

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

Visual Impairment

Other Neurological

Other Sensory/Speech

Missing

55 to 64

12 (Low)

15 (Low)

Missing

13 (Low)



■ Utilisation

arwin Remote

38%


This panel shows plan utilisation over the exposure period




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 the NDIS helped wit choice and control?
Core											
Consumables	341	16	21.3	98%	100%	0%	0.24	0.07	30%	36%	34%
Daily Activities	341	26	13.1	85%	29%	21%	4.96	2.53	51%	36%	34%
Community	341	15	22.7	99%	0%	25%	3.24	1.00	31%	36%	34%
Transport	341	9	37.9	100%	0%	0%	0.23	0.04	17%	36%	34%
Core total	341	33	10.3	88%	25%	13%	8.67	3.65	42%	36%	34%
Capacity Building											
Daily Activities	352	26	13.5	88%	30%	10%	3,41	0.84	25%	36%	34%
Employment	47	0	0.0	0%	0%	0%	0.15	0.00	0%	32%	38%
Relationships	15	1	15.0	100%	0%	0%	0.11	0.00	2%	0%	14%
Social and Civic	158	6	26.3	100%	0%	0%	0.63	0.05	7%	32%	29%
Support Coordination	352	26	13.5	93%	0%	20%	1.87	1.07	57%	36%	34%
Capacity Building total	352	45	7.8	79%	16%	11%	6.47	2.15	33%	36%	34%
Capital											
Assistive Technology	104	4	26.0	100%	0%	0%	0.62	0.17	27%	56%	42%
Home Modifications	18	1	18.0	100%	0%	0%	0.02	.000	24%	88%	29%
Capital total	104	5	20.8	100%	0%	0%	0.64	0.17	27%	56%	42%
Missing	0	0	0.0	0%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0%	0%	0%
All support categories	352	53	6.6	76%	21%	21%	15.78	5.97	38%	36%	34%

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 participants and the number of registered service providers Ratio between the number of active participants and the number of registered service providers Proportion of provider payments over the exposure 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 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 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 the 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.
	red 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. ed a lower score under the metric. For example, a low provider concentration is considered a sign of a competitive market.







