Cancer services performance indicators

2021 audit

OFFICIAL

Victoria State Government | Department of Health

To receive this document in another format, phone (03) 9456 3332, using the National Relay Service 13 36 77 if required, or email the Cancer Support, Treatment and Research unit <cancerplanning@health.vic.gov.au>.

Contents

Introduction

The Victorian cancer services performance indicator (CSPI) program was set up in 2007 to measure and monitor progress with Victorian Government policy. In 2022 the government undertook a statewide audit across Victorian hospitals that deliver cancer care to check the status of specific elements of cancer care provided in 2021. The performance indicators described in this report for the 2021 audit focus on multidisciplinary care and supportive care. Each Integrated Cancer Service (ICS) collects the audit data to monitor processes of care and identify where care can be improved.

The *Victorian cancer plan 2020–2024* was developed under the *Improving Cancer Outcomes Act 2014*. It reflects the government's commitment to health system reform by providing a long-term approach to improving cancer outcomes. The cancer plan sets long-term goals to 2040 including policy, planning and research priorities. It provides key directions for specific action areas to reduce the burden of cancer. These goals helped in determining the performance indicators chosen for audit. The Department of Health sets targets for each indicator. The targets are longstanding and/or reflect the mandated cancer notification regulations.

Long-term goals of the cancer plan to 2040 include to:

- **halve** the proportion of Victorians diagnosed with preventable cancers
- achieve **equitable** outcomes for all Victorians
- ensure Victorians have **the best possible** experience of the cancer treatment and care system
- **increase one- and five-year survival of Victorians with cancer**.

Over time, indicators have been added, removed and reintroduced into the audit. This was to monitor the sustainability of results achieved in previous years and the capture of data mandated for reporting to the Victorian Cancer Registry (VCR).[1] The indicators included in the 2021 audit are documented evidence of:

- multidisciplinary team meeting (MDM) recommendations
- cancer staging in the MDM recommendations
- patient Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) performance status in the MDM recommendations
- communication of the initial treatment plan to the person's general practitioner (GP)
- supportive care screening.

This report's findings and recommendations aim to ensure continuing improvement at the health service level. ICS, supported by their governance committees, play a significant supportive role in enabling local cancer service improvement activities to address gaps in the audit results.

It is a requirement of all ICS to collect and report accurate data and ensure appropriate data storage as per the *Financial Management Act 1994*. The *Cancer services performance indicator audit of 2021 activity – information and methodology* document provides guidance for the rationale, definitions and targets. This document is available on request by emailing the department's Cancer Support, Treatment and Research Unit <cancerplanning@health.vic.gov.au>.

---

[1] Refer to the Improving Cancer Outcomes (Diagnosis Reporting) Regulations 2015 <https://www.legislation.vic.gov.au/in-force/statutory-rules/improving-cancer-outcomes-diagnosis-reporting-regulations-2015>.

Overview of results

The number of patients audited for the 2021 report is 3,314 (metropolitan ICS: *n* = 1,955; regional ICS: *n* = 1,269; paediatric ICS: *n* = 90).

Table 1 provides a high-level summary of the statewide results up to 2021 against the 2021 performance targets. A new sampling mechanism (outlined in the 'Methods' section) has been used since the 2018 audit to provide a more balanced sample across tumour streams and health service campuses. This aims to provide greater accuracy in estimating results for less common tumour streams and smaller campuses compared with using simple random sampling, the sampling method used for audits prior to 2017. Results for 2018, 2020 and 2021 in Table 1 have been rescaled to the eligible audit population to help compare with prior audits where simple random sampling was used.

Table 1: Statewide summary of results

Indicator	2014 result	2015 result	2017 result[2]	2018 result[3]	2020 result	2021 result	Target
1. Documented evidence of MDM recommendations	70%	72%	69%	74%	72%	72%	**85%[4]**
2. Documented evidence of disease staging in the MDM recommendations[5]	79%	81%	72%	78%	74%	74%	**85%[6]**
3. Documented evidence of patient ECOG performance status in the MDM recommendations[7]	N/A	N/A	32%	37%	39%	41%	**100%**
4. Documented evidence of communication of initial treatment plan to GP	71%	77%	78%	N/A	79%	82%	**100%**
5. Documented evidence of supportive care screening	37%	39%	39%	38%	31%	36%	**80%[8]**
Number of medical records audited	**3,591**	**3,447**	**3,542**	**3,300**	**3,603**	**3,314**	

Notes:

Hume data limitation: Victorian patients may receive care in another state, which is not captured in Victorian datasets. This particularly affects the data for patients in the Hume Regional Integrated Cancer Service (HRICS) area, who regularly undergo their treatment in Albury, New South Wales. For the audit in 2021, HRICS manually identified patients from the Albury campus of Albury Wodonga Health for audit.

Cells containing N/A indicate that data was not collected for that indicator in the relevant audit.

No audit was conducted on 2016 and 2019 diagnoses.

---

[2] Weighted sampling was used for the 2017 audit, and results were not rescaled to the target population.

[3] Weighted sampling was used for the 2018, 2020 and 2021 audits, and results were rescaled to reflect the target population distribution for comparability.

[4] Target set at 80 per cent prior to 2018.

[5] Results prior to 2015 excluded haematology and central nervous system (CNS) data.

[6] Target set at 100 per cent prior to 2018.

[7] Does not include the Paediatric Integrated Cancer Service (PICS) because ECOG is a measure of functional status in adult cancer patients and is not used in children's cancer care.

[8] Target set at 50 per cent prior to 2017.

Performance against policy

The performance indicators help implement relevant cancer policy and allow progress to be monitored and evaluated. The ICS are well placed to facilitate activities aimed at improving their community's experience of cancer within these four areas of focus.

In terms of findings, significant variation continues to persist between ICS across all measures.

Although there has been some improvement over time at the statewide level, across the board performance lags behind the targets.

The department supports a strategy whereby sites that are exemplars share their learnings on effective implementation strategies to improve achievements across all ICS. ICS are encouraged to consider implementing service improvement strategies to address this performance shortfall. Reporting against these activities may be requested.

Data quality assurance

Data and information provided under the CSPI audit were reviewed locally and approved by the ICS program manager or clinical director before submission, and on the provided template. This has helped minimise persistent data quality issues in the data collation process. Any queries about submissions were resolved through the relevant ICS program manager.

Distribution of findings

The department expects cancer service performance results to be presented at ICS governance and clinical advisory committee meetings. The department also encourages more regular scrutiny. Findings should be routinely presented to tumour groups and/or MDMs and to other stakeholders involved in local quality improvement activities. This includes health service quality units. Again, using MDM software can help in local tracking processes.

