30 April 2013

The Hon Julia Gillard MP  
Prime Minister  
Parliament House  
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Prime Minister

On behalf of the COAG Reform Council, I am pleased to present our report *Homelessness 2011–12: Comparing performance across Australia*.

In 2008, all Australian governments agreed to work together to improve housing affordability and reduce homelessness and Indigenous housing disadvantage. The National Affordable Housing Agreement aims to ensure all Australians have access to safe and sustainable housing.

This is the council’s fourth report on the National Affordable Housing Agreement and this year, with the advantage of 2011 Census data, we focus on the homelessness and Indigenous overcrowding outcomes of the agreement.

I am pleased to report that there has been good progress in tackling the most readily recognised form of homelessness—rough sleeping. Between 2006 and 2011, both the number of rough sleepers and the rate of rough sleeping in the population decreased.

Despite this, the overall level of homelessness rose over the same period. This was driven by increases in the numbers of people living in supported accommodation and in severely crowded houses—conditions which do not meet the agreement’s definition of safe and sustainable housing.

Homelessness among Indigenous Australians remains many times higher than for non-Indigenous Australians, although we can report that there has been improvement in some locations and within certain types of homelessness, such as Indigenous rough sleeping.

The council hopes that the findings in this report will assist COAG with its reform agenda and contribute to ongoing engagement in ensuring all Australians have access to affordable housing.

Yours sincerely

JOHN BRUMBY  
Chairman
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Homelessness 2011–12

key findings

From 2006 to 2011, the number of rough sleepers fell but overall homelessness went up due to increases in severe crowding and temporary accommodation. COAG’s benchmark to reduce homelessness by 7% is unlikely to be met—but there has been progress on the benchmark to reduce Indigenous overcrowding.

Between 2006 and 2011 the number of rough sleepers fell by 6.0%, from 7247 to 6813

According to ABS figures, rates of rough sleeping were highest in Queensland (4 per 10 000 persons), Western Australia (4 per 10 000 persons) and the Northern Territory (40 per 10 000 persons). Rough sleepers are only 6.5% of all homeless people, but the fall in their number shows progress addressing the most severe form of homelessness.

Proportion of homelessness by type, 2011

More people living in severely crowded and temporary accommodation

In 2011, 41 390 people were living in severely crowded dwellings, 9859 more than in 2006. Most of these people live in major cities, especially Sydney and Melbourne, or in remote Indigenous communities. Two thirds of the additional people living in severely crowded dwellings were people born overseas with many of these people likely to be recent migrants.

The number of people living in temporary accommodation grew to 39 665—an increase of 6376 between 2006 and 2011. Over 60% of the increase in people living in temporary accommodation was due to more people living in supported accommodation. This is a service response for people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness due to factors such as insecure housing, financial difficulties or the presence or threat of violence at home. Increases in supported accommodation underpin the large jumps in the homelessness rates of the ACT and Tasmania.

Percentage change in number of homeless people, by type (2006–2011)
The rate of Indigenous Australians living in severely crowded dwellings fell

Indigenous Australians living in severely crowded dwellings make up 75% of the Indigenous homeless population. Severe crowding is the major reason Indigenous homelessness rates are 14 times higher than the non-Indigenous population. Indigenous people living in severely crowded dwellings in very remote areas of the Northern Territory represent 11.2% of all homeless Australians.

The overall rate of Indigenous homelessness fell from 571 per 10 000 people in 2006 to 488 per 10 000 people in 2011—a drop of 14.5%.

**Homeless population in 2011 (27.6% Indigenous)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indigenous</th>
<th>Non-Indigenous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian population (2.7% Indigenous)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Progress towards COAG’s benchmarks**

The number of homeless people increased by 15 509 people, or 17.3%, from 89 728 to 105 237 between 2006 and 2011. This suggests COAG is unlikely to reduce homelessness by 7% by 2013. This will be the council’s final assessment of performance against this benchmark as no further data is expected before the next Census in 2016.

The proportion of Indigenous people living in overcrowded dwellings—requiring at least three or more bedrooms—fell from 664 per 10 000 Indigenous Australians to 582 Indigenous Australians, a 12.3% reduction. This suggests good progress toward COAG’s benchmark to reduce the proportion of Indigenous households living in overcrowded conditions by 20% by 2017–18.

**COAG’s homelessness benchmarks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To reduce the number of homeless persons by 7% by 2013</th>
<th>To reduce the rate of Indigenous overcrowding by 20% by 2017–18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Up 17.3% from 2006 to 2011 | Down 12.3% from 2006 to 2011 |

**A note about this year’s report**

This year we have only reported on the homelessness and Indigenous overcrowding outcomes of the National Affordable Housing Agreement. Homelessness estimates are only available every five years so this report has taken the opportunity to provide a more detailed analysis of homelessness. Additionally, the assessment of outcomes for housing supply and affordability would be difficult due to the impact of new Census population counts and the need to extrapolate income data.
Recommendations

Recommendation 1
The COAG Reform Council recommends that COAG note that:

a. between 2006 and 2011, there was a reduction in the number of rough sleepers (434 fewer people)

b. COAG’s benchmark to reduce homelessness by 7% by 2013 is unlikely to be met because of:
   - an increase of 9859 in the number of people living in severely crowded dwellings
   - an increase of 3929 in the number of people living in supported accommodation for the homeless

c. Census data shows that progress has been made toward meeting the COAG benchmark to reduce rates of Indigenous overcrowding by 20% by 2017–18.

Recommendation 2
The COAG Reform Council recommends that COAG agree to amend the National Affordable Housing Agreement (NAHA) to:

a. ensure that milestones set for performance benchmarks align with years in which data are available—particularly the homelessness target for which the next data will come from the 2016 Census

b. use a count of people to measure progress towards reducing levels of overcrowding amongst Indigenous Australians.

