



M
D
S



Report 2005



Medical Practice in rural & remote Australia: Combined Rural Workforce Agencies National Minimum Data Set (MDS) Report as at 30th November 2005



Tasmanian General Practice Divisions Ltd
Rural Workforce Support



Health Workforce
Queensland



RURAL
DOCTORS
WORKFORCE
AGENCY INC.

General Practice
and
Primary Health Care
NT



NSW RURAL DOCTORS NETWORK



RWAV
Rural Workforce Agency, Victoria
Supporting Victoria's Rural Doctors



WACRRM
Western Australian Centre
for Remote & Rural Medicine

Health Workforce Queensland and New South Wales Rural Doctors Network 2006

This work is copyright. Apart from any use as permitted under the *Copyright Act 1968*, no part may be reproduced without prior written permission from Health Workforce Queensland or the New South Wales Rural Doctors Network. Requests and enquiries concerning reproduction and rights should be directed to Health Workforce Queensland or the New South Wales Rural Doctors Network.

Suggested citation

Health Workforce Queensland and New South Wales Rural Doctors Network (2006). Medical practice in rural and remote Australia: Combined Rural Workforce Agencies National Minimum Data Set report as at 30th November 2005. Brisbane: HWQ.

Compiled by:

Col White – Health Workforce Queensland

and

Peter Williams – New South Wales Rural Doctors Network

ISBN 0-9803026-0-9

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all state and territory Rural Workforce Agencies and staff for their time, patience and contributions in providing the data used in this report and their commitment to the compilation of a national data set. We also appreciate the time expended in validating the data and providing feedback on the initial drafts.

Table of contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Demographics of the rural and remote GP workforce.....	1
3.	Workloads.....	5
4.	Length of stay in current principal practice.....	7
5.	Known number of proceduralists	8
6.	Emergency care and Aboriginal health	10
7.	Types of practice	11
8.	Primary Income Source	11
9.	Primary Model of Service Provision	12
10.	Registrars.....	12
11.	On-call hours available and worked	12
12.	Leave wanted versus leave taken.....	13
13.	State or Territory variations.....	13
14.	Summary.....	14
16.	Terminology	15
17.	References	15
	Appendix 1.....	16
	Appendix 2.....	17

List of Figures

Figure 1	Percentage of female practitioners by state	3
Figure 2	Number of practitioners by 5 year age categories and gender	3
Figure 3	Proportion of male and female in 5 year age categories	4
Figure 4	Average total hours by gender and age categories	7
Figure 5	Venn diagram illustrating numbers undertaking single and/or multiple procedures	9
Figure 6	Gender composition of proceduralist rural workforce	9

List of Tables

Table 1	Practitioner numbers by State and RRMA	2
Table 2	Gender by RRMA	2
Table 3	Gender by State	2
Table 4	Practitioner ages by gender and RRMA (broad categories)	4
Table 5	Self-reported GP clinical hours	5
Table 6	Self-reported GP clinical hours by gender	5
Table 7	Self-reported total hours	6
Table 8	Self-reported total hours by gender	6
Table 9	Length of stay in current practice by RRMA	7
Table 10	Number of practitioners undertaking procedural work by type and State	8
Table 11	Number of practitioners undertaking procedural work by type and RRMA	8
Table 12	Number and proportions of practitioners providing emergency care by state	10
Table 13	Number and proportions of practitioners providing emergency care services by RRMA	10

Table 14	Number and proportions of practitioners providing Aboriginal health services by state	10
Table 15	Number and proportions of practitioners providing Aboriginal health services by RRMA	10
Table 16	Practice type by RRMA	11
Table 17	Self-reported primary income source	11
Table 18	Primary model of service provision	12
Table 19	Registrars in rural practice by state/territory	12
Table 20	Average hours available on call and average hours on call worked	13
Table 21	Average leave wanted and average leave taken (weeks)	13

Rural Workforce Agencies National Minimum Data Set Report – 30 November 2005

1. Introduction

During the 2001-2004 triennium, as a part of their contractual agreement with the Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing (AGDoHA), Rural Workforce Agencies (RWAs) in all states and territory were required to collect and report a minimum, specified set of data in relation to the rural and remote general practice workforce in locations classified RRMA 4 through RRMA 7.

