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## Figure 1: Plan utilisation summary

For each of the 80 service districts with more than 9 months of experience in Scheme, the utilisation rate is calculated and then compared to the benchmark for that district. This results in a gap to benchmark for each district. A district is more likely to be flagged as a hot spot if it is below the benchmark.

There are 50 districts below benchmark and 30 districts above benchmark. Overall,

* 8 districts have a utilisation rate that is more than 10% below benchmark;
* 8 districts are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 34 districts are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 29 districts are 0% to 5% above benchmark; and
* 1 district is 5% to 10% above benchmark.

## Figure 2: Plan utilisation for districts with less than $75m in total plan budgets

Of the 28 districts with less than $75m in total plan budgets,

* 8 districts are more than 10% below benchmark;
* 7 districts are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 8 districts are 0% to 5% below benchmark; and
* 5 districts are 0% to 5% above benchmark.

For these smaller districts, the top five potential hot spot districts have been identified based on their gap to benchmark, weighted by their total plan budget.

1. Eyre and Western in South Australia, which phased into the Scheme on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 0 to 14 years old, had a utilisation rate of 53%, compared to a benchmark of 67%.
2. Limestone Coast in South Australia, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 0 to 14 years old, had a utilisation rate of 61%, compared to a benchmark of 73%.
3. Murray and Mallee in South Australia, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 0 to 14 years old, had a utilisation rate of 63%, compared to a benchmark of 71%.
4. East Arnhem in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 January 2017, had a utilisation rate of 33% compared to a benchmark of 66%.
5. Yorke and Mid North in South Australia, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 0 to 14 years old, had a utilisation rate of 59%, compared to a benchmark of 68%.

## Figure 3: Plan utilisation for districts with $75m to $175m in total plan budgets

Of the 23 districts with $75m to $175m in total plan budgets,

* 13 districts are 0% to 5% below benchmark; and
* 10 districts are 0% to 5% above benchmark.

For these medium-sized districts, the top five potential hot spot districts have been identified based on their gap to benchmark, weighted by their total plan budget.

1. Rockhampton in Queensland, which phased into the Scheme on 1 January 2018, had a utilisation rate of 65% compared to a benchmark of 70%.
2. Townsville in Queensland, which phased in on 1 April 2016, had a utilisation rate of 68% compared to a benchmark of 72%.
3. Inner Gippsland in Victoria, which phased in on 1 October 2017, had a utilisation rate of 63%, compared to a benchmark of 67%.
4. Darwin Urban in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 January 2017, had a utilisation rate of 69%, compared to a benchmark of 73%.
5. Western District in Victoria, which phased in on 1 October 2017, had a utilisation rate of 69%, compared to a benchmark of 73%.

## Figure 4: Plan utilisation for districts with greater than $175m in total plan budgets

Of the 29 districts with greater than $175m in total plan budgets,

* 1 district is 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 13 districts are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 14 districts are 0% to 5% above benchmark; and
* 1 district is 5% to 10% above benchmark.

For these larger districts, the top five potential hot spot districts have been identified based on their gap to benchmark, weighted by their total plan budget.

1. Hunter New England in New South Wales, which phased into the Scheme on 1 July 2013, had a utilisation rate of 73%, compared to a benchmark of 75%.
2. Western New South Wales in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had a utilisation rate of 66%, compared to benchmark of 72%.
3. Northern Adelaide in South Australia, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 0 to 14 years old, had a utilisation rate of 70%, compared to a benchmark of 72%.
4. Barwon in Victoria, which phased into the Scheme on 1 July 2013, had a utilisation rate of 70%, compared to a benchmark of 73%.
5. Southern Adelaide in South Australia, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 0 to 14 years old, had a utilisation rate of 70%, compared to a benchmark of 72%.

## Figure 5: Provider concentration summary

For each of the 80 service districts with more than 9 months of experience in Scheme, the provider concentration level is calculated and then compared to the benchmark national average of 85%. This results in a gap to benchmark for each district. A district is more likely to be flagged as a hot spot if it is above the benchmark.

There are 70 districts below benchmark and 10 districts above benchmark. Overall,

* 18 districts are more than 40% below the benchmark;
* 33 districts are 20% to 40% below the benchmark;
* 19 districts are 0% to 20% below the benchmark;
* 4 districts are 0% to 5% above the benchmark; and
* 6 districts are 5% to 10% above the benchmark.

## Figure 6: Provider concentration for districts with less than $75m in total plan budgets

Of the 28 districts with less than $75m in total plan budgets,

* 2 districts are more than 40% below benchmark;
* 4 districts are 20% to 40% below benchmark;
* 12 districts are 0% to 20% below benchmark;
* 4 districts are 0% to 5% above benchmark; and
* 6 districts are 5% to 10% above benchmark.

For these smaller districts, the top five potential hot spot districts have been identified based on their gap to benchmark, weighted by their total plan budget.

1. Central Australia in Northern Territory, which phased into the Scheme on 1 July 2017, had a provider concentration level of 91%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
2. Kimberley-Pilbara in Western Australia, which phased into the Scheme on 1 October 2018, had a provider concentration level of 88%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
3. Great Southern in Western Australia, which phased into the Scheme on 1 July 2019, had a provider concentration level of 94%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
4. Midwest-Gascoyne in Western Australia, which phased into the Scheme on 1 July 2019, had a provider concentration level of 94%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
5. Katherine in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had a provider concentration level of 91%, compared to benchmark of 85%.