Recommendation 3
The COAG Reform Council recommends COAG agree to further work being done to:

a. improve the performance framework to include measures of sustainable housing outcomes for people who are homeless or are at risk of becoming homeless.
Chapter 1.

Overall homelessness

This chapter discusses overall homelessness, including the data released from the 2011 Census. It reports on Indigenous homelessness, particularly looking at people living in severely crowded dwellings.
How this chapter links to the National Affordable Housing Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section in this chapter</th>
<th>Performance indicators</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness in 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>• People who are homeless or at risk of homelessness achieve sustainable housing and social inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness increased</td>
<td>• Proportion of Australians who are homeless</td>
<td>• 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous homelessness</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Indigenous people have improved housing amenity and reduced overcrowding, particularly in remote areas and discrete communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like to know more about the indicators?

Appendix A outlines the structure of the National Affordable Housing Agreement and details the indicators and benchmarks under the agreement that are not included in this report in detail, either due to data quality and availability issues, or because there was little change in performance year on year.
Key findings

The increase in homelessness was due to large increases in the number of people living in severely crowded dwellings and temporary accommodation. The number of people living in severely crowded dwellings increased by 31.3% and the number in temporary accommodation by 19.2% between 2006 and 2011. These increases caused the rise in the overall level of homelessness. Positively, the number of rough sleepers fell by 6.0%.

Rates of homelessness amongst Indigenous Australians are 14 times higher than for non-Indigenous Australians—primarily due to high rates of severe crowding in remote communities. One in twenty Indigenous people were homeless in 2011, and Indigenous people made up one-quarter of the homeless population—a small increase from 2006. However, due to an increase in the underlying Indigenous population, rates have decreased from 571 to 488 people per 10 000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of key findings in this chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>105 237 people were homelessness in 2011</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In 2011, most homeless people were living in severely crowded dwellings or temporary accommodation.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>One in four people who are homeless are Indigenous</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The proportion of Indigenous people who are homeless is 14 times higher than for non-Indigenous Australians.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Homelessness in 2011

105 237 people were homeless in 2011—most lived in severely crowded or temporary accommodation.

There are different types of homelessness

Being homeless means you lack access to adequate living arrangements. In its most severe form it means sleeping without shelter. However, it also reflects having no tenure or control of your living space. To provide a clear picture of progress addressing homelessness under the National Affordable Housing Agreement we report on the prevalence of these different types of homelessness (see Box 1).

People at risk of homelessness—an important client group for specialist homelessness services—lack housing security because of financial difficulties or the presence or threat of violence in the home. These people are not included in the homelessness estimates presented in this report.

Box 1 Types of homelessness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rough sleeping</th>
<th>People who are living in improvised dwellings, tents or sleeping out.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Couch surfing</td>
<td>People who do not have fixed tenure but are staying temporarily with other households.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary accommodation</td>
<td>Living in accommodation where tenure or control of space is restricted. This category includes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supported accommodation—people living in supported accommodation for the homeless. Supported accommodation is often an appropriate service response and a pathway to sustainable housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Boarding houses—people living in boarding houses. While some people in boarding houses have tenure, they are still categorised as homeless as they lack control of space or have no privacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other temporary lodging—mostly people staying in hotels and motels with no usual address.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe crowding</td>
<td>People who lack control of space as a result of living in a dwelling which needs four or more extra bedrooms to meet the Canadian National Occupancy Standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most homeless people are not rough sleepers

People living in severely crowded dwellings represent the most common type of homelessness, at nearly 40% of the homeless population in 2011. This figure is similar to the combined total of people living in temporary accommodation (37.7%), which includes supported accommodation, boarding houses and other temporary lodgings (Figure 1.1). Rough sleepers represented 6.5% of the homeless population.
Types of homelessness vary between States and Territories

As shown in figure 1.1, different jurisdictions have different patterns of homelessness by type. For example, the large majority of homeless people in the Northern Territory are those living in severely crowded dwellings. There is also a difference in the nature of temporary accommodation found in each jurisdiction. In the ACT (95.3%) and Victoria (63.6%) supported accommodation is the most common form of temporary accommodation. In NSW (55.7%) and Western Australia (57.0%) a greater proportion live in boarding houses.

**Figure 1.1** Types of homelessness as proportions of the homeless population, 2011

![Diagram showing types of homelessness by jurisdiction](source: ABS—see Appendix D.)

The Northern Territory has the highest rates of homelessness

In 2011, the national rate of homelessness was 49 people per 10 000 population—or 1 in 200 Australians. The Northern Territory homelessness rate of 731 people per 10 000—or 1 in 14 people—was 14 times higher than any other jurisdiction. Tasmania had the lowest rate of homelessness at 32 people per 10 000 (Figure 1.2).

**Figure 1.2** Rates of homelessness by jurisdiction, 2011

![Map showing rates of homelessness by jurisdiction](source: ABS—see Appendix D.)
Homelessness increased

Despite a drop in rough sleeping, homelessness increased between 2006 and 2011—a result of more people living in severely crowded or temporary accommodation.

The number of homeless people increased in every State and Territory

The ABS estimates that 105,237 Australians were homeless on the night of the 2011 Census—17.3% more than in 2006. The number of homeless people increased in every State and Territory between 2006 and 2011 (Figure 1.3). NSW and Victoria had the largest numerical increases, with an additional 5,971 and 5,379 homeless people respectively.

The rate of homelessness also increased—but not in every jurisdiction

In 2011, the rate of homelessness was 49 people per 10,000 population. Nationally, this was an increase of 8.2% from 45 people per 10,000 in 2006 (Figure 1.4). The highest rates of increase were in the ACT (70.6%) and Tasmania (32.9%), but these jurisdictions had the lowest rates in 2006. The rate of homelessness fell in Queensland (-5.2%) and the Northern Territory (-7.7%).