Undertaken individually by each RWA, deidentified data were compiled nationally through the Australian Rural and Remote Workforce Agencies Group (ARRWAG) to provide a comprehensive portrayal of the Australian rural and remote medical workforce.

The requirement to collect and report a minimum data set and compile these data through ARRWAG were not included in AGDoHA's specifications for the 2004-2007 triennium. However, the RWAs in all states and territory appreciated the utility of maintaining a core set of data in relation the rural and remote medical workforce that was current and based on operational information systems maintained by the RWAs. As such it was decided that the RWAs would continue to collect and compile a national Minimum Data Set for RRMA 4 to 7 locations.

The data were first compiled at a national level in December 2001 and are updated on an annual basis as at 30th November each year. Data in relation to numbers of GPs, age, gender, procedural skills and length of stay in current location are largely derived from databases maintained by each RWA. Data in relation to primary income source, models of service provision, hours of work and types of practice are largely self-reported.

Each RWA normally surveys rural and remote medical practitioners in their state or territory in the third quarter each year. Core questions for the Minimum Data Set have been developed and standardised among the states and territories. In addition, states and territory have the flexibility to incorporate additional questions should they wish. While the annual MDS survey is a major component of the data reported, all RWAs utilise additional resources to verify and validate their data. It should also be noted that the number of doctors reported reflect the more stable elements of the rural and remote medical workforce and do not normally include transient, short term service providers (e.g. locum tenens).

Data provided in this report are a compilation of core data provided by Rural Workforce Agencies in all states and territory and was current as at 30th November 2005.

2. Demographics of the rural and remote GP workforce

This section will enumerate the rural and remote medical workforce by state, RRMA, age and gender.

Data indicated that as at 30 November 2005, the number of medical practitioners practicing in RRMA 4 to 7 locations was 4317. This represents an increase of 131 practitioners (3.13%) compared with numbers reported as at 30th November 2004. Table 1 presents the total number of medical practitioners working in RRMA 4 to 7 by State or Territory as at 30th November 2005.

Table 2 provides a breakdown of this distribution by gender and RRMA while Table 3 displays gender composition by state.

Table 1: Practitioner numbers by State and RRMA

State	RRMA4	RRMA5	RRMA6	RRMA7	Total
NSW	522	639	0	37	1198
NT	0	2	61	26	89
QLD	350	454	98	91	993
SA	103	283	0	25	411
Tas	47	114	0	2	163
VIC	316	611	0	8	935
WA	150	177	122	79	528
Total	1488	2280	281	268	4317

Table 2: Gender by RRMA

RRMA	Male	Female	% Female	Total
RRMA4	1040	448	30.1	1488
RRMA5	1592	688	30.2	2280
RRMA6	183	98	34.9	281
RRMA7	208	60	22.4	268
Total	3023	1294	30.0%	4317

Table 3: Gender by State

State/Territory	Male	Female	% Female	Total
NSW	859	339	28.3	1198
NT	52	37	41.6	89
QLD	679	314	31.6	993
SA	303	108	26.3	411
TAS	108	55	33.7	163
VIC	642	293	31.3	935
WA	380	148	28.0	528
Total	3023	1294	30.0	4317

Table 3 indicates that the proportion of female practitioners in the Northern Territory is comparatively higher than any other state. Figure 1 displays the percentage of female practitioners by state compared with the national average for rural and remote female practitioners. Figure 2 provides a breakdown of the number of rural and remote medical practitioners by gender and 5 year age categories. Figure 3 displays the proportion of male and female practitioners in five-year age categories.

Figure 1: Percentage of female practitioners by state




Figure 2: Number of rural and remote medical practitioners by 5 year age categories (N=3759)





Figure 3: Proportion of male and female practitioners in five-year age categories (N=3759)



Nationally, the average age for male GPs was 49.0 (N2664) years and 43.9 for females (N1095). The overall average age for all practitioners (N=3759) was 47.5 years. Table 4 displays gender distribution by broad age categories by RRMA.

