Service District: Hume Moreland (phase-in date: 1 March 2018) | Support Category: All | All Participants





Service District: Hume Moreland (phase-in date: 1 March 2018) | 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	7,449	221	33.7	59%	4%	12%	6.9	4.6	67%	55%	73%
Daily Activities	4,323	407	10.6	47%	14%	20%	102.4	90.0	88%	54%	74%
Community	4.956	327	15.2	42%	14%	16%	55.8	32.3	58%	52%	73%
Transport	3.257	47	69.3	72%	0%	50%	7.5	8.2	110%	52%	74%
Core total	8.437	609	13.9	43%	14%	17%	172.5	135.1	78%	56%	72%
	-,										1
Capacity Building											
Choice and Control	3,868	155	25.0	68%	4%	4%	2.6	2.7	101%	52%	72%
Daily Activities	8,720	481	18.1	49%	9%	16%	58.2	34.6	59%	56%	72%
Employment	235	30	7.8	86% 🔴	0%	46%	1.8	• 0.8	46% 🔴	41% 🔴	70%
Relationships	849	102	8.3	52%	0%	14%	4.8	2.7	56%	18% 🔴	69%
Social and Civic	650	54	12.0	58%	0%	0%	1.6	+ 0.5	29% 🔴	57%	69%
Support Coordination	3,436	320	10.7	32%	6%	11%	9.5	7.3	77%	50%	70%
Capacity Building total	8,758	701	12.5	38%	7%	16%	79.0	48.8	62%	56%	72%
Capital											
Assistive Technology	1,453	142	10.2	48%	8%	36%	7.4	3.6	49%	62%	77%
Home Modifications	442	38	11.6	73%	31%	23%	2.0	1.4	70%	36%	78%
Capital total	1,612	162	10.0	42%	11%	32%	9.4	5.0	53%	55%	77%
Missing	0	0	0.0	0%	0%	0%	0.0	0.0	0%	0%	0%
All support categories	8.832	1.015	8.7	39%	11%	18%	260.9	188.9	72%	56%	72%

Note Conty the major support astegories are shown. Note: Capacity Building total includes Health and Wellbeing, Home Living and Lifelong Learning although these support categories are not shown. Note: Capacity Building total includes Health and Wellbeing, Home Living and Lifelong Learning although these support categories are not shown. Note: A utilisation rate may be above 100% due to fungibility which refers to the ability of participants to use their funding flexibly between different support types, albeit within certain lin Note: A utilisation rate may be above 100% due to fungibility which refers to the ability of participants to use their funding flexibly between different support types, albeit within certain lin

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 shrinkage 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 parcicipants within the service district / support category, over the exposure period. 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 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 dots indicate the top 10 percentile of service districts / support categories when ranked by performance against benchmark for the given metric. In other words, performing relatively well under the given metric.
	under some metrics. For example, a high utilisation rate is a sign of a functioning market where participants have access to the supports they need. d' performance. For example, a low provider concentration is a sign of a competitive market.

Service District: Hume Moreland (phase-in date: 1 March 2018) | Support Category: All | Participants Receiving SIL/SDA





Service District: Hume Moreland (phase-in date: 1 March 2018) | Support Category: All | Participants Receiving SIL/SDA



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	224	62	3.6	72%	0%		0%		0.4	0.3	62%	14%	77%
Daily Activities	257	102	2.5	59%	17%	ŏ.	15%	-	28.6	27.6	96%	17%	78%
Community	248	94	2.6	46%	13%	_	15%		8.3	4.3	52%	16%	77%
Transport	251	7	35.9	100%	0%		0%		0.4	0.3	83%	15%	78%
Core total	257	182	1.4	55%	19%		17%		37.7	32.5	86%	17%	78%
												,.	1
Capacity Building													
Choice and Control	138	35	3.9	76%	0%		0%		0.1	+ 0.1	103%	22%	79%
Daily Activities	256	115	2.2	76%	11%		32%		2.7	2.1	78%	16%	78%
Employment	4	2	2.0	100%	0%		100%	•	0.0	0.0	56%	50%	75%
Relationships	139	45	3.1	62%	10%		0%		1.0	0.6	63%	4%	74% 🔴
Social and Civic	4	3	1.3 🔵	100%	0%		0%		0.0	0.0	31% 🔴	75%	75% 🔴
Support Coordination	257	74	3.5	53%	5%		20%		1.0	1.0	98%	17%	78%
Capacity Building total	257	182	1.4	54%	8%		10%		4.9	3.9	79%	17%	78%
Capital								_					
Assistive Technology	99	35	2.8	79%	0%		67%		0.7	0.5	70%	21%	76%
Home Modifications	224	10	2.0	100%	20%		20%	-	1.1	0.5	66%	11%	76%
Capital total	224	45	5.1	79%	13%		38%	·-·	1.8	1.2	67%	11%	76%
Capital total	228	40	J.I	19%	13%		30%		1.0	1.2	0170	1170	10%
Missing	0	0	0.0	0%	0%		0%		0.0	0.0	0%	0%	0%
All support categories	257	307	0.8	49%	17%		14%		44.4	37.6	85%	17%	78%

Note Concern the major support categories are shown. Note: Capacity Building total includes Health and Wellbeing, Home Living and Lifelong Learning although these support categories are not shown. Note: Capacity Building total includes Health and Wellbeing, Home Living and Lifelong Learning although these support categories are not shown. Note: A utilisation rate may be above 100% due to fungibility which refers to the ability of participants to use their funding flexibly between different support types, albeit within certain lin Note: A utilisation rate may be above 100% due to fungibility which refers to the ability of participants to use their funding flexibly between different support types, albeit within certain lin

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 shrinkage 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 parcicipants within the service district / support category, over the exposure period. 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 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 dots indicate the top 10 percentile of service districts / support categories when ranked by performance against benchmark for the given metric. In other words, performing relatively well under the given metric.
	under some metrics. For example, a high utilisation rate is a sign of a functioning market where participants have access to the supports they need. d' performance. For example, a low provider concentration is a sign of a competitive market.

