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## Figure 1: Plan utilisation summary

For each of the 80 service districts with more than 9 months of experience in Scheme, the utilisation rate is calculated and then compared to the benchmark for that district. This results in a gap to benchmark for each district. A district is more likely to be flagged as a hot spot if it is below the benchmark.

There are 49 districts below benchmark and 31 districts above benchmark. Overall,

* 8 districts have a utilisation rate that is more than 10% below benchmark;
* 12 districts are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 29 districts are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 29 districts are 0% to 5% above benchmark; and
* 2 districts are 5% to 10% above benchmark.

## Figure 2: Plan utilisation for districts with less than $100m in total plan budgets

Of the 28 districts with less than $100m in total plan budgets,

* 8 districts are more than 10% below benchmark;
* 6 districts are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 10 districts are 0% to 5% below benchmark; and
* 4 districts are 0% to 5% above benchmark.

For these smaller districts, the top five potential hot spot districts have been identified based on their gap to benchmark, weighted by their total plan budget.

1. Goulburn in Victoria, which phased into the Scheme on 1 January 2019, had a utilisation rate of 54%, compared to a benchmark of 62%.
2. Outer Gippsland in Victoria, which phased in on 1 January 2019, had a utilisation rate of 51%, compared to a benchmark of 62%.
3. 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 59%, compared to a benchmark of 69%.
4. Kimberley-Pilbara in Western Australia, which phased in on 1 October 2018, had a utilisation rate of 49% compared to a benchmark of 60%.
5. 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 53%, compared to a benchmark of 64%.

## Figure 3: Plan utilisation for districts with $100m to $225m in total plan budgets

Of the 27 districts with $100m to $225m in total plan budgets,

* 4 districts are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 11 districts are 0% to 5% below benchmark; and
* 12 districts are 0% to 5% above benchmark.

For these medium-sized districts, the top five potential hot spot districts have been identified based on their gap to benchmark, weighted by their total plan budget.

1. Western New South Wales in New South Wales, which phased into the Scheme on 1 July 2017, had a utilisation rate of 63% compared to a benchmark of 69%.
2. Central Highlands in Victoria, which phased in on 1 January 2017, had a utilisation rate of 63% compared to a benchmark of 70%.
3. Inner Gippsland in Victoria, which phased in on 1 October 2017, had a utilisation rate of 59%, compared to a benchmark of 65%.
4. Loddon in Victoria, which phased in on 1 May 2017, had a utilisation rate of 63%, compared to a benchmark of 68%.
5. Western District in Victoria, which phased in on 1 October 2017, had a utilisation rate of 63%, compared to a benchmark of 70%.

## Figure 4: Plan utilisation for districts with greater than $225m in total plan budgets

Of the 25 districts with greater than $225m in total plan budgets,

* 2 district are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 8 districts are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 13 districts are 0% to 5% above benchmark; and
* 2 districts are 5% to 10% above benchmark.

For these larger districts, the top five potential hot spot districts have been identified based on their gap to benchmark, weighted by their total plan budget.

1. Inner East Melbourne in Victoria, which phased into the Scheme on 1 November 2017, had a utilisation rate of 64%, compared to a benchmark of 69%.
2. North East Melbourne in Victoria, which phased in on 1 July 2016, had a utilisation rate of 66%, compared to benchmark of 70%.
3. Barwon in Victoria, which phased in on 1 July 2013, had a utilisation rate of 64%, compared to a benchmark of 70%.
4. Outer East Melbourne in Victoria, which phased in on 1 November 2017, had a utilisation rate of 62%, compared to a benchmark of 66%.
5. Bayside Peninsula in Victoria, which phased in on 1 April 2018, had a utilisation rate of 62%, compared to a benchmark of 65%.

## Figure 5: Provider concentration summary

For each of the 80 service districts 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 district. A district is more likely to be flagged as a hot spot if it is above the benchmark.

There are 73 districts below benchmark and 7 districts above benchmark. Overall,

* 19 districts are more than 40% below the benchmark;
* 34 districts are 20% to 40% below the benchmark;
* 20 districts are 0% to 20% below the benchmark;
* 4 districts are 0% to 5% above the benchmark; and
* 3 districts are 5% to 10% above the benchmark.

## Figure 6: Provider concentration for districts with less than $100m in total plan budgets

Of the 28 districts with less than $100m in total plan budgets,

* 5 districts are 20% to 40% below benchmark;
* 16 districts are 0% to 20% below benchmark;
* 4 districts are 0% to 5% above benchmark; and
* 3 districts are 5% to 10% above benchmark.

For these smaller districts, the top five potential hot spot districts have been identified based on their gap to benchmark, weighted by their total plan budget.

1. Great Southern in Western Australia, which phased into the Scheme on 1 July 2019, had a provider concentration level of 93%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
2. Midwest-Gascoyne in Western Australia, which phased in on 1 July 2019, had a provider concentration level of 94%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
3. Goldfields-Esperance in Western Australia, which phased in on 1 October 2018, had a provider concentration level of 90%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
4. Far North in South Australia, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 0 to 14 years old, had a provider concentration level of 89%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
5. Barkly in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 July 2014, had a provider concentration level of 92%, compared to benchmark of 85%.