Table 4: Practitioner ages by gender and RRMA - broad age categories (N=3760)

Age Category	Gender	RRMA 4	RRMA 5	RRMA 6	RRMA 7	Total
25-34	Male	58	87	29	16	190
	Female	53	97	27	12	189
	Total	111	184	56	28	379
35-44	Male	251	414	58	76	799
	Female	146	220	37	23	426
	Total	397	634	95	99	1225
45-54	Male	354	534	52	59	999
	Female	134	208	15	12	369
	Total	488	742	67	71	1368
55-64	Male	160	279	28	30	497
	Female	37	52	5	3	97
	Total	197	331	33	33	594
65 plus	Male	60	104	4	12	180
	Female	7	6	1	0	14
	Total	67	110	5	12	194

3. Workloads

Estimates of Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) and Full Time Workload Equivalents (FWEs) as used by the Health Insurance Commission (HIC) in calculating GP medical service provision are based solely on the number and the dollar value of claims made by a provider over a given reference period (usually 12 months). While these can be useful measures of overall service provision under Medicare, they do not reflect the number of hours worked in providing medical services or services provided that are not claimed or are not claimable through the HIC. For example, a medical practitioner is classified as full-time by the HIC if the Schedule fee value of services processed over a 12 month period is \$86,727¹ (2003-2004) or more for that practitioner. Similarly, a Full Time Workload Equivalent (FWE) value is calculated for each doctor by dividing the doctor's Medicare billing (Schedule fee value of claims processed by the HIC during the reference period) by the mean billing of full-time doctors for reference period. For the 2002-2003 reference period, this value for vocationally registered doctors was \$221,864.²

An alternative measure of service provision is number of hours worked. The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) defines full-time work as being 35 hours per week or more and part-time work as less than 35 hours. It is this measure that has been chosen by ARRWAG to differentiate between full-time and part-time service provision.

An estimate of full-time or part-time medical service provision utilising ABS benchmark was undertaken based on self reported GP clinical hours worked. Data was available for 69% of the total number of GPs. Data as displayed in Table 5 indicates that 64% of respondents worked 35 hours a week or more in the provision of routine clinical GP services.

Table 5: Self-reported GP clinical hours

Hours	Frequency	Percent
Less than 20 hours	330	11.1
20 to 35 hours	748	25.1
35 hours plus	1902	63.8
Total	2980	100.0

It should be noted that hours reported are for those worked in GP practice only and should not be interpreted as total hours since hospital hours, travel, teaching, supervision time etc. are not included. The average number of GP clinical hours reported was 36.2 hours per week (N=2980).

A further breakdown of self-reported GP clinical hours by gender is displayed in Table 6 below.

Table 6: Self-reported GP clinical hours by gender

Clinical Hours	Male		Female	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Less than 20 hours	153	7.4	177	19.6
20 to 35 hours	396	19.1	352	38.9
35 hours plus	1526	73.5	376	41.5
Total	2075	100	905	100

¹ Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing. (2005). *RFT 127/0405 - Request for tender for a medical workforce profile project*. Canberra: ADoHA

² Ibid

Self reported total hours were also explored. In addition to clinical hours, these hours may include hospital hours, time spent in travel between practices, population health, teaching, administrative or representative work. Data were available for 73% of practitioners. Table 7 displays self-reported total weekly hours while Table 8 displays total hours by gender. The average reported total hours were 44.1 hours per week (N=3148).

Table 7: Self-reported total hours

Hours	Number	Percent
Less than 20 hours	217	6.9
20 to 35 hours	492	15.6
35 hours plus	2439	77.5
Total	3148	100.0

Data indicates that 22.5% of practitioners are currently working part time as defined by the ABS (i.e. less than 35 hours per week).


Table 8: Self-reported total hours by gender

Total Hours	Male		Female	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Less than 20 hours	86	3.9	131	13.8
20 to 35 hours	213	9.7	279	29.5
35 hours plus	1902	86.4	537	56.7
Total	2201	100.0	947	100.0

Data for both self reported GP and self reported total hours, appears to be in line with national trends that suggest that female practitioners tend to work less hours compared with their male counterparts (AMWAC, 2005; CDHAC, 2001). Explanations for these differences have been well documented and reported in a considerable number of studies and will not be explored further in this analysis.

