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## Figure 1: Plan utilisation summary

For each of the 80 service districts the utilisation rate is calculated and then compared to the benchmark for that service district. This results in a gap to benchmark for each service district. A service district is more likely to be flagged as a “hot spot” if it is below the benchmark.

There are 50 service districts below benchmark and 30 service districts above benchmark. Overall,

* 6 service districts have a utilisation rate that is more than 10% below benchmark;
* 9 service districts are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 35 service districts are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 27 service districts are 0% to 5% above benchmark; and
* 3 service districts are 5% to 10% above benchmark.

## Figure 2: Plan utilisation for service districts with less than $100m in total plan budgets

Of the 28 service districts with less than $100m in total plan budgets,

* 6 service districts are more than 10% below benchmark;
* 5 service districts are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 13 service districts are 0% to 5% below benchmark; and
* 4 service districts are 0% to 5% above benchmark.

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

1. Kimberley-Pilbara in Western Australia, which phased in on 1 October 2018, had an utilisation rate of 51% compared to a benchmark of 65%.
2. Eyre and Western in South Australia, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 0 to 14 years old, had an utilisation rate of 55%, compared to a benchmark of 68%.
3. Murray and Mallee in South Australia, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 0 to 14 years old, had an utilisation rate of 63%, compared to a benchmark of 72%.
4. Goulburn in Victoria, which phased into the Scheme on 1 January 2019, had an utilisation rate of 61%, compared to a benchmark of 66%.
5. Limestone Coast in South Australia, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 0 to 14 years old, had an utilisation rate of 65%, compared to a benchmark of 73%.

## Figure 3: Plan utilisation for service districts with $100m to $250m in total plan budgets

Of the 27 service districts with $100m to $250m in total plan budgets,

* 3 service districts are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 13 service districts are 0% to 5% below benchmark; and
* 11 service districts are 0% to 5% above benchmark.

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

1. Western New South Wales in New South Wales, which phased into the Scheme on 1 July 2017, had an utilisation rate of 67% compared to a benchmark of 73%.
2. Loddon in Victoria, which phased in on 1 May 2017, had an utilisation rate of 67%, compared to a benchmark of 71%.
3. Central Highlands in Victoria, which phased in on 1 January 2017, had an utilisation rate of 68% compared to a benchmark of 73%.
4. Rockhampton in Queensland, which phased in on 1 January 2018, had an utilisation rate of 66%, compared to a benchmark of 71%.
5. Western District in Victoria, which phased in on 1 October 2017, had an utilisation rate of 67%, compared to a benchmark of 74%.

## Figure 4: Plan utilisation for service districts with greater than $250m in total plan budgets

Of the 25 service districts with greater than $250m in total plan budgets,

* 1 service district are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 9 service districts are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 12 service districts are 0% to 5% above benchmark; and
* 3 service districts are 5% to 10% above benchmark.

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

1. Hunter New England in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2013, had an utilisation rate of 72%, compared to a benchmark of 75%.
2. Bayside Peninsula in Victoria, which phased in on 1 April 2018, had an utilisation rate of 66%, compared to a benchmark of 69%.
3. Barwon in Victoria, which phased in on 1 July 2013, had an utilisation rate of 68%, compared to a benchmark of 74%.
4. North East Melbourne in Victoria, which phased in on 1 July 2016, had an utilisation rate of 70%, compared to benchmark of 73%.
5. Outer East Melbourne in Victoria, which phased in on 1 November 2017, had an utilisation rate of 66%, compared to a benchmark of 70%.

## Figure 5: Provider concentration summary

For each of the 80 service districts 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 service district. A service district is more likely to be flagged as a “hot spot” if it is above the benchmark.

There are 74 service districts below benchmark and 6 service districts above benchmark. Overall,

* 19 service districts are more than 40% below the benchmark;
* 33 service districts are 20% to 40% below the benchmark;
* 22 service districts are 0% to 20% below the benchmark;
* 3 service districts are 0% to 5% above the benchmark; and
* 3 service districts are 5% to 10% above the benchmark.

## Figure 6: Provider concentration for service districts with less than $100m in total plan budgets

Of the 28 service districts with less than $100m in total plan budgets,

* 5 service districts are 20% to 40% below benchmark;
* 17 service districts are 0% to 20% below benchmark;
* 3 service districts are 0% to 5% above benchmark; and
* 3 service districts are 5% to 10% above benchmark.

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

1. Midwest-Gascoyne in Western Australia, which phased in on 1 July 2019, had a provider concentration level of 93%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
2. Goldfields-Esperance in Western Australia, which phased in on 1 October 2018, had a provider concentration level of 91%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
3. Far North in South Australia, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 0 to 14 years old, had a provider concentration level of 91%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
4. Great Southern in Western Australia, which phased into the Scheme on 1 July 2019, had a provider concentration level of 88%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
5. East Arnhem in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 January 2017, had a provider concentration level of 87%, compared to benchmark of 85%.

