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## Page 1, Table 1: Service district summary

For each of the 80 service districts with more than 9 months experience in Scheme, 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 participants with approved plans, the number of registered active providers, total plan budgets and total payments are also shown. The 7 indicators have a ‘traffic light system’ where the top 10% and bottom 10% of districts – by gap to benchmark – are highlighted.

For **participants per provider**, the top 10% districts are as follows.

* Far North (South Australia) has 5.5 participants per provider.
* Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island (South Australia) has 5.7.
* Barkly (Northern Territory) has 3.8.
* Central Australia (Northern Territory) has 4.1.
* Darwin Remote (Northern Territory) has 5.5.
* East Arnhem (Northern Territory) has 4.6.
* Katherine (Northern Territory) has 2.2.
* Wheat Belt (Western Australia) has 4.5.

The bottom 10% districts are as follows.

* Hunter New England (New South Wales) has 15.9 participants per provider.
* Illawarra Shoalhaven (New South Wales) has 13.2.
* Mid North Coast (New South Wales) has 13.2.
* Northern New South Wales (New South Wales) has 14.3.
* Outer Gippsland (Victoria) has 13.0.
* Northern Adelaide (South Australia) has 17.7.
* Southern Adelaide (South Australia) has 14.9.
* Australian Capital Territory has 16.4.

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

* Hunter New England (New South Wales) has provider concentration level of 28%.
* South Western Sydney (New South Wales) has 32%.
* Western Sydney (New South Wales) has 35%.
* Hume Moreland (Victoria) has 34%.
* North East Melbourne (Victoria) has 35%.
* Brisbane (Queensland) has 35%.
* Caboolture / Strathpine (Queensland) has 36%.
* Ipswich (Queensland) has 33%.

The bottom 10% districts are as follows.

* Barkly (Northern Territory) has provider concentration level of 93%.
* Central Australia (Northern Territory) has 91%.
* East Arnhem (Northern Territory) has 91%.
* Katherine (Northern Territory) has 91%.
* Goldfields – Esperance (Western Australia) has 88%.
* Great Southern (Western Australia) has 94%.
* Kimberley – Pilbara (Western Australia) has 88%.
* Midwest – Gascoyne (Western Australia) has 94%.

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

* Goulbourn (Victoria) has provider growth of 38% since the previous exposure period.
* Barkly (Northern Territory) has 36%.
* Central North Metro (Western Australia) has 59%.
* Goldfields – Esperance (Western Australia) has 42%.
* Great Southern (Western Australia) has 86%.
* Midwest – Gascoyne (Western Australia) has 86%.
* South East Metro (Western Australia) has 70%.
* Wheat Belt (Western Australia) has 32%.

The bottom 10% districts are as follows.

* Mid North Coast (New South Wales) has provider growth of 7% since the previous exposure period.
* Central Highlands (Victoria) has 7%.
* Ovens Murray (Victoria) has 9%.
* Townsville (Queensland) has 7%.
* Barossa, Light and Lower North (South Australia) has 8%.
* Eyre and Western (South Australia) has 3%.
* Limestone Coast (South Australia) has 8%.
* TAS South West (Tasmania) has 8%.

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

* Goulbourn (Victoria) has provider shrinkage of 7% since the previous exposure period.
* Mallee (Victoria) has 4%.
* Outer Gippsland (Victoria) has 5%.
* Caboolture / Strathpine (Queensland) has 6%.
* Central North Metro (Western Australia) has 3%.
* Goldfields – Esperance (Western Australia) has 0%.
* Kimberley – Pilbara (Western Australia) has 4%.
* Midwest – Gascoyne (Western Australia) has 0%.

The bottom 10% districts are as follows.

* Mid North Coast (New South Wales) has provider shrinkage of 28% since the previous exposure period.
* Northern New South Wales (New South Wales) has 29%.
* Western District (Victoria) has 25%.
* Barossa, Light and Lower North (South Australia) has 24%.
* Eyre and Western (South Australia) has 26%.
* Far North (South Australia) has 23%.
* Limestone Coast (South Australia) has 40%.
* Southern Adelaide (South Australia) has 24%.

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

* South Eastern Sydney (New South Wales) has utilisation of 76%.
* Western Sydney (New South Wales) has utilisation of 77%.
* Hume Moreland (New South Wales) has utilisation of 68%.
* Southern Melbourne (New South Wales) has 67%.
* Maroochydore (Queensland) has 68%.
* Robina (Queensland) has 73%.
* Central South Metro (Western Australia) has 67%.
* South West (Western Australia) has 65%.

The bottom 10% districts are as follows.