ICS program officers should provide local analyses and results directly to individual health services and MDMs. They should also help services improve their performance over time.

Methods

Target population

The target population for the CSPI program is Victorian[9] cancer patients newly diagnosed in 2021. They must have started treatment within Victoria in 2021 in any of the health services with which data-sharing agreements have been signed and the data is accessible centrally. This includes all public campuses (irrespective of the operator) and some private campuses where data-sharing agreements are in place between the health service and the ICS. Patients were allocated to an ICS for auditing based on the campus of first treatment.

Data source

The patients were identified from the Victorian Admitted Episodes Dataset (VAED) only and were not based on the linked VAED–VCR data. Using data from the VAED allows the audit to be conducted on the most recent calendar year, which is not possible using the VAED–VCR data. In effect, this excludes cancer patients who only received care outside of hospital such as oral chemotherapy or non-admitted radiotherapy, or those who were under active surveillance only.

HRICS manually identified an extra sample of patients from the Albury campus of Albury Wodonga Health to include in the audit. Patients treated at this campus are not identifiable in the VAED.

Inclusion criteria

Patients with admissions in 2021 with any malignant cancer ICD-10-AM code (excluding uncertain behaviour tumours) and any of the tumour stream–specific procedure codes were included in the target population. The cancer-specific ICD-10-AM diagnosis codes (summarised in Appendix 1) and the tumour stream–specific procedure codes were provided to ICS before beginning the audit. These are available on request. Patients were categorised into established tumour stream groupings if both a tumour stream–specific diagnosis code and procedure code were present in the same admission. The sampling methodology and tumour stream–specific procedure codes will be reviewed for future audits.

Exclusion criteria

Patients with the following characteristics were excluded from the target population:

- non-Victorian
- admitted within the same tumour stream within the preceding five years (to ensure only new diagnoses are captured)
- diagnosed within more than one tumour stream (to avoid including patients being treated and managed for multiple tumours).

For the eight ICS that focus on adult cancer care, patients were also excluded if they were younger than 18 years of age.

---

[9] Victorian cancer patients are those receiving cancer treatment at a Victorian health service where their usual residence is a Victorian address.

For the statewide PICS, patients were also excluded if:

- they were 18 years or older
- their first treatment was not at the Royal Children's Hospital or Monash Children's Hospital.

During the audit process, patients were also excluded if:

- they were diagnosed outside of 2021
- they had no active treatment
- they had prior treatment at another campus
- their diagnosis was a recurrence
- their medical record was not available.

Sampling strategy

Patients were sampled from the target population using a centralised sample selection process. Sampling was conducted at the ICS level to ensure enough cases were sampled for each ICS. Refer to Appendix 2: Sampling mechanism for details.

Size of patient sample

The CSPI program requires an adequate sample size to ensure the results are meaningful and can identify change in performance over time. The department sourced clinical epidemiological advice to estimate the required sample size. The sample size required to estimate percentage to within +/– 5 per cent with 95 per cent confidence was considered. The final sample for the regional ICS is lower than the epidemiological advice recommends, but this is in part to account for the need for regional patients to travel for treatment for some tumour streams. Similarly, the metropolitan ICS sample is somewhat inflated to account for the referral of patients from outside the ICS for rare tumour stream care. Each regional ICS was required to audit 250 patients, and each metropolitan ICS was required to audit 650 patients. All remaining cases were also provided to each ICS to ensure the required number for audit would be reached. Refer to Appendix 3 for the number of patients audited within each tumour stream for each ICS.

Sampling mechanism

Audits undertaken between 2007 and 2016 used a simple random sample method from the target population to identify the audit population. The resulting audit populations included many patients diagnosed within common tumour streams (for example, breast) and had few patients from rarer tumour streams. These population samples are representative of the target population. However, they minimise the ability to make accurate interpretations about less common tumour streams due to the low numbers sampled. The 2017 CSPI audit used weighted sampling to allow oversampling of rare tumour streams and to under sample common tumour streams. The resulting sample from each tumour stream is therefore large enough to make accurate conclusions while maintaining the original ICS-specific sample sizes. The sampling mechanism was updated again for the 2018 CSPI audit, aiming to select an equal number of patients across hospital campuses within tumour streams. To be eligible for audit from a campus, we needed a minimum of 10 patients from a tumour stream. Refer to Appendix 2: Sampling mechanism for details on how we calculated the sampling weights.

Results

For statewide summaries presented by tumour streams, all patients audited from PICS were grouped together in the same tumour stream (referred to as 'PICS TS' in the tables).

ECOG is not used in children's cancer because it is a measure for adult medicine. Therefore, patients from PICS were excluded from the results for performance indicator 3 (documented evidence of ECOG). For all the remaining indicators, the overall statewide measures include data from the PICS and the ICS.

This section of the report presents the results of heath service audit data as submitted by their respective ICS (collective and by tumour stream). Tables 2 to 6 break down the results by indicator, tumour stream and ICS. Refer to Abbreviations list for abbreviations used in the tables.

Performance indicator 1: Documented evidence of multidisciplinary team meeting recommendations

Rationale	Multidisciplinary care is a key part of providing best practice care for cancer patients. Documenting MDM recommendations in the medical record ensures such information is accessible to all team members. The department's 2007 publication *Achieving best practice cancer care: a guide for implementing multidisciplinary care* states 'recommendations are recorded in the patient's medical record and signed by the presenting or treating clinician'. The 2018 *Victorian cancer multidisciplinary team meeting quality framework* describes quality standards, indicators and measures that align with this performance indicator. Effective communication between all team members involved in a patient's care is critical for maximising patient care coordination. This performance measure gives an indication of the level of documentation of MDM recommendations in the central medical record.
Definition	Of those patients who were audited, the proportion who had documented evidence of MDM recommendations.
Target	**85 per cent**
Performance	Adjusted: 72 per cent statewide (raw estimate: 70 per cent)
Numerator	Total number of new cancer patients with documented evidence of MDM recommendations
Denominator	Total number of new cancer patients audited

MDM discussion should ideally be conducted prospectively, noting that for some tumours (for example, acute leukaemia), treatment is required to start immediately in which case a retrospective MDM is an indication of best practice. Specific audit data on the percentage of patients with documented evidence of MDM recommendations whose MDM was prospective, presented by tumour stream and ICS, is available in Appendix 4.

