Service District: Central Highlands (phase-in date: 1 January 2017) | Support Category: All | All Participants





Service District: Central Highlands (phase-in date: 1 January 2017) | Support Category: All | All Participants



| Support category | Active participants with approved plans | h 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 the NDIS helped wit choice and control? |
|-------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|-------------|---|--|
| ouppoint outogoly | | | | concentration | growth | Shi nkuge | Duugoto (+11) | i dymonio (tiny | othisation | | |
| Core | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Consumables | 3,908 | 92 | 42.5 | 78% | 0% | 17% | 3.1 | 1.8 | 56% | 54% | 72% |
| Daily Activities | 3,001 | 157 | 19.1 | 71% | 10% | 17% | 68.6 | 57.3 | 84% | 54% | 73% |
| Community | 3,489 | 110 | 31.7 | 72% | 11% | 11% | 35.1 | 18.1 | 52% | 52% | 72% |
| Transport | 2,093 | 49 | 42.7 🔴 | 73% | 0% | 0% | 3.8 | 3.5 | 91% | 50% | 75% |
| Core total | 4,362 | 232 | 18.8 | 67% | 10% | 13% | 110.6 | 80.6 | 73% | 54% | 72% |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capacity Building | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Daily Activities | 4,727 | 204 | 23.2 | 69% | 2% | 21% | 21.6 | 10.5 | 49% | 54% | 72% |
| Employment | 298 | 19 | 15.7 | 96% 🔴 | 14% | 43% | 2.2 | 1.5 | 70% | 48% | 73% |
| Relationships | 419 | 44 | 9.5 | 77% | 8% | 25% | 2.4 | 0.9 | 36% | 21% | 67% |
| Social and Civic | 490 | 27 | 18.1 | 85% | 0% | 0% | + 0.9 | + 0.3 | 29% | 54% | 76% |
| Support Coordination | 1,831 | 125 | 14.6 | 54% | 3% | 32% | 4.5 | 3.0 | 68% | 48% | 72% |
| Capacity Building total | 4,793 | 312 | 15.4 | 58% | 4% | 20% | 33.7 | 18.1 | 54% | 55% | 72% |
| Capital | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Assistive Technology | 888 | 70 | 12.7 | 71% | 0% | 45% | 5.0 | 2.3 | 46% | 62% | 75% |
| Home Modifications | 399 | 27 | 14.8 | 82% | 8% | 15% | 2.3 | 2.1 | 90% | 33% | 78% |
| Capital total | 1.087 | 85 | 12.8 | 62% | 6% | 30% | 7.3 | 4.4 | 60% | 53% | 76% |
| ouplial total | 1,001 | | 1210 | 02,0 | 0,0 | 0070 | | | 0070 | 00,0 | |
| Missing | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| All support categories | 4.873 | 467 | 10.4 | 61% | 4% | 19% | 151.6 | 103.1 | 68% | 55% | 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 limitation

| Indicator definitions | |
|--|--|
| Active participants with approved plans | Number of active participants who have an approved plan and reside in the service district / have supports relating to the support category in their plan |
| Active providers Participants per provider Provider concentration Provider growth Provider shrinkage | Number of providers that received payments for supports provided to participants within the service district / support category, over the exposure period Ratio between the number of active participants and the number of active providers Proportion of provider payments over the exposure period that were paid to the top 100 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 funct 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 the 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 service 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 service districts / 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. ed a lower score under the metric. For example, a low provider concentration is considered a sign of a competitive market. |

Service District: Central Highlands (phase-in date: 1 January 2017) | Support Category: All | SIL/SDA Participants





Service District: Central Highlands (phase-in date: 1 January 2017) | Support Category: All | SIL/SDA Participants



| Support category | Active participants with approved plans | 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 the NDIS helped wit choice and control? |
|-------------------------|--|------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|-----|-----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------|---|--|
| Core | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Consumables | 265 | 27 | 9.8 | 88% | 0% | - 1 | 33% | 0.4 | * 0.2 | 60% | 16% | 78% |
| Daily Activities | 296 | 49 | 6.0 | 84% | 23% | | 23% | 35.6 | 33.3 | 94% | 17% | 78% |
| Community | 297 | 43 | 6.9 | 80% | 21% | _ | 17% | 9.6 | 5.0 | 52% | 17% | 78% |
| Transport | 297 | 19 | 15.6 | 88% | 0% | | 0% | 0.5 | 0.3 | 69% | 17% | 78% |
| Core total | 298 | 77 | 3.9 | 77% | 21% | †- | 29% | 46.0 | 38.8 | 84% | 17% | 78% |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capacity Building | | 10 | | | | | | 1.3 | | 4004 | 1701 | 700/ |
| Daily Activities | 298 | 48 | 6.2 | 79% | 0% | | 27% | | 0.6 | 47% | 17% | 78% |
| Employment | 21 | 3 | 7.0 | 100% | 0% | | 100% | 0.2 | 0.1 | 75% | 43% | 85% |
| Relationships | 134 | 23 | 5.8 | 89% | 25% | • | 0% | 0.9 | 0.4 | 43% | 14% | 77% |
| Social and Civic | 9 | 1 | 9.0 | 100% | 0% | | 0% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4% 🔴 | 25% | 88% |
| Support Coordination | 298 | 41 | 7.3 | 69% | 0% | | 25% | 1.0 | 0.7 | 67% | 17% | 78% |
| Capacity Building total | 298 | 90 | 3.3 | 61% | 0% | | 26% | 3.6 | 2.0 | 55% | 17% | 78% |
| Capital | | | | | | i. | | | | | | |
| Assistive Technology | 103 | 20 | 5.2 | 96% | 0% | | 0% | 0.6 | 0.3 | 44% | 15% 🔴 | 76% |
| Home Modifications | 264 | 7 | 37.7 🔴 | 100% | 0% | | 0% | 1.3 | 1.3 | 97% 🔵 | 16% | 77% |
| Capital total | 278 | 26 | 10.7 | 92% | 0% | | 0% | 1.9 | 1.5 | 80% | 17% | 77% |
| Missing | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | | 0% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| All support categories | 298 | 139 | 2.1 | 73% | 12% | -+ | 25% | 51.5 | 42.3 | 82% | 17% | 78% |

