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## Introduction

This report presents analysis on the delivery of the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS) by the National Disability Agency (NDIA) as at 31 March 2016.

Specifically the analysis includes:

* **Participant satisfaction**. Participant satisfaction remains high. On a scale of very poor (‑2) to very good (+2), with neutral being 0, participant satisfaction is at 1.63. This is consistent with previous quarters.
* **Participant numbers**. 29,769 participants were eligible for the scheme (100% of the bilateral target). This is an increase of 3,894 participants over the quarter. 24,866 participants had an approved plan (83% of the bilateral target), which is an increase of 2,585 participants over the quarter.
* **Total scheme costs**. Considering the number of participants who have entered the scheme and distribution of packages committed to these participants, the scheme is within budget for the three year trial period (ending 30 June 2016).

The report also includes information on:

* **The amount of support committed to participants**, including trends, the distribution of packages committed to participants, and actual payments made to date.
* **Continuous improvement** to the scheme to ensure scheme sustainability, including the development of references packages and an outcomes framework.

It is important to note that it is early stages in the roll out of the NDIS. Scheme experience will emerge over time and allow more thorough analysis of financial sustainability.

Concurrent trials are also underway in the South West and Cockburn-Kwinana in Western Australia based on the Western Australia NDIS My Way Model. Information on these trials are not included in this report. Information on the Western Australian NDIS My Way Model trial sites are published separately by the Western Australian Disability Services Commission.

## Scheme experience (1 July 2013 to 31 March 2016)

### Participant satisfaction

Participant satisfaction with the Agency has remained very high in recent months. Satisfaction is reported on a scale of very poor (-2) to very good (+2), with neutral being 0. The participant satisfaction level is currently 1.63, consistent with results since June 2015.

### Participants

As at the 31 March 2016 (Table 1):

* 29,769 participants were eligible for the scheme (100% of the bilateral target).[[1]](#footnote-1) This is an increase of 3,894 participants since 31 December 2015.
* 24,866 participants had an approved plan (83% of the bilateral target). This is an increase of 2,585 participants since 31 December 2015.
* The number of participants relative to the bilateral agreements is lower compared with the December 2015 results (100%, compared with 104%) and the number of participants with approved plans relative to the bilateral agreements has also decreased compared with the December 2015 results (83%, compared with 89%). This is largely due to the reduction in the number of plans approved in the South Australian trial site, along with the January 2016 holiday season, and the transition to a new IT system.
* In the South Australian trial site, the bilateral number of 5,085 was reached on 31 August 2015 and has since been revised to 8,500 effective from February 2016. The bilateral targets for the Tasmanian and Barwon trial sites have also been revised to 1,125 and 5,289 respectively. [[2]](#footnote-2)
* The actuarial baseline model used a different methodology to determine the likely number of participants in each trial site. This analysis resulted in different estimates to the bilateral agreements. The number of participants in the scheme to date compared with the actuarial baseline model is included in Appendix A. As the trial sites were resourced in line with the bilateral agreements, the estimated number of participants in the actuarial model is difficult to achieve.

Table 1 Eligible participants and participants with approved plans

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1 July 2013 to 31 March 2016** | **NSW**  **(Hunter)** | **NSW**  **(Nepean Blue Mountains)** | **SA** | **TAS** | **VIC** | **ACT** | **NT** | **WA** | **Total** |
| Number of expected participants (bilateral agreements) [[3]](#footnote-3),[[4]](#footnote-4) | 8,841 | 1,400 | 6,451 | 1,031 | 4,955 | 3,651 | 154 | 3,422 | 29,905 |
| Number of participants (active & inactive participants) | 7,167 | 1,299 | 7,788 | 1,279 | 5,515 | 4,292 | 138 | 2,291 | 29,769 |
| *Percentage deemed eligible compared with expected* | *81%* | *93%* | *121%* | *124%* | *111%* | *118%* | *90%* | *67%* | *100%* |
| Number of participants with current approved plans (active & inactive participants) | 6,510 | 1,083 | 5,825 | 1,135 | 4,867 | 3,429 | 135 | 1,882 | 24,866 |
| *Percentage with approved plans compared with expected* | *74%* | *77%* | *90%* | *110%* | *98%* | *94%* | *88%* | *55%* | *83%* |

### Trends in plan approvals

Figure 1 and Figure 2 show participants with approved plans by month compared with the bilateral agreements and the actuarial model.