A more refined breakdown of average total hours by gender and age categories is presented in Figure 4. Additional, detailed data in relation to hours worked is presented in Appendix 1.

Figure 4: Average total hours worked by gender and age categories (N=2961)



4. Length of stay in current principal practice

Nationally, the average length of stay in current principal practice was 8.1 years. A more refined breakdown by duration and RRMA is provided in Table 9.

Table 9: Length of stay in current practice by RRMA

	Duration								Total
	< 6mths	6-12 mths	1-2 yrs	2-3 yrs	3-5 yrs	5-10 yrs	10-20 yrs	20 yrs +	
RRMA 4	127	149	175	160	178	233	232	201	1455
RRMA 5	165	246	225	235	279	333	399	320	2202
RRMA 6	44	57	45	24	36	36	22	15	279
RRMA 7	35	44	40	34	39	35	17	12	256
Total	371	496	485	453	532	637	670	548	4192

Data indicates that while 79.3 % (N=3325) of respondents have practiced in their current rural and remote locations for more than a year, 20.7% (N=867) are relatively new to their current practice and have been practising in these locations for less than 12 months.

5. Known number of proceduralists

The MDS survey further seeks to enumerate the number of rural and remote non-specialist practitioners providing procedural services in RRMA 4 to 7 locations. However, national data in relation to the provision of procedural services in rural and remote Australia may be incomplete due to non-respondents. The known number and proportions of practitioners providing specified procedural services as at 30 November 2005 is detailed in Tables 10 to 13 (below). In many cases it is possible for a practitioner to perform a number of procedures e.g., Anaesthetics and Obstetrics or Obstetrics and Surgery. The number of known procedural practitioners as detailed in Tables 10 and 11 (N=929) is therefore less than the total number of procedures documented (N1407). Of the 929 procedural practitioners, 386 (41.5%) perform multiple procedures. A Venn diagram illustrating practitioners undertaking single or multiple procedures is displayed in Figure 5. Gender composition of proceduralists compared to the general rural and remote medical workforce is displayed in Figure 6.

Table 10: Number of practitioners undertaking procedural work by type and State

Procedure	NSW	NT	QLD	SA	Tas	VIC	WA	National*
Anaesthetics General	100	6	82	76	1	105	93	463
Obstetrics Normal delivery	149	7	125	77	6	155	142	661
Surgery Operative	62	6	60	27	5	68	55	283
Known Proceduralists**	230	14	167	124	9	198	187	929
Total Practitioners	1198	89	993	411	163	935	528	4317

Table 11: Number of practitioners undertaking procedural work by type and RRMA

	RRMA4	RRMA5	RRMA6	RRMA7	National*
Anaesthetics General	114	280	34	35	463
Obstetrics Normal Delivery	167	382	57	55	661
Surgery Operative	74	172	22	15	283
Known Proceduralists**	237	543	75	74	929
Total Practitioners	1488	2280	281	268	4317

* GPs practicing in RRMA 4 - 7

** GPs practicing in at least one procedural field

Figure 5: Venn diagram illustrating numbers undertaking single or multiple procedures (N929)





Figure 6: Gender composition of procedural practitioners (RRMA 4 to 7)



6. Emergency care and Aboriginal health

The survey further sought to enumerate the number of rural and remote practitioners who provide regular emergency care or Aboriginal health services. Tables 12 to 15 display these figures by state and RRMA.

