# Region / Support Category Summary Dashboard – SIL only – as at 31 December 2019 (with exposure period: 1 April 2019 to 30 September 2019)
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## Page 1, Table 1: Bilateral region summary

For **participants utilising Supported Independent Living (SIL) supports** across each of the 76 bilateral regions with more than 12 months experience in Scheme, 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 NDIS helped with choice and control?” indicator

The number of active (SIL) participants with approved plans, the number of registered active providers, total plan budgets and total payments are also shown. The 7 indicators have a ‘traffic light system’ where the top 10% and bottom 10% of regions – by gap to benchmark – are highlighted.

For (SIL) **participants per provider**, the top 10% regions are as follows.

* Far West (New South Wales) has 1.0 (SIL) participants per provider.
* Barossa, Light and Lower North (South Australia) has 0.8.
* Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island (South Australia) has 1.0.
* Barkly (Northern Territory) has 0.9.
* Katherine (Northern Territory) has 0.8.
* Goldfields-Esperance (Western Australia) has 0.3.
* North Metro (Western Australia) has 1.0.
* Wheat Belt (Western Australia) has 4.4.

The bottom 10% regions are as follows.

* Hunter New England (New South Wales) has 3.1 participants per provider.
* Western NSW (New South Wales) has 2.9
* Mallee (Victoria) has 2.7.
* Outer Gippsland (Victoria) has 3.4.
* Western District (Victoria) has 2.9.
* Northern Adelaide (South Australia) has 3.3.
* Southern Adelaide (South Australia) has 3.6.
* North East Metro (Western Australia) has 3.0.

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

* Hunter New England (New South Wales) has provider concentration level of 51%.
* South Western Sydney (New South Wales) has 59%.
* Sydney (New South Wales) has 60%.
* Bayside Peninsula (Victoria) has 60%.
* North East Melbourne (Victoria) has 53%.
* Brisbane (Queensland) has 61%.
* Ipswich (Queensland) has 57%.
* Toowoomba (Queensland) has 59%.

The bottom 10% regions are as follows.

* Far West (New South Wales) has provider concentration level of 99%.
* Eyre and Western (South Australia) has 99%.
* Far North (South Australia) has 99%.
* Yorke and Mid North (South Australia) has 99%.
* Barkly (Northern Territory) has 100%.
* Goldfields – Esperance (Western Australia) has 100%.
* Kimberley – Pilbara (Western Australia) has 100%.
* Wheat Belt (Western Australia) has 100%.

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

* Mallee (Victoria) has provider growth of 100% since the previous exposure period.
* Outer Gippsland (Victoria) has provider growth of 80% since the previous exposure period.
* Caboolture / Strathpine (Queensland) has 87%.
* Maroochydore (Queensland) has 92%.
* Adelaide hills (South Australia) has 99%.
* Murray and Mallee (South Australia) has 99%.
* Kimberley – Pilbara (Western Australia) has 100%.
* South West (Western Australia) has 100%.

The bottom 10% regions are as follows.

* Far West (New South Wales) has provider growth of 0% since the previous exposure period.
* Northern NSW (New South Wales) has 7%.
* Southern NSW (New South Wales) has 5%.
* Western District (Victoria) has 4%.
* Bundaberg (Queensland) has 6%.
* Far North (South Australia) has 0%.
* Australian Capital Territory has 6%.
* Barkly (Northern Territory) has 0%.

For **provider shrinkage**, the top 10% regions are as follows. All regions have provider shrinkage of 0% since the previous exposure period.

* Far West (New South Wales)
* Mallee (Victoria)
* Outer Gippsland (Victoria)
* Caboolture / Strathpine (Queensland)
* Maroochydore (Queensland)
* Maryborough (Queensland)
* Adelaide hills (South Australia)
* Eyre and Western (South Australia)
* Far North (South Australia)
* Murray and Mallee (South Australia)
* Yorke and Mid North (South Australia)
* Barkly (Northern Territory)
* Goldfields – Esperance (Western Australia)
* Kimberley – Pilbara (Western Australia)
* North Metro (Western Australia)
* South West (Western Australia)
* Wheat Belt (Western Australia)

The bottom 10% regions are as follows.

* Mid North Coast (New South Wales) has provider shrinkage of 19% since the previous exposure period.
* Northern NSW (New South Wales) has 24%.
* Sydney (New South Wales) has 17%.
* Goulburn (Victoria) has 20%.
* Ovens Murray (Victoria) has 24%.
* Western District (Victoria) has 24%.
* Toowoomba (Queensland) has 20%.
* Darwin Urban (Northern Territory) has 19%.