In the March 2016 quarter, plan reviews represented more than half of the plans approved in the New South Wales - Hunter (68%), South Australian (70%), Tasmanian (79%), Victorian (96%) and Western Australian trial sites (70%).

In all trial sites, there were a low number of first plans approved in January 2016 due to the holiday season, and February due to the transition to a new IT system.

The number of first plan approvals in the New South Wales (Hunter) trial site has decreased slightly since the previous quarter. However, the total number of plans approved by month increased throughout the quarter.

In the South Australian trial site, the revised bilateral target resulted in a large increase in first plan approvals in the March 2016 quarter.

The number of participants receiving their first approved plan in the Australian Capital Territory trial site this quarter was lower than the bilateral target.

In the Victorian trial site, there were a high number of plan reviews in February 2016 and March 2016.

On 1 July 2015, an early roll out to full scheme commenced in the New South Wales (Nepean Blue Mountains) site with plans being approved from 1 September 2015. The number of first plan approvals were slightly higher than the bilateral target for February 2016 and March 2016. This balances the lower than expected number of first plan approvals in January 2016 due to the holiday season.

Figure 1 Participants with approved plans by month compared with the bilateral agreements and the actuarial model – NSW (Hunter), SA, TAS and VIC trial sites

This graph shows the number of approved plans on the vertical axis and the month of approval on the horizontal axis. The graph shows both first plans, as well as any subsequent plan reviews.

For the Hunter trial site, there were very few plans approved in July 2013. The number of approved plans from August 2013 to January 2014 was generally steady, at around 150 per month. There were a large number of plans approved in February and March, with 300 plans approved in February and over 500 in March 2014. March 2015 also saw a major increase in both the number of approved plans, at over 300, and the number of plan reviews. Since then, the number of first plans and plan reviews have continued at this level. There was a drop in number of approved plans from July 2015, there has been a steady increase since but it remains under under both the bilateral and actuarial targets. The number of plan reviews have been increasing over the March 2016 quarter.This graph shows the number of approved plans on the vertical axis and the month of approval on the horizontal axis. The graph shows both first plans, as well as any subsequent plan reviews.

For South Australia, the number of participants with approved plans generally increased each month from July 2013, peaking at around 220 in March 2014. There was a drop in the number of plans approved in April 2014 to around 100 however since then, the number of plans approved has steadily increased each month to over 600 in June 2015. The bilateral target of 5,085 was reached on August 31, as a result the number of approved plans has decreased in the September 2015 quarter and further decreased in the December 2015 quarter. The number of approved plans has increased in February 2016 and March 2016.

This graph shows the number of approved plans on the vertical axis and the month of approval on the horizontal axis. The graph shows both first plans, as well as any subsequent plan reviews.

For Tasmania, the number of participants with approved plans is generally in line with both the bilateral agreement and the actuarial model. With the exception of July 2013, the average number of participants with approved plans each month was around 70 during the first year of the scheme. Since July 2014, the focus has been on plan reviews.This graph shows the number of approved plans on the vertical axis and the month of approval on the horizontal axis. The graph shows both first plans, as well as any subsequent plan reviews.

For Victoria, there were very few participants with approved plans in July. Between August 2013 and January 2014, the average number of participants with approved plans was generally around 200 per month. There were a large number of participants with approved plans in February and March 2014, over 400 plans per month. In April 2014, very few plans were approved but numbers increased again in May and June 2014. Since July 2014, the number of plan reviews has increased significantly.

