


District: Darwin Remote (phase in date: 1 July 2017) | Support Category: All | All Participants







District: Darwin Remote (phase in date: 1 July 2017) | Support Category: All | All Participants



| upport category | Active participants with approved plans | Registered active providers | Participants per provider | Provider concentration | Provider growth | Provider shrinkage | Total plan budgets (\$m) | Payments (\$m) | Utilisation | Outcomes indicator on choice and control | Has NDIS helped w choice and contro |
|-------------------------|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------|---|--|
| ore | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Consumables | 288 | 11 | 26.2 | 99% | 0% | 0% | 0.20 | 0.04 | 19% | 41% | 34% |
| Daily Activities | 283 | 22 | 12.9 | 88% | 8% | 8% | 3.77 | 1.84 | 49% | 41% | 34% |
| Community | 283 | 13 | 21.8 | 100% | 33% | 17% | 2.33 | 0.83 | 36% | 41% | 34% |
| Transport | 282 | 9 | 31.3 🔴 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0.18 | 0.04 | 24% | 41% | 34% |
| Core total | 288 | 28 | 10.3 | 89% | 25% | 13% | 6.48 | 2.76 | 43% | 41% | 34% |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| apacity Building | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Daily Activities | 302 | 26 | 11.6 | 80% | 30% | 30% 🔴 | 2.37 | 0.58 | 25% | 41% | 34% |
| Employment | 40 | 1 | 40.0 🔴 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0.11 | 0.00 | 1% | 33% | 37% |
| Social and Civic | 127 | 5 | 25.4 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0.50 | 0.05 | 10% | 35% | 35% |
| Support Coordination | 302 | 18 | 16.8 | 95% | 18% | 18% 🔴 | 1.51 | 0.94 | 62% | 41% | 34% |
| Capacity Building total | 302 | 43 | 7.0 | 76% | 20% | 25% | 4.70 | 1.70 | 36% | 41% | 34% |
| apital | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Assistive Technology | 96 | 5 | 19.2 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0.59 | 0.21 | 36% | 62% | 38% |
| Home Modifications | 18 | 1 | 18.0 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0.03 | 0.00 | 2% | 82% | 29% |
| Capital total | 96 | 5 | 19.2 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0.62 | 0.21 | 35% | 62% | 38% |
| Missing | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| All support categories | 302 | 55 | 5.5 | 74% | 15% | 11% | 11.80 | 4.67 | 40% | 41% | 34% |

Note: A utilisation rate may be above 100% due to the fungibility of core supports. This refers to the ability of participants to use their funding flexibly between different support types, albeit within certain limitations.

| Indicator definitions | |
|---|--|
| Active participants with approved plans | 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 Participants per provider Provider concentration Provider growth Provider shrinkage | Number of registered service providers that have provided a support to a participant within the district / support category, over the exposure period Ratio between the number of active participants and the number of registered service providers Proportion of providers for which payments have grown by more than 100% compared to the previous exposure period. Only providers that received more than \$10k in payments in both exposure periods have been considered Proportion of providers for which payments have grown by more than 100% compared to the previous exposure period. Only providers that received more than \$10k in payments in both exposure periods have been considered Proportion of providers for which sparsets have been with by more than 50% compared to the previous exposure period. Only providers that received more than \$10k in payments in both exposure periods have been considered |
| Total plan budgets Payments Utilisation | Value of supports committed in participant plans for the exposure period 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 (YPIRAC)) Ratio between payments and total plan budgets |
| Outcomes indicator on choice and control Has NDIS helped with choice and control? | Proportion of participants who reported in their most recent outcomes survey that they choose who supports them Proportion of participants who reported in their most recent outcomes survey that the NDIS has helped with choice and control |
| • | The green dots indicate the top 10% of districts / support categories when ranked by performance against benchmark for the given metric – in other words – performing relatively well under the metric under consideration The red dots indicate the bottom 10% of districts / support categories when ranked by performance against benchmark for the given metric – in other words – performing relatively poorly under the metric under consideration |
| | dered 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. dered a lower score under the metric. For example, a low provider concentration is considered a sign of a competitive market. |

