







Participant profile



Please note that the data presented are based on only six months of data and not a full year.





Service provider indicators



Plan utilisation



Outcomes framework




Support category summary





| 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 | 4,550 | 141 | 32.3 | 77% | 0% | 9% | 5.3 | 3.1 | 58% | 59% | 79% |
| Daily Activities | 3,125 | 186 | 16.8 | 55% | 7% | 22% | 114.4 | 91.5 | 80% | 57% | 80% |
| Community | 3,304 | 118 | 28.0 | 60% | 13% | 18% | 41.6 | 34.1 | 82% | 54% | 79% |
| Transport | 2,338 | 66 | 35.4 | 69% | 0% | 13% | 3.2 | 3.0 | 93% | 53% | 80% |
| Core total | 5,295 | 298 | 17.8 | 63% | 8% | 18% | 164.5 | 131.7 | 80% | 58% | 78% |
| Capacity Building | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Choice and Control | 2,336 | 93 | 25.1 | 86% | 8% | 8% | 1.7 | 1.6 | 97% | 64% | 78% |
| Daily Activities | 5,878 | 249 | 23.6 | 56% | 4% | 20% | 33.1 | 17.7 | 54% | 58% | 78% |
| Employment | 148 | 10 | 14.8 | 100% | 20% | 40% | 1.2 | 0.6 | 52% | 36% | 71% |
| Relationships | 312 | 28 | 11.1 | 88% | 9% | 9% | 2.1 | 1.0 | 47% | 18% | 78% |
| Social and Civic | 153 | 23 | 6.7 | 90% | 0% | 40% | 0.4 | 0.2 | 46% | 47% | 71% |
| Support Coordination | 2,435 | 100 | 24.4 | 81% | 0% | 13% | 7.0 | 5.3 | 75% | 51% | 76% |
| Capacity Building total | 5,928 | 311 | 19.1 | 85% | 1% | 18% | 45.8 | 26.5 | 68% | 58% | 78% |
| Capital | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Assistive Technology | 1,335 | 83 | 16.1 | 82% | 10% | 29% | 6.4 | 3.7 | 58% | 68% | 82% |

Participant profile


Please note that the data presented are based on only six months of data and not a full year.





Service provider indicators



Plan utilisation



Outcomes framework



Support category summary

| 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 | 310 | 48 | 6.5 | 85% | 0% | 33% | 0.7 | 0.5 | 65% | 19% | 82% |
| Daily Activities | 339 | 82 | 4.1 | 57% | 7% | 16% | 48.3 | 47.2 | 98% | 21% | 83% |
| Community | 326 | 62 | 5.3 | 62% | 3% | 15% | 9.8 | 7.9 | 80% | 21% | 83% |
| Transport | 332 | 37 | 9.0 | 74% | 0% | 0% | 0.4 | 0.3 | 73% | 21% | 83% |
| Core total | 340 | 133 | 2.6 | 66% | 9% | 14% | 59.2 | 55.8 | 84% | 21% | 83% |
| Capacity Building | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Choice and Control | 68 | 14 | 4.9 | 96% | 0% | 0% | 0.1 | 0.1 | 96% | 31% | 79% |
| Daily Activities | 339 | 91 | 3.7 | 56% | 5% | 9% | 2.0 | 1.2 | 64% | 21% | 83% |
| Employment | 5 | 4 | 1.3 | 100% | 0% | 100% | 0.1 | 0.0 | 52% | 0% | 50% |
| Relationships | 114 | 16 | 7.1 | 95% | 0% | 25% | 0.9 | 0.5 | 55% | 11% | 81% |
| Social and Civic | 2 | 1 | 2.0 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 46% | 0% | 100% |
| Support Coordination | 336 | 31 | 10.8 | 87% | 0% | 7% | 1.2 | 1.0 | 85% | 20% | 83% |
| Capacity Building total | 340 | 124 | 2.7 | 57% | 0% | 12% | 4.3 | 2.9 | 68% | 21% | 83% |
| Capital | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Assistive Technology | 161 | 30 | 5.4 | 92% | 0% | 20% | 0.9 | 0.5 | 57% | 25% | 82% |
| Home Modifications | 72 | 9 | 8.0 | 25% | 0% | 0% | 0.6 | 0.4 | 74% | 21% | 85% |
| Capital total | 193 | 37 | 5.2 | 89% | 13% | 13% | 1.5 | 1.0 | 64% | 23% | 83% |
| Missing | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| All support categories | 340 | 212 | 1.6 | 53% | 6% | 13% | 65.0 | 59.7 | 92% | 21% | 83% |