Figure 2 Participants with approved plans by month compared with the bilateral agreements and the actuarial model – ACT, NT, and WA trial sites and NSW (Nepean Blue Mountains) site[[5]](#footnote-5)

This graph shows the number of approved plans on the vertical axis and month of approval on the horizontal axis. The graph shows only first plans - there have been very few plan reviews in this trial site.

In the ACT trial site, the majority of plan approvals for the first quarter were in the month of September. The second quarter of 2014/15 averaged about 100 plan approvals per month. The third quarter of 2014/15 averaged close to 150 plans per month, peaking in March at around 250 plan approvals. The fourth quarter of 2014/15 and first quarter of 2015/16 followed a similar pattern. Since October 2015, the pattern of gradual increase across each quarter has flattened and remained around 250 first plan approvals each month. First plan approvals in March 2016 quarter have dropped below both the bilateral and actuarial targets. This graph shows the number of approved plans on the vertical axis and month of approval on the horizontal axis. The graph shows only first plans - there have been very few plan reviews in this trial site.

For the NT trial site, the majority of plan approvals were in the months of August and September 2014. There were an additional nine participants with their first plan approved in June 2015.

No plan approvals were scheduled in the first month of operations, and there have been few plan approvals to date, as expected due to the size of the trial site.

A new engagement officer was recently hired in the Northern Territory which has seen a spike in approved plans. In September 2015 there were 30 plans approved which is almost triple the amount approved in recent months. The number of approved plans have since dropped, with the highest in December 2015 of 14. The number of plan approvals has increased slightly to reach 10 in March 2016.This graph shows the number of approved plans on the vertical axis and month of approval on the horizontal axis. The graph shows only first plans - there have been very few plan reviews in this trial site.

No plan approvals were scheduled in the first month of operations. The number of plans approved peaked in March 2015 at around 280.

September 2015 saw the first round of plan reviews commence.

For this new trial site in 2014/15, the majority of plan approvals for the first quarter were in the month of September. The second quarter of 2014/15 averaged about 100 plan approvals per month. The third quarter of 2014/15 averaged close to 150 plans per month, peaking in March at around 275 plan approvals. Since September 2015, there has been a large increase in plan reviews. Since October 2015, the number of first plan approvals remains significantly lower than bilateral and actuarial targets. This graph shows the number of approved plans on the vertical axis and month of approval on the horizontal axis. The graph shows only first plans - there have been no plan reviews in this trial site.

In the first month of operations 50 participants recieved an approved plan. The expected number of plan approved is 200 per month, which was met in December 2015. The number of plan approvals in March 2016 quarter has largely remains around the bilateral target. 

### Committed support

As at 31 March 2016, 24,866 participants (active and inactive) have approved plans, and $1,960.9 million of support has been committed to these participants (Table 2).

Of this $1,960.9 million:

* It is estimated that $141.0 million (7%) was provided in 2013-14 (including actual paid to date). The funding envelope based on the bilateral agreements for 2013-14 is $148.8 million, including cash and in-kind. Hence, for participants who have entered the scheme in the first year, committed support for 2013-14 is around 95% of the funding envelope (Table 2).[[6]](#footnote-6)
* $504.7 million (26%) is estimated to be provided in 2014-15. This compares with the funding envelope based on the bilateral agreements for 2014-15 of $456.9 million, including both cash and in-kind. Therefore, for participants who have entered the scheme to date, committed support for 2014-15 is around 110% of the funding envelope for 2014-15 (Table 2).
* $848.5 million (43%) is estimated to be provided in 2015-16. The funding envelope based on the bilateral agreements for 2015-16 is $871.9 million, including both cash and in-kind. Thus, for participants who have entered the scheme to date, committed support for 2015-16 is 97% of the funding envelope for 2015-16.
* $466.7 million (24%) is expected to be provided in 2016-17 and beyond.
* Note: committed support exceeds the funding envelope in 2014-15 and is close to the funding envelope in 2015-16. However, as not all committed support is being utilised, an actual deficit will not arise. That is, the scheme will be within the budget for the three years of trial. Further, due to the phasing of participants into the scheme during the trial period comparing committed support with the bilateral agreement does not reflect full scheme costs.