Table 12: Number and proportions of practitioners providing emergency care by state

State	Number	Percent
NSW	250	20.9
NT	34	38.2
QLD	565	56.9
SA	167	40.6
Tas	80	49.1
VIC	341	36.5
WA	350	66.3
Total	1787	41.4

Table 13: Number and proportions of practitioners providing emergency care services by RRMA

RRMA	Number	Percent
RRMA4	423	28.4
RRMA5	1036	45.4
RRMA6	153	54.4
RRMA7	175	65.3
Total	1787	41.4

Table 14: Number and proportions of practitioners providing Aboriginal health services by State

State	Number	Percent
NSW	144	12.0
NT	73	82.0
QLD	339	34.1
SA	43	10.5
Tas	18	11.0
VIC	77	8.2
WA	228	43.2
Total	922	21.4

Table 15: Number and proportions of practitioners providing Aboriginal health services by RRMA

RRMA	Number	Percent
RRMA4	232	15.6
RRMA5	378	16.6
RRMA6	167	59.4
RRMA7	145	54.1
Total	922	21.4

7. Types of practice

The Number of GPs working in each practice type by RRMA was also explored. Table 16 displays the number of doctors working in each practice type by RRMA for the period ending 30th November 2005. Data was missing or inadequately described for 21 respondents.

Table 16: Practice type by RRMA

RRMA	Solo		Group	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
4	155	10.4%	1322	88.8%
5	371	16.3%	1900	83.5%
6	20	7.1%	261	92.9%
7	79	29.6%	188	70.4%
Total	625	14.5%	3671	85.1%

8. Primary Income Source

Table 17 below displays self-reported data on primary income source. Data was available for 2822 (65.4%) respondents. Caution should be exercised in interpreting these data as a significant number of practitioners had more than one income source and in some cases the option selected was not always consistent with known data. For example, in Queensland, some Medical Superintendents with Right to Private Practice described their primary income source as 'Fee for service' while others chose the 'State salaried with rights to private practice' option.

Table 17: Self -reported primary income source

Primary Income Source	Number	Percent
Fee for service	1738	61.6
State salaried with right to private practice	119	4.2
State salaried without right to private practice	215	7.6
Private practice wage or salary	589	20.9
Local government wage or salary	8	0.3
Non government wage or salary	57	2.0
Aboriginal community controlled health service salary	93	3.3
Other	3	0.1
Total	2822	100.0

9. Primary Model of Service Provision

Table 18 below displays self-reported data on primary models of service provision. Data was available for 3378 (78.2%) respondents. Again, caution needs to be exercised in the interpretation of these data as many practitioners have several models of service provision and in some instances, the option chosen was not always consistent with known data. For example, the number of Registrars is understated as many described their primary model as 'Resident GP' or 'Hospital Based GP'.

Table 18: Primary model of service provision

Primary Model of service provision	Number	Percent
Resident GP	2809	83.2
"Fly in Fly Out"	45	1.3
Member of a Primary Health Care Team	87	2.6
Hospital based GP	158	4.7
Registrar	253	7.5
Other	26	0.8
Total	3378	100.0

10. Registrars

The number of Registrars currently working in RRMA 4 to 7 locations by state was also explored. These data differ somewhat from self-reported data as shown in Table 18. This is largely due to the tendency of some respondents to describe their primary model of service provision differently to known data maintained by RWAs. Data as displayed in Table 19 indicates that nationally, Registrars comprise approximately 10.3% of the rural and remote medical workforce.

Table 19: Registrars in rural practice by state or territory – number and percent

State	Number	Percent	Total
NSW	101	8.4%	1198
NT	3	3.4%	89
QLD	120	12.1%	993
SA	48	11.7%	411
Tas	4	2.5%	163
VIC	123	13.2%	935
WA	44	8.3%	528
Total	443	10.3%	4317

11. On-call hours available and worked

Respondents were also asked the number of hours they were available on call each week at their practice or hospital and the number of on-call hours actually worked. As many practitioners in small communities and solo doctor towns consider that they are on call 24 hours per day, 7 days a

week, the number of on-call hours available was allowed a maximum of 168 hours. Due to a number of erratic responses in relation to on-call hours actually worked, the maximum number of hours allowed was restricted to 40 hours. Table 20 displays the responses that satisfied both these conditions and shows the average number of hours reported as being worked and the average number of hours reported as being available on call for 1773 respondents.

