Service District: Outer Gippsland (phase-in date: 1 January 2019) | Support Category: All | All Participants





Service District: Outer Gippsland (phase-in date: 1 January 2019) | Support Category: All | All 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	1,841	54	34.1 🔴	86%	10%	30%	1.7	0.9	57%	59%	73%
Daily Activities	1,442	62	23.3	80%	16%	29%	27.4	22.5	82%	60%	73%
Community	1,585	56	28.3	88%	21%	13%	18.3	8.6	47%	60%	73%
Transport	990	16	61.9 🔴	95%	0%	0%	1.6	1.4	91% 🔵	56%	75%
Core total	2,027	78	26.0	79%	20%	20%	48.9	33.4	68%	61%	73%
Capacity Building											
Daily Activities	2,035	71	28.7	83%	9%	9%	9.9	4.5	45%	61%	73%
Employment	111	12	9.3	100%	50%	0%	0.5	0.2	34%	46% 🔴	78%
Relationships	148	20	7.4 🔵	87%	33% 🔵	0%	0.7	+ 0.1	20% 🔴	30% 🔴	76%
Social and Civic	351	19	18.5	91%	20%	20%	0.9	+ 0.3	29%	70%	74%
Support Coordination	985	66	14.9	73%	6%	11%	2.2	1.3	60%	60%	71%
Capacity Building total	2,085	122	17.1	75%	11%	11%	15.7	7.6	48%	61%	73%
Capital											
Assistive Technology	470	47	10.0	79%	13%	38% 🔴	2.7	1.2	44%	61%	76%
Home Modifications	174	14	12.4	98%	0%	33% 🔴	0.6	0.4	70%	52%	82%
Capital total	530	53	10.0	76%	10%	30%	3.3	1.6	49%	58%	78%
Missing	0	0	0.0	0%	0%	0%	0.0	0.0	0%	0%	0%
All support categories	2.097	156	13.4	75%	14%	16%	68.0	42.7	63%	61%	73%

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 limitati

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
	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: Outer Gippsland (phase-in date: 1 January 2019) | Support Category: All | SIL/SDA Participants





Service District: Outer Gippsland (phase-in date: 1 January 2019) | 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?
				oon oon a data a	3.0111			,	othioution		
Core											
Consumables	69	9	7.7	100%	0%	0%	0.1	+ 0.0	40%	23%	88%
Daily Activities	73	15	4.9	99%	38%	38% 🗧	6.7	7.0	104%	22%	87%
Community	72	12	6.0	99%	29%	0%	2.2	1.4	63%	22%	87%
Transport	71	3	23.7 🔴	100%	0%	0%	0.1	• 0.1	63%	23%	87%
Core total	73	17	4.3	98%	33%	25%	9.2	8.5	92%	22%	87%
Capacity Building											
Daily Activities	71	9	7.9	100%	25%	0%	0.3	0.1	47%	21%	87%
Employment	5	2	2.5	100%	0%	0%	0.0	+ 0.0	53%	40%	100%
Relationships	26	4	6.5	100%	0%	0%	0.1	+ 0.0	35%	15% 🔴	88%
Social and Civic	6	1	6.0	100%	0%	0%	0.0	0.0	14%	33%	83%
Support Coordination	73	15	4.9	94%	0%	0%	0.2	0.1	72%	22%	87%
Capacity Building total	73	22	3.3	88%	0%	0%	0.7	0.4	55%	22%	87%
Capital											
Assistive Technology	28	7	4.0	100%	0%	0%	0.2	• 0.1	36%	25%	89%
Home Modifications	67	4	16.8	100%	0%	0%	0.3	0.3	103%	22%	88%
Capital total	69	11	6.3	100%	0%	0%	0.4	0.3	78%	23%	88%
Missing	0	0	0.0	0%	0%	0%	0.0	0.0	0%	0%	0%
All support categories	73	32	2.3	96%	33%	20%	10.3	9.2	89%	22%	87%

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 limita

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 structs 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 Proportion of providers for which payments have structs have structs have brunc 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 dols 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
	red 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. sidered a lower score under the metric. For example, a low provider concentration is considered a sign of a competitive market.

Service District: Outer Gippsland (phase-in date: 1 January 2019) | Support Category: All | Non-SIL/SDA Participants





Service District: Outer Gippsland (phase-in date: 1 January 2019) | 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	1,772	53	33.4 🔴	86%	10%	40% 🔴	1.5	0.9	58%	61%	72%
Daily Activities	1,369	59	23.2	87%	18%	25%	20.7	15.5	75%	63%	72%
Community	1,513	54	28.0	87%	23%	14%	16.1	7.2	45%	62%	72%
Transport	919	16	57.4 🔴	95%	0%	0%	1.5	1.4	93%	58%	73%
Core total	1,954	74	26.4	85%	14%	17%	39.8	25.0	63%	63%	72%
Capacity Building											
Daily Activities	1,964	71	27.7	82%	10%	10%	9.6	4.4	45%	63%	72%
Employment	106	12	8.8	100%	50%	0%	0.5	0.2	33%	47%	76%
Relationships	122	19	6.4	85%	0%	0%	0.6	+ 0.1	17% 🔴	37%	70%
Social and Civic	345	19	18.2	91%	20%	20%	0.9	0.3	29%	71%	73%
Support Coordination	912	65	14.0	73% 🔵	7%	7%	2.0	1.2	59%	64%	69%
Capacity Building total	2,012	121	16.6	75%	8%	11%	15.0	7.2	48%	63%	72%
Capital											
Assistive Technology	442	46	9.6	78%	25%	38%	2.5	1.1	45%	64%	75%
Home Modifications	107	10	10.7	100%	0%	50%	0.4	0.2	45%	73%	77%
Capital total	461	48	9.6	77%	22%	33%	2.9	1.3	45%	65%	76%
Missing	0	0	0.0	0%	0%	0%	0.0	0.0	0%	0%	0%
All support categories	2.024	150	13.5	80%	9%	16%	57.7	33.5	58%	63%	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 gayments over the exposure period that were paid to the top 10 providers Proportion of providers for which payments have frawn 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 shown 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 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 dols 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. a lower score under the metric. For example, a low provider concentration is considered a sign of a competitive market.