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





Outcomes framework


Outcomes indicator on choice	and control	bu asimone disability		hu level of function			bu comptenses setime		has to a	Unanana atatur			hii CAL S	-4			
y age group		by primary disability		by level of function			by remoteness rating		by Inc	ligenous status			by CALD s	atus			
0% 20% 40%	60% 80% 1		20% 40% 60% 80% 100%	0%	20% 40%	60% 80% 100%	0% 20%	40% 60% 80% 100%	100%				100%				
0 to 6		Acquired brain injury		1 (High)			Major Cities		90%				90%				
		Autism		2 (High)			wajor cities		80%				80%				
' to 14		Cerebral Palsy		3 (High)					70% -				70%				
		Developmental Delay		4 (High)			Population > 50,000		60% - 50% -				60% 50%				
to 18		Down Syndrome							40%				40%				
		Global Developmental Delay		5 (High)			Population between		30%				30%				
to 24		Hearing Impairment		6 (Medium)			15,000 and 50,000		20%				20%				
		Intellectual Disability		7 (Medium)			Population between		10%				10%				
to 34		Multiple Sclerosis		8 (Medium)			5,000 and 15,000		0%	φ φ	70	D)	0%	0	0	ъ	-
		Psychosocial disability		9 (Medium)						300	tatec	Missing		CALD	CALC	stated	SSIN
to 44		Spinal Cord Injury					Population less than 5,000			ige jige	ot si	×		0	Ģ	ot si	ž
		Stroke		10 (Medium)						<u> </u>	2				ž	2	
to 54		Visual Impairment		11 (Low)			Remote			N							
- 04		Other Neurological		12 (Low)			71011010			■ Darwin Remote	Benchm	nark*		Darwin Remote	Э	Benchmark	k*
to 64				13 (Low)													
65+		Other Physical		14 (Low)			Very Remote			Proportion of parti	cipants who rep	orted that	1 [
05+		Other Sensory/Speech								they choose who	supports them					proportion of	
ssing		Other		15 (Low)			Missing			Darwin Remote Benchmark*		36% 56%		reported in the		cent outcome no supports th	
Saling		Missing		Missing						Relative to bench	mark	0.64x	-				
■ Darwin Remote	Benchmark*	■ Darwin Remote	■Benchmark*	■ Darwin	D	- B 1 1 A							-7	The benchman	k is the na	tional averag	ge, adjusted
			- Benchinark	■ Daiwin	Remote	Benchmark*	■ Darwin Remote	Benchmark*					,	iv of SII / SD	1 narticina	nte	
as the NDIS helped you have	more choices and more		- Delicillar	= Dalwin	Remote	■Benchmark*	■ Darwin Remote	■ Benchmark*					,	nix of SIL / SDA	A participai	nts	
	more choices and more			by level of function		Benchmark*	■ Darwin Remote	■ Benchmark*	by Ind	ligenous status			by CALD s		A participai	nts	
		control over your life? by primary disability		by level of function		60% 80% 100%	by remoteness rating	■ Benchmark* 40% 60% 80% 100%	-	ligenous status			by CALD s		A participai	nts	
9% 20% 40%		control over your life? by primary disability 00% 0%	ı	by level of function			by remoteness rating		100%	ligenous status			by CALD s		A participai	nts	
9% 20% 40%		control over your life? by primary disability 00% 0% Acquired brain injury	ı	by level of function 0% 1 (High)			by remoteness rating		-	ligenous status			by CALD s		A participai	nts	
0% 20% 40% 0 to 6		control over your life? by primary disability 00% 0% Acquired brain injury Autism	ı	by level of function			by remoteness rating 0% 20%		100% -	ligenous status			by CALD s		A participai	nts	
0% 20% 40% 0 to 6		control over your life? by primary disability 00% 0% 0% Acquired brain injury Autism Cerebral Palsy	ı	by level of function 0% 1 (High)			by remoteness rating 0% 20% Major Cities		100% = 90% = 80% =	digenous status			by CALD s		A participai	nts	
age group 0% 20% 40% 0 to 6 to 14		control over your life? by primary disability 00% 0% Acquired brain injury Autism Cerebral Palsy Developmental Delay	ı	by level of function 0% 1 (High) 2 (High)			by remoteness rating 0% 20%		100% - 90% - 80% - 70% - 60% - 50% -	ligenous status			by CALD s 100% 90% 80% 70% 60% 50%		A participa	nts	
o% 20% 40% 0 to 6		control over your life? by primary disability 00% 0% Acquired brain injury Autism Cerebral Palsy Developmental Delay Down Syndrome	ı	by level of function 0% 1 (High) 2 (High) 3 (High) 4 (High)			by remoteness rating 0% 20% Major Cities Population > 50,000		100% = 90% = 80% = 60% = 50% = 40% = 70% =	ligenous status			by CALD s 100% 90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40%		A participa	nts	
o% 20% 40% 0 to 14 to 18		control over your life? by primary disability 00% 0% Acquired brain injury Autism Cerebral Palsy Developmental Delay Down Syndrome Global Developmental Delay	ı	by level of function 0% 1 (High) 2 (High) 3 (High) 4 (High) 5 (High)			by remoteness rating 0% 20% Major Cities		100% - 90% - 80% - 70% - 60% - 50% - 40% -	ligenous status			by CALD s 100% 90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 30%		A participa	nts	
o% 20% 40% 0 to 14 to 18		control over your life? by primary disability 00% 0% Acquired brain injury Autism Cerebral Palsy Developmental Delay Down Syndrome	ı	by level of function 0% 1 (High) 2 (High) 3 (High) 4 (High) 5 (High) 6 (Medium)			by remoteness rating 0% 20% Major Cities Population > 50,000 Population between		100% - 90% - 80% - 70% - 60% - 50% - 40% - 20% -	ligenous status			by CALD s 100% 90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 30% 20%		A participa	nts	
