriate module on previous experience of homelessness for the 2014 National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Survey (NATSISS).
* *Journeys home: Longitudinal Study of Factors Affecting Housing Stability*: This is the first large-scale longitudinal study following the lives of 1 550 Australians who are homeless or may be vulnerable to homelessness. The survey will be held over up to four waves, each six months apart, from September 2011 to the first half of 2013. Reports and analysis are anticipated to be available after each wave. Findings from Wave 1 were published in July 2012 (Scutella et al 2012). Wave 3 interviews commenced in the field on 1 September 2012 and were due to finish on 30 November 2012 (FaHCSIA 2012).
* *A five per cent Statistical Longitudinal Census Dataset (SLCD)*: The ABS is planning to create a SLCD by bringing together data from the 2006 Census with data from the 2011 Census and future Censuses, to build a picture of how society moves through various changes. The ABS will investigate using the five per cent SLCD to undertake longitudinal analysis of the circumstances of those who have been identified as likely to be homeless.

## Outputs

There are seven outputs in the NAHA (table 7). For this report, specifications have been developed for five of the seven outputs. Specifications have not been developed for outputs (f) and (g):

* output (f) — this output requires data that are not currently available through a national data collection. The NHSC has identified major gaps and inconsistencies in land supply data, with some of these due to varying definitions and expectations about development time frames and housing yield of land identified for residential use. Improving national information of the land and dwelling supply pipeline is a priority of the NHSC (NHSC 2010)
* output (g) — there is inconsistency between the terms ‘safe and appropriate housing’ used in this output and the terms ‘housing amenity and reduced overcrowding’ used in the associated outcome. This output may be redundant, as two of the performance indicators in the NAHA ‘proportion of Indigenous households living in houses of acceptable standard’ and ‘proportion of Indigenous households living in overcrowded conditions’ appear to capture relevant information.

Table 7 Outputs in the National Affordable Housing Agreement**a**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Output | Page no. in this report |
| 1. number of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who are assisted to secure and sustain their tenancies | , , |
| 1. number of people who are assisted to move from crisis accommodation or primary homelessness to sustainable accommodation |  |
| 1. number of households assisted in social housing |  |
| 1. number of households in private rental receiving subsidies |  |
| 1. number of people receiving home purchase assistance |  |
| 1. number of zoned lots available for residential construction |  |
| 1. number of Indigenous households provided with safe and appropriate housing |  |

a The outputs are presented in this table using the direct wording from para. 8 of the NAHA (COAG 2012a). This does not necessarily reflect the measures used to report against the indicators in this report.

### Output (a.1) (main): Number of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who are assisted to secure and sustain their tenancies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Key amendments from previous cycle of reporting: | The outputs in the revised NAHA have not changed from the previous NAHA. The Specialist Homelessness Services (SHS) data collection commenced on 1 July 2011 and replaces the Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP) data collection. The final year of SAAP data and the first year of SHS data are presented in this report. |
| Outcome: | People who are homeless or at risk of homelessness achieve sustainable housing and social inclusion |
| Measure: | Number of Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP)/Specialist Homelessness Services (SHS) clients who had house/flat accommodation with tenure after support  The measure is defined as:   * [SAAP] number of SAAP clients who had house/flat accommodation after support, with tenure type: purchasing/purchased own home, private rental, public housing rental, rent-free accommodation, boarding * and did not present within 30 days of receiving support for crisis, short or medium term support accommodation * [SHS] number of SHS clients who had house/flat accommodation after support, with tenure type: purchasing/purchased own home (including life tenure), private rental, public housing rental, community housing rental, other rental, rent-free accommodation, and was not couch surfing or boarding * and did not present within 30 days of receiving support seeking short term or emergency accommodation, medium term/transitional accommodation or long-term housing   and is presented as a *number*  This output measure is a proxy. It only captures those who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who access SAAP/SHS services. Sustainability of tenancy is only measured up to 30 days after receiving support. |
| Data source: | Interim SAAP Data Collection (SAAP). Data are available annually.  Specialist Homelessness Services Data Collection (SHS). Data are available quarterly, but reported as annual data. |
| Data provider: | SAAP and SHS — AIHW |
| Data availability: | 2010‑11 (SAAP) [Additional data for restricted scope of persons 18 years or over and backcast to baseline reporting year]  2011‑12 (SHS) |
| Cross tabulations provided: | State and Territory, by:   * sex by age * Indigenous status |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 2 Results |
| For this report, SHS data are available for 2011-12.   * Data by age and sex are presented in table NAHA.a.1.1. * Data by Indigenous status are presented in table NAHA.a.1.2.   For this report, new SAAP data are available for 2010-11.   * Data by age and sex are presented in table NAHA.a.1.3. * Data by Indigenous status are presented in table NAHA.a.1.4.   Data for 2009-10 are available in the 2010-11 NAHA performance report and data for 2007-08 and 2008-09 are available in the 2009-10 NAHA performance report. |
|  |
|  |

#### Attachment tables

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table NAHA.a.1.1** | Number of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who are assisted (by a SHS worker) to secure and sustain their tenancies: Homelessness proxy, by State and Territory, by age, by sex, 2011-12 (number) |
| **Table NAHA.a.1.2** | Number of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who are assisted (by a SHS worker) to secure and sustain their tenancies: Homelessness proxy, by State and Territory, by Indigenous status, 2011-12 (number) |
| **Table NAHA.a.1.3** | Number of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who are assisted (by a SAAP worker) to secure and sustain their tenancies: Homelessness proxy, by State and Territory, by age, by sex, 2010-11 (number) |
| **Table NAHA.a.1.4** | Number of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who are assisted (by a SAAP worker) to secure and sustain their tenancies: Homelessness proxy, by State and Territory, by Indigenous status, 2010-11 (number) |

### Output (a.2) (supplementary): Number of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who are assisted to secure and sustain their tenancies: Housing proxy

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Key amendments  from second cycle of reporting: | The outputs in the revised NAHA have not changed from the previous NAHA. No amendments made. |
| Outcome: | People who are homeless or at risk of homelessness achieve sustainable housing and social inclusion |
| Measure: | Number of households assisted in social housing that were homeless or at risk of homelessness at time of allocation  The measure is defined as:   * count of number of newly assisted households for year ending 30 June in public housing (PH), state owned and managed Indigenous housing (SOMIH) and community housing (CH) that were in greatest need at time of allocation   and is presented as a *number*  This output measure is a proxy. It only captures the pathways into social housing for those who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who apply through the social housing system and does not include people who were assisted to secure and sustain private or other rental tenancies. It is determined by the following assumptions:   * allocation reflects demand for social housing, not overall need for social housing * it only captures homeless people (or those at risk of homelessness) who have applied for social housing and have been allocated * that being allocated to social housing is by definition assistance to secure and sustain tenure with no requirement for length of tenure   Greatest need is used as a proxy for homelessness or risk of homelessness. Households in ‘greatest need’ are those who at the time of allocation were subject to one or more of the following circumstances:   * they were homeless * their life or safety was at risk in their accommodation * their health condition was aggravated by their housing * their housing was inappropriate to their needs * they had very high rental costs |
| Data source: | Social housing data: PH, SOMIH, CH. Data are available annually |
| Data provider: | AIHW |
| Data availability: | 2011-12 |
| Cross tabulations provided: | State and Territory, by:   * program type * program type by remoteness classification (ASGC) (PH and SOMIH) * program type (Indigenous households only) (PH and CH) |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 3 Results |
| For this report, new data are available for 2011-12.   * Data by program type are presented in table NAHA.a.2.1. * Data by program type and location are presented in table NAHA.a.2.2. * Data for Indigenous households by program type are presented in table NAHA.a.2.3.   Data for 2010-11 are available in the 2010-11 NAHA performance report and data for 2007-08, 2008-09 and 2009-10 are available in the 2009-10 NAHA performance report. |
|  |
|  |

#### Attachment tables

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table NAHA.a.2.1** | Number of newly assisted households that were in greatest need at time of allocation, by State and Territory, by program type, 2011-12 (number) |
| **Table NAHA.a.2.2** | Number of newly assisted households that were in greatest need at time of allocation, by State and Territory, by program type, by location,  2011-12 (number) |
| **Table NAHA.a.2.3** | Number of newly assisted Indigenous households that were in greatest need at time of allocation, by State and Territory, by program type, 2011-12 (number) |

### Output (a.3) (supplementary): Number of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who are assisted to secure and sustain their tenancies: Housing proxy

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Key amendments  from previous cycle of reporting: | The outputs in the revised NAHA have not changed from the previous NAHA. No amendments made. |
| Outcome: | People who are homeless or at risk of homelessness achieve sustainable housing and social inclusion |
| Measure: | Number of households assisted in social housing that were homeless or at risk of homelessness at time of allocation and who sustain their tenancies for 12 months or more  The measure is defined as:   * *Numerator* — number of newly assisted households over the previous financial year in public housing (PH) and state owned and managed Indigenous housing (SOMIH) that were in greatest need at time of allocation with a tenure length of 12 months or more at 30 June (end of current financial year) regardless of whether they are current tenants * *Denominator* — number of newly assisted households over the previous financial year in PH and SOMIH that were in greatest need at time of allocation   and is presented as a *number* and as a *proportion*  This output measure is a proxy as it only captures homeless (or at risk of homelessness) people who secure a public rental housing or state owned and managed Indigenous housing tenancy but not community housing or Indigenous community housing and it does not include people who were assisted to secure and sustain private rental tenancies. Furthermore households who exited public rental housing or SOMIH into a sustainable private rental tenancy prior to remaining for 12 months will not be included which may result in an undercount  Greatest need is used as a proxy for homelessness or risk of homelessness. Households in ‘greatest need’ are those who at the time of allocation were subject to one or more of the following circumstances:   * they were homeless * their life or safety was at risk in their accommodation * their health condition was aggravated by their housing * their housing was inappropriate to their needs * they had very high rental costs |
| Data source: | Social housing data: PH, SOMIH. Data are available annually |
| Data provider: | AIHW |
| Data availability: | 2011-12 |
| Cross tabulations provided: | State and Territory, by:   * program type * program type by remoteness classification (ASGC) * program type (Indigenous households only) |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 4 Results |
| For this report, new data are available for 2011-12.  • Data by program type are presented in table NAHA.a.3.1.  • Data by program type and location are presented in table NAHA.a.3.2.  • Data for Indigenous households in public rental housing are presented in table NAHA.a.3.3.  Data are available for 2010-11 in the 2010-11 NAHA performance report and data are available for 2007-08, 2008-09 and 2009-10 in the 2009-10 NAHA performance report. |
|  |
|  |

#### Attachment tables

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table NAHA.a.3.1** | Number and proportion of households that were in greatest need at time of allocation during 2010-11 who were assisted to secure and sustain their tenancies: Housing proxy, by State and Territory, by program type, 2011-12 |
| **Table NAHA.a.3.2** | Number and proportion of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness that were in greatest need at time of allocation during 2010-11 who were assisted to secure and sustain their tenancies: Housing proxy, by State and Territory, by program type, by location, 2011-12 |
| **Table NAHA.a.3.3** | Number and proportion of Indigenous households that were in greatest need at time of allocation during 2010-11 who are assisted to secure and sustain their tenancies in public rental housing: Housing proxy, by State and Territory 2011-12 |

### Output (b): Number of people who are assisted to move from crisis accommodation or primary homelessness to sustainable accommodation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Key amendments  from previous cycle of reporting: | The outputs in the revised NAHA have not changed from the previous NAHA. The Specialist Homelessness Services (SHS) data collection commenced on 1 July 2011 and replaces the Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP) data collection. The final year of SAAP data and the first year of SHS data are presented in this report. |
| Outcome: | People who are homeless or at risk of homelessness achieve sustainable housing and social inclusion |
| Measure: | Number of Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP)/Specialist Homelessness Services (SHS) clients who were primary homeless or in crisis/short term accommodation who had house/flat accommodation with tenure after support  The measure is defined as:   * [SAAP] number of SAAP clients who were in an improvised dwelling or rough sleeping, or in SAAP/SHS/Crisis Accommodation Program (CAP) crisis/short term accommodation (including Transitional Housing Management crisis); and * subsequently obtained a house/flat accommodation immediately after support, with tenure type: purchasing/purchased own home, private rental, public housing rental, rent-free accommodation, boarding; and * did not have a need for further accommodation support identified that included crisis, short or medium term accommodation within 30 days * [SHS] number of SHS clients who were in an improvised building/dwelling, motor vehicle, tent, no dwelling/street/park/in the open or in emergency accommodation. or who were provided crisis accommodation by an SHS agency, and * subsequently obtained a house/flat accommodation immediately after support, with tenure type: purchasing/purchased own home (including life tenure), private rental, public housing rental, community housing rental, other rental, rent-free accommodation, and was not couch surfing or boarding * and did not present within 30 days of receiving support seeking short term or emergency accommodation, medium term/transitional accommodation or long-term housing   and is presented as a *number*  This output measure is a proxy as it only captures homeless people who access a SAAP/SHS service. Sustainability of tenancy is only measured up to 30 days after receiving support. |
| Data source: | Interim SAAP Data Collection (SAAP). Data are available annually.  SHS Data Collection (SHS). Data are available quarterly, but reported as annual data. |
| Data provider: | SAAP and SHS — AIHW |
| Data availability: | 2010‑11 (SAAP) [Additional data for restricted scope of persons 18 years or over and backcast to baseline reporting year]  2011‑12 (SHS) |
| Cross tabulations provided: | State and Territory, by:   * sex by age * Indigenous status |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 5 Results |
| For this report, SHS data are available for 2011-12.   * Data by age and sex are presented in table NAHA.b.1. * Data by Indigenous status are presented in table NAHA.b.2.   For this report, new SAAP data are available for 2010-11.   * Data by age and sex are presented in table NAHA.b.3. * Data by Indigenous status are presented in table NAHA.b.4.   Data for 2009-10 are available in the 2010-11 NAHA performance report and data for 2007-08 and 2008-09 are available in the 2009-10 NAHA performance report. |
|  |
|  |

#### Attachment tables

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table NAHA.b.1** | Number of people who are assisted (by a SHS worker) to move from crisis accommodation or primary homelessness to sustainable accommodation, by State and Territory, by sex, by age, 2011-12 (number) |
| **Table NAHA.b.2** | Number of people who are assisted (by a SHS worker) to move from crisis accommodation or primary homelessness to sustainable accommodation, by State and Territory, by Indigenous status, 2011-12 (number) |
| **Table NAHA.b.3** | Number of people who are assisted (by a SAAP worker) to move from crisis accommodation or primary homelessness to sustainable accommodation, by State and Territory, by sex, by age, 2010-11 (number) |
| **Table NAHA.b.4** | Number of people who are assisted (by a SAAP worker) to move from crisis accommodation or primary homelessness to sustainable accommodation, by State and Territory, by Indigenous status, 2010-11 (number) |

### Output (c): Number of households assisted in social housing

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Key amendments from previous cycle of reporting: | The outputs in the revised NAHA have not changed from the previous NAHA. No amendments made. |
| Outcomes: | People are able to rent housing that meets their needs  Indigenous people have the same housing opportunities as other Australians |
| Measure: | Number of households assisted in social housing  The measure is defined as:   * Count of the number of households assisted at 30 June of the year preceding the reporting year in public housing (PH), state owned and managed Indigenous housing (SOMIH), community housing (CH) and Indigenous community housing (ICH) * Count of the number of households newly assisted during the reporting year by PH, SOMIH and CH * Count of the number of households assisted at 30 June of the end of the reporting year in public housing (PH), state owned and managed Indigenous housing (SOMIH), community housing (CH) and Indigenous community housing (ICH)   and are presented as *numbers*  Number of dwellings is used as a proxy for number of households for ICH |
| Data source: | Social housing: PH, SOMIH, CH and ICH. Data are available annually. |
| Data provider: | AIHW |
| Data availability: | 2011-12 — PH, SOMIH, CH  30 June 2012 — PH, SOMIH, CH  30 June 2011 — ICH  Data are available annually |
| Cross tabulations provided: | (all) State and Territory, by:   * program type   (PH, SOMIH) State and Territory, by:   * remoteness classification (ASGC) * household composition * main income source for household   (PH, CH) State and Territory (Indigenous households only)  (PH, SOMIH, CH) State and Territory (households with a person with disability only) — CH by number of households assisted at 30 June only. CH data not available for count of number of households newly assisted during the reporting year. |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 6 Results |
| For this report, new data are available for 2011-12 for public housing (PH), state owned and managed Indigenous housing (SOMIH) and community housing (CH). For Indigenous community housing (ICH) new data are available for 2011.   * Data for social housing by program type (PH, SOMIH, CH) are presented in table NAHA.c.1. * Data for ICH dwellings are presented in table NAHA.c.2. * Data for social housing by program type (PH, SOMIH) by location are presented in table NAHA.c.3. * Data for Indigenous households by program type (PH, CH) are presented in table NAHA.c.4. * Data for social housing by program type (PH, SOMIH, CH) for households with a person with disability are presented in table NAHA.c.5. * Data for social housing by program type (PH, SOMIH) by main source of income are presented in table NAHA.c.6. * Data for social housing by program type (PH, SOMIH) by household composition are presented in table NAHA.c.7.   Data for 2010-11 are available in the 2010-11 NAHA performance report and data for 2007-08, 2008-09 and (for PH, SOMIH and CH) 2009-10 are available in the 2009-10 NAHA performance report. |
|  |
|  |

#### Attachment tables

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table NAHA.c.1** | Number of households assisted in social housing, by program type, by State and Territory, 2011-12 (number) |
| **Table NAHA.c.2** | Number of Indigenous Community Housing dwellings, by State and Territory, 2011 (number) |
| **Table NAHA.c.3** | Number of households assisted in social housing, by State and Territory, by program type, by location, 2011-12 (number) |
| **Table NAHA.c.4** | Number of Indigenous households assisted in social housing, by program type, by State and Territory,  2011-12 (number) |
| **Table NAHA.c.5** | Number of households with a person with disability assisted in social housing, by program type, by State and Territory, 2011-12 (number) |
| **Table NAHA.c.6** | Number of households assisted in social housing, by State and Territory, by program type, by main source of income, 2011-12 (number) |
| **Table NAHA.c.7** | Number of households assisted in social housing, by State and Territory, by program type, by household composition, 2011-12 (number) |

### Output (d): Number of households in private rental receiving subsidies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Key amendments from previous cycle of reporting: | The outputs in the revised NAHA have not changed from the previous NAHA. No amendments made. |
| Outcomes: | People are able to rent housing that meets their needs  Indigenous people have the same housing opportunities as other Australians |
| Measure: | Number of households in private rental receiving subsidies  (*Main*)  The measure is defined as:   * Count of all income units in receipt of Commonwealth Rent Assistance (CRA) as at the first Friday in June   and is presented as a *number*  For the purposes of this measure, it is assumed that all recipients of state based rent assistance would also be eligible for, and most likely receiving, CRA  (*Supplementary*)  The measure is defined as:   * Count of the number of households assisted through state based private rent assistance   and is presented as a *number* |
| Data source: | (*Main*)  Australian Government Housing Dataset (AGHDS)  (*Supplementary*)  Private Rent Assistance National Minimum Dataset |
| Data provider: | AGHDS — FaHCSIA  Private Rent Assistance National Minimum Dataset — AIHW |
| Data availability: | 3 June 2012 — AGHDS  2011-12 — Private Rent Assistance National Minimum Dataset  Data are available annually |
| Cross tabulations provided: | (*Main*) State and Territory, by:   * Indigenous status by capital city/rest of state/territory * income unit type   (*Supplementary*) State and Territory, by:   * program type |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 7 Results |
| For this report, new data are available for Commonwealth Rent Assistance (CRA) for 2012. New data are available for state based private rent assistance for 2011-12.   * Data for CRA by income unit type are presented in table NAHA.d.1. * Data for CRA by Indigenous status and geographic location are presented in table NAHA.d.2. * Data for state based private rent assistance by program type are presented in table NAHA.d.3.   Data for 2011 (CRA) and 2010-11 (state based private rent assistance) are available in the 2010-11 NAHA performance report and data for 2010 (CRA) and 2009-10 (state based private rent assistance) are available in the 2009-10 NAHA performance report. |
|  |
|  |

#### Attachment tables

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table NAHA.d.1** | Number of income units in receipt of CRA at 1 June 2012, by State and Territory, by income unit type (number) |
| **Table NAHA.d.2** | Number of income units in receipt of CRA at 1 June 2012, by State and Territory, by Indigenous status and geographic location (number) |
| **Table NAHA.d.3** | Private rent assistance summary totals, by State and Territory, by program type, 2011-12 (number) |

### Output (e): Number of people receiving home purchase assistance

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Key amendments from previous cycle of reporting: | The outputs in the revised NAHA have not changed from the previous NAHA. No amendments made. |
| Outcomes: | People can purchase affordable housing  Indigenous people have the same housing opportunities as other Australians |
| Measure: | Number of persons receiving home purchase assistance from State Housing Authorities, State Revenue Offices and the Commonwealth |
| Measure (1): | Number of households receiving home purchase assistance from State Housing Authorities  The measure is defined as:   * Count of all households receiving home purchase assistance from State Housing Authorities   and is presented as a *number*  Households are used as the counting unit as households, not people, are the measurable unit in receipt of State Housing Authority Home Purchase Assistance |
| Measure (2): | Number of people receiving home purchase assistance (the First Home Owner Scheme [FHOS] grant and the First Home Owner Boost [FHOB]) from State Revenue Offices  The measure is defined as:   * Count of number of FHOS and FHOB grants paid   and is presented as a *number* |
| Measure (3): | Number of people receiving Commonwealth provided home purchase assistance (Home Ownership Program [HOP] and Home Ownership on Indigenous Land Program [HOIL])  The measure is defined as:   * Count of all households receiving home purchase assistance (HOP and HOIL) from the Commonwealth   and is presented as a *number* |
| Data sources: | Home Purchase Assistance National Minimum Dataset State Housing Authority Home Purchase Assistance  State Revenue Offices data (FHOS and FHOB) are not yet available. Data are required from this source in order to report this output measure in full and avoid double-counting. In the interim, aggregate data will be sourced by Treasuries for the FHOS and FHOB provided to households in 2011‑12.  HOP and HOIL administrative data  Data are available annually. |
| Data provider: | State Housing Authority Home Purchase Assistance — AIHW  FHOS and FHOB — Treasury  Commonwealth provided home purchase assistance (HOP and HOIL) — FaHCSIA |
| Data availability: | 2011-12 (All) |
| Cross tabulations provided: | State Housing Authority Home Purchase Assistance  State and Territory, by:   * program type   FHOS and FHOB  State and Territory  Commonwealth provided home purchase assistance  State and Territory |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 8 Results |
| For this report, new data are available for 2011-12.   * Data for State Housing Authority home purchase assistance by program type are presented in table NAHA.e.1. * Data for First Home Owner Scheme grant and First Home Owner Boost by State and Territory are presented in table NAHA.e.2. * Data for Home Ownership Program and Home Ownership on Indigenous Land by State and Territory are presented in table NAHA.e.3.   Data for 2010-11 are available in the 2010-11 NAHA performance report and data for 2009-10 are available in the 2009-10 NAHA performance report. |
|  |
|  |

#### Attachment tables

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table NAHA.e.1** | Number of households receiving home purchase assistance from State Housing Authorities, by State and Territory, by program type, 2011-12 (number) |
| **Table NAHA.e.2** | Number of people receiving home purchase assistance (First Home Owner Scheme grant and the First Home Owner Boost) from State Revenue Offices, by State and Territory, 2011-12 (number) |
| **Table NAHA.e.3** | Number of households receiving home purchase assistance from the Commonwealth, by State and Territory, by program, 2011-12 (number) |

### Output (f): Number of zoned lots available for residential construction

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Key amendments from previous cycle of reporting: | The outputs in the revised NAHA have not changed from the previous NAHA. No amendments made. |
| Outcome: | People have access to housing through an efficient and responsive  housing market |
| Measure: | A measure for this output has yet to be developed |

### Output (g): Number of Indigenous households provided with safe and appropriate housing

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Key amendments from previous cycle of reporting: | The outputs in the revised NAHA have not changed from the previous NAHA. No amendments made. |
| Outcome: | Indigenous people have the same housing opportunities as other  Australians |
| Measure: | A measure for this output has yet to be developed |

## Performance indicators

This report includes information for all ‘performance indicators’ included in the NAHA (table 8).

