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## Figure 1: Plan utilisation summary

For each of the 76 bilateral regions with more than 9 months of experience in Scheme, the utilisation rate is calculated and then compared to the benchmark for that region. This results in a gap to benchmark for each region. A region is more likely to be flagged as a hot spot if it is below the benchmark.

There are 49 regions below benchmark and 27 regions above benchmark. Overall,

* 8 regions have a utilisation rate that is more than 10% below benchmark;
* 11 regions are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 30 regions are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 22 region is 0% to 5% above benchmark;
* 4 regions are 5% to 10% above benchmark; and
* 1 regions are more than 10% above benchmark.

## Figure 2: Plan utilisation for regions with less than $50m in total plan budgets

Of the 23 regions with less than $50m in total plan budgets,

* 8 regions are more than 10% below benchmark;
* 9 regions are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 3 regions are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 1 region is 0% to 5% above benchmark;
* 1 region is 5% to 10% above benchmark; and
* 1 region is more than 10% above benchmark

For these smaller regions, the top five potential hot spot regions have been identified based on their gap to benchmark, weighted by their total plan budget.

1. Outer Gippsland in Victoria, which phased into the Scheme on 1 January 2019, had a utilisation rate of 47% compared to a benchmark of 58%.
2. East Arnhem in Northern Territory, which phased into the Scheme on 1 January 2017, had an utilisation rate of 27%, compared to a benchmark of 65%.
3. Eyre and Western in South Australia, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 0 to 14 years old, had a utilisation rate of 53%, compared to a benchmark of 65%.
4. Limestone Coast in South Australia, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 0 to 14 years old, had a utilisation rate of 61%, compared to a benchmark of 71%.
5. Barkly in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 July 2014, had a utilisation rate of 38%, compared to a benchmark of 75%.

## Figure 3: Plan utilisation for regions with $50m to $150m in total plan budgets

Of the 25 regions with $50m to $150m in total plan budgets,

* 2 regions are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 13 regions are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 8 regions are 0% to 5% above benchmark; and
* 2 regions are 5% to 10% above benchmark.

For these medium-sized regions, the top five potential hot spot regions have been identified based on their gap to benchmark, weighted by their total plan budget.

1. Inner Gippsland in Victoria, which phased into the Scheme on 1 October 2017, had a utilisation rate of 59%, compared to a benchmark of 66%.
2. Darwin Urban in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 January 2017, had a utilisation rate of 64%, compared to a benchmark of 73%.
3. Rockhampton in Queensland, which phased in on 1 January 2018, had a utilisation rate of 66% compared to a benchmark of 69%.
4. Townsville in Queensland, which phased in on 1 April 2016, had a utilisation rate of 69% compared to a benchmark of 72%.
5. Mackay in Queensland, which phased in on 1 November 2016, had a utilisation rate of 68% compared to a benchmark of 71%.

## Figure 4: Plan utilisation for regions with greater than $150m in total plan budgets

Of the 28 regions with greater than $150m in total plan budgets,

* 14 regions are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 13 regions are 0% to 5% above benchmark; and
* 1 region is 5% to 10% above benchmark.

For these larger regions, the top five potential hot spot regions have been identified based on their gap to benchmark, weighted by their total plan budget.

1. Barwon in Victoria, which phased into the Scheme on 1 July 2013, had a utilisation rate of 69%, compared to a benchmark of 73%.
2. Northern Adelaide in South Australia, which phased in on 1 July 2013, had a utilisation rate of 69%, compared to a benchmark of 72%.
3. Toowoomba in Queensland, which phased in on 1 January 2017, had a utilisation rate of 67%, compared to a benchmark of 72%.
4. Western New South Wales in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had a utilisation rate of 67%, compared to benchmark of 71%.
5. Southern Adelaide in South Australia, which phased in on 1 July 2013, had a utilisation rate of 68%, compared to a benchmark of 71%.

## Figure 5: Provider concentration summary

For each of the 76 bilateral regions with more than 9 months of experience in Scheme, the provider concentration level is calculated and then compared to the benchmark national average of 85%. This results in a gap to benchmark for each region. A region is more likely to be flagged as a hot spot if it is above the benchmark.

There are 67 regions below benchmark and 9 regions above benchmark. Overall,

* 15 regions are more than 40% below the benchmark;
* 31 regions are 20% to 40% below the benchmark;
* 21 regions are 0% to 20% below the benchmark;
* 3 regions are 0% to 5% above the benchmark; and
* 6 regions are 5% to 10% above the benchmark.

## Figure 6: Provider concentration for regions with less than $50m in total plan budgets

Of the 23 regions with less than $50m in total plan budgets,

* 4 regions are 20% to 40% below benchmark;
* 10 regions are 0% to 20% below benchmark;
* 3 regions are 0% to 5% above benchmark; and
* 6 regions are 5% to 10% above benchmark.

For these smaller regions, the top five potential hot spot regions have been identified based on their gap to benchmark, weighted by their total plan budget.

1. Central Australia in Northern Territory, which phased into the Scheme on 1 July 2017, had a provider concentration level of 92%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
2. Kimberley-Pilbara in Western Australia, which phased into the Scheme on 1 October 2018, had a provider concentration level of 94% compared to a benchmark of 85%.
3. Barkly in Northern Territory, which phased into the Scheme on 1 July 2014, had a provider concentration level of 94%, compared to benchmark of 85%.
4. Katherine in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had a provider concentration level of 92%, compared to benchmark of 85%.
5. Goldfields-Esperance in Western Australia, which phased into the Scheme on 1 October 2018, had a provider concentration level of 95% compared to a benchmark of 85%.

