# Service District / Support Category Summary Dashboard – participants receiving SIL/SDA – as at 31 December 2021 (with exposure period: 1 April 2021 to 30 September 2021)
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## Page 1, Table 1: Service district summary

For **participants receiving SIL/SDA** across 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 SIL/SDA 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 percentile and bottom 10 percentile of service districts – by gap to benchmark – are highlighted.

For **participants receiving SIL/SDA per provider**, the top 10 percentile service districts are as follows.

* Hume Moreland (Victoria) has 0.8 participants receiving SIL/SDA per provider.
* Barossa, Light and Lower North (South Australia) has 0.7.
* Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island (South Australia) has 0.9.
* Barkly (Northern Territory) has 0.6.
* Darwin Remote (Northern Territory) has 0.5.
* East Arnhem (Northern Territory) has 1.0.
* Katherine (Northern Territory) has 0.8.
* Kimberley-Pilbara (Western Australia) has 1.0.

The bottom 10 percentile service districts are as follows.

* Hunter New England (New South Wales) has 2.6 participants receiving SIL/SDA per provider.
* Murrumbidgee (New South Wales) has 2.5.
* Northern New South Wales (New South Wales) has 2.7.
* Western New South Wales (New South Wales) has 2.7.
* Bayside Peninsula (Victoria) has 2.7.
* Western District (Victoria) has 3.1.
* Northern Adelaide (South Australia) has 2.9.
* Southern Adelaide (South Australia) has 2.9.

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

* Hunter New England (New South Wales) has provider concentration level of 38%.
* South Western Sydney (New South Wales) has 37%.
* Beenleigh (Queensland) has 46%.
* Brisbane (Queensland) has 42%.
* Caboolture/Strathpine (Queensland) has 44%.
* Ipswich (Queensland) has 36%.
* Maroochydore (Queensland) has 42%.
* Robina (Queensland) has 44%.

The bottom 10 percentile service districts are as follows.

* Far West (New South Wales) has provider concentration level of 100%.
* Barkly (Northern Territory) has 99%.
* Darwin Remote (Northern Territory) has 100%.
* East Arnhem (Northern Territory) has 100%.
* Goldfields – Esperance (Western Australia) has 99%.
* Great Southern (Western Australia) has 99%.
* Midwest – Gascoyne (Western Australia) has 99%.
* Wheat Belt (Western Australia) has 99%.

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

* Far West (New South Wales) has provider growth of 17% since the previous exposure period.
* Brimbank Melton (Victoria) has provider growth of 20%.
* Hume Moreland (Victoria) has 17%.
* Mallee (Victoria) has 17%.
* Outer Gippsland (Victoria) has 25%.
* Rockhampton (Queensland) has 17%.
* Far North (South Australia) has 17%.
* Kimberly-Pilbara (Western Australia) has 20%.

The bottom 10 percentile service districts are as follows.

* Eyre and Western (South Australia) has provider growth of 0% since the previous exposure period.
* Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island (South Australia) has 0%.
* Barkly (Northern Territory) has 0%.
* Darwin Remote (Northern Territory) has 0%.
* East Arnhem (Northern Territory) has 0%.
* Goldfields – Esperance (Western Australia) has 0%.
* Great Southern (Western Australia) has 0%.
* Midwest – Gascoyne (Western Australia) has 0%.
* Wheat Belt (Western Australia) has 0%.

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

* Adelaide Hills (South Australia) has provider shrinkage of 3% since the previous exposure period.
* Eyre and Western (South Australia) has 0%.
* Far North (South Australia) has 0%.
* Murray and Mallee (South Australia) has 4%.
* Barkly (Northern Territory) has 0%.
* East Arnhem (Northern Territory) has 0%.
* Great Southern (Western Australia) has 0%.
* Midwest – Gascoyne (Western Australia) has 0%.

The bottom 10 percentile service districts are as follows.

* Far West (New South Wales) has provider shrinkage of 33% since the previous exposure period.
* Limestone Coast (South Australia) has 29%.
* TAS South West (Tasmania) has 25%.
* Central Australia (Northern Territory) has 34%.
* Darwin Remote (Northern Territory) has 100%.
* Darwin Urban (Northern Territory) has 25%.
* Goldfields – Esperance (Western Australia) has 25%.
* Kimberley – Pilbara (Western Australia) has 40%.

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

* Beenleigh (Queensland) has utilisation of 94%.
* Brisbane (Queensland) has 99%.
* Ipswich (Queensland) has 100%.
* Maryborough (Queensland) has 96%.
* Robina (Queensland) has 92%.
* Rockhampton (Queensland) has 92%.
* Townsville (Queensland) has 92%.
* Barkly (Northern Territory) has 96%.