Table 20: Average hours available on call and average hours on call worked

	Number	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Std. Deviation
Hours per week on call worked	1470	1	40	8.4	8.3
Hours per week available on call	1773	1	168	59.9	54.6

12. Leave wanted versus leave taken

Respondents were asked to indicate the number of weeks leave desired each year and the number of weeks actually taken. As a significant number indicated 26 to 52 weeks leave desired, it was decided to set a more realistic maximum of 10 weeks for both leave wanted and desired. All other responses have been filtered out. Data for the 1689 valid responses indicate that there is an average 1.7 week deficit between annual leave wanted and annual leave taken.

Table 21: Average leave wanted and average leave taken (weeks)

	Number	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Annual LeaveTaken	1689	0.7	10	4.3	1.9
Annual_Leave_wanted	1346	1	10	6.0	1.8

13. State or Territory variations

Queensland:

Queensland data includes 170 state salaried doctors (Residential Medical Officers, Senior Medical Officers and Medical Superintendents) who do not have the right of private practice. However, due to the differing nature of medical service provision in Queensland, it is estimated that 60 to 70 percent of these doctors provide primary care or GP type services in their communities. In the absence of a reliable method of differentiating their degree of primary care provision, they have been included in the current dataset. The negative aspect of this inclusion is that it probably does provide an overestimate of primary care or GP type services currently available in rural and remote Queensland. The data do not include Senior Medical Officer employed by Queensland Health in Maryborough, Hervey Bay or Mount Isa. Due to the size and nature of these hospitals, it is considered that these SMOs are providing non GP type services. Additionally, RFDS Medical Officers working from the Cairns base have been reclassified as RRMA 7 due to the communities they service.

Northern Territory:

The survey went out to NT DHCS hospital doctors who are on our database; however this is by no means an accurate account. There could be uncounted doctors who for various reasons are not picked up by the survey.

14. Summary

The data provided in this report has been based on agreed elements for a national Minimum Data Set for Rural Workforce Agencies. While the data may differ to that produced by the HIC, we believe that it is probably as valid since numbers reported reflect 'on ground' realities and are based on local knowledge of medical provision in communities. Measures such as FTE and FWE are based on the number and dollar value of claims processed by the HIC and often do not capture the full complexity of medical service provision in rural and remote communities. State or Territory Rural Workforce Agencies are satisfied that the collated data provides a relatively accurate portrayal of medical service provision in their areas as at the 30th November 2005 reporting date.

As indicated in the introduction, many aspects of the data contained in this report are not solely dependent on survey response but are derived from known working data maintained by Rural Workforce Agencies in their individual state or territory. Survey responses are largely used to validate and update known data. Response rates for the current data collection period were; NSW 47.1%, NT 52.8%, QLD 59.9%, SA 58.6%, TAS 83.0%, VIC 50.1%, WA 78.6%.

Trends evident in this report include:

- An increase of 3.13% (N=131) in rural practitioner numbers nationally between 30th November 2004 and 30th November 2005.
- A small change in the percentage of female practitioners working in RRMA 4 to 7 locations.
- A reduction in the number of rural and remote practitioners working in sole practice situations (14.5% as opposed to 15.7% in 2004).
- A continuation of national trends with increasing number of female practitioners in lower age groups.
- A continuation of trends that suggest that female practitioners tend to work less hours compared with their male counterparts.
- A reduction in the average number of clinical hours worked per week. Average clinical hours reported in November 2004 were 36.54. For 2005, the average clinical hours reported was 36.2 hours
- A decline in the proportion of rural and remote practitioners providing procedural services
- A small increase in total hours reported to 44.1 hours in 2005 compared with 43.7 hours per week in 2004.

A table outlining these trends or changes is provided in Appendix 1.

16. Terminology

ABS	Australian Bureau of Statistics
ACCHS	Aboriginal Community Controlled Health Service
AMWAC	Australian Medical Workforce Advisory Committee
ARRWAG	Australian Rural and Remote Workforce Agencies Group
CDHAC	Commonwealth Department of Health and Aged Care (now Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing)
AGDoHA	Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing
FTE's	Full-time equivalents (calculated on HIC billings of \$82,414 or more)
FWE's	Full-time workload equivalents (calculated on average HIC billings for full-time doctors - (\$221,864 for 2002-2003 reference period)
HIC	Health Insurance Commission (now Medicare Australia)
RFDS	Royal Flying Doctor Service
RRMA	Rural Remote and Metropolitan Area Classification
RWA	Rural Workforce Agency

17. References

Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing. (2005). *RFT 127/0405 - Request for tender for a medical workforce profile project*. Canberra: ADoHA

Australian Medical Workforce Advisory Committee. (2005). *The General Practice Workforce in Australia: Supply and Requirements to 2013, AMWAC Report 2005.2*. Sydney.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (2001). Outcomes of ABS views on remoteness consultation, Australia. ABS Cat No 1244.0.00.001. Canberra, ABS.