y age group 0% 20% 40% 0 to 6 to 14 to 18		control over your life? by primary disability 00% 0% Acquired brain injury Autism Cerebral Palsy Developmental Delay Down Syndrome Global Developmental Delay	ı	by level of function 0% 1 (High) 2 (High) 3 (High) 4 (High) 5 (High)			by remoteness rating 0% 20% Major Cities Population > 50,000 Population between 15,000 and 50,000 Population between		100% - 90% - 80% - 70% - 60% - 50% - 40% -	ligenous status			by CALD s 100% 90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 30% 20% 10%	atus	A participa	nts	
y age group 0% 20% 40% 0 to 6 7 to 14 5 to 18		control over your life? by primary disability 00% 0% Acquired brain injury Autism Cerebral Palsy Developmental Delay Down Syndrome Global Developmental Delay Hearing Impairment	ı	by level of function 0% 1 (High) 2 (High) 3 (High) 4 (High) 5 (High) 6 (Medium)			by remoteness rating 0% 20% Major Cities Population > 50,000 Population between 15,000 and 50,000		100% = 90% = 80% = 70% = 60% = 50% = 40% = 20% = 10% =	ligenous status	paj	gui	by CALD s 100% 90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 30% 20%	atus	A participa		Sup.
0 to 6 7 to 14 5 to 18 9 to 24		control over your life? by primary disability 00% 0% Acquired brain injury Autism Cerebral Palsy Developmental Delay Down Syndrome Global Developmental Delay Hearing Impairment Intellectual Disability	ı	by level of function 0% 1 (High) 2 (High) 3 (High) 4 (High) 5 (High) 6 (Medium) 7 (Medium)			by remoteness rating 0% 20% Major Cities Population > 50,000 Population between 15,000 and 50,000 Population between 5,000 and 15,000 and 15,000		100% = 90% = 80% = 70% = 60% = 50% = 40% = 20% = 10% =	ligenous status	stated stated	Missing	by CALD s 100% 90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 30% 20% 10%	atus	A participal	po reis	Missing
y age group 0% 20% 40% 0 to 6 7 to 14 5 to 18 0 to 24 5 to 34		by primary disability 0% Acquired brain injury Autism Cerebral Palsy Developmental Delay Down Syndrome Global Developmental Delay Hearing Impairment Intellectual Disability Multiple Scierosis	ı	by level of function 0% 1 (High) 2 (High) 3 (High) 4 (High) 5 (High) 6 (Medium) 7 (Medium) 8 (Medium) 9 (Medium)			by remoteness rating 0% 20% Major Cities Population > 50,000 Population between 15,000 and 50,000 Population between		100% = 90% = 80% = 70% = 60% = 50% = 40% = 20% = 10% =	snouečipu snouečipu	Not stated	Missing	by CALD s 100% 90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 30% 20% 10%	atus	A participa		Missing
o% 20% 40% 0 to 6 to 14 to 18 to 24 to 34		by primary disability 00% Acquired brain injury Autism Cerebral Palsy Developmental Delay Down Syndrome Global Developmental Delay Hearing Impairment Intellectual Disability Multiple Sclerosis Psychosocial disability	ı	by level of function 0% 1 (High) 2 (High) 3 (High) 4 (High) 5 (High) 6 (Medium) 7 (Medium) 8 (Medium) 9 (Medium) 10 (Medium)			by remoteness rating 0% 20% Major Cities Population > 50,000 Population between 15,000 and 50,000 Population between 5,000 and 15,000 Population letses		100% = 90% = 80% = 70% = 60% = 50% = 40% = 20% = 10% =	iligenous status snou-86jui-uo)	Not stated	Missing	by CALD s 100% 90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 30% 20% 10%	atus	A participa		Missing
o% 20% 40% 0 to 6 to 14 to 18 to 24 to 34		control over your life? by primary disability 00% Acquired brain injury Autism Cerebral Palsy Developmental Delay Down Syndrome Global Developmental Delay Hearing Impairment Intellectual Disability Multiple Sclerosis Psychosocial disability Spinal Cord Injury Stroke	ı	by level of function 0% 1 (High) 2 (High) 3 (High) 4 (High) 5 (High) 6 (Medium) 7 (Medium) 8 (Medium) 9 (Medium)			by remoteness rating 0% 20% Major Cities Population > 50,000 Population between 15,000 and 50,000 Population between 5,000 and 15,000 Population letses		100% - 90% - 80% - 70% - 60% - 50% - 40% - 20% - 10% -	Indigenous Non-indigenous	Not stated	Missing	by CALD s 100% 90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 20% 10% 0%	CALD	Non-CALD	Not stated	Mssing
y age group 0% 20% 40% 0 to 6 1 to 14 5 to 18 1 to 24 5 to 34 5 to 44		by primary disability 0% Acquired brain injury Autism Cerebral Palsy Developmental Delay Down Syndrome Global Developmental Delay Hearing Impairment Intellectual Disability Multiple Sclerosis Psychosocial disability Spinal Cord Injury Stroke Visual Impairment	ı	by level of function 0% 1 (High) 2 (High) 3 (High) 4 (High) 5 (High) 6 (Medium) 7 (Medium) 8 (Medium) 9 (Medium) 10 (Medium)			by remoteness rating 0% 20% Major Cities Population > 50,000 Population between 15,000 and 50,000 Population between 5,000 and 15,000 Population less than 5,000		100% - 90% - 80% - 70% - 60% - 50% - 40% - 20% - 10% -	s ou significant	pajets to W	Được Được Muser M	by CALD s 100% 90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 20% 10% 0%	atus	Non-CALD		Mssing