Data for the performance indicators in this report are presented in attachments identified in references throughout this report by a ‘NAHA’ prefix. The CRC has requested that data included in previous NAHA performance reports not be reproduced in subsequent reports. Therefore, this report contains only data that relate to more recent reporting periods, or which have been revised since earlier NAHA reports or where there are new indicators/measures.

Table 8 Performance indicators in the National Affordable Housing Agreement**a**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Performance indicator | Page no. in this report |
| 1. Proportion of low income renter households in rental stress | 38 |
| 2. The number of homes sold or built per 1000 low and moderate income households that are affordable by low and moderate income households |  |
| 3. Proportion of Australians who are homeless |  |
| 4. Proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness |  |
| 5. Proportion of Indigenous households owning or purchasing a home |  |
| 6. Proportion of Indigenous households living in overcrowded conditions including in remote and discrete communities |  |
| 7. Proportion of Indigenous households living in houses of an acceptable standard including in remote and discrete communities |  |
| 8. Estimated cumulative gap between underlying demand for housing and housing supply, as a proportion of the increase in underlying demand |  |

a The performance indicators are presented in this table using the direct wording from para 16 of the NAHA (COAG 2012a). This does not necessarily reflect the measures used to report against the indicators in this report.

### Indicator 1: Proportion of low income renter households in rental stress

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Key amendments from previous cycle of reporting: | This indicator was in the previous NAHA. However, the word ‘renter’ has now been included to describe which households are in rental stress (no impact on time series), and the supplementary measure for low income social housing in rental stress has been removed. (NAHA review report recommendation endorsed by COAG) |
| Outcome: | People are able to rent housing that meets their needs |
| Measure: | The proportion of rental households in the bottom two income quintiles that spend more than 30 per cent of their income on rent  The measure is defined as:   * *numerator* — number of low income rental households in rental stress * *denominator* — total number of low income rental households   and is presented as a *proportion*  For low income rental households, computation for *numerator*:   * (a) Household income is gross household income excluding Commonwealth Rent Assistance (CRA) * (b) Rental expenses is the amount paid in rent plus any rates required to be paid by the renter less CRA or other ongoing rental assistance * Household is included in the numerator if (b) exceeds 30 per cent of (a) * For all states and territories, the values for capital cities will be calculated separately from the rest of state. These values will be added together to provide the national figure   Computation for *denominator*: The bottom two quintiles calculated using equivalised disposable household income excluding CRA or other rent assistance on a state by state basis  *95 per cent confidence intervals and relative standard errors calculated for proportions.* |
| Data source: | *Numerator and denominator* —  (All)Survey of Income and Housing (SIH). Data are collected every two years  (Indigenous)Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Survey (AATSIHS) and National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Survey (NATSISS). Data are collected on an alternating three‑yearly cycle |
| Data provider: | ABS |
| Data availability: | No new data available for:   * SIH — 2009-10 data provided for the previous report * NATSISS/AATSIHS — 2008 data provided for baseline report |
| Cross tabulations provided: | Nil |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 9 Comment on data quality |
| No new data are available for reporting against this indicator. Data for 2009-10 are available in the 2010-11 NAHA performance report and data for 2007-08 are available in the 2009-10 NAHA performance report. Data for Indigenous households from the 2008 NATSISS were included in the baseline 2008-09 NAHA performance report.  The Steering Committee notes that data from the 2011-12 SIH and the 2012-13 AATSIHS are both anticipated to be available for the 2012-13 NAHA performance report. |
|  |
|  |

### Indicator 2: The number of homes sold or built per 1000 low and moderate income households that are affordable by low and moderate income households

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Key amendments from previous cycle of reporting: | This indicator has changed from the associated indicator in the previous NAHA, and has been amended from a proportion of homes sold to a rate per 1000 population households. Data have been backcast to 2007-08.  Data are no longer provided for non-SIH years (based on NAHA review report findings endorsed by COAG) |
| Outcome: | People can purchase affordable housing |
| Measure: | The number of homes sold or built per 1000 low and moderate income households that are affordable by low and moderate income households  The measure is defined as:   * *numerator* — number of homes sold or built that are affordable by low and moderate income households * *denominator* — total number of low and moderate income households   and is presented as a *rate per 1000 low and moderate income households*  Computation for *numerator*:   * low and moderate income households are those with equivalised disposable incomes in the bottom three income quintiles (moderate, income statistic used is the median gross incomes up to the 59th–61st percentiles of equivalised disposable household incomes), and bottom two income quintiles (low, income statistic used is the median gross incomes up to the 39th–41st percentiles of equivalised disposable household incomes), calculated on a state by state basis * Performance Indicator (PI) is calculated for those at the top of the ‘low’ and ‘moderate’ ranges * housing costs are affordable when the household spends no more than 30 per cent of their gross income on mortgage payments * currently only includes ‘sold’ properties due to unknown data source for contracts completed for ‘owner built’ properties * purchase date is the contract exchange date * for all states and territories, the value of the capital cities is calculated separately from the rest of state. These values are added together to provide the national figure   Assumptions made in calculating mortgage costs are:   * the interest rate is the Reserve Bank of Australia (RBA) standard variable rate, averaged out over the year (ref: Table F5, column K in monthly RBA Bulletin, Housing Loan, Banks, Variable, Standard) * a 10 per cent deposit on the full purchase price is assumed |
| Data source: | *Numerator* — Valuer General data for sales. Data are available monthly  (All) Survey of Income and Housing (SIH) to determine the income amount at the top of the low–moderate income bracket, and subsequently, the house price that is affordable for that level. Data are collected every two years with extrapolation of affordability values in the interim year  (Indigenous) Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Survey (AATSIHS) and National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Survey (NATSISS). Data are collected on an alternating three‑yearly cycle  *Denominator* — SIH |
| Data provider: | ABS |
| Data availability: | Backcast for 2007-08 and 2009-10 (revised to reflect the change to the measure in the revised NAHA)  SIH 2007-08, 2009-10  Valuer general sales data 2007-08 and 2009-10  No new data available by Indigenous status:   * NATSISS/AATSIHS — 2008 data provided in the baseline report (will be revised when 2012-13 AATSIHS data are available) |
| Cross tabulations provided: | Moderate income, State and Territory, by:   * capital city/balance of state * dwelling type * dwelling type and capital city/balance of state   Low income, State and Territory, by:   * capital city/balance of state * dwelling type * dwelling type and capital city/balance of state |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 10 Results |
| For this report, new data for this indicator are available for 2009-10 and 2007-08.   * Data by location (low income households) are presented in tables NAHA.2.1 (2009‑10) and NAHA.2.7 (2007-08). * Data by dwelling type (low income households) are presented in tables NAHA.2.2 (2009‑10) and NAHA.2.8 (2007-08). * Data by location and dwelling type (low income households) are presented in tables NAHA.2.3 (2009-10) and NAHA.2.9 (2007-08). * Data by location (low and moderate income households) are presented in tables NAHA.2.4 (2009-10) and NAHA.2.10 (2007-08). * Data by dwelling type (low and moderate income households) are presented in tables NAHA.2.5 (2009-10) and NAHA.2.11 (2007-08). * Data by location and dwelling type (low and moderate income households) are presented in tables NAHA.2.6 (2009-10) and NAHA.2.12 (2007-08). |
|  |
|  |

#### Attachment tables

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table NAHA.2.1** | Number of homes sold or built per 1000 low income households that are affordable by low income households, by State and Territory, by location, 2009-10 |
| **Table NAHA.2.2** | Number of homes sold or built per 1000 low income households that are affordable by low income households, by State and Territory, by dwelling type, 2009-10 |
| **Table NAHA.2.3** | Number of homes sold or built per 1000 low income households that are affordable by low income households, by State and Territory, by dwelling type and location, 2009-10 |
| **Table NAHA.2.4** | Number of homes sold or built per 1000 low and moderate income households that are affordable by low and moderate income households, by State and Territory, by location, 2009-10 |
| **Table NAHA.2.5** | Number of homes sold or built per 1000 low and moderate income households that are affordable by low and moderate income households, by State and Territory, by dwelling type, 2009-10 |
| **Table NAHA.2.6** | Number of homes sold or built per 1000 low and moderate income households that are affordable by low and moderate income households, by State and Territory, by dwelling type and location, 2009‑10 |
| **Table NAHA.2.7** | Number of homes sold or built per 1000 low income households that are affordable by low income households, by State and Territory, by location, 2007-08 |
| **Table NAHA.2.8** | Number of homes sold or built per 1000 low income households that are affordable by low income households, by State and Territory, by dwelling type, 2007-08 |
| **Table NAHA.2.9** | Number of homes sold or built per 1000 low income households that are affordable by low income households, by State and Territory, by dwelling type and location, 2007-08 |
| **Table NAHA.2.10** | Number of homes sold or built per 1000 low and moderate income households that are affordable by low and moderate income households, by State and Territory, by location, 2007-08 |
| **Table NAHA.2.11** | Number of homes sold or built per 1000 low and moderate income households that are affordable by low and moderate income households, by State and Territory, by dwelling type, 2007-08 |
| **Table NAHA.2.12** | Number of homes sold or built per 1000 low and moderate income households that are affordable by low and moderate income households, by State and Territory, by dwelling type and location, 2007‑08 |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 11 Comment on data quality |
| The DQS for this indicator has been prepared by the ABS and is included in its original form in the section of this report titled ‘Data Quality Statements’. Key points from the DQS are summarised below.   * The data provide relevant information, at the State and Territory level, on the proportion of homes sold that are affordable by low and moderate income households. Homes are assessed as affordable if the household spends no more than 30 per cent of their gross income on mortgage payments (including both interest and capital repayments). * The Survey of Income and Housing (SIH) does not include households in very remote areas, which affects the comparability of the NT results. * Monthly Valuer General data are available for the price of sold properties. * Data are available every two years from the SIH for all households and every three years from Indigenous surveys for Indigenous households. * Data are of acceptable accuracy. * Detailed explanatory notes on the SIH are publicly available to assist in the interpretation of results. * Additional data from the data sources are available on-line, and on request, but the availability of some sales data may be subject to conditions.   The Steering Committee also notes the following issue:   * The wording of this indicator in the NAHA is ‘The number of homes sold or built per 1000 low and moderate income households that are affordable by low and moderate income households’. The data used for this indicator exclude owner-built properties. No suitable data on owner-built properties are available. |
|  |
|  |

### Indicator 3: Proportion of Australians who are homeless

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Key amendments from previous cycle of reporting: | This indicator was in the previous NAHA. However, the method of calculating this indicator has changed. Recompiled data for 2006 are reported to provide a comparable time series. |
| Outcome: | People who are homeless or at risk of homelessness achieve sustainable housing and social inclusion |
| Measure: | The proportion of Australians who are homeless — as defined by the ABS (2012c)  The measure is defined as:   * *numerator* — number of Australians who are homeless * *denominator* — number of Australians   and is presented as a *rate per 10 000 population* |
| Data source: | *Numerator and denominator* — Census of Population and Housing. Data are available every five years. |
| Data provider: | ABS |
| Data availability: | 2006 [recompiled baseline] and 2011. |
| Cross tabulations provided: | State and Territory, by:   * homelessness operational group * age and sex * Indigenous status * core activity restriction * homeless operational group by remoteness (2006 only) * Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas (SEIFA) Index of Relative Socioeconomic Disadvantage (IRSD) (2006 only) |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 12 Results |
| For this report, new data are available for 2011.   * Data by State and Territory, by homeless operational group are presented in table NAHA.3.1. * Data by State and Territory, by age and sex are presented in table NAHA.3.2. * Data by State and Territory, by Indigenous status are presented in table NAHA.3.3. * Data by State and Territory, by core activity restriction are presented in table NAHA.3.4.   Data for 2006 have been revised, based on the ABS definition of homelessness and new method of calculating the indicator.   * Data by State and Territory, by homeless operational group are presented in table NAHA.3.5. * Data by State and Territory, by age and sex are presented in table NAHA.3.6. * Data by State and Territory, by Indigenous status are presented in table NAHA.3.7. * Data by State and Territory, by core activity restriction are presented in table NAHA.3.8. * Data by State and Territory, by remoteness classification (ARIA) are presented in table NAHA.3.9. * Data by State and Territory, by SEIFA IRSD are presented in table NAHA.3.10. |
|  |
|  |

#### Attachment tables

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table NAHA.3.1** | Proportion of Australians who are homeless, by homelessness operational group, by State and Territory, 2011 |
| **Table NAHA.3.2** | Proportion of Australians who are homeless, by age and sex, by State and Territory, 2011 |
| **Table NAHA.3.3** | Proportion of Australians who are homeless, by Indigenous status, by State and Territory, 2011 |
| **Table NAHA.3.4** | Proportion of Australians who are homeless, by core activity restriction, by State and Territory, 2011 |
| **Table NAHA.3.5** | Proportion of Australians who are homeless, by homelessness operational group, by State and Territory, 2006 |
| **Table NAHA.3.6** | Proportion of Australians who are homeless, by age and sex, by State and Territory, 2006 |
| **Table NAHA.3.7** | Proportion of Australians who are homeless, by Indigenous status, by State and Territory, 2006 |
| **Table NAHA.3.8** | Proportion of Australians who are homeless, by core activity restriction, by State and Territory, 2006 |
| **Table NAHA.3.9** | Proportion of Australians who are homeless, by remoteness classification (ARIA), by State and Territory, 2006 |
| **Table NAHA.3.10** | Proportion of Australians who are homeless, by SEIFA IRSD, by State and Territory, 2006 |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 13 Comment on data quality |
| The DQS for this indicator has been prepared by the ABS and is included in its original form in the section of this report titled ‘Data Quality Statements’. Key points from the DQS are summarised below.   * The data provide relevant information, at the State and Territory level, on the proportion of Australians who are homeless, based on the ABS definition (ABS 2012d). Data are available by Indigenous status. The most recent available data (2011) will not be available by SES (based on SEIFA IRSD) until March 2013 at the earliest. * Census data are available every five years. The most recent available data are for 2011. Revised data for 2006 have been provided due to a change in definition and method used to estimate homelessness counts, and are not comparable to data in previous NAHA performance reports. * Detailed explanatory notes are publicly available to assist in the interpretation of results. * Additional data from the data source are available on-line, and on request.   The Steering Committee also notes the following issues:   * Observing homeless people in any data collection is a challenge. The ABS has developed special strategies to enumerate some homeless populations that are hard to enumerate through the standard Census procedures. Despite these efforts it is likely that a proportion of the homeless population will remain under-enumerated. The Census is not designed to classify people according to whether or not they were homeless on Census night. Instead, estimates of the homeless population may be derived from the Census using analytical techniques, based on both characteristics observed in the Census and assumptions about the way people may respond to Census questions. * The development of an inter-censal count of homelessness is a priority. |
|  |
|  |

### Indicator 4: Proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Key amendments  from previous cycle of reporting: | This indicator was in the previous NAHA. The Specialist Homelessness Services (SHS) data collection commenced on 1 July 2011 and replaces the Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP) data collection. The final year of SAAP data and the first year of SHS data are presented in this report. |
| Outcome: | People who are homeless or at risk of homelessness achieve sustainable housing and social inclusion |
| Measure: | There is currently no data collection identified that measures the proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness.  There are two measures provided for this indicator:    (*Main*) Measure 4a provides the most accurate measure of repeat homelessness experienced by SHS clients, but is not comparable to previous measures.  (*Supplementary*) Measure 4b provides the most comparable measure to provide a time series with historical SAAP data.  **Measure 4a**  The measure is defined as:   * *numerator* —number of SHS clients who change status from ‘homeless’ to ‘not homeless’ and back to ‘homeless’ or have repeat support periods where housing situation is identified as ‘homeless’. * *denominator* — number of SHS clients who experienced homelessness at any time during the reporting period (as defined above)   and is presented as a *proportion*  ‘Repeat support periods of homelessness’ are defined as a gap between support periods (where housing situation is identified as homeless) of at least six weeks.  A SHS client is considered ‘homeless’ if their housing situation is any of the following:  Dwelling type is: caravan, tent, cabin, boat, improvised building/dwelling, no dwelling/ street/park/in the open, motor vehicle, boarding/rooming house, emergency accommodation, or hotel/motel/bed and breakfast;  *OR*  Tenure type is: Renting or living rent-free in transitional housing, caravan park, boarding/rooming house, emergency accommodation/night shelter/women’s refuge/ youth shelter;  *OR*  Condition of occupancy is: ‘couch surfing’.  **Measure 4b**  (SHS for SAAP comparisons) The measure is defined as:   * *numerator* — number of Specialist Homelessness Services (SHS) clients (aged 18 years or over) who more than once in 2011-12 have housing/accommodation need identified by a SHS agency worker * *denominator* — number of Specialist Homelessness Services (SHS) clients (aged 18 years or over) in 2011-12 who have housing/accommodation need identified by a SHS agency worker   and is presented as a *proportion*  (SAAP) The measure is defined as:   * *numerator* — number of Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP) clients (and accompanying children) who more than once in the year have housing/accommodation need identified by SAAP agency worker * *denominator* — number of SAAP clients (and accompanying children) in the year who have housing/accommodation need identified by SAAP agency worker   and is presented as a *proportion*  The measures under this indicator are *proxies* as they only capture homeless people who access SHS/SAAP (ie, homeless people who do not access homelessness services are not identified). |
| Data source: | Interim SAAP data collection (SAAP). Data are collected annually.  SHS data collection (SHS). Data are available quarterly, but reported as annual data. |
| Data provider: | SAAP and SHS — AIHW |
| Data availability: | 2010-11 (SAAP) [Additional data for restricted scope of persons 18 years or over and backcast to baseline reporting year]  2011-12 (SHS) |
| Cross tabulations provided: | State and Territory, by:   * age and sex * Indigenous status * capital city/balance of state |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 14 Results |
| For this report, SHS data are available for 2011-12.   * Data by age and sex are presented in tables NAHA.4.1 and NAHA.4.4. * Data by Indigenous status are presented in table NAHA.4.2 and NAHA.4.5. * Data by location are presented in table NAHA.4.3 and NAHA.4.6.   For this report, new SAAP data are available for 2010-11.   * Data by age and sex are presented in table NAHA.4.7. * Data by Indigenous status are presented in table NAHA.4.8. * Data by location are presented in table NAHA.4.9.   SAAP data for 2009-10, 2008-09 and 2007-08 have been revised in this report.   * Data for 2009-10 are presented in tables NAHA.4.10 and NAHA.4.11. * Data for 2008-09 are presented in tables NAHA.4.12 and NAHA.4.13. * Data for 2007-08 are presented in tables NAHA.4.14 and NAHA.4.15. |
|  |
|  |

#### Attachment tables

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table NAHA.4.1** | Proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness (SHS), by State and Territory, by age and sex, 2011-12 |
| **Table NAHA.4.2** | Proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness (SHS), by State and Territory, by Indigenous status, 2011-12 |
| **Table NAHA.4.3** | Proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness (SHS), by State and Territory, by location, 2011-12 |
| **Table NAHA.4.4** | Proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness (SHS), by State and Territory, by age and sex, 2011-12 |
| **Table NAHA.4.5** | Proportion of people aged 18 years or over experiencing repeat periods of homelessness (SHS), by State and Territory, by Indigenous status, 2011-12 |
| **Table NAHA.4.6** | Proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness (SHS), by State and Territory, by location, 2011-12 |
| **Table NAHA.4.7** | Proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness (SAAP), by State and Territory, by age and sex, 2010-11 |
| **Table NAHA.4.8** | Proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness (SAAP), by State and Territory, by Indigenous status, 2010-11 |
| **Table NAHA.4.9** | Proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness (SAAP), by State and Territory, by location, 2010-11 |
| **Table NAHA.4.10** | Proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness (SAAP), by State and Territory, by age and sex, 2009-10 |
| **Table NAHA.4.11** | Proportion of people, aged 18 years or over, experiencing repeat periods of homelessness (SAAP), by State and Territory, by Indigenous status, 2009-10 |
| **Table NAHA.4.12** | Proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness (SAAP), by State and Territory, by age and sex, 2008-09 |
| **Table NAHA.4.13** | Proportion of people, aged 18 years or over, experiencing repeat periods of homelessness (SAAP), by State and Territory, by Indigenous status, 2008-09 |
| **Table NAHA.4.14** | Proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness (SAAP), by State and Territory, by age and sex, 2007-08 |
| **Table NAHA.4.15** | Proportion of people, aged 18 years or over, experiencing repeat periods of homelessness (SAAP), by State and Territory, by Indigenous status, 2007-08 |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 15 Comment on data quality |
| The DQS for this indicator has been prepared by the AIHW and is included in its original form in the section of this report titled ‘Data Quality Statements’. Key points from the DQS are summarised below.   * The data provide relevant information, at the State and Territory level, on the proportion of people who are supported at a SHS/SAAP agency and are assessed by a SHS/SAAP agency worker as having need for housing or accommodation support more than once in a year. Data are available by Indigenous status. Data are not available by socioeconomic status (SES). * Two measures are provided for this indicator. Measure 4a (main measure) is the best available measure of repeat homelessness based on the new SHS collection, but data for this measure are not comparable with SAAP data. Measure 4b (supplementary measure) is provided to enable the best available time series comparison with previous years data from the SAAP collection (where both are restricted to people aged 18 years or over). Data for SA were not available for measure 4b for 2011-12. * The measures count people accessing homelessness services within a single financial year. * They are not measures of the proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness, as it does not capture people who experience homelessness but did not access homelessness services. * People assessed as requiring homelessness services in a previous year but only once in the current year are excluded from the scope of the measures. * Only SHS agencies who received funding for at least four months during the 2011‑12 financial year are in scope for the 2011­‑12 reporting period. * Annual data are available. The most recent available data are for 2011-12 (SHS). * Data are of acceptable accuracy. * Detailed explanatory notes are publicly available to assist in the interpretation of results. * Additional data from the data source are available on-line, and on request.   The Steering Committee also notes the following issues:   * The scope of the SHS collection includes people who are not homeless, because SHS include services to prevent people who are at risk of homelessness from becoming homeless. * The scope of the SHS collection includes agencies that receive funding under the NAHA and the NPAH. * The SHS data has been modelled to account for clients with unknown values for Indigenous status and age, whilst the SAAP data includes only clients whose Indigenous status and age are known. |
|  |
|  |