Table 22: Percentage of patients with documented evidence of MDM recommendations compared with a target of 85 per cent, by tumour stream and ICS, 2021

Tumour stream / ICS	NEMICS	SMICS	WCMICS	BSWRICS	GRICS	HRICS	LMICS	GICS	PICS	2021 overall	2021 overall – weighted
Breast	100% (95%, 100%)	97% (90%, 99%)	97% (90%, 99%)	71% (54%, 83%)	67% (53%, 79%)	82% (70%, 90%)	45% (31%, 60%)	69% (53%, 82%)		83% (79%, 86%)	**85% (81%, 88%)**
CNS	100% (88%, 100%)	77% (64%, 86%)	52% (39%, 65%)							72% (63%, 79%)	**70% (61%, 78%)**
Colorectal	96% (89%, 99%)	88% (78%, 94%)	83% (71%, 90%)	57% (39%, 73%)	64% (51%, 76%)	73% (60%, 83%)	51% (36%, 67%)	42% (26%, 59%)		75% (70%, 78%)	**77% (73%, 81%)**
Endocrine/thyroid	36% (21%, 54%)	98% (88%, 100%)	85% (73%, 93%)							78% (70%, 85%)	**77% (69%, 84%)**
Genitourinary	92% (83%, 96%)	76% (64%, 84%)	71% (59%, 81%)	10% (4%, 26%)	9% (4%, 19%)	42% (30%, 54%)	12% (5%, 26%)	23% (12%, 39%)		50% (45%, 54%)	**48% (43%, 54%)**
Gynaecological	99% (92%, 100%)	92% (82%, 97%)	94% (85%, 97%)	19% (8%, 40%)	0% (0%, 49%)		0% (0%, 22%)	94% (74%, 99%)		81% (76%, 86%)	**87% (82%, 90%)**
Haematological	75% (65%, 84%)	56% (44%, 68%)	62% (50%, 73%)	27% (14%, 44%)	58% (36%, 77%)	35% (18%, 57%)	57% (39%, 73%)	13% (5%, 29%)		54% (49%, 59%)	**61% (56%, 67%)**
Head & neck	93% (81%, 98%)	100% (93%, 100%)	98% (91%, 100%)	57% (37%, 74%)				100% (80%, 100%)		93% (88%, 96%)	**96% (94%, 98%)**
Lung	90% (80%, 95%)	77% (65%, 85%)	90% (81%, 96%)	59% (41%, 75%)	55% (40%, 69%)	81% (64%, 91%)	77% (59%, 88%)	40% (25%, 58%)		75% (70%, 79%)	**77% (73%, 82%)**
Melanoma	44% (31%, 58%)	75% (62%, 84%)	66% (51%, 78%)	10% (3%, 25%)	21% (8%, 48%)	12% (5%, 28%)	9% (3%, 24%)	7% (2%, 23%)		37% (32%, 43%)	**49% (42%, 56%)**
UGI	92% (83%, 96%)	81% (70%, 89%)	92% (83%, 97%)	68% (48%, 83%)	47% (27%, 68%)	90% (60%, 98%)	46% (29%, 65%)	81% (62%, 91%)		80% (75%, 84%)	**83% (78%, 87%)**
PICS TS									98% (92%, 99%)	98% (92%, 99%)	**98% (93%, 100%)**
2021 overall	86% (83%, 89%)	83% (80%, 85%)	82% (79%, 85%)	42% (36%, 48%)	46% (40%, 52%)	59% (53%, 65%)	39% (33%, 45%)	47% (41%, 53%)	98% (92%, 99%)	70% (68%, 71%)	
2021 overall – weighted	**90% (87%, 92%)**	**86% (83%, 89%)**	**85% (81%, 87%)**	**47% (38%, 56%)**	**50% (43%, 56%)**	**57% (51%, 64%)**	**42% (34%, 50%)**	**46% (40%, 53%)**	**98% (93%, 100%)**		**72% (71%, 74%)**

Notes: Colours have been used to aid in visual interpretation but do not provide any additional information. Dark purple indicates the target was reached. Light purple indicates the result was within 20 per cent of the target. White indicates the result was more than 20 per cent less than the target.

All blank cells indicate that no patients were audited. UGI = upper gastrointestinal.

Results in each cell include a raw estimate (or rescaled estimate for '2021 overall – weighted') and 95 per cent confidence intervals in brackets.

'2021 overall – weighted' results have been rescaled to the population available for sampling to account for the weighted sampling method.

Performance indicator 2: Documented evidence of cancer staging in the multidisciplinary team meeting recommendations

Rationale	Staging is the cornerstone of treatment planning. MDMs across the state are working hard to include appropriately credentialled specialists to inform both clinical and histopathological staging. Quality standard 8.3 of the *Victorian cancer multidisciplinary team meeting quality framework* states that the MDM team ensures relevant information about the patient and optimal treatment are considered, including staging. The optimal care pathways outline staging requirements for each tumour stream. Staging should be recorded using the AJCC staging (TNM), SEER or another accepted staging system for the disease type as endorsed by local tumour groups or multidisciplinary teams. One example of a well-accepted 'other' staging system is the Dukes staging system for colorectal cancer. Another is the International Federation of Gynaecology and Obstetrics staging system for gynaecological cancer.
	Disease stage is a data item mandated for notification to the VCR under the Improving Cancer Act (Diagnosis Reporting) Regulations.[10]
Definition	Of those patients who were audited and had documented evidence of MDM recommendations, the proportion who had cancer staging present in their MDM recommendations.
Target	**85 per cent**
Performance	Adjusted: 74 per cent statewide (raw estimate: 75 per cent)
Numerator	Total number of new cancer patients with documented evidence of cancer staging[11] in the MDM recommendations
Denominator	Total number of new cancer patients with documented MDM recommendations

Note: Accepted staging systems may be updated for future audits, with new staging criteria being incorporated as supporting evidence emerges.

The acceptable evidence for cancer staging does not neatly fit into childhood cancer staging practice. Childhood cancers are rare and generally differ from adult cancer in their biology, clinical classification and treatment. The staging systems used for adult cancers, which are well-established and universally accepted, are not adequate for staging many cancers that occur in children. There is no universally accepted system for staging most childhood cancer types. Therefore, other staging systems that were appropriate for childhood cancers, such as the World Health Organization's classification for CNS tumours, were considered acceptable for patients audited in PICS.

---

[10] Refer to the Improving Cancer Outcomes (Diagnosis Reporting) Regulations 2015 <https://www.legislation.vic.gov.au/in-force/statutory-rules/improving-cancer-outcomes-diagnosis-reporting-regulations-2015>.

[11] Staging should be recorded as per AJCC staging (TNM), SEER or another accepted staging system for the disease type as endorsed by local tumour groups or MDMs.

