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## Page 1, Table 1: Service district summary

For **participants not receiving Supported Independent Living (SIL)/SDA** across each of the 80 service districts, 7 indicators have been calculated. These are:

* Participants per provider;
* Provider concentration;
* Provider growth;
* Provider shrinkage;
* Utilisation;
* Outcomes indicator on choice and control; and
* “Has the NDIS helped with choice and control?” indicator

The number of active Non-SIL/SDA participants with approved plans, the number of active providers, total plan budgets and total payments are also shown. Indicators are added where the top 10 percentile and bottom 10 percentile of service districts – by gap to benchmark – are highlighted.

For **participants not receiving SIL/SDA per provider**, the top 10 percentile service districts are as follows.

* Far West (New South Wales) has 6.1 participants per provider.
* Sydney (New South Wales) has 7.0.
* Barkly (Northern Territory) has 3.0.
* Central Australia (Northern Territory) has 5.0.
* Darwin Remote (Northern Territory) has 5.6.
* East Arnhem (Northern Territory) has 4.9.
* Katherine (Northern Territory) has 2.4.
* Wheat Belt (Western Australia) has 5.2.

The bottom 10 percentile service districts are as follows.

* Hunter New England (New South Wales) has 17.8 participants per provider.
* Mid North Coast (New South Wales) has 18.1.
* Northern New South Wales (New South Wales) has 17.4.
* Bayside Peninsula (Victoria) has 17.6.
* Western District (Victoria) has 16.7.
* Northern Adelaide (South Australia) has 22.1.
* Southern Adelaide (South Australia) has 18.6.
* Australian Capital Territory has 19.1.

For **provider concentration**, the top 10 percentile service districts are as follows.

* Hunter New England (New South Wales) has provider concentration level of 32%.
* Nepean Blue Mountains (New South Wales) has 42%.
* South Western Sydney (New South Wales) has 28%.
* Western Sydney (New South Wales) has 31%.
* Hume Moreland (Victoria) has 43%.
* Brisbane (Queensland) has 42%.
* North East Metro (Western Australia) has 42%.
* South Metro (Western Australia) has 38%.

The bottom 10 percentile service districts are as follows.

* Mallee (Victoria) has provider concentration level of 83%.
* Eyre and Western (South Australia) has 87%.
* Far North (South Australia) has 86%.
* Limestone Coast (South Australia) has 88%.
* East Arnhem (Northern Territory) has 90%.
* Goldfields – Esperance (Western Australia) has 84%.
* Great Southern (Western Australia) has 88%.
* Midwest – Gascoyne (Western Australia) has 88%.

For **provider growth**, the top 10 percentile service districts are as follows.

* Bundaberg (Queensland) has provider growth of 15% since the previous exposure period.
* Robina (Queensland) has 15%.
* Far North (South Australia) has 19%.
* TAS North West (Tasmania) has 16%.
* Barkly (Northern Territory) has 17%.
* Darwin Remote (Northern Territory) has 21%.
* Kimberley – Pilbara (Western Australia) has 17%.
* Midwest – Gascoyne (Western Australia) has 19%.

The bottom 10 percentile service districts are as follows.

* Far West (New South Wales) has provider growth of 5% since the previous exposure period.
* North Sydney (New South Wales) has 7%.
* Adelaide Hills (South Australia) has 5%.
* Eastern Adelaide (South Australia) has 5%.
* Eyre and Western (South Australia) has 3%.
* Limestone Coast (South Australia) has 5%.
* Murray and Mallee (South Australia) has 7%.
* East Arnhem (Northern Territory) has 0%.

For **provider shrinkage**, the top 10 percentile service districts are as follows.

* Bayside Peninsula (Victoria) has provider shrinkage of 15% since the previous exposure period.
* Outer Gippsland (Victoria) has 15%.
* Western District (Victoria) has 11%.
* Bundaberg (Queensland) has 12%.
* Maryborough (Queensland) has 14%.
* Far North (South Australia) has 14%.
* Great Southern (Western Australia) has 14%.
* Wheat Belt (Western Australia) has 15%.

