NATIONAL REGULATORY SYSTEM
COMMUNITY HOUSING
A joint initiative of Commonwealth, State and Territory Governments

NRSCH Performance Metrics

Information for providers

This guidance is intended to provide general advice aligned with the NRSCH Regulatory Code. Where more detailed or jurisdiction-specific clarification is required to complete the metrics, you should consult your compliance analyst, who will be familiar with the relevant policy settings within their state or territory.

What are performance metrics?

NRSCH metrics are operational and financial measures used to assess the performance of community housing providers. They do not determine compliance on their own but help identify strengths, risks, and areas for improvement. The Registrar considers both the metrics and provider explanations when reviewing results.

Why are metrics collected?

- **Continuous improvement**: Identify strengths and areas for development.
- **Transparency:** Provide clear, evidence-based communication about performance.
- **Accountability:** Support effective management and governance.

How are metrics used?

- Metrics are grouped into seven key areas covering financial and non-financial indicators. The following information relates to non-financial metrics (Performance Outcomes 1-6). Financial Viability Guidance is available by clicking the link or visiting the NRSCH website.
- Results use a traffic-light system (green, amber, red). Red or amber signals data outside target range, not failure.
- Each metric has a defined formula and target range, calculated from compliance return data. The tables below set out the calculation and thresholds for each metrics.

Results will always be interpreted alongside a provider's explanation and contextual factors.

Useful resources

- Data Definitions – Registration and compliance return
- Financial Viability Guidance

Performance Outcome 1: Tenancy and housing services metrics

Tenancy and housing services metrics provide objective indicators of how effectively a provider manages tenancies and delivers core housing services. These metrics cover eviction rates, tenant satisfaction, survey participation, and the overall quality of housing services. Strong performance in these metrics typically signals effective tenancy management, high tenant satisfaction, and strong engagement.

What are we measuring?	Purpose	How the information is used
Metrics 1.2.4a – Short/medium-term eviction rate **Definition:** The proportion of tenants evicted from short- and medium-term housing during the year, expressed as a percentage of all short- and medium-term tenancies at 30 June. **Short/medium-term housing** is often time-limited, transitional, or linked to specific support programs. **Formula:** 1.2.4a *Number of short- to medium-term evictions for the year ÷ 1.2.1a Number of short- and medium-term tenancies at 30 June* **Indicator:** Green: < 3.5% Amber: ≥ 3.5%	To assess risks associated with unsuccessful tenancies and their potential impact on tenancy management, maintenance, and financial performance.	To support analysis of eviction trends and underlying causes of eviction in short- and medium-term accommodation. Short – medium tenancies tend to be shorter, less stable and may involve more complex support needs. As a result, providers may face a higher likelihood of eviction events. This is reflected in the thresholds.
Metrics 1.2.4b – Long-term eviction rate **Definition:** The proportion of tenants evicted from long-term housing during the year, expressed as a percentage of all long-term	To assess risks associated with unsuccessful tenancies and their potential impact on tenancy management, maintenance, and financial performance.	To support analysis of eviction trends and underlying causes of eviction in long-term accommodation. Long-term housing is expected to be more

What are we measuring?	Purpose	How the information is used
tenancies at 30 June. **Formula:** 1.2.4b *Number of long-term evictions for the year ÷ 1.2.1b Number of long-term tenancies at 30 June* **Indicator:** Green: ≤ 1% Amber: > 1%		stable, which is why a lower eviction rate thresholds applies to long-term tenancies when assessing performance.
Metrics 1.3a – Tenant response rate **Definition:** The percentage of tenants who complete and return the tenant survey. **Formula:** 1.4.3 *Number of surveys returned ÷ 1.2.1 Total tenancies for the year* **Indicator:** Green: ≥ 10% Amber: < 10%	To provide an indicator of the effectiveness of engagement and provider communication in encouraging survey participation. The response rate directly affects the provider's ability to understand tenant needs and make evidence-based improvements to services.	The tenant response rate provides insight into how accessible and effective the provider's feedback channels are. It provides insights into how easily tenants access, understand, and complete the survey.
Metrics 1.3b - Survey return rate **Definition:** The percentage of distributed surveys that are completed and returned. **Formula:** 1.4.3 *Number of surveys returned* ÷ 1.4.2 *Number of surveys*	To provide an indicator of the quality and reliability of survey data.	To understand the accuracy and usefulness of analysis. It provides insight into how well providers connect with tenants and whether improvements are required in engagement strategies.