Table 33: Percentage of patients with documented evidence of cancer staging in MDM recommendations compared with a target of 85 per cent, by tumour stream and ICS, 2021

Tumour stream / ICS	NEMICS	SMICS	WCMICS	BSWRICS	GRICS	HRICS	LMICS	GICS	PICS	2021 overall	2021 overall – weighted
Breast	36% (26%, 48%)	92% (83%, 97%)	92% (83%, 97%)	100% (86%, 100%)	33% (20%, 50%)	62% (47%, 75%)	100% (82%, 100%)	100% (87%, 100%)		73% (68%, 78%)	**74% (69%, 79%)**
CNS	61% (42%, 76%)	80% (65%, 90%)	89% (73%, 96%)							77% (68%, 84%)	**79% (69%, 86%)**
Colorectal	84% (73%, 90%)	80% (68%, 88%)	73% (60%, 83%)	100% (82%, 100%)	69% (53%, 82%)	83% (69%, 91%)	89% (69%, 97%)	100% (77%, 100%)		81% (77%, 85%)	**83% (78%, 87%)**
Endocrine/thyroid	90% (60%, 98%)	81% (67%, 90%)	76% (61%, 86%)							80% (70%, 87%)	**78% (68%, 86%)**
Genitourinary	68% (56%, 78%)	74% (60%, 84%)	72% (58%, 83%)	100% (44%, 100%)	40% (12%, 77%)	92% (75%, 98%)	100% (57%, 100%)	100% (68%, 100%)		75% (69%, 80%)	**75% (68%, 80%)**
Gynaecological	97% (90%, 99%)	79% (66%, 88%)	78% (65%, 86%)	75% (30%, 95%)				100% (82%, 100%)		87% (81%, 91%)	**85% (78%, 90%)**
Haematological	71% (58%, 81%)	72% (56%, 84%)	60% (45%, 74%)	25% (7%, 59%)	36% (15%, 65%)	0% (0%, 35%)	53% (31%, 74%)	100% (51%, 100%)		61% (54%, 68%)	**62% (54%, 69%)**
Head & neck	92% (80%, 97%)	96% (88%, 99%)	90% (80%, 95%)	38% (18%, 64%)				100% (80%, 100%)		90% (84%, 93%)	**92% (87%, 95%)**
Lung	85% (74%, 92%)	92% (81%, 97%)	88% (77%, 94%)	81% (57%, 93%)	52% (33%, 71%)	68% (48%, 83%)	96% (79%, 99%)	100% (76%, 100%)		84% (79%, 88%)	**83% (77%, 87%)**
Melanoma	82% (61%, 93%)	50% (36%, 64%)	48% (31%, 66%)	67% (21%, 94%)	67% (21%, 94%)	25% (5%, 70%)	100% (44%, 100%)	100% (34%, 100%)		58% (49%, 67%)	**42% (32%, 54%)**
UGI	50% (38%, 62%)	37% (25%, 51%)	67% (54%, 78%)	100% (82%, 100%)	22% (6%, 55%)	11% (2%, 43%)	100% (76%, 100%)	100% (85%, 100%)		59% (53%, 65%)	**56% (49%, 63%)**
PICS TS									67% (57%, 76%)	67% (57%, 76%)	**71% (61%, 80%)**
2021 overall	72% (68%, 75%)	77% (73%, 80%)	77% (74%, 81%)	82% (73%, 88%)	48% (40%, 57%)	67% (59%, 74%)	89% (81%, 94%)	100% (97%, 100%)	67% (57%, 76%)	75% (73%, 77%)	
2021 overall – weighted	**65% (60%, 70%)**	**76% (71%, 80%)**	**78% (74%, 82%)**	**85% (76%, 91%)**	**45% (35%, 55%)**	**68% (60%, 75%)**	**94% (89%, 97%)**	**100% (100%, 100%)**	**71% (61%, 80%)**		**74% (72%, 76%)**

Notes: Colours have been used to aid in visual interpretation but do not provide any additional information. Dark purple indicates the target was reached. Light purple indicates the result was within 20 per cent of the target. White indicates the result was more than 20 per cent less than the target.

All blank cells indicate that no patients were audited.

Results in each cell include a raw estimate (or rescaled estimate for '2021 overall – weighted') and 95 per cent confidence intervals in brackets.

'2021 Overall – weighted' results have been rescaled to the population available for sampling to account for the weighted sampling method.

Performance indicator 3: Documented evidence of patient ECOG performance status in the multidisciplinary team meeting recommendations

Rationale	Doctors and researchers use ECOG performance status scales and criteria to:
	• assess how a patient's disease is progressing
	• assess how a disease affects the daily living abilities of a patient
	• determine appropriate treatment and prognosis.
	The Improving Cancer Outcomes Act requires recording of ECOG status in notifications sent to the VCR. This allows appropriate risk adjustment and comparative analyses of patient health outcomes. Documenting ECOG in the MDM recommendations would enable easy identification of ECOG for notifying the VCR as required under the Improving Cancer Act (Diagnosis Reporting) Regulations.[12]
Definition	Of those patients who were audited and had documented evidence of MDM recommendations, the proportion who had patient ECOG performance in their MDM recommendations (PICS not included).
Target	**100 per cent**
Performance	Adjusted: 41 per cent statewide (raw estimate: 42 per cent)
Numerator	Total number of new cancer patients with documented evidence of patient ECOG performance status in the MDM recommendations
Denominator	Total number of new cancer patients with documented MDM recommendations

ECOG is not used in children's cancer because it is a measure for adult medicine. Data collected for ECOG in MDM recommendations is therefore not applicable to PICS, and hence PICS patients were excluded from this indicator.

---

[12] Refer to the Victorian Consolidated Regulations
<http://classic.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/vic/consol_reg/icorr2015586/sch1.html>.