The bottom 10 percentile service districts are as follows.

* Far West (New South Wales) has provider shrinkage of 38% since the previous exposure period.
* Limestone Coast (South Australia) has 30%.
* Yorke and Mid North (South Australia) has 27%.
* TAS North (Tasmania) has 30%.
* Barkly (Northern Territory) has 39%.
* Darwin Remote (Northern Territory) has 32%.
* East Arnhem (Northern Territory) has 44%.
* Goldfields – Esperance (Western Australia) has 27%.

For **utilisation**, the top 10 percentile service districts are as follows.

* Beenleigh (Queensland) has utilisation of 74%.
* Brisbane (Queensland) has 72%.
* Caboolture/Strathpine (Queensland) has 72%.
* Maroochydore (Queensland) has 72%.
* Robina (Queensland) has 76%.
* Central North Metro (Western Australia) has 70%.
* South East Metro (Western Australia) has 69%.
* South West (Western Australia) has 70%.

The bottom 10 percentile service districts are as follows.

* Far West (New South Wales) has utilisation of 54%.
* Western New South Wales (New South Wales) has 58%.
* Eyre and Western (South Australia) has 55%.
* Far North (South Australia) has 46%.
* Barkly (Northern Territory) has 47%.
* Darwin Remote (Northern Territory) has 53%.
* East Arnhem (Northern Territory) has 38%.
* Kimberley-Pilbara (Western Australia) has 52%.

For **outcomes indicator on choice and control**, the top 10 percentile service districts are as follows.

* Barwon (Victoria) has an outcomes indicator on choice and control of 67%.
* Eastern Adelaide (South Australia) has 66%.
* Eyre and Western (South Australia) has 66%.
* Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island (South Australia) has 68%.
* Limestone Coast (South Australia) has 67%.
* Murray and Mallee (South Australia) has 67%.
* Australian Capital Territory has 67%.
* Barkly (Northern Territory) has 72%.

The bottom 10 percentile service districts are as follows.

* South Eastern Sydney (New South Wales) has an outcomes indicator on choice and control of 51%.
* South Western Sydney (New South Wales) has 48%.
* Central Australia (Northern Territory) has 50%.
* Darwin Remote (Northern Territory) has 40%.
* East Arnhem (Northern Territory) has 47%.
* Katherine (Northern Territory) has 38%.
* Central North Metro (Western Australia) has 50%.
* Goldfields – Esperance (Western Australia) has 47%.

For **“Has the NDIS helped with choice and control?” indicator**, the top 10 percentile service districts are as follows.

* Beenleigh (Queensland) has an indicator of 82%.
* Brisbane (Queensland) has 81%.
* Bundaberg (Queensland) has 79%.
* Mackay (Queensland) has 79%.
* Maroochydore (Queensland) has 85%.
* Maryborough (Queensland) has 80%.
* Toowoomba (Queensland) has 81%.
* Katherine (Northern Territory) has 85%.

The bottom 10 percentile service districts are as follows.

* Far North (South Australia) has an indicator of 52%.
* Barkly (Northern Territory) has 63%.
* Darwin Remote (Northern Territory) has 36%.
* East Arnhem (Northern Territory) has 48%.
* Goldfields – Esperance (Western Australia) has 59%.
* Kimberley – Pilbara (Western Australia) has 65%.
* Midwest – Gascoyne (Western Australia) has 64%.
* Wheat Belt (Western Australia) has 62%.

## Page 2, Table 1: Support category summary, for all service districts

For each of the 15 support categories, the same indicators have been calculated. The number of active participants not receiving SIL/SDA with approved plans, the number of active providers, total plan budgets and total payments are also shown. Indicators are added where the top 10 percentile and bottom 10 percentile of service districts – by gap to benchmark – are highlighted.

