District: Inner East Melbourne (phase in date: 1 November 2017) | Support Category: All | All Participants

Multiple Sclerosis

35 to 44

Psychosocial disability

9 (Medium)







CALD

tated

Missing

CALD

District: Inner East Melbourne (phase in date: 1 November 2017) | 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 w choice and contro |
|--|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------|---|--|
| re | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Consumables | 6,937 | 165 | 42.0 | 62% | 23% | 15% | 6.24 | 3.22 | 52% | 42% | 70% |
| Daily Activities | 6,837 | 284 | 24.1 | 64% | 13% | 22% | 146.50 | 119.28 | 81% | 42% | 69% |
| Community | 6,886 | 246 | 28.0 | 54% | 7% | 24% | 70.00 | 41.02 | 59% | 42% | 69% |
| Transport | 6,545 | 71 | 92.2 🔴 | 66% | 0% | 38% 🔴 | 6.25 | 6.06 | 97% | 42% | 70% |
| Core total | 7,049 | 446 | 15.8 | 57% | 9% | 20% | 228.99 | 169.58 | 74% | 43% | 69% |
| pacity Building | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Daily Activities | 7,358 | 401 | 18.3 | 56% | 5% | 16% | 36,91 | 21.79 | 59% | 42% | 69% |
| | | | | | | | 3.50 | | | | |
| Employment Social and Civic | 565 823 | 45 | 12.6 15.8 | 83% • 68% | 9% 0% | 18% 60% | 1.45 | 2.41 | 69% 29% | 38% 43% | 70% 67% |
| Social and Civic Support Coordination | 3.880 | | 15.8 | | 0% 7% | | 9.04 | 6.42 | 29% 71% | 43% | |
| | -1 | 183 | | 44% | | 11% | 58.03 | | | | 69% |
| Capacity Building total | 7,545 | 561 | 13.4 | 38% | 9% | 16% | 58.03 | 35.55 | 61% | 43% | 69% |
| pital | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Assistive Technology | 1,866 | 133 | 14.0 | 62% | 44% | 19% | 8.62 | 5.49 | 64% | 47% | 72% |
| Home Modifications | 1,049 | 42 | 25.0 | 79% | 14% | 29% | 4.55 | 3.45 | 76% | 23% | 72% |
| Capital total | 2,291 | 161 | 14.2 | 53% | 43% | 16% | 13.18 | 8.94 | 68% | 39% | 72% |
| Missing | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| All support categories | 7.643 | 887 | 8.6 | 51% | 15% | 19% | 300.20 | 214.07 | 71% | 43% | 69% |

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 district / 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 district / support category, over the exposure period Ratio between the number of active participants and the number of registered service providers Proportion of providers for which payments have 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 structure by more than 15% 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 districts / 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 districts / 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. |

District: Inner East Melbourne (phase in date: 1 November 2017) | Support Category: All | Participants in Supported Independent Living (SIL)





District: Inner East Melbourne (phase in date: 1 November 2017) | Support Category: All | Participants in Supported Independent Living (SIL)



| Support 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 |
|----------------------|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------|---|--|
| Core | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Consumables | 731 | 89 | 8.2 | 59% | 22% | 22% | 1.14 | + 0.59 | 52% | 7% | 71% |
| Daily Activities | 734 | 75 | 9.8 | 82% | 9% | 20% | 79.52 | 74.64 | 94% | 7% | 71% |
| Community | 734 | 117 | 6.3 | 53% | 9% | 17% | 21.69 | 14.71 | 68% | 7% | 71% |
| Transport | 733 | 47 | 15.6 🔴 | 73% | 0% | 25% | 1.06 | 0.86 | 81% | 7% | 71% |
| Core total | 734 | 193 | 3.8 | 67% | 10% | 14% | 103.41 | 90.80 | 88% | 7% | 71% |
| apacity Building | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Daily Activities | 718 | 130 | 5.5 | 55% | 15% | 11% | 2.78 | 1.63 | 59% | 7% 🔴 | 71% |
| Employment | 57 | 13 | 4.4 | 99% | 0% | 20% | 0.42 | 0.33 | 78% | 18% | 83% |
| Social and Civic | + 11 | 3 | 3.7 | 100% 🔴 | 0% | 0% | 0.02 | 0.00 | 10% 🔴 | 18% 🔵 | 82% |
| Support Coordination | 731 | 77 | 9.5 | 53% | 0% | 25% | 1.78 | 1.30 | 73% | 7% | 71% |