Source: ABS—see Appendix D.
More people living in severely overcrowded dwellings and temporary accommodation

The number of people living in severely crowded dwellings increased by 9859 (31.3%) and the number in temporary accommodation by 6376 (19.2%) between 2006 and 2011. These increases caused the rise in the overall level of homelessness. Positively, the number of rough sleepers fell by 6.0% and couch surfers fell by 1.7% (Figure 1.5).

Figure 1.5  Change in numbers of homeless people by type of homelessness, 2006–2011

The drop in rough sleeping reflects a longer term trend

The increase in the number of homeless people (15 509) since 2006 follows a drop in the number of homeless people between 2001 and 2006 (5586). However the number of rough sleepers has continued to decline from 2001 through 2006 to 2011. In 2011 there were 23.8% or 2133 fewer rough sleepers than in 2001 (see Figure 1.6).

Figure 1.6  Homeless people and rough sleepers, 2001–2011

Source: ABS—see Appendix D.
Indigenous homelessness

Rates of homelessness amongst Indigenous Australians are 14 times higher than for non-Indigenous Australians—primarily due to high rates of severe crowding in remote communities.

Indigenous people made up one-quarter of the homeless population

In 2011, 26 744—or one in twenty—Indigenous people were homeless (Figure 1.7). This is a 3.0% increase on 2006, when 25 953 Indigenous Australians were homeless.

Rates of Indigenous homelessness have fallen

The rate of homelessness for Indigenous people in 2011 was 488 people per 10 000, 14 times higher than for the non-Indigenous population (35 per 10 000 people). These rates fell from 571 per 10 000 people in 2006—a drop of 14.5%. The largest falls were in Queensland (17%) and South Australia (27%). Rates increased in Victoria (3%), Tasmania (55%) and the ACT (166%) (Figure 1.8). The fall in the rate of Indigenous homelessness—despite a small increase in the number of Indigenous people who were homeless—reflects the large increase in the Indigenous population between 2006 and 2011.

Source: ABS—see Appendix D.
In 2011, 75% of Indigenous homeless people lived in severely crowded dwellings

Living in a severely crowded dwelling is the most common form of homelessness amongst Indigenous Australians—representing 75% of all Indigenous homelessness. In very remote Australia, 1 in 5 Indigenous people lived in a severely crowded dwelling—accounting for 15% of all homeless Australians.

Severe crowding is the largest contributor to the high rates of Indigenous homelessness in the Northern Territory. Indigenous people living in severely crowded accommodation in very remote areas of the Northern Territory represent 11.2% of all homeless Australians.

Figure 1.9 Rates of severe crowding for Indigenous persons, 2006 and 2011

![Graph showing rates of severe crowding for Indigenous persons, 2006 and 2011](Source: ABS—see Appendix D.)

There were fewer Indigenous rough sleepers in 2011 than 2006

Nationally, there were 413 fewer Indigenous rough sleepers in 2011 than in 2006. Proportionally, the largest decrease was in South Australia (67.4%), followed by the Northern Territory (33.1%) and Queensland (29.1%) (Figure 1.10). There were increases in NSW, Victoria and Tasmania—though in Victoria and Tasmania these changes are based on small numbers.

Figure 1.10 Indigenous rough sleeping by State and Territory

(a) Number of Indigenous rough sleepers, 2011

![Map showing number of Indigenous rough sleepers, 2011](Source: ABS—see Appendix D.)

(b) Change in the number of Indigenous rough sleepers, 2006–2011

![Map showing change in number of Indigenous rough sleepers, 2006–2011](Increase: -7.4%, -67.4%, 53.6%; Decrease: -33.1%, -29.1%, 76.5%; No Change: 0.0%, 20.2%)
Chapter 2.

Different types of homelessness

This chapter reports on Australians experiencing different types of homelessness—rough sleeping, couch surfing, severe crowding, and temporary accommodation. It also reports on the proportion of supported accommodation clients who were identified as needing services on more than one occasion during the year.
How this chapter links to the National Affordable Housing Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section in this chapter</th>
<th>Performance indicators</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Rough sleeping          | • Proportion of Australians who are homeless  
                          • Proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness |
| Couch surfing           |                        |          |
| Severe crowding         |                        |          |
| Temporary accommodation |                        |          |
| Sustainable accommodation|                       |          |

Like to know more about the indicators?

Appendix A outlines the structure of the National Affordable Housing Agreement and details the indicators and benchmarks under the agreement that are not included in this report in detail, either due to data quality and availability issues, or because there was little change in performance year on year.
Key findings

There has been a 6.0% drop in the number of rough sleepers—the most severe type of homelessness—between 2006 and 2011. There were large increases in the number of people living in severely crowded dwellings and temporary (mostly supported) accommodation.

Summary of key findings in this chapter

- **Progress made in tackling rough sleeping—the most severe form of homelessness.**
  - Rough sleeping down 6.0%

- **The number of couch surfers decreased slightly between 2006 and 2011.**
  - Couch surfing down 1.7%

- **The increase in homelessness has been largely driven by an increase in severe crowding.**
  - Severe crowding up 31.3%

- **6376 more people lived in temporary accommodation in 2011 than in 2006.**
  - Temporary accommodation up 19.2%
Rough sleeping

Between 2006 and 2011, the number of rough sleepers—mostly adult men—fell by 6.0%. However when comparing jurisdictions it is important to consider the localised distribution of rough sleepers.

Fewer people are rough sleeping

Nationally, the number of people rough sleeping—those living in improvised dwellings, tents or sleeping out—has fallen from 7247 in 2006 to 6813 in 2011. This is a drop in the rate of people rough sleeping from 4 to 3 per 10 000 people. The drop in the rate of rough sleeping is a positive result, illustrating progress tackling the most severe form of homelessness.