y age group 0% 20% 40% 0 to 6 7 to 14 5 to 18		by primary disability 00% Acquired brain injury Autism Cerebral Palsy Developmental Delay Down Syndrome Global Developmental Delay Hearing Impairment Intellectual Disability Multiple Sclerosis Psychosocial disability Spinal Cord Injury Stroke Visual Impairment Other Neurological	ı	by level of function 0% 1 (High) 2 (High) 3 (High) 4 (High) 5 (High) 6 (Medium) 7 (Medium) 8 (Medium) 9 (Medium) 10 (Medium) 11 (Low)			by remoteness rating 0% 20% Major Cities Population > 50,000 Population between 15,000 and 50,000 Population between 5,000 and 15,000 Population less than 5,000 Remote		100% - 90% - 80% - 70% - 60% - 50% - 40% - 20% - 10% -	Indigenous Non-indigenous	Palets to V V ■ Benchm	€ussiyi Musark*	by CALD s 100% 90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 20% 10% 0%	CALD	Non-CALD	Not stated	Mssing
y age group 0% 20% 40% 0 to 6 7 to 14 5 to 18 10 to 24 5 to 34 5 to 44 5 to 54		by primary disability 00% Acquired brain injury Autism Cerebral Palsy Developmental Delay Down Syndrome Global Developmental Delay Hearing Impairment Intellectual Disability Multiple Sclerosis Psychosocial disability Spinal Cord Injury Stroke Visual Impairment Other Neurological Other Physical	ı	by level of function 0% 1 (High) 2 (High) 3 (High) 4 (High) 5 (High) 6 (Medium) 7 (Medium) 8 (Medium) 9 (Medium) 10 (Medium) 11 (Low) 12 (Low) 13 (Low)			by remoteness rating 0% 20% Major Cities Population > 50,000 Population between 15,000 and 50,000 Population between 5,000 and 15,000 Population less than 5,000		100% - 90% - 80% - 70% - 60% - 50% - 40% - 20% - 10% -	g ou a ppi-i-boy	cipants who rep	orted that the	by CALD s 100% 90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 30% 10%	의 전 Darwin Remote	A participal	Pages SU V V ■ Benchmark	, Mssing
y age group 0% 20% 40% 0 to 6 7 to 14 5 to 18 3 to 24 5 to 34 5 to 54		by primary disability 00% Acquired brain injury Autism Cerebral Palsy Developmental Delay Down Syndrome Global Developmental Delay Hearing Impairment Intellectual Disability Multiple Sclerosis Psychosocial disability Spinal Cord Injury Stroke Visual Impairment Other Neurological Other Physical Other Sensory/Speech	ı	by level of function 0% 1 (High) 2 (High) 3 (High) 4 (High) 5 (High) 6 (Medium) 7 (Medium) 8 (Medium) 10 (Medium) 11 (Low) 12 (Low) 13 (Low)			by remoteness rating 0% 20% Major Cities Population > 50,000 Population between 15,000 and 50,000 Population between 5,000 and 15,000 Population less than 5,000 Remote		100% - 90% - 80% - 70% - 60% - 50% - 40% - 20% - 10% -	snous dipujuo N ■ Darwin Remote Proportion of part NDIS has helped	cipants who rep	orted that the	by CALD s 100% 90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 30% 10%	Operation Remote	A participal	Benchmark	bussyW k*
y age group 0% 20% 40% 0 to 6 1 to 14 5 to 18 1 to 24 5 to 34 5 to 54 6 to 54		by primary disability 00% Acquired brain injury Autism Cerebral Palsy Developmental Delay Down Syndrome Global Developmental Delay Hearing Impairment Intellectual Disability Multiple Sclerosis Psychosocial disability Spinal Cord Injury Stroke Visual Impairment Other Neurological Other Physical Other Sensory/Speech Other	ı	by level of function 0% 1 (High) 2 (High) 3 (High) 4 (High) 5 (Heigh) 7 (Medium) 7 (Medium) 9 (Medium) 10 (Medium) 11 (Low) 12 (Low) 13 (Low) 14 (Low)			by remoteness rating 0% 20% Major Cities Population > 50,000 Population between 15,000 and 50,000 Population between 5,000 and 15,000 Population less than 5,000 Remote		100% - 90% - 80% - 70% - 60% - 50% - 40% - 20% - 10% -	g ou a goula de pui de la company de la comp	cipants who rep	orted that the control	by CALD s 100% 90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 30% 10%	Darwin Remote	Q TO YOUR WAY OF THE PROPERTY	Benchmark	bussey k*
y age group 0% 20% 40% 0 to 6 7 to 14 5 to 18 10 to 24 5 to 34 5 to 44 5 to 54		by primary disability 00% Acquired brain injury Autism Cerebral Palsy Developmental Delay Down Syndrome Global Developmental Delay Hearing Impairment Intellectual Disability Multiple Sclerosis Psychosocial disability Spinal Cord Injury Stroke Visual Impairment Other Neurological Other Physical Other Sensory/Speech	ı	by level of function 0% 1 (High) 2 (High) 3 (High) 4 (High) 5 (High) 6 (Medium) 7 (Medium) 8 (Medium) 10 (Medium) 11 (Low) 12 (Low) 13 (Low)			by remoteness rating 0% 20% Major Cities Population > 50,000 Population between 15,000 and 50,000 Population between 5,000 and 15,000 Remote Very Remote		100% - 90% - 80% - 70% - 60% - 50% - 40% - 20% - 10% -	snous dipujuo N ■ Darwin Remote Proportion of part NDIS has helped	cipants who rep with choice and	orted that the	by CALD s 100% 90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 30% 10%	Darwin Remote	Q TO YOUR WAY OF THE PROPERTY	Benchmari	9.000 September 1999


