Region: North East Melbourne (phase in date: 1 July 2016) | Support Category: All | All Participants







Region: North East Melbourne (phase in date: 1 July 2016) | Support Category: All | All Participants



pport 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 NDIS helped choice and contr
re											
Consumables	3.628	143	25.4	76%	8%	8%	3.63	1.82	50%	50%	68%
Daily Activities	4,281	295	14.5	49%	16%	18%	107.27	91.27	85%	46%	69%
Community	4,201	215	20.8	45%	10%	10%	44,78	29.88	67%	43%	69%
Transport	3,365	43	78.3	73%	0%	100%	6.07	6.30	104%	42%	70%
Core total	5,935	429	13.8	42%	14%	9%	161.75	129.26	80%	42%	67%
	5,555	423	15.5	42.70	1470	370		123.20	0070	4370	0770
pacity Building											
Daily Activities	7,530	565	13.3	39% 🔵	9%	26%	27.69	15.38	56%	49%	66%
Employment	552	35	15.8	86%	11%	17%	3.66	2.75	75%	44%	72%
Social and Civic	1,212	130	9.3	45%	5%	10%	3.81	1.49	39%	55%	61%
Support Coordination	3,792	157	24.2	51%	12%	27%	10.66	6.52	61%	45%	67%
Capacity Building total	7,860	664	11.8	32%	10%	21%	50.65	28.72	57%	49%	66%
bital											
Assistive Technology	1,466	104	14.1	89%	25%	25%	4.85	2.87	59%	59%	68%
Home Modifications	865	25	34.6 🔴	91% 🔴	14%	14%	4.73	2.53	53%	29%	75%
Capital total	1,930	121	16.0	84%	21%	14%	9.59	5.41	56%	47%	72%
Missing	0	0	0.0	0%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0%	0%	0%
All support categories	8.053	926	8.7	36%	13%	15%	221.99	163.76	74%	50%	66%

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 limitations.

Indicator definitions	
Active participants with approved plans	Number of active participants who have an approved plan and reside in the region / 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 region / 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 providers for which payments have grown by more than 10% 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 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 regions / 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 regions / support categories when ranked by performance against benchmark for the given metric – in other words – performing relatively poorly under the metric under consideration
	dered 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. dered a lower score under the metric. For example, a low provider concentration is considered a sign of a competitive market.

Region: North East Melbourne (phase in date: 1 July 2016) | Support Category: All | Participants in Supported Independent Living (SIL)





Region: North East Melbourne (phase in date: 1 July 2016) | Support Category: All | Participants in Supported Independent Living (SIL)



pport 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 NDIS helped w choice and contro
re											
Consumables	438	50	8.8	90%	0%	0%	0.60	+ 0.30	50%	12%	77%
Daily Activities	653	64	10.2	71%	15%	21%	60.76	59.91	99%	14%	78%
Community	641	100	6.4	61%	5%	25%	13.37	9.65	72%	14%	79%
Transport	622	18	34.6	97%	0%	100%	0.79	0.76	97%	12%	78%
Core total	653	150	4.4	61%	13%	17%	75.51	70.63	94%	14%	78%
pacity Building											
Daily Activities	591	129	4.6	51%	0%	44% 🔴	1.52	0.78	51%	13%	78%
Employment	77	11	7.0	99%	0%	0%	0.53	0.49	94%	30%	87%
Social and Civic	18	19	0.9	85%	0%	0%	0.07	0.03	44%	28%	93%
Support Coordination	649	62	10.5	72%	0%	12%	2.14	1.48	69%	14%	78%
Capacity Building total	651	183	3.6	49%	0%	24%	5.20	3.23	62%	14%	78%
pital											
Assistive Technology	202	23	8.8	97%	0%	0%	0.73	+ 0.39	53%	14%	75%
Home Modifications	599	10	59.9 🔴	100% 🔴	33%	0%	3.86	2.25	58%	12%	78%
Capital total	608	32	19.0	90%	25%	0%	4.59	2.64	57%	12%	78%
Missing	0	0	0.0	0%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0%	0%	0%
All support categories	653	275	2.4	57%	10%	22%	85.30	76.50	90%	14%	78%

ſ		
	Indicator definitions	
	Active participants with approved plans	Number of active participants who have an approved plan and reside in the region / 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 region / support category, over the exposure period Ratio between the number of dative participants and the number of registered service providers Proportion of provider payments were the exposure period that were paid to the top 10 providers Proportion of providers for which payments have grown by more than 10% 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 struck 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 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 regions / 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 regions / support categories when ranked by performance against benchmark for the given metric – in other words – performing relatively poorly under the metric under consideration
		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.

Region: North East Melbourne (phase in date: 1 July 2016) | Support Category: All | Participants not in Supported Independent Living (Non-SIL)







Region: North East Melbourne (phase in date: 1 July 2016) | Support Category: All | Participants not in Supported Independent Living (Non-SIL)



upport 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 NDIS helped wit choice and control?
ore											
Consumables	3,190	132	24.2 🔴	74%	11%	0%	3.03	1.52	50%	59%	66%
Daily Activities	3,628	286	12.7	48%	15% 🔵	16%	46.52	31.35	67%	53%	67%
Community	3.835	209	18.3	42%	15%	11%	31.41	20.23	64%	49%	67%
Transport	2,743	35	78.4	76%	0%	0%	5.28	5.53	105%	49%	68%
Core total	5,282	412	12.8	38%	13%	9%	86.24	58.63	68%	55%	65%
apacity Building											
Daily Activities	6,939	541	12.8	39%	7%	25%	26.17	14.60	56%	55%	64%
Employment	475	35	13.6	85%	13%	25%	3.14	2.25	72%	46%	69%
Social and Civic	1,194	125	9.6	46%	5%	10%	3.73	1.46	39%	55%	61%
Support Coordination	3,143	153	20.5	50%	9%	24%	8.52	5.04	59%	52%	64%
Capacity Building total	7,209	642	11.2	33%	8%	23%	45.45	25.48	56%	55%	64%
apital											
Assistive Technology	1,264	99	12.8	91%	25%	25%	4.12	2.49	60%	69%	67%
Home Modifications	266	16	16.6	99% 🔴	0%	25%	0.87	0.28	32%	70%	66%
Capital total	1,322	108	12.2	88%	18%	18%	4.99	2.77	55%	68%	67%
Missing	0	0	0.0	0%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0%	0%	0%
All support categories	7.400	889	8.3	33%	13%	16%	136.69	87.26	64%	56%	64%

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 limitations.

Indicator definitions	
Active participants with approved plans	Number of active participants who have an approved plan and reside in the region / 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 region / 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 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 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 regions / 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 regions / support categories when ranked by performance against benchmark for the given metric – in other words – performing relatively poorly under the metric under consideration
	idered 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.