Table 2 Committed support to date and amount committed to be provided in 2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | **Total** | | **Total (excl. large residential centres)** | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Expected to be provided ($m)** | |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2013/14 |  |  | $141.0 | 7% | $133.6 | 8% |
| 2014/15 |  |  | $504.7 | 26% | $435.9 | 26% |
| 2015/16 |  |  | $848.5 | 43% | $743.7 | 44% |
| 2016/17 |  |  | $466.7 | 24% | $387.8 | 23% |
| **Total** |  |  | **$1,960.9** | **100%** | **$1,701.0** | **100%** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Funding envelope for 2013/14 ($m)** | |  | **$148.8** |  | **$148.8** |  |
| Expected to be provided in 2013/14 as a proportion of 2013/14 funding envelope | | |  | *95%* |  | *90%* |
| **Funding envelope for 2014/15 ($m)** | |  | **$456.9** |  | **$456.9** |  |
| Expected to be provided in 2014/15 as a proportion of 2014/15 funding envelope | | |  | *110%* |  | *95%* |
| **Funding envelope for 2015/16 ($m)** | | | **$871.9** |  | **$871.9** |  |  |
| Expected to be provided in 2015/16 as a proportion of 2015/16 funding envelope | | |  | *97%* |  | *85%* |

### Actual payments

Actual payments to service providers and participants who are self-managing their plans as at 31 March 2016 was $884.9 million, of which $91.3 million relates to supports provided in 2013-14, $372.7 million relates to supported provided in 2014-15, and $421.0 million relates to supports provided in 2015-16.

* Actual payments to date for supports provided in 2013-14 represent 65% of all committed supports.
* Actual payments to date for supports provided in 2014-15 represent 74% of all committed supports.
* Actual payments to date for all supports 69% of all committed supports.

Note: payments continue to be made for the 2013-14 and 2014-15 support years, so these utilisation factors may increase.

### Trends in average package cost

The average annualised package cost across all trial sites at the end of March 2016 is $39,593 including large residences (Stockton, Kanangra and Colanda)[[7]](#footnote-7), and $35,992 excluding Stockton, Kanangra and Colanda.[[8]](#footnote-8) Average annualised package costs on a monthly basis are presented in Figure 3 and Figure 4.

The average annualised package cost in the New South Wales (Hunter), South Australian, Tasmanian and Victorian trial sites is approximately $39,654 including Stockton, Kanangra and Colanda, and approximately $34,729 excluding Stockton, Kanangra and Colanda.

The average package costs for participants in the trial sites that commenced on 1 July 2014 are not representative of the overall average cost due to the way that existing participants are being phased into the scheme.

Note: the benchmark average annualised package cost for 2015-16 is $38,588 reflecting the inflation factor included in the bilateral agreements.

Note: Average annualised package cost is not an appropriate measure of scheme performance when considered in isolation from other metrics. It is important to consider the number of scheme participants, the distribution of packages committed to these participants and actual payments for supports provided. All of these factors contribute to the overall cost.

Figure 3 Average annualised committed package cost by trial site – monthly averages (NSW - Hunter, SA, TAS and VIC)[[9]](#footnote-9)

This graph shows the average annualised cost on the vertical axis and the month of approval on the horizontal axis.

From September 2014 to March 2015 the average annualised plan cost was higher when including the Stockton large residential centre when compared to the average cost when excluding. Since April 2015 the average cost has been comparable when including and excluding the Stockton large residential centre.

The average annualised package cost was in line with the expected during August 2015. Since September 2015, the average annualised package cost for both including and excluding large residential centre has slowly increased beyond the expected cost. The average annualised pacakage cost for both including and excluding large residential centres has dropped but remains above expected cost in March 2016. This graph shows the average annualised cost on the vertical axis and the month of approval on the horizontal axis.