### Indicator 5: Proportion of Indigenous households owning or purchasing a home

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Key amendments from previous cycle of reporting: | This indicator was in the previous NAHA (old indicator 6). No amendments have been made |
| Outcomes: | People can purchase affordable housing  Indigenous people have the same housing opportunities (in relation to homelessness services, housing rental, housing purchase and access to housing) through an efficient and responsive housing market |
| Measure: | Proportion of Indigenous households owning or purchasing a home  The measure is defined as:   * *numerator* — number of Indigenous households owning or purchasing a home * *denominator* — total number of Indigenous households   and is presented as a *proportion*  *95 per cent confidence intervals and relative standard errors calculated for proportions.* |
| Data source: | *Numerator and denominator* —  Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Survey (AATSIHS) and National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Survey (NATSISS). Data are collected on an alternating three‑yearly cycle |
| Data provider: | ABS |
| Data availability: | No new data available for this cycle of reporting:   * NATSISS — 2008 data provided in the baseline report |
| Cross tabulations provided: | Nil |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 16 Comment on data quality |
| No new data are available for reporting against this indicator. Data for 2008 are available in the baseline 2008-09 NAHA performance report.  The Steering Committee notes that data from the 2012-13 Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Survey are anticipated to be available for the 2012-13 NAHA performance report. |
|  |
|  |

### Indicator 6: Proportion of Indigenous households living in overcrowded conditions including in remote and discrete communities

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Key amendments from previous cycle of reporting: | The title for this indicator has changed from the associated indicator in the previous NAHA (old indicator 7), with the addition of the words ‘including in remote and discrete communities’. There are no changes to measures or data for this cycle of reporting. |
| Outcome: | Indigenous people have improved amenity and reduced overcrowding, particularly in remote areas and discrete communities |
| Measure: | The measure is defined as:   * *numerator* — number of overcrowded Indigenous households (calculated using the Canadian National Occupancy Standard) * *denominator* — total number of Indigenous households   and is presented as a *proportion*  *95 per cent confidence intervals and relative standard errors calculated for proportions for sample survey data source* |
| Data source: | *Numerator and denominator* —  (*Main*) Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Survey (AATSIHS) and National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Survey (NATSISS). Data are collected on an alternating three‑yearly cycle  (*Supplementary*)Social housing: public housing (PH), state owned and managed Indigenous housing (SOMIH), community housing (CH) and Indigenous community housing (ICH) data (excludes private renters/home owners). Data are collected annually  Overcrowding is defined as needing one or more additional bedrooms to meet the Canadian National Occupancy Standard |
| Data provider: | AATSIHS and NATSISS — ABS  Social housing — AIHW |
| Data availability: | Social housing — 30 June 2011 (ICH); 30 June 2012 (PH, SOMIH, CH)  No new data available for:   * NATSISS — 2008 data provided in the baseline report |
| Cross tabulations provided: | (*Supplementary*) Social housing: PH and SOMIH  State and Territory, by program type by:   * number of bedrooms needed   (*Supplementary*) Social housing: ICH  State and Territory, by:   * number of bedrooms needed   (*Supplementary*) Social housing: CH  State and Territory |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 17 Results |
| No new data were available for reporting against the main measure for this indicator (2008 data are available in the baseline 2008-09 NAHA performance report).  New data for the supplementary measure are available for 2011 (Indigenous community housing [ICH]) and 2012 (public housing [PH], state owned and managed Indigenous housing [SOMIH] and community housing [CH]).   * Data for social housing, by State and Territory, by program type (PH, SOMIH and CH), are presented in tables NAHA.6.1. * Data for ICH, by State and Territory are presented in tables NAHA.6.2. * Data for PH, SOMIH and ICH, by State and Territory, by bedrooms needed, are presented in tables NAHA.6.3—6.5.   Data for the supplementary measures for 2010 (ICH) and 2011 (PH, SOMIH and CH) are available in the 2010-11 NAHA performance report and data for the supplementary measures for 2009 (ICH) and 2010 (PH, SOMIH and CH) are available in the 2009-10 NAHA performance report. |
|  |
|  |

#### Attachment tables

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table NAHA.6.1** | Proportion of Indigenous households living in overcrowded conditions, by State and Territory, by program type, 30 June 2012 |
| **Table NAHA.6.2** | Proportion of households in Indigenous community housing living in overcrowded conditions, by State and Territory, 30 June 2011 |
| **Table NAHA.6.3** | Proportion of Indigenous households in public rental housing living in overcrowded conditions, by State and Territory, by bedrooms needed, 30 June 2012 |
| **Table NAHA.6.4** | Proportion of households in State Owned and Managed Indigenous Housing living in overcrowded conditions, by State and Territory, by bedrooms needed, 30 June 2012 |
| **Table NAHA.6.5** | Proportion of households in Indigenous community housing living in overcrowded conditions, by State and Territory, by bedrooms needed, 30 June 2011 |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 18 Comment on data quality |
| The DQS for this indicator has been prepared by the AIHW, and is included in its original form in the section of this report titled ‘Data Quality Statements’. Key points from the DQS are summarised below.   * New data are available for the supplementary measure, and provide relevant supplementary information on the proportion of Indigenous households in social housing (public rental housing, state owned and managed Indigenous housing (SOMIH), community housing (CH) and Indigenous community housing (ICH)) living in overcrowded conditions. Data are available by State and Territory if the social housing program operates in that State and Territory. * Overcrowding is calculated using the Canadian National Occupancy Standard (CNOS). * Data for the supplementary measure are available annually. The most recent data are for 2010-11 (PH, CH and SOMIH) and 2009-10 (ICH). * Detailed explanatory notes are publicly available to assist in the interpretation of results. * Additional data from the data source are available on-line, and on request.   The Steering Committee also notes the following issue:   * Data for the supplementary measure are available disaggregated by remoteness. However, following consultation with the CRC, this disaggregation has been removed due to the large amount of data required to be suppressed for confidentiality reasons. |
|  |
|  |

### Indicator 7: Proportion of Indigenous households living in houses of an acceptable standard including in remote and discrete communities

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Key amendments from previous cycle of reporting: | The title for this indicator has changed from the associated indicator in the previous NAHA (old indicator 8), with the addition of the words ‘including in remote and discrete communities’. Data are available for the first time from the supplementary data source — the National Social Housing Survey. |
| Outcome: | Indigenous people have improved amenity and reduced overcrowding, particularly in remote areas and discrete communities |
| Measure: | Proportion of Indigenous households living in houses of an acceptable standard  The measure is defined as:   * *numerator* — number of Indigenous households living in houses of an acceptable standard * *denominator* — total number of Indigenous households   and is presented as a *proportion*  For all housing tenures, acceptable standard is defined as a household with four working facilities (for washing people, for washing clothes/bedding, for storing/preparing food and sewerage) and not more than two major structural problems  *95 per cent confidence intervals and relative standard errors calculated for proportions for sample survey data sources* |
| Data source: | *Numerator and denominator* —  (*Main*) Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Survey (AATSIHS) and National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Survey (NATSISS). Data are collected on an alternating three-yearly cycle  (S*upplementary*)Social housing: public housing (PH), state owned and managed Indigenous housing (SOMIH), community housing (CH) and Indigenous community housing (ICH) datasets. Data are collected annually, however required data items are not yet collected.  (S*upplementary*)National Social Housing Survey (NSHS). Data are collected annually |
| Data provider: | AATSIHS and NATSISS — ABS  Social housing and NSHS — AIHW |
| Data availability: | * NATSISS — 2008 data provided in the baseline report [no new data available for this cycle of reporting] * Social housing — not available * NSHS — 2012 |
| Cross tabulations provided: | NSHS — Indigenous households:   * by remoteness areas * by State and Territory |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 19 Results |
| For this report new supplementary data are available for 2012:   * Data for social housing, by remoteness areas, by program type (PH, SOMIH and CH), are presented in table NAHA.7.1. * Data for social housing, by State and Territory, by program type (PH, SOMIH and CH), are presented in table NAHA.7.2.   Data for 2008 (from the main data source) were reported in the 2008-09 baseline NAHA report. |
|  |
|  |

#### Attachment tables

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table NAHA.7.1** | Proportion of Indigenous households living in houses of an acceptable standard, by remoteness areas, 2012 (proportion) |
| **Table NAHA.7.2** | Proportion of Indigenous households living in houses of an acceptable standard, by State/Territory, 2012 (proportion) |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 20 Comment on data quality |
| The DQS for this indicator has been prepared by the AIHW and is included in its original form in the section of this report titled ‘Data Quality Statements’. Key points from the DQS are summarised below.   * The data provide relevant information, by State and Territory, on the proportion of Indigenous households living in houses of an acceptable standard, where acceptable standard means ‘has at least four facilities and they are working, and not more than two major structural problems’. * The response rate for the 2012 National Social Housing Survey was 16.3 per cent and a considerable proportion of the tenants surveyed did not respond to the Indigenous status question. Low response rates are only an issue if there is a systematic bias in how non‑respondents would have answered the questions. As no assessment has been undertaken it is not possible to determine whether there is a non-response bias. * Whilst NSHS data are available for previous years, they are not directly comparable due to changes in method and questionnaire design. * Published results from the 2012 NSHS will be available online, and on request. * Detailed explanatory notes will be publicly available to assist in the interpretation of results.   The Steering Committee also notes the following issue:   * Due to the low response rates for the NSHS, an assessment of potential non‑response bias is recommended to assist in determining the accuracy of the results. |
|  |
|  |

### Indicator 8: Estimated cumulative gap between underlying demand for housing and housing supply, as a proportion of the increase in underlying demand

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Key amendments from previous cycle of reporting: | This is a new indicator in the revised NAHA (though previously included in the Steering Committee’s NAHA reports as interim indicator 9). Prior years data have been revised and are included in this report. The revised data take into account an adjustment to the calculations of net housing supply |
| Outcome: | People have access to housing through an efficient and responsive housing market |
| Measure: | Estimated cumulative gap between underlying demand for housing and housing supply, as a proportion of the increase in underlying demand  The measure is defined as:   * *numerator* — cumulative gap between supply and demand since 2001 (number of households) * *denominator* — cumulative increase in demand since 2001 (number of households)   and is presented as a *proportion* |
| Data source: | *Supply projections* — ABS Building Activity, Australia and National Housing Supply Council estimates for completions net of demolitions and vacancies  *Demand* — National Housing Supply Council estimates of underlying demand |
| Data provider: | National Housing Supply Council |
| Data availability: | 2002 to 2010 (revised) and 2011 |
| Cross tabulations provided: | State and Territory |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 21 Results |
| For this report, new data are available for 2011. Data from years prior to 2010 have been updated due to adjustments made by the National Housing Supply Council and are included in this report.  Data by State and Territory are presented in table NAHA.8.1. |
|  |
|  |

#### Attachment tables

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table NAHA.8.1** | Estimated cumulative gap between underlying demand for housing and housing supply, as a proportion of the increase in underlying demand since 2001, by State and Territory |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 22 Comment on data quality |
| The DQS for this indicator has been prepared by the National Housing Supply Council (NHSC) secretariat and is included in its original form in the section of this report titled ‘Data Quality Statements’. Key points from the DQS are summarised below.   * The data provide relevant information, by State and Territory, on the estimated cumulative gap between underlying demand for housing and housing supply, and are reported as a proportion of the increase in underlying demand since 2001. The 2001 base year does not represent a point of equilibrium — it coincides with a Census of Population and Housing and is sufficiently long ago to have enabled some market adjustments in response to housing demand. * Estimates are available annually from the NHSC *State of Supply* reports. The most recent available data are for 2011 and further data will be published in the forthcoming *State of Supply* report due for release in 2013. Estimates are primarily based on Census data, supplemented by other ABS collections and information provided by states and territories. * Data are of acceptable accuracy. * Detailed explanatory notes are publicly available to assist in the interpretation of results. * Some of the data used in the estimates are available on-line and on request.   The Steering Committee also notes the following issues:   * The estimated cumulative gap between underlying demand for housing and housing supply is extremely sensitive to the assumptions that underpin the methodology, including assumptions about future population growth, future land supply, the treatment of unoccupied dwellings and the estimation of demolitions. * Where the NHSC was unable to find nationally comparable data to incorporate in its estimates, it used available jurisdictional data, which may affect the comparability of the results. * The Select Council on Housing and Homelessness has been requested to report on any proposed improvements to this indicator in the first quarter of 2013 (COAG 2012b). |
|  |
|  |

## Performance benchmarks

The CRC has requested the Steering Committee to report against the performance benchmarks identified in the NAHA. At its 7 December meeting, COAG agreed to provisional performance benchmarks, which will be reviewed following the Standing Council on Federal Financial Relations’ review of funding adequacy in 2013.

The provisional performance benchmarks in the NAHA are:

* 1. From 2007­‑08 to 2015‑16, a 10 per cent reduction nationally in the proportion of low-income renter households in rental stress
  2. From 2006 to 2013, a seven per cent reduction nationally in the number of homeless Australians
  3. From 2008 to 2017‑18, a 10 per cent increase nationally in the proportion of Indigenous households owning or purchasing a home
  4. From 2008 to 2017‑18, a 20 per cent reduction nationally in the proportion of Indigenous households living in overcrowded conditions.

Outlined below are the performance benchmarks, any associated issues and, where available, data for the most recent reporting period. Links are provided to the related NAHA outcome and, where relevant, to the related performance indicator.

### Performance benchmark (a): From 2007‑08 to 2015‑16, a 10 per cent reduction nationally in the proportion of low-income renter households in rental stress

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Key amendments from previous cycle of reporting: | This new (provisional) benchmark relates to performance indicator 1. |
| Outcome: | People are able to rent housing that meets their needs |
| Measure: | The benchmark is measured by the national percentage change in the proportion of rental households in the bottom two income quintiles that spend more than 30 per cent of their income on rent  The measure is defined as:   * *numerator* — number of low income rental households in rental stress * *denominator* — total number of low income rental households   and is presented as a *proportion*  For low income rental households, computation for *numerator*:   * (a) Household income is gross household income excluding Commonwealth Rent Assistance (CRA) * (b) Rental expenses is the amount paid in rent plus any rates required to be paid by the renter less CRA or other ongoing rental assistance * Household is included in the numerator if (b) exceeds 30 per cent of (a) * For all states and territories, the values for capital cities will be calculated separately from the rest of state. These values will be added together to provide the national figure   Computation for *denominator*: The bottom two quintiles calculated using equivalised disposable household income excluding CRA or other rent assistance on a state by state basis  *95 per cent confidence intervals and relative standard errors calculated for proportion* |
| Related performance indicator: | Performance indicator 1: Proportion of low income renter households in rental stress |
| Data source: | *Numerator and denominator* —  Survey of Income and Housing (SIH). Data are collected every two years |
| Data provider: | ABS |
| Data availability: | No new data available for benchmark:   * SIH — 2009-10 data provided in the 2010-11 NAHA performance report |
| Baseline: | The baseline for the benchmark is 2007-08 (data provided in the 2009‑10 NAHA performance report). |
| Cross tabulations provided: | Nil |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 23 Comment on data quality |
| No new data were available for this report. Available data, data quality statements and comments on data quality are reported against performance indicator 1 in previous NAHA performance reports (2007-08 data in the 2009-10 report and 2009-10 data in the 2010-11 report). |
|  |
|  |

### Performance benchmark (b): From 2006 to 2013, a seven per cent reduction nationally in the number of homeless Australians

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Key amendments from previous cycle of reporting: | This new benchmark relates to performance indicator 3. |
| Outcome: | People who are homeless or at risk of homelessness achieve sustainable housing and social inclusion |
| Measure: | The benchmark is measured by the national percentage change in the proportion of Australians who are homeless — as defined by the ABS (2012c)  The measure is defined as:   * *numerator* — number of Australians who are homeless * *denominator* — number of Australians   and is presented as a *rate per 10 000 population* |
| Related performance indicator: | Performance indicator 3: Proportion of Australians who are homeless |
| Data source: | *Numerator and denominator* — Census of Population and Housing. Data are available every five years. |
| Data provider: | ABS |
| Data availability: | 2006 and 2011 |
| Baseline: | The baseline for the benchmark is 2006 |
| Cross tabulations provided: | National |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 24 Results |
| For this report, data are available for 2006 (revised for baseline) and 2011.   * Data for 2011 are available in table NAHA.3.1 * Data for 2006 are available in table NAHA.3.5. |
|  |
|  |

#### Attachment tables

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **NAHA.3.1** | Proportion of Australians who are homeless, by homelessness operational group, by State and Territory, 2011 |
| **NAHA.3.5** | Proportion of Australians who are homeless, by homelessness operational group, by State and Territory, 2006 |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 25 Comment on data quality |
| Details are included in the comment on data quality for performance indicator 3. |
|  |
|  |

### Performance benchmark (c): From 2008 to 2017‑18, a 10 per cent increase nationally in the proportion of Indigenous households owning or purchasing a home

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Key amendments from previous cycle of reporting: | | This new benchmark relates to performance indicator 5. |
| Outcome: | | People can purchase affordable housing  Indigenous people have the same housing opportunities as other Australians |
| Measure: | | The benchmark is measured by the national percentage change in the proportion of Indigenous households owning or purchasing a home  The measure is defined as:   * *numerator* — number of Indigenous households owning or purchasing a home * *denominator* — total number of Indigenous households   and is presented as a *proportion*  *95 per cent confidence intervals and relative standard errors calculated for proportion* |
| Related performance indicator: | | Performance indicator 5: Proportion of Indigenous households owning or purchasing a home |
| Data source: | | *Numerator and denominator* —  Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Survey (AATSIHS) and National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Survey (NATSISS). Data are collected on an alternating three‑yearly cycle |
| Data provider: | | ABS |
| Data availability: | | No new data available for benchmark:   * NATSISS — 2008 data provided in the baseline report |
| Baseline: | | The baseline for the benchmark is 2008 (data provided in the 2008‑09 NAHA performance report). |
| Cross tabulations provided: | | Nil |
| Box 26 Comment on data quality | |
| No new data were available for this report. Available data, data quality statements and comments on data quality are reported against performance indicator 6 in the 2008-09 NAHA performance report. | |
|  | |
|  | |

### Performance benchmark (d): From 2008 to 2017–18, a 20 per cent reduction nationally in the proportion of Indigenous households living in overcrowded conditions

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Key amendments from previous cycle of reporting: | | This new benchmark relates to performance indicator 6. |
| Outcome: | | Indigenous people have improved amenity and reduced overcrowding, particularly in remote areas and discrete communities |
| Measure: | | The benchmark is measured by the national percentage change in the proportion of Indigenous households living in overcrowded conditions  The measure is defined as:   * *numerator* — number of overcrowded Indigenous households (calculated using the Canadian National Occupancy Standard) * *denominator* — total number of Indigenous households   and is presented as a *proportion*  *95 per cent confidence intervals and relative standard errors calculated for proportion* |
| Related performance indicator: | | Performance indicator 6: Proportion of Indigenous households living in overcrowded conditions including in remote and discrete communities |
| Data source: | | *Numerator and denominator* —  Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Survey (AATSIHS) and National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Survey (NATSISS). Data are collected on an alternating three‑yearly cycle |
| Data provider: | | ABS |
| Data availability: | | No new data available for benchmark:   * NATSISS — 2008 data provided in the baseline report |
| Baseline: | | The baseline for this benchmark is 2008 (data provided in the 2008-09 NAHA performance report) |
| Cross tabulations provided: | | Nil |
| Box 27 Comment on data quality | |
| No new data were available for this report. Available data, data quality statements and comments on data quality are reported against performance indicator 6 in the 2008-09 NAHA performance report. | |
|  | |
|  | |
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## Data Quality Statements

This attachment includes copies of all DQSs as provided by the data providers. The Steering Committee has not made any amendments to the content of these DQSs.

DQSs were not required for the outputs, but have been included if provided by the data provider. Table 9 lists each output and performance indicator in the NAHA and the page reference for the associated DQS.

Table 9 Data quality statements for outputs, performance indicators and performance benchmarks in the National Affordable Housing Agreement**a**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Output | Page no. in this report |
| 1. number of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who are assisted to secure and sustain their tenancies | , 245, , 286, 290, 292, 295, 300 |
| 1. number of people who are assisted to move from crisis accommodation or primary homelessness to sustainable accommodation | , 250, , 286, 290, 292, 295, 300 |
| 1. number of households assisted in social housing | .. |
| 1. number of households in private rental receiving subsidies | 252 |
| 1. number of people receiving home purchase assistance | , 257 |
| 1. number of zoned lots available for residential construction | .. |
| 1. number of Indigenous households provided with safe and appropriate housing | .. |
| Performance indicators | Page no. in this report |
| 1. Proportion of low income renter households in rental stress | .. |
| 2. The number of homes sold or built per 1000 low and moderate income households that are affordable by low and moderate income households | 258 |
| 3. Proportion of Australians who are homeless | 261 |
| 4. Proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness | , 267, , 286 |
| 5. Proportion of Indigenous households owning or purchasing a home | .. |
| 6. Proportion of Indigenous households living in overcrowded conditions including in remote and discrete communities | , 290, 292, 295, 300 |
| 7. Proportion of Indigenous households living in houses of an acceptable standard including in remote and discrete communities | 275, 290, 292, 295, 300 |
| 8. Estimated cumulative gap between underlying demand for housing and housing supply, as a proportion of the increase in underlying demand |  |
| Performance benchmarks | Page no. in this report |
| 1. From 2007–08 to 2015–16, a 10 per cent reduction nationally in the proportion of low-income renter households in rental stress | .. |
| 1. From 2006 to 2013, a seven per cent reduction nationally in the number of homeless Australians | 261 |

(Continued next page)

Table 9 (continued)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Performance benchmarks | Page no. in this report |
| 1. From 2008 to 2017–18, a 10 per cent increase nationally in the proportion of Indigenous households owning or purchasing a home | .. |
| 1. From 2008 to 2017–18, a 20 per cent reduction nationally in the proportion of Indigenous households living in overcrowded conditions | .. |

a The outputs, performance indicators and performance benchmarks are presented in this table using the direct wording from para. 8, 16 and 19 of the NAHA (COAG 2012a).

..Not applicable as data are not available for this report.