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (2002). *Australia's health 2002*. Canberra: AIHW.

Commonwealth Department of Health and Aged Care. (2001). *The Australian Medical Workforce. Occasional Papers New Series No.12, August 2001*. Canberra: CDHAC.

Commonwealth Department of Health and Aged Care. (2001). *Measuring remoteness: accessibility/remoteness index of Australia (ARIA). Occasional Papers: New Series Number 14, October 2001*. Canberra: CDHAC.

Appendix 1

Trends or changes November 2002 to November 2005

	2002	2003	2004	2005
Total practitioners	3903	4074	4186	4317
Percent female	28.4	29.7	29.7	30.0
Percent male	71.6	70.3	70.3	70.0
Average age female	42.19	42.6	43.4	43.9
Average age male	47.72	48.01	48.6	49.0
Average age (all)	46.65	46.44	47.1	47.5
Average GP clinical hours	37.67	37.08	36.54	36.2
Average total hours	46.65	46.65	43.68	44.1
Average length of stay in current practice (years)	8.29	9.15	8.25	8.1
*Proceduralists General Anaesthetics	456	435	459	463
*Proceduralists Obstetrics (Normal delivery)	706	638	657	661
*Proceduralists Operative surgery	287	287	304	283
*Known Proceduralists (practising in at least one procedural field)	935	902	933	929
* Proportion of rural practitioners providing procedural services	24.0	22.1	22.3	21.5
Proportion of practitioners providing emergency care services	41.70	46.60	46.85	41.4
Proportion of practitioners providing Aboriginal health services	20.50	22.8	19.0	21.4
Proportion of GPs working in solo practices	16.6	15.8	15.7	14.5
Proportion of GPs working in group practices	83.4	84.2	84.3	85.5

Appendix 2

Rural, Remote and Metropolitan Area Classification (RRMA) and Accessibility/Remoteness Index of Australia (ARIA)³

Many regional programs are targeted at areas of geographic disadvantage and the convenient label of being 'rural' areas often refers to these areas. However, there is not a generally accepted or generally applicable definition for the Australian context that can be used to identify rural areas. As a result, the RRMA classification has been widely used to determine eligibility of an area for program funding. The RRMA classification was used to assign each SLA (based on 1991 boundaries) to one of 7 categories that were further aggregated into three basic zones (Metropolitan, Rural, and Remote).

The seven RRMA categories are:

1. Capital Cities (Metropolitan Zone)
2. Other Metropolitan Centres (Metropolitan Zone)
3. Large Rural Centres (Rural Zone)
4. Small Rural Centres (Rural Zone)
5. Other Rural Areas (Rural Zone)
6. Remote Centres (Remote Zone)
7. Other Remote Areas (Remote Zone)

The use of the word 'rural' in several of the category names of the RRMA classification was not originally intended to be a definition of rurality. However, over time, RRMA category names have evolved into a simple and convenient way of interpreting rurality. Many programs that have to make decisions on eligibility for assistance are constrained by legislation and policy to using RRMA categories that 'define' rural areas. Within the Commonwealth Department of Health and Ageing administration of regional assistance will move from the use of the RRMA classification to use of ARIA over time.

ARIA stands for Accessibility/Remoteness Index of Australia. During 1998, the Commonwealth Department of Health and Aged Care commissioned a project to measure and classify the remoteness of populated localities in relation to 'service centres' of various sizes (based on the 1996 Census). The result was the ARIA index developed by the National Key Centre for Social Applications of Geographical Information Systems (GISCA) at the University of Adelaide. ARIA uses Geographic Information System (GIS) technology to provide a measure of remoteness (from service centres) for all places and points in Australia.