What are we measuring?	Purpose	How the information is used
distributed **Indicator:** Green: ≥ 25% Amber: 5–24% Red: < 5%		
Metrics 1.4 – Tenant satisfaction rate **Definition:** The percentage of tenants who report being satisfied with the overall quality of housing services, based on survey responses received. **Formula:** 1.4.4 *Number of satisfied responses* ÷ 1.4.3 *Number of surveys returned* **Indicator:** Green: ≥ 75% Amber: 50–74% Red: < 50%	To provide a direct indicator of tenant experience and service quality and assess tenants' overall satisfaction with the housing services they receive.	This information helps assess how effectively a provider is meeting tenant needs and delivering core tenancy services. It helps identify what is working well and highlights areas requiring continuous improvement.

Performance Outcome 2: Housing asset metrics

Housing asset metrics provide objective, transparent indicators of how effectively a provider manages its properties and delivers related services. These metrics cover property condition, maintenance timeliness, repairs, project delivery, occupancy, and tenant satisfaction. Strong performance in these metrics typically signals effective asset management and high service quality.

Metrics 2.4a–2.4d (projects on time/budget at completion and in-progress schedule/budget) provide a combined view of both retrospective delivery reliability and current pipeline health. These indicators help assess whether a provider is delivering projects as planned and managing emerging risks effectively. Strong performance in these metrics typically signals effective planning, governance, and financial stewardship.

What are we measuring?	Purpose	How the information is used
Metrics 2.1a - Percentage of properties meeting state standard **Definition:** Completed inspections by qualified persons where the condition of the tenancy unit met relevant state housing authority property condition standards as a percentage of inspections completed on the condition of individual tenancy units during the year **Formula:** 2.1.4 *Number of condition standards met* ÷ 2.1.3 *Number of condition inspections completed* **Indicator:** • Green: ≥ 70% • Amber: 60%–69% • Red: < 60%	To provide an objective indicator of asset management effectiveness. Strong performance signals that properties are being maintained to required standards and that tenants are receiving high-quality housing services.	By tracking the percentage of properties that meet standards, providers and regulators can pinpoint where maintenance efforts need to be prioritised—especially if the percentage falls below the thresholds. The results support accountability, regulatory oversight, and continuous improvement across the sector.

What are we measuring?	Purpose	How the information is used
Metrics 2.2a - Urgent repairs completed within jurisdictional limits **Definition:** Urgent repairs completed within jurisdictional requirements as a percentage of urgent repairs requested including requests outstanding from the previous year. **Formula:** 2.2.2 *Urgent repairs completed* ÷ 2.2.1 *Urgent repair requests* **Indicator:** • Green: ≥ 90% • Amber: 79%–89% • Red: < 79%	To measure how effectively providers respond to urgent maintenance needs. High performance indicates responsiveness and reliability in addressing critical issues which is a key aspect of high-quality housing services.	Results pinpoint opportunities to improve maintenance workflows, contractor performance, or resource allocation. Persistent delays may signal operational risks requiring regulatory follow-up.
Metrics 2.2b - Percentage of tenants satisfied with maintenance services out of those responding to the question **Definition:** Tenants who express satisfaction with maintenance services as a percentage of those answering the question. **Formula:** 2.3.1 Satisfied with maintenance/ 2.3.2 Responding to maintenance question	To objectively measure how well providers are meeting tenant expectations for maintenance services, to support accountability, and to drive continuous improvement in service quality.	Used to identify service improvement needs in maintenance quality or communication. By tracking tenant satisfaction, providers are held accountable for the quality of their maintenance services. If satisfaction rates are low, it signals a need for providers to review and improve their maintenance processes, communication, or contractor performance.

What are we measuring?	Purpose	How the information is used
Indicator: Green ≥75%, Amber 65–74%, Red <65%		
Metrics 2.2c - Percentage non urgent repairs completed within jurisdictional limits **Definition:** Non urgent repairs completed within jurisdictional requirements as a percentage of non urgent repairs requested including requests outstanding from the previous year. **Formula:** 2.2.4 Non urgent repairs completed/ 2.2.3 Non-urgent repair requests **Indicator:** Green ≥80%, Amber 70–79%, Red <70%	This metric serves as an objective indicator of a provider's ability to handle the management of housing assets. It measures how well providers are responding to non-urgent maintenance needs.	Used to highlight process or contractor issues and improve workflow. By monitoring the completion rate of non-urgent repairs, providers and regulators can pinpoint where maintenance processes or contractor performance may need to be improved.
Metrics 2.3b - Percentage of tenants expressing satisfaction with the condition of the property as a percentage of those responding to the question **Definition:** Tenants who express satisfaction with overall condition of the housing unit as a percentage of those answering the question.	This metric provides an objective measure of how well providers are maintaining their housing stock. High satisfaction rates signal that providers are delivering quality housing services and maintaining properties to a high standard.	To understand how tenants feel about the overall condition of their housing units. Tenant satisfaction is a direct indicator of whether the physical condition of properties meets tenant needs and expectations. It ensures that providers are held to consistent standards and that tenants' voices are considered in service delivery and improvement