## Figure 7: Provider concentration for service districts with $100m to $250m in total plan budgets

Of the 27 service districts with $100m to $250m in total plan budgets,

* 7 service districts are more than 40% below benchmark;
* 16 service districts are 20% to 40% below benchmark; and
* 4 service districts are 0% to 20% below benchmark.

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

1. Western District in Victoria, which phased into the Scheme on 1 October 2017, had a provider concentration level of 78%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
2. TAS North in Tasmania, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 15 to 24 years old, had a provider concentration level of 68%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
3. Maryborough in Queensland, which phased in on 1 July 2018, had a provider concentration level of 69%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
4. Inner Gippsland in Victoria, which phased in on 1 October 2017, had a provider concentration level of 67%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
5. TAS South West in Tasmania, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 15 to 24 years old, had a provider concentration level of 58%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.

## Figure 8: Provider concentration for service districts with greater than $250m in total plan budgets

Of the 25 service districts with greater than $250m in total plan budgets,

* 12 service districts are more than 40% below benchmark;
* 12 service districts are 20% to 40% below benchmark; and
* 1 service district is 0% to 20% below benchmark.

For these larger service districts, the top five potential “hot spot” service districts 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 provider concentration level of 66%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
2. 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 63%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
3. Australian Capital Territory, which phased in on 1 July 2014, had a provider concentration level of 55%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
4. Outer East Melbourne in Victoria, which phased in on 1 November 2017, had a provider concentration level of 58%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
5. Illawarra Shoalhaven in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had a provider concentration level of 53% compared to a benchmark of 85%.

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

For each of the 80 service districts the outcomes indicator on choice and control is calculated and then compared to the benchmark for that service district. This results in a gap to benchmark for each service district. A service district is more likely to be flagged as a “hot spot” if it is below the benchmark.

There are 36 service districts below benchmark and 44 service districts above benchmark.

Overall,

* 3 service districts are more than 10% below the benchmark;
* 10 service districts are 5% to 10% below the benchmark;
* 23 service district is 0% to 5% below the benchmark;
* 29 service districts are 0% to 5% above the benchmark;
* 14 service districts are 5% to 10% above the benchmark; and
* 1 service district is more than 10% above the benchmark.

## Figure 10: Outcomes indicator on choice and control for service districts with less than $100m in total plan budgets

Of the 28 service districts with less than $100m in total plan budgets,

* 3 service districts are more than 10% below benchmark;
* 4 service districts are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 6 service districts are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 7 service districts are 0% to 5% above benchmark;
* 7 service districts are 5% to 10% above benchmark; and
* 1 service district is more than 10% above benchmark.

For these smaller service districts, the top five potential “hot spot” service districts 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 an outcomes indicator of 38%, compared to a benchmark of 48%.
2. Darwin Remote in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 38%, compared to a benchmark of 57%.
3. TAS South East in Tasmania, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 15 to 24 years old, had an outcomes indicator of 48%, compared to a benchmark of 52%.
4. Katherine in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 31%, compared to a benchmark of 48%.
5. Goldfields-Esperance in Western Australia, which phased in on 1 October 2018, had an outcomes indicator of 45%, compared to a benchmark of 54%.

## Figure 11: Outcomes indicator on choice and control for service districts with $100m to $250m in total plan budgets

Of the 27 service districts with $100m to $250m in total plan budgets,

* 2 service districts are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 7 service districts are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 14 service districts are 0% to 5% above benchmark; and
* 4 service districts are 5% to 10% above benchmark.

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

1. Central North Metro in Western Australia, which phased in on 1 July 2019, had an outcomes indicator of 45%, compared to a benchmark of 52%.
2. Brim bank Melton in Victoria, which phased into the Scheme on 1 October 2018, had an outcomes indicator of 49%, compared to a benchmark of 54%.
3. North Metro in Western Australia, which phased in on 1 October 2018, had an outcomes indicator of 49%, compared to a benchmark of 54%.
4. Darwin Urban in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 January 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 43%, compared to a benchmark of 48%.
5. Northern New South Wales in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 52%, compared to a benchmark of 54%.

## Figure 12: Outcomes indicator on choice and control for service districts with greater than $250m in total plan budgets

Of the 25 service districts with greater than $250m in total plan budgets,

* 4 service districts are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 10 service districts are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 8 service districts are 0% to 5% above benchmark;
* 3 service district is 5% to 10% above benchmark; and

For these larger service districts, the top five potential “hot spot” service districts 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 45%, compared to benchmark of 53%.
2. Western Sydney in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2016, had an outcomes indicator of 47%, compared to benchmark of 52%.
3. South Eastern Sydney in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 45%, compared to benchmark of 52%.
4. Southern Melbourne in Victoria, which phased in on 1 September 2018, had an outcomes indicator of 49%, compared to benchmark of 55%.
5. North Sydney in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2016, had an outcomes indicator of 46%, compared to benchmark of 51%.