## Figure 7: Provider concentration for districts with $100m to $225m in total plan budgets

Of the 27 districts with $100m to $225m in total plan budgets,

* 6 districts are more than 40% below benchmark;
* 17 districts are 20% to 40% below benchmark; and
* 4 districts are 0% to 20% below benchmark.

For these medium-sized districts, the top five potential hot spot districts have been identified based on their gap to benchmark, weighted by their total plan budget.

1. Western District in Victoria, which phased into the Scheme on 1 October 2017, had a provider concentration level of 80%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
2. TAS North in Tasmania, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 15 to 24 years old, had a provider concentration level of 67%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
3. Maryborough in Queensland, which phased in on 1 July 2018, had a provider concentration level of 70%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
4. Inner Gippsland in Victoria, which phased in on 1 October 2017, had a provider concentration level of 67%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
5. TAS South West in Tasmania, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 15 to 24 years old, had a provider concentration level of 62%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.

## Figure 8: Provider concentration for districts with greater than $225m in total plan budgets

Of the 25 districts with greater than $225m in total plan budgets,

* 13 districts are more than 40% below benchmark; and
* 12 districts are 20% to 40% below benchmark.

For these larger districts, the top five potential hot spot districts 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 provider concentration level of 63%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
2. 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 a benchmark of 85%.
3. Australian Capital Territory, which phased in on 1 July 2014, had a provider concentration level of 54%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
4. Outer East Melbourne in Victoria, which phased in on 1 November 2017, had a provider concentration level of 57%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
5. Illawarra Shoalhaven in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had a provider concentration level of 55% compared to a benchmark of 85%.

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

For each of the 80 service districts 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 district. This results in a gap to benchmark for each district. A district is more likely to be flagged as a hot spot if it is below the benchmark.

There are 36 districts below benchmark and 44 districts above benchmark. Overall,

* 4 districts are more than 10% below the benchmark;
* 13 districts are 5% to 10% below the benchmark;
* 19 district is 0% to 5% below the benchmark;
* 25 districts are 0% to 5% above the benchmark;
* 16 districts are 5% to 10% above the benchmark; and
* 3 districts are more than 10% above the benchmark.

## Figure 10: Outcomes indicator on choice and control for districts with less than $100m in total plan budgets

Of the 28 districts with less than $100m in total plan budgets,

* 4 districts are more than 10% below benchmark;
* 3 districts are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 7 districts are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 4 districts are 0% to 5% above benchmark;
* 9 districts are 5% to 10% above benchmark; and
* 1 district is more than 10% above benchmark.

For these smaller districts, the top five potential hot spot districts 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 an outcomes indicator of 37%, compared to a benchmark of 46%.
2. TAS South East in Tasmania, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 15 to 24 years old, had an outcomes indicator of 46%, compared to a benchmark of 51%.
3. Darwin Remote in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 36%, compared to a benchmark of 56%.
4. Katherine in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 27%, compared to a benchmark of 45%.
5. Goldfields-Esperance in Western Australia, which phased in on 1 October 2018, had an outcomes indicator of 42%, compared to a benchmark of 53%.

## Figure 11: Outcomes indicator on choice and control for districts with $100m to $225m in total plan budgets

Of the 27 districts with $100m to $225m in total plan budgets,

* 3 districts are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 6 districts are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 12 districts are 0% to 5% above benchmark; and
* 6 districts are 5% to 10% above benchmark.

For these medium-sized districts, the top five potential hot spot districts have been identified based on their gap to benchmark, weighted by their total plan budget.

1. Brimbank Melton in Victoria, which phased into the Scheme on 1 October 2018, had an outcomes indicator of 48%, compared to a benchmark of 54%.
2. Central North Metro in Western Australia, which phased in on 1 July 2019, had an outcomes indicator of 44%, compared to a benchmark of 51%.
3. North Metro in Western Australia, which phased in on 1 October 2018, had an outcomes indicator of 48%, compared to a benchmark of 53%.
4. Darwin Urban in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 January 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 42%, compared to a benchmark of 47%.
5. Western New South Wales in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 49%, compared to a benchmark of 50%.

## Figure 12: Outcomes indicator on choice and control for districts with greater than $225m in total plan budgets

Of the 25 districts with greater than $225m in total plan budgets,

* 7 districts are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 6 districts are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 9 districts are 0% to 5% above benchmark;
* 1 district is 5% to 10% above benchmark; and
* 2 districts are more than 10% above benchmark.

For these larger districts, the top five potential hot spot districts 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 44%, compared to benchmark of 52%.
2. Western Sydney in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2016, had an outcomes indicator of 46%, compared to benchmark of 51%.
3. South Eastern Sydney in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 44%, compared to benchmark of 52%.
4. North Sydney in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2016, had an outcomes indicator of 45%, compared to benchmark of 50%.
5. Sydney in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 45%, compared to benchmark of 53%.