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

* North Sydney (New South Wales) has utilisation of 91%
* Central Highlands (Victoria) has 90%.
* Loddon (Victoria) has 89%.
* Ovens Murray (Victoria) has 89%.
* Bundaberg (Queensland) has 90%.
* Australian Capital Territory has 89%.
* Goldfields – Esperance (Western Australia) has 89%.
* South West (Western Australia) has 89%.

The bottom 10% regions are as follows.

* Outer Gippsland (Victoria) has utilisation of 74%.
* Western Melbourne (Victoria) has utilisation of 71%.
* Eyre and Western (South Australia) has 76%.
* Far North (South Australia) has 67%.
* Limestone Coast (South Australia) has 76%.
* Barkly (Northern Territory) has 56%.
* Darwin Urban (Northern Territory) has 76%.
* East Arnhem (Northern Territory) has 27%.
* Kimberley – Pilbara (Western Australia) has 77%.

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

* Outer Gippsland (Victoria) has an outcomes indicator on choice and control of 29%.
* Rockhampton (Queensland) has 25%.
* Limestone Coast (South Australia) has 25%.
* Western Adelaide (South Australia) has 25%.
* TAS South West (Tasmania) has 23%
* Barkly (Northern Territory) has 25%.
* Central South Metro (Western Australia) has 24%.
* Kimberley – Pilbara (Western Australia) has 30%.

The bottom 10% regions are as follows.

* North Sydney (New South Wales) has 8%.
* Inner East Melbourne (Victoria) has 7%.
* Barossa, Light and Lower North (South Australia) has 8%.
* Far North (South Australia) has 0%.
* Central Australia (Northern Territory) has 7%.
* Darwin Urban (Northern Territory) has 6%.
* Katherine in (Northern Territory) has 0%.
* Goldfields – Esperance (Western Australia) has 0%.

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

* Goulburn (Victoria) has an indicator of 100%.
* Outer Gippsland (Victoria) has 100%.
* Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island (South Australia) has 90%.
* Murray and Mallee (South Australia) has 100%.
* TAS North West (Tasmania) has 92%.
* Central South Metro (Western Australia) has 92%.
* Kimberley – Pilbara (Western Australia) has 100%.
* South West (Western Australia) has 100%.

The bottom 10% regions are as follows.

* Outer East Melbourne (Victoria) has 57%.
* Ovens Murray (Victoria) has 53%.
* Eastern Adelaide (South Australia) has 43%.
* Eyre and Western (South Australia) has 0%.
* Southern Adelaide (South Australia) has 55%.
* Western Adelaide (South Australia) has 50%.
* Yorke and Mid North (South Australia) has 43%.
* Goldfields – Esperance (Western Australia) has 0%.

## Page 2, Table 1: Support category summary, for all bilateral regions

For each of the 15 support categories, the same 7 indicators have been calculated. The number of active (SIL) participants with approved plans, the number of registered active providers, total plan budgets and total payments are also shown. The 7 indicators have a ‘traffic light system’ where the top 10% and bottom 10% of support categories – by gap to benchmark – are highlighted.

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

* Capacity Building – Home Living has 4.7 participants per provider.

The bottom 10% support categories are as follows.

* Core – Transport has 43.8 participants per provider.
* Capital – Home Modifications has 69.2.

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

* Core - Community has a provider concentration level of 17%.
* Capacity Building – Support Coordination has 19%.

The bottom 10% support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Home Living has a provider concentration level of 95%.

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

* Core - Consumables has provider growth of 28% since the previous exposure period.
* Capital – Assistive Technology has 38%.

The bottom 10% support categories are as follows.

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

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

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

The bottom 10% support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Social and Civic has provider shrinkage of 40% since the previous exposure period.
* Capital – Home Modifications has 26%.

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

* Core – Daily Activities has a utilisation rate of 93%.
* Capacity Building – Choice and Control has 91%.

The bottom 10% support categories are as follows.

* Core – Consumables has a utilisation rate of 36%.
* Capacity Building – Home Living has 21%.

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

* Capacity Building – Home Living has an outcomes indicator of 36%.
* Capital – Social and Civic has an outcomes indicator of 22%.

The bottom 10% support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Relationships has 9%.

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

* Capacity Building – Employment has an indicator of 82%.
* Capacity Building – Home Living has 82%.

The bottom 10% support categories are as follows.

* Capacity Building – Choice and Control has an indicator of 73%.

## 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 region / have supports relating to the support category in their plan.
* **Registered active providers** is defined as the number of registered service providers that have provided a support to a participant within the region / support category, over the exposure period.
* **Participants per provider** is defined as the ratio between the number of active participants and the number of registered service 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 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.