Table 44: Percentage of patients with documented evidence of ECOG performance status in MDM recommendations compared with a target of 100 per cent, by tumour stream and ICS, 2021

Tumour stream / ICS	NEMICS	SMICS	WCMICS	BSWRICS	GRICS	HRICS	LMICS	GICS	2021 overall	2021 overall – weighted
Breast	25% (16%, 36%)	95% (87%, 98%)	6% (2%, 15%)	0% (0%, 14%)	15% (7%, 31%)	45% (31%, 60%)	89% (67%, 97%)	92% (75%, 98%)	43% (38%, 48%)	**41% (35%, 47%)**
CNS	21% (10%, 40%)	0% (0%, 9%)	39% (24%, 58%)						18% (11%, 27%)	**20% (12%, 30%)**
Colorectal	33% (23%, 44%)	20% (12%, 32%)	29% (18%, 42%)	0% (0%, 18%)	31% (18%, 47%)	34% (22%, 49%)	95% (75%, 99%)	77% (50%, 92%)	34% (29%, 39%)	**32% (27%, 38%)**
Endocrine/thyroid	10% (2%, 40%)	38% (25%, 53%)	10% (4%, 23%)						23% (15%, 32%)	**22% (15%, 32%)**
Genitourinary	6% (2%, 14%)	30% (19%, 44%)	13% (6%, 25%)	0% (0%, 56%)	60% (23%, 88%)	92% (75%, 98%)	100% (57%, 100%)	0% (0%, 32%)	27% (21%, 33%)	**29% (23%, 36%)**
Gynaecological	74% (63%, 83%)	98% (89%, 100%)	47% (34%, 59%)	0% (0%, 49%)				94% (73%, 99%)	72% (65%, 78%)	**75% (68%, 81%)**
Haematological	52% (39%, 64%)	28% (16%, 44%)	28% (16%, 43%)	25% (7%, 59%)	9% (2%, 38%)	0% (0%, 35%)	100% (82%, 100%)	75% (30%, 95%)	41% (34%, 48%)	**38% (30%, 46%)**
Head & neck	20% (10%, 35%)	60% (47%, 72%)	42% (31%, 55%)	0% (0%, 23%)				80% (55%, 93%)	43% (36%, 50%)	**57% (49%, 64%)**
Lung	67% (54%, 77%)	76% (63%, 86%)	54% (42%, 67%)	6% (1%, 28%)	83% (63%, 93%)	60% (41%, 77%)	91% (73%, 98%)	92% (65%, 99%)	66% (60%, 72%)	**65% (59%, 71%)**
Melanoma	23% (10%, 43%)	14% (7%, 28%)	22% (11%, 41%)	0% (0%, 56%)	67% (21%, 94%)	50% (15%, 85%)	67% (21%, 94%)	50% (9%, 91%)	23% (16%, 31%)	**22% (13%, 33%)**
UGI	41% (30%, 53%)	25% (16%, 39%)	43% (31%, 56%)	6% (1%, 27%)	22% (6%, 55%)	0% (0%, 30%)	100% (76%, 100%)	90% (71%, 97%)	41% (35%, 47%)	**35% (29%, 42%)**
2021 overall	38% (34%, 42%)	47% (43%, 51%)	31% (27%, 35%)	4% (1%, 9%)	36% (28%, 45%)	48% (40%, 56%)	94% (87%, 97%)	81% (73%, 87%)	42% (40%, 44%)	
2021 overall – weighted	**34% (30%, 38%)**	**51% (46%, 56%)**	**30% (26%, 35%)**	**3% (1%, 10%)**	**31% (23%, 40%)**	**47% (39%, 55%)**	**93% (83%, 97%)**	**78% (68%, 86%)**		**41% (39%, 44%)**

Notes: Colours have been used to aid in visual interpretation but do not provide any additional information. Dark purple indicates the target was reached. Light purple indicates the result was within 20 per cent of the target. White indicates the result was more than 20 per cent less than the target.

All blank cells indicate that no patients were audited.

Results in each cell include a raw estimate (or rescaled estimate for '2021 overall – weighted') and 95 per cent confidence intervals in brackets.

'2021 overall – weighted' results have been rescaled to the population available for sampling to account for the weighted sampling method.

Performance indicator 4: Documented evidence of communication of initial treatment plan to general practitioner

Rationale	The GP (or paediatrician) is a key member of a team of care providers for patients with a new diagnosis of cancer. Timely communication of a patient's treatment plan to the GP or paediatrician will enhance the quality and coordination of care for the patient. An initial treatment plan is a single document that should include both confirmation of the cancer diagnosis and details of the next steps for the care of the patient. This measure provides an indication of the level of documentation of communication of the treatment plan to the GP or paediatrician.
Definition	Of those patients who were audited, what proportion had documented evidence of communication of initial treatment plan to their GP.
Target	**100 per cent**
Performance	Adjusted: 82 per cent statewide (raw estimate: 81 per cent)
Numerator	Total number of new cancer patients with evidence of communication of the treatment plan to the GP (or paediatrician)
Denominator	Total number of new cancer patients audited

Table 55: Percentage of patients with documented evidence of communication to GP compared with a target of 100 per cent, by tumour stream and ICS, 2021

Tumour stream / ICS	NEMICS	SMICS	WCMICS	BSWRICS	GRICS	HRICS	LMICS	GICS	PICS	2021 overall	2021 overall – weighted
Breast	91% (82%, 96%)	93% (84%, 97%)	90% (80%, 95%)	97% (85%, 99%)	90% (78%, 96%)	65% (51%, 76%)	75% (60%, 86%)	61% (45%, 75%)		84% (80%, 87%)	**85% (81%, 88%)**
CNS	86% (69%, 94%)	71% (58%, 82%)	76% (63%, 85%)							76% (68%, 83%)	**75% (67%, 82%)**
Colorectal	83% (73%, 90%)	90% (80%, 95%)	89% (79%, 95%)	80% (63%, 90%)	82% (70%, 90%)	77% (64%, 86%)	81% (66%, 91%)	100% (89%, 100%)		85% (81%, 88%)	**83% (79%, 87%)**
Endocrine/thyroid	89% (73%, 96%)	88% (76%, 95%)	83% (70%, 91%)							87% (79%, 92%)	**86% (79%, 92%)**
Genitourinary	80% (69%, 87%)	98% (92%, 100%)	76% (64%, 84%)	76% (58%, 88%)	50% (37%, 63%)	80% (68%, 88%)	72% (57%, 84%)	54% (38%, 70%)		75% (71%, 79%)	**80% (75%, 83%)**
Gynaecological	94% (86%, 98%)	85% (72%, 92%)	81% (69%, 89%)	86% (65%, 95%)	50% (15%, 85%)		100% (78%, 100%)	94% (74%, 99%)		87% (83%, 91%)	**88% (83%, 92%)**
Haematological	77% (66%, 85%)	81% (70%, 89%)	78% (67%, 86%)	100% (89%, 100%)	84% (62%, 94%)	100% (84%, 100%)	93% (79%, 98%)	90% (75%, 97%)		84% (80%, 88%)	**83% (78%, 87%)**
Head & neck	81% (67%, 90%)	60% (47%, 72%)	75% (63%, 84%)	91% (73%, 98%)				87% (62%, 96%)		75% (68%, 81%)	**81% (75%, 86%)**
Lung	93% (84%, 97%)	55% (43%, 67%)	86% (75%, 92%)	93% (77%, 98%)	83% (69%, 92%)	87% (71%, 95%)	100% (89%, 100%)	77% (59%, 88%)		82% (78%, 86%)	**82% (78%, 86%)**
Melanoma	42% (29%, 56%)	88% (76%, 94%)	83% (69%, 91%)	48% (32%, 65%)	64% (39%, 84%)	22% (11%, 39%)	64% (47%, 78%)	54% (36%, 70%)		60% (54%, 66%)	**67% (60%, 73%)**
UGI	77% (66%, 85%)	89% (79%, 95%)	73% (61%, 82%)	100% (87%, 100%)	79% (57%, 91%)	70% (40%, 89%)	100% (87%, 100%)	85% (66%, 94%)		83% (78%, 87%)	**81% (76%, 85%)**
PICS TS									99% (94%, 100%)	99% (94%, 100%)	**99% (95%, 100%)**
2021 overall	81% (78%, 84%)	82% (79%, 85%)	81% (78%, 84%)	85% (80%, 89%)	75% (70%, 80%)	71% (65%, 76%)	83% (78%, 87%)	76% (70%, 81%)	99% (94%, 100%)	81% (79%, 82%)	
2021 overall – weighted	**82% (78%, 85%)**	**84% (80%, 87%)**	**82% (78%, 85%)**	**88% (82%, 92%)**	**78% (72%, 82%)**	**73% (67%, 78%)**	**87% (81%, 91%)**	**75% (69%, 81%)**	**99% (95%, 100%)**		**82% (80%, 83%)**

