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



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





| upport category | Active participants with approved plans | 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 choice and control |
|-------------------------|--|------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------|---|---|
| ore | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Consumables | 327 | 18 | 18.2 | 95% | 0% | 0% | 0.2 | 0.1 | 34% | 38% | 38% |
| Daily Activities | 253 | 30 | 8.4 | 88% | 24% | 65% | 4.9 | 3.6 | 74% | 35% | 40% |
| Community | 279 | 19 | 14.7 | 93% | 20% | 10% | 3.0 | 1.4 | 46% | 36% | 41% |
| Transport | 193 | 10 | 19.3 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0.2 | 0.0 | 20% | 35% | 40% |
| Core total | 376 | 39 | 9.6 | 87% | 32% | 58% | 8.3 | 5.1 | 61% | 39% | 38% |
| apacity Building | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Choice and Control | 351 | 19 | 18.5 | 96% | 0% | 0% | 0.4 | 0.3 | 92% | 41% | 38% |
| Daily Activities | 400 | 33 | 12.1 | 86% | 7% | 14% | 3.6 | 1.3 | 37% | 40% | 37% |
| Employment | 41 | 2 | 20.5 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0% | 29% | 29% |
| Relationships | 15 | 2 | 7.5 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0.1 | + 0.0 | 5% | 11% | 29% |
| Social and Civic | 166 | 7 | 23.7 | 100% | 50% | 50% | 0.7 | 0.1 | 17% | 34% | 40% |
| Support Coordination | 399 | 30 | 13.3 | 94% | 9% | 9% | 1.9 | 1.3 | 69% | 40% | 37% |
| Capacity Building total | 402 | 54 | 7.4 | 78% | 11% | 15% | 6.8 | 3.1 | 46% | 40% | 37% |
| apital | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Assistive Technology | 91 | 10 | 9.1 | 100% | 0% | 100% | 0.5 | 0.1 | 13% | 62% | 46% |
| Home Modifications | 10 | 1 | 10.0 | 100% | 0% | 0% | + 0.0 | 0.0 | 7% | 70% | 50% |
| Capital total | 91 | 11 | 8.3 | 100% | 0% | 100% | 0.5 | 0.1 | 12% | 62% | 46% |
| Missing | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| All support categories | 402 | 73 | 5.5 | 78% | 21% | 32% | 15.7 | 8.3 | 53% | 40% | 37% |

| Note: Only the major support categories are snown. | |
|---|---|
| Note: Capacity Building total includes Health and We | ellbeing, Home Living and Lifelong Learning although these support categories are not shown. |
| Note: A utilisation rate may be above 100% for the si | ix month exposure period considered, due to the uneven distribution of payments over the duration of a plan. In addition, the utilisation rate for core supports may be above 100% due to fungibility which 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 service district / have supports relating to the support category in their plan. |
| | |
| Active providers | Number of providers that received payments for supports provided to participants within the service district / support category, over the exposure period. |
| Participants per provider | Ratio between the number of active participants and the number of active 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 suppose committed in particular plans to the explosing period. Value of planyments 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 | Value of all pathiests over the exposure period industry partiests to providers, payments of participants, and others payments and total plant exposure providers. Ratio between payments and total plant doubtes. |
| Othisation | Natio between payments and total pian total |
| Outcomes indicator on choice and control | 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? | 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 percentile of service districts / support categories when ranked by performance against benchmark for the given metric. In other words, performing relatively well under the given metric. |
| | The red dots indicate the bottom 10 percentile of service districts / support categories when ranked by performance against benchmark for the given metric. In other words, performing relatively poorly under the given metric. |
| | |
| | ance under some metrics. For example, a high utilisation rate is a sign of a functioning market where participants have access to the supports they need. |
| For other metrics, a lower score is considered to be | good' performance. For example, a low provider concentration is a sign of a competitive market. |

Service District: Darwin Remote (phase-in date: 1 July 2017) | Support Category: All | Participants Receiving SIL/SDA