The bottom 10 percentile service districts are as follows.

* Barwon (Victoria) has utilisation of 81%.
* Brimbank Melton (Victoria) has 79%.
* Outer East Melbourne (Victoria) has 81%.
* Ovens Murray (Victoria) has 79%.
* Eyre and Western (South Australia) has 77%.
* Darwin Remote (Northern Territory) has 33%.
* East Arnhem (Northern Territory) has 59%.
* Great Southern (Western Australia) has 79%.

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

* Barwon (Victoria) has an outcomes indicator on choice and control of 26%.
* Robina (Queensland) has 25%.
* Rockhampton (Queensland) has 27%.
* Toowoomba (Queensland) has 24%.
* TAS South West (Tasmania) has 27%.
* Australian Capital Territory has 25%.
* Darwin Remote (Northern Territory) has 100%.
* East Arnhem (Northern Territory) has 50%.

The bottom 10 percentile service districts are as follows.

* Inner East Melbourne (Victoria) has an outcomes indicator on choice and control of 9%.
* Loddon (Victoria) has 9%.
* Far North (South Australia) has 4%.
* Barkly (Northern Territory) has 0%.
* Central Australia (Northern Territory) has 8%.
* Darwin Urban (Northern Territory) has 9%.
* Katherine (Northern Territory) has 7%.
* Goldfields – Esperance (Western Australia) has 4%.

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

* North Sydney (New South Wales) has an indicator of 89%.
* Goulburn (Victoria) has 88%.
* Outer Gippsland (Victoria) has 89%.
* Bundaberg (Queensland) has 91%.
* Maroochydore (Queensland) has 91%.
* TAS North West (Tasmania) has 89%.
* Barkly (Northern Territory) has 100%.
* Darwin Remote (Northern Territory) has 100%.

The bottom 10 percentile service districts are as follows.

* Eastern Adelaide (South Australia) has an indicator of 62%.
* Northern Adelaide (South Australia) has 69%.
* Southern Adelaide (South Australia) has 69%.
* Yorke and Mid North (South Australia) has 64%.
* Central Australia (Northern Territory) has 64%.
* East Arnhem (Northern Territory) has 0%.
* Goldfields – Esperance (Western Australia) has 68%.
* Kimberley – Pilbara (Western Australia) has 62%.

## 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 receiving SIL/SDA with approved plans, the number of active providers, total plan budgets and total payments are also shown. Indicators are added where the top 10 percentile and bottom 10 percentile of service districts – by gap to benchmark – are highlighted.

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

* Capacity Building – Lifelong Learning has 2.0 participants per provider.
* Capacity Building – Social and Civic has 4.0.

The bottom 10 percentile support categories are as follows.

* Core – Transport has 42.6 participants per provider.
* Capital – Home Modifications has 47.6.

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

* Core – Community has a provider concentration level of 17%.
* Capacity Building – Support Coordination has 15%.

The bottom 10 percentile support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Home Living has a provider concentration level of 100%.
* Capacity Building – Lifelong Learning has 100%.

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

* Capacity Building – Relationships has provider growth of 14% since the previous exposure period.
* Capital – Home Modifications has 14%.

The bottom 10 percentile support categories are as follows.

* Core – Transport has provider growth of 0% since the previous exposure period.
* Capacity Building – Employment has 0%.
* Capacity Building – Home Living has 0%.
* Capacity Building – Lifelong Learning has 0%.
* Capacity Building – Social and Civic has 0%.

For **provider shrinkage**, the top 10 percentile support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Home Living has provider shrinkage of 0% since the previous exposure period.
* Capacity Building – Lifelong Learning has 0%.

The bottom 10 percentile support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Employment has provider shrinkage of 73% since the previous exposure period.
* Capital – Assistive Technology has 34%.

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

* Core – Daily Activities has an utilisation rate of 96%.
* Capacity Building – Choice and Control has 101%.

The bottom 10 percentile support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Home Living has an utilisation rate of 14%.
* Capacity Building – Lifelong Learning has 10%.

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

* Capacity Building – Home Living has an outcomes indicator of 38%.
* Capacity Building – Lifelong Learning has 50%.

The bottom 10 percentile support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Relationships has an outcomes indicator 11%.
* Capital – Home Modifications has 15%.

For **“Has the NDIS helped with choice and control?” indicator**, the top 10 percentile support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Health and Wellbeing has an indicator of 82%.
* Capacity Building – Home Living has 89%.

The bottom 10 percentile support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Lifelong Learning has an indicator of 50%.
* Capacity Building – Social and Civic has 76%.

## 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: A higher score is considered to be ‘good’ performance 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.