However, as shown in Figure 2.1b, whilst the overall level of rough sleeping has decreased, jurisdictional results are varied. There were large decreases in most jurisdictions but increases in Victoria (38.9%), Tasmania (27.9%) and NSW (20.3%).

Figure 2.1 Rough sleeping

(a) Rates per 10 000 population, 2011

(b) Change in the number of rough sleepers, 2006–2011

Source: ABS—see Appendix D.

Rough sleeping is concentrated in remote areas, major cities and coastal areas

Rough sleeping tends to be concentrated in localised areas, which makes jurisdictional comparison challenging (Figure 2.2). See Appendix B for more detailed information.

- Large concentrations of rough sleepers occur in the outback areas of the Northern Territory (499 people), Western Australia (408) and Queensland (185). With the addition of Darwin (342), remote Northern Australia has over 21% of Australia’s rough sleepers but only 2.4% of Australia’s total population.
- The inner suburbs of Sydney (492 people), Melbourne (384) and Perth (189) are home to over 15% of Australia’s rough sleepers.
24% of all rough sleepers were counted in the Northern NSW and Queensland coastal areas. The coastal regions with the largest rough sleeping populations are Richmond–Tweed (316) in NSW, and Fitzroy (241) and Cairns (201) in Queensland.

The council notes that the Census is taken in August—winter in southern Australia, and the dry season in the north of Australia. Seasonal factors may affect levels of rough sleeping.

**Figure 2.2** Geographic distribution of rough sleeping, 2006 and 2011

Most rough sleepers are adult men

Men aged between 25 and 64 make up more than half (51.0%) of rough sleepers (Figure 2.3), though they represent little more than a quarter of the population.

**Figure 2.3** Rough sleeping by age and gender, 2011
Couch surfing

**Nationally, the number of people couch surfing fell by 1.7% between 2006 and 2011.**

There was a small decrease in the number of people couch surfing

Nationally, the number of people who are living temporarily in another household because they have nowhere else to live fell by 1.7% between 2006 and 2011, from 17 663 to 17 369.

Nationally in 2011, the rate of couch surfing was 8 people per 10 000. The Northern Territory had the highest rate of couch surfing, with 20 people per 10 000. NSW (7 per 10 000) and Victoria (6 per 10 000) had the lowest rates of couch surfing (Figure 2.4a).

The largest decrease in couch surfing occurred in Queensland, with a fall of 13.7% or 681 people (Figure 2.4b). While actual numbers of couch surfers increased slightly in most other jurisdictions, the increase in the total population meant that rates of couch surfing declined.

**Figure 2.4 Couch surfing**

(a) Rates per 10 000 population, 2011

(b) Change in number of couch surfers, 2006–2011

![Map showing rates per 10 000 population and change in number of couch surfers](image)

Source: ABS—see Appendix D.

Couch surfing is more prevalent amongst the Indigenous population

Indigenous Australians (19 per 10 000) are more than twice as likely to be staying temporarily in another household as non–Indigenous Australians (8 per 10 000) (Figure 2.5). Among Indigenous Australians, couch surfing is most prevalent in the major cities (22 per 10 000). In contrast, couch surfing amongst non–Indigenous people is concentrated in remote (19 per 10 000) and very remote (38 per 10 000) Australia.

Between 2006 and 2011 the number of Indigenous couch surfers increased from 872 to 1014 persons, a rise of 16.3%. The largest component of this increase was in inner regional areas with an additional 72 people from 2006 to 2011 (see Appendices B and C for information on the remoteness classification).
Change in the number of couch surfers varied by remoteness areas

Whilst the overall number of couch surfers decreased, they increased in remote and very remote areas—although the size of the changes was small (Figure 2.6). Decreases occurred in major cities (106 people) and outer regional areas (316). The increase in very remote areas was 127 people.
Severe crowding

Most of the 31.3% increase in the number of Australians living in severely crowded dwellings was amongst overseas-born people living in major cities.

Increase in the number of Australians who live in severely crowded dwellings

In considering this increase, it should be noted that people living in severely crowded dwellings were not defined as homeless in the council’s baseline report.

In 2011, there were 41,390 people living in severely crowded conditions, an increase of 9859, or 31.3% from 2006. This accounts for 63.6% of the increase in the overall homeless population. The number of people living in severely crowded dwellings rose in every jurisdiction with NSW (63.6%), Victoria (80.6%) and ACT (263.6%) having the greatest increases (Figure 2.7b).

This is an increase in the rate of severe crowding from 16 per 10,000 persons in 2006 to 19 per 10,000 persons in 2011. The Northern Territory had rates of severe crowding which were at least 32 times that of any other jurisdiction (Figure 2.7a).

Figure 2.7     Severe crowding

(a) Rates per 10 000 population, 2011

(b) Change in number of people living in severely crowded dwellings, 2006–2011

Source: ABS—see Appendix D.

Most Indigenous people living in severely crowded dwellings are in remote areas

Indigenous people make up nearly 50% of the population living in severely crowded conditions. This is highly concentrated in very remote communities with these areas accounting for 78.8% of Indigenous people living in severely crowded conditions (Figure 2.8).