## Figure 7: Provider concentration for districts with $75m to $175m in total plan budgets

Of the 23 districts with $75m to $175m in total plan budgets,

* 2 districts are more than 40% below benchmark;
* 15 districts are 20% to 40% below benchmark; and
* 6 districts are 0% to 20% below benchmark.

For these medium-sized districts, the top five potential hot spot districts have been identified based on their gap to benchmark, weighted by their total plan budget.

1. TAS North West in Tasmania, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 15 to 24 years old, had a provider concentration level of 75%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
2. Western District in Victoria, which phased in on 1 October 2017, had a provider concentration level of 77%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
3. Maryborough in Queensland, which phased in on 1 July 2018, had a provider concentration level of 74%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
4. TAS South West in Tasmania, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 15 to 24 years old, had a provider concentration level of 66%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
5. TAS North in Tasmania, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 15 to 24 years old, had a provider concentration level of 63%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.

## Figure 8: Provider concentration for districts with greater than $175m in total plan budgets

Of the 29 districts with greater than $175m in total plan budgets,

* 14 districts are more than 40% below benchmark;
* 14 districts are 20% to 40% below benchmark; and
* 1 district is 0% to 20% below benchmark.

For these larger districts, the top five potential hot spot districts have been identified based on their gap to benchmark, weighted by their total plan budget.

1. Southern Adelaide in South Australia, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 0 to 14 years old, had a provider concentration level of 66%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
2. Northern New South Wales in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had a provider concentration level of 60%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
3. Western New South Wales in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had a provider concentration level of 59%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
4. Barwon in Victoria, which phased in on 1 July 2013, had a provider concentration level of 60%, compared to a benchmark of 85%.
5. North East Metro in Western Australia, which phased in on 1 July 2014, had a provider concentration level of 50% compared to a benchmark of 85%.

## Figure 9: Outcomes indicator on choice and control summary

For each of the 80 service districts with more than 9 months of experience in Scheme, the outcomes indicator on choice and control is calculated and then compared to the benchmark for that district. This results in a gap to benchmark for each district. A district is more likely to be flagged as a hot spot if it is below the benchmark.

There are 36 districts below benchmark and 44 districts above benchmark. Overall,

* 4 districts are more than 10% below the benchmark;
* 15 districts are 5% to 10% below the benchmark;
* 17 district is 0% to 5% below the benchmark;
* 22 districts are 0% to 5% above the benchmark;
* 18 districts are 5% to 10% above the benchmark; and
* 4 districts are more than 10% above the benchmark.

## Figure 10: Outcomes indicator on choice and control for districts with less than $75m in total plan budgets

Of the 28 districts with less than $75m in total plan budgets,

* 4 districts are more than 10% below benchmark;
* 5 districts are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 6 districts are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 4 districts are 0% to 5% above benchmark;
* 7 districts are 5% to 10% above benchmark; and
* 2 district is more than 10% above benchmark.

For these smaller districts, the top five potential hot spot districts have been identified based on their gap to benchmark, weighted by their total plan budget.

1. Central Australia in Northern Territory, which phased into the Scheme on 1 July 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 34%, compared to a benchmark of 44%.
2. Central North Metro in Western Australia, which phased in on 1 July 2019, had an outcomes indicator of 46%, compared to a benchmark of 54%
3. TAS South East in Tasmania, which phased in on 1 July 2013 for participants aged 15 to 24 years old, had an outcomes indicator of 43%, compared to a benchmark of 50%.
4. Katherine in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 23%, compared to a benchmark of 44%.
5. Darwin Remote in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 41%, compared to a benchmark of 55%.

## Figure 11: Outcomes indicator on choice and control for districts with $75m to $175m in total plan budgets

Of the 23 districts with $75m to $175m in total plan budgets,

* 3 districts are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 2 districts are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 10 districts are 0% to 5% above benchmark; and
* 8 districts are 5% to 10% above benchmark.

For these medium-sized districts, the top five potential hot spot districts have been identified based on their gap to benchmark, weighted by their total plan budget.

1. Brimbank Melton in Victoria, which phased in on 1 October 2018, had an outcomes indicator of 47%, compared to a benchmark of 53%.
2. Darwin Urban in Northern Territory, which phased in on 1 January 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 39%, compared to a benchmark of 45%.
3. North Metro in Western Australia, which phased in on 1 October 2018, had an outcomes indicator of 48%, compared to a benchmark of 54%.
4. Maryborough in Queensland, which phased in on 1 July 2018, had an outcomes indicator of 49%, compared to a benchmark of 51%.
5. Murrumbidgee in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 50%, compared to a benchmark of 51%.

## Figure 12: Outcomes indicator on choice and control for districts with greater than $175m in total plan budgets

Of the 29 districts with greater than $175m in total plan budgets,

* 7 districts are 5% to 10% below benchmark;
* 9 districts are 0% to 5% below benchmark;
* 8 districts are 0% to 5% above benchmark;
* 3 districts are 5% to 10% above benchmark; and
* 2 districts are more than 10% above benchmark.

For these larger districts, the top five potential hot spot districts have been identified based on their gap to benchmark, weighted by their total plan budget.

1. South Western Sydney in New South Wales, which phased into the Scheme on 1 July 2016, had an outcomes indicator of 43%, compared to benchmark of 51%.
2. Western Sydney in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2016, had an outcomes indicator of 44%, compared to benchmark of 50%.
3. South Eastern Sydney in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 42%, compared to benchmark of 51%.
4. Sydney in New South Wales, which phased in on 1 July 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 43%, compared to benchmark of 52%.
5. Inner East Melbourne in Victoria, which phased in on 1 November 2017, had an outcomes indicator of 43%, compared to benchmark of 49%.