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## Figure 1: Plan utilisation summary

For each of the 64 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 39 regions below benchmark and 25 regions above benchmark. Overall,

* 5 regions have a utilisation rate that is more than 10% below benchmark;
* 6 regions are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 28 regions are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 21 region is 0% to 5% above benchmark;
* 2 regions are 5% to 10% above benchmark; and
* 2 regions are more than 10% above benchmark.

## Figure 2: Plan utilisation for regions with less than $25m in total plan budgets

Of the 14 regions with less than $25m in total plan budgets,

* 5 regions are more than 10% below benchmark;
* 4 regions are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 3 regions are 0% to 5% below benchmark; and
* 2 regions are 0% to 5% 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. East Arnhem in Northern Territory, which phased into the Scheme on 1 January 2017, had a utilisation rate of 30%, compared to benchmark of 62%.
2. Murray and Mallee in South Australia, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 0 to 14 years old, had a utilisation rate of 52%, compared to benchmark of 63%.
3. Barkly in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 July 2014, had a utilisation rate of 42%, compared to benchmark of 75%.
4. 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 48%, compared to benchmark of 58%.
5. 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 58%, compared to benchmark of 65%.

## Figure 3: Plan utilisation for regions with $25m to $100m in total plan budgets

Of the 23 regions with $25m to $100m in total plan budgets,

* 2 regions are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 13 regions are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 5 regions are 0% to 5% above benchmark;
* 1 region is 5% to 10% above benchmark; and
* 2 regions are more than 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 53%, compared to benchmark of 62%.
2. Darwin Urban in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 January 2017, had a utilisation rate of 68%, compared to benchmark of 72%.
3. Central Australia in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had a utilisation rate of 70%, compared to benchmark of 77%.
4. Ovens Murray in Victoria, which phased in on 1 October 2017, had a utilisation rate of 62% compared to a benchmark of 64%.
5. Tasmania South East in Tasmania, which phased in on 1 July 2013, had a utilisation rate of 67% compared to a benchmark of 72%.

## Figure 4: Plan utilisation for regions with greater than $100m in total plan budgets

Of the 27 regions with greater than $100m in total plan budgets,

* 12 regions are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 14 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 68%, compared to benchmark of 72%.
2. Bayside Peninsula in Victoria, which phased in on 1 April 2018, had a utilisation rate of 57%, compared to benchmark of 60%.
3. Hunter New England in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2013, had a utilisation rate of 72%, compared to benchmark of 73%.
4. Toowoomba in Queensland, which phased in on 1 January 2017, had a utilisation rate of 65%, compared to benchmark of 69%.
5. Beenleigh in Queensland, which phased in on 1 July 2018, had a utilisation rate of 50%, compared to benchmark of 55%.

## Figure 5: Provider concentration summary

For each of the 64 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 59 regions below benchmark and 5 regions above benchmark. Overall,

* 12 regions are more than 40% below the benchmark;
* 28 regions are 20% to 40% below the benchmark;
* 19 regions are 0% to 20% below the benchmark;
* 3 regions are 0% to 5% above the benchmark;
* 1 region is 5% to 10% above the benchmark; and
* 1 region is more than 10% above the benchmark.

## Figure 6: Provider concentration for regions with less than $25m in total plan budgets

Of the 14 regions with less than $25m in total plan budgets,

* 3 regions are 20% to 40% below benchmark;
* 7 regions are 0% to 20% below benchmark;
* 3 regions are 0% to 5% above benchmark;
* 0 regions are 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. Barkly in Northern Territory, which phased into the Scheme on 1 July 2014, had a provider concentration level of 97%, compared to benchmark of 85%.
2. East Arnhem in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 January 2017, had a provider concentration level of 89%, compared to benchmark of 85%.
3. Katherine in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had a provider concentration level of 87%, compared to benchmark of 85%.
4. Far North in South Australia, which phased in on 1 July 2013, had a provider concentration level of 86%, compared to benchmark of 85%.
5. Darwin remote in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had a provider concentration level of 80%, compared to benchmark of 85%.