In contrast, non-Indigenous severe crowding is concentrated in Australia’s major cities (Figure 2.8). Sydney and Melbourne have particularly high numbers of people living in severely crowded conditions. Altogether, it was estimated that, in 2011, 8282 and 5375 non-Indigenous people were accommodated in severely crowded dwellings in the major cities of NSW and Victoria respectively.
Figure 2.8  People living in severely crowded dwellings by Indigenous status and remoteness areas, 2011

Recently–arrived migrants in major cities were a large part of the rise in severe crowding

Most of the increase in severe crowding between 2006 and 2011 occurred amongst non-Indigenous Australians. The number of Indigenous people living in severely crowded dwellings increased by 2.9%, compared to 79.8% for non-Indigenous people. Major cities tend to attract migrants, and the major contributors to severe crowding amongst non–Indigenous Australians are likely to be recent migrants (Figure 2.9). ‘Two thirds of the rise in ‘severe’ crowding [between 2006 and 2011] is attributable to the doubling of the number in this homelessness group who were born overseas’ (ABS 2012 p.6).

Figure 2.9  Rates of severe crowding by country of birth (and Indigenous status), 2011

**Although it is estimated that 0.2% of Indigenous Australians are born overseas, to supply these estimates it has been assumed that all Indigenous Australians are born in Australia.

Source: ABS—see Appendix D.
Temporary accommodation

The 19.2% increase in the number of Australians living in temporary accommodation is mainly due to more people staying in supported accommodation.

More people are living in temporary accommodation in all States and Territories

In 2011, 39,665 people lived in temporary accommodation—in supported accommodation, boarding houses, and other temporary lodgings such as hotels and motels. This was 6,376 more than in 2006.

In 2011, the national rate for people living in temporary accommodation was 18 people for every 10,000 Australians, a 9.5% increase on the rate in 2006 (17 per 10,000). Over half (53.6%) of these people lived in supported accommodation. A further 44.7% lived in boarding houses.

The Northern Territory (49 people per 10,000) had the highest proportion of people living in temporary accommodation (Figure 2.10a). Victoria (23 per 10,000) and the ACT (33 per 10,000) also had a higher proportion of people living in temporary accommodation than the national average.

The number of people in temporary accommodation increased in every State and Territory between 2006 and 2011 and more than doubled in Tasmania (up 100.8%) and the ACT (up 129.2%) over this period (Figure 2.10b).

Figure 2.10  Temporary accommodation

(a) Rates per 10,000 population, 2011

(b) Change in number of people in temporary accommodation, 2006–2011

Source: ABS—see Appendix D.

People live in different kinds of temporary accommodation across jurisdictions

Supported accommodation accounted for the large majority of people in temporary accommodation in Victoria (63.6%), South Australia (61.7%), Tasmania (64.8%) and the ACT (95.3%). In NSW and Western Australia the majority of those in temporary accommodation lived in boarding houses (55.7% and 57.0% respectively).
Supported accommodation is a major component of the measured increase in homelessness

Supported accommodation is an important service for people who are homeless, or at risk of homelessness. People staying in supported accommodation have received assistance for a variety of reasons, such as relationship breakdown, financial stress or housing insecurity. The AIHW reports that, in 2011–12, 34% of clients receiving assistance from homelessness agencies were escaping some form of domestic violence, with 45% of these clients identifying a need for short-term and emergency accommodation (AIHW 2012b, pp.57–59).

Some client groups of specialist homelessness services, such as people suffering domestic violence or those whose tenure is vulnerable for reasons such as financial stress, are not counted as homeless by the ABS. The provision of supported accommodation to these clients may, in effect, make them homeless according to the indicator.

The more-than-doubling of people in supported accommodation in Tasmania, the ACT, and the Northern Territory (Figure 2.12) contributed to over 50% of the increase in the homeless population of these jurisdictions. It is important to acknowledge the role of supported accommodation as a service response when interpreting the large increase in homelessness rates in these jurisdictions.
Sustainable accommodation

7.3% of all clients who required housing support were identified as needing further assistance later.

8722 Specialist Homelessness Services clients had a need for accommodation identified more than once in 2011–12

The provision of sustainable housing—rather than short term fixes—is critical to the wellbeing of people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. To measure the ability of service providers to deliver such housing, the National Affordable Housing Agreement looks at the number of clients who request housing assistance more than once in a financial year. The council has previously raised concerns regarding the adequacy of this proxy measure (see Box 2) and finds it difficult to make conclusions regarding progress towards the achievement of the outcome.

Of clients who requested accommodation support from a specialist homelessness service in 2011–12, 7.3% returned seeking further accommodation support. The rate was highest in the ACT at 13.2%, and lowest in South Australia at 4.8% (Figure 2.13). As these data come from the new Specialist Homelessness Services Data Collection, it is not possible to report progress over time against this indicator.

Figure 2.13  Specialist Homelessness Services clients who had a need for accommodation identified more than once in 2011–12

Source: AIHW—see Appendix D.
**Box 2  Measuring achievement of sustainable housing**

An important factor in achieving sustainable housing and social inclusion is ensuring that people who are homeless, or at risk of homelessness, have access to long term secure housing. This is measured in the National Affordable Housing Agreement by performance indicator (d) the proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness.

This indicator has a proxy measure based on the number of Specialist Homelessness Services (SHS) clients who change status from ‘homeless’ to ‘not homeless’ and back to ‘homeless’, or have repeat support periods where the housing situation is identified as homeless. Due to conceptual and data quality issues the council does not believe it is able to report achievement of the outcome using the data currently provided.

The council has identified a number of limitations to this performance indicator, which were summarised in the recent review of the National Affordable Housing Agreement. They included that:

- the indicator only covers those people who used homelessness services and may not be representative of repeat homelessness in the broader homeless population
- it does not capture those homeless people who used homelessness services initially, but did not return when experiencing further periods of homelessness
- it may be less useful in remote and very remote areas, where services are more limited
- identifying clients with repeat need relies on correct linkage of data and services identifying a repeat need during the financial year
- the number of repeat clients identified is likely to be influenced by the availability and nature of services provided within a jurisdiction.

The council also notes that the direction of the indicator is ambiguous. While a decrease would generally be considered to be desirable, it is also possible that an increase could be interpreted as an improvement if it means that services are reaching more clients who need them or that more clients are returning for assistance when they need it.