### Data Quality Statement – Output (a.1): Number of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who are assisted to secure and sustain their tenancies (SAAP)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Output:** | Number of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who are assisted to secure and sustain their tenancies |
| **Measure (computation):** | Number of SAAP clients and accompanying children (within a financial year reporting period) who had house/flat accommodation after support, with tenure type:   * purchasing/purchased own home, private rental, public housing rental, rent-free accommodation, boarding, and * did not present within 30 days for crisis, short or medium-term accommodation. |
| **Key data quality issues:** | The main data quality issue is relevance:   * The SAAP data used to compile this proxy output do not cover the whole of the homeless (and at risk) population. Rather, only people who access SAAP services are captured in the data. * It is difficult to measure the extent to which clients are able to achieve a sustainable housing outcome as SAAP data provides limited information on long-term outcomes. |
| **Data source/s:** | Interim SAAP National Data Collection (NDC) - Client Collection. |
| **Institutional environment:** | See General SAAP DQS. |
| **Relevance:** | This proxy output does not cover all homeless people but only those that are supported at a SAAP agency. Homeless people who do not receive support from SAAP agencies are not in scope for the proxy output.  It is difficult to measure the extent to which clients are able to ‘sustain’ a tenancy. This is because SAAP records information on immediate outcomes of clients (i.e. a client’s housing circumstance immediately after support), providing limited information on long-term outcomes. For this proxy output, a client is counted if they achieve a housing outcome (house/flat accommodation with tenure) and do not return to a SAAP agency (with an accommodation need for crisis, short-term or medium-term accommodation) within 30 days. This gives some indication as to whether a client has achieved a sustainable outcome as they have not re-presented with housing difficulties. However, a client may return to a SAAP agency (with an accommodation need) at a later date.  See General SAAP DQS. |
| **Timeliness:** | The reporting period for this proxy output is a financial year. Data will be provided for the 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11 financial years.  See General SAAP DQS. |
| **Accuracy:** | This proxy output measures the number of SAAP clients who achieve a sustainable housing outcome after support. It must be noted that not all SAAP clients who achieve a housing outcome will be captured. One possible reason for this is that some clients may cease using SAAP services and not return to provide further information. In these cases information will not be captured at the end of a support period and the client’s housing outcome will be unknown.  All clients who achieve a sustainable housing outcome within a particular reference year will be counted for that year. This includes clients that may have opened a support period during the previous year. For example, a client who begins a support period in 2007-08 will be included in the 2008-09 reporting period if they achieve an outcome in that year. Conversely, clients who open a support period in the reference year but do not achieve a housing outcome in that year will not be counted. These clients will be captured in the following reporting period if they achieve a sustainable housing outcome.  An adjustment has been used to account for clients who achieve a housing outcome within 30 days of the end of the financial year reporting period. For these clients it is not possible to know if they were able to sustain a housing outcome for the 30 days. As such, an adjustment has been made based on the probability that they were able to achieve a sustainable housing outcome.  An adjustment has been made to account for client non-consent and agency non-participation. In particular, missing support periods for observed clients – which occur due to clients giving consent in some support periods and not in others; and due to clients visiting both participating agencies and non-participating agencies – are imputed. The imputation model was not constrained to keep totals constant, thus totals for different disaggregations may not concur.  See General SAAP DQS. |
| **Coherence:** | Some RoGS and NAHA measures can be considered complementary where they cover similar concepts. However, even when both measures have been derived from the SAAP collection, these estimates should only be compared with caution. Different adjustments may have been made to SAAP data for NAHA reporting, in order to improve comparability between the NAHA performance measures and more appropriately capture the information required by these measures.  See General SAAP DQS. |
| **Accessibility:** | See General SAAP DQS. |
| **Interpretability:** | See General SAAP DQS. |

### Data Quality Statement – Output (a.1): Number of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who are assisted to secure and sustain their tenancies (SHS)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Output:** | Number of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who are assisted to secure and sustain their tenancies |
| **Measure (computation):** | Number Specialist Homelessness Services (SHS) clients who had house/flat accommodation with tenure after support.  The measure is defined as:  count of number of SHS clients who had house/flat accommodation after support, with tenure type:   * Purchasing/Purchased home (including life tenure); or * Private housing renter who is not couch surfing or boarding (including those living rent free); or * Public housing renter who is not couch surfing or boarding (including those living rent free); or * Community housing renter who is not couch surfing or boarding (including those living rent free);or * Other renter who is not couch surfing or boarding (including those living rent free).   AND   * Did not present again to a SHS agency within 30 days of receiving support seeking short term or emergency accommodation, medium term/transitional accommodation or long-term housing. |
| **Key data quality issues:** | This output measure is a proxy as SHSC data does not contain all homeless people and those at risk of homelessness, but only those who seek assistance from an SHS agency.  Sustainability of tenancy is measured by examining a 30 day period after receiving support.  Social inclusion is unable to be measured. |
| **Data source/s:** | Specialist Homelessness Services Collection. Data are available annually |
| **Institutional environment:** | See General SHSC DQS. |
| **Relevance:** | This output measure is a proxy as it only captures those who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who access specialist homelessness services.  It is difficult to measure the extent to which clients are able to ‘sustain’ a tenancy. This is because the SHSC records information on immediate outcomes of clients (i.e. a client’s housing circumstance immediately after support), providing limited information on long-term outcomes. For this proxy output, a client is counted if they achieve a housing outcome (as specified above) and do not return to an SHS agency with an accommodation need (as specified above) within 30 days. This gives some indication as to whether a client has achieved sustainable housing, as they have not re-presented with housing difficulties within 30 days.  See General SHSC DQS. |
| **Timeliness:** | The reporting period for this proxy output is the 2011-12 financial year.  See General SHSC DQS. |
| **Accuracy:** | This estimate includes clients with missing information. This information has been attributed in proportion with those clients for whom information is available.  See General SHSC DQS. |
| **Coherence:** | Some RoGS and NAHA measures can be considered complementary where they cover similar concepts. However, even when both measures have been derived from the SHSC, these estimates should be compared with caution. Outputs and Performance Indicators are specified differently in NAHA when compared to RoGS. This will produce different numbers.  This output measure varies slightly from the previous measure derived from SAAP data. The main difference is in how secure tenancy is defined. The SHSC measure does not include people who were in a house or flat and boarding, who were included in the SAAP definition.  Some other differences are due to changes in scope and methodology between SAAP and SHSC. The data are most comparable between SAAP and SHSC for clients aged 18 years or over due to significant differences in the treatment of children aged 0-17 in the two collections.  See General SHSC DQS. |
| **Accessibility:** | See General SHSC DQS. |
| **Interpretability:** | See General SHSC DQS. |

### Data Quality Statement – Output (b): Number of people who are assisted to move from crisis accommodation or primary homelessness to sustainable accommodation (SAAP)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Target/Outcome** | People who are homeless or at risk of homelessness achieve sustainable housing and social inclusion |
| **Indicator:** | Number of people who are assisted to move from crisis accommodation or primary homelessness to sustainable accommodation. |
| **Measure (computation):** | Number of SAAP clients and accompanying children (within a financial year reporting period) who were:   * in an improvised dwelling or rough sleeping, or in SAAP/CAP (Crisis Accommodation Program) accommodation before obtaining house/flat accommodation with tenure, * and had house/flat accommodation immediately after support, with tenure type: purchasing/purchased own home, private rental, public housing rental, rent-free accommodation, boarding, and * did not present within 30 days for crisis accommodation, short or medium-term accommodation. |
| **Key data quality issues:** | The main data quality issue is relevance:   * The SAAP data used to compile this proxy output do not cover the whole of the homeless (and at risk) population. Rather, only people who access SAAP services are captured in the data. * It is difficult to measure the extent to which clients are able to achieve a sustainable housing outcome as SAAP data provides limited information on long-term outcomes. |
| **Data source/s:** | Interim SAAP National Data Collection (NDC) - Client Collection. |
| **Institutional environment:** | See General SAAP DQS. |
| **Relevance:** | This proxy output does not cover all homeless people but only those that are supported at a SAAP agency. Homeless people who do not receive support from SAAP agencies are not in scope for the proxy output.  It is difficult to measure the extent to which clients are able to ‘sustain’ a tenancy. This is because SAAP records information on immediate outcomes of clients (i.e. a client’s housing circumstance immediately after support), providing limited information on long-term outcomes. For this proxy output, a client is counted if they achieve a housing outcome (house/flat accommodation with tenure) and do not return to a SAAP agency (with an accommodation need for crisis, short-term or medium-term accommodation) within 30 days. This gives some indication as to whether a client has achieved a sustainable outcome as they have not re-presented with housing difficulties. However, a client may return to a SAAP agency (with an accommodation need) at a later date.  See General SAAP DQS. |
| **Timeliness:** | The reporting period for this proxy output is a financial year. Data is provided for the 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11 financial years.  See General SAAP DQS. |
| **Accuracy:** | This proxy output measures the number of SAAP clients who achieve a sustainable housing outcome after support. It must be noted that not all SAAP clients who achieve a housing outcome will be captured. One possible reason for this is that some clients may cease using SAAP services and not return to provide further information. In these cases, information about clients will not be captured at the end of a support period and their housing outcome will be unknown.  All clients who achieve a sustainable housing outcome within a particular reference year will be counted for that year. This includes clients that may have opened a support period during the previous year. For example, a client who begins a support period in 2007-08 will be included in the 2008-09 reporting period if they achieve an outcome in that year. Conversely, clients who open a support period in the reference year but do not achieve a housing outcome in that year will not be counted. These clients will be captured in the following reporting period if they achieve a sustainable housing outcome.  An adjustment has been used to account for clients who achieve a housing outcome within 30 days of the end of the financial year reporting period. For these clients it is not possible to know if they were able to sustain a housing outcome for the 30 days. As such, an adjustment has been made based on the probability that they were able to achieve a sustainable housing outcome.  An adjustment has been made to account for client non-consent and agency non-participation. In particular, missing support periods for observed clients – which occur due to clients giving consent in some support periods and not in others; and due to clients visiting both participating agencies and non-participating agencies – are imputed. The imputation model was not constrained to keep totals constant, thus totals for different disaggregations may not concur.  Data for Victoria is affected by the model of homelessness service delivery used in this state where much of the supported accommodation is provided via the complementary Transitional Housing Management (THM) program. Accommodation provided under the THM program was not consistently recorded in the SAAP Client Collection as ‘SAAP/CAP accommodation’, which has resulted in some under-reporting of accommodation provided by Victorian agencies. For more information about Victorian data see: AIHW 2010. Government-funded specialist homelessness services: *SAAP National Data Collection annual report 2008-09*. Cat. No. HOU 291. Canberra: AIHW.  See General SAAP DQS. |
| **Coherence:** | Some RoGS and NAHA measures can be considered complementary where they cover similar concepts. However, even when both measures have been derived from the SAAP collection, these estimates should only be compared with caution. Different adjustments may have been made to SAAP data for NAHA reporting, in order to improve comparability between the NAHA performance measures and more appropriately capture the information required by these measures.  See General SAAP DQS. |
| **Accessibility:** | See General SAAP DQS. |
| **Interpretability:** | See General SAAP DQS. |

### Data Quality Statement – Output (b): Number of people who are assisted to move from crisis accommodation or primary homelessness to sustainable accommodation (SHS)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Target/Outcome** | People who are homeless or at risk of homelessness achieve sustainable housing and social inclusion |
| **Indicator:** | Number of people who are assisted to move from crisis accommodation or primary homelessness to sustainable accommodation. |
| **Measure (computation):** | Number of Specialist Homelessness Services (SHS) clients who were primary homeless or in crisis/short term accommodation who had house/flat accommodation with tenure after support  The measure is defined as:  count of number of SHS clients who before support were in   * an improvised building/dwelling; or * motor vehicle; or * tent; or * no dwelling/street/park/in the open; or * emergency accommodation * or who were provided crisis accommodation by an SHS agency   AND  obtained a house/flat accommodation immediately after support, with tenure type of:   * Purchasing/Purchased home (including life tenure); or * Private housing renter who is not couch surfing or boarding (including those living rent free) ; or * Public housing renter who is not couch surfing or boarding (including those living rent free) ; or * Community housing renter who is not couch surfing or boarding (including those living rent free) ; or * Other renter who is not couch surfing or boarding (including those living rent free);   AND   * did not present again to a SHS agency within 30 days of receiving support seeking short term or emergency accommodation, medium term/transitional housing or long-term housing. |
| **Key data quality issues:** | This output measure is a proxy as SHSC data does not contain all homeless people and those at risk of homelessness, but only those who seek assistance from an SHS agency  Sustainability of tenancy is measured by examining a 30 day period after receiving support.  Social inclusion is unable to be measured. |
| **Data source/s:** | Specialist Homelessness Services Collection. Data are available annually |
| **Institutional environment:** | See General SHSC DQS. |
| **Relevance:** | This output measure is a proxy as it only captures those who are homeless or at risk of homelessness who access specialist homelessness services.  It is difficult to measure the extent to which clients are able to ‘sustain’ a tenancy. This is because the SHSC records information on immediate outcomes of clients (i.e. a client’s housing circumstance immediately after support), providing limited information on long-term outcomes. For this proxy output, a client is counted if they achieve a housing outcome (as specified above) and do not return to an SHS agency with an accommodation need (as specified above) within 30 days. This gives some indication as to whether a client has achieved sustainable housing, as they have not re-presented with housing difficulties within 30 days.  See General SHSC DQS. |
| **Timeliness:** | The reporting period for this proxy output is the 2011-12 financial year.  See General SHSC DQS. |
| **Accuracy:** | This estimate includes clients with missing information. This information has been attributed in proportion with those clients for whom information is available.  See General SHSC DQS. |
| **Coherence:** | Some RoGS and NAHA measures can be considered complementary where they cover similar concepts. However, even when both measures have been derived from the SHSC, these estimates should be compared with caution. Outputs and Performance Indicators are specified differently in NAHA when compared to RoGS. This will produce different numbers.  This output measure varies slightly from the previous measure derived from SAAP data. The main difference is in how secure tenancy is defined. The SHSC measure does not include people who were in a house or flat and boarding, who were included in the SAAP definition.  Some other differences are due to changes in scope and methodology between SAAP and SHSC. The data are most comparable between SAAP and SHSC for clients aged 18 years or over due to significant differences in the treatment of children aged 0-17 in the two collections.  See General SHSC DQS. |
| **Accessibility:** | See General SHSC DQS. |
| **Interpretability:** | See General SHSC DQS. |

### Data Quality Statement – Output (d): Number of households in private rental receiving subsidies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator:** | Household counts |
| **Measure (computation):** | Number of households assisted (sum) |
| **Data source/s:** | Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Data sets are provided annually to the AIHW by jurisdictions. The data contain information about private rent assistance provided to households during the previous financial year, and are drawn from administrative data held by the jurisdictions. This data source is used for all household counts. |
| **Institutional environment:** | Data for 2011-12 were provided to the AIHW as part of the Housing Ministers Advisory Committee work program. The AIHW is an Australian Government statutory authority accountable to Parliament and operates under the provisions of the *Australian Institute of Health and Welfare Act 1987*. This Act ensures that the data collections managed by the AIHW are kept securely and under strict conditions with respect to privacy and confidentiality. More information about the AIHW is available on the AIHW website ([www.aihw.gov.au](http://www.aihw.gov.au)).  The AIHW receives, compiles, edits and verifies data in collaboration with jurisdictions, which retain ownership of the data and must approve any jurisdiction level output before it is released. The finalised data sets are used by the AIHW for collation, reporting and analysis. |
| **Relevance:** | The data collected are an administrative by-product of the management of private rent assistance programs run by the jurisdictions and conform well in terms of coverage and reference period.  Not all jurisdictions collect or update all data items for every household so substitutions are made in some cases. |
| **Timeliness:** | Data are collected annually, for the financial year ending 30 June. The private rent assistance data reported here are for 2011-12 (the most current data available). |
| **Accuracy:** | There are some known accuracy issues with the data collected; the administrative data sets from which this collection is drawn have inaccuracies to varying degrees including missing data and data coding or recording errors.  Care should be taken in interpreting the figures with respect to inferring a total number of households assisted by each jurisdiction. Some households received multiple types of assistance. Thus, a simple sum of the number of households assisted across each assistance type would overstate the total number of households assisted due to double counting.  *Specific State/Territory issues are:*  Victoria   * Data on private rent assistance funded under the Victorian Housing Establishment Fund (HEF) was not collected for the 2011-12 collection. The jurisdiction provided estimates based on funding levels and historical data. These estimates are given in the footnotes to the table NAHA.d.3. |
| **Coherence:** | Care is required when comparing outputs across jurisdictions. Differences in the data collected and which records are included or excluded from a calculation can affect the coherence of the outputs.  Coherence over time has been affected by changes in the methodology:   * numbers of households assisted by rental grants, subsidies and relief cannot be compared with figures produced prior to 2011-12 due to a change in methodology.   *Specific State/Territory issues are:*  New South Wales   * The 2011-12 collection does not include hotel/motel assistance. Previously hotel/motel assistance was included under rental grants, subsidies and relief. Thus, data on the number of households assisted by rental grants, subsidies and relief is not comparable with data from 2010-11 and earlier reference periods.   South Australia   * In the 2011-12 collection hotel/motel assistance was reported under ‘other’ assistance. In the 2010-11 collection hotel/motel assistance was reported under rental grants, subsidies and relief. Thus, data are |
| **Accessibility:** | Annual data as reported are available publically on the AIHW website. Disaggregated data and unit record data may be requested through the national data repository and provided subject to jurisdiction approval. |
| **Interpretability:** | Metadata and definitions relating to this data source can be found in the National Housing Assistance Data Dictionary (AIHW Cat no. HOU147). Supplementary information can be found in the private rent assistance collection manual which is available upon request from the AIHW. |

### Data Quality Statement – Output (e): Number of people receiving home purchase assistance (AIHW)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator:** | Household counts |
| **Measure (computation):** | Number of households assisted (sum) |
| **Data source/s:** | Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Data sets are provided annually to the AIHW by jurisdictions. The data contain information about home purchase assistance received by households during the previous financial year, and repayable home purchase assistance issued to households in all previous financial periods for which loans remain outstanding.  The data are drawn from administrative data held by the jurisdictions. |
| **Institutional environment:** | Data for 2011-12 were provided to the AIHW as part of the Housing Ministers Advisory Committee work program. The AIHW is an Australian Government statutory authority accountable to Parliament and operates under the provisions of the *Australian Institute of Health and Welfare Act 1987*. This Act ensures that the data collections managed by the AIHW are kept securely and under strict conditions with respect to privacy and confidentiality. More information about the AIHW is available on the AIHW website (www.aihw.gov.au).  The AIHW receives, compiles, edits and verifies data in collaboration with jurisdictions, which retain ownership of the data and must approve any jurisdiction level output before it is released. The finalised data sets are used by the AIHW for collation, reporting and analysis. |
| **Relevance:** | The data collected are an administrative by-product of the management of home purchase assistance programs run by the jurisdictions and conform well in terms of coverage. |
| **Timeliness:** | Data are collected annually, for the financial year ending 30 June. The home purchase assistance data reported here are for 2011-12 (the most current data available). |
| **Accuracy:** | There are some known accuracy issues with the data collected; the administrative data sets from which this collection is drawn have inaccuracies to varying degrees including missing data and data coding or recording errors.  Care should be taken in interpreting the figures with respect to inferring a total number of households assisted by each jurisdiction. Some households received multiple types of assistance. Thus, a simple sum of the number of households assisted across each assistance type would overstate the total number of households assisted due to double counting. |
| **Coherence:** | Care is required when comparing outputs across jurisdictions. Differences in the data collected and which records are included or excluded from a calculation can affect the coherence of the outputs.  *Specific State/Territory issues are:*  Victoria   * A change in accordance with the scope of the collection in 2011-12 has led to a change in the reported number of households assisted under ‘Other’ assistance. Prior to the 2011-12 collection, a home renovations scheme has been included under ‘Other’ assistance. This is not the case for the 2011-12 collection.   Queensland   * A change in accordance with the scope of the collection in 2011-12 has led to a change in the reported number of households assisted under direct lending. Prior to the 2011-12 collection, aspects of sale to tenant programs that were not direct lending were reported under direct lending. This is not the case for the 2011-12 collection, thus, data is not comparable with data from 2010-11 and earlier reference periods.   Western Australia   * A change in accordance with the scope of the collection in 2011-12 has led to changes in the reported number of households assisted by direct lending, interest rate assistance and ‘Other’ assistance. Thus, data is not comparable with data from 2010-11 and earlier reference periods. * Prior to the 2011-12 collection, ‘Other’ assistance was exclusively constituted by loans that funded the state’s share of equity in shared equity dwellings, and thus, was not financial assistance to households. In the 2011-12 collection, ‘Other’ assistance is constituted by waived mortgage insurance on direct lending. * In the 2011-12 collection, the number of households reported as assisted by direct lending included those households that were issued loans in the 2011-12 financial year and those households that held loans that were issued in a previous reference period. In the 2010-11 collection, this number included only those households that were issued loans in the 2010-11 financial year. * Loans issued after October 2009 received a variable rate 78bps above loans issued post October 2009. In the 2010-11 collection the jurisdiction included households with loans on the lower variable interest rate, those issued prior to October 2009, as in receipt of interest rate assistance. In the 2011-12 collection these households were included under direct lending, since they held loans issued in a previous financial period; the relative interest rate discount was, however, footnoted, rather than included in the NAHA table under interest rate assistance.   Australian Capital Territory   * A change in accordance with the scope of the collection in 2011-12 has led to a change in the reported number of households assisted under direct lending. Prior to the 2011-12 collection, the ACT did not report households that held loans on home purchase assistance provided prior to the collection year. This information provided under direct lending for 2011-12 pertains to a program that closed to new entrants in 1996. Thus, data is not comparable with data from 2010-11 and earlier reference periods. |
| **Accessibility:** | Annual data as reported are available publically on the AIHW website. Disaggregated data and unit record data may be requested through the national data repository and provided subject to jurisdiction approval. |
| **Interpretability:** | Metadata and definitions relating to this data source can be found in the National Housing Assistance Data Dictionary (AIHW Cat no. HOU147). Supplementary information can be found in the home purchase assistance collection manual which is available upon request from the AIHW. |

### Data Quality Statement – Output (e): Number of people receiving home purchase assistance (State and Territory Offices of State Revenue)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator:** | Number of people receiving home purchase assistance |
| **Measure (computation):** | Number of FHOS applications that were paid for the period |
| **Data source/s:** | National First Home Owner Database |
| **Institutional environment:** | The data is produced by State and Territory Offices of State Revenue from information held on the National First Home Owner Database.  The data on the National First Home Owner Database is collected as part of the administration of the First Home Owner Grant, as legislated for under the relevant State or Territory First Home Owner Grant Act. |
| **Relevance:** | Data is relevant to output 5 of the National Affordable Housing Agreement – ‘Number of people receiving home purchase assistance’. |
| **Timeliness:** | The National First Home Owner Database is updated daily. Monthly reports are produced based on information contained in the database. |
| **Accuracy:** | The data is sourced from the National First Home Owner Database and is correct at time of production.  As indicated in the table, some jurisdictions’ FHOS grant numbers do not reflect reclaimed grants. Where FHOS grant numbers are adjusted for reclaimed grants, the grants do not reflect grants paid in 2010-11 that are reclaimed after time of the production of the data. |
| **Coherence:** | Data is collected as part of a national scheme with consistent eligibility criteria across states and territories. Data should therefore be comparable between jurisdictions, notwithstanding any differences in reporting methodology or the timing of production of data. |
| **Accessibility:** | The full data set for all states and territories is not publicly available, however a number of states and territories publish grant numbers on their websites. |
| **Interpretability:** | The data is not complex and does not require additional information to interpret. |

### Data Quality Statement – Indicator 2: Proportion of homes sold or built that are affordable by low and moderate income households

