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## Table of Contents

[Service District / Support Category Summary Dashboard – as at 30 June 2021 (with exposure period: 1 October 2020 to 31 March 2021) 1](#_Toc81835798)

[Table of Contents 1](#_Toc81835799)

[Page 1, Table 1: Service district summary 2](#_Toc81835800)

[Page 2, Table 1: Support category summary, for all service districts 5](#_Toc81835801)

[Page 2, Table 2: Definitions for the indicators 7](#_Toc81835802)

## Page 1, Table 1: Service district summary

For each of the 80 service districts, 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 active providers, total plan budgets and total payments are also shown. Indicators are added where the top 10% and bottom 10% of service districts – by gap to benchmark – are highlighted.

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

* Far West (New South Wales) has 6.4 participants per provider.
* Far North (South Australia) has 6.2.
* Barkly (Northern Territory) has 3.3.
* Central Australia (Northern Territory) has 5.5.
* Darwin Remote (Northern Territory) has 5.6.
* East Arnhem (Northern Territory) has 4.5.
* Katherine (Northern Territory) has 2.6.
* Wheat Belt (Western Australia) has 4.7.

The bottom 10% service districts are as follows.

* Hunter New England (New South Wales) has 17.2 participants per provider.
* Mid North Coast (New South Wales) has 17.8.
* Northern New South Wales (New South Wales) has 17.0.
* Bayside Peninsula (Victoria) has 16.4.
* Western District (Victoria) has 15.7.
* Northern Adelaide (South Australia) has 20.7.
* Southern Adelaide (South Australia) has 17.3.
* Australian Capital Territory has 18.0.

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

* Hunter New England (New South Wales) has provider concentration level of 26%.
* Nepean Blue Mountains (New South Wales) has 34%.
* South Western Sydney (New South Wales) has 27%.
* Western Sydney (New South Wales) has 31%.
* North East Melbourne (Victoria) has 37%.
* Beenleigh (Queensland) has 37%
* Brisbane (Queensland) has 36%.
* Ipswich (Queensland) has 31%.

The bottom 10% service districts are as follows.

* Far North (South Australia) has provider concentration level of 91%.
* Limestone Coast (South Australia) has 84%.
* Barkly (Northern Territory) has 84%.
* East Arnhem (Northern Territory) has 87%.
* Katherine (Northern Territory) has 86%.
* Goldfields – Esperance (Western Australia) has 91%.
* Great Southern (Western Australia) has 88%.
* Midwest – Gascoyne (Western Australia) has 93%.

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

* Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island (South Australia) has provider growth of 21% since the previous exposure period.
* Darwin Remote (Northern Territory) has 19%.
* Central North Metro (Western Australia) has 18%.
* Goldfields – Esperance (Western Australia) has 21%.
* Great Southern (Western Australia) has 20%.
* South East Metro (Western Australia) has 19%.
* South West (Western Australia) has 19%.
* Wheat Belt (Western Australia) has 17%.

The bottom 10% service districts are as follows.

* Central Highlands (Victoria) has provider growth of 4% since the previous exposure period.
* Goulburn (Victoria) has 7%.
* Western District (Victoria) has 5%.
* Mackay (Queensland) has 7%.
* Townsville (Queensland) has 9%.
* Adelaide Hills (South Australia) has 6%.
* Eyre and Western (South Australia) has 3%.
* Limestone Coast (South Australia) has 7%.
* Western Adelaide (South Australia) has 6%.

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

* Far West (New South Wales) has provider shrinkage of 13% since the previous exposure period.
* Inner Gippsland (Victoria) has 13%.
* Central North Metro (Western Australia) has 14%.
* Central South Metro (Western Australia) has 13%.
* Great Southern (Western Australia) has 13%.
* Midwest – Gascoyne (Western Australia) has 11%.
* South East Metro (Western Australia) has 12%.

The bottom 10% service districts are as follows.

* Southern New South Wales (New South Wales) has provider shrinkage of 25% since the previous exposure period.
* Barwon (Victoria) has 30%.
* Goulburn (Victoria) has 24%.
* Outer East Melbourne (Victoria) has 26%.
* Mackay (Queensland) has 25%.
* Eastern Adelaide (South Australia) has 27%.
* Western Adelaide (South Australia) has 25%.
* Barkly (Northern Territory) has 40%.