The development of the ARIA index deliberately avoided defining 'rural' areas. In many cases the term 'rural' is used when people are really referring to regional or non-metropolitan Australia. In these situations regional or non-metropolitan areas can be interpreted based on the degree of remoteness of an area (as measured in ARIA by accessibility to service centres). However in other situations a pure remoteness measure may not be the preferred approach. It may be more appropriate to take into account the population size of nearby urban centres and the use of RRMA categories is an accepted way of doing this. Thus it is acknowledged that some program areas rely on RRMA categories to determine eligibility for funding and there is a need to overlay the RRMA categories to current geographic boundaries and use this approach in conjunction with ARIA. To

³ Measuring Remoteness: Accessibility/Remoteness Index of Australia (ARIA). Occasional Papers: New Series No. 14. Commonwealth Department of Health and Aged Care. Further information is available from the department website <http://www.health.gov.au/ari/aria.htm>

meet the need for programs being able to identify the RRMA-like categories, each of the 1996 SLAs have been allocated a RRMA category code, with categories 6 and 7 being collapsed into a single group for the remote zone.

ARIA defines **five categories** of remoteness based on road distance to service centres, and is available for a variety of geographical units including localities, Census Collection districts (CCDs), Statistical Local Areas (SLAs) and postcodes. The five categories are:

1. **Highly Accessible** (ARIA score 0 - 1.84) - relatively unrestricted accessibility to a wide range of goods and services and opportunities for social interaction
2. **Accessible** (ARIA score >1.84 - 3.51) - some restrictions to accessibility of some goods, services and opportunities for social interaction
3. **Moderately Accessible** (ARIA score >3.51 -5.80) - significantly restricted accessibility of goods, services and opportunities for social interaction
4. **Remote** (ARIA score >5.80 - 9.08) - very restricted accessibility of goods, services and opportunities for social interaction
5. **Very Remote** (ARIA score >9.08 - 12) - very little accessibility of goods, services and opportunities for social interaction

Until recently, rurality has been described almost exclusively by the seven level Rural, Remote and Metropolitan Areas (RRMA) classification. This classification is based on the size of the local population centre as well as a measure of remoteness⁴.

Work by the National Key Centre for the Social Applications of Geographical Information Systems (GISCA) from 1996 saw the development of improved measures of remoteness: the Accessibility/Remoteness Index of Australia (ARIA), a continuous variable with a remoteness score of 0-12; and its successor, ARIA+ (similar to ARIA, but with a remoteness score of 0-15).

From ARIA, the department of Health and Ageing developed its five-level classification (also called ARIA), and from ARIA+, the Australian Bureau of Statistics developed its six-level classification, the Australian Standard Geographic Classification (ASGC) Remoteness Structure⁵.

Remoteness classifications

		RRMA		DoHA ARIA			ASGC Remoteness		
Broad Category	Fine Category	Population (000,000)	%	Category	Population (000,000)	%	Category	Population (000,000)	%
Metropolitan	Capital Cities	11.6	64	Highly Accessible	14.9	81	Major Cities	12.1	66
	Other Metropolitan centres	1.4	8						
Rural	Large Rural centres	1.1	6	Accessible	2.2	12	Inner Regional Outer Regional	3.8	21
	Small Rural centres	1.2	7						
	Other Rural centres	2.4	13	Moderately Accessible	0.8	4		2.0	11
Remote	Remote centres	0.2	1	Remote	0.2	1	Remote	0.3	0.3
	Other Remote areas	0.3	2	Very Remote	0.2	1	Very Remote	0.2	0.2
				Remote			Remote Migatory	<0.1	

Note: This table is a rough guide only; the various classes in each classification are not equivalent.
Sources: AIHW Population Estimates; AIHW Australia's Health 2002.

⁴ Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (2002). Australia's health 2002. Canberra: AIHW

⁵ Australian Bureau of Statistics (2001). Outcomes of ABS views on remoteness consultation, Australia. ABS Cat No 1244.0.00.001. Canberra, ABS.