| Capacity Building total | 732 | 206 | 3.6 | 36% | 8% | 15% | 6.77 | 4.23 | 63% | 7% | 71% |
|-------------------------|-----|-----|--------|-----|-----|-----|--------|--------|-----|----|-----|
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capital | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Assistive Technology | 332 | 46 | 7.2 | 85% | 25% | 25% | 1.82 | + 1.01 | 56% | 7% | 70% |
| Home Modifications | 698 | 12 | 58.2 🔴 | 99% | 25% | 25% | 3.43 | 2.95 | 86% | 7% | 71% |
| Capital total | 710 | 57 | 12.5 | 70% | 25% | 25% | 5.25 | 3.96 | 76% | 7% | 70% |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Missing | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All support categories | 734 | 342 | 2.1 | 62% | 11% | 18% | 115.43 | 98.99 | 86% | 7% | 71% |

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 district / 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 district / 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 struct 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 |
| Total plan budgets Payments Utilisation | Value of supports committed in participant plans for the exposure period Value of all parments over the exposure period, including parments to providers, parments to participants, and off-system parments (in-kind and Younger People In Residential Aged Care (YPIRAC)) Ratio between parments and total plans hodgets |
| 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 districts / 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 districts / 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. considered a lower score under the metric. For example, a low provider concentration is considered a sign of a competitive market. |

Psychosocial disability

35 to 44

9 (Medium)

District: Inner East Melbourne (phase in date: 1 November 2017) | Support Category: All | Participants not in Supported Independent Living (Non-SIL)







CALD

Missing

CALD

District: Inner East Melbourne (phase in date: 1 November 2017) | Support Category: All | Participants not in Supported Independent Living (Non-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 wi choice and control |
|-------------------------|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------|---|--|
| re | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Consumables | 6,206 | 137 | 45.3 🔴 | 70% | 29% | 14% | 5.10 | 2.62 | 51% | 49% | 69% |
| Daily Activities | 6,103 | 263 | 23.2 | 75% | 12% | 25% | 66.99 | 44.64 | 67% | 49% | 69% |
| Community | 6,152 | 223 | 27.6 | 62% | 10% | 24% | 48.30 | 26.31 | 54% | 49% | 69% |
| Transport | 5,812 | 50 | 116.2 | 73% | 20% | 20% | 5.19 | 5.20 | 100% | 49% | 69% |
| Core total | 6,315 | 396 | 15.9 | 68% | 11% | 23% | 125.58 | 78.78 | 63% | 49% | 69% |
| pacity Building | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Daily Activities | 6,640 | 360 | 18.4 | 59% | 3% | 15% | 34.13 | 20.16 | 59% | 49% | 69% |
| Employment | 508 | 44 | 11.5 | 82% | 9% | 18% | 3.08 | 2.09 | 68% | 41% | 68% |
| Social and Civic | 812 | 52 | 15.6 | 68% | 0% | 50% | 1.43 | 0.42 | 30% | 43% | 67% |
| Support Coordination | 3,149 | 182 | 17.3 | 47% | 5% | 10% | 7.26 | 5.11 | 70% | 46% | 69% |
| Capacity Building total | 6,813 | 523 | 13.0 | 41% | 8% | 15% | 51.27 | 31.32 | 61% | 50% | 69% |
| pital | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Assistive Technology | 1,534 | 126 | 12.2 | 58% | 41% | 21% | 6.80 | 4.47 | 66% | 59% | 72% |
| Home Modifications | 351 | 31 | 11.3 | 84% | 0% | 33% | | 0.50 | 45% | 60% | 77% |
| Capital total | 1,581 | 144 | 11.0 | 55% | 39% | 18% | 7.93 | 4.98 | 63% | 59% | 73% |
| Missing | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| All support categories | 6,909 | 809 | 8.5 | 57% | 12% | 21% | 184.77 | 115.08 | 62% | 50% | 69% |

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 district / 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 district / 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 plans housdets |
| 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 districts / 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 districts / support categories when ranked by performance against benchmark for the given metric – in other words – performing relatively poorly under the metric under consideration |
| | tered 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. |