

A
B
I
L
I
T
Y

3 to 1



by SiMaRi

A trending topic for
'Ability 3to1' to address
is:

Understanding the
National Disability
Insurance Scheme, to
(hopefully) improve both
your funding and quality-
of-life outcomes!



Since it became law in 2013, The National Disability Insurance Scheme is Australia's main funding method, to pay for resources to assist eligible individuals with disabilities, from 0 to 65 years of age.

I believe that to achieve the best possible funding outcomes,
an applicant needs to understand the 'nuts and bolts' of
the machine they are working.

In other words, an applicant needs to

understand the core nature of the

National Disability Insurance Scheme (N.D.I.S).

My interpretation and experience of the

N.D.I.S is the following.

The N.D.I.S is a Business model
with a Human Rights intention.

The intention of this funding model was
to uphold, provide and maintain the
needs and Human Rights of eligible
people with disabilities.

This was to be done by funding and
providing 'reasonable and necessary'
supports and resources.

When the N.D.I.S first began, it was estimated that approximately 500,000 out of 4.4 million people in Australia who have disabilities, would be assisted by this new funding method.

However, the Demand for this assistance

has become greater than the Supply.

For the number of individuals with

disabilities in need of funding for

supports, has been underestimated.

Applicants for this funding, now more
than ever, have to 'compete' for this
resource.

I believe that competitors increase their odds of achieving their needed funding, by forming goals for their applications which reflect the core nature of the N.D.I.S.

Goals which plan to reduce the applicant's need to use and request the same level of resources in the future.

Reducing an individual's need for assistance is generally achieved by building up a person's skills and level of capacity to do daily activities.

An individual's goals, which are a part of the funding application, need to demonstrate potential 'value for money'.

This financial investment in the individual, needs to be assessed as being 'a good investment'.

For example, the idea of intervening early
in the treatment and management of
an individual's disability, increases the
likelihood of better outcomes.

Better outcomes reduce the impact of
an individual's disability on being able
to do activities of daily living, such as
personal care, communication, mobility, etc.

Another example is that by providing
equipment and support workers to enable a
young adult with a disability to move out of a
nursing home,

or to remain living in their family home,

or to live in their own rented or mortgaged home,

reduces the need for a
government to fund, provide or
extend government housing
or accommodation facilities.

However, these examples of 'good investments' do not always lead to the funding result or amount requested in an application.

In fact, as made evident by the
increasing number of appeals and
reviews of funding applications,

there is an increasing number of individuals
with significant disabilities, who have had
their funding reduced or even rejected.

Some of the main reasons, according to my interpretation and experience of the N.D.I.S process, are the following.

1. The person who writes the funding application (a Support Coordinator, a Local Area Coordinator, a Plan Coordinator, etc) is not as aware as they need to be of

the preferred language, which needs to focus on
words and phrases which express and refer to
the applicant's goals to grow their ability

for social participation and economic participation

(OR less future dependency on funded resources).

2. The medical specialists and therapists who are providing the assessments and reports to support the funding application are not as aware as they need to be of

the preferred language AND the information
needed to certify that the applicant is a 'good
investment' by

describing the supports needed to build the abilities of the applicant, to potentially reduce their dependency on funded resources in the future.

3. The applicant and/or their support network
(family, friends, advocates, service providers,
etc) are not as aware as they need to be of

aiming for and setting 'good investment goals'

which will still increase the applicant's

quality of life.

For example, if an individual with a disability does not have the ability to be employed in the open labour market,

perhaps with assistance, they can build the skills they need (verbal communication, social communication, literacy and numeracy, sensory, fine motor, gross motor skills, etc)

to develop their own small business,
such as an online business, in the future.

In summary, the N.D.I.S funding is finite,
as taxes and government financial budgets
are not stretching far enough.

Government solutions for sustaining this
funding method are proving to be divisive.

Upholding the Human Rights of eligible
individuals with disabilities
is in conflict with the proposed
business-based solutions.

Let's Brainstorm 3 tasks towards achieving 1 goal, of a sustainable funding scheme:

1. Should people who receive N.D.I.S funding be asset-tested or means-tested?
2. Write YOUR idea in the 'comments' section.
3. Write YOUR idea in the 'comments' section.

