

CASE STUDY NDIS Advice in Response to Application for a Power Wheelchair with Power Elevating Legrest

Having trouble getting Power Elevating Legrests approved for your clients by the NDIS? Here's a case study that may help you understand why it is being declined.

NDIS Criteria

As per the NDIS Act 2013, all criteria in Section 34 must be met to determine whether a request for supports is considered reasonable and necessary.

Powered Wheelchair

Based on the evidence provided, the request for funding for the power wheelchair with powered features is considered to meet the NDIS reasonable and necessary criteria, except power elevating legrest. You must provide an updated quote without the elevating legrest feature which does not meet Section 34.1 (c) of the NDIS Act 2013 and Rules 7.1 (c(i)) of the NDIS (Supports for Participants) Rules 2013.

Why Doesn't the Power Elevating Legrest Meet the NDIS Reasonable and Necessary Criteria in This Case?

From the information provided, the AT assessor indicates the power leg elevation function is intended to support blood circulation, contracture management and stretching. It is not clear that the provision of the power elevating legrest function to assist with blood circulation, contracture management and stretching (ie. health and wellbeing) is a responsibility of the NDIS, given that the intent is to be used as a therapy tool rather than a specific assistive technology device to assist with the applicant's daily needs. It is prescribed for the applicant as a clinical intervention to stretch muscles and support blood circulation. In this sense it is regarded as a treatment technique or tool therefore not the responsibility of the scheme to fund (Rule 7.5c(i)).

The elevating legrest feature does not meet the NDIS reasonable and necessary criteria and is considered an above standard option. Should the participant's family choose to have the power elevating legrest feature installed, the cost associated with this feature can be self-funded by their family.

Further Explanation/Considerations

It is an expectation that when a therapist considers a mobility aid that it would meet the participant's mobility needs at home/in the community taking into consideration current functional abilities/needs, taking into consideration the intended frequency and duration of use in the intended environments when selecting the most appropriate device. It is expected that the prescribed powered wheelchair would meet all of the participant's mobility needs, at home and in the community for the life expectancy of the assistive technology.



When NDIA provides funding for AT supports based on a therapist's recommendation, NDIA expects that the recommended AT will meet the participant's needs for the serviceable lifetime of this equipment and if funding is required during that time due to foreseeable circumstances, NDIS would not be expected to provide further AT/capital funding for the same purpose (eg. mobility device). In the instance where the prescribed AT does not meet the participant's assessed requirements, NDIS will not be responsible for remediation of this prescription.

Recommendation and Next Steps

- Based on the evidence provided, the request for funding the powered wheelchair with powered features is considered to meet the NDIS reasonable and necessary criteria pending an updated quote without the elevating legrest feature which does not meet Section 34.1(c) of the NDIS Act 2013 and Rules 7.1 (c(i)) of the NDIS (Supports for Participants) Rules 2013.
- 2. Please provide an updated and fully itemised guote without the power elevating legrest.

Need Help with Your NDIS Reporting?

Please contact our friendly, knowledgeable team for assistance. Simply call Customer Service on 07 3265 4663 or email sales@powermobility.com.au with your enquiry.

DISCLAIMER: Please note that this case study is not intended to be, nor should it be relied upon, as any form of advice and or recommendation. Moreover, the case study is provided for educational purposes only and Power Mobility is not liable and/or responsible for any errors or omissions in the content, and or damages, harm and/or loss related to the contents of the case study.