Notes: Colours have been used to aid in visual interpretation but do not provide any additional information. Dark purple indicates the target was reached. Light purple indicates the result was within 20 per cent of the target. White indicates the result was more than 20 per cent less than the target.

All blank cells indicate that no patients were audited.

Results in each cell include a raw estimate (or rescaled estimate for '2021 overall – weighted') and 95 per cent confidence intervals in brackets.

'2021 overall – weighted' results have been rescaled to the population available for sampling to account for the weighted sampling method

Performance indicator 5: Documented evidence of supportive care screening

Rationale	Supportive care addresses a wide range of needs across the continuum of care for those affected by cancer. It is increasingly seen as a core part of cancer care. Improving supportive care for those affected by cancer is one of the priority areas for the ICS. This measure provides an indication of the level of documented appropriate supportive care screening.
Definition	Of those patients who were audited, the proportion who had documented evidence of supportive care screening using the one validated tool (the NCCN Distress Thermometer).
Target	**80 per cent**
Performance	Adjusted: 36 per cent statewide (raw estimate: 34 per cent)
Numerator	Total number of new cancer patients with documented evidence of supportive care screening
Denominator	Total number of new cancer patients audited

Note: For PICS, psychosocial assessments using the Psychosocial Assessment Tool (PAT) are routinely provided to all Royal Children's Hospital patients at diagnosis or first visit with a social worker. However, social workers refer to this period as a time of crisis in which patients and families respond better to verbal interaction recorded by the social work team. Because the PAT is a repeat of this information, many patients do not complete it. Monash Children's Hospital uses its own assessment tool alongside the PAT. Monash does not offer the PAT to non–English speaking families.

Table 66: Percentage of patients with documented evidence of supportive care screening compared with a target of 80 per cent, by tumour stream and ICS, 2021

Tumour stream / ICS	NEMICS	SMICS	WCMICS	BSWRICS	GRICS	HRICS	LMICS	GICS	PICS	2021 overall	2021 overall – weighted
Breast	80% (69%, 88%)	85% (75%, 92%)	34% (24%, 46%)	15% (6%, 30%)	39% (26%, 53%)	61% (47%, 73%)	22% (12%, 38%)	42% (27%, 58%)		52% (47%, 56%)	**54% (48%, 59%)**
CNS	46% (30%, 64%)	19% (11%, 32%)	4% (1%, 13%)							19% (13%, 26%)	**17% (11%, 24%)**
Colorectal	21% (13%, 31%)	31% (22%, 43%)	21% (12%, 32%)	10% (3%, 26%)	34% (23%, 47%)	20% (11%, 32%)	11% (4%, 25%)	13% (5%, 29%)		22% (18%, 26%)	**23% (19%, 27%)**
Endocrine/thyroid	7% (2%, 23%)	5% (1%, 15%)	12% (6%, 25%)							8% (5%, 15%)	**10% (5%, 17%)**
Genitourinary	27% (18%, 38%)	24% (16%, 36%)	14% (7%, 24%)	14% (5%, 31%)	14% (7%, 26%)	20% (12%, 32%)	22% (12%, 38%)	23% (12%, 39%)		20% (17%, 24%)	**19% (15%, 23%)**
Gynaecological	25% (16%, 37%)	56% (42%, 68%)	32% (22%, 45%)	19% (8%, 40%)	75% (30%, 95%)		43% (21%, 67%)	33% (16%, 56%)		36% (30%, 42%)	**38% (32%, 45%)**
Haematological	40% (30%, 51%)	58% (46%, 69%)	5% (2%, 13%)	47% (30%, 64%)	74% (51%, 88%)	50% (30%, 70%)	57% (39%, 73%)	35% (21%, 53%)		41% (36%, 46%)	**37% (32%, 43%)**
Head & neck	42% (28%, 57%)	47% (35%, 60%)	15% (8%, 26%)	17% (7%, 37%)				87% (62%, 96%)		36% (29%, 43%)	**39% (32%, 47%)**
Lung	58% (46%, 69%)	63% (51%, 74%)	11% (5%, 21%)	26% (13%, 45%)	83% (69%, 92%)	77% (60%, 89%)	70% (52%, 83%)	47% (30%, 64%)		53% (48%, 58%)	**52% (46%, 57%)**
Melanoma	4% (1%, 13%)	46% (34%, 59%)	24% (14%, 39%)	3% (1%, 16%)	21% (8%, 48%)	0% (0%, 11%)	6% (2%, 20%)	11% (4%, 27%)		16% (13%, 21%)	**28% (22%, 36%)**
UGI	30% (21%, 41%)	65% (53%, 76%)	16% (9%, 27%)	36% (20%, 55%)	63% (41%, 81%)	80% (49%, 94%)	69% (50%, 83%)	35% (19%, 54%)		42% (37%, 48%)	**43% (37%, 49%)**
PICS TS									48% (38%, 58%)	48% (38%, 58%)	**44% (33%, 55%)**
2021 overall	36% (32%, 40%)	47% (43%, 51%)	17% (14%, 20%)	20% (16%, 26%)	44% (38%, 50%)	37% (31%, 43%)	34% (29%, 40%)	33% (28%, 39%)	48% (38%, 58%)	34% (32%, 36%)	
2021 overall – weighted	**39% (35%, 44%)**	**54% (50%, 59%)**	**23% (19%, 28%)**	**14% (10%, 19%)**	**43% (36%, 49%)**	**35% (29%, 41%)**	**30% (24%, 38%)**	**35% (28%, 42%)**	**44% (33%, 55%)**		**36% (34%, 38%)**

Notes: Colours have been used to aid in visual interpretation but do not provide any additional information. Dark purple indicates the target was reached. Light purple indicates the result was within 20 per cent of the target. White indicates the result was more than 20 per cent less than the target.