Note: Only 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: A utilisation rate may be above 100% for the six month exposure period considered, due to the uneven distribution of payments over the duration of a plan. In addition, the utilisation rate for core supports 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 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**: Number of providers that received payments for supports provided to participants within the service district / support category, over the exposure period.
- Participants per provider**: Ratio between the number of active participants and the number of active providers.
- Provider concentration**: Proportion of provider payments over the exposure period that were paid to the top 10 providers.
- Provider growth**: 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.
- Provider shrinkage**: 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**: Value of supports committed in participant plans for the exposure period.
- Payments**: 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)).
- Utilisation**: Ratio between payments and total plan budgets.
- Outcomes indicator on choice and control**: Proportion of participants who reported in their most recent outcomes survey that they choose who supports them.
- Has the NDIS helped with choice and control?**: 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.





Note: A higher score is considered to be 'good' performance 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. For other metrics, a lower score is considered to be 'good' performance. For example, a low provider concentration is a sign of a competitive market.

Participant profile

Please note that the data presented are based on only six months of data and not a full year.



Service provider indicators



Plan utilisation



Outcomes framework



Support category summary

| 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 | 4,240 | 129 | 32.9 | 76% | 0% | 16% | 4.6 | 2.6 | 57% | 65% | 78% |
| Daily Activities | 2,786 | 177 | 15.7 | 60% | 7% | 27% | 66.1 | 44.3 | 67% | 62% | 79% |
| Community | 2,978 | 113 | 26.4 | 62% | 12% | 19% | 31.8 | 26.2 | 82% | 59% | 78% |
| Transport | 2,006 | 62 | 32.4 | 71% | 0% | 8% | 2.8 | 2.7 | 96% | 58% | 79% |
| Core total | 4,955 | 277 | 17.9 | 68% | 6% | 24% | 105.3 | 75.8 | 72% | 63% | 77% |
| Capacity Building | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Choice and Control | 2,268 | 92 | 24.7 | 86% | 8% | 8% | 1.6 | 1.6 | 97% | 66% | 78% |
| Daily Activities | 5,539 | 241 | 23.0 | 58% | 3% | 21% | 31.1 | 16.5 | 53% | 63% | 78% |
| Employment | 143 | 10 | 14.3 | 100% | 20% | 40% | 1.1 | 0.6 | 52% | 36% | 71% |
| Relationships | 198 | 24 | 8.3 | 85% | 11% | 22% | 1.2 | 0.5 | 41% | 24% | 75% |
| Social and Civic | 151 | 23 | 6.6 | 90% | 0% | 40% | 0.4 | 0.2 | 46% | 49% | 70% |
| Support Coordination | 2,099 | 95 | 22.1 | 82% | 0% | 4% | 5.8 | 4.2 | 74% | 58% | 74% |
| Capacity Building total | 5,588 | 301 | 18.6 | 56% | 0% | 18% | 41.6 | 23.7 | 57% | 62% | 77% |
| Capital | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Assistive Technology | 1,174 | 75 | 15.7 | 82% | 16% | 32% | 5.5 | 3.2 | 58% | 76% | 82% |
| Home Modifications | 134 | 17 | 7.9 | 97% | 67% | 17% | 1.0 | 0.9 | 93% | 78% | 83% |
| Capital total | 1,193 | 78 | 15.3 | 80% | 25% | 33% | 6.4 | 4.1 | 63% | 76% | 82% |
| Missing | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| All support categories | 5,631 | 451 | 12.5 | 55% | 7% | 24% | 153.3 | 103.6 | 68% | 62% | 77% |

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:** Number of providers that received payments for supports provided to participants within the service district / support category, over the exposure period.
- Participants per provider:** Ratio between the number of active participants and the number of active providers.
- Provider concentration:** Proportion of provider payments over the exposure period that were paid to the top 10 providers.
- Provider growth:** 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.
- Provider shrinkage:** 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:** Value of supports committed in participant plans for the exposure period.
- Payments:** 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)).
- Utilisation:** Ratio between payments and total plan budgets.
- Outcomes indicator on choice and control:** Proportion of participants who reported in their most recent outcomes survey that they choose who supports them.
- Has the NDIS helped with choice and control?:** 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.

Note: A higher score is considered to be 'good' performance 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. For other metrics, a lower score is considered to be 'good' performance. For example, a low provider concentration is a sign of a competitive market.