Region: Hume Moreland (phase in date: 1 March 2018) | Support Category: All | All Participants







Region: Hume Moreland (phase in date: 1 March 2018) | Support Category: All | All Participants



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											1
Consumables	3,857	167	23.1 🔴	67%	11%	0%	3.49	1.69	48%	49%	63%
Daily Activities	2,998	304	9.9	50%	31%	12%	53.47	41.21	77%	48%	63%
Community	3,125	231	13.5	46%	22%	9%	29.18	17.42	60%	47%	64%
Transport	2,164	29	74.6	87%	0%	0%	5.20	5.50	106% 🔵	45%	64%
Core total	4,601	468	9.8	41%	24%	8%	91.33	65.81	72%	51%	63%
apacity Building											1
Daily Activities	5,321	418	12.7	46%	25%	8%	21.12	10.37	49%	51%	63%
Employment	272	26	10.5	89%	9%	9%	1.82	1.24	68%	46%	65%
Social and Civic	436	56	7.8	53%	0%	0%	0.96	+ 0.30	31%	59%	62%
Support Coordination	1,862	157	11.9	50%	12%	0%	4.50	3.17	70%	44%	62%
Capacity Building total	5,390	535	10.1	38%	21%	8%	30.58	16.37	54%	51%	63%
apital											1
Assistive Technology	1,024	81	12.6	76%	67%	11%	3.54	2.58	73%	56%	67%
Home Modifications	303	17	17.8	95% 🔴	0%	0%	1.05	0.57	54%	27%	65%
Capital total	1,149	92	12.5	73%	67%	11%	4.58	3.15	69%	50%	67%
Missing	0	0	0.0	0%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0%	0%	0%
All support categories	5.468	840	6.5	34%	26%	8%	126.50	85.41	68%	52%	62%

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 05% 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
	ed 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. ad a lower score under the metric. For example, a low provider concentration is considered a sign of a competitive market.

Region: Hume Moreland (phase in date: 1 March 2018) | Support Category: All | Participants in Supported Independent Living (SIL)

Psychosocial disability

35 to 44

9 (Medium)







Missing

Region: Hume Moreland (phase in date: 1 March 2018) | Support Category: All | Participants in Supported Independent Living (SIL)



oport 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 wi choice and control
e											
Consumables	175	26	6.7	88%	0%	0%	0.31	+ 0.10	32%	12%	62%
Daily Activities	204	41	5.0	94%	14%	7%	18.21	17.31	95%	15%	63%
Community	200	65	3.1	63%	17%	10% 🔴	4.36	2.70	62%	14%	63%
Transport	196	7	28.0	100%	0%	0%	0.24	0.19	77%	12%	64%
Core total	204	90	2.3	77%	27%	12%	23.12	20.30	88%	15%	63%
pacity Building											
Daily Activities	200	59	3.4	64%	0%	33% 🔴	0.59	0.25	43%	16%	63%
Employment	9	3	3.0	100%	0%	0%	0.07	+ 0.05	75%	44%	67%
Social and Civic	6	4	1.5	100%	0%	0%	0.03	0.01	33%	67%	67%
Support Coordination	204	38	5.4	78%	20%	0%	0.51	0.34	67%	15%	63%
Capacity Building total	204	95	2.1	55%	8%	0%	1.39	0.73	52%	15%	63%
bital											
Assistive Technology	72	9	8.0	100% 🔴	0%	0%	0.28	* 0.11	39%	13%	51%
Home Modifications	168	4	42.0 🔴	100%	0%	0%	0.74	0.44	59%	8% 🔴	58%
Capital total	172	13	13.2	99%	0%	0%	1.02	0.55	54%	8%	59%
Missing	0	0	0.0	0%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0%	0%	0%
All support categories	204	157	1.3	72%	23%	10%	25.53	21.58	85%	15%	63%

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 tare 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 shown 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
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. onsidered a lower score under the metric. For example, a low provider concentration is considered a sign of a competitive market.

Region: Hume Moreland (phase in date: 1 March 2018) | Support Category: All | Participants not in Supported Independent Living (Non-SIL)







Region: Hume Moreland (phase in date: 1 March 2018) | 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 w choice and contro
ore											
Consumables	3,682	164	22.5 🔴	67%	0%	0%	3.18	1.59	50%	53%	63%
Daily Activities	2,794	301	9.3	49%	29%	15%	35.26	23.89	68%	52%	63%
Community	2,925	220	13.3	45%	22%	8%	24.83	14.72	59%	50%	64%
Transport	1,968	24	82.0 🔴	89%	0%	0%	4.95	5.31	107% 🔵	49%	65%
Core total	4,397	459	9.6	40%	24%	9%	68.22	45.51	67%	54%	63%
apacity Building											
Daily Activities	5,121	408	12.6	46%	24%	9%	20.53	10.12	49%	54%	63%
Employment	263	25	10.5	89%	9%	9%	1.76	1.19	68%	46% 🔴	65%
Social and Civic	430	56	7.7	53%	0%	0%	0.93	0.29	31%	59%	62%
Support Coordination	1,658	150	11.1	50%	11%	0%	3.99	2.83	71%	48%	62%
Capacity Building total	5,186	519	10.0	37%	20%	8%	29.18	15.64	54%	54%	63%
apital											
Assistive Technology	952	80	11.9	76%	63%	13%	3.26	2.48	76%	61%	69%
Home Modifications	135	13	10.4	99% 🔴	0%	0%	0.30	+ 0.13	42%	54%	74%
Capital total	977	88	11.1	74%	63%	13%	3.56	2.60	73%	61%	70%
Missing	0	0	0.0	0%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0%	0%	0%
All support categories	5.264	819	6.4	34%	25%	8%	100.97	63.84	63%	55%	62%

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
	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. idered a lower score under the metric. For example, a low provider concentration is considered a sign of a competitive market.