## Figure 7: Provider concentration for regions with $50m to $150m in total plan budgets

Of the 25 regions with $50m to $150m in total plan budgets,

* 2 regions are more than 40% below benchmark;
* 13 regions are 20% to 40% below benchmark; and
* 10 regions are 0% to 20% below benchmark.

For these medium-sized regions, the top five potential hot spot regions have been identified based on their gap to benchmark, weighted by their total plan budget.

1. Bundaberg in Queensland, which phased in on 1 October 2017, had a provider concentration level of 79%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
2. TAS North West in Tasmania, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 15 to 24 years old, had a provider concentration level of 79%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
3. Western District in Victoria, which phased in on 1 October 2017, had a provider concentration level of 75%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
4. Maryborough in Queensland, which phased in on 1 July 2018, had a provider concentration level of 74% compared to a benchmark of 85%.
5. Darwin Urban in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 January 2017, had a provider concentration level of 71%, compared to benchmark of 85%.

## Figure 8: Provider concentration for regions with greater than $150m in total plan budgets

Of the 28 regions with greater than $150m in total plan budgets,

* 13 regions are more than 40% below benchmark;
* 14 regions are 20% to 40% below benchmark; and
* 1 region is 0% to 20% below benchmark.

For these larger regions, the top five potential hot spot regions have been identified based on their gap to benchmark, weighted by their total plan budget.

1. Southern Adelaide in South Australia, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 0 to 14 years old, had a provider concentration level of 68%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
2. Western New South Wales in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had a provider concentration level of 60%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
3. Northern New South Wales in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had a provider concentration level of 59%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
4. North East Metro in Western Australia, which phased in on 1 July 2014, had a provider concentration level of 51% compared to a benchmark of 85%.
5. Outer East Melbourne in Victoria, which phased in on 1 November 2017, had a provider concentration level of 60% compared to a benchmark of 85%.

## Figure 9: Outcomes indicator on choice and control summary

For each of the 76 bilateral regions with more than 9 months of experience in Scheme, the outcomes indicator on choice and control is calculated and then compared to the benchmark for that region. This results in a gap to benchmark for each region. A region is more likely to be flagged as a hot spot if it is below the benchmark.

There are 33 regions below benchmark and 43 regions above benchmark. Overall,

* 2 regions are more than 10% below the benchmark;
* 12 regions are 5% to 10% below the benchmark;
* 19 region is 0% to 5% below the benchmark;
* 24 regions are 0% to 5% above the benchmark;
* 16 regions are 5% to 10% above the benchmark; and
* 3 regions are more than 10% above the benchmark.

## Figure 10: Outcomes indicator on choice and control for regions with less than $50m in total plan budgets

Of the 23 regions with less than $50m in total plan budgets,

* 2 regions are more than 10% below benchmark;
* 6 regions are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 3 regions are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 4 regions are 0% to 5% above benchmark;
* 6 regions are 5% to 10% above benchmark; and
* 2 region is more than 10% above benchmark.

For these smaller regions, the top five potential hot spot regions have been identified based on their gap to benchmark, weighted by their total plan budget.

1. North Metro in Western Australia, which phased into the Scheme on 1 October 2018, had an outcomes indicator of 45%, compared to a benchmark of 53%.
2. Central Australia in Northern Territory, which phased into the Scheme on 1 July 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 32% compared to a benchmark of 42%.
3. TAS South East in Tasmania, which phased into the Scheme on 1 July 2013, had an outcomes indicator of 41% compared to a benchmark of 48%.
4. Katherine in Northern Territory, which phased into the Scheme on 1 January 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 24%, compared to a benchmark of 44%.
5. East Arnhem in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 January 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 42%, compared to a benchmark of 55%.

## Figure 11: Outcomes indicator on choice and control for regions with $50m to $150m in total plan budgets

Of the 25 regions with $50m to $150m in total plan budgets,

* 8 regions are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 10 region is 0% to 5% above benchmark; and
* 7 regions are 5% to 10% above benchmark.

For these medium-sized regions, the top five potential hot spot regions have been identified based on their gap to benchmark, weighted by their total plan budget.

1. Brimbank Melton in Victoria, which phased in on 1 October 2018, had an outcomes indicator of 47%, compared to a benchmark of 51%.
2. Darwin Urban in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 January 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 39%, compared to a benchmark of 44%.
3. Murrumbidgee in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 47%, compared to a benchmark of 50%.
4. Maroochydore in Queensland, which phased in on 1 January 2019, had an outcomes indicator of 48% compared to a benchmark of 50%.
5. Maryborough in Queensland, which phased in on 1 July 2018, had an outcomes indicator of 47%, compared to a benchmark of 50%.

## Figure 12: Outcomes indicator on choice and control for regions with greater than $150m in total plan budgets

Of the 28 regions with greater than $150m in total plan budgets,

* 6 regions are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 8 regions are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 10 region is 0% to 5% above benchmark;
* 3 region is 5% to 10% above benchmark; and
* 1 regions are more than 10% above benchmark.

For these larger regions, the top five potential hot spot regions have been identified based on their gap to benchmark, weighted by their total plan budget.

1. South Western Sydney in New South Wales, which phased into the Scheme on 1 July 2016, had an outcomes indicator of 42%, compared to benchmark of 50%.
2. Western Sydney in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2016, had an outcomes indicator of 43%, compared to benchmark of 49%.
3. South Eastern Sydney in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 41%, compared to benchmark of 50%.
4. Inner East Melbourne in Victoria, which phased in on 1 November 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 41%, compared to benchmark of 46%.
5. Sydney in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 42%, compared to benchmark of 51%.