Service District: Darwin Remote (phase-in date: 1 July 2017) | Support Category: All | Participants Receiving SIL/SDA






| Consumables | pport category | Active participants with approved plans | 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 choice and control |
|--|-------------------------|---|------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------|---|--|
| Daily Activities 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | re | | | į | | | | | | | | |
| Community 1 1 1 1.0 100% 0% 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 68% 100% Core total 1 1.0 100% 0% 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 1536% 100% 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 1536% 100% 0% 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 1536% 100% 0% 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 1536% 100% 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 1536% 0% 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 1536% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 108% 100% 0% 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 0.0 108% 100% 0% 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 0.0 0% 0% 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 | Consumables | 1 | 1 | 1.0 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 46% | 100% | 100% |
| Transport 1 1 1 1.0 100% 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 153% 100% 100% Core total 1 1 1.0 100% 0% 0% 100% 0.1 0.0 26% 100% 100% 0.1 0.0 26% 100% 0.1 0.0 26% 100% 0.1 0.0 0.0 26% 100% 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 | Daily Activities | 1 | 1 | 1.0 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0.1 | 0.0 | 15% | 100% | 100% |
| Core total 1 | Community | 1 | 1 | 1.0 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 68% | 100% | 100% |
| Core total 1 | Transport | 1 | 1 | 1.0 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 153% | 100% | 100% |
| Choice and Control 1 1 1 1.0 100% 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 108% 100% 0 100% | Core total | 1 | 1 | | 100% | 0% | 100% | 0.1 | 0.0 | 26% | 100% | 100% |
| Choice and Control 1 1 1 1.0 100% 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 108% 100% 0 100% | pacity Building | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Daily Activities 1 1 1 1.0 100% 0% 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 8% 100% Employment 0 0 0 0.0 0% 0% 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 0% 0% 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 | | 1 | 1 | 1.0 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 108% | 100% | 100% |
| Employment 0 0 0 0.0 0.0 0% 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 0.0 0% 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 | Daily Activities | 1 | 1 | | | | 0% | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 100% |
| Social and Civic 0 0 0.0 0.0 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 0% 0% Support Coordination 1 1 1.0 100% 0% 0.0 0.0 0.0 133% 100% Capacity Building total 1 1 1.0 100% 0% 100% 0.0 0.0 55% 100% pital Assistive Technology 1 1 1.0 100% 0% 0.0 0.0 45% 100% 0 Home Modifications 1 1.0 100% 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 21% 100% 0 | | 0 | 0 | | | 0% | 0% | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0% |
| Support Coordination | Relationships | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Capacity Building total 1 1 1.0 100% 0% 100% 0.0 0.0 55% 100% pital Assistive Technology 1 1 1.0 100% 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 45% 100% 0 Home Modifications 1 1 1.0 100% 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 21% 100% 0 | Social and Civic | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Capacity Building total 1 1 1.0 100% 0% 100% 0.0 0.0 55% 100% Pital Assistive Technology 1 1 1 1.0 100% 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 45% 100% 0 100% | Support Coordination | 1 | 1 | 1.0 | | | | 0.0 | | | 100% | 100% |
| Assistive Technology 1 1 1 1.0 • 100% • 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 45% 100% • Home Modifications 1 1 1.0 • 100% • 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 21% 100% • | Capacity Building total | 1 | 1 | 1.0 | 100% | 0% | 100% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 55% | 100% | 100% |
| Assistive Technology 1 1 1 1.0 • 100% • 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 45% 100% • Home Modifications 1 1 1.0 • 100% • 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 21% 100% • | pital | | | į | | | | | | | | |
| Home Modifications 1 1 1.0 ● 100% ● 0% 0% 0.0 21% 100% ● | | 1 | 1 | 1.0 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 45% | 100% | 100% |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1.0 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21% | 100% | 100% |
| 50 100 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 0 | Capital total | 1 | 2 | 0.5 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 31% | 100% | 100% |
| Missing 0 0 0.0 0% 0% 0% 0.0 0.0 0% | Missing | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% |