Service District: Hume Moreland (phase-in date: 1 March 2018) | Support Category: All | Participants Not Receiving SIL/SDA

Participant profile Please note that the data presented are based on only six months of data and not a full year Distribution of active p nts with an approved plan by CALD sta by primary dis by Indig by ren 5% 10% 15% 20% 25% 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100% 120% 0% 20% 0% 0% 100% 90% 90% Acquired brain injury 1 (High) 80% 0 to 6 Maior Cities 80% Autism 70% 2 (High) 70% 60% Cerebral Palsy 60% 7 to 14 3 (High) Population > 50,000 elopmental Delay 50% 50% 40% 30% 4 (High) 40% 15 to 18 Down Syndrome 5 (High) 30% Population between 15,000 and 50,000 Global Developmental Delay 📕 20% 20% 6 (Medium) 19 to 24 Hearing Impairment 10% 0% 10% 7 (Medium) Intellectual Disability _ Population between 5,000 and 15,000 0% 25 to 34 CALD CALD Missing Multiple Sclerosis 📕 8 (Medium) Missi Psychosocial disability 9 (Medium) 🚦 Population less than 5,000 20 ğ Spinal Cord Injury 10 (Medium) Stroke 45 to 54 11 (Low) Visual Impairment Remote Hume Moreland Benchmark^{*} Hume Moreland Benchmark 12 (Low) 55 to 64 Other Neurological 13 (Low) Other Physical Very Remote This panel shows the distribution of active participants with an approved plan who have each participant characteristic. 65+ Other Sensory/Speech 14 (Low) 📕 Other 15 (Low) The figures shown are based on the number of participants as at the end of the exposure period. Missing chmark* 457,345 Missing Missing Missing The benchmark is the national dis articipants not receiving SIL/SDA Hume Moreland Hume Moreland Hume Moreland Benchmark* Benchmark* Benchmark[®] Hume Moreland Benchmark



Service District: Hume Moreland (phase-in date: 1 March 2018) | Support Category: All | Participants Not Receiving SIL/SDA



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	7,225	210	34.4 🔴	60%	5%	10%	6.4	4.4	68%	58%	73%
Daily Activities	4,066	373	10.9	53%	12%	21%	73.8	62.4	85%	57%	74%
Community	4,708	309	15.2	44%	14%	18%	47.6	28.0	59%	55%	72%
Transport	3,006	42	71.6 🔴	76%	0%	0%	7.1	7.9	111% 🔵	55%	74%
Core total	8,180	567	14.4	47%	13%	18%	134.8	102.6	76%	58%	72%
Capacity Building											
Choice and Control	3,730	153	24.4	67%	0%	4%	2.5	2.6	101% 🔵	54%	71%
Daily Activities	8,464	459	18.4	50%	9%	15%	55.5	32.5	59%	58%	72%
Employment	231	29	8.0	87%	0%	46%	1.8	0.8	45% 🔴	41%	70%
Relationships	710	91	7.8 🔵	56%	5%	14%	3.8	2.0	54%	23%	67% 🔴
Social and Civic	646	51	12.7	60%	0%	0%	1.6	+ 0.5	29% 🔴	57%	69%
Support Coordination	3,179	313	10.2	32%	8%	9%	8.5	6.4	75%	54%	69% 🔴
Capacity Building total	8,501	673	12.6	40%	8%	16%	74.1	44.9	61%	58%	72%
Capital		134									
Assistive Technology	1,354	104	10.1	47%	9%	42%	6.7	3.1	47%	66%	78%
Home Modifications		28	7.8	79%		25%	0.9	+ 0.7	76%	68%	81%
Capital total	1,384	146	9.5	41%	13%	38%	7.6	3.8	50%	65%	77%
Missing	0	0	0.0	0%	0%	0%	0.0	0.0	0%	0%	0%
All support categories	8.575	955	9.0	43%	11%	18%	216.5	151.3	70%	59%	71%

Note Concern the major support astegories are shown. Note: Capacity Building total includes Health and Wellbeing, Home Living and Lifelong Learning although these support categories are not shown. Note: Capacity Building total includes Health and Wellbeing, Home Living and Lifelong Learning although these support categories are not shown. Note: A utilisation rate may be above 100% due to fungibility which refers to the ability of participants to use their funding flexibly between different support types, albeit within certain lin Note: A utilisation rate may be above 100% due to fungibility which refers to the ability of participants to use their funding flexibly between different support types, albeit within certain lin

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 structs 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 percentile of service districts / support categories when ranked by performance against benchmark for the given metric. In other words, performing relatively well under the given metric. The red dots indicate the bottom 10 percentile of service districts / support categories when ranked by performance against benchmark for the given metric. In other words, performing relatively poorly under the given metric.
	ce under some metrics. For example, a high utilisation rate is a sign of a functioning market where participants have access to the supports they need. good' performance. For example, a low provider concentration is a sign of a competitive market.