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outcome:** | People can purchase affordable housing |
| **Indicator:** | The number of homes sold or built per 1000 low and moderate income households that are affordable by low and moderate income households |
| **Measure (computation):** | Numerator  Number of homes sold or built that are affordable by low and moderate income households   * Low and moderate income households are those with equivalised disposable household incomes (EDHI) in the bottom three quintiles, calculated on a state by state basis, and separately for capital city and balance of state. * The Indicator is calculated for those at the top of the low and moderate income range, i.e. at the top of the third quintile, in each state by capital city/balance of state regions. An additional measure, for context, is taken at the top of the second quintile. * Gross household income for those households at the top of the third quintile is measured as the median gross household income for all households in the EDHI percentile range 59-61, with the context measure taken as the gross household income for all households in the EDHI percentile range 39-41. * Homes are assessed to be affordable when the household spends no more than 30 per cent of their gross income on mortgage payments (including both interest and capital repayments). * Mortgage payments are calculated using: the standard monthly variable interest rate series, published by the Reserve Bank of Australia, averaged over the year; assumed 10 per cent deposit on the full purchase price; and repayments over a 25 year loan contract.   Denominator  Total number of low/moderate income households  Computation  Number of homes sold or built that are affordable by low and moderate income households / Total number of low/moderate income households x 1000 |
| **Data source/s:** | Numerator  ABS Survey of Income and Housing (SIH) data are used to determine the gross income at the top of the low and moderate income ranges, together with the mortgage calculation to determine the house price that is affordable at that level of income. Valuer General data supplied by the relevant agency in each state or territory is the source of data on home sale prices.  Denominator  ABS Survey of Income and Housing is used to determine the number of low/moderate income households. |
| **Institutional environment:** | Data on sales of properties are collected by the Land Titles Office, or Valuer General, in each State and Territory. Each property transaction is registered to enable the relevant state/territory government authority to maintain a record of property ownership and to facilitate the collection of taxes and duties. Each jurisdiction has different legislation governing the collection of information on property transfers and land valuations.  For information on the institutional environment of the ABS, including the legislative obligations of the ABS, financing and governance arrangements, and mechanisms for scrutiny of ABS operations, please see [ABS Institutional Environment](http://www.abs.gov.au/websitedbs/d3310114.nsf/4a256353001af3ed4b2562bb00121564/10ca14cb967e5b83ca2573ae00197b65!OpenDocument). |
| **Relevance:** | The data on property transactions includes sold properties, and excludes owner-built properties.  The most recent income data available from the SIH is for 2009-10.  Property transactions include those registered with each state/territory authority and available for inclusion in the ABS dataset prior to 18 October 2010. Sales records collected from South Australia and Northern Territory include settlement date, but not exchange date, and exchange date has been modelled by ABS for these two jurisdictions  Disaggregation is by State and Territory, capital city and balance of state and by separate houses and other dwellings.  As SIH excludes the 0.8 per cent of the Australian population living in very remote areas, the comparability of data for the Northern Territory is affected where these people account for around 23 per cent of the population. |
| **Timeliness:** | Valuer General  The ABS obtains price information from the Valuer General each quarter. It takes several months for all transactions relating to a particular quarter to be finally settled, recorded by the relevant state/territory agency and then passed on to the ABS.  SIH  The biennial SIH is enumerated over a twelve month period to account for seasonal variability in its measures. Results for 2009-10 were released in August 2011. Results for 2007-08 were released in August 2009. |
| **Accuracy** | Valuer General  Analysis of Valuer General data was undertaken by the ABS to identify and eliminate duplicate records, non-market transactions, land sales and data entry errors. These transactions have been removed from the data before computation of the indicator.  SIH  In 2009-10, the SIH sample size was increased from 9 345 households in 2007-08 to 18 071 households in 2009-10. The increase sample includes an extra 4 200 households located outside capital cities to better support COAG performance reporting. It also includes an additional pensioner sample of metropolitan households whose main source of income was a government pension benefit and / or allowance.  The final sample on which estimates are based is composed of persons for which all necessary information is available. Of the selected dwellings, there were 18 285 in the scope of the survey, of which 14 864 (81 per cent) were included as part of the final estimates. For the additional pensioner sample 4 084 dwellings were identified as being in scope, of which 3 207 dwellings (67 per cent) were included on the final file.  Most of the non-response was due to householders that were not able to be contacted, and only one-sixth of the non-response was due to households refusing to participate in the survey. To account in part for non-response, SIH data are weighted by: state, part of state, age, sex, labour force status, number of households and household composition.  The total sample in 2007-08 was 9 345 households, with a response rate of 84 per cent. Most of the non-response was due to householders that were not able to be contacted, and only one sixth of the non‑response was due to households refusing to participate in the survey. To account in part for non-response, SIH data are weighted by: state; part of state; age; sex; labour force status; number of households; and household composition. |
| **Coherence** | The data items used to construct the measures are consistent between cycles within each data source, and support assessment of change over time. |
| **Accessibility** | Aggregate data for this measure can be provided on request; however, availability of some sales data may be subject to certain conditions imposed by data providers. |
| **Interpretability** | Information to aid interpretation of SIH data is available in the [Survey of Income and Housing User Guide](http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/DetailsPage/6503.02009-10?OpenDocument) on the ABS web site. |

### Data Quality Statement – Indicator 3: Proportion of Australians who are homeless

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outcome:** | People who are homeless or at risk of homelessness achieve sustainable housing and social inclusion |
| **Indicator:** | Proportion of Australians who are homeless |
| **Measure (computation):** | The proportion of Australians who are homeless (as defined by the ABS)  The measure is defined as:   * Numerator - Number of Australians who are homeless * Denominator – number of Australians   and is presented as a *proportion*. |
| **Data source/s:** | Census of Population and Housing. Data are available every five years. |
| **Institutional environment:** | For information on the institutional environment of the ABS, including the legislative obligations of the ABS, financing and governance arrangements, and mechanisms for scrutiny of ABS operations, please see [ABS Institutional Environment](http://www.abs.gov.au/websitedbs/d3310114.nsf/4a256353001af3ed4b2562bb00121564/10ca14cb967e5b83ca2573ae00197b65!OpenDocument). |
| **Relevance:** | A quality prevalence measure of homelessness that can be used to track changes over time allows society to both judge some aspects of the scale of the problem and hold itself and governments accountable for some outcomes at this broad level. To target prevention, or amelioration of the circumstances of homelessness, and measure progress, the locations of the homeless and their characteristics are required.  With homelessness having a prevalence of just 0.5 per cent, and with less than half of the people experiencing homelessness approaching a formal service for assistance, there are few data sources which can report on prevalence. Only the ABS Census of Population and Housing can support the estimation of the prevalence of homelessness.  Use of the Census in estimating homelessness provides cross classification by homeless operational groups and by the range of personal characteristics which are available. This allows the homeless population to be compared to the whole population as well as to other populations who may be marginally housed and whose living arrangements are close to the statistical boundary of homelessness and who may be at risk of homelessness. |
| **Timeliness:** | Official homelessness estimates from the Census are available every five years, within 14 days of the publication of second release Census variables. On 12 November 2012 ABS released the official homelessness estimates for 2011.  On 11 September 2012 ABS released the first official estimates of the prevalence of homelessness for 2006 and 2001. |
| **Accuracy** | Official ABS estimates of the prevalence of homelessness use a methodology which is transparent, consistent and repeatable, and suitable for measuring change over time.  While ‘homelessness' itself is not a characteristic that is directly measured in the Census, estimates are derived from the Census using analytical techniques, based on both the characteristics observed in the Census and assumptions about the way people may respond to Census questions.  The Census is likely to under-enumerate some homeless groups such as homeless Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians and so called ‘rough sleepers’. Official ABS estimates of the prevalence of homelessness will reflect any such under-enumeration. In addition, due to the way that people may respond to the Census, official ABS estimates of homelessness are likely to underestimate the level of homelessness for both youth and people displaced due to domestic and family violence. However, trends are not expected to be affected by this level error.  ABS has developed a range of strategies for each Census aimed at maximising the enumeration of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians and those who may be ‘sleeping rough’. |
| **Coherence** | The ABS uses a consistent, transparent and repeatable methodology for estimating the number of people enumerated in the Census of Population and Housing who may be homeless on Census night. More details on the methodology can be found in the publication: [Information Paper - Methodology for Estimating Homelessness from the Census of Population and Housing](http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/mf/2049.0.55.001) (cat. no. 2049.0.55.001). The homelessness estimates can be compared to estimates for both the general population and for those in marginal housing at the boundary with homelessness.  Other collections which inform on other aspects of homelessness, such as the incidence of homelessness and people’s past experiences of homelessness, include the ABS General Social Survey and the AIHW Special Homelessness Services collection. Care should be taken when comparing homelessness data from different sources due to the different collection methodologies and the different scope of the collections.  Geographic breakdowns for this measure have been based on the place of usual residence of people and not the place that people were enumerated on Census night.  People with no usual address have been allocated to the geographic area that they were enumerated in on Census night.  Cells in tables have been randomly adjusted to avoid the release of confidential data. As a result individual cells within tables may not add to totals and corresponding cells across multiple tables may differ slightly. |
| **Accessibility** | In addition to published estimates in [Census of Population and Housing: Estimating homelessness](http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Lookup/2049.0Main+Features12006?OpenDocument) (cat. no. 2049.0), other homelessness results from the Census are available from the ABS on request. Please contact the ABS on (02) 6252 6174 or [living.conditions@abs.gov.au](mailto:living.conditions@abs.gov.au) for more information. |
| **Interpretability** | Official estimates of homelessness are published in [Census of Population and Housing: Estimating Homelessness](http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Lookup/2049.0Main+Features12006?OpenDocument) (cat. no. 2049.0).  Back ground information on the methodology used to estimate homelessness can be found in [Information Paper - Methodology for Estimating Homelessness from the Census of Population and Housing](http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/mf/2049.0.55.001) (cat. no. 2049.0.55.001). |

### Data Quality Statement – Indicator 4: Proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness (SAAP)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outcome:** | People who are homeless or at risk of homelessness achieve sustainable housing and social inclusion. |
| **Indicator:** | Proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness. |
| **Measure (computation):** | The proxy measure has been defined as:  Numerator  Number of Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP) clients and accompanying children who more than once (in the financial year reporting period) have a housing/accommodation need identified by SAAP agency worker.  Denominator  Number of SAAP clients and accompanying children who (in the financial year reporting period) have housing/accommodation need identified by SAAP agency worker.  In essence this proxy measure considers the concept of repeat homelessness by attempting to capture the proportion of homeless people who are assessed as having a need for housing or accommodation support more than once a year.  The proxy indicator is useful as a relative measure which can be used to indicate the proportion of people that fail to achieve a sustained outcome when provided with accommodation support. This proxy indicator should provide an appropriate indication of the change in the proportion of people experiencing repeat homelessness over time. |
| **Key data quality issues:** | The key data quality issue for the proxy indicator is relevance:   * The proxy indicator does not cover all homeless people but only those people (and accompanying children) that are supported at a SAAP agency and are assessed as having a housing/accommodation need by a SAAP agency worker. * Agency reporting practices and policies can result in multiple support periods being recorded for each episode of homelessness. For example, a client may present at a SAAP agency several times during a homelessness experience. In this way, several support periods may be recorded for a single period of homelessness. This necessitates an adjustment to be made to identify repeat homelessness. A gap of 6 weeks between SAAP support periods has been used to identify distinct periods of homelessness. Without using a gap the number of support periods overestimates the incidents of repeat homelessness, however using a gap can also lead to some repeat periods of homelessness being unidentified. The gap of 6 weeks provides a reasonable balance between these two extremes. * By only counting homeless people within a single year, persons who had periods of homelessness in previous years could fall out of scope for the proxy indicator. |
| **Measure (computation):** | Proxy Numerator  Number of SAAP clients and accompanying children who had more than 1 distinct SAAP support period (during the financial year reporting period) for which a housing/accommodation need was identified by a SAAP agency worker.  Proxy Denominator  Total number of SAAP clients and accompanying children for whom a housing/accommodation need was identified by a SAAP agency worker (during the financial year reporting period).  Proxy Proportion  Proxy Numerator ÷ Proxy Denominator. |
| **Data source/s:** | SAAP National Data Collection (NDC).  See General SAAP DQS. |
| **Institutional environment:** | See General SAAP DQS. |
| **Relevance:** | The proxy indicator does not cover all homeless people but only those that are supported at a SAAP agency and are assessed as having a housing/accommodation need by a SAAP agency worker. Homeless people who do not receive support from SAAP agencies and SAAP clients who are not identified as having a housing/accommodation need are not in scope for the proxy indicator.  The financial year was chosen as a standard time frame for the proxy indicator as this is in line with the SAAP reporting period and repeat periods of homelessness must be measured over a period of time. By only counting homeless people within a financial year, persons who had multiple periods of homelessness spanning across different financial years may fall out of scope for the proxy indicator.  Multiple periods of SAAP support can be provided which could relate to just a single episode of homelessness. This can happen, for example, when a SAAP client receives support and then seeks additional support for the same episode of homelessness over the following days. A SAAP client’s support period is assumed to relate to a different period of homelessness when there is a gap of 6 weeks or more between support periods for which a housing/accommodation need has been identified. A gap of 6 weeks has been determined to provide a reasonable balance between identifying support periods which relate to different episodes of homelessness and extending the minimum gap required for identifying distinct support periods. If the minimum gap between distinct support periods is extended too far this leads to more gaps between support periods crossing into the following financial year and potentially falling out of scope for the proxy indicator.  See General SAAP DQS. |
| **Timeliness:** | See General SAAP DQS. |
| **Accuracy:** | Data for Victoria is affected by the model of homelessness service delivery used in this state where much of the supported accommodation is provided via the complementary Transitional Housing Management (THM) program. Accommodation provided under the THM program was not consistently recorded in the SAAP Client Collection as ‘SAAP/CAP accommodation’, which has resulted in some under-reporting of accommodation provided by Victorian agencies. For more information about Victorian data see: AIHW 2010. Government-funded specialist homelessness services: SAAP National Data Collection annual report 2010-11. Cat. No. HOU 250. Canberra: AIHW.  An adjustment has been made to account for client non-consent and agency non-participation. In particular, missing support periods for observed clients – which occur due to clients giving consent in some support periods and not in others; and due to clients visiting both participating agencies and non-participating agencies – are imputed. The imputation model was not constrained to keep totals constant, thus totals for different disaggregations may not concur.  See General SAAP DQS. |
| **Coherence:** | Both the numerators and the denominators in the proxy indicator tables have been drawn from the SAAP NDC and have been produced using the same definitions and estimation schemes.  The total number of SAAP clients for whom a housing/accommodation need was identified during the financial year reference period was chosen for the denominator as it is the measure that will provide the most reliable comparison with the numerator of the proxy indicator. The denominator for the proxy indicator was estimated from the SAAP NDC so that changes to the proxy proportion would not be driven by inconsistencies in the estimation of the numerator and denominator.  Some RoGS and NAHA measures can be considered complementary where they cover similar concepts. However, even when both measures have been derived from the SAAP collection, these estimates should only be compared with caution. Different adjustments may have been made to SAAP data for NAHA reporting, in order to improve comparability between the NAHA performance measures and more appropriately capture the information required by these measures.  See General SAAP DQS. |
| **Accessibility:** | See General SAAP DQS. |
| **Interpretability:** | See General SAAP DQS. |

### Data Quality Statement – Indicator 4: Proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness (SHS)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outcome:** | People who are homeless or at risk of homelessness achieve sustainable housing and social inclusion. |
| **Indicator:** | Proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness. |
| **Measure (computation):** | There are two measures for this indicator.  The first (A) provides a measure of repeat periods of homelessness experienced by SHS clients taking advantage of the monthly collection of data in SHSC. It is not comparable to the previous SAAP based interim measure. The second (B) produces the most comparable indicator for comparison with the previous SAAP interim measure.  The proxy measure has been defined as:  **(A)**  Numerator  Number of SHS clients who change status from ‘homeless’ to ‘not homeless’ and back to ‘homeless’ or have repeat support periods where housing situation is identified as ‘homeless’.  Denominator  Number of SHS clients who experienced homelessness at any time during the reporting period.  and is presented as a *proportion*.  **(B)**  Numerator  Number of Specialist Homelessness Services (SHS) clients (aged 18 years or over) who more than once in 2011-12 have housing/accommodation need identified by a SHS agency worker.  Denominator  Number of Specialist Homelessness Services (SHS) clients (aged 18 years or over) in 2011-12 who have housing/accommodation need identified by a SHS agency worker.  and is presented as a *proportion*.  This output measure is a proxy as it only captures homeless people who access specialist homelessness services. Social inclusion is unable to be measured.  In essence, this proxy measure considers the concept of repeat homelessness in two different ways. The first measure captures those clients whose housing status changes during the year, such that they are able to be identified as moving from homeless to housed and back to homeless again. The second measure captures the proportion of homeless people who are assessed as having a need for housing or accommodation support more than once a year.  The proxy indicator is useful as a relative measure which can be used to indicate the proportion of people that fail to achieve a sustained outcome when provided with accommodation support. This proxy indicator should provide an appropriate indication of the change in the proportion of people experiencing repeat homelessness over time. |
| **Key data quality issues:** | The key data quality issue for the proxy indicator is relevance:   * SHSC data does not cover all homeless people and those at risk of homelessness, but only those who seek assistance from an SHS agency. Not everyone in scope for SHSC is homeless, because specialist homelessness agencies provide services to people who are at risk of homelessness aimed at preventing them from becoming homeless, as well as to people who are currently homeless. * By only counting homeless people within a single year, persons who had periods of homelessness in previous years could fall out of scope for the proxy indicator. |
| **Measure (computation):** | **(A)**  Proxy Numerator  Number of SHS clients who change status from ‘homeless’ to ‘not homeless’ and back to ‘homeless’ or have repeat support periods where housing situation is identified as ‘homeless’.  Proxy Denominator  Number of SHS clients who experienced homelessness at any time during 2011-12.  Proxy Proportion  Proxy Numerator ÷ Proxy Denominator.  **(B)**  Proxy Numerator  Number of SHSC clients who had more than 1 distinct SHSC support period during 2011-12, for which a housing/accommodation need was identified.  Proxy Denominator  Total number of SHSC clients for whom a housing/accommodation need was identified during 2011-12  Proxy Proportion  Proxy Numerator ÷ Proxy Denominator. |
| **Data source/s:** | Numerator & Denominator – Specialist Homelessness Services Collection. Data are available annually. |
| **Institutional environment:** | See General SHSC DQS. |
| **Relevance:** | SHSC data does not cover all homeless people and those at risk of homelessness, but only those who seek assistance from an SHS agency. Not everyone in scope for SHSC is homeless, because specialist homelessness agencies provide services to people who are at risk of homelessness aimed at preventing them from becoming homeless, as well as to people who are currently  Clients who are not identified as having a housing/accommodation need are not in scope for the proxy indicator (B).  The financial year was chosen as a standard time frame for the proxy indicator. By only counting homeless people within a financial year, persons who had multiple periods of homelessness spanning across different financial years may fall out of scope for the proxy indicator.  See General SHSC DQS. |
| **Timeliness:** | See General SHSC DQS. |
| **Accuracy:** | See General SHSC DQS. |
| **Coherence:** | Both the numerators and the denominators in the proxy indicator tables have been drawn from the SHSC and have been produced using the same definitions and estimation schemes.  The total number of SHSC clients for whom a housing/accommodation need was identified during the financial year reference period was chosen for the denominator as it is the measure that will provide the most reliable comparison with the numerator of the proxy indicator. The denominator for the proxy indicator was estimated from the SHSC so that changes to the proxy proportion would not be driven by inconsistencies in the estimation of the numerator and denominator.  Some RoGS and NAHA measures can be considered complementary where they cover similar concepts. However, even when both measures have been derived from the SHS collection, these estimates should be compared with extreme caution. Different adjustments may have been made to SHS data for NAHA reporting, in order to improve comparability between the NAHA performance measures and more appropriately capture the information required by these measures.  *Specific State/Territory issues are:*  South Australia  Due to timing differences between the development phases of the H2H and SHIP systems, certain data items could not be implemented in H2H before the collection for the SHSC commenced. Consequently, SHSC data about clients’ needs for assistance where associated services have not been provided do not include data from SA. Similarly, data on individuals who sought but did not receive any assistance from SA are under-reported in the SHSC due to limitations of H2H in capturing the full measure of this data. An upgrade to the H2H system was implemented in August 2012 and South Australian data on unmet demand will be available for reporting for 2012-13.  See General SHSC DQS. |
| **Accessibility:** | See General SHSC DQS. |
| **Interpretability:** | See General SHSC DQS. |

### Data Quality Statement – Indicator 6: Proportion of Indigenous households living in overcrowded conditions including in remote and discrete communities