## Figure 7: Provider concentration for regions with $25m to $100m in total plan budgets

Of the 23 regions with $25m to $100m in total plan budgets,

* 1 region is more than 40% below benchmark;
* 11 regions are 20% to 40% below benchmark;
* 10 regions are 0% to 20% below benchmark;
* 0 regions are 0% to 5% above benchmark; and
* 1 region is 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. Central Australia in Northern Territory, which phased into the Scheme on 1 July 2017, had a provider concentration level of 94%, compared to 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 82%, compared to benchmark of 85%.
3. Darwin Urban in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 January 2017, had a provider concentration level of 81%, compared to benchmark of 85%.
4. TAS South East in Tasmania, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 15 to 24 years old, had a provider concentration level of 73%, compared to benchmark of 85%.
5. Bundaberg in Queensland, which phased in on 1 October 2017, had a provider concentration level of 78%, compared to benchmark of 85%.

## Figure 8: Provider concentration for regions with greater than $100m in total plan budgets

Of the 27 regions with greater than $100m in total plan budgets,

* 11 region is more than 40% below benchmark;
* 14 regions are 20% to 40% below benchmark; and
* 2 regions are 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. Murrumbidgee in New South Wales, which phased into the Scheme on 1 July 2017, had a provider concentration level of 67%, compared to 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 66%, compared to benchmark of 85%.
3. 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 64%, compared to benchmark of 85%.
4. Northern New South Wales in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had a provider concentration level of 60%, compared to benchmark of 85%.
5. Mid North Coast in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had a provider concentration level of 54%, compared to benchmark of 85%.

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

For each of the 64 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 26 regions below benchmark and 38 regions above benchmark. Overall,

* 2 regions are more than 10% below the benchmark;
* 9 regions are 5% to 10% below the benchmark;
* 15 region is 0% to 5% below the benchmark;
* 26 regions are 0% to 5% above the benchmark;
* 8 regions are 5% to 10% above the benchmark; and
* 4 regions are more than 10% above the benchmark.

## Figure 10: Outcomes indicator on choice and control for regions with less than $25m in total plan budgets

Of the 14 regions with less than $25m in total plan budgets,

* 2 regions are more than 10% below benchmark;
* 0 regions are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 4 regions are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 5 regions are 0% to 5% above benchmark;
* 2 regions are 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. Katherine in Northern Territory, which phased into the Scheme on 1 January 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 25%, compared to benchmark of 47%.
2. East Arnhem in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 January 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 43%, compared to benchmark of 54%.
3. Far North South Australia in South Australia, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 0 to 14 years old, had an outcomes indicator of 43%, compared to benchmark of 47%.
4. Far West in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 49%, compared to benchmark of 51%.
5. Darwin Remote in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 51%, compared to benchmark of 54%.

## Figure 11: Outcomes indicator on choice and control for regions with $25m to $100m in total plan budgets

Of the 23 regions with $25m to $100m in total plan budgets,

* 4 regions are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 3 regions are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 10 region is 0% to 5% above benchmark;
* 5 regions are 5% to 10% above benchmark; and
* 1 region is more than 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. Robina in Queensland, which phased in on 1 July 2018, had an outcomes indicator of 43%, compared to benchmark of 49%.
2. Darwin Urban in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 January 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 35%, compared to benchmark of 43%.
3. Tasmania South East in Tasmania, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 15 to 24 years old, had an outcomes indicator of 35%, compared to benchmark of 45%.
4. Maryborough in Queensland, which phased in on 1 July 2018, had an outcomes indicator of 46%, compared to benchmark of 48%.
5. Central Australia in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 31%, compared to benchmark of 36%.

## Figure 12: Outcomes indicator on choice and control for regions with greater than $100m in total plan budgets

Of the 27 regions with greater than $100m in total plan budgets,

* 5 regions are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 8 regions are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 11 region is 0% to 5% above benchmark;
* 1 region is 5% to 10% above benchmark; and
* 2 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. South Eastern Sydney in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 40%, compared to benchmark of 49%.
3. Western Sydney in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2016, had an outcomes indicator of 43%, compared to benchmark of 48%.
4. Inner East Melbourne in Victoria, which phased in on 1 November 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 39%, compared to benchmark of 46%.
5. Sydney in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 41%, compared to benchmark of 49%.