45 to 54

55 to 64

Missing


65+

Darwin Remote

Benchmark

District: Darwin Remote (phase in date: 1 July 2017) | Support Category: All | Participants in Supported Independent Living (SIL)





Very Re

Missing

Darwin Remote

Benchmark

11 (Low)

12 (Low)

13 (Low)

14 (Low)

Missing

15 (Low)

Darwin Remote

Benchmark

Visual Impairment

Other Neurological

Other Sensory/Speech

Darwin Remote

Other Physical

Other

Missing

Benchmark

arwin Remot 5.49 enchmark* 9.22 0.60;


Be

Darwin R

This panel shows the ratio between the number of active rticipants, and the number of registered service rs that provided a support, over the exposure per The benchmark is the unweighted national average


■ Be

Darwin Re





District: Darwin Remote (phase in date: 1 July 2017) | Support Category: All | Participants in Supported Independent Living (SIL)




| Support category | Active participants with approved plans | Registered active providers | Participants per provider | Provider concentration | Provider growth | Provider shrinkage | Total plan budgets (\$m) | Payments (\$m) | Utilisation | Outcomes indicator on choice and control | Has NDIS helped wi choice and control |
|-------------------------|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------|---|--|
| Core | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Consumables | b | b | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | o.bo | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Daily Activities | Ľ | ľ | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Community | Ĭ. | ι. Γ | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Transport | ĥ | ĥ | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Core total | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Capacity Building | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Daily Activities | ò | b | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Employment | 0 | 6 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Social and Civic | 0 | 6 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Support Coordination | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Capacity Building total | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Capital | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Assistive Technology | ¢ | þ | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Home Modifications | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Capital total | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Missing | φ | þ | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| All support categories | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 0% |


Note: A utilisation rate may be above 100% due to the tungibility of core supports. This refers to the ability of participants to use their funding flexibly between different support types, albeit within certain limitations.

| Active participants with approved plans | Number of active participants who have an approved plan and reside in the district / have supports relating to the support category in their plan |
|--|---|
| Active participants with approved plans | Number or active participants who have an approved plan and reside in the distinct have support category in their plan |
| Registered active providers | 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 | Ratio between the number of active participants and the number of registered service providers |
| Provider concentration | Proportion of provider payments over the exposure period that were paid to the top 10 providers |
| Provider growth | Proportion of providers for which payments have grown by more than 100% compared to the previous exposure period. Only providers that received more than \$10k in payments in both exposure periods have been considered |
| Provider shrinkage | Proportion of providers for which payments have shrunk by more than 25% compared to the previous exposure period. Only providers that received more than \$10k in payments in both exposure periods have been considered |
| | |
| Total plan budgets | Value of supports committed in participant plans for the exposure period |
| Payments | 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 (YPIRAC)) |
| Utilisation | Ratio between payments and total plan budgets |
| Outcomes indicator on choice and control | Proportion of participants who reported in their most recent outcomes survey that they choose who supports them |
| Has NDIS helped with choice and control? | Proportion of participants who reported in their most recent outcomes survey that the NDIS has helped with choice and control |
| | reportant or participantial monoportical in their relative and the report and control and control |
| • | The green dots indicate the too 10% of districts / support categoories when ranked by performance against benchmark for the given metric – in other words – performing relatively well under the metric under consideration |
| ē ieta ar se | The red dots indicate the bottom 10% of districts / support categories when ranked by performance against benchmark for the given metric – in other words – performing relatively poorly under the metric under consideration |
| | |


District: Darwin Remote (phase in date: 1 July 2017) | Support Category: All | Participants not in Supported Independent Living (Non-SIL)