For **participants per provider**, the top 10 percentile support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Home Living has 17.2 participants per provider.
* Capacity Building – Lifelong Learning has 9.1.

The bottom 10 percentile support categories are as follows.

* Core – Transport has 176.9 participants per provider.
* Capacity Building – Choice and Control has 218.4.

For **provider concentration**, the top 10 percentile support categories are as follows.

* Core – Community has a provider concentration level of 24%.
* Capacity Building – Support Coordination has 12%.

The bottom 10 percentile support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Home Living has a provider concentration level of 49%.
* Capacity Building – Lifelong Learning has 92%.

For **provider growth**, the top 10 percentile support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Home Living has provider growth of 25% since the previous exposure period.
* Capital – Home Modifications has 20%.

The bottom 10 percentile support categories are as follows.

* Core – Transport has a provider growth of 3% since the previous exposure period.
* Capacity Building – Lifelong Learning has 0%.

For **provider shrinkage**, the top 10 percentile support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Choice and Control has provider shrinkage of 4% since the previous exposure period.
* Capacity Building – Lifelong Learning has 0%.

The bottom 10 percentile support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Employment has provider shrinkage of 45% since the previous exposure period.
* Capital – Assistive Technology has 33%.

For **utilisation**, the top 10 percentile support categories are as follows.

* Core – Transport has an utilisation rate of 103%.
* Capacity Building – Choice and Control has 99%.

The bottom 10 percentile support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Home Living has an utilisation rate of 21%.
* Capacity Building – Lifelong Learning has 32%.

For **outcomes indicator on choice and control**, the top 10 percentile support categories are as follows.

* Capital – Assistive Technology has an outcomes indicator of 69%.
* Capital – Home Modifications has 72%.

The bottom 10 percentile support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Lifelong Learning has an outcomes indicator 36%.
* Capacity Building – Relationships has 22%.

For **“Has the NDIS helped with choice and control?” indicator**, the top 10 percentile support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Health and Wellbeing has an indicator of 80%.
* Capital – Home Modifications has 81%.

The bottom 10 percentile support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Home Living has an indicator of 66%.
* Capacity Building – Relationships has 68%.

## Page 2, Table 2: Definitions for the indicators

* **Active participants with approved plans** is defined as the number of active participants who have an approved plan and reside in the service district / have supports relating to the support category in their plan.
* **Active providers** is defined as the number of providers that received payments for supports provided to participants within the service district / support category, over the exposure period.
* **Participants per provider** is defined as the ratio between the number of active participants and the number of active providers.
* **Provider concentration** is defined as the proportion of provider payments over the exposure period that were paid to the top 10 providers.
* **Provider growth** is defined as the proportion of providers for which payments have grown by more than 100% compared to the previous exposure period. Only providers that received more than $10,000 in payments in both exposure periods have been considered.
* **Provider shrinkage** is defined as the proportion of providers for which payments have shrunk by more than 25% compared to the previous exposure period. Only providers that received more than $10,000 in payments in both exposure periods have been considered.
* **Total plan budgets** is defined as the value of supports committed in participant plans for the exposure period.
* **Payments** is defined as the value of all payments over the exposure period, including payments to providers, payments to participants, and off-system payments (in-kind and Younger People In Residential Aged Care).
* **Utilisation** is defined as the ratio between payments and total plan budgets.
* **Outcomes indicator on choice and control** is defined as the proportion of participants who reported in their most recent outcomes survey that they choose who supports them.
* **“Has the NDIS helped with choice and control?”** indicator is defined as the proportion of participants who reported in their most recent outcomes survey that the NDIS has helped with choice and control.
* Note: A higher score is considered to be ‘good’ performance under some metrics. For example, a high utilisation rate is a sign of a functioning market where participants have access to the supports they need. For other metrics, a lower score is considered to be ‘good’ performance. For example, a low provider concentration is a sign of a competitive market.