The average annualised plan cost has been steady about the expected for the South Australian trial site. March 2016 quarter average annualised plan cost were below expected cost. This graph shows the average annualised cost on the vertical axis and the month of approval on the horizontal axis.

The average annualised plan cost was higher than expected for September and October 2014. The cost then stabalised about the average until July 2015 since which the average anualised plan cost has been higher than expected. The average annualised plan cost was lower than expected in November 2015 and approximately in line with expected since December 2015, with the exception of February 2016 where the average annuualised cost was higher.This graph shows the average annualised cost on the vertical axis and the month of approval on the horizontal axis.

The average annualised plan cost including Colanda has been comparable to the average annualsied plan cost excluding Colanda in all months except July and September 2015, for which the average cost was higher when including Colanda. The average annualised plan cost excluding Colanda has been approximately in line with the expected.

**Figure 4 Average annualised committed package cost by trial site – monthly averages (ACT, NT, WA and NSW - Nepean Blue Mountains)**[[10]](#footnote-10),[[11]](#footnote-11)

This graph shows the average annualised cost on the vertical axis and the month of approval on the horizontal axis.

Average annualised plan cost was highest for plans approved in September 2014. Since then the average annualised cost has halved and stabalised around the $40,000. The average annualised plan cost have remained around the expected annaulised average cost of approximately $38,000 since July 2015. There was a increase to $57,000 in December 2015, the cost has remained above expected since.This graph shows the average annualised cost on the vertical axis and the month of approval on the horizontal axis.

The average annualised plan cost for the Northern Territory has fluctuated a great deal due the small number of participants at this trial site.This graph shows the average annualised cost on the vertical axis and the month of approval on the horizontal axis.

The average annualised plan cost was slightly below expected since August 2015 and have since increased to roughly around the expected cost.This graph shows the average annualised cost on the vertical axis and the month of approval on the horizontal axis.

The average annualised cost has stayed around the expected annualised average cost. 

### Distribution of package costs

Consistent with previous results, across all trial sites the distribution of support packages differs from expectations. In particular, fewer low cost participants than expected have entered the scheme, and fewer medium cost participants have entered the scheme (with the exception of the $10,000 to $30,000 groups). The number of high cost participants is largely in line with expected (Figure 5 and Figure 6).

The distribution of cost is highly skewed towards a small number of participants with high cost packages– specifically, of the 10,712 active participants with approved plans in the New South Wales (Hunter) and Victorian trial sites excluding the Stockton, Kanangra and Colanda large residences, 7,104 participants (66%) have an annualised package cost of less than $30,000 (Figure 7).

The total annualised package cost of the 7,104 participants with support packages of less than $30,000 is $97.7 million which represents only 22% of total committed supports. On the other hand, the total annualised package cost of the 1,185 participants with support packages of more than $100,000 is $221.4 million which represents 50% of total committed supports.[[12]](#footnote-12) Therefore, the total cost of the scheme will be driven by the relatively few participants with high cost plans. Note: there are a relatively high number of group homes in the Hunter region in New South Wales compared with other regions. This is driving the higher proportion of high cost participants compared with expected.

Figure 5 Distribution of package costs by trial site – NSW (Hunter), SA, TAS and VIC trial sites[[13]](#footnote-13)

This graph has the number of participants on the vertical axis and the annualised committed support band on the horizontal axis.

The actual number of participants is lower than expected in all of the low cost bands except for the $10,001-$30,000 which saw a great deal more participants than expected. This graph has the number of participants on the vertical axis and the annualised committed support band on the horizontal axis.

Actual was higher than expected in only one support band in South Australia, $10,001-$30,000. All other support bands saw the expected or less than the expected number of participants.
This graph has the number of participants on the vertical axis and the annualised committed support band on the horizontal axis.