* Eyre and Western (South Australia) has utilisation of 53%.
* Far North (South Australia) has 48%.
* Limestone Coast (South Australia) has 61%.
* Barkly (Northern Territory) has 53%.
* Darwin Remote (Northern Territory) has 40%.
* East Arnhem (Northern Territory) has 33%.
* Goldfields – Esperance (Western Australia) has 44%.
* Midwest – Gascoyne (Western Australia) has 40%.

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

* Hunter New England (New South Wales) has an outcomes indicator on choice and control of 60%.
* Barwon (Victoria) has 67%.
* Toowoomba (Queensland) has 58%.
* Eyre and Western (South Australia) has 62%.
* Limestone Coast (South Australia) has 62%.
* TAS South West (Tasmania) has 57%.
* Australian Capital Territory has 66%.
* Barkly (Northern Territory) has 67%

The bottom 10% districts are as follows.

* South Eastern Sydney (New South Wales) has an outcomes indicator of 42%.
* South Western Sydney (New South Wales) has 43%.
* Sydney (New South Wales) has 43%.
* Central Australia (Northern Territory) has 34%.
* Darwin Remote (Northern Territory) has 41%.
* East Arnhem (Northern Territory) has 43%.
* Katherine (Northern Territory) has 23%.
* Goldfields – Esperance (Western Australia) has 44%.

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

* Southern New South Wales (New South Wales) has an indicator of 79%.
* Beenleigh (Queensland) has 80%.
* Bundaberg (Queensland) has 79%.
* Maroochydore (Queensland) has 82%.
* Toowoomba (Queensland) has 79%.
* Katherine (Northern Territory) has 79%.
* Central South Metro (Western Australia) has 77%.
* Great Southern (Western Australia) has 100%.

The bottom 10% districts are as follows.

* Adelaide Hills (South Australia) has an indicator of 58%.
* Far North (South Australia) has 51%.
* Limestone Coast (South Australia) has 55%.
* TAS South East (Tasmania) has 58%.
* Darwin Remote (Northern Territory) has 34%.
* East Arnhem (Northern Territory) has 34%.
* Goldfields – Esperance (Western Australia) has 46%.
* Kimberley – Pilbara (Western Australia) has 58%.

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

For each of the 15 support categories, the same 7 indicators have been calculated. The number of active participants with approved plans, the number of registered active providers, total plan budgets and total payments are also shown. The 7 indicators have a ‘traffic light system’ where the top 10% and bottom 10% of support categories – by gap to benchmark – are highlighted.

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

* Capacity Building – Home Living has 13.9 participants per provider.
* Capacity Building – Lifelong Learning has 4.7.

The bottom 10% support categories are as follows.

* Core – Consumables has 163.9 participants per provider.
* Core – Transport has 306.6.

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

* Core - Community has a provider concentration level of 17%.
* Capacity Building – Support Coordination has 12%.

The bottom 10% support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Home Living has a provider concentration level of 42%.
* Capacity Building – Lifelong Learning has 77%.

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

* Capital – Assistive Technology has provider growth of 30% since the previous exposure period.
* Capital – Home Modifications has 25%.

The bottom 10% support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Home Living has provider growth of 0% since the previous exposure period.
* Capacity Building – Lifelong Learning has 0%.

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

* Capacity Building – Choice and Control has provider shrinkage of 3% since the previous exposure period.
* Capacity Building – Lifelong Learning has 0%.

The bottom 10% support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Home Living has provider shrinkage of 25% since the previous exposure period.
* Capacity Building – Social and Civic has 25%.

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

* Core – Transport has a utilisation rate of 100%.
* Capacity Building – Choice and Control has 94%.

The bottom 10% support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Home Living has a utilisation rate of 16%.
* Capacity Building – Lifelong Learning has 17%.

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

* Capital – Assistive Technology has an outcomes indicator of 60%.
* Capital – Home Modifications has 38%.

The bottom 10% support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Lifelong Learning has an outcomes indicator of 40%.
* Capacity Building – Relationships has 17%.

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

* Capacity Building – Health and Wellbeing has an indicator of 77%.
* Capital – Assistive Technology has 74%.

The bottom 10% support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Home Living has an indicator of 62%.
* Capacity Building – Relationships has 69%.

## 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 district / have supports relating to the support category in their plan.
* **Registered active providers** is defined as the number of registered service providers that have provided a support to a participant within the 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 registered service 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: For some metrics – ‘good’ performance is considered a higher score under the metric. For example, high utilisation rates are considered a sign of a functioning market where participants have access to the supports they need. For other metrics, a ‘good’ performance is considered a lower score under the metric. For example, a low provider concentration is considered a sign of a competitive market.