| Note: Only the major support categories are shown. | |
|--|---|
| | being, Home Living and Lifelong Learning although these support categories are not shown. |
| Note: A utilisation rate may be above 100% for the six | month exposure period considered, due to the uneven distribution of payments over the duration of a plan. In addition, the utilisation rate for core supports may be above 100% due to fungibility which 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 service district / have supports relating to the support category in their plan. |
| Active providers | Number of providers that received payments for supports provided to participants within the service district / support category, over the exposure period. |
| Participants per provider | Number of provides that received payments of supports provided to participations within the service distinct/ support category, over the exposure period. Ratio between the number of active participats and the number of active providers. |
| Provider concentration | Proportion of provider payments over the exposure period that were paid to the total of provider s. |
| 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. |
| Tatalalan kudasta | |
| Total plan budgets Payments | Value of supports committed in participant plans for the exposure period. Value of all paryments over the exposure period, including payments to providers, payments (in-kind and Younger People In Residential Aged Care (YPIRAC)). |
| Utilisation | value or all payments over the explosure person, including payments or providers, payments to participants, and on-system payments and todard and including the payments and total plan budgets. Ratio between payments and total plan budgets. |
| o timo di ori | Natio outroon polynomia una total pain societa. |
| Outcomes indicator on choice and control | 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? | 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 percentile of service districts / support categories when ranked by performance against benchmark for the given metric. In other words, performing relatively well under the given metric. |
| | The great dots indicate the cut in between the service usualizes, support categories when rained by performance against benchmark for the given metric. In other words, performing relatively beautiful and usualized in the given metric. |
| <u>-</u> | |
| | ce under some metrics. For example, a high utilisation rate is a sign of a functioning market where participants have access to the supports they need. |
| For other metrics, a lower score is considered to be | good' performance. For example, a low provider concentration is a sign of a competitive market. |

Service District: Darwin Remote (phase-in date: 1 July 2017) | Support Category: All | Participants Not Receiving SIL/SDA







| upport category | Active participants with approved plans | 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 he choice and co | |
|-------------------------|---|------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----|-----------------------|---|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------|---|----------------------------------|---|
| ore | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Consumables | 326 | 18 | 18.1 | 95% | 0% | • | 0% | | 0.2 | 0.1 | 34% | 38% | 37% | |
| Daily Activities | 252 | 30 | 8.4 | 88% | 24% | | 59% | | 4.8 | 3.6 | 74% | 35% | 39% | |
| Community | 278 | 19 | 14.6 | 94% | 22% | į | 11% | | 3.0 | 1.4 | 46% | 36% | 40% | |
| Transport | 192 | 10 | 19.2 | 100% | 0% | | 0% | | 0.2 | 0.0 | 20% | 35% | 39% | |
| Core total | 375 | 39 | 9.6 | 87% | 32% | | 53% | | 8.2 | 5.1 | 61% | 39% | 37% | |
| apacity Building | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Choice and Control | 350 | 19 | 18.4 | 96% | 0% | • | 0% | | 0.4 | 0.3 | 92% | 41% | 37% | |
| Daily Activities | 399 | 33 | 12.1 | 86% | 7% | 1 | 14% | | 3.5 | 1.3 | 37% | 40% | 36% | |
| Employment | 41 | 2 | 20.5 | 100% | 0% | • | 0% | | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0% | 29% | 29% | |
| Relationships | 15 | 2 | 7.5 | 100% | 0% | • | 0% | | 0.1 | + 0.0 | 5% | 11% | 29% | |
| Social and Civic | 166 | 7 | 23.7 | 100% | 50% | • ! | 50% | | 0.7 | 0.1 | 17% | 34% | 40% | |
| Support Coordination | 398 | 30 | 13.3 | 94% | 9% | 1 | 9% | | 1.9 | 1.3 | 69% | 40% | 36% | |
| Capacity Building total | 401 | 54 | 7.4 | 78% | 11% | | 15% | | 6.8 | 3.1 | 46% | 40% | 36% | |
| apital | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Assistive Technology | 90 | 10 | 9.0 | 100% | 0% | • | 100% | • | 0.5 | 0.1 | 12% | 62% | 45% | |
| Home Modifications | 9 | 0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | • | 0% | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0% | 67% | 33% | |
| Capital total | 90 | 10 | 9.0 | 100% | 0% | | 100% | | 0.5 | 0.1 | 12% | 62% | 45% | |
| Missing | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | | 0% | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | |
| All support categories | 401 | 72 | 5.6 | 78% | 21% | | 32% | | 15.6 | 8.2 | 53% | 40% | 36% | — |

| Indicator definitions | |
|--|---|
| Active participants with approved plans | 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 Participants per provider Provider concentration Provider growth Provider shrinkage | Number of providers that received payments for supports provided to participants within the service district / support category, over the exposure period. Ratio between the number of active participants and the number of active 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 percentile of service districts / support categories when ranked by performance against benchmark for the given metric. In other words, performing relatively well under the given metric. The red dots indicate the bottom 10 percentile of service districts / support categories when ranked by performance against benchmark for the given metric. In other words, performing relatively well under the given metric. |
| | ance under some metrics. For example, a high utilisation rate is a sign of a functioning market where participants have access to the supports they need. |