The actual number of participants was greater than the expected number of participants for the $30,001-$100,000 support band and the $250,001+ support band. 
This graph has the number of participants on the vertical axis and the annualised committed support band on the horizontal axis.

There are many more participants in the $10,001 - $30,000 support band than expected.


Figure 6 Distribution of package costs by trial site – ACT, NT, WA, and NSW (Nepean Blue Mountains) sites[[14]](#footnote-14)

This graph has the number of participants on the vertical axis and the annualised committed support band on the horizontal axis.

The ACT trial site has seen more participants in the $10,001 - $30,000 support band than expected. The other support bands all saw less than expected or as expected.This graph has the number of participants on the vertical axis and the annualised committed support band on the horizontal axis.

The number of participants in each support band was lower than expected for all support bands except the $10,000 - $30,000 and $250,001+ band. This graph needs to be viewed with caution due to the small number of participants in the NT trial site.
This graph has the number of participants on the vertical axis and the annualised committed support band on the horizontal axis.

The WA trial site has seen more participants than expected in the $10,001 - $30,000 support band and fewer than or the expected number of participants in the other support bands.
This graph has the number of participants on the vertical axis and the annualised committed support band on the horizontal axis.

The Nepean Blue Mountains has seen fewer participants than expected in all support bands, but the relative number of participants in the $10,001 - $30,000 support band is higher than expected.

**Figure 7 Total package costs and number of participants by trial site and annualised committed support band**

This graph is for New South Wales (excluding the Stockton and Kanangra large residences). 

It shows the total annualised committed support amount on the vertical axis and the annualised committed support band on the horizontal axis.

The New South Wales trial site excluding the Stockton and Kanangra residencies has seen roughly $40,000,000 more than expected spent on participants in the $100,000+ support band. Spend has been less than expected on all other support bands except the $10,001 - $30,000 band which has seen roughly $10,000,000 more than expected spent.

The actual number of participants has been lower for each support band except for the $10,001 - $30,000 support band. 

This graph is for Victoria (excluding the Colanda large residence). It shows the total annualised committed support amount on the vertical axis and the annualised committed support band on the horizontal axis.

Spend has been less than or equal to expected for all support bands except for the $10,001 - $30,000 band. The $10,001 - $30,000 support band has seen a larger than expected number of participants as well as roughly $15,000,000 worth of committed support above the expected.

## Continuous improvement

The National Disability Insurance Agency continues to improve the scheme in response to scheme experience. This aims to ensure that the objectives of the scheme are being met for participants, and the scheme remains financially sustainable.

Two pieces of work that will continue to assist with achieving participant outcomes and financial sustainability are the development of the reference packages and the development of an outcomes framework.

### Reference packages

Reference packages are being developed to assist with detailed monitoring of scheme experience, including analysis of potential cost drivers. Reference packages aim to provide an annual benchmark funding level of support for participants with similar support needs and characteristics. Reference packages also allow a referential link between resource allocation to individual participants (that is, the amount of funded support provided to each individual participant) and the overall funding envelope.

A pilot of the reference packages commenced in February 2015 and data have now been collected for approximately 4,500 participants.

Note: the reference package is not a benchmark used to determine the support a participant receives, but rather allows detailed monitoring to be undertaken.

### Outcomes framework

Work is has been undertaken to develop an outcomes framework for measuring participant and family/carer outcomes. The development of this outcomes framework considers how outcomes can be measured at the scheme level as well as the individual level.

The development of this framework has involved consideration of a number of domestic and international frameworks, and has included consultations with a range of experts and stakeholders, including the Independent Advisory Council.

The framework includes eight participant domains – choice and control, daily activities, relationships, home, health and wellbeing, lifelong learning, work, and social, community & civic participation – as well as outcomes related specifically to families/carers.

The outcomes framework was piloted in the first three months of 2015. The results of the pilot, along with feedback from consultation with the disability sector were used to refine the framework. The results of the pilot study were released publicly in December 2015:

http://www.ndis.gov.au/document/outcomes-framework-pilot

The NDIS outcomes framework has been collected for approximately 4,100 participants.