All blank cells indicate that no patients were audited.

Results in each cell include a raw estimate (or rescaled estimate for '2021 overall – weighted') and 95 per cent confidence intervals in brackets.

'2021 overall – weighted' results have been rescaled to the population available for sampling to account for the weighted sampling method

Appendix 1: Tumour stream groupings

Tumour stream	ICD-10-AM codes
Breast	C50
Central nervous system	C69, C70, C71, C72
Colorectal	C18, C19, C20, C21
Endocrine/thyroid	C37, C73, C74, C75
Genitourinary	C60, C61, C62, C63, C64, C65, C66, C67, C68
Gynaecological	C51, C52, C53, C54, C55, C56, C57, C58
Haematological	C81, C82, C83, C84, C85, C88, C90, C91, C92, C93, C94, C95, C96
Head & neck	C00, C01, C02, C03, C04, C05, C06, C07, C08, C09, C10, C11, C12, C13, C14, C30, C31, C32
Lung	C33, C34, C38.4, C39, C45.0
Skin	C43
Upper gastrointestinal	C15, C16, C17, C22, C23, C24, C25, C26

Appendix 2: Sampling mechanism

The 2021 cancer service performance indicator audit used weighted sampling to allow for equal sampling between tumour streams and health services. This ensures enough patients across all tumour streams and health services are audited so reasonable conclusions can be drawn. The sampling mechanism used for this audit differs from the 2017 cancer services performance indicator audit weighting sampling, which oversampled smaller tumour streams but did not account for individual health services. Prior to the 2017 audit, simple random sampling was the method used. A minimum of 10 patients was required for a tumour stream to be eligible for audit from a campus.

Weights were assigned to each patient in the audit population, based on the tumour stream they belong to and the health service they were first treated at (according to the Victorian Admitted Episodes Dataset) by the following equation:

$$Weight_{i,j,k} = \frac{1}{M_{i,k}} \frac{1}{N_{i,j,k}}$$

Where:

- i = ICS of treatment
- j = campus of treatment
- k = tumour stream
- $M_{i,k}$ = number of campuses within ICS i that identified patients in tumour stream k
- $N_{i,j,k}$ = number of patients within ICS i, campus j and tumour stream k.

For example, at 'ICS X' there were four campuses that had breast cancer patients identified. Therefore, the weight calculation is as follows:

$$Weight_{ICS\ X,Campus\ y,Breast} = \frac{1}{M_{ICS\ X,Breast}} \times \frac{1}{N_{ICS\ X,Campus\ y,Breast}}$$

Tumour stream	Campus	Total patients in target population ($N_{ICS\ X,Campus\ y,Breast}$)	Weight
Breast	A	250	$\frac{1}{4} \times \frac{1}{250}$
	B	130	$\frac{1}{4} \times \frac{1}{130}$
	C	110	$\frac{1}{4} \times \frac{1}{110}$
	D	50	$\frac{1}{4} \times \frac{1}{50}$
Total		540	

To rescale the population for the overall ICS and tumour stream results, a rescaling multiplier was calculated for each person based on the tumour stream and campus they were treated at. These multipliers aim to rescale the sample, so the results represent the population distribution, and not the sampling distribution. Summing the rescaling multiplier across the entire sample will equal the same number as the number of patients sampled. Patients within tumour streams and campuses

that were oversampled will have a rescaling multiplier less than 1, and those within tumour streams and campuses that were under sampled will have a rescaling multiplier greater than 1. Patients treated at the Albury campus of Albury Wodonga Health will have a rescaling multiplier of 1 because these patients were not identified through the Victorian Admitted Episodes Dataset and therefore we cannot calculate the number of patients who would have been eligible for audit.

$$RescaleMultiplier_{i,j,k} = \frac{N_{i,j,k}}{n_{i,j,k}} \times \frac{n_i}{N_i}$$

Where:

- i = ICS of treatment
- j = campus of treatment
- k = tumour stream
- $N_{i,j,k}$ = number of patients in target population within ICS i, campus j and tumour stream k
- $n_{i,j,k}$ = number of patients sampled within ICS i, campus j and tumour stream k
- N_i = number of patients in target population within ICS i
- n_i = number of patients sampled within ICS i.

Appendix 3: Cancer service performance indicator audit population, 2021

Table A3.1: Number of patients audited within each tumour stream, by ICS, 2021

Tumour stream / ICS	NEMICS	SMICS	WCMICS	BSWRICS	GRICS	HRICS	LMICS	GICS	PICS	Statewide
Breast	69 (11%)	67 (10%)	68 (10%)	34 (14%)	49 (19%)	51 (20%)	40 (16%)	36 (14%)		**414 (12%)**
CNS	28 (4%)	52 (8%)	54 (8%)						27 (30%)	**161 (5%)**
Colorectal	76 (12%)	67 (10%)	63 (10%)	30 (12%)	56 (22%)	56 (22%)	37 (15%)	31 (12%)		**416 (13%)**
Endocrine/thyroid	28 (4%)	43 (7%)	48 (7%)							**119 (4%)**
Genitourinary	74 (11%)	66 (10%)	66 (10%)	29 (12%)	56 (22%)	60 (23%)	40 (16%)	35 (14%)		**426 (13%)**
Gynaecological	67 (10%)	52 (8%)	62 (10%)	21 (8%)	4 (2%)		14 (6%)	18 (7%)		**238 (7%)**
Haematological	77 (12%)	64 (10%)	64 (10%)	30 (12%)	19 (7%)	20 (8%)	30 (12%)	31 (12%)	35 (39%)	**370 (11%)**
Head & neck	43 (7%)	55 (8%)	60 (9%)	23 (9%)				15 (6%)		**196 (6%)**
Lung	67 (10%)	65 (10%)	63 (10%)	27 (11%)	42 (16%)	31 (12%)	30 (12%)	30 (12%)		**355 (11%)**
Melanoma	50 (8%)	56 (9%)	41 (6%)	31 (12%)	14 (5%)	32 (12%)	33 (13%)	28 (11%)		**285 (9%)**
Solid tumours									28 (31%)	**28 (1%)**
UGI	74 (11%)	63 (10%)	63 (10%)	25 (10%)	19 (7%)	10 (4%)	26 (10%)	26 (10%)		**306 (9%)**
Total	**653**	**650**	**652**	**250**	**259**	**260**	**250**	**250**	**90**	**3,314**
Regional residents	81 (12%)	90 (14%)	160 (25%)	247 (99%)	257 (99%)	259 (100%)	250 (100%)	247 (99%)	25 (28%)	1,616 (49%)

Notes: Percentages are calculated as a percentage of the number of patients within the ICS, allowing for comparison between ICS.