District: Darwin Remote (phase in date: 1 July 2017) | Support Category: All | Participants not in Supported Independent Living (Non-SIL)



| ipport category | Active participants with approved plans | Registered active providers | Participants per provider | Provider concentration | Provider growth | Provider shrinkage | Total plan budgets (\$m) | Payments (\$m) | Utilisation | Outcomes indicator on choice and control | Has NDIS helped wit choice and control? |
|-------------------------|---|--------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------|---|--|
| ore | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Consumables | 288 | 11 | 26.2 | 99% | 0% | 0% | 0.20 | 0.04 | 19% | 41% | 34% |
| Daily Activities | 283 | 22 | 12.9 | 88% | 8% | 8% | 3.77 | 1.84 | 49% | 41% | 34% |
| Community | 283 | 13 | 21.8 | 100% | 33% | 17% | 2.33 | 0.83 | 36% | 41% | 34% |
| Transport | 282 | 9 | 31.3 🔴 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0.18 | 0.04 | 24% | 41% | 34% |
| Core total | 288 | 28 | 10.3 | 89% | 25% | 13% | 6.48 | 2.76 | 43% | 41% | 34% |
| pacity Building | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Daily Activities | 302 | 26 | 11.6 | 80% | 30% | 30% 🔴 | 2.37 | 0.58 | 25% | 41% | 34% |
| Employment | 40 | 1 | 40.0 🔴 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0.11 | 0.00 | 1% | 33% | 37% |
| Social and Civic | 127 | 5 | 25.4 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0.50 | 0.05 | 10% | 35% | 35% |
| Support Coordination | 302 | 18 | 16.8 | 95% | 18% | 18% 🔴 | 1.51 | 0.94 | 62% | 41% | 34% |
| Capacity Building total | 302 | 43 | 7.0 | 76% | 20% | 25% | 4.70 | 1.70 | 36% | 41% | 34% |
| pital | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Assistive Technology | 96 | 5 | 19.2 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0.59 | 0.21 | 36% | 62% | 38% |
| Home Modifications | 18 | 1 | 18.0 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0.03 | 0.00 | 2% | 82% | 29% |
| Capital total | 96 | 5 | 19.2 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0.62 | 0.21 | 35% | 62% | 38% |
| Missing | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| All support categories | 302 | 55 | 5.5 | 74% | 15% | 11% | 11.80 | 4.67 | 40% | 41% | 34% |

Note: A utilisation rate may be above 100% due to the fungibility of core supports. This refers to the ability of participants to use their funding flexibly between different support types, albeit within certain limitations.

| Indicator definitions | |
|---|---|
| Active participants with approved plans | 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 Participants per provider Provider concentration Provider growth Provider shrinkage | Number of registered service providers that have provided a support to a participant within the district / support category, over the exposure period Ratio between the number of active participants and the number of registered service providers Proportion of providers for which payments have period that were paid to the top 10 providers Proportion of providers for which payments have grown by more than 100% compared to the previous exposure period. Only providers that received more than \$10k in payments in both exposure periods have been considered Proportion of providers for which payments have struct by more than 100% compared to the previous exposure period. Only providers that received more than \$10k in payments in both exposure periods have been considered |
| Total plan budgets Payments Utilisation | Value of supports committed in participant plans for the exposure period 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 (YPIRAC)) Ratio between payments and total plan budgets |
| Outcomes indicator on choice and control Has NDIS helped with choice and control? | Proportion of participants who reported in their most recent outcomes survey that they choose who supports them Proportion of participants who reported in their most recent outcomes survey that the NDIS has helped with choice and control |
| • | The green dots indicate the top 10% of districts / support categories when ranked by performance against benchmark for the given metric – in other words – performing relatively well under the metric under consideration The red dots indicate the bottom 10% of districts / support categories when ranked by performance against benchmark for the given metric – in other words – performing relatively poorly under the metric under consideration |
| | dered 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. idered a lower score under the metric. For example, a low provider concentration is considered a sign of a competitive market. |