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outcome:** | Indigenous people have improved housing amenity and reduced overcrowding, particularly in remote areas and discrete communities |
| **Indicator:** | Proportion of Indigenous households that are living in overcrowded conditions |
| **Measure (computation):** | The measure is presented as a proportion and is defined as:  Numerator  Number of overcrowded Indigenous households (calculated using the Canadian National Occupancy Standard)  Denominator  Total number of all Indigenous households for which bedroom requirements and dwelling details are known |
| **Data source/s:** | Public rental housing and SOMIH  Data sets are provided annually to the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) by jurisdictions. The data contain information about public rental housing and state owned and managed Indigenous housing (SOMIH) dwellings, households assisted and households on the waitlist, during the previous financial year and at 30 June, and are drawn from administrative data held by the jurisdictions.  Mainstream community housing  Data are provided annually to the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) by jurisdictions and are sourced from community housing organisations via survey and from the jurisdiction’s administrative systems. The annual data collection captures information about community housing organisations, the dwellings they manage and the tenants assisted. Limited financial information from the previous financial year is also collected.  Indigenous community housing  Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Data are provided annually to the AIHW by jurisdictions and are sourced from administrative data and dwelling audits (held by jurisdictions) and survey data from Indigenous Community Housing Organisations (ICHOs).  The annual data collection captures information about ICHOs the dwellings they manage and the households assisted at 30 June. |
| **Institutional environment:** | Data were provided to the AIHW as part of the Housing Ministers Advisory Committee work paper.  The AIHW is an Australian Government statutory authority accountable to Parliament and operates under the provisions of the *Australian Institute of Health and Welfare Act 1987*. This Act ensures that the data collections managed by the AIHW are kept securely and under strict conditions with respect to privacy and confidentiality. More information about the AIHW is available on the AIHW website (www.aihw.gov.au).  The AIHW receives, compiles, edits and verifies data in collaboration with jurisdictions, which retain ownership of the data and must approve any jurisdiction level output before it is released. The finalised data sets are used by the AIHW for collation, reporting and analysis. |
| **Relevance:** | Public rental housing and SOMIH  The data collected are an administrative by-product of the management of public rental housing and SOMIH programs run by the jurisdictions and conform well in terms of scope, coverage and reference period.  Not all data items required are available for all households. Only households with complete information have been included in the calculation.  Mainstream community housing  Community housing for the purpose of this collection includes all tenancy (rental) units under management of a community housing organisation. Additional jurisdiction-specific inclusions and exclusions also apply.  The data collected by the jurisdictions conform well in terms of the reference period however due to the jurisdiction-specific inclusions and exclusions; the data does not conform well in terms of scope and coverage.  Not all data items required are available for all households. Only households with complete information have been included in the calculation.  Indigenous Community Housing  ICH for the purposes of this collection includes all dwellings targeted to Indigenous people that are managed by an ICHO. ICHOs include community organisations such as resource agencies and land councils, which have a range of functions, provided that they manage housing for Indigenous people. All data items except D1b and D19b exclude dwellings managed by unfunded organisations. For NSW this means excluding ICHOs that are not actively registered. |
| **Timeliness** | Public rental housing, SOMIH and mainstream community housing  Data are collected annually. The reference period for this indicator is 30 June 2012 for public rental housing, SOMIH and mainstream community housing.  Indigenous Community Housing  Data are collected annually, for the financial year ending 30 June. The most recent data available are for 2010‑11.  Specific State/Territory issues are:  South Australia  All dwelling and household data is based on tenancy and asset audits conducted in 2008 and 2009 with updates performed on some communities. |
| **Accuracy** | There are some known accuracy issues with the data collected:  Public rental housing and SOMIH  The administrative data sets from which this collection is drawn have inaccuracies to varying degrees including missing data, out-of-date data and data coding or recording errors.  Not all data items required are available for all households, in particular multiple-family households. In these cases, the single/couple status of household members may be derived based on information that is available including household composition and age. Only households with complete information have been included in the calculation.  *Public rental housing exclusions*   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **Total ongoing households** | **Excludes households, with bdr or required bdr details unknown** | ***Exclusions (%)*** | | **NSW** | 111 087 | 1 285 | ***1.2*** | | **Vic** | 62 779 | 4 769 | ***7.6*** | | **Qld** | 51 074 | – | – | | **WA** | 32 625 | – | – | | **SA** | 39 264 | 1 | – | | **Tas** | 10 902 | – | – | | **ACT** | 10 793 | 1 129 | ***10.5*** | | **NT** | 4 899 | 91 | ***1.9*** |   .. Not applicable. – Nil or rounded to zero.  *SOMIH exclusions*   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **Total ongoing households** | **Excludes households with bdr or required bdr details unknown** | ***Exclusions (%)*** | | **NSW** | 4 372 | 81 | ***1.9*** | | **Vic** | .. | .. | ***..*** | | **Qld** | 3 230 | – | – | | **WA** | .. | .. | ***..*** | | **SA** | 1 756 | – | – | | **Tas** | 334 | – | – | | **ACT** | .. | .. | ***..*** | | **NT** | .. | .. | ***..*** |   .. Not applicable. – Nil or rounded to zero.  Disaggregation can lead to small cell sizes which are volatile — very small cells have been suppressed to protect confidentiality.  Specific state/territory issues are:  Victoria   * Bedroom requirements are unknown for many households in Victoria that have not applied for, or do not receive, a rental rebate. 4769 households (7.6 per cent) are excluded from overcrowding calculations due to missing information.   Australian Capital Territory   * Bedroom requirements are unknown for many households in the ACT. 1 129 households (10.5 per cent) are excluded from overcrowding calculations due to missing information.   Mainstream community housing  Those households for which household member details (age, sex or relationship status) could not be determined have been excluded. Assumptions have been made where only partial household information is known in order to include them in this indicator, including:   * all single or couple-only households each require one bedroom only; * any unmatched single person in a household each requires their own bedroom; and * each person in a household that is classified as a ‘group of unrelated adults’ requires their own bedroom.   Indigenous community housing  Complete data was not available for all dwellings or ICHOs in every jurisdiction. Data should be interpreted with caution as it may not fully reflect the entire funded portion of the jurisdiction. Due to poor coverage, the denominator only includes Indigenous households for which household groups and dwelling details are known. Due to poor coverage, a national value is not provided.  Where the coverage of the data relating to a performance indicator is less than 95 per cent in a jurisdiction or at the national level, details of the coverage are provided.  *Completeness coverage:*   * Victoria: 46.9 per cent * Queensland: 63.7 per cent * Western Australia: 66.0 per cent * South Australia: 49.8 per cent   Specific State/Territory issues:  Queensland  Household information provided is for 11 Department managed Communities and 6 dwellings in Kowanyama. |
| **Coherence** | Care is required when comparing across jurisdictions for reasons of varying accuracy (details above).  Public rental housing, SOMIH and mainstream community housing  From 2009-10, the CNOS has been used to calculate bedroom requirements. In previous years, the Proxy Occupancy Standard was used, meaning that coherence over time has been affected by changes in methodology.  The use of the CNOS and change to the definition of overcrowding as households requiring one bedroom or more in 2009-10 has resulted in an increase to the estimation of overcrowding.  Indigenous community housing  From 2009–10, the definition of overcrowding has been changed to households requiring ‘one bedroom or more’ from ‘two bedrooms or more in 2008–09 and prior. This change has resulted in an increase to the estimation of overcrowding, and affects coherence over time.  Data within jurisdictions may not be comparable to previous years due to variation in the ICHOs that respond to the survey or for which jurisdictions can provide data.  Specific State/Territory issues:  New South Wales  At the July 2011 Housing and Homelessness Information Management Group meeting, members agreed to a nationally consistent non-extrapolation approach to reporting incomplete ICH data. Members also agreed the cessation of collecting aggregate overcrowding data at the organisational level, and that the Canadian National Occupancy Standard (CNOS) is the only accepted standard for calculating overcrowding rates.  Due to these decisions, NSW was unable to provide overcrowding figures for the 2010-11 financial year.  Queensland  In prior years, household data for communities managed by the Indigenous Local Government Councils was sourced from the PCAT Survey which was conducted in 2006 by the former Department of Housing. Overcrowding figures for 2010‑11 have been calculated for the Indigenous communities that have their tenancies managed by the State (1912 dwellings). |
| **Accessibility** | Annual data will be reported in *Housing Assistance in Australia*, which will be available publically on the AIHW website. Additional disaggregations are available on application and subject to jurisdiction approval. |
| **Interpretability** | Metadata and definitions relating to this data source can be found in the National Housing Assistance Data Dictionary (AIHW Cat no. HOU147) ([meteor.aihw.gov.au/content/index.phtml/itemId/181162](http://meteor.aihw.gov.au/content/index.phtml/itemId/181162)).  Supplementary information can be found in the housing collection data manuals which are available upon request from the AIHW. |

### Data Quality Statement – Indicator 7: Proportion of Indigenous households living in houses of an acceptable standard

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outcome:** | Indigenous people have improved amenity and reduced overcrowding, particularly in remote areas and discrete communities |
| **Indicator:** | Proportion of Indigenous households living in houses of an acceptable standard |
| **Measure (computation):** | Numerator  Number of Indigenous households who indicated that their household has at least 4 facilities and that they are working and did not indicate that they had more than two major structural problems.  Denominator  Number of tenants who gave a valid answer to the facilities and structural problems question and who answered the Indigenous status question multiplied by 100.  Proportion of Indigenous households that have four working facilities and no more than two major structural problems |
| **Data source/s:** | 2012 National Social Housing Survey |
| **Institutional environment:** | The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) is a major national agency set up by the Australian Government under the *Australian Institute of Health and Welfare Act 1987* to provide reliable, regular and relevant information and statistics on Australia's health and welfare. It is an independent statutory authority established in 1987, governed by a management Board, and accountable to the Australian Parliament through the Health and Ageing portfolio.  The AIHW aims to improve the health and wellbeing of Australians through better health and welfare information and statistics. It collects and reports information on a wide range of topics and issues, ranging from health and welfare expenditure, hospitals, disease and injury, and mental health, to ageing, homelessness, disability and child protection.  The Institute also plays a role in developing and maintaining national metadata standards. This work contributes to improving the quality and consistency of national health and welfare statistics. The Institute works closely with governments and non-government organisations to achieve greater adherence to these standards in administrative data collections to promote national consistency and comparability of data and reporting.  One of the main functions of the AIHW is to work with the states and territories to improve the quality of administrative data and, where possible, to compile national datasets based on data from each jurisdiction, to analyse these datasets and disseminate information and statistics.  The *Australian Institute of Health and Welfare Act 1987*, in conjunction with compliance to the Privacy Act 1988, (Cth) ensures that the data collections managed by the AIHW are kept securely and under the strictest conditions with respect to privacy and confidentiality.  For further information see the AIHW website [www.aihw.gov.au](http://www.aihw.gov.au). |
| **Relevance:** | The 2012 NSHS comprise of tenants from public housing, community housing and state owned and managed Indigenous housing. The Indigenous Community Housing (ICH) sector was excluded from the survey. All states and territories participated in the survey if the relevant program was operated in their jurisdiction. All remoteness areas were included in the sample. The speed of delivery to, and returns from, more remote locations may have impacted the number of responses received from tenants in these areas. |
| **Timeliness** | Data are not collected annually. Surveys for PH and CH were conducted in 2001, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2010 and 2012. Surveys for SOMIH were conducted in 2005, 2007 and 2012.  The fieldwork for 2012 was conducted from 18 May–27 June for the ACT. For all other jurisdictions, fieldwork was conducted from 25 May–30 July.  For 2012, NSHS data are generally collected for the reference period for the last 12 months since May 2011. |
| **Accuracy** | Missing data  Some survey respondents did not answer all questions, either because they were unable or unwilling to provide a response. The survey responses for these people were retained in the sample, and the missing values were recorded as not answered. No attempt was made to deduce or impute these missing values. A considerable proportion of tenants did not answer the Indigenous status question: 18 per cent of PH tenants, 5 per cent of SOMIH tenants and 17 per cent of CH tenants did not provide a response.  Response rates and contact rates  The accuracy of the outputs from the 2012 NSHS are affected by the response rates across the jurisdictions and at the National level (see response rate table below).   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Jurisdiction** | **Sample size** | **Response rate** | | **PH** | | | | NSW | 5 082 | 15.5% | | VIC | 526 | 13.8% | | QLD | 665 | 22.2% | | SA | 506 | 21.9% | | ACT | 665 | 24.7% | | WA | 517 | 15.4% | | TAS | 486 | 18.3% | | NT | 537 | 11.8% | | **CH** | | | | NSW | 1 119 | 17.0% | | VIC | 376 | 15.7% | | QLD | 399 | 16.0% | | SA | 372 | 17.4% | | ACT | 109 | 20.0% | | WA | 391 | 15.0% | | TAS | 285 | 34.8% | | **SOMIH** | | | | NSW | 658 | 15.4% | | QLD | 370 | 11.7% | | SA | 213 | 12.3% | | TAS | 105 | 31.5% |   Overall, 82 175 questionnaires were sent to tenants in PH, CH and SOMIH, of which 13 381 questionnaires were categorised as being complete and useable, representing a response rate for the 2012 survey of 16.3 per cent; considerably lower than the 2010 survey of 38.6 per cent.  A low response rate does not necessarily mean that the results are biased. As long as the non-respondents are not systematically different in terms of how they would have answered the questions, there is no bias. Given the relatively low response rates for this survey, it is likely there is some bias in the estimates. However, it is not possible to identify or estimate any bias.  Scope and coverage  Caution should be used when comparing trend data or data between jurisdictions due to the response rates from the NSHS for the 2012 reference period.  The 2012 NSHS sampling and stratification methods were similar to the 2010 and 2007 survey i.e. sample was randomly selected of each jurisdiction’s SOMIH, Public and Community housing tenants. As requested by NSW PH, stratified sampling was undertaken for NSW PH tenancies stratified by region/area. However in 2010 and 2007 all jurisdictions were stratified by:   * metropolitan and non-metropolitan * housing region or area * dwelling type (detached house, attached house/duplex/townhouse and flat/unit)   The 2012 NSHS was designed to meet minimum sample requirements for each housing program.  Sample design  Simple random sampling was undertaking for all housing programs except for NSW PH in which stratified sampling was undertaken in order to obtain minimum sample size requirements for each area.  To produce reliable estimates for each housing program, minimum sample sizes were set for each housing program. An additional 4950 booster sample was allocated to NSW PH (4300) and NSW CH (650).  The over-sampling of lesser populated states and territories produced a sample that was not proportional to the jurisdiction/housing programs distribution of the social housing population. Weighting was applied to adjust for imbalances arising from execution of the sampling and differential response rates, and to ensure that the results relate to the social housing population.  With the exception of ACT, the weighting for the 2012 survey was calculated as the number of households divided by the number of responses for each jurisdiction by housing type by ARIA. For ACT, weights were calculated by the same method by housing type without ARIA.  Sampling error  The measure used to indicate reliability of individual estimates reported in 2012 was the relative standard error (RSE). Only estimates with RSEs of less than 25 per cent are considered sufficiently reliable for most purposes. Results subject to RSEs of between 25 per cent and 50 per cent should be considered with caution and those with relative standard errors greater than 50 per cent should be considered as unreliable for most practical purposes.  Non-sampling error  In addition to sampling errors, the estimates are subject to non‑sampling errors. These can arise from errors in reporting of responses (for example, failure of respondents’ memories, incorrect completion of the survey form), the unwillingness of respondents to reveal their true responses and the higher levels of non-response from certain subgroups of the population.  The survey findings are also based on self-reported data. |
| **Coherence** | In 2010, the data collected for public and community housing exclude the ACT as this jurisdiction had undertaken its own collection. Trend data should therefore be interpreted with caution.  Comparisons between jurisdictions’ data should be undertaken with caution due to differences in response rates and non-sampling error.  Surveys in this series commenced in 2001. Over time, modifications have been made to the survey’s methodology and questionnaire design. The sample design and the questionnaire of the 2012 survey differs in a number of important respects from previous versions of the survey. |
| **Accessibility** | Published results from the 2012 NSHS will be available on the AIHW website, see *National Social Housing Survey 2012: national results bulletin and National Social Housing Survey 2012: detailed findings* report. Access to the confidentialised unit record file may be requested through the AIHW Ethics Committee. |
| **Interpretability** | Information to aid in interpretation of 2012 NSHS results will be available in the ‘Explanatory Notes’ section of the National Social Housing Survey 2012: detailed findings report.  In addition, the 2012 NSHS Technical Report, code book and other supporting documentation will be available on the AIHW website. Metadata and definitions relating to this data source can be found in the National Housing Assistance Data Dictionary (AIHW Cat no. HOU147). Supplementary information can be found in the public rental housing collection manual which is available upon request from the AIHW. |

### Data Quality Statement – Indicator 8: Estimated cumulative gap between underlying demand for housing and housing supply, as a proportion of the increase in underlying demand

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outcome:** | People have access to housing through an efficient and responsive housing market |
| **Indicator:** | Estimated cumulative gap between underlying demand for housing and housing supply, as a proportion of the increase in underlying demand. |
| **Measure (computation):** | The measure is defined as:   * Numerator — Cumulative gaps between supply and demand since 2001 * Denominator — Cumulative increase in demand since 2001   and is reported as a *percentage*.  The National Housing Supply Council (NHSC) emphasises that the choice of 2001 as the base year is not on the basis that that year represents a point of equilibrium nationally or within any particular submarket. Rather, it coincides with a Census of Population and Housing and it is sufficiently long ago to have enabled some market adjustments in response to housing demand. |
| **Data source/s:** | Numerator  Estimates of cumulative underlying demand from 2001-2006 is based on ABS Household and Family Projections 2001 to 2026 cat. no. 3236.0. From 2007 projections are spliced medium household growth scenario estimates which use the updated Estimated Resident Population (ERP) from ABS Australian Demographic Statistics cat no 3101.0 produced from McDonald-Temple commissioned research. The 2011 Census and revised 2011 ERP have **not** been used.  Cumulative housing supply estimates are based on ABS Building Approvals, Australia cat. no. 8731.0 adjusted by the NHSC for Demolitions and Unoccupied Dwellings.  Estimates for Demolitions were based on additional census information, up to 2006, and data provided by State and Territory planning agencies.  Estimates of unoccupied dwellings were based on the 2006 Census count of Unoccupied Private Dwellings which are defined as structures built specifically for living purposes which are habitable, but unoccupied on Census Night. Vacant houses, holiday homes, huts and cabins (other than seasonal workers' quarters) are counted as unoccupied dwellings. Also included are newly completed dwellings not yet occupied, dwellings which are vacant because they are due for demolition or repair, and dwellings to let.  The cumulative gaps between Supply and Demand since 2001 are the difference between estimated underlying demand and estimated housing supply.  Denominator  Cumulative increase in demand is calculated above and the percentage is calculated from the cumulative gap as a percentage of the cumulative demand from 2001. |
| **Institutional environment:** | The estimates derived for this indicator are primarily based on data collected by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. Under the provisions of the *Census and Statistics Act 1905*, survey participants, if directed in writing to provide information, are legally obliged to do so.  The NHSC estimates for demolitions use the Census data and State and Territory planning agency information available to enhance the estimates. The information provided is based on information collected from the legislative requirements for development in states and territories. |
| **Relevance:** | The data used to compile this indicator are the best available sources of information at the time of publication. The NHSC engages in ongoing discussions with the ABS, the planning agencies in the states and territories and it investigates ways of improving the information available to measure the underlying demand and supply in the housing market. |
| **Timeliness:** | The estimates primarily use Census data as the basis for estimating of underlying demand and as an input into the supply of dwellings. The estimates have **not** been updated for the 2011 Census results, or the revised estimate of the Estimated Resident Population (ERP). The ERP at June 2011 was revised lower by around 300,000 persons by the ABS following the Census, this may lead the NHSC to revise its estimate of the housing shortfall in future.  As the 2006 Census is the latest data used, the estimates rely on other ABS collections and information provided by the states and territories to enhance the estimates for the years after 2006. |
| **Accuracy:** | Historic estimates of the housing shortfall were revised in June 2012 when the 2011 estimates were published. This was to correct a miscalculation in the previous report that lead to a modest overstatement of the increase in housing supply since 2001. This lead to the housing shortfall being revised modestly higher from that published in the 2011 State of Supply Report.  There are four principal sources of error in Census data: respondent error, processing error, partial response and undercount. Quality management of the Census program aims to reduce error as much as possible, and to provide a measure of the remaining error to data users, to allow them to use the data in an informed way.  Projections of underlying demand are based on a widely accepted methodology developed by Australian National University (ANU) demographer Professor Peter McDonald and used by the ABS. However, the ERP is an input into this model and the revisions to it described above may lead to revisions to estimated and projected underlying demand.  While the states and territories do not have accurate and comparable data on demolitions for their jurisdictions the information provided by the states and territories is used to improve the NHSC estimates. |
| **Coherence:** | Changes to Census definitions have the potential to impact on trends and comparisons over time. As the indicator is broadly based on Census data and the ABS quarterly Building Approvals collection, the estimates within the 5 year Census periods are broadly internally consistent.  Estimates for demolitions may be less reliable as they rely on informed contributions from State and Territory planning agencies over time. State and territory agencies do not generally collect or report detailed information which consistently and accurately measures net demolitions. |
| **Accessibility:** | The derivation of the indicator relies on publicly available data, purchased data, commissioned research and information sourced from State and Territory planning agencies. Some of the data and information used in the NHSC estimates is not available to the public. |
| **Interpretability:** | Supplementary information on the methodology used to derive estimates for underlying demand and housing supply and measuring the gap between supply and demand for private dwellings is included in the NHSC’s Housing Supply and Affordability – Key Indicators, 2012 Report. |