We acknowledge that progress has been made in the development of these data through the development of the Specialist Homelessness Services data collection. However, we remain of the view that further work is required to measure progress against this outcome.

The council recommends further work be done to develop a more appropriate indicator and data to support the measurement of the sustainable housing outcome. The council also supports the recommendation of the Working Group which reviewed the National Affordable Housing Agreement that other data development work, such as the development of intercensal measures of homelessness, is a higher priority than this indicator.
Chapter 3. Homelessness: Performance benchmarks

Homelessness 2011 – Comparing Performance Across Australia

Accountability, governments, performance, supported services, Victoria, South Australia, Queensland, Tasmania, Northern Territory, Australia, Agenda, improving, on track, progress, Federal Financial Relations, Indigenous, temporary, housing partnership, Intergovernmental Agreement, Western Australia, migrants, tenure, dwelling, NAHA, COAG, people, sustainable, economic, long-term strategy, Australian Capital Territory, social inclusion.
Chapter 3.

Performance benchmarks

This chapter reports on COAG’s national benchmarks and compares performance across the States and Territories. It reports on COAG’s benchmark on homelessness and on the benchmark on Indigenous overcrowding.
How this chapter links to the National Affordable Housing Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section in this chapter</th>
<th>Performance indicators</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COAG’s benchmarks</td>
<td>Proportion of Australians who are homeless</td>
<td>People who are homeless or at risk of homelessness achieve sustainable housing and social inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indigenous people have improved housing amenity and reduced overcrowding, particularly in remote and areas and discrete communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like to know more about the indicators?

Appendix A outlines the structure of the National Affordable Housing Agreement and details the indicators and benchmarks under the agreement that are not included in this report in detail, either due to data quality and availability issues, or because there was little change in performance year on year.
Key findings

The number of homeless people increased in every State and Territory between 2006 and 2011, resulting in a 17.3% increase in homelessness nationally.

The rate of Indigenous Australians living in overcrowded dwellings has decreased by 12.3% between 2006 and 2011.

Summary of key findings in this chapter

- COAG is not likely to meet the benchmark to reduce homelessness by 7% by 2013.
- Progress made towards reducing Indigenous overcrowding by 20% by 2017-18.

Homelessness up 17.3%

Indigenous overcrowding down 12.3%
COAG’s benchmarks

The benchmark to reduce the number of homeless people by 7% is unlikely to be met, but progress has been made towards reducing the rate of Indigenous overcrowding by 20% by 2017-18.

The number of homeless people increased 17.3% between 2006 and 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2011, 105 237 Australians were homeless, an increase of 15 509 people since 2006. This suggests that COAG will not meet its benchmark to reduce the number of homeless people by 7% by 2013. The number of homeless people increased in every State and Territory between 2006 and 2011 (Figure 3.1).

Figure 3.1 Change in number of homeless persons by State and Territory, 2006–2011

Source: ABS—see Appendix D.

When interpreting the rise in overall homelessness it is important to note that though severe crowding and temporary accommodation are forms of homelessness:

- temporary accommodation could also be a legitimate service response which may lead to sustainable housing
- severe crowding was not categorised as homelessness in our baseline report.
Drop in the proportion of Indigenous people living in overcrowded dwellings

To assess this benchmark we have used ABS Census data as a proxy for the National Aboriginal Strait Islander Social Survey data. Census data measures overcrowding by counting the number of people living in dwellings requiring three or more bedrooms. Those living in severely crowded dwellings requiring an extra four or more bedrooms are also classified as homeless. The number of bedrooms required is determined by the Canadian National Occupancy Standard (see Appendices C and D, and Figure 3.2, for more technical information).

Nationally, the number of Indigenous Australians living in overcrowded dwellings increased by 716 persons, from 30,196 persons in 2006 to 30,912 persons in 2011. As the size of the Indigenous population increased, rates decreased from 664 people per 10,000 in 2006 to 582 per 10,000 in 2011, a drop of 12.3%.

The rate of Indigenous Australians living in overcrowded dwellings fell by 12.3% between 2006 and 2011

The majority of Indigenous people living in overcrowded conditions live in Queensland (6392), Western Australia (4597) and the Northern Territory (17,462). These States have high proportions of Indigenous people living in remote communities.

Figure 3.2 Indigenous overcrowding by State and Territory, 2011

Source: ABS—see Appendix D.
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Chapter 4.

Improving performance reporting

This chapter outlines the council’s views on how the performance reporting framework for the National Affordable Housing Agreement could be improved.
Better benchmarks and indicators

Despite improvements, there are still significant issues with reporting on the homelessness and overcrowding outcomes of the National Affordable Housing Agreement.

At its July 2012 meeting, COAG adopted a revised performance framework for the National Affordable Housing Agreement. We support this new framework and the inclusion of provisional benchmarks within the revised agreement, which will improve our ability to track progress towards outcomes. Under the Intergovernmental Agreement on Federal Financial Relations, the council may advise COAG on changes to improve the performance reporting framework.

Benchmarks in the National Affordable Housing Agreement should be aligned with data availability

The provisional benchmark to reduce the number of homeless people by 7% by 2013 cannot be assessed. The number of homeless people is measured using Census data, which is undertaken again in 2016.

We recommend that this benchmark be revised so that it can be assessed. This may be achieved either by changing the date of the benchmark to 2016, with a consequent adjustment to the benchmark to be achieved, or by taking an intercensal count of homeless persons.