## Appendix A

This appendix provides a comparison of the number of participants in the scheme to date compared with the actuarial baseline model.

Table A.1 Participants compared with the actuarial baseline model

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1 July 2013 to 31 March 2016** | **NSW (Hunter)** | **SA** | **TAS** | **VIC** | **ACT** | **NT** | **WA** | **NSW (Nepean Blue Mountains)** | **Total** |
|
|
| Number of expected participants (bilateral agreements) - (a) [[15]](#footnote-15),[[16]](#footnote-16) | 8,841 | 6,451 | 1,031 | 4,955 | 3,651 | 154 | 3,422 | 1,400 | 29,905 |
| Number of expected participants (actuarial model) - (b) | 8,684 | 10,186 | 1,092 | 5,525 | 4,174 | 154 | 2,681 | 1,400 | 33,896 |
| Number of participants (active & inactive participants) | 7,167 | 7,788 | 1,279 | 5,515 | 4,292 | 138 | 2,291 | 1,299 | 29,769 |
| *Percentage deemed eligible compared with expected - (a)* | *81%* | *121%* | *124%* | *111%* | *118%* | *90%* | *67%* | *93%* | *100%* |
| *Percentage deemed eligible compared with expected - (b)* | *83%* | *76%* | *117%* | *100%* | *103%* | *90%* | *85%* | *93%* | *88%* |
| Number of participants with current approved plans (active & inactive participants) | 6,510 | 5,825 | 1,135 | 4,867 | 3,429 | 135 | 1,882 | 1,083 | 24,866 |
| *Percentage with approved plans compared with expected - (a)* | *74%* | *90%* | *110%* | *98%* | *94%* | *88%* | *55%* | *77%* | *83%* |
| *Percentage with approved plans compared with expected - (b)* | *75%* | *57%* | *104%* | *88%* | *82%* | *88%* | *70%* | *77%* | *73%* |

1. Note: this excludes the 16 participants who have been determined eligible as at 31 March 2016 in the Far North Queensland early transition site but do not yet have approved plans. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Note: these revisions do not reflect higher than expected scheme costs. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Bilateral agreement targets are targets for approved plans, rather than participants. The NDIS funding responsibility begins from the date of first plan approval. There is a lag between a participant being deemed eligible and having their plan approved. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Where bilateral agreement targets are quarterly, the monthly target is pro-rated evenly across the months (e.g. the monthly target is one third of the quarterly target). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The vertical axis is different for the Northern Territory and Nepean Blue Mountains sites. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Note: the amount of committed supports expected to be provided in both 2013-14 and 2014-15 has increased since the end of these financial years. The main reasons for this increase include correction of errors in funded supports entered into Siebel, funded supports being added and quotes from providers being received and updated in plans. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Stockton and Kanangra are large residences in the New South Wales trial site and Colanda is a large residential centre in the Victorian trial site. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. New South Wales (Hunter) did not specify the average cost of providing supported accommodation in the Stockton and Kanangra large residential centre and hence an estimate has been used. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. The vertical axis is different for each trial site. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Note: the number of participants with approved plans in the Northern Territory is low. Hence numbers should be treated with caution. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. The vertical axis is different for each trial site. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. The Stockton, Kanangra and Colanda large residences result in high concentrations of high cost people in specific geographical areas. For this reason Stockton, Kanangra and Colanda have been excluded from this analysis. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. The vertical axis is different for each trial site [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. The vertical axis is different for all trial sites and the New South Wales (Nepean Blue Mountains) site [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Bilateral agreement targets are targets for approved plans, rather than participants. The NDIS funding responsibility begins from the date of first plan approval. There is a lag between a participant being deemed eligible and having their plan approved. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Where bilateral agreement targets are quarterly, the monthly target is pro-rated evenly across the months (e.g. monthly target is one third of quarterly target). [↑](#footnote-ref-16)