What are we measuring?	Purpose	How the information is used
Formula: 2.3.4 Satisfied with overall condition/2.3.5 Responding to condition question **Indicator:** Green >=75% Amber 65 – 74% Red <65%		plans.
Metrics 2.3c - Percentage of tenants responding to the question on satisfaction with the condition of the property as a percentage of the survey response **Definition:** Tenants responding to the question on satisfaction with the condition of the property as a percentage of the survey response. **Formula:** 2.3.5 Responding to condition question/ 1.4.3 Number of surveys returned **No indicator**	To assess tenant engagement with property condition feedback to ensure the reliability of satisfaction data and to support continuous improvement in tenant engagement and service delivery.	To understand how many tenants are actively providing feedback on the condition of their housing units. This helps gauge the level of tenant engagement and the representativeness of the satisfaction data collected. A higher response rate to the satisfaction question means the results are more reliable and reflective of the broader tenant population. If only a small proportion of tenants respond, the data may not accurately represent overall tenant sentiment. Tracking this metric helps providers and regulators pinpoint whether there are barriers to tenants sharing their views. If response rates are low, it may indicate a need to improve communication strategies, simplify surveys, or offer incentives for participation.

What are we measuring?	Purpose	How the information is used
Metrics 2.4a – Project status This metrics is assigned to each Project in progress in the 5-Year Growth Plan. **Formula:** Based on response to 'Project status' in 5-year Growth Plan **Indicator:** Green Project status = Project is on track and no issues to report Amber Project status = • Project is on track but there may be some upcoming issues, or • Project is experiencing some issues that could impact progress; or • Project is impacted by issues that need attention Red Project status = • Project is significantly impacted by issues that could result in the project being terminated OR • Project is abandoned, terminated or suspended	This metrics forms part of a broader set of project performance indicators that together help assess planning, governance and delivery effectiveness.	Used to identify delays and improve project management practices. It provides insight into how reliably providers deliver projects, identifies risks or weaknesses in planning and governance and promotes continuous improvement in the management of asset programs. Tracking whether projects are delivered on time helps regulators identify where these risks may exist so that they can be explored with the provider.

What are we measuring?	Purpose	How the information is used
Metrics 2.4b Project on budget This metrics is assigned to each Project in progress in the 5-Year Growth Plan. **Formula:** Based on response to 'Project on budget' in 5-year Growth Plan **Indicator:** Green Project on budget =Yes Red Project on budget = No	To assess whether providers are managing project costs effectively. Staying within budget may demonstrate strong financial stewardship, good planning, and effective contractor and risk management.	Tracking this measure helps identify any cost overruns and supports discussions about planning processes, financial oversight, and opportunities to strengthen project governance.

No metrics are applied to Performance Outcome 3

Performance Outcome 4: Governance metrics

Governance metrics provide insight into the effectiveness, accountability, and maturity of a provider's leadership and oversight. Regular governing body meetings, timely reviews, and up-to-date risk and financial controls are indicators of strong, proactive governance. These metrics help demonstrate whether the provider's leadership is engaged, decisions are made with appropriate representation, and key risks are actively managed. Strong performance in governance metrics is linked to better service delivery and long-term sustainability.

What are we measuring ?	Purpose	How is this information used?
Metrics 4.1a - Number of governing body meetings held **Definition:** This metrics records whether the governing body met at least six times in the year. It is derived from the field reference: **Formula:** 4.1.3 Number held **Indicator:** Green >=6 Red <6	To measure the regularity and consistency of governing body oversight. Meeting frequency helps show whether leadership is engaged and responsive to issues as they arise.	Supports assessment of governance rhythm appropriate to the scale and complexity of community housing operations and triggers review if meetings fall below expectations.
Metrics 4.1b - Percentage of meetings held that were quorate **Definition:** This metric measures the percentage of governing body meetings that were quorate—that is, meetings where enough members were present to make formal decisions. **Formula:** 4.1.4 Number held that were quorate/ 4.1.3 Number held **Indicator:** Green >=80% Red <80%	To assess whether the organisation has a reliable and functional governance structure. Quoracy shows whether the provider has a functioning and dependable governance structure and can make timely and effective decisions.	Helps identify early signs of governance instability such as poor attendance, availability issues, or insufficient board composition. These may prompt further regulatory review.