Measures for Indigenous overcrowding are not comparable over time, nor between jurisdictions, and may understate the level of overcrowding

We have chosen not to report supplementary data supplied for the proportion of Indigenous households living in overcrowded conditions as the data do not appear to be suitable for jurisdictional comparisons. The measure is based on the bedroom entitlement policies of State and Territory housing authorities, which might differ from each other. They might also differ from the Canadian National Occupancy Standard—the accepted basis of the overcrowding outcome. We also cannot make comparisons with data from before 2009–10 due to a change in methodology (AIHW 2012, p79).

We are also concerned that the current measures of Indigenous overcrowding are based on a count of households rather than persons. This may create an impression of a lower level of amenity lost to overcrowding by giving a marginally overcrowded household the same emphasis as one that is more severely overcrowded.

We recommend that the indicator be changed to use a count of people rather than a count of households. Publicly available data from the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Survey includes person–based estimates of overcrowding, which the council believes are better suited to measuring whether Indigenous people have reduced levels of overcrowding.
Further work is needed to improve measurement of sustainable housing outcomes for people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness

Under the NAHA, the outcome of achieving sustainable housing is measured by the ‘proportion of people experiencing repeat periods of homelessness’. Repeat periods of homelessness are measured using Specialist Homelessness Services data on people who have sought assistance for housing more than once in a specific financial year with more than six weeks between seeking assistance.

We acknowledge the improvements to this indicator using the Specialist Homelessness Services data collection. However, the changes do not fully address the concerns we have previously outlined regarding the conceptual adequacy of this indicator (summarised at page 33 of this report).
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Appendix A
The National Affordable Housing Agreement

About the agreement
The National Affordable Housing Agreement (NAHA) is one of six National Agreements. Under the NAHA, COAG—the Commonwealth, State and Territory Governments—committed to the objective of ensuring all Australians have access to affordable, safe and sustainable housing that contributes to social and economic participation. In the NAHA, governments identified outcomes, outputs, performance indicators and performance benchmarks by which the community could assess their performance.

The NAHA is a schedule to the Intergovernmental Agreement on Federal Financial Relations (part of Schedule F: National Agreements), which came into effect on 1 January 2009, and has been revised since it came into effect.

The latest version of NAHA is available at: www.federalfinancialrelations.gov.au/content/national_agreements.aspx

Performance indicators not reported
Each year, we report on only a selection of performance indicators under the objective and outcomes in the National Affordable Housing Agreement. In some years, we cannot report on indicators for reasons such as data not being available or measures not yet being agreed between governments.

We also choose not to report some indicators for which we have been given data. Indicators we choose not to report in detail are usually omitted because there has been little change since the previous year. Additionally, in some cases, we may choose not to report on an indicator because we think the data are not helpful for measuring progress towards COAG’s outcome. Data for indicators provided by the SCRGSP but not reported in detail are still published in the Statistical Supplement to this report.

Below, we detail what we cannot report and what we do not report. This is also shown in the table that follows.

What we cannot report
Since our 2010–11 report, new data have not become available for low-income households in rental stress or the proportion of Indigenous households owning or purchasing a home. We cannot report on these measures this year.

What we do not report
Due to the availability of new Census data pertaining to homelessness, this year we have focused on the aspects of the NAHA relating to homelessness. Additionally, the need to extrapolate income data from last year’s Survey of Income and Housing, and the re-basing of population estimates based on the 2011 Census population count means that the most recent data for the measures under the outcomes ‘People can purchase affordable housing’ and ‘People have access to housing through an efficient and responsive housing market’ is contested.
### National Affordable Housing Agreement structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People who are homeless or at risk of homelessness achieve sustainable housing and social inclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Australians who are homeless</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People are able to rent housing that meets their needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of low–income households in rental stress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People can purchase affordable housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of homes sold or built per 1000 low and moderate income households that are affordable by low and moderate income households</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People have access to housing through an efficient and responsive housing market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated cumulative gap between underlying demand for housing and housing supply, as a proportion of the increase in underlying demand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Indigenous households owning or purchasing a home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indigenous people have improved housing amenity and reduced overcrowding, particularly in remote areas and discrete communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Indigenous households living in overcrowded conditions including in remote and discrete communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Included in this report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
Supporting information

General information
Numerous findings in this report are reported by remoteness, using the 2006 ABS Accessibility/Remoteness Index of Australia. This classification is based on physical road distance from urban centres of varying sizes and is presented visually in Figure A.1.

Figure A.1  Remoteness areas in Australia, 2006

Rough sleeping

Figure A.2 outlines the areas identified in the rough sleeping chapter as having particularly high prevalence of rough sleeping.

Figure A.2 Areas in which rough sleeping is prevalent, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of area (Statistical Area 4)</th>
<th>State/Territory</th>
<th>Estimated number of rough sleepers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outback areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland – Outback</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia – Outback</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory – Outback</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner city areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney – City and Inner South</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne – Inner</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth – Inner</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Coast regional areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffs Harbour – Grafton</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid North Coast</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond – Tweed</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairns</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzroy</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Coast</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackay</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Coast</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsville</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide Bay</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Appendix C