The last row, 'Regional residents', shows the number and percentage of patients with a non–metropolitan Melbourne postcode recorded in their admission.

Appendix 4: Proportion of prospective multidisciplinary team meetings, 2021

Table A4.1: Percentage of patients with documented evidence MDM recommendations whose MDM was prospective, by tumour stream and ICS, 2021

Tumour stream / ICS	NEMICS	SMICS	WCMICS	BSWRICS	GRICS	HRICS	LMICS	GICS	PICS	2020 overall	2020 overall – weighted
Breast	80% (69%, 88%)	46% (35%, 58%)	77% (66%, 86%)	92% (74%, 98%)	94% (80%, 98%)	29% (17%, 44%)	11% (3%, 33%)	20% (9%, 39%)		61% (56%, 66%)	**59% (53%, 65%)**
CNS	54% (36%, 70%)	22% (12%, 38%)	75% (57%, 87%)							47% (37%, 57%)	**48% (38%, 58%)**
Colorectal	74% (63%, 83%)	64% (52%, 75%)	75% (62%, 85%)	82% (59%, 94%)	89% (75%, 96%)	34% (22%, 49%)	58% (36%, 77%)	46% (23%, 71%)		67% (62%, 72%)	**65% (59%, 70%)**
Endocrine/thyroid	90% (60%, 98%)	57% (42%, 71%)	61% (46%, 74%)							62% (52%, 72%)	**64% (54%, 73%)**
Genitourinary	78% (67%, 86%)	86% (74%, 93%)	85% (72%, 93%)	100% (44%, 100%)	100% (57%, 100%)	76% (57%, 89%)	40% (12%, 77%)	50% (22%, 78%)		80% (74%, 85%)	**78% (71%, 83%)**
Gynaecological	98% (92%, 100%)	79% (66%, 88%)	97% (88%, 99%)	100% (51%, 100%)				47% (26%, 69%)		89% (83%, 92%)	**92% (87%, 95%)**
Haematological	66% (53%, 76%)	75% (59%, 86%)	85% (71%, 93%)	100% (68%, 100%)	91% (62%, 98%)	100% (65%, 100%)	88% (66%, 97%)	75% (30%, 95%)		78% (72%, 84%)	**79% (72%, 85%)**
Head & neck	82% (68%, 91%)	67% (54%, 78%)	95% (86%, 98%)	85% (58%, 96%)				100% (80%, 100%)		84% (77%, 88%)	**89% (84%, 93%)**
Lung	93% (84%, 97%)	58% (44%, 71%)	84% (73%, 91%)	88% (64%, 97%)	100% (86%, 100%)	100% (87%, 100%)	96% (79%, 99%)	58% (32%, 81%)		84% (79%, 88%)	**84% (78%, 88%)**
Melanoma	68% (47%, 84%)	74% (59%, 85%)	96% (82%, 99%)	100% (44%, 100%)	100% (44%, 100%)	25% (5%, 70%)		50% (9%, 91%)		75% (66%, 83%)	**73% (62%, 82%)**
UGI	88% (78%, 94%)	10% (4%, 21%)	88% (77%, 94%)	82% (59%, 94%)	100% (70%, 100%)	89% (57%, 98%)	92% (65%, 99%)	86% (65%, 95%)		72% (66%, 77%)	**69% (62%, 75%)**
PICS TS									48% (38%, 59%)	48% (38%, 59%)	**54% (43%, 65%)**
2020 overall	81% (77%, 84%)	58% (54%, 62%)	84% (81%, 87%)	89% (81%, 93%)	94% (88%, 97%)	56% (48%, 64%)	65% (55%, 74%)	57% (48%, 66%)	48% (38%, 59%)	72% (71%, 74%)	
2020 overall – weighted	**78% (73%, 81%)**	**58% (53%, 63%)**	**84% (80%, 88%)**	**93% (86%, 96%)**	**94% (88%, 97%)**	**52% (44%, 60%)**	**45% (33%, 57%)**	**46% (36%, 57%)**	**54% (43%, 65%)**		**71% (69%, 73%)**

Notes: Colours have been used to aid in visual interpretation but do not provide any additional information. The proportion of prospective MDMs was divided in to five levels: 0 to 20 per cent, 20 to 40 per cent, 40 to 60 per cent, 60 to 80 per cent, and 80 to 100 per cent. The white to dark purple colour gradient represents a progression of prospective MDM proportions. White indicates less than 20 per cent prospective MDM. Dark purple indicates greater than 80 per cent of prospective MDM.

All blank cells indicate that no patients were audited.

Results in each cell include a raw estimate (or rescaled estimate for '2021 overall – weighted') and 95 per cent confidence intervals in brackets.

'2021 overall – weighted' results have been rescaled to the population available for sampling to account for the weighted sampling method.

Abbreviations list

Victorian Integrated Cancer Services names in full

Abbreviated name	Integrated Cancer Service name in full
NEMICS	North Eastern Melbourne Integrated Cancer Service
SMICS	Southern Melbourne Integrated Cancer Service
WCMICS	Western and Central Melbourne Integrated Cancer Service
BSWRICS	Barwon South Western Regional Integrated Cancer Service
GRICS	Gippsland Regional Integrated Cancer Service
HRICS	Hume Regional Integrated Cancer Service
LMICS	Loddon Mallee Integrated Cancer Service
GICS	Grampians Integrated Cancer Service
PICS	Paediatric Integrated Cancer Service

Tumour stream names in full

Abbreviated name	Tumour stream name in full
CNS	central nervous system
UGI	upper gastrointestinal

Other abbreviations

Abbreviated name	Name in full
CSPI	cancer services performance indicators
ECOG	Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group
GP	general practitioner
ICS	Integrated Cancer Services
MDM	multidisciplinary meeting
VAED	Victorian Admitted Episodes Dataset
VCR	Victorian Cancer Registry