### Data Quality Statement – Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key data quality issues** | The key data quality issue related to the use of SAAP (Supported Accommodation Assistance Program) data is relevance. SAAP data does not capture the whole of the homeless (and at risk) population, rather only people who access SAAP services. |
| **Data source/s** | SAAP National Data Collection (NDC) - Client Collection.  SAAP NDC – the NDC provides information on the provision of assistance through SAAP. Data are recorded by service providers during, or immediately following, contact with clients and are then forwarded to the National Data Collection Agency (NDCA) after clients’ support periods have ended or, for ongoing clients, at the end of the reporting period (30 June). |
| **Institutional environment** | The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) has had the role of the SAAP NDCA since the collection’s inception in 1996-97.  The AIHW works closely with all state, territory and Australian Government authorities in collecting, analysing and disseminating data. However, the Institute is an independent statutory authority within the Health and Ageing portfolio, and is responsible to the Minister for Health and Ageing. The Institute is governed by a Board, which is accountable to the parliament of Australia through the Minister.  When errors are found in published data, those errors are corrected immediately in publications on the AIHW website, and where necessary, in on-line tables and online interactive data cubes. Corrections are documented on the AIHW website.  There are various mechanisms in place that provide the framework for the implementation and governance of SAAP and the NDCA. These mechanisms include the *SAAP Act* (1994) and the Multilateral and Bilateral Agreements which set out accountability arrangements, management structures, and funding allocations.  As part of the Australian Government’s National Reform Agenda, the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) replaced SAAP with the new National Affordable Housing Agreement (NAHA), effective from 1 January 2009. |
| **Relevance** | SAAP data does not cover all homeless people and those at risk of homelessness, but only those that are supported at a SAAP agency. Homeless people (and those at risk) who do not receive support from SAAP agencies are not in scope for proxy indicators compiled solely from SAAP data.  The proxy indicators that have been complied using SAAP data have the same scope as the SAAP Client Collection. In the SAAP Client Collection, data are collected by support providers for each client support period. An individual client may receive support on more than one occasion – either from the same SAAP agency or from different SAAP agencies.  The scope for the proxy indicators is all people who were either SAAP clients or children accompanying SAAP clients during the 2010-11 financial year.  A SAAP client is a person who is homeless or at imminent risk of homelessness who:   * is accommodated by a SAAP agency; or * enters into an ongoing support relationship with a SAAP agency; or * receives support or assistance from a SAAP agency which entails generally 1 hour or more of a worker’s time, either with that client directly or on behalf of that client, on a given day.   This includes people who are aged 18 years or older and people of any age not accompanied by a parent or guardian.  People can be considered as SAAP clients for a particular financial year reporting period when:   * the client’s support period ended in the reporting period, or * the client’s support period started on or before the end of the reporting period and either was ongoing at the end of the reporting period (30 June) or the end date of the support period was unknown and the record was entered by the NDCA before the data entry close-off date for the reporting period.   An accompanying child is a person aged under 18 years who:   * has a parent or guardian who is a SAAP client; and * accompanies that client to a SAAP agency any time during that client’s support period; and/or * receives assistance directly as a consequence of a parent or guardian’s support period.   A SAAP support period commences when a client begins to receive support and/or supported accommodation from a SAAP agency. The support period is considered to finish when:   * the client ends the relationship with the agency; or * the agency ends the relationship with the client.   If it is not clear whether the agency or the client has ended the relationship, the support period is assumed to have ended if no assistance has been provided to the client for a period of 1 month. In such a case, the date the support period ended is the last contact with the client.  The SAAP definition of homelessness used in these proxy indicators comes from the *SAAP act 1994* and is consistent with publications such as the Government-funded specialist homelessness services: SAAP National Data Collection annual report 2010-11. Cat. No. HOU 250. Canberra: AIHW. Under SAAP, people are considered homeless when they do not have access to safe and secure housing.  The financial year was chosen as a standard time frame for the proxy indicator as this is in line with the SAAP reporting period. |
| **Timeliness** | The reporting period for each of the proxy indicators and outputs is a financial year.  SAAP data has been recorded on a continuous basis and published annually since 1996. The most recent reference period for the data is 2010–11. The data for the 2010-11 financial year was first published in: AIHW (2011) *Government-funded specialist homelessness services: SAAP National Data Collection annual report 2010-11*. Cat. No. HOU 250. Canberra: AIHW.  The SAAP NDC annual reports are published between 6 to 9 months after the end of the reference period. |
| **Accuracy** | An adjustment has been made to account for client non-consent and agency non-participation. In 2010-11 the SAAP Client Collection achieved an agency participation rate of 90 per cent and a valid consent rate of 85 per cent for clients. As data is not obtained from all SAAP clients an adjustment is required to ensure that the estimates reflect the entire SAAP client population.  The adjustment scheme assumes that, on average, the demographic characteristics and circumstances of people are the same regardless of whether data about them were reported to the NDCA. In this way, adjustments can be made to account for clients who do not give consent. The scheme adjusts estimates to allow for agency non-participation (if this occurs), for clients who give valid consent for some support periods but not for others (referred to as ‘mixed consent’), and for clients who do not give consent in any of their periods of support. There is no strictly objective method that can be applied to the data from the Client Collection to adjust estimates for incomplete response. Karmel (1999:23, 26) describes the statistical assumptions underlying the adjustment scheme developed by the AIHW.  Note that the adjustment scheme does not account for inaccuracies associated with the use of the statistical linkage key. Statistical linkage keys allow data collected on separate occasions from the same person to be combined without identifying the person. Thus they allow enumeration of actual clients and accompanying children in addition to occasions of support. There are a small number of inaccuracies caused by identical statistical linkage keys and changing linkage key information for the same client.  Inconsistent reporting of Indigenous status by clients has been adjusted for by using the Indigenous status of the first valid (i.e. non-missing and consenting) response provided by the client. As different periods of homelessness can occur in different states, a similar option was chosen for determining the state of the client. The state of the client is determined to be the state of the SAAP agency where the client first presented within the financial year.  For confidentiality reasons, numerators with small cell sizes (those less than 3 and the next smallest cell) and corresponding proportions will not be reported.  Rates based on numerators less than 5 or denominators less than 100 have been published but should be used with extreme caution as they may not be reliable. |
| **Coherence** | NAHA Indictor 4 and NAHA Outputs A and B have been produced using the same data source: SAAP National Data Collection (NDC) - Client Collection.  SAAP data used to compile proxy indicators and outputs for 2009-10 and 2010-11 have been affected by changes in funding arrangements. As described above, on the 1st January 2009 SAAP V was replaced by the NAHA. The development and implementation of new services under the revised arrangements have been ongoing. It is not possible to quantify the extent to which services changed or new services were added in the first 6 months of the operation of the NAHA, although it is known that these were not extensive. The majority of existing services under SAAP continued. For more information about the NAHA see AIHW 2011. Government-funded specialist homelessness services: SAAP National Data Collection annual report 2010-11. Cat. No. HOU 250. Canberra: AIHW. |
| **Accessibility** | Related data to those shown in the proxy indicator tables are available publicly in the SAAP annual reports released by AIHW. Not all disaggregations, including those shown in these performance indicator tables, are published directly but may be requested, subject to jurisdiction approval.  The relevant publications associated with the proxy indicators are:   * AIHW 2011. *Government-funded specialist homelessness services: SAAP National Data Collection annual report 2010-11*. Cat. No. HOU 250. Canberra: AIHW. |
| **Interpretability** | Further information on the adjustment scheme, legislation and the SAAP collection can be found in:   1. AIHW 2011. *Government-funded specialist homelessness services: SAAP National Data Collection annual report 2010-11*. Cat. No. HOU 250. Canberra: AIHW. 2. AIHW 2005*. SAAP National Data Collection collector’s manual July 2005*. Canberra: AIHW. 3. Karmel R 1999. *SAAP National Data Collection: adjustment methods for incomplete coverage*. Canberra: AIHW. 4. Commonwealth of Australia, 1994, *Supported Accommodation Assistance Act 1994*, Act No. 162 of 1994, Canberra. 5. National Affordable Housing Agreement [www.federalfinancialrelations.gov.au/content/national\_agreements.aspx](http://www.federalfinancialrelations.gov.au/content/national_agreements.aspx) |

### Data Quality Statement – Specialist Homelessness Services Collection (SHS)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key data quality issues** | The key data quality issue related to the use of SHSC (Specialist Homelessness Services Collection) data is relevance. SHSC data does not contain all homeless people and those at risk of homelessness, but only those who seek assistance from an SHS agency. |
| **Data source/s** | Specialist Homelessness Services Client Collection.  The SHSC collects information on people who receive services from agencies that are funded under the NAHA or the NPAH to provide specialist homelessness services. A limited amount of data is also collected about clients who seek, but do not receive, assistance from a specialist homelessness agency.  Data are collected monthly from agencies participating in the collection. |
| **Institutional environment** | The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) is a major national agency set up by the Australian Government under the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare Act 1987 to provide reliable, regular and relevant information and statistics on Australia's health and welfare. It is an independent statutory authority established in 1987, governed by a management Board, and accountable to the Australian Parliament through the Health and Ageing portfolio.  The AIHW aims to provide authoritative information and statistics to promote better health and wellbeing. The Institute collects and reports information on a wide range of topics and issues, ranging from health and welfare expenditure, hospitals, disease and injury, and mental health, to ageing, homelessness, disability and child protection.  The Institute also plays a role in developing and maintaining national metadata standards. This work contributes to improving the quality and consistency of national health and welfare statistics. The Institute works closely with governments and non-government organisations to achieve greater adherence to these standards in administrative data collections to promote national consistency and comparability of data and reporting.  One of the main functions of the AIHW is to work with the states and territories to improve the quality of administrative data and, where possible, to compile national data sets based on data from each jurisdiction, to analyse these data sets and disseminate information and statistics.  The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare Act 1987, in conjunction with compliance to the Privacy Act 1988, ensures that the data collections managed by the AIHW are kept securely and under the strictest conditions with respect to privacy and confidentiality.  For further information see the AIHW website <www.aihw.gov.au>.  The SHSC was developed by AIHW in conjunction with the states and territories and is administered by the AIHW. |
| **Relevance** | Scope and coverage―clients  The SHSC collects information about clients of specialist homelessness agencies that is people who receives assistance from agencies funded by state and territory governments to respond to or prevent homelessness. In addition, some information is also collected about unassisted people, that is, any person who seeks services from a specialist homelessness agency and does not receive any services at that time.  SHSC data does not cover all homeless people and those at risk of homelessness, but only those who seek assistance from an SHS agency.  Not everyone in scope for SHSC is homeless, because specialist homelessness agencies provide services to people who are at risk of homelessness aimed at preventing them from becoming homeless, as well as to people who are currently homeless.  Data about clients is submitted based on support periods―a period of support provided by a specialist homelessness service agency to a client. Information about clients is then linked together based on a statistical key.  A client may be of any age—children are clients if they receive specialist homelessness assistance.  Scope and coverage―agencies  The SHSC collects information on people who seek and receive services from specialist homelessness agencies. All agencies that receive funding under the NAHA or NPAH to provide specialist homelessness services are in scope for the SHSC in general, but only those who received funding for at least four months during the 2011‒12 financial year are in scope for the 2011‒12 reporting period. Agencies that are in coverage are those in-scope agencies for which details have been provided to the AIHW by the relevant state/territory department.  Since the beginning of the SHSC in July 2011, the number of agencies covered by the data collection has steadily increased as jurisdictions identified and enlisted agencies that were expected to participate.  Of all agencies expected to participate in the collection in at least one month during the 2011‒12 reporting period, 76 per cent submitted information for all 12 collection months and 91 per cent submitted data for at least one month |
| **Timeliness** | The SHSC began on 1 July 2011. Specialist homelessness agencies provide their data to the AIHW each month, once sufficient data is received and validated ‘snapshots’ are created at particular points in time for reporting purposes.  The 2011‒12 snapshot contains data submitted to the AIHW for the July 2011 to June 2012 collection months, using responses received and validated as at 27 August 2012. |
| **Accuracy** | Potential sources of error  As with all data collections, the SHSC estimates are subject to error. These can arise from data coding and processing errors, inaccurate data or missing data. Reported findings are based on data reported by agency workers.  Data validation  The AIHW receives data from specialist homelessness agencies every month. These data go through two processes of data validation (error checking). Firstly, data validation is incorporated into the client management systems (CMSs) most agencies use to record their data. Secondly, data are submitted through the AIHW online reporting web-portal, Specialist Homelessness Online Reporting (SHOR). SHOR completes a more thorough data validation and reports (to staff of the homelessness agency) any errors that need correcting before data can be accepted.  Statistical Linkage Key (SLK) validity  An individual client may seek or receive support on more than one occasion—either from the same agency or from a different agency. Data from individual clients who presented at different agencies and/or at different times is matched based on a statistical linkage key (SLK) which allows client level data to be created. The SLK is constructed from information about the client’s date of birth, sex and an alphacode based on selected letters of their name.  If a support period record does not have a valid SLK, it cannot be linked to a client, and thus it is not included in client-level tables (although it is included in support period-level tables). Ninety-three per cent of support periods had a valid SLK in 2011‒12.  Incomplete responses  In many support periods, in 2011‒12, valid responses were not recorded for all questions—invalid responses were recorded, ‘don’t know’ was selected, or no response was recorded. Support periods with invalid/’don’t know’/missing responses were retained in the collection and, no attempt was made to deduce or impute the true value of invalid/’don’t know’/missing responses.  Where data relate to the total population the estimate includes clients with missing information. This information has been attributed in proportion with those clients for whom information is available. In tables where the population relates to clients with a particular need or accommodation circumstance, clients with missing needs information are excluded.  Non-response bias  Non-response occurs where there is less than 100 per cent agency participation, less than 100 per cent SLK validity and where there are incomplete responses. However estimates will not necessarily be biased. If the non-respondents are not systematically different in terms of how they would have answered the questions, then there will be no bias. However, no information is yet available to indicate whether or not there is any systematic bias in agency non-participation, SLK validity and incomplete responses  Imputation  An imputation strategy is used to correct for two types of non-sampling error: agency non-response and data error in the statistical linkage key data item, which is used to link information about individual clients together to provide a complete picture for that client.  This strategy has three parts. The first addresses the ‘ramp-up’ of response levels as agencies start to submit data to the new collection. This element will not be required in future years when the collection has become established. The second part addresses agency non-response by using both explicit and implicit imputation and results in agency weights and some explicitly imputed service period records and end dates. The third part addresses the impact of invalid statistical linkage keys (SLKs) on the total number of clients and results in client weights.  Agencies that are out of scope for 9 months in 2011‒12 are deemed to be out of scope for the whole period and excluded from all calculations. |
| **Coherence** | NAHA Indicator 4 and NAHA Outputs A and B for the 2011-12 reporting year have been produced using the same data source: SHS - Client Collection.  Prior to 2011-12, the AIHW used the SAAP National Data Collection (NDC) to report against NAHA Indicator 4 and outputs A and B. The SHSC replaces the SAAP NDC, which began in 1996. The SHSC differs from the SAAP NDC in many respects.  Identification of Clients and Children as clients  One of the major differences between the two collections is that the SHSC provides a greater ability to identify individual clients. In the SAAP NDC only a limited amount of information on clients was available, and this was largely restricted to demographic data. The data that made up the unique statistical linkage key (SLK) for each individual was subject to consent and where this was not obtained it was difficult to match individuals with the support they received or identify multiple periods of support for the same client. The SAAP NDC was therefore only able to provide reliable estimates at a support period level.  In the SHSC all individuals who receive a service from an SHS agency are counted as clients. The same information is collected about children’s individual circumstances, services and outcomes as those of adults. The SHSC does not count accompanying children who do not receive a service.  Greater Scope  Under the SAAP NDC only those agencies funded under the SAAP were in scope. Under the SHSC, all agencies that receive funding under the NAHA and NPAH to provide specialist homelessness services are in scope.  New and Revised Items  In the SAAP NDC, there were 29 data items for clients and eight data items for accompanying children. In the SHSC, there are 53 data items (19 new and 23 revised) collected from clients. These additional questions create richer data, allowing a more comprehensive picture of clients’ circumstances and their experience of homelessness services to emerge.  More frequent and regular reporting of a client situation  In the SAAP NDC, certain questions were asked about a client’s situation immediately before they commenced support and immediately after their support. In the SHSC, there are five reference timeframes used for various data items―a week before the start of the support period, when the support period starts; during each month, at the last service provision date each month, and at the end of the support period.  In addition, under the SAAP NDC, data were only submitted annually by agencies, whereas in the SHSC data are submitted monthly |
| **Accessibility** | Published results from 2011-12 are available on the AIHW website. Data not available online or in reports can be obtained from the Communications, Media and Marketing Unit on (02) 6244 1032 or via email to info@aihw.gov.au. Data requests are charged on a cost-recovery basis. |
| **Interpretability** | Information on the development of the SHSC, definitions and concepts, and collection materials and processes can be found on the AIHW website, <www.aihw.gov.au/homelessness>. Information on definitions, concepts and classifications can also be found in the SHSC’s collection manual, also available on the website <www.aihw.gov.au/shsc-resources/>. |

### Data Quality Statement – State Owned and Managed Indigenous Housing

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Data source/s:** | Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Data sets are provided annually to the AIHW by jurisdictions. The data contain information about SOMIH dwellings, households assisted and households on the waitlist, during the previous financial year and at 30 June, and are drawn from administrative data held by the jurisdictions. This data source is used for all SOMIH indicators except ‘net recurrent cost per dwelling’, ‘amenity/location’ and ‘overall satisfaction’. |
| **Institutional environment:** | Data for 2011-12 were provided to the AIHW as part of the Housing Ministers Advisory Committee work program. The AIHW is an Australian Government statutory authority accountable to Parliament and operates under the provisions of the *Australian Institute of Health and Welfare Act 1987*. This Act ensures that the data collections managed by the AIHW are kept securely and under strict conditions with respect to privacy and confidentiality. More information about the AIHW is available on the AIHW website ([www.aihw.gov.au](http://www.aihw.gov.au)).  The AIHW receives, compiles, edits and verifies data in collaboration with jurisdictions, which retain ownership of the data and must approve any jurisdiction level output before it is released. The finalised data sets are used by the AIHW for collation, reporting and analysis. |
| **Relevance:** | The data collected are an administrative by-product of the management of SOMIH programs run by the jurisdictions and conform well in terms of scope, coverage and reference period.  Not all jurisdictions have a separately identified or funded SOMIH program. In these cases all jurisdiction managed social housing dwellings are reported in the public rental housing data collection.  Classifications used for income, greatest need and vacancy reason are not consistent across the jurisdictions and are mapped to a common standard.  Not all jurisdictions collect or update all data items for every tenant so substitutions are made in some cases.  State and Territory Government housing authority’s bedroom entitlement policies may differ from the Canadian National Occupancy Standard which is used in dwelling utilisation calculations. |
| **Timeliness:** | Data are collected annually, for the financial year ending 30 June. The public rental housing data reported here are for 2011-12 (the most current data available). |
| **Accuracy:** | There are some known accuracy issues with the data collected:   * the administrative data sets from which this collection is drawn have inaccuracies to varying degrees including missing data, out-of-date data and data coding or recording errors; * not all jurisdictions capture all data items so substitution is required to calculate some outputs of this collection. Data items affected are gross and assessable income. In addition, disability status is derived using the receipt of a disability pension as a proxy in some jurisdictions; * for some jurisdictions, disability information may be self-identified and not mandatory to report under program eligibility requirements; * many jurisdictions do not update income information for non-rebated households, so outputs produced using data from these households should be used with caution; * estimates produced using the Accessibility/Remoteness Index of Australia (ARIA) are rounded and this may cause discrepancies between estimates produced for regions and those produced for the total of the regions; * disaggregation can lead to small cell sizes which are volatile - very small cells have been suppressed to protect confidentiality. |
| **Coherence:** | Care is required when comparing outputs across jurisdictions. Differences in the data collected and which records are included or excluded from a calculation can affect the coherence of the outputs.  Coherence over time has been affected by changes in methodology:   * measurements using low income cannot be compared with low income figures produced prior to 2009-10 due to a change in methodology; * measurements of overcrowding cannot be compared with figures produced prior to 2009-10 due to a change in methodology; * measurements of underutilisation cannot be compared with figures produced prior to 2011-12 due to a change in methodology.   Specific State/Territory issues are:  New South Wales  A change in the client management system in 2010-11 has led to the potential for changes in the descriptors. Care should be exercised when comparing data with data from the 2009-10 and earlier reference periods.  Care should be taken when comparing the number and proportion of low income households to the 2009-10 and earlier reporting periods as there has been a change to reported household incomes: from 2010-11 onwards, Commonwealth Rent Assistance is no longer included in household income. This will lead to an increase in the number of households identified as low income. |
| **Accessibility:** | Annual data as reported are available publically on the AIHW website. Disaggregated data and unit record data may be requested through the national data repository and provided subject to jurisdiction approval. |
| **Interpretability:** | Metadata and definitions relating to this data source can be found in the *National Housing Assistance Data Dictionary* (AIHW Cat no. HOU147). Supplementary information can be found in the public rental housing collection manual which is available upon request from the AIHW. |

### Data Quality Statement – Public Rental Housing

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Data source/s** | Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Data sets are provided annually to the AIHW by jurisdictions. The data contain information about public rental housing dwellings, households assisted and households on the waitlist, during the previous financial year and at 30 June, and are drawn from administrative data held by the jurisdictions. This data source is used for all public rental housing indicators except ‘net recurrent cost per dwelling’, ‘amenity/location’ and ‘overall satisfaction’. |
| **Institutional environment** | Data for 2011-12 were provided to the AIHW as part of the Housing Ministers Advisory Committee work program. The AIHW is an Australian Government statutory authority accountable to Parliament and operates under the provisions of the *Australian Institute of Health and Welfare Act 1987*. This Act ensures that the data collections managed by the AIHW are kept securely and under strict conditions with respect to privacy and confidentiality. More information about the AIHW is available on the AIHW website ([www.aihw.gov.au](http://www.aihw.gov.au)).  The AIHW receives, compiles, edits and verifies data in collaboration with jurisdictions, which retain ownership of the data and must approve any jurisdiction level output before it is released. The finalised data sets are used by the AIHW for collation, reporting and analysis. |
| **Relevance** | The data collected are an administrative by-product of the management of public rental housing programs run by the jurisdictions and conform well in terms of scope, coverage and reference period.  Classifications used for income, greatest need and vacancy reason are not consistent across the jurisdictions and are mapped to a common standard.  Not all jurisdictions collect or update all data items for every tenant so substitutions are made in some cases.  State and Territory Government housing authority’s bedroom entitlement policies may differ from the Canadian National Occupancy Standard which is used in dwelling utilisation calculations. |
| **Timeliness** | Data are collected annually, for the financial year ending 30 June. The public rental housing data reported here are for 2011-12 (the most current data available). |
| **Accuracy** | There are some known accuracy issues with the data collected:   * the administrative data sets from which this collection is drawn have inaccuracies to varying degrees including missing data, out-of-date data and data coding or recording errors; * not all jurisdictions capture all data items so substitution is required to calculate some outputs of this collection. Data items affected are gross and assessable income. In addition, disability status is derived using the receipt of a disability pension as a proxy in some jurisdictions; * for some jurisdictions, disability information may be self-identified and not mandatory to report under program eligibility requirements; * Indigenous status is self-identified and not mandatory to report under program eligibility requirements; * many jurisdictions do not update income information for non-rebated households, so outputs produced using data from these households should be used with caution; * estimates produced using the Accessibility/Remoteness Index of Australia (ARIA) are rounded and this may cause discrepancies between estimates produced for regions and those produced for the total of the regions; * disaggregation can lead to small cell sizes which are volatile - very small cells have been suppressed to protect confidentiality.   Specific State/Territory issues are:  New South Wales  The total number of Indigenous households has been supplied by the jurisdiction rather than calculated using the unit record data. The NSW public housing system undercounts Indigenous tenancies due to under‑reporting of Indigenous status for tenants housed prior to 2004, when mandatory reporting was introduced. The reported number of Indigenous tenancies has been estimated using 2011 Census data. |
| **Coherence** | Care is required when comparing outputs across jurisdictions. Differences in the data collected and which records are included or excluded from a calculation can affect the coherence of the outputs.  Coherence over time has been affected by changes in methodology:   * measurements using low income cannot be compared with low income figures produced prior to 2009-10 due to a change in methodology; * measurements of overcrowding cannot be compared with figures produced prior to 2009-10 due to a change in methodology; * measurements of underutilisation cannot be compared with figures produced prior to 2011-12 due to a change in methodology.   Specific State/Territory issues are:  New South Wales  A change in the client management system in 2010-11 has led to the potential for changes in the descriptors. Care should be exercised when comparing data with data from the 2009-10 and earlier reference periods.  The total number of Indigenous households is not comparable to other jurisdictions due to the methodology adopted (based on the 2011 Census of Population and Housing, adjusted for Census undercounting of public rental housing households).  Western Australia  Households and dwellings that, prior to 2010-11, were reported under the state owned and managed Indigenous housing (SOMIH) program are now reported under public housing. As such, 2011-12 figures are not comparable to data from 2009-10 and earlier reference periods. |
| **Accessibility** | Annual data as reported are available publically on the AIHW website. Disaggregated data and unit record data may be requested through the national data repository and provided subject to jurisdiction approval. |
| **Interpretability** | Metadata and definitions relating to this data source can be found in the *National Housing Assistance Data Dictionary* (AIHW Cat no. HOU147). Supplementary information can be found in the public rental housing collection manual which is available upon request from the AIHW. |