Support category summary

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 the NDIS helped with choice and control?
Core											
Consumables	þ	þ	0.0	0%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0%	0%	0%
Daily Activities	þ	þ	0.0	0%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0%	0%	0%
Community	þ	þ	0.0	0%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0%	0%	0%
Transport	þ	þ	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	Ь	b	0.0	0%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0%	0%	0%
Employment	b	b	0.0	0%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0%	0%	0%
Relationships	b l	b	0.0	0%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0%	0%	0%
Social and Civic	b	b	0.0	0%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0%	0%	0%
Support Coordination	b	þ	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	b	b	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	þ	þ	0.0	0%	0%	0%	o.bo	o.þo	0%	0%	0%
All support categories	0	0	0.0	0%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0%	0%	0%

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 provider payments over the exposure period that were paid to the top 10 providers Proportion of provider 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 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 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 the 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
	ed 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. sidered a lower score under the metric. For example, a low provider concentration is considered a sign of a competitive market.









Registered active

Active participants

Participants

Provider





Support category	with approved plans	providers	per provider	concentration	growth	snrinkage	budgets (\$m)	Payments (\$m)	Utilisation	choice and control	choice and control
Core											
Consumables	341	16	21.3	98%	100%	0%	0.24	0.07	30%	36%	34%
Daily Activities	341	26	13.1	85%	29%	21%	4.96	2.53	51%	36%	34%
Community	341	15	22.7	99%	0%	25%	3.24	1.00	31%	36%	34%
Transport	341	9	37.9	100%	0%	0%	0.23	0.04	17%	36%	34%
Core total	341	33	10.3	88%	25%	13%	8.67	3.65	42%	36%	34%
apacity Building											
Daily Activities	050	26	40.5	000/	000/	400/	3.41	0.84	25%	2004	0.40/
	352	26	13.5	88%	30%	10%				36%	34%
Employment	47	0	0.0	0%	0%	0%	0.15	0.00	0%	32%	38%
Relationships	15	1	15.0	100%	0%	0%	0.11	0.00	2%	0%	14%
Social and Civic	158	6	26.3	100%	0%	0%	0.63	0.05	7%	32%	29%
Support Coordination	352	26	13.5	93%	0%	20%	1.87	1.07	57%	36%	34%
Capacity Building total	352	45	7.8	79%	16%	11%	6.47	2.15	33%	36%	34%
Capital											
Analytica Taskandana	404		00.0	4000/	00/	00/	0.62	0.47	070/	500/	400/

Provide

Total plan

Provider

Outcomes indicator on Has the NDIS helped with

100% 100% **100%** Capital total 0.0 0.00 0.00 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 15.78 6.6 5.97 76% 21% 21% 38% 36% 34% All support categories Note: Only the major support categories are shown.

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 limitation.

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 over the exposure period that were paid to the top 10 providers Proportion of providers for which payments have grown by more than 100% compared to the top 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 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 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 the 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.
	ared a higher score under the metric. For example, high utilisation rates are considered a sign market wherepart and a house score in the supports they need.