## Terms used in this report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ABS</strong></td>
<td>Australian Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AIHW</strong></td>
<td>Australian Institute of Health and Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boarding houses</strong></td>
<td>Refers to people living in boarding houses for the homeless (not students, religious orders or hospitals).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Census</strong></td>
<td>Census of Population and Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COAG</strong></td>
<td>Council of Australian Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of birth</strong></td>
<td>The Census records a person’s country of birth, using the current names of countries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Canadian National Occupancy Standard (CNOS)** | The Canadian National Occupancy Standard (CNOS) for housing appropriateness is sensitive to both household size and composition. CNOS assesses the bedroom requirements of a household by specifying that:  
  - there should be no more than two persons per bedroom  
  - children less than 5 years of age of different sexes may reasonably share a bedroom  
  - children 5 years of age or older of opposite sex should have separate bedrooms  
  - children less than 18 years of age and of the same sex may reasonably share a bedroom  
  - single household members 18 years or over should have a separate bedroom, as should parents or couples.  
Households living in dwellings where this standard cannot be met are considered to be overcrowded.  |
| **Couch surfing**           | Refers to people who do not have fixed tenure but are staying temporarily with other households.                                             |
| **Homelessness**            | This report follows the ABS definition of homelessness: when a person does not have suitable accommodation alternatives they are considered homeless if their current living arrangement:  
  - is in a dwelling that is inadequate, or  
  - has no tenure, or if their initial tenure is short and not extendable, or  
  - does not allow them to have control of, and access to space for social relations.  |
<p>| <strong>Indigenous</strong>              | We use the terms 'Indigenous', 'Indigenous Australians' and 'Indigenous people' to refer to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Intergovernmental Agreement on Federal Financial Relations (IGA)</strong></th>
<th>The overarching framework for the Commonwealth’s financial relations with the States and Territories. The NAHA is an agreement under the IGA.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NAHA</strong></td>
<td>National Affordable Housing Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other temporary lodging</strong></td>
<td>Primarily refers to people staying in hotels, motels, etc. who have no usual address.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remoteness</strong></td>
<td>This report uses the standard ABS classification of remoteness (ARIA). Remoteness is defined as major cities, inner regional, outer regional, remote and very remote areas. The division is based on physical road distance from urban centres of varying sizes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rough sleeping</strong></td>
<td>Refers to people who are living in improvised dwellings, tents or sleeping out. This is the most readily recognised form of homelessness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Severe crowding</strong></td>
<td>Refers to people who are living in dwellings that need four or more extra bedrooms to accommodate the occupants adequately, as determined by the Canadian National Occupancy Standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCRGSP</strong></td>
<td>Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision, an intergovernmental committee, supported by a Secretariat within the Productivity Commission. Under the IGA, the Steering Committee is responsible for compiling and supplying performance information for the COAG Reform Council’s reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialist Homelessness Services (SHS)</strong></td>
<td>See Supported accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supported accommodation</strong></td>
<td>Refers to people living in supported accommodation for the homeless supplied by State and Territory governments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temporary accommodation</strong></td>
<td>At points in this report, we have grouped supported accommodation, boarding houses, and other temporary lodging (all of which are defined above) under the heading of temporary accommodation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D
Data sources and notes

The SCRGSP compiled and supplied performance information to the COAG Reform Council for this report. We have also used performance information in addition to that provided by the Steering Committee. We publish the Steering Committee’s report and any additional data we have used in our statistical supplement. The table below lists each figure in the report and gives a corresponding reference to the table in our statistical supplement, available on our website.

The SCRGSP supplies data quality statements on the data they provide, which we have also published in the statistical supplement to this report. Where users require data quality information beyond that provided alongside the non-Steering Committee data in our statistical supplement, further information is generally available from the relevant data provider.

### National Affordable Housing Agreement: figure numbers and performance information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Types of homelessness as proportions of the homeless population, 2011</td>
<td>NAHA.3.1: Proportion of Australians who are homeless, by homelessness operational group, by State and Territory, 2011</td>
<td>ABS (unpublished) Census of Population and Housing, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Count of homeless people, 2006 and 2011</td>
<td>NAHA.3.1, NAHA.3.5: Proportion of Australians who are homeless, by homelessness operational group, by State and Territory, (year)</td>
<td>ABS (unpublished) Census of Population and Housing, 2006 and 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Rates of homelessness by jurisdiction, 2006 and 2011</td>
<td>NAHA.3.1, NAHA.3.5: Proportion of Australians who are homeless, by homelessness operational group, by State and Territory, (year)</td>
<td>ABS (unpublished) Census of Population and Housing, 2006 and 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAHA.3.1, NAHA.3.5: Proportion of Australians who are homeless, by homelessness operational group, by State and Territory, (year)</td>
<td>ABS (unpublished) Census of Population and Housing, 2006 and 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This figure excludes the proportion of the population with Indigenous status ‘not stated’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAHA.3.1, NAHA.3.5: Proportion of Australians who are homeless, by homelessness operational group, by State and Territory, (year)</td>
<td>ABS (unpublished) Census of Population and Housing, 2006 and 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The council commissioned this data from the ABS. As well as including relevant disaggregations in our statistical supplement, we have included the entire spreadsheet as an addendum to this report on our website.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### National Affordable Housing Agreement: figure numbers and performance information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 1.10: Indigenous rough sleeping by State and Territory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 2.1: Rough sleeping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 2.2: Geographic distribution of rough sleeping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 2.3: Rough sleeping by age and gender, 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 2.4: Couch surfing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### National Affordable Housing Agreement: figure numbers and performance information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 2.5: Rates of couch surfing by Indigenous status and remoteness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 2.6: Change in number of couch surfers by remoteness areas, Australia, 2006–2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 2.7: Severe crowding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 2.8: People living in severely crowded dwellings by Indigenous status and remoteness areas, 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 2.9: Rates of severe crowding by country of birth (and Indigenous status), 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 2.10: Temporary accommodation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## National Affordable Housing Agreement: figure numbers and performance information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 2.11: Proportion of people in each sub-type of temporary accommodation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 2.12: Supported accommodation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 2.13: Specialist Homelessness Services clients who had a need for accommodation identified more than once in 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 3.1: Change in number of homeless persons by State and Territory, 2006–2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 3.2: Indigenous overcrowding by State and Territory, 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

This figure identifies dwellings requiring an extra 3 bedrooms, or 4 or more bedrooms, under the Canadian National Occupancy Standard (CNOS). The SCRGSP describes the CNOS as ‘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.’ (SCRGSP contextual appendix to NAHA 2011–12 performance information, p13).
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