What are we measuring ?	Purpose	How is this information used?
Metrics 4.3.2 - Governing body evaluation currency **Definition:** This metrics captures the date of the last governing body evaluation compared with the application due date **Formula:** 4.3.2 Overall performance evaluation **Indicator:** Green: Governing body evaluation completed within the last 3 years Red: Governing body evaluation is more than 3 years old	To assess how regularly the governing body reviews its performance. Routine evaluations demonstrate accountability, strategic capability, and a commitment to continuous improvement.	Supports the regulator's understanding of governance maturity and helps identify when intervention or follow-up may be required. Regular evaluations signal strong leadership capability.
Metrics 4.3.3 - CEO performance review currency **Definition:** This metrics records the date of the last CEO performance review and compares it to the provider's application due date. **Formula:** 4.3.3 CEO performance evaluation **Indicator** >1 year from due date.	To confirm that the governing body is actively overseeing the organisation's most senior leader. Regular reviews support leadership accountability and effective organisational performance management.	Contributes to the wider governance assessment, helping regulators understand leadership stability, governance processes, and the organisation's capability to address emerging risks.
Metrics 4.4.4 - Budget sign off currency **Definition:** This metrics captures whether the organisation's *annual*	To assess timely financial governance and organisational preparedness. On-time budget approval is a critical responsibility of the governing body.	A late sign-off may indicate governance or financial planning risks and may trigger further regulatory investigation into broader governance performance.

What are we measuring ?	Purpose	How is this information used?
financial budget was signed off on or before 31 July of the current year. **Formula:** 4.5.2 Financial budget sign off **Indicator:** Green: signed by 31 July Red: signed after 31 July		
Metrics 4.5.1 - Risk management system currency **Definition:** This metrics records the date of the last review of the provider's risk management system, compared with the application due date. **Formula:** 4.5.1 Review of risk management system **Indicator:** Green: Risk management framework reviewed within the last 2 years Red: Risk management framework review is 2 years or older	To confirm that providers maintain up-to-date and effective risk management systems. Regular reviews ensure risks are identified, assessed, and managed proactively.	Supports assessment of governance maturity and helps identify early warning signs of operational or governance risk. This informs risk-based regulatory oversight.

Performance Outcome 5: Probity metrics

Probity metrics provide objective indicators of a provider's commitment to integrity, ethical conduct, and risk management. These metrics cover the currency of the code of conduct, sufficiency of employment checks, and the regular review of fraud, corruption, and criminal conduct systems. Strong performance in these metrics typically signals robust probity controls and organisational integrity.

What the metric measures	Purpose	How is this information used?
Metrics 5.1 - Currency of code of conduct **Definition:** Records the date of the most recent review of the provider's Code of Conduct compared with the application due date. **Formula:** 5.1.1 Date of last review **Indicator:** Red Last review was more than 3 years before the due date.	To confirm that providers maintain a current and robust Code of Conduct that supports ethical governance, clear staff expectations, and organisational integrity.	Used to assess probity maturity, identify emerging organisational or compliance risks, and support risk-based regulatory oversight.
Metrics 5.2 - Sufficiency of employment checks (number of positions requiring checks recruited to and number of checks completed) **Definition:** Compares the number of positions requiring probity-related employment checks with the number of checks completed: **Formula:** 5.2.4 Number of checks completed – 5.2.3 Number of positions filled **Indicator:** Green Checks completed = or > positions requiring checks Red Checks completed < positions requiring checks	To ensure all required probity checks are completed for relevant positions. This safeguards organisational integrity, risk management, safety, and compliance.	Helps identify gaps in HR and governance systems, informs risk-based follow-up, and supports monitoring of safe and appropriate recruitment practices.

What the metric measures	Purpose	How is this information used?
Metrics 5.3 - Currency of date of review of fraud, corruption and criminal conduct **Definition:** Records the date of the last review of the provider's fraud, corruption, and criminal conduct management systems, **Formula**: 5.3.2 Date of last review **Indicator:** Green: Last review ≤ 2 years before due date Red: Last review > 2 years before due date	To ensure providers regularly review and maintain effective systems for managing fraud, corruption, and criminal conduct.	The information is used to identify potential probity risks early, assess organisational integrity, and support risk-based regulatory oversight.