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

* South Eastern Sydney (New South Wales) has utilisation of 76%.
* South Western Sydney (New South Wales) has 78%.
* Beenleigh (Queensland) has 75%.
* Brisbane (Queensland) has 75%.
* Maroochydore (Queensland) has 72%.
* Robina (Queensland) has 76%.
* Central North Metro (Western Australia) has 69%.
* South West (Western Australia) has 70%.

The bottom 10% service districts are as follows.

* Eyre and Western (South Australia) has utilisation of 55%.
* Far North (South Australia) has 56%.
* Murray and Mallee (South Australia) has 63%.
* Barkly (Northern Territory) has 64%.
* Darwin Remote (Northern Territory) has 46%.
* East Arnhem (Northern Territory) has 46%.
* Kimberley-Pilbara (Western Australia) has 51%.
* Wheat Belt (Western Australia) has 54%.

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

* Barwon (Victoria) has an outcomes indicator on choice and control of 66%.
* Toowoomba (Queensland) has 59%.
* Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island (South Australia) has 62%.
* Limestone Coast (South Australia) has 61%.
* Murray and Mallee (South Australia) has 60%.
* TAS South West (Tasmania) has 58%.
* Australian Capital Territory has 65%.
* Barkly (Northern Territory) has 70%

The bottom 10% service districts are as follows.

* South Eastern Sydney (New South Wales) has an outcomes indicator of 45%.
* South Western Sydney (New South Wales) has 45%.
* Central Australia (Northern Territory) has 38%.
* Darwin Remote (Northern Territory) has 38%.
* East Arnhem (Northern Territory) has 46%.
* Katherine (Northern Territory) has 31%.
* Central North Metro (Western Australia) has 45%.
* Goldfields – Esperance (Western Australia) has 45%.

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

* Southern New South Wales (New South Wales) has 79%.
* Beenleigh (Queensland) has 83%.
* Brisbane (Queensland) has 80%.
* Bundaberg (Queensland) has 81%.
* Maroochydore (Queensland) has 85%.
* Toowoomba (Queensland) has 80%.
* Katherine (Northern Territory) has 81%.
* South East Metro (Western Australia) has 79%.

The bottom 10% service districts are as follows.

* Far North (South Australia) has an indicator of 53%.
* Limestone Coast (South Australia) has 63%.
* Darwin Remote (Northern Territory) has 37%.
* East Arnhem (Northern Territory) has 37%.
* Goldfields – Esperance (Western Australia) has 53%.
* Kimberley – Pilbara (Western Australia) has 62%.
* Midwest-Gascoyne (Western Australia) has 59%.
* Wheat Belt (Western Australia) has 61%.

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

For each of the 15 support categories, the same indicators have been calculated. The number of active participants with approved plans, the number of active providers, total plan budgets and total payments are also shown. Indicators are added where the top 10% and bottom 10% of service districts – by gap to benchmark – are highlighted.

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

* Capacity Building – Home Living has 20.7 participants per provider.
* Capacity Building – Lifelong Learning has 8.3.

The bottom 10% support categories are as follows.

* Core – Transport has 181.2 participants per provider.
* Capacity Building – Choice and Control has 208.0.

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

* Core - Community has a provider concentration level of 19%.
* Capacity Building – Support Coordination has 12%.

The bottom 10% support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Home Living has a provider concentration level of 47%.
* Capacity Building – Lifelong Learning has 85%.

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

* Core – Community has provider growth of 15% since the previous exposure period.
* Capacity Building – Home Living has 20%.

The bottom 10% support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Health and Wellbeing has provider growth of 5% 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 6% since the previous exposure period.
* Capacity Building – Lifelong Learning has 0%.

The bottom 10% support categories are as follows.

* Capital – Assistive Technology has provider shrinkage of 41% since the previous exposure period.
* Capital – Home Modifications has 35%.

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

* Core – Transport has an utilisation rate of 96%.
* Capacity Building – Choice and Control has 95%.

The bottom 10% support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Home Living has an utilisation rate of 16%.
* Capacity Building – Lifelong Learning has 23%.

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

* Capital – Assistive Technology has an outcomes indicator of 61%.
* Capital – Home Modifications has 40%.

The bottom 10% support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Lifelong Learning has an outcomes indicator of 29%.
* 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 79%.
* Capital – Assistive Technology has 78%.

The bottom 10% support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Home Living has an indicator of 65%.
* Capacity Building – Relationships has 71%.

## 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 service district / have supports relating to the support category in their plan.
* **Active providers** is defined as the number of providers that received payments for supports provided to participants within the service 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 active 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.