### Data Quality Statement – Community Housing

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Data source/s:** | Data are provided annually to the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) by jurisdictions and are sourced from community housing organisations via a survey and from the jurisdiction’s administrative systems. The annual data collection captures information about community housing organisations, the dwellings they manage and the tenants assisted. Limited financial information from the previous financial year is also collected. |
| **Institutional environment:** | Data for 2011-12 were provided to the AIHW as part of the Housing Ministers Advisory Committee work program. The AIHW is an Australian Government statutory authority accountable to Parliament and operates under the provisions of the *Australian Institute of Health and Welfare Act 1987*. This Act ensures that the data collections managed by the AIHW are kept securely and under strict conditions with respect to privacy and confidentiality. More information about the AIHW is available on the AIHW website ([www.aihw.gov.au](http://www.aihw.gov.au)).  The AIHW receives, compiles, edits and verifies the data in collaboration with jurisdictions who retain ownership of the data and must approve any jurisdiction level output before it is released. The finalised data sets were used by the AIHW for collation, reporting and analysis for all jurisdictions except New South Wales and Queensland, who have calculated their own figures using their own data collection processes. |
| **Relevance:** | Community housing, for the purpose of this collection, includes all tenancy (rental) units under management of a community housing organisation (excluding Indigenous community housing organisations). Additional jurisdiction-specific inclusions and exclusions also apply.  The data collected by the jurisdictions conform well in terms of reference period; however, due to the jurisdiction-specific inclusions and exclusions, the data does not conform well in terms of scope and coverage. |
| **Timeliness:** | Data are collected annually, for the financial year ending 30 June. The public rental housing data reported here are for 2011-12 (the most current data available). |
| **Accuracy:** | Data are subject to non-response and are incomplete for some jurisdictions. The information was sourced via a survey of community housing organisations and levels of accuracy are subject to non-response bias. The response rate indicates the level of exposure to potential bias which differs between jurisdictions – as outlined below.   * New South Wales - Of the 130 community housing organisations, 32 responded to the survey accounting for 98 per cent of the total dwelling portfolio. Data for NSW are weighted to account for non-response. * Victoria - Of the 106 community housing organisations, 77 responded to the survey accounting for 98 per cent of the total dwelling portfolio. * Queensland - Of the 284 community housing organisations, 102 provided administrative data accounting for 71 per cent of the total dwelling portfolio. * Western Australia - Of the 29 registered community housing organisations, 19 responded to the survey accounting for 92 per cent of the total dwelling portfolio of registered community housing organisations that did not deal exclusively with CAP properties. * South Australia – All of the 86 community housing organisations responded to the survey accounting for 100 per cent of the total dwelling portfolio. * Tasmania - Of the 78 community housing organisations, 43 responded to the survey accounting for 84 per cent of the total dwelling portfolio. * The Australian Capital Territory – All of the 5 community housing organisations responded to the survey accounting for 100 per cent of the total dwelling portfolio.   As in previous years, the Northern Territory did not survey its community housing sector for 2011–12.  National outputs and indicators were calculated using only those jurisdictions where complete information is available and valid.  Household and dwelling information from those community housing organisations which received Australian Government funding as one-off grants in the past is generally not available, and may be excluded from reporting.  Applicants may appear on waiting lists of more than one community housing organisation, with the exception of Queensland and South Australia where consolidated waiting lists are in operation. Queensland and Victoria have integrated wait lists for all social housing. Thus, using wait list figures for these jurisdictions to report against the community housing alone leads to an overestimate of the number of households waiting to be allocated a community housing dwelling.  NSW, WA, NT, and ACT were unable to provide National Rental Affordability Scheme properties due to data quality issues.  Specific State/Territory issues are:  New South Wales   * The proportion of low income households is based on those households in receipt of Centrelink benefits as their main source of income, and has been applied to survey responses. NSW is unable to provide gross income so assessable income has been used to calculate equivalised ‘gross’ income used in determining low income status. * In April 2010, NSW implemented an integrated social housing waiting list, combining public and community housing into a single list. Waiting list data are now reported as public housing. This has resulted in data not being available for all community housing providers at 30 June 2012. * Financial activity data for the year ending 30 June 2012 are sourced from quarterly submissions from providers’ administrative data.   Victoria   * Due to data quality issues identified with data returns, a number of households previously flagged as Indigenous now have a status of unknown. * Victoria has one waiting list for all social housing. Using this list to report against community housing alone leads to an overestimate of the number of households waiting to be allocated a community housing dwelling.   Queensland   * Queensland has one waiting list for all social housing. Using this list to report against community housing alone leads to an overestimate of the number of households waiting to be allocated a community housing dwelling.   Western Australia   * The number of households at 30 June 2012 may be an overestimate due to underlying data quality issues. This may affect measures of occupancy. Occupied tenancy (rental) units used to provide additional housing support are not included.   South Australia   * A centralised community housing waitlist was implemented in March 2010 and most organisations use this waitlist. In the 2010–11 community housing survey, a number of organisations also provided separate waitlist figures. These figures have been added to the centralised community housing waitlist figure, which may overstate the waitlist figure.   Australian Capital Territory   * The number of households at 30 June 2012 may be an underestimate, whilst the number of tenancy (rental) units may be an overestimate due to underlying data quality issues. This may affect measures of occupancy.   Northern Territory   * It is assumed that all dwellings are tenantable. |
| **Coherence** | Care is required when comparing outputs within a jurisdiction with results from previous reporting periods due to variability in survey response rates of community housing organisations.  National performance indicator results were calculated where complete data were available and valid (i.e. both numerator and denominator were available and valid).  Some Indigenous households may be under-reported as data are based on Indigenous self-identification.  There were changes in the methodology used in 2010-11 onwards for collecting data on community housing waiting lists in all jurisdictions, which has affected the numbers reported for ‘Total new applicants with greatest need’ and ‘Total applicants on waiting list’’.  In May 2009, Housing Ministers agreed to integrate public and community housing waiting lists in all jurisdictions by July 2011. NSW, Queensland, WA, the ACT, and the NT, each have integrated waiting lists. South Australia has a register that integrates multiple community housing waiting lists into a single housing register and Tasmania uses a manual integrated system. Victoria has an integrated approach involving a referral process but does not yet have a common waiting list.  Specific State/Territory issues are:  Queensland   * The number of Indigenous households and households with a disability and households with a non-English speaking background has increased due to improvements in the data collection methodology. * The number of new Indigenous household allocations has risen due to ongoing refinements in the data collection methodology. * There have been changes in the methodology used in 2010-11 onwards to collect data on allocation of new households which may affect the number of new households. Properties managed under the National Rental Affordability Scheme and the Nation Building and Jobs Program were included in 2010-11 for the first time. * Queensland: Changes in the methodology used in 2010-11 onwards may have affected the results for total net recurrent costs.   South Australia   * A centralised community housing waitlist was implemented in March 2010. Category 1 need is used as a proxy for greatest need for the centralised waitlist. Category 1 need includes those who are deemed to be in urgent housing need with long term barriers to accessing or maintaining private housing options. * Improvements in data quality may have significantly increased the number of newly assisted households; the increased number of newly assisted households that were in greatest need at time of allocation, and the increased number of disability households may be due to improvements in data collection methods. * Total untenantable tenancy (rental) units in 2009–10 included work in progress properties that were nearly completed. Work in progress properties that were nearly completed were not included in 2010–11.   Western Australia   * For the 2011-12 collection only 29 registered community housing providers were surveyed. Unregistered providers and those registered providers who only dealt with CAP properties were excluded. These exclusions did not apply for previous collections. This represents a significant scope change relative to the 2010-11 collection, in which 182 housing providers were surveyed. |
| **Accessibility** | Annual data will be reported in Housing Assistance in Australia, which will be available publicly on the AIHW website. Additional disaggregations of data are available on application and subject to jurisdiction approval. |
| **Interpretability** | Metadata and definitions relating to this data source can be found in the *National Housing Assistance Data Dictionary* (AIHW Cat no. HOU147) <meteor.aihw.gov.au/content/index.phtml/itemId/181162>.  Supplementary information can be found in the housing collection data manuals which are available upon request from the AIHW. |

### Data Quality Statement – Indigenous Community Housing

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Data source/s:** | Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Data are provided annually to the AIHW by jurisdictions and are sourced from administrative data and dwelling audits (held by jurisdictions) and survey data from Indigenous Community Housing Organisations (ICHOs).  The annual data collection captures information about ICHOs, the dwellings they manage and the households assisted at 30 June. Financial information is for the year ending 30 June. |
| **Institutional environment:** | Data for 2010–11 were provided to the AIHW as part of the Housing Ministers Advisory Committee work program.  The AIHW is an Australian Government statutory authority accountable to Parliament and operates under the provisions of the *Australian Institute of Health and Welfare Act 1987*. This Act ensures that the data collections managed by the AIHW are kept securely and under strict conditions with respect to privacy and confidentiality. More information about the AIHW is available on the AIHW website ([www.aihw.gov.au](file:///\\\\mel_1\\groups\\Monitor\\09%20National%20Agreement%20Report\\02%20NAR%20Report%20WIP\\2011-12%20NAR%20Report%20-%20tranche%202\\2011-12%20NAR%20second%20draft\\NAHA\\www.aihw.gov.au)).  The AIHW receives, compiles, edits and verifies data in collaboration with jurisdictions, which retain ownership of the data and must approve any jurisdiction level output before it is released. The finalised data sets are used by the AIHW for collation, reporting and analysis. |
| **Relevance:** | ICH for the purposes of this collection includes all dwellings targeted to Indigenous people that are managed by an ICHO. ICHOs are any Aboriginal and/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, which have a range of functions, provided that they manage housing for Indigenous people. All data items except D1b and D19b exclude dwellings managed by unfunded organisations. For NSW this means excluding ICHOs that are not actively registered. |
| **Timeliness:** | Data are collected annually, for the financial year ending 30 June. The most recent data available are for 2010‑11.  Specific State/Territory issues are:  South Australia   * All dwelling and household data is based on tenancy and asset audits conducted in 2008 and 2009 with updates performed on some communities.   Tasmania   * Data includes six new constructions awaiting handover.   Australian Capital Territory   * Administrative data is used for dwelling data items as the sole ICHO in the ACT did not complete a survey for 2010-11. |
| **Accuracy:** | There are known issues with the accuracy of data collected:   * Care should be used comparing data across jurisdictions due to variation in scope and/or definitions between administrative systems. This reflects the variation in how ICH operates across jurisdictions * Jurisdictions may use more than one source of data which may impact data quality. * In 2010‑11, unit record data was provided by Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania. A mix of unit record and aggregate data was provided by New South Wales, Queensland, Western Australia and the Northern Territory. Administrative data is used for dwelling data items as the sole ICHO in the ACT did not complete a survey for 2010-11. * In many cases complete data were not available for all dwellings or ICHOs in the jurisdiction. Therefore, data item totals and performance indicator values may not fully reflect the entire funded portion of the jurisdiction. * Performance indicators, reported as proportions have been adjusted for non-response by excluding unknowns/ non-responders from the denominator. The national performance indicators, reported as proportions, were calculated using data from only those jurisdictions where both numerator and denominator were available and valid. * Where coverage of incomplete data is less than 95 per cent, details are included in footnotes accompanying the descriptive data, and the DQS for performance indicators.   Specific State/Territory issues are:  New South Wales   * The ICH sector collects data from Aboriginal Community Housing Providers (ACHPs) that are actively registered with the Aboriginal Housing Office (AHO), rather than by their funding status. For the purposes of this collection, active registration is used as a proxy for funding, but it should be noted that active registration does not guarantee funding. * The data provided is for permanent dwellings managed by ACHPs that are registered with AHO and provided data as at June 2011. It does not include data on permanent dwellings managed by ACHPs that did not provide data as at June 2011.   Queensland, Western Australia and South Australia   * The 2010–11 ICH data collection includes dwellings in Queensland, Western Australia and South Australia that are owned by Indigenous communities, but have transferred responsibility for tenancy management to the state housing authority.   Northern Territory   * ICH dwellings are managed by ICHOs located in very remote parts of the Northern Territory. These ICHOs provide tenancy and maintenance services to not only dwellings in the community they are located in but also to outlying communities and outstations.  Some of the outlying communities and outstations are inaccessible for parts of the year (mainly during the wet season) and some only consist of a handful of dwellings. The Northern Territory relies on the information collected by the ICHOs and there is a shared understanding that it is not always possible for the ICHO to have current information on these locations, due to distance and access issues. For 2010‑11, no data is collected on these outstation dwellings. |
| **Coherence:** | Data within jurisdictions may not be comparable to previous years due to variation in the response rate to the survey for which jurisdictions can provide data.  There have been a variety of different data quality issues each year. For specific caveats on previous years’ data, consult the footnotes and DQS in the relevant edition of this report.  For reasons of data quality and availability, the scope of the ICH collection was restricted in 2009‑10 to include only funded organisations (i.e. ICHOs that received funding in the reported financial year).  Since 2009‑10, only ICHO and dwelling numbers are reported for unfunded organisations (i.e. ICHOs that received funding in previous financial years but not in reported financial year).  From 2009‑10, the scope of the ICH collection is consistent with the scope of the 2006‑07 and earlier collections. In comparison, the 2008‑09 and 2007‑08 collections included unfunded ICHOs.  Previously, the Australian Government had administrative responsibility for some ICHOs in Victoria, Queensland and all ICHOs in Tasmania. Data for these dwellings were reported collectively under the jurisdiction ‘Australian Government’. In 2009, responsibility for these ICHOs was transferred to the respective jurisdiction, and data for these dwellings are now reported under the relevant state or territory.  The Report on Government Services (RoGS) report use a different dwelling count data item to what is included in the in the National Affordable Housing Agreement (NAHA) report. The dwelling count data item used in the NAHA report includes all dwellings targeted to Indigenous people, (funded and unfunded and permanent and improvised dwellings). The RoGS dwelling counts only include permanent dwellings, however in the RoGS report a separate data item specifying the number of improvised dwellings is provided.  Specific State/Territory issues are:  Victoria   * For the two years prior to 2009‑10, Victoria reported against one agency (Aboriginal Housing Victoria) for ICH. From 2009‑10 Victoria is reporting on an additional 18 agencies since assuming administrative responsibility for the former Community Housing and Infrastructure Program (CHIP), previously managed by the Commonwealth. Due to this change Victorian data is not comparable with previous years.   Queensland   * The dwelling numbers for unfunded organisations was provided by the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaHCSIA) in 2008 and has not been verified by FaHCSIA as being correct. Permanent dwellings in unfunded organisations are therefore not included. |
| **Accessibility:** | Annual data will be reported in *Housing Assistance in Australia*, which will be available publically on the AIHW website. Additional disaggregations are available on application and subject to jurisdiction approval. |
| **Interpretability:** | Metadata and definitions relating to this data source can be found in the *National Housing Assistance Data Dictionary* (AIHW Cat no. HOU147) (<http://meteor.aihw.gov.au/content/index.phtml/itemId/181162>).  Supplementary information can be found in the housing collection data manuals which are available upon request from the AIHW. |
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## Acronyms and abbreviations

AATSIHS Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Survey

ABS Australian Bureau of Statistics

ACHP Aboriginal Community Housing Providers

ACT Australian Capital Territory

AGHDS Australian Government Housing Data Set

AHO Aboriginal Housing Office

AIHW Australian Institute of Health and Welfare

ANU Australian National University

ARIA Accessibility/Remoteness Index of Australia

ASGC Australian Standard Geographical Classification

CAP Crisis Accommodation Program

CDEP Community Development Employment Project

Census Census of Population and Housing

CH Community Housing

CHIP Community Housing and Infrastructure Program

CNOS Canadian National Occupancy Standard

COAG Council of Australian Governments

CRC COAG Reform Council

CRA Commonwealth Rent Assistance

DQS Data Quality Statement

EDHI Equivalised disposable household income

ERP Estimated Resident Population

FaHCSIA Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs

FHOB First Home Owner Boost

FHOS First Home Owner Scheme grant

GSS ABS General Social Survey

HEF Housing Establishment Fund

HOIL Home Owned on Indigenous Land

HOP Home Ownership Program

ICH Indigenous Community Housing

ICHO Indigenous Community Housing Organisation

IGA Intergovernmental Agreement on Federal Financial Relations

NA National Agreement

NAHA National Affordable Housing Agreement

NATSISS National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Survey

NDC National Data Collection

NDCA National Data Collection Agency

NHSC National Housing Supply Council

NP National Partnership

NSHS National Social Housing Survey

NSW New South Wales

NT Northern Territory

PH Public Housing

PI Performance Indicator

Qld Queensland

RBA Reserve Bank of Australia

RoGs Report on Government Services

RSE Relative standard error

SA South Australia

SAAP Supported Accommodation Assistance Program

SCFFR Standing Council for Federal Financial Relations

SCRGSP Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision

SDAC Survey of Disability, Ageing and Carers

SEIFA IRSD Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas Index of Relative Socioeconomic Disadvantage

SHS Specialist Homelessness Services

SIH Survey of Income and Housing

SLCD Statistical Longitudinal Census Dataset

SPP Specific Purpose Payment

SOMIH State Owned and Managed Indigenous Housing

Tas Tasmania

THM Transitional Housing Management

VET Vocational Education and Training

Vic Victoria

WA Western Australia

## Glossary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Aboriginal** | A person who identifies as being of Aboriginal origin. May also include people who identify as being of both Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander origin. | |
| **Age standardised rates** | Age standardised rates enable comparisons to be made between populations that have different age structures. Age standardisation is often used when comparing the Indigenous and non-Indigenous populations because the Indigenous population is younger than the non‑Indigenous population. Outcomes for some indicators are influenced by age, therefore, it is appropriate to age standardise the data when comparing the results. When comparisons are not being made between the two populations, the data are not age standardised. | |
| **Census Night** | For the 2006 Census, Census Night was the evening of Tuesday 8 August. For the 2011 Census, Census Night was the evening of Tuesday 9 August. | |
| **Confidence intervals** | Survey data, for example data from the NATSISS, are subject to sampling error because they are based on samples of the total population. Where survey data are shown in charts in this report, error bars are included, showing 95 per cent confidence intervals. There is a 95 per cent chance that the true value of the data item lies within the interval shown by the error bars. See ‘statistical significance’. | |
| **Equivalised household income** | Equivalised household income adjusts the actual incomes of households to make households of different sizes and compositions comparable. It results in a measure of the economic resources available to members of a standardised household. | |
| **Income ranges** | See ‘quintiles’. | |
| **Inner regional** | See ‘remoteness areas’. | |
| **Indigenous status not stated/ Indigenous status unknown** | Where a person’s Indigenous origin has either not been asked or not recorded. | |
| **Indigenous** | A person of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander origin who identifies as an Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander. | |
| **Inner regional** | See ‘remoteness areas’. | |
| **Jurisdiction** | The Australian Government or a State or Territory Government and areas that it has legal authority over. | |
| **Homelessness operational group** | ABS uses rules to classify people who were enumerated in the Census on Census night as homeless (or not) under the statistical definition of homelessness.  Six broad sets of rules are used which give rise to the homeless operational groups: 'Persons who are in improvised dwellings, tents or sleeping out', 'Persons in supported accommodation for the homeless', 'Persons staying temporarily with other households', 'Persons staying in boarding houses', 'Persons in other temporary lodging' and 'Persons in 'severely' crowded dwellings'. | |
| **Labour force** | The labour force is the most widely used measure of the economically active population or the formal supply of labour. It is a measure of the number of persons contributing to, or willing to contribute to, the supply of labour and, as defined by the ABS, comprises two mutually exclusive categories of population: the employed (people who have worked for at least one hour in the reference week, including those who have participated in Community Development Employment Projects (CDEP)), and the unemployed (people who are without work, but are actively looking for work and available to start work within four weeks). | |
| **Life-cycle group** | The life cycle groups used in this report are shown below. In general, data relating to a group include all members of the household | |
|  | *Life cycle group* | *….are households containing* |
|  | Young group household | Two or more people, all unrelated, all aged 15-34 years |
|  | Young lone person | Only one person aged 15-34 years |
|  | Couple family with young children | A couple with children, youngest child aged 0-4 years |
|  | Couple family with young adult children | A couple with children, youngest child aged 15-29 years |
|  | Older couple family without children | A couple without children, both partners aged 65 years or more |
| **Major cities** | See ‘remoteness areas’. | |
| **Mean and median income measures** | A mean income value is the average value of a set of income data. It is calculated by adding up all the values in the set of data and dividing that sum by the number of values in the dataset. Median value is the middle point of a set of income data. Lining up the values in a set of income data from largest to smallest, the one in the centre is the median income value (if the centre point lies between two numbers, the median value is the average value of the two numbers).  Median value is a better measure for income than mean as mean income values are more influenced by extreme income values (including the lowest and highest incomes). Therefore, median income value is a more accurate measure of income for an average household or average individual income earner. | |
|  | For example, the gross monthly incomes for 9 households are: $10 000, $5000, $2500, $1500, $1500, $1500, $1000, $450, $450.  The mean income value among the 9 households is ($10 000+$5 000+$2500+$1500+$1500+$1500+$1000+ $450+$450)/9=$2655.6. The median income value is the fifth value (the mid point), $1500. | |
| **Non-Indigenous** | A person who does not identify as Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander. | |
| **Non-remote** | See ‘remoteness areas’. | |
| **Outer regional** | See ‘remoteness areas’. | |
| **Quintiles** | Income quintiles are groups that result from ranking all people in the population in ascending order (from the lowest to the highest) according to their incomes and then dividing the population into five equal groups, each comprising 20 per cent of the population. In addition to use in measuring income distribution, quintiles can also be used for grouping other data. | |
| **Rate ratio** | The rate ratio is the rate for the Indigenous population divided by the rate for the non‑Indigenous population. See ‘relative Indigenous disadvantage’. | |
| **Regional** | See ‘remoteness areas’. | |
| **Relative Indigenous disadvantage** | Relative Indigenous disadvantage is measured by comparing the rate of Indigenous disadvantage (for example, the proportion of Indigenous people reporting they do not have a non-school qualification) with the rate for the non-Indigenous population. See ‘rate ratio’. | |
| **Relative standard error (RSE)** | The relative standard error (RSE) of a survey data estimate is a measure of the reliability of the estimate and depends on both the number of persons giving a particular answer in the survey and the size of the population. The RSE is expressed as a percentage of the estimate. The higher the RSE, the less reliable the estimate. Relative standard errors for survey estimates are included in the attachment tables. See also ‘statistical significance’. | |
| **Remote** | See ‘remoteness areas’. | |
| **Remoteness** | See ‘remoteness areas’. | |
| **Remoteness areas** | Remoteness areas are defined in the Australian Standard Geographical Classification (ASGC) developed by the ABS. The ASGC remoteness classification identifies a place in Australia as having a particular degree of remoteness. The remoteness of each place is determined using the Accessibility/Remoteness Index of Australia (ARIA). The ABS generates an average ARIA score for each location based on its distance from population centres of various sizes. Locations are then added together to form the remoteness areas in each State and Territory. Remoteness areas comprise the following six categories:   * major cities of Australia * inner regional Australia * outer regional Australia * remote Australia * very remote Australia * migratory regions (comprising off-shore, shipping and migratory places).   The aim of the ASGC remoteness structure is not to provide a measure of the remoteness of a particular location but to divide Australia into five broad categories (excluding migratory regions) of remoteness for comparative statistical purposes. | |
| **Statistical significance** | Statistical significance is a measure of the degree of difference between survey data estimates. The potential for sampling error — that is, the error that occurs by chance because the data are obtained from only a sample and not the entire population — means that reported responses may not indicate the true responses.  Using the relative standard errors (RSE) of survey data estimates, it is possible to use a formula to test whether the difference is statistically significant. If there is an overlap between confidence intervals for different data items, it cannot be stated for certain that there is a statistically significant difference between the results. See ‘confidence intervals’ and ‘relative standard error’. | |
| **Torres Strait Islander people** | People who identify as being of Torres Strait Islander origin. May also include people who identify as being of both Torres Strait Islander and Aboriginal origin. | |
| **Very remote** | See ‘remoteness areas’. | |

1. ‘Other dwellings’ includes visitors only, other non-classifiable households, non‑private dwellings and migratory, off-shore and shipping statistical areas. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For example, the many Australians overseas on Census night, and who left their dwelling vacant while away, may have a different tenure structure to those persons enumerated at home. Similarly, the people in the 143 000 visitor only households on Census night, or otherwise away from home but elsewhere in Australia and leaving uninhabited some of the nearly one million dwellings vacant on Census night, may have a different tenure structure to those dwellings enumerated with usual residents present on Census night. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. See glossary for more information on life cycle groups. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)