Performance Outcome 6: Management metrics

Management metrics provide objective indicators of how effectively a provider manages its housing portfolio and tenancy operations. These metrics cover occupancy rates, tenancy turnover, turnaround times for vacant properties, rent outstanding, and rent foregone. Strong performance in these metrics typically signals efficient operational management and financial stewardship.

What the metric measures	Purpose	How is this information used?
Metrics 6.1a - Occupancy rate **Definition:** The percentage of tenancy units that are occupied at a point in time. **Formula**: 6.1.12 Total number of tenancy units - 6.1.1 Nbr vacant tenantable tenancy units)/ 6.1.12 Total number of tenancy units **Indicator:** Green: ≥ 97% Amber: < 97%	To understand whether providers are effectively utilising their housing stock and to identify potential operational or financial risks early.	Results are used to assess occupancy efficiency, financial sustainability, and the provider's ability to meet housing demand. Low occupancy may signal avoidable vacancies, operational constraints, or demand-management issues.
Metrics 6.1b - Tenancy turnover **Definition:** The percentage of tenancies that exit during the year, based on the average number of tenancies over the previous two years. **Formula:** 6.1.6 Tenancy exits for the year ÷ [(6.1.4 previous-year tenancies + 6.1.5 current-year tenancies)/2] *There is no indicator for this metrics*	To understand tenancy stability, service effectiveness, and operational efficiency. **Low turnover** may indicate stable, long-term housing outcomes. **High turnover** can suggest challenges such as tenancy sustainability issues, poor property–tenant fit, inadequate support services, or operational inefficiencies.	Turnover is assessed alongside occupancy and turnaround times to provide a holistic view of tenancy management performance and to identify areas where additional support, operational changes, or process improvements may be required.

What the metric measures	Purpose	How is this information used?
Metrics 6.1c - Tenancy turnaround (tenantable) **Definition:** The average number of calendar days that tenantable properties remain vacant before being re-let. **Formula:** 6.1.7 Calendar days vacant (tenantable) ÷ 6.1.11 Number of vacant tenantable units re-let **Indicator:** Green: ≤ 14 days Amber: >14 to <29 days Red: ≥ 29 days	To measure how quickly tenantable properties are returned to service and to identify financial and operational risks arising from unnecessary delays.	This metric helps assess operational efficiency and the provider's ability to minimise avoidable vacancies and make the best use of available housing stock.
Metrics 6.1d Tenancy turnaround (untenantable) **Definition:** The average calendar days vacant (untenantable) determined with reference to the total number of actual vacant untenantable properties relet. **Formula:** 6.1.8 Calendar days vacant untenantable/6.1.10 Nbr vacant untenantable relet **Indicator:** Green <=28 days Amber 29 - 35 days Red >=36 days	To understand the timeliness of repairs and reinstatement of untenantable properties to its habitable standard.	Results highlight delays or bottlenecks caused by repairs, contractor performance, or asset-management processes that extend vacancy periods and affect service delivery.

What the metric measures	Purpose	How is this information used?
Metrics 6.2a - Rent outstanding **Definition:** Rent outstanding from current and former tenants as a percentage of total potential rental income **Formula:** 6.2.2 Rent outstanding current, former tenants/ 6.2.3 Total potential rental income ($) **Indicator:** Red >2.5% Green <= 2.5%	To measure financial performance and assess the effectiveness of income-management practices.	High rent arrears may prompt review of income-management processes, support strategies for tenants, and broader financial oversight.
Metrics 6.2b - Rent foregone (vacant tenantable) **Definition:** Total rent foregone as a percentage of the total potential rental income **Formula:** 6.2.1 Rent foregone vacant tenantable/ 6.2.3 Total potential rental income ($) **Indicator:** Red >2.5% Green <=2.5%	To track financial loss arising from tenantable properties that remain vacant and therefore do not generate income.	This information is used to identify operational issues contributing to avoidable vacancies, assess financial sustainability, and support discussions on improving allocation processes and turnaround times.

Title: NRSCH Performance Metrics – Information for providers

Document Owner: NRSCH

TRIM Ref: D26/124627

Classification: Guidance

Applicability: Providers seeking registration or registered under the NRSCH

Document History

Version: 2.2

Effective Date: 5 August 2026

Next Review Date: August 2027

Reason for Amendment:

- Update to traffic light indicators for *Metric 4.3.2 (Governing Body Evaluation)* and *Metric 4.5.1 (Risk Management Currency)* to align the assessment approach
- Update threshold error in metric 2.2b. Correct threshold is 75%