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 limitat

| Indicator definitions | |
|--|--|
| Active participants with approved plans | Number of active participants who have an approved plan and reside in the service district / have supports relating to the support category in their plan |
| Active providers Participants per provider Provider concentration Provider growth Provider shrinkage | Number of providers that received payments for supports provided to participants within the service district / support category, over the exposure period Raio between the number of active participants and the number of active providers Proportion of provider gayments 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 should 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 the 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 service 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 service districts / support categories when ranked by performance against benchmark for the given metric – in other words – performing relatively poorly under the metric under consideration |
| | 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. tered a lower score under the metric. For example, a low provider concentration is considered a sign of a competitive market. |

Service District: Central Highlands (phase-in date: 1 January 2017) | Support Category: All | Non-SIL/SDA Participants





Service District: Central Highlands (phase-in date: 1 January 2017) | Support Category: All | Non-SIL/SDA Participants



| Support category | Active participants with approved plans | 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 the NDIS helped with choice and control? |
|-------------------------|--|------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Core | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Consumables | 3,643 | 87 | 41.9 🔴 | 79% | 0% | 25% | 2.7 | 1.5 | 56% | 59% | 71% |
| Daily Activities | 2,705 | 148 | 18.3 | 78% | 8% | 12% | 33.0 | 24.0 | 73% | 59% | 72% |
| Community | 3,192 | 107 | 29.8 | 73% | 14% | 4% | 25.5 | 13.1 | 51% | 57% | 71% |
| Transport | 1,796 | 46 | 39.0 🔴 | 75% | 0% | 0% | 3.4 | 3.2 | 95% 🔵 | 55% | 74% |
| Core total | 4,064 | 218 | 18.6 | 74% | 8% | 11% | 64.5 | 41.8 | 65% | 59% | 71% |
| Capacity Building | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Daily Activities | 4,429 | 198 | 22.4 | 69% | 2% | 15% | 20.3 | 9.9 | 49% | 59% | 71% |
| Employment | 277 | 19 | 14.6 | 96% 🔴 | 14% 🔵 | 43% 🔴 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 70% | 49% 🔴 | 72% |
| Relationships | 285 | 37 | 7.7 | 78% | 22% | 33% | 1.5 | 0.5 | 32% | 28% | 58% |
| Social and Civic | 481 | 27 | 17.8 | 86% | 0% | 0% | 0.9 | • 0.3 | 30% | 55% | 76% |
| Support Coordination | 1,533 | 121 | 12.7 | 53% | 5% | 30% | 3.5 | 2.4 | 68% | 55% | 70% |
| Capacity Building total | 4,495 | 301 | 14.9 | 60% | 4% | 16% | 30.2 | 16.1 | 53% | 59% | 71% |
| Capital | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Assistive Technology | 785 | 66 | 11.9 | 70% | 9% | 41% 🔴 | 4.3 | 2.0 | 46% | 70% | 75% |
| Home Modifications | 135 | 22 | 6.1 🛛 | 85% | 10% | 20% | 1.0 | 0.8 | 81% | 69% | 80% |
| Capital total | 809 | 76 | 10.6 | 62% | 13% | 35% | 5.4 | 2.8 | 53% | 69% | 75% |
| Missing | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| All support categories | 4.575 | 440 | 10.4 | 66% | 5% | 19% | 100.1 | 60.7 | 61% | 59% | 70% |

Note: A utilisation rate may support caregories are shown. Note: A utilisation rate may be above 100% due to the funcibility of core supports. This refers to the ability of participants to use their fundina flexibly between different support types, albeit within certain limitat

| Indicator definitions | |
|--|--|
| Active participants with approved plans | Number of active participants who have an approved plan and reside in the service district / have supports relating to the support category in their plan |
| Active providers Participants per provider Provider concentration Provider growth Provider shrinkage | Number of providers that received payments for supports provided to participants within the service district / support category, over the exposure period Ratio between the number of active participants and the number of active 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 the 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 service 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 service districts / support categories when ranked by performance against benchmark for the given metric – in other words – performing relatively poorly under the metric under consideration |
| | d 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. d a lower score under the metric. For